

Rebuild Planning Committee

December 15, 2004

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Location:

Ohio Board of Regents Offices (Main Conference Room)
30 East Broad Street, 36th floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3414

Meeting Attendees:

Richard Petrick, Ohio Board of Regents
James Nargang, Ohio Board of Regents
Ron James, Ohio Board of Regents
Stephanie McCann, Ohio Board of Regents - HEI
Radha Venkatraman, Ohio Board of Regents – HEI
Emmanuel Anunike, Ohio Department of Development
Kirk Bond, US Department of Energy (via Conference Phone)
Michael Burrill, University of Cincinnati
Jerry Hutton, Hocking Technical College
Richard Shultz, Ohio University
Robert Haslinger, Terra State Community College
Wallace Giffen, The Ohio State University
Michael Burrill, University of Cincinnati
John Donegan, University of Toledo

Meeting Topic/Agenda:

1. Program Goals (review Draft Elements document)
2. FEDS Proposal
3. Building Operator Certification
4. Ohio Air Quality Development Authority Bonds
 - a) Support of central plant & energy efficiency projects
 - b) Opportunity to self-fund program activities
5. State-wide Sustainability Course
 - a) Use of current grant funds to support
6. Other
 - a) Sponsorship of LEED training
7. Next Meeting Date

Meeting Materials:

- FEDS (Facility Energy Decision System – 5.0) Handout (2)
Decision-Making Software for Energy Efficiency
- Michael Burrill Email (12/15) & UC Chart Handout
- Donald Scherer Email (12/13) Handout
- Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (MEEA) Handout
Building Operator Certification
- Executive Summary (DEMO-CASE1)/OA Methodology Handout

Introductions were made by everyone present.

The purpose of the meeting was to review/determine program goals, program and training opportunities and potential funding opportunities.

Much of the meetings planned agenda was not covered. The introduction of the FEDS program and a statewide database of energy information (by building) became the major focus of this meeting.

Kirk Bond: (via Phone Conferencing)

Kirk opened with an introduction to the FEDS Software Program (Facility Energy Decision System – 5.0). Began identifying institutions current energy focus as the “Where am I?” stage; however, in order to determine optimum conditions institutions should focus on “Where Can I be?”

This can be accomplished by using established data to identify the most optimum building types. The FEDS Program can provide this data/information; and become an invaluable tool for campus planning.

The FEDS Program offers:

- Series of Training Workshops
- Comprehensive Data Collection
- Informed Reporting
- What to do?/How to do it?

FEDS Program Software (Facility Energy Decision System – 5.0):

- Software is based on the collective input from federal military bases
- Interactive Software (Prompts for Corrections/Determinations)
- Software is Free (Training costs are associated with the system)

Michael Burrill:

Statewide Data Collection/Reporting – Per Individual Building

The first step would be creating a process for gathering information.

1st to measure the information and 2nd propose changes based on those findings. Meter readings are an effective way to gather energy consumption data. Building metering is a must, unless another method is determined that will provide data which is representative of the individual campus.

- Creation of Baseline Determinations
 - Beginning Data Tables (*Residence Halls, Admin/Classrooms, Libraries*)
- Database of Comparable Facilities (Apples to Apples)

If state capital funds were set-up specifically for energy savings/efficiency the statewide metering project could be implemented with more ease.

Kirk Bond:

Kirk proposed that the FEDS program could be used as an alternative to creating a metering program and implementing it. The FEDS program acts as an unbiased engineering firm. The real time information provided by metering can often be too much information to process. This information can be helpful but is usually easier to phase in at a later step.

The FEDS data will establish rules defined by the institutions and become part of the campus planning process. Data can be shared with hired engineering firms (Work Study Students) identifying current conditions. The campus will better understand the needs of their facilities and will be better able to clearly select a design firm and identify their desired outcomes/changes.

Statewide building comparisons are not always helpful and could lead to competition among the campuses.

Rebuild Planning Committee

Page 3

Meeting Minutes

December 15, 2004

John Donegan:

Making determinations regarding the adoption of the FEDS Program requires having an understanding of the program. Is it possible to preview the software and outputs to gain a better understanding of the FEDS program? In order to adopt a new system at the campus level, the programs operations, outcomes and potential cost-savings will have to be shared with other campus departments. The Business/Operational/Financial Departments are all separate from Engineering/Facilities (on larger campuses).

Regional difference factors (*i.e. climate/weather, available utilities, sources, etc*) should also be considered in the proposed “shared data collection”. Even in the comparison of “Apples to Apples”.

Kirk Bond:

- Building Assessment based on the FEDS Program
 - Materials Input (Minimal Input Required to Deliver Results)
(Fuel, Rates/Demand, Square Footage, Occupancy/Hours, Thermal Load, Climate, etc)
 - Web Demo Available (1st Review by Planning Committee)
 - 1-3 Hour On-Line Introduction to Software & Trial

Michael Burrill:

What type of data will need to be collected? Is it similar to information currently on file with HEI (Higher Education Information Systems)?

Stephanie McCann:

The information collected by HEI does not currently identify individual building functions.

There is currently no comparable data system set-up on the HEI system; however, one can be created. The first step in creating a data table would be determining what additional information would need to be collected. The request and collection of the additional data; input of data and the training of Data Reporters will take additional time and preparation.

Richard Petrick:

In order to understand more fully the pro’s and con’s of a metering project. What are current metering costs? State funding cannot be determined for the creation of a metering project without funding availability in the expected Capital Bill, which is currently on a 6 month delay.

Michael Burrill:

The current costs for meters can range from \$4,000 to \$7,000 per unit.

Summary of FEDS & Energy Database Discussion:

- Standardize units of measurement (for all participating Ohio Campuses)
 - Determine cost per standard unit of measure
- Creation of Survey/Templates (who meters/what needs to be metered/results)
 - What would it take to get “X” number of buildings to gain accurate readings for measure?
 - Keep data/program simple
 - Initial Data (Focus on a specific type of building/facility)
ex. Dormitories, Administrative, Classrooms, Libraries (any non-Lab Facilities)
- Focus on Energy Consumption at Source
- Cost Savings – based on aggregate totals of consumption (BTU & EUI)
 - Looking for the \$ per cost-savings to show the Business/Operational/Financial Departments

***Next Step from the Planning Committee relative to FEDS & energy database –**

- 1) Develop a web conference on FEDS for review by the Planning Committee members. After the web conference, follow-up with committee members to determine if FEDS is appropriate.
- 2) Develop a survey instrument to determine energy information that can be provided by each campus.
- 3) Use survey information to determine which building classifications will yield the most data.
- 4) Present decision on FEDS and survey results at next Capital Consultation.

Ohio Air Quality Development Authority Bonds

The Authority promotes energy efficiency projects; any project directly related to maintaining cleaner air is eligible for funding. Jim Nargang will pursue the possibility of the campuses getting access to these funds. A portion of the debt service can be set aside to fund program activities through OBR.

The committee discussed supporting a state-wide sustainability course. The committee members agreed that expansion of the course is a good idea. However, the committee is not interested in supporting this program with limited Rebuild funds.

The balance of the agenda was tabled and will be addressed at a future meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30pm.