



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
www.cityofmadison.com

## Meeting Minutes - Draft SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE

---

Monday, January 27, 2014

4:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room 300  
Madison Municipal Building

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 4:34 p.m.

**Present:** 12 -

David Ahrens; Hans J. Hinke; John M. Conowall; Rajan V. Shukla; John M. Robinson; Lance E. Green; Sam J. Breidenbach; Anya M. Firszt; Lou W. Host-Jablonski; Richard A. Heinemann; Zachary T. Schuster and Chelsea Chandler

**Absent:** 1 -

Richard J. Pearson

**Excused:** 4 -

Jesse J. Shields; David A. Albino; Jeannette E. LeZaks and David P. Rhode

**Others present:** Jeanne Hoffman, Sherrie Gruder, Bryant Moroder, James Irwin and Kay Schindel.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Green moved to approve minutes - motion seconded by Heinemann. Minutes were unanimously approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

### DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

## OLD BUSINESS

### 32255

Creating Section 29.047 of the Madison General Ordinances to create an energy benchmarking requirements for certain types of buildings in the City of Madison and amending Sections 1.08(3)(a) and (4) to establish a bail deposit for violation of this requirement that is enforceable by the City Engineer.

Attachments:

[BODY](#)

[EPA DataTrends & Savings](#)

[MEEA Benchmarking Metrics Fact Sheet](#)

[Madison's Benchmarking FAQ's](#)

[Overview Slide Presentation](#)

[EnergyStar Handouts Dec 18 2013.pdf](#)

[Energy Benchmarking \(Legistar #32255\) EDC Memo 12-18-13 2 0.pdf](#)

[CRANES-BldgBnchmrk Ltrr City Econ Comm-2013-12-18.pdf](#)

[MadBenchOrd0ct2013.pptx](#)

[GMCOC Email 1-8-14.pdf](#)

[Letter to City of Madison alders opposing energy benchmarking ordinance \(2](#)

[Hoffman-Newton emails 1-9-2014.pdf](#)

[Hoffman-Newton email 1-13-2014.pdf](#)

[NEMA-Supports-Energy-Benchmarking.pdf](#)

[Transwestern Letter.pdf](#)

[Benchmarking Letter of Support - Rapid Improvement 14Jan14.pdf](#)

[ATT00001.htm](#)

[Letter from BOMA-Wisconsin opposing mandatory energy data reporting.pdf](#)

[GMCC Newton Handout jan 14 2014.pdf](#)

[Commercial Benchmarking Policy Matrix 9 13.pdf](#)

[Figure 1 Revised](#)

**Phil Salkin – Government Affairs with Realtors Association of South Central Wisconsin has concerns about Section 9 regarding responsibility of tenants. Ordinance indicates that tenants have 30 days to provide information to building owner. Renters might not be aware that they are part of this ordinance and there is a penalty section does apply and there are fines. Also spoke about the state law and whether this section violates state lawn. Understands that that Ald. Ahrens may have some suggested changes that will fix this issue. Suggests referring this item until it is soap also suggested getting an ad-hoc committee together to talk about this.**

**Shukla – What are your ideas that are alternatives?**

**Salkin – Try a voluntary program and if no one does it – then make it mandatory.**

**Delora Newton – Greater Madison Chamber of Commerce Chamber board understands the good idea of benchmarking and energy efficiency.**

**We are against this ordinance. This ordinance makes it seem like: Businesses are bad actors and businesses can't do this work accurately.**

**Finally, businesses do not want to make the numbers to be public.**

Better Building Challenge – results show that it works too. There are some big businesses in Madison that are already doing this voluntarily. Through the Mpower Program – 70 businesses are benchmarking.

Sustainable Practices come from the ground up not top down. 81% of sustainability leaders say you need to work with businesses to get them to be more sustainable.

We would be willing partner to work on a voluntary program.

Conowall – Why would businesses be worried about sharing their information?

Newton – Used the example of Laundry 101. That if energy and water usage, etc are available, competitors can take advantage of this information.

Conowall – What about voluntary?

Newton – Chamber will help get businesses to join a voluntary program.

Sherrie Gruder gave two presentations at EDC. Better Building Challenge – in Chicago 14 businesses participating – now, with energy benchmarking, 3500 will be benchmarked because they passed energy benchmarking ordinance. Mpower has 70 employees – with benchmarking we would get 1500.

Better Building Challenge is also a very different program with specific requirements on the part of participating companies. Much more work than energy benchmarking ordinance.

The presentations are on Legistar. The city will look to assisted with implementation. We could delay implementation by one year and that would provide more time to educate, but still need to make it mandatory.

Milwaukee did Better Building Challenge too but small number of buildings – only 10 buildings are participating but one building is over 1.0 million square feet.

There are 400 buildings in Madison that use Portfolio Manager including government buildings and only 5 energy star rated. In Minneapolis they have had 45 buildings become energy star rated each in the last two years – because of their benchmarking ordinance.

This is to help the city achieve an 80% carbon reduction by 2050. A lot of carbon is coming from existing buildings.

Gruder showed the new graph which suggests 20,000 square foot might be the sweet spot for getting the optimal number of buildings and square footage.

Green – asked questions about making available energy data?

Gruder – Stated that manufacturing is not included in the ordinance.

Green – What is the cost?

Gruder – best way is to enter data monthly. Total time would be around 4-12 hours per year. Once it is set up the software with your square footage, etc – entering energy data is very quick. For bigger building, facilities manager would do this. For smaller buildings, there are firms out there that could help and/or the city could help these owners too with assistance. Rapid Improvement who spoke at EDC, indicated they are working on a program where you could upload your energy information for \$75 for a year worth of data. Audit would be different.

Ahrens - EDC meeting and speakers today have some issues.

I am suggesting we do the following:

1) Delay implementation for one year – during that year for a committee to be established – (stakeholders) work on implementation and marketing – what are the needs of business and building owners how can the City best provide technical assistance for businesses and also assistant businesses that want to do energy efficiency. Ordinance would be put on hold for one year.

2) Audit – a lot of information and some misinformation about the audit for example who can do them, etc.? Audit may have an adverse impact on small business. EDC wants audit every 5 years not 3 years.

The point of the audit is not to catch business but maintain good data that is right. I am suggesting that we change the audit language where an audit would be done by a contractor or by the city. Participates would be randomly picked and an audit would be done on X% of participates per year. If someone is picked, you are not picked again for three years.

3) Tenants need to give information to building owners and building owners need to notify that they want this information, but if the tenants, do not provide this, then the owner is not subject to penalties.

4) Also look to Cap penalties to \$1000 per year.

5) Change penalties so that it does not impact tenants.

6) EDC only wanted 50,000 square feet. The current is at 15,000 square feet. We need to figure out what number we want to go to... 20,000, 25,000 square feet?

7) The disclosure only has the energy star score not the energy usage. The energy data – gives the building owner information about how they compare with others. Disclosure makes some of the information public. This limited public information will help the market act - truly as a free market. At the EDC a representative from T. Wall indicated that a large percentage of their costs are for energy - tenants are going to want to know this – to know if they are in an efficient building.

There is a debate happening right now about is this going to be voluntary or mandatory? No other major public issue has happened without laws. Real changes happen when there is a mandatory law requiring it.

Host-Jablonski – Why delay a year?

Ahrens – Provides more time to stakeholders. This is beneficial. There are several implementation issues that need to be addressed.

Gruder – Some other cities set up task forces, etc. to help with implementation. They passed a mandatory ordinance, but pushes out implementation so that the city can educate stakeholders better. Another point is what this information does. In Seattle they just disclosed data and they found that many buildings are performing better than anticipated around 900 businesses have an energy star rating of 50% or above, but the disclosure also showed – which groups of buildings the City should prioritize in trying to get them more energy efficient - which segments of buildings need improvement like healthcare or low-income housing, etc.

Conowall – in disclosure it talks about what is energy intensity?

Ahrens – We will consider taking this out. Energy intensity is used for types of buildings that do not have an energy star rating yet.

Breidenbach – As a home builder/remodel there is no easy way for me to easily compare energy efficiency in buildings. I do not like mandates, but sometimes we need them to protect us from ourselves. Energy Benchmarking is like a nutrition label for buildings – provides information that owners, renters, realtors, appraisers, etc will find helpful. This “nudge” gets them to where they really understand where they stand – it will really help them and it will really help the city meet our goals of reducing energy and carbon.

Salkin – I have heard four maybe more possible big amendments to this ordinance, – please refer this item and bring a substitute back to this committee - =that we can all see and also review.

People may find tenant energy information more useful than building information. I like the idea of delaying, but we should really look at voluntary and a committee first.

Robinson – Does the disclosure does water usage concern you?

Ahrens – We need to talk with Water Utility

Conowall – Why aren't industrial building included?

Ahrens – There would be a huge variation in energy use and the majority of the energy use comes from the process not the building so the energy information would not allow you to compare.

There was a motion by Conowall to refer this to the February Meeting, motion was seconded by Shukla - motion passed unanimously.

32211

Grow Solar Wisconsin Presentation on the pilot "Solar Bulk Purchasing Program" and the need for a Solar Loan Reserve Fund

**Attachments:** [Madison Solar Slides 11 18 13 v 2.pdf](#)  
[MadiSUN Solar Group Buy and LLR Resolution.pdf](#)  
[WI Solar Installations.pptx](#)  
[Renew.pdf](#)

Hoffman – Gave some background. The City was a Solar American City for several years, we did a lot of things to promote solar and decrease barriers to solar. We conducted a couple of Solar Bulk Purchasing programs in the past and they were successful. We also feel that developing a Solar Loan Reserve Fund would allow more people to implement solar on their homes and it could also provide a 1 to 20 leverage with the \$100,000.

Green – We are talking about \$124,000?

Hoffman – Yes, \$100,000 for the Solar Loan Reserve Fund and \$24,000 for Solar Bulk Purchasing Program.

Breidenbach – Do we know if this will work?

Moroder – We asked through a survey in the past and we feel that a Solar Loan Reserve Fund would be well received also the City of Milwaukee does have this program add had done about 20 loans so far.

Shukla/Schuster – What is the full plan for the \$1.0million in the budget? We need to see a full plan.

Host-Jablonski – suggested we have this plan on the next agenda.

Green – What does this do in term of leveraging funding.

Moroder – answered with a significant increase in carbon reduction through this type of program.

Conowall – We need a budget for not only 2014 but for the next several years.

Green – move to pass this resolution.

Conowall – seconded the motion

Breidenbach – Will we get the funding back?

Moroder – yes eventually once the financial institutions are ok with this type of loan program the \$100,000 could come back to the city.

Shukla – Very interested in looking hoe we get the most leverage from the programs/projects we fun.

Green moved to accept this report - motion was seconded by Conowall and the motion passed unanimously.

32653

Authorizing the City to contract with the University of Wisconsin and the Center on Wisconsin Strategy to prepare an Energy Efficiency Plan and authorizing the application to Georgetown University Energy Prize Contest.

**This Resolution was RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER**

[32893](#)

Presentation on Solar Installations on City Facilities

Attachments: [Madison Megawatt V2.pdf](#)

Schindel presented the Power Point presentation.

Green - Are we not doing green power?

Hoffman explained how the \$1.0 million got into the budget and that we are not purchasing green power through MG&E now.

Host- Jablonski - how much is 1megawatt?

Schindel - more than 1% less than 10% of what the city uses annually.

Host-Jablonski - Can we actually do it? Megawatt by 2020?

Schindel - we may not get enough money each year. That is more of an issue than roof space.

Breidenbach - What is the return on investment - green power vs. solar.

Schindel - renewable energy you get a system that will be creating green energy for years to come - green power - green power for that one year.

Hoffman - The City did talk with MG&E before we dropped out of the program.

Breidenbach -- What about our carbon inventory?

Hoffman - the carbon inventory we use, considers the energy generation for our region which is what our carbon footprint is based on - not green power we purchase from MG&E.

Heinemann - does solar power reduce our carbon more?

Schindel - with a solar system you know how much energy you have created each year which has a reduction in carbon.

Green - are we using the energy?

Schindel - we use it right on the site to the greatest extend we can so we can get the "retail" value of the energy.

Host-Jablonski - how did the City of Monona do it?

Hoffman - that is a 3rd party owned system - which is very different financially structured. The City of Monona does not own the system and is paying for the green attributes annually and then gets the energy for free.

The committee thanked Kay Schindel for presenting.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Breidenbach moved to adjourn - motion was seconded by Firszt and was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.