



## ENERGY AND CLIMATE COMMITTEE (ECC)

### AGENDA

Wednesday, June 7, 2023, 8:00 AM

City Hall, Second Floor Council Chambers

#### **Members:**

Zach Luse, Chair

Paul Roth, Vice Chair

Diana Duffy

Jake Pipp

Councilor Raleigh Ormerod

Jude Nuru

Peter Hansel

Clair Oursler

Kenneth Swymer

Councilor Bryan Lake

Beth Campbell

Lisa Maxfield, Alternate

Chuck Redfern, Alternate

Rowland Russell, Alternate

#### **Staff:**

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes – May 3, 2023
3. ECC Work Groups
  - a. Proposed work group assignments/membership
  - b. Format for monthly report-outs
  - c. Next steps
4. Community Power Program update
5. Legislative Update
  - a. 2021 Energy Code
6. Committee Membership
7. New Business
8. Upcoming Dates of Interest:
  - a. Jeff Speck Presentation: Monday, June 12, 2023, Heberton Hall
  - b. SWRPC Annual Meeting: Tuesday, June 13, 2023
  - c. Building a Clean Energy Future virtual workshop: Thursday, June 15, 2023, 6:00 pm
  - d. Next Meeting: Wednesday, July 5, 2023 – 8:00 am – To Be Confirmed
9. Adjourn

Link to ECC Google Drive Folder:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1O1WIR0fADTNijRt13v3DU7k2FwxXDcGs?usp=sharing>

1 City of Keene  
2 New Hampshire

3  
4  
5 ENERGY AND CLIMATE COMMITTEE  
6 MEETING MINUTES  
7

Wednesday, May 3, 2023

8:00 AM

Council Chambers, City Hall

Members Present:

-Zach Luse, Chair  
-Paul Roth, Vice Chair  
-Councilor Bryan Lake  
-Peter Hansel  
-Jake Pipp  
-Jude Nuru  
-Diana Duffy  
-Clair Oursler  
-Kenneth Swymer  
-Charles Redfern, Alternate  
-Lisa Maxfield, Alternate  
-Rowland Russell, Alternate

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

Guests:

Chris Skoglund, Clean Energy NH  
Mike Hagan, City of Keene Plans Examiner  
Med Kopczynski, City of Keene Economic  
Development Director

Members Not Present:

Councilor Raleigh Ormerod  
Beth Campbell

8  
9 **1) Call to Order and Roll Call**

10 Chair Luse called the meeting to order at 8:03 AM. Attendance was taken by roll call.  
11

12 **2) Approval of Minutes – April 5, 2023 & April 11, 2023**

13 Chair Luse noted the minutes for the retreat said 8AM, but the retreat was at 1PM. With no other  
14 changes to the minutes, Chair Luse asked for a motion to adopt the minutes, and noted that both  
15 sets of minutes could be adopted at the same time. Vice Chair Paul Roth motioned to approve the  
16 minutes with a second from Councilor Bryan Lake. With no opposition, the minutes were  
17 accepted.  
18

19 **3) Guest Speakers: 2021 Energy Code**

20 **A) Chris Skoglund, Clean Energy NH**

21 Mr. Skoglund offered a little background explaining that Clean Energy New Hampshire is often  
22 considered to be a trade organization that is out to support principally solar organizations, but  
23 they have a membership that has grown to represent thirty-six municipalities which covers  
24 approximately 425,000 New Hampshire residents and almost one third of the population. While  
25 their membership does include numerous solar installers, they also have many other clean energy

26 companies, as well as all three utilities, and then non-energy businesses that are members of their  
27 organization.

28

29 They do not see their mission as to advance the economic interests of any one entity but to  
30 pursue clean, affordable local abundant clean energy for all. Mr. Skoglund's interest in building  
31 energy codes is one that he brought to the organization back in 2022, when he moved over from  
32 the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, where he had been for  
33 approximately fifteen years. His portfolio there was mostly climate and energy, and he was  
34 fortunate to work with Rhett Lamb and Micaela Engert, when they were with Keene, on climate  
35 mitigation and climate adaptation issues, and very often held Keene up as the city to follow.  
36 He explained that his involvement in building energy codes came after recognizing that the most  
37 cost-effective and ideal time to incorporate energy attributes, especially energy efficiency ones,  
38 is when the building is first built. Having to go back into a building adds time, cost, and material  
39 costs that would not otherwise be there. Buildings can last decades to centuries in New  
40 Hampshire as opposed to some energy measures which mainly last just a few years, so by  
41 building right the first time it saves money in the long run.

42

43 Beginning in 2009, building energy codes became slightly more problematic for the state as that  
44 was when the stimulus program was passed by the Obama Administration and embedded in that  
45 program were requirements necessary for the State to able to accept future funding from the  
46 Federal Government. As such, building energy codes had to be updated to the 2009 levels.  
47 Codes are updated every three years, so three years later when the 2012 codes came out, there  
48 was a big jump in terms of the efficiency requirements, which translated to a big jump in the  
49 upfront costs that the builders and contractors would experience when putting these codes in  
50 place. These were also costs that were not necessarily going to be recognized by the real estate  
51 market, making it a much larger issue all the way through in terms of who ends up paying and  
52 who ends up benefitting, which results in this distinction, called the split incentive. The occupant  
53 will usually be the beneficiary, but sometimes the costs are borne by the realtors and the  
54 contractors.

55

56 The Building Energy Code Review or the Building Code Review Board, which was created in  
57 2000 out of recognition that the State would benefit from a uniform code, opted to try to skip the  
58 2012 code. When the 2015 code came up, there was again a modest increase in the efficiency of  
59 that, but it was still a big jump over 2009. The Building Energy Code Review Board ended up  
60 adopting the 2015 Energy Code, but when it went to the Legislature there was significant  
61 pushback. The code was ultimately amended on the energy side, both for the residential chapter  
62 and then for the commercial chapter. It took 4 years of haggling for all parties to agree on the  
63 adoption of the 2015 code. Those key amendments were left in place until last March of 2022.

64

65 As a result of the disagreement concerning energy codes as well as fire code, the code adoption  
66 ended up being almost three cycles behind. This started to impact insurance rates for  
67 municipalities across the state. Currently, the state is on the 2018 code and the Building Code  
68 Review Board is considering the 2021 code, even though the 2024 codes are about to come out.

69 In response, there was recognition from some key representatives and Senators that a more  
70 consistent review and adoption process was needed, especially since some municipalities were  
71 already pushing for more advanced modern energy code and there were also significant  
72 insurance implications for falling too far behind the code. By watching and learning from  
73 surrounding states as well as across the country, they hope to identify what worked and what  
74 does not work and what new codes would be a benefit so that they are not moving ahead and  
75 adopting codes that might be counterproductive or not work within the climate, or just turn out to  
76 be technically unfeasible.

77

78 Mr. Skoglund explained that Mr. Mike Hagan has been leading one group, which is the energy  
79 code chapter review of the 2021 code. There's another couple of individuals that are leading up  
80 the residential chapter, which also include energy elements. He explained that the energy  
81 elements in the residential chapter are separate from the amendments, and this can lead to it  
82 being quite confusing and is a direct result of the different but interrelated moving parts and  
83 references across time. The concern lies in that there is a big jump between the 2018 code and  
84 the 2021 code in terms of efficiency. While there is a big gain in terms of energy reduction, it  
85 comes at an upfront capital cost to the contractors and the developers, and this is a cost that may  
86 not be easily recovered in a real estate market. He explained there has been more work to try to  
87 address how to have more upfront ratings for buildings that are more accessible and  
88 understandable to the consumer. The contractors and home builders have made it clear that they  
89 do not wish to adopt the 2021 code and they prefer to stay with the 2018 code. So far, that is the  
90 only position that has been laid out.

91

92 On Friday morning, Mr. Hagan will be facilitating a conversation at the Department of Safety  
93 from 10AM to Noon, which will provide an opportunity to dig into some of the assumptions that  
94 the builders and contractors have. He mentioned some claims about recent added costs to new  
95 residence in the range of \$30-40,000. He believes those are not new costs, but rather the total  
96 cost of compliance with the code and believes they may be using some values that were provided  
97 by the National Association of Homebuilders. Mr. Skoglund was hopeful that they would be able  
98 to dig into and understand those numbers better. This will hopefully help various stakeholders to  
99 be able to find some common ground allowing for amendments that are modest, without  
100 eliminating all the energy efficiency benefit. While hopeful, he is also realistic that this will take  
101 some haggling and some deep diving into the specific details of the various proposals and data  
102 that the home builders and contractors are going to place before them. This situation is  
103 compounded by several municipalities that are interested in moving faster than the State because  
104 of their climate energy targets. The town of Durham often gets cited as a bad actor because they  
105 have an ordinance that allows them to or directs them to adopt the newest building energy code  
106 as soon as it is released. They are currently working under the 2021 code and as soon as the 2024  
107 code comes out they will start implementing that. This creates a headache for contractors,  
108 builders and code enforcement officials as it creates a patchwork of different codes used  
109 throughout the state rather than a uniform building energy code. Mr. Skoglund paused there for  
110 questions.

111

112 Chair Luse thanked Mr. Skoglund and asked what some of the items were that have been seen as  
113 significant added costs. Mr. Skoglund welcomed Mr. Hagan to step in. Mr. Skoglund shared that  
114 his portfolio covers a bunch of different technology, but shared that from his perspective, some  
115 of the added costs tend to be from the weatherization requirements, such as insulation.  
116 Requirements have gotten more stringent requiring continuous insulation that is on the outside  
117 and is air sealed. For example, if someone was to install pink board, they would also have to  
118 ensure that all the junctions between the boards are sealed and tight. By adding insulation, it adds  
119 one level of efficiency. By ensuring that there are no leaks in the building envelope, that ensures  
120 that any air that has been heated or cooled stays where it should be. This, however, comes at an  
121 additional cost because not only is there the cost for the foam board and the sealant, but also the  
122 increased workforce costs for crews to go through and seal all of it.

123  
124 There is also this question of mechanical ventilation. Previously, buildings used to be built so  
125 that they ventilated themselves. Mr. Skoglund explained that anyone that has been in an older  
126 building knows that there are drafts and leaks around the windows or up in the attic. As building  
127 science has improved, buildings have gotten tighter. While this is beneficial on the energy side,  
128 this has raised new concerns. Warm, moist air that is trapped inside a building creates ideal  
129 conditions for mold and fungus and can lead to what is called sick building syndrome. Building  
130 materials have also advanced so that they are not just using all-natural material, but they are  
131 using material that can off gas. It comes down to a balancing act of making sure that a building is  
132 tight and adequately insulated in terms of air not getting in or out, but still allowing for  
133 controlled air exchange to prevent moist, stale air from accumulating to make sure these  
134 buildings not only operate properly and last a long time, but also do not become a source of  
135 illness for the inhabitants or users of the building. Unfortunately, the mechanical systems are  
136 somewhat of a new feature and while they add long term health benefit, it comes at a significant  
137 upfront cost that can be a hindrance.

138  
139 Chair Luse shared that as someone who has done the air, ceiling, and weatherization piece on a  
140 one hundred and fifty-year-old church, he knows it is incredibly hard to do later and it seems  
141 short sighted to him. Mr. Skoglund responded that he spent one winter up in his attic air sealing  
142 all the top plates. One of the things that he noticed was how over a 50- or 60-year period, that  
143 insulation had degraded. All along the vent areas, where air was being vented outside, it was  
144 black from the dust that had been migrating up through the wall spaces and up against the  
145 insulation. He did this in the middle of winter, so he also got a chance to see what happens when  
146 that warm air touches the cold insulation. He was able to tell where he needed to seal based on  
147 the color. He noted new modern buildings will eliminate that, and last longer if they are built, as  
148 the code defines, but then who pays?

149  
150 Chair Luse asked if they were to decide not to adopt the 2021 building energy codes or weaken  
151 them significantly, whether that would put the city farther behind for the 2024 codes, and result  
152 in having to catch up when those come out. Mr. Skoglund responded that while he has not seen  
153 the analysis on what the jump is for 2021 to 2024, the previous 2012-2015 jumps were  
154 significant. Ultimately, the building community is pushing for a goal of having net-zero

155 buildings that are cost effective to build for the first time by 2030 or shortly after. He explained  
156 that the codes are ratcheting down, but it is his understanding that between 2015 and 2018, there  
157 was a very modest increase in efficiency of about 1%. Really, the code was focused on fixing  
158 some administrative and clerical issues to make it simpler to implement, but also allowing the  
159 building community a moment to catch its breath with a pause after the big jumps between 2012  
160 and 2015. Between the 2018 and 2021 code, there is almost a 14% improvement in efficiency. A  
161 jump of that nature does incur new construction techniques and new material costs. He noted that  
162 the 2015 amendments have only recently been implemented, and this jump is seen as possibly  
163 having a significant impact of the building community, which is where he believes a lot of the  
164 concern lies. There are those that feel that the code has gone far enough, the buildings should be  
165 free to breathe, and it is not needed to have them be as tight nor is there a need for the  
166 mechanical ventilation. However, on the other side, there are those that recognize that there is a  
167 need to eliminate or significantly reduce energy consumption to decarbonize the economy and  
168 having buildings that last for a century that are not optimally efficient, is just going to get in the  
169 way of that. This creates this tension between who pays now/ who pays later.

170  
171 Chair Luse asked if Mr. Hagan or Mr. Medard Kopczynski had anything to add before he opened  
172 it up to questions.

173  
174 **B) Mike Hagan, City of Keene Plans Examiner**

175 Mr. Hagan approached the microphone, thanked the committee for having him and introduced  
176 himself. He shared that he sits on the Building Code Review Board and has been on the board for  
177 six years now and served as an alternate two years before that. He explained that while Mr.  
178 Skoglund went over the cycle, he is there to help everyone get an understanding of where they  
179 are in the process at this point. He explained that Mr. Kopczynski is the chair of that committee,  
180 but was on medical leave, so in his absence, Mr. Hagan stepped up. Mr. Kopczynski has since  
181 returned and is helping out as they move forward in preparation for this next meeting coming up  
182 on Friday.

183  
184 Mr. Hagan provided a little history of the Building Code Review Board, explaining that it is  
185 made up of eighteen different representatives from different associations. He represents the New  
186 Hampshire Building Officials Association on the Board as a representative for codes and  
187 enforcement portion. He explained there are only two other code enforcement representatives on  
188 the board and the rest are all represented by the Association of General Contractors and the spot  
189 that Mr. Skoglund held. Mr. Hagan asked if Mr. Skoglund's spot was with the Department of  
190 Energy.

191 Mr. Skoglund clarified that he never sat on the board and was with the Department of  
192 Environmental Services. He further explained that the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) had a  
193 seat, but when the public utilities were divided into the PUC and the Department of Energy, the  
194 Department of Energy was given a seat. He is not sure if that individual's been able to make it  
195 lately.

196

197 Mr. Hagan explained that the first thing they do with a change in code adoption is look at  
198 whether it is an increase, decrease or neutral. They do not necessarily have to look at all 900,000  
199 pages of code, but rather at the changes proposed between the previous code adoption and the  
200 proposed code. As a committee, they break into smaller subcommittees and then make  
201 recommendations from there. At this point, they are at the subcommittee level with the  
202 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) as it has not been recommended to the full  
203 board yet. They are working with all the parties involved in this including Mr. Skoglund,  
204 representatives from the Legislature, and representatives from the Homebuilders Association.  
205 There were some pretty strong opinions on both sides, and more is expected for this meeting on  
206 Friday. What they hope to do is determine if people want to move the code forward or stay at the  
207 2018. If the decision is to move the code forward, it is of benefit as it means staying with the  
208 most up-to-date code adoption. It prevents falling too far behind, which is a requirement for  
209 insurance ratings. He explained if the code is more than six years back, insurances can ding you  
210 on ratings as can The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) with building codes.  
211 So, there is a lot that goes into Insurance Services Office (ISO) ratings for municipalities, and it  
212 is at all levels; not just the building department, but also fire and police. It makes an impact on  
213 how the whole city is rated.

214  
215 On Friday, they are hoping to get everybody together and move forward. They have set aside a  
216 three-hour block to get everybody in one room and propose how they want to move the code  
217 forward or not move the code forward, etc. Mr. Hagan, and Mr. Mike Soucy, Department of  
218 Energy, have been working on some proposed amendments for the envelope itself. Currently, the  
219 envelope requires increased or continuous R value on the exterior. New Hampshire is split into 2  
220 zones: zone five (the three lower counties-Cheshire County, Hillsborough County and  
221 Rockingham County) and zone 6 (the upper counties). Zone 6 has higher standards because of  
222 the 2015 to 2018 changes. Right now, under the 2018, Zone 6 already has continuous R value.  
223 Many developers up there are already feeling the impact of that change. With the 2021 changes,  
224 the continuous R value change will continue down to zone 5, which is where the most population  
225 is in the State of New Hampshire (Keene, Manchester, Portsmouth, Nashua, etc.).

226  
227 He explained that many of the benefits that come out of the IECC are not just in the thermal  
228 envelope of the building; it is with the energy and electrical portion, which is a thick part of the  
229 energy code as are the mechanical systems, the ratings for those mechanical systems and the  
230 efficiencies of those mechanical systems. Much of it comes down to education and educating  
231 new homeowners on the mechanical systems, how to maintain them, when to replace them, etc.  
232 The education portion needs to catch up as well on these very efficient homes.

233  
234 Ms. Diana Duffy asked for clarification on whether this was all residential or residential and  
235 commercial. Mr. Hagan responded that the residential code is used to build from beginning to  
236 end with mechanical, electrical, plumbing, etc. Commercial (three units and above) is broken out  
237 into different codes (mechanical, building, accessibility, electrical, etc.). He clarified these  
238 changes would be for all new buildings and all existing buildings, which are also impacted with  
239 code updates and presents a challenge of how to implement the updates into existing structures.

240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282

**C) Medard Kopczynski, City of Keene Director of Economic Development**

Mr. Kopczynski introduced himself and explained he was one of the original members of the Building Code Review Board and sat on the 2012 Committee for the International Conservation Energy Conservation Code. He explained the issue really is not granite countertops versus energy. The battle is going to be over affordable housing. The residential portion of the energy code applies to all residential occupancies less than three stories high. He explained that people tend to think in terms of houses, but apartment buildings that are less than three stories high are also covered under that code. The basic conversation that he hears from developers is that there is no benefit to them to meet the energy code because they build the building. There is no payback because even if they own the building and build to rent out, the beneficiary is not them- it is the tenant. So, the question would be what at the State level can be done, and he shared that there are other conversations currently happening to determine what would facilitate payback.

He explained that there is a conversation that needs to be had around the code adoption. Staying with the 2018 code is not a simple answer as it is more complicated to stay on the 2018. What one is really looking at is adopting some manner of the 2021 energy code and determining what portions can be amended. He explained that in their report, they broke it down into three potential costs. They can determine those costs using various reports that are out there. Pacific Northwest Labs, which has a contract with the Department of Energy, creates reports down to the State Level, but explained that many of these reports have been there for a while and have not taken into consideration the level of inflation. There is also the ongoing cost of operating. It is not just adopting the changes as in many cases owners must be very clear, and very careful in making sure whoever is operating the building knows some of the tricks of maintaining that equipment and making sure it is operating right. There is also going to be ongoing maintenance and repairs. The third cost they identified was societal, especially given the ongoing national discussion about the cost of carbon, increasing temperatures from climate and things like that. He does believe there is an increased cost, but he does not think the discussion is going to be around whether to include granite counters in a half million-dollar home. He believes the real discussion is going to be on affordable housing and how this affects affordable housing.

Mr. Kopczynski explained that they have asked Mike Soucy and Mike Hagan, who are the most experienced in working with the document, to go in and look at where those differences lie, which will be the subject of the discussion for Friday. He also explained that very shortly, the energy code is becoming standards-based as it has recently been suspended. Ultimately, the IECC and the National Association of Homebuilders want to progress to a net zero code, but the battle will be affordability.

Chair Luse mentioned that one thing he heard Mr. Skoglund say earlier on was that the real estate market did not recognize some of these improvements. He asked if Mr. Kopczynski thought home energy labeling could help with that. Mr. Kopczynski responded that he did, he believed there had been discussions around that and he understood that there were even places for that within the MLS. The question around that would be how to get that industry on board.

283 He said he believed Mr. Greenwald, Jr. was coming into the presidency of the Realtors  
284 Association and thought there was an opportunity for a discussion to take place. He noted that it  
285 really is a matter of creating demand and questioned how to stimulate or reward the people who  
286 are building apartments and apartment buildings to build them to be more efficient.

287  
288 Mr. Skoglund asked if he could add to the conversation. At the last Building Code Review  
289 Board, he heard people saying rents cannot support the added marginal incremental costs of the  
290 new codes. There were developers in attendance who build their own buildings and then rent  
291 them out. They were finding in their markets that they could not make a profit given current  
292 construction costs, current material construction costs and inflation rates, and the cost of labor.  
293 They were not able to recover and still make a profit from the existing pool of renters.  
294 This ends up creating this dynamic where, if the costs are too high and the rents do not support  
295 both the profit and recovery of first costs, buildings may not get built. As a result, they have  
296 engaged the New Hampshire Housing and Finance Authority, who were part of the conversation  
297 in 2015 through 2018 to make sure it was on their radar.

298  
299 **D) Questions and Answers**

300 Chair Luse recognized Ms. Brunner. She noted that when the Committee was working on the  
301 energy plan a few years back, they had done some research into the split incentive issue and  
302 looked at what some other communities in the New England area are doing. The city of  
303 Burlington had a good example of how they have handled it. They also looked at some  
304 communities in Massachusetts who have a local ordinance where they offer rewards or  
305 incentives. For example, if a landlord who owns a rental property pays the energy costs and they  
306 pay for the utility bills, they do not have to comply to meet the energy standards. If, however, a  
307 landlord forwards those bills to the tenants, they then are required to meet the energy standards.  
308 She added that she was not sure how it works in New Hampshire and was not aware of any  
309 community in New Hampshire that has done this, but wanted to remind people of it as it has  
310 been a couple of years. One of the key recommendations developed and put into the energy plan  
311 to deal with this issue was benchmarking and home energy labeling. Those two strategies were  
312 identified to try and help make the cost of energy and energy efficient upgrades to buildings  
313 more transparent when choosing whether to rent or buy.

314  
315 Mr. Kopczyński asked Ms. Brunner if the density bonus was also put in there. Ms. Brunner  
316 clarified that a density bonus for solar was put in, but it was not tied to the building code.  
317 Chair Luse suggested investigating the topic of split incentives as an issue to explore further. He  
318 asked if there were any other areas that committee members or members of the public thought  
319 they should be acting on or keeping an eye on.

320  
321 Ms. Nora Hanke spoke and shared that she wanted to mention and ask the experts here if they  
322 want to make any comments about funding from the BIL or IRA (recent federal legislation) that  
323 supports stretch building codes and bringing municipalities, counties, and states into compliance  
324 with existing codes.

325

326 Mr. Skoglund offered to speak to it quickly. He shared that there had been an organization called  
327 Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships (NEEP). The organization was headquartered in  
328 Massachusetts but covers the 15 Coastal States from Maine down to West Virginia. They had  
329 reached out to New Hampshire, to see if NH wanted to be part of a workforce program that  
330 would support the implementation of more modern codes. Ultimately, the New Hampshire  
331 Department of Energy had to decline because there was a requirement insisting that the state  
332 have adopted newest energy code, and because before the state can adopt a code, there is a state  
333 statute that requires a two-year cooling off period before adoption. Clean Energy New  
334 Hampshire, and some other parties are watching that process because we do have a workforce  
335 issue, a program that we are attempting to maintain through the New Hampshire Saves program.  
336 New Hampshire Saves is run by the utilities, using repair funds and a new plan that is going to be  
337 filed on July first of this year. He is also involved in that effort and as part of this conversation,  
338 he reached out to the Department of Energy to see if any funding might be able to cover that  
339 incremental cost, especially for affordable housing.

340  
341 Mr. Kopczynski shared he was hoping there would be some InvestNH money directed that way.  
342 Mr. Kopczynski explained that the whole energy code conversation goes back to Jimmy Carter  
343 days. There was a split made due to the economy at the time and they treated industrial or  
344 commercial very differently than they treated residential, because they did not want to kill the  
345 economy at the time. He clarified that the underlying cost is something called Ashrae 90. All the  
346 codes discussed and contained in the book he presented are found to be equivalent to Ashrae 90.  
347 He believes it is a statutory requirement and is something they pointed out in the report. The  
348 State is supposed to certify back to Congress that their top energy code equals the latest adopted  
349 version of Ashrae 90. There is no penalty that he is aware of for not complying, but there is this  
350 underlying requirement at the Federal Level.

351  
352 Ms. Brunner reminded everyone of the time and given their interest in the topic, asked if there  
353 was interest in continuing this topic on another date. Chair Luse agreed they did want to continue  
354 this discussion at a future meeting.

355  
356 Mr. Hagan requested to add one thing to answer Chair Luse's question. He stated the importance  
357 that all municipalities, when looking to adopt or make building code changes, be vetted through  
358 the Building Code Review Board as that process is part of the State law change. Mr. Hagan  
359 explained that they could be of benefit to the committee if they propose either a stretch code or a  
360 change. Code Enforcement already had two educated and talented individuals that already  
361 worked for the city that could help with that process if you choose to move in that  
362 direction. He encouraged the committee, if they are meeting at a subcommittee level, to utilize  
363 his department as they could help move through that process. He noted that many communities  
364 try to do it and are unsuccessful due to not understanding or following the process. Chair Luse  
365 thanked Mr. Hagan, Mr. Skoglund and Mr. Kopczynski for their time and the very informative  
366 discussion.

367  
368 4) **ECC Work Groups**

369                   **A)    Retreat Recap**

370 Chair Luse moved on to discuss the retreat, provided a recap and shared that the conversation  
371 with Julia Griffin was great. He shared that she suggested having people monitor legislation and  
372 the New England ISO because there is relatively no oversight, and they manage the reliability  
373 and wholesale market around New England. She shared that it is often more effective to have  
374 citizens speak up on legislation because they are not paid to be there. She also discussed leaving  
375 room to shift priorities to where volunteers were really interested and knowledgeable if it aligns  
376 with the group’s goals. She also suggested using students from Dartmouth in Hanover, and that  
377 there might be an opportunity to work more with Keene State students or Antioch students. He  
378 shared that Ms. Brunner gave a great background on the climate action and adaptation plans, and  
379 the energy plan, and the purpose of the committee, which was all laid out in the minutes.

380  
381                   **B)    Proposed work groups and assignments/membership**

382 The priorities for 2023 and 2024 were also discussed during the retreat. The current committees  
383 were spread thin, and they wanted to focus on more resources to get more done. There were lots  
384 of ideas and he thought when they sat down to figure out what the work group should be, they  
385 decided a lot of those priorities and ideas like home energy labeling, benchmarking, and  
386 measurements, all could be done by a staff person if they were able to find the funding to do that.  
387 As a result, one of the new work groups is grant funding and partnerships to really look at where  
388 to find funds to hire somebody to help facilitate and do a lot of these things.

389  
390 Education and outreach were two big themes and the electric vehicle piece kind of got folded a  
391 little bit into that. Chair Luse believed market forces are going to drive EV adoption, but there  
392 were some issues around chargers that could be addressed. Ultimately, they decided to table the  
393 electric vehicle work group for now and focus on education and outreach, community solar as  
394 that was making some really good progress on finding solar sites.

395  
396 The Committee decided to have five work groups: 1 - education and outreach, 2 - community  
397 solar, 3 - grants, funding and partnerships, 4 - legislative tracking, and 5 - food security.

398  
399 Chair Luse suggested using the limited time left to determine who was going to lead each group  
400 and who desired to be members. He suggested sticking to a core work group that each person  
401 really wanted to focus on. Ms. Brunner offered to put together a survey, or a poll, or something  
402 that she could send out for people to pick their first and second choice. Chair Luse offered to  
403 lead the education and outreach. Councilor Lake offered to lead the legislative work group. Mr.  
404 Clair Ousler offered to work on education and outreach. Mr. Rowland Russell offered to lead the  
405 food security group and offered to be on the grant funding and partnerships group. Mr. Hansel  
406 agreed to be on community solar. Mr. Jude Nuru offered to lead the community solar.  
407 Mr. Nuru stated he was initially under the impression that the legislative update was to be done  
408 by the sustainability coordinator. Chair Luse said they would need to determine the role and  
409 responsibilities for that.

410  
411                   **C)    Format for monthly report-outs**

412 Chair Luse suggested changing how the report-outs are done going forward. He suggested  
413 a Google form that would allow the committee to report-out up to a week in advance. This would  
414 provide Ms. Brunner enough time to get the reports into the agenda packet. The report-outs  
415 would be in a more structured format that should be simple to fill out and submit, and then there  
416 would be a section of the meeting to address whatever topics or decisions need to be made.

417

418 **5) Community Power Program**

419 **A) Update on program launch**

420 Chair Luse moved on to community power and asked if anybody had anything to add quickly.  
421 Mr. Brunner said the first task of the education and outreach group will be to figure out how to  
422 promote that opt-up in the next 2 weeks before the May fifteenth deadline. She said they were in  
423 the middle of that right now. The letters were sent out, April 12th, and so everyone in Keene  
424 received one of two letters, either an opt-out letter with an opt-out card (if they are currently on  
425 Eversource) or if they are currently on third-party supplier, they should have received an opt-in  
426 letter. The exception to that is, if somebody recently moved in the last couple of months, then  
427 they might have been missed because of the date of the data.

428

429 The second information meeting occurred last night, and she thanked those committee members  
430 who were in attendance. She shared that the first meeting had almost 200 attendees. The deadline  
431 for people to join the program, opt-out of the program or choose a different option is May 15th.  
432 While there is a deadline, it should be made clear that they can also change at any point and  
433 without penalty, if they are not on some other provider that has a penalty for changing. She  
434 reiterated that the May 15<sup>th</sup> deadline is for people who want to join the program when it launches  
435 or opt out of the program before it launches. You can change it after that deadline, but there will  
436 likely be a delay.

437

438 The program will start with the meter reads in June, so any changes will not be reflected until the  
439 July bill for June usage. If someone makes changes after the deadline of May 15<sup>th</sup>, changes  
440 would not likely be noticed until August or September bills depending on when the changes were  
441 made.

442 **B) “opt up to 100%” Campaign**

443 Chair Luse suggested talking to neighbors or friends and encouraging them to opt up.

444

445 **6) Report-outs on Recent ECC-sponsored Events**

446 **A) NHSaves Button Up Workshop**

447 Chair Luse also shared that the Clean Energy Team did a NH Saves Button Up workshop on  
448 May 1<sup>st</sup>. They had eighteen attendees. It was overall a good event with great feedback. There  
449 were able to get a lot of good information into people’s hands.

450

451 **7) Legislative Update**

452 Chair Luse shared that he did not have much in terms of a legislative update other than he did  
453 personally respond to the SB 54 with remote testimony.

454

455       **8) Committee Membership**

456 Chair Luse discussed committee membership and how they are always looking for members. He  
457 believed they had 2 alternate positions and suggested committee members keep eyes and ears  
458 open for anyone that might be interested in joining.

459

460       **9) New Business**

461           **A) Potential Fall Retreat**

462 Lastly, Chair Luse discussed the idea of doing a fall retreat like the recent spring retreat. He felt  
463 the retreat was successful and offered time to talk about the issues, the group's priorities, and  
464 discuss how the group was doing overall. He personally believed that it served to energize the  
465 group and help everyone keep an eye on the prize and stay focused on goals. The group was  
466 open to it and scheduling work will start soon.

467

468       **10) Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 7, 2023- 8:00AM**

469 Without any other new business, Chair Luse shared that the next meeting is Wednesday, June 7<sup>th</sup>  
470 at 8AM.

471

472       **11) Adjournment**

473 Chair Luse adjourned the meeting at 9:15AM.

474

475 Respectfully submitted by,  
476 Amanda Trask, Minute Taker

477

478 Reviewed and edited by,  
479 Mari Brunner, Senior Planner



## ENERGY AND CLIMATE COMMITTEE (ECC)

### 2023-2024 WORK GROUPS

#### **Education and Outreach**

Members: Zach Luse (lead), Lisa Maxfield, Clair Oursler, *Carolyn Jones*

Draft Description: This group will research and identify priority energy and climate topics and share information about them. Example topics include, but are not limited to electric vehicles, clean energy incentives for residents/businesses, Keene Community Power “opt-up” option, heat pumps, etc. The work group will share information by collaborating with community partners, participating in local/regional events (e.g. Earth Festival), and organizing events (e.g. Annual Energy Week in October, NH Saves workshops).

*Example* Goals (these may change):

1. Organize & coordinate the annual Energy Week with help from partners.
2. Participate in at least two local or regional events to share information (e.g. Earth Day).
3. Write at least three letters to the editor on clean energy or climate topics.
4. Write an article for the Shopper News “Green Monadnock” column in early October to promote Energy Week events.

Monthly meeting schedule: TBD

Link to folder: <https://tinyurl.com/y4py4v3j>

#### **Grants, Fundraising, Partnerships**

Members: Chuck Redfern (lead), Beth Campbell, Ken Swymer

Draft Description: This group will research grants and funding opportunities and, with approval from the full Committee, submit applications to receive funding for specific programs or other purposes (e.g. fund a sustainability coordinator position). If funding is awarded, this group will seek City Council approval for the funding. In addition, this group will identify and collaborate with community partners to increase the capacity of Keene to accomplish its energy and climate goals.

Goals: TBD

Monthly meeting schedule: TBD

Link to folder: <https://tinyurl.com/z45bcqfb>

## **Legislative Tracking**

Members: Bryan Lake (lead), Jake Pipp, Raleigh Ormerod, *Mike Metell*

Draft Description: This group will track legislation and regulatory bodies related to energy and climate change (e.g. New England ISO, Building Code Review Board), share information with the full committee on legislation or regulatory matters that could impact the City of Keene, and make recommendations to the Committee regarding actions the Committee could take to influence the legislative or regulatory process at the local, state, and/or regional (multi-state) level.

Goals: TBD

Monthly meeting schedule: TBD

Link to folder: <https://tinyurl.com/2wxan2p3>

## **Community Solar**

Members: Jude Nuru (lead), Peter Hansel, Diana Duffy, *Bruce Norlund, John Kondos, Scott Maslansky*

Draft Description: This group will work with city staff to identify potential sites for community solar in Keene and share information about these potential sites with solar energy companies, other relevant organizations and potential off-takers/beneficiaries of a community solar installation. In addition, this group will share information about solar generally with residents and businesses in Keene (e.g. state, local, and federal incentives, "how-to" guide, etc.). Finally, this group may research and make recommendations to the full committee regarding ways to incentivize or decrease barriers to solar locally.

Goals: TBD

Monthly meeting schedule: TBD

Link to folder: <https://tinyurl.com/bddptnkd>

## **Food Security**

Members: Rowland Russell (lead)

Draft Description: This group will bring together various sectors of the community to research and discuss ways to foster food security in Keene and the larger region. The work group will include a coordinating group that will attend all sessions, and three focus groups that will each meet three times, organized around the following themes: 1 – farmers/producers, 2 – homeowners/residents, and 3 – social services/support. This work group will summarize findings and lessons learned throughout this process in a final report.

Goals: TBD

Monthly meeting schedule: TBD

Link to folder: <https://tinyurl.com/2p8k2hs7>