



ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEETING

~ MINUTES ~

Wednesday, June 22, 2022

5:30 PM

Sullivan Chamber
795 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139

Call to Order

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E. Denise Simmons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Paul F. Toner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

The Ordinance Committee will meet to continue a public hearing on proposed amendments to the Building Energy Use Disclosure Ordinance (Ordinance #2021-26)

Call to Order

The Ordinance Committee met on June 22, 2022 to hold a public hearing on proposed amendments to the Building Energy Use Disclosure Ordinance (Ordinance #2021-26).
Councillor Zondervan read the Governor's Executive Order regarding remote participation and requested that the Deputy City Clerk call the roll to indicate a quorum for the hearing.
The roll was called and resulted as followed:

PRESENT:

COUNCILLOR CARLONE, VICE MAYOR MALLON, COUNCILLOR
MCGOVERN, COUNCILLOR NOLAN, COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN

- 5

ABSENT:

COUNCILLOR AZEEM, COUNCILLOR SIMMONS, COUNCILLOR TONER,
MAYOR SIDDQUI

- 4

A QUORUM IS PRESENT WITH FIVE MEMBERS.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Clerk, and I believe Councillor Azeem will be joining us as well. I think he's actually stuck in the audience at the moment. Okay, and then we're also joined by a panel representing some of the covered property owners in Cambridge, including Harvard, and MIT, and the Chamber of Commerce. If you can promote those representatives as

they join, and we'll hear from them in a few minutes. First, I'd like to give a brief presentation, just catch us up to this moment and to talk about the proposed amendments. I see that we're joined by the Mayor as well. And Councillor Azeem. The Clerk distributed the proposed text of new amendments, in addition to the amendments from CDD. I'll move to bring those amendments before us so we can discuss them, but I don't expect that we'll be voting on them tonight. Then I'll give a quick presentation to give you an overview of those amendments. Then we'll hear from our panelists. We'll hear from the public and then we can have discussion. On a motion to bring the proposed amendments before us for discussion.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA MALLON: Is there discussion on that motion?

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Yes.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA MALLON: May I have the floor?

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Yes, please Vice Mayor go ahead.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA MALLON: Thank you, as we just received these proposed amendments, they were quite lengthy, very, very late. I would propose that we, I'm going to be voting no to be bringing this in front of us. I think that's the reason we're here tonight is to really talk about the discussions that have been had, what people have been wanting to propose for amendments, but I think having the language in front of us is going to be very clunky and tricky. I'll be voting on bringing those before us. Thank you. I yield back.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Okay, thank you. I guess I don't understand your objection if you're saying we're here to discuss those proposed amendments. So why wouldn't we want them before us to discuss them?

VICE MAYOR ALANNA MALLON: Mr. Chair. Just to respond to that. I think my understanding of this meeting is that we're here to discuss the discussions that have gone on that have led us here tonight, none of us had been part of that conversation. Besides the Mayor, yourself, and Councillor Nolan, and I think just having a verbal conversation tonight without language in front of us, I think is the way to go. Given how late we got those amendments, how lengthy they are. I'll be voting no. People can chime in here or do what they want. That's why I'll be voting no, tonight. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR PAUL TONER: Mr. Chair?

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Sorry Councillor Toner, I have Councillor McGovern, the Mayor and Councillor Azeem ahead of you, Councillor Toner. But if you want to go quickly, I can recognize.

COUNCILLOR PAUL TONER: I can wait my turn.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Okay. And welcome. Thanks for joining us. Councillor McGovern.

COUNCILLOR MARC MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I haven't had a chance today to really look at these amendments. They came in at a little after 10 o'clock. I've been out at different meetings and kind of scanned them really, really, quickly. I think the difference is we can make it if you want to talk about them and explain why you're making them, that's one thing. But if we're asking to substitute the amendments into the language that I'm not comfortable with doing, because I don't really understand what they mean, and I haven't had a chance to really review them. I don't want to put them in the ordinance as a new version, because I'm not going to vote for something that I haven't had a chance to review. We can talk about anything we want, but I'm not going to vote to substitute the amended language right now, because I again, I haven't had the opportunity to review them. And I don't want to vote for something that I haven't reviewed.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you Councillors. That's not the motion, the motion is to bring them before us so we can discuss them. We're not voting to substitute them or to amend the ordinance. We're just bringing them formally before the committee so that we can discuss them in our deliberations. That's all we're doing. Mayor Siddiqui

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: I wanted to just chime in here. I think there was a meeting prior, it was a little while ago, but I think some of the amendments weren't before us so we couldn't talk about it. I thought the point of this meeting was to go through what's been discussed, if we don't have them before us, we're not going to be able to talk about it. I think we should, I'm going to support having them in front

of us. I'm not voting on anything tonight. I don't think anyone else is either, it's more to have a discussion about what's before us and go through that piece by piece. Because it has not involved anyone else, but we've done this in the past to have amendments, but of course to discuss them. I apologize, I thought people have gotten. Mislead the council here, I think it's we want to go through what's been worked on and to react to it, and not substituted in any way, not take a vote on it. It's simply to go through it. And they would have to be in motion at some point in this meeting, but at some point to move amendments, but there's nothing that's going to be moved. It's more to have discussion. Anyway, I'm repeating what I'm saying, so I'll stop there. I'll be supporting to bring it forward to talk about it.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor for explaining that. And my apologies to the committee if I didn't explain it properly. The text of the language that I'm trying to bring before the committee simply captures what we've been discussing with the building owners. Again, the motion is not to adopt those amendments. The motion is simply to bring them formally before the committee so we can discuss them, but they capture those discussions that we want to talk about. So that's why I would like to bring them before the committee. Councillor Azeem.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before I get to my comment, I just wanted to say I'll be a little quiet during this call and maybe seem a little weird. I just have COVID and spent the morning at the hospital so I'm not in a great place to talk right now. I'll try participate in this meeting as long as I can, because I know it's important. I just wanted to say I think that bringing forward the language would be helpful in that we can have a high level discussion about the discussion that you, the Mayor and Councillor Nolan have had, but it would be very helpful to have the specific language because I think at the high level, probably all of us agree or majority of us, but the specific details really matter. I'd be very curious to learn those in particular. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you Councillor, thanks for joining us, despite not feeling well. I hope you feel better soon. I'll recognize Councillor Toner and then Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PAUL TONER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to get some clarification. I'm glad that the Mayor said we won't be voting on anything. I'm perfectly happy to talk and discuss anything before the council tonight. I think we've spent about two or three weeks now getting barrage by emails, quite honestly prompted by some information that has been put out by you, Mr. Chair. People demanding that we be prepared to vote on these ordinances. I would just like the public in general to know that this is about discussing BEUDO and the ordinance and not having any votes this evening. I think there's an awful lot that still needs to be discussed and done with these ordinances. We still need to hear I think the pros and cons of the proposals before we take any hard decisions about any changes. I don't know about you, but my email box has been filled for the past couple of weeks by people demanding that I be at this meeting and demanding that I vote to support these things. Somebody is under the misunderstanding that is going to be a vote tonight. I yield. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you Councillor. Just to clarify that I did not tell anybody that will be voting on anything tonight.

COUNCILLOR PAUL TONER: Mr. Chair was there a rally called before the meeting by you.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Not by me, the rally is organized by the students. And that's not okay.

COUNCILLOR PAUL TONER: It went out on your newsletter.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Excuse me I'm speaking. We're not discussing whether or not rallies happened, rallies can happen, that's irrelevant to this meeting. I did not instruct anyone that were voting on anything tonight. That's up to the committee whether they want to vote on something or not. Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA NOLAN: Thank you. Councillor Toner yielded, and you're done also?

COUNCILLOR PAUL TONER: I yield.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA NOLAN: Tensions are running high. It is very complex. We have been getting a lot of emails. There's been back and forth. I think what might be helpful for the council and as Councillor Toner said, for the public to understand, we had had another meeting, we've been working on this for a few months, it is an incredibly important and yet really, really complex issue that cannot be

resolved in just a couple of back and forth. It is a groundbreaking thing that we're thinking of doing. While Boston has done some elements of this, we are seeking to go even stronger than Boston to address the issue of emission pollution. That being said, we've had a number of meetings with various stakeholders, they have not included the whole community, they have not included the whole council. I will reiterate, I see the purpose of this meeting is to understand what some of the questions that people have some of the concerns people have. And the amendments before us are a combination of some language that was put together in response to some of the stakeholders wanting us to change some of the proposed language to better align with their understanding of what was feasible. We're not there yet. I don't think we have consensus that everything that is being proposed or the specific language is ready to be voted on. I definitely endorsed that as well. And yet some of the concepts that have been presented in a email that is public that the council only got, I think a day or so before the last ordinance meeting from a range of stakeholders, including some of the institutions, Harvard, MIT, Alexandria, the Chamber of Commerce, raised some real questions and concerns that had then been incorporated, at least to some extent, as best we could discern some of the ways that we could include them in some of the amendments before us. I think it's important we are able to both understand what those issues are. And as counselors under chaired Zondervan, noted at the beginning there will be some panelists from some of those meetings. Mr. Lucey from Harvard. It's already a panelist I know, it's Gallup from MIT. It's a participant that will be a panelist so they can explain some of their questions. Their concerns were we've worked on it while we've come to an agreement that we do want something stronger and something new, real groundbreaking, we're certainly not there yet. I find myself not ready to vote for any of these amendments to be incorporated into the language of the ordinance. However, I will vote to bring them forward so that we can discuss it and understand the the issues that we've been wrestling with. And we're all wrestling with this. And it is very challenging to figure out how to address this. But it's we can we also step back and realize that it's pretty exciting. We're here now, because we are getting to a place where I think we're going to have an ordinance that will be a model for the rest of the country. So I yield.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you Councillor Nolan. Councillor Carlone has not spoken yet.

COUNCILLOR DENISE CARLONE: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm looking forward to getting an update of where we stand. Which is what I thought the meeting was about. I want you all to know that on news tonight, the focus was both on Afghanistan's earthquakes, but then environmental disasters in South Africa, China, Spain. Not to mention the heat in the United States going across the country for days. This is a critical issue. All of us learning where we stand in these negotiations would be very helpful in moving it forward. I look forward to that. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I yield.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you Councillor I appreciate that. Councillor McGovern.

COUNCILLOR MARC MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to make sure I got that. For everyone's knowledge and mind. All voting is to bring these, we're not voting to substitute them in the ordinance. We're not voting that this is new language for the ordinance. We're simply voting to break because I think, for me, what I got what I got today was a redline version of the ordinance with these amendments incorporated into them. I think that's where, at least for me, that's where the confusion was, because I'm not voting to put these amendments in the ordinance when I haven't reviewed them. Of course, we should talk about them. So I just want to make sure that we're all clear. It's not to substitute this language into the ordinance. It's simply to bring these amendments forward so they can be part of the discussion. Correct?

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Exactly. Thank you, Councillor.

COUNCILLOR MARC MCGOVERN: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: On that motion, Madam Clerk?

DEPUTY CITY CLERK, PAULA CRANE: On the motion.

YEA: COUNCILLOR AZEEM, COUNCILLOR CARLONE, COUNCILLOR MCGOVERN, COUNCILOR

NOLAN, COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN, MAYOR SIDDIQUI

- 6

NAY: VICE MAYOR MALLON, COUNCILLOR TONER

- 2

ABSENT: COUNCILLOR SIMMONS

- 1

DEPUTY CITY CLERK, PAULA CRANE: The motion passes on the affirmative vote with six in favor, two in the negative, and one recorded as absent.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Clerk and thank you all for that. So those amendments are before us for discussion. **(ATTACHMENT A)** What I would like to do is go to a quick presentation to explain where we are. Thank you, Madam Clerk if you could give me permission to share the screen I'll share a presentation instead.

DEPUTY CITY CLERK, PAULA CRANE: You have permission Councillor.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Great, thank you. Apologies system loading. Okay, so what I'll go through is the timeline of our discussion so far. The stakeholder meetings and what we've heard in those conversations, some background information about how the ordinance works, and then the proposed changes that offer additional flexibility as requested by the building owners, and then some quick q&a, and then we'll go to the panelists and public comment and then we'll have discussion. Going way back to 2013 we're at the netzero zoning petition which led to the Task Force. One of the earliest proposals, also the task force recommendations was the adopting the building energy disclosure ordinance, which happened in 2014, and requires that large certain large properties disclose their energy and emissions every year. In 2015, the military action plan is adopted and then includes provisions to update the building and use disclosure ordinance with performance requirements to reduce emissions if emissions were not decreasing on their own by 2018. In 2018 the BEUDO data in fact shows that emissions are not coming down. In 2019 and 2020 the city council contemplated a ban on gas and new construction that was ultimately abandoned. Then in early 2021, we introduced the Green New Deal for Cambridge, which would charge certain new commercial developments for emissions, including embodied emissions, and then use those funds to create economic opportunity. Then later in 2021, the updates to the BEUDO amendment, which we're calling BEUDO for emissions reductions, is presented to the Council by CDD. That adds an emissions reductions component to the disclosure requirement. In January 2022, we reintroduced the Green New Deal and integrated some of it with the material proposal. Starting early this year we began with your discussions, we introduced a amendment to change the timeline from 2015 to 2035. In March, we started conversations with building owners and other impacted institutions and organizations that were hosted by the Mayor. I'll discuss those in more detail in a moment. Then in April, this committee voted to change the timeline from 2015 to 2035. I'll describe that in a little bit more detail.

In this graph, the blue area demonstrates the original proposed emissions reductions scheme by CDD.

This is on the on the left is the baseline emission, so 100%. Then every five years, the emissions would be reduced. Then by 2050 they would reduce to zero. What we've proposed and what the committee voted to adopt was the change the timeline, the deadline, for achieving that zero to 2035. There would still be a 20% reduction by 2025, then an 8% reduction per year, reaching zero by 2035. The building owners and others ultimately supported that change, but they did ask for additional flexibility in the ordinance so that they could achieve those emissions reductions. That's what we've been mainly discussing with them, in these meetings hosted by the mayor is how can we make the ordinance more flexible, so that they can achieve those emissions reductions.

Just quickly about how the proposed ordinance would work. This is the original proposal by CDD.

Existing buildings would reduce their emissions from 2018 2019 baseline. Those reductions could be

achieved through for example, energy efficiency, or installing or purchasing renewable electricity. Then new buildings starting in 2025 would have a zero emissions baseline. Essentially, they would be net zero from the beginning. As you know, the City itself is building Net Zero buildings now, and in most of the large, new developments are rapidly approaching that standard as well. Then the ordinance includes an alternative compliance credit, which is a last resort in case the building is not able to achieve its emissions reductions goals, they can pay the city \$234 a ton, so that they're still in compliance with the ordinance. That number comes directly from Boston where they passed the BERDO or building energy reduction ordinance. That number is based on the average cost of removing a ton of emissions from a building. The idea is to set the price so that it's cheaper to actually remove those emissions than to pay the city because we're not trying to collect this money. This is an alternative compliance in the case the building can't reduce their emissions.

Then as I mentioned earlier, we've been having conversations with the impacted property owners starting in March. We've been meeting roughly every month, hosted by the Mayor, and including myself, Councillor Nolan, and Sam from the Community Development Department. This is a partial list of some of the participants including Harvard, MIT, Timco, Alexandria, Kendall Square Business Association, Mass Bio, the Chamber of Commerce, and many more. During those discussions, they have brought to us concerns and requests and the language that we are discussing tonight tries to address some of those concerns and requests, and it's not fully baked language, it's just trying to capture those discussions so that we have a concrete way of measuring progress and those discussions. One of the themes that kept coming back was we need flexibility, so the original ordinance was quite rigid in the sense that you either reduce your emissions or you pay \$234 a ton. What we've been discussing are various mechanisms to make alternative options available. For example, other ways to comply, besides reducing emissions in your building or paying the alternative compliance credit. We also discussed and introduced a concept of differing alternative compliance credits, and I'll discuss these in more detail. There was a request to be able to allow local and global carbon credits, so we've been discussing how to do that in a limited way to add more flexibility. There was a request to make the campus designation more flexible. We've made those adjustments. Then there was a request around particularly cogeneration facilities owned by Harvard and MIT and several others, in being able to use the actual emissions factors there. There were concerns raised about the utilities ability to support these efforts. We proposed some exemptions in case the utility fails to meet those requirements. Then there were questions around backup generators, we've put in exemptions for those as well.

Just to quickly talk about the alternative compliance credit changes that we've proposed. One proposal is to allow the owners of a building to pay for emissions reductions in a different building that is owned by someone else. In case it may be more difficult for the owner of the first building to make some changes, but it's easier for the other building to make those changes in the short term, then, instead of paying the city they can pay to make those changes in the other buildings. In this example, both buildings would need to reduce their emissions 20% by 2025. If the first building doesn't reduce their emissions at all, but they pay for the other building to reduce an additional 20%, then they are given credit for that reduction and they don't need to pay the city alternative compliance payments.

Another mechanism that we introduced is called the third alternative compliance credits. Each year in this example, starting in 2025, the building is supposed to reduce 20% and 2025, an additional 8% and 2026 and an additional 8% and 2027. If the building doesn't do that, they would owe \$234 a ton times those percentages. Over three years, they would end up paying 84% of their emissions in alternative compliance credits. If they defer those alternative compliance credits against a capital project that is approved by the Community Development Department, then they don't pay those charges, so the first three years, they defer those payments. Then in 2028, they convert the building so that it's net zero. So that produces 100% emissions reductions in 2028. They would have owed 84% of cumulative reductions over the previous three years, but since they produced 100%, that covers the 84%, and so they don't have to pay the city anything.

Then to show a slightly more complicated example, suppose that they defer their alternative compliance credits for four years, they would end up owing 128%. Because they are net zero in this case in 2029, that

would cover 100%, and then in 2030, they could cover the other remaining 28%. They would still end up not paying the city anything. This is a very flexible mechanism that that we're discussing with the property owners so that they can plan ahead, get their plans approved by the Department, and then not pay the city any money while they plan and implement those improvements, and ultimately deliver a net zero building which is of course the entire goal of this ordinance.

What is a carbon credits? This is a third party verified removal of one ton of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions somewhere in the world, it could be anywhere in the world. These are tradable instruments, and the price is set by the market, so they can vary in price, and buyers can decide based on quality and the cost, how much they want to pay. All of the building owners, and the Councillors and CDD in the discussions all agree that the more local these offsets are, the better. An alternative compliance credit is effectively a local offset, but it's not a third party verify. What this proposal anticipates is a creation of a local carbon credit. It does leave that a little bit openness to what we mean by local, but certainly no further away than the New England region under the current proposal. Under this proposal, the building owners instead of paying the city two or \$234 per ton would be allowed to use a carbon credit for some of those alternative compliance payments. They would be able to subtract the cost of the carbon credit from \$234 a ton. Then they would still owe the city the difference. Because we want to promote local carbon credits, under this proposal, we will allow those to be used until 2045. Each year 5% less of the alternative compliance credits can be offset using local carbon credits. It would phase out in 2045, starting in 100%, in 2025. Then for the global carbon credits, which already exists, so those could use right away. Those would phase out faster, so they'll they will be reduced by 10% in a year and will phase out in 2035. Again, the idea is to create an incentive to use the local carbon credits instead of the global ones and to phase them out before the buildings achieve net zero.

Now, carbon credits are not a panacea. There's lots of well documented issues and concerns with them. I've just summarized three here. One is nonlocality, so the carbon offset happens somewhere else, not in the building itself, which means that that building will continue to produce those emissions until they're eventually removed. Our goal is to remove them as soon as possible. The carbon offset is not ideal because it allows those emissions to continue to happen. Non additionality is a concern that these emissions may not, these offsets rather, may not represent a net reduction in emissions. For example, if trees were cut down, and then someone pays to plant new trees on that same site, that's not a net reduction in emissions, because when the trees were originally put down, of course, that caused more emissions than when they replanted. Then impermanence, using the example of planting trees, if those trees end up burning down in the fire, then those carbon molecules go back in the atmosphere. Those emissions reductions are wiped out. Those are some of the concerns with carbon credits. Because of those concerns, what we're proposing is that they can't be used one for one, but that the price can be subtracted from the alternative compliance credits price. That also captures the fact that the higher the quality of the offset, the higher price would be. Buying higher priced offsets would mean a greater reduction in payments to the city, but we would be okay with that, because they would be better carbon offsets in the end.

Then the campus designation. Previously, the owners could only qualify as a campus if they occupied those buildings. That pretty much limited to as the some of the institutions like Harvard and MIT. What we're proposing is to allow any five buildings to be treated as a campus. A campus can calculate their emissions on the total collection of those buildings, which means that, as illustrated here on the right, they could modify one or two of the buildings, and get those to net zero or close to net zero, and achieve in this example, a 20% reduction. They don't have to modify all five buildings at the same time. The only caveat to that is that the worst performance performing building needs to be improved to some extent. We don't want the worst performing buildings to be ignored. While the rest of the buildings are being upgraded. The emissions factors are a response, once again, to a direct request by the building owners, particularly those that operate cogeneration plants. Originally, the language meant that the emissions that we would describe to those facilities would mirror the emissions on the grid. They've explained to us that they're actually able to operate these facilities much more efficiently than the grid electricity that's produced. By using the actual emissions factors for their facilities, they would essentially lower their emissions

compared to the old way. That's a clear benefit to the building owners, and it is fair, because ultimately, this is a closer approximation to the emissions that they're actually producing.

As I mentioned, the utility failure exemption. For example, if a building owner pays for solar panel installations, and then they have to wait for the utility to connect those solar panels into the grid. That can take months or sometimes even years. Obviously, that's not the building owners fault. If the utility is delaying that that connection, then the building owner would not be penalized for that delay. They would be able to subtract those emissions or essentially not owe us those alternative compliance credits while they're waiting for the utility to connect solar panels. Similarly, with backup generators, obviously those are necessary in case the electricity goes out. For routine testing and maintenance or some actual power outages, which are, again, not the fault of the building owner, the proposal would exempt those emissions from the calculations. They would still be reported, but they wouldn't need to pay alternative compliance credits for those emissions. That was a very quick, high level overview of the discussions and some of the changes that resulted. We can do some quick q&a, and then I would love to go to our panelists who will discuss some of these from their perspective. Any questions from my colleagues? Please use the zoom to raise your hand if you have a question. Okay, so I see Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA NOLAN: Thank you. I don't have a question. Just a short comment. That part of what you laid out are the kinds of issues and comments that we heard. We've tried been trying to discuss and I know if you haven't made it clear, there's a few panelists from that group who will be talking about some questions and concerns and ways of moving forward. To make sure people all understand the layout of this part of what Chair Zondervan just laid out was a listing of a whole range of issues that have come up as we've sought to try to omit this, and that a specific language we can get to later but right now we're at the high level of understanding that.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Councillor Nolan. I see no other questions. I'll go to Sarah Gallup from MIT, then there's a panel of I believe three speakers, who would like to give some comments and then the panelists will be available for questions as well.

SARAH GALLOP, MIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We do have three folks. It's so funny, I can see two of myself on the screen. That's so interesting. I wish there were two of myself, I would get more work done. We have three folks who would love to just share some information. We really appreciate the fact that this is an educational hearing tonight where we can share information and ideas and then try to move forward together. The three people, if the Clerk is able to raise them up to panelists, are Joe Higgins from MIT and Yve Torrie from ABC. Now Eve is actually present in the Sullivan Chamber, so she can speak from the table there. Then the other is either Jaclyn Olson or Heather Henrickson from Harvard. It depended on what the timing was of this part. Tom Lucy from Harvard may be more clear on that.

TOM LUCY, HARVARD: Jaclyn's in the chamber so she'll be able to share.

SARAH GALLOP, MIT: Okay. That's it, Mr. Chair, those three.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thanks so much, Sarah. We'll go to Joe Higgins first.

JOE HIGGINS, MIT: Hi, thank you, Sarah, and thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Joe Higgins. I'm the Vice President of stewardship and campus services at MIT. I really appreciate the opportunity to be here this evening to share some educational information with the Council and the public that's relevant to these amendments. This is all based on my knowledge and experience in overseeing large scale energy systems. Before I do speak specifically on two specific topics, I'd like to say that MIT shares the same goals and objectives with the City on this topic, we want to reduce emissions as quickly as we can, on our campus locally and globally, while the tools that we have available to us today. It has to be within a framework and a timeline that is achievable. We spent years developing our own net zero plan for 2026. I think it's important to establish that we're not far apart in our overreaching aspirations, but we do have more work to do to get this right. Especially in educating others, it's you know, we're pretty sophisticated with our faculty and some engineers we have on staff, but what does this mean for all the other covered property owners? Many of them who are joining us tonight, know very little about what all this will mean. As Councillor Nolan said, it's very complicated. It's very confusing. How are organizations going to track this program?

The first topic is realistic expectations for the power grid. How we get energy to our covered properties. Two assumptions have become a part of this conversation that I'm afraid aren't reality at this point. The first is the grid not green yet. It's only 15% renewables, it's coming along. It's going to take some time, but it's on a much longer trajectory than 2035. The other reality is that we don't have enough capacity in the electric grid, in the City of Cambridge, in the City of Boston, in the city of New York, pick other cities have done this particular title ordinance. Just based upon some early estimates, the entire grid capacity will need to double in the City of Cambridge and the City of Boston and the state of Massachusetts to support the large scale electrification. This is really out of our control. A much more coordinated effort is needed. With Eversource we need a transmission distribution first model. We all understand that when we ring up Eversource and say I need 100 megawatts, they say they'll laugh at us. Let me explain a little bit further on this. This is the exciting part. We are in the middle of the biggest energy transition in the history of New England and the modern world. Most folks can't see it happening around them today, or don't know about it yet or knowledgeable about it, but it is happening. It's very exciting. We're really happy to be a part of these conversations. The way that we produce, distribute, and use electric power will be infinitely more complex in the next decades. There will be investments to the trillions and billions of dollars in New England, and how we structure those investments and what the rules are, have to be hammered out to cover those. Intermittent offshore, wind capacity, energy, storage, electric field, all electrical, all very exciting. This is going to be infinitely more complex in the next decades how we manage this grid reliably, and what the rules are, and how this ordinance is written, we really need to take all of those factors into consideration.

When drafting this ordinance, we need to be talking about public infrastructure. Eversource's power distribution networks are limited, they cannot be solved at the property owner level, just running extension cords down the street to support their heat pump on the top of their building. This is a big issue, it's a big issue. It has to be taken very seriously. Many countries have messed up this and missing a non transmission for small and running right to generation and extension cords. We need to have a clear understanding of what the timelines and what's realistic and achievable with this ordinance. There should be some modeling. What are the economics of this like? What are the actual environmental impacts of this like in the City of Cambridge? What are the technical issues that we really need to hammer out with subject matter experts so that we're designing around public infrastructure in the right way. The investments that you know, we're going to all have to make are very large, and they don't pay off immediately. We need some degree of certainty and consistency in the rules and expectations. It starts at the state level with Eversource, and then it trickles down to the municipal level. We have to reorder kind of the thinking on how we solve this issue. Much more collaboration is needed on this front with the city and Eversource getting up at a table, understanding the true constraints and a determination of realistic timeframes toward electrification. If the grid doesn't have the capacity to supply the required amount of green electricity to certain Cambridge properties, they get relief, but others might not. Why should some people be punished and others not? Eversource and other utilities, and you'll hear from Eve on this are on the Commonwealth statutory timeline to be net zero by 2050, to reach electrification capacity, and to meet demand from electrified buildings and transportation infrastructure. Their timeline is 2050, we're talking about 2035, we need to be more flexible for talking about 2035. Then understanding what the grid can realistically be anticipated in Cambridge in 2035 help us determine what's actually achievable here within the proposed ordinance.

Lastly, on the matter of carbon offsets, the concept of the use of local national and global carbon offsets to reduce emissions has been much aligned in the conversation today. When you really look beyond the headlines, and our faculty have been researching this for quite a while now. We actually see this as a tremendous opportunity for the City of Cambridge. Even the Commonwealth recognizes that after 2050, some degree of offsets within the carbon markets will have to be invested in in order to be truly net zero as a Commonwealth.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: thanks, Joe. You can finish up.

JOE HIGGINS, MIT: I just want to say thanks everyone. Those are the two points that I wanted to make that those are the two things that we really need the work ahead to come to some agreements on.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Great. Thanks so much. Just to clarify, no one is assuming that the grid is net zero emissions already. In fact, the ordinance has provisions for allowing renewable energy that's, that's not directly connected to the building. I do agree with you that we need to work on Eversource and luckily we have 13 years to do that work, so let's get going. Alright, so next year from Eve, is that right?

YVE TORRIE, ABC: Can you hear me? Great. Thank you. Thank you, Councillor Zondervan. My name is Yve Torrie, I'm the Director of Climate Energy and Resilience at a better city, which is an organization representing 130 business leaders in Greater Boston. As part of our energy and environment work, our team has worked very closely with the City of Boston and other stakeholders over the last two plus years on the amendment to Boston's Building Performance Standard, which is known as Burdo 2.0. Where existing large buildings are to be net zero by 2050, which we ended up agreeing was challenging but achievable. Sixteen of our members own property and Cambridge one has a large tenant and two others who are property managers. Some of these members were part of the City of Cambridge as climate and energy team initial BEUDO amendment, which also concluded a net zero by 2050 goal. When the goal was shifted to 2030 earlier this year, our members asked us to be engaged in this process. I just want to be clear, just as MIT stated, we're definitely on the same side as Councillors and I'm sure other speakers who will speak tonight, and our desire to reach net zero as soon as possible. Our members are some of the national leaders and large building sustainability and climate. They also understand the challenges of existing large buildings getting to net zero. Unfortunately, they do not think a net zero by 2035 goal is feasible, technically. We ask the City Council to consider net zero by 2050, and work with stakeholders and technical experts through some of the challenges and existing buildings. Just to reiterate some of the challenges we see whether 2035 goal, which had been detailed and now written comments. The first is what Joe has already spoken about a set the grid is on the Commonwealth track to be net zero by 2050. We need to understand what the increased electricity demand from buildings in Cambridge will be, but not just that, what the load, what the capacity per load zone is within the different areas in Cambridge, to be able to effectively sequence electrification of buildings and transportation in a timely way. Another issue is large, commercial HVAC is extremely costly, and has a lifespan of 30 years plus. Potentially, we could consider incentives for early retirement of HVAC equipment that is based on fossil fuel use. Commercial leases are generally 10 to 15 years. During that time, tenants can't simply be kicked out if you want to retrofit the building. This is again, we need to figure out viable solutions to that. We do appreciate the work that has happened to include our concerns about renewable energy on site and the interconnection issues, and also backup generation per emergency backup generation so we really appreciate that.

Regarding the ordinance itself, we did have couple of recommendations. The first is we are concerned that the alternative compliance credits are currently going into the City's general funds. We suggest that a governing body be set up specifically to govern these funds to equitably manage and distribute them for decarbonization projects, such as district energy solutions, large scale energy storage and the development of a climate bank. Boston does have a model for that. We also ask that differing alternative compliance credits should be a mechanism to allow capital projects to be planned and implemented to reduce GHGs without paying compliance credits. Understanding that if those goals are not met, that GHG reduction isn't met, they would have to go back and pay all the fees plus 10%. Lastly, we also understand how offset programs historically have had questionable ethics and efficacy. We recommend using best practices that we laid out in an abettors City report from 2021. If the City moves forward with carbon offset programs for compliance, we don't understand why buildings would need to pay additional alternative compliance credits when they are approved programs by the city.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thanks, Yve. If we can go to Heather, I don't see her on the Zoom.

?????: Actually, Jaclyn Olson is in the chambers.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Okay, go ahead.

JACLYN OLSON, HARVARD: Thank you Councillor Zondervan and thank you to the Council for allowing me to testify tonight. My name is Jaclyn Olson and I serve as the Associate Director in the

Office for Sustainability at Harvard University. I also want to reiterate that Harvard shares the City's overall goals in addition to what Joe and Yve mentioned, but we do have a couple of issues to address in my portion of the testimony.

First is the current language that requires annual building emissions targets. Annual targets are not the right approach if the goal is to drive buildings or district energy systems to electrify as quickly as possible or to implement energy efficiency projects. Most buildings and campuses will need a multiyear plan approach to plan and implement the necessary capital projects in their complex commercial, academic, and lab buildings. In many cases, this will require buildings to be closed for multiple years as new building systems are installed. As such, these annual targets appear to serve the purpose of revenue generation, since it is not possible for most buildings to reduce energy and emissions by 8% every year for many years. Fire targets make much more sense from a capital planning perspective if the goal is to drive building efficiency and electrification improvements. This will streamline planning and allow coordination with the utilities to help us reduce emissions as quickly and efficiently as possible.

We also wanted to comment on the deferred alternative compliance credit. We want to confirm what we heard today because this is different from what we've heard in previous meetings and different than what was written in the ordinance from what we had read. We do want to confirm that there are no payments if the planned reductions and the deferred payments, if the deferred payments, planned reductions actually happen by the date planned, there would be no payments to the City. That's something we'd like to confirm at a future date.

Second, we would also like to address one aspect of the campus approach. The campus approach allows campus owners to take a portfolio level view and do the smartest and best projects first, and to take into consideration complexities like research science, space needs for classes, etc. The latest proposal requires that the worst performing uncovered property, defined as highest greenhouse gas emissions per square foot, be a contributing greenhouse gas reductions during the compliance period. This is too prescriptive. The point of the campus approach is to be able to identify and implement the best projects across the portfolio of buildings. Emissions per square foot is not always an indicator of building efficiency, or an indicator that the building has more emissions reduction opportunities compared to other buildings in the portfolio. For example, if we add more scientists into an existing lab building, this could increase emissions in the building, yet we avoid building a new building, which would result in significantly more emissions overall. As long as the campus is achieving the stated target across the portfolio, there's no reason to require action in any particular building by any particular point in time. If you give us the overall campus target and let the experts who manage our buildings figure out the best way to hit it, we think that's a better approach.

And lastly, this is a very complex piece of legislation, perhaps the most complex proposal that the Cambridge City Council has taken on it some time. It requires more study, analysis, and work. We appreciate that there have been meetings with stakeholders and some productive dialogue. However, much more work needs to be done. We are prepared to continue talking with the Council and City staff on these shared goals. And we look forward to doing that in the months ahead. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Great, thank you so much. Thank you to all the panelists for your testimony. We will now go to public comment, and then we'll have discussion, and the panelists will be available for answering any questions as well, so thank you for that as well. Madam Clerk if we can go to public comment.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The first speaker is Margery Davies.

MARGERY DAVIS: Hi, my name is Margery Davies. I live at 35 William Street and I'm a member of mothers out front. I know that you're all aware that the climate crisis is urgent. Every day brings a new story about the impact that climate change is having, and the news is always worse, not better. I know that you are also aware that climate change has disparate impacts on low-income communities and communities of color, including in Cambridge. The large buildings in Cambridge, which are responsible for close to 70% of greenhouse gas emissions in our city need to reduce their emissions period. This news that is continuing to come in worse with every news story would make me think that people would want it to speed up their addressing climate change and do that as quickly as possible. Thanks to the ordinance

committee voting for voting to set 2035 as the target date for net zero greenhouse gas emissions from large buildings. This is an important step. It helps to bring Cambridge more in line with recent International Panel on Climate Change conclusion that we need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 50% by 2030. It also matters as significant as the 2035 vote is however, it also matters how we get there. It has been proposed that buildings covered by BEUDO be allowed to account for their greenhouse gas emissions with carbon offsets, including global carbon offsets. This is paid to pollute. It does not limit emissions from large buildings in Cambridge which is precisely what we should be trying to do. Well, there is a place for offsets during the transition off fossil fuels one would hope that offsets would be used as little and as briefly as possible. Please support the strongest possible BEUDO amendments. As our elected leaders, you should hold the large building owners accountable for the 70% of greenhouse gas emissions for which they are responsible. Thank you.

PAULA CLERK, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Ani Wodeyar.

ANI WODEYAR: Hi, this is Ani. I live on Seagrave Road. I wanted to stress that it would be wonderful if the committee passed the ordinance with the strongest possible measures for going to net zero by 2035. That said, I from what I was hearing from Harvard and MIT, it sounded like they wish for more time, but it's not it was clear that the original BEUDO effort was attempted to provide Harvard and MIT an opportunity to create a plan for themselves, but this didn't happen, which clearly why the council needs to step in now. For this reason, I encourage the Council to continue to move forward, and of course, here the stakeholders needs, but to ensure that the strongest possible Buderim amendments are passed. Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Kari Kuelzer.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Kari has not joined the zoom

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Carolyn Magid.

CAROLYN MAGID: My name is Carolyn Magid. I live in 71 Reed St in North Cambridge. I'm here as a member of the community to let you know what I want out of this important process. I want to say that when we're talking about the existential threat of climate change, I believe I and all members of the community are stakeholders. I hope you will listen to our voices. As Greta Thunberg and all the world's leading climate scientists repeatedly remind us, there's an enormous disconnect between what we know about the climate crisis and what we're prepared to do to prevent its worst effects. Cambridge has an opportunity to bring our actions more in line with what we all know needs to be done. Moving the timeline from 2050 to 2035 was an excellent step. Now we need to pass the Green New Deal and BEUDO as soon as possible without watering down on the emissions charges. If we have to allow offsets at all we need to keep them local rather than allowing them to be global. This will make it possible to create green jobs and economic opportunity right here in Cambridge, very important equity goal. We're building emissions cannot be directly reduced. Clearly the best option the alternative compliance payment should be \$234 a ton the cost of removing a ton of carbon from local buildings based on Boston's ordinance and an associated study. Please also include consideration of embodied emissions in this ordinance. It's really important that we account for the pollution generated by mining, manufacturing and transportation of materials that go into a new building. Thank you so much to all of you who've worked so hard to get to this point. Please support the Green New Deal and the Nolan Zondervan Siddiqui BEUDO amendments in help Cambridge take the strongest steps possible to combat climate change.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is B Kimmerman

B. KIMMERMAN: Hi, my name is B Kimmerman. I am the Director of Government and Community Relations at the Kendall Square Association. As you know, the KSA has been weighing in on this matter for months, we were able to submit collective edits to the proposed BEUDO amendments in collaboration with MIT, Harvard, Mass Bio and the Cambridge Chamber following many meetings with members of the council and city staff to workshop the language together. I especially want to say thank you to Councillor Nolan, Chair Zondervan, and Mayor Siddiqui for creating that space and for your continued engagement with us. We've made good progress together on such a complex and comprehensive issue. It's so important that we stay at it to make sure that everyone who's going to be directly impacted in the community fully understands this issue, the amendments, and their implications. Although we've been making progress in our meetings, we're also concerned to learn how many organizations are unaware of

the original BEUDO enacted in 2014, let alone the proposed amendments before us today. We're even more concerned about the misunderstandings and misinformation among those who are aware of this. There are so many constantly moving parts within this ordinance is very complex language that even those of us who are heavily involved in this process are easily confused. To reiterate the KSA's position, while we have concerns about the grid being ready to deliver clean electricity, we support the advancement of the net zero requirement and from 2050 to 2035, if and only if, one, the right flexibility mechanisms that allow our businesses and institutions to achieve this objective through the most efficient and sine space pathways are incorporated, and two, all building owners and tenants who are going to be impacted are effectively and thoroughly informed about the facts, including economic and environmental impacts. This requires full engagement with not just those of us who've been at the table these past few months, but with energy and regulatory experts, reputable standard setting bodies in the voluntary carbon market, as well as utility companies with transparent communication and to the broader community about our learnings. There's no question that climate change is something we have to tackle with urgency, but for something as important as this we have to do it the right way and the best way, which we can because this is Cambridge. Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Barbara Anthony.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Barbara Anthony, you're logged into the Zoom multiple times, can you please raise your hands so we can unmute the appropriate login?

Barbara Anthony, if you can raise your hand to be unmuted, thank you.

Madam Clerk, there are eight Barbara Anthony's in the zoom, So I'm not sure which one to unmute. We can go to the next person.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Sharon DeVos.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Sharon DeVos unfortunately, we are unable to unmute you. You need to update your version of zoom. Please log off, update your zoom and when you come back, raise your hand and we can unmute you. Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Lee Faris.

LEE FARRIS: Thank you, Lee Ferris, and I'm speaking for the Cambridge Residence Alliance in strong support of the green New Deal and the Nolan, Zondervan, Siddiqui BEUDO amendments, which will help prevent the worst impacts of the climate crisis for our city and our residents. Many thanks to the Councillors who supported the new deadline of 2035 instead of 2050. We ask that that 2035 deadline be included in the final ordinance. I understand that the Chamber of Commerce and MIT and Harvard and some building owners want greater flexibility, which is fine. We think the changes described today by Councillor Zondervan sound promising. The building owners also want to be able to use global carbon offsets. The Residence Alliance would oppose doing that because we want to reduce emissions locally, and to have the funds that are generated be used to create local green jobs. We think that the \$234 per ton alternative compliance credit payment is appropriate. It needs to be required in order to incentivize changes in in buildings, and as the planning board noted, including embodied emissions in this ordinance is a crucial part of this proposal in order to account for carbon emitted in constructing new buildings. Zoning changes proposed will have the co-benefit of improving the quality of the air that we breathe in Cambridge and reducing the number of premature deaths caused by fine particulate pollution, especially in low income and communities of color. We asked councilors to discuss and then pass the Green New Deal and the BEUDO amendments. Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Gleb Bahmutov you have the floor.

GLEB BAHMUTOV: Dear Cambridge City Council this is Gleb Bahmutov from Winslow Street? I'm a father and a coach in the Cambridge Youth Soccer League. The climate crisis is here and it's scary and urgent. It's not something we can push to the 2050. Now we're talking people, animals, entire ecosystems dying from a heat and wildfires right now. What will the weather forecast been a couple of years, we don't have time to say we cannot wait. We can wait for factor x and ban will act. Any new fossil fuel emissions either direct or indirect must be accounted for. We cannot fool Mother Nature. It gives a final greenhouse gas global tally. And it currently stands at 420 parts per million of carbon in the atmosphere. It's the level of carbon not seen in the last 3 million years. There's a huge disparity in wealth and in fossil fuel

pollution, and I believe there is pretty much one to one correlation with people, corporations and educational institutions responsible for bulk of a crisis must take the financial and moral responsibility for solving it. We cannot track the planet, our state and our city. We should cut emissions not pretend didn't happen, or they're too complicated to even track. I encourage the Council to adapt with building carbon amendments and to take bolder steps after that. We should stop pouring the gasoline into a fire literally and figuratively. Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Cynthia Hibbard.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Cynthia Herbert has not joined. Nancy Donohue please go ahead, you have the floor.

NANCY DONOHUE: Hi, Mr. Chairman, Mayor Siddiqui, and members of the ordinance committee. My name is Nancy Donohue and I am the director of Government Affairs for the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce. For the last couple of months we have participated in a series of discussions with businesses and institutions, city staff, the Mayor, and the proponents in an effort to develop sustainable policies that address the threats posed by climate change. The objective for the chamber has always been to work together to craft a real solution that achieves the net zero goal we all can be proud of. However, as time goes on, instead of providing clarity, more and more questions have arisen. What will be the impact on local nonprofits, religious organizations, hospitals, and nursing homes? Perhaps most importantly, how does this affect the escalating cost of housing in Cambridge, we ask that you consider the unintended consequences passage will have on these entities. It has also become abundantly clear that the vast majority of property owners do not know what the City Council is considering. It is virtually impossible for the average person. To understand the magnitude of this proposal, we need to find a workable solution for all including small and medium sized businesses, which don't necessarily have the resources of some of our larger companies. For some, the impact on their financial wellbeing may be devastating. As always, the Chamber looks forward to continuing this dialogue and working together to ensure Cambridge remains a safe and desirable place to live, work and thrive. Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Patrick Barrett.

PATRICK BARRETT: Thank you. My name is Patrick Barrett, 41 Pleasant St. I think the biggest takeaway that I'm saying is if Harvard and MIT are up at the table, unable to figure this out, how the hell am I supposed to? I'm a small property owner that got swept up in this. I have to admit that up until last week, I had no idea this was even going on. I build buildings, I'm a zoning attorney, a pretty good one too. I see myself as a person always tries to be solution oriented. The practical matters of how this is supposed to be implemented are really not considered in this ordinance. Transformers, switchgear. Imagine driving an SUV into the first floor of your building and that's going to be powered when you fully electrify. I've heard people talk about people who are living in low-income housing, and they had the Cambridge Residence Alliance speak, how you going to explain to 50 unit buildings are greater or aggregated properties that equal to 50 units, while they're going to be evicted, because they have to upgrade their buildings. That's when it's going to take to remove for us at higher gas systems. That's what it's going to take to remove the gas infrastructure that's in some of these buildings, let alone and I know we don't care about business, but it feels a little bit disingenuous when I'm coming up here to speak and it's off the cusp of a rally that it has the slogan, you know, people before profits. Then, you know, we hear talking points that have been sent by the chair of this committee to sort of gloss over the more practical and muted aspects of this. I asked you to look at backup power generation, which you did, but then you added language yesterday languages to yesterday, that tells me that I can use it till 2035, and then I have to use a low power source, a low emission device that doesn't exist on the planet Earth, how is that even remotely equitable, or a process where we're all supposed to be working together? Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Louise Parker.

LOUISE PARKER: Hi, I'm speaking with saving in strong support the Green New Deal and the BEUDO amendments. I'm here less for myself and more for our children and grandchildren, as well as marginalized communities, all of whom will bear the brunt of global warming. This is an existential crisis of faith that we all face. And we're nearly out of time to address it effectively. I support the move to the 2035 deadline rather than waiting to 2050. I appreciate the Councillors who supported that. I understand

from hearing here and previously that MIT and Harvard are proposing using global carbon offsets. Those won't necessarily meet the goals that we have. For example, if we want to create green jobs right here, level offsets can't do that. Even more importantly, these offsets don't necessarily reduce greenhouse gases, they actually can promote the continued pollution and other types of problems such as the seizure indigenous land, and the hindering of development of a true low carbon economy, which is what we really need to be moving towards. We're out of time. I can't say that enough. If you've been reading the recent reports from the UN and others, we literally, I was just reading earlier this week about the warming of the oceans. We literally have almost no time to turn this around the time is now, and I really urge you to move forward on the Green New Deal and BEUDO here with the strongest possible amendments as soon as possible. Thank you so much for your consideration on this and your action, I hope on this really crucial issue.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Miriam Stodolsky you have the floor.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Miriam please you would need to update your version of Zoom and then log back into the call and we can call on you, just raise your hand when you return.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Theodora Skeadas

NAOMI STEPHEN: Theodora Skeadas is not on the Zoom.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Hayden Smith.

HAYDEN SMITH: Chair, Council people, thanks for this opportunity to speak. My name is Hayden Smith I live in Boston and work in Kendall Square. I am a public sector employee who policy analysis around decarbonization. Also certified in sustainable compliance, and I'm here in support of these BEUDO amendments and the more impressive 2035 goal. I just want to point out how dramatically the conversation and the markets around decarbonization have changed over the past few years. While Cambridge was a leader in setting the net zero by 2050 goal when that was originally passed. Now at the federal level, we have a net zero economy wide goal by 2050. In order to do that, the building sector has to be decarbonized. As anyone who's gotten into it can tell you designing for Net Zero is much, much easier and more cost effective than retrofitting existing buildings. We have a old housing stock in this area that's beautiful, but it's going to be a real challenge to convert to net zero. Building new designs, designing for net zero from start is at this point, something no brainer if we're if we're truly committed to achieving net zero by 2050. Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Thank you. Barbara Anthony you have the floor.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Barbara Anthony, please unmute yourself, you have the floor.

BARBARA ANTHONY: Thank you very much apologize for the delays caused by my inept technical skills. Thank you very much to Daniel Castle, a volunteer assistant who has been gracious enough to help me through this. Okay, let me just say that I'm not going to speak to any of the technical requirements. I could hardly even get out of the Zoom call. What I am very concerned about and I am a voice in strong opposition to these amendments. The reason was stated very aptly, by a few speakers ago. Most of the people here in Cambridge who are going to be affected by these have no idea that what we're talking about tonight. I am a trustee of 1580 House, which is a condominium building on 1580 Mass Ave. We have 50 units, 50 individual units, one and two bedroom units. Every unit has their own HVAC system. My understanding is that we will be covered as a building with more than 25,000 square feet under the rubric of this municipal ordinance that you all discuss it. My bet is that none of the owners, I am probably the only one of 50 owners in this building, that knows anything about what you are talking about tonight. I just found out today when I got an email from the Harvard Square Business Association. I found out my management company just learned about recently. What I'm saying here is we are people who need to be brought, we are the stakeholders. We may not be Harvard and MIT. We are the stakeholders here in Cambridge and we vote or we pay property taxes. We have to stop municipal government from passing ordinances and regulations that steamroll over ordinary people who don't know what is going on. Not because we're stupid or we're not good or ill informed but because we're simply left out of these loops that appear to be going on. Let me say this, we are a building that for which there is no technology right now to convert us to heat pumps. I personally have investigated this for my own unit

very recently. Because of the way the building is configured and constructed, we have gas units fired by electricity that vent out.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Your turn is up. The next speaker is Miriam Stodolsky.

BARBARA ANTHONY: Wait a minute wait a minute.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Miriam Stodolsky you have the floor.

NAOMI STEPHEN: ma'am unfortunately we cannot unmute you if you don't update your version of zoom. I'm getting a message that you're still using the older version.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Owen Ebose.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Owen is not on the Zoom.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Amber Houghstow.

AMBER HOUGHSTOWN: Hello, my name is Amber, I work with the Center for Environmental peacebuilding. As part of my professional work, I follow international climate policy negotiations and I advise on state level climate mitigation and adaptation planning internationally. Based on my experience following global policy planning and financial trends, I can share that the Green New Deal legislation together with the amendments that Councillor Zondervan described today are among the most thoughtful I've seen so far in my work. They would prepare the City of Cambridge and its local institutions to fully access and participate in future climate finance and carbon market mechanisms, which are changing rapidly and are in line with what this legislation has foreseen. The year long timeline is also in accordance with changes in the cadence of capital planning that have needed to take place globally, both for local institutions and for governments themselves. The primary challenge remaining appears to be centered around massive public education needs. I would strongly encourage any measures that allow forward movement on this policy, particularly those that are really including a lot of education and explanation of what is happening to stakeholders, because these policies are very thoughtful, there are very crucial, and I expect them to incur a lot of public support once everybody really knows exactly what is happening and what is needed. So thank you very much for your work on this.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Glenna Wyman, you have the floor.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Glenna Wyman, please unmute yourself.

GLENNA WYMAN: My name is Glenna Wyman, and I live in CHA Senior Housing in Cambridge. I strongly support latest proposals. I've heard from some people who have spoken about feeling broadsided, I would really urge every citizen listening to get involved, there's so many ways to get involved and get informed. As you can see from the proposal, the goals are in the future. There's a lot of detail about how the City would be brought along. As someone with lung disease, I'm very grateful for this plan. I can say that the CHA has been in my building, which was just we have has gone a long way toward working on some of these issues in the way this building was built so and they took on some financial, low income housing tax credits to do it, but these goals are important. We can't let next generations have our sit on our hands once again, for another couple decades. Thank you very much, and I applaud the three leaders on the Council that brought this forth.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Steven Cellucci. Go ahead Stephen.

STEPHEN CELLUCCI: Thank you. My name is Stephen Cellucci, I'm a homeowner in West Cambridge at 32 Vineyard Street, and I'm speaking on behalf of my neighbors, my community, and my family, including my parents and grandparents who lived in Cambridge, and especially my two-year-old, who has a planet to inherit. Councillors, I know you have dozens of other issues on your plate. I want to thank you for taking the time to prioritize the urgent matter of climate. I especially want to thank the Councillors who put in hours of hard work on these amendments to those who voted to change the timeline from 2015 to 2035, and to all those who are speaking with a clear and principled voice in support of these amendments, the purpose of which is simple, reduce carbon emissions here in Cambridge. The goal is not to meet an abstract numerical target so we can tell ourselves we reached net zero. The climate does not care whether we use accounting tricks to reach net zero. The only thing that matters to the climate is how much we pollute. That's why the details matter. So please remember that you represent us, the people of Cambridge, who are speaking with a united voice on this issue. Pass the amendments with

the \$234 per ton alternative compliance option. Don't allow global carbon offsets as a loophole. Keep embodied emissions in the language. These details make all the difference between our City being a leader and being a follower on climate change. Why shouldn't Cambridge be a national leader on climate change? We look for the resources, we have to know how, and the clear support of our people. I understand that the legislation is complex, but the heart of the issue is simple. Our goal should be to bring our city to true net zero, not technical net zero. The only way to do that is for the leaders of research and industry based here in Cambridge to reduce emissions here in Cambridge or to pay the costs to remove them here in Cambridge. The idea that we have to figure out how every institution is going to handle every detail of getting their emissions down before creating a public policy, I think has it backwards. We know that private actors are driven by incentives. The point of these ordinances is not to concern themselves with how builders and institutions get the emissions down is to create a strong enough incentive to get on it, yesterday ideally, but by 2035 is the next best thing that people are counting on. Thank you very much for your time and attention.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Nathaniel Ince.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Nathaniel Ince is not on the call.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Alim Dixon.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Sorry Alim is not on.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Eric Grunbaum.

ERIC GRUNBAUM: Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. Eric Grunbaum, 98 Montgomery Street. As some of you may know, I've been very concerned about climate for years in part because of the health impacts. The Lancet Medical Journal calls climate change the greatest health threat of the 21st century and also the greatest opportunity if we solve it. It's time we take actions here in Cambridge that are equal to the threat the world our state, our city, and especially Alewife, my neighborhood faces. I'm here today to ask you to seriously consider Green New Deal, the amendments to BEUDO and not water at a down. Working in clean energy as I do, I can tell you that the cheaper a carbon offset is, the less likely it is to have any benefit. The more local or regional it is, the more positive impact there will be here in our communities, in jobs and in clean air. Massachusetts has no fossil fuels, no coal, no oil, no gas, the billions we spend on bound energy, our dollars sent out of state to oil and gas multinationals. The more money we spend on efficiency and clean energy, the more jobs we create. The more economic development we can generate here. In Cambridge, the Green New Deal is particularly powerful, since it can channel money into Cambridge, to prepare people for jobs that will be in high growth over the next few decades. The Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that wind and solar have are two of the top five fastest growing occupations through 2030. Let's keep those jobs here in Cambridge and let's show true leadership on climate. locally, regionally, and even globally. Our large institutions and businesses have solved existential problems amazingly quickly during the pandemic. Let's do the same on climate now, and not in a delayed future. Thanks to the Councillors who have led and who are supporting this effort. One final question for the large institutions and companies. When I look at satellite images, why do I see massive expanses of roof and no solar? Adding solar everywhere possible seems an obvious step to offset demand on site, and not just with out of state virtual PPAs, that's a challenge I offer you. Thank you again for the opportunity to speak.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Gilda Nogueira

NAOMI STEPHENS: Madam quick before we go to Gilda, Owen Ebose has joined us by phone. Owen please go ahead, unmute yourself you have the floor. Owen you may need to dial star six to unmute yourself by phone.

OWEN EBOSE: Thank you. Hello, my name is Owen. I'm a sophomore at Harvard College and I support the Green New Deal. First, I have to say I don't think we can ignore how this meeting started. It was suggested at receiving emails from your constituents and students holding a rally is somehow a problem. Student engagement in the democratic process should be something that excites you. If it worries you, you're doing something wrong. That's been a common theme. It's been really hard for Cambridge residents to get a seat at the decision making table throughout this process. That's why to add

our voices to the conversation, nearly 150 Harvard and MIT students wrote and signed on to a letter in complete support of the Cambridge Green New Deal and demanding real and concrete climate action. I'd like to read some of that letter now. In a report released just days ago, scientists at the University of Massachusetts Boston made clear that climate change will cause increasingly serious harm to communities across Greater Boston in the coming decades. Because our federal and state governments have not taken action at a scale large enough to address this crisis, we must step up to protect the people of Cambridge. The Green New Deal is not only an important step in mitigating climate change, it would also create important economic opportunities for low income Cambridge families. That sort of empowerment is crucial in a city where black families endure poverty rates two times higher than average. What we do here will have wide reaching consequences. We can demonstrate to the world that it's possible to make real climate progress on the city level. I want everyone here to know, we won't stop emailing, we won't stop rallying. And yes, it's about time that we put people over profits. Students have spoken out, I'm here to speak on behalf of those students. We want to make sure that our institutions as tuition paying students, Harvard and MIT, take this seriously. We're here to work with you, we're ready to negotiate. Please sit down and truly live up to your commitments, your bold commitment to actually reduce your emissions. As people before me have pointed out, we can talk about global carbon offsets all we want.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: Your time is up, the next speaker up is Gilda Nogueira.

NAOMI STEPHN: Gilda Nogueira is not on the zoom.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Owen Leddy.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Owen Leddy has not joined.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Sophie Coppieters T' Wallant.

SOPHIE COPPIETERS T' WALLANT: Hi, my name is Sophie Coppieters T' Wallant and I'm a graduate student at MIT. There I work on research on fuel cells and other energy storage technologies to help transition the grid to more renewable technologies. As someone who's working at MIT on trying to reduce our emissions generally, I think it's really important that MIT and large institutions like this, that they commit on a local level as well to reducing emissions beyond their lofty research goals. I think because of that, I am very supportive of moving the timeline up to 2035. I also would like to say that preventing MIT and Harvard and other businesses from purchasing offsets is really important so that these emission cuts are benefiting our local community, and also reducing the health impacts to our local community as well. Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Alex Hershey.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Alex is not joined.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker Jett Zhang.

JETT ZHANG: Hi, it's Jett Zhang here. I'm a third year Harvard student and I'm new to Cambridge. I say a few things. Thank you for your time. First of all, I grew up in the South, where even just pushing for some municipal renewable energy with tough things. Coming here is I'm definitely happy to see that there is ambition to reach net zero and everything. I am someone who's been fighting against climate crisis for years now. It's taken the last and really a toll a big hole in mental health last few years. I have a friend in the Philippines whose communities are separate typhoons every year, that every year getting stronger and stronger. Basically, you already know that, but I we all want to do everything we can to help our community and to stop the climate crisis. I just I'm, yeah, I'm looking to be more and more involved with this, but I just have a few things. First of all, is it just carbon dioxide? Well, that the majority of the carbon emissions, methane and other carbon emissions are also a big factor. Also, I've heard that the community that many community members feel like they haven't been included here. I know contracts on urban has done a great job to engage the public. If you said climate change is your number one priority and if it's a central threat, and you treat it like it is, then I think you shouldn't be there community, everyone the public, every single minute city building manager, every tenant, and everyone should know about this and that figuring out how to get the community involved everyone involved in this collective effort to avert to come out of a crisis. Thank you.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Sara Sheffels.

SARA SHEFFELS: Hi, my name is Sara Sheffels and I live at 255 Broadway in Cambridge. I'm an MIT grad student, and I've been here for about five years. My research is in material science, and I work on technologies that could lead to more energy efficient computing. I support the Cambridge Green New Deal and the proposed BUEDO amendments, because it is crucial that we reduce our emissions locally and invest in our local community and local greening jobs. I understand that this is a groundbreaking set of policies, and it will require a lot of care and attention to detail and discussion to make sure that it's feasible. I want to emphasize that we need to take strong steps to reduce or to reach zero emissions in a timely manner and that we cannot wait for complete certainty before we act. I think that the research that I and other MIT researchers do has immense benefits to society. I do not think that our contributions, or the fact that MIT has its own climate action plan, should exempt institutions like MIT from contributing to the timely decarbonization of their local communities. Thanks.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The next speaker is Amber Houghstow.

NAOMI STEPHEN: Madam Clerk, Amber Houghstow was called previously and is not on the Zoom. And neither is the last person, Jim.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: There are no more speakers signed up for public comment Councillor.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Clerk. Thank you to everyone who's spoken public comment. We can now go to discussion. We still have 15 minutes on the clock, but if we want continued discussion after that, I can entertain a motion to extend the meeting. If any Councillors would like to speak.

COUNCILLOR PAUL TONER: Mr. Chair

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Yes, Councillor Toner.

COUNCILLOR PAUL TONER: Just to start off, Mr. Chair, just a point of clarification. I've seen emails, and I've heard a lot of people talking about us voting to move from 2050 to 2035. I may have missed an ordinance meeting in the past, I don't recall us actually voting to change the deadline from 2050 to 2035. If you or somebody else can clarify for me, when or if that vote actually took place.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Council. Yes. You didn't miss that ordinance committee meeting. We had a quorum of five Councillors in attendance. We voted to ask CDD to propose specific language to change the deadline from 2050 to 2035.

COUNCILLOR PAUL TONER: Okay, that just the next issue I want to bring up is, you know, my earlier comments were not against public emails or public rally's. My concern was, a lot of people were led to believe we're going to be taking your vote on some very big issues this evening. I was told that that wasn't the issue. I'm just concerned that people will lead to believe that we are going to be taking your hard vote on these particular proposals this evening, which, as people have pointed out, I personally haven't had a chance to read through them because we got them at 10:30 this morning. I do want to thank you, Mr. Chair, and Councillor Nolan and the Mayor for taking the extra time to be involved in these discussions. I am rather concerned because when I first came onto the council, and we first had meetings about this particular issue, CDD and our staff were proposing a plan of 2050 that actually had significant buy in from the large institutions and the business community, and MIT and Harvard. Unfortunately, we seem to have fallen into a situation where we're now pushing 15-year reduction the time limit. Instead of using a system of providing incentives for people to try to get to lower carbon emission, we're promoting a system where people will have to pay penalties. I hope we can move away from that as we go forward with this process. I'll also just say that, originally, Mr. Chair, you and Councillor Nolan were involved and then the Mayor has become involved, it has become a little bit of a game of phone tag. I personally, as a Councillor, I'm hearing one set of reports from you, my fellow Councillors, and then I hear a completely different story from folks that are involved in these discussions about what the tenor of the conversation is, so at some point you may actually want to open up the conversation to more of the council and have a broader, more open dialogue moving forward, because I feel like a lot of the challenge is that folks are getting two different sets of information. I'd like to move beyond that, as a former negotiator of teacher contracts, I was big on interest based bargaining in good faith bargaining and having an open discussion. I hope we can move on to that. I know that that is not necessarily that's not your

intent, or Councillor Nolan's, or the Mayor's, but I think because it's been such a closed conversation between a limited number of people there's a lot of questions about what's really being discussed, and how we can get there. I'll just say, I do appreciate the Harvard and MIT students that are calling in, and the people from the research community. I am not an expert in environmental science. I'm hearing from, you know, from one set of experts that, yes, we can get there. There's going to be an awful lot of need for an awful lot of supports and new technology, and we're not going to be able to get up there by 2035. So let's work together and map out the plan. Then I'm hearing from other people, yes, we can get there. As someone who's not an expert in this field, I really need someone to help walk us through what's fair to everybody in the community, what is going to be best for the City of Cambridge, and all the stakeholders involved going forward. I have children and hopefully future grandchildren as well, and I want a better Cambridge and have a better world as well. I also live in reality. I don't want to be punishing people who are trying to do good work and agree with us on our goals, but are seeing that, you know, they need more time and more flexibility. I yield, Mr. Chair.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Councillor. I do want to correct a couple of things. Again, for the record, no one was told that we would be voting on legislation tonight. I can't speak for other people's perceptions, but certainly we did not tell anyone that. Also know, your characterization that somehow we shifted from incentives to penalties is not accurate. The original language includes the \$234 a ton alternative compliance payment, which is not a penalty, it is a way to comply with the ordinance. We have not changed that. On the contrary, we're proposing additional flexibility mechanisms as requested by the stakeholders. As to the conversations hosted by the Mayor, I certainly appreciate the challenges with that. I would love nothing more than those conversations to be open to all the Councillors, but unfortunately, open meeting law prevents us from doing that, which is why we have these ordinance committee meetings so that we can all discuss the matters at hand. I appreciate you being here. I appreciate your comments. That's what we're doing right now is having that that conversation and we will have that conversation as long as it takes to get to a place where we're ready to vote on this legislation. Councillor Nolan.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA NOLAN: Thank you, Chair Zondervan. Thanks to all of the presenters. I have a few comments. I'm not sure. I think there's some embedded questions. First of all, tonight, we are not talking about the Green New Deal. We're just talking about BEUDO and BEUDERO, which is part of a package of some proposals related to the Green New Deal. I think there's some confusion about that, I just want to make it clear that for me, this is about one specific part of a way that we are addressing our climate goals. I want to address the timeline. I have to say sitting here, it was a real surprise to me to hear from many of the people with whom we've been discussing around whom I heard a pretty strong consensus that 2035 was doable, as long as there was flexibility. It needs to be paired with flexibility, it needs to be paired with either carbon credits or some way in assurance that we can use offsite or verified renewable energy. That was the reason that I supported and many of us supported changing the deadline to 2035. I'm hearing a different message tonight, which is of a concern to me, because again, many of the people who are now saying oh my gosh 2035 and that might not be doable, is not in line with what we heard on the record before and certainly in some of the negotiated means. I think that is something that really does need to be worked out so that we're all in sync. To remind us all of that deadline. Yes, it is true that the world as a whole has 2050, and the state has set 2050 overall for ultimate, you know, no fossil fuels. The state itself has a goal of 50% reduction from 1990 levels, not recent levels. 1990, which is a really early level of emissions, and 50% reduction by 2030. That is dramatic, and it's very, it's probably even more dramatic than what we're talking about. If the world has to get to fossil fuel free by 2050, there is no way that a climate leader like Cambridge should be anywhere, except way ahead of that. The world needs to get to 2050, that means leaders have to get there by 2030, or 2035. I encourage all of us to keep that in mind. As I have said publicly and praise them both Harvard and MIT have set a now it's different terminology, but it's fossil fuel neutrality for Harvard by 2026. That is in four years. MIT is a very similar worked really, really, hard on a on a very aggressive goal. It may be different approaches to get there, but those goals are 2026. What we are saying, and I still stand behind is that Cambridge should stand up and say we can get to, depending on how you define it, and what flexibilities in there, but we can get to a net

zero by 2035, with some flexibility in our ordinances. The challenge to all of us, for those of you who don't know, Ithaca New York has pledged, is working right now, is already on track of a city of 30,000 with 6000 buildings 40% of which were built before 1940. Similar to Cambridge. To be decarbonized, completely by 2030. They are decarbonizing every single one of their buildings, 2030 That is five years before we're contemplating in this order. That is all of us to say, let's really take that charge. If not, we're not going to be Ithaca, at least join them and think about decarbonizing our whole city, maybe by 2040, maybe not by 2030 or 2035. If we could decarbonize our whole building by 2040, not waiting until 2050. It's really critically important. We keep that in mind, as opposed to the goal and saying the whole world, you know, that's China and everyone else doing 2050. That is not what our goal should be. The one quick other point, admissions is not just a number, we think of it that way. Oh, it's just emissions, that's carbon and of 267,000 metric tons of carbon emitted from this building. It is pollution, it is local pollution, with global implications. Much of it should be seen as something that we have to solve globally. It is very local impact every single time that we turn on a gas stove, we know there's research, that there are particles that are emitted into the air, they're literally getting into the lungs of people in this city and making them sick. When we talk about why it's important to focus on local carbon emission reduction, it's because the pollution is local, and we need to reduce the locally. What we're contemplating this having some flexibility for at least a period of time, to allow, instead of a specific local reduction to have some kind of carbon credits be used elsewhere. Ultimately, we need to reduce our own pollution care, while we also pay attention to the global world, just like we wouldn't ever want to say, well, you know, we could build housing cheaper elsewhere. We want to house people in Cambridge, and that's why we're willing to spend a lot of money to do that similar for our reducing our pollution, not just emission, non judgmental word. Then finally, I agree totally on the need to work on communication, frankly, we collectively, the City has completely failed to communicate that BEUDO passed in 2014. That's 2014, eight years ago, and there are still a lot of small property owners subjected to BEUDO in this city, who have never reported on their emissions, never known that they were supposed to, and now they are suddenly assuming we pass something are going to be faced with not only do you are you supposed to be reporting, but we're going to be requiring you to reduce that emission pollution. It is definitely something I look forward to us doing a much better job of understanding how we can reach out and challenging all of us and particularly to work with the city to say we need to maybe if it's individually call every single one of those 200 smaller property owners who have not been involved at this meeting that's haven't reported on their buttons, and didn't even know that for last eight years we've had a local ordinance in place that required them to report on their usage of electric electricity and all of their energy, and they haven't done it so of course they're totally floored by the idea that we are going to make them do more. I'm committed to working forward on many of these issues and pushing us forward, I want us to set a ground breaking legislation because we are looked to as a leader, we need to assert our leadership. Yet, I certainly identify many of those issues that I just talked about in terms of making sure that we're on the cutting edge of timing, and understanding why local pollution and then also really working on communication because we cannot pass something until we make sure that that is aware of it. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Councillor Nolan. I still have Councillor McGovern, Councillor Azeem, Councillor Carlone and the Mayor waiting to speak so I'll entertain a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes so we can hear from everyone.

VICE MAYOR ALANNA MALLON: So moved.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you on that motion. Madam clerk

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: On the motion to extend by 15 minutes.

YEA: COUNCILLOR AZEEM, COUNCILLOR CARLONE, VICE MAYOR MALLON, COUNCILLOR MCGOVERN, COUNCILLOR NOLAN, COUNCILLOR TONER, COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN, MAYOR SIDDIQUI

- 8

ABSENT: COUNCILLOR SIMMONS

- 1

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The motion to extend by 15 minutes passes on the affirmative vote with eight in favor. One recorded as absent.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERBAN: Thank you, Madam Clerk. I'll now go to Councillor McGovern.

COUNCILLOR MARC MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will try to stay for the extra 15 minutes I have something I have a personal matter I have to address. Just a couple of things. First of all, thank you to you, to the Mayor, to Councillor Nolan. Everyone who's been working hard on this issue. It's really complicated. There's obviously a lot of moving parts. I also say that, you know, I really hope that and I truly believe that there isn't there isn't anyone on this council or involved in this conversation, who doesn't believe that we're in a climate crisis, and that we have to move quickly, but smartly, as well. Even if folks raise questions or raise concerns, or are trying to figure things out, I really hope people don't interpret that as somehow, you know, not caring or not believing that this was a crisis. We're lucky to live in a city that believes that science is real, and we understand this. I hope the conversations can go forward, you know, as collaboratively and as harmoniously as possible, Mr. Chair. Looking at my notes here, on the communication piece, if what I heard, I didn't know this, but if what I heard from Councillor Nolan just now is true, that we're talking about 200 smaller property owners that are going to be impacted by this, that is not a big number. We should, I don't know if we have to pass an order asking the city to do this, if they're not doing it on their own or what, but we should certainly be doing everything that we can to inform folks about what it is we are trying to do. When I think of when we did the tree ordinance, you know, we did mailings to people, right? We wanted to make sure especially when you're talking about things that might induce a fine somewhere down the road. We want people to know that this is what they're, you know, this is what's going on, and we want their input. I don't know if we have to pass something or whatever to make that happen.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Would you like to hear from CDD?

COUNCILLOR MARC MCGOVERN: Are they here? Yeah, I mean, whatever we need to do.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Yeah, sure. All right. So Iram Farooq if you're able to respond to that concern.

IRAM FAROOQ, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: Thank you, Chair. Good evening, Iram Farooq, Assistant City Manager Community Development. I'm here with Susanne Rasmussen and Seth Federspeil from our Climate team. I'm going to ask Seth to speak a little bit to the outreach that typically is done to all of the property owners. I do want to say that we do send out mailings. It's a little different word property owners because sending to a Cambridge address doesn't necessarily get the information to the person if somebody is not local. It's really hard for us to know if they just didn't receive it or if they, for want of a better words, are scofflaws and just chose not to respond. We are staffing, we have recently staffed up and are looking at a more detailed strategy to do that targeted outreach. I'm going to turn around do Suzanne and Seth to say a little bit more about the outreach strategy thus far.

SETH FEDERSPEIL, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: Thanks, Iram, and through you, Mr. Chair. In terms of the outreach strategy, so far, we have an email list for all of the BEUDO covered properties. That email list has received an email for each of the council hearings, since the BEUDO amendments were originally proposed by the City Manager to the City Council last November. That email list was also utilized to invite all of the BUEDO property owners to the policy development and workshops the city held prior to the amendment proposal being released. Then to add to your comments on compliance and outreach to buildings. Again, largely thanks to our new staff, who is specifically dedicated to administering the BEUDO ordinance, we have been significantly increasing our outreach to buildings. We have sent certified mail to every single building that has not responded to the BEUDO ordinance for reporting requirements. From that, we've gotten a very strong response. We're down to I think about 50 buildings that we're still working on making contact with and our staff is actually personally going door to door to knock on those doors and find the right contacts in each of those buildings. I think we certainly have more work to do, but we are on track to getting full awareness and participation in the current ordinance.

COUNCILLOR MARC MCGOVERN: Thank you. That's, that's great to know. That's great to hear. I appreciate that. Also, Mr. Chair, through you, or to you. I know that these the meetings that have been happening and with all with all the love and respect to my university friends and the Alexandria's and the Boston Properties of the world, my sort of concern about a lot is are the much smaller property owners, right? Who are going to are not the huge emitters, but are going to get sort of obviously play a part in it, but are going to get caught up in this and what this is going to how this is going to impact them, especially not even new buildings as much as retrofitting buildings and the cost that that those are going to have. I think maybe thinking about ways that the City can somehow maybe be helpful and financially, whether it's low interest loans, or grants, or whatever, I don't know the answer. Something that helped the smaller property owners and ultimately we want them to do this. It's going to be, the financial impact is not going to be really different on smaller property owners than the larger ones. Then lastly, Mr. Chair, I was forwarded an article from the Boston Business Journal, I think he came out in February, that Boston was having a real difficult time with the reporting in terms of getting accurate numbers that said the example they use that the Trinity Church in Copley Square came out as emitting 18 times more greenhouse gases than the Hancock Building, which obviously is not true. Are we learning from that? And are we trying to do something differently? Because it seems like this has been a problem. It's been a problem in other places as well. Are we going to just say, we're going to just do the same thing they're doing and it's going to be a problem for us? Or how are we going to address that? Learning from their mistakes?

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Councillor. I'll respond quickly to go to CDD as well. Particularly on your on your last question, because we've had some issues with reporting here in Cambridge, as well. Councillor Nolan covered a similarly large area and reporting. In terms of the small property owners, it's certainly, I'm happy to work with the Mayor and figure out some better ways to communicate with them and maybe have a similar kind of forum where we can talk with them directly. I think some of these meetings that we've been having so far, have been more around making changes to the language so that, you know, again, these properties can actually comply with the 2035 deadline. As soon as we have more stability around these mechanisms and how we can do that, then I think we can have more productive conversations with smaller property owners as well to make sure we were hearing their concerns, but that we are also going to them with some solutions in hand. Speaking to solutions enhance. We have a statewide program to mass save, that does provide financial assistance to homeowners and small businesses and large businesses as well, to make some of these energy efficiency changes and improvements. That's an existing program. It's not a panacea, it doesn't solve every problem, but it's, it's there. That will continue to, to help. Then the City is working on our Community Choice electricity program to try to get that to a place where people who participate in that, including small businesses, would automatically see a significant drop in their emissions. Hopefully, that will come to pass. That would also go a long way towards assisting some of our smaller property owners and residents as well. I do want to hear from CDD on reporting issues as well, and then we'll go to Councillor Azeem.

SETH FEDERSPIEL, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: Okay, I can address the question about the reporting issues. we do each year go through a data quality screening process of the data that's received through BEUDO. We work with a consultant who looks at each report and puts it through a screen to make sure that the data has not changed, by orders of magnitude in either direction from prior years. Then we have, we're in the process of instituting, or we have now instituted a new data management software that gives us the ability to do more sophisticated screening of the data to see what small changes might be caused by and to really see those trends over time. I want to also point out that in the proposed amendments, submitted by the City Manager, there's a requirement that all BEUDO covered properties would have to have a third party body verify their data for their baseline year, so that the year that sets their baseline emissions, as well as the reported data in the after the first compliance period, to make sure that those are as accurate as possible.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Councillor McGovern do you yield?

COUNCILLOR MARC MCGOVERN: I do, thank you.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Councillor. We'll go to Councillor Azeem and then Councillor Carlone.

COUNCILLOR BURHAN AZEEM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to say thank you for meeting, I think it was really helpful to hear from everyone. Also at a time when we didn't necessarily need to vote. I think that moving the date earlier, it is very important and that I think that 2050 is too late to meet all of our climate goals. I think one of the commenters made a comment about us already been at 420 parts per million. I just remember not too long ago, when we were complaining about our goal being to get to around 400 parts. I think that things are not looking too great in terms of climate change and those sorts of things. I wanted to add a few comments. I appreciate all the work that you, the Mayor, and Councillor Nolan have done. With the details it's exciting to see the language. I think there's a lot of details at a high degree, I think there's a lot of details that I'd love to read up on and talk to you guys all about. I think that 2035 is an important goal and the details will hopefully make it very plausible for everyone to make it already you buildings are mostly net zero or can be net zero. Or, you know, LEED Platinum. So we've made a lot of progress in new buildings and so thinking about how do we retrofit older buildings, right incentives to allow reconstruction or to play with the carbon credits to make an easier time in between so that we give the incentive to cheat as quickly as possible, but also give them a little bit of a relief pattern. In case we needed a lot of those details I think will help manage and make this a really great program. I'm excited to learn and make progress on those. I think they just want to give a general sense of where I was at. I don't know there'll be plenty of time to go through the details. I'm excited to continue to move in on this. I think that you know, we can reach a probably a pretty good place where most parties end up pretty happy with it, so I'm excited for that. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you so much Councillor, and thanks for coming despite not feeling well, and hope you feel better. We'll go to Councillor Carlone, and then we may have to extend the meeting for a few more minutes.

COUNCILLOR DENISE CARLONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll be relatively quick. First of all, I appreciate all the input. I learned even more from it. I have experience in green buildings, not a huge amount, but I've done a few. A lot of it is really very straightforward. It's the rehabs that are more problematic. We're still building buildings that are not sustainable, mill buildings, in Cambridge, privately and institutionally, we're doing that. As far as a realistic grid expectation from Eversource, if we don't set a goal that is needed, I guarantee you, it'll be done by 2050. That's the point. Goals bring about change. We have to work with everyone. I realized that MIT, Harvard, the Chamber, wants to do things differently, have done things differently, but we're all working together. Even if you bought credits outside of Cambridge, in the South or Canada, eventually you can sell those and use that money for local work. It's not like you're throwing it away. In fact, that might even increase in value over time. Cambridge has I've said many times, because we're talking about lab zoning. Cambridge has more labs, than any other city in this country, per capita. Which means our dirty buildings, many of which are labs, are very dense relative to other cities. They affect people in the abutting neighborhoods. That's where we have to focus, I think, on the dirtiest buildings. We know which ones they are. Hopefully, we'll get to talk about that. Of course, this is a crisis. We've known experts have said the crisis is coming in the late 70s, early 80s. I studied environmental design, it was different. It was more working with the land in the 60s. In the 70s in graduate school, we talked about this. We all thought it might not really happen. Well, we've known about this a long time as Councillor Nolan said, believe it was 2014. She said, when the first plans were put into place, we failed miserably. Probably because we were aiming for 2050. This is a war. That's the only way our country gets our act together when it's a crisis that approaches being a war. We all, all of us have to change plans and focus on this. I'm for the proposal. Yes, I think we can modify, but the goal has to be kept. Even if we don't make 2035. We made it a 2037. And that's still a lot better than 2055. So that's where I stand. Thank you. I yield. Mr. Chair.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you so much Councillor. We do need to extend a little bit longer, so I'll entertain a motion for another two minutes.

COUNCILLOR PATRICIA NOLAN: So moved

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: On that motion Madam Clerk.

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: On the motion to extend the time of the hearing to 10 minutes.

YEA: COUNCILLOR CARLONE, VICE MAYOR MALLON, COUNCILLOR NOLAN, COUNCILLOR

TONER, COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN, MAYOR SIDDIQUI

- 6

ABSENT: COUNCILLOR AZEEM, COUNCILLOR MCGOVERN, COUNCILLOR SIMMONS - 3

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The motion to extend is adopted on the affirmative vote with six in favor and three recorded as absent.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Madam Clerk. I'll go to Mayor Siddiqui.

MAYOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI: Thank you. Where do I start? So, you know, I think there's been progress that's made, has been made through those working group conversations. There's some still outstanding questions and the questions that we are getting just has required a lot of time and effort already. CDD, the Council, MIT, Harvard, many others. What to think all the time, that's it we are working progress on this, the conversations, you know, are tough there. There's not agreement on some issues. Actually, we look back there have been good changes that have made in response to the flexibility that has been asked for. I think ultimately, my goal is to keep at it, and keep working through it. Ultimately, this Ordinance Committee will have to decide when to make a decision. As we've done in the past, we'll have to will, things up or down based on a number of factors, we've done that with the green group. And as we've done that, with pretty much everything, and sometimes we can't come to an agreement, and in this situation, I think there's going to be some compromise that everyone is making, and we may not be able to beat you know, everyone's positions. I'm committed to keep figuring it out. Then we do have the Councillors and this Committee has to do a lot of other a number of things. I think, after this meeting, I'll with the Chair and other stakeholders, keep getting other people involved and figure out some kind of timeline so that we can build some kind of resolution. Because at some point we may just not have an agreement on everything, and I'm okay with that. But I think as long as we are making sure people's concerns are heard, and we're taking into account what we need to be taking account on back, then we can go from there. That's all I'll say. This is a work in progress.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: thank you so much, Madam Mayor, and thank you for convening those meetings and continuing to make sure that we're having those conversations. I'm committed as well to having those conversations as long as we need to, and as you said, that it's up to this Committee to decide when we're ready to take some votes and, and move forward. At this point, I don't think we're ready to vote on anything today. We can either adjourn and then reconvene and hear from the public again, or we can recess and then I'll schedule a meeting, and then we can continue the conversation. Hopefully, my colleagues will have an opportunity to review the proposed changes. Again, that's not final language, I'm putting it into the ordinance because that's the easiest way to do it. Before we move to adopt and use that language, we would have it reviewed by a Law Department and certainly would continue to have conversations with the staff as well. It's not final, final language, but it does communicate some of the ideas that we've been discussing with the property owners. Unless there's further comments or questions, I'll entertain a motion to either adjourn or recess. What's the will of the committee?

COUNCILLOR DENISE CARLONE: I move to recess Mr. Chair.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you, councillor. On that motion?

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: On the motion to recess the hearing.

YEA: COUNCILLOR CARLONE, VICE MAYOR MALLON, COUNCILLOR NOLAN, COUNCILLOR

TONER, COUNCILLOR ZONDERVAN, MAYOR SIDDIQUI

- 6

ABSENT: COUNCILLOR AZEEM, COUNCILLOR MCGOVERN, COUNCILLOR SIMMONS

-3

PAULA CRANE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK: The meeting is recessed on the affirmative vote with six in favor and three recorded as absent.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thanks everyone.

COUNCILLOR DENISE CARLONE: Thank you, good night.

MEETING WAS RECESSED AT 7:52PM

The Ordinance Committee will meet to continue a public hearing on proposed amendments to the Building Energy Use Disclosure Ordinance (Ordinance #2021-26)

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 Councillor Zondervan, transmitting suggested amended language to Ordinance Number 1360 (#2021-26).

A communication was received from Councillor Zondervan, transmitting a presentation regarding BUEDO.

Sundry communications were received, regarding BUEDO.

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 Councillor Zondervan, transmitting suggested amended language to Ordinance Number 1360 (#2021-26).

A communication was received from Councillor Zondervan, transmitting a presentation regarding BUEDO.

Sundry communications were received, regarding BUEDO.