



## **Clean Energy Future Committee Meeting Minutes**

*Approved at the 12/18/2020 meeting*

November 20, 2020

8:00 – 9:30 a.m.

Virtual Meeting – Hosted on Zoom

Members present: Jim DiTullio, Ken Pruitt, Dave Levy, Emily Sullivan, Shelly Dein, Dan Amstutz, Pasi Miettinen, Ryan Katofsky, Coralie Cooper, Nellie Akenhead, Marc Breslow

Also attending: Anne Wright, Pat Hanlon, Amos Meeks

Members not present: Dianne Mahon, Adam Chapdelaine

The meeting convened at 8:05 a.m.

### **Video Meeting Procedures**

Mr. Pruitt read a set of prepared remarks explaining the procedures that the Committee would follow to hold a virtual meeting. Governor Baker signed an Executive Order in response to the COVID-19 pandemic allowing virtual meetings, which suspended the usual Open Meeting Law requirement that a quorum of committee members be physically present in order to hold an official committee meeting.

### **Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Pruitt displayed the Minutes from the October 23rd Meeting. He highlighted two specific edits suggested by Mr. Amstutz as he displayed the changes in the Minutes. Mr. Pruitt asked for any further changes from the Committee Members. No changes were brought forward. Mr. Katofsky motioned to approve the Minutes as amended. Ms. Dein seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The Committee unanimously approved the October 23rd Meeting Minutes.

### **Agenda Item 1: Discussion of Warrant Article Number 5 (Approved by Special Town Meeting)**

Mr. Pruitt summarized Warrant Article Number 5 (regarding the regulation of fossil fuel infrastructure in new construction and major renovations), which was approved by the Special Town Meeting on November 18. Mr. Pruitt noted Mr. Pat Hanlon and Mr. Amos Meeks presented the article. He also said that CEFC members Mr. DiTullio and Mr. Levy spoke passionately in favor of supporting the article. Mr. Pruitt then commented

that several Town Meeting Members spoke in favor of it, one Member moved the question and the motion passed with about 93% of Town Meeting voting in favor of it.

Mr. Pruitt noted that this is the first of the 31 items in the CEFC's Draft Net Zero Plan to have had positive action. Mr. Pruitt invited Mr. Hanlon and Ms. Wright to discuss the ramifications of passage of Warrant Article 5 and what comes next.

Ms. Wright thanked all those who contributed to the effort. She noted that there was a good ground game getting people information about the Warrant Article, making sure it was briefed in the Precinct Meetings, and noting there was considerable outreach to the business community and housing advocates.

Mr. Hanlon then commented on the Warrant Article itself. He noted it was both a home rule petition and a bylaw. The bylaw, which would restrict fossil fuel infrastructure in new construction and major renovations, cannot go into effect until the home rule petition is approved by the state legislature. Mr. Hanlon also noted that the home rule petition gives the Town of Arlington authority to make further changes for fossil fuel use if the Town deems it appropriate (via Town Meeting vote). The next step is for Arlington's legislative delegation to introduce the legislation and then help advocate for its passage. Mr. Hanlon did speak to Representative Sean Garballey, who is expected to be an active supporter, working with State Senator Cindy Friedman and Representative Dave Rogers on introducing this piece of legislation in January.

Mr. Hanlon noted that the Town of Lexington may seek a similar home rule petition in the spring of 2021. Mr. Hanlon noted that State Senator Cindy Friedman also represents Lexington.

Ms. Cooper asked if the bylaw in Warrant Article 5 was similar to the previously drafted Warrant Article 13. Mr. Hanlon said that it is almost identical.

Ms. Wright noted that Brookline and some other cities and towns are thinking about similar actions. Ms. Wright speculated that there could be further requests to the legislature if more cities and towns pass local legislation in similar fashion.

Ms. Wright also noted that other towns and cities are passing zoning incentives for electric only construction and other similar efforts.

Mr. Hanlon then discussed what more could be done in Arlington. He noted he wants to improve efforts to reach out to various constituencies, improving knowledge, etc. Mr. Hanlon believes more can be done to discuss how heat pumps can be used in new buildings, etc. He stressed more can be done in education, etc. on this topic.

Mr. Miettinen noted how successful the campaign was to get this effort passed. He echoed how important education will be, highlighting the example of how many furnaces, air conditioners, etc. break in Arlington per month. Mr. Miettinen noted that education is critical to get people to think about heat pumps as an alternative for their heating system. Mr. Katofsky noted that the new high school is also using air source heat pumps and wanted to highlight this.

Mr. Hanlon noted that Town Meeting Member Mr. John Warden incorrectly stated at Town Meeting that the new High School design would rely on natural gas-fired furnace for heating, since geothermal heat pumps had been eliminated from the design. In fact, the High School will be heated exclusively with air source heat pumps, and Mr. Hanlon wanted that corrected for the record. After some discussion, Mr. Hanlon and Ms. Wright agreed to email all Town Meeting members after Town Meeting had ended with this correction.

## **Agenda Item Two: Review of the draft Net Zero Roadmap**

Mr. Pruitt returned to the proposed initiatives in the Net Zero Roadmap based on stakeholder feedback. He highlighted some small changes to Net Zero Buildings measure 3, which calls for changes in zoning to allow for net zero buildings. The changes would explicitly include commercial buildings in the measure. The committee had no objection to this change.

Mr. Pruitt then highlighted Net Zero Buildings measure 5, which previously called for all municipal buildings to be more energy efficient, but now also calls for new municipal buildings and major renovations to be fossil fuel-free. Mr. Katofsky noted that certain buildings may not have the technology or other options for fossil fuel free abilities to be feasible, adding that there should be some language about feasibility.

Ms. Cooper raised a concern that she did not want to create too much of an “out.” Mr. Levy asked if buildings should be all electric or net zero? He objected to the statement “to the extent feasible.” Mr. Miettinen suggested a better requirement than all electric would be “fossil fuel free.” It was agreed to substitute “fossil fuel-free” for “all electric,” and not to include “to the extent feasible.”

Mr. Pruitt then turned to NZB11, which would require solar panels on new commercial and multi-family buildings. It is modeled after Watertown’s 2018 solar ordinance. Mr. Pruitt noted it is a judgment call on what the right number of units for residential buildings will be in terms of an applicability cutoff. He emphasized that one of the most important factors is building ownership – the more owners, the more complex it is to apportion solar net metering credits.

Ms. Cooper asked if the “complexity” of net metering is due to a current rate structure or will it be fixed in future versions of the Mass. solar regulations? Mr. Pruitt noted the rules could change on this point but there is no indication that they will change.

Mr. Amstutz wondered if this debate (the cutoff for multi-family applicability) should be tabled and considered in the future. Ms. Dein noted that she doesn’t want this to be an issue that a lot of people object to in the Net Zero Plan. From a feasibility perspective, Ms. Dein noted unless there is a professional building manager, issues like this can cause significant problems.

Mr. Levy noted it should be done across all apartments.

Mr. Miettinen highlighted that from an emissions standpoint, this is not a particularly impactful measure, because solar generation credits can be realized outside of Arlington.

Mr. Katofsky expressed his support of removing the number of units referenced in this measure, so that the cutoff would be determined later during implementation of the measure. Mr. Pruitt agreed to make that change. The Committee expressed no objection.

Mr. Pruitt then asked for CEFC members to help review new introductory sections that he recently wrote for the Mobility and Energy sections.

Mr. Pruitt noted that Mr. Amstutz made a comment about transportation and parking, including free parking, noting parking is often a free resource but it should be priced and managed accordingly in order to incentivize more people to walk, bicycle and take public transportation. Ms. Dein and Ms. Cooper suggested a global search for the word “electric vehicle” in the Mobility section and to replace that term with “zero emission vehicle”. The Committee expressed no objection to either Mr. Amstutz’s change or Ms. Dein and Ms. Cooper’s changes. Mr. Amstutz offered to email specific language to Mr. Pruitt after the meeting.

Mr. Pruitt then noted a series of other small changes to the Roadmap that did not require discussion and concluded his remarks on the Roadmap.

Mr. Pruitt noted that while the goal is to finish the Net Zero Plan by end of 2020, it may end up being completed in early 2021 given the timing to schedule certain stakeholder feedback and other logistics. Mr. Pruitt then noted that the “Getting to Net Zero” chapter is forthcoming, and he will circulate to Committee members for comments. Mr. Pruitt then noted that Mr. Levy is working on a one-page “Letter From the Future,” which is intended to be the first chapter of the Net Zero Plan. Mr. Pruitt noted that the Committee is fairly close to having a draft of the whole plan, but that he is doubtful the plan can be approved formally by the Committee at its December 18 Meeting.

Mr. Katofsky made a motion to adjourn and Ms. Cooper seconded the motion. The Committee unanimously approved the motion.

The Meeting ended at 9:31am. The next meeting will occur on December 18, 2020.

Submitted by Dave Levy.