



ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEETING

~ MINUTES ~

Wednesday, February 9, 2022

5:30 PM

Sullivan Chamber

The Ordinance Committee met to conduct a public hearing on proposed amendments to the Building Energy Use Disclosure Ordinance (2021-26)

Attendee Name	Present	Absent	Late	Arrived
Marc C. McGovern	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Quinton Zondervan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Burhan Azeem	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Dennis J. Carlone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Alanna Mallon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Patricia Nolan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sumbul Siddiqui	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E. Denise Simmons	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: THANK YOU. A QUORUM OF THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE BEING PRESENT IN THIS MEETING IN ORDER TO CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUILDING ENERGY USE DISCLOSURE ORDINANCE 2021-26. PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 20 OF THE ACT 2021 BY THE MASSACHUSETTS GEN. ASSEMBLY AND APPROVED BY THE GOVERNOR. THE CITY HAS THE RIGHT TO USE ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION IN MEETINGS OF THE CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL. TO WATCH THE MEETING PLEASE TUNE TO CHANNEL 22 OR VISIT THE OPEN MEETING FOR PORTAL ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE. TODAY'S MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED IN A REMOTE FORMAT. IF YOU LIKE TO PROVIDE PUBLIC COMMENT PLEASE GO TO [LISTING NAMES] TO SIGN UP FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. WE WILL NOT ALLOW ANY ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS SIGN-UPS AFTER 6 PM. ALL THOSE TODAY WILL BE TAKEN BY ROLL CALL. MR. CLERK PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: THANK YOU MR. CLERK OBVIOUSLY THERE IS A LOT TO COVER. ON THE AGENDA WE ARE GOING TO HEAR FIRST FROM CDD. THEN WE CAN HAVE SOME CLARIFYING QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE. WE WILL THEN HEAR FROM COUNCILLOR NOLAN WITH A PRESENTATION ON THE AMENDMENTS THAT SHE WISHES TO BRING FORWARD. WE CAN HAVE CLARIFYING QUESTIONS FOLLOWING THAT PRESENTATION. WE WILL THEN HEAR FROM COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN WILL PRESENT THE GREEN NEW DEAL AMENDMENTS. WE CAN ASK QUESTIONS AFTER THAT. WE WILL GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT. AND THEN IF TIME WILL GO INTO WE CAN HAVE MORE DISCUSSION WE SORT OF ANTICIPATE THIS IS GOING TO TAKE CERTAINLY MORE THAN ONE MEETING TO GET THROUGH. SO THIS IS GOING TO BE A PROCESS. WE CERTAINLY WILL GET EVERYTHING TONIGHT. SO WITH THAT I THINK WE SHOULD PROBABLY JUST JUMP RIGHT IN AND GO TO CDD. ASSISTANT MANAGER.

>> Iram Farooq, Assistant City Manager of Community Development: THANK YOU COUNCILLOR MCGOVERN GOOD EVENING TO THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE. IT WAS A PLEASURE TO BE HERE. AND WE'RE ACTUALLY REALLY EXCITED TO BE HERE TO BE TALKING TO YOU TODAY ABOUT AMENDMENTS TO THE BUILDING ENERGY USE DISCLOSURE ORDINANCE THESE ARE LONG TIME IN THE MAKING. WE'VE BEEN WORKING ON THIS ALONG WITH MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY WITH THE REGULATED COMMUNITY AS WELL. STARTING PRE-PANDEMIC AND WITH SOME HOLD UP OVER TIME. SO IT'S REALLY NICE TO FINALLY HAVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS BEFORE THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE. WE FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT ADDING EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS REQUIREMENTS TO THE BUILDING ENERGY USE

DISCLOSURE ORDINANCE IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPACTFUL WAYS TO GET US TO NET ZERO GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AS A COMMUNITY. AND THAT IS SOMETHING THAT HAS BEEN VERY MUCH IN THE FOREFRONT OF THE TEAM AS THEY WORKED ON FRAMING THE RECOMMENDATIONS. I NOTE THAT THERE ARE MULTIPLE DIFFERENT OPINIONS ON THIS. WE WELCOME DISCUSSION ON THE VARIOUS IDEAS.

BUT I'M REALLY HAPPY TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO TALK YOU ABOUT THE GENESIS OF THE SPECIFICS THAT ARE IN THE PROPOSAL THAT HAS COME OUT OF THE WORK FOLLOWING THE NET ZERO ACTION PLAN. I WILL SAY THAT OUR PRESENTATION WHICH WILL BE GIVEN BY THE SPEC IS LARGELY THE SAME AS THE PRESENTATION AS THE HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE IN DECEMBER.

MOSTLY BECAUSE THE PETITION THE TEXT OF THE ORDINANCE OF THE PROPOSAL IS THE SAME. HOWEVER I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE DO DO THIS SINCE WE ARE NOW IN THE FORMAL ORDINANCE PROCESS AND IT WOULD MAKE SURE THAT EVERYBODY'S INTERESTED IS ATTENDING THIS HEARING AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO HEAR THE FULL SCOPE OF WHAT IS ON THE TABLE. SO WITH THAT I WILL JUST INTRODUCE. [LISTING NAMES] WE HEAR FROM ME MORE DEPARTMENT AND HAD THE LAW DEPARTMENT WAS DEFTLY PARTNER IN FRAMING FOR SPECIFICS OF THIS TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY PASSED THE MUSTARD AND IT WAS TURNED OVER TO. [LISTING NAMES] WHO IS LEADS THE NET ZERO WORK AT CDD. SETH OVER TO YOU.

>> Seth Federspiel, Sustainability Planner: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I WILL PULL UP THE PRESENTATION. THOSE FULL SCREEN SIDE COMING THROUGH FOR EVERYONE? GREAT. THANKS VERY MUCH FOR HAVING ME THIS EVENING. AS THE ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER SAID APOLOGIZE TO THOSE OF YOU FROM THIS WILL BE FAMILIAR PRESENTATION PRINT BUT I THINK AGAIN IT'S HELPFUL WAY TO GET EVERYBODY ON THE SAME PAGE. IN TERMS OF WHERE WE ARE WITH THIS PROCESS. I'M GOING TO MOVE THROUGH THIS PRETTY QUICKLY SO THAT WE CAN GET TO THE OTHER PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION I'M CERTAINLY HAPPY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AS WE GO. ALRIGHT SO I'M GOING TO BRIEFLY DISCUSS THE CONTEXT IN THE BACKGROUND FOR THE BUILDING ENERGY DISCLOSURE ORDINANCE PURSUANT TO CURRENT AMENDMENTS TALK ABOUT THE PROCESS AND GETTING TO THOSE AMENDMENTS.

I WILL FOCUS MOST OF THE PRESENTATION ON REVIEWING THE CONTENT OF THE AMENDMENTS THEMSELVES AS PROPOSED BY CDD AND THE CITY MANAGER BACK IN NOVEMBER. SO AS WE WERE SAID THE REASON WE ARE FOCUSED ON BUILDING AND REDUCING BILLING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BECAUSE BUILDINGS PLAY SUCH A LARGE ROLE IN OUR VENOUS GAS INVENTORY. SO IN ORDER TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN MEETING OUR CLIMATE CHANGE GOALS IS IMPERATIVE TO REDUCE EMISSIONS FROM BUILDINGS IN CAMBRIDGE AND WHEN WE LOOK AT BEUDO BUILDING SPECIFICALLY BEUDO APPLIES TO COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS THAT A LARGER THAN 25,000 FT. IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS LARGER THAN 50 UNITS. THESE BUILDINGS HAVE QUITE A FEW. NEVER.

SORRY ABOUT THAT. BUT THEY COUNT FOR ABOUT 60% OF THE SQUARE FOOTAGE OF THE CITY. AND THE ENERGY USE AND ALMOST 70% OF THE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS OF THE BUILDING SECTOR. SO 70% OF THAT 80%. THEY COME FROM BUILDINGS. THE REASON GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS ARE SOMEWHAT HIGHER THAN ENERGY IS IS BECAUSE OF THE AMOUNT OF ELECTRICITY USED BY THESE BUILDINGS WHICH HAS A SLIGHTLY HIGHER EMISSIONS FACTOR THEN NATURAL GAS.

WE MENTIONED THE ACTION PLAN I WENT TO BRIEFLY PLACE THIS PROPOSAL IN CONTEXT OF THE ACTION PLAN THE UPDATE WHICH WAS SUBMITTED TO COUNCIL A LITTLE BIT EARLIER THIS YEAR. THE ACTION PLAN IS A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR REDUCING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM BUILDINGS. AND WHILE BEUDO PLAYS A VERY IMPORTANT PIECE OF THAT. IT IS NOT THE ONLY PIECE.

SO ACROSS THE ACTION PLAN WHICH HAS ACTIONS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS THE NEW BUILDINGS AND THE ENERGY SUPPLY. WE HAVE COMBINATION PROPOSED REQUIREMENTS SUCH AS THE COUNTRY AMENDMENTS BUT ALSO A RANGE OF INCENTIVES AND SUPPORT IN ENABLING ACTIONS. SO BEUDO AGAIN PLAYS ONE PIECE OF THAT. BUT IN ORDER FOR THE NET ZERO ACTION PLAN TO BE SUCCESSFUL AND TO SUCCESSFULLY MEET OUR GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION GOALS WE NEED TO ACTIVATE ALL OF THESE ACTIONS TOGETHER TO ADDRESS THE FULL SET OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BUILDINGS IN CAMBRIDGE.

ON THE BEUDO PROCESS, BEUDO WAS ADOPTED IN 2014. INCLUDED A PROVISION THAT IN 20 TEAM WE REVIEWED THE IMPACT OF BEUDO. THAT REVIEW PROCESS SHOWED THAT THE ENERGY USE OF BEUDO BUILDINGS REMAINED RELATIVELY STABLE OVER THE TIME OF THE ORDINANCE. THIS AGAIN ENERGY USE WHICH IS DISTINCT FROM GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS OR HAVE GONE DOWN SLIGHTLY FOR BEUDO BUILDINGS. LARGELY DUE TO IMPROVEMENTS IN ELECTRICITY DEGRADES BUT CERTAINLY THIS TREND IS NOT SATISFYING THE SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT IN ENERGY PERFORMANCE CALLED FOR BY THE ORDINANCE. SO THIS TRIGGER THEN OUR PROCESS TO CONSIDER WHAT AMENDMENTS THE ORDINANCE WOULD LOOK LIKE.

SO TO BRIEFLY REVIEW THAT PROCESS A PROCESS AGAIN IN 2017 SO WE BEEN WORKING ON IT FOR NUMBER OF YEARS. IN THAT PROCESS CENTERED LARGELY AROUND CONSULTATION WITH THE ACTUAL BEUDO PROPERTY OWNERS TO REALLY UNDERSTAND WITH THEM WHAT THE CONSIDERATIONS ARE FOR IMPROVING ENERGY PERFORMANCE AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM THOSE BUILDINGS AND TO WORK TOWARDS DEVELOPING A PROPOSED APPROACH THAT CAN WORK FOR THE BUILDINGS AND ACHIEVE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS THAT WE NEED TO ACHIEVE.

AND SO COMING OUT OF THIS PROCESS WE HAD GENERAL SUPPORT FROM THE REGULATED COMMUNITY. ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND ASSIGNED SPACE TARGETS THAT WERE ESTABLISHED THEREIN. THERE IS A GOAL TO ESTABLISH REGULATORY CERTAINTIES SO TRIED TO GET THE POLICY FIGURED OUT SOONER RATHER THAN LATER. AND A DESIRE TO BALANCE FLEXIBILITY IN THE POLICY WITH SIMPLICITY AND PREDICTABILITY AGAIN KNOWING WHAT TO EXPECT GOING FORWARD.

I'M GOING TO JUMP INTO THE ACTUAL PROPOSAL THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS WERE SUBMITTED TO COUNCIL BACK IN NOVEMBER OF LAST YEAR. THIS LINE SUMMARIZES THEM I'M GOING TO GO THROUGH THESE ONE BY ONE. BUT IT'S YOU FOR YOUR REFERENCE. SO OF COURSE THE CENTER OF THE POLICY PROPOSAL IS THE ACTUAL PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS. AND SO POINT TO NOTE HERE IS THAT THE PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS ARE IN GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BREAKS AS OPPOSED TO ENERGY OR ANOTHER UNIT. AND THE REASON FOR THAT DO NOT HAVE CONVERSATION WITH THE PROPERTY OWNERS THAT ARE PREFERENCE FOR THAT UNIT OF WHAT WE ARE REGULATING TO MATCH WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO ACHIEVE.

I ADVISED REDUCING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BEING ABLE TO HAVE A LOT OF FLEXIBILITY FOR HOW THOSE REDUCTIONS ARE ACHIEVED SO THEY CAN COME FROM BOTH ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE MEASURES. THE ACTUAL COMPLAINTS AND TARGETS ARE ON THE LEFT-HAND SIDE AND IT WILL GO THROUGH THOSE ON THE NEXT SLIDE. BUT BASED ON THOSE TARGETS WE BASE IT ON WHAT THE SIZES: FOUR FROM THE IPCC IN TERMS OF OUR 2050 NET ZERO COMMITMENT.

IN THE INTERIM TARGETS BETWEEN NOW AND THEN. AND THEN THE OTHER IMPORTANT ASPECT TO UNDERSTAND HERE IS THAT THE CAMBRIDGE PROPOSAL THIS IS DIFFERENT THAN FOR EXAMPLE THE BOSTON ORDINANCE IS SETTING TARGETS RELATIVE TO EACH INDIVIDUALS BUILDINGS BASELINE. THIS REALLY SIMPLIFIES THE APPROACH.

BY AVOIDING THE NEED TO CALCULATE THE UNIVERSAL TARGET. BY BUILDING TYPE PRINT IT ALSO GIVES US MORE CERTAINTY ABOUT THE OUTCOME BECAUSE WE KNOW THAT ALL OF THE BUILDINGS ARE REDUCING A CERTAIN PERCENTAGE THEN THE OUTCOME IS THAT PERCENTAGE REDUCTION. IN EACH BUILDING IS THEN CONTRIBUTING A PROPORTIONAL AMOUNT OF THAT PERCENTAGE REDUCTION DEPENDING ON WHERE THEY ARE STARTING. SO HIGHER EMITTING BUILDING HAS TWO MAKE A LARGER ABSOLUTE REDUCTION. TO MAKE THE SAME PERCENTAGE AS A MORE EFFICIENT BUILDING IS A LOWER ABSOLUTE REDUCTION AGAIN AT THE SAME PERCENTAGE. SO THIS GRAPH IS VISUALIZING WHAT THOSE THRESHOLDS LOOK LIKE OVERTIME. AND SO AGAIN THE OLD WORLD TRAJECTORY PUT THIS ON THAT SCIENCE-BASED TARGETED NET 0 BY 2050 AND WE CHOSE INCREMENTS IN FIVE YEARS. TO MATCH UP WITH THE RETROFIT CYCLES THAT BUILDINGS WILL UNDERTAKE. SO ACKNOWLEDGING THAT IT TAKES TIME FOR BUILDINGS TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT RETROFITS. SO THAT WAY WE HAVE THESE STEPS SO THE BUILDINGS HAVE FIVE YEARS THEN THEY CAN MEET THE STEPS FOR ANOTHER FIVE YEARS AS ANTICIPATED THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.

AND BECAUSE THE BASELINE IS CONSISTENT THROUGHOUT ANY EARLY ACTION THAT IS TAKEN DURING ANY OF THE STEPS IS GIVEN CREDIT FOR IN THE FOLLOWING STEPS PRINCE OF THE BUILDING GOES BELOW 20% IN THE FIRST . FOR EXAMPLE THE NET AUTOMATICALLY CREDITED TOWARDS THE NEXT COMPLAINTS WE MET. THE WAY WE REGULATE COMPLAINTS IS LIKE REGULATING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FOR EACH ENERGY USE IN THE BUILDING. MULTIPLIED BY THE APPROPRIATE EMISSIONS FACTOR FOR THAT ENERGY USE. WE'LL TALK ABOUT THAT A LITTLE MORE AT THE NEXT LIGHT. THEN THERE'S ALSO A PROVISION THAT BUILDINGS CAN TAKE CREDIT FOR ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE CREDITS. WHICH ARE PURCHASED AND GO TO REINVEST IN GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION REDUCTIONS ELSEWHERE IN THE CITY.

THEN RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY WHICH I'LL TALK ABOUT IN A SECOND. IT IS ALSO A PART OF THE CALCULATION AND IT SUBTRACTED FROM THE ELECTRICITY USE PORTION OF THE ENERGY FORMULA. SO THE EMISSION FACTORS ARE IMPORTANT BECAUSE EMISSION FACTORS TRANSLATE THE AMOUNT OF ENERGY THAT THE BUILDINGS ARE USING TO THE EMISSIONS. FOR EXAMPLE ELECTRICITY EMISSIONS CHANGE OVER TIME AS THE STATE AND NATIONAL ELECTRIC GRID FOR CLEANER. SO WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF PLANNING THE STAKEHOLDER-BASED PROCESS TO DETERMINE THE EMISSION FACTORS IN PARTICULAR FOR THE ELECTRICAL GRID COMING IN LOOKING BACKWARDS TO THE BASELINE AND PROJECTING FORWARD SO THAT BUILDINGS KNOW WHAT THEY CAN EXPECT TO RECEIVE CREDIT FROM THE GRID OVER THE PERIOD OF EACH COMPLIANCE PERIOD.

WE WANT TO PROJECT FORWARD FIVE YEARS OF THE TIME TO GIVE BUILDING THAT CERTAINTY. SO AS THE BUILDING WENT TO COMPLY WITH THE PERFORMANCE STANDARD THEY CAN TAKE ON-SITE EMISSION REDUCTIONS. BY INCREASING THEIR ENERGY EFFICIENCY BY ELECTRIFYING THERE AND USES OF ENERGY IN GETTING OFF FOSSIL FUELS. AND BY PRODUCING ELECTRICITY THROUGH ON-SITE RENEWABLE SOURCES. THEY CAN ALSO PURCHASE OFF-SITE RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY. THIS APPLIES TO THE ELECTRICAL USE OF THE BUILDING. OR THEY CAN PURCHASE ALTERNATE COMPLAINTS CREDITS. BASICALLY TALK ABOUT EACH OF THESE. SO FOR THE OFF-SITE RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY WE WENT THROUGH A STAKEHOLDER PROCESS TO ESTABLISH THE CRITERIA WHAT COUNTS AS OFF-SITE RENEWABLE PRINT WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THESE NOBLES ARE HIGH QUALITY AND ARE ADDING TO THE ROOM NOBLES ON THE GRID AS OPPOSED TO KIND OF COUNTING THE SAME OR NOBLES THAT ARE ALREADY OUT THERE.

SO THESE REQUIREMENTS ARE FAIRLY STRINGENT. IN ORDER TO ADD TO THAT WERE NOBLES OUT THERE. AND WERE HOPING TO HELP BUILDING OWNERS ACCESS THESE WERE NOBLES POTENTIALLY THROUGH PATHWAYS SUCH AS OUR COMMUNITY AGGREGATION PROGRAM. THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE CREDITS AGAIN ARE AN ALTERNATIVE

COMPLIANCE MECHANISM THAT BUILDINGS CAN CHOOSE AND WE PROPOSE A PRICE FOR THESE CREDITS OF \$234 A TON WHICH IS CONSISTENT WITH THE BOSTON ORDINANCE. AND THAT PRICE IS BASED ON THE AVERAGE COST OF PRODUCING EMISSIONS FROM BUILDINGS SUCH AS THESE. SO IT TAKES THE AVERAGE COST OVER TIME AND DEPOSIT FORWARD TO UNDERSTAND WITHOUT MARGINAL COST WOULD BE CONNECT THE GOAL IS TO INCENTIVIZE BUILDINGS TO TAKE ACTION BUT THEN GIVE A REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE PAYMENT MECHANISM WHICH WOULD THEN BE REINVESTED IN CITY PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS TO REDUCE CARBON THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY.

SO ANOTHER ASPECT OF THE PROPOSAL FROM CDD IS BEEN BUILDINGS THE OPTION TO CHOOSE AN EARLIER BASELINE. THIS IS IN RESPONSE FROM TRUNK THE BACK OF THE BUILDING OWNERS THAT THEY WANTED TO HAVE A WAY TO TAKE CREDIT FOR ACTION BEFORE THAT DEFAULT BASELINE OF 2018 /2019. SO WHAT WE'VE DONE IS WE'VE ALLOWED A BASELINE BACK AS FAR AS 2010. BUT THEN WE SCALED THE REDUCTIONS SO THAT BUILDINGS REMAIN ON THAT SCIENCE-BASED TRAJECTORY OF 50% BY 2030 RELATIVE TO THAT 2010 BASELINE AND 100% BY 2050. SO WE CAN SEE THAT IN THESE NEXT COUPLE OF GRAPHS AND CHARTS.SO ON AVERAGE BEUDO BUILDINGS HAVE BEEN REDUCING THEIR EMISSIONS LARGELY AGAIN DUE TO THE GRID BY 2.53% A YEAR.

SO WHEN WE LOOK AT THAT TRAJECTORY IF YOU TAKE A BUILDING BACK BEYOND THE DEFAULT BASELINE WE ASSUME THAT THEIR MISSIONS WOULD HAVE BEEN HIGHER IN 2010 AND THEY WERE IN 2018 AND 2019. SO THE AMOUNT OF REDUCTIONS THAT THEY NEED TO MAKE BY 2030 TARGET ARE THEN PROPORTIONALLY HIGHER. IF BUILDINGS CHOOSE THE 2010 BASELINE THEY HAVE TO MAKE A 50% REDUCTION BY 2030 AS OPPOSED TO THE 40% REDUCTION FOR BUILDINGS TAKING THE DEFAULT BASELINE. BUT WHAT THIS ALLOWS IS FOR BUILDINGS THAT TO TAKE EARLY ACTION SAY THAT BUILDING REDUCES THE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BY 35% IN 2050 BEFORE THE DEFAULT BASELINE AT 35% REDUCTION WOULD HAVE THEM IN COMPLIANCE THROUGH THE OTHER 2029. SO THEY WOULD GET CREDIT FOR HAVING MAKING THE EFFORT FOR THE EARLY ACTION.

AND IT WOULD PRORATE THOSE REDUCTIONS OVER TIME. SO THIS SLIDE SHOWS THAT IF YOU TAKE AN EARLY BASELINE IN BETWEEN THE DEFAULT BASELINE IN THE 2010 YEAR THEN THE AMOUNT OF REDUCTION REQUIREMENT IS PRORATED ACCORDINGLY. THE OTHER FLEXIBILITY MECHANISM SHALL BE INCLUDED IS SPECIFIC OPTIONAL PATHWAYS FOR BOTH LABORATORIES AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING. I WILL SHOW HOW YOU WANT TO BE VERY CLEAR THAT WHILE THIS IS MORE FLEXIBLY TO THESE BUILDING TYPES IT ACHIEVES THE EXACT SAME AMOUNT OF A ROLE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS OVER TIME.

SO YOU SEE THAT THESE BUILDINGS HAVE A LONGER TIME PERIOD TO COMPLY TO GIVE THEM MORE TIME TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT THESE BUDGETS. BUT THEY HAVE HIGHER PRODUCTION PROFESSIONALS TO RATHER THAN THE 20% THRESHOLD IN 2035. THAT WAS PROPOSED THESE BUILDINGS WOULD HAVE TO HIT A 33% REDUCTION THRESHOLD STARTING IN 2027. AND SO WHEN WE LOOK AT THAT IN COMPARISON TO THE DEFAULT PATHWAY OVER TIME THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PATHWAY IS AN ORANGE. THE DEFAULT PATHWAY IS IN BLUE. AND YOU SEE THE KIND OF FLOP IF YOU DO THE MATH ON HYPOTHETICAL BUILDING THE LIFETIME EMISSIONS FROM THOSE TWO BUILDINGS OVER THE POLICY PERIOD ARE EXACTLY THE SAME.

SO AGAIN IT IS NOT A LESS STRINGENT PATHWAY FOR THOSE BUILDINGS. IT'S JUST FLEXIBILITY MECHANISM TO GIVE THEM MORE TIME TO PLAN FOR AND IMPLEMENT THOSE PROJECTS. WE'VE ALSO PROPOSE FLEXIBILITY FOR CAMPUSES. THIS BEING TRUE CAMPUSES LIKE THE UNIVERSITY FOR THAT CITY BUILDINGS IT DOES NOT APPLY TO PORTFOLIO OWNERS OF RENTED PROPERTIES. BUT THE GOAL IS TO LET THOSE SUMMERS AGGREGATE THEIR MISSIONS ACROSS ALL OF THEIR BUILDINGS AND SO THAT THEY CAN THEN MAKE INVESTMENTS AT THAT CAMPUS LEVEL.

THERE ARE HANDFUL OF EXEMPTIONS IN THE PROPOSAL. THE PRIMARY EXEMPTION BEING BUILDINGS THAT HAVE ALREADY LIMITED THEIR MISSIONS WERE ACHIEVED NET ZERO AND WE EXPECT MOST NEW BUILDINGS WILL ACHIEVE THAT STANDARD IN THE NEAR FUTURE SO FOR NEW BUILDINGS BUILT IN THE IN BETWEEN YEARS. THERE'S A GRACE PERIOD FOR THOSE BUILDINGS TO BE ABLE TO GET UP TO SPEED AND PLAN THEIR ADMISSION TRAJECTORY EMISSIONS REDUCTION WITH NET 0 BY 2050.

AGAIN LOOKING AT THE BIGGER PICTURE NET ZERO ACTION PLAN OTHER AVENUES THAT REQUIRE BUILDINGS TO ACHIEVE NET ZERO. AS MANY OF YOU PROBABLY KNOW THE STATE IS JUST RELEASED THE FIRST DRAFT OF THEIR NET ZERO THRESHOLD PROPOSAL SO WILL FOLLOW IN PARTICIPATING IN DEVELOPMENT OF THAT PROPOSAL VERY CLOSELY. OVER THE NEXT YEAR SO THAT WE HAVE A CLEAR MECHANISM TO REQUIRE BUILDINGS TO ACHIEVE NET ZERO EMISSIONS AND THEREFORE HAVE ACHIEVED THE GOALS OF THE BUILDING ENERGY USE DISCLOSURE ORDINANCE. PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS. WE ALSO PROPOSE EXEMPTIONS FOR BUILDINGS THAT ARE NOT OPERATING THAT ARE VACANT. BEING DEMOLISHED. EVERY BUILDINGS UNDER FINANCIAL DISTRESS.

IN THE EVENT OF NONCOMPLIANCE WE GOT THE EXISTING PENALTY STRUCTURE FOR BEUDO. THE OTHER ELEMENTS OF COMPLIANCE WITH PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS. SO SEPARATE PENALTIES CAN BE ASSESSED FOR NOT REPORTING THE CURRENT PENALTY STRUCTURE. FOR REPORTING FALSE DATA SINCE WE CAN'T DELETE THE PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENT FINDS BASED ON DATA. WE REQUIRE BUILDINGS TO PROPOSED THE BUILDINGS ARE REQUIRED TO HAVE A THIRD-PARTY AUDIT OF THEIR BASELINE. AN COMPLIANCE DATE OF SO WE CAN CHECK THE VERACITY OF THAT DATA AND OF COURSE NOT COMPLYING WITH THE ACTUAL PERFORMANCE REDUCTIONS. SO THE FORM OF THE PENALTY IS A VIOLATION OF UP TO \$300 PER VIOLATION PER DAY. AND FINALLY WE PROPOSE THAT ONCE WE GET THE FIRST YEAR OF REPORTING IN THE FIRST COMPLAINT THAT THE POLICY BE REVIEWED AND MAKE IT IS THE TIME TO CHECK IN ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE POLICY. TO CONSIDER ADJUSTMENTS THAT ARE NEEDED AND TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THOSE ADJUSTMENTS.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO ASK CLARIFYING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PRESENTATION WE JUST CELEBRATED I SEEM COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN COCHAIR OF THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE AND COUNCILLOR CARLONE IF OTHERS HAVE QUESTIONS PLEASE USE THE RAISE YOUR HAND FEATURE.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan,Chair: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR THANKS TO SETH FOR THAT EXCELLENT PRESENTATION. I'M EXCITED AS WELL TO BE DISCUSSING THESE AMENDMENTS PRINT I HAD A QUICK QUESTION ABOUT THE EXEMPTIONS FOR BUILDINGS. IF WE CAN SAY A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THAT. IF THE BUILDING IS TRULY NET ZERO WOULD WE WANT THEM TO NONETHELESS REPORT THEIR ENERGY EMISSIONS SO WE CAN VERIFY THAT IF THEY ARE NET ZERO AND THEY WOULD KNOW WITH ANY MONEY. THEN IT WOULD BE DE FACTO EXEMPT ANYWAY.

>> Seth Federspiel: I THINK THAT'S A FAIR QUESTION. THE ASSUMPTION IS THAT ZERO BUILDINGS WILL CONTINUE TO COMPLY WITH THE REPORTING ELEMENTS OF BEUDO. BUT THEY WOULD NOT BE EXPECTED TO FOLLOW THE MISSION REDUCTION TRAJECTORY IF THEY ALREADY DONE SO. I THINK MAY BE A BIT OF A TECHNICALITY. AND SO IS SOMETHING WE'RE HAPPY TO DISCUSS AND FIGURE OUT THE MOST EFFICIENT WAY TO ADDRESS.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan,Chair: AWESOME THANK YOU.

>> Dennis J Carlone: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR. THAT THEY MIGHT HAVE BEEN THE SECOND PRESENTATION AS YOU INDICATED IT WAS A GOOD THING BECAUSE I ACTUALLY THINK I GOT MORE OUT OF IT THIS TIME. AND I THINK I THANK YOU FOR THAT. IT WAS AN EXCELLENT PRESENTATION. MY QUESTION IS ON THE PENALTIES HE WOULDN'T JUST BE

ASSUMING SOMEBODY DOESN'T LISTEN AT ALL WHICH HOPEFULLY WILL HAPPEN. IT'S MORE THAN THE THREE ZONES THAT YOU CALLED FOR THE THREE AREAS WHICH WERE THAT UP TO 350,000 RATED IT WOULD BE PLUS THE TONNAGE PENALTY WOULD IT NOT?

>> Seth Federspiel: AGAIN I WOULD DEFER TO THE LAW DEPARTMENT FOR GUIDANCE ON THIS. I DON'T KNOW IF MEGAN WAS THE WAY IN HERE?

>> Megan Bayer, Associate City Solicitor: THROUGH YOU MR. CHAIR. SO WE ARE LIMITED IN THE WAY THAT WE CAN ISSUE A PENALTY. UNDER THE NONCOMMITTAL DISPOSITION STATUTE AND/OR ORDINANCE SO IT'S \$300 A DAY FOR A VIOLATION. AND THAT IS THE MAXIMUM THAT WE CAN DEPOSE.

>> Dennis J Carlone: TRYING TO GET CLARIFICATION HOW DO YOU CHARGE PER TON ASSUMING THEY DIDN'T REDUCE ANYTHING? THAT'S WHY THEY DIDN'T REPORT. WE THINK THAT WOULD BE AN ADD-ON MAY BE THAT COLD A PENALTY. I DON'T KNOW WHAT TO CALL THE \$234 PER TON. COST BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT WOULD BE BOTH. I MEAN IT'S A SERIOUS IT'S MORE SERIOUS AND MORE OF AN ENCOURAGEMENT TO FOLLOW UP. \$350,000 QUITE FRANKLY FOR SOME PEOPLE WOULD NOT BE A BIG ISSUE. IF THE TONNAGE IS ALSO PAID FOR. THE EXHAUST. THAT'S A SERIOUS COMBINATION . I DON'T THINK ... I ASSUME BOTH WOULD BE IN EFFECT WHAT ABOUT THE EXHAUST? THE GREENHOUSE GASES IN THE AIR? I'M NOT TRYING TO BE TRICKY.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: I THINK COUNCILOR THERE WERE TWO NUMBERS THAT WERE PUT UP THERE AS PENALTIES THERE WAS THE \$234 THEN THERE WAS THE \$300 A DAY. SO I THINK WHAT COUNCILLOR CARLONE IS ASKING IS THAT MEAN TO BE \$524 PER DAY THAT WE GET FIND \$234 PLUS \$300.

>> Dennis J Carlone: I'M SORRY I THOUGHT I SAID THAT BUT MAYBE NOT.

>> Seth Federspiel: THROUGH YOU MR CHAIR I JUST WANT TO ADD THE \$234 IS NOT A PENALTY. IT IS NOT A FINE. THE \$234 IS AN ALTERNATE COMPLAINECE OPTION. THE BUILDINGS MAY CHOOSE TO SATISFY ALL OR PART OF THEIR GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION REDUCTION REQUIREMENT. SO THEY CAN MAKE THAT PAYMENT TO THE FUND TO SATISFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE ORDINANCE. BUT IT'S NOT A PENALTY. AND IF THEY ... THEREFORE IF THEY DON'T REPORT OR DON'T DO ANYTHING AT ALL THE \$234 WOULD NOT BE PART OF THAT EQUATION.

>> Dennis J Carlone: I WILL LET IT RIDE THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: QUICK FOLLOW-UP. THEN I WILL GO TO COUNCILLOR TONER. I HAD A QUESTION ON THAT WAS WELL HOW DID THAT FIGURE DID YOU ARRIVE AT THAT FIGURE IS THAT ENOUGH OF A DETERRENT FOR SOMEONE ULTIMATELY WANT PEOPLE TO COMPLY AND NOT BUY THEIR WAY OUT OF IT. HOW DID YOU GET THAT NUMBER? IS HE GOING TO BE EASIER FOR SOMEBODY TO BUY THEIR WAY OUT OF DOING THIS?

>> Seth Federspiel: JUST TO CLARIFY MR. CHAIR YOU ARE SPEAKING TO THE \$234? WE ARRIVED AT THAT NUMBER BY BUILDING OFF THE ANALYSIS THAT BOSTON HAD DONE. ON THE ACTUAL COST OF REDUCING EMISSIONS IN BUILDINGS SUCH AS THOSE COVERED BY BEUDO. SO THE ANALYSIS SHOWED THAT THE AVERAGE COST OF ALL OF THE MEASURES THAT MIGHT BE TAKEN BETWEEN NOW AND 2050 TO GET THE NET ZERO WOULD BE THAT \$234. SO THE IDEA IS BY SETTING THAT AS THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE CREDIT LEVEL BUILDINGS WOULD BE INCENTIVIZED TO TAKE THE MANY MEASURES THAT COST SIGNIFICANTLY LESS THAN THAT AND SO THAT HAVE A NEGATIVE COST OR SAVINGS BUILDINGS IN OVERTIME AS IS WRITTEN IN THE PROPOSAL THAT ALTERNATIVE AMOUNT COULD ALSO BE ADJUSTED TO REFLECT THE CHANGES IN TECHNOLOGY AND CHANGES IN

COST. SO THE IDEA IS TO INCENTIVIZE THE BUILDINGS TO TAKE AS MUCH ACTION DIRECTLY AS THEY CAN.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: THANK YOU COUNCILLOR TONER.

>> Paul F. Toner: LIKE YOU MR. CHAIR SET AROUND MY QUESTION IS DO YOU BASED ON WHAT YOU PRESENTED AND BEING IN THE PROCESS IT SEEMS LIKE YOU DID A PRETTY THOROUGH JOB OF ENGAGING ALL THE STAKEHOLDERS THE UNIVERSITIES BUSINESS GROUPS AND OTHERS THAT MIGHT BE IMPACTED BY THAT . IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU ALSO REACHED SOME DEGREE OF CONSENSUS ABOUT THE ACHIEVABILITY BY 2050 OF MAY MEETING THESE GOALS IS THAT CORRECT?

>> Seth Federspiel: SO WE HAD 40 MEETINGS WITH THE STAKEHOLDERS OVER THE FOUR YEARS THAT WE'VE BEEN WORKING ON THIS. I WILL LET THEM SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES. BUT I THINK THE SENSES WE DID REACH A GOOD LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON BOTH THE FORM AND ASTRINGENCY IN THE TIMELINE OF THE POLICY. AGAIN NOTING THAT REALLY THE TIMELINE THAT WE PURSUED IS ONE THAT IS IN LINE WITH THE SCIENCE DEMANDING RENT CLIMATE CHANGE.

>> Paul F. Toner: MY ONLY FOLLOW-UP YOU MENTIONED IPCC I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH THAT ORGANIZATION. I KNOW YOU SAID THAT THIS PLAN MEETS IPCC STANDARDS THE NOTE WE DID AT LEAST ONE LETTER AND PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM SOMEONE SUGGESTING MAY BE IPCC HAS A DIFFERENT TAKE ON THINGS. CAN YOU CLARIFY FOR ME WHETHER THIS MEETS IPCC STANDARDS OR NOT?

>> Seth Federspiel: SURE THROUGH YOU MR CHAIR THE IPCC IS INTER INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE. IT IS THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL OF SCIENTISTS TO STUDY, CHANGE AND ASSESS WHAT GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BE ACHIEVED TO AVOID THE WORST EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE. AND SO THE SCIENCE THAT WE ARE BASING IT ON WAS BASED ON THE 2018 AND 2020 REPORT. WHICH CITED A 50% REDUCTION BY 2010. I'M SORRY 50% REDUCTION RELATIVE TO 2010 BY 2030. AND 100% REDUCTION FOR NET 0 BY 2050. IT IS THAT PACE WE NEED TO ACHIEVE. SO THAT AGAIN IS A TRAJECTORY THAT WE DESIGNED THE POLICY TO ACHIEVE.

>> Paul F. Toner: ONE LESS FOLLOW-UP AS ANYTHING CHANGED IN THE PAST YEAR AND THEY COME OUT WITH DIFFERENT METRICS OR ANYTHING OR ARE THEY STILL IN AGREEMENT WITH THAT LAST STATEMENT YOU MADE THAT?

>> Seth Federspiel: TO MY KNOWLEDGE IT'S STILL THE SAME.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: ANY OTHER CLARIFYING QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE? NOT SEEING ANY OTHER HANDS. OKAY. THANK YOU THANK YOU FOR THE PRESENTATION DON'T GO AWAY. WE WILL NOW GO TO COUNCILLOR NOLAN.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: HOW OFTEN DO WITH THE SAY THAT I'M REALLY SORRY.DO I SHARE MY SCREEN NOW AND THEN WE WILL SEE IF THIS WORKS.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: YOU SHOULD HAVE THE ABILITY TO SHARE YOUR SCREEN.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: I'M IN CITY HALL BUT NOT. ALL GOOD?

THIS IS A VISUAL PRESENTATION LAYING OUT AMENDMENTS THAT COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN COUNCILLOR CARLONE AND I HAVE DISCUSSED OVER THE LAST FEW MONTHS ACTUALLY AS THE BEUDO CONVERSATION HAPPENED. SO YOU ALL THE CITY COUNCIL AS A MATTER OF PUBLIC RECORD RECEIVED A MEMO THAT WAS PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR OUR MONDAY MEETING. WITH A LITTLE BIT MORE TEXT AROUND US.

THIS WILL NOT THIS PRESENTATION DOESN'T TALK ABOUT THE ACTUAL LANGUAGE CHANGES BUT IT DOES PRESENT A SUMMARY OF WHAT IT IS WE ARE PROPOSING AND WHY.

LET ME GO BACK. THIS BUILDING JUST SO PEOPLE KNOW THIS IMAGE SHOWS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW ALEXANDRIA I'LL LET BUILDING WHICH INCLUDES A GEOTHERMAL FIELD THROUGH REDUCED ENERGY REQUIREMENTS AND OMISSION . SHE BUILDINGS HAVING BUILT RIGHT NOW AS WE SPEAK IN CAMBRIDGE. FAR BETTER THEN THE EXISTING BUILDINGS. AS CDD NOTED IN THE ORIGINAL BEUDO WITH METHODS FOR REDUCTIONS AND IT DID NOT SUCCEED.

BEUDO IS CRITICAL TO OUR SUCCESS AS A CITY TO REACH OUR CLINICALS. WHAT BEUDO DOES IS MANDATE EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS FROM EXISTING LARGE BUILDING. SET ABLY TALK ABOUT THIS. AND CDD IS PUT FORTH A PROPOSAL FOR HOW THAT WOULD BE PUT IN PLACE. IT WAS A PRICE OF EMISSIONS FROM BUILDINGS AND EVENTUALLY REQUIRES EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS TO NET ZERO. THE PICTURE ON THIS PAGE IS THE NEW MIT BUILDING ON MAIN STREET. THE CITY COUNCIL HAS FOR MANY YEARS WORKED ON CLIMATE EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS. AND IT WAS ACTUALLY 2011 A COUPLE OF PEOPLE YOU WERE ON THE COUNCIL THIS COUNCIL VOTED IN ZONING AT THE TIME THE REASON THIS REALLY CRITICALLY IMPORTANT IS EVEN IN 2011 EVERY SINGLE BUILDING OWNER CAMBRIDGE WAS ON NOTICE THAT NET ZERO SOMETHING THE COUNCIL AND THE CITY WAS INCREDIBLY INTERESTED IN. AT THAT TIME CAMBRIDGE WAS NOT READY TO BUILD THESE BUILDINGS AND NET ZERO.

UNFORTUNATELY THE AMENDMENTS DIDN'T PASS. BUT WITH BEUDERO THESE BUILDINGS LIKE EVERY OTHER EXISTING BUILDING LEFT TO BECOME A NET ZERO OVERTIME. IT IS A REALLY IMPORTANT CONTEXT THAT WE ALL HAVE TO BE AWARE OF AND I KNOW THAT SEVERAL COUNCILORS AND SOME IN THE PUBLIC ARE NOT AS AWARE OF THE TIMELINE HERE. SETH MENTIONED IT WITH NET ZERO ACTION PLAN THAT HELPED CREATE BEUDO IN THE FIRST PLACE. THAT FIRST ACTION PLAN LAID OUT A TIMELINE FOR BEUDO ENCODED THE ACTUAL LANGUAGE OF BEUDO WAS INITIATED THE PATIENT THAT THIS IS MEANT TO SPUR REDUCTIONS IN EMISSIONS. IF IT DOESN'T BY THE END OF 2018 REQUIREMENTS WERE GOING TO BE PUT IN PLACE. THERE WAS SUPPOSED TO BE PUT IN PLACE AND TESTED FROM 2018 – 2022. THE FIRST VERSION OF PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS WHICH WOULD HAVE MANDATED PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS TO REDUCE EMISSIONS.

THE FIRST PERIOD NEVER HAPPENED WE ARE NOW STARTING THE FIRST PERIOD JUST IN 2022. WE WAS WITH ME AT THE END OF IT FIRST PERIOD WHICH IS ABOUT THE REVIEWED AND 23 THREE AND A SECOND VERSION OF REQUIREMENTS STARTED IN 2024. IT IS CRITICALLY IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND WHY IT IS THAT FOR ALL OF THE WORK THAT IS BEEN DONE THE BEUDO NET ZERO ACTION PLAN TIMELINE WE ARE THREE YEARS BEHIND. IN ANTICIPATED ALSO POSSIBLE FOR ADDING REQUIREMENTS WHICH AGAIN MEANS EVERY SINGLE BUILDING OWNER HAS KNOWN SINCE 2014 SINCE BEUDO PASS. THAT THIS WAS COMING. SO WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING IS TO BUILD ON THE FANTASTIC WORK OF CDD PUT FORTH A LOT OF EFFORT INTO THE BEUDERO STANDARDS AND DO A COUPLE THINGS. ONE SIMPLIFIED BY TAKING OUT SOME FAIRLY COMPLEX ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE TIMELINES. TAKING OUT SOME DIFFERENT REMOVE SOME OF THIS ADDITIONAL WORK THAT WAS DONE AND ARGUED OVER THE APPLICATION. THERE'S A FEW KEY THINGS. NUMBER ONE MINUTE FASTER REDUCTIONS THE NET 0 BY 2050. TO REDUCE EMISSIONS FASTER ON THE HIGHEST EMITTERS MAINLY LET BUILDING TRADES AND THEN CHARGE NEW NONRESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS FOR ALL PERMISSIONS THAT WILL BE SOMEONE'S DISCUSSED IN LINE WITH THE GREEN NEW DEAL AMENDMENTS THE COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN WILL BE TALKING ABOUT. IMAGE ON THIS PAGE.

IF THE NEW FILE MEDICAL REALTY BUILDING FOR THURSDAY. THIS WILL BE AN ALL ELECTRIC FILE THAT BUILDINGS WHICH MEANS THEY CAN QUICKLY GET TO NET ZERO TO

PURCHASE THE RENEWABLE ENERGY. ALMOST FROM DAY ONE. IT IS CRITICAL TO NOTE GIVEN PARTICULARLY APPRECIATE COUNCILLOR TONER'S QUESTION ABOUT THE IPCC TARGET WE ARE A LOT ABOUT SCIENCE -BASED TARGETS. HERE IS THE DEAL. THE IPCC TARGET OF 2050 IS FOR THE EARTH AS A WHOLE. THE EARTH AS A WHOLE.

IF THAT IS GOING TO BE REACHED IT ABSOLUTELY REQUIRES THAT ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERS HAVE TO BE MUCH FASTER THAN WHAT THE IPCC ULTIMATE END GOAL IS. THERE IS NO WAY THAT THE ENTIRE EARTH BY FOLLOWING WILL FOLLOW THE EMISSIONS THAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT WHICH MEANS ALL OF US WITH YOURS AS IS ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERS ABSOLUTELY HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO ACCELERATE BECAUSE OTHERWISE THERE IS NO HELP FOR THE PLANET I MET WITH TREVOR STRETCHING OR EXAGGERATING THAT. NOT ONLY THAT THE WORLD HAS CHANGED A LOT REMEMBER BEUDO WAS PASSED IN 2014. WE DISCUSSED IN 2012 2013 WAS FINALLY PASSED BY THE COUNCIL IN 2014 WE ARE SIX YEARS BEYOND THAT. IN THE WORLD IS ONLY MERCHANT WE CANNOT MEET OUR OWN GOALS. WITHOUT ACCELERATED TIMELINE IS WHY WE'RE SAYING IT SHOULD NOT BE 2050.

AND AGAIN IT SHOULD NOT BE A SURPRISE TO BUILDING OWNER. SINCE BEUDO WAS PASSED MANY YEARS AGO. SO THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE AMENDMENTS TO THE AMENDMENTS WHICH WILL AGAIN SEEM IN WRITING. AND IT'S A NAME PUBLIC. NET 0 BY 2035. NOT 2050. THAT IS COMPLETELY IN LINE WITH THE SIGNS BASED TARGETS OF THE IPCC 'S AS WE KNOW AND AS ALL OF THE PEOPLE WHO DISCUSSED THIS UPSET THERE NEEDS TO BE SOME ACTION BY MANY PLAYERS UP FRONT. IT IS WHY 90% OF NEW HOMES IN THE NETHERLANDS BUILT IN LAST YEAR 90% IN THE LAST YEAR WERE FOSSIL FUEL FREE. IF IT DOES GO BE FOSSIL FUEL FREE BY 2030. WE CANNOT WAIT UNTIL 2050 AND CANNOT BE SATISFIED WITH JUST BEING WITH THE CROWD WOULD BE I THINK A HUGE LOST OPPORTUNITY FOR CLIMATE LIKE EVERY TRADE WILL BE DOING THE SIMPLIFIED REDUCTION TO A PERCENT A YEAR. NOT EVERY FIVE YEARS. STRIKE SOME OF THE EXEMPTIONS. ALLOW AN ALTERNATIVE SCHEDULE FOR 100% AFFORDABLE HOUSING GUESS. BUT NOT FOR LABORATORY SPACE LABORATORIES SHOULD NOT BE EXEMPT.

THEY ALREADY ARE BEING BUILT FOSSIL FUEL FREE. D FRANKLY THE HIGHEST EMITTERS AND ALSO THE MOST PROFITABLE FOR THEIR EXECUTIVE SUITE 5. THAT WE SHOULD BE MOVING TO SAY ALL OF THEM SHOULD BE NET ZERO AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. ESTABLISH MORE STRINGENT BASELINE. SO WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING IS A KIND OF HYBRID. WHAT BOSTON DID WITH SET A BASELINE FOR ALL BUILDINGS TO MATCH WRITTEN WILL BE A THING JUST WHEREVER YOU ARE YOU START A NEW LOWER FROM THERE. WHAT WE'RE SAYING IS THAT YES THAT IS ABSOLUTELY TRUE. IF YOU'RE LOWER THAN AVERAGE OR IF YOU'RE EVEN AVERAGE TO START WHERE YOU ARE JUST REDUCE ON A TIMESCALE. BUT IF YOU'RE ONE OF THE HIGHEST EMITTERS. WHY WOULD HE ALLOW YOU TO START OUT REALLY, REALLY HIGH AND ONLY REDUCE THE SAME PERCENTAGE AS SOMEBODY ELSE. SO IT WILL BE KIND OF A HYBRID APPROACH. JUST FOR THAT FIRST DREAM ACT WINTERING EFFORTS PERIOD DURING THE SAME TIMELINE AS EVERYONE ELSE AND ALTHOUGH BEUDO BUILDINGS THE BASELINE IS TO BE ZERO EMISSIONS.

AS SETH SAID THAT IS TRUE FOR ALL EXISTING NATURAL BUILDINGS ON THE BUILDINGS THAT IT WILL BE BUILT IN THE CITY NEXT YEAR'S HAVE TO BE ZERO BASELINE FOR GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. THAT ELEMENT WILL BE PRESENTED A LITTLE MORE IN-DEPTH WITH PART OF THE DEGREE NEW DEAL AMENDMENT. SO WHY DO WE SAY 2035 JUST REMIND THE COUNCIL. BEFORE I WAS ON IT. MAYBE FOR COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN WITH ON THEIR CERTAINLY NOT BEFORE COUNCILLOR CARLONE. A APRIL 24, 2017 POLICY ORDER PASSED THAT THE COUNCIL SUPPORTS THE GOAL OF USING 100% CLEAN AND RENEWABLE ENERGY IN CAMBRIDGE INCLUDING IN BUILDING ENERGY TRANSPORTATION BY 2035.

GOAL WAS REAFFIRMED DECEMBER 13 OF 2021. SO I'M REMINDING ALL OF US WE CANNOT POSSIBLY ACHIEVE THAT GOAL. IN BEUDO BUILDINGS ARE STILL BURNING FOSSIL FUELS AT

THE 2035. LIKELY CAN EVEN ACHIEVE IT WITH A LONG-TERM GOAL OF 2040 OR 2050 IF WE DON'T TAKE ACCELERATED ACTION NOW. AND AT THIS POINT WE STILL CAUSING EMISSIONS INDIRECTLY. HOW MANY OF US HAVE GOTTEN AN AMAZON OR SOME KIND OF DELIVERY IN THE LAST FEW WEEKS?

THOSE ARE ALL SHIPPING OF GOODS INTO CAMBRIDGE WHICH THE EMISSIONS ARE NOT CAPTURED IN THIS. SO THIS IS A REMINDER THAT A NET ZERO BEUDERO BUILDING BUSINESS REALLY MEAN ZERO OMISSIONS. BECAUSE YOU CAN HAVE RESIDUAL MISSIONS AND YOU CAN ALSO BASICALLY BUY YOUR WAY OUT. AS SETH NOTED MANY OF THESE PLACES HAVE JUST MET THERE REDUCTION TARGETS BY THE GREENING OF THE GRID BY 100% RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ELECTRICITY DEVON STOP BURNING FOSSIL FUELS. THEY JUST USED 100% RENEWABLE ENERGY AS A WAY TO MEET LOWER THEIR MISSIONS. THAT STILL ALLOWED.

AND UNDER THE CURRENT BEUDERO PROPOSAL BUILDING UNTIL PAID TO POLLUTE WHILE MEETING THE DEFINITION OF NET ZERO. THEN WE CHANGE LATER. THERE IS LOVE IF YOU REALLY SAVE I CANNOT POSSIBLY STOP BURNING FOSSIL FUELS MY BASEMENT AND YOU PAY THAT ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE PAYMENT. SO ANOTHER REASON WE'RE PASSIONATE ABOUT THIS IS THAT WE KNOW IT'S BEEN REALLY, REALLY, REALLY HARD THE CITIES BEEN WORKING ON CLIMATE ACTIONS FOR MORE THAN 20 YEARS. MORE THAN 20 DIVERSE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN WAS IN 2002 LITERALLY 20 YEARS AGO. AND THERE'S A WHOLE SLEW OF WORK DONE EVEN FOR THAT PLAN. WE BEEN TRYING TO REDUCE EMISSIONS SINCE 2003 IF NOT BEFORE AND IT'S BEEN UNSUCCESSFUL. THESE ARE SOME QUOTES FROM VARIOUS I THINK MOSTLY THE FIRST COUPLE THE CPAC ANNUAL REPORT FOR GREEN ASK IF THE MISSION CONTINUE TO INCREASE. 2003 IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT MISSIONS WILL REMAIN IN 1990. THE GOALS OF REDUCING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BY 2010 HAD NOT BEEN MET IN MY 20% RATE REDUCTION IN OVERALL THE CITYWIDE BUILDING EMISSIONS FROM 2012 – 2019 GROUP 11.3% IS THE MOST RECENT DATA WE HAVE THIS IS BASED ON THE OUTSIDE CONSULTANT DMV GIVE A REPORT LOOKING NET ZERO ACTION PLAN AND THIS IS FOR THE BUILDING SECTOR THEY FOUND OVERALL IT GREW FROM 2012 – 2019 11% IT WAS WITH ME GOING DOWN 20 OR 30% AND IT HASN'T. IN THAT DIRECTION PLAN FIVE YEAR REVIEW WHICH IS PUBLISHED IN 2021 I BELIEVE THAT 2020 I THINK IS 2021 FOUND THAT THE FIRST FIVE YEARS OF THAT PLAN WHICH WAS AN ACTION PLAN WAS TO LEAD TO REDUCTION IN FACT ESSENTIALLY LED TO NO PROGRESS. THEY HAD COLLATED 1% DECREASE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS WHICH OF COURSE 1% IS ALMOST NOTHING.

THEN THEY BEAT IN THE DATA. THAT WAS ANYTHING WILL WILL BE EXPECTED TO WHAT WE HOPE FOR IS FAR BEHIND WHAT WE EXPECTED RALPH AND BARBARA HAD OR DESIRED OUTCOMES TO REVIEW CALLED FOR A DRASTICALLY DIFFERENT APPROACH TO PART OF WHAT LED US HERE TODAY TO BEUDERO. SO LET'S LOOK AT WHAT WOULD HAPPEN THIS IS A VISUAL TO SAY ROLE TALK ABOUT THE SAME THING. GETTING TO NET ZERO. WE ARE PROPOSING LET'S DO IT FASTER DECLINE. THAT IS IT. THIS SHOWS YOU AN OVERALL THE BEUDERO BUILDINGS STARTED 100% THE PROPOSAL WE ARE SAYING IS ALREADY GOING TO MAKE THIS RAPID STEEP DECLINE AND GET TO NET 0 BY 2035.

AND THE OTHER WAY THE AMENDMENTS ARE PROPOSING TO AMEND IT STILL HAS THE DECLINE WITHOUT ACTUALLY CHANGING THAT A METHODOLOGY WE ARE SAYING IT HAS TO BE FASTER. BOTH SCHEDULE REQUIRE 20% REDUCTION STARTING AT 2025. AND NOT A LOT BEFORE THEM OTHER THAN FOR HIGH EMITTERS. AS WE MENTIONED AS WE KNOW RAPID NEAR-TERM EMISSIONS ARE CRITICAL. JUST LIKE ANYTHING ELSE.

IF YOU PAYING OFF YOUR INTEREST IS IN YOUR PAY IT THE BETTER. FOR HERE THE SOONER WE REDUCE EMISSIONS THE BETTER BECAUSE IF YOU DON'T REDUCE THE MISSION THEN THEY GO ON FOR 10 YEARS IF YOU DO SING THEM IN 10 YEARS THERE WAS A LOT LESS THAN REDUCING THEM NOW. CAMBRIDGE IS A LEADER ON CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION.

OR WANTS TO BE RIGHT NOW WE REALLY SHOULD STEP IT UP AND SHOW OTHERS THAT CAN BE DONE. THE OTHER REMINDER FROM A BUS IS WHAT ACTUAL BUILDING WILL DO IF I WANTED BUILDING JUST LIKE MY HOUSE HAVE BEEN LOOKING AT HEATING THOMPSON CROWDSOURCING EXCHANGE IT WILL BE LOVELY TO THIS NICE STEP FUNCTION FOR INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS WILL BE ON I MIGHT HAVE BEEN OBAMA RENEWABLE ENERGY AND REDUCE IMMEDIATELY I'M GOING TO ELECTRIFY MEDIALLY. IT WOULD BE MORE LIKABLE TO DROP PRETTY SOON. AND THEN USING RENEWABLE ENERGY PURCHASES. IT WILL BE ALL CLEAN AND A STEP FUNCTION FOR EVERYBODY OR A PERCENT PER YEAR OF THE EVAN WELLEK 50% WHEN YOU'RE 40% THE NEXT YEAR AND THEN THEY WILL BE DONE.

AGAIN WE CAN TALK MORE ABOUT WHAT THIS MEANS ANOTHER OF THESE STEPS COMPLETELY ELIMINATES EMISSIONS. IT'S REALLY ONLY THE ACTUAL ENERGY CONSUMPTION THAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT RIGHT HERE IN THIS CHART. IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT TO CREATE ECONOMIC PRESSURE IN FAVOR OF ELIMINATING WASTEFUL ENERGY CONSUMPTION WE DON'T NEED. SO HERE'S AN EXAMPLE. LET'S USE AN EXAMPLE OF HOW OUR PROPOSAL VARIES FROM THE AMENDMENTS ON THE TABLE. SO YOU KNOW WHAT THIS DATA SHOWS YOU HAVE A NICE REDLINE AND A PINK LINE. REDLINE IS FOR ACCORDING TO THE 2019 BEUDO DATA FROM EVERY YEAR YOU CAN LOOK IT UP ON THE WEB YOU HAVE ABOUT 800 BUILDINGS PER YEAR OUT OF 1000 FOUR USE. ACCORDING TO THIS DATA WAS ACCESSED ON THE CAMBRIDGE DATA PLURAL WAS A REALLY HIGH LEVEL OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INTENSITY WHICH IS MEASURED IN KILOGRAMS OF CARBON PER SQUARE FOOT. WHAT WE'RE SAYING IS THE REALLY HIGH EMITTERS IS THAT OF BEING ABLE TO START HI JUST REDUCE LIKE EVERYBODY ELSE WHICH IS WHAT THE REDLINE IS SAFE TO IMMEDIATELY REDUCE.

AGAIN THEY CAN BUY ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE THANKS THE CONNECTION IN MANY DIFFERENT WAYS BUT THEY HAVE TO REDUCE IT DOWN TO THE INDUSTRY AVERAGE BY 2025 PRINTS AND FROM THERE RUN THERE JUST LIKE EVERYONE ELSE. SO THESE ARE TWO SPECIFIC PROPERTIES IN CAMBRIDGE FROM THE BEUDO DATABASE WHEN IS. [LISTING NAMES] WHICH IS A SUPER HIGHWAY ABOVE AVERAGE THEN THE OTHER IS TO OXFORD STREET AT THE HARVARD LAB AND BASICALLY AT THE AVERAGE OF LABS AND FOR THEM THE CDD PROPOSAL WOULD BE YES OVER TIME THEY DON'T REDUCE THAT MUCH BECAUSE THEY ARE PRETTY GOOD IN TERMS OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION INTENSITY. OUR PROPOSAL SLIDES AND REDUCE FASTER. IT'S WORTH NOTING THAT BOTH OF THESE BUILDINGS AROUND THE LIST OF THE TOP 25 LARGEST BUILDINGS EMITTERS IN CAMBRIDGE.

OF THE THOUSANDS THAT WE FOUND IN THE BEUDO LIST THE TOP 25 BOTH OF THESE ARE ON IT WHICH MEANS EVEN TO OXFORD STREET WHICH IS FAR FAR LESS THAN BIOGENIC IS THE ONE OF THE TOP 25 LARGEST BUILDINGS OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INTENSITY WHICH MEANS SETTINGS INDUSTRY-STANDARD WOULD NOT IN EFFECT IN THE VAST MAJORITY OF BUILDINGS. ONLY REQUIRE 15 OR 20 BUILDINGS TO DRAMATICALLY MOVE THAT SENDER BY 2025. BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT ALREADY MEETING IT. SO JESSIE AND LTG STANDARD THE USE OF 25 IS KEPT LEADING USING ADMISSION STANDARDS FROM BOSTON BEUDO PROPOSAL NUMBER FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY WAS 19.2 KG PER SQUARE FOOT. AND FOR MANUFACTURING WITH 23.9. SO WE CHOSE 24 IS NEW JERSEY STANDARDS BUT IS THE HIGHEST OF BOTH OF THOSE WE MIGHT SET IF WE GO WITH HIS APPROACH IS SOMETHING A LITTLE BIT LOWER BUT IT SEEMS LIKE THAT'S A PRETTY SOLID NUMBER TO START WITH. ALL THE DATA COMES FROM THE CAMBRIDGE OPEN DATA PORTAL.

AND IT'S FROM THE YEAR 2019 AS A BASELINE. SO THE SUMMARY HERE IS THAT AN UNDERPERFORMING BUILDING MEANING WAY MORE THAN EVER IT IS GOING TO PRODUCE SOONER BECAUSE IT IF YOU VISUALIZE THAT LIE BETWEEN THE PINK AND REDLINE ALL OF THAT IS ADDITIONAL EMISSIONS THAT WILL BE PAID FOR UNDER THE PROPOSAL.

FINAL SLIDE. SO LET'S ALSO REMEMBER EVEN IF BEUDERO BUILDINGS WHICH IS 1000 BUILDINGS EXCEPT NOTED ONLY 7% IN NUMBER BUT AT 60%-70% OF EMISSIONS. EVEN IF

THEY ALL COLLECTIVELY CUT THEIR EMISSIONS IN HALF. THAT ONLY GETS US TO HAVE OUR GOAL. THE CITY NEEDS OTHER MAJOR CUTS IN ORDER TO GET TO EVEN HALF BECAUSE BEUDO BUILDINGS ARE LITTLE BIT OVER HALF THE ENERGY THE TOTAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IN THE CITY. SO IF THEY GO DOWN WE ONLY SOLVE ... THE PIE CHART IS GOING TO GET NET ZERO CITYWIDE PRINT 50% REDUCTION FOR BEUDO IS ONLY 20% OF THE WHOLE CITY. SO IN VAIN IF WE ACHIEVE THAT GOAL ON THE NOSE IT DOESN'T MEAN WE ACHIEVE IT FOR CAMBRIDGE OVERALL MEANS WITH OVERSHOOT FOR THE BEUDO SECTOR TO LEAVE ROOM FOR THE CHALLENGES EVERYBODY ELSE GOING TO FACE THE REST OF THE CITY'S KNUCKLE TO REDUCE THEIR EMISSIONS BY 50%.

SO THAT IS WHAT WE HOPE OUR COLLEAGUES WILL AGREE. IT'S AN URGENT AREA WE KNOW THAT PEOPLE HAVE WORKED WITH A RANGE OF STAKEHOLDERS. WHAT I CAN SAY IS THIS IS FEASIBLE KNOWLEDGE SAW EXAMPLES ASSEMBLED AN EXAMPLE TO BUILDINGS IN CAMBRIDGE RIGHT NOW AND BUILT THIS WAY. AND THAT REDUCTION CAN HAPPEN AND EVENTUALLY IS VERY THE REPORT AT THE CHOSE WHEN YOU DO THIS YOU ACTUALLY SAVE MONEY THAT THE STATE CANAL WITH PROPOSAL FOR NET ZERO ENERGY STRETCH CODE AS I'VE MENTIONED AND FINALLY THE RESPONSE FROM THE COMMUNITY AND FOLKS THAT FOLLOW THIS IS NOT GOING TO GET US WHERE WE NEED TO GO THAT IS NOT GOING TO SAY BUT WE CANNOT RELY ON THAT BECAUSE IT'S GOING TO ALLOW CONTINUED USE OF FOSSIL FUELS WHICH WE SHOULD NOT SUSTAIN IN CAMBRIDGE.

THAT IS IT COUNCILLOR McGOVERN. I WILL STOP SHARING?

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: THANK YOU COUNCIL QUESTIONS?

>> Paul F. Toner: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR. COUNCILLOR NOLAN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OUTREACH TO THE VARIOUS STAKEHOLDERS WHO WERE INVOLVED IN 40 MEETINGS OVER THE PAST FOUR YEARS TO DISCUSS THESE POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS CONNECT I'M JUST CONCERNED ABOUT MAKING THESE CHANGES AND YANKING THE RUG OUT FROM CONSENSUS DOCUMENTS AT THIS POINT. HAVE YOU HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO REACH OUT TO THEM.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: WE HAVEN'T TALKED TO THE ENTIRE CLIMATE PROTECTION ACTION COMMITTEE. THE CLIMATE CRISIS WORKING GROUP AND SEVERAL MEMBERS OF THE NET-ZERO ACTION PLAN TASK FORCE. THEY HAVE ALL SENT LETTERS TO THE COUNCIL AGREEING THAT WE NEED TO ACCELERATE AND WE NEED TO DO THIS. THAT IS CERTAINLY SOMETHING THAT IS NEXT STEP AS WE GO FORWARD IN THIS PROCESS. AND I WILL SAY OUTREACH TO THOSE ACTORS INCLUDES A NUMBER OF PEOPLE WERE ON THE NET ZERO ACTION PLAN THAT WAS DISCUSSED AGAIN AT THE CLIMATE CRISIS WORKING GROUP AND AT THE CPAC WHICH IS THE CENTRAL BODY OF THE CITY TO GIVE ADVICE TO THE CITY AS A WHOLE ON CLIMATE ISSUES. DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR QUESTION?

>> Paul F. Toner: ONE FOLLOW-UP I DON'T KNOW THE MEMBERS OF THE SPEC DOES THAT INCLUDE PEOPLE REPRESENTED FROM MIT, HARVARD, THE BIO-LABS ARE THEY IN AGREEMENT THAT THIS IS SOMETHING THAT THEY SUPPORT?

>> Patricia M. Nolan: I CAN'T SPEAK FOR ALL OF THE MEMBERS. WE CAN HEAR FROM THEM. MY RESPONSE TO THAT IS THERE IS GOING TO BE SOME PUSHBACK FROM THOSE PLAYERS. MY RESPONSE IS OF COURSE BECAUSE THEY ARE THE HIGHEST EMITTERS. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THOSE HIGHEST EMITTERS, IT IS THE PEOPLE YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT. SO IT'S LIKE SAYING YES I'M NOT DISMISSING THAT WHOLE PROCESS. WHAT I AM SAYING WE TRIED TO SAY IN THE PRESENTATION THIS IS A DIFFERENT WORLD FROM EVEN FIVE YEARS AGO. AND EVERY SINGLE BUILDING IN CAMBRIDGE HAS BEEN ON NOTICED SINCE LONG BEFORE BUEDO CAME FORWARD BUT THAT WAS PROMULGATED AND ACTUALLY IN 2014 THAT THIS WAS COMING.

>> Paul F. Toner: AGAIN MR. CHAIR, THROUGH YOU MR CHAIR MY ONLY CONCERN IS AS A CITY AND AS A COUNCIL WE INVITE PEOPLE TO THE TABLE TO HAVE THESE DISCUSSIONS TO COME UP WITH A CONSENSUS DOCUMENT AND THEN WE THROW A COMPLETE CURVEBALL AND SUGGEST REDUCING THINGS BY 15 YEARS. I THINK EVEN IN YOUR COMMENTS YOU SAID SEVERAL YEARS BEHIND AND WE ALSO NOW GO TO TRUNCATE IT BY 50 YEARS. I UNDERSTAND THE URGENCY I GET THE COMMENTS FOR GETTING. I DO HOPE THAT WE GO TO ENGAGE THE OTHER STAKEHOLDERS ESPECIALLY THE ONE THAT GOING TO IMPLEMENT THIS TO GET THEIR RESPONSE.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan,Chair: MR. CHAIR CAN GIVE A DIRECT RESPONSE TO ... THANK YOU MR. CHAIR THROUGH YOU MR CHAIR TO COUNCILLOR TONER. I APPRECIATE THE QUESTION I THINK IS A FAIR QUESTION. BUT I WILL ADD THAT WE ARE STAKEHOLDERS ALSO. AS RESIDENTS OF THE CITY. AN INHABITANTS OF THIS PLANET. THE DECISION ABOUT HOW MUCH POLLUTION WE ARE SUPPOSED TO ACCEPT IS NOT PURELY UP TO THE BUILDING OWNERS. THAT BEING SAID PERSONALLY I'VE BEEN IN CONVERSATION WITH THESE DEVELOPERS AND BUILDING OPERATORS IN CAMBRIDGE FOR OVER A DECADE. ON THIS ISSUE. SO THIS IS NOT NEW IT IS NOT BEING SPRUNG OUT OF NOWHERE. AS COUNCILLOR NOLAN MENTIONED BACK IN 2011 THERE WAS A VOTE IN HIS COUNCIL ON MIT'S PROPOSED BUILDINGS. ON MAIN STREET SOLD TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE WE CAN UNFORTUNATELY WE CAN'T AFFORD LOBBYISTS AND CONSULTANTS BUT TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE WE MADE OUR VOICES HEARD AS RESIDENTS AND STAKEHOLDERS IN THE CITY WE BEEN VERY CLEAR FOR OVER 10 YEARS THAT WE NEED THESE BUILDINGS TO BE NET ZERO NOW. PARTICULARLY THE NEW ONES BUT ALSO THE EXISTING ONES.

AND THE BEUDO PROCESS GOES BACK FOR 2014 IT WAS ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL IN 2014. BUT WAS WORKED ON FOR SEVERAL YEARS BEFORE THAT.THERE SHOULDN'T BE ANY SURPRISES HERE THAT WE ARE SAYING THIS TIMELINE IS TOO LITTLE TOO LATE AND THANK YOU MR. CHAIR.

>> Paul F. Toner: I DON'T WANT TO ENGAGE IN A BIG DEBATE I JUST FEEL THAT IF THEY WERE GOING TO SHAVE 15 YEARS OFF A TIMELINE THAT WAS AGREED TO BY 40 MEETINGS AND FOUR YEARS WITH ALL STAKEHOLDERS UNDERSTAND WERE ALL STAKEHOLDERS AND MAKE THE LIMITED BUT TO GET THE SENSE THAT A DOME OF THE SELF BECOME A CRISIS AS QUICK AS EVERYBODY ELSE. BUT I ALSO DON'T HAVE TO MEET THESE REQUIREMENTS. I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ENGAGE THOSE FOLKS AND HAVE CONVERSATION ABOUT HOW WE DO THINGS AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE AND AS THEY ARE AWAY AS POSSIBLE. AND NOT JUST SURPRISE THEM WITH A 15 YEAR CHANGE IN THE TIMELINE. THANK YOU.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan,Chair: MR. CHAIR THROUGH YOU MR CHAIR THESE AMENDMENTS WERE FIRST PUT FORTH BY COUNCILLOR NOLAN COUNCILLOR CARLONE AND MYSELF BY MYSELF AT THE HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT MEETING AGAIN HAVING AN ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING NOW. WE WERE PLANNING TO HAVE ANOTHER ORDINANCE COMMITTEE AT LEAST ONE MORE. SO THERE'S PLENTY MORE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE BUILDING OWNERS TO LET US KNOW HOW THEY FEEL AND READ THE LETTER FROM THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TODAY.

>> Alanna M. Mallon,Vice Mayor: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR THROUGH YOU MR CHAIR FOLLOWING ALONG WHAT COUNCILLOR TONER WAS SAYING. I THINK WE ARE IN A DIFFERENT TIME RIGHT NOW. WE HAVE RECEIVED SOME REALLY BAD NEWS EVEN RECENTLY THAT NEW ENGLAND IS IN A DIRE SITUATION AND MESSAGES IT'S IN PARTICULAR. THE LAND IS SHIFTING UNDERNEATH OUR FEET AND WE DO NEED THESE TO RESPOND TO MAKE SURE WE ARE BEING RESPONSIVE A SHIP THAT TIMELINE THE ONE THING I'M WONDERING IS IF THERE IS SOME TIME YOU ORDINANCE COMMITTEE IS NOT A GREAT PLACE TO HAVE THAT CONVERSATION WITH BUILDING OWNERS.

WE GOT A COUPLE BUILDING OR DEVELOPER LIKE ADDING ALEXANDRIA BIOMED FOR BUILDING BUILDINGS CURRENTLY ILLEGAL? ALSO FREE. WE ALSO HAVE DEVELOPERS WOULD NOT BEEN BROUGHT TO THE TABLE AROUND SOME OF THESE AMENDMENTS AND AM WONDERING IF THERE IS A WAY TO DO THAT OUTSIDE OF THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE PROCESS. THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO BRING PEOPLE TO THE TABLE TO TALK ABOUT WHY THIS IS SO IMPORTANT TO TALK ABOUT SOME OF THESE AMENDMENTS AND CHANGES AND TIMELINES I'M NOT SAYING CHANGE THEM. NECESSARILY BUT I AM... IT IS IMPORTANT FOR PEOPLE TO WORK TOGETHER. WE GET AN EMAIL FROM THEM A TAP THAT THEY WERE NOT CONTACTED THERE WHEN THE BIGGEST DEVELOPERS IN THE CITY AND I WOULD HOPE THAT WE WOULD GO TO THEM AS A PARTNER AND A SOMEBODY WHY NOT HAS A REALLY AGGRESSIVE CHEMICALS.

WHAT ARE THOSE CHEMICALS IN ALCHEMY THE PARTNERS AND WORK TOGETHER. SO IN BETWEEN NOW AND THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING AND SUBSEQUENT ORDINANCE MEETINGS I WOULD ENCOURAGE US TO HAVE A CONVERSATION OR MOTION MAKERS FOR THE AMENDMENT MAKERS IN THIS CASE TO HAVE THAT CONVERSATION WITH SOME OF THOSE EAGER DEVELOPERS THE ONES THAT ARE DOING THE FOSSIL PRE-WORK. ALEXANDRIA BIOMED AND THE FOLKS THAT ARE NOT NECESSARILY BUILDING RIGHT NOW NET ZERO APOSTLE THREE BUT HAD WE HAD THAT CONVERSATION AND BRING EVERYBODY TO THE TABLE BECAUSE WE DO KNOW THAT THERE WAS THOSE 40 CONVERSATIONS WE NOTE THAT THERE WAS SOME CONSENSUS AND I UNDERSTAND WE ALL UNDERSTAND WE ARE IN AN EMERGENCY.

THE LENDER SHIFTING UNDERNEATH OUR FEET HOW WE WORK TOGETHER AND PARTNER. IT'S NOT A QUESTION THAT'S EARLY. I GUESS IT'S MORE OF A COMMENT OF LET'S TRY TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO BRING THE PLAYERS TO THE TABLE AND REALLY TALK ABOUT WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO DO TOGETHER AND PARTNER. SO I WILL YIELD BACK AT THE TIME SORRY MR. CHAIR THAT WAS IN A QUESTION FOR THE COMMITTEE.

>> Dennis J Carlone: DON'T YOU WISH YOU HAD THAT BUTTON CONTROL ALL THE TIME. I DO HAVE A QUESTION FOR SETH ON THE 40 MEETINGS HE MENTIONED . SET WITHOUT REALLY BEUDO OR WITH A NET ZERO MEETINGS?

>> Seth Federspiel: THAT WAS BEUDO THROUGH YOU MR. CHAIR BEGINNING IN 2018 WE HAD A SERIES OF MEETING THE ROPE WITH ALL BEUDO BUILDING OWNERS. FIRST TO DESIGN TO GO THROUGH A PROCESS TO UNDERSTAND WHAT THE FRAMEWORK FOR BUILDING PERFORMANCE STANDARDS IN CAMBRIDGE COULD BE. WE ALSO HAD A SERIES OF MEETINGS ABOUT THE TECHNICAL SUPPORT AND RESOURCES THAT THESE BUILDINGS WOULD NEED TO ACHIEVE THE EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS WE ARE TALKING ABOUT WE ALREADY LAUNCHED THE CAMBRIDGE HEALING ENERGY RETROFIT PROGRAM IN THE FALL OF 2019. TO PROVIDE EASY ACCESS TO THIS DATE INCENTIVES AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR BUILDING TO MEET THE STANDARDS THERE WERE NUMBER WORKING GROUP MEETINGS AS WELL AS FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS BECAUSE THIS PROCESS DID STRETCH OUT IN PART DUE TO THE PANDEMIC AND OTHER DELAYS AND SO WE HAD CONTINUAL MEETINGS IN 2020 AND 2021 SO THAT ALL OF THE PROPERTY OWNERS COULD BE AWARE OF THE PROPOSAL LEADING UP TO THIS OMISSION TO COUNCIL.

>> Dennis J Carlone: THANK YOU I WORK WITH DEVELOPERS ALMOST MY WHOLE CAREER. IT CERTAINLY HAD BEEN IN DESIGN FOR 45 YEARS.AND I FOUND THAT THERE WERE FEW ENLIGHTENED ONCE WE GET IT. LIKE JOE MAGUIRE AND ALEXANDRIA AND THAT THERE ARE OTHERS WHO WERE SO, AND I GET WHY, SHORT-TERM THINKING. THEY LIKED PUTTING EXPENSES LIKE WE ALL DO IF YOU OWN A HOME OR A CONDOMINIUM OUT AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE. I BELIEVE COUNCILLOR NOLAN MENTIONED THIS BUT WHEN MIT GOT ITS UP THE ZONING FOR MAINSTREAM THE ORIGINAL CONDITION WAS NET ZERO BUILDINGS.

THAT WAS VOTED ON BY THE COUNCIL. AND APPROVED AND THEN MIT SPOKE TO ONE OR TWO OF THE COUNCILORS AND THE VOTES WERE CHANGED. SO THIS ISN'T NEW. THIS HAS BEEN AROUND. MY OWN FEELING IS AS I TRIED TO SAY A FEW WEEKS AGO IF OUR GOAL IS 2050 AND WE OVERSHOOT IT'S 2060. OUR GOAL IS 2035 AND WE OVERSHOOT IT'S 2042 OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. THERE IS NO DOUBT IN MY MIND THE WORLD IS GOING TO OVERSHOOT AND WE ARE THE LEADERS. WE ARE THE SMARTEST PEOPLE.

AS FAR AS DEVELOPERS GO OF COURSE WE HAVE TO TALK TO THEM. OF COURSE INSTITUTIONS. BELIEVE ME THEY KNOW. BUT WE HAVE TO TALK TO THEM. BUT WE REPRESENT MORE THAN DEVELOPERS. WE REPRESENT THE RESIDENTS I'VE TOLD YOU ALL THAT I HAVE BAD ASTHMA. YOU CAN HEAR IT. AND SOME OF THE LONGER TERM COUNCILORS MIGHT REMEMBER THAT WAS A FEW YEARS IN THE WINTER WHEN I COULDN'T TALK WITHOUT COUGHING EVERY SENTENCE WHICH I'M SURE EXCITED EVERYBODY AND THAT WAS BECAUSE OF THE AIR QUALITY. THANK GOD I HAVE MEDICATION THAT HELPS.

MY POINT IS THIS A SERIOUS STUFF. I THINK THE CITY HAS DONE GREAT WORK. AND WE ARE REVVING IT UP. AND MAYBE IT WILL BE MET BUT IT WILL BE A LOT CLOSER AND A LOT SOONER IF OUR GOAL IS SOONER. THANK YOU.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: THANK YOU COUNCILLOR. ANYBODY ELSE BEFORE ASKING MY QUESTION.

A COUPLE OF THINGS I WILL MAKE A QUICK COMMENT I THINK WE'RE SORT OF I DON'T HAVE SPLITTING HAIRS IS RIGHTS TERM OR MISSING EACH OTHER I THINK THE COMMENT PEOPLE HAVE KNOWN THAT THIS IS COMING TRUE. THIS IS BEEN TALKED ABOUT FOR A LONG TIME. BUT WHAT THEY SORT OF THOUGHT WAS COMING WAS 2050. 2035 AND ALL THESE OTHER AMENDMENTS TO NOW BEING PROPOSED TONIGHT WITHOUT SOMETHING THAT PEOPLE NECESSARILY SAW COMING UNTIL THEY WERE PRESENTED IN DECEMBER. I THINK BOTH THINGS ARE ACTUALLY TRUE. PEOPLE KNEW SOMETHING WAS COMING AND WAS HIS COMMITTEE TO WORK ON IT. AND THEY THOUGHT THAT WAS COMING WAS 2050 AND NOW ALL OF A SUDDEN WE HAVE ALL OF THESE NEW THINGS ARE SAYING 2035 NOTHING WHICH IS BETTER OR WORSE. SO THE FEELING FOR SOME OF THOSE FOLKS I THINK WE DIMINISHED NEVER REALLY DISCUSSED THIS ENOUGH?

I THINK IT'S ALSO UNDERSTANDABLE BECAUSE THESE ARE PRETTY SIGNIFICANT CHANGES THAT MAY BE NECESSARY CHANGES BUT IS NOT QUITE FAIR TO SAY THEY KNEW THIS IS COMING THEY KNEW THE OVERALL GOAL WAS COMING DID NOT KNOW THE AMENDMENTS WERE COMING. THAT ASIDE COUNCILLOR NOLAN I DON'T KNOW IF YOU CAN ANSWER THIS OR MAYBE SETH. IN THE EXAMPLES YOU GAVE NOT TO TALK ABOUT NEW BUILDINGS.

ALSO TALK ABOUT RETROFITTING BUILDINGS SO AN EXAMPLE THAT YOU GAVE FOR ALL THE BUILDINGS WHICH I'M NOT AN EXPERT USED ALEXANDRIA BIOMED. THESE BUILDINGS ARE BEING BUILT NOW AGAIN UNLESS EXPERTS USING TO ME THAT THAT MIGHT BE AN EASIER THING TO BUILD SOMETHING FROM SCRATCH AND DO SOMETHING A CERTAIN WAY THEN RETROFITTING. I GUESS MY QUESTION I WOULD LOVE 2035.

I SORT OF AGREE WITH RATHER SET AMBITIOUS GOALS IF YOU DON'T MAKE THEM AS COUNCILLOR CARLONE JUST SAID I DON'T SET GOALS THAT MAKE US JUST FEEL GOOD BECAUSE THEY'RE LIKE WE ARE JUST DOING SOMETHING WE SAID 23 BUT WE ARE BETTER THAN EVERYBODY ELSE. I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY CAN BE DONE AS A SCIENCES THERE THAT THEY ARE ACHIEVABLE. WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RETROFITTING A BUILDING VERSUS BUILDING A NEW BUILDING WHAT HAPPENS IF ALL THESE BUILDINGS GO ELECTRIC WITHOUT A LOT OF BETTER POWER GRID AND THEN WHAT DOES THAT MEAN THAT THAT MEANS WE NEED MORE SUBSTATIONS AND THEN WHERE THOSE GO TO GOLDIE THAT WE LIKE THEM.

SO WE WENT TO SUBSTATION NEAR THEIR HOUSE. THIS WILL SERVE LAYERS TOGETHER I GUESS MY QUESTION TO COUNCILLOR NOLAN WITH YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NEW BUILDINGS VERSUS RETROFITTING BUILDINGS AND ARE THESE GOALS APPLICABLE TO BOTH OF THOSE KINDS OF THINGS? IS IT EASIER TO BUILD A NEW BUILDING AND MEET THESE GOALS VERSUS RETROFIT AND MEET HIS GOALS.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: I TOTALLY AGREE WE SHOULD GET ALL THE PLAYERS TO THE TABLE. I WITH THAT. IT'S SOMETHING THAT WE NEED TO BE DOING. I WILL ALSO NOTE THAT IF BUILDING OWNERS ARE THE TABLE THAT IS LIKE THE TOBACCO COMPANIES BEING WHAT TO SAY HOW DO YOU REDUCE SMOKING. THERE ARE LITERALLY THE PEOPLE REMITTING THESE EMISSIONS.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: I DON'T WANT TO PUT MIT IN THE SAME CATEGORY AS TOBACCO COMPANIES.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: I THINK THEY CAN DO IT RIGHT I THINK THEY COULD TOTALLY DO IT. TO DIRECTLY ANSWER YOUR QUESTION I THINK YOU RAISE ALL THOSE IMPORTANT THINGS WE'VE DISCUSSED WHICH IS THE EDUCATION THAT SUBSTATIONS THE CAPACITY OF THE GRID. WHICH IS PROBABLY WHY WHAT WE REALLY WANT TO DO IS WE WANT SHIELD MICROGRIDS ACROSS THE ENTIRE CITY WANT GROUNDS FOR SEED EXCHANGE TO BE USED TO GET DRAMATICALLY LOWERS THE LOAD ON THE EXISTING ELECTRIC STRUCTURE BECAUSE YOU ARE TAPPING INTO THE EARTH'S NATURAL HEAT. AND FOR SEVERAL PLACES WHERE THAT IS ALREADY IN PLACE. FOR LARGE BUILDING.

AND THEY DO NOT HAVE TO RELY ON THEY CAN DO IT WITH THE EXISTING ELECTRICAL STRUCTURE BUT THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT YOUR SPECIFIC QUESTION ABOUT RETROFITTING THAT EASIER WITH NEWER BUT REMEMBER THE EXISTING BEUDERO AMENDMENTS ASSUME EVERY EXISTING BUILDING IT TO COME DOWN TO ZERO. IT'S ONLY A MATTER OF BY WHEN.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: SOME OF THE QUESTION WAS ANOTHER DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THIS I'VE HEARD PEOPLE SAY THAT SCIENTISTS ARE QUITE THERE YET. IT'S NOT QUITE READY. SO PART OF THE GOALS OF 2050 WERE TO SORT OF HOPING THAT THINGS WOULD KIND OF CATCH UP AND I GUESS IS THAT.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: I TALKED TO DEVELOPERS IN THE LAST COUPLE WEEKS AND THEY SAID IF YOU WANT ASK US TO DO THIS FIVE YEARS AGO I WOULD'VE SAID YOU ARE CRAZY RIGHT NOW IT REALLY HAS CHANGED. CAN IT HAPPEN? I WOULD ARGUE ESPECIALLY GIVEN AS AN MIT AND HARVARD'S COMMITMENT GAVE THE PEOPLE THE BEST PEOPLE PLACED ON EARTH TO DO THIS. THEY CAN DO IT AND REMEMBER IF YOU CAN'T GET THERE WITHIN A FEW YEARS YOU CAN HAVE A TOTAL TURN COMPLAINANT'S FAMOUS WHICH THEN GO INTO A FUND TO HELP SOLVE THIS.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: THANK YOU I KNOW OTHER FOLKS WITH MY QUESTION. I WOULD SAY THIS BEFORE I TURN IT OVER I'M GOING TO GO TO. [LISTING NAMES] BECAUSE BEFORE I GO THERE. THIS DOES BRING UP AND IMAGINE THIS MONDAY NIGHT. ABOUT IS THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE AND THIS APOLLO LEVEL WITH THE VICE MAYOR SAID THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE IS A MORE CLUNKY COMMITTEE. WE GET THE LANGUAGE. WE GET AN AMENDMENT. WE DISCUSSED THE AMENDMENT. IT JUST US AT THE TABLE. WE DECIDE WHAT WE LIKE THE AMENDMENT OR WE DON'T VOTE ON IT. WHEREAS IT'S NOT LIKE A HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE WHERE GOODBYE DH SP AND YOU BUY THAT NONPROFIT AFTERSCHOOL PEOPLE AND YOU MIGHT ALWAYS HAVE THE PEOPLE TO THE TABLE AND WE SIT AROUND AND SAY HOW WE COME TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM.

I GUESS THAT SORT OF A QUESTION IN TERMS OF YES MIT WILL, I DON'T KNOW IF THEY'RE ON THE PHONE NOW. THEY WILL, IT WILL STAY THERE THREE MINUTES OR TWO MINUTES.

AND THAT IS IT THAT IS DIFFERENT THAN BEING AT THE TABLE SAYING OKAY HOW DO WE ALL GET TO THE GOAL OF 2035 AND HERE'S WHAT OUR PROBLEMS ARE AND HEAR WHAT OUR CONCERNS ARE HAPPILY POSED MANY SUBSTATIONS AROUND THE CITY? THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN IN THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE. SO WITH SOMETHING FOR US TO THINK ABOUT. IT'S NOT THE PAST THESE AMENDMENTS THEN IT'S CODIFIED ASSAULT. THAT THE DISCUSSIONS HAPPENING AFTER THE FACT. IT'S SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT THIS IS THE BEST PLACE TO HAVE THOSE MORE IN THE WEEDS KIND OF CONVERSATIONS.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: THE DIRECTION THE IPCC SAVE THE RECENT REPORT WAS CODE RED FOR HUMANITY LITERALLY IS WHAT IT WAS CALLED IT HAS CHANGED.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: I'M GOING TO GO TO.

[LISTING NAMES]

>> Iram Farooq: THANK YOU CHAIR McGOVERN LITERALLY WANTED TO BUMP INTO SETH BECAUSE HE AND THE TEAM HAVE DONE A LOT OF WORK ON EXISTING BUILDINGS. AND BRINGING THEIR ENERGY EFFICIENCY SO WE CAN SPEAK TO YOUR QUESTION AND I JUST ALSO WANTED TO MENTION THAT BEUDO APPLIES TO A PRETTY WIDE SPECTRUM OF BUILDINGS. I KNOW WE SORT OF BEEN FOCUSING A LOT ON THE THREE LARGE DAIRY CAPITALIZED PLAYERS. BUT THERE ARE NUMBER OF SMALLER BUILDINGS THAT ARE SUBJECT TO THE BEUDO AMENDMENTS THAT DO BEUDO AND THEN THE AMENDMENTS PRAYED THAT WILL HAVE DIFFERENT LEVELS OF CAPACITY IN ORDER TO COMPLY. I JUST PULLED WANT TO TURN OVER TO SETH.

>> Seth Federspiel: THANK YOU I JUST WANT TO REMIND YOU MR. CHAIR AND REST OF THE COUNCILORS OF THE TABLE I SHOWED EARLY IN THE PRESENTATION ABOUT THE STRUCTURE OF THE ACTION PLAN. SO BEUDO AMENDMENTS AND BEUDO AS IT CURRENTLY STANDS IS SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED TO ADDRESS EXISTING BUILDINGS AND ALL THE EXISTING BUILDINGS. OBVIOUSLY BUILDINGS BECOME EXISTING BUILDINGS BUT THERE OTHER PARTS OF THE NET ZERO ACTION PLAN WHERE WE SEE TO MOVE NEW BUILDINGS TO ACHIEVING NET ZERO EMISSIONS FROM THE START. SO BEUDO FOCUSED ON EXISTING BUILDINGS. AND AS A VERY DIFFERENT PROCESS FROM THE EXISTING BUILDING TO RETROFIT TO CHANGE ITS EXISTING SYSTEMS AND TAKE THEM OUT AND REPLACE THEM. TO ACHIEVE NET ZERO EMISSIONS THAN IT IS FOR NEW BUILDING TO BE DESIGNED TO BE NET ZERO EMISSIONS FROM THE START. I JUST WANT TO MAKE THAT DISTINCTION.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: I DO SEE COUNCILLOR CARLONE COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN I SAW COUNCILLOR CARLONE COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN PANTS POP UP IN RELATION TO MY QUESTION UNTIL JUST GOTTEN UP TO HOLD ON THAT BECAUSE NOT GOING TO GET TO THIS RESOLVED TONIGHT I'M JUST WORRIED ABOUT THE TIME WE GOT 30 PEOPLE. I DO NOT HOLD AS PEOPLE ARE SPEAKING BUT EVEN IF TOO MANY FEATURES THAT ONE HOUR. AND THEN WE STILL HAVE TO HEAR COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN'S PRESENTATION AND GO TO CLARIFYING QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT. WERE GOING TO BE WELL PAST AT 7:30 PM IF WE DO THOSE PUBLIC COMMENTS AND DO ALL THAT RIGHT NOW. I DON'T THINK WE NEED TO TALK. YOU CAN ANSWER THOSE IF YOU HAVE SOMETHING ADDITIONAL TO ADD DON'T FEEL I DON'T WASTE TIME ANSWERING MY QUESTIONS. IF THAT'S OKAY?

>> Dennis J Carlone: JUST QUICKLY ABSOLUTELY EXISTING BUILDINGS ARE DIFFERENT LEASES GET FINISHED AT CERTAIN TIMES. SO I'M SURE SETH ARE THINKING ABOUT THIS. THERE WOULD BE A PLAN FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS. SO ONE OR TWO FLOORS WOULD BE VACANT INTO YEARS. THAT'S WHEN WORK GETS DONE AND IT CAN ALL BE DONE UNTIL MOST OF THE BUILDING IS DONE. BUT NEVERTHELESS IT WOULD SPEEDED UP QUITE A BIT. I'M DONE. I WOULDN'T SAY ANYMORE.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan,Chair: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR I WILL BE BRIEF. MY PRESENTATION IS NOT VERY LONG.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: CAN YOU SPEAK UP IT'S VERY HARD TO HEAR YOU.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan,Chair: UNCOVERED YOU RIGHT NOW FROM MY LIVING ROOM IN AN OLD ELECTRIC THAT ZERO BUILDING. IT TOOK ME 15 YEARS TO RETROFIT BUT WE ARE USING 60% LESS ENERGY OVERALL TO RUN OUR HOUSE. AND WE USING LESS ELECTRICITY OVERALL TO RUN OUR HOUSE BECAUSE WE HAVE SOLAR PANELS. SO THE ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION IS COMPLEX. BUT THE BRIEF ANSWER IS IT ABSOLUTELY CAN BE DONE. WE ABSOLUTELY HAVE TO DO IT AND IT DOES NOT REQUIRE BRINGING TONS OF ELECTRICITY INTO THE CITY CAN'T REQUIRE THAT THAT'S NOT A GOOD SOLUTION. WE HAVE TO DO IT LOCALLY BY USING OUR LOCAL ENERGY SOURCES GEOTHERMAL WITH THE USE OF SOLAR. AND THEN OF COURSE WE BRING IN SOME RENEWABLE ENERGY FROM WIND. AND THE BEUDERO STRUCTURE IS QUITE GOOD. IF YOU LOOK AT THE AMENDMENTS THAT WE ARE PROPOSING IT'S LIKE 5% OF THE TAX WE ARE TRYING TO AMEND.

IT INCLUDES 30 SPECIFIC WAYS THAT THESE BUILDINGS CAN OFFSET THEIR ENERGY USE BY BUILDING MORE RENEWABLE ENERGY OFF-SITE THAT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE PIPED INTO CAMBRIDGE BECAUSE THE GRID ITSELF IS GOING TO BECOME MORE RENEWABLE. IT'S A COMPLICATED ANSWER BUT THE ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION IS YES YOU CAN DO THIS WORK AND WE HAVE TO DO IT.

>> E. Denise Simmons: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR THIS IS BEEN A VERY GOOD CONVERSATION I DID WANT TO SAY TWO THINGS. OR SEVERAL THINGS QUICKLY I WANTED TO GET THE PUBLIC COMMENTS BECAUSE I DO WANT TO HEAR PEOPLE FROM THE COMMUNITY. TO SAY I WANT TO THANK MY COLLEAGUES FOR THE TIME AND THE TALENT THEY BROUGHT TO THIS PROCESS AND COUNCILLOR NOLAN EXUBERANCE IS PALPABLE. I DO HAVE CONCERNS IN THE MORNING AND SAID. I BELIEVE SOME THESE AMENDMENTS ARE FAIRLY NEW. IN CAMBRIDGE WE AS A CITY WE TALK ABOUT BEING A LEADER. WE HAVE BEEN A LEADER IN TRANSPARENCY AND PREDICTIVE ABILITY.

SO IF YOU THINK SOMEBODY WERE GOING TO DO THIS AND WERE GOING TO DO THIS IN 2050 AND THEN TURN AROUND AND JUST CHANGE IT WITHOUT HAVING DISCOURSE MEANINGFUL DISCOURSE WE ARE NOT DOING WHAT WE CAN DO. I THINK THE VICE MAYOR SAID THAT THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE THAT PLAYS A DIFFERENT I RESPECTFULLY ASK SOME OF THESE AMENDMENTS I'VE NOT HEARD FROM COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN GO BACK TO COMMITTEE BE PROPERLY VETTED. I DON'T KNOW WHAT BECAUSE FRENCH NATIONS OR THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES MAY BE AND I'M JUST AS CONCERNED ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE AS THE PERSON OF COLOR KNOW THAT SOME OF THE DOWNSIDES OF THE CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT MY COMMUNITY MORE THAN ANY OTHERS. THANK YOU FOR USING THE PICTURES OF BLACK PEOPLE MS NOLAN. SO FOR ME IF WERE GOING TO BE ABOUT TRANSPARENCY PREDICTABILITY THAT WE NEED TO BE TRANSPARENT AND PREDICTABLE. AND TO DO THAT? DO YOU REALLY NEED TO TAKE US BACK TO THE TABLE AND INVITE PEOPLE. TO HAVE A CONVERSATION I DON'T THINK IT'S EFFICIENT ENOUGH TO SAY WELL I TALK TO THESE PEOPLE AND THEY KNEW IT WAS COMING.

SO I WANT TO SAY WITH ALL SINCERITY I CERTAINLY RESPECT THE WORK THAT SON I LOOK FORWARD TO MY COLLEAGUES PRESENTATION THAT'S ABOUT TEMPERING I WOULD HOPE THAT WE GET RATHER SOON TO PUBLIC COMMENT I THINK YOU SAID CHAIRPERSON THERE ARE 30 PEOPLE AND 7:00 I RECOMMEND WE CONTINUE THIS CONVERSATION BECAUSE IT REALLY IS GOING TO TAKE MORE TIME NOT TO ADJOURN PERHAPS A RECESS TO CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION AFTER WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT. MY STRUGGLE RECOMMENDATION WOULD BE TO THINK BACK TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE AND REALLY TEASE THIS OUT A LOT MORE. I YIELD THE FLOOR.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN LET ME ASK YOU THIS HOW LONG DO YOU THINK YOUR PRESENTATION IS.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan,Chair: MAYBE 10 MINUTES.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: WHY DON'T WE DO THAT. AND MAYBE WE CAN BE A LITTLE BIT MAYBE WE CAN HOLD SOME OF OUR CLARIFYING QUESTIONS SINCE WE'RE GOING TO COME BACK WE CAN CERTAINLY REVISIT COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN'S PRESENTATION. AND THEN GET THE PUBLIC COMMENT. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN IF WE GET THE PUBLIC COMMENTS AND WE RECESS THAT WOULD BE NO PUBLIC COMMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING. IF WE ADJOURN WOULD MEAN WE WOULD HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING. SOME WOULD HAVE TO DECIDE WHETHER THAT WILL WE GET THERE. COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN WHAT WOULD YOUR PRESENTATION AS PLANNED? MAYBE WE WILL HOLD UP IN SOME CLARIFYING QUESTIONS OR GET THROUGH THEM QUICKLY AND THEN HOPEFULLY GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT IN THE NEXT 10 MINUTES FOR 15 MINUTES.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan,Chair: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR CAN EVERYBODY SEE MY SCREEN? I DO WANT TO PREFACE BY SAYING THE ORIGINAL NET ZERO TASK FORCE WHICH I WAS A PART OF WITH COUNCILLOR CARLONE WE DID HAVE CONVERSATIONS WITH THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY. AT THAT TIME AS WELL. I'M ALWAYS HAPPY AND OPEN TO DOING THAT AGAIN AND MORE. BUT I DO HAVE TO SAY THAT THE FACT THAT 40 MEETINGS WERE HAD WITHOUT US AND WE ARE ALSO STAKEHOLDERS DOESN'T MEAN THAT SOMEHOW WE HAVE TO ABIDE BY THIS AGREEMENT BECAUSE WE ARE EXCLUDED FROM THAT CONVERSATION. IT'S NEVER TOO LATE SO LET'S COMMUNICATE AND CERTAINLY REACH OUT TO SOME OF THESE BUILDING OWNERS AND HAVE THIS CONVERSATION. I'M NOT IN FAVOR OF SENDING THIS BACK TO COMMITTEE. WE ALREADY HAD THIS LAST WEEK. THANK YOU COUNCILLOR NOLAN FOR PRESENTING THOSE AMENDMENTS.

WHICH I'M ABOUT TO PRESENT HERE IS A SMALLER SET OF AMENDMENTS THAT ARE PROBABLY CALLED THE GREEN NEW DEAL AND I WORKED ON WITH COUNCILLOR NOLAN AND COUNCILLOR CARLONE SOME OF THESE IDEAS WERE PRESENTED LAST YEAR AS PART OF THE GREEN NEW DEAL ZONING POSITION AND BASED ON FEEDBACK FROM THE PLANNING BOARD WE PULLED IT OUT OF ZONING AND IS PART IS BEING PUT INTO BEUDERO WHICH WASN'T AVAILABLE TO US AT THAT TIME. SO WE ARE PROPOSING THREE AMENDMENTS. ONE IS TO ALLOW THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE PAYMENTS CALLED CREDITS IN THE LANGUAGE TO BE USED FOR GREEN JOBS TRAINING PROGRAMS. NUMBER TWO IS TO REQUIRE ALL LARGE NEW COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS TO PAPER ALL EMISSIONS. AND NUMBER THREE TO INCLUDE.

[UNCLEAR AUDIO].

THIS IS JUST SHOWING SOME OF THE INVESTMENTS HAPPENING WHERE ACROSS THE STREET FROM YOU CAN SEE ON THIS MAP ALL OF THESE TECHNOLOGY BUILDINGS THAT ARE CREATING TREMENDOUS ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BUT NOT FOR THE PEOPLE LIVING ACROSS THE STREET. AND WE ARE DEALING WITH A DOUBLE INJUSTICE AREA AS COUNCILLOR SIMMONS MENTIONED CLIMATE CHANGE DISPROPORTIONATELY IMPACTS PEOPLE OF COLOR AND LOW INCOME COMMUNITIES AND EXCLUDED FROM THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES AND THEIR BEING DISPLACED BY THE RISING COST THAT IS CREATED BY ALL OF THIS HIGH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. THERE IS A LOT OF INJUSTICE HAPPENING AND WHEN WE ARE CONTRACTING CLIMATE CHANGE WITH DO KEEP THAT IN MIND AND TRY TO DESIGN POLICY THAT COUNTERACTS BOTH ECONOMIC INJUSTICES AND BECOME INJUSTICE HAPPENING.

THAT'S WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO ACCOMPLISH WITH THE GREEN NEW DEAL. AS YOU KNOW ON MONDAY WE TRADUCED A PROPOSAL FOR GREEN JOBS ORDINANCE. THANKS AGAIN TO COUNCILLOR SIMMONS AND THE MAYOR AND COUNCILLOR CARLONE FOR THE SUPPORT ON

THAT. AND AT THE IDEA IN THIS AMENDMENT HERE IS SIMPLY TO ALLOW THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE PAYMENTS THAT ARE BEING MADE BY THE DEVELOPERS IF THE BUILDING ISN'T NET ZERO TO GO TOWARDS THOSE GREEN JOBS TRAINING PROGRAMS. UNTIL THIS SHOWS THE ACTUAL TEXT AND YOU DEED LITERALLY JUST A FEW WORDS AT THE END THAT SAY THEY CAN BE USED FOR GREEN JOBS TRAINING PROGRAM SPRINT THAT IS AMENDMENT NUMBER ONE. THEN AMENDMENT NUMBER TWO IS TO REQUIRE ALL NEW COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS TO PAY FOR ALL OF THEIR EMISSIONS. ONE QUESTION MIGHT BE WHY? SO THIS IS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RESOURCES WHICH IS A STATE DEPARTMENT CHOSEN A BLACK LINE THE PROJECTED EMISSIONS FROM BUILDINGS.

THIS IS THROUGHOUT THE STATE THROUGH 2050 IF WE DON'T REQUIRE THEM TO STOP FOSSIL FUELS. THEN THE GREEN TRIANGLE WHICH I ADDED SHOWING APPROXIMATELY THE AMOUNT OF EMISSIONS THAT THEY CAN BE AVOIDED IF WE GOT NET ZERO STANDARD NEXT YEAR 2023 FOR THE NEW BUILDING. SO YOU CAN SEE HOW MUCH POTENTIAL EMISSIONS WE CAN AVOID IF WE PUT IN PLACE REQUIREMENTS THEY START CONSUMING FOSSIL FUELS OR STOP CONSUMING FOSSIL FUELS. IT'S THIS IS TOTALLY FEASIBLE IN FACT YESTERDAY MORNING DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RESOURCES INTRODUCED NET ZERO ENERGY STRETCH CODE THAT WE CAN POTENTIALLY ENACT BY NEXT YEAR. THIS IS ANOTHER QUICK EXAMPLE OF THE IMPACT OF NEW BUILDINGS. NEW BUILDINGS PROJECTED UP TO 2050 BY SQUARE FOOTAGE ARE GREEN AT THE TOP AND EXISTING BUILDINGS ARE BLUE AT THE BOTTOM. CLEARLY THE EXISTING BUILDINGS LITTLE DOMINATE THE BUILDINGS BY 2050 DOES A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF CONSTRUCTION THAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN BETWEEN NOW AND THEN. AND ALL THAT GREEN AREA COULD BE ZERO EMISSIONS IF WE ADOPT THE RIGHT POLICIES NOW.

WHY THE COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS AND SET REALLY COVER THIS WELL ALREADY. COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SIMPLY COUNT FOR THE VAST MAJORITY OF OUR EMISSIONS AND WE DON'T PUT IN PLACE STRINGENT REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW BUILDINGS WERE GOING TO SEE EXACTLY THE SAME RESULT AGAIN AS WE DID WITH MIT AND MAIN STREET. SET ALSO MENTIONED HIS EARLIER 6% OF THE BUILDINGS IN THE CITY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO THIRDS OF THE EMISSIONS. IT'S PRETTY STRAIGHTFORWARD. WE KNOW WHERE THE PROBLEM IS AND IF WE ADDRESS THOSE BUILDINGS WE CANNOT DOWN OUR EMISSIONS THEN FOR THE NEW BUILDINGS WOULD AVOID THE PROBLEM IN THE FIRST PLACE TO BE NET ZERO. SO THE AMENDMENT FOR THIS IS SIMPLY TO ADD A SENTENCE WHICH HAS ALL NONRESIDENTIAL COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES RECEIVE A SPECIAL PERMIT FOR 2022 AND BEYOND BASED ON NET ZERO.

BASICALLY THEY'RE NOT REDUCING FROM ZERO THERE EXPECTED TO BE AT ZERO AND IF THEY HAVE ANY EMISSION ABOVE ZERO THEY WOULD PAY INTO THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE PAYMENT FOR THOSE EMISSIONS WHICH THEN THE CITY CAN USE TO INSTALL SOLAR PANELS TO HELP MAKE AFFORDABLE HOUSING MORE ENERGY EFFICIENT. I DEFUNDED GREEN JOBS TRAINING PROGRAMS THROUGH THESE MINUTES. THEN THE LAST PIECE IS THE AND BODY DIVISIONS THIS IS JUST QUICKLY SHOWING WHAT WE MEAN THAT THAT SO THE BODY DIVISIONS ARE THE EMISSIONS FROM REDUCING MANUFACTURING MINING AND MATERIALS THAT GO INTO THE BUILDINGS. I TOLD THE EMISSIONS THAT RESULTS FROM THAT AS WELL AS THAT TRANSPORTING THOSE MATERIALS TO THE BUILDING SITE IN SOME CASES THESE MATERIALS COME FROM FAR AWAY. AND THEN OF COURSE THE EMISSIONS PRODUCED BY THE ACTUAL CONSTRUCTION AND HEAVY EQUIPMENT TO DO THAT AND HERE'S WHY.

SO THIS IS FROM ANOTHER REPORT SHOWING THAT THE BUILDING MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION ARE 11% OF OUR GLOBAL EMISSIONS. THAT'S A PRETTY SIGNIFICANT NUMBER. THAT IS CURRENTLY COMPLETELY UNACCOUNTED FOR. AND MOST OF THAT IS IN THE CONCRETE STEEL AND MATERIALS THERE IS GLASS AND THAT AS WELL.

IT'S RELATIVELY STRAIGHTFORWARD FOR US TO CALCULATE AT LEAST ROUGHLY WHAT THE EMISSIONS CONTRIBUTION FOR A NEW BUILDING . THE WHOLE IDEA BEHIND CHARGING FOR THOSE TO CREATE ECONOMIC PRESSURES ON THE DEVELOPERS TO MINIMIZE THOSE EMISSIONS. I WILL READ ALL THIS.

THIS SET OF SLIDES SPECIFIED AGAIN THE EXACT LANGUAGE THAT CREATES THE EMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS AND IT BASICALLY SAYS FOR NEW COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS THEY WOULD HAVE TO PAY TOWARD THE EMISSIONS OVER A TEN-YEAR PERIOD TO GAIN ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE CREDITS. HE GOES INTO MORE DETAIL ABOUT WHAT IS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE CALCULATION AS WELL IS WHAT WE LEFT OUT OF THE EMISSIONS REGULATIONS. THIS QUICKLY JUST WRAP UP IS A SUMMARY OF THE EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT. SO TRY TO AMENDMENTS AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED. WOULD CHARGE A NEW BUILDING FOR THE AREA THAT REPRESENTS THE EXCESS EMISSIONS.

AND ACCORDING TO BEUDERO THAT TO GET THOSE OPERATING EMISSIONS TO 0 BY 2050. BUT IF THEY DON'T MANAGE TO DO THAT WHICH IS SIMULATED HERE READ THAN THEY CAN PAY \$234 PER TON THOSE EXCESS EMISSIONS WAS IMPORTANT TO NOTE IS THAT THEY WANT PAPER THE EMBODIED EMISSIONS AND THEY WILL PAY FOR THE OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS BUT THEY ALLOWED UNDER THE REDUCTION SCHEDULE PROPOSED BY THE BEUDERO. WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING THESE AMENDMENTS IS THAT THE NEW COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS WOULD PAY FOR ALL OF THEIR EMISSIONS UNDER THESE AMENDMENTS AND SO AS BEEN SAID EARLIER THESE EMISSIONS ARE ALL AVOIDABLE TO A LARGE EXTENT IS REASONABLE TO SAY WE CAN AVOID THEM THAT WE HAVE TO PAY FOR THEM.

THEY WOULD USE THOSE FUNDS TO DO EMISSION REDUCTIONS ELSEWHERE AND TO CREATE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR LOW INCOME. THAT IS THE CONCLUSION OF MY PRESENTATION.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: GREAT THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR SIMMONS I ASSUME THAT HAND WAS FROM BEFORE?

>> E. Denise Simmons: YES IT WAS THANK YOU.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: ANY QUICK QUESTIONS ON THAT ISSUE.

>> E. Denise Simmons: IT WASN'T THE QUESTION WAS I DON'T I DID NOT WANT TO BE THOUGHT OF HOW WE TRIED TO CUT OFF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. IN TERMS OF YOUR RIGHT WHEN YOU SAID IF WE RECESS THIS MEETING WILL BE ABLE TO HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT BECAUSE WE WOULD'VE ALREADY HAD IT. BUT IF THERE IS NO APPETITE TO BRING THIS INTO A FORUM WHERE THEY CAN BE MORE ENGAGEMENT BECAUSE PUBLIC COMMENT DOESN'T GIVE US THE KIND OF ENGAGEMENT THAT WE NEEDED TO HEAR FROM PEOPLE 'S PERSPECTIVES THEN I WOULD NOT RECOMMEND THAT WE RECESS. JUST HAD A STATION ORDINANCE COMMITTEE.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: I HAVE A THOUGHT ON HOW WE MAY WANT TO DO WE CAN DO ALL THIS BUT I WILL SAY THAT KEEP YOU ALL IN SUSPENSE UNTIL THE END. AND LET'S GET TO PUBLIC COMMENT WE DON'T GIVE FOLKS TWO MINUTES PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD. OBVIOUSLY WE KNOW WHAT YOU'RE HERE TO TALK ABOUT. MR. CLERK CAN YOU CALL WITH FIRST.

>> Kristine Jelstrup: 120 PLEASANT ST. GOOD EVENING AND THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TO. I ENJOYED THE PRESENTATION. I WILL KEEP THIS SHORT AS I CAN HEAR YOU ALL WELL AWARE THAT THE COMING CRISIS IS UPON US. AND GETTING WORSE WITH EVERY PASSING YEAR. 80% OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IN CAMBRIDGE COME FROM BUILDINGS EMISSIONS. ALL CAMBRIDGE BUILDINGS HAVE GONE UP OVER 11% FROM 2012 – 2019. IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT WE REVERSE THIS DISTURBING TREND AND MOVE

TOWARDS GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTIONS QUICKLY. IT'S HARD TO IMAGINE REDUCTIONS IN THE FUTURE WHEN THE TREND HAS BEEN TO INCREASE EMISSIONS. IN ORDER TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS WE NEED TO HOLD SUPER EMITTER BUILDINGS TO ACCOUNT FOR ALL OF THEIR EMISSIONS. IT'S CRUCIAL TO CAMBRIDGE TO PASS THE STRONGEST BEUDO AMENDMENTS POSSIBLE. BEUDO IS BY FAR OUR BEST OPPORTUNITY TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IN CAMBRIDGE. LASTLY CAMBRIDGE SHOULD AIM TO REACH NET ZERO EMISSIONS BY 2035 NOT 2050 WE NEED TO ACT BOLDLY AND WE NEED TO ACT NOW. THANK YOU.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: THANK YOU.

>> Margery Davies: I'M SPEAKING AS A MEMBER OF THE NET ZERO ACTION PLAN FUND REVIEW TEST FORCE. I APPRECIATED THE OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE TASK FORCE AND HAVE LEARNED A LOT FROM IT. I'M ALSO A MEMBER OF THE CAMBRIDGE CHAPTER OF MOTHER'S OUT FRONT. I HAVE SPOKEN TO YOU A NUMBER OF TIMES ABOUT BEUDO. ONE THING I WANT TO MAKE CLEAR IS IN TERMS OF BEUDO AMENDMENTS AS PROPOSED BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, THE NET ZERO ACTION PLAN TASK FORCE WAS GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON THOSE PROPOSED BEUDO AMENDMENTS ONCE THEY'VE BEEN SUBMITTED. THE TASK FORCE WASN'T INVOLVED IN CRAFTING THOSE BEUDO AMENDMENTS. I'LL BE AS BRIEF AS I CAN WITH SEVERAL POINTS. NUMBER ONE CAMBRIDGE NEEDS TO MOVE MORE QUICKLY. IT'S BEEN MY MAIN CONCERN SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE TASK FORCE WORK IN CAMBRIDGE REALLY NEEDS TO SPEED UP IN MY OPINION. SECOND POINT IS THAT LESS THAN TWO MONTHS AGO ON DECEMBER 13 THE CITY COUNCIL REAFFIRMED ITS COMMITMENT ORIGINALLY MADE IN 2017 FOR THE GOAL OF USING 100% CLEAN AND RENEWABLE ENERGY BY 2035 NOT 2050.

POINT NUMBER THREE THAT SITUATION IS URGENT. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IN CAMBRIDGE HAVE GONE UP OVER 11% NOT FOUND IN RECENT YEARS. THIS IS GOING IN THE WRONG DIRECTION. POINT NUMBER FOUR ACCOUNTABILITY. I'M CONCERNED THAT CAMBRIDGE DOES NOT HOLD ITSELF ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE GOALS FOR THE SEPARATED DEADLINES ARE OFTEN MISSED OR WE FAIL TO ENFORCE REQUIREMENTS ONE TROUBLING EXAMPLE IS THE RATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR BUILDINGS COVERED BY BEUDO. NUMBER BUILDINGS HAVE BEEN REQUIRED TO REPORT THEIR BEUDO ABOUT THE REPORT OF THEIR EMISSIONS FOR THE PAST SIX YEARS. IN 2015 95% OF BEUDO BUILDINGS REPORTED THEIR ENERGY USE. THE PERCENTAGE OF BUILDINGS REPORTING HAS GONE STEADILY DOWN EVERY YEAR SINCE. BY 2020 ONLY 73% OF BEUDO BUILDINGS REPORTED.

POINT NUMBER FIVE. THE BEUDO AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT NEED TO BE STRENGTHENED. THE BEUDO AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY COUNCILLOR NOLAN AND COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN DO JUST THAT AND NOTE THAT YOU WILL SUPPORT THEM. IN CONCLUSION THIS IS IN A COMPETITION. WE ARE ALL IN THIS TOGETHER. CITY COUNCILORS SHOULD BE STAFF AND CAMBRIDGE RESIDENTS CREATING THE STRONGEST BEUDO AMENDMENTS THAT WE CAN SHOULD BE A GROUP EFFORT. WHEN WE SUCCEED WE WILL ALL BE ABLE TO BE PROUD OF HER ROLES IN REDUCING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IN CAMBRIDGE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> Greg Carey-Medlock: I LIVE IN 253 RIVER ST. TODAY LIKE TO EXPRESS MY SUPPORT FOR THE BEUDO AMENDMENTS AS PROPOSED BY COUNCILORS I MOVED TO CAMBRIDGE RECENTLY WITH MY WIFE AND SON. WHEN THE MOST APPEALING FEATURES OF CAMBRIDGE LESS IS THAT IT'S A LEADER IN PROGRESSIVE ACTION. INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION. IN OUR HOMES WE FEEL STRONGLY THAT DUTY TO LEAVE THE WORLD A BIT BETTER FOR NEXT GENERATION. THANK YOU COUNCILORS FOR YOUR SERVICE AND DOING YOUR PART THE NEXT GENERATION.

CAMBRIDGE IS A WALKABLE LIKABLE CITY WITH EXCELLENT PUBLIC TRANSIT WHICH STRONGLY ENABLES OUR ABILITY TO REDUCE EMISSIONS. HOWEVER GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM BUILDINGS ARE INCREASING DESPITE INFRASTRUCTURE FOR AN EMISSIONS MONITORING PUT IN PLACE BY BEUDO. BUILDING BEUDO HAVE GONE UP BY 11%.

AND COMMERCIAL INSTITUTIONAL BUILDING SPECIFICALLY WE SEEN AT 29% INCREASE IN CARBON EMISSIONS. AS A SCIENTIST MYSELF WHICH IS SIMPLY LABORATORY SETTINGS I CAN TELL YOU THAT THIS IS NOT NECESSARY. WE NEED A COORDINATED AND PROACTIVE RESPONSE TO REDUCE BUILDING EMISSIONS THROUGH IMPROVED LOCALLY PROBABLY MITIGATE OR INFLUENCE ON CLIMATE CHANGE PRESENCE. THE PROPOSED BEUDO AMENDMENTS DO JUST THAT. CLIMATE CHANGE IS AN URGENT AND UNPARALLELED PROBLEM. IN EXTRA HELP WITH JOB SECURITY IN HOMES ESPECIALLY FROM THOSE VULNERABLE MEMBERS OF OUR COMMUNITY. WE MUST MOVE QUICKLY. I'M IN SUPPORT OF REACHING NET 0 BY 2035 AS COMMITTED TO PREVIOUSLY BY THE COUNCIL. I URGE THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE AND COUNCIL TO IMPROVE THE AMENDMENTS AND TO PRIORITIZE CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION. THANK YOU.

>> David Rabkin: CHAIR OF THE COMING PROTECTION ACTION COMMITTEE. I'M GOING TO RESPOND TO WHAT I HEARD TONIGHT AND CHANGE MY REMARKS A LITTLE BIT. FIRST TO SOMETHING COUNCILLOR McGOVERN PUT ON THE TABLE. MARK WE ARE GOING ALL ELECTRICS OR PRETTY CLOSE. IT'S GOING TO TAKE A LOT OF WORK. IT JUST A MATTER OF HOW FAST IT'S GOING TO BE. SO WE REALLY HAVE TO FOCUS ON THAT. SECONDLY BEUDO IS ABOUT EXISTING BUILDINGS. BUT WE ALSO NEED TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT NEW BUILDINGS.

RIGHT NOW WHEN IT COMES TO NEW BUILDINGS WE ARE WAITING FOR THE STATE TO UPDATE THE STRETCH ENERGY CODE. UNFORTUNATELY THAT'S ALMOST A YEAR AWAY. BEST CASE. HOW MUCH IN CONSTRUCTION ARE WE COMMITTED BETWEEN NOW AND THEN. IT IS A BIG MISSED OPPORTUNITY. WE NEED TO TAKE ACTION ON A SHORT RUN WE NEED AN APPROACH PROBABLY BASED ON SPECIAL PERMITS. THAT SEEMS LIKE A LIKELY GOOD PARTIAL SOLUTION. I RECOMMEND KEEPING IT SIMPLE SO IT CAN BE DESIGNED AND IMPLEMENTED QUICKLY.

THIRD MY MAJOR POINT. PLEASE REMEMBER CPAC'S LETTERS OF DECEMBER ABOUT BEUDERO . THEY'RE VERY SUPPORTIVE OF WHAT CAME OUT OF THOSE 40 CONVERSATIONS. AS WAS TALKED ABOUT EARLIER. AND YET WE WROTE IN A LETTER THAT BEUDERO IS PROPOSED FILLED ALL SORTS OF THE CITY'S NEEDS. SO WE RECOMMENDED THAT THE CITY ACCELERATED THE TIMELINE IN BEUDERO CONSIDERS INCLUDING SMALLER BUILDINGS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK. EXPLORE ADDITIONAL MEASURES TO REDUCE EMISSIONS FROM THE HIGHEST EMITTING BUILDINGS MORE QUICKLY THAN PLANNED. CREATE A SCHEDULE TO PHASE OUT THE ACP. THAT MAY REQUIRE THE ELIMINATION OF ON-SITE FOSSIL FUEL BURNING SYSTEMS.

EVALUATE THE ACP MORE FREQUENTLY THAN PLANNED STARTING AT THE END OF THE FIRST COMPLAINEE PERIOD. ADOPTS THE COMMONWEALTH NEW STRETCH CODE AS QUICKLY AS WE POSSIBLY CAN. AND FINALLY INVEST IN PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE THE ACCESS TO THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES THAT PROPERTY OWNERS ARE GOING TO NEED IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO ACTUALLY MAKE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE BUILDINGS THAT WE NEED TO MEET OUR EMISSIONS GOALS.

GIVEN OFFICIAL RECOMMENDATIONS COMING FROM A PLAYER THAT IS VERY SUPPORTIVE AND IT SHOULD HAVE BOUGHT IN COMPLETELY I DON'T THINK IT'S APPROPRIATE TO LABEL BEUDERO THUS FAR AS A RESULT OF A CONSENSUS PROCESS. A CHALLENGING IT WAS TO GET WHERE WE ARE WE STILL HAVE A WAY TO GO. THANK YOU.

>> Robert Michael Pittsley: HELLO I'M CALLING FROM 56 NORFOLK ST. THE MANY EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE HAVE BEGUN TO TAKE PLACE AND FINALLY BECOME LATELY UNDER NORMAL. NOT LIVING A SCIENTIFICALLY PREDICTED TIME.FACED WITH EMERGING DISEASES FOOD INSECURITY AND SEA LEVEL RISE. ONE WITH SO MANY UNDESIRABLE REALITIES FACED BY ENVIRONMENT OF JUSTICE COMMUNITIES DIFFERENTLY COME PUBLIC DIRECT WE NEED TO DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO TRANSITION TO A SYSTEM MORE CONDUCIVE THE PUBLIC AND BY MENTAL HEALTH.

WE MUST PROTECT THE VIABILITY OF THIS NEW DECISION ALONG WITH OUR AIR QUALITY. URBAN VEGETATION HAS SEVERAL IMPORTANT FUNCTIONS BEYOND AESTHETICS. OUR TREES AND SHRUBS HAVE MULTIPLE IMPACT IN THEIR AIR QUALITY LIKE FOR INSTANCE SCHOOLS ARE SURROUNDED BY GREEN SPACE HAVE LOWER LEVELS OF POLLUTION IN THEIR CLASSROOM. IN THE PAST THREE YEARS THE FOLKS AROUND RESPIRATORY HEALTH THAT WE DO OUR BEST TO PROTECT OUR AIR.

THE INDIRECT EFFECT OF NATURAL GAS LEAKAGE ON URBAN VEGETATION IS OBVIOUS SINCE THE SOIL GAS PHASE COMPOSITION LEAK IS AVAILABLE FOR PLANT GROWTH.WITHIN THE GAS ZONE THE OXYGEN CONSERVATION IS VERY LOW TO ZERO WHILE CARBON DIOXIDE IS HIGH. CONSEQUENTLY ROOF GROWTH IS STOPPED AND RESPIRATION IS INHIBITED SO UPTAKE OF WATER NUTRIENTS ARE REDUCED AND EVENTUALLY THE PLANTS DIE. AFTER THE EFFECTS OF GAS LEAKAGE MAY PERSIST FOR CAN SIMPLE MATTER OF TIME TOXIC COMPONENTS CAN BE LEFT IN THE SOIL AS REDUCED AND ORGANIC SUBSTANCES. EFFECTIVE RESTRICTIONS AND PREVENTION OF LEAKAGE WITH NATURAL GAS AS WELL AS ENSUING INJURY TO STREET TREES CAN ONLY BE REALIZED IF THERE'S GOOD COOPERATION BETWEEN THE CITY COUNCIL PARKS DEPARTMENT AND MUNICIPAL GAS COMPANIES.

I'M HERE TONIGHT ASKING THE CAMBRIDGE MOVE FASTER, REACH HIRE AND SET THE EXAMPLE. WE CAN AND MUST REACH NET ZERO MISSIONS BY 2035 NOT 2050. VAST AMOUNTS OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH CLEARLY EXPLAIN AND CAN CONFIRM THE DANGER AND FAILURE OF OUR RECURRING ENERGY SYSTEMS AS WELL AS THE VIABILITY OF A MORE SUSTAINABLE ALTERNATIVES THAT ARE MODELED IN CITIES AROUND THE WORLD.

CITY COUNCIL PLEASE ADOPT THE HIGHER STANDARDS PLEASE PROVIDE JOBS FOR PEOPLE TO BUILD A HEALTHIER FUTURE HELD THE BUILDINGS THAT WE NEED. AND PLEASE BAN GAS HOOKUPS FOR BUILDINGS AND REFLECT THE 2035 THAT'S YOUR GOAL UPON OLD BEUDO TARGETS AND SENDERS.

Motion to suspend the rules to extend the meeting until 8PM

	present	absent	yea	nay
Councillor Azeem			x	
Councillor Carlone			x	
Vice Mayor Mallon			x	
Councillor Nolan			x	
Mayor Siddiqui			x	
Councillor Simmons		x		
Councillor Toner			x	
Chair - Councillor Zondervan			x	
Chair - Councillor McGovern			x	

>> Sarah Gallop: THANK YOU CAN YOU HEAR ME. GOOD EVENING EVERYONE. MIT HAS BEEN WORKING CLOSELY WITH CITY STAFF AND CAMBRIDGE STAKEHOLDERS SINCE BEFORE BEUDO'S INCEPTION IN 2014. WE BEEN ENGAGED IN ALL PHASES OF THE ORIGINAL ORDINANCES DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION. AND NOW THE

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS RELATED TO PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS. WE APPLAUD THE CITY'S COMMITMENT TO AN OPEN AND TRANSPARENT PROCESS. WITH PLENTIFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO ENGAGE REVIEW COMMENTS AND CODEVELOP SOLUTIONS TO CONSTANTLY IMPROVE BEUDO. OUR PLAN FOR THIS HEARING WAS TO EXPRESS SUPPORT FOR THE NOVEMBER 2021 AMENDMENTS WITH THE REQUEST FOR CONTINUED COLLABORATION ON A FEW REMAINING ISSUES. THOSE TOPICS INCLUDE CLARITY AROUND THE MISSIONS BASELINE. THE ROLE OF CARBON OFFSET CREDIT PRODUCTS. AS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE CREDIT WE HAVE EVERY CONFIDENCE THAT WE CAN ADDRESS THESE MATTERS TOGETHER FOR MUTUAL SATISFACTION JUST AS WE HAVE FOR MULTITUDE OF DETAILS OVER THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS.

UNFORTUNATELY WE'RE NOT ABLE TO SUPPORT BEUDO TONIGHT BECAUSE OF THE NEW AMENDMENTS THAT WERE INTRODUCED TWO DAYS AGO. THESE LATE EDITS HAVE NOT BEEN DISCUSSED WITH STAKEHOLDERS. AND ARE NOT ENDORSED BY CITY STAFF. THIS LAST-MINUTE FLURRY OF ACTIVITY RUNS COUNTER TO THE NATURE OF THE ENTIRE BEUDO EFFORT . WHILE WE'VE ONLY BRIEFLY SCANNED PROPOSED EDITS RECEIVED THE LABORATORIES HAVE BEEN DELETED FROM A SECTION IT'S BEEN EXCESSIVELY RESEARCH HAS ANYBODY ASKED THE BEUDO LABORATORY WORKING GROUP FOR A TEMPLATE?

WE NOTICED THE TIME FRAMES HAVE BEEN DRASTICALLY CONDENSED LEAVING OPEN QUESTIONS REGARDING FEASIBILITY. AND AVAILABLE TECHNOLOGY. AS ANYBODY REACHED OUT TO HAVE RESOURCE TO GET ITS VIEW? MIT IS COMMITTED TO A COMPREHENSIVE ACTION PLAN OF ACHIEVING NET ZERO EMISSIONS BY 2026. IN ELIMINATING ALL DIRECT EMISSIONS BY 2050. IT'S NO COINCIDENCE OUR COMMON GOALS ARE ALIGNED WITH THE CITY'S NET ZERO ACTION PLAN AND THE BEUDO AMENDMENTS.

IT'S BECAUSE WE WORK TOGETHER THEY AND DAY OUT ON THESE MATTERS WE SHARE DATA BEST PRACTICES EXPERTISE AND PHILOSOPHIES WE ARGUE OFFER COUNTERPROPOSALS REWRITE AND REGROUP. AND WE MAKE SIGNIFICANT ADVANCEMENTS AS A RESULT OF OUR COMMITMENT TO THE PLANET AND AS TO THE MOST RELIABLE WAY OF BRINGING ABOUT PROGRESS. COLLABORATION. WE URGE YOU TO ADVANCE IN NOVEMBER 2020 BEUDO AMENDMENTS WITH CONTINUING DIALOGUE IN THE AREAS WE NOTED. THANK YOU.

>> Thomas Lucey: SORRY ABOUT THAT GOOD EVENING I'M TOM LUCY SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY. HARVARD IS NEGATED WITH THE CITY REGARDING REDUCING EMISSIONS TO CLIMATE CHANGE AND SUSTAINABILITY FOR DECADES. WE'VE ADVANCED WORLD SECOND-GENERATION CLIMATE GOALS AND OUR CAMPUS IS THROUGH LEADING-EDGE GOALS. WE ARE PLEASED TO PARTICIPATED AND CONTRIBUTED FOR MANY YEARS TO THE CITY STAFF RUN SICKLE TO PRESENT THE RESULT IN THE BEUDO RECOMMENDATIONS.

RELEASED IN NOVEMBER. NOW GIVEN THE TIME LIMIT IN PUBLIC COMMENT WHEN I PUT THE ADDRESS THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS BUT WE WILL REACT TO THE NEW AMENDMENTS WERE UNVEILED MONDAY NIGHT.

SO IT'S NOT AMENDMENTS MADE WITH THE SAME FULL AND THOROUGH VETTING OF PUBLIC DIALOGUE AS THE BEUDO PROCESS BECAUSE OF THE TIME TO REENGAGE ALL STAKEHOLDERS TO ENSURE REMAINS A CIVIL AND RESPECTFUL DIALOGUE. EVERYONE IN THIS IMPULSE SHARES THE SAME GOALS OF ADDRESSING EMISSIONS AND SAVING THE PLANET. NO ONE IS A MONOPOLY ON THOSE SENTIMENTS NOR THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE BEST APPROACH TO ACHIEVE THEM. AS FOR THE NEWLY CRAFTED AMENDMENTS WITH SOME INITIAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS. GIVEN THE STATE OF CURRENT TECHNOLOGIES THESE PROPOSED REGULATIONS WILL PUSH BUILDING OWNERS EXPLORE ELECTRIFICATION AT THE SAME TIME. WE'VE NOT SEEN A PLANET SHOWING THAT THE REGIONAL OR LOCAL GRID IS CAPABLE OF HANDLING THESE CHANGES SO RAPIDLY.

SO WE ASKED FOR THE CITY WORKING WITH THE STATE AND EVERSOURCE TO UNDERSTAND THE IMPACT OF THIS RELATION AND WHAT THE IMPACT WOULD BE ON THE REGIONAL ELECTRIC GRID AND SPECIFICALLY CAMBRIDGE. IS CAMBRIDGE PLANNING TO DO A FEASIBILITY STUDY TO UNDERSTAND THE SCOPE CHANGES LEFT TO MEET THE 2030 PROPOSED DEADLINES AND TO UNDERSTAND THE RISKS AND COSTS INVOLVED? WHAT IS THE ANTICIPATED INCREASE ELECTRICAL DEMAND? AND HOW WILL THIS ELECTRICAL SUPPLY BE GENERATED? AND IF THE CITY ACTIVELY ENGAGE WITH THE RESOURCE PROVIDES THIS INCREASED DEMAND TO THE CITY? THIS REMOVES OUR ABILITY TO UTILIZE OUR SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTISE AS WELL AS A RIGOROUS APPROACH TO RESEARCH AND SCIENCE TO ACHIEVE NET ZERO EMISSIONS. WE WANT TO DO THIS IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE CITY AND TO IDENTIFY THE BEST PATH TO ACHIEVE OUR SHARED GOAL OF SCIENCE-BASED NET ZERO SOLUTIONS. I HOPE WE GET THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO SO AND THAT THESE AMENDMENTS ARE NOT ABSTRACT WOULD BENEFIT FROM TRUE SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS ON THE ROAD PUBLIC DIALOGUE.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: THANK YOU. OKAY. I'M GOING TO GO TO COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN THEN I HAVE A THOUGHT.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan,Chair: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR. AND TO MY COLLEAGUES ON THE COMMITTEE. MY SUGGESTION WAS AND REMAINS THAT WE KEEP THIS MATTER IN COMMITTEE. WE WILL SCHEDULE ANOTHER HEARING AND WILL HAVE TIME IN BETWEEN TO TALK WITH ANYONE WHO WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS THESE MATTERS IN MORE DETAIL. AND I DO TAKE SOME ISSUE WITH THE SCOLDING FOR RECEIVING ON NOT REACHING OUT BECAUSE PEOPLE KNOW OUR PHONE NUMBERS AND THEY CAN REACH OUT TO US AS WELL. I'M HAPPY TO PROCEED IN THAT WAY AND I THINK WE WILL HAVE PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITY FOR DIALOGUE BEFORE WE BRING THIS FORWARD.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: THANK YOU AND THANK EVERY SINGLE PUBLIC SPEAKER. I DO WANT TO RESPOND. I TOTALLY UNDERSTAND AND ENDORSED AND I KNOW THE FRUSTRATION. I WILL REMIND PEOPLE THAT AGENDA WAS PUBLIC LAST WEEK. IT IS TRUE THOUGH THAT THIS SPECIFICS OF THIS WERE NOT KNOWN UNTIL THAT AGENDA WAS PUBLIC LAST WEEK. I THINK IF WE KEEP THIS IN COMMITTEE I ALSO WANT TO DO IS: MANY OF THE HEALTH ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE HAVE IT BE MORE OF A ROUNDTABLE TO ANY PLAYER INCLUDING FROM BOTH HARVARD AND MIT. HAVE THOSE DISCUSSIONS. I DO WANT TO REMIND ALL OF US THAT IF WE DO WANT AN OPEN AND TRANSPARENT PROCESS MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THOSE 40 MEETINGS WERE CLOSED-DOOR MEETINGS THAT WERE NOT IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN. THERE WERE ONLY WITH BUILDING OWNERS.

WITH ALL THE STAKEHOLDERS OF THE TABLE THAT'S WHERE WE NEED TO GO NEXT. THAT PROCESS LED TO PARTICULAR AMENDMENTS. WHICH SOME OF US ARE NOW SAYING WE NEED TO BE CHANGED IN THE FACE OF AGAIN THE IPCC LEADERS REPORT ISSUED LAST YEAR WITH LITERALLY " CODE RED FOR HUMANITY.SO I UNDERSTAND ALL OF US WANT TO GET THERE. AND THE QUESTION IS HOW TO GET THERE. I WANT TO HAVE THOSE DISCUSSIONS. I WANT THIS TO GET THERE. I WANT HARVARD, MIT, ALL THE BUILDING OWNERS IN THE CITY TO BE WITH US AT THE TABLE. I KNOW MANY OF MY COLLEAGUES COMMITTED TO THAT. LET'S NOT THROW THIS OUT AS AN IDEA THAT WE SHOULDN'T ENDORSE SOMETHING THAT THE REST OF THE CITY DIDN'T EVEN THAT BEFORE WAS JUST PUT ON THE TABLE.

ONCE IT WAS PUT ON THE TABLE SOME OF US CAME TOGETHER WORKING WITH A RANGE OF PEOPLE ACROSS THE CITY WITH JUST OUR HEADS IT WAS WORKING WITH A RANGE OF EXPERTS ACROSS THE CITY. IN A GREASED DOES LOTS OF QUESTIONS TO ASK ABOUT ELECTRIC CAPACITY ABOUT HOW WE ARE DOING IT I WOULD LOVE TO KEEP THIS IN COMMITTEE BUT ALSO LETTING MY COLLEAGUES KNOW IF YOU THINK THAT MAKES SENSE THAT THAT IS THE APPROPRIATE VENUE TO HAVE VERY QUICKLY AS SOON AS WE CAN SCHEDULE IT HELP THE ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING AND RUN IT LIKE A

ROUNDTABLE AND SPECIFICALLY INVITE ANY OF THE FOLKS WERE IN THOSE 40 MEETINGS IF THEY WOULD COME AND TALK ABOUT HIS AND EVERSOURCE IN THE CITY.

>> Dennis J Carlone: THANK YOU COCHAIR. I THINK THE ISSUES RAISED PRIMARILY BY THE INSTITUTIONS ARE FAIR. I THINK MY COLLEAGUES HAVE RESPONDED IN PART BUT AS COUNCILLOR NOLAN WAS REFERRING TO I THINK THE PEOPLE WE TALK TO NEED TO SHOW UP AT THIS ROUNDTABLE. IT MIGHT BE THAT I HAVE SOME BACKGROUND IN GREEN ARCHITECTURE BUT NOT IN ALL OF THESE FIELDS. THAT IS FOR SURE. AND WE DO NEED THE EXPERTS TO TALK ABOUT THIS. WE ARE NOT SAYING JUST ACCEPT IT BECAUSE IT IS SUBMITTED BY US. WE HAVE TO HAVE THESE DISCUSSIONS BUT AT THE END IT'S ONLY ABOUT OUR WORLD AND OUR CITY AND NOTHING IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THIS. IN TRYING TO PUSH THE EFFORT FORWARD TO ME IF WE CAN MAKE THIS WORK WHY NOT? THAT'S REALLY WHAT IT COMES DOWN TO. IF WE CAN CLEAN UP THE AIR SOONER WHY NOT? THAT IS WHAT THIS IS ABOUT. YES THERE'S BEEN NEGOTIATION AS MY FELLOW COUNCILORS HAVE SAID WE'VE NOT BEEN A PART OF THAT. AND WE ARE THE ONES THAT MAKE THOSE DECISIONS. FINAL DECISIONS. WE HAVE TO INFLUENCE EACH OTHER IN THE RIGHT WAY. THANK YOU.

>> Burhan Azeem: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR. APOLOGIES FOR NOT USING THE HAND THING MY ZOOM ISN'T WORKING. I HAD TWO QUESTIONS FOR THE CITY OR MAINLY FOR THE CITY BUT ALSO IF THE AMENDMENT MAKERS WANT TO ANSWER THAT IS FINE AS WELL. I'M CURIOUS WHY THESE AMENDMENTS, WHY THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL FOCUSES ONLY LARGE BUILDINGS RATHER THAN THE SMALL BUILDINGS CONSIDERING THEY ALSO ARE A LARGE CONSUMER OF THE EMISSIONS PRINT ON TOP OF THAT WHITE TRANSPORTATION EMISSIONS ARE NOT INCLUDED MY SENSE IS IF YOU HAVE EMPTY PARKING LOTS WOULD BE EASIER FOR TO QUALIFY FOR THESE THAN THE EQUIVALENT HOUSE JUST BECAUSE THE EMPTY PARKING LOT USING LESS CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS OBVIOUS IS USED FOR TRENDS RELATING MORE GAS POWERED VEHICLES. SO KIND OF DOESN'T FIT INTO THIS PARTICULAR VERSION. I WAS JUST CURIOUS WHY THOSE WERE LEFT OUT? ON THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL.

>> Seth Federspiel: AGAIN NET ZERO ACTION... I WILL TAKE THOSE TWO QUESTION REVERSED. THE NET ZERO ACTION PLANS IS EXCLUSIVELY FOCUSED ON BUILDING EMISSIONS. WHICH AGAIN ARE ABOUT 83% OF THE CITIES EMISSIONS WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING A NET ZERO TRANSPORTATION PLAN THAT WILL ADDRESS THE TRANSPORTATION SECTOR BUT THAT'S A SEPARATE PROCESS. NOT THAT IT'S NOT BEING INSERTED IS NOT PART OF THIS POLICY. IN TERMS OF THE BUILDING SCIENCE THRESHOLD THE BUILDING ENERGY USE DISCLOSURE ORDINANCE THAT IS IN EFFECT AND WAS ADOPTED IN 2014. APPLIES TO SPECIFICALLY TWO LARGE BUILDINGS IN CAMBRIDGE. THE COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS WHEN HE 5000 SQUARE FT. OR GREATER. AND RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS LARGELY IN 50 UNITS. THOSE BUILDINGS ACCOUNT FOR ABOUT 70% OF THE BUILDING SECTOR EMISSIONS. EVEN THOUGH THEY'RE ONLY ABOUT 6% OF THE NUMBER OF BUILDINGS. SO THE PROPOSAL THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL FROM DOES NOT PROPOSE ANY CHANGES TO THOSE THRESHOLDS.

>> Burhan Azeem: THROUGH YOU MR CHAIR REASONABLY MET UP UNDERSTAND I FORGET THE EXACT NUMBER BUT A PERCENT OF OUR BUILDINGS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR 60% OF THE EMISSIONS BUT IN THE ORIGINAL FIVE YOU SHOWED WAS REALLY ABOUT SQUARE FOOTAGE. LIKE THE SQUARE FOOTAGE OF THE BUILDINGS ROUGHLY CORRESPONDS WITH THE PERCENT OF EMISSIONS TO THE LARGE COMMERCIAL LARGE BUILDINGS IN GENERAL EXCEED 2% OF US WERE FOOTAGE IN THE CITY. THERE WERE LIKE 70% OF THE EMISSIONS. I DON'T SEE A GREAT DISPARITY BETWEEN THE SURFACE AREA OF THESE SIZES. I'M WONDERING... I'M WORRIED A LITTLE BIT THAT TRIPLE-DECKER'S FOR EXAMPLE DON'T GET INCLUDED BUT ONCE YOU GET THE FOUR OR FIVE STORIES WHENEVER THE THRESHOLD IS IT SEEMS A LITTLE BIT ARBITRARY IS THERE REASON TO NOT INCLUDE RED SMALLER BUILDINGS?

>> Seth Federspiel: AGAIN THIS IS CONSIDERED AT SOME LENGTH WHEN THE BEUDO ORDINANCE WAS ORIGINALLY ADOPTED. CONSIDERATION OF THE BALANCING POINT BETWEEN WHAT IS ASKED OF BUILDING OWNERS AND HOW MANY BUILDING OWNERS WOULD BE REQUIRED TO TAKE THOSE ACTIONS. AND SO FOR 25,000 SQUARE-FOOT AND 50 UNITS THRESHOLDS WERE ESTABLISHED TO CAPTURE AGAIN THAT BULK OF THE SQUARE FOOTAGE THAT YOU MENTION. WHILE REQUIRING A RELATIVELY SMALL NUMBER OF BUILDING OWNERS TO GO THROUGH THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS TO DO THAT REPORTING. AND IN TERMS OF ADDRESSING EMISSIONS FROM ALL THE BUILDINGS IN THE CITY THAT'S WITH A FULL NET ZERO ACTION PLAN IS REALLY IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER ALL OF THE DIFFERENT ACTIONS OVER BUILDINGS OF THEIR SMALLER THAN THE BEUDO TRAVERSE HOLD FOR THE NEXT ZERO ACTION PLAN PROPOSES THAT WE CONSIDER PRODUCTION POINTS BASED REQUIREMENTS. FOR THOSE SMALLER BUILDINGS WHEN THEY'RE BEING SOLD RELEGATED FOR LEAST COULD USE THOSE NATURAL TURNOVER POINTS AS OPPORTUNITIES FOR UPGRADES LEAD TO GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION REDUCTIONS.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: I'M GOING TO GO TO MAYOR SIDDIQUI IT LOOKS LIKE YOU'RE COMING TO US FROM A BUNKER.

>> Mayor Siddiqui: I'M FINE WITH KEEPING THIS IN COMMITTEE. I WILL SAY ON THIS TOPIC. WE'VE... THE COUNCIL PAST CASTLES OF TALK ABOUT VARIOUS ISSUES EVERYTHING FROM THE LINKAGE FEE AND INCREASING IT TO.. TO THIS ISSUE WHERE FUNDAMENTALLY SOMETIMES THERE IS DISAGREEMENT AND PARTNERSHIP MAY NOT BE ABLE TO HAPPEN. WITH THAT SAID I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT TO HAVE OUR PARTNERS AT THE TABLE AND HELP US THINK THROUGH A LOT OF DIFFERENT DECISION POINTS BUT ULTIMATELY FROM WHAT I'VE SEEN IS THAT ON THIS TOPIC THERE HAVE BEEN A TON OF MEETINGS AND THERE IS A SENSE FROM A NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS, ACTIVISTS WHO FEEL LIKE THEY HAVEN'T BEEN HEARD THERE INVITED TO THE TABLE BUT THIS FUNDAMENTAL DISAGREEMENT. WE SHOULD DEFINITELY KEEP HAVING A CONVERSATION ABOUT THESE AMENDMENTS. MUCH MORE IS TO BE DONE. AND AT THE END OF THE DAY I THINK ULTIMATELY WE HAVE TO VOTE THESE UP AND DOWN. AND I THINK THERE MAY NOT BE CONSENSUS HERE. I THINK THIS IS JUST THE REALITY OF THE SITUATION. IF WERE LOOKING FOR CONSENSUS ON THIS CASE AND EVERYTHING I'VE HEARD IN ALL THE MEETINGS I HAVE HAPPEN A NOTCH WITHOUT EXIST. AND IT IS IMPORTANT TO HEAR FROM AND HAVE FURTHER CONVERSATIONS I WILL STOP THERE BUT I'M HAPPY TO KEEP THIS IN COMMITTEE AS WE PLANNED NOT TO VOTE IN ANYTHING TONIGHT.

>> Paul F. Toner: THANK YOU MR. COCHAIR. I'M GO TO THROW MY AND THE NEW GUY CARD IN THE TABLE I'M HEARING THAT THERE WERE 40 MEETINGS OVER FOUR YEARS. BUT FOR SOME REASON CITY COUNCILORS WERE INVITED AND OF THE FOLKS WERE INVITED TO THE MEETINGS. I'M NOT CLEAR ON THAT OF WHY THAT IS THE CASE. BUT I DO WANT TO ENCOURAGE COUNCILLOR NOLAN THAT IF WE ARE NOT GOING TO TAKE IT OUT OF THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE THAT YOU HAVE THAT HEARING SPEAK IN THE LEAST FROM THIS MY EXPERIENCE AND MY FIRST ORDINANCE MEETING THIS DOESN'T SEEM LIKE THE APPROPRIATE VENUE TO ACTUALLY GET TO THE REAL CORE ISSUES ABOUT WHAT CAN AND CAN'T BE DONE WHAT'S REALISTIC? WHAT'S PRACTICAL? I'M NOT SUGGESTING THAT EVERYBODY'S GOING TO AGREE BUT IT SOUNDS LIKE ACCORDING TO THE MAYOR ACTIVISTS FELT LIKE THEY WEREN'T HEARD. IF THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE A DIFFERENT VENUE TO TALK ABOUT THESE ISSUES AND GET EVERYBODY'S INPUT BEFORE WE FINALLY BOUGHT AN IT I WOULD APPRECIATE THAT. GOING FORWARD.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: WHAT IT WAS GOING TO SUGGEST...WE SAID FROM THE BEGINNING IT WAS GOING TO BE ANOTHER ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING NOTHING WAS ADVANCING TODAY. THAT WAS CLEAR FROM THE BEGINNING. SO WE CAN KEEP THIS IN COMMITTEE AND SEND THE SUBJECT MATTER TO HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT SHARED BY COUNCILLOR NOLAN SO THAT SHE CAN BRING IT UP AT THAT MEETING OR EVENT

UNNECESSARY CAN WE JUST KEEP IT IN COMMITTEE THEN SHE JUST CALL HER OWN MEETING?

OBVIOUSLY THE GOAL BEING I WOULD THINK COUNCILLOR NOLAN THAT YOU CALL THAT MEETING SOON. SO FOR THE NEXT ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING SO WE HAVE WHATEVER COMES OUT OF THAT MEETING IF OTHER THINGS NEED TO BE AMENDED OR ADJUSTED WE HAVE THAT FOR THE NEXT ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING SO MR. CLERK IS THERE ANY PROCEDURAL THING OR CAN COUNCILLOR NOLAN JUST CALLED ON ME NOW THAT IS IF AN ORDINANCE WITH TO DO ANYTHING TO SEND BACK OR CAN I JUST HAPPEN.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson,Clerk: THROUGH YOU MR CHAIR THERE IS NO PROCEDURAL MOTION THAT NEEDS TO HAPPEND. I WOULD CAUTION THAT MAY BE TALK TO I DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S ANYBODY FROM THE LAW DEPARTMENT ON THE CALL. THIS IS A PROCESS PREDICATED UNDER THE GENERAL LAWS. I DON'T KNOW IF IT PRECLUDES SOMETHING LIKE THAT. MY ONE POINT OF CAUTION FOR THE COUNCIL.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: ANYONE FROM THE SOLICITOR'S OFFICE.

>> Megan BayerL CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG BUT I DON'T BELIEVE THIS IS NOT A ZONING PETITION.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson,Clerk: I APOLOGIZE I'M SORRY ABOUT THAT.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: JUST TO COME IN. I KNOW THIS IS RADICAL IN THE POLITICAL LANDSCAPE THAT WE ARE IN. THESE DAYS. MAYBE WE SHOULD TRY TO ASSUME GOOD INTENTIONS AND EVERYBODY'S PARK INSTEAD OF BAD INTENTIONS ON EVERYBODY'S PART. WHAT MAKES CAMBRIDGE GREAT THIS WE HEARD THIS FROM A NEW COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC HEALTH CAME HERE FROM TEXAS IT'S GREAT TO BE IN A CITY WHERE YOU DON'T HAVE TO CONVINCING PEOPLE THAT SCIENCE IS REAL. I DON'T THINK THAT ANYBODY EVEN IF THOSE COUNCILORS WILL RAISE QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROCESS AND WHO SPOKE TO A SITTING YOU'RE SAYING WE DON'T BELIEVE THAT SCIENCE AND WANT TO DELAY THIS AS LONG AS POSSIBLE.AND WE CAN TRY NOT TO JUST BECAUSE SOMEBODY ASKED THE QUESTION OR RAISES A CONCERN DOESN'T MEAN THAT THEY DON'T AGREE WITH WHAT THE ULTIMATE GOALS ARE. AND IF SO LET'S NOT DO THAT TO EACH OTHER AS THIS GOES FORWARD.AND I THINK THAT'S WAS ULTIMATELY GOING TO MAKE THE LEADER IN THIS. BY ASKING A QUESTION LIKE OKAY WERE GOING FOR 2035 IS THAT POSSIBLE? THAT IS NOT MY SAYING THAT I THINK CLIMATE CHANGE DOESN'T EXIST AND IT'S A HOAX IS MY ASKING ARE WE SETTING A GOAL THEY CAN ACTUALLY BE ACHIEVED AND HELP ME UNDERSTAND IT. LET'S NOT DO THAT TO EACH OTHER IN THIS CONVERSATION. IT IS TOO IMPORTANT.

COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN I WILL GO TO YOU IT SOUNDS LIKE I GUESS ONE OF THE QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS WE WANT TO RECESS OR ADJOURN? AGAIN THE APPLICATION OF THAT IS IF WE RECESS THE NEXT MEETING WILL BE A DIRECT CONTINUATION OF THIS MEETING WHICH MEANS NO PUBLIC COMMENTS OR WE ADJOURN AND WE COME BACK AND WE CAN PICK IT UP WHERE WE LEFT OFF AND HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT THOSE ARE THE ONLY I BELIEVE THE ONLY TWO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WITH EITHER OF THOSE DECISIONS.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan,Chair: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR ON HAPPY TO MAKE A MOTION TO ADJOURN ONCE WE ARE READY FOR THAT. I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD RECESS AS WE BEEN TALKING ABOUT THERE'S A LOT OF FURTHER PUBLIC CONVERSATION THAT NEEDS TO HAPPEN. I CERTAINLY DON'T WANT TO AVOID THE PUBLIC COMMENT IN OUR NEXT MEETING. I WANT TO AGREE WITH YOU WHOLEHEARTEDLY. I'D DON'T QUESTION ANY OF MY COLLEAGUES INTENTIONS. I DON'T DOUBT THAT WE UNDERSTAND THE CHALLENGES THAT WE FACE WITH CLIMATE CRISIS. I DO THINK THAT THEIR COMMERCIAL INTERESTS WERE PROTECTING THEMSELVES. THAT IS THEIR JOB. WE NEED TO HAVE THAT CONVERSATION AS

WAS SAID AT THE END OF THE DAY WITH DESIGN WHICH WAY WITH WE WANT TO GO ON THIS THAT IS OUR JOB. OUR RESPONSIBILITY. I'M PERFECTLY HAPPY TO HAVE A HEARING ON THIS IN COUNCILLOR NOLAN'S COMMITTEE I THINK IT WOULD BE GREAT. I DO WANT ALSO POINT OUT THAT IN THE ORDINANCE COMMITTEE ROUTINELY DEVELOPERS MAKE PRESENTATIONS TO US ABOUT THEIR PROJECTS. THERE IS NOTHING PREVENTING US FROM INVITING BUILDING OWNERS AND DEVELOPERS TO COME TO THE NEXT HEARING AND MAKE A PRESENTATION. ABOUT THEIR CONCERNS AND QUESTIONS AND AGAIN WE CAN HAVE CONVERSATIONS OFF-LINE AS WELL ABOUT ANY CONCERNS THAT THEY HAVE ABOUT IT. I LOOK FORWARD TO THOSE CONVERSATIONS. REGARDLESS OF THE OUTCOME WE ARE ALL LEARNING AND GROWING ON THIS ISSUE BY HAVING THOSE CONVERSATIONS.

>> Vice Mayor Mallon: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR WAS ALSO GOING TO THROW MY SUPPORT BEHIND ADJOURNING RATHER THAN RECESSING THAT SEEMS LIKE THAT IS A MOTION ON THE TABLE. I WILL YIELD BACK.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: I WOULD SAY COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN I THINK YOU'RE RIGHT. I THINK WE DID HAVE ANOTHER ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING CAN HAVE HARVARD MIT OR WHOEVER COME. I WOULD PREFER TO DO IT IN ANOTHER COMMITTEE JUST SO THE WEEKEND WHAT COMES BACK ORDINANCE MIGHT BE THE SAME AMENDMENT IN MY THAT'S GOING TO BE UP YOU GUYS TO WHICH YOU FILE MIGHT BE DIFFERENT SLABS OF PRESENTATIONS IN ORDINANCE AND THEN THERE'S NOT A LOT OF TIME TO DISCUSS IT AND DO THE WORK SO I THINK DO THAT WORK IN THE SUBCOMMITTEE BRING IT TO ORDINANCE READY TO GO AND THERE MAY BE NOTHING TO CHANGE I DON'T KNOW. WE'RE SORT OF CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN WE ARE SCHEDULING AS FOR MEETING TODAY WE ARE SCHEDULING ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS OUT UNTIL THE END OF MARCH. AT THIS POINT. SO THERE IS NOT A TON OF TIME FOR A LITTLE BIT OF TIME YOU CAN EVEN HAVE MORE THAN ONE MEETING.

>> Dennis J Carlone: COUNCILLOR AZEEM IS IN THE FIRST PHRASE YOU WANT

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: I WAS TRYING TO REINFORCE NEGATIVE BEHAVIOR.

>> Burhan Azeem: SORRY I HAVE A PROBLEM WITH A HAND FEATURE ON ZOOM. I WOULD PUT IT UP AS I COULD. THROUGH YOU MR CHAIR I BE INTERESTED IF POSSIBLE TO HEAR THAT CITY'S RESPONSE TO THE MENON SPRINT THE PRESENTATION COVERED BY THE CITY WAS MOSTLY FOR THE ORIGINAL VERSION THAT THE AMENDMENTS. AND BE CURIOUS TO HEAR WHAT THE CITY INTO THINKING ABOUT THOSE IN THE MIDST I'M NOT SURE IF THAT'S POSSIBLE BUT I'D BE INTERESTED IN IF IT IS.

>> Marc C. McGovern,Chair: PROBABLY NOT POSSIBLE TONIGHT UNLESS WE EXTEND FOR THE I'M ASSUMING WE HAVE THAT IMPORTANT AT THE NEXT ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING. OR EVEN IN THE HEALTH ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING WHEN THEY GET DISCUSSED.

>> Dennis J Carlone: THANK YOU MR. COCHAIR ON THE QUESTION OF NOT IF THIS IS ZONING I NOTICE ONE OF OUR ZONING PEOPLE WHO KNOWS A LOT ABOUT ZONING SORT OF HAD BODY LANGUAGE THAT QUESTION HERSELF. I THINK IT WOULD BE GREAT TO GET A RESPONSE ALSO FROM.

>> Iram Farooq: THROUGH YOU MR CHAIR THIS IS A MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE AND IS NOT ZONING. SO IT WILL NOT BE GOING TO PLANNING BOARD AS. IT IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE SAME KIND OF TIMELINES.

>> Dennis J Carlone: THANK YOU SETTLOR WANTED TO ADD. YOU WANT WE HAVE A MOTION ON THE TABLE TO ADJOURN. THE PLAN WILL BE THAT WE WILL GO TO ADJOURN THIS MEETING WILL SCHEDULE ANOTHER ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING IN THE INTERIM. COUNCILLOR NOLAN IS GOING TO SCHEDULE HEALTH ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING.

AN INVITE VARIOUS GROUPS TO THE TABLE TO TALK ABOUT THESE AMENDMENTS AND THE OVERALL PLAN AND SEE IF THERE'S ANYTHING THAT NEEDS TO BE TWEAKED. AND THEN WE WILL BE BACK TO ORDINANCE A LATER DATE. THAT IS WHERE WE ARE. ON A MOTION TO ADJOURN ROLL CALL.

Motion to adjourn

	present	absent	yea	nay
Councillor Azeem			x	
Councillor Carlone			x	
Vice Mayor Mallon			x	
Councillor Nolan			x	
Mayor Siddiqui			x	
Councillor Simmons			x	
Councillor Toner			x	
Chair - Councillor Zondervan			x	
Chair - Councillor McGovern			x	

Ordinance #2021-26 A communication transmitted from Louis A. DePasquale, City Manager, relative to Awaiting Report Item Number 21-84 regarding BEUDO (Building Energy Use Disclosure Ordinance) proposed amendments.

A communication was received from Councillors Nolan and Zondervan, transmitting a memorandum regarding BEUDO Amendments.

A communication was received from Seth Federspiel, Sustainability Planner for the City of Cambridge, transmitting a presentation

- 1. A communication was received from Councillor Zondervan, transmitting a presentation for the Ordinance Committee meeting on February 9, 2022**
- 2. A communication was received from Councillor Nolan transmitting a presentation for the Ordinance Committee meeting on February 9, 2022**