# **Energy and Water Conservation Report Format**

# **Projects Over $10M Construction Cost**

*2013-07-15: Revised to require yearly savings of KWH and Therms be reported, for DTE energy incentive programs.*

*Utilize the following report format to indicate compliance to U-M Design Guideline 3.2. Supplemental narratives and tables may be provided in addition to the information required below, but for the required tables indicated below, do not change the table explanations, format, headings, footnotes, or the order in which the tables are presented.* ***The data in the tables in this sample report is for illustrative purposes only, update to the project specific values.***  *Provide a cover page with the project name, project number, date and report version: SD, DD, CD, or FINAL. Provide similar information in the report footer.*

**Executive Summary**

Energy conservation measures (ECMs) were evaluated using ASHRAE 90.1 Appendix G procedures. Appendix G requires estimated savings be compared to a *Baseline Building* that exactly meets ASHRAE 90.1 energy code requirements. U-M Design Guidelines require projects reduce energy cost by 30% compared to the ASHRAE 90.1 *Baseline Building*.

The version of the ASHRAE standard that this project was evaluated against was ASHRAE 90.1-*XXXX <insert year>*

**The estimated total annual cost savings by implementing the recommended ECMs is** *<insert dollars>***, which is equivalent to an annual percent savings of** *<insert percentage>* **compared to a ASHRAE 90.1 *Baseline Building*.**

**The estimated total annual water savings by implementing the recommended water conservation measures is** *<insert gallons>***, which is equivalent to an annual percent savings of** *<insert percentage>* **compared to a building complying with the Michigan Plumbing Code.**

**Table 1: Recommended ECMs (ECM Interactions Not Accounted For)**

Table 1 lists all the ECMs that are recommended for implementation on this project. It indicates the savings potential for each ECM without regard to the impact ECMs may have upon one another. Because of such "interactions", the actual cost savings for some ECMs will be less than when they are analyzed on a stand-alone basis. For example, the savings from an ECM that reduces lighting energy will be partially offset by increased space heating requirements due to less light energy heating the space. Table 2 accounts for such ECM interactions.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1: Recommended ECMs (ECM interactions not accounted for)** | | | |
| **ECM No.** | **Description** | **Dollars/Year Savings** | **First Cost** |
| 1c | Increase Wall Insulation to 2.75" | $18,400 | $350,000 |
| 2b | Improved Window Performance, SHGC = 0.33, U = 0.44 | $8,000 | $190,000 |
| 3 | Day Lighting Sensors, Atrium | $12,000 | $42,000 |
| 4 | Desiccant Wheel | $40,000 | $200,000 |
| 5 | Exterior Shades, South Façade | $15,000 | $78,000 |
| 6 | Increase Thermostat Deadband | $7,000 | $0 |
| 7 | Install Free Cooling System | $55,000 | $350,000 |
|  | **Total First Cost:** |  | $1,210,000 |
|  | **Total Savings (no interactions accounted for):** | **$155,400** |  |

**Table 2: Summary ECM Savings (with ECM Interactions)**

Table 2 reports the total estimated ECM savings with ECM interactions taken into account. Where combinations of ECMs are listed, it indicates that those ECMs interact with one another and therefore had to be analyzed as a group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: Summary ECM Savings (with ECM interactions)** | |  |
| **ECM No.** | **Description** | **Dollars/Year Savings** |
| Combo 1 | Combines ECMs 1c,2b,3,5 | $50,300 |
| ECM 4 | Desiccant Wheel | $40,000 |
| ECM 6 | Increase Thermostat Deadband | $7,000 |
| ECM 7 | Install Free Cooling System | $55,000 |
|  | **Total Savings (interactions accounted for):** | **$152,300** |

**Table 3: Energy Conservation Predicted Results**

Table 3 indicates the percent savings for *<insert the building/project name>* versus a similar building constructed to exactly meet energy code requirements. The estimated annual energy cost for the building without the recommended ECMs is presented first; the energy cost for the same building with the recommended ECMs implemented is presented second. The requirement of U-M Design Guideline 3.2 is for designs to provide buildings that cost 30% less to operate versus buildings designed to exactly meet the energy code.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 3: Energy Conservation Predicted Results1** |  |
| **Estimated Energy Costs w/o ECMs2** | **Dollars/Year** |
| ASHRAE Base Building | $420,000 |
| Elevators | $15,000 |
| Process Cooling | $12,000 |
| Outdoor Lights | $4,200 |
| **Total Energy Cost w/o ECMs:** | $451,200 |
| **Estimated Annual Energy Cost Avoidance w/ECMs:** | **$152,300** |
| **Estimated Percentage Cost Avoidance:** | **34%** |
| **Total Estimated First Cost of ECMs:** | **$1,210,000** |
| **Over-all Simple Payback (years):** | **7.9** |

Note 1: Compared to a baseline ASHRAE building using ASHRAE 90.1 Appendix G methodology.

Actual energy use and savings may vary due to occupancy levels, occupancy schedules, utility

rates, and other factors different than assumed in the analysis.

Note 2: Energy use break-down reported per ASHRAE 90.1 Appendix G requirements.

*Table 4 provides a breakdown of ECM savings reported in energy units, useful for Utility incentive programs.*

**Table 4: Estimated Annual Savings in Energy Units, per ECM**

Table 4 reports the estimated savings in energy units, with ECM interactions taken into account. Where combinations of ECMs are listed, it indicates that those ECMs interact with one another and therefore had to be analyzed as a group.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4: Estimated Annual Savings in Energy Units, per ECM** | |  |  |
| **ECM No.** | **Description** | **KWH/Year Savings** | **Therms/Year**  **Savings** |
| Combo 1 | Combines ECMs 1c,2b,3,5 |  |  |
| ECM 4 | Desiccant Wheel |  |  |
| ECM 6 | Increase Thermostat Deadband |  |  |
| ECM 7 | Install Free Cooling System |  |  |
|  | **Total:** |  |  |

**Table 5: Water Conservation Measures and Predicted Results**

Table 5 indicates the water saving measures and resulting percent water savings predicted for this project versus a project constructed to meet building code requirements (building code requirements are based on Energy Policy Act of 1992 fixture performance dictates). The requirement of U-M Design Guideline 3.2 is for designs to provide projects that use 20% less water than projects designed to exactly meet the building code.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 5: Water Conservation** |  |
| **Water Conservation Measure** | **Estimated Annual Savings (Gallons)** |
| Dual Flush Water Closets | 7,000 |
| Waterless or 1/8 Gallon Per Flush Urinals | 5,000 |
| HVAC Condensate Used For Cooling Tower Make-Up | 8,000 |
| 2 GPM Shower Heads | 12,000 |
| Gray Water Recovery | 9,000 |
| **Estimated Total Annual Water Savings:** | **41,000** |
| **Annual Water use w/o Water Conservation Measures:** | **200,000** |
| **Estimated Percentage Savings:** | **21%** |

**Table 6: Summary of ECM Evaluations**

Table 6 summarizes every ECM evaluated by the design team for this particular project, along with various ECM financial metrics. For a detailed description and analysis of individual ECMs, please see the Appendices.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6: Summary of ECM Evaluated** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **ECM No.** | **Description** | **First Cost Estimate** | **Annual Costs Savings** | **Simple Payback** | **ROI** | **Persistence1 H/M/L** | **AcceptedYes/No** | **Comments** |
| **1a** | Additional 0.75" Wall Insulation | $180,000 | $14,000 | 12.9 | 7.8% | H | **N** | SD design/estimate included insulation 1" thicker than required by code. |
| **1b** | Additional 1" Wall Insulation | $300,000 | $16,500 | 18.2 | 5.5% | H | **N** |  |
| **1c** | Additional 1.5" Wall Insulation | $350,000 | $18,400 | 19.0 | 5.3% | H | **Y** |  |
| **2a** | Glass SHGC =0.38 | $186,000 | $7,500 | 24.8 | 4.0% | M | **N** |  |
| **2b** | Glass SHGC =0.33 | $190,000 | $8,000 | 23.8 | 4.2% | M | **Y** |  |
| **2c** | Argon Filled Triple Glazed Glass SHGC = 0.26 | $265,000 | $13,400 | 19.8 | 5.1% | L | **N** | Seal life guaranteed only 10 years. Slight gray tint. |
| **3** | Day Lighting Sensors, Atrium | $42,000 | $12,000 | 3.5 | 28.6% | M | **Y** |  |
| **4** | Desiccant Wheel | $200,000 | $40,000 | 5.0 | 20.0% | M | **Y** |  |
| **5** | Exterior Shades, South Facade | $78,000 | $15,000 | 5.2 | 19.2% | H | **Y** |  |
| **6** | Increase Thermostat Deadband | $0 | $7,000 | N/A | N/A | L | **Y** |  |
| 7 | Free Cooling Process Load | $350,000 | $55,000 | 6.4 | 15.7% | H | **Y** |  |
| **8** | Shower Heat Recovery Device | $24,000 | $3,000 | 8.0 | 12.5% | L | **N** | Maintenance issues |

Note 1: Persistence represents an opinion of the probability that the estimated energy savings will be fully realized.

**Useful Information:**

KWH: Kilowatt Hours

MBTU: Thousands of British Thermal Units

Therms x 100 = MBTU

KWH x 3.413 = MBTU

**Appendix A**

**Table A1: Energy Cost Assumptions:**

Table A1 reports the energy cost assumptions utilized for energy cost calculations.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A1: Energy Costs Assumptions** | |  |
| **Energy Type** | **Cost** | **Comments** |
| Electricity | $0.079 /kwh | DTE Direct Purchase Rate |
| Natural Gas | $0.842/therm | MichiCon Direct Purchase Rate |
| District Steam | $1.90/therm | U-M Utility Rate |
| District Chilled Water | $1.07/therm | U-M Utility Rate |

**Table A2: Accepted ECMs (no ECM interactions) Additional Information**

Table A2 presents the estimated annual cost and energy savings, and the relative contribution each ECM contributed toward total savings. Electrical and gas savings for each ECM have been converted to energy units of MBTU and combined.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A2: Accepted ECMs (no ECM interactions) Additional Information** | | | | |  |  |
| **ECM No.** | **Description** | **Dollars/Yr Savings** | **% of Total $ Savings** | **MBTU/Yr Savings** | **% of Total MBTU Savings** | **First Cost** |
| 1c | Increase Wall Insulation to 2.75" | $18,400 | 11.8% | 450 | 16.8% | $350,000 |
| 2b | Improved Window Performance, SHGC = 0.33, U = 0.44 | $8,000 | 5.1% | 183 | 6.8% | $190,000 |
| 3 | Day Lighting Sensors, Atrium | $12,000 | 7.7% | 350 | 13.1% | $42,000 |
| 4 | Desiccant Wheel | $40,000 | 25.7% | 600 | 22.4% | $200,000 |
| 5 | Exterior Shades, South Façade | $15,000 | 9.7% | 224 | 8.4% | $78,000 |
| 6 | Increase Stat Deadband | $7,000 | 4.5% | 170 | 6.4% | $0 |
| 7 | Install Free Cooling System | $55,000 | 35.4% | 700 | 26.1% | $350,000 |
|  | **Total First Cost:** |  |  |  |  | **$1,210,000** |
|  | **Total Cost Savings:** | **$155,400** |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Total Energy Savings:** |  |  | **2,677** |  |  |

**Tables A3 and A4:**

U-M Design Guideline 3.2 requires that all projects implement certain "mandatory" energy conservation measures, and it requires that other energy conservation measures be "evaluated" for every project. Tables A3 and A4 indicate which of the mandatory and evaluated measures were found applicable to the project.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A3: Review of Mandatory Energy Conservation Measures** | | | | | | | | |  | |
| **Mandatory ECM No.** | | **Description** | | **Implemented Yes/No** | | | | **Comments** | | **ECM Cross Ref.** | |
| a | | Window Blinds/Shades | | Y | | | |  | | ECM 9 | |
| b | | Occupancy Schedules | | Y | | | |  | |  | |
| c | | Part Load Efficiency | | Y | | | |  | |  | |
| d | | HVAC System Zoning | | Y | | | |  | | ECM 8 | |
| e | | DDC VAV Control | | Y | | | |  | |  | |
| f | | Standalone HVAC Systems | | N | | | | No process areas. | |  | |
| g | | Laboratory ECMs | | N | | | | Not a lab building. | |  | |
| h | | Building Envelope Thermal Scanning | | Y | | | |  | | ECM 4 | |
| i | | Limit Incandescent Lighting | | Y | | | |  | |  | |
| j | | Lighting and Power Justification | | N | | | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  | | |  | | | |  | |
| **Table A4: Review of Mandatory Energy Evaluations** | | | | |  | | | |  | |
| **Mandatory Eval. No.** | | **Description** | | **Implemented Yes/No** | | | **Comments** | | | **ECM Cross Ref.** | |
| a | | Additional Below-Grade Insulation | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| b | | Additional Wall Insulation | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| c | | Additional Roof Insulation | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| d | | Improved Glazing (1) | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| e | | Eliminate Server Rooms | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| f | | High Efficiency Chiller (1) | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| g | | Free Cooling | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| h | | Heat Recovery | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| i | | Increased Envelope Inspections | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| j | | Occupancy/Daylight Sensing | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| k | | High Efficiency Boiler (1) | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| l | | High Efficiency HVAC Equipment (1) | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| m | | Variable Volume Kitchen Hoods | |  | | |  | | |  | |

Note 1: Performance/efficiency better than required by code.

**Appendix B**

**Detailed ECM descriptions and analysis:**

*Provide a detailed description and evaluation for each ECM. Each evaluation shall include the summary table indicated below, located at the beginning of the ECM. Number similar ECMs -a,-b,-c etc. as per the example.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ECM No.** | **Description** | **First Cost Estimate** | **Dollars/Year Savings** | **Simple Payback** | **MBTU/Year Savings** | |
| 1a | Additional 0.75" Polystyrene Wall Insulation | $180,000 | $14,000 | 12.9 |  | |
| 1b | Additional 1" Polystyrene Wall Insulation | $300,000 | $16,500 | 18.2 |  | |
| 1c | Additional 1.5" Polystyrene Wall Insulation | $350,000 | $18,400 | 19.0 |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Description:** | |  |  |  | |  |
|  | The base building wall insulation requirement, Per ASHRAE 90.7 2007 = |  |  |  | |  |
|  | R = 11.9 hr-ft2-F/Btu |  |  |  | |  |
|  | U value = 0.084 Btu/(hr-ft2-F) |  |  |  | |  |
|  | This ECM would increase the insulation thickness as follows: |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Increase 1.25" thick insulation to 2.0" Thick |  |  |  | |  |
|  | R = 15.87 hr-ft2-F/Btu |  |  |  | |  |
|  | U value = 0.063 Btu/(hr-ft2-F) |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Increase 1.25" thick insulation to 2.25" Thick |  |  |  | |  |
|  | R = 17.2 hr-ft2-F/Btu |  |  |  | |  |
|  | U value = 0.058 Btu/(hr-ft2-F) |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Increase 1.25" thick insulation to 2.75" Thick |  |  |  | |  |
|  | R = 19.9 hr-ft2-F/Btu |  |  |  | |  |
|  | U value = 0.050 Btu/(hr-ft2-F) |  |  |  | |  |
| **Construction Costs:** | |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| *Describe the basis of the first cost estimate.* | |  |  |  | |  |

**Appendix C:**

*Include the following in report Appendix C (in the order indicated):*

* *Energy Impact Statement.*
* *A breakdown of energy usage by at least the following components: lights, internal equipment loads, service water heating equipment, space heating equipment, space cooling and heat rejection equipment, fans, and other HVAC equipment (such as pumps)*
* *Completed COMcheck compliance report demonstrating compliance to the mandatory provisions of ASHRAE Standard 90.1.*
* *Complete input data files and output reports from the energy simulation program. Include the name of the simulation program(s) used. The output reports shall also show the amount of time any loads are not met by the HVAC system for the baseline building design and the proposed building design. The proposed building design shall not have more “unmet hours” than the baseline building.*
* *An explanation of any error messages noted in the simulation program output.*