

# Climate Solutions Workgroup – Energize Denver Task Force

April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2021

## Purpose

As part of fulfilling the Energize Denver Task Force charge, the Climate Solutions workgroup will evaluate initial policy options presented by the City and consultants for Task Force review and decision making. The workgroup will do a ‘first pass’ at pros/cons, other considerations, and relevant trade-offs between and among the different policy options related to highly efficient, renewable-powered, electrified buildings to achieve the Task Force NZE mandate. The workgroup will raise issues and questions, flag concerns, and help the City frame and narrow options, in order to help focus Task Force deliberations. The workgroup will coordinate with the Equity and Workforce workgroups as needed.

## Participants

### Energize Denver Task Force Members

Steve Morgan, Boulder Energy Engineers, Rocky Mountain Association of Energy Engineers

Jennie Gonzales, IBEW 68

Celeste Cizik, Group 14 Engineering

Scott Prestidge, Colorado Oil and Gas Association

Christine Brinker, Southwest Energy Efficiency Project

Mike Kruger, Colorado Solar and Storage Association (COSSA)

Sergio Cordova, Pipefitters Local Union No. 208

Jonathan Cappelli, Neighborhood Development Collaborative

Ariana Gonzalez, Natural Resources Defense Council

Amie Mayhew, Colorado Hotel & Lodging Association

### Supporting Staff and Subject Matter Experts

Katrina Managan, City and County of Denver

Jan Keleher, City and County of Denver

Amber Wood, City and County of Denver

Ryan Golten, Consensus Building Institute

Sean Denniston, New Buildings Institute

Zachary Hart, Institute for Market Transformation

## Work Plan

The workgroup will meet as needed, beginning in March, to:

1. Help the City refine its Building Performance Policy Design Tool.
2. Using the Policy Design Tool, prior to each Task Force meeting starting in April, help the City evaluate, at a preliminary level for Task Force discussion and decision-making, different policy options for building energy efficiency and renewable energy, and then electrification, to bring existing buildings to NZE by 2040.

## Agenda

-Introductions

### -Briefing/Recap

- What carbon policies other cities are doing
- Performance and prescriptive pathways

### -Policy design tool

- Goals
  - Identify end goals
- Policy Design
  - Performance
  - Prescriptive
- Policy Options
- Considerations
  - Suggestions/Changes
  - Questions

### Conclusion/Next Steps

## Meeting Notes

### Policy design tool

#### -Goals

- Identify end goals
  - Would performance goals be better for bigger buildings and prescriptive for smaller buildings?
  - Is there a way to align city and state climate goals?

#### -Policy Design

- Policy should consider what pathways and measurements are used
  - EUI vs. EnergyStar score
    - Would EUI reductions equate to EnergyStar score increase?
- Would prescriptive pathways be beneficial if buildings don't have a history of energy efficiency or reduction?
  - What if these buildings don't meet performance marks?
    - What about a probationary period to make up for non-compliance
      - Step 1: Performance Pathway
      - Step 2: Prescriptive options (1 year to comply?)
      - Step 3: Penalty
- Prescriptive pathways
  - Focus on low hanging fruit
  - Allows goals to be met even if it isn't initially
- What should policy be for buildings that are all electric?
  - Still need to meet reduction and efficiency goals

#### -Policy Options

- Prescriptive alternative pathways
  - Reductions in EUI
  - Would EUI reductions equate EnergyStar score increase?
  - Montgomery County approach
    - Best for buildings that need the most work
    - Low hanging fruit
    - Has the most flexibility for building owners and managers.
  - Would being prescriptive approach produce anticipated results?
    - If buildings are already low performing what would make sure they're meeting goals?
    - If performance goals are not met, then prescriptive controls can be implemented to reach goal
    - Prescriptive path can be the middle way
      - After performance goal is not met
      - Before penalty
  - Prescriptive approach should not be viewed as a lesser option
    - People shouldn't feel guilty for taking this option
    - Prescriptive should be a possibility for people as an alternative pathway
      - Should be more stringent to account for uncertainty
  - Prescriptive pathways can be only pathway except goals and checkpoints would need to be more stringent and frequent
  - Would there need to be new prescriptive option/changes outside of retuning that would be required every cycle
    - Could it be tiered by building, age, etc.
      - Changes and requirements assigned by building's group

#### -Considerations

- Suggestions/Changes
  - "Performance, prescriptive, penalty" framework frequently suggested
  - Suggest to taskforce that performance and prescriptive are co-equal
    - Performance
      - Outlines what needs to be done, structured framework
    - Prescriptive
      - Easy to explain and understand, a lot more freedom to meet goals, hard to measure