



**A Supplemental to the Joint Task Force on Resilient Efficient Buildings Report, Which Was Not Reached Through Consensus.**

**A. The Process Implemented By The Task Force Violated Its Commitment To Consensus**

The ReBuild Task Force was created after the initial version of SB 1518 failed to garner enough votes to pass the Oregon Legislature. As a compromise, a task force was established to find ways to decarbonize Oregon’s building stock. At the very first meeting the Co-Chairs made it clear that the mandate was to work by consensus and to focus on policy proposals that had the consensus support of the Task Force to move forward. Unfortunately, consensus was never followed, and instead the Task Force focused on policy proposals that had majority support.

At every turn a near-majority expressed their opposition to proposed actions such as bifurcating building codes, fuel switching, changing ETO’s mission, disregarding CPP mandates, disregarding the critical realities of peak energy demand, conclusions drawn by SSG’s incomplete modeling and many other policy ideas presented during Task Force meetings. By definition, this vocal opposition established that there was not consensus for the aforementioned policy proposals, yet the Task Force continued to pursue them. The Co-Chairs continued to survey member support for these items and continued to devote lengthy meeting agenda time to further their discussion despite the clear absence of consensus, or even a near consensus.

And yet, despite the obvious lack of consensus for the policy items recommended in the Majority Report, the Report frames these proposals as being the result of months of study, productive discussion and work that eventually led to consensus. The notion that there is consensus for these items was erroneous at the time the policy proposals were introduced and it remains erroneous today.

**B. Moderate, Consensus Based Proposals**

The Majority Report promotes policy proposals absent Task Force consensus, despite the commitment to do so. While one avenue would be to reject the entire report, we believe it is more important to propose what we believe are measures that ALL Task Force members

support. Our proposal reflects identified consensus items across labor, environmental, industry, and utility groups:

1. Renovate & retrofit existing buildings, both residential and commercial, to make them more resilient, use less energy, reduce their current carbon footprint and improve indoor air quality. The timeline should be aggressive but not unrealistic and should include an incentive-based funding program. When setting any standards, it is critical we utilize nationally set standards and requirements, which we know continue to push the envelope in efficiency and health impacts. It is especially important to provide financial support to those least able to afford these upgrades, and those living in high-exposure locations in industrial or transportation corridors.
2. Educate the public about cost-, energy- and carbon-efficient heating systems, whatever the fuel source, as a key to build understanding and help people make smart decisions and investments in both private and public infrastructure.
3. Utilize heat pump technology, especially as an alternative to resistance heating systems (e.g. baseboard and wall fan heating units). Substantial de-carbonization and energy reduction will result. However, careful analysis of energy and carbon reduction should be undertaken in our state's varied climate zones to assure a reasonable return on the investments. Whatever alternative is chosen by the property owner, solely using resistance heating in existing or new construction should be discouraged (perhaps even banned) across the state.
4. The building code should remain "Unified," rather than "Balkanized" with different energy/carbon regulations in different jurisdictions. All permitting authorities and essentially all builders and unions agree that the current system of code review and change has been effective, technically sound and is strongly trending toward both carbon and energy reduction. It ain't broke, so don't "fix it."
5. Use available federal, state and local funding judiciously and efficiently on actual implementation of these measures to create RESULTS rather than bureaucracy. The ETO is an effective model and reasonably efficient. Demand that the state create a state-wide implementation model that is efficient and effective, limiting overhead expenses to less than 15% of overall cost.

**C. The Survey Methodology Cited In the Majority Report Was Flawed and Vague.  
Examples and Commentary Follows:**

The Majority Report draws the erroneous conclusion that there is support for a slate of policy proposals based on the results of surveying Task Force members multiple times. The reason why the conclusions are erroneous is that the methodology of the surveys was deeply flawed and unable to render any specific conclusions. The survey questions were too generic and high level to reveal any meaningful data or conclusions about a particular Task Force member's position on a given issue. For example, Task Force members were surveyed to gauge their

support for decarbonizing public buildings. While a laudable goal, one that rightfully received overwhelming support from the Task Force, the survey establishes just that – a laudable generic goal.

First, the Task Force never discussed, nor agreed on a definition of “decarbonization,” let alone how to measure it or assess accountability. Some Task Force members pushed to electrify all public buildings and count the emissions from those buildings at the site level. However, electricity is only as clean as its source. If the electricity powering public buildings is made from 100% coal-fired generation and the emissions measured from the buildings are only accounted for at the site, those emissions would appear to be zero. However, the emissions from coal-powered electricity would be exceptional. Moreover, some Task Force members would oppose decarbonizing public buildings if doing so included using renewable natural gas and renewable hydrogen via the gas system.

Policy is incredibly complicated and the details matter. Offering up such a generic policy proposal devoid of any detail, and then assuming that there is support for the proposal based on the results of a generic policy survey is the wrong conclusion to draw.

Every survey question aimed at gauging Task Force members’ support or opposition to a particular proposal suffered from the same lack of policy detail needed to gauge members’ interest and better understand potential problems. Rather than acknowledge this, the Majority Report doubles down on generic conclusions. Inaccurate survey results are almost certain to inflame tensions in the Legislature between members and stakeholders who might otherwise come to an agreement but are unable to do so because proponents of a particular policy that rely on this survey as partial justification of support may quickly learn that the Majority Report was erroneous in its conclusion that support actually exists, when it never did.

#### **D. Conclusion**

All that said, we believe the 5 proposals we have included here are actionable, important and robust steps forward for the State of Oregon. We want to create practical change **NOW** rather than fight about Task Force process issues or have good proposals fail from a bad case of over-reach and political in-fighting. Let’s get this moving forward, reducing long-term cost, energy usage and carbon emissions.