



CHARLES D. BAKER
GOVERNOR

KARYN E. POLITO
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

MIKE KENNEALY
SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Division of Professional Licensure
Office of Public Safety and Inspections
1000 Washington Street, Suite 710
Boston, Massachusetts 02118

EDWARD A. PALLESCHI
UNDERSECRETARY OF CONSUMER
AFFAIRS AND BUSINESS
REGULATION

LAYLA D'EMILIA
COMMISSIONER, DIVISION OF
PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE

BBRS Energy Advisory Committee (EAC)

Chairman Meskus took roll call:

Layla D'Emilia, or designee*	√ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Patrick Woodcock, or designee**	√ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Zbigniew Wozny	<input type="checkbox"/> present	√ absent
Tom Moberg	√ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Emily Paparella-Vice Chair	√ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent

Curtis Meskus-Chair	√ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
John Anderson	√ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Jonathan Bruce	√ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Gabriel P. Stallions	√ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent

* *State District Building Inspector Adelle Reynolds participated as the designee for DPL Commissioner, Lyla D'Emilia.*

** *Ian Finlayson designee for DOER Commissioner Patrick Woodcock.*

December 7, 2020 Meeting Minutes
General notes on format of these minutes

- *These minutes represent general points of discussion by members and audience participants during the regular meeting session. The minutes are not intended to be a verbatim account of discussions.*
- *Votes are noted as **MOTION** by, seconded by, and whether it was a unanimous or split vote.*
- *Agenda topics as numbered may be in the same order as they appear on the meeting agenda.*
- *The meeting agenda is listed as **EXHIBIT A**; others are listed sequentially as addresses during the meeting.*

Regular Meeting Portion

Roll Call. Chairman Curtis Meskus opened the meeting about 10:03 am by taking roll call. Ian Finlayson, Adelle Reynolds, Tom Moberg, Emily Paparella Curtis Meskus, John Anderson, Jonathan Bruce, and Gabriel Stallions all identified themselves as present.

1. **Review\Vote** approval of the November 2, 2020 EAC meeting minutes. Chairman Meskus tabled for more information on agenda item 2.
2. **Review\Vote** code change proposal 11-06-2019 that proposes to amend Appendix 115 AA (**EXHIBIT B**) (referred to further as the proposal). Chairman Meskus spoke about identifying all the technical implications is the last task assignment. Jonathan Bruce talked about several of the following technical issues:
 - Technically the proposal is not "net zero" – if combustion is allowed cannot get to zero.
 - Technically does nothing to improve building efficiency.



- Technically in some areas there are problems connecting to the grid.
- Technically, in some areas the grid may not be adequate to supply increased electrical demand.
- Technically forces owners into a third-party market.
 - Possibly affordable now – low cost developable sites already done.
 - Supply and demand.
 - BitCoin analogy.
- Technically biases off site credits depending on producer.
- Technically, it determines location of generation – only Congress can regulate interstate commerce.
- Technically AIA is asking BBRS to do the job of convincing their clients of the assumed advantages.
- Technically architects can do everything proposed without BBRS action.
 - There is nothing in the building code preventing a design in conformance with the proposal.
- Technically the modeling software can be changed and therefore create a moving target.
 - HERS software is producing different results for same building.
- Technically, it places undue burden on the building official.
 - What happens when an owner has a dispute with the builder or energy supplier?
 - What happens if off-site producer does not maintain proper records?
- Technically, it just does not belong in the building code, as it does nothing to increase building efficiency or design. Proposal simply forces owner into a third party market.

Gabriel Stallions spoke about situations where a building energy system operates at a high-energy efficiency has lower energy usage. Jonathan Bruce talked about the proposal does nothing to improve a building energy system. The proposal forces an owner into a third party renewable energy market.

Jonathan Bruce offered a motion that there are numerous significant technical implications with the proposal. No one seconded the motion. The motion failed.

John Nunnari spoke about the proposal offers a path to net-zero design. The proposal intended to work in conjunction with the 2018 IECC as it sets the minimum energy efficiency requirements. He also spoke about the proposal not meant to achieve net-zero.

Jonathan Bruce spoke about section 105.1, in the proposal says the purpose is to achieve zero net carbon, and any combustion on-site prevents a net zero result. He talked about it having requirements that introduce technical implications.

Ian Finlayson talked about the differences between zero emissions and net-zero.

Emily Paparella spoke about the Committee discussed a net-zero definition and that it is not about zero carbon. Net-zero is the quantity of energy used offset by an equal amount of renewable energy.

Jonathan Bruce spoke about excess renewable energy situations but cannot send the extra energy into the grid because it is undersized. He also talked about multiple buildings with solar cannot share the power if the grid does not allow sending the power into the grid. This forces building owners to purchase energy from a third party.

John Nunnari thinks the issue Jonathan described is a net metering issue and has nothing to do with the proposal.

Ian Finlayson spoke about last month's meeting included hearing about renewable energy supplies are plentiful.

Gabriel Stallions offered a comment. Buildings required to have a generator for reasons stipulated in a code would need an exemption from the proposal's requirements.

Chairperson Meskus spoke about the proposal that limits where power can come from (in particular, ISO group) and questioned whether it is reasonable. Jonathan Bruce expressed concern that this restricts a building owner from purchasing energy available in other parts of the country.

John Nunnari spoke about Section AA108.2.2, number 5 in the proposal requires purchasing from a renewable energy supplier and does not stipulate where the power comes from. He thinks the Committee can offer language that would make the proposal work.

Jonathan Bruce does not believe the BBRs tasks for the Committee include offering changes to the proposal. He also spoke about the proposal, introduces technical issues concerning who is providing the power.

Kerry Dietz spoke about the BBRs appreciating the work the EAC is doing, and she thinks the board is looking for language it can rely on.

Ian Finlayson believes the ICC has adopted the language in the proposal, and for this reason, the proposal requirements are technically feasible. Emily Paparella agreed.

Tom Moberg also believes the language is in the 2021 IECC, but the provisions do not make the building any more energy efficient. He would like to see incentives for utilizing the proposal requirements. The proposal appears to narrow where the building owner can purchase power.

Jonathan Bruce spoke about not all buildings can achieve net-zero, and the proposal requires purchasing renewable energy from restricted sources. Ian Finlayson thinks the Committee could flag this as a policy issue for the BBRs.

John Nunnari explained the provisions in section AA108.2.2 #5 of the proposal that intends to have the renewable energy coming from local sources, which gives Massachusetts more controls. Jonathan Bruce expressed concern about regulating energy credits for purchasing in Massachusetts impacts interstate commerce.

On a **MOTION** by Ian Finlayson and seconded by Emily Paparella that the proposal has no technical issue with adopting because the ICC has adopted. There might be technical considerations for

buildings generating all its energy needs onsite. Adelle Reynolds spoke about the ICC adopting the code provisions does not mean that the BBRS has to adopt it. Roll call; Emily Paparella, Curtis Meskus, John Anderson, Tom Moberg, Ian Finlayson, and Gabriel Stallions all voted in the affirmative. Jonathan Bruce Adelle Reynolds voted in the negative. Six in the affirmative and two in the negative. The motion passes.

3. **Adjourn.** On a **MOTION** by John Anderson, seconded by Adelle Reynolds, it was a unanimous vote to adjourn the regular meeting at about 11:5 pm. Adelle Reynolds, Emily Paparella, Curtis Meskus, John Anderson, Tom Moberg, Ian Finlayson, Jonathan Bruce and Gabriel Stallions all voted in the affirmative. Next meeting January 4th.

EXHIBITS:

- A. Meeting Agenda
- B. Code Change Proposal 05-06-2020 – MA E-Z Code Chapter 115 -Appendix AA.