

**Commercial Building Energy Labeling Working Group**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**September 11, 2020**

**Approval of Minutes from July meeting**

- Keith Downs reviewed the July meeting notes.
- Motion to approve – Jenn G., second Randy. Motion approved by voice vote.

**Recap of findings from IMT meeting on July 17th (Mike Russom)**

- Cliff from IMT provided details and answers to our questions.
- Mandatory vs. Voluntary – Mandatory gets better participation, bigger bang for your buck.
- How to avoid resistance in rural areas – focus on how you set sq. footage requirements as most rural areas have smaller buildings.
  - Jenn G. – still may need more on how this would work in a more rural area.
  - Mike R. – really aren't any states that we can look to that have passed a mandatory requirement that are like VT.
- Cliff also sent follow-up information, which is on the SharePoint sent in the research folder. Would be good for folks to review.
- Jenn: Was a good exercise to come up with the questions for the IMT meeting and we should continue to think about more questions as they will come up.
  - Mike R. – can add a document to the Sharepoint set for folks to enter questions.
  - Jenn: Maybe could add an Appendix of FAQ's to report.

**Draft write-up of Subgroup #2, Building Assessors (Randy)**

- Posted on the Sharepoint site
- Will use ESPM platform
- Assumed will begin as voluntary and then go to mandatory.
  - Need to be on same page regarding what mandatory means. The group is recommending that it's just regarding labeling the building and not meeting energy performance standards.
- Recommend 10,000 sq ft. minimum.
- Summary of findings:
  - By using ESPM will be able to take advantage of a lot of free services they provide.
  - Will be able to take advantage of ES promotional materials, etc.
  - Scoring – difference between Energy Star certification vs getting an ES score. Not requiring/recommending that buildings need to get certification, although some may want to. ES Certification requires verification by an architect. Recommend that if someone gets a 75 score or above it needs to be verified by an architect or PE (could also add others such as CEM's, etc.) to be sure that people aren't just putting in information to get a higher score, regardless of whether they are attempting to achieve ES certification.
    - Dan E. – some buildings, such as correctional facilities, can't get a score. Can look further into how these type of buildings could still participate even if they can't get a score through ESPM. Would still want them to enter data into ESPM.
    - Need to make sure utility usage data is accurate or scores could be inflated.

- Dan E. – BGS won't likely agree to pay for someone to certify for buildings that have scores over 75. Mike R: Perhaps some buildings that don't change hands like govt. buildings, hospitals, etc. that don't change hands often can be exempt.
  - Kelly L. – could there be an indicator somewhere, on the label/report to indicate whether its verified or not to solve this issue? This would be similar to what the Res. group is doing with their profile/label.
- ESPM offers free training. Also recommend that VT provide periodic training to assist building owners in complying (101 type training), also have a more technical training for those that may be dealing with more complex buildings/systems.
- Recommend QA/monitoring on 10% of the buildings. Also, may identify how training might address any issues that are identified.
  - Who would pay for the audit? Answer: Have identified the costs in the budget, but not where the funds would come from.
  - Keith D.: 10% seems a bit high. Maybe a smaller percentage with a more thorough review. The current amount in the budget would probably only cover a paper review and not an onsite audit/visit. What about a 2% sample?
    - Maybe adjust number if you find issues with compliance?
    - Keith L.: Could recommend a starting point and then say it should be increased if there are issues discovered.
    - Jenn G.: Need to make sure you are sampling different building types as well.
    - Also look at different Square footage as well.

#### **Draft write-up of Subgroup #3, Building Performance Reporting (Mike R.)**

- Provided a summary of write-up, which is posted on Sharepoint site.
- Assumes that we will use ESPM and will be reported to an Administrator who would make information publicly available.
- HELIX is based on SEED platform, so can include ESPM data.
- EAN is currently going through a transition but was able to get some cost estimates for public display of Comm. benchmarking. (\$15-\$30K to program in and then annual maintenance of \$5K-\$10K)
  - EAN atlas includes visualization and information that is similar to other states.
  - Mike C.: Would you be able to also see the label? Mike R.: Could likely include that.
- Waiting to get more from NEEP, including cost estimates.
- Propose to use ESPM report, which includes the "score".
  - Craig P: Should we also include other label options?
  - Dan E: Then there will be cost implications.
  - Maybe say that other labels/reports were considered, but this was chosen due to cost considerations
  - Will follow-up with ESPM to see if the reports/label could be modified at all (Mike C. and Dan E. will follow-up)
- Discussion of opt-out language and why that was included in Act 62.

#### **Draft write-up of Subgroup #4, Mgt Subcommittee (Michael Crowley)**

- Keith D suggested that this section include a discussion of the pros and cons of voluntary vs. mandatory. Mike C. will add that information.
- Mike went through the sections of the write-up
- Kelly L: Suggest moving minimum Program Admin. task up to that section.

- Keith D.: Comment on whether sq footage requirements for mandatory should be changed?
  - Should the cut-off for buildings not having to meet the requirement be 10,000 sq ft, 20,000 sq ft? Suggestion that we look at the number of buildings we would be talking about at each of these cut-offs. Mike C. will look at the impact of different cut-offs.

**Discussion and next steps**

- Revised subcommittee write-ups should be completed by X, to give members a week to review before October 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.
- Members should add their comments into the documents on the sharepoint site to facilitate discussion at the meeting.