

Commercial Building Energy Labeling Working Group
Meeting Notes
October 9, 2020

Attendees: Michael Crowley, Keith Downes (co-chairs), Kelly Launder, Keith Levenson, Craig Peltier, Michael Russom, Tim Heney, Dan Edson, Geoff Wilcox, Robert Lehmert, Peter Tucker (Director of Advocacy affairs, VAR)

Approval of Minutes from September meeting

- Keith Downs reviewed the September meeting notes.
- Motion to approve – Mike Russom, second Mike Crowley. Tim Heney abstained. Motion approved by voice vote.

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

- Added section on voluntary vs. mandatory labeling.
- Discussed including dissenting opinions regarding the mandatory or other requirements. PSD will draft some language to include regarding.
 - Others will review and may also want to be included in dissenting opinion
 - Need to define what mandatory means, be clear that we are not talking about mandatory improvements or penalties for not meeting some energy UI threshold.
 - Keith D.: Should also include information on differences in participation in other jurisdictions if mandatory vs. voluntary.
 - Kelly: But also need to caveat that the experience in VT, which has progressive EE programs could be different/higher.
- Would updating of energy profiles be required on some regular basis?
 - ESPM is usually updated annually
 - Some other jurisdictions require updating every three years
 - Mike C.: The management section doesn't specify, but we were assuming every year, which is typically how it works with ESPM.
 - Robert: Buildings usage doesn't change that much year to year. Would advocate more for time of sale timing, not annually. Full disclosure when building changes hands
 - DE: Most buildings don't change hands often. BGS is extreme example.
 - Tim H.: Agree, doesn't seem like usage changes enough to have annually.
 - Keith D.: Could have it be voluntary, especially for smaller buildings, and then mandatory every three years or something like that.
- Mike R: How much time does an annual update take?
 - Dan E: It doesn't take much time. Maybe an hour per building.
- Craig: Should maybe include a side-bar in the report regarding how much time it would take to set up in ESPM and update annually.
- Tim H: Need to be careful about adding reporting requirements if they aren't going to be meaningful. Suggest that we check in with members on where they are on this.
- Mike C: EVT is not in the business of enforcing and wouldn't want to be the administrator of a mandatory program. No strong opinion on mandatory v. voluntary. If the group wants to move forward with a mandatory program they won't get in the way of it. When ESPM is used effectively it can be valuable. If a property owner feels like they are being forced to do something they likely won't embrace it and use it effectively. This is a risk of the mandatory path.

- Mike R.: In favor of annual benchmarking with ESPM. This drives improvement. Can't manage what you don't measure.
- Tim H: Strong inclination from realtors that it be voluntary not mandatory. Especially time of sale mandates, strongly oppose, as it adds to cost/process becomes even more cumbersome than it already is.
- Dan E: They defer to the PSD on mandatory vs. voluntary.
- Geoff W: If this would impact MF low-income and that cost would be passed on to them wouldn't be for it. If had to pick, would probably go with voluntary.
- Robert L: Think a blower door should be required for buildings. [Note: ESPM does not have an airtightness input – only operational data]
 - Mike R: Blower doors for buildings over 20,000 sq ft would be difficult
- Craig: Thinks this section should lay out the pros and cons of voluntary vs. mandatory better. Doesn't seem like we're going to have a consensus anyway.
- Keith D: Think it should be mandatory, every three years, with encouragement to do voluntary annually for those that would see the value.
- Mike C.: If we did have a mandatory approach, table shows how it would roll out. And is there a minimum size for requirements.
 - Budget piece still needs to be filled out with other subgroups.
 - Provided estimates of the number of properties that would fit into certain sq. footage requirements.
 - Any discussion on cut off for mandatory?
 - Keith L: Thinks there has to be a cut-off, but not sure where that should be. Perhaps subcommittee should make a recommendation.
 - Keith D.: 20k sq.ft. is the IMT recommendation for a lower limit, but I advocate for smaller
 - Leaning towards providing discussion and opinions versus definitive recommendations as suggested by Craig.

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

- There weren't many changes from the last presentation of the write-up.
- Added mention of new BEAM project. Kelly L.: There was a description of this project in the residential section, which could be added here. BEAM is in its infancy, so not ready for this application yet.
- Budget: Still haven't received estimate from NEEP. Added caveat for EAN portion per their request. Also don't have a budget for label development, but don't know if a cost estimate is needed given that it will be created for free in ESPM.
- Dan E: Mentioned conversations with EPA about whether the "label" could be modified for VT. Mike R.: request to have that included in the write-up.

Draft write-up of Subgroup #2, Building Assessors (Keith L)

- Changed proposed roll-out table to be consistent with other groups. Will decide when putting together report, which to use.
- Reviewed other additions to the write-up, including some budget changes.
- Removed call center recommendations as that is covered in another subgroup.
- Role for assessor in a voluntary program is minimal. Really more in play if there is a mandatory program. So not sure how much detail to include.
- Perhaps review again at next meeting seeing how some changes have yet to be made.

Discussion and next steps

- Meeting on October 23rd, Keith asked about conflicts with the meeting. Dan E. has conflict. Others can make it.
- At next meeting would like to finalize recommendations from working group. Each subgroup should put together a summary of all recommendations to go through at next meeting.
 - Keith D.: If all reports are updated by the end of next week, then the Chairs can put together the list of recommendations.