From:	EDC
To:	Freedman, Andrea
Subject:	FW: Energy Benchmarking
Date:	Wednesday, January 18, 2023 5:17:55 PM
Attachments:	Email Correspondence with Jessica Price.pdf

From: Jim Ring <jimr@parktowne.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2023 4:51 PM
To: EDC <EDC@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Energy Benchmarking

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

EDC Members,

The city instructed staff years ago to implement a voluntary program for energy benchmarking, yet that never occurred. Now, the city is trying to move right past that into a mandatory process without even having tried the voluntary route. The action before you tonight should be voted down in favor of a voluntary program.

I attended a listening session on the matter. Afterwards, I emailed back and forth with Jessica Price with some questions. I also downloaded a 147 page report from Seattle, where they tested this type of program against office buildings of 50,000-100,000 SF. I've attached a printout of that back and forth for your review. I did not have the opportunity to respond to her last email but have typed in a few comments in reply.

The city is selling this plan on data that 30% of greenhouse gas emissions come from commercial buildings. However, that is strictly a local number. The US EPA reports that commercial buildings nationally only contribute 7%, the second lowest source in the country. Given that climate changes is national/global in scale and these buildings only contribute 7% on this scale, a minor improvement at local level commercial buildings will cost local owners and taxpayers much more than the benefit that will result for global climate change.

The city has estimated that tune-ups will cost an average of $.15/SF and produce 12% average energy cost reductions. At these figures, Madison believes that this program **may** be cost neutral. However, Seattle found that the average cost was actually $.21/SF and the actual benefit was only a 7% reduction in energy costs. So, their program ran 40% higher on cost with 40% less benefit than predicted. With those kind of results you can be sure the Madison program will be cost negative, again with little positive impact on global climate change.

The report also stated that office buildings would see one of the lowest benefits while school buildings saw more. This would make sense. Private owners with their own money invested are more likely to minimize their expenses since it's their own money. Why don't we start with

government buildings first and see how this goes?

Finally, the most prevalent changes required by the consultants in Seattle were changes to temperature and lighting settings and schedules. Basically, property owners are going to be told at what temperature to set their building and when to turn their heat and lights on and off. Again, we don't just waste money for the fun of it, we set our schedules for a reason. But that will only matter if the consultant agrees with our reasons, otherwise a change will be required. And we already spend thousands of dollars per year on HVAC check-ups that will catch most of the things the paid consultant will be looking for.

We have to try and get most of this information from our tenants and if they don't comply, the city will come down on them or we will just have to estimate data, which is basically of no value. This isn't just impacting a few building owners, but a majority of the businesses in the city. Again, a government building where they are the only tenant would be a good place to start.

This program should be voluntary and the results can then be analyzed to see what the true costs and benefits will be before jumping in with both feet with a mandatory program with a likely negative cost-benefit.

Thanks for your consideration.

Jim Ring
President/CEO
Park Towne
402 Gammon Place, Suite 300
Madison, WI 53719

P: 608.833.9044 ext 303
F: 608.833.1792

ParkTowne.com
ConservancyPlace.com

PARK TOWNE
DEVELOPMENT ◢ MANAGEMENT ◢ REALTY