IL-TRM Policy Issues for SAG
June 21, 2018 SAG Teleconference Meeting

The IL-TRM Administrator requested that SAG resolve several policy issues that have been raised during the IL-TRM Version 7.0 process. The policy issues relate to secondary electricity savings from reduced water use and below code baselines.

Secondary Electricity Savings from Reduced Water Use Issue

Elevate Energy prepared a memo on secondary electricity savings from reduced water use, reducing the potable water delivery and waste water treatment requirements of the system. Elevate's proposal is to add a factor to measures in the IL-TRM that save water due to these "secondary" or "systematic" savings. For example, for every gallon of water saved, Elevate's rational is there are additional savings to the system, not just the end-user.

The current proposal would allow this extra savings to be claimed to contribute towards savings goals, but would *not* be included in TRC testing, since the avoided costs of water already incorporate the system wide monetary value of reduced water use.

- **SAG Question:** Is it appropriate to claim secondary energy savings that do not go to the customer or end user?
    - Larry Kotewa (Elevate Energy) will present a brief overview of the memo, proposal and rationale to SAG.

Below Code Baseline Issues

The IL-TRM Administrator suggested three possible scenarios where a below baseline condition might be characterized in a TRM.

Scenario 1: Early Replacement Measures

Early replacement programs include claiming savings between what is existing and what is installed. There are situations where the unit being replaced is lower than existing code.

- This characterization of a below code condition is appropriate and the baseline is adjusted to a new baseline at code level after the assumed remaining useful life of the existing equipment.

Scenario 2: Assuming Time of Sale or New Construction Baseline that is Lower than Code due to Actual Installation Practices

There are select measures where actual common practices do not meet code requirements. One example is lighting controls in new construction. While occupancy controls are required by code, recent evaluation has indicated that they often are not being installed. Another example is where code requires continuous ventilation to an

occupied space, though there are certainly instances where units are operated less. Characterizing savings from RTU Advanced Controls could be higher than reality if it is always assumed that all applications offset continuous operation.

- **SAG Questions:**
  - Should the baseline always be code even if evidence suggests actual "average" practice is below code?
  - In the occupancy lighting control example, should fixture savings be based on hours of use assumptions assuming code was met (i.e. with controls) or where controls have not been installed, is it appropriate to assume higher hours of use without controls.

Scenario 3: Assuming an Efficient Condition that Doesn't Meet Code

The TAC is considering adding the advanced thermostat as a commercial measure. The savings data on advanced thermostats is for residential installation, however there are situations where these thermostats are being installed commercially. If a residential advanced thermostat is installed on a larger (>5ton) commercial piece of equipment, it will not meet code requirements relating to economizer fault detection (FDD alarm) and other control requirements. A more sophisticated controller is supposed to be installed.

- **SAG Question:** Is it appropriate to characterize a measure from the installation of an efficient measure that saves energy but that does not meet other code requirements?