



# Comprehensive Energy Audit For Recreation Center



---

Prepared For  
**Tuluksak Native Community**

**March 19, 2012**

**Prepared By:**

**ANTHC-DEHE  
1901 Bragaw St. Suite 200  
Anchorage, Alaska 99508**

# Table of Contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
2. AUDIT AND ANALYSIS BACKGROUND .....	4
2.1 Program Description .....	4
2.2 Audit Description .....	4
2.3. Method of Analysis .....	5
2.4 Limitations of Study .....	6
3. Recreation Center .....	7
3.2 Predicted Energy Use .....	8
3.2.1 Energy Usage / Tariffs .....	8
3.2.2 Energy Use Index (EUI) .....	10
3.3 AkWarm© Building Simulation .....	11
4. ENERGY COST SAVING MEASURES .....	12
4.1 Summary of Results .....	12
4.2 Interactive Effects of Projects .....	13
Appendix A – Listing of Energy Conservation and Renewable Energy Websites.....	14
Appendix B – Direct Vent Oil Heater Programming.....	16

## PREFACE

The Energy Projects Group at the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium (ANTHC) prepared this document for the Tuluksak Native Community. The authors of this report are Chris Mercer, Certified Energy Auditor (CEA) and Gavin Dixon.

The purpose of this report is to provide a comprehensive document that summarizes the findings and analysis that resulted from an energy audit conducted over the past couple months by the Energy Projects Group of ANTHC. This report analyzes historical energy use and identifies costs and savings of recommended energy efficiency measures. Discussions of site specific concerns and an Energy Efficiency Action Plan are also included in this report.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Energy Projects Group gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Joey Allain, Tuluksak Utility Manager.

# 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report was prepared for the Tuluksak Native Community. The scope of the audit focused on Recreation Center. The scope of this report is a comprehensive energy study, which included an analysis of building shell, interior and exterior lighting systems, HVAC systems, and plug loads.

Based on electricity and fuel oil prices in effect at the time of the audit, the annual predicted energy costs for the buildings analyzed are \$1,116 for Electricity, \$1,572 for #1 Oil, and a modeled cost of \$81 for Spruce Wood based on \$200/chord of wood. The total energy costs are \$2,769 per year.

It should be noted that this facility received the power cost equalization (PCE) subsidy last year from the state of Alaska. If it had not received PCE, it would have paid \$3,324 for electricity.

Table 1.1 below summarizes the energy efficiency measures analyzed for the Recreation Center. Listed are the estimates of the annual savings, installed costs, and two different financial measures of investment return.

Table 1.1 PRIORITY LIST – ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES						
Rank	Feature	Improvement Description	Annual Energy Savings	Installed Cost	Savings to Investment Ratio, SIR <sup>1</sup>	Simple Payback (Years) <sup>2</sup>
1	HVAC And DHW	Using more wood and the toyo to heat the building and using the electric heaters sparingly, as well as ensuring they are turned off will dramatically reduce costs to operate the facility.	\$358	\$100	37.34	0.3
2	Air Tightening	Perform air sealing to reduce air leakage by 300 cfm at 50 Pascals.	\$90	\$750	1.08	8.3
3	Cathedral Ceiling: Rec Center	Install R-14 rigid board insulation. No cost included for covering insulation.	\$513	\$11,243	1.02	21.9
<b>TOTAL, all measures</b>			<b>\$961</b>	<b>\$12,093</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>12.6</b>

**Table Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> Savings to Investment Ratio (SIR) is a life-cycle cost measure calculated by dividing the total savings over the life of a project (expressed in today’s dollars) by its investment costs. The SIR is an indication of the profitability of a measure; the higher the SIR, the more profitable the project. An SIR greater than 1.0 indicates a cost-effective project (i.e. more savings than cost). Remember that this profitability is based on the position of that Energy Efficiency Measure (EEM) in the overall list and assumes that the measures above it are implemented first.

<sup>2</sup> Simple Payback (SP) is a measure of the length of time required for the savings from an EEM to payback the investment cost, not counting interest on the investment and any future changes in

energy prices. It is calculated by dividing the investment cost by the expected first-year savings of the EEM.

With all of these energy efficiency measures in place, the annual utility cost can be reduced by \$961 per year, or 34.7% of the buildings' total energy costs. These measures are estimated to cost \$12,093, for an overall simple payback period of 12.6 years.

Table 1.2 below is a breakdown of the annual energy cost across various energy end use types, such as Space Heating and Water Heating. The first row in the table shows the breakdown for the building as it is now. The second row shows the expected breakdown of energy cost for the building assuming all of the retrofits in this report are implemented. Finally, the last row shows the annual energy savings that will be achieved from the retrofits.

<b>Table 1.2 Annual Energy Cost Estimate</b>											
<b>Description</b>	<b>Space Heating</b>	<b>Space Cooling</b>	<b>Water Heating</b>	<b>Lighting</b>	<b>Refrigeration</b>	<b>Other Electrical</b>	<b>Cooking</b>	<b>Clothes Drying</b>	<b>Ventilation Fans</b>	<b>Service Fees</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
Existing Building	\$2,609	\$0	\$0	\$103	\$0	\$57	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$2,769</b>
With All Proposed Retrofits	\$1,648	\$0	\$0	\$103	\$0	\$57	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$1,808</b>
SAVINGS	\$961	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$961</b>

## **2. AUDIT AND ANALYSIS BACKGROUND**

### ***2.1 Program Description***

This audit included services to identify, develop, and evaluate energy efficiency measures at the Recreation Center. The scope of this project included evaluating building shell, lighting and other electrical systems, and HVAC equipment, motors and pumps. Measures were analyzed based on life-cycle-cost techniques, which include the initial cost of the equipment, life of the equipment, annual energy cost, annual maintenance cost, and a discount rate of 3.0%/year in excess of general inflation.

### ***2.2 Audit Description***

Preliminary audit information was gathered in preparation for the site survey. The site survey provides critical information in deciphering where energy is used and what opportunities exist within a building. The entire site was surveyed to inventory the following to gain an understanding of how each building operates:

- Building envelope (roof, windows, etc.)
- Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment (HVAC)

- Lighting systems and controls
- Building-specific equipment

The building site visit was performed to survey all major building components and systems. The site visit included detailed inspection of energy consuming components. Summary of building occupancy schedules, operating and maintenance practices, and energy management programs provided by the building manager were collected along with the system and components to determine a more accurate impact on energy consumption.

Details collected from Recreation Center enable a model of the building's energy usage to be developed, highlighting the building's total energy consumption, energy consumption by specific building component, and equivalent energy cost. The analysis involves distinguishing the different fuels used on site, and analyzing their consumption in different activity areas of the building.

Recreation Center is classified as being made up of the following activity areas:

1) Recreation Center (Bingo Hall): 1,152 square feet

In addition, the methodology involves taking into account a wide range of factors specific to the building. These factors are used in the construction of the model of energy used. The factors include:

- Occupancy hours
- Local climate conditions
- Prices paid for energy

### ***2.3. Method of Analysis***

Data collected was processed using AkWarm© Energy Use Software to estimate energy savings for each of the proposed energy efficiency measures (EEMs). The recommendations focus on the building envelope; HVAC; lighting, plug load, and other electrical improvements; and motor and pump systems that will reduce annual energy consumption.

EEMs are evaluated based on building use and processes, local climate conditions, building construction type, function, operational schedule, existing conditions, and foreseen future plans. Energy savings are calculated based on industry standard methods and engineering estimations.

Our analysis provides a number of tools for assessing the cost effectiveness of various improvement options. These tools utilize **Life-Cycle Costing**, which is defined in this context as a method of cost analysis that estimates the total cost of a project over the period of time that includes both the construction cost and ongoing maintenance and operating costs.

**Savings to Investment Ratio (SIR) = Savings divided by Investment**

**Savings** includes the total discounted dollar savings considered over the life of the improvement. When these savings are added up, changes in future fuel prices as projected by the Department of Energy are included. Future savings are discounted to the present to

account for the time-value of money (i.e. money's ability to earn interest over time). The **Investment** in the SIR calculation includes the labor and materials required to install the measure. An SIR value of at least 1.0 indicates that the project is cost-effective—total savings exceed the investment costs.

**Simple payback** is a cost analysis method whereby the investment cost of a project is divided by the first year's savings of the project to give the number of years required to recover the cost of the investment. This may be compared to the expected time before replacement of the system or component will be required. For example, if a boiler costs \$12,000 and results in a savings of \$1,000 in the first year, the payback time is 12 years. If the boiler has an expected life to replacement of 10 years, it would not be financially viable to make the investment since the payback period of 12 years is greater than the project life.

The Simple Payback calculation does not consider likely increases in future annual savings due to energy price increases. As an offsetting simplification, simple payback does not consider the need to earn interest on the investment (i.e. it does not consider the time-value of money). Because of these simplifications, the SIR figure is considered to be a better financial investment indicator than the Simple Payback measure.

Measures are implemented in order of cost-effectiveness. The program first calculates individual SIRs, and ranks all measures by SIR, higher SIRs at the top of the list. An individual measure must have an individual  $SIR \geq 1$  to make the cut. Next the building is modified and re-simulated with the highest ranked measure included. Now all remaining measures are re-evaluated and ranked, and the next most cost-effective measure is implemented. AkWarm goes through this iterative process until all appropriate measures have been evaluated and installed.

It is important to note that the savings for each recommendation is calculated based on implementing the most cost effective measure first, and then cycling through the list to find the next most cost effective measure. Implementation of more than one EEM often affects the savings of other EEMs. The savings may in some cases be relatively higher if an individual EEM is implemented in lieu of multiple recommended EEMs. For example implementing a reduced operating schedule for inefficient lighting will result in relatively high savings. Implementing a reduced operating schedule for newly installed efficient lighting will result in lower relative savings, because the efficient lighting system uses less energy during each hour of operation. If multiple EEM's are recommended to be implemented, AkWarm calculates the combined savings appropriately.

Cost savings are calculated based on estimated initial costs for each measure. Installation costs include labor and equipment to estimate the full up-front investment required to implement a change. Costs are derived from Means Cost Data, industry publications, and local contractors and equipment suppliers.

## ***2.4 Limitations of Study***

All results are dependent on the quality of input data provided, and can only act as an approximation. In some instances, several methods may achieve the identified savings. This

report is not intended as a final design document. The design professional or other persons following the recommendations shall accept responsibility and liability for the results.

### **3. Recreation Center**

The 1,152 square foot Recreation Center was constructed in 1970, with a normal occupancy of 8 people. The number of hours of operation for this building average 4.3 hours per day, considering all seven days of the week.

#### **Description of Building Shell**

The exterior walls are 2x4 construction 3.5 inches of batt insulation.  
The building has a cold roof with 1.5 inches of insulation.

The floor of the building is on a leaky crawlspace with one and a half inches of insulation.

Typical windows throughout the building are double paned wood frame windows, though several windows have a broken pane.

The door is metal polyurethane with a metal edge.

#### **Description of Heating Plants**

The Heating Plants used in the building are:

##### Mini Monitor

Fuel Type:	#1 Oil
Input Rating:	22,000 BTU/hr
Steady State Efficiency:	82 %
Idle Loss:	1 %
Heat Distribution Type:	Air

##### Wood Stove

Fuel Type:	Spruce Wood
Input Rating:	175,340 BTU/hr
Steady State Efficiency:	65 %
Idle Loss:	0 %
Heat Distribution Type:	Air

##### Electric Heater

Fuel Type:	Electricity
Input Rating:	1.5 kwh
Steady State Efficiency:	100 %
Idle Loss:	0 %
Heat Distribution Type:	Air

#### **Space Heating Distribution Systems**

Electric heaters are used when the facility is cold, but it appears that sometimes they are left on when the building is not in use, which is the single largest electrical load on the building.

### **Lighting**

Lighting in the building is made up of seven T8 fluorescent lighting fixtures with two 28 watt bulbs each, and several incandescent bulbs.

### **Plug Loads**

Bingo equipment and a CB radio make up the plug loads in the building.

## ***3.2 Predicted Energy Use***

### **3.2.1 Energy Usage / Tariffs**

The electric usage profile charts (below) represents the predicted electrical usage for the building. If actual electricity usage records were available, the model used to predict usage was calibrated to approximately match actual usage. The electric utility measures consumption in kilowatt-hours (kWh) and maximum demand in kilowatts (kW). One kWh usage is equivalent to 1,000 watts running for one hour.

The fuel oil usage profile shows the fuel oil usage for the building. Fuel oil consumption is measured in gallons. One gallon of #1 Fuel Oil provides approximately 132,000 BTUs of energy.

The following is a list of the utility companies providing energy to the building and the class of service provided:

Electricity: Tuluksak Traditional Power - Commercial - Sm

The average cost for each type of fuel used in this building is shown below in Table 3.1. This figure includes all surcharges, subsidies, and utility customer charges:

<b>Table 3.1 – Average Energy Cost</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<b>Average Energy Cost</b>
Electricity	\$ 0.15/kWh
#1 Oil	\$ 6.50/gallons
Spruce Wood	\$ 25/cords

#### **3.2.1.1 Total Energy Use and Cost Breakdown**

At current rates, Tuluksak Native Community pays approximately \$2,769 annually for electricity and other fuel costs for the Recreation Center.

Figure 3.1 below reflects the estimated distribution of costs across the primary end uses of energy based on the AkWarm© computer simulation. Comparing the “Retrofit” bar in the

figure to the “Existing” bar shows the potential savings from implementing all of the energy efficiency measures shown in this report.

**Figure 3.1**  
**Annual Energy Costs by End Use**




Figure 3.2 below shows how the annual energy cost of the building splits between the different fuels used by the building. The “Existing” bar shows the breakdown for the building as it is now; the “Retrofit” bar shows the predicted costs if all of the energy efficiency measures in this report are implemented.

**Figure 3.2**  
**Annual Energy Costs by Fuel Type**





Figure 3.3 below addresses only Space Heating costs. The figure shows how each heat loss component contributes to those costs; for example, the figure shows how much annual space heating cost is caused by the heat loss through the Walls/Doors. For each component, the space heating cost for the Existing building is shown (blue bar) and the space heating cost assuming all retrofits are implemented (yellow bar) are shown.

**Figure 3.3  
Annual Space Heating Cost by Component**



The tables below show AkWarm’s estimate of the monthly fuel use for each of the fuels used in the building. For each fuel, the fuel use is broken down across the energy end uses. Note, in the tables below “DHW” refers to Domestic Hot Water heating.

Electrical Consumption (kWh)												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Other_Electrical	33	30	33	31	33	31	33	33	31	33	31	33
Lighting	58	53	58	56	58	56	58	58	56	58	56	58
Space_Heating	990	889	813	483	295	183	160	189	263	440	659	1009

Fuel Oil #1 Consumption (Gallons)												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Space_Heating	37	33	31	19	12	7	6	7	11	17	25	38

Spruce Wood Consumption (Cords)												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Space_Heating	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

### 3.2.2 Energy Use Index (EUI)

Energy Use Index (EUI) is a measure of a building’s annual energy utilization per square foot of building. This calculation is completed by converting all utility usage consumed by a building for one year, to British Thermal Units (Btu) or kBtu, and dividing this number by the building square footage. EUI is a good measure of a building’s energy use and is utilized regularly for comparison of energy performance for similar building types. The Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) Buildings Technology Center under a contract with the U.S. Department of

Energy maintains a Benchmarking Building Energy Performance Program. The ORNL website determines how a building’s energy use compares with similar facilities throughout the U.S. and in a specific region or state.

Source use differs from site usage when comparing a building’s energy consumption with the national average. Site energy use is the energy consumed by the building at the building site only. Source energy use includes the site energy use as well as all of the losses to create and distribute the energy to the building. Source energy represents the total amount of raw fuel that is required to operate the building. It incorporates all transmission, delivery, and production losses, which allows for a complete assessment of energy efficiency in a building. The type of utility purchased has a substantial impact on the source energy use of a building. The EPA has determined that source energy is the most comparable unit for evaluation purposes and overall global impact. Both the site and source EUI ratings for the building are provided to understand and compare the differences in energy use.

The site and source EUIs for this building are calculated as follows. (See Table 3.4 for details):

$$\text{Building Site EUI} = \frac{(\text{Electric Usage in kBtu} + \text{Fuel Oil Usage in kBtu} + \text{similar for other fuels})}{\text{Building Square Footage}}$$

$$\text{Building Source EUI} = \frac{(\text{Electric Usage in kBtu} \times \text{SS Ratio} + \text{Fuel Oil Usage in kBtu} \times \text{SS Ratio} + \text{similar for other fuels})}{\text{Building Square Footage}}$$

where “SS Ratio” is the Source Energy to Site Energy ratio for the particular fuel.

**Table 3.4**  
**Recreation Center EUI Calculations**

Energy Type	Building Fuel Use per Year	Site Energy Use per Year, kBTU	Source/Site Ratio	Source Energy Use per Year, kBTU
Electricity	7,442 kWh	25,401	3.340	84,838
#1 Oil	242 gallons	31,920	1.010	32,239
Spruce Wood	3.24 cords	58,707	1.000	58,707
<b>Total</b>		<b>116,028</b>		<b>175,785</b>
<b>BUILDING AREA</b> 1,152 Square Feet				
<b>BUILDING SITE EUI</b>		101	kBTU/Ft <sup>2</sup> /Yr	
<b>BUILDING SOURCE EUI</b>		153	kBTU/Ft <sup>2</sup> /Yr	
* Site - Source Ratio data is provided by the Energy Star Performance Rating Methodology for Incorporating Source Energy Use document issued March 2011.				

### **3.3 AkWarm© Building Simulation**

An accurate model of the building performance can be created by simulating the thermal performance of the walls, roof, windows and floors of the building. The HVAC system and central plant are modeled as well, accounting for the outside air ventilation required by the building and the heat recovery equipment in place.

The model uses local weather data and is trued up to historical energy use to ensure its accuracy. The model can be used now and in the future to measure the utility bill impact of all types of energy projects, including improving building insulation, modifying glazing, changing air

handler schedules, increasing heat recovery, installing high efficiency boilers, using variable air volume air handlers, adjusting outside air ventilation and adding cogeneration systems.

For the purposes of this study, the Recreation Center was modeled using AkWarm© energy use software to establish a baseline space heating and cooling energy usage. Climate data from Tuluksak was used for analysis. From this, the model was be calibrated to predict the impact of theoretical energy savings measures. Once annual energy savings from a particular measure were predicted and the initial capital cost was estimated, payback scenarios were approximated. Equipment cost estimate calculations are provided in Appendix D.

**Limitations of AkWarm© Models**

- The model is based on typical mean year weather data for Tuluksak. This data represents the average ambient weather profile as observed over approximately 30 years. As such, the gas and electric profiles generated will not likely compare perfectly with actual energy billing information from any single year. This is especially true for years with extreme warm or cold periods, or even years with unexpectedly moderate weather.
- The heating and cooling load model is a simple two-zone model consisting of the building’s core interior spaces and the building’s perimeter spaces. This simplified approach loses accuracy for buildings that have large variations in cooling/heating loads across different parts of the building.
- The model does not model HVAC systems that simultaneously provide both heating and cooling to the same building space (typically done as a means of providing temperature control in the space).

The energy balances shown in Section 3.1 were derived from the output generated by the AkWarm© simulations.

**4. ENERGY COST SAVING MEASURES**

**4.1 Summary of Results**

The energy saving measures are summarized in Table 4.1. Please refer to the individual measure descriptions later in this report for more detail. Calculations and cost estimates for analyzed measures are provided in Appendix C.

<b>Table 4.1                      Recreation Center, Tuluksak, Alaska                      PRIORITY LIST – ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES</b>						
Rank	Feature	Improvement Description	Annual Energy Savings	Installed Cost	Savings to Investment Ratio, SIR	Simple Payback (Years)
1	HVAC And DHW	Using more wood and the toyo to heat the building and using the electric heaters sparingly, as well as ensuring they are turned off will dramatically reduce costs to operate the facility.	\$358	\$100	37.34	0.3

**Table 4.1**  
**Recreation Center, Tuluksak, Alaska**  
**PRIORITY LIST – ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES**

Rank	Feature	Improvement Description	Annual Energy Savings	Installed Cost	Savings to Investment Ratio, SIR	Simple Payback (Years)
2	Air Tightening	Perform air sealing to reduce air leakage by 300 cfm at 50 Pascals.	\$90	\$750	1.08	8.3
3	Cathedral Ceiling: Rec Center	Install R-14 rigid board insulation. No cost included for covering insulation.	\$513	\$11,243	1.02	21.9
<b>TOTAL, all measures</b>			<b>\$961</b>	<b>\$12,093</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>12.6</b>

### 4.2 Interactive Effects of Projects

The savings for a particular measure are calculated assuming all recommended EEMs coming before that measure in the list are implemented. If some EEMs are not implemented, savings for the remaining EEMs will be affected. For example, if ceiling insulation is not added, then savings from a project to replace the heating system will be increased, because the heating system for the building supplies a larger load.

In general, all projects are evaluated sequentially so energy savings associated with one EEM would not also be attributed to another EEM. By modeling the recommended project sequentially, the analysis accounts for interactive affects among the EEMs and does not “double count” savings.

Interior lighting, plug loads, facility equipment, and occupants generate heat within the building. When the building is in cooling mode, these items contribute to the overall cooling demands of the building; therefore, lighting efficiency improvements will reduce cooling requirements in air-conditioned buildings. Conversely, lighting-efficiency improvements are anticipated to slightly increase heating requirements. Heating penalties and cooling benefits were included in the lighting project analysis.

### 4.3 Building Shell Measures

#### 4.3.1 Insulation Measures

Rank	Location	Existing Type/R-Value	Recommendation Type/R-Value
3	Cathedral Ceiling: Rec Center	Framing Type: Standard Framing Spacing: 24 inches Insulated Sheathing: R-4 Batt:FG or RW, 1.25 inches Bottom Insulation Layer: None Top Insulation Layer: None Modeled R-Value: 6.8	Install R-14 rigid board insulation. No cost included for covering insulation.
<b>Installation Cost</b>		\$11,243	<b>Estimated Life of Measure (yrs)</b> 30
<b>Breakeven Cost</b>		\$11,468	<b>Savings-to-Investment Ratio</b> 1.0
			<b>Energy Savings (/yr)</b> \$513
			<b>Simple Payback yrs</b> 22
Auditors Notes: If this facility is going to continue to be used for many years, further insulation should be added in the form of board stock insulation. Especially in the ceiling, though the floor and walls could be valuable as well.			

### 4.3.2 Air Sealing Measures

Rank	Location	Existing Air Leakage Level (cfm@50/75 Pa)	Recommended Air Leakage Reduction (cfm@50/75 Pa)
2		Air Tightness estimated as: 1300 cfm at 50 Pascals	Perform air sealing to reduce air leakage by 300 cfm at 50 Pascals.
<b>Installation Cost</b>	\$750	<b>Estimated Life of Measure (yrs)</b>	10
<b>Energy Savings (/yr)</b>		<b>Simple Payback yrs</b>	8
<b>Breakeven Cost</b>	\$812	<b>Savings-to-Investment Ratio</b>	1.1
Auditors Notes: Broken Windows should be boarded up and weather stripping applied to the door. Spray foam should be used around leaky windows and joints in the building to further reduce air transfer and drafts.			

### 4.4 Mechanical Equipment Measures

#### 4.4.1 Heating/Cooling/Domestic Hot Water Measure

Rank	Recommendation
1	Using more wood and continuing to use the toyo to heat the building and using the electric heaters sparingly, as well as ensuring they are turned off will dramatically reduce costs to operate the facility.
<b>Installation Cost</b>	\$100
<b>Estimated Life of Measure (yrs)</b>	20
<b>Energy Savings (/yr)</b>	\$358
<b>Breakeven Cost</b>	\$3,734
<b>Savings-to-Investment Ratio</b>	37.3
<b>Simple Payback yrs</b>	0
Auditors Notes: The electric heaters need to be used as little as possible. They are very inefficient heaters and should not be used to heat the building. Using the wood stove more consistently and firing it up further in advance of building occupied periods could save a lot of electricity, with limited increased costs of wood gathering.	

## 5. ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACTION PLAN

Through inspection of the energy-using equipment on-site and discussions with site facilities personnel, this energy audit has identified several energy-saving measures. The measures will reduce the amount of fuel burned and electricity used at the site. The projects will not degrade the performance of the building and, in some cases, will improve it.

Several types of EEMs can be implemented immediately by building staff, and others will require various amounts of lead time for engineering and equipment acquisition. In some cases, there are logical advantages to implementing EEMs concurrently. For example, if the same electrical contractor is used to install both lighting equipment and motors, implementation of these measures should be scheduled to occur simultaneously.

## Appendix A – Listing of Energy Conservation and Renewable Energy Websites

### Lighting

Illumination Engineering Society - <http://www.iesna.org/>

Energy Star Compact Fluorescent Lighting Program - [www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=cfls.pr\\_cfls](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=cfls.pr_cfls)

DOE Solid State Lighting Program - <http://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/ssl/>

DOE office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy - [http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/consumer/your\\_workplace/](http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/consumer/your_workplace/)

Energy Star – [http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=lighting.pr\\_lighting](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=lighting.pr_lighting)

### **Hot Water Heaters**

Heat Pump Water Heaters -

[http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/consumer/your\\_home/water\\_heating/index.cfm/mytopic=12840](http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/consumer/your_home/water_heating/index.cfm/mytopic=12840)

### **Solar Water Heating**

FEMP Federal Technology Alerts – [http://www.eere.energy.gov/femp/pdfs/FTA\\_solwat\\_heat.pdf](http://www.eere.energy.gov/femp/pdfs/FTA_solwat_heat.pdf)

Solar Radiation Data Manual – <http://rredc.nrel.gov/solar/pubs/redbook>

### **Plug Loads**

DOE office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy – [http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/consumer/your\\_workplace/](http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/consumer/your_workplace/)

Energy Star – [http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?fuseaction=find\\_a\\_product](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?fuseaction=find_a_product)

The Greenest Desktop Computers of 2008 - <http://www.metaefficient.com/computers/the-greenest-pcs-of-2008.html>

### **Wind**

AWEA Web Site – <http://www.awea.org>

National Wind Coordinating Collaborative – <http://www.nationalwind.org>

Utility Wind Interest Group site: <http://www.uwig.org>

WPA Web Site – <http://www.windpoweringamerica.gov>

Homepower Web Site: <http://homepower.com>

Windustry Project: <http://www.windustry.com>

### **Solar**

NREL – <http://www.nrel.gov/rredc/>

Firstlook – <http://firstlook.3tiergroup.com>

TMY or Weather Data – [http://rredc.nrel.gov/solar/old\\_data/nsrdb/1991-2005/tmy3/](http://rredc.nrel.gov/solar/old_data/nsrdb/1991-2005/tmy3/)

State and Utility Incentives and Utility Policies - <http://www.dsireusa.org>

## **Appendix B – Direct Vent Oil Heater Programming**

Using the temperature setbacks built into most direct vent oil heaters, such as Toyotomi Lasers and Monitor MPIs is a simple, cost effective way to save energy. We recommend setback temperatures of 60 degrees for nights and weekends in offices and other frequently occupied facilities. In buildings that are occupied intermittently, such as Bingo Halls, we recommend a setback of 50 or 55 degrees. Facilities that are never occupied, such as lift stations and well houses, should be setback to 40 degrees, to prevent freezeups. Check the following websites for tips on programming the built in temperature setback capabilities of your specific direct vent oil heater.

[http://www.toyotomiusa.com/ownersManuals\\_ventedHeaters.php](http://www.toyotomiusa.com/ownersManuals_ventedHeaters.php)

<http://www.monitorproducts.com/customer-support/manuals>