

City of Cambridge
Climate Protection Action Committee

December 12, 2019
City Hall Annex, 2nd Floor Meeting Room

Attendees: Melissa Chan (chair), Tom Chase (Secretary), Keith Giamportone, Lyn Huckabee, Ted Live, Emily Pesquera, Lauren Miller, Trisha Montalbo, Jerrad Pierce, Julie Wormser; *staff:* Bronwyn Cooke

Net Zero Update

- Bring CPAC letter of support for Net Zero progress report to City Council
- 5 year review – looking to contract and kick-off with consultant next week
- Solicitation for stakeholders for the 5 year review task force will go out next week. Looking for one CPAC member to serve on that. Group will meet 5 times between now and end of FY20.
- Question: was it closed solicitation?
- Answer: we solicited through State contact. Allows for contracting for services directly from service providers on State list.
- Note: State list is going to be re-bid next year.

BEUDO performance requirement

- The 6 % of the total buildings that are covered by BEUDO (by number) represent...
 - half of the total square footage
 - 60% of total building energy use
 - And 70% of total building emissions
- Due in part to higher use of electricity in larger buildings, which has a higher emissions factor for electricity (per MMBTu)
- NZAP action to analyze BEUDO data to see if emissions improvements were happening, or if intervention needed.
- Small decrease in energy use intensity (1.1% a year) Not a significant improvement compared to the trajectory we need to be on.
- Determined that intervention needed to meet goals
- Started with consultant support to analyzed other policies/programs, and our BEUDO data
- Looked at other performance requirements in other cities
- Looked at BEUDO data to see if there were places for obvious cut offs (e.g. lowest performing)
 - no clear threshold between low and high performing BEUDO buildings, making it difficult to set a cutoff/threshold
- Looked at what types of energy retrofits might exist and their cost, with and without incentives
- concluded that there was still lots of cost effective opportunities to improve performance
- Stakeholder group convened to design straw man proposal for a performance standard, and led to principles for a BEUDO requirement
- All buildings should take action relative to where each is starting from

- There should be choice and flexibility in compliance pathways, for unique circumstances
- Exemptions for high performing buildings
- Voluntary program for early action. This launched this past October, concierge service for comprehensive energy retrofits to package Mass Save retrofits. 10 building owners have opted in to date. Ahead of schedule in the action plan.
- Additional feedback indicated metric should be emissions, not energy, to give more flexibility, and to align with climate goals.
- Perspective pathway was evaluated but concluded that it couldn't be applied in a way that consistently led to significant emissions reduction.
- Looked at peer city precedents (see slides)
- Based on stakeholder feedback, switched proposal from energy use standard to emissions standard
 - Allows for much more flexibility. Emissions targets can be met by reducing energy use OR by purchasing lower carbon energy sources
 - Question: what GHGs included?
 - Answer: scope 1 and 2 GHG from building operations (CO₂, N₂O and CH₄)
- Proposed adoption in 2 stages
 - Ordinance amendment to set overall framework and principles (timeline, exemptions etc) but details to be set by stakeholders and promulgated (likely by CDD) under the ordinance.
- Overall framework elements
 - REQUIREMENT IS 20% REDUCTION OVER BASELINE YEAR EVERY 5 YEARS
 - Likely not going to offer a prescriptive pathway
 - Question: is anyone using prescriptive pathway?
 - Answer: NYC has a prescriptive option for affordable housing (basically an exemption)
 - Baseline will be average of 2019 and 2020 reports (option to choose an earlier baseline to account for early action)
 - Compliance to begin in 2021, year 4 and 5 average will be measured to look for a 20% reduction
 - This gives incentive for early action (if doing a big capital project, and you get more than 20% reduction, you'd still get credit. If we re-set the baseline every 5-year compliance period, higher reduction in first compliance period would be dis-incentivized.
 - Penalty not figured out yet – legal questions
 - Possibility of alternative compliance payments
 - Want to avoid fines that don't incentivize GHG emissions reductions
 - Exemptions
 - If you're already at zero emissions!
 - Exemptions for new buildings (a building built in 2022 might not make sense to have compliance in 2025)
 - Hardship
- Details to be determined by stakeholder group and promulgated per the ordinance

- Renewable Energy criteria for meeting requirements
- Need to have criteria for what offsite RE sources count/don't count
- Need flexibility in this over time, as RE products change over time
- Will need a way to report RE purchases
- Campus pathways
- Need to decide if campuses will be allowed to meet requirement by reporting reductions at campus level?
- Comment: campus should be allowed for any multi-property owner
- Answer: maybe, but want to avoid unintended consequences...loose definition of "campus"
- Labs
- Labs might need more time, while still being held to same standard (skipping interim target, meeting a larger, longer term target)
- Ordinance written in a way that keeps tenants on the hook as well
- How to define a lab? Many are in multi-use properties, and many are designed to change use type from office to lab over time
- Question: are we setting maximum offsite RE limits?
- Answer: no, thought about it. Stakeholder prefer the single standard and flexibility. If we set good criteria, each building should be able to do their own math on cost effective pathways and cost effective efficiency will always be less than buying offsite renewables that meet the criteria. IMT disagrees with not having an EE backstop.
- Process
- Reviewing draft ordinance with legal team. They are raising quite a few questions
- Committed to go back to full stakeholder group before proposal submitted to city council
- Goal is to have continued stakeholder engagement
- Legal advice is that MORE should be set in the ordinance framework/language, so may require more stakeholder engagement to hammer out those additional details in the framework.
- CPAC will be invited to forthcoming stakeholder meeting
- Question: how many CPAC reps?
- Answer: One please. Too many people in the stakeholder group to manage otherwise
- Question: what barriers do you anticipate?
- Answer: no major pushback on this proposal from stakeholders. If stakeholders can't participate in defining the details, they might start.
- Comment: for campuses, could add clause that says every x cycle, every building must be touched.
- Question: funding for retrofits sometimes comes from FEMA after a disaster. Will that present a challenge/opportunity to this?

CPAC/RAC subcommittee

- John and Bronwyn met with RAC to discuss joint committee
- Comments from RAC
- They are pretty busy with single use plastics. Their work is very much driven by emotional response to waste (sea turtles with straws stuck up their nose etc.)
- Discussed leveraging product specific interest/emotional response to educate/engage on more impactful waste related issues
- “develop framework” sounds a lot like the work that’s been done for zero waste master plan. RAC may have a little “recommendations” fatigue after single use plastics and ZWMP, and members are interested in more hands-on activities, like re-use events. But, would also be good to take a step back, look at the bigger picture, get ahead of the curve with emotional responses
- Discussed opportunity to build on the existing work, dig into commercial waste more, as much of the ZWMP actions are geared toward municipal waste
- Grounding work in broader framework for action, and pilots on food and textiles is of interest and seems like good alignment.
- Martha Henry, Janet Mosley, Rob Gogan all expressed interest.
- February start date would work best for RAC
- CPAC members interested were Julie Wormser, Lyn Huckabee, Peter Crawley (?)
- Might be worth asking Brian Goldberg. MIT is doing some interesting things on waste.

Notes by Bronwyn Cooke