

2019 Nonresidential New Construction

Cost Effectiveness Study DRAFT Results

March 7, 2019

Farhad Farahmand

TRC Advanced Energy











Nonresidential Methodology

- Measure definition and research
 - Efficiency packages
 - Solar PV + battery
 - All-electric space and water heating, including utility infrastructure
 - Costs from local contractors
- Ran building simulations
 - EnergySoft collaboration, developers of EnergyPro
 - Engine based on CBECC-Com 2019 0.4 (January)
 - GHG emissions factors built-in
- Cost effectiveness metrics
 - Time Dependent Valuation (TDV) per CEC methodology
 - On-bill with Time of Use Rates



Efficiency Measure Packages

	Fuel	Type				
Package		Mixed Fuel	All- Electric	Energy Efficiency Measures	Solar PV & Battery	High Efficiency Appliances
	ode Minimum all other packages)	X				
	+ EE	X		X		
Mixed-Fuel	+ EE + PV	X		X	X	
	+ HE	X				X
	Fed Code Min		Electric Efficiency & Battery X			
All-Electric	+ EE		X	X		
	+ EE + PV		X	X	X	
	+ HE		X			X

EE = Energy Efficiency

PV = Solar PV + Battery

HE = High Efficiency / Preemptive



Nonresidential Building Prototypes

		Medium Office	Medium Retail	Small Hotel
Conditione	d Floor Area (ft)	53,628	24,691	42,552
Num. of Sto	ories	3	1	4
Num. of Guest Rooms		0	0	78
HVAC System	ACM Baseline	Packaged DX + VAV with HW reheat. Central gas boilers.	Single zone packaged DX with gas furnaces	NonRes: Packaged DX + VAV with HW reheat. Central gas boilers. Res: Single zone DX AC unit with gas furnaces
	Proposed All- Electric	Packaged DX + VAV with electric resistance reheat.	Single zone packaged heat pumps	NonRes: Packaged DX + VAV with electric resistance reheat Res: Single zone heat pumps
DHW	ACM Baseline	Electric resistance with storage	Electric resistance with storage	NonRes: Electric resistance storage Res: Central gas storage with recirculation
System	Proposed All- Electric	Electric resistance with storage	Electric resistance with storage	NonRes: Electric resistance storage Res: Individual heat pumps

Measure Descriptions and Applications to Each Prototype

Package	Measure	Office	Retail	Hotel						
	ENVELOPE									
	Lower SHGC Fenestration	X	Χ							
	Fenestration as a Function of Orientation	X								
	DHW/HVAC									
	Drain Water Heat Recovery			Χ						
	VAV Box Minimum Flow	X		Χ						
EE	Economizers on Small Capacity Systems		Χ							
	LIGHTING									
	Interior Lighting Reduced LPD	X	Χ	X						
	Institutional Tuning	X	Χ	X						
	Daylight Dimming Plus Off	X								
	Occupant Sensing in Open Plan Offices	X								
	Solar PV	135 kW	80 kW	90 kW						
PV										
	50 kWh Battery	X	X	X						
HE	Preemptive efficiencies	X	X	X						



Key Considerations While Viewing Results

- Local reach codes must both
 - Have >0% compliance margin
 - Be cost effective
- Solar PV or batteries do not earn compliance credit
- Standard Design HVAC or DHW remain mixed-fuel even when Proposed Design is electric
- Findings are specific to the scenarios analyzed under this methodology and assumptions.
- HE runs for CZs other than CZs 2, 3, 4, 12 will be included in final report



MEDIUM OFFICE – Compliance Margins & Cost Effectiveness

CZ	Utility	Mixed Fuel Compliance Margin			All Ele	ectric Cor	mpliance M	<u>LEGEND</u>	
			EE + PV	HE	Fed Code	EE	EE + PV	HE	
CZ1	PG&E	17%	17%		-18%	5%	5%		>0% Compliance
CZ2	PG&E	17%	17%	4%	-8%	10%	10%	-5%	
CZ3	PG&E	20%	20%	3%	-9%	15%	15%	-8%	and <u>both</u>
CZ4	PG&E	14%	14%	5%	-6%	9%	9%	-3%	
CZ5	PG&E	18%	18%		-9%	11%	11%		TDV Cost Effective
CZ6	SCE/SCG	20%	20%		-5%	18%	18%		and and
CZ7	SDG&E	20%	20%		-2%	20%	20%		On-Bill Cost Effective
CZ8	SCE/SCG	18%	18%		-2%	18%	18%		>0% Compliance
CZ9	SCE/SCG	16%	16%		-2%	14%	14%		20 % Compliance
CZ10	SCE/SCG	17%	17%		-4%	13%	13%		and <u>either</u>
CZ10-2	SDG&E	17%	17%		-4%	13%	13%		dia <u>ottioi</u>
CZ11	PG&E	13%	13%		-5%	9%	9%		TDV Cost Effective
CZ12	PG&E	14%	14%	5%	-5%	9%	9%	-2%	or
CZ13	PG&E	13%	13%		-5%	9%	9%		On-Bill Cost Effective
CZ14	SCE/SCG	18%	18%		0%	14%	14%		20/ 2 !!
CZ14-2	SDG&E	13%	13%		-5%	9%	9%		<0% Compliance
CZ15	SCE/SCG	12%	12%		-2%	11%	11%]
CZ16	PG&E	14%	14%		-27%	-13%	-13%] <u>or</u>
									not cost effective
Avg GHO	G Savings	16%	44%	5%	2%	18%	47%	4%	Hot cost effective



MEDIUM RETAIL – Compliance Margins & Cost Effectiveness

		Mixed Fu	el Compliano	e Margin	All Ele	ctric Comp	oliance Mar	gin]
CZ	Utility	EE	EE + PV	HE	Fed Code	EE	EE + PV	HE	<u>LEGEND</u>
CZ1	PG&E	18%	18%		-4.1%	15%	15%		>0% Compliance
CZ2	PG&E	14%	14%	3%	-1.1%	15%	15%	2%	
CZ3	PG&E	16%	16%	2%	-0.4%	16%	16%	2%	and <u>both</u>
CZ4	PG&E	15%	15%	3%	-0.1%	15%	15%	3%	dia <u>botii</u>
CZ5	PG&E	16%	16%		-1.2%	15%	15%		TDV Cost Effective
CZ6	SCE/SCG	10%	10%		0.5%	11%	11%		and
CZ7	SDG&E	13%	13%		0.3%	13%	13%		On-Bill Cost Effective
CZ8	SCE/SCG	10%	10%		0.4%	10%	10%		
CZ9	SCE/SCG	9%	9%		0.4%	10%	10%		>0% Compliance
CZ10	SCE/SCG	12%	12%		0.1%	12%	12%		
CZ10-2	SDG&E	12%	12%		0.1%	12%	12%		and <u>either</u>
CZ11	PG&E	13%	13%		0.5%	12%	12%		TDV Cost Effective
CZ12	PG&E	13%	13%	4%	-0.1%	13%	13%	4%	
CZ13	PG&E	12%	12%		-0.4%	12%	12%		On-Bill Cost Effective
CZ14	SCE/SCG	12%	12%		0.5%	12%	12%		OH BIII GOST EHEOLIVE
CZ14-2	SDG&E	12%	12%		0.5%	12%	12%		<0% Compliance
CZ15	SCE/SCG	11%	11%		0.9%	10%	10%		
CZ16	PG&E	13%	13%		-12%	3%	3%		<u>or</u>
Avg GH	G Savings	11%	68%	2%	6%	15%	74%	9%	not cost effective



SMALL HOTEL – Compliance Margins & Cost Effectiveness

		Mixed Fuel Compliance Margin			All Electric Compliance Margin				
CZ	Utility	EE	EE + PV	HE	Fed Code	EE	EE + PV	HE	
CZ1	PG&E	7%	7%		-68%	-51%	-51%		
CZ2	PG&E	7%	7%	2%	-52%	-39%	-39%	-25%	
CZ3	PG&E	9%	9%	1%	-58%	-41%	-41%	-28%	
CZ4	PG&E	7%	7%	1%	-54%	-42%	-42%	-27%	
CZ5	PG&E	9%	9%		-60%	-42%	-42%		
CZ6	SCE/SCG	8%	8%		-50%	-37%	-37%		
CZ7	SDG&E	9%	9%		-50%	-36%	-36%		
CZ8	SCE/SCG	7%	7%		-49%	-41%	-41%		
CZ9	SCE/SCG	6%	6%		-44%	-37%	-37%		
CZ10	SCE/SCG	5%	5%		-40%	-34%	-34%		
CZ10-2	SDG&E	5%	5%		-40%	-34%	-34%		
CZ11	PG&E	4%	4%		-42%	-35%	-35%		
CZ12	PG&E	5%	5%	3%	-47%	-38%	-38%	-21%	
CZ13	PG&E	4%	4%		-41%	-35%	-35%		
CZ14	SCE/SCG	4%	4%		-41%	-34%	-34%		
CZ14-2	SDG&E	4%	4%		-41%	-34%	-34%		
CZ15	SCE/SCG	3%	3%		-27%	-24%	-24%		
CZ16	PG&E	5%	5%		-78%	-59%	-59%		
Avg GHO	G Savings	1%	20%	2%	-3%	-1%	13%	14%	

LEGEND

>0% Compliance

and both

TDV Cost Effective and On-Bill Cost Effective

>0% Compliance

and <u>either</u>

TDV Cost Effective
or
On-Bill Cost Effective

<0% Compliance

<u>or</u>

not cost effective



Summary and Conclusions

- Medium Office and Retail mixed-fuel scenarios achieve higher compliance margins, but all-electric scenarios achieve higher GHG savings reductions.
- 2. Small Hotel is challenging to show cost-effectively exceeding the state's budget, and uncertain precision given modeling limitations.
- 3. High efficiency appliances must be integrated into design, but are not a panacea.
- 4. ACM updates regarding HVAC and DHW baselines, and treatment of solar PV, would change results.



Reach Code Measure Considerations

- Develop measures specific to building types and/or building systems.
 - Groceries, labs, spas... have very different energy demands
- Lower GHG emissions with
 - All-electric design
 - "Office and retail buildings less than 50,000 ft2..."
 - "All rooftop packaged units ..."
 - Higher compliance margins for mixed-fuel buildings
 - Increased solar PV penetration

