



ZERO ENERGY COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS CONSORTIUM

Workforce Development Working Group

Zero Energy Commercial Buildings Consortium (CBC) 1st Call Meeting Notes April 2, 2010 12:00-1:00 pm EST

Key Conclusions

- Our task is specific to commercial buildings and not on all green jobs
- The group needs to be mindful of the definition of workforce vs. labor force (refer to the Bureau of Labor Statistics)
- The group will need to define who we are training, what we are training them for, what is the job demand, and how do we specify the correct training.
- As a first step, the group will need to understand what professions are involved at which stages of the building design, delivery, and operations process
- Another first step is to understand existing training curriculum and tools, who are existing training delivery agents and what are their footprints. This includes states and trade associations as starting points.

Next Steps

- The chairs, Tom Dietsche and Mike Bobker will revise the scope and flesh it out to include the discussion on the scope from the call
- Susan Buchan and David Walker will dig up resources from associations on workforce and training
 - Other members can forward relevant materials directly to Susan and David for now until the file-sharing site is up and running
- Members will gather resources on states' status and processes
- For those who will be at ACEEE Summer Study, Asilomar CA 8/15-8/20, get in touch with Mike Bobker and we can organize a meeting. There is a new summer study track on Energy Workforce Education that should be of interest to us.

Meeting Minutes

Welcome and Introductions

1. Overview of agenda
2. Chair and Participant Introductions

Consortium Objectives and Deliverables

1. Consortium's Approach / Organization - See <http://zeroenergycbc.org/about/>

Michael Bobker raised the question of whether we can get to net-zero. Is it feasible?

- Jim Woods—yes more or less, but not always cost-effective
- Jeff Harris—low energy is possible, but small-ish buildings will need to catch up to larger more sophisticated buildings. We need managers for smaller buildings the same as we manage large buildings as more systems are put into smaller buildings. This will mean new workforce demands in a lot more places than we have now.
- Kim Hughes—new construction is probably easier in terms of net-zero, but retrofits are harder. With new technologies, new demands will grow.
- Mark Sands—agrees with Jim. We need good cost-benefit analysis.
- As more workforce development takes place, it will increase the supply of available labor and expertise and decrease labor costs, ultimately making net-zero buildings more cost-effective.

Working Group Process and Structure

Chairs urged members to please review the [Working Group Charter](#) online, especially expectations for members. This is important to the chairs because they will rely on members a lot.

The chairs reviewed the expected level of commitment from members and there were no objections.

Working Groups—Draft Scope

<http://zeroenergycbc.org/workinggroups/workforce.php>

Tom Dietche opened up by saying that the scope is currently short and sweet, and we will want to flesh it out. To start, we will want to apply 2 bullets under design to each of the following areas.

The group discussed how to define who we are training, what we are training them for, what is the job demand, and how do we specify the correct training.

- Cathy Cotter raised the difference between workforce vs. labor force. Perhaps we can be consistent with bureau of labor statistics and use their definitions—Cathy will email information to chairs
- Tom Dietche stated the group will also need to address the demand side of workforce and job creation.
- Jeff Harris: In addition to design, delivery, and operation, there may be some many other related professions: commissioning for example. Besides the core professions, others who are related to the market will also need education (real estate, appraisers, lenders, manufacturers, R&D).
- Kim: we need to look at the whole building process and identify who's doing what in buildings (ex: electricians as lighting designers)? Who do we need to reach and need to train?
- Cathy: At the same time, we will need to be forward looking and anticipate structural changes in industry and economy-wide.
- People are already getting training. What are the existing curriculum and tools? What impact do we need to look at there.
 - o Ex: Do modeling tools even have capability to allow net-zero?
 - o Tools could be a workforce section by itself
 - o Jeff Harris: the issue of tools is also related to IDBD group, and this may be an area to collaborate with that group

Working Group Draft Outline

- David Walker – under Heading 3, add “How is training delivered” (online, in person, etc.)
- Jim Wood—What do we mean by gap analysis?
 - o Mike: we need to inventory what’s being done, where it’s being done and map that against what we think the workforce needs (years into future)
 - o Cathy: by occupation? This may be a huge undertaking
 - o Mike/Tom concurs that a comprehensive gap analysis by occupation is too big to take on, and our method should be to conduct a literature review of existing job and workforce reports. For example, to start with we should check with major associations for their reports.