

UMP Steering Committee Meeting – 5/31/2012

Attendees

Michael Brandt
Brian Granahan
Tina Jayaweera
Chuck Kurnik
Michael Li
Julie Michals
William Miller

William Newbold
Mary Ann Ralls
Alexandra Rekkas
Steve Schiller
Nancy Seidman
Alan Shedd
Rodney Sobin

- Commercial lighting controls and residential furnace/boiler
- Would like SC comments back by June 7th
- Protocols complete on June 20th
- Public reviews pushed back to June 12th for earlier protocols
- Cross-cutting chapters – reschedule SC meeting for June 28th
- Comments from SC by June 26th
- SC Member – Can the 28th meeting end before 2 p.m. Eastern Time?

Residential furnace and boiler

- Gas impact evaluation is a relatively new measure compared to other efficiency programs; less relative scrutiny of gas versus electric
 - Less information to rely on
- How to use AFUE – rated peak output of unit divided by peak input is roughly equal to AFUE, although the AFUE is supposed to represent annual number
- Strict definitions about what values were
- Protocol combines eng equation for installing eff unit compared to unit they would have installed. Also includes billing analysis. Don't have to worry about 90/10 precision is you are going after everybody.
- The capacity of the unit times the equivalent full-load hours is equal to how much gas the facility that has the boiler needs to run itself. Normalized annual gas use.
- Either just figure out therm savings, you can calculate all savings for people in that group and take average. Can calculate average annual full load hours and use TRM equation for everyone who comes into program. Depends how your region calculates savings.
- Protocol is developed from DOE national standard.
- Billing analysis grounds results into heating consumption better than eng analysis where people use another proxy.
- SC Member – Does not apply to condensing boilers?
- It does. The input equation works for condensing boilers.
- SC Member – Not clear in protocol. Need to specifically mention that baseline is new standard practice furnace/boiler at same impact capacity as one used.

- Mentioned in protocol. Are you matching input or output capacity? Different answers depending on answer.
- SC Member – Did mention like and like. Need to be explicit about unit you are taking out.
- Explicit in protocol itself.
- SC Member – Doesn't say "use this."
- Please show me which part needs to be improved on.
- SC Member – I will send in comments.
- Did you look at impact at condensing boilers on AFUE??? It's not so much part load efficiency – setting.
- For commercial units, people have been going out into the field to determine. No one has done that on residential side.
- Your billing analysis will take care of it. It will throw other assumptions off on TRM.
- David Jacobson - Will check if it's feasible to do on res scale
- I think billing analysis is better for res

Lighting controls

- Challenge with incentive program, sometimes don't have the necessary data and must make some assumptions about what measure is actually saving.
- ASHRAE standards call for lighting controls as baseline. Smaller amt of savings compared to a retrofit program.
- Algorithm – control savings factor varies by facilities type
- Interactive impacts
- Lighting control required data fields
- Are these pre- or post- equivalent full load hours?
- Pre-
- How do you measure the pre? Recommending going in before retrofit is done?
- In some cases. In terms of what's being done, that's not what's being done. Done work with sensor strip loggers that can identify whether the space is occupied or unoccupied. If use that in pre case, efficient way for developing occupancy sensors. Extensive database of their data. Gives space type, occupancy sensor.
- Ongoing debate on whether need to do metering
- SC Member – Different approaches that lead to different levels of rigor. What to use to determine baseline. Prohibitive to some program administrators to take that approach. It is an approach used in practice. Is it not possible to provide basic approach being recommended, but enhanced approach is this? Can apply to other approaches as well.
- Chuck Kurnik – where we lie right now, we will have baseline recommendation that protocols are making. The alternate option is a slightly less rigorous recommendation, for programs with fewer resources.
- Hossein Haeri – That's a good point. Unitary hvac is only one where we are offering more rigorous alternative.

- Commercial lighting protocol not posted yet. Some discussion about having 2 levels. We don't need to decide this here. Maybe not across board for all protocols. Finding recommended practice.
- The recommendation is the more rigorous – metering
- David Jacobson – what you're saying is that 99% of current evaluations don't require pre-metering. You will require them to require pre-metering. I think that is preferred method.
- SC Member – where you say metering requirements aren't being recommended.
- Based on post-metering
- SC Member – compare to other ones, this is the quickest and dirtiest. Default values going in. metering didn't sound like it was preferred.
- David Jacobson – agree, seemed like estimated values were preferred.
- Steve Carlson – that needs to be clarified. For the sake of an implementer establishing a value for an initial tracking estimate. Not intended for evaluation.
- SC Member – in most cases you won't be able to invest in metering. Invest in projects to do metering across business types. We need to offer several levels depending on resources and need.
- Steve Carlson – Itg controls is small part of big programs
- SC Member – this is a SC level discussion as to when these protocols are introduced, are they introduced as *the* way to do it or *a* way to do it? Based on discussion on other protocols, sounds like it is a way to do it. What if Itg controls are a big deal? Would you want a tighter evaluation to know if it's a good idea or not.
- Hossein Haeri – that's been our understanding, but instead of saying a way. We also understand these are recommended ways understanding that there are other ways. Also provide some options in cases where there are resource constraints. Don't have the resources to do metering.
- SC Member – must say recommended under these situations
- SC Member – my understanding is that the protocols will be required for DOE grant programs. We support flexibility on this.
- SC Member – we think it makes sense to think that through a little better. Number of grantees is small and would be in this situation.
- SC Member – sounds like there is further thinking from DOE about this.
- Chuck Kurnik – we will modify the talking points based on feedback from this call and elsewhere.
- Wrap-up – will be posting due dates – comments by Thursday June 7th, cross-cutting protocols out in next week and a half. Q&A session on Thursday June 28th.