

Commercial Building Energy Labeling Working Group
Meeting Notes
July 10, 2020

Approval of Minutes from June meeting

- Motion to approve – Mike Russom, second Mike Crowley. Motion approved by voice vote.

Discussion: Upcoming call with IMT (Mike Russom)

- Send any questions for IMT to Mike by July 15th, even if you can't attend the meeting
- He will organize questions and send back out to the group.
- Let Mike know if you can only attend a portion of the meeting so he can put those questions at the beginning.
- What are the components of a program that lend themselves to the 2-5% uplift? For example mandatory vs voluntary, in conjunction with efficiency programs.
- Accepted methodology for estimating what the impacts of benchmarking are, how to do an impact assessment. (Mike C)
- What are the drivers other than mandatory requirements. What are the links on the behavioral side? What drives uptake. (Craig P)
- What do they know about rural areas vs urban? (Jen G.)
- What are some of the key things jurisdictions have learned, what would they change after implementing policies. Things we should be thinking about when designing. (Mike Crowley)
- Opportunity costs, typical payback. How to ensure you get enough energy savings to make it worth it. (Jen G.)
- What are some typical administrative costs and scope of work. (Mike Crowley)
- General program costs – putting up website, etc. How would we scale that to our population. (Keith Downes)

Discussion: Estimating cost of energy labeling (Keith Downes)

- Best practice for putting together budgets and make it more manageable.
- Divide into manageable tasks and then deliverable steps and subtasks. Can keep at just task level if easier. Wouldn't try to break down any further than subtasks as this should be pretty high level.
- Build budget from ground up: Start a spreadsheet listing each task and subtask in a row.
- Separate labor hours from other expenses. Columns should be organized into different labor rates. Labor rates vary widely in the range of \$50 - \$350 per hour depending on the credentials needed for the task. Typically, rates are likely to fall in the \$100 - \$250 range.
- Labor rates are what the company would charge, including overhead and profit, not they would actually pay their staff.
- Add up all costs and then do a sanity check.
- Should we include items that we may not be able to estimate costs for? (Dan E.)
 - I think so. Its still good information to have the list of other things that need to be accounted for, but we don't have an estimate for (Kelly L.)
- Keith will help all subcommittees with putting together their budgets to ensure consistency.
- Should come up with budget estimates for both mandatory and voluntary program (Keith D.)

Presentation from the Mgt Subcommittee (Michael Crowley)

- Walked through subcommittee recommendations
- Will take all the other subcommittee budgets and put them here.
- Looking at both mandatory and voluntary tracks.
- Program admin. mirrors what was recommended on the Res. side – EVT would be the admin. However, EVT doesn't currently have funds budgeted for statewide admin. So need to address that.
- Did we look at other options other than EVT admin. voluntary program? (Keith L.)
 - Could do another third party and would do a regular RFP process if went with that option (Dan E)
 - We also discussed that the PSD doesn't have the resources to administer. (Kelly L)
- Advisory group – PSD, EEUs, OEO Other stakeholders. Should we add others like advocacy groups such as EAN, VPIRG? (Mike R.)
 - Maybe list the type of organizations, but wouldn't want to list specific orgs. without checking with them first, can get into those details later. (Kelly L.)
- Budgets – need to be detailed out once the subcommittees have the specific amounts, but this is the basic outline of some of the potential costs/budget impacts. (Mike C.)
 - He will go back to EVT to try to estimate their admin. costs.
 - Still try to get estimate from Overlay for admin. of a mandatory program – Mike R. will follow-up with them now that we have better information on the number of commercial buildings in VT.
- Rollout schedule: Year 1: outreach/awareness to owners/prop mgrs., Year 2: building owners begin collecting data, Year 3: largest buildings start reporting, Year 4: 50,000 SF or larger, etc.
- Impact – although there seems to be research on positive impacts of benchmarking, there seemed to be hesitancy to attribute it just to benchmarking. Hard to pinpoint actual impact. (Mike C)
- Evaluation: criteria: level of compliance, energy upgrades done as result of program, increase in EE/DSM program participation, occupancy rates, Impacts on Real Estate sales (for time of sale program), Consumer awareness.

Draft write-up of Subgroup #1, Research Progress in Other Jurisdictions (Mike R.)

- Presented draft write-up. Start with scope of research
- Reviewed research findings: Reporting – Mandatory vs. Voluntary; Labeling and Online visualization; Energy Assessors requirements and training; Verification; Elements of successful benchmarking; Impacts of successful standards
 - Some jurisdictions start with voluntary to prime the market and then go to mandatory. A few jurisdictions have pulled back on their mandatory requirements.
 - Only two jurisdictions have physical labels, most are virtual. Physical labels have caused some confusion
 - ESPM is set up to allow for building owners to enter data themselves.
- Mike will send the draft out to the group for comments. Please provide by July 17th.

Reports from Subcommittees (Subcommittee Leads)

Group 2: Building Assessors (Keith L.)

- Have struggled to meet. Keith L. will get group together to flesh out report they previously presented.

Group 2: Building Performance (Mike R.)

- Have more specific recommendations developed
- Had initial conversation with NEEP regarding HELIX and will come back with a cost estimate.
 - They are looking at having a split fixed and variable fee (fixed fee and then variable fee based on the number of buildings)
 - Reached out to EAN

Discussion and next steps

- Building Assessors group is scheduled to report out at next meeting.
- Send Mike C. and Keith D. any topics/key discussions your interested in having at the next meeting.
- Include overview/debrief of IMT call for those that can't attend? (Kelly L)