

Climate Protection Action Committee

Minutes

October 10, 2019

City Hall Annex, 2nd Floor Meet Room

Attendees: Melissa Chan (chair), Steven Nutter (vice chair), Peter Crawley, Keith Giamportone, Trisha Montalbo, Jerrad Pierce, Keren Schlomy, Julie Wormser; *staff:* Susanne Ramussen, Bronwyn Cooke, Seth Federspiel

6:15 Director's Report

BEUDO retrofit program

- Kick-off October 25th in Tech Square

Revolving Loan fund

- adder revenue from aggregation to be reinvested into solar generation
- creates a RE ordinance to set up the fund
- funds can't be spent on private betterments
- funds must be spent within the year, to benefit those who have paid into it
- once solar projects are tapped out, move on to other emissions reductions (but would need amending to do that) ordinance language specifies renewable energy generation
- \$1.25 million over the 2 years expected

City Directed to investigate authority to ban of new gas infrastructure

6:20 NZAP Progress Report

- Looking for committee members for reviewing written report, provide comments to Seth, and a letter/cover letter for the report to go to the City Manager
- Report is coming early, to be able to better plan for FY21 budget cycle, also to be incorporated into the 5 year review process
- Sub-committee to review over October and bring letter for full committee review at November meeting
- Qualitative review of all actions, some quantitative actions, big picture quantitative outcomes (not many, other than BEUDO). Quantitative tracking is a priority of the 5 year review.
- Progress in report is as of October (but not much time has past since last report, so won't see much time here)
- Finished year 4, we're in year 5 of the 25 year NZAP
- Getting into implementation of some programs, and policy adoption of some aspects that started as research projects
- Actions that need some kind of legislative action are highlighted/summarized
 - These are things that need to happen to achieve the NZAP

Actions

Custom retrofit program - See slides for details

- Q: what exactly does the Energy retrofit advisor do? A: provide information and support for piecing incentives/programs together. Accessing the programs is challenging, e.g. commercial meter for whole building puts a building in the commercial program, versus in unit elements that would put a building in residential program
- Q: what's the key barrier? A: reaching building owners/marketing the program. Complexity of our buildings, not well served by the MassSave standard programs

BEUDO requirements – see slides for details

- Q: is 20% reduction on top of RPS? A: no, they get some credit for whats happening on grid, acts as incentive to electrify
- Q: are other cities allowing RECs? A: NYC is different, sets a rate for each building type (rather than over a building's own baseline).
- Q: different building typologies might have a different pathways to achieve requirement? A: yes, like a lab. Might have to achieve the 10 years target, longer window in which to achieve
- Q: is there a percent expected to be achieved by EE as opposed to RE and RECS? A: no, thought about it a lot, but stakeholder feedback was that if GHG reductions is the goal, then unit of measurement should be GHGs, but we'd set criteria for what RE counts, such that it would still incentivize achieving the reductions though EE on site.
Follow up comment: keep tracking both units, EUI and GHG emissions, make sure we're still driving efficiency in our buildings

Upgrades at time of renovation or sale (for smaller buildings not covered by BEUDO requirements) – see slides for detail

- Q: Can this be linked to resilience upgrade? A: Yes, would be great for CPAC to reiterate that
- Comment: concern about dissuading landlords from maintaining rental properties

Market based incentive programs – see slides for details

Density Bonus – see slides for details

- Q: who was supporting the project? A: through zero cities, working with Arch. 2030 and New Buildings Inst.
- Q: did we look at land/building value? A: yes, envision looked at this and determined a 10-15% density bonus would make it attractive to a developer
- Comment: start density bonus from the projected flood heights.
*questions/discussion about whether this a bonus, or an adjustment, and what

the value is. How to measure/where to start measuring the height bonus. How it's done for a building in the flood zone, versus not in the flood zone. *general feedback to coordinate NZAP and Resiliency actions

Amendments to Green Building Requirements – see slides for details

- Q: Is the stretch code following this? A: No, still 2015 based. Base code is increasing Jan. 1. Stretch code is not. A few key amendments, can't trade window to wall ratio. Stakeholders have asked for state to start thinking about a net zero building code.
- Q: how can we do green building requirements if we don't have control over building code? A: we can set performance standards, we can't specify how they meet the performance standard.

*Melissa noted time, presentation was sped up and questions were held, and it was recommended that anyone with detailed questions be involved in the sub-committee for detailed review.

Renewal of Municipal Building

LCESS

Rooftop solar installation requirement

Develop MOU with utilities

Local Carbon Fund

- Q: is this something that could help fund the split incentive issue? A: yes, that's the principle. A local fund could help ensure achieving the net zero.
- Q: anti-aid amendment issue? A: no, would be a third party, and a voluntary option to meet emissions reduction requirements.

Communications Strategy

5 year review

Net Zero Labs Standards

*Jerrad, Peter, Keith, Julie - volunteered to be part of the sub-committee. Seth will schedule with them to get review process underway.

7:45 Consumption & GHG emissions

What do we consider consumption? Up to the committee to decide

Presentation was mostly related to materials.

Is the scope covering what we want it to cover, is it a complete set of objectives?

May need to subtract objectives. It seems researchy, just focus on waste generated by students, get a more circular economy, get things to be re-used. Less state and federal advocacy.

Rather than pursuing the complexity of studying GHG inventories...just rely in existing scientific literature, committee can work with conclusions about top 25 products and services in terms of GHG

- Julie and Lyn volunteered for the committee