Meeting Notes

Rebuild Planning Committee Meeting – September 9, 2005

Energy Efficiency Legislation – HB 251 Current Status

Given the current high cost of energy, there is a significant amount of interest in passing this legislation. The standards used by the Ohio School Facilities Commission for classroom facilities construction projects are not feasible for state buildings and higher education facilities. The following are two possible recommendations of this Committee:

1) require new buildings to be built with energy usage at 30% below the ASHRAE Standard 90.1
2) creation of a design manual to help achieve 30% efficiency

Committee members noted that energy usage on a building by building basis would be difficult, and suggested that facility usage would be more feasible. One member suggested that legislation take into account each institution's historical energy usage as a baseline. One way to evaluate building performance is to apply LEED standards. Wright State University is looking at new LEED standards for its laboratories. With LEED, building modeling is essential; however, LEED also has a process for existing buildings as well as a monitoring element. One problem with monitoring is the lack of metering on many campuses. Jim Nargang mentioned Energy Star guidelines as an alternate method of setting goals and making comparisons. Under any scenario, energy has to be made a priority from the beginning, as there is normally a high front-end premium cost. Rather than locking institutions into rigorous building specifications, Jim suggested a goal-oriented approach to energy efficiency. In order to capture in payback the cost of escalating energy costs, campuses should be encouraged to develop an energy policy/plan, and look into the possibility of creating regional energy offices.

Energy Reporting Database

Jim Nargang raised the possibility of creating an energy reporting database that would collect data on a building by building basis. Such data could then be used to either re-commission or retro-fit buildings. Another idea would be to create a pilot in which campus data would be provided to Dr. Kissock at the University of Dayton and normalized to allow campus comparisons. Given the lack of metering, committee members were not supportive of providing funding for such projects. Jim noted that there is some interest among the Regents in setting aside some capital funds for metering. As an alternative, committee members suggested that an energy audit would be a better use of funds. Other suggested uses included re-commissioning of buildings and training. Training could be part of a matching component, as capital funds cannot be used for training. Manny noted that the Office of Energy Services has some training funds available on a first-come first-serve basis. Capital funds can be used for projects that have a lifespan greater than five years. It could be argued that re-commissioning is similar to renovation. However, it's hard to justify the payback on re-commissioning because the results are not known until after it is completed. A systems audit would provide a tangible list that could be taken to the legislature as justification for funds. A "Facilities Energy Master Plan" might be one way to present it.

Proposed Energy Investment Program
Jim proposed a program in which campuses would receive seed funds to establish a revolving operating fund for energy efficiency projects. Committee members were supportive of such a program, but felt that it would not significantly reduce deferred maintenance. Finance-related questions related to such a program would have to be directed to campus business managers; however, we would need to develop something concrete such as a position paper to present to them. A smaller fund would likely be more heavily utilized by smaller institutions. This program would likely start as a pilot at one or two institutions.

Regents Rebuild – Compression Planning
Next, Jim led the group through a series of "Compression Planning" steps as a way to focus in on the issue of moving the Regents Rebuild program forward. The overall purpose of the program is to reduce energy costs by 20% over five years. Background information included the following:

- Program started with Department of Energy Rebuild funds
- Supported at the facility management level
- State support provided by OBR and DOE
- Awareness of what can be done varies among campuses
- No additional state funds
- No dedicated staff
- No non-state resources and limited alternative financing resources
- OBR has sponsored workshops since receiving Rebuild grant

The group then brainstormed for ideas on services that OBR could provide to facility managers. The following were ranked as being highest in priority:

- Advocate for additional state capital funds for energy efficiency initiatives
- Act as an agent to express concerns to regulatory agencies on behalf of campuses
- Advocate for increasing contracting options

Next, the group shared ideas for maintaining and growing the partnership. The highest ranked ideas were as follows:

- Sponsor regional meetings and workshops
- Recognize the efforts of individual campuses
- Conduct peer group visits to non-participating institutions

To achieve this, the following key steps need to be taken:

- Develop a regional liaison / champion
- Survey campuses to determine which specific areas to focus on
- Develop a steering committee based on a cross-section of campuses
- Develop a mission statement
- Continue sponsorship of meetings/workshops

Specific tasks to be completed by OBR include nominating individuals for the steering committee via a letter to Presidents (copied to CFOs), research ways to reach out to faculty and

staff, and meet with OBR's marketing group and senior staff. Once formed, the steering committed would develop a mission statement and plan workshops.