



Energy Trust of Oregon

Request for Proposals:

2018-2019 New Buildings Program Impact Evaluation

Responses to Questions

1. *Question: It looks like a total of 892 projects were completed in 2018-2019. Approximately how many of these projects can we expect to have 12 months of utility bill data (for the purpose of modeling calibration when appropriate/necessary)?*

Answer: Generally, we can locate utility billing data for about 95 percent of commercial projects. However, a full 12 months of post-occupancy data won't be available for some projects completed in 2019 until Q1 2021. Also, in some cases where we can locate utility billing data, it can be difficult to identify the correct meters. For instance, a new building constructed on a campus may share an address with the other buildings. In these cases it may be necessary for the selected evaluator to record or obtain the meter numbers physically present at the site in order to properly link the project information to utility billing information. Another complication that occasionally arises is when there is not a one-to-one relationship between the project and a utility meter. This is somewhat common for major renovations and additions where the project area is not separately metered from the rest of the building. This may also occur in a campus setting where a new building is not separately metered but connected to the meter of a neighboring building, or when the entire campus is master metered.

2. *Question: For the Whole Building track, what specific building simulation models/tools were used by the program allies to calculate savings?*

Answer: A variety of modeling tools are used by program allies, but the most frequently used tool is eQuest. A small number of projects utilized EnergyPlus/OpenStudio, Trane Trace, and IESVE.

3. *Question: Given the coronavirus pandemic, is a virtual kick-off acceptable rather than a typical in-person kick-off meeting?*

Answer: Yes. That is the expected format.

4. *Question: For projects with building simulation modeling, which software program or programs are used to do the modeling?*

Answer: See above.

5. *Question: We see this evaluation cycle includes eight large/complex new building projects (three projects in 2018 and five in 2019) that contribute significant savings to the total evaluation program savings (19% of total electric savings and 27% of total gas savings) and are expected to be evaluated under a separate contract.*

- a. *The projects that will be removed in Task 3 represent a significant portion of the electric savings tracked over the two years. Can Energy Trust provide a table with the savings by Buildings Type that will not require site specific evaluation by the selected contractor?*

Answer: The following table provides a list of the eight large/complex projects completed in the 2018-2019 program years that were diverted and will be evaluated separately. The RFP mis-stated the program year in which some of these projects were completed and savings were claimed. Six of these projects actually completed in 2018 and only two were completed in 2019.

Program Year	Building Type	# of Projects	kWh Savings	Therm Savings
2018	Hospital/Healthcare	3	4,547,100	261,700
2018	Warehouse	3	7,011,500	0
2019	Lodging/Hotel/Motel	1	448,600	91,600
2019	Office	1	3,308,700	0

b. Will all eight projects be evaluated outside this contract, or will some projects be evaluated under this contract?

Answer: Yes, all eight projects will be evaluated separately, outside of this contract. However, as noted in the RFP, the results from 2018-2019 large project studies will either need to be removed from the sample frame of the 2018-2019 program impact evaluation or the results will need to be integrated.

6. *Question: Task 5. Analysis states that site specific analyses must be provided for the largest 20 projects in the sample. Task 6. Reporting asks for site reports for all sites. Can Energy Trust clarify if site-specific results and reports are being requests for all projects or only the largest 20 projects sampled?*

Answer: Sorry for the confusion. Task 6 mis-stated the requirement. We would like to see site reports for only the largest 20 projects in the sample. We expect that the results for smaller projects will be more generalizable and that they can be described in aggregate in the evaluation report. Standout findings and large variances in savings for individual projects should also be described in the evaluation report, regardless of project size.