

Aspen BPS Stakeholder Committee – Meeting #3

March 21st 2023, 12:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. (via Zoom)

Prepared by the Consensus Building Institute (CBI)

Meeting in Brief

The Building Performance Standard (BPS) Stakeholder Committee met virtually to discuss whether and how beneficial electrification should be included in Aspen’s Building Performance Standards policy and what alternative compliance pathways will be necessary to enable buildings to comply with both the energy efficiency and electrification aspects of the policy. The full presentation is available [here](#). Details of these discussions are provided below.

Meeting agendas, meeting summaries and other materials for the BPS Committee can be found toward the bottom of [Aspen’s Building IQ website](#).

Recap from Meeting #2

Clare McLaughlin, Aspen’s Sustainability Programs Administrator, began by providing an update on the policy options discussed by the Committee regarding the size and types of buildings that should be covered. Given the broad support for adopting energy use intensity (EUI) targets, Laura Dyas from Group14 presented analysis on what a 30% reduction goal might look like, and Clare shared a proposed timeline for EUI targets for Committee members to consider. Additionally, as residential buildings were top of mind for the Committee at the last meeting, four policy pathways to include residential buildings in BPS were presented.

1. Pilot BPS for existing large residential buildings ($\geq 5k$ sq. ft.)
2. Pilot BPS and develop alternative residential policies
3. Develop alternative residential policies
4. Recommend future action

The Committee completed a poll on their preference between the options, and results showed that Option 1 and 3 were most favorable. The City will consider this feedback and follow up with the Committee at an upcoming meeting.

Beneficial Electrification

Clare presented the Committee with options and examples from other cities regarding how they have incorporated beneficial electrification into their BPS policy, with pros and cons for each. The Committee broke into small groups to discuss whether beneficial electrification should be incorporated into Aspen’s BPS policy, and if so, how it could be approached, potential challenges that might arise, and what further analysis should be explored.

Small Group Discussions

- Should Aspen have an electrification component in our BPS, requiring a balance of tradeoffs between reaching our BPS goals and addressing the likely implementation challenges?
 - Overall consensus was **yes, electrification should be a part of Aspen’s BPS policy** because we cannot reach our GHG emissions reductions goal without it
 - Hesitation from some due to the unknowns surrounding **cost and feasibility**

- One suggestion was to pass electrification through a separate policy outside of BPS as it may be **less controversial** and easier to push through
- If so, considering examples from other cities and the Aspen context, what **type of approach** do you like for Aspen, and why – at a **CONCEPTUAL** level?
 - **Replacement upon retirement** or end of useful life
 - Prevents wasteful replacement of functional equipment
 - Easy to plan for and understand for building owners and managers
 - Support for a prescriptive approach
 - Sets **clear expectations** for property owners
 - Places the responsibility on the government to determine what needs to be done
 - More obvious and easier to define if a building cannot meet a specific prescriptive measure and needs an alternate pathway
 - Somewhat less support for a performance approach
 - Lends itself to a **menu of options** to choose from
 - Allows **greater flexibility** for building owners and managers
 - **Difficult to understand** without involving outside consultants
 - It is important to pay attention to equipment after it is installed to ensure that it is operating efficiently and effectively – performance targets holds people **accountable to that tracking and maintenance**
 - **Combination** of performance-based targets and prescriptive policy
 - Allow for more **flexibility** depending on building type, age, and capital structure
- What would be the **key challenges**? How could/should we account for those challenges?
 - It is difficult to make meaningful recommendations without having **specific data** from **case study** examples
 - The expectations need to be made as **simple and clear** as possible to ensure compliance and **minimize administrative burden**
 - Aspen's **unique environment** and heating needs may not be conducive to the **currently available technology**
 - Aspen has a **unique energy load** due to snowmelt and water heating for pools and spas. Could make it more difficult to use other cities for data reference
 - Specifically, the current **boiler** technology does not support retrofits for many buildings in Aspen
 - What will the **costs** be for these upgrades and retrofits and who will be **responsible for paying**?
 - Currently there are items in the **land use code** that would prevent the approval of energy efficient upgrades e.g. noise and equipment size
 - **Space for transformers** specifically may be inadequate
 - Concerns that the **electric grid** may not be able to support the **additional load**
 - The benefits of electrification hinge on **utilities meeting their own ambitious goals**
 - Aspen has many **historic buildings** that may not be able to meet required standards
 - The current **permitting process** is already **cumbersome**, and this could compound the burden. Incentives should include expediting this process.
 - **Emergency planning** in the event of **natural disasters** and **power outages**

Additional Supports and Research

The City asked Committee members what support might be needed to address some of the challenges raised during the discussion.

- What, if any, further analysis should Aspen potentially explore with the ETF?
 - Better understanding of what **technological advancements** may come online before 2030 target
 - More specific **case studies**
 - **Cost analysis examples** from projects and buildings
 - Availability of third party organizations to offer **advising services**
 - Information on the **incentives** other cities have used to **encourage electrification**
 - Better understanding of **system resiliency** and how to ensure that the technology recommended is the **right fit** for a particular building
 - Can we model if a new energy code building meets site EUI?

Compliance Pathways

Following the presentation and small group discussion on beneficial electrification, Clare presented two city examples for **Alternate Compliance Pathways** and potential options for those buildings that will be unable to hit targets. The same small groups convened again to discuss.

- What **TYPES** of alternative compliance pathways will be important for Aspen buildings, and **WHY**?
 - Electrification bonus credits– helps EUI tackle electrification component
 - Alternative timelines to accommodate capital plans and allow for certain technologies to catch up
 - Limit exterior energy use
 - Prescriptive as an alternative pathway
 - Specific reduction percentage
 - Already efficient buildings who can make limited changes– bonus credit can help them hit targets
 - Building Performance Action Plan– building owner proposes what they CAN do with support of auditor/engineer/assessor (e.g., reduce energy use by 5%; adjust timeline for interim or final target)
 - Alternative Compliance Payment – a possibility, but many noted they would prefer to avoid this as it will not lead to reduction goals (this may be necessary, especially at the beginning of the program, to avoid forcing upgrades where they do not make sense)
 - More adjustments are tough administratively but might be necessary to help unique buildings succeed

Next Steps & Working Groups

The **next Committee meeting** will be held virtually on April 25th 9:00am - 12:00pm and focus on Costs, Compliance, and Enforcement.

City staff has worked with several Committee volunteers to organize a **Workforce working group**, which will be hosting a roundtable discussion with outside stakeholder members to better understand workforce needs under a new BPS policy. This will take place **Monday April 3rd, 2023**. Workforce working group members include Mike Bouchet, James Burton, Ryland French, Jimmy Marcus, and Ben Wolff.

Staff is also working to organize two additional working groups: 1) an Equity & Affordability working group, which will help ensure that the BPS policy prioritizes and supports under-resourced buildings, avoids negative unintended consequences to low-income residents, and establishes structures for equitable implementation of the policy; 2) a Water working group that will examine the opportunities a BPS policy could offer for water efficiency measures in existing buildings in the City.

Homework for Committee members

- Inform city staff if you would like to be involved in the Equity & Affordability Working Group

Meeting Attendees

The meeting was attended by the following Committee members and City staff:

City of Aspen

Clare McLaughlin, Sustainability Programs Administrator

Tessa Schreiner, Climate Action Manager

Lauran Garcia, Aspen's Sustainability Intern

Stakeholder Committee Members

Present		
X	Mike Bouchet	Aspen Skiing Company
X	Matthew Gillen	Aspen Pitkin County Housing Authority (APCHA)
X	Jimmy Marcus	M Dev Co
	Kym Ryan	M&W Properties
X	Benjamin Wolff	Frias Property Managers
X	August Hasz	REG
X	Joshua Kace	Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
X	Ben Levenson	City of Aspen Assets
X	Bob Narracci	City of Aspen Zoning
X	Mary Oliver	Design Workshop
X	Dave Rybak	Rybak Architecture & Development, P.C.
X	Derek Skalko	Historic Preservation, 1 Friday Designs
X	Nick Thompson	City of Aspen Buildings
X	Christine Brinker	Southwest Energy Efficiency Project (SWEET)
X	Ryland French	Community Office for Resource Efficiency (CORE)
X	Luke Ilderton	Energy Outreach Colorado
X	CJ Oliver	City of Aspen Environmental Health & Sustainability
X	Amanda Poindexter	United States Green Building Council (USGBC)
X	Erin Sherman	Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI)
X	James Burton	Institute for Market Transformation (IMT)
X	Justin Forman	City of Aspen Utilities
X	Kyle Lord	Holy Cross Energy

X	Jason Auslander	Black Hills Energy
X	Carolyn Sackariason	City of Aspen Communications