BUILDINGENERGY BOSTON

AIA Provider: Northeast Sustainable Energy Association

Provider Number: G338

The Elephant in the Room: How to Affordably Increase the Energy Efficiency of Our Existing Housing Stock?

Course Number :

David Joyce Brian Butler Sean Jeffords Bill Womeldorf Synergy Construction EnerScore & Good Energy Construction Beyond Green UMass Amherst

Course Curator: B

Brice Hereford

Course Date: March 9, 2016

Credit(s) earned on completion of this course will be reported to AIA CES for AIA members. Certificates of Completion for both AIA members and non-AIA members are available upon request.

This course is registered with AIA

CES for continuing professional education. As such, it does not include content that may be deemed or construed to be an approval or endorsement by the AIA of any material of construction or any method or manner of handling, using, distributing, or dealing in any material or product.

Questions related to specific materials, methods, and services will be addressed at the conclusion of this presentation.

enerscore

Insert David's Logo Here



"LEADERS IN ENERGY EFFICIENCY"

Family Business Established In 1998



Course Description

The biggest hurdle for energy efficiency in the built environment today is how to improve the energy efficiency of our existing housing stock in an affordable manner. These three practitioners bring several years of experience to the fore. They have seen what works, what doesn't, and why. The session will review the best building practices of how to view, evaluate and perform an energy upgrade to a property. Average square foot costs on energy efficiency return will be discussed and what can be the expected energy reductions from certain projects. This session will focus on some of the easier energy-efficiency upgrades to be taken now and what to put off to employ our next generation. Evaluation of the existing available financial resources to be used for offsetting the owner costs and how they might be improved. Lastly, they will address when a project is beyond the scope of affordability and what telltale signs to look for.

Learning Objectives

At the end of the this course, participants will be able to:

1. At the end of the session, participants will be able to identify when, where and how a DER will be economically viable.

2. At the end of the session, participants will know how to decide what tasks will be the most cost-effective for a DER.

3. At the end of the session, participants will be able to perform their own DER.

4. At the end of the session, participants will know what programs are available for helping fund their DER.

ELEPHANT in the Room

How do we Affordably Retrofit our **Existing Housing Stock?**









Sean Jeffords Bill Womeldorf

Brice Hereford David Joyce

Brian Butler

Best Building Practices & Pro Tips



by David Joyce CEO, Synergy Construction, LLC

Deep Energy Retrofits

What to expect

Best practices

Controlling costs


































































Bro Trade CTRACE For Residential Construction Pros

Energy Reductions & Tools for Modeling



by Brian Butler President, Enerscore

DER: Value Prop

Brian Butler

Creating demand more important than valueengineering?









enerscore

Home Energy Performance Made Visible

The Problem

Energy is invisible in residential real estate so.....



The pace of significant improvement is..... s....l....o.....w.....

Problem



Solution



Home Expenses



Consumers drive change



Buyers / Renters show strong interest in data.



his area is very walkable — most emands can be accomplished on foot. Transit is good, with many nearby public transportation options. It's convenient to use a bike for most trips.

Energy Efficiency: 1749 NW 61st St

enerscore

Estimated annual utility cost: \$240

Great! The building data suggests a very efficient structure. 69

Improve my EnerScore >

Predictive profiling not new



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Energy and Buildings

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/enbuild

Developing a pre-retrofit energy consumption metric to model post-retrofit energy savings: Phase one of a three-phase research initiative

Kate Goldstein^{a,*}, Michael Blasnik^b, Mike Heaney^c, Ben Polly^c, Craig Christensen^c, Les Norford^a

^a Massachusetts Institute of Technology, United States

^b Michael Blasnik and Associates, United States

^c National Renewable Energy Laboratory, United States

Predictive profiling not new

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy

Energy Efficiency &

Chicagoland Single-Family Housing Characterization

J. Spanier, R. Scheu, L. Brand, and J. Yang Partnership for Advanced Residential Retrofit (PARR)

June 2012



Group 1: Brick, 1978-Present, 1 to 1.5 stories (no split level)

2.5% of populationMean Site EUI: 81.8Mean therms: 1077Mean kWh: 8887Mean finished square footage: 1741





Group 2: Brick, 1978-Present, Split level (1.5 stories)

1.9% of populationMean Site EUI: 112.6Mean therms: 1205Mean kWh: 10076Mean finished square footage: 1404





Group 3: Brick, 1978-Present, 2 stories

4.7% of population Mean Site EUI: 76.7 Mean therms: 1446 Mean kWh: 12482 Mean finished square footage: 2506



Group 4: Brick, 1942-1978, 1 to 1.5 stories (no split level)

17.9% of population Mean Site EUI: 129.6 Mean therms: 1212 Mean kWh: 8859 Mean finished square footage: 1217





Group 7: Brick, Pre-1942, 1 to 1.5 stories (no split level)

11.6% of population Mean Site EUI: 161.3 Mean therms: 1442 Mean kWh: 8927 Mean finished square footage: 1141



	Source EUI, Btu/sq. ft.			Gas in Therms			Electricity in kWh		
GROUP	BEopt, Today	CNT Mean	Dev, %	BEopt, Today	CNT Mean	Dev, %	BEopt, Today	CNT Mean	Dev, %
1	132.7	126.2	5%	1161.5	1077.0	8%	9074.7	8887	2%
2	164.1	176.1	-7%	1146.5	1205.0	-5%	9159.2	10076	-9%
3	118.7	120.2	-1%	1502.9	1446.0	4%	11607.5	12482	-7%
4	196.4	192.3	2%	1215.7	1212.0	0%	9254.1	8859	4%
5	195.1	198.2	-2%	1350.6	1344.0	0%	9227.1	9643	-4%
6	155.2	147.7	5%	1712.9	1553.0	10%	11533.5	11714	-2%
7	224.7	227.8	-1%	1430.6	1442.0	-1%	8724.6	8927	-2%
8	177.1	169.3	5%	1940.9	1757.0	10%	10607.6	11062	-4%
9	132.0	135.7	-3%	1209.5	1217.0	-1%	9203.6	9719	-5%
10	193.9	199.1	-3%	1473.6	1480.0	0%	8771.6	9321	-6%
11	111.8	114.0	-2%	1706.0	1749.0	-2%	14733.4	14914	-1%
12	191.0	199.0	-4%	1204.6	1268.0	-5%	8256.8	8483	-3%
13	163.9	172.0	-5%	1395.6	1467.0	-5%	9367.3	9802	-4%
14	216.4	222.9	-3%	1578.7	1608.0	-2%	8624.4	9050	-5%
15	168.6	164.8	2%	2034.9	1913.0	6%	10869.8	11348	-4%

	Source EUI, Btu/sq. ft.			Gas in Therms			Electricity in kWh		
GROUP	BEopt, Today	CNT Mean	Dev, %	BEopt, Today	CNT Mean	Dev, %	BEopt, Today	CNT Mean	Dev, %
1	132.7	126.2	5%	1161.5	1077.0	8%	9074.7	8887	2%
2	164.1	176.1	-7%	1146.5	1205.0	-5%	9159.2	10076	-9%
3	118.7	120.2	-1%	1502.9	1446.0	4%	11607.5	12482	-7%
4	196.4	192.3	2%	1215.7	1212.0	0%	9254.1	8859	4%
5	195.1	198.2	-2%	1350.6	1344.0	0%	9227.1	9643	-4%
6	155.2	147.7	5%	1712.9	1553.0	10%	11533.5	11714	-2%
7	224.7	227.8	-1%	1430.6	1442.0	-1%	8724.6	8927	-2%
8	177.1	169.3	5%	1940.9	1757.0	10%	10607.6	11062	-4%
9	132.0	135.7	-3%	1209.5	1217.0	-1%	9203.6	9719	-5%
10	193.9	199.1	-3%	1473.6	1480.0	0%	8771.6	9321	-6%
11	111.8	114.0	-2%	1706.0	1749.0	-2%	14733.4	14914	-1%
12	191.0	199.0	-4%	1204.6	1268.0	-5%	8256.8	8483	-3%
13	163.9	172.0	-5%	1395.6	1467.0	-5%	9367.3	9802	-4%
14	216.4	222.9	-3%	1578.7	1608.0	-2%	8624.4	9050	-5%
15	168.6	164.8	2%	2034.9	1913.0	6%	10869.8	11348	-4%

Table 1. Cook County Assessor Data Snapshot

Variable	Description				
PIN	13-digit unique identifier				
Address					
City	Mailing city				
ZIP	5-digit zip code				
Township	Assessor township within Cook County				
Assessor class	Class is based on age, square footage, and number of units				
Number of units	Number				
Square footage	Measured as finished space				
Year built					
Bedrooms	Number				
Bathrooms (full)	Number				
Bathrooms (half)	Number				
Exterior Construction	Type of exterior construction				
Roof	Type of roof construction				
Basement	Type of basement				
Attic	Type of attic				
Heating System	Type of heating system				
Air Conditioning	Type of air conditioning system				
Fireplace					
Garage	Number of spaces available				
Garage (exterior construction)	Exterior construction of garage				

So... why not utility bills?





So... why not utility bills?







Method

- Basic processing by age of home and "Effective Year Built"
- ACH50 tied primarily to age
- ACH50 also tied to type: more complex geometry = more leakage
- Fuel type: oil systems typically less efficient
- System type: steam systems less efficient

Method, cont.

- Table of assumptions from surveys of IC's, Chicagoland DOE study and other sources
- Identify trends in SF assessed values to glean levels of envelope performance.
- Assumptions are then modeled by Michael Blasnik's SIMPLE Audit to generate EUI &
- $A \sim F$ rating

Testing

- Raters in multiple states supplying data to tune predictive algorithms
- Energy auditors push audit data back to EnerScore at user's request.

Results

- Ratings for all homes
- Buyers, sellers, renters "see" home performance
- Owners and landlords respond to a market that values and *openly* compares metrics of home performance.
Level playing field



Square foot Costs & Avoiding Financial Trouble



by Sean Jeffords President And CEO, Beyond Green Construction



Barriers to Growth

- Access to reliable information: The current state of information for consumers is not consistent, reliable or readily available.. ...Mass Save? ...DER's? ...Solar? ...New Pipeline?
- Lack of Financing options: We currently lack mortgages that can assist in a large upfront expense for energy efficiency on a DER level..
- Home Inflation and Appraise-abilty: A good % of our homes are inflated above the market value and banks do not have appraisal formulas for homes that are exceptionally energy efficient..
- Lack of Incentives and programs that support deeper more advanced deep energy retrofits...







Case #1 Ranch home no basement...





















ROI: 2.9% Payback: 34 ½ Years \$141.8 \$/SF \$1 Invested > .03 Cents Gained				
EUI 55.4	RetrofitCostsAfterIncentives\$266,739PurchasePrice\$194,700	((Value Returned \$199,153) Appraised Value \$282,286	EUI 6.21
Purchase Price + Appraised Value Retrofit Costs = \$282,286 \$461,439				

Case #2 Ranch with basement



We tried the air to water heat pump..



We ended up needing a back up..







Courtesy of Zillow











Case #4 Phased DER Project



Phase 1 Results... ROI: 91.5% | Payback: 1 Year | \$1.11 \$/SF \$1 Invested → .91 Cents Gained

Project Details:

EUI

37.2

- 12 Hours Air Sealing
 - Attic Insulation R60
 - Polyiso on Kneewalls
 - New LED Lighting
 - Attic Venting



Total Project Costs (After Incentives) \$644

Phase 2 Results... ROI: 15.25% | Payback: 6 ¹⁄₂ Years | \$25.87 \$/SF \$1 Invested → .15 Cents Gained

Project Details:

- EUINew 5kW PV Solar SystemEUI22.9(Solarize MA, \$2.30 /Watt)7.76(Does Not Include SRECs)7.76
 - New Asphalt Roof

Total Project Costs (After Incentives) \$15k

Phase 3 Options...

Option A: Heat Pump ROI: 20.4% | Payback: 5 Years | 4.49 \$/SF

Option B: Replace Windows ROI: 1.7% | Payback: 58 Years | 13.07 \$/SF

Option C: Rigid Foam Exterior Walls ROI: 1% | Payback: 92 Years | 25.09 \$/SF

Finances & Incentives...

Room for Improvement?



by Bill Womeldorf Graduate Student, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Existing Policies

•DER Incentive Programs

Mass Save

•Solarize MA

• Financing



Average returns associated with the DERs case studies from Sean





Financing Options

•0% Heat Loans up to 50K

• Expanded Heat Loans

Barrier Mitigation Grants
MA Solar Loan

Room for Improvements

- Green Leases
- •Net Metering
- Zero Energy Building Code
- Other Suggestions?



From the 2015 Update of the Massachusetts Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2020

This concludes The American Institute of Architects Continuing Education Systems Course

