Captions should now be available. Please pardon the delay.

Hi Paula - we don’t plan to write a specific report on this community forum, but will of course reference any outcomes in further communications. See also the Q&A log. If you’d like to stay up to date with BEUDO happenings, please sign up below if you are not already on the list!

camb.ma/beudoupdates

Currently Mayor Siddiqui, Councillors Nolan, Toner and Zondervan are on the call. Some of the councillors had conflicts, and will join later. And all indicated that they look forward to reviewing the report from the meeting.

The date of all documents is recorded along with the draft, thanks!

Yes, a recording is available at [www.cambridgema.gov/beudo](http://www.cambridgema.gov/beudo) live answered

live answered

live answered

The current proposal is for residential buildings to achieve a 50% GHG reduction beginning in 2030 through 2036, a 66.7% reduction (from the baseline) 2037-2043, an 83.4% reduction 2044-2049, and a 100% reduction 2050 onwards. Commercial buildings must make a 20% reduction beginning in 2025, an additional 8% reduction per year through 2034, and then a 100% reduction from 2035 onwards.

If alternative compliance credits or fines are used/issued, the amount will depend based on the volume needed or length of violation. The per-unit responsibility will then vary by building size.

It’s not one time but CDD has to approve each deferral. You could theoretically defer multiple years to the same capital project and then roll up those deferred reductions in the actually produced reductions after the project is completed.

Alternative Compliance Credits would be available to any BEUDO property which meets the requirements of compliance with the ordinance.

It’s not one time but CDD has to approve each deferral. You could theoretically defer multiple years to the same capital project and then roll up those deferred reductions in the actually produced reductions after the project is completed.

The building would have access to all the same compliance mechanisms.

Is the contents of Q&A viewable in the video recording of the meeting? live answered

live answered
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live answered

live answered

live answered

live answered

live answered
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live answered
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any proposals under consideration to lower the threshold of applicability below 50 units for residential buildings (I live in a 48-unit building)?</td>
<td>Currently there is not a specific proposal. However, in the not too distant future, every building, including single family homes will have to become net zero. The entire city will have to be net zero long before 2050 if we are to be environmental leaders.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 2 of the amended ordinance page downloaded from the CDD states: &quot;No new Deferred Credits will be approved by the Department after 2035, nor shall the Department approve Deferred Credits against more than one capital project per building.&quot;</td>
<td>Right; we don’t want them to keep track of multiple simultaneous capital projects that emissions are deferred to. But serial capital projects are allowed, and multiple deferrals against the same project are allowed.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given that this imposes financial hardship on building owners and tenants, shouldn’t the city’s initial focus be on cleaning up its own house (so to speak) by net-zero’ing ALL its own buildings first?</td>
<td>Yes - and the city has been working to reduce emissions from its own buildings, and has reduced our own emissions significantly. We are on track to have our operations be net zero before 2050 - and have a goal of 2035.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the building’s Benchmarking Information be for the entire building or is the building split between the Condominium common areas and individual units with separate Owners? Will energy usage and emissions be measured for individual units and Condominium common area or for the entire building? Will the Trustees of the Condominium be responsible for the replacement of gas-fired equipment in individual units which by the Master Deed is the responsibility of unit owners? Will individual unit owners with less than 25,000 square feet in total be exempt from the ordinance (and excluded from the total building) or will the unit owners with less than 25,000 square feet be included in the entire building with all of the unit owners and Condominium common area being viewed as a Large Non-Residential Covered Building? Do unit owners, Trustees or both gather and maintain records under the ordinance? Does the City assess fines against the unit owners, the Trustees or both?</td>
<td>BEUDO compliance is applied at the parcel level</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have there been any discussions about the impacts to healthcare facilities? Senior living complexes? Nursing homes? Skilled nursing facilities?</td>
<td>The current proposal for residential was in the presentation, which is available. This entire proposal is still under consideration - nothing has been approved yet.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have just announced a change in the schedule for residential retrofit. We have previously been told 33% reduction by 2027, 67% reduction by 2034. Please confirm the new schedule.</td>
<td>You get credit because you have less to reduce now to get to zero.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the case of large single tenant buildings where the tenant is directly responsible for 100% of the utility costs per legal lease agreements, who would be responsible for compliance?</td>
<td>Hi Beth - on the BEUDO website, under the tab of &quot;Who Has to Report&quot;, there is a searchable table of all BEUDO buildings. Additionally, you can see all data reported in the Open Data portal here: <a href="https://data.cambridgema.gov/Energy-and-the-Environment/Cambridge-Building-Energy-and-Water-Use-Data-Disc/72g6-j7aq/data">https://data.cambridgema.gov/Energy-and-the-Environment/Cambridge-Building-Energy-and-Water-Use-Data-Disc/72g6-j7aq/data</a></td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where can we obtain a list of all the buildings to which the ordinance will apply?</td>
<td>This was addressed live by Susanne Rasmussen</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about historical properties which will never get to net zero in preservation properties. There should be some provision for excluding for-profit commercial units in condominiums from the energy totals, since AFAIK condominiums have no control over the energy use of those units. I am a property manager of condominium buildings.</td>
<td>This is addressed in the Ordinance. The owner is ultimately responsible for compliance with any requirements, benchmarking or emissions reductions.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the information presented. The baseline for these buildings would be based on 2018/2019 reporting. What if we took major energy efficiency measures prior to 2018/2019. How can we get &quot;credit&quot; for those past initiatives?</td>
<td>You get credit because you have less to reduce now to get to zero.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the buildings I manage are 100+ year old mass masonry buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Date 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty: If residential is such a small part of the problem, why are we including them at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are there any proposals under consideration to lower the threshold of applicability below 50 units for residential buildings (I live in a 48-unit building)?</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amendment that accelerated the timeline to 2035 included housing over 50 units, now we are hearing that these buildings would revert to the timeline of 2050. Could you clarify this?</td>
<td>I want to confirm - the net zero deadline currently under consideration is 2035 for non residential, and 2050 for residential</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about lab buildings? Will you consider an exception on the timeline for life sciences given the unique challenges they face reaching net zero.</td>
<td>I’m not in favor of that; the technology and capabilities exist for these buildings to comply.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When will smaller buildings (e.g. single family homes) be brought in?</td>
<td>There are other policies in the Net Zero Action Plan being considered for single family homes including time of sale energy efficiency requirements.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again: WHERE CAN WE OBTAIN A LIST OF ALL BUILDINGS TO WHICH THE ORDINANCE WILL APPLY?</td>
<td>We have studied pathways to electrifying a variety of building types, and are in the process of finalizing the results. Keep in mind that a variety of compliance pathways are available for residential buildings and the requirements will be phased in over time.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our healthcare facilities (Mount Auburn Hospital, CHA, Santa Maria Nursing Home and Spaulding etc.) will all face tremendous barriers in meeting these BEUDO requirements. Is the City expecting these facilities to reduce occupancy in order to upgrade and retrofit? This could cause a huge issue for the entire community.</td>
<td>We are working on a plan to provide a 100% renewable energy electricity option for Cambridge entities.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent cities and towns, as well as the Commonwealth have different compliance dates. Won’t this penalize Cambridge business and drive exiting business to those communities?</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why not freeze (sunset ordinance) if green energy is not available. Also why pay a differential. If offsets work why collect money. Lastly why make folks pay penalties who are making capital investments. total disincentive to invest. these are our same concerns. These are very straightforward</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you agree with that condos emit less GHG (per unit) than single family home, could you consider excluding residential buildings from the BEUDO building ordinance and treats condos when you make policies to the plan you handle single family buildings?</td>
<td>Yes, that is a reasonable approach that will be discussed and considered by the Ordinance Committee.</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is compliance money collected by the City at $234 per ton going to be used by the City only for directly reducing emissions in Cambridge? And how does it make sense to pay $234 per ton to the City when an owner could reduce 10x more emissions outside of the city therefore having greater climate impact?

The city's own data shows that all residential properties contribute 20% of the City's greenhouse gas production, but covered BEUDO residential properties only 5% (and condominiums only 1.1%). Using the City's 2016 Housing Profile data, we can see that BEUDO residential buildings represent 39% of the city's dwelling units but produce only 25% of the residential greenhouse gases. On the other hand, non-BEUDO residential buildings produce 75% of the residential greenhouse gases but represent 61% of the dwelling units, supporting the notion that larger, more dense buildings are more carbon sparing than smaller ones.

The inherent efficiency of large residential buildings is further confirmed by the fact that when looking at BEUDO's reported multifamily emission data, those buildings generally have lower than average per household and per capita annual CO2e emissions. My understanding is that if the cost of fully offsetting emissions is less than the $234 penalty, the owner would have to pay the difference.

Asako Severn & Quinton: why not just make it apply to everyone fairly instead of singling 50+ unit buildings out?

BERDO hasn't really been implemented in the form of a tax

And think about how individual homeowners and tenants without the wealth to manage these increased costs might get some help to do so. ie put on your Environmental Justice hats when thinking about this.

Quinton that is just a rationalization. The same data input we have to do could actually be done FAR more easily by a single family homeowner! And I said back in 2014 or so that it wasn't fair to single us out.

Quinton yes - efficiency matters. Which is why we're focused on non residential at first. Eventually all buildings in the city will have to be fossil fuel free. the climate crisis demands it. The only question is when.

Why would Cambridge require building owners to pay penalties to the City after fully negating building emissions through the ordinance's various mechanisms?

We would not. Can you elaborate? There are no penalties in the ordinance other than for non-compliance.

Could someone explain clearly what goes into the net calculation? Sometimes is it unclear if we are discussing zero emissions or net zero emissions.

It's net zero emissions over the course of one year. So for example if you building produces lots of solar electricity in the summer, that gets subtracted from grid electricity consumption in the winter. The result should be zero or less.

I second the consideration that residential properties be dropped from this current ordinance. BERDO residential buildings (based on the city's data) make up 5% of the city's total emissions and the rest of housing is 15%. Furthermore BERDO residential buildings represent only 39% of the city's housing units and 25% of the residential emissions. Other housing represents 61% of the housing units and make up 75% of the residential emissions. You are squeezing the wrong lemon.

$234 is not a penalty but a compliance mechanism. If you are buying offsets that cost less than $234 then they are likely not high quality emissions removal offsets. $234 is the cost of removing emissions from a local building and that price point has to be maintained to ensure there is an incentive to actually remove the emissions instead of paying the offset.

If the emission pollution is reduced for less than $234/ton, no additional payment. If the emission pollution is offset by a non local credit that is less than $234 then the difference needs to be paid - since local pollution needs to be offset locally.

My understanding is that if the cost of fully offsetting emissions is less than the $234 penalty, the owner would have to pay the difference.

They're not being singled out; 50+ buildings are subject to the ordinance now. It's not feasible to monitor individual smaller buildings' emissions, but exempting 50+ unit buildings from the reduction requirements is a reasonable approach that will be discussed and considered by the Ordinance Committee.

BERDO is not a tax either.

Yes single family home owners can do the analysis (I'm doing it for my home) but CDD cannot manage that volume of buildings in terms of compliance. I agree with you that it isn't fair, but we are not singling you out, it's just an artifact of the existing ordinance being amended right now.

In the case where tenants are responsible for maintaining their own space and mechanical equipment per legal lease agreements, can you clarify if the responsibility to reach net zero by 2035 falls solely on the owner?

The parcel owner is ultimately responsible for compliance with the ordinance.
Some European countries like the Netherlands make it a priority to make this a common project and emphasize that “we are all in this together.” By focusing on fewer than half of households, requiring painful sacrifice of them and not of the majority of households, Cambridge is sending the opposite message. Why is it O.K. to make a building with 50 units pay for credits for work not done, while a building with 49 units pays nothing for work not done?

Inputting all the data is an extra burden imposed on us you all said it was easy to make us comply because we had the management staffing to do it, but in fact we have to pay for that service.

We are not singling you out...it’s just that we did before. Come on. That’s a tautology

Doesn’t the legality of the Alternative Compliance Credits, hinge on timeline due to its impact on feasibility?

Meaning BERDO doesn’t have a tax (because there are more ways to achieve 2050), while the BEUDO proposal might

That is not correct. Property owners can choose to combine multiple buildings into a “campus” but buildings under 25,000 are not subject to the ordinance if they are on separate parcels. Buildings under 25,000sf on a single parcel with aggregate square footage over 25,000 are subject.

A review of the prosed ordinance leaves one to believe that if a commercial property owner owns multiple properties (none of which are 25,000SF or more) but cumulatively are over 25,000SF they will be subject to the ordinance. Please provide clarity.

Doesn’t a 2018-19 baseline reward building owners who haven’t been implementing incremental efficiency measures over a number of years? Many of us started taking all of the reasonable and available measures over the course of time so our 2018-19 baseline would be much cleaner than others’. And the feasibility of further measurements for those of us who have been conscientious is either financially, technologically, or practically much more challenging.

Listening to this discussion I feel more and more strongly that the same rules should not apply to residential buildings as to nonresidential buildings.

To Marilee’s question, I appreciate the comment but aren’t condo owners going to be on the 2050 timeline, more than 20 years away?

yes - all residential are on a 2050 timeline. And the city is aware that many residents will need financial support to meet the goals. We are committed to making sure the solution is equitable

Have there been any discussions about the impact to hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, senior independent living residences (i.e., reduced/relocated room capacity at health care facilities)?

Healthcare facilities have not been separated out, and would have the same range of compliance options as other building types to align with their operational needs.

How will this work for biz condo building where individual owners are under 25k sq ft but the collective building is over. Will individual owners be responsible for common areas and others that are out of compliance?

I think my question was skipped: In the case where tenants are responsible for maintaining their own space and mechanical equipment per legal lease agreements, can you clarify if the responsibility to reach net zero by 2035 falls solely on the owner?

I have seen repeated assertions that starting from a better baseline pays for itself because you have less work to do to achieve net zero. But since each building must reduce relative to its own individual baseline, “dirtier” buildings can more easily make the required percentage reductions, plus they are not paying for recent capital expenditures to improve energy efficiency.

More than half the properties in the City are non compliant to the zoning ordinance. Many properties are considered historic or in historic or conservation districts. Those are the local regulations I am asking about. We are on a “2050” timeline but must cut by 50% in the not too distant future AND the cutting by 50% is not possible without retrofitting...we can’t just retrofit half. There’s no way to do that. We have one central boiler / heat plant for 66 units.

Eventually, yes, but that’s true anyway, regardless of this ordinance. Equipment has to be replaced, and emissions have to be eliminated eventually anyway. But since you have a lower baseline it will be easier to get the required reductions from other means and defer the equipment upgrade; for example through 100% renewable energy provided through the CCE.

Quentin, to your statement “All those reductions count because you don’t have to make them again.” this is not true for buildings like mine who only a couple of years ago replaced our entire heating and AC systems after consultation with MassSave and would now have to replace it all over again.
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It’s not about lights & so forth it’s about heating.

Yes, this is an important point I forgot to make. The only way to “cut by half” is to buy credits. (which I find to be a questionable practice.)

Will the offset cost increase over time?

That is possible yes, but it is based on cost of removing emissions, so those costs could also come down over time.

How is the Alternative Compliance Credit an “offset” if it doesn’t actually remove emissions/offset?

Because the money would be spent to remove emissions.

So by 2030 either we need to have raised some six figure number =or= we start levying additional fees to buy the multiple $234 credits.

Either way in the next year or two we will have to start levying revenue from the owners to create a capital reserve to be able to eventually do this. My last back of the envelope calculation

Your answer the guy suggests who did energy work before the base year suggests to me that you think the rest will be easy when in fact that will be the hardest to get done. I know you think the technology is just around the corner but you have been saying that for a decade.

Patty it’s not electricity its fuel/gas for most of the older buildings. The high cost will be the high cost of converting to electricity for heating. That’s the only tech that is currently truly available for large multi unit

The fact that you are starting from a lower baseline thus have less effort to make to get to net zero does not take into account the actual “wasted” expenditure, perhaps $200K or $300K, that goes by the wayside.

Electric heat pumps & mini splits will not work in older multi unit residential buildings. The tech isn’t there according to the NRDC

How do you know that buildings cause more emissions than cars in Cambridge? Where are those numbers published?

The information referenced can be found in our Community Emissions reports, found here:

Is the GHG analysis publicly available?

The information referenced can be found in our Community Emissions reports, found here:

What methodology is used to determine GHG emissions and are you certain you are accurate? If so please explain. What is the break down in ghg emissions between Residential, Small Commercial, and Large Commercial?

The methodology follows the Global Protocol for Community-Scale Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventories. More information on the report can be found here:

I read that 80% of GHG are from 6% of the buildings. condos off gas less than single family and multi family because they share infrastructure. is that right?

I agree that the newest buildings have far less emissions, which gives hope that the existing buildings can lower their emissions.

What percentage of Cambridge emissions come from biotech in Kendall Square?

BEUDO residential buildings make up 1/4 of the emissions of the entire City (5%); non-BEUDO residential buildings make up 15% but are not covered by the ordinance
What are the comparative contributions to emissions by different sizes of residential buildings based on number of units/households?

I agree with comments emphasizing the hardship for residential buildings compared to non-residential (who can deduct or depreciate costs or pass them on), Even the delay of reaching net zero is insufficient and partially illusory when the first step is a 50% reduction in 2030. How does the contribution of residential BEUDO buildings compare to other sectors such as transportation?

Transportation is responsible for about 10% of citywide GHG emissions. Residential BEUDO buildings are responsible for about 7% of citywide GHG emissions.

A parcel is also referred to as a ‘map lot’, these are lines drawn around property boundaries often for tax and assessing purposes. A parcel of land can contain no buildings, one building, or multiple buildings.

Our building was not invited and no condo buildings I’m aware of were aware of this. I checked with the management company that does our reporting. They said they need to pay them to do this. Considering that young people have the most at stake when it comes to climate change, why are only property owners considered “stakeholders” in this conversation? Shouldn’t we reframe our language to be more inclusive?

All residents, including young people are stakeholders. We can make that clear. The only people affected by needing to take action based on BEUDO are property owners, by definition. If that wasn’t clear, apologies.

I am surprised that this process and multiple meetings have been happening when the BEUDO buildings (mine) have not been informed. Those were meetings held by a subgroup of owners - to review how to structure amendments so BEUDO could be effective. The council was not involved. Now we are committed to having a more open inclusive process moving forward - and together get to real reductions in our emission pollution.

As I understand it 40 meetings were held before this first briefing, is that correct and if so why was that? When will the City provide detailed and specific responses to the heavily researched and good faith amendments proposed by the Chamber Business Group? I am surprised that this process and multiple meetings have been happening when the BEUDO buildings (mine) have not been informed. Has the Executive Office of the City, the City Manager’s office and particularly the new City Manager who just started in the job in the past week weighed in on these amendments? What feedback on the feasibility/achievability of this timeline have you gotten from large commercial property owners you have been working with? When was the invitation sent to property manager/owners sent? When did those invitations stop? Of the property owners you reached out to who was at the table in 2021? No one in my district (Central Square) was notified and several have no idea they are supposed to submit. Can you provide a list of property owners you have been working with? Considering that young people have the most at stake when it comes to climate change, why are only property owners considered “stakeholders” in this conversation? Shouldn’t we reframe our language to be more inclusive?

All residents, including young people are stakeholders. We can make that clear. The only people affected by needing to take action based on BEUDO are property owners, by definition. If that wasn’t clear, apologies.

As I understand it 40 meetings were held before this first briefing, is that correct and if so why was that? When will the City provide detailed and specific responses to the heavily researched and good faith amendments proposed by the Chamber Business Group? I am surprised that this process and multiple meetings have been happening when the BEUDO buildings (mine) have not been informed. Those were meetings held by a subgroup of owners - to review how to structure amendments so BEUDO could be effective. The council was not involved. Now we are committed to having a more open inclusive process moving forward - and together get to real reductions in our emission pollution.

As I understand it 40 meetings were held before this first briefing, is that correct and if so why was that? When will the City provide detailed and specific responses to the heavily researched and good faith amendments proposed by the Chamber Business Group? I am surprised that this process and multiple meetings have been happening when the BEUDO buildings (mine) have not been informed. Those were meetings held by a subgroup of owners - to review how to structure amendments so BEUDO could be effective. The council was not involved. Now we are committed to having a more open inclusive process moving forward - and together get to real reductions in our emission pollution.
contacting management companies don’t get to the trustees who run the building. If 1100 buildings need
converting why weren’t we at the table? Who is paying? How do we keep up with capital projects while
funding this as well? Next eggs will be lost.

The city should realize that unless condo management companies are paid to attend meetings, they will not.
Inviting the property manager of a condo without informing the board of trustees that they should attend,
insures they will not attend. You had an obligation to notify trustees, who have the fiduciary responsibility for
their buildings. Not management companies. As a result, condo buildings have been eliminated from the
early conceptual development of this policy. Our issues have not been heard.

Has Eversource looked or provided input on the new amendments?

Has Eversource looked or provided input on the new amendments?

Eversource has been part of the amendment discussion process and has not provided specific comments on the
current version.

Where is Eversource tonight? Why are they not participating in this discussion appering right now?

Eversource has been part of the amendment discussion process and has not provided specific comments on the
current version.

What is your plan for financial support as was available in Ithaca?

Has Eversource provided information on what this will do to electricity rates in Cambridge?

Can the City of Cambridge provide funding like Ithaca has to assist the incredibly high costs of retro-fitting
buildings? Can the city of Cambridge pull together a sustainability team to assist owners to put a price and
capital plan together to assist? Where is Eversource in this conversation?

Is there Federal or state funding? Is there displacement during conversion to electric? We don’t have enough
electricity coming into our building as it is. Who pays for conversion?

What cost did you decide it was fair to ask each household to pay for retrofits? What allowance do you plan to
make for households that would have to pay considerably more? Has any work been done to estimate the
total expected cost of this plan to individual buildings of certain sizes and age?

What is your plan for financial support as was available in Ithaca? Eversource is NOT ON BOARD

As is evidenced by tonight’s discussion, the topic of these amendments is hugely complex. How do we
ensure that all nine policymakers (City Councillors) are informed of the full breadth of impacts on all sectors
of the Cambridge community?

Please be sure to notify BEUDO covered residential OWNERS when Cambridge has finalized
incentives/subsidies for retrofits, PARTICULARLY for large scale electric boilers and large scale on demand
water heaters, and for upgrading a buildings electrical infrastructure to power them. Also, inform OWNERS
when EV charging station subsidies become available. Budget planning needs to happen well in advance in
order to acculate funds to renovate, so let us plan ASAP.

All councillors are following discussions. There will be additional ordinance meetings for the whole council where all
amendments will be reviewed.

My question is regarding the restaurant community. Landlords will be forced to fast track a transition to
electrical sourced HVAC systems moving entirely away from gas.

The result will be that restaurants will be forced to replace the majority of their equipment which is
currently gas fired, resulting in a great expense to the tenant. This could be the final nail in the coffin for
many. This community needs more time to prepare!

Can the City of Cambridge provide funding like Ithaca has to assist the incredibly high costs of retro-fitting
buildings? Can the city of Cambridge put together a sustainability team to assist owners to put a price and
capital plan together to assist? Where is Eversource in this conversation?

Ithaca is not providing funding; BlocPower is through privately financed loans. Yes, we are pursuing similar programs.

Recent state and federal climate bills will provide significant funding for clean energy retrofits, and additional resources are
expected between today and 2030.

There is no single cost for compliance. The multiple compliance mechanism options and gradual timeline provide
owners with flexibility.

There is no single cost for compliance. The multiple compliance mechanism options and gradual timeline provide
owners with flexibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contacting management companies don’t get to the trustees who run the building. If 1100 buildings need converting why weren’t we at the table? Who is paying? How do we keep up with capital projects while funding this as well? Next eggs will be lost.</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The city should realize that unless condo management companies are paid to attend meetings, they will not. Inviting the property manager of a condo without informing the board of trustees that they should attend, insures they will not attend. You had an obligation to notify trustees, who have the fiduciary responsibility for their buildings. Not management companies. As a result, condo buildings have been eliminated from the early conceptual development of this policy. Our issues have not been heard.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment Sharon, and again the City and Council apologize for inconsistent outreach to BEUDO owners such as condo tenants. We have set up a form where anyone can add their name to a list to be contacted re: BEUDO: camb.ma/beudoupdates</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Eversource looked or provided input on the new amendments?</td>
<td>Eversource has been part of the amendment discussion process and has not provided specific comments on the current version.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is Eversource tonight? Why are they not participating in this discussion appearing right now?</td>
<td>Eversource has been part of the amendment discussion process and has not provided specific comments on the current version.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your plan for financial support as was available in Ithaca? Eversource is NOT ON BOARD</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As is evidenced by tonight’s discussion, the topic of these amendments is hugely complex. How do we ensure that all nine policymakers (City Councillors) are informed of the full breadth of impacts on all sectors of the Cambridge community?</td>
<td>All councillors are following discussions. There will be additional ordinance meetings for the whole council where all amendments will be reviewed.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please contact trustees of 50+ buildings. This is a potential hardship to condo owners who are upgrading their individual units while dealing with massive assessments for capital projects in an old building.</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, if any, financial support will be available from the city for organizations to carry out the required retrofits? Ithaca has been mentioned several times as an example. Is Cambridge prepared to offer similar financial support as was available in Ithaca?</td>
<td>Ithaca is not providing funding; BlocPower is through privately financed loans. Yes, we are pursuing similar programs. Recent state and federal climate bills will provide significant funding for clean energy retrofits, and additional resources are expected between today and 2030.</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My question is regarding the restaurant community. Landlords will be forced to fast track a transition to electrical sourced HVAC systems moving entirely away from gas. The result will be that restaurants will be forced to replace the majority of their equipment which is currently gas fired, resulting in a great expense to the tenant. This could be the final nail in the coffin for many. This community needs more time to prepare!</td>
<td>Recent state and federal climate bills will provide significant funding for clean energy retrofits, and additional resources are expected between today and 2030.</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the City of Cambridge provide funding like Ithaca has to assist the incredibly high costs of retro-fitting buildings? Can the city of Cambridge put together a sustainability team to assist owners to put a price and capital plan together to assist? Where is Eversource in this conversation?</td>
<td>Ithaca is not providing funding; BlocPower is through privately financed loans. Yes, we are pursuing similar programs. Recent state and federal climate bills will provide significant funding for clean energy retrofits, and additional resources are expected between today and 2030.</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there Federal or state funding? Is there displacement during conversion to electric? We don’t have enough electricity coming into our building as it is. Who pays for conversion?</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Eversource provided information on what this will do to electricity rates in Cambridge?</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What cost did you decide it was fair to ask each household to pay for retrofits? What allowance do you plan to make for households that would have to pay considerably more? Has any work been done to estimate the total expected cost of this plan to individual buildings of certain sizes and age?</td>
<td>There is no single cost for compliance. The multiple compliance mechanism options and gradual timeline provide owners with flexibility.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, if any, financial support will be available from the city for organizations to carry out the required retrofits? Ithaca has been mentioned several times as an example. Is Cambridge prepared to offer similar financial support as was available in Ithaca?</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone met with housing experts to analyze the potential financial impact this would have and how much could it cost individual owners? What would the fines be for noncompliance annually and what would individual condo owners expect to see as an assessment for retrofitting their building?</td>
<td>live answered</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, if any, financial support will be available from the city for organizations to carry out the required retrofits? Ithaca has been mentioned several times as an example. Is Cambridge prepared to offer similar financial support as was available in Ithaca?</td>
<td>The City of Cambridge (and further, the state and federal government) certainly plan to offer incentives to building owners throughout this process. The language of the ordinance contains references to penalties as a matter of legality, whereas the incentives are not litigious in nature and are also bound to evolve and change over time.</td>
<td>Question Finance</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:26 9/15/2022 19:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is the City of Cambridge choosing penalties over incentives to reach these shared climate goals?</td>
<td>the mandate is to use that money to reduce local emissions - it will not be available for any other purpose.</td>
<td>Question Finance</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:32 9/15/2022 19:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will Cambridge do with the $234/tonne money it receives?</td>
<td>It's some six figure number to convert old multi unit boilers and distribution systems that were built over 100 years ago from gas or oil to electricity</td>
<td>Comment Finance</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:12 9/15/2022 20:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the city reduce the 40% higher cost of its municipal &quot;green premium&quot; program relative to the standard plan?</td>
<td>we're working on that. I will note that even the 100% renewable option in the aggregation is currently lower than Eversource standard.</td>
<td>Question Finance</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:20 9/15/2022 20:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Compliance Credits in Cambridge have the potential to yield a significant amount of revenue annually, which could and should be leveraged to further Cambridge’s decarbonization efforts. How will this revenue be governed and disbursed, it is very important to clarify and share with transparency to the public.</td>
<td>It would be reported in the annual budget and at city council meetings as with all other city expenditures.</td>
<td>Question Finance</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:21 9/15/2022 20:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why has this ordinance changed since the last ordinance hearing and can the new language be made clearer?</td>
<td>Alternative compliance payments are required when offsets are not local, yet there are no verifiable local offset mechanisms. That doesn't make sense and seems illegal. How will the money be used?</td>
<td>live answered Question Finance</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:12 9/15/2022 20:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the city reduce the 40% higher cost of its municipal &quot;green premium&quot; program relative to the standard plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Finance</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live answered Question General</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment Comment General</td>
<td>9/15/2022 18:43 9/15/2022 18:52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why has the ordinance changed since the last ordinance hearing and can the new language be made clearer?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question General</td>
<td>9/15/2022 18:56 9/15/2022 19:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an owner and the initiative sounds like “social responsibility” it is also (leads to very expensive changes and will force the elderly and others on fixed income out of the city.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments Comment General</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:14 9/15/2022 19:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does the city plan to do, and when, to make the cost and burden of achieving net zero emissions shared equitably by all Cambridge residents?</td>
<td>For the full Net Zero Action plan for all buildings in Cambridge, see <a href="http://www.cambridgema.gov/netzero">www.cambridgema.gov/netzero</a></td>
<td>Question General</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which, if any cities have implemented the Net Zero plan already?</td>
<td>Hi Lawrence - there is no one plan that any city follows, they are all city-specific. There are many cities that have adopted Building Performance Standards (BPS) along with their climate action plans - those include Boston, New York, Washington DC, Denver, St Louis, and many others.</td>
<td>Question General</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:39 9/15/2022 19:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not able to stay the whole meeting but would like to voice my support for BEUDO and Green New Deal.</td>
<td>I am not able to stay the whole meeting but would like to voice my support for BEUDO and Green New Deal.</td>
<td>Comment Finance</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:44 9/15/2022 20:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a question, but I’m an MIT student and I wanted to voice my support for the BEUDO amendments. Given the much higher impact of commercial buildings in Cambridge (particularly the disproportionate impact of campus buildings like MIT’s), the language of the amendments really resonate with the social responsibility an institution like MIT or Harvard should hold. The possibility of private financing and new financial assistance programs, like in the IRA, also make this very feasible, especially for small businesses and residential buildings. Thank you for advancing this work!</td>
<td>Not a question, but I’m an MIT student and I wanted to voice my support for the BEUDO amendments. Given the much higher impact of commercial buildings in Cambridge (particularly the disproportionate impact of campus buildings like MIT’s), the language of the amendments really resonate with the social responsibility an institution like MIT or Harvard should hold. The possibility of private financing and new financial assistance programs, like in the IRA, also make this very feasible, especially for small businesses and residential buildings. Thank you for advancing this work!</td>
<td>Comment General</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:26 9/15/2022 19:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi, not a question but I am a climate and energy researcher and would like to voice my strong support for the Cambridge Green New Deal, including BEUDO, especially with the longer timeline for housing. In order for the people living in Cambridge and all over the world to be able to live in their homes - single family, condo, or otherwise - without constant fear of extreme heat, flooding, stronger storms than we are prepared to handle, or drought, we need to reduce emissions as soon as physically possible.</td>
<td>Hi, not a question but I am a climate and energy researcher and would like to voice my strong support for the Cambridge Green New Deal, including BEUDO, especially with the longer timeline for housing. In order for the people living in Cambridge and all over the world to be able to live in their homes - single family, condo, or otherwise - without constant fear of extreme heat, flooding, stronger storms than we are prepared to handle, or drought, we need to reduce emissions as soon as physically possible.</td>
<td>Comment General</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yet, many of the most vocal against climate change buys SUV’s and don’t even to really care about Climate
change.

Students are not paying the price, easy for them tho advocate

Will the student advocates be paying part of the $5 million to retrofit the buildings? Point is, it is easy to ask
for a quick passage of this policy when you are not forced to deplete your life savings to pay for it.

What is Boston’s timeline?

Lots still to learn and evidently lots still to figure out but thank you very much for this evening.

Thank you to the councilors who are supporting this proposal. Seeing elected officials take seriously the
threat of the climate crisis and put forward concrete proposals to put decarbonization into practice gives me
hope for a survivable future.

Has the city studied grid overloads in other areas of the country? What may Cambridge expect?

How much increase is expected in electrification, and can our current infrastructure absorb it?

Where is the utility (Eversource) in all of this? Are they on board? Can the grid handle the program?

Does the state electricity grid affect Cambridge’s ability to deliver the energy? How does that work? (Thank
you)

Has Eversource been involved in these discussions and are they able to commit to providing the clean energy
and infrastructure to meet the 2035 goal?

Has anyone analyzed the impact on grid demand when Cambridge will peak in the winter?

Please address the Eversource questions transparently. Exactly what is their position on achievability of
2035?

Understood. Eversource is NOT on board.

Eversource is at 2050. Have they told the City that 2035 is doable?

Has the City lined up the forecasted availability of green electricity with the BEUDO ordinance timeline? To
convert buildings to electricity without the production being green seems to run counter to the goals.

Have you considered the impact on the grid of increased demand for electricity as building move away from
fossil fuels, and how that additional electricity is going to be generated?

There’s an ongoing project in Kendall square to relocate an Eversource substation to the current location of
the blue parking garage. How does that play into BEUDO if at all?

Does city buildings buy electricity from the city aggregation program

What is the Council’s response to the City Solicitors memo wherein she though the CDD version of this
ordinance was likely not compliant with state law?

What analysis has been done of local regulatory barriers that limit property owners from mankind
investments in their properties?

The City Solicitor has indicated that the penalties are an illegal tax. Why are we pursuing penalties?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Technical support</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would it not be prudent to get a definitive legal opinion on the legality of these penalties before spending more time and money on this initiative? and not depend on &quot;Boston did it&quot;?</td>
<td>Would it not be prudent to get a definitive legal opinion on the legality of these penalties before spending more time and money on this initiative? and not depend on &quot;Boston did it&quot;?</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff: I will be sharing this with the Council members:</td>
<td>Staff: I will be sharing this with the Council members:</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:55 9/15/2022 20:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the retrofit advisor be able to sit down with me? Look at my energy usage reporting and help me understand how far away we are from zero. I'm not sure I'm educated enough to truly understand enough to explain to my clients? Looking for some hand holding I guess.</td>
<td>We have done some outreach and understand the barriers are knowledge, financial and technical help. The city has been working to address those barriers.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:17 9/15/2022 19:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What barriers, technical, regulatory, and financial have you identified that have limited building owners to date from making improvements? Where are those barriers documented? What solutions, beyond state and federal technical assistance, have you identified to address specific identified barriers?</td>
<td>We have done some outreach and understand the barriers are knowledge, financial and technical help. The city has been working to address those barriers.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:39 9/15/2022 19:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the retrofit concierge program helped any buildings figure out a path forward yet? If yes, could the city publish stories of how those buildings are proceeding and what their costs are?</td>
<td>This is a good question Lee - We are working directly with Eversource to publish case studies regarding large projects with incentives covering 90% and upwards of the costs for retrofits in residential and commercial buildings. We're excited to share them with the community once they are produced!</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:39 9/15/2022 19:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd like to share an additional, more recent report than the NRDC one shared above on heat pumps, specifically for water heating, in this case. For multifamily:</td>
<td>Thank you Kathy</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>9/15/2022 19:55 9/15/2022 20:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And, provide a local retrofit success story we can learn from:</td>
<td>And, provide a local retrofit success story we can learn from:</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not understanding why many folks participating in the meeting seem to be having difficulty understanding that electricity from renewable sources reduces emissions, therefore likely reducing the need to pay any sort of fee to be compliant. Could there perhaps be a clear explanation of this somewhere on a city website page talking about BEUDO?</td>
<td>I'm not understanding why many folks participating in the meeting seem to be having difficulty understanding that electricity from renewable sources reduces emissions, therefore likely reducing the need to pay any sort of fee to be compliant. Could there perhaps be a clear explanation of this somewhere on a city website page talking about BEUDO?</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd like to share an additional, more recent report than the NRDC one shared above on heat pumps, specifically for water heating, in this case. For multifamily:</td>
<td>I'd like to share an additional, more recent report than the NRDC one shared above on heat pumps, specifically for water heating, in this case. For multifamily:</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>9/15/2022 20:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>