Memorandum

To: Technical Advisory Committee

**FROM:** KALEE WHITEHOUSE, PROJECT MANAGER, and SAM DENT, TECHNICAL LEAD - VEIC

subject: v12.0 Errata Measures effective 01/01/2024

date: 06/05/2024

**Cc:** CELIA JOHNSON, SAG

This memo documents errata changes to Version 12.0 of the Illinois Technical Reference Manual (TRM) that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommends be made effective 01/01/2024.

VEIC has provided a summary table below showing the errata measures and a brief summary of what was changed, followed by the v11.0 measures themselves.

TRM Policy Document, Section 3.2.1, states that,

“TAC participants should notify the TAC when a TRM mistake or omission is found. If a significant mistake or omission is found in the TRM that results in an unreasonable savings estimate, the Program Administrators, Evaluators, TRM Administrator, and TAC will strive to reach consensus on a solution that will result in a reasonable savings estimate. For example, an unreasonable savings estimate may result from an error or omission in the TRM.

“In these limited cases where consensus is reached, the TRM Administrator shall inform the Evaluators to use corrected TRM algorithms and inputs to calculate energy and capacity savings, in addition to using the Commission-approved TRM algorithms and inputs to calculate savings. If the corrected TRM algorithms and inputs are stipulated for acceptance by all the parties in the Program Administrator’s savings docket, then the corrected TRM savings verification values may be used for the purpose of measuring savings toward compliance with the Program Administrator’s energy savings goals. Errors and omissions found in the TRM will be officially corrected through the annual TRM Update proceeding and will be identified as ‘Errata’.”

It is our belief and understanding that the following measures have been determined to be consensus errata by the Program Administrators, Evaluators, and the entire TAC. The term ‘errata’ is used to describe these measures, and in accordance with the TRM Policy Document, the Evaluators may use this version of the measures during evaluation of the current program year (in addition to the measures currently in Version 12.0 of the TRM).

**Summary of Errata Measures**

| **Section** | **Measure Name** | **Measure Code** | **Brief Summary of Change** | **TAC Reviewed and Approved As of** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4.1.11 | Commercial LED Grow Lights | CI-AGE-GROW-V06-240101 | Error discovered in calculation file of CFs where additional hour beyond peak period was being included. | NEW |
| 4.2.3 | Commercial Steam Cooker | CI-FSE-STMC-V08-240101 | Idle calculation needs to divide preheat time by 60 minutes per hour. | NEW |
| 4.2.18 | Rack Oven - Double Oven | CI-FSE-RKOV-V04-240101 | Fixed error in deemed savings calculation. | NEW |
| 4.2.22 | Automatic Conveyor Broiler | CI-FSE-ACBL-V02-240101 | Fixed error in preheat energy calculation. | NEW |
| 4.3.1 | Water Heater | CI-HWE-STWH-V11-240101 | Fixed error in large water heater fuel switch calculation. | NEW |
| 4.4.7 | ENERGY STAR and CEE Tier 2 Room Air Conditioner | CI-HVC-ESRA-V04-240101 | Update to ENERGY STAR and CEE Tier 2 specifications that came in to effect in October 2023. | NEW |
| 4.4.10 | High Efficiency Boiler | CI-HVC-BOIL-V12-240101 | Update to baseline after the 2023 Federal Standard update was vacated. | NEW |
| 4.4.51 | Advanced Rooftop Controls with High Rotor Pole Switch Reluctance Motors | CI-HVC-HSRM-V05-240101 | Addition of load factor and motor efficiency into the energy savings algorithm since study used is calculated on brake horsepower and not nominal horsepower. | NEW |
| 4.4.54 | Process Heating Boiler | CI-HVC-PHBO-V04-240101 | Update to baseline after the 2023 Federal Standard update was vacated. | NEW |
| 4.5.13 | Occupancy Controlled Bi-Level Lighting Fixtures | CI-LTG-OCBL-V06-240101 | Fixed CFbaseline to be 1.0 since pre condition is limited to fixtures on 8760. | NEW |
| 4.6.8 | Refrigeration Economizers | CI-RFG-ECON-V08-240101 | Fixed analysis error where condenser fan savings had not been appropriately adjusted to reflect Illinois climate. | NEW |
| 4.8.9 | High Frequency Battery Chargers | CI-MSC-BACH-V03-240101 | Fixed error in kW algorithm. | NEW |
| 4.8.25 | Warm-Mix Asphalt Chemical Additives | CI-MSC-WMIX-V02-240101 | Fixed error in SF table for Additives. | NEW |
| 5.1.2 | ENERGY STAR Clothes Washer | RS-APL-ESCL-V12-240101 | Fixed transcription error in electric v fuel DHW split for Peoples Gas unknown, and resultant all DU value. | 11/15/2023 |
| 5.1.4 | ENERGY STAR Dishwasher | RS-APL-ESDI-V10-240101 | Fixed transcription error in electric v fuel DHW split for Peoples Gas unknown, and resultant all DU value. | 11/15/2023 |
| 5.1.7 | ENERGY STAR and CEE Tier 2 Room Air Conditioner | RS-APL-ESRA-V11-240101 | Update to ENERGY STAR and CEE Tier 2 specifications that came in to effect in October 2023. | NEW |
| 5.1.12 | Ozone Laundry | RS-APL-OZNE-V07-240101 | Fixed transcription error in electric v fuel DHW split for Peoples Gas unknown, and resultant all DU value. | 11/15/2023 |
| 5.1.13 | Income Qualified: ENERGY STAR and CEE Tier 2 Room Air Conditioner | RS-APL-IQRA-V05-240101 | Update to ENERGY STAR and CEE Tier 2 specifications that came in to effect in October 2023. | NEW |
| 5.4.1 | Domestic Hot Water Pipe Insulation | RS-HWE-PINS-V08-240101 | Fixed transcription error in electric v fuel DHW split for Peoples Gas unknown, and resultant all DU value. | 11/15/2023 |
| 5.4.4 | Low Flow Faucet Aerators | RS-HWE-LFFA-V14-240101 | Fixed transcription error in electric v fuel DHW split for Peoples Gas unknown, and resultant all DU value. | 11/15/2023 |
| 5.4.5 | Low Flow Showerheads | RS-HWE-LFSH-V13-240101 | Fixed transcription error in electric v fuel DHW split for Peoples Gas unknown, and resultant all DU value. | 11/15/2023 |
| 5.4.8 | Thermostatic Restrictor Shower Valve | RS-HWE-TRVA-V09-240101 | Fixed transcription error in electric v fuel DHW split for Peoples Gas unknown, and resultant all DU value. | 11/15/2023 |
| 5.4.9 | Shower Timer | RS-DHW-SHTM-V07-240101 | Fixed transcription error in electric v fuel DHW split for Peoples Gas unknown, and resultant all DU value. | 11/15/2023 |
| 5.6.8 | High Performance Windows | RS-SHL-TTWI-V04-240101 | Fixed transcription error in savings tables for single pane windows | 11/15/2023 |

### 4.1.11 Commercial LED Grow Lights

###### Description

LED lamp technology offers reduced energy and maintenance costs when compared with conventional light sources. LED technology has a significantly longer useful life lasting 30,000 hours or more and significantly reduces maintenance costs. The savings and costs for this measure are evaluated with the replacement of HID grow lights with LED fixtures. LED lamps offer a more robust lighting source, longer lifetime, and greater electrical efficiency than conventional supplemental grow lights.

This measure is designed for other interior horticultural applications that use artificial light stimulation in an indoor conditioned space.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

LED fixtures must have a reduced wattage, be listed on the Design Lights Consortium (DLC) qualified products list,[[1]](#footnote-2) be UL Listed, have a power factor (PF) ≥0.90, a photosynthetic photon efficacy (PPE) of no less than 1.9 micromoles per joule, a minimum rated lifetime of 50,000 hours, and a minimum warranty of 5 years. If DLC PPE requirements for LED grow lighting exceeds the current requirements, the new PPE will become the efficient equipment standard.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline equipment is the industry established grow light based on the horticultural application, as detailed in the table below. HID fixtures are assumed for flowering and vegetative crops. T5 high-output fixtures are assumed for seedling and microgreen crops.

| **Crop Type** | **Baseline Technology Type** | **Baseline PPE (μmol/J)[[2]](#footnote-3)** | **Baseline Fixture Wattage[[3]](#footnote-4)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Flowering Crops (Tomatoes and Peppers) | High Pressure Sodium | 1.7 | 1,100 W |
| Vegetative Growth | Metal Halide | 1.25[[4]](#footnote-5) | 640 W |
| Microgreens[[5]](#footnote-6) | T5 HO Fixture | 1.0[[6]](#footnote-7) | 358 W |
| Propagation[[7]](#footnote-8) | T5 HO Fixture | 1.0[[8]](#footnote-9) | 234 W |
| Medical Cannabis – Flowering Stage | High Pressure Sodium | 1.7 | 1,100 W |
| Medical Cannabis – Vegetative Stage | Metal Halide | 1.25[[9]](#footnote-10) | 640 W |
| Medical Cannabis – Cloning, Seeding, and Propagation | T5 HO Fixture | 1.0[[10]](#footnote-11) | 234W |
| Recreational Cannabis – Flowering Stage | HID/LED/Other | 2.2[[11]](#footnote-12) | 850 W[[12]](#footnote-13) |
| Recreational Cannabis – Vegetative Stage | HID/LED/Other | 2.213 | 640 W |
| Recreational Cannabis – Cloning, Seeding, and Propagation | T5/LED/Other | 2.213 | 234 W |

Recreational cannabis cultivation facilities have a separate equipment definition due to Illinois legislation.[[13]](#footnote-14) See cannabis cultivation code from “Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act,” Illinois HB 1438:

*“The Lighting Power Densities (LPD) for cultivation space commits to not exceed an average of 36 watts per gross square foot of active and growing space canopy, or all installed lighting technology shall meet a photosynthetic photon efficacy (PPE) of no less than 2.2 micromoles per joule fixture and shall be featured on the Design Lights Consortium (DLC) Horticultural Specification Qualified Products List (QPL).”*

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is 9.5 years (average rated life of 50,000 hours).[[14]](#footnote-15)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

LED Fixture Costs:[[15]](#footnote-16)

≤ 250 Watts = $ 325.87 per fixture

> 250 Watts = $ 535.04 per fixture

###### Loadshape

Loadshape C65 – Non-Residential Indoor Agriculture Vegetative Room

Loadshape C66 – Non-Residential Indoor Agriculture Flowering Room

###### Coincidence Factor

Summer coincidence factor for vegetative rooms = 0.95

Summer coincidence factor for flowering rooms = 0.76

Algorithm

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

PPF Equivalence Method:

Where:

PPFTotal,i = Total Photosynthetically-active Photon Flux output of the installed efficient fixtures for a specific growth phase, i in units of µmol/s. Equal to the number of fixtures installed multiplied by the PPF output per fixture.

PPEBL,i = Photosynthetically-active Photon Flux Efficiency of the assumed baseline fixture for a specific growth phase, i in units of µmol/J. Can be found in the table above.

PPFFixture,i = The Photosynthetically-active Photon Flux output of an individual fixture installed for a specific growth phase, i in units of µmol/s.[[16]](#footnote-17)

Qtyi = The installed quantity of efficient fixtures.

i = An indicator used to separate growth phases of products or different plants. “i” can be used to separate “Flowering” and “Vegetative”, or different crop types, such as “Flowering Crops (tomatoes and peppers)” and “Microgreens”.

1000 = Watts to kilowatts conversion factor

kWee,i = Total power of the installed fixtures for a specific growth phase, i.

Hours = Annual operating hours. See table below for typical hours of operation breakdown by crop type.

| **Crop Types** | **Hours of Operation per Day[[17]](#footnote-18)** | **Annual Hours of Operation[[18]](#footnote-19)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Flowering Crops (Tomatoes/Peppers) | 12 | 4,200 |
| Vegetative/Propagation Growth | 18 | 6,300 |
| Microgreens | 18 | 6,300 |
| Medical Cannabis – Flower Stage | 12 | 4,200 |
| Recreational Cannabis – Flowering Stage | 12 | 4,200 |

WHFe = 1.21[[19]](#footnote-20) if cooling or unknown or 1.00 if none; waste heat factor for energy to account for cooling savings from efficient lighting in cooled buildings.

|  |
| --- |
| **For example,** a recreational cannabis growth facility is installing 100 efficient LED fixtures in their flowering spaces. Using the manufacturer and model number, the DLC Qualified Products List for horiculture lighting lists these fixtures as consuming 529W and having a Photosynthetic Photon Efficiency (PPE) of 3.3 µmol/J and producing 1,722 µmol/s. One hundred (100) fixtures at 529W each is a total lighting power of 52.9 kW. The baseline PPE is 2.2 µmol/J, as dictated by IL HB 1438. The total flux output and annual energy savings calculations are shown below.  = 172,200 µmol/s  = 128,944 kWh |

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

Where:

WHFd = 1.22 if cooling or 1.00 if none; waste heat factor for demand to account for cooling savings from efficient lighting in cooled buildings.

CF = 0.95 for vegetative crops and flowering crops

|  |
| --- |
| **For example,** a recreational cannabis growth facility is installing 100 efficient LED fixtures in their flowering spaces. Using the manufacturer and model number, the DLC Qualified Products List for horiculture lighting lists these fixtures as consuming 529W and having a Photosynthetic Photon Efficiency (PPE) of 3.3 µmol/J and producing 1,722 µmol/s. One hundred (100) fixtures at 529W each is a total lighting power of 52.9 kW. The baseline PPE is 2.2 µmol/J, as dictated by IL HB 1438. The total flux output and peak demand savings calculations are shown below.  = 172,200 µmol/s  = 29.41 kW |

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

N/A

###### Water and Other Non-Energy Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

Any costs associated with moving the LED lighting fixture to different heights throughout the different growing phases should also be included as an O&M consideration.

###### Measure Code: CI-AGE-GROW-V06-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2024

### 4.2.3 Commercial Steam Cooker

###### Description

To qualify for this measure the installed equipment must be an ENERGY STAR® steamer in place of a standard steamer in a commercial kitchen. Savings are presented dependent on the pan capacity and corresponding idle rate at heavy load cooking capacity and if the steamer is gas or electric.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To qualify for this measure the installed equipment must be as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Gas** | **Electric** |
| ENERGY STAR® qualified with 38% minimum cooking energy efficiency at heavy load (potato) cooking capacity for gas steam cookers. | ENERGY STAR® qualified with 50% minimum cooking energy efficiency at heavy load (potato) cooking capacity for electric steam cookers. |

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline condition is assumed to be a non-ENERGY STAR® commercial steamer at end of life. It is assumed that the efficient equipment and baseline equipment have the same number of pans.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 12 years.[[20]](#footnote-21)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The incremental capital cost for this measure uses actual costs, otherwise use costs outlined below:[[21]](#footnote-22)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Equipment Type** | **Baseline Equipment Cost** | **Efficient Equipment Cost** | **Incremental Cost** |
| Electric | $5,444 | $8,201 | $2,758 |
| Gas | $10,265 | $12,324 | $2,059 |

###### Loadshape

Loadshape C01 – Commercial Electric Cooking

###### Coincidence Factor

Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for measure is provided below for different building type:[[22]](#footnote-23)

| **Location** | **CF**  **CF** |
| --- | --- |
| Fast Food Limited Menu | 0.32 |
| Fast Food Expanded Menu | 0.41 |
| Pizza | 0.46 |
| Full Service Limited Menu | 0.51 |
| Full Service Expanded Menu | 0.36 |
| Cafeteria | 0.39 |
| Unknown | 0.408 |

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

Formulas below are applicable to both gas and electric steam cookers. Please use appropriate lookup values and identified flags.

###### Energy Savings and Fossil Fuel Savings

Non Fuel Switch Measures

The algorithm below applies to ENERGY STAR electric steam cooker compared to baseline electric steam cooker:

ΔkWh = (Δidle Energy + Δpreheat Energy + Δcooking Energy) \* Days

The algorithm below applies to ENERGY STAR gas steam cooker compared to baseline gas steam cooker:

Δtherms = (Δidle Energy + Δpreheat Energy + Δcooking Energy) \* 1/100,000 \* Days

Fuel Switch/Electrification Measures

Fuel switch / electrification measures must produce positive total energy savings (i.e., reduction in Btus at the premises) in order to qualify. This is determined as follows:

SiteEnergySavings (MMBTUs) = [GasConsumptionReplaced] – [ElectricConsumptionAdded]

= [(Idle EnergyGasBase + Preheat EnergyGasBase + Cooking EnergyGasBase) \* 1/1,000,000 \* Days] –

[(Idle EnergyElecEE + Preheat EnergyElecEE + Cooking EnergyElecEE) \* 3412/1,000,000 \* Days]

If SiteEnergySavings calculated above is positive, the measure is eligible.

The appropriate savings claim is dependent on which utilities are supporting the measure as provided in a table below:

| **Measure supported by:** | **Electric Utility claims (kWh):** | **Gas Utility claims (therms):** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Electric utility only | SiteEnergySavings \* 1,000,000/3,412 | N/A |
| Electric and gas utility  (Note utilities may make alternative agreements to how savings are allocated as long as total MMBtu savings remains the same). | %IncentiveElectric \* SiteEnergySavings \*  1,000,000/3,412 | %IncentiveGas \* SiteEnergySavings \* 10 |
| Gas utility only | N/A | SiteEnergySavings \* 10 |

Where:

ΔIdle Energy = ((((1- CSM%Baseline)\* IDLEBASE + CSM%Baseline \* PCBASE \* EFOOD / EFFBASE) \* (HOURSday – (F / PCBase) – ( PREnumber \*PRETimeBase / 60))) - (((1- CSM%ENERGYSTAR) \* IDLEENERGYSTAR + CSM%ENERGYSTAR \* PCENERGYSTAR \* EFOOD / EFFENERGYSTAR) \* (HOURSDay - (F l/ PCENERGYSTAR ) - (PREnumber \* PRETimeEE / 60))))

ΔPreheat Energy = (PREnumber \*(PREheatEnergyBase - PREheatEnergyEE)

ΔCooking Energy = ((1/ EFFBASE) - (1/ EFFENERGY STAR)) \* F \* EFOOD

Idle EnergyGasBase = ((((1- CSM%Baseline)\* IDLEBASE + CSM%Baseline \* PCBASE \* EFOOD / EFFBASE) \* (HOURSday - (F / PCBase) - ( PREnumber \*PRETimeGasBase/60)))

Preheat EnergyGasBase = (PREnumber \* PreheatEnergyGasBase)

Cooking EnergyGasBase = (1/ EFFBASE) \* F \* EFOOD

Idle EnergyElecEE = (((1- CSM%ENERGYSTAR) \* IDLEENERGYSTAR + CSM%ENERGYSTAR \* PCENERGY \* EFOOD / EFFENERGYSTAR) \* (HOURSDay - (F / PCENERGYSTAR ) - (PREnumber \* PRETimeElecEE/60))))

Preheat EnergyElecEE = (PREnumber \* PreheatEnergyElecEE)

Cooking EnergyElecEE = (1/ EFFENERGY STAR) \* F \* EFOOD

Where:

CSM%Baseline = Baseline Steamer Time in Manual Steam Mode (% of time)

= 90%[[23]](#footnote-24)

IDLEBase = Idle Energy Rate of Base Steamer[[24]](#footnote-25)

| **Number of Pans** | **IDLEBASE - Gas,**  **Btu/hr** | **IDLEBASE - Electric, kw** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 11,000 | 1.0 |
| 4 | 14,667 | 1.33 |
| 5 | 18,333 | 1.67 |
| 6 | 22,000 | 2.0 |
| 10 | 18,000 | 1.2 |

PCBase = Production Capacity of Base Steamer[[25]](#footnote-26)

| **Number of Pans** | **PCBASE, gas (lbs/hr)** | **PCBASE, electric (lbs/hr)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 65 | 70 |
| 4 | 87 | 93 |
| 5 | 108 | 117 |
| 6 | 130 | 140 |
| 10 | 233 | 233 |

EFOOD= Amount of Energy Absorbed by the food during cooking known as ASTM Energy to Food (Btu/lb or kW/lb)

=105 Btu/lb (gas steamers) or 0.0308 (electric steamers) [[26]](#footnote-27)

EFFBASE =Heavy Load Cooking Efficiency for Base Steamer

=15% (gas steamers) or 26% (electric steamers) [[27]](#footnote-28)

HOURSday  = Average Daily Operation (hours)

| **Type of Food Service** | **Hoursday[[28]](#footnote-29)** |
| --- | --- |
| Fast Food, limited menu | 4 |
| Fast Food, expanded menu | 5 |
| Pizza | 8 |
| Full Service, limited menu | 8 |
| Full Service, expanded menu | 7 |
| Cafeteria | 6 |
| Unknown | 6[[29]](#footnote-30) |
| Custom | Varies |

F = Food cooked per day (lbs/day)

= custom or if unknown, use 100 lbs/day[[30]](#footnote-31)

CSM%ENERGYSTAR = ENERGY STAR Steamer's Time in Manual Steam Mode (% of time)[[31]](#footnote-32)

= 0%

IDLEENERGYSTAR = Idle Energy Rate of ENERGY STAR®[[32]](#footnote-33)

=Actual, or

| **Number of Pans** | **IDLEENERGY STAR – gas, (Btu/hr)** | **IDLEENERGY STAR – electric, (kW)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 6,250 | 0.40 |
| 4 | 8,333 | 0.53 |
| 5 | 10,417 | 0.67 |
| 6 | 12,500 | 0.80 |
| 10 | 12,500 | 0.80 |

PCENERGYSTAR = Production Capacity of ENERGY STAR® Steamer[[33]](#footnote-34)

=Actual, or

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of Pans** | **PCENERGY - gas(lbs/hr)** | **PCENERGY – electric (lbs/hr)** |
| 3 | 55 | 50 |
| 4 | 73 | 67 |
| 5 | 92 | 83 |
| 6 | 110 | 100 |
| 10 | 200 | 167 |

EFFENERGYSTAR = Heavy Load Cooking Efficiency for ENERGY STAR® Steamer(%)

=Actual, or 38% (gas steamer) or 50% (electric steamer) [[34]](#footnote-35)

PREnumber = Number of preheats per day

=1[[35]](#footnote-36) (if unknown, use 1)

PREheatEnergyBase = Energy per preheat of Base Steamer[[36]](#footnote-37)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Equipment Type** | **Preheat Energy** |
| Electric | 1.78 kWh |
| Gas | 18,832.7 Btu |

PREheatEnergyEE = Energy per preheat of ENERGY STAR Steamer[[37]](#footnote-38)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Equipment Type** | **Preheat Energy** |
| Electric | 1.67 kWh |
| Gas | 10,293.9 Btu |

PRETimeBase =Preheat duration of Base Steamer[[38]](#footnote-39)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Equipment Type** | **Preheat Time (minutes)** |
| Electric | 11.9 |
| Gas | 10.9 |

PRETimeEE = Preheat duration of ENERGY STAR Steamer[[39]](#footnote-40)

| **Equipment Type** | **Preheat Time (minutes)** |
| --- | --- |
| Electric | 13.2 |
| Gas | 13.4 |

EFFBASE =Heavy Load Cooking Efficiency for Base Steamer

=15% (gas steamer) or 26% (electric steamer) [[40]](#footnote-41)

EFFENERGYSTAR =Heavy Load Cooking Efficiency for ENERGY STAR® Steamer

=Actual, or 38% (gas steamer) or 50% (electric steamer) [[41]](#footnote-42)

F = Food cooked per day (lbs/day)

= custom or if unknown, use 100 lbs/day[[42]](#footnote-43)

EFOOD = Amount of Energy Absorbed by the food during cooking known as ASTM Energy to Food[[43]](#footnote-44)

| **EFOOD - gas(Btu/lb)** | **EFOOD (kWh/lb)** |
| --- | --- |
| 105[[44]](#footnote-45) | 0.0308[[45]](#footnote-46) |

Days = days/yr steamer operating (use 365.25 days/yr if heavy use restaurant and exact number unknown)

**For example**, for an ENERGY STAR gas steam cooker compared to baseline gas cooker: A 3 pan steamer in a full service restaurant

ΔSavings = (ΔIdle Energy + ΔPreheat Energy + ΔCooking Energy) \* Days \* 1/100.000

ΔIdle Energy = ((((1- 0.9)\* 11000 + 0.9 \* 65 \* 105 /0.15 )\*(7 - (100 / 65)-(1\*10.9/60))) - (((1-0) \* 6250 + 0 \* 55 \* 105 / 0.38) \* (7 - (100 / 55) - (1\*13.4/60))))

= 191,028

ΔPreheat Energy = (1 \*(18,832.7-10,293.9)

= 8,539

ΔCooking Energy = (((1/ 0.15) - (1/ 0.38)) \* (100 lb/day \* 105 btu/lb)))

= 42368

ΔTherms = (191,028 + 8,539 + 42368) \* 365.25 \*1/100,000

= 884 therms

For an ENERGY STAR electric steam cooker compared to baseline electric cooker: A 3 pan steamer in a cafeteria:

ΔSavings = (ΔIdle Energy + ΔPreheat Energy + ΔCooking Energy) \* Days

ΔIdle Energy = ((((1- .9)\* 1.0 + .9 \* 70 \* 0.0308 /0.26 )\*(6 - (100 / 70)-(1\*11.9/60))) - (((1-0) \* 0.4 + 0 \* 50 \* 0.0308 / 0.50) \* (6 - (100 / 50) - (1\*13.2/60))))

= 31.6

ΔPreheat Energy = (1 \*(1.78 - 1.67 ))

= 0.1

ΔCooking Energy = (((1/ 0.26) - (1/ 0.5)) \* (100 \* 0.0308)))

= 5.7

ΔkWh = (31.6 + 0.1 + 5.7) \* 365.25 days

= 13,660 kWh

For an ENERGY STAR electric steam cooker compared to baseline gas cooker: A 3 pan steamer in a cafeteria:

SiteEnergySavings (MMBTUs) = [GasConsumptionReplaced] – [ElectricConsumptionAdded]

= [(Idle EnergyGasBase + Preheat EnergyGasBase + Cooking EnergyGasBase) \* 1/1,000,000 \* Days] –

[(Idle EnergyElecEE + Preheat EnergyElecEE + Cooking EnergyElecEE) \* 3412/1,000,000 \* Days]

Idle EnergyGasBase = ((((1- 0.9)\* 11000 + 0.9 \* 65 \* 105 /0.15 )\*(6 - (100 / 65)-(1\*10.9/60)))

= 187,432 Btu

Preheat EnergyGasBase = (1 \* 18,832)

= 18,832 Btu

Cooking EnergyGasBase = (1/ 0.15) \* (100 lb/day \* 105 btu/lb)

= 70,000

Idle EnergyElecEE = (((1-0) \* 0.4 + 0 \* 50 \* 0.0308 / 0.50) \* (6 - (100 / 50) - (1\*13.2/60))))

= 1.5 kWh

Preheat EnergyElecEE = (1 \* 1.67)

= 1.67 kWh

Cooking EnergyElecEE = (1/ 0.5) \* (100 \* 0.0308)

= 6.16

SiteEnergySavings (MMBTUs) = [(187,432 + 18,832 + 70,000) \* 1/1,000,000 \* 365.25] – [(1.5 + 1.67 + 6.16) \* 3412/1,000,000 \* 365.25]

= 89.3 MMBtu

If supported by an electric utility: ΔkWh = ΔSiteEnergySavings \* 1,000,000 / 3,412

= 89.3 \* 1,000,000/3412

= 26,172kWh

Secondary kWh Savings for Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment

The following savings should be included in the total savings for this measure, but should not be included in TRC tests to avoid double counting the economic benefit of water savings.

ΔkWhwater = ΔWater (gallons) / 1,000,000 \* Ewater supply

Where

Ewater supply = IL Supply Energy Factor (kWh/Million Gallons)

=2,571[[46]](#footnote-47)

**For example**, an electric 3 pan steamer with average efficiency in a full service – expanded menu restaurant

ΔWater (gallons) = (40 - 10) \* 7 \* 365.25

= 76,703 gallons

ΔkWhwater = 76,703/1,000,000\*2,571

= 197 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

This is only applicable to the electric steam cooker.

Non-fuel switch measures:

ΔkW = ((ΔIdle Energy + ΔPreheat Energy + ΔCooking Energy) /HOURSDay) \* CF

ΔkW = - ((Idle EnergyElecEE + Preheat EnergyElecEE + Cooking EnergyElecEE) /HOURSDay) \* CF

Where:

CF =Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for measure is provided below for different locations:[[47]](#footnote-48)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Location** | **CF**  **CF** |
| Fast Food Limited Menu | 0.32 |
| Fast Food Expanded Menu | 0.41 |
| Pizza | 0.46 |
| Full Service Limited Menu | 0.51 |
| Full Service Expanded Menu | 0.36 |
| Cafeteria | 0.39 |

Other values as defined above

**For example**, for 3 pan electric steam cooker located in a cafeteria:

ΔkW = ((ΔIdle Energy + ΔPreheat Energy + ΔCooking Energy )/(HOURSDay \* Days)) \* CF

= ((31.18 + 0.5 + 5.69)/6) \* 0.39

= 2.43 kW

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

Calculation provided together with Electric Energy Savings above.

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

This is applicable to both gas and electric steam cookers.

ΔWater (gallons) = (WBASE -WENERGYSTAR®)\*HOURSDay \* Days

Where

WBASE = Water Consumption Rate of Base Steamer (gal/hr)

= 40[[48]](#footnote-49)

WENERGYSTAR = Water Consumption Rate of ENERGY STAR® Steamer look up[[49]](#footnote-50)

=Actual, or

| **Equipment Type** | **gal/hr** |
| --- | --- |
| Boilerless | 1.69 |
| Steam Generation | 6.6 |

**For example**, a boilerless electric 3 pan steamer with in a full service restaurant

ΔWater (gallons) = (40 -1.69) \* 7 \* 365.25

= 97,949 gallons

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Cost Effectiveness Screening and Load Reduction Forecasting when Fuel Switching

This measure can involve fuel switching from fossil fuel to electric.

For the purposes of forecasting load reductions due to fuel switch projects per Section 16-111.5B, changes in site energy use at the customer’s meter (using ΔkWh algorithm below), customer switching estimates, NTG, and any other adjustment factors deemed appropriate, should be used.

The inputs to cost effectiveness screening should reflect the actual impacts on the electric and fuel consumption at the customer meter and, for fuel switching measures, should therefore reflect the decrease in one fuel and increase in another, as opposed to the single savings value calculated in the “Electric and Fossil Fuel Energy Savings” section above. Therefore in addition to the calculation of savings claimed, the following values should be used to assess the cost effectiveness of the measure.

ΔTherms = [Gas Cooking Consumption Replaced]

= [(Idle EnergyGasBase + Preheat EnergyGasBase + Cooking EnergyGasBase) \* 1/100,000 \* Days]

ΔkWh = [Electric Cooking Consumption Added]

= - [(Idle EnergyElecEE + Preheat EnergyElecEE + Cooking EnergyElecEE) \* Days]

###### Measure Code: CI-FSE-STMC-V08-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2028

### 4.2.18 Rack Oven - Double Oven

###### Description

This measure applies to natural gas fired high efficiency rack oven - double oven installed in a commercial kitchen.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To qualify for this measure the installed equipment must be a new natural gas rack oven - double oven with a baking efficiency ≥ 56%.[[50]](#footnote-51)

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline equipment is an existing natural gas rack oven – double oven with a baking efficiency <51%.[[51]](#footnote-52)

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 12 years.[[52]](#footnote-53)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The incremental capital cost for this measure is $3,000.[[53]](#footnote-54)

###### Loadshape

N/A

###### Coincidence Factor

N/A

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

N/A

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

N/A

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

Custom calculation below, otherwise use deemed value of 585 therms based on default values.[[54]](#footnote-55)

Where[[55]](#footnote-56):

DailyPreheats = Number of preheats per day

= Custom; or if unknown, 1

PreheatEnergyEE = Preheat energy of energy efficient rack oven – double oven

= Custom; or if unknown 65,758 Btu

PreheatEnergyBase = Preheat energy of baseline rack oven – double oven

= Custom; or if unknown 90,009 Btu

IdleRateEE =Idle rate of energy efficient rack oven – double oven

=Custom; or if unknown, 24,600 Btu/hr

IdleRateBase =Idle rate of baseline rack oven – double oven

=Custom; or if unknown, 36,909 Btu/hr

LB = Pounds of food cooked per day

= Custom; or if unknown, 1,200 lb/day

PCEE = Production capacity of energy efficient rack oven – double oven

= Custom; or if unknown, 279 lbs/hour

PCBase = Production capacity of baseline rack oven – double oven

= Custom; or if unknown, 272 lbs/hour

PreheatTime = Length of a single preheat

= Custom; or if unknown, 20 minutes

60 = Conversion of minutes to hour

EFOOD = ASTM energy to food ratio, the energy absorbed by food during cooking

= 235 Btu/lb

EffEE = Cooking efficiency of energy efficient rack oven – double oven

= Custom; or if unknown, use 56%

EffBase = Cooking efficiency of baseline rack oven – double oven

= Custom; or if unknown, 51%

Hours = Average daily hours of operation

= Custom; or if unknown, use 12 hours[[56]](#footnote-57)

100,000 = Btu to therms conversion factor

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code CI-FSE-RKOV-V04-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2028

### 4.2.22 Automatic Conveyor Broiler

###### Description

This measure applies to natural gas fired energy efficient automatic conveyor broiler installed in a commercial kitchen. Conveyor broilers are one of the most energy intensive appliances in a commercial kitchen and energy efficient automatic conveyor broilers have potential to save energy while providing similar capacities and reducing the heat load in a kitchen[[57]](#footnote-58).

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To be eligible for rebates, the energy efficient natural gas fired automatic conveyor broiler must have a catalyst and an input rate less than 80 kBtu/hr or a dual stage or modulating valve with a capability of throttling the input rate below 80 kBtu/hr[[58]](#footnote-59).

Natural gas fired energy efficient automatic conveyor broilers equipped with electric bun grills and/or electric heating/warming elements are eligible for electric energy savings.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The base case is defined as natural gas fired automatic conveyor broiler capable of maintaining a temperature above 600⁰F and an idle rate greater than the energy efficient replacement.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 12 years[[59]](#footnote-60).

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The incremental capital cost varies based on the conveyor width[[60]](#footnote-61):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Conveyor Width (in)** | **IMC** |
| 18in | $2,523 |
| 26in | $3,146 |
| 30in | $3,659 |

###### Loadshape

N/A

###### Coincidence Factor

Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for measure is 0.90[[61]](#footnote-62).

Algorithm

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

Natural gas fired energy efficient automatic conveyor broilers equipped with electric bun grills and/or electric heating/warming elements are eligible for electric energy savings.

ΔkWh = kWHbase – kWheff

kWh = ElectricalIDLE(kW)\*HoursDAY \*Days

Where:

ElectricalIDLE(kW) = Electrical Idle Energy Rate. See table below[[62]](#footnote-63). If known, use actual.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Conveyor Width (in)** | **Baseline Idle Energy Rate (kW)** | **EE Idle Energy Rate (kW)** |
| <20in | 1.84 | 0.20 |
| 20in -26in | 1.35 | 0.37 |
| >26in | 4.80 | 1.15 |

HoursDAY = Daily Operating Hours. See table below. If known, use actual.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Location** | **HoursDAY** |
| Smaller restaurants;  2nd broiler in 24-hr restaurant | 8 hours[[63]](#footnote-64) |
| 24 hour restaurant | 23 hours[[64]](#footnote-65) |

Days = Days per year of operation

= Actual, default =

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Location** | **Days** |
| Smaller restaurants;  2nd broiler in 24-hr restaurant | 312 days[[65]](#footnote-66) |
| 24 hour restaurant | 363 days[[66]](#footnote-67) |

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = ΔkWh/ AnnualHours \* CF

Where:

ΔkWh = Annual kWh savings from measure as calculated above.

AnnualHours = HoursDAY \* Days

= Actual. If unknown, use values listed above.

CF = Summer Peak Coincidence Factor

= 0.90

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

∆Therms = ΔIdle Energy + ΔPreheat Energy + ΔCooking Energy

ΔIdle Energy = (Idle EnergyBase - Idle EnergyEE)/100,000

Idle EnergyBase = (HoursDAY – (LB/PCBase) – (PRETimeBase/60))\* IDLEBase

Idle EnergyEE = (HoursDAY – (LB/PCEE) – (PRETimeEE/60))\* IDLEEE

Where:

LB = pounds of food cooked per day (lb/day)

PC = Production capacity (lbs/hr)

PRETIME = Preheat time (min/day)

IDLE = Idle energy rate (Btu/hr)

*If known, use actual values, otherwise see table below:[[67]](#footnote-68)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Conveyor Width (in)** | **LB**  **(lb/day)** | | **PC**  **(Lbs/hr)** | | **PreTIME**  **(Min)** | | **IDLE**  **(Btu/hr)** | |
| **Base** | **EE** | **Base** | **EE** | **Base** | **EE** | **Base** | **EE** |
| <20in | 75 | | 29 | 21 | 10 | 29 | 54,500 | 28,000 |
| 20in - 26in | 150 | | 48 | 42 | 8 | 16 | 78,120 | 47,960 |
| >26in | 110 | | 90 | 86 | 22 | 12 | 104,000 | 57,000 |

∆Preheat Energy = (PREENERGYBase - PREENERGYEff)/100,000

Where:

PREENERGY = Preheat energy (Btu)

∆Cooking Energy = (Cooking Energybase- Cooking EnergyEff)/100,000

Cooking Energybase = (LB/PCBase) \* CookingRateBase

Cooking EnergyEE = (LB/PCEE) \* CookingRateEE

CookingRateBase = Baseline Cooking energy rate (Btu/hr)

CookingRateEE = Efficient Cooking energy rate (Btu/hr)

*If known, use actual values, otherwise see table below:[[68]](#footnote-69)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Conveyor Width (in)** | **PreENERGY (Btu)** | | **CookingRate (Btu/hr)** | |
| **Base** | **EE** | **Base** | **EE** |
| <20in | 11,500 | 13,500 | 55,000 | 28,500 |
| 20in - 26in | 14,130 | 14,214 | 78,240 | 50,938 |
| >26in | 42,500 | 13,500 | 111,210 | 67,117 |

###### Water and Other Non-Energy Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: CI-FSE-ACBL-V02-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2026

### 4.3.1 Water Heater

###### Description

This measure is for upgrading from minimum code to a high efficiency water heater. Storage water heaters are used to supply hot water for a variety of commercial building types. Storage capacities vary greatly depending on the application. Large consumers of hot water include (but not limited to) industries, hotels/motels and restaurants.

Tankless water heaters function similar to standard hot water heaters except they do not have a storage tank. When there is a call for hot water, the water is heated instantaneously as it passes through the heating element and then proceeds to the user or appliance calling for hot water. Tankless water heaters achieve savings by eliminating the standby losses that occur in stand-alone or tank-type water heaters and by being more efficient than the baseline storage hot water heater.

Heat pump water heaters use electricity to move heat from one place to another instead of generating heat directly and can allow for additional energy savings. Savings are presented dependent on the heating system installed in the home due to the impact of the heat pump water heater on the heating loads.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS, NC. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

The minimum specifications of the high efficiency equipment should be defined by the programs.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

Time of Sale: The baseline condition is assumed to be a new standard water heater of same type as the existing unit being replaced, meeting the Federal Standard for ≤75,000 Btuh units and IECC 2021 for all others. If existing type is unknown, assume same water heater type as the efficient unit.

For Residential-sized >55 gallon HPWH tanks, the baseline should assume the same capacity and use the appropriate standard listed below, unless it can be confirmed that the existing tank being replaced was <55 gallon (and the larger tank is only being used to achieve greater efficiency of the heat pump cycle and prevent the unit from going in to resistance mode), in which case the existing unit capacity and the <55 gallon algorithms should be used.

New Construction: The baseline condition is a new standard water heater of the same type as the efficient, meeting the IECC code level in place at the time the building permit was issued. As code requirements and adoption can differ from municipality to municipality, the user should verify which version of code is applicable given these constraints. Note, IECC 2021 is expected to become effective statewide in 2023. IECC 2018 is the requisite code for any projects with permitting dates spanning July 1, 2019 to the IECC 2021 effective date. Prior to July 1, 2019, IECC 2015 is the applicable code.

Note the same draw pattern (very small, low, medium and high draw) should be used for both baseline and efficient units. Definitions of draw pattern are provided below.

| **Equipment Type** | **Sub Category** | **Draw Pattern** | **Federal Standard – Uniform Energy Factor[[69]](#footnote-70)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Residential  Gas Storage Water Heaters  ≤75,000 Btu/h | ≤55 gallon tanks | Very small | UEF = 0.3456 – (0.0020 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Low | UEF = 0.5982 – (0.0019 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Medium | UEF = 0.6483 – (0.0017 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| High | UEF = 0.6920 – (0.0013 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| >55 gallon and ≤100 gallon tanks | Very small | UEF = 0.6470 – (0.0006 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Low | UEF = 0.7689 – (0.0005 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Medium | UEF = 0.7897 – (0.0004 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| High | UEF = 0.8072 – (0.0003 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Residential-duty Commercial High Capacity Storage Gas-Fired Storage Water Heaters > 75,000 Btu/h | ≤120 gallon tanks | Very small | UEF = 0.2674 – (0.0009 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Low | UEF = 0.5362 – (0.0012 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Medium | UEF = 0.6002 – (0.0011 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| High | UEF = 0.6597 – (0.0009 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Commercial Gas Storage Water Heaters  >75,000 Btu/h and ≤155,000 Btu/h | >120 gallon tanks | All | 80% Ethermal,  Standby Losses = (Q /800 + 110√Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Commercial Gas Storage Water Heaters  >155,000 Btu/h |  |
| Residential Gas Instantaneous Water Heaters  ≤ 200,000 Btu/h | ≤2 gal | Very low | UEF = 0.80 |
| All other | UEF = 0.81 |
| Commercial Gas Instantaneous Water Heaters  > 200,000 Btu/h | <10 gal | All | 80% Ethermal |
| ≥10 gal | All | 80% Ethermal |
| Residential Electric Storage Water Heaters  ≤ 75,000 Btu/h | ≤55 gallon tanks | Very small | UEF = 0.8808 – (0.0008 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Low | UEF = 0.9254 – (0.0003 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Medium | UEF = 0.9307 – (0.0002 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| High | UEF = 0.9349 – (0.0001 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| >55 gallon and ≤120 gallon tanks [[70]](#footnote-71) | Very small | UEF = 1.9236 – (0.0011 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Low | UEF = 2.0440 – (0.0011 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Medium | UEF = 2.1171 – (0.0011 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| High | UEF = 2.2418 – (0.0011 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Residential Electric Instantaneous Water Heaters | ≤12kW and ≤2 gal | All other | UEF = 0.91 |
| High | UEF = 0.92 |
| Residential-duty Commercial  Electric Instantaneous Water Heaters | > 12kW and ≤58.6 kW and ≤2 gal | All | UEF = 0.80 |

Residential-duty Commercial Water Heaters meet the following criteria:

* Is not designed to provide outlet hot water at temperatures greater than 180 °F; and
* If electric, must use a single-phase external power supply; and
* Gas-fired Storage Water Heater with a rated input no greater than 105 kBtu/h and a DOE Rated Storage volume no greater than 120 gallons.
* Electric Instantaneous with a rated input no greater than 58.6 kW and a DOE Rated Storage volume no greater than 2 gallons.

Draw patterns are based on first hour rating (gallons) for storage tanks and maximum flow (GPM) for instantaneous as shown below:[[71]](#footnote-72)

| **Storage Water Heater Draw Pattern** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Draw Pattern** | **First Hour Rating (gallons)** |
| Very Small | ≥ 0 and < 18 |
| Low | ≥ 18 and < 51 |
| Medium | ≥ 51 and < 75 |
| High | ≥ 75 |

| **Instantaneous Water Heater Draw Pattern** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Draw Pattern** | **Max GPM** |
| Very Small | ≥ 0 and < 1.7 |
| Low | ≥ 1.7 and < 2.8 |
| Medium | ≥ 2.8 and < 4 |
| High | ≥ 4 |

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 15 years for storage[[72]](#footnote-73) and heat pump units[[73]](#footnote-74), 5 years for electric tankless,[[74]](#footnote-75) and 20 years for gas tankless.[[75]](#footnote-76)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The full install cost and incremental cost assumptions are provided below. Actual costs should be used where available:

Gas storage water heaters:[[76]](#footnote-77)

| **Equipment Type** | **Category** | **Install Cost** | **Incremental Cost** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gas Storage Water Heaters ≤ 75,000 Btu/h, ≤55 Gallons | Baseline | $616 | N/A |
| Efficient | $1,055 | $440 |
| Gas Storage Water Heaters > 75,000 Btu/h | 0.80 Et | $4,886 | N/A |
| 0.83 Et | $5,106 | $220 |
| 0.84 Et | $5,299 | $413 |
| 0.85 Et | $5,415 | $529 |
| 0.86 Et | $5,532 | $646 |
| 0.87 Et | $5,648 | $762 |
| 0.88 Et | $5,765 | $879 |
| 0.89 Et | $5,882 | $996 |
| 0.90 Et | $6,021 | $1,135 |

For electric water heaters, the incremental capital cost for this measure is assumed to be:[[77]](#footnote-78)

| **Tank Size** | **Incremental Cost** |
| --- | --- |
| 50 gallons | $1050 |
| 80 gallons | $1050 |
| 100 gallons | $1950 |

The incremental capital cost for an electric tankless heater this measure is assumed to be:[[78]](#footnote-79)

| **Output (gpm) at delta T 70** | **Incremental Cost** |
| --- | --- |
| 5 | $1050 |
| 10 | $1050 |
| 15 | $1950 |

The incremental capital cost for a gas fired tankless heater is assumed to be[[79]](#footnote-80):

| **Output (gpm) at delta T 70** | **Incremental Cost** |
| --- | --- |
| 5.0 | $1,500 |
| 10.0 | $1,500 |
| 15.0 | $2,400 |

For a heat pump water heater, the incremental installation cost (including labor) should be used. Defaults are provided below.[[80]](#footnote-81) Actual efficient costs can also be used although care should be taken as installation costs can vary For a heat pump water heater, the incremental installation cost (including labor) should be used. Defaults are provided below.[[81]](#footnote-82) Actual efficient costs can also be used although care should be taken as installation costs can vary significantly due to complexities of a particular site.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Capacity** | **Efficiency Range** | **Baseline Installed Cost** | **Efficient Installed Cost** | **Incremental Installed Cost** |
| ≤55 gallons | <2.6 UEF | $1,032 | $2,062 | $1,030 |
| ≥2.6 UEF | $1,032 | $2,231 | $1,199 |
| >55 gallons | <2.6 UEF | $1,319 | $2,432 | $1,113 |
| ≥2.6 UEF | $1,319 | $3,116 | $1,797 |

###### Loadshape

For electric hot water heaters, use Loadshape C02 - Commercial Electric DHW.

###### Coincidence Factor

The coincidence factor is assumed to be 0.925.[[82]](#footnote-83)

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Electric Energy and Fossil Fuel Savings

Non Fuel Switch Measures

Electric energy savings are calculated for electric water heaters per the equations given below.

Electric units ≤12 kW:

Electric units > 12kW:

Natural gas energy savings are calculated for natural gas storage water heaters per the equations given below.

Additional Standby Loss Savings

Gas Storage Water Heaters >75,000 Btu/h can claim additional savings due to lower standby losses.

Fuel Switch/Electrification Measures:

Fuel switch / electrification measures must produce positive total energy savings (i.e., reduction in Btus at the premises) in order to qualify. This is determined as follows:

Electric units ≤12 kW:

SiteEnergySavings (MMBTUs) = [GasConsumptionReplaced] – [ElectricConsumptionAdded]

=

Electric units > 12kW and gas units >75,000 Btu/h:

SiteEnergySavings (MMBTUs) = [GasConsumptionReplaced] – [ElectricConsumptionAdded] + (HPWHWasteHeatcool \* 0.003412) – (HPWHWasteHeatheat \* ConversionToMMBtu)

[GasConsumptionReplaced]

[ElectricConsumptionAdded]=

HPWHWasteHeatcool =

HPWHWasteHeatheat   =

If Electric Heat

If Gas Heat

ConversionToMMBtu      =

If Electric Heat                    = 0.003412  kWh/MMBtu

                If Gas Heat                          = 0.1  Therms/MMBtu

If SiteEnergySavings calculated above is positive, the measure is eligible.

The appropriate savings claim is dependent on which utilities are supporting the measure as provided in a table below:

| **Measure supported by:** | **Electric Utility claims (kWh):** | **Gas Utility claims (therms):** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Electric utility only | SiteEnergySavings \* 1,000,000/3,412 | N/A |
| Electric and gas utility  (Note utilities may make alternative agreements to how savings are allocated as long as total MMBtu savings remains the same). | %IncentiveElectric \* SiteEnergySavings \*  1,000,000/3,412 | %IncentiveGas \* SiteEnergySavings \* 10 |
| Gas utility only | N/A | SiteEnergySavings \* 10 |

Where:

Tout = Tank temperature

= 125°F

Tin = Incoming water temperature from well or municiple system

= 50.7°F [[83]](#footnote-84)

HotWaterUseGallon = Estimated annual hot water consumption (gallons)

= Actual if possible to provide reasonable custom estimate. If not, two methodologies are provided to develop an estimate:

1. Consumption per usable storage tank capacity

= Capacity \* Consumption/cap

Where:

Capacity = Usable capacity of hot water storage tank in gallons

= Actual

Consumption/cap = Estimate of consumption per gallon of usable tank capacity, based on building type:[[84]](#footnote-85)

| **Building Type[[85]](#footnote-86)** | **Consumption/Cap** |
| --- | --- |
| Convenience | 528 |
| Education | 568 |
| Grocery | 528 |
| Health | 788 |
| Large Office | 511 |
| Large Retail | 528 |
| Lodging | 715 |
| Other Commercial | 341 |
| Restaurant | 622 |
| Small Office | 511 |
| Small Retail | 528 |
| Warehouse | 341 |
| Nursing | 672 |
| Multi-Family | 894 |
| Unknown | 555[[86]](#footnote-87) |

2. Consumption per unit area by building type

= (Area/1000) \* Consumption/1,000 sq.ft.

Where:

Area = Area in sq.ft that is served by DHW boiler

= Actual

Consumption/1,000 sq.ft. = Estimate of DHW consumption per 1,000 sq.ft. based on building type:[[87]](#footnote-88)

| **Building Type[[88]](#footnote-89)** | **Consumption/1,000 sq.ft.** |
| --- | --- |
| Convenience | 4,594 |
| Education | 7,285 |
| Grocery | 697 |
| Health | 24,540 |
| Large Office | 1,818 |
| Large Retail | 1,354 |
| Lodging | 29,548 |
| Other Commercial | 3,941 |
| Restaurant | 44,439 |
| Small Office | 1,540 |
| Small Retail | 6,111 |
| Warehouse | 1,239 |
| Nursing | 30,503 |
| Multi-Family | 15,434 |

γWater = Specific weight capacity of water (lb/gal)

= 8.33 lbs/gal

1 = Specific heat of water (Btu/lb.°F)

UEFelecbase = Rated efficiency of baseline water heater expressed as Uniform Energy Factor (UEF);

Note the same draw pattern (very small, low, medium and high draw) should be used for both baseline and efficient units.

| **Equipment Type** | **Sub Category** | **Draw Pattern** | **Federal Standard – Uniform Energy Factor[[89]](#footnote-90)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Residential Electric Storage Water Heaters  ≤ 75,000 Btu/h | ≤55 gallon tanks | Very small | UEF = 0.8808 – (0.0008 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Low | UEF = 0.9254 – (0.0003 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Medium | UEF = 0.9307 – (0.0002 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| High | UEF = 0.9349 – (0.0001 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| >55 gallon and ≤120 gallon tanks [[90]](#footnote-91) | Very small | UEF = 1.9236 – (0.0011 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Low | UEF = 2.0440 – (0.0011 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Medium | UEF = 2.1171 – (0.0011 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| High | UEF = 2.2418 – (0.0011 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Residential Electric Instantaneous Water Heaters | ≤12kW and ≤2 gal | All other | UEF = 0.91 |
| High | UEF = 0.92 |
| Residential-duty Commercial  Electric Instantaneous Water Heaters | > 12kW and ≤58.6 kW and ≤2 gal | All | UEF = 0.80 |

Draw patterns are based on first hour rating (gallons) for storage tanks and maximum flow (GPM) for instantaneous as shown below:[[91]](#footnote-92)

| **Storage Water Heater Draw Pattern** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Draw Pattern** | **First Hour Rating (gallons)** |
| Very Small | ≥ 0 and < 18 |
| Low | ≥ 18 and < 51 |
| Medium | ≥ 51 and < 75 |
| High | ≥ 75 |

| **Instantaneous Water Heater Draw Pattern** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Draw Pattern** | **Max GPM** |
| Very Small | ≥ 0 and < 1.7 |
| Low | ≥ 1.7 and < 2.8 |
| Medium | ≥ 2.8 and < 4 |
| High | ≥ 4 |

UEFeff = Rated efficiency of efficient water heater expressed as Uniform Energy Factor (UEF)

= Actual

3412 = Converts Btu to kWh

HPWHWasteheatcool = Heat Pump Water Heater Only - Cooling savings from conversion of heat in building to water heat[[92]](#footnote-93)

Where:

LF = Location Factor

= 1.0 for HPWH installation in a conditioned space

= 0.5 for HPWH installation in an unknown location[[93]](#footnote-94)

= 0.0 for installation in an unconditioned space

25% = Portion of reduced waste heat that results in cooling savings[[94]](#footnote-95)

COPCOOL = COP of Central Air Conditioner

= Actual - If unknown, assume 3.08 (10.5 SEER / 3.412)

LM = Latent multiplier to account for latent cooling demand

= 1.33 [[95]](#footnote-96)

Cool = 1 if building has central cooling, 0 if not cooled

HPWHWasteheatHeat = Heat Pump Water Heater Only - Heating cost from conversion of heat in building to water heat (dependent on heating fuel)

Where:

35% = Portion of reduced waste heat that results in increased heating load[[96]](#footnote-97)

COPHEAT  = COP of electric heating system

= Actual system efficiency including duct loss - If not available, use:[[97]](#footnote-98)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **System Type** | **Age of Equipment** | **HSPF Estimate** | **ηHeat (Effective COP Estimate) (HSPF/3.412)\*0.85** |
| Heat Pump | Before 2006 | 6.8 | 1.7 |
| 2006 - 2014 | 7.7 | 1.92 |
| 2015 on | 8.2 | 2.04 |
| Resistance | N/A | N/A | 1 |

ElectricHeat = 1 if building is electrically heated, 0 if not

**For example,** for a 50 gallon, 95% UEF storage unit installed in a 1500 ft2 restaurant:

ΔkWh = ((125 – 50.7) \* ((1,500/1,000) \* 44,439) \* 8.33 \* 1 \* (1/0.88 - 1/0.95))/3412 + 0 + 0

= 1012 kWh

Electric units > 12kW:

Tair = Ambient Air Temperature

= 70°F

V = Rated tank volume in gallons

= Actual

SLelecbase = Standby loss of electric baseline unit (%/hr)

= 0.30 + 27/V

SLeff = Nameplate standby loss of new water heater, in BTU/h

8766 = Hours per year

**For example**, >12kW, 100 gallon storage unit with rated standby loss of 0.5 %/hr:

SLbase = 0.3 + (27 / 100)

= 0.57%/hr

ΔkWh = (((125 – 70) \* 100 \* 8.33 \* 1 \* (0.57- 0.5)/100) \* 8766)/3412

= 82.4 kWh

Gas units:

100,000 = Converts Btu to Therms

EFgasbase = Rated efficiency of baseline water heater (expressed as Uniform Energy Factor (UEF) or Thermal Efficiency as provided below).

Note the same draw pattern (very small, low, medium and high draw) should be used for both baseline and efficient units.

| **Equipment Type** | **Sub Category** | **Draw Pattern** | **Federal Standard – Uniform Energy Factor[[98]](#footnote-99)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Residential  Gas Storage Water Heaters  ≤75,000 Btu/h | ≤55 gallon tanks | Very small | UEF = 0.3456 – (0.0020 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Low | UEF = 0.5982 – (0.0019 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Medium | UEF = 0.6483 – (0.0017 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| High | UEF = 0.6920 – (0.0013 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| >55 gallon and ≤100 gallon tanks | Very small | UEF = 0.6470 – (0.0006 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Low | UEF = 0.7689 – (0.0005 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Medium | UEF = 0.7897 – (0.0004 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| High | UEF = 0.8072 – (0.0003 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Residential-duty Commercial High Capacity Storage Gas-Fired Storage Water Heaters > 75,000 Btu/h | ≤120 gallon tanks | Very small | UEF = 0.2674 – (0.0009 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Low | UEF = 0.5362 – (0.0012 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Medium | UEF = 0.6002 – (0.0011 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| High | UEF = 0.6597 – (0.0009 \* Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Commercial Gas Storage Water Heaters  >75,000 Btu/h and ≤155,000 Btu/h | >120 gallon tanks | All | 80% Ethermal,  Standby Losses = (Q /800 + 110√Rated Storage Volume in Gallons) |
| Commercial Gas Storage Water Heaters  >155,000 Btu/h |  |
| Residential Gas Instantaneous Water Heaters  ≤ 200,000 Btu/h | ≤2 gal | Very low | UEF = 0.80 |
| All other | UEF = 0.81 |
| Commercial Gas Instantaneous Water Heaters  > 200,000 Btu/h | <10 gal | All | 80% Ethermal |
| ≥10 gal | All | 78% Ethermal |

Draw patterns are based on first hour rating (gallons) for storage tanks and maximum flow (GPM) for instantaneous as shown below:[[99]](#footnote-100)

| **Storage Water Heater Draw Pattern** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Draw Pattern** | **First Hour Rating (gallons)** |
| Very Small | ≥ 0 and < 18 |
| Low | ≥ 18 and < 51 |
| Medium | ≥ 51 and < 75 |
| High | ≥ 75 |

| **Instantaneous Water Heater Draw Pattern** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Draw Pattern** | **Max GPM** |
| Very Small | ≥ 0 and < 1.7 |
| Low | ≥ 1.7 and < 2.8 |
| Medium | ≥ 2.8 and < 4 |

HPWHWasteHeatGasHeat = Heat Pump Water Heater Only - Heating cost from conversion of heat in building to water heat (dependent on heating fuel)

ηHeat = Heating system efficiency including duct loss

= Actual

Where:

SLgasbase = Standby loss of gas baseline unit (Btu/h)

Q = Nameplate input rating in Btu/h

V = Rated volume in gallons

SLeff = Nameplate standby loss of new water heater, in Btu/h

8766 = Hours per year

**For example**, for a 200,000 Btu/h, 150 gallon, 90% UEF storage unit with rated standby loss of 1029 BTU/h installed in a 1500 ft2 restaurant:

ΔTherms = ((125 – 50.7) \* ((1,500/1,000) \* 44,439) \* 8.33 \* 1 \* (1/0.8 - 1/0.9))/100,000

= 57.3 Therms

ΔThermsStandby = (((200000/800 + 110 \* √150) – 1029) \* 8766)/100,000

= 49.8 Therms

ΔThermsTotal = 57.3 + 49.8

= 107.1 Therms

**Fuel switch example**, a 160,000 Btu/h, 120 gallon, 80% UEF storage unit with rated standby loss of 1405 BTU/h installed in a 1500 ft2 restaurant (with gas heat 85% AFUE and cooling) is replaced with a 120 gallon HPWH with medium draw (UEF = 2.1171 – (0.0011 \* 100)  = 2.0) and standby loss rate of 0.5%/hr installed in a unknown location.

GasConsumptionReplaced    =   (((125 – 50.7) \* ((1,500/1,000) \* 44,439) \* 8.33 \* 1 \* 1/0.8)/1,000,000) + ((1405 \* 8766)/1,000,000)

                                                             = 63.8 MMBtu

ElectricConsumptionAdded  =   (((125 – 50.7) \* ((1,500/1,000) \* 44,439) \* 8.33 \* 1 \* 1/2.0)/1,000,000) + ((((125 – 50.7) \* 120 \* 8.33 \* 1 \* 0.5/100) \* 8766)/1,000,000)

                                                                  = 23.9 MMBtu

HPWHWasteHeatcool=   ((125 – 50.7) \* ((1,500/1,000) \* 44,439) \* 8.33 \* 1 \* (1 - 1/2.0) \* 0.5 \* 0.25 \* 1.33) / (3.08 \* 3412 \* 1)

                                                            = 326 kWh

HPWHWasteHeatGasHeat  = ((125 – 50.7) \* ((1,500/1,000) \* 44,439) \* 8.33 \* 1 \* (1 - 1/2.0) \* 0.5 \* 0.35) / (100,000 \* 0.85 \* 1)

                                                            = 42 Therms

SiteEnergySavings (MMBTUs)          = 63.8 – 23.9 + (326 \* 0.003412) – (42 \* 0.1)

                                                             = 36.8 MMBtu

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

Where:

Hours = Full load hours of water heater

= 6461 [[100]](#footnote-101)

CF = Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for measure

= 0.925 [[101]](#footnote-102)

**For example**, >12kW, 100 gallon storage unit with rated standby loss of 0.5 %/hr:

ΔkW = 82.4 / 6,461 \* 0.925

= 0.0118 kW

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

Calculation provided together with Electric Energy Savings above.

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

The deemed O&M cost adjustment for a tankless heaters is $100.[[102]](#footnote-103)

###### Cost Effectiveness Screening and Load Reduction Forecasting when Fuel Switching

This measure can involve fuel switching from fossil fuel to electric.

For the purposes of forecasting load reductions due to fuel switch projects per Section 16-111.5B, changes in site energy use at the customer’s meter (using ΔkWh algorithm below), customer switching estimates, NTG, and any other adjustment factors deemed appropriate, should be used.

The inputs to cost effectiveness screening should reflect the actual impacts on the electric and fuel consumption at the customer meter and, for fuel switching measures, should therefore reflect the decrease in one fuel and increase in another, as opposed to the single savings value calculated in the “Electric and Fossil Fuel Energy Savings” section above. Therefore in addition to the calculation of savings claimed, the following values should be used to assess the cost effectiveness of the measure.

Electric units ≤12 kW:

ΔTherms = [GasConsumptionReplaced]

ΔkWh = [ElectricConsumptionAdded]

Electric units > 12kW and gas units >75,000 Btu/h:

ΔTherms = [GasConsumptionReplaced]

ΔkWh = [ElectricConsumptionAdded]

###### Measure Code: CI-HWE-STWH-V11-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2027

### 4.4.7 ENERGY STAR and CEE Tier 2 Room Air Conditioner

###### Description

This measure relates to the purchase and installation of a room air conditioning unit that meets either the ENERGY STAR or CEE Tier 2 minimum qualifying efficiency specifications, in place of a baseline unit meeting minimum Federal Standard efficiency ratings presented below:[[103]](#footnote-104)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product Class (Btu/H)** | **Federal Standard CEER, with louvered sides** | **Federal Standard CEER, without louvered sides** | **ENERGY STAR CEER, with louvered sides** | **ENERGY STAR CEER, without louvered sides** | **CEE Tier 2**  **CEER** |
| < 8,000 | 11.0 | 10.0 | 13.7 | 12.8 | 14.85 |
| 8,000 to 10,999 | 10.9 | 9.6 | 14.7 | 13.0 | 14.72 |
| 11,000 to 13,999 | 9.5 | 12.8 |
| 14,000 to 19,999 | 10.7 | 9.3 | 14.4 | 12.6 | 14.45 |
| 20,000 to 27,999 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.69 |
| >= 28,000 | 9.0 | 12.2 | 12.15 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Casement** | **Federal Standard (CEER)** | **ENERGY STAR (CEER)** |
| Casement-only | 9.5 | 12.8 |
| Casement-slider | 10.4 | 14.0 |

| **Reverse Cycle -Product Class (Btu/H)** | **Federal Standard CEER, with louvered sides** | **Federal Standard CEER, without louvered sides** | **ENERGY STAR CEER, with louvered sides** | **ENERGY STAR CEER, without louvered sides** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| < 14,000 | N/A | 9.3 | N/A | 12.6 |
| >= 14,000 | N/A | 8.7 | N/A | 11.7 |
| < 20,000 | 9.8 | N/A | 13.2 | N/A |
| >= 20,000 | 9.3 | N/A | 12.6 | N/A |

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To qualify for this measure the new room air conditioning unit must meet the ENERGY STAR efficiency standards presented above.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline assumption is a new room air conditioning unit that meets the current minimum federal efficiency standards presented above.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The measure life is assumed to be 12 years. [[104]](#footnote-105)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The incremental cost for this measure is assumed to be $40 for an ENERGY STAR unit and $261 for a CEE Tier 2 unit.[[105]](#footnote-106)

###### Loadshape

Loadshape C03 - Commercial Cooling

###### Coincidence Factor

The summer peak coincidence factor for cooling is provided in two different ways below. The first is used to estimate peak savings during the utility peak hour and is most indicative of actual peak benefits, and the second represents the *average* savings over the defined summer peak period, and is presented so that savings can be bid into PJM’s capacity market.  Both values provided are based on analysis of Itron eShape data for Missouri, calibrated to Illinois loads, supplied by Ameren.

CFSSP = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Commercial cooling (during system peak hour)

= 91.3% [[106]](#footnote-107)

CFPJM = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Commercial cooling (average during peak period)

= 47.8%[[107]](#footnote-108)

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Energy Savings

ΔkWh = (FLHRoomAC \* Btu/h \* (1/CEERbase - 1/CEERee))/1000

Where:

FLHRoomAC = Full Load Hours of room air conditioning unit

= Equivalent Full Load Hours for cooling in Existing Buildings are provided in section 4.4 HVAC End Use

Btu/h = Input capacity of unit

= Actual. If unknown assume 8,500 Btu/hr [[108]](#footnote-109)

CEERbase = Combined Energy Efficiency Ratio of baseline unit

= As provided in tables above

CEERee = Combined Energy Efficiency Ratio of ENERGY STAR or CEE Super Efficient unit

= Actual. If unknown assume minimum qualifying standard as provided in tables above

**For example**, for an 8,500 Btu/h capacity ENERGY STAR unit, with louvered sides, in an unknown location in Rockford:

ΔkWHENERGY STAR = (1133 \* 8500 \* (1/10.9 – 1/14.7)) / 1000

= 228.4 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = Btu/h \* ((1/CEERbase - 1/CEERee))/1000) \* CF

Where:

CFSSP = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Commercial cooling (during system peak hour)

= 91.3% [[109]](#footnote-110)

CFPJM = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Commercial cooling (average during peak period)

= 47.8%[[110]](#footnote-111)

Other variable as defined above

For example, for an 8,500 Btu/h capacity ENERGY STAR unit, with louvered sides, in Rockford during system peak:

ΔkWENERGY STAR = ((8500 \* (1/10.9 – 1/14.7)) / 1000) \* 0.913

= 0.184 kW

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

N/A

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: CI-HVC-ESRA-V04-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2026

### 4.4.10 High Efficiency Boiler

###### Description

To qualify for this measure the installed equipment must be replacement of an existing boiler at the end of its service life, in a commercial or multifamily space with a high efficiency, gas-fired steam or hot water boiler. High efficiency boilers achieve gas savings through the utilization of a sealed combustion chamber and multiple heat exchangers that remove a significant portion of the waste heat from flue gasses. Because multiple heat exchangers are used to remove waste heat from the escaping flue gasses, some of the flue gasses condense and must be drained.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS, NC. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To qualify for this measure the installed equipment must be a boiler used 80% or more for space heating, not process, and boiler AFUE, ET (thermal efficiency), or EC (combustion efficiency) rating must be rated greater than or equal to 85% for hot water boilers and 83% for steam boilers.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

Dependent on when the unit is installed and whether the unit is hot water or steam. The baseline efficiency source is the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 with technical amendments from Federal Register, volume 81, Number 10, January 15, 2016 for boilers <300,000 and Federal Register, volume 74, Number 139, July 22, 2009 for boilers >300,000 Btu/hr.[[111]](#footnote-112)

For boilers <300,000 Btu/hr the technical amendments include the recent compliance dates for gas-fired hot water and steam boilers manufactured on or after January 15, 2021.[[112]](#footnote-113)

Note, for natural draft steam boilers, as IECC 2021, Illinois state energy code that is expected to become effective statewide in 2024, exceeds the minimum federal efficiency standards, it was replaced in favor of the more aggressive thermal efficiency values in the table below. For new construction applications where the permitting date is prior to the state’s adoption of IECC 2021, it is recommended to use the applicable edition of IECC corresponding to that timeline. As code requirements and adoption can differ from municipality to municipality, the user should verify which version of code is applicable given these constraints.

Each gas-fired commercial packaged boiler must meet the applicable energy conservation standard levels detailed in the table below.

Boiler baseline efficiency standards

| **Boiler Type** | **Efficiency** |
| --- | --- |
| Hot Water Boiler < 300,000 Btu/h | 84% AFUE |
| Hot Water Boiler > 300,000 Btu/h and < 2,500,000 Btu/h | 80% ET |
| Hot Water Boiler > 2,500,000 Btu/h | 82% EC |
| Steam Boiler < 300,000 Btu/h | 82% AFUE |
| Steam Boiler > 300,000 Btu/h and < 2,500,000 Btu/h | 79% ET |
| Steam Boiler > 2,500,000 Btu/h | 79% ET |

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 25 years.[[113]](#footnote-115)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The measure cost for this technology is tiered based on the boiler type and combustion efficiencies. As installation costs for the base case and the measure case units are assumed to be the same, labor costs are not specified for this measure.

Incremental and Gross Measure costs for Space Heating Boilers

| **Boiler Type** | **Incremental Measure Cost ($/KBtu)[[114]](#footnote-116)** | **Full Installed Measure Cost ($/KBtu)[[115]](#footnote-117)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Hot Water Boiler >85% EC and <90% EC | $2.17 | $12.94 |
| Hot Water Boiler >90% EC | $12.17 | $22.95 |
| Steam Boiler >83% EC and <85% EC | $4.35 | $19.24 |
| Modular Steam Boiler Arrays (>85% EC)[[116]](#footnote-118) | Custom | |

###### Loadshape

N/A

###### Coincidence Factor

N/A

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

N/A

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

N/A

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

ΔTherms = EFLH \* Capacity \* ((EfficiencyEE - EfficiencyBase) / EfficiencyBase) / 100,000

Where:

EFLH = Equivalent Full Load Hours for heating in Existing Buildings or New Construction are provided in section 4.4 HVAC End Use

Capacity = Nominal Heating Input Capacity Boiler Size (Btu/hr) for efficient unit not existing unit

= custom Boiler input capacity in Btu/hr

EfficiencyBase = Baseline Boiler Efficiency Rating, dependant on year and boiler type

Hot water boiler baseline:

| **Boiler Capacity and Distribution Type** | **Efficiency** |
| --- | --- |
| Hot Water <300,000 Btu/hr[[117]](#footnote-119) | 84% AFUE |
| Hot Water ≥300,000 & ≤2,500,000 Btu/hr[[118]](#footnote-120) | 80% ET |
| Hot Water Boiler > 2,500,000[[119]](#footnote-121) | 82% EC |

Steam boiler baseline:

| **Boiler Capacity and Distribution Type** | **Efficiency** |
| --- | --- |
| Steam <300,000 Btu/hr[[120]](#footnote-123) | 82% AFUE |
| Steam Boiler > 300,000 Btu/h and < 2,500,000 Btu/h [[121]](#footnote-124) | 79% ET |
| Steam - natural draft ≥300,000 & ≤2,500,000 Btu/hr | 79% TE[[122]](#footnote-125) |
| Steam Boiler >2,500,000 Btu/h | 79% ET |
| Steam - natural draft >2,500,000 Btu/hr | 79% ET [[123]](#footnote-126) |

EfficiencyEE = Efficent Boiler Efficiency Rating

=actual value, specified to one significant digit (i.e., 95.7%)

**For example**, a 150,000 btu/hr water boiler meeting AFUE 90% is installed in Rockford at a high rise office building , in the year 2022

ΔTherms = 2,089\* 150,000 \* (0.90-0.840)/0.840) / 100,000 Btu/Therm

= 224 Therms

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: CI-HVC-BOIL-V12-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2027

### 4.4.51 Advanced Rooftop Controls with High Rotor Pole Switch Reluctance Motors

###### Description

A High Rotor Pole Switch Reluctance Motor (HRSRM) is a type of brushless DC electric motor that runs by reluctance torque. Unlike other DC motor types, power is delivered to windings in the stator rather than the rotor. This simplifies the mechanical design; power does not need to be delivered to a moving part, but requires a switching system through software control to deliver power to the different windings. Electronic devices can precisely time switch, facilitating HRSRM configurations.

In applications on rooftop units (RTUs), the HRSRM motor is comparable or more efficient than an RTU equipped with a variable speed drive supply fan. It results in fan-energy savings and can also include cooling savings if coupled with compressor or ventilation control, compared to a baseline scenario of constant-volume, constant-ventilation operation that is typical of single-zone, packaged HVAC units.

Fan energy savings come from the new integrated motor controls that allow for higher efficiency at varying loads and is achieved in all applications. Cooling savings can also be added from the effective use of variable speed or multi-stage cooling.

The markets that can be served by HRSRM motors are those which utilize RTUs, including but not limited to:

1. Fast-Service Restaurant
2. Full-Service Restaurant
3. Small Office
4. Stand-Alone Retail
5. Strip Mall
6. Warehouse

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: NC, RF, EREP. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

The efficient equipment is a single-zone, packaged HVAC unit with an existing functional integrated economizer that has been fitted with a HRSRM supply-fan and integrated speed control. This applies to both retrofit and new construction, and early replacement applications.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline equipment is a single-zone, packaged HVAC unit (with an existing functional integrated economizer)

that lacks demand-controlled ventilation controls and lacks supply-fan speed control via a variable-frequency drive.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 12 years based on the HRSRM life.[[124]](#footnote-127)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

Actual measure costs should be used if available. If costs are not available, the deemed measure cost below can be used. Material cost is based on the horsepower (hp) of the supply fan used in the RTU. Retrofit represents the full cost of the installation. New construction and early replacement represent the incremental cost of the motor itself on a new unit.[[125]](#footnote-128)

Deemed Measure Cost Details

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **HP** | **Material Cost** | **Labor Hours** | **Labor Rate** | **Deemed Cost** |
| Retrofit | 1 | $1,554.75 | 3 | $96.67 | $1,844.76 |
| Retrofit | 1.5 | $1,580.75 | 3 | $96.67 | $1,870.76 |
| Retrofit | 2 | $1,644.75 | 3 | $96.67 | $1,934.76 |
| Retrofit | 5 | $1,758.75 | 3 | $96.67 | $2,048.76 |
| Retrofit | 7.5 | $2,417.75 | 3 | $96.67 | $2,707.76 |
| Retrofit | 10 | $2,587.75 | 3 | $96.67 | $2,877.76 |
| New Construction/Early Replacement | 1 | $932.85 | - | - | $932.85 |
| New Construction/Early Replacement | 1.5 | $948.45 | - | - | $948.45 |
| New Construction/Early Replacement | 2 | $986.85 | - | - | $986.85 |
| New Construction/Early Replacement | 5 | $1,055.25 | - | - | $1,055.25 |
| New Construction/Early Replacement | 7.5 | $1,450.65 | - | - | $1,450.65 |
| New Construction/Early Replacement | 10 | $1,552.65 | - | - | $1,552.65 |

###### Loadshape

Commercial ventilation C23

###### Coincidence Factor

CFSSP = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Commercial cooling (during system peak hour)

= 91.3%[[126]](#footnote-129)

CFPJM = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Commercial cooling (average during peak period)

= 47.8%[[127]](#footnote-130)

Algorithm

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

Six different building types were selected for study. OpenStudio measures were used to generate ASHRAE 90.1-2013 code-compliant DOE prototype baseline models for each building type. The total conditioned area, the number of conditioned zones, and the peak cooling demand for each building are summarized in the following table.[[128]](#footnote-131)

Selected DOE Prototype Buildings

| **Building Type** | **Small Office** | **Stand-Alone Retail** | **Warehouse** | **Strip Mall** | **Fast-Service Restaurant** | **Full-Service Restaurant** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Conditioned Area (ft2) | 5,502 | 24,692 | 52,045 | 22,500 | 2,501 | 5,502 |
| Number of Conditioned Zones | 5 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 2 |
| Total Fan Break Horsepower (BHP) | 3.5 | 25 | 5 | 23 | 7 | 11 |
| Design Cooling Load (Ton) | 8.5 | 65 | 13 | 69 | 20 | 33 |

In order to achieve savings, the RTU control options consist of following modes:

1. 1. Ventilation Mode:
   1. a. Outdoor air is at a minimum for building type
   2. b. Fan speed set to 40%
   3. c. Heating and cooling coils are off
2. 2. Economizer Mode
   1. a. Outdoor air rate was set from 40% and increased as needed to satisfy indoor air temperature
   2. b. When outdoor air could no longer satisfy cooling, cooling mode was staged on
3. 3. Mechanical Cooling Mode
   1. a. Outdoor air is at a minimum for building type
   2. b. Compressors (if multiple or variable) were staged/modulated to meet setpoint temperature of the space
   3. c. Supply fan set to 100%
4. 4. Heating mode
   1. a. Outdoor air is at a minimum for building type
   2. b. Heating coil staged as necessary
   3. c. Supply fan set to 100%

The models produced a percentage energy savings based on using a HRSRM fan and varying compressor types. Retrofit savings include fan only. For new construction and early replacement, savings are based on compressor type and energy efficiency of the unit. These RTU control options are reflected in the table below. As a correction to these entries, a second set of single two-stage compressor RTU fan options are also reflected in the *Energy Savings Type: ESF\_Fan* entry in the table below[[129]](#footnote-132) and are characterized by the following speed settings:

1. 1. Ventilation Mode:
   1. a. Outdoor air is at a minimum for building type
   2. b. Supply fan set to 40%
   3. c. Heating and cooling coils are off
2. 2. Economizer Mode:
   1. a. No change compared to existing RTU settings
3. 3. Mechanical Cooling Mode (Stage 1):
   1. a. Outdoor air is at a minimum for building type
   2. b. Compressor stage 1 ON
   3. c. Supply fan set to 75%
4. 4. Mechanical Cooling Mode (Stage 2):
   1. a. Outdoor air is at a minimum for building type
   2. b. Compressor stage 1 & 2 ON
   3. c. Supply fan set to 90%
5. 5. Heating Mode:
   1. a. Outdoor air is at a minimum for building type
   2. b. Heating coil staged as necessary
   3. c. Supply fan set to 90%

###### Electric Energy Savings

For units with cooling capacities less than 65 kBtu/hr:

ΔkWH = (kBtu/hr) \* (1/ SEERexist) \* EFLH \* ESF\_Cooling + 0.746 \* FanHP \* (LF/ηmotor) \* RunHours \* ESF\_Fan

For units with cooling capacities equal to or greater than 65 kBtu/hr:

ΔkWH = (kBtu/hr) \* (1/IEERexist) \* EFLH \* ESF\_Cooling + 0.746 \* FanHP \* (LF/ηmotor) \* RunHours \* ESF\_Fan

Where:

kBtu/hr = capacity of the cooling equipment in kBtu per hour (1 ton of cooling capacity equals 12 kBtu/hr)

SEERexist = Seasonal Energy Efficiency Ratio of the existing equipment

= Actual. Or assume Code base in place at the original time of existing unit installation. IECC 2018 (effective July 1, 2019 to until IECC 2021 effective date) and IECC 2021 (expected to become effective statewide in 2024) provided below for referenced. As code requirements and adoption can differ from municipality to municipality, the user should verify which version of code is applicable given these constraints.

IEERexist = Integrated Energy Efficiency Ratio of the existing equipment

= Actual. Or assume Code base in place at the original time of existing unit installation. IECC 2018 (effective July 1, 2019 to until IECC 2021 effective date) and IECC 2021 (is expected to become effective statewide in 2024) provided below for reference. As code requirements and adoption can differ from municipality to municipality, the user should verify which version of code is applicable given these constraints.

EFLH = Equivalent Full Load Hours for cooling in Existing Buildings or New Construction are provided in Illinois TRM version 8.0 section 4.4 HVAC End Use

ESF\_Cooling = Energy savings factor for cooling as found in table below.[[130]](#footnote-133)

ESF\_Fan = Energy savings factor for cooling as found in table below[[131]](#footnote-134)

Energy Savings Factors

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Energy Savings Type** | **Retrofit Type** | **HRSRM on Single Stage Compressor** | **HRSRM on Single Two Stage Compressor** | **HRSRM on Variable Speed Compressor** |
| ESF\_Cooling[[132]](#footnote-135) | New Construction/Early Replacement | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| ESF\_Cooling[[133]](#footnote-136) | Supply Fan Retrofit Only | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ESF\_Fan944 | New Construction/Early Replacement | 46.6% | 61.0% | 64.8% |
| ESF\_Fan944 | Supply Fan Retrofit Only | 46.6% | 61.0% | 64.8% |

FanHP = Horsepower of fan in RTU

= Actual

LF = Load Factor; Motor Load at Fan Design CFM (Default = 65%)[[134]](#footnote-137)

𝜂𝑚𝑜𝑡𝑜r = Installed nominal/nameplate motor efficiency

Default motor is a NEMA Premium efficiency, ODP, 4-pole/1800 RPM fan motor

**NEMA Premium Efficiency Motors Default Efficiencies[[135]](#footnote-138)**

| **Size HP** | **Open Drip Proof (ODP)** | | | **Totally Enclosed Fan-Cooled (TEFC)** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **# of Poles** | | | **# of Poles** | | |
| **6** | **4** | **2** | **6** | **4** | **2** |
| **Speed (RPM)** | | | **Speed (RPM)** | | |
| **1200** | **1800 Default** | **3600** | **1200** | **1800** | **3600** |
| 1 | 0.825 | 0.855 | 0.770 | 0.825 | 0.855 | 0.770 |
| 1.5 | 0.865 | 0.865 | 0.840 | 0.875 | 0.865 | 0.840 |
| 2 | 0.875 | 0.865 | 0.855 | 0.885 | 0.865 | 0.855 |
| 3 | 0.885 | 0.895 | 0.855 | 0.895 | 0.895 | 0.865 |
| 5 | 0.895 | 0.895 | 0.865 | 0.895 | 0.895 | 0.885 |
| 7.5 | 0.902 | 0.910 | 0.885 | 0.910 | 0.917 | 0.895 |
| 10 | 0.917 | 0.917 | 0.895 | 0.910 | 0.917 | 0.902 |
| 15 | 0.917 | 0.930 | 0.902 | 0.917 | 0.924 | 0.910 |
| 20 | 0.924 | 0.930 | 0.910 | 0.917 | 0.930 | 0.910 |
| 25 | 0.930 | 0.936 | 0.917 | 0.930 | 0.936 | 0.917 |
| 30 | 0.936 | 0.941 | 0.917 | 0.930 | 0.936 | 0.917 |
| 40 | 0.941 | 0.941 | 0.924 | 0.941 | 0.941 | 0.924 |
| 50 | 0.941 | 0.945 | 0.930 | 0.941 | 0.945 | 0.930 |
| 60 | 0.945 | 0.950 | 0.936 | 0.945 | 0.950 | 0.936 |
| 75 | 0.945 | 0.950 | 0.936 | 0.945 | 0.954 | 0.936 |
| 100 | 0.950 | 0.954 | 0.936 | 0.950 | 0.954 | 0.941 |
| 125 | 0.950 | 0.954 | 0.941 | 0.950 | 0.954 | 0.950 |
| 150 | 0.954 | 0.958 | 0.941 | 0.958 | 0.958 | 0.950 |
| 200 | 0.954 | 0.958 | 0.950 | 0.958 | 0.962 | 0.954 |
| 250 | 0.954 | 0.958 | 0.950 | 0.958 | 0.962 | 0.958 |
| 300 | 0.954 | 0.958 | 0.954 | 0.958 | 0.962 | 0.958 |
| 350 | 0.954 | 0.958 | 0.954 | 0.958 | 0.962 | 0.958 |
| 400 | 0.958 | 0.958 | 0.958 | 0.958 | 0.962 | 0.958 |
| 450 | 0.962 | 0.962 | 0.958 | 0.958 | 0.962 | 0.958 |
| 500 | 0.962 | 0.962 | 0.958 | 0.958 | 0.962 | 0.958 |

RunHours = Annual operating hours for fan motor based on building type

= Default hours are provided for HVAC applications which vary by HVAC application and building type in the following table.[[136]](#footnote-139) When available, actual hours should be used.

| **Building Type** | **Total Fan Run Hours** | **Model Source** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assembly | 7,235 | eQuest |
| Assisted Living | 8,760 | eQuest |
| Auto Dealership | 7,451 | OpenStudio |
| College | 4,836 | OpenStudio |
| Convenience Store | 7,004 | eQuest |
| Drug Store | 7,156 | OpenStudio |
| Elementary School | 3,765 | OpenStudio |
| Emergency Services | 8,760 | OpenStudio |
| Garage | 7,357 | eQuest |
| Grocery | 8,543 | OpenStudio |
| Healthcare Clinic | 4,314 | OpenStudio |
| High School | 3,460 | OpenStudio |
| Manufacturing Facility | 8,706 | eQuest |
| MF – High Rise | 8,760 | OpenStudio |
| MF – Mid Rise | 8,760 | OpenStudio |
| Hotel/Motel – Guest | 2,409 | OpenStudio |
| Hotel/Motel – Common | 8,683 | OpenStudio |
| Movie Theater | 7,505 | eQuest |
| Office – Low Rise | 6,345 | OpenStudio |
| Office – Mid Rise | 3,440 | OpenStudio |
| Religious Building | 7,380 | eQuest |
| Restaurant | 7,302 | OpenStudio |
| Retail – Department Store | 7,155 | OpenStudio |
| Retail – Strip Mall | 6,921 | OpenStudio |
| Warehouse | 6,832 | OpenStudio |
| Unknown | 6,241 | n/a |

2018 IECC Minimum Efficiency Requirements





2021 IECC Minimum Efficiency Requirements

Table

Description automatically generated

Table

Description automatically generated

Table

Description automatically generated

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = [(kBtu/hr) \* (1/EERexist) \* ESF\_Cooling + 0.746 \* FanHP \* (LF/ηmotor) \* ESF\_Fan] \* CF

Where:

EERexist = Energy Efficiency Ratio of the existing equipment (assume the following conversion from SEER to EER for calculation of peak savings: EER = (-0.02 \* SEER2) + (1.12 \* SEER))

= Actual, or assume Code base in place at the original time of existing unit installation

CFSSP = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Commercial cooling (during system peak hour)

= 91.3%

CFPJM = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Commercial cooling (average during peak period)

= 47.8%

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

N/A

###### Water and Other Non-Energy Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: CI-HVC-HSRM-V05-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2028

### 4.4.54 Process Heating Boiler

###### Description

A process boiler is a pressure vessel that transfers heat to water for industrial process applications. Process boilers can be configured as an integrated packaged boiler or as modular instantaneous boiler arrays. This measure is applicable to boilers which serve process loads in a facility.

Modular instantaneous boilers are a recent addition to the industrial/commercial market aimed at addressing some of the drawbacks of conventional large boiler systems. They achieve high efficiencies by using multiple smaller sized modules to meet the minimum demand. They allow each boiler to operate at or close to full rated load most of the time, with reduced standby losses. The boiler design is a low water mass pressure vessel that produces steam at operating pressure rapidly then shuts off the combustion system once the demand requirement is met, thereby saving fuel.

Traditional packaged boiler systems are designed to provide the entire steam load of the facility using one or two boilers. Typically, the boiler horsepower is sized for the maximum steam load required at any facility. However, the average steam load of any facility is only 30 to 40 percent of this, and the average load on the boiler system is low. Therefore, they are not able to achieve these high efficiencies.[[137]](#footnote-140)

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: NC, EREP, TOS.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

The efficient case is the replacement of a non-residential standard efficiency process boiler for process loads with a high-efficiency process boiler exceeding the energy conservation standards outlined below. The efficient unit may either be a conventional packaged boiler or a modular boiler array system. Non-residential commercial boilers are defined as having an input rating greater than 300,000 Btu/h.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

For Time of Sale and New Construction:

Gas-fired boilers, termed as commercial packaged boilers, manufactured after March 12, 2012 must comply with the standards defined in the Code of Federal Regulations, 10 CFR 431.87.[[138]](#footnote-141)

Note, for natural draft steam boilers, as IECC 2021, Illinois state energy code, expected to become effective statewide in 2024, exceeds the minimum federal efficiency standards, it was replaced in favor of the more aggressive thermal efficiency values in the table below. For new construction applications where the permitting date is prior to the state’s adoption of IECC 2021 it is recommended to use the applicable edition of IECC corresponding to that timeline. As code requirements and adoption can differ from municipality to municipality, the user should verify which version of code is applicable given these constraints.

Boiler baseline efficiency standards

| **Boiler Type** | **Efficiency[[139]](#footnote-142)** |
| --- | --- |
| Hot Water Boiler > 300,000 Btu/h and < 2,500,000 Btu/h | 80% ET |
| Hot Water Boiler > 2,500,000 Btu/h and <10,000,000 Btu/h | 82% EC |
| Hot Water Boiler >10,000,000 Btu/h | 82% EC |
| Steam Boiler > 300,000 Btu/h and < 2,500,000 Btu/h | 79% ET |
| Steam Boiler > 2,500,000 Btu/h and <10,000,000 Btu/h | 79% ET |
| Steam Boiler > 10,000,000 Btu/h | 79% ET |

where ET means “thermal efficiency” and EC means “combustion efficiency” as defined in 10 CFR 431.82.

For early replacement: The efficiency of the existing equipment should be used for the assumed remaining useful life of the equipment and a new baseline equipment as described above for the remainder of the measure life.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 25 years.[[140]](#footnote-143)

For EREP, the remaining useful life of the existing equipment is assumed to be 1/3rd of EUL (25/3) or 8 years.

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The measure cost for this technology is tiered based on the boiler type and combustion efficiencies. As installation costs for the base case and the measure case units are assumed to be the same, labor costs are not specified for this measure.

Incremental and Gross Measure costs for Process Boilers

| **Boiler Type** | **Incremental Measure Cost ($/Kbtu)[[141]](#footnote-144)** | **Full Measure Cost ($/Kbtu)[[142]](#footnote-145)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Hot Water Boiler >85% EC and <90% EC | $2.17 | $12.94 |
| Hot Water Boiler >90% EC | $12.17 | $22.95 |
| Steam Boiler >83% EC and <85% EC | $4.35 | $19.24 |
| Modular Steam Boiler Arrays (>85% EC)[[143]](#footnote-146) | Custom | |

A deferred baseline replacement cost, consistent with the delta between the full measure cost and incremental cost above should be assumed after the remaining useful life of the existing equipment.

###### Loadshape

N/A

###### Coincidence Factor

N/A

Algorithm

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

N/A

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

N/A

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

For first 8 years:

For remaining 17 years:

Where:

8,766 = Annual Operating hours for Process Boilers

The assumed hours of operation are based on continual plant operation. Variation in plant operating hours is accounted for in the utilization factor. While the boiler may operate during the entire year, it may not be operating at its full rated load.

Capacity = Nominal heating input capacity boiler size for high-efficiency unit (Btu/hr)

UF = Utilization Factor

= Custom or if unknown 41.9%[[144]](#footnote-147)

EfficiencyExist = Existing boiler efficiency rating,

= Actual

EfficiencyBase = Baseline boiler efficiency rating, dependent on year and boiler type or use actual operating efficiencies for early replacements. See table in “Definition of Baseline Equipment.”

EfficiencyEE = Efficient boiler efficiency rating for packaged or modular boiler system

= Actual value, specified to one significant digit (i.e., 95.7%)

100,000 = Constant to convert from Btu to therm

**For example**, an 800,000 Btu/hr gas-fired process steam boiler with a thermal efficiency rating of 87% is installed replacing a similar sized natural draft steam boiler with baseline efficiency of 79%.

ΔTherms = 8,766 \* 800,000 \* 0.419 \* (0.870 – 0.790)/0.790 / 100,000

= 2,976 therms

###### Water and Other Non-Energy Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: CI-HVC-PHBO-V04-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2027

### 4.5.13 Occupancy Controlled Bi-Level Lighting Fixtures

###### Description

This measure relates to replacing existing uncontrolled continuous lighting fixtures with new bi-level lighting fixtures. This measure can only relate to replacement in an existing building, since multi-level switching is required in the Commercial new construction building energy code (IECC 2012/2015/2018/2021). This measure is limited to 24/7 operation.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: RF.

If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

In order for this characterization to apply, the efficient system is assumed to be an occupancy controlled lighting fixture operating 24/7, that reduces light level during unoccupied periods.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline equipment is assumed to be an uncontrolled lighting system on continuously, e.g. in stairwells and corridors for health and safety reasons.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life for all lighting controls is assumed to be 10 years.[[145]](#footnote-148)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

When available, the actual cost of the measure shall be used. When not available, the assumed measure cost is $274.[[146]](#footnote-149)

###### Loadshape

|  |
| --- |
| Loadshape C06 - Commercial Indoor Lighting |
| Loadshape C07 - Grocery/Conv. Store Indoor Lighting |
| Loadshape C08 - Hospital Indoor Lighting |
| Loadshape C09 - Office Indoor Lighting |
| Loadshape C10 - Restaurant Indoor Lighting |
| Loadshape C11 - Retail Indoor Lighting |
| Loadshape C12 - Warehouse Indoor Lighting |
| Loadshape C13 - K-12 School Indoor Lighting |
| Loadshape C14 - Indust. 1-shift (8/5) (e.g., comp. air, lights) |
| Loadshape C15 - Indust. 2-shift (16/5) (e.g., comp. air, lights) |
| Loadshape C16 - Indust. 3-shift (24/5) (e.g., comp. air, lights) |
| Loadshape C17 - Indust. 4-shift (24/7) (e.g., comp. air, lights) |
| Loadshape C18 - Industrial Indoor Lighting |
| Loadshape C19 - Industrial Outdoor Lighting |
| Loadshape C20 - Commercial Outdoor Lighting |

###### Coincidence Factor

The summer peak coincidence factor for this measure is dependent on the location type. Values are provided for each building type in the reference section below.

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

ΔkWh = (KWBaseline - (KWControlled \*(1 –ESF))) \* Hours \* WHFe

Where:

KWBaseline = Total baseline lighting load of the existing/baseline fixture

= Actual

Note that if the existing fixture is only being retrofit with bi-level occupancy controls and not being replaced KWBaseline will equal KWControlled .

KWControlled = Total contolled lighting load at full light output of the new bi-level fixture

= Actual

Hours = Number of hours lighting is on. This measure is limited to 24/7 operation.

= 8,766

ESF = Energy Savings factor (represents the percentage reduction to the KWControlled due to the occupancy control).

= % Standby Mode \* (1 - % Full Light at Standby Mode)

% Standby Mode = Represents the percentage of the time the fixture is operating in standby (i.e. low-wattage) mode.

% Full Light at Standby Mode = Represents the assumed wattage consumption during standby mode relative to the full wattage consumption. Can be achieved either through dimming or a stepped control strategy.

= Dependent on application. If participant provided or metered data is available for both or either of these inputs a custom savings factor should be calculated. If not defaults are provided below:

| **Application** | **% Standby Mode** | **% Full Light at Standby Mode** | **Energy Savings Factor (ESF)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stairwells | 78.5%[[147]](#footnote-150) | 50% | 39.3% |
| 33% | 52.6% |
| 10% | 70.7% |
| 5% | 74.6% |
| Corridors | 50.0%[[148]](#footnote-151) | 50% | 25.0% |
| 33% | 33.5% |
| 10% | 45.0% |
| 5% | 47.5% |
| Other 24/7 Space Type | 50.0%[[149]](#footnote-152) | 50% | 25.0% |
| 33% | 33.5% |
| 10% | 45.0% |
| 5% | 47.5% |

WHFe = Waste heat factor for energy to account for cooling energy savings from efficient lighting is provided in the Reference Table in Section 4.5 for each building type. If building is un-cooled, the value is 1.0.

###### Heating Penalty

If electrically heated building:

ΔkWhheatpenalty[[150]](#footnote-153) = (KWBaseline - (KWControlled \*(1 –ESF))) \* Hours \* -IFkWh

Where:

IFkWh = Lighting-HVAC Interation Factor for electric heating impacts; this factor represents the increased electric space heating requirements due to the reduction of waste heat rejected by the efficent lighting. Values are provided in the Reference Table in Section 4.5. If unknown, use the Miscellaneous value.

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = (KWBaseline - (KWControlled \* (1 –ESF))) \* WHFd \* (CFbaseline - CFos)

Where:

WHFd = Waste Heat Factor for Demand to account for cooling savings from efficient lighting in cooled buildings is provided in the Reference Table in Section 4.5. If the building is un-cooled WHFd is 1.

CFbaseline = Baseline Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for the lighting system without Occupancy Sensors installed.

= 1.0 (due to 24/7 operation)

CFos = Retrofit Summer Peak Coincidence Factor the lighting system with Occupancy Sensors installed.

= 0.15 regardless of building type.[[151]](#footnote-154)

###### Natural Gas Heating Penalty

If natural gas heating:

Δtherms = (KWBaseline - (KWControlled \*(1 –ESF))) \* Hours \* - IFTherms

Where:

IFTherms = Lighting-HVAC Integration Factor for gas heating impacts; this factor represents the increased gas space heating requirements due to the reduction of waste heat rejected by the efficient lighting and provided in the Reference Table in Section 4.5 by buidling type.

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: CI-LTG-OCBL-V06-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2030

### 4.6.8 Refrigeration Economizers

###### Description

This measure applies to commercial walk in refrigeration systems and includes two components, outside air economizers and evaporator fan controllers. Economizers save energy by bringing in outside air when weather conditions allow, rather than operating the compressor. Walk-in refrigeration systems evaporator fans run almost all the time; 24 hrs/day, 365 days/yr. This is because they must run constantly to provide cooling when the compressor is running, and to provide air circulation when the compressor is not running. However, evaporator fans are a very inefficient method of providing air circulation. Installing an evaporator fan control system will turn off evaporator fans while the compressor is not running, and instead turn on an energy-efficient 35 watt fan to provide air circulation, resulting in significant energy savings. This measure allows for economizer systems with evaporator fan controls plus a circulation fan and without a circulation fan.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: RF.

If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified. IECC code requires economizers in certain instances and therefore projects relying on code baseline definitions must verify eligibility.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To qualify for this measure an economizer is installed on a walk in refrigeration system.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline condition is a walk-in refrigeration system without an economizer.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The estimated life of this measure is 15 years.[[152]](#footnote-155)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

Installation costs can vary considerably depending on system size (larger systems may require multiple economizer units), physical site layouts (locating economizer intakes and ductwork), and controls elected. Therefore, actual site-specific costs should be used.

###### Loadshape

Loadshape C22 - Commercial Refrigeration

###### Coincidence Factor

The summer peak coincidence factor for this measure is assumed to be 0%.[[153]](#footnote-156)

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

Electric energy savings is calculated dependent on whether evaporator fans controls are installed.

With Fan Control Installed

ΔkWh = [HP \* kWhCond] + [((kWEvap \* nFans) – kWCirc) \* Hours \* DCComp \* BF] – [kWEcon \* DCEcon \* Hours]

Without Fan Control Installed

ΔkWh = [HP \* kWhCond] – [kWEcon \* DCEcon \* Hours]

Where:

HP = Horsepower of Compressor

= actual installed

kWhCond = Condensing unit savings, kWh/HP[[154]](#footnote-157)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Climate Zone**  **(City based upon)** | **Hermetic / Semi-Hermetic** | **Scroll** | **Discus** |
| 1 (Rockford) | 494 | 434 | 410 |
| 2 (Chicago/O’Hare) | 423 | 372 | 352 |
| 3 (Springfield) | 321 | 282 | 267 |
| 4 (Belleview) | 230 | 202 | 191 |
| 5 (Marion) | 136 | 119 | 113 |

Hours = Number of annual hours that economizer operates [[155]](#footnote-158)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Region (city)** | **Hours** |
| 1 (Rockford) | 2,033 |
| 2 (Chicago/O’Hare) | 1,806 |
| 3 (Springfield) | 1,350 |
| 4 (Belleview) | 1,112 |
| 5 (Marion) | 752 |

DCComp = Duty cycle of the compressor

= 50% [[156]](#footnote-159)

kWEvap = Connected load kW of each evaporator fan

= If known, actual installed. Otherwise assume 0.126 kW[[157]](#footnote-160)

kWCirc = Connected load kW of the circulating fan

= If known, actual installed. Otherwise assume 0.035 kW[[158]](#footnote-161)

nFans = Number of evaporator fans

= actual number of evaporator fans

DCEcon = Duty cycle of the economizer fan on days that are cool enough for the economizer to be working

= If known, actual installed. Otherwise assume 63%[[159]](#footnote-162)

BF = Bonus factor for reduced cooling load from reduction of waste heat generation as a

result of running the evaporator fan less

= 1.3[[160]](#footnote-163)

kWEcon = Connected load kW of the economizer fan

= If known, actual installed. Otherwise assume 0.227 kW.[[161]](#footnote-164)

**For example,** adding an outdoor air economizer and fan controls in Rockford to a 5 hp hermetic compressor walk in refrigeration unit with 3 evaporator fans would save:

ΔkWh = [hp \* kWhCond] + [((kWEvap \* nFans) – kWCirc) \* Hours \* DCComp \* BF] – [kWEcon \* DCEcon \* Hours]

= [5 \* 494] + [((0.126 \* 3) – 0.035) \* 2033 \*0.5 \* 1.3] – [0.227 \* 0.63 \* 2033]

= 2633 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

kW= kWh / Hours \* CF

Where:

CF = Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for the measure

= 0 [[162]](#footnote-165)

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

N/A

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: CI-RFG-ECON-V08-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2028

### 4.8.9 High Frequency Battery Chargers

###### Description

This measure applies to industrial high frequency battery chargers, used for industrial equipment such as fork lifts, replacing existing SCR (silicon controlled rectifier) or ferroresonant charging technology. High frequency battery chargers have a greater system efficiency.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS, NC. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

High frequency battery charger systems with minimum Power Conversion Efficiency of 90% and a minimum 8-hour shift operation five days per week.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

SCR or ferroresonant battery charger systems with minimum 8-hour shift operation five days per week.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

15 years[[163]](#footnote-166)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The deemed incremental measure cost is $400.[[164]](#footnote-167)

###### Loadshape

Loadshape C14 - Indust. 1-shift (8/5) (e.g., comp. air, lights)

Loadshape C15 - Indust. 2-shift (16/5) (e.g., comp. air, lights)

Loadshape C16 - Indust. 3-shift (24/5) (e.g., comp. air, lights)

Loadshape C17 - Indust. 4-shift (24/7) (e.g., comp. air, lights)

###### Coincidence Factor

The coincidence factor is assumed to be 0.0 for 1 and 2-shift operation and 1.0 for 3 and 4-shift operation.[[165]](#footnote-168)

Algorithm

###### Electric Energy Savings

∆kWh = (CAP \* DOD) \* CHG \* (CRB/ PCB - CREE / PCEE)

Where:

CAP = Capacity of Battery

= Use actual battery capacity, otherwise use a default value of 35 kWh[[166]](#footnote-169)

DOD = Depth of Discharge

= Use actual depth of discharge, otherwise use a default value of 80%.[[167]](#footnote-170)

CHG = Number of Charges per year

= Use actual number of annual charges, if unknown use values below based on the type of operations[[168]](#footnote-171)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard Operations** | **Number of Charges per year** |
| 1-shift (8 hrs/day – 5 days/week) | 520 |
| 2-shift (16 hrs/day – 5 days/week) | 1040 |
| 3-shift (24 hrs/day – 5 days/week) | 1560 |
| 4-shift (24 hrs/day – 7 days/week) | 2184 |

CRB = Baseline Charge Return Factor

= 1.2485[[169]](#footnote-172)

PCB = Baseline Power Conversion Efficiency

= 0.84[[170]](#footnote-173)

CREE = Efficient Charge Return Factor

= 1.107[[171]](#footnote-174)

PCEE = Efficient Power Conversion Efficiency

= 0.89[[172]](#footnote-175)

Default savings using defaults provided above are provided below:

| **Standard Operations** | **ΔkWh** |
| --- | --- |
| 1-shift (8 hrs/day – 5 days/week) | 3,531 |
| 2-shift (16 hrs/day – 5 days/week) | 7,061 |
| 3-shift (24 hrs/day – 5 days/week) | 10,592 |
| 4-shift (24 hrs/day – 7 days/week) | 14,829 |

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

∆kW = (PFEE\* PCEE – PFB \*PCB) \* VoltsDC­ \* AmpsDC / 1000 \* CF

Where:

PFB = Power factor of baseline charger

= 0.9095[[173]](#footnote-176)

PFEE = Power factor of high frequency charger

= 0.9370[[174]](#footnote-177)

VoltsDC = Actual DC rated voltage of charger (assumed baseline charger is replaced with same rated high frequency unit)

= Use actual battery DC voltage rating, otherwise use a default value of 48 volts.[[175]](#footnote-178)

AmpsDC = Actual DC rated amperage of charger (assumed baseline charger is replaced with same rated high frequency unit)

= Use actual battery DC ampere rating, otherwise use a default value of 81 amps.[[176]](#footnote-179)

1,000 = watt to kilowatt conversion factor

CF = Summer Coincident Peak Factor for this measure

= 0.0 (for 1 and 2-shift operation)[[177]](#footnote-180)

= 1.0 (for 3 and 4-shift operation)[[178]](#footnote-181)

Other variables as provided above.

Default savings using defaults provided above are provided below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard Operations** | **∆kW** |
| 1-shift (8 hrs/day – 5 days/week) | 0 |
| 2-shift (16 hrs/day – 5 days/week) | 0 |
| 3-shift (24 hrs/day – 5 days/week) | 0.2720 |
| 4-shift (24 hrs/day – 7 days/week) | 0.2720 |

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

N/A

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: CI-MSC-BACH-V03-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2030

### 4.8.25 Warm-Mix Asphalt Chemical Additives

###### Description

Warm-Mix Asphalt (WMA) is the name for a variety of technologies that allow for production and placement of asphalt at temperatures lower than traditional Hot-Mix Asphalt (HMA). The production temperature of WMA is typically 25°F to 90°F below that of HMA, resulting in reduced energy consumption. The actual temperature reduction depends upon the warm mix technology used. Currently, there are three categories of WMA technologies: asphalt foaming technologies, organic additives, and chemical additives.

The asphalt foaming technologies include a variety of processes to foam asphalt, including water-injecting systems, damp aggregate, or the addition of a hydrophilic material such as a zeolite. In the asphalt plant, the water turns to steam, disperses throughout the asphalt, and expands the binder, providing a corresponding temporary increase in volume and fluids content, similar in effect to increasing the binder content. Chemical additives often include surfactants that aid in coating and lubrication of the asphalt binder in the mixture. Lastly, organic additives are typically special types of waxes that cause a decrease in binder viscosity above the melting point of the wax.

In additional to energy savings, using WMA in place of HMA reduces greenhouse gas emissions and provides multiple non-energy benefits, such as beter compaction, cool-weather paving, longer haul distances, and improved working conditions for the paving crew (reduction of fumes and odors). Warm-mix chemical additives allow for the mixing and placement of asphalt at temperatures lower than traditional HMA while maintaining similar strength, durability, and performance characteristics.

This measure is applicable to the industrial market with the end user in the transporation sector. WMA can be used in any climate, as the lower mix temperature allows WMA to be used in cooler ambient conditions than traditional HMA.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

The efficient case is WMA. WMA is generally produced at temperatures ranging from 25°F to 90°F lower than HMA.[[179]](#footnote-182)

General WMA technologies can be categorized as chemical additives, organic additives, and water-based foaming methods. Chemical additives reduce the internal friction between aggregate particles and thin films of binders when subjected to high shear rates during mixing and high shear stress during compaction. In contrast, the other two WMA methods rely on reduction of binder viscosity.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline case is traditional HMA. HMA is traditionally mixed between 280°F and 320°F.[[180]](#footnote-183)

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The measure life is 1 year. Savings occur during production, and last only as long as the production runs. Since savings and costs scale to tons of asphalt production, a 1-year measure life appropriately tracks lifecycle savings.

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The costs of WMA depend primarily on the type of WMA technology that is used. Of the WMA technology options, water-injection asphalt foaming typically have the lowest cost per ton. Water injection WMA technologies have a lower incremental cost at around $0.08 per ton.[[181]](#footnote-184)

Compared to other WMA technologies, additive based WMA technologies increase the mix costs by $2.50 per ton[[182]](#footnote-185) due to the cost of chemicals and freight costs.

###### Loadshape

N/A

###### Coincidence Factor

N/A

Algorithm

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

Energy savings are dependent on multiple factors that primarily affect the production of WMA. The following factors have been identified as the primary contributors to energy consumption:

* Mixing drum temperature
* Additive type

###### Electric Energy Savings

N/A.

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

N/A.

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

Average temperature reduction achieved by plants that reduce mix production temperature when using WMA must be determined to estimate reductions in energy consumption. In practice, WMA production temperatures when using water-injection foaming technologies are typically about 25°F lower than those for hot mix asphalt (HMA) using the same mix design. WMA produced with additives tends to have substantially lower mixing temperatures. For the purpose of estimating energy savings, a temperature difference of 50°F is assumed for additive-type WMA compared to HMA using the same mix design.

Where:

tons = Tons of asphalt produced

SF = WMA production savings factor (therms/ton)

= See Table for SF for Water Injection Foaming and Additives

Energy Savings by mixing temperature reduction

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WMA Production Technology** | **[A]**  **Energy Savings [[183]](#footnote-187) (therms/Δ°F/ton)** | **[B]**  **Temperature Reduction (°F)** | **[C] = [A]\*[B]**  **SF**  **(therms/ton)** |
| Water Injection Foaming | 0.011 | 25 | 0.275 |
| Additives | 0.011 | 50 | 0.55 |
| Custom Documented | 0.011 | Custom | Calculated |

**Example**:

A plant producing 1,000 ton ashphalt everyday now decides to adopt additives for energy savings and non energy benefits. The savings for that plant will be computed:

Savings = 1,000 tons \* 0.55 (therms/ton)

= 550 therms saved.

###### Water and Other Non-Energy Impact Descriptions and Calculation

In addition to reduced energy consumption, reduction in production temperatures results in reduced greenhouse gas emissions from the combustion process and any emissions from the mixed asphalt. The reduction of emissions, fumes, and odors results in a healthier work environment for production operators, truck drivers, and application workers. The lower temperature mix also allows for an extended paving season, night paving, and longer hauling distances for the WMA in comparison to HMA with faster application times.

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

**Measure Code: CI-MSC-WMIX-V02-240101**

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2030

### ENERGY STAR Clothes Washers

###### Description

This measure relates to the installation of a clothes washer meeting the ENERGY STAR, ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 or CEE Advanced Tier minimum qualifications. Note if the DHW and dryer fuels of the installations are unknown (for example through a retail program) savings should be based on a weighted blend using RECS data (the resultant values (kWh, therms and gallons of water) are provided). The algorithms can also be used to calculate site specific savings where DHW and dryer fuels are known.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types:  TOS, NC.

If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

Clothes washer must meet the ENERGY STAR, ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 or CEE Advanced Tier minimum qualifications, as required by the program.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline condition is a standard sized clothes washer meeting the minimum federal baseline as of January 2018.[[184]](#footnote-188)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Efficiency Level** | **Top Loading >2.5 Cu ft** | **Front Loading >2.5 Cu ft** |
| Federal Standard | ≥1.57 IMEF, ≤6.5 IWF | ≥1.84 IMEF, ≤4.7 IWF |
| ENERGY STAR | ≥2.06 IMEF, ≤4.3 IWF | ≥2.76 IMEF, ≤3.2 IWF |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 | ≥2.92 IMEF, ≤3.2 IWF | |
| CEE Advanced Tier | ≥3.1 IMEF, ≤3.0 IWF | |

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 14 years[[185]](#footnote-189)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The incremental cost for an ENERGY STAR unit for a non-IQ participant is assumed to be $87, for an ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 unit it is $85 and for a CEE Advanced Tier it is $99.[[186]](#footnote-190)

For an IQ participant the incremental cost is assumed to be $214, for an ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 unit it is $212 and for a CEE Advanced Tier it is $227.[[187]](#footnote-191)

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustments

N/A

###### Loadshape

Loadshape R01 - Residential Clothes Washer

###### Coincidence Factor

The coincidence factor for this measure is 3.8%.[[188]](#footnote-192)

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

1. Calculate clothes washer savings based on the Integrated Modified Energy Factor (IMEF).

The Integrated Modified Energy Factor (IMEF) includes unit operation, standby, water heating, and drying energy use: *"IMEF is the quotient of the capacity of the clothes container, C, divided by the total clothes washer energy consumption per cycle, with such energy consumption expressed as the sum of the machine electrical energy consumption, M, the hot water energy consumption, E, the energy required for removal of the remaining moisture in the wash load, D, and the combined low-power mode energy consumption"* .[[189]](#footnote-193)

The hot water and dryer savings calculated here assumes electric DHW and Dryer (this will be separated in Step 2).

IMEFsavings[[190]](#footnote-194) = Capacity \* (IQAdj/IMEFbase - 1/IMEFeff) \* Ncycles

Where

Capacity = Clothes Washer capacity (cubic feet)

= Actual. If capacity is unknown assume 3.55 cubic feet [[191]](#footnote-195)

IQAdj = Baseline consumption adjustment for IQ program participants to account for a portion of participants who would have utilized the secondary market.[[192]](#footnote-196)

= 1.28 if IQ (for PY 2024 - note this value will be updated to 1.02 in 2025 to account for the Federal Standard shift that occurred in 2015), 1.0 if non-IQ

IMEFbase = Integrated Modified Energy Factor of baseline unit

= 1.71[[193]](#footnote-197)

IMEFeff = Integrated Modified Energy Factor of efficient unit

= Actual. If unknown assume average values provided below.

Ncycles = Number of Cycles per year

= 295[[194]](#footnote-198)

IMEFsavings is provided below based on deemed values:[[195]](#footnote-199)

| **Efficiency Level** | **IMEF** | **IMEF Savings (kWh)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Federal Standard | 1.75 | 0.0 |
| ENERGY STAR | 2.21 | 139.6 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 | 2.92 | 254.8 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 3.10 | 275.6 |

1. Break out savings calculated in Step 1 for electric DHW and electric dryer

∆kWh = [Capacity \* 1/IMEFbase \* Ncycles \* (%CWbase + (%DHWbase \* %Electric\_DHW) + (%Dryerbase \* %Electric\_Dryer))] - [Capacity \* 1/IMEFeff \* Ncycles \* (%CWeff + (%DHWeff \* %Electric\_DHW) + (%Dryereff \* %Electric\_Dryer))]

Where:

%CW = Percentage of total energy consumption for Clothes Washer operation (different for baseline and efficient unit – see table below)

%DHW = Percentage of total energy consumption used for water heating (different for baseline and efficient unit – see table below)

%Dryer = Percentage of total energy consumption for dryer operation (different for baseline and efficient unit – see table below)

|  | **Percentage of Total Energy Consumption[[196]](#footnote-200)** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **%CW** | **%DHW** | **%Dryer** |
| Baseline | 6.7% | 15.8% | 77.5% |
| ENERGY STAR | 6.6% | 13.0% | 80.4% |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 | 8.2% | 8.8% | 82.9% |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 8.9% | 7.0% | 84.1% |

%Electric\_DHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be electric

= 100 % for Electric

= 0 % for Fossil Fuel

= If unknown[[197]](#footnote-201), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[198]](#footnote-202) | 24% | 25% | 40% | 43% | 28% |
| ComEd[[199]](#footnote-203) | 8% | | 11% | | 9% |
| People’s Gas[[200]](#footnote-204) | 23% | 26% | 49% | 50% | 37% |
| Northshore Gas[[201]](#footnote-205) | 20% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[202]](#footnote-206) | 20% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | 23% |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

%Electric\_Dryer = Percentage of dryer savings assumed to be electric

| **Dryer fuel** | **%Electric\_Dryer** |
| --- | --- |
| Electric | 100% |
| Natural Gas | 0% |
| Unknown | 69%[[203]](#footnote-207) |

Using the default/unknown assumptions provided above, the prescriptive savings for each configuration are presented below:

|  | **ΔkWH – Non IQ Participants** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electric DHW Electric Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Electric DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Electric DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Gas DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Electric Dryer** | **Unknown DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Unknown Dryer** |
| ENERGY STAR | 139.6 | 104.3 | 45.3 | 10.1 | 110.3 | 75.1 | 114.2 | 19.9 | 85.0 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 | 254.8 | 189.4 | 77.1 | 11.7 | 199.7 | 134.4 | 207.7 | 30.0 | 152.7 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 275.6 | 202.3 | 84.5 | 11.1 | 210.8 | 154.5 | 235.1 | 26.0 | 170.3 |

|  | **ΔkWH –IQ Participants (2024)** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electric DHW Electric Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Electric DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Electric DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Gas DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Electric Dryer** | **Unknown DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Unknown Dryer** |
| ENERGY STAR | 309.7 | 231.4 | 100.5 | 22.4 | 244.7 | 166.6 | 253.3 | 44.1 | 188.6 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 | 424.3 | 315.4 | 128.4 | 19.5 | 332.5 | 223.8 | 345.9 | 50.0 | 254.3 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 445.0 | 326.7 | 136.4 | 17.9 | 340.4 | 249.5 | 379.6 | 42.0 | 275.0 |

|  | **ΔkWH –IQ Participants (2025 on)** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electric DHW Electric Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Electric DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Electric DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Gas DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Electric Dryer** | **Unknown DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Unknown Dryer** |
| ENERGY STAR | 153.3 | 114.5 | 49.7 | 11.1 | 121.1 | 82.5 | 125.4 | 21.9 | 93.3 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 | 268.4 | 199.5 | 81.2 | 12.3 | 210.4 | 141.6 | 218.8 | 31.6 | 160.9 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 289.2 | 212.3 | 88.7 | 11.6 | 221.2 | 162.1 | 246.7 | 27.3 | 178.7 |

Secondary kWh Savings for Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment

The following savings should be included in the total savings for this measure but should not be included in TRC tests to avoid double counting the economic benefit of water savings.

ΔkWhwater = ΔWater (gallons) / 1,000,000 \* Ewater total

Where

∆Water (gallons) = Water saved, in gallons – as calculated below.

Ewater total = IL Total Water Energy Factor (kWh/Million Gallons)

=5,010[[204]](#footnote-208)

Using defaults provided:

ENERGY STAR ΔkWhwater = 1,595/1,000,000 \* 5,010

= 8.0 kWh [13.6 kWh for IQ (2024), 8.5 kWh for IQ (2025 on)]

ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 ΔkWhwater = 2,500/1,000,000 \* 5,010

= 12.5 kWh [18.2 kWh for IQ (2024), 13.1 kWh for IQ (2025 on)]

CEE Advanced Tier ΔkWhwater = 2,709/1,000,000 \* 5,010

= 13.6 kWh [19.3 kWh for IQ (2024), 14.2 kWh for IQ (2025 on)]

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = ΔkWh/Hours \* CF

Where:

ΔkWh = Energy Savings as calculated above. Note do not include the secondary savings in this calculation.

Hours = Assumed Run hours of Clothes Washer

= 295 hours[[205]](#footnote-209)

CF = Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for measure.

= 0.038[[206]](#footnote-210)

Using the default assumptions provided above, the prescriptive savings for each configuration are presented below:

|  | **ΔkW- Non IQ Participants** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electric DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Electric DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Electric DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Gas DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Electric Dryer** | **Unknown DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Unknown Dryer** |
| ENERGY STAR | 0.0180 | 0.0134 | 0.0058 | 0.0013 | 0.0142 | 0.0097 | 0.0147 | 0.0026 | 0.0109 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 3 | 0.0328 | 0.0244 | 0.0099 | 0.0015 | 0.0257 | 0.0173 | 0.0268 | 0.0039 | 0.0197 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 0.0355 | 0.0261 | 0.0109 | 0.0014 | 0.0272 | 0.0199 | 0.0303 | 0.0034 | 0.0219 |

|  | **ΔkW- IQ Participants (2024)** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electric DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Electric DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Electric DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Gas DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Electric Dryer** | **Unknown DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Unknown Dryer** |
| ENERGY STAR | 0.0399 | 0.0298 | 0.0129 | 0.0029 | 0.0315 | 0.0215 | 0.0326 | 0.0057 | 0.0243 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 3 | 0.0547 | 0.0406 | 0.0165 | 0.0025 | 0.0428 | 0.0288 | 0.0446 | 0.0064 | 0.0328 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 0.0573 | 0.0421 | 0.0176 | 0.0023 | 0.0438 | 0.0321 | 0.0489 | 0.0054 | 0.0354 |

|  | **ΔkW- IQ Participants (2025 on)** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electric DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Electric DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Electric DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Gas DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Electric Dryer** | **Unknown DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Unknown Dryer** |
| ENERGY STAR | 0.0197 | 0.0148 | 0.0064 | 0.0014 | 0.0156 | 0.0106 | 0.0162 | 0.0028 | 0.0120 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 3 | 0.0346 | 0.0257 | 0.0105 | 0.0016 | 0.0271 | 0.0182 | 0.0282 | 0.0041 | 0.0207 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 0.0373 | 0.0273 | 0.0114 | 0.0015 | 0.0285 | 0.0209 | 0.0318 | 0.0035 | 0.0230 |

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

Break out savings calculated in Step 1 of electric energy savings (MEF savings) and extract Natural Gas DHW and Natural Gas dryer savings from total savings:

∆Therm = [(Capacity \* IQAdj/IMEFbase \* Ncycles \* ((%DHWbase \* %Fossil\_DHW \* R\_eff) + (%Dryerbase \* %Gas \_Dryer))) – (Capacity \* 1/IMEFeff \* Ncycles \* ((%DHWeff \* %Fossil\_DHW \* R\_eff) + (%Dryereff \* %Gas\_Dryer)))] \* Therm\_convert

Where:

Therm\_convert = Convertion factor from kWh to Therm

= 0.03412

R\_eff = Recovery efficiency factor

= 1.26[[207]](#footnote-211)

%Fossil\_DHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be Fossil Fuel

= 100 % for Fossil fuel

= 0 % for Electric

= If unknown[[208]](#footnote-212), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[209]](#footnote-213) | 76% | 75% | 60% | 57% | 72% |
| ComEd[[210]](#footnote-214) | 92% | | 89% | | 91% |
| People’s Gas[[211]](#footnote-215) | 77% | 74% | 51% | 50% | 63% |
| Northshore Gas[[212]](#footnote-216) | 80% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[213]](#footnote-217) | 80% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | **77%** |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

%Fossil\_Dryer = Percentage of dryer savings assumed to be fossil fuel

| **Dryer fuel** | **%Gas\_Dryer** |
| --- | --- |
| Electric | 0% |
| Fossil Fuel | 100% |
| Unknown | 31%[[214]](#footnote-218) |

Other factors as defined above.

Using the default/unknown assumptions provided above, the prescriptive savings for each configuration are presented below:

|  | **ΔTherms – Non IQ Participants** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electric DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Electric DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Electric DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Gas DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Electric Dryer** | **Unknown DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Unknown Dryer** |
| ENERGY STAR | 0.0 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 4.7 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 2.1 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 6.1 | 8.9 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 8.1 | 3.9 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 0.0 | 3.2 | 6.5 | 9.7 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 1.7 | 8.9 | 4.0 |

|  | **ΔTherms – IQ Participants (2024)** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electric DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Electric DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Electric DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Gas DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Electric Dryer** | **Unknown DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Unknown Dryer** |
| ENERGY STAR | 0 | 3.3 | 7.1 | 10.4 | 2.2 | 5.5 | 2.4 | 9.5 | 4.7 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 | 0 | 4.7 | 10.2 | 14.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 3.3 | 13.5 | 6.5 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 0 | 5.2 | 10.5 | 15.7 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 2.7 | 14.4 | 6.5 |

|  | **ΔTherms – IQ Participants (2025 on)** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electric DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Electric Dryer** | **Electric DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Gas DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Electric DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Gas DHW Unknown Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Electric Dryer** | **Unknown DHW**  **Gas Dryer** | **Unknown DHW Unknown Dryer** |
| ENERGY STAR | 0 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 5.2 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 4.7 | 2.3 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 | 0 | 2.9 | 6.4 | 9.4 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 2.1 | 8.5 | 4.1 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 0 | 3.4 | 6.8 | 10.2 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 1.8 | 9.3 | 4.2 |

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

∆Water (gallons) = Capacity \* ((IWFbase \* IQAdjWater) - IWFeff) \* Ncycles

Where

∆Water (gallons) = Water saved, in gallons

IWFbase = Integrated Water Factor of baseline clothes washer

= 5.59[[215]](#footnote-219)

IQAdjWater = Baseline water consumption adjustment for IQ program participants to account for a portion of participants who would have utilized the secondary market.[[216]](#footnote-220)

= 1.19 if IQ (for PY 2024 - note this value will be updated to 1.02 in 2025 to account for the Federal Standard shift that occurred in 2015), 1.0 if non-IQ

IWFeff = Water Factor of efficient clothes washer

= Actual. If unknown assume average values provided below.

Using the default assumptions provided above, the prescriptive water savings for each efficiency level are presented below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Efficiency Level** | **IWF** | **∆Water (gallons per year)** | | |
| **Non-IQ** | **IQ (2024)** | **IQ (2025 on)** |
| Federal Standard | 5.59 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ENERGY STAR | 4.07 | 1,595 | 2,722 | 1,706 |
| ENERGY STAR Most Efficient/CEE Tier 2 | 3.2 | 2,500 | 3,633 | 2,617 |
| CEE Advanced Tier | 3 | 2,709 | 3,842 | 2,826 |

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: RS-APL-ESCL-V12-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2025

### 5.1.4 ENERGY STAR Dishwasher

###### Description

A standard or compact residential dishwasher meeting ENERGY STAR standards is installed in place of a model meeting the federal standard.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types:  TOS, NC. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

The efficient equipment is defined as a standard or compact dishwasher meeting the ENERGY STAR standards presented in the table below.

**ENERGY STAR Requirements (Version 7.0, Effective July 19, 2023)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dishwasher Type** | **Maximum kWh/year** | **Maximum gallons/cycle** |
| Standard  (≥ 8 place settings + six serving pieces) | 240 | 3.2 |
| Standard with Connected Functionality[[217]](#footnote-221) | 252 |
| Compact  (< 8 place settings + six serving pieces) | 155 | 2.0 |

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline reflects the minimum federal efficiency standards for dishwashers effective May 30, 2013, as presented in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dishwasher Type** | **Maximum kWh/year** | **Maximum gallons/cycle** |
| Standard | 307 | 5.0 |
| Compact | 222 | 3.5 |

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The assumed lifetime of the measure is 11 years.[[218]](#footnote-222)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The incremental cost for standard and compact dishwashers is provided in the table below:[[219]](#footnote-223)

| **Dishwasher Type** | **Baseline Cost** | | **ENERGY STAR Cost** | **Incremental Cost** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Non-IQ** | **IQ[[220]](#footnote-224)** | **Non-IQ** | **IQ** |
| Standard | $255.63 | $213.03 | $331.30 | $75.67 | $118.28 |
| Compact | $290.13 | $241.78 | $308.62 | $18.49 | $66.85 |

###### Loadshape

Loadshape R02 - Residential Dish Washer

###### Coincidence Factor

The coincidence factor is assumed to be 2.6%.[[221]](#footnote-225)

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

ΔkWh[[222]](#footnote-226) = ((kWhBase- kWhESTAR) \* (%kWh\_op + (%kWh\_heat \* %Electric\_DHW )))

Where:

kWhBASE *=* Baseline kWh consumption per year

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dishwasher Type** | **Maximum kWh/year** | |
| **Non-IQ** | **IQ**[[223]](#footnote-227) |
| Standard | 307 | 310 |
| Compact | 222 | 224 |

kWhESTAR *=* ENERGY STAR kWh annual consumption

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dishwasher Type** | **Maximum kWh/year** |
| Standard | 240 |
| Standard with Connected Functionality | 252 |
| Compact | 155 |

%kWh\_op = Percentage of dishwasher energy consumption used for unit operation

= 100 - 56%[[224]](#footnote-228)

= 44%

%kWh\_heat = Percentage of dishwasher energy consumption used for water heating

= 56%[[225]](#footnote-229)

%Electric\_DHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be electric

= 100 % for Electric

= 0 % for Fossil Fuel

= If unknown[[226]](#footnote-230), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[227]](#footnote-231) | 24% | 25% | 40% | 43% | 28% |
| ComEd[[228]](#footnote-232) | 8% | | 11% | | 9% |
| People’s Gas[[229]](#footnote-233) | 23% | 26% | 49% | 50% | 37% |
| Northshore Gas[[230]](#footnote-234) | 20% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[231]](#footnote-235) | 20% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | 23% |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dishwasher Type** | **ΔkWh - Non IQ** | | | **ΔkWh - IQ** | | |
| **With Electric DHW** | **With Gas DHW** | **With Unknown location and building type DHW** | **With Electric DHW** | **With Gas DHW** | **With Unknown location and building type DHW** |
| ENERGY STAR Standard | 67 | 29.5 | 40 | 69.8 | 30.7 | 41.7 |
| ENERGY STAR Standard with Connected Functionality | 55 | 24.2 | 32.8 | 57.8 | 25.4 | 34.5 |
| ENERGY STAR Compact | 67 | 29.5 | 40 | 69.1 | 30.4 | 41.2 |

Secondary kWh Savings for Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment

The following savings should be included in the total savings for this measure but should not be included in TRC tests to avoid double counting the economic benefit of water savings.

ΔkWhwater = ΔWater (gallons) / 1,000,000 \* Ewater total

Where

Ewater total = IL Total Water Energy Factor (kWh/Million Gallons)

=5,010[[232]](#footnote-236)

Using defaults provided:

Standard ΔkWhwater = 252/1,000,000 \* 5,010

= 1.3 kWh

Compact ΔkWhwater = 67/1,000,000 \* 5,010

= 0.3 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings[[233]](#footnote-237)

ΔkW = ΔkWh/Hours \* CF

Where:

ΔkWh = Annual kWh savings from measure as calculated above. Note do not include the secondary savings in this calculation.

Hours = Annual operating hours[[234]](#footnote-238)

= 353 hours

CF = Summer Peak Coincidence Factor

= 2.6% [[235]](#footnote-239)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dishwasher Type** | **ΔkW - Non IQ** | | | **ΔkW - IQ** | | |
| **With Electric DHW** | **With Gas DHW** | **With Unknown location and building type DHW** | **With Electric DHW** | **With Gas DHW** | **With Unknown location and building type DHW** |
| ENERGY STAR Standard | 0.0049 | 0.0022 | 0.0029 | 0.0051 | 0.0023 | 0.0031 |
| ENERGY STAR Standard with Connected Functionality | 0.0041 | 0.0018 | 0.0024 | 0.0043 | 0.0019 | 0.0025 |
| ENERGY STAR Compact | 0.0049 | 0.0022 | 0.0029 | 0.0051 | 0.0022 | 0.0030 |

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

Δ Therm = (kWhBase- kWhESTAR) \* %kWh\_heat \* %Fossil\_DHW \* R\_eff \* 0.03412

Where

%kWh\_heat = % of dishwasher energy used for water heating

= 56%

%Fossil\_DHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be fossil fuel

= 100 % for Fossil Fuel

= 0 % for Electric

= If unknown[[236]](#footnote-240), use the following table:

|  | **Location** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[237]](#footnote-241) | 76% | 75% | 60% | 57% | 72% |
| ComEd[[238]](#footnote-242) | 92% | | 89% | | 91% |
| People’s Gas[[239]](#footnote-243) | 77% | 74% | 51% | 50% | 63% |
| Northshore Gas[[240]](#footnote-244) | 80% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[241]](#footnote-245) | 80% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | **77%** |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

R\_eff = Recovery efficiency factor

= 1.26[[242]](#footnote-246)

0.03412 = factor to convert from kWh to Therm

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dishwasher Type** | **ΔTherms - Non IQ** | | | **ΔTherms - IQ** | | |
| **With Electric DHW** | **With Gas DHW** | **With Unknown location and building type DHW** | **With Electric DHW** | **With Gas DHW** | **With Unknown location and building type DHW** |
| ENERGY STAR Standard | 0 | 1.61 | 1.61 | 0 | 1.68 | 1.21 |
| ENERGY STAR Standard with Connected Functionality | 0 | 1.32 | 0.95 | 0 | 1.39 | 1.00 |
| ENERGY STAR Compact | 0 | 1.61 | 1.61 | 0 | 1.66 | 1.20 |

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

ΔWater (gallons) = WaterBase- WaterEFF

Where

WaterBase = water consumption of conventional unit

| **Dishwasher Type** | **WaterBase (gallons) [[243]](#footnote-247)** |
| --- | --- |
| Standard | 840 |
| Compact | 588 |

WaterEFF = annualwater consumption of efficient unit:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dishwasher Type** | **WaterEFF (gallons) [[244]](#footnote-248)** |
| Standard | 538 |
| Compact | 336 |

| **Dishwasher Type** | **ΔWater(gallons)** |
| --- | --- |
| ENERGY STAR Standard | 302 |
| ENERGY STAR Compact | 252 |

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: RS-APL-ESDI-V10-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2025

### 5.1.7 ENERGY STAR and CEE Tier 2 Room Air Conditioner

###### Description

This measure relates to:

1. Time of Sale the purchase and installation of a room air conditioning unit that meets ENERGY STAR version 5.0, which is effective October 30th 2023[[245]](#footnote-249), or CEE Tier 2 minimum qualifying efficiency specifications, in place of a baseline unit. The baseline is based on the Federal Standard effective June 1st, 2014.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product Type and Class (Btu/hr)** | | **Federal Standard with louvered sides**  **(CEER) [[246]](#footnote-250)** | **Federal Standard without louvered sides**  **(CEER)** | **ENERGY STAR v5.0 with louvered sides (CEER)** **[[247]](#footnote-251)** | **ENERGY STAR v5.0 without louvered sides (CEER)** | **CEE Tier 2 (CEER)[[248]](#footnote-252)** |
| Without Reverse Cycle | < 8,000 | 11.0 | 10.0 | 13.7 | 12.8 | 14.85 |
| 8,000 to 10,999 | 10.9 | 9.6 | 14.7 | 13.0 | 14.72 |
| 11,000 to 13,999 | 10.9 | 9.5 | 14.7 | 12.8 | 14.72 |
| 14,000 to 19,999 | 10.7 | 9.3 | 14.4 | 12.6 | 14.45 |
| 20,000 to 27,999 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.69 |
| >=28,000 | 9.0 | 9.4 | 12.2 | 12.7 | 12.15 |
| With Reverse Cycle | <14,000 | 9.8 | 9.3 | 13.2 | 12.6 | N/A |
| 14,000 to 19,999 | 9.8 | 8.7 | 13.2 | 11.7 | N/A |
| >=20,000 | 9.3 | 8.7 | 12.6 | 11.7 | N/A |
| Casement only | | 9.5 | | 12.8 | |  |
| Casement-Slider | | 10.4 | | 14.0 | |  |

Side louvers extend from a room air conditioner model in order to position the unit in a window. A model without louvered sides is placed in a built-in wall sleeve and are commonly referred to as "through-the-wall" or "built-in" models.

Casement-only refers to a room air conditioner designed for mounting in a casement window of a specific size.

Casement-slider refers to a room air conditioner with an encased assembly designed for mounting in a sliding or casement window of a specific size.

Reverse cycle refers to the heating function found in certain room air conditioner models.

1. Early Replacement: the early removal of an existing residential inefficient Room AC unit from service, prior to its natural end of life, and replacement with a new ENERGY STAR qualifying unit. Savings are calculated between existing unit and efficient unit consumption during the remaining life of the existing unit, and between new baseline unit and efficient unit consumption for the remainder of the measure life.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types:  TOS, NC, EREP.

If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To qualify for this measure, the new room air conditioning unit must meet the ENERGY STAR version 5.0, which is effective October 30th 2023[[249]](#footnote-253), efficiency standards presented above.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

Time of Sale: the baseline assumption is a new room air conditioning unit that meets the Federal Standard (effective June 1st, 2014)[[250]](#footnote-254) efficiency standards as presented above.

Early Replacement: the baseline is the existing Room AC for the assumed remaining useful life of the unit and the new baseline as defined above for the remainder of the measure life.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The measure life is assumed to be 12 years.[[251]](#footnote-255)

Remaining life of existing equipment is assumed to be 4 years.[[252]](#footnote-256)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

Time of Sale: The incremental cost for this measure is assumed to be $40 for an ENERGY STAR unit and $261 for a CEE Tier 2 unit.[[253]](#footnote-257)

Early Replacement: The measure cost is the full cost of removing the existing unit and installing a new one. The actual program cost should be used. If unavailable assume $448 for ENERGY STAR unit and $669 for CEE Tier 2 unit.[[254]](#footnote-258)

The avoided replacement cost (after 4 years) of a baseline replacement unit is $432.[[255]](#footnote-259) This cost should be discounted to present value using the nominal societal discount rate.

###### Loadshape

Loadshape R08 - Residential Cooling

###### Coincidence Factor

The coincidence factor for this measure is assumed to be 0.3.[[256]](#footnote-260)

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

Time of Sale: ΔkWh = (FLHRoomAC \* Btu/H \* (1/CEERbase - 1/CEERee))/1000

Early Replacment:

ΔkWh for remaining life of existing unit (1st 4 years) = (FLHRoomAC \* Btu/H \* (1/(EERexist/1.01) - 1/CEERee))/1000

ΔkWh for remaining measure life (next 8 years) = (FLHRoomAC \* Btu/H \* (1/CEERbase - 1/CEERee))/1000

Where:

FLHRoomAC = Full Load Hours of room air conditioning unit

= dependent on location:[[257]](#footnote-261)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Climate Zone**  **(City based upon)** | **FLHRoomAC** |
| 1 (Rockford) | 235 |
| 2 (Chicago) | 261 |
| 3 (Springfield) | 340 |
| 4 (Belleville) | 447 |
| 5 (Marion) | 396 |
| Weighted Average**[[258]](#footnote-262)**  ComEd  Ameren  Statewide | 256  364  286 |

Btu/H = Size of rebated unit

= Actual. If unknown assume 8500 Btu/hr[[259]](#footnote-263)

EERexist =Efficiency of existing unit

= Actual. If unknown assume 7.7 [[260]](#footnote-264)

1.01 = Factor to convert EER to CEER (CEER includes standby and off power consumption)[[261]](#footnote-265)

CEERbase = Combined Energy Efficiency Ratio of baseline unit

= As provided in tables above

CEERee = Combined Energy Efficiency Ratio of CEE Tier 1 or ENERGY STAR unit

= Actual. If unknown, assume minimum qualifying standard as provided in tables above

**Time of Sale:**

**For example**, for an 8,500 Btu/H capacity unit, with louvered sides, in an unknown location:

ΔkWHENERGY STAR = (286 \* 8500 \* (1/10.9 – 1/14.7)) / 1000

= 57.7 kWh

**Early Replacement:**

**For example**, a 7.7EER, 9000Btu/h unit is removed from a home in Springfield and replaced with an ENERGY STAR unit with louvered sides:

ΔkWh for remaining life of existing unit (1st 4 years) = (340 \* 9000 \* (1/(7.7/1.01) - 1/14.7))/1000

= 193.2 kWh

ΔkWh for remaining measure life (next 8 years) = (340 \* 9000 \* (1/10.9 - 1/14.7))/1000

= 72.6 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

Time of Sale: ΔkW = Btu/H \* ((1/(CEERbase \*1.01) - 1/(CEERee \* 1.01)))/1000) \* CF

Early Replacement: ΔkW = Btu/H \* ((1/EERexist - 1/(CEERee \* 1.01)))/1000) \* CF

Where:

CF = Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for measure

= 0.3[[262]](#footnote-266)

* 1. = Factor to convert CEER to EER (CEER includes standby and off power consumption)[[263]](#footnote-267)

Other variable as defined above

**Time of Sale:**

**For example**, for an 8,500 Btu/H capacity unit, with louvered sides, for an unknown location:

ΔkWENERGY STAR = ((8500 \* (1/(10.9 \* 1.01) – 1/(14.7\*1.01))) / 1000) \* 0.3

= 0.060 kW

**Early Replacement:**

**For example**, a 7.7 EER, 9000Btu/h unit is removed from a home in Springfield and replaced with an ENERGY STAR unit with louvered sides:

ΔkW for remaining life of existing unit (1st 4 years) = ((9000 \* (1/7.7 - 1/(14.7 \* 1.01)))/1000) \* 0.3

= 0.169 kW

ΔkW for remaining measure life (next 8 years) = ((9000 \* (1/(10.9 \* 1.01) - 1/(14.7 \* 1.01)))/1000) \* 0.3

= 0.063 kW

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

N/A

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: RS-APL-ESRA-V11-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2026

### 5.1.12 Ozone Laundry

###### Description

A new ozone laundry system is added-on to new or existing residential clothes washing machine(s) or washing machines located in multifamily building common areas. The system generates ozone (O3), a naturally occurring molecule, which helps clean fabrics by chemically reacting with soils in cold water. Adding an ozone laundry system(s) eliminate the use of chemicals, detergents, and hot water by residential washing machine(s).

Energy savings will be achieved at the domestic hot water heater as it will no longer supply hot water to the washing machine. Cold water usage by the clothes washer will increase, but overall water usage will stay constant.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS, RNC, RF. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

A new, single-unit ozone laundry system(s) rated for residential clothes washing machines is added-on to new or existing residential clothes washing machines. The ozone laundry system must be connected to both the hot and cold water inlets of the clothes washing machine so that hot water from the domestic hot water heater is no longer provided to the clothes washer.

The ozone laundry system(s) must transfer ozone into the water through:

* Venturi injection
* Bubble diffusion
* Additional applications may be considered upon program review and approval on a case by case basis

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The base case equipment is a conventional residential washing machine with no ozone generator installed. The washing machine is provided hot water from a domestic hot water heater.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The measure equipment effective useful life (EUL) is estimated at 8 years based on the typical lifetime of products currently available in the market.[[264]](#footnote-268)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The deemed measure cost is $300 for a new single-unit ozone laundry system.[[265]](#footnote-269)

###### Loadshape

Loadshape R01 – Residential Clothes Washer

###### Coincidence Factor

The coincidence factor for this measure is 3.8%.[[266]](#footnote-270)

Algorithm

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

∆kWh = kWhHotWash \* (%HotWashbase - %HotWashOzone)

Where:

kWhHotWash = (%ElectricDHW \* Capacity \* IWF \* %HotWater \* (Tout - TIN) \* 8.33 \* 1.0 \* Ncycles) / (RE\_electric \* 3.412)

%ElectricDHW = Proportion of water heating supplied by electric heating

= 100 % for Electric

= 0 % for Fossil Fuel

= If unknown[[267]](#footnote-271), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[268]](#footnote-272) | 24% | 25% | 40% | 43% | 28% |
| ComEd[[269]](#footnote-273) | 8% | | 11% | | 9% |
| People’s Gas[[270]](#footnote-274) | 23% | 26% | 49% | 50% | 37% |
| Northshore Gas[[271]](#footnote-275) | 20% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[272]](#footnote-276) | 20% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | **23%** |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

Capacity = Clothes washer capacity (cubic feet).

= Actual. If unknown, assume 5.0 cubic feet.[[273]](#footnote-277)

IWF = Integrated water factor (gallons/cycle/ft3).

= Actual. If unknown, use the following values

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Efficiency Level** | **IWF (gallons/cycle/ft3)** | |
| **Top loading > 2.5 Cu ft** | **Front Loading > 2.5 Cu ft** |
| Federal Standard (up to January 1, 2018) | 8.4 | 4.7 |
| Federal Standard (after January 1, 2018) – Use if unit level is unknown. | 6.5 | 4.7 |
| ENERGY STAR (as of February 2018) | 4.3 | 3.2 |
| CEE Tier 2 | 3.2 | 3.2 |

%HotWater = Percentage of water usage that is supplied by the domestic hot water heater when the hot or warm wash cycles are selected.[[274]](#footnote-278)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Single-Family Home** | **Multifamily** |
| 0.1759 | 0.2960 |

Tout = Tank temperature

= 125°F

Tin = Incoming water temperature from well or municipal system

= 50.7°F [[275]](#footnote-279)

8.33 = Specific weight of water (lbs/gallon)

1.0 = Heat capacity of water (Btu/lb oF)

Ncycles = Number of Cycles per year

| **Single-Family Home** | **Multifamily** |
| --- | --- |
| 295[[276]](#footnote-280) | 1,243[[277]](#footnote-281) |

RE\_electric = Recovery efficiency of electric water heater

= 0.98[[278]](#footnote-282) for Electric Resistance

= 3.51[[279]](#footnote-283) for Electric HPWH

3412 = Btus to kWh conversion (Btu/kWh)

%HotWashbase = Average percentage of loads that use hot or warm water with baseline equipment. [[280]](#footnote-284)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Single-Family Home** | **Multifamily** |
| 0.7743 | 0.7438 |

%HotWashOzone = Percentage of loads that use hot or warm water with efficient equipment.

= 0.0

**For example,** a residential ozone laundry system is installed in a single-family home with an electric domestic hot water heater. The capacity and IWF of the baseline equipment is unknown.

∆kWh = (1 \* 5.0 \* 6.5 \* 0.1759 \* (125 – 50.7) \* 8.33 \* 1.0 \* 295) / (0.98 \* 3412) \* (0.7743 – 0)

= 242 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = ΔkWh/Hours \* CF

Where:

ΔkWh = Energy Savings as calculated above

Hours = Assumed Run hours of Clothes Washer

= 264 hours[[281]](#footnote-285)

CF = Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for measure.

= 0.038[[282]](#footnote-286)

**For example**, a residential ozone laundry system is installed in a single-family home with an electric domestic hot water heater. The capacity and IWF of the baseline equipment is unknown.

∆kW = 231/295 \* 0.038

= 0.0298kW

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

∆Therm = ThermHotWash \* (%HotWashbase - %HotWashOzone)

Where:

ThermHotWash = (%FossilDHW \* Capacity \* IWF \* %HotWater \* (Tout - TIN) \* 8.33 \* 1.0 \* Ncycles) / (RE\_gas \* 100,000)

%FossilDHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be fossil fuel

= 100 % for Fossil Fuel

= 0 % for Electric

= If unknown[[283]](#footnote-287), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[284]](#footnote-288) | 76% | 75% | 60% | 57% | 72% |
| ComEd[[285]](#footnote-289) | 92% | | 89% | | 91% |
| People’s Gas[[286]](#footnote-290) | 77% | 74% | 51% | 50% | 63% |
| Northshore Gas[[287]](#footnote-291) | 80% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[288]](#footnote-292) | 80% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | **77%** |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

RE\_gas = Recovery efficiency of gas water heater

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Single-Family Homes** | **Multifamily** |
| 79%[[289]](#footnote-293) | 67%[[290]](#footnote-294) |

100,000 = Btus to Therms conversion (Btu/Therm).

**For example**, a residential ozone laundry system is installed in a single-family home with a gas domestic hot water heater. The capacity and IWF of the baseline equipment is unknown.

∆Therms = (1 \* 5.0 \* 6.5 \* 0.1759 \* (125 – 50.7) \* 8.33 \* 1.0 \* 295)/(0.79 \* 100,000)\*(0.7743 – 0)

= 10.2 Therms

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

**Laundry Detergent Savings**

Annual savings from not purchasing laundry detergent that are realized by efficient equipment end-user(s) ($/year).

Detergent savings per year = Detergent\_cost \* Ncycles

Where:

Detergent\_cost = Average laundry detergent cost per load ($/load).

= 0.16[[291]](#footnote-295)

**For example**, a residential ozone laundry system is installed in a single-family home.

Detergent savings per year = 0.16 \* 295

= $47.20

###### Measure Code: RS-APL-OZNE-V06-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2026

### 5.1.13 Income Qualified: ENERGY STAR and CEE Tier 2 Room Air Conditioner

###### Description

This measure relates to the purchase and installation of a room air conditioning unit that meets ENERGY STAR version 5.0 which is effective October 30th 2023 (equivalent to CEE Tier 1) or CEE Tier 2 minimum qualifying efficiency specifications, in place of an existing inefficient unit or a newly acquired inefficient unit through the secondary market. This measure is to be used by programs supporting the installation of efficient Room AC in income qualified households. The COVID pandemic of 2020 has meant that opportunities for income qualified populations to keep themselves and their families cool and comfortable during the summer heat have been restricted as access to cooling centers and air conditioned public areas have become limited. This can result in hospitalization or even death from heat exhaustion.

It is assumed that the Room AC’s characterized in this measure are being used less as a luxury and more as a necessity and that access to a single AC unit per household will result in run hours more consistent with central AC usage.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types:  TOS, EREP.

If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To qualify for this measure the new room air conditioning unit must meet the ENERGY STAR version 5.0 (effective October 30th 2023)[[292]](#footnote-296) efficiency standards presented above.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product Type and Class (Btu/hr)** | | **ENERGY STAR v5.0 with louvered sides (CEER)** | **ENERGY STAR v5.0 without louvered sides (CEER)** | **CEE Tier 2 (CEER)[[293]](#footnote-297)** |
| Without Reverse Cycle | < 8,000 | 13.7 | 12.8 | 14.85 |
| 8,000 to 10,999 | 14.7 | 13.0 | 14.72 |
| 11,000 to 13,999 | 14.7 | 12.8 | 14.72 |
| 14,000 to 19,999 | 14.4 | 12.6 | 14.45 |
| 20,000 to 27,999 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.69 |
| >=28,000 | 12.2 | 12.7 | 12.15 |
| With Reverse Cycle | <14,000 | 13.2 | 12.6 | N/A |
| 14,000 to 19,999 | 13.2 | 11.7 | N/A |
| >=20,000 | 12.6 | 11.7 | N/A |
| Casement only | | 12.8 | |  |
| Casement-Slider | | 14.0 | |  |

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

For both Time of Sale and Early Replacement the baseline assumption is an inefficient unit either existing in the home or being purchased or acquired via the secondary market.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The measure life is assumed to be 12 years.[[294]](#footnote-298)

Since the baseline unit is assumed to be purchased from the secondary market, it is assumed that the remaining life of the baseline unit is 6 years and would need to be replaced with another unit from the secondary market at that point.

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The actual full cost of the ENERGY STAR unit should be used. If unavailable assume $300.[[295]](#footnote-299) If a CEE Tier 2 unit is installed assume $508.[[296]](#footnote-300)

The cost of the inefficient secondary market unit is assumed to be $50.

Therefore, where the new unit replaces an existing unit the measure cost is $300 for ENERGY STAR or $508 for CEE Tier 2, and where there is no existing unit the measure cost is assumed to be $250 for ENERGY STAR or $458 for CEE Tier 2.

The avoided replacement cost (after 6 years) of the replacement secondary market unit is $50. This cost should be discounted to present value using the nominal societal discount rate.

###### Loadshape

Loadshape R08 - Residential Cooling

###### Coincidence Factor

The summer peak coincidence factor for cooling is provided in two different ways below. The first is used to estimate peak savings during the utility peak hour and is most indicative of actual peak benefits, and the second represents the *average* savings over the defined summer peak period and is presented so that savings can be bid into PJM’s capacity market.

CFSSP = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Central A/C (during system peak hour)

= 68%[[297]](#footnote-301)

CFPJM = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Central A/C (average during PJM peak period)

= 46.6%[[298]](#footnote-302)

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

ΔkWh = (FLHRoomAC \* Btu/H \* (1/(EERbase/1.01) - 1/CEERee))/1000

Where:

FLHRoomAC = Full Load Hours of room air conditioning unit

= dependent on location[[299]](#footnote-303) [[300]](#footnote-304):

| **Climate Zone**  **(City based upon)** | **FLHcool (single family)** | **FLHcool (multifamily)** | **FLH\_cooling (weatherized multifamily)** [[301]](#footnote-305) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 (Rockford) | 547 | 499 | 320 |
| 2 (Chicago) | 709 | 629 | 403 |
| 3 (Springfield) | 779 | 707 | 453 |
| 4 (Belleville) | 1082 | 982 | 630 |
| 5 (Marion/ Murphysboro) | 956 | 868 | 557 |
| Weighted Average[[302]](#footnote-306)  ComEd  Ameren  Statewide | 676  875  731 | 603  791  655 | 386  507  420 |

Btu/H = Size of installed unit

= Actual. If unknown assume 8500 Btu/hr[[303]](#footnote-307)

EERbase =Efficiency of existing / baseline unit

= Actual. If unknown assume 7.7 [[304]](#footnote-308)

1.01 = Factor to convert EER to CEER (CEER includes standby and off power consumption)[[305]](#footnote-309)

CEERee = Combined Energy Efficiency Ratio of ENERGY STAR unit

= Actual. If unknown assume minimum qualifying standard as provided in tables above

**For example**, for an 8,500 Btu/H capacity unit, with louvered sides, in an unknown multifamily location:

ΔkWHENERGY STAR = (655 \* 8500 \* (1/(7.7/1.01) – 1/14.7)) / 1000

= 352 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = Btu/H \* ((1/EERexist - 1/(CEERee \* 1.01)))/1000) \* CF

Where:

CFSSP = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Central A/C (during system peak hour)

= 68%[[306]](#footnote-310)

CFPJM = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Central A/C (average during PJM peak period)

= 46.6%[[307]](#footnote-311)

* 1. = Factor to convert CEER to EER (CEER includes standby and off power consumption)[[308]](#footnote-312)

Other variable as defined above

**For example**, for an 8,500 Btu/H capacity unit, with louvered sides, for an unknown multifamily location:

ΔkW SSP = (8500 \* (1/7.7– 1/(14.7\*1.01))) / 1000 \* 0.68

= 0.3613 kW

ΔkW PJM = (8500 \* (1/7.7– 1/(14.7\*1.01))) / 1000 \* 0.466

= 0.2476 kW

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

N/A

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: RS-APL-IQRA-V05-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2026

### 5.4.1 Domestic Hot Water Pipe Insulation

###### Description

This measure describes adding insulation to un-insulated domestic hot water pipes. The measure assumes the pipe wrap is installed either to the first length of both the hot and cold pipe (this is the most cost-effective section to insulate in non-circulating systems, since the water pipes act as an extension of the hot water tank) or to a hot water recirculating loop. Insulating this length therefore helps reduce standby losses. Default savings are provided per 3ft length and are appropriate up to 6ft of the hot water pipe and 3ft of the cold. Where a hot water recirculating pump is in use, this measure is viable for the entire hot water loop.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types:  TOS, NC, RF, KITS.

If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

The efficient case is installing pipe wrap insulation to a length of hot water pipe.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline is an un-insulated hot water pipe.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The measure life is assumed to be 15 years.[[309]](#footnote-313)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The actual installation cost should be used if known. If unknown, the measure cost including material and installation is assumed to be $3 per linear foot.[[310]](#footnote-314) For foam pipe insulation assume a measure cost of $0.26/ft for ½” insulation and $0.31/ft for ¾” insulation.[[311]](#footnote-315)

###### Loadshape

Loadshape C53 - Flat

###### Coincidence Factor

This measure assumes a flat loadshape since savings relate to reducing standby losses and as such the coincidence factor is 1.

Algorithm

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

ΔkWh = %Electric\_DHW \* ((1 / Rexist – 1 / Rnew) \* Cinside \* Leffective \* ΔT \* 8,766 \* ISR)/ ηDHW / 3412

Where:

%Electric\_DHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be electric

= 100 % for Electric

= 0 % for Fossil Fuel

= If unknown[[312]](#footnote-316), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[313]](#footnote-317) | 24% | 25% | 40% | 43% | 28% |
| ComEd[[314]](#footnote-318) | 8% | | 11% | | 9% |
| People’s Gas[[315]](#footnote-319) | 23% | 26% | 49% | 50% | 37% |
| Northshore Gas[[316]](#footnote-320) | 20% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[317]](#footnote-321) | 20% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | 23% |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

Rexist = Pipe heat loss coefficient of uninsulated pipe (existing) [(hr-°F-ft)/Btu]

= Varies based on pipe size and material. See table below for values.

Rnew = Pipe heat loss coefficient of insulated pipe (new) [(hr-°F-ft)/Btu]

= Actual (Rexist + R value of insulation[[318]](#footnote-322))

Cinside = Inside circumference of the pipe [ft]

= Actual (0.5” pipe = 0.1427 ft, 0.75” pipe = 0.2055 ft); See table below for values.

Leffective = Effective length of pipe from water heating source covered by pipe insulation (ft) [[319]](#footnote-323)

= LHorizontal + αLVertical

= Actual; See table below for α values. If unknown, assume 3ft of vertical and remaining   
 horizontal.

ΔT = Average temperature difference between supplied water and outside air temperature (°F)

= 60°F [[320]](#footnote-324)

8,766 = Hours per year

ISR = In Service Rate

= 0.50 for Kits distribution[[321]](#footnote-325), 0.78 for Virtual Assessment followed by Self-Installation[[322]](#footnote-326), and 1.0 for Direct Install, TOS, or Verified Install program types

ηDHW = Recovery efficiency of electric hot water heater

= 0.98 [[323]](#footnote-327)

3412 = Conversion from Btu to kWh

Parameter assumptions for various pipe sizes and materials:

| **Type and Size** | **CInside[[324]](#footnote-328) (I.D.\*π/12)  (ft)** | **Product of Overall Heat Transfer Coefficient and Pipe Area (UA) per foot[[325]](#footnote-329) from bare pipe (BTU/hr·ft·°F)** | **Pipe Area per linear foot (ft3)[[326]](#footnote-330)** | **Rexist ((hr·ft·°F)/BTU)** | **Horizontal to Vertical Adjustment Factor (α)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ½” Copper Pipe | 0.1427 | 0.345 | 0.153 | 0.444 | 0.67 |
| ¾” Copper Pipe | 0.2055 | 0.417 | 0.217 | 0.521 | 0.72 |
| ½” PEX | 0.1270 | 0.438 | 0.145 | 0.332 | 0.73 |
| ¾” PEX | 0.1783 | 0.545 | 0.204 | 0.374 | 0.77 |

**For example**, insulating 6 feet of 0.75” copper pipe (4ft vertical + 2ft horizontal) with R-5 wrap through a Direct Install program:

ΔkWh = (((1 / Rexist – 1 / Rnew) \* Cinside \* Leffective \* ΔT \* 8,766 \* 1.0) / ηDHW) / 3412

= (((1/0.521 - 1/3.521) \* 0.2055 \* (2 + 4 \* 0.72) \* 60 \* 8766 \* 1.0) / 0.98 )/3412

= 258 kWh

The following table provides annual energy savings per foot of pipe insulation for various configurations:

|  | **ΔkWh Savings per Foot of Insulation (kWh/ft)** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure Configuration** | **Kit Distribution (ISR = 50%)** | **All Other Programs**  **(ISR = 100%)** |
| **Horizontal Pipe Orientation** |  |  |
| ½” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 22 | 44.0 |
| ¾” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 26.5 | 52.9 |
| ½” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 27.1 | 54.2 |
| ¾” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 33.4 | 66.7 |
| **Vertical Pipe Orientation** |  |  |
| ½” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 14.8 | 29.5 |
| ¾” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 19.1 | 38.1 |
| ½” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 19.8 | 39.5 |
| ¾” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 25.7 | 51.3 |
| **Unknown** |  |  |
| R-3, ½” thick insulation for ½” pipes  – pipe type and configuration unknown (average of vertical and horizontal configurations for ½”pipe) | 20.9 | 41.8 |
| R-3, ½” thick insulation for ¾” pipes – pipe type and configuration unknown (average of vertical and horizontal configurations for ¾”pipe) | 26.1 | 52.2 |
| Unknown pipe type (straight average) and configuration (average of all vertical and horizontal configurations) insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 23.5 | 46.9 |

**Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings**

∆kW**=** ∆kWh/ 8766

Where:

ΔkWh = kWh savings from pipe wrap installation

8766 = Number of hours in a year (since savings are assumed to be constant over year).

**For example**, insulating 6 feet of 0.75” copper pipe (4ft vertical + 2ft horizontal) with R-5 wrap through a Direct Install program:

ΔkW = 258/8766

= 0.0294kW

The following table provides peak demand savings per foot of pipe insulation for various configurations:

|  | **ΔkW Savings per Foot of Insulation (kW/ft)** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure Configuration** | **Kit Distribution (ISR = 50%)** | **All Other Programs**  **(ISR = 100%)** |
| **Horizontal Pipe Orientation** |  |  |
| ½” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.0025 | 0.0050 |
| ¾” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.0030 | 0.0060 |
| ½” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.0031 | 0.0062 |
| ¾” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.0038 | 0.0076 |
| **Vertical Pipe Orientation** |  |  |
| ½” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.0017 | 0.0034 |
| ¾” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.0022 | 0.0043 |
| ½” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.0023 | 0.0045 |
| ¾” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.0030 | 0.0059 |
| **Unknown** |  |  |
| R-3, ½” thick insulation for ½” pipes – pipe type and configuration unknown (average of vertical and horizontal configurations for ½”pipe) | 0.0024 | 0.0048 |
| R-3, ½” thick insulation for ¾” pipes – pipe type and configuration unknown (average of vertical and horizontal configurations for ¾”pipe) | 0.0030 | 0.0060 |
| Unknown pipe type (straight average) and configuration (average of vertical and horizontal configurations for all pipes) insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.0027 | 0.0053 |

**Natural Gas Savings**

For Natural Gas DHW systems:

ΔTherm = %Fossil\_DHW \* (((1 / Rexist – 1 / Rnew) \* Cinside \* Leffective \* ΔT \* 8,766 \* ISR) / ηDHW) /100,000

Where:

%Fossil\_DHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be fossil fuel

= 100 % for Fossil Fuel

= 0 % for Electric

= If unknown[[327]](#footnote-331), use the following table:

|  | **Location** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[328]](#footnote-332) | 76% | 75% | 60% | 57% | 72% |
| ComEd[[329]](#footnote-333) | 92% | | 89% | | 91% |
| People’s Gas[[330]](#footnote-334) | 77% | 74% | 51% | 50% | 63% |
| Northshore Gas[[331]](#footnote-335) | 80% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[332]](#footnote-336) | 80% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | **77%** |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

ηDHW = Recovery efficiency of fossil hot water heater

= 0.78 [[333]](#footnote-337)

Other variables as defined above

**For example**, insulating 6 feet of 0.75” copper pipe (4ft vertical + 2ft horizontal) with R-5 wrap through a Direct Install program:

ΔTherm = (((1 / Rexist – 1 / Rnew) \* Cinside \* Leffective \* ΔT \* 8,766 \* ISR) / ηDHW) /100,000

= (((1/0.521 - 1/3.521) \* 0.2055 \* (2 + 4 \* 0.72) \* 60 \* 8766 \* 1.0) / 0.78 / 100,000

= 11.06 therms

The following table provides Natural Gas savings per foot of pipe insulation for various configurations:

|  | **ΔTherm Savings per Foot of Insulation (Therms/ft)** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure Configuration** | **Kit Distribution (ISR = 50%)** | **All Other Programs**  **(ISR = 100%)** |
| **Horizontal Pipe Orientation** |  |  |
| ½” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.95 | 1.89 |
| ¾” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 1.14 | 2.27 |
| ½” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 1.16 | 2.32 |
| ¾” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 1.43 | 2.86 |
| **Vertical Pipe Orientation** |  |  |
| ½” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.63 | 1.26 |
| ¾” Copper Pipe insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.82 | 1.63 |
| ½” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 0.85 | 1.70 |
| ¾” PEX insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 1.1 | 2.20 |
| **Unknown** |  |  |
| R-3, ½” thick insulation for ½” pipes – pipe type and configuration unknown (average of vertical and horizontal configurations for ½”pipe) | 0.9 | 1.79 |
| R-3, ½” thick insulation for ¾” pipes – pipe type and configuration unknown (average of vertical and horizontal configurations for ¾”pipe) | 1.12 | 2.24 |
| Unknown pipe type (straight average) and configuration (average of vertical and horizontal configurations for all pipes) insulated with R-3, ½” thick insulation | 1.01 | 2.01 |

**Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation**

N/A

**Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation**

N/A

**Measure Code: RS-HWE-PINS-V08-240101**

**Review Deadline: 1/1/2025**

### 5.4.4 ­Low Flow Faucet Aerators

###### Description

This measure relates to the installation of a low flow faucet aerator in a household kitchen or bath faucet fixture.

This measure may be used for units provided through Efficiency Kits however the in service rate for such measures should be derived through evaluation results specifically for this implementation methodology.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: TOS, NC, RF, DI, KITS.

If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To qualify for this measure the installed equipment must be a low flow faucet aerator, for bathrooms rated at 1.5 gallons per minute (GPM) or less, or for kitchens rated at 2.2 GPM or less. Savings are calculated on an average savings per faucet fixture basis.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline condition is assumed to be a standard bathroom faucet aerator rated at 2.2 GPM or greater, or a standard kitchen faucet aerator rated at 2.2 GPM or greater.

Average measured flow rates are used in the algorithm and are lower, reflecting the penetration of previously installed low flow fixtures (and therefore the freerider rate for this measure should be 0), use of the faucet at less than full flow, debris buildup, and lower water system pressure than fixtures are rated at.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 10 years.[[334]](#footnote-338)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

For time of sale or new construction the incremental cost for this measure is $3,[[335]](#footnote-339) or program actual.

For faucet aerators provided through Direct Install or within Efficiency Kits, the actual program delivery costs (including labor if applicable) should be utilized. If unknown, assume $8 for Direct Install[[336]](#footnote-340) and $3 for Efficiency Kits.

###### Loadshape

Loadshape R03 - Residential Electric DHW

###### Coincidence Factor

The coincidence factor for this measure is assumed to be 2.2%.[[337]](#footnote-341)

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

Note these savings are *per* faucet retrofitted[[338]](#footnote-342) (unless faucet type is unknown, then it is per household).

ΔkWh = %ElectricDHW \* ((GPM\_base \* L\_base - GPM\_low \* L\_low) \* Household \* 365.25 \*DF / FPH) \* EPG\_electric \* ISR

Where:

%ElectricDHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be electric

= 100 % for Electric

= 0 % for Fossil Fuel

= If unknown[[339]](#footnote-343), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[340]](#footnote-344) | 24% | 25% | 40% | 43% | 28% |
| ComEd[[341]](#footnote-345) | 8% | | 11% | | 9% |
| People’s Gas[[342]](#footnote-346) | 23% | 26% | 49% | 50% | 37% |
| Northshore Gas[[343]](#footnote-347) | 20% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[344]](#footnote-348) | 20% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | 23% |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

GPM\_base = Average flow rate, in gallons per minute, of the baseline faucet “as-used.”

= If unknown assume values in table below, or custom based on metering studies,[[345]](#footnote-349) or if measured during DI:

= Measured full throttle flow \* 0.83 throttling factor[[346]](#footnote-350)

Note, if GPM\_base is based upon the deemed assumptions below, since these include participants that had existing low flow fixtures, the freerider rate for this measure should be 0.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Faucet Type** | **GPM**[[347]](#footnote-351) |
| Kitchen | 1.63 |
| Bathroom | 1.53 |
| If faucet location unknown | 1.58 |

GPM\_low = Average flow rate, in gallons per minute, of the low-flow faucet aerator “as-used”

= 0.94,[[348]](#footnote-352) or custom based on metering studies,[[349]](#footnote-353) or if measured during DI:

= Rated full throttle flow \* 0.95 throttling factor[[350]](#footnote-354)

L\_base = Average baseline daily length faucet use per capita for faucet of interest in minutes

= if available custom based on metering studies, if not use:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Faucet Type** | **L\_base (min/person/day)** |
| Kitchen | 4.5[[351]](#footnote-355) |
| Bathroom | 1.6[[352]](#footnote-356) |
| If faucet location unknown (total for household): Single-Family except mobile homes | 9.0[[353]](#footnote-357) |
| If location unknown (total for household): Multifamily and mobile homes | 6.9[[354]](#footnote-358) |
| If faucet location and building type unknown (total for household) | 8.3[[355]](#footnote-359) |

L\_low = Average retrofit daily length faucet use per capita for faucet of interest in minutes

= if available custom based on metering studies, if not use:

| **Faucet Type** | **L\_low (min/person/day)** |
| --- | --- |
| Kitchen | 4.5[[356]](#footnote-360) |
| Bathroom | 1.6[[357]](#footnote-361) |
| If faucet location unknown (total for household): Single-Family except mobile homes | 9.0[[358]](#footnote-362) |
| If faucet location unknown (total for household): Multifamily | 6.9[[359]](#footnote-363) |
| If faucet location and building type unknown (total for household) | 8.3[[360]](#footnote-364) |

Household = Average number of people per household

| **Household Unit Type** | **Household** |
| --- | --- |
| Single-Family - Deemed | 2.56[[361]](#footnote-365) |
| Multi-Family - Deemed | 2.1[[362]](#footnote-366) |
| Household type unknown | 2.42[[363]](#footnote-367) |
| Custom | Actual Occupancy or Number of Bedrooms[[364]](#footnote-368) |

Use Multifamily if: Building meets utility’s definition for multifamily

365.25 = Days in a year, on average.

DF = Drain Factor

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Faucet Type** | **Drain Factor[[365]](#footnote-369)** |
| Kitchen | 75% |
| Bath | 90% |
| Unknown | 79.5% |

FPH = Faucets Per Household

| **Faucet Type** | **FPH** |
| --- | --- |
| Kitchen Faucets Per Home (KFPH) | 1 |
| Bathroom Faucets Per Home (BFPH): Single-Family except mobile homes | 2.83[[366]](#footnote-370) |
| Bathroom Faucets Per Home (BFPH): Multifamily and mobile homes | 1.5[[367]](#footnote-371) |
| If faucet location unknown (total for household): Single-Family except mobile homes | 3.83 |
| If faucet location unknown (total for household): Multifamily and mobile homes | 2.5 |
| If faucet location and building type unknown (total for household) | 3.42[[368]](#footnote-372) |

EPG\_electric = Energy per gallon of water used by faucet supplied by electric water heater

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (WaterTemp - SupplyTemp)) / (RE\_electric \* 3412)

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (86 – 50.7)) / (0.98 \* 3412)

= 0.0879 kWh/gal (Bath), 0.1054 kWh/gal (Kitchen), 0.1004 kWh/gal (Unknown)

8.33 = Specific weight of water (lbs/gallon)

1.0 = Heat Capacity of water (btu/lb-°F)

WaterTemp = Assumed temperature of mixed water

= 86F for Bath, 93F for Kitchen 91F for Unknown[[369]](#footnote-373)

SupplyTemp = Assumed temperature of water entering house

= 50.7°F [[370]](#footnote-374)

RE\_electric = Recovery efficiency of electric water heater

= 98% [[371]](#footnote-375)

3412 = Converts Btu to kWh (btu/kWh)

ISR = In service rate of faucet aerators dependant on install method as listed in table below

| **Selection** | **ISR** |
| --- | --- |
| Direct Install | 0.93[[372]](#footnote-376),[[373]](#footnote-377) |
| Virtual Assessment followed by Unverified Self-Install | 0.77[[374]](#footnote-378),[[375]](#footnote-379) |
| Requested Efficiency Kit | 0.60[[376]](#footnote-380) |
| Distributed Efficiency Kit (Income Eligible) | 0.46[[377]](#footnote-381) |
| Community Distributed Kit | 0.45[[378]](#footnote-382) |
| Distributed School Efficiency Kit | 0.505[[379]](#footnote-383) |

For example, a direct installed kitchen low flow faucet aerator in an individual electric DHW home:

ΔkWh = 1.0 \* (((1.63 \* 4.5 – 0.94 \* 4.5) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \*0.75) / 1) \* 0.1054 \* 0.93

= 213.4 kWh

For example, a direct installed bath low flow faucet aerator in a shared electric DHW home:

ΔkWh = 1.0 \* (((1.53 \* 1.6 – 0.94 \* 1.6) \* 2.1 \* 365.25 \* 0.90) /1.5) \* 0.0879 \* 0.93

= 35.5 kWh

For example, a direct installed low flow faucet aerator in unknown faucet in an individual electric DHW home:

ΔkWh = 1.0 \* (((1.58 \* 9.0 – 0.94 \* 9.0) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \* 0.795) /3.83) \* 0.1004 \* 0.93

= 104.4 kWh

Secondary kWh Savings for Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment

The following savings should be included in the total savings for this measure but should not be included in TRC tests to avoid double counting the economic benefit of water savings.

ΔkWhwater = ΔWater (gallons) / 1,000,000 \* Ewater total

Where

Ewater total = IL Total Water Energy Factor (kWh/Million Gallons)

=5010[[380]](#footnote-384)

For example, a direct installed kitchen low flow aerator in an single family home

ΔWater (gallons) = (((1.63 \* 4.5 – 0.94 \* 4.5) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \*0.75) / 1) \* 0.93

= 2025 gallons

ΔkWhwater = 2025/1000000 \* 5010

=10.1 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = ΔkWh / Hours \* CF

Where:

ΔkWh = calculated value above. Note do not include the secondary savings in this calculation.

Hours = Annual electric DHW recovery hours for faucet use per faucet

= ((GPM\_base \* L\_base) \* Household/FPH \* 365.25 \* DF ) \* 0.567[[381]](#footnote-385) / GPH

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Building Type** | **Faucet location** | **Calculation** | **Hours per faucet** |
| Single Family | Kitchen | ((1.63 \* 4.5) \* 2.56/1 \* 365.25 \* 0.75) \* 0.567 / 26.1 | 112 |
| Bathroom | ((1. 53 \* 1.6) \* 2.56/2.83 \* 365.25 \* 0.9) \* 0.567 / 26.1 | 16 |
| Unknown | ((1. 58\* 9.0) \* 2.56/3.83 \* 365.25 \* 0.795) \* 0.567 / 26.1 | 60 |
| Multifamily | Kitchen | ((1. 63 \* 4.5) \* 2.1/1 \* 365.25 \* 0.75) \* 0.567 / 26.1 | 92 |
| Bathroom | ((1. 53\* 1.6) \* 2.1/1.5 \* 365.25 \* 0.9) \* 0.567 / 26.1 | 24 |
| Unknown | ((1. 58 \* 6.9) \* 2.1/2.5 \* 365.25 \* 0.795) \* 0.567 / 26.1 | 58 |

GPH = Gallons per hour recovery of electric water heater calculated for 69.3F temp rise (120-50.7), 98% recovery efficiency, and typical 4.5kW electric resistance storage tank.

= 26.1

CF = Coincidence Factor for electric load reduction

= 0.022[[382]](#footnote-386)

For example, a direct installed kitchen low flow faucet aerator in a single family electric DHW home:

ΔkW =178/112 \* 0.022

= 0.035 kW

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

ΔTherms = %FossilDHW \* ((GPM\_base \* L\_base - GPM\_low \* L\_low) \* Household \* 365.25 \*DF / FPH) \* EPG\_gas \* ISR

Where:

%FossilDHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be fossil fuel

= 100 % for Fossil Fuel

= 0 % for Electric

= If unknown[[383]](#footnote-387), use the following table:

|  | **Location** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[384]](#footnote-388) | 76% | 75% | 60% | 57% | 72% |
| ComEd[[385]](#footnote-389) | 92% | | 89% | | 91% |
| People’s Gas[[386]](#footnote-390) | 77% | 74% | 51% | 50% | 63% |
| Northshore Gas[[387]](#footnote-391) | 80% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[388]](#footnote-392) | 80% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | **77%** |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

EPG\_gas = Energy per gallon of Hot water supplied by gas

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (WaterTemp - SupplyTemp)) / (RE\_gas \* 100,000)

= 0.0038 Therm/gal for SF homes (Bath), 0.0045 Therm/gal for SF homes (Kitchen), 0.0043 Therm/gal for SF homes (Unknown)

= 0.0044 Therm/gal for MF homes (Bath), 0.0053 Therm/gal for MF homes (Kitchen), 0.0050 Therm/gal for MF homes (Unknown)

RE\_gas = Recovery efficiency of gas water heater

= 78% For individual water heater[[389]](#footnote-393)

= 67% For shared water heater[[390]](#footnote-394)

If unknown, use individual water heater value for single family, use shared water heater value for multifamily. Use multifamily if building meets utility’s definition for multifamily.

100,000 = Converts Btus to Therms (btu/Therm)

Other variables as defined above.

For example, a direct-installed kitchen low flow faucet aerator in a fuel DHW single-family home:

ΔTherms = 1.0 \* (((1.63 \* 4.5 – 0.94 \* 4.5) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \*0.75) / 1) \* 0.0045 \* 0.93

= 9.11 Therms

For example, a direct installed bath low flow faucet aerator in a fuel DHW multi-family home:

ΔTherms = 1.0 \* (((1.53 \* 1.6 – 0.94 \* 1.6) \* 2.1 \* 365.25 \* 0.90) /1.5) \* 0.0044 \* 0.93

= 1.78 Therms

For example, a direct installed low flow faucet aerator in unknown faucet in a fuel DHW single-family home:

ΔTherms = 1.0 \* (((1.58 \* 9.0 – 0.94 \* 9.0) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \* 0.795) /3.83) \* 0.0043 \* 0.93

= 4.47 Therms

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

ΔWater (gallons) = ((GPM\_base \* L\_base - GPM\_low \* L\_low) \* Household \* 365.25 \*DF / FPH) \* ISR

Variables as defined above

For example, a direct-installed kitchen low flow aerator in a single family home

ΔWater (gallons) = (((1.63 \* 4.5 – 0.94 \* 4.5) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \*0.75) / 1) \* 0.93

= 2025 gallons

For example, a direct installed bath low flow faucet aerator in a multi-family home:

ΔWater (gallons) = (((1.53 \* 1.6 – 0.94 \* 1.6) \* 2.1 \* 365.25 \* 0.90) /1.5) \* 0.93

= 404 gallons

For example, a direct installed low flow faucet aerator in unknown faucet in a single family home:

ΔWater (gallons) = (((1.58 \* 9.0 – 0.94 \* 9.0) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \* 0.795) /3.83) \* 0.93

= 1040 gallons

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Sources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source ID** | **Reference** |
| 1 | 2011, DeOreo, William. California Single Family Water Use Efficiency Study. April 20, 2011. |
| 2 | 2000, Mayer, Peter, William DeOreo, and David Lewis. Seattle Home Water Conservation Study. December 2000. |
| 3 | 1999, Mayer, Peter, William DeOreo. Residential End Uses of Water. Published by AWWA Research Foundation and American Water Works Association. 1999. |
| 4 | 2003, Mayer, Peter, William DeOreo. Residential Indoor Water Conservation Study. Aquacraft, Inc. Water Engineering and Management. Prepared for East Bay Municipal Utility District and the US EPA. July 2003. |
| 5 | 2011, DeOreo, William. Analysis of Water Use in New Single Family Homes. By Aquacraft. For Salt Lake City Corporation and US EPA. July 20, 2011. |
| 6 | 2011, Aquacraft. Albuquerque Single Family Water Use Efficiency and Retrofit Study. For Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority. December 1, 2011. |
| 7 | 2008, Schultdt, Marc, and Debra Tachibana. Energy related Water Fixture Measurements: Securing the Baseline for Northwest Single Family Homes. 2008 ACEEE Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings. |

###### Measure Code: RS-HWE-LFFA-V14-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2025

### 5.4.5 Low Flow Showerheads

###### Description

This measure relates to the installation of a low flow showerhead in a single or multi-family household.

This measure may be used for units provided through Efficiency Kits; however the in service rate for such measures should be derived through evaluation results specifically for this implementation methodology.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types:  TOS, RF, NC, DI, KITS.

If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To qualify for this measure the installed equipment must be a low flow showerhead rated at least 0.5 gallons per minute (GPM) less than the existing showerhead. Savings are calculated on a per showerhead fixture basis.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

For Direct install programs, the baseline condition is assumed to be a standard showerhead rated at 2.0 GPM or greater.

For retrofit and time-of-sale programs, the baseline condition is assumed to be a representative average of existing showerhead flow rates of participating customers including a range of low flow showerheads, standard-flow showerheads, and high-flow showerheads.

Average measured flow rates are used in the algorithm and are lower, reflecting the penetration of previously installed low flow fixtures (and therefore the freerider rate for this measure should be 0), use of the shower at less than full flow, debris buildup, and lower water system pressure than fixtures are rated at.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 10 years.[[391]](#footnote-395)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

For time of sale or new construction the incremental cost for this measure is $7 or program actual.[[392]](#footnote-396)

For low flow showerheads provided through Direct Install or within Efficiency Kits, the actual program delivery costs (including labor if applicable) should be utilized. If unknown assume $12 for Direct Install[[393]](#footnote-397) and $7 for Efficiency Kits.

###### Loadshape

Loadshape R03 - Residential Electric DHW

###### Coincidence Factor

The coincidence factor for this measure is assumed to be 2.78%.[[394]](#footnote-398)

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

Note these savings are per showerhead fixture

ΔkWh = %ElectricDHW \* ((GPM\_base \* L\_base - GPM\_low \* L\_low) \* Household \* SPCD \* 365.25 / SPH) \* EPG\_electric \* ISR

Where:

%ElectricDHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be electric

= 100 % for Electric

= 0 % for Fossil Fuel

= If unknown[[395]](#footnote-399), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[396]](#footnote-400) | 24% | 25% | 40% | 43% | 28% |
| ComEd[[397]](#footnote-401) | 8% | | 11% | | 9% |
| People’s Gas[[398]](#footnote-402) | 23% | 26% | 49% | 50% | 37% |
| Northshore Gas[[399]](#footnote-403) | 20% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[400]](#footnote-404) | 20% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | 23% |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

GPM\_base = Average flow rate, in gallons per minute, of the baseline faucet “as-used.”

Note, if GPM\_base is based upon the deemed assumptions below, since these include participants that had existing low flow fixtures, the freerider rate for this measure should be 0.

| **Program** | **GPM\_base** |
| --- | --- |
| Direct-install | 2.24[[401]](#footnote-405) |
| Retrofit, Efficiency Kits, NC or TOS | 2.35[[402]](#footnote-406) |

GPM\_low = As-used flow rate of the low-flow showerhead, which may, as a result of measurements of program evaulations deviate from rated flows, see table below:

| **Rated Flow** |
| --- |
| 2.0 GPM |
| 1.75 GPM |
| 1.5 GPM |
| Custom or Actual[[403]](#footnote-407) |

L\_base = Shower length in minutes with baseline showerhead

= 7.8 min[[404]](#footnote-408)

L\_low = Shower length in minutes with low-flow showerhead

= 7.8 min[[405]](#footnote-409)

Household = Average number of people per household

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Household Unit Type[[406]](#footnote-410)** | **Household** |
| Single-Family - Deemed | 2.56[[407]](#footnote-411) |
| Multi-Family - Deemed | 2.1[[408]](#footnote-412) |
| Household type unknown | 2.42[[409]](#footnote-413) |
| Custom | Actual Occupancy or Number of Bedrooms[[410]](#footnote-414) |

Use Multifamily if: Building meets utility’s definition for multifamily

SPCD = Showers Per Capita Per Day

= 0.6[[411]](#footnote-415)

365.25 = Days per year, on average.

SPH = Showerheads Per Household so that per-showerhead savings fractions can be determined

| **Household Type** | **SPH** |
| --- | --- |
| Single-Family except mobile homes | 1.79[[412]](#footnote-416) |
| Multifamily and mobile homes | 1.3[[413]](#footnote-417) |
| Household type unknown | 1.64[[414]](#footnote-418) |
| Custom | Actual |

Use Multifamily if: Building meets utility’s definition for multifamily

EPG\_electric = Energy per gallon of hot water supplied by electric

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (ShowerTemp - SupplyTemp)) / (RE\_electric \* 3412)

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (101 – 50.7)) / (0.98 \* 3412)

= 0.125 kWh/gal

8.33 = Specific weight of water (lbs/gallon)

1.0 = Heat Capacity of water (btu/lb-°)

ShowerTemp = Assumed temperature of water

= 101°F[[415]](#footnote-419)

SupplyTemp = Assumed temperature of water entering house

= 50.7°F [[416]](#footnote-420)

RE\_electric = Recovery efficiency of electric water heater

= 98%[[417]](#footnote-421)

3412 = Converts Btu to kWh (btu/kWh)

ISR = In service rate of showerhead dependant on install method as listed in table below

| **Selection** | **ISR** |
| --- | --- |
| Direct Install | 0.96[[418]](#footnote-422),[[419]](#footnote-423) |
| Virtual Assessment followed by Unverified Self-Install | 0.803[[420]](#footnote-424) |
| Requested Efficiency Kits | 0.65[[421]](#footnote-425) |
| Distributed Efficiency Kits (Income Eligible) | 0.48[[422]](#footnote-426) |
| Distributed School Efficiency Kit showerhead | 0.574[[423]](#footnote-427) |

**For example**, a direct-installed 1.5 GPM low flow showerhead in a single family home with electric DHW where the number of showers is not known:

ΔkWh = 1.0 \* ((2.24 \* 7.8 – 1.5 \* 7.8) \* 2.56 \* 0.6 \* 365.25 / 1.79) \* 0.125 \* 0.96

= 217 kWh

Secondary kWh Savings for Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment

The following savings should be included in the total savings for this measure, but should not be included in TRC tests to avoid double counting the economic benefit of water savings.

ΔkWhwater = ΔWater (gallons) / 1,000,000 \* Ewater total

Where

Ewater total = IL Total Water Energy Factor (kWh/Million Gallons)

= 5010[[424]](#footnote-428)

**For example**, a direct installed 1.5 GPM low flow showerhead in a single family where the number of showers is not known:

ΔWater (gallons) = ((2.24 \* 7.8 – 1.5 \* 7.8) \* 2.56 \* 0.6 \* 365.25 / 1.79) \* 0.96

= 1737 gallons

ΔkWhwater = 1737/1,000,000 \* 5010

= 8.7 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = ΔkWh/Hours \* CF

Where:

ΔkWh = calculated value above. Note do not include the secondary savings in this calculation.

Hours = Annual electric DHW recovery hours for showerhead use

= ((GPM\_base \* L\_base) \* Household \* SPCD \* 365.25 ) \* 0.726[[425]](#footnote-429) / GPH

= 273 for SF Direct Install; 224 for MF Direct Install

= 286 for SF Retrofit, Efficiency Kits, NC and TOS; 236 for MF Retrofit, Efficiency Kits, NC and TOS

Use Multifamily if: Building meets utility’s definition for multifamily

GPH = Gallons per hour recovery of electric water heater calculated for 69.3F temp rise (120-50.7), 98% recovery efficiency, and typical 4.5kW electric resistance storage tank.

= 26.1

CF = Coincidence Factor for electric load reduction

= 0.0278[[426]](#footnote-430)

**For example**, a direct installed 1.5 GPM low flow showerhead in a single family home with electric DHW where the number of showers is not known:

ΔkW = 217/273 \* 0.0278

= 0.022 kW

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

ΔTherms = %FossilDHW \* ((GPM\_base \* L\_base - GPM\_low \* L\_low) \* Household \* SPCD \* 365.25 / SPH) \* EPG\_gas \* ISR

Where:

%FossilDHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be fossil fuel

= 100 % for Fossil Fuel

= 0 % for Electric

= If unknown[[427]](#footnote-431), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[428]](#footnote-432) | 76% | 75% | 60% | 57% | 72% |
| ComEd[[429]](#footnote-433) | 92% | | 89% | | 91% |
| People’s Gas[[430]](#footnote-434) | 77% | 74% | 51% | 50% | 63% |
| Northshore Gas[[431]](#footnote-435) | 80% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[432]](#footnote-436) | 80% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | **77%** |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

EPG\_gas = Energy per gallon of Hot water supplied by gas

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (ShowerTemp - SupplyTemp)) / (RE\_gas \* 100,000)

= 0.0054 Therm/gal for SF homes

= 0.0063 Therm/gal for MF homes

RE\_gas = Recovery efficiency of gas water heater

= 78% For individual water heater[[433]](#footnote-437)

= 67% For shared water heater[[434]](#footnote-438)

If unknown, use individual water heater value for single family, use shared water heater value for multifamily. Use multifamily if building meets utility’s definition for multifamily.

100,000 = Converts Btus to Therms (btu/Therm)

Other variables as defined above.

**For example**, a direct installed 1.5 GPM low flow showerhead in a gas fired DHW single family home where the number of showers is not known:

ΔTherms = 1.0 \* ((2.24 \* 7.8 – 1.5 \* 7.8) \* 2.56 \* 0.6 \* 365.25 / 1.79) \* 0.0054 \* 0.96

= 9.4 therms

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

ΔWater (gallons) = ((GPM\_base \* L\_base - GPM\_low \* L\_low) \* Household \* SPCD \* 365.25 / SPH) \* ISR

Variables as defined above

**For example**, a direct installed 1.5 GPM low flow showerhead in a single family home where the number of showers is not known:

ΔWater (gallons) = ((2.24 \* 7.8 – 1.5 \* 7.8) \* 2.56 \* 0.6 \* 365.25 / 1.79) \* 0.96

= 1737 gallons

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

**Sources**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source ID** | **Reference** |
| 1 | 2011, DeOreo, William. California Single Family Water Use Efficiency Study. April 20, 2011. |
| 2 | 2000, Mayer, Peter, William DeOreo, and David Lewis. Seattle Home Water Conservation Study. December 2000. |
| 3 | 1999, Mayer, Peter, William DeOreo. Residential End Uses of Water. Published by AWWA Research Foundation and American Water Works Association. 1999. |
| 4 | 2003, Mayer, Peter, William DeOreo. Residential Indoor Water Conservation Study. Aquacraft, Inc. Water Engineering and Management. Prepared for East Bay Municipal Utility District and the US EPA. July 2003. |
| 5 | 2011, DeOreo, William. Analysis of Water Use in New Single Family Homes. By Aquacraft. For Salt Lake City Corporation and US EPA. July 20, 2011. |
| 6 | 2011, Aquacraft. Albuquerque Single Family Water Use Efficiency and Retrofit Study. For Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority. December 1, 2011. |
| 7 | 2008, Schultdt, Marc, and Debra Tachibana. Energy related Water Fixture Measurements: Securing the Baseline for Northwest Single Family Homes. 2008 ACEEE Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings. |

###### Measure Code: RS-HWE-LFSH-V13-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2025

### 5.4.8 Thermostatic Restrictor Shower Valve

###### Description

The measure is the installation of a thermostatic restrictor shower valve in a single or multi-family household. This is a valve attached to a residential showerhead which restricts hot water flow through the showerhead once the water reaches a set point (generally 95F or lower).

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program types: RF, NC, DI. If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

To qualify for this measure the installed equipment must be a thermostatic restrictor shower valve installed on a residential showerhead.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline equipment is the residential showerhead without the restrictor valve installed.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The expected measure life is assumed to be 10 years.[[435]](#footnote-439)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The incremental cost of the measure should be the actual program cost (including labor if applicable), or $30[[436]](#footnote-440) plus $20 labor[[437]](#footnote-441) if not available.

###### Loadshape

Loadshape R03 - Residential Electric DHW

###### Coincidence Factor

The coincidence factor for this measure is assumed to be 0.22%.[[438]](#footnote-442)

**Algorithm**

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

ΔkWh = %ElectricDHW \* ((GPM\_base\_S \* L\_showerdevice) \* Household \* SPCD \* 365.25 / SPH) \* EPG\_electric \* ISR

Where:

%ElectricDHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be electric

= 100 % for Electric

= 0 % for Fossil Fuel

= If unknown[[439]](#footnote-443), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[440]](#footnote-444) | 24% | 25% | 40% | 43% | 28% |
| ComEd[[441]](#footnote-445) | 8% | | 11% | | 9% |
| People’s Gas[[442]](#footnote-446) | 23% | 26% | 49% | 50% | 37% |
| Northshore Gas[[443]](#footnote-447) | 20% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[444]](#footnote-448) | 20% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | 23% |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

GPM\_base\_S = Flow rate of the basecase showerhead, or actual if available

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program** | **GPM** |
| Direct-install, device only | 2.24[[445]](#footnote-449) |
| New Construction or direct install of device and low flow showerhead | Rated or actual flow of program-installed showerhead |
| Retrofit or TOS | 2.35[[446]](#footnote-450) |

L\_showerdevice = Hot water waste time avoided due to thermostatic restrictor valve

= 0.89 minutes[[447]](#footnote-451)

Household = Average number of people per household

| **Household Unit Type[[448]](#footnote-452)** | **Household** |
| --- | --- |
| Single-Family - Deemed | 2.56[[449]](#footnote-453) |
| Multi-Family - Deemed | 2.1[[450]](#footnote-454) |
| Household type unknown | 2.42[[451]](#footnote-455) |
| Custom | Actual Occupancy or Number of Bedrooms[[452]](#footnote-456) |

Use Multifamily if: Building meets utility’s definition for multifamily

SPCD = Showers Per Capita Per Day

= 0.6[[453]](#footnote-457)

365.25 = Days per year, on average.

SPH = Showerheads Per Household so that per-showerhead savings fractions can be determined

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Household Type** | **SPH** |
| Single-Family | 1.79[[454]](#footnote-458) |
| Multifamily | 1.3[[455]](#footnote-459) |
| Household type unknown | 1.64[[456]](#footnote-460) |
| Custom | Actual |

Use Multifamily if: Building meets utility’s definition for multifamily

EPG\_electric = Energy per gallon of hot water supplied by electric

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (ShowerTemp - SupplyTemp)) / (RE\_electric \* 3412)

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (101 – 50.7)) / (0.98 \* 3412)

= 0.125 kWh/gal

8.33 = Specific weight of water (lbs/gallon)

1.0 = Heat Capacity of water (btu/lb-°)

ShowerTemp = Assumed temperature of water

= 101F [[457]](#footnote-461)

SupplyTemp = Assumed temperature of water entering house

= 50.7°F [[458]](#footnote-462)

RE\_electric = Recovery efficiency of electric water heater

= 98% [[459]](#footnote-463)

3412 = Converts Btu to kWh (btu/kWh)

ISR = In service rate of showerhead

= Dependent on program delivery method as listed in table below

| **Selection** | **ISR** |
| --- | --- |
| Direct Install - Single Family | 0.98**[[460]](#footnote-464)** |
| Direct Install – Multi Family | 0.95[[461]](#footnote-465) |
| Efficiency Kits | To be determined through evaluation |

Use Multifamily if: Building meets utility’s definition for multifamily

**For example**, a direct installed valve in a single-family home with electric DHW:

ΔkWh = 1.0 \* (2.24 \* 0.89 \* 2.56 \* 0.6 \* 365.25 / 1.79) \* 0.125 \* 0.98

= 76.5 kWh

Secondary kWh Savings for Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment

The following savings should be included in the total savings for this measure, but should not be included in TRC tests to avoid double counting the economic benefit of water savings.

ΔkWhwater = ΔWater (gallons) / 1,000,000 \* Ewater total

Where

Ewater total = IL Total Water Energy Factor (kWh/Million Gallons)

=5,010[[462]](#footnote-466)

**For example**, a direct installed thermostatic restrictor device in a single family home where the number of showers is not known:

ΔWater (gallons) = ((2.24\* 0.89) \* 2.56 \* 0.6 \* 365.25 / 1.79) \* 0.98

= 612 gallons

ΔkWhwater = 612/1,000,000 \* 5010

= 3.1 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = ΔkWh/Hours \* CF

Where:

ΔkWh = calculated value above. Note do not include the secondary savings in this calculation.

Hours = Annual electric DHW recovery hours for wasted showerhead use prevented by device

= ((GPM\_base\_S \* L\_showerdevice) \* Household \* SPCD \* 365.25 ) \* 0.726[[463]](#footnote-467) / GPH

GPH = Gallons per hour recovery of electric water heater calculated for 69.3F temp rise (120-50.7), 98% recovery efficiency, and typical 4.5kW electric resistance storage tank.

= 26.1

= 31.1 for SF Direct Install; 25.5 for MF Direct Install

= 32.6 for SF Retrofit and TOS; 26.7 for MF Retrofit and TOS

Use Multifamily if: Building meets utility’s definition for multifamily

CF = Coincidence Factor for electric load reduction

= 0.0022[[464]](#footnote-468)

**For example**, a direct installed thermostatic restrictor device in a home with electric DHW where the number of showers is not known.

ΔkW = 76.5/31.1 \* 0.0022

= 0.0054 kW

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

ΔTherms = %FossilDHW \* ((GPM\_base\_S \* L\_showerdevice)\* Household \* SPCD \* 365.25 / SPH) \* EPG\_gas \* ISR

Where:

%FossilDHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be fossil fuel

= 100 % for Fossil Fuel

= 0 % for Electric

= If unknown[[465]](#footnote-469), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[466]](#footnote-470) | 76% | 75% | 60% | 57% | 72% |
| ComEd[[467]](#footnote-471) | 92% | | 89% | | 91% |
| People’s Gas[[468]](#footnote-472) | 77% | 74% | 51% | 50% | 63% |
| Northshore Gas[[469]](#footnote-473) | 80% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[470]](#footnote-474) | 80% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | **77%** |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

EPG\_gas = Energy per gallon of Hot water supplied by gas

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (ShowerTemp - SupplyTemp)) / (RE\_gas \* 100,000)

= 0.0054 Therm/gal for SF homes

= 0.0063 Therm/gal for MF homes

RE\_gas = Recovery efficiency of gas water heater

= 78% For SF homes[[471]](#footnote-475)

= 67% For MF homes[[472]](#footnote-476)

Use Multifamily if: Building has shared DHW.

100,000 = Converts Btus to Therms (btu/Therm)

Other variables as defined above.

**For example**, a direct installed thermostatic restrictor device in a gas fired DHW single family home where the number of showers is not known:

ΔTherms = 1.0 \* ((2.24 \* 0.89) \* 2.56 \* 0.6 \* 365.25 / 1.79) \* 0.0054 \* 0.98

= 3.3 therms

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

ΔWater (gallons) = ((GPM\_base\_S \* L\_showerdevice) \* Household \* SPCD \* 365.25 / SPH) \* ISR

Variables as defined above

**For example**, a direct installed thermostatic restrictor device in a single family home where the number of showers is not known:

ΔWater (gallons) = ((2.24 \* 0.89) \* 2.56 \* 0.6 \* 365.25 / 1.79) \* 0.98

= 612 gallons

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

**Sources**

| **Source ID** | **Reference** |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | 2011, DeOreo, William. California Single Family Water Use Efficiency Study. April 20, 2011. |
| 2 | 2000, Mayer, Peter, William DeOreo, and David Lewis. Seattle Home Water Conservation Study. December 2000. |
| 3 | 1999, Mayer, Peter, William DeOreo. Residential End Uses of Water. Published by AWWA Research Foundation and American Water Works Association. 1999. |
| 4 | 2003, Mayer, Peter, William DeOreo. Residential Indoor Water Conservation Study. Aquacraft, Inc. Water Engineering and Management. Prepared for East Bay Municipal Utility District and the US EPA. July 2003. |
| 5 | 2011, DeOreo, William. Analysis of Water Use in New Single Family Homes. By Aquacraft. For Salt Lake City Corporation and US EPA. July 20, 2011. |
| 6 | 2011, Aquacraft. Albuquerque Single Family Water Use Efficiency and Retrofit Study. For Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority. December 1, 2011. |
| 7 | 2008, Schultdt, Marc, and Debra Tachibana. Energy related Water Fixture Measurements: Securing the Baseline for Northwest Single Family Homes. 2008 ACEEE Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings. |
| 8 | 2011, Lutz, Jim. “Water and Energy Wasted During Residential Shower Events: Findings from a Pilot Field Study of Hot Water Distribution Systems”, Energy Analysis Department Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, September 2011. |
| 9 | 2008, Water Conservation Program: ShowerStart Pilot Project White Paper, City of San Diego, CA. |
| 10 | 2012, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Work Paper PGECODHW113, Low Flow Showerhead and Thermostatic Shower Restriction Valve, Revision # 4, August 2012. |
| 11 | 2008, “Simply & Cost Effectively Reducing Shower Based Warm-Up Waste: Increasing Convenience & Conservation by Attaching ShowerStart to Existing Showerheads”, ShowerStart LLC. |
| 12 | 2014, New York State Record of Revision to the TRM, Case 07-M-0548, June 19, 2014. |

###### Measure Code: RS-HWE-TRVA-V08-230101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2023

### 5.4.9 Shower Timer

###### Description

Shower Timers are designed to make it easy for people to consistently take short showers, resulting in water and energy savings.

The shower timer provides a reminder to participants on length of their shower visually or auditorily.

This measure was developed to be applicable to the following program type: KITS, DI.

If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

The shower timer should provide a reminder to participants to keep showers to a length of 5 minutes or less.

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

The baseline is no shower timer.

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The deemed lifetime is 2 years.[[473]](#footnote-477)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

For shower timers provided in Efficiency Kits, the actual program delivery costs should be utilized.

###### Loadshape

Loadshape R03 - Residential Electric DHW

###### Coincidence Factor

The coincidence factor for this measure is assumed to be 2.78%.[[474]](#footnote-478)

Algorithm

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

∆kWh = %Electric DHW \* GPM \* (L\_base – L\_timer) \* Household \* Days/yr \* SPCD \* UsageFactor \* EPG\_Electric

Where:

%Electric DHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be electric

= 100 % for Electric

= 0 % for Fossil Fuel

= If unknown[[475]](#footnote-479), use the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Location** | | | | |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[476]](#footnote-480) | 24% | 25% | 40% | 43% | 28% |
| ComEd[[477]](#footnote-481) | 8% | | 11% | | 9% |
| People’s Gas[[478]](#footnote-482) | 23% | 26% | 49% | 50% | 37% |
| Northshore Gas[[479]](#footnote-483) | 20% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[480]](#footnote-484) | 20% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | 23% |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

GPM = Flow rate of showerhead as used

= Custom, to be determined through evaluation. If data is not available use 1.93[[481]](#footnote-485)

L\_base = Number of minutes in shower without a shower timer

=7.8 minutes[[482]](#footnote-486)

L\_timer = Number of minutes in shower after shower timer

= Custom, to be determined through evaluation. If data is not available use 5.79.[[483]](#footnote-487)

Household = Number in household using timer

| **Household Unit Type[[484]](#footnote-488)** | **Household** |
| --- | --- |
| Single-Family - Deemed | 2.56[[485]](#footnote-489) |
| Multi-Family - Deemed | 2.1[[486]](#footnote-490) |
| Household type unknown | 2.42[[487]](#footnote-491) |
| Custom | Actual Occupancy or Number of Bedrooms[[488]](#footnote-492) |

Days/yr = 365.25

SPCD = Showers Per Capita Per Day

= 0.6[[489]](#footnote-493)

UsageFactor = How often each participant is using shower timer

=Custom, to be determined through evaluation. If data is not available use 0.34[[490]](#footnote-494)

EPG\_Electric = Energy per gallon of hot water supplied by electric

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (ShowerTemp - SupplyTemp)) / (RE\_electric \* 3412)

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (101 – 50.7)) / (0.98 \* 3412)

=0.125 kWh/gal

Where:

ShowerTemp = Assumed temperature of water

= 101°F[[491]](#footnote-495)

SupplyTemp = Assumed temperature of water entering house

= 50.7°F [[492]](#footnote-496)

Based on default assumptions provided above, the savings for a single family home would be:

∆kWh = %Electric DHW \* GPM \* (L\_base – L\_timer) \* Household \* Days/yr \* SPCD \* UsageFactor \* EPG\_Electric

= 0.16 \* 1.93 \* (7.8 – 5.79) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \* 0.6 \* 0.34 \* 0.125

=14.8kWh

Secondary kWh Savings for Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment

The following savings should be included in the total savings for this measure, but should not be included in TRC tests to avoid double counting the economic benefit of water savings.

ΔkWhwater = ΔWater (gallons) / 1,000,000 \* Ewater total

Where

Ewater total = IL Total Water Energy Factor (kWh/Million Gallons)

=5,010[[493]](#footnote-497)

Based on default assumptions provided above, the savings for a single family home would be:

ΔWater (gallons) = GPM \* (L\_base – L\_timer) \* Household **\*** Days/yr \* SPCD \* UsageFactor

= 1.93 \* (7.8 – 5.79) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \* 0.6 \* 0.34

= 740.0 gallons

ΔkWhwater = 740/1,000,000 \* 5010

= 3.7 kWh

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

ΔkW = ΔkWh/Hours \* CF

Where:

ΔkWh = calculated value above. Note do not include the secondary savings in this calculation.

Hours = Annual electric DHW recovery hours for showerhead use

= (GPM\_base \* L\_base \* Household \* SPCD \* UsageFactor \* 365.25) \* 0.726 [[494]](#footnote-498) / GPH

GPH = Gallons per hour recovery of electric water heater calculated for 69.3F temp rise (120-50.7), 98% recovery efficiency, and typical 4.5kW electric resistance storage tank.

= 26.1

CF = Coincidence Factor for electric load reduction

= 0.0278[[495]](#footnote-499)

Based on default assumptions provided above, the savings for a single family home would be:

Hours = (1.93 \* 7.8 \* 2.56 \* 0.6 \* 0.34 \* 365.25) \* 0.726/26.1

= 79.9 Hours

ΔkW = ΔkWh/Hours \* CF

= 14.8 / 79.9 \* 0.0278

= 0.0051 kW

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

∆Therms = %FossilDHW \* GPM \* (L\_base – L\_timer) \* Household **\*** Days/yr \* SPCD \* UsageFactor \* EPG\_Gas

%FossilDHW = Percentage of DHW savings assumed to be fossil fuel

= 100 % for Fossil Fuel

= 0 % for Electric

= If unknown[[496]](#footnote-500), use the following table:

|  | **Location** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Utility** | **Single Family** | **Single Family Low Income** | **Multi Family** | **Multi Family Low Income** | **Unknown** |
| Ameren[[497]](#footnote-501) | 76% | 75% | 60% | 57% | 72% |
| ComEd[[498]](#footnote-502) | 92% | | 89% | | 91% |
| People’s Gas[[499]](#footnote-503) | 77% | 74% | 51% | 50% | 63% |
| Northshore Gas[[500]](#footnote-504) | 80% | | | | |
| Nicor Gas[[501]](#footnote-505) | 80% | | | | |
| **All DUs** |  | | | | **77%** |

*Note*: If a measure is supported by a gas and electric utility, utilize the assumptions above for the gas utility

EPG\_gas = Energy per gallon of Hot water supplied by gas

= (8.33 \* 1.0 \* (ShowerTemp - SupplyTemp)) / (RE\_gas \* 100,000)

= 0.00537 Therm/gal for SF homes

= 0.00625 Therm/gal for MF homes

RE\_gas = Recovery efficiency of gas water heater

= 78% For SF homes [[502]](#footnote-506)

= 67% For MF homes[[503]](#footnote-507)

Use Multifamily if: Building has shared DHW.

100,000 = Converts Btus to Therms (btu/Therm)

Other variables as defined above.

Based on default assumptions provided above, the savings for a single family home would be:

∆ Therms = %FossilDHW \* GPM \* (L\_base – L\_timer) \* Household **\*** Days/yr \* SPCD \* UsageFactor \* EPG\_Gas

= 0.84 \* 1.93 \* (7.8 – 5.79) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \* 0.6 \* 0.34 \* 0.00537

= 3.3 Therms

###### Water Descriptions and Calculation

ΔWater (gallons) = GPM \* (L\_base – L\_timer) \* Household **\*** Days/yr \* SPCD \* UsageFactor

Variables as defined above

Based on default assumptions provided above, the savings for a single family home would be:

ΔWater (gallons) = GPM \* (L\_base – L\_timer) \* Household **\*** Days/yr \* SPCD \* UsageFactor

= 1.93 \* (7.8 – 5.79) \* 2.56 \* 365.25 \* 0.6 \* 0.34

= 740.0 gallons

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure code: RS-DHW-SHTM-V06-230101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2026

### 5.6.8 High Performance Windows

###### Description

High Performance Windows (HPWs) greatly improve building thermal envelope performance compared to code standard double-glazed windows. HPWs must achieve a U-value ≤ 0.22 for the Northern climate zone,[[504]](#footnote-508) or ≤ 0.25 for the North-Central climate zone. High performance windows significantly decrease heat loss through a building’s envelope in a number of ways: by adding one or more additional panes of glass in the insulating glass unit (IGU), applying additional coatings to the glass panes, adding new gas fill, and/or using thermally improved spacers.

HPWs’ reduced heat transfer significantly effects home energy savings as windows are often the weakest part of any building envelope. In addition to reducing heat transfer, HPWs also reduce air infiltration, thereby contributing to decreased HVAC loads. HPWs provide benefits for both heating and cooling seasons, and for both natural gas- and electrically-heated and cooled homes. They also have non-energy benefits such as increased thermal comfort and decreased outside noise.

This measure was developed for the following program types: New Construction (NC), Retrofit (RF), Time of Sale (TOS), and Early Replacement (EREP). If applied to other program types, the measure savings should be verified.

###### Definition of Efficient Equipment

HPWs are windows that meet the ENERGY STAR® version 7.0 performance specifications shown below:

Table 1: Key Product Criteria for High Performance Windows[[505]](#footnote-509)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **ENERGY STAR**  **Climate Zone** | **U-Value** | **SHGC** | **Prescriptive or Performance-Based** |
| 1 – Rockford  2 – Chicago  3 – Springfield | Northern | ≤ 0.22 | ≥ 0.17 | Prescriptive |
| = 0.23 | ≥ 0.35 | Equivalent Energy Performance |
| = 0.24 |
| = 0.25 | ≥ 0.40 |
| = 0.26 |
| 4 – Belleville | North-Central | ≤ 0.25 | ≤ 0.40 | Prescriptive |
| 5 – Marion | Prescriptive |

HPWs can achieve these performance specifications in a number of ways. Some examples of HPWs include:

* Thin Triple Windows (TTW) – the insulating glass unit (IGU) contains three panes of glass. A thin pane of center glass allows the IGU to fit within a standard window frame, eliminating the need to redesign the window. The inclusion of a thin pane of center glass allows for an additional surface for low-E coating, reducing the window’s emissivity of thermal radiation and the rate of heat transfer by improving the U-value of the IGU and overall assembly. TTWs have two equal width panes of glass on the exterior and interior of the IGU and a thin center piece of glass that allows the IGU to fit within an existing double-pane window frame.
* Triple Pane Windows – conventional triple pane windows that contain three panes of standard thickness glass. These windows provide an additional surface for a low-e coating and provide improved thermal performance by decreasing a window’s emissivity and improving the window’s resistance to heat loss. These windows are typically heavier than double-panes or TTWs and require a redesign of the window to allow the heavier, wider IGU to fit within the window frame.
* Double-pane windows that have low-e coatings on the two surfaces that face the cavity between the two panes of glass as well as on the interior-facing interior pane of glass, warm edge spacers, and improved frame thermal properties (e.g., adding foam or other insulation to the frame cavities).[[506]](#footnote-510)

###### Definition of Baseline Equipment

New Construction and Time of Sale: The tables below show International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) 2018 and IECC 2021 window codes for new construction. For first permits dated November 1, 2022 or later in the city of Chicago, residential new construction must be built in accordance with IECC 2021. The remainder of Illinois must be built in accordance with IECC 2018 until the IECC 2021 effective date.

Table 2: IECC – Fenestration Requirements[[507]](#footnote-511),[[508]](#footnote-512)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **IECC Climate Zone** | **U-Value** | **SHGC** |
| 1 – Rockford | 5 | ≤ 0.30 | *Not Rated[[509]](#footnote-513)* |
| 2 – Chicago | ≤ 0.40**[[510]](#footnote-514)** |
| 3 – Springfield | *Not Rated[[511]](#footnote-515)* |
| 4 – Belleville | 4 | ≤ 0.32 | ≤ 0.40 |
| 5 – Marion |

Early Replacement in Existing Homes:

Table 3: Existing Homes – Existing Window Values: Double Pane[[512]](#footnote-516)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **U-Value** | **SHGC** |
| 1 – Rockford | 0.55 | 0.63 |
| 2 – Chicago |
| 3 – Springfield |
| 4 – Belleville |
| 5 – Marion |

Table 4: Existing Homes – Existing Window Values: Single Pane[[513]](#footnote-517)

| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **U-Value** | **SHGC** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 – Rockford | 1.0 | 0.76 |
| 2 – Chicago |
| 3 – Springfield |
| 4 – Belleville |
| 5 – Marion |

###### Deemed Lifetime of Efficient Equipment

The measure life is assumed to be 40 years.[[514]](#footnote-518)

The remaining life of existing equipment is assumed to be 13 years.[[515]](#footnote-519)

###### Deemed Measure Cost

The incremental cost for this measure depends on the program delivery type/baseline and climate zone.

New Construction (NC) and Time of Sale (TOS): includes only equipment cost above baseline:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **ENERGY STAR Climate Zone** | **NC or TOS[[516]](#footnote-520)** |
| 1 – Rockford  2 – Chicago  3 - Springfield | Northern | $3.85/ft2 |
| 4 – Belleville  5 – Marion | North-Central | $2.18/ft2 |

Early Replacement (EREP): Actual equipment and labor costs for installation, less the present value of the assumed deferred replacement cost, should be used. If this is unknown, assume the defaults below. The assumed deferred cost (after 13 years) of replacing existing windows with a new code required double-pane baseline unit is assumed to be $48.50 per square foot[[517]](#footnote-521).

| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **ENERGY STAR Climate Zone** | **EREP** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 – Rockford  2 – Chicago  3 - Springfield | Northern | $52.35/ft2 |
| 4 – Belleville  5 – Marion | North-Central | $50.68/ft2 |

Retrofit (RF): Actual costs of equipment and labor should be used.

###### Loadshape

Loadshape R08 - Residential Cooling

Loadshape R09 - Residential Electric Space Heat

Loadshape R10 - Residential Electric Heating and Cooling

###### Coincidence Factor

The summer peak coincidence factor for cooling is provided in two different ways below. The first is used to estimate peak savings during the utility peak hour and is most indicative of actual peak benefits, and the second represents the average savings over the defined summer peak period, and is presented so that savings can be bid into PJM’s Forward Capacity Market.

CFSSP = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Central A/C (during utility peak hour)

= 68%[[518]](#footnote-522)

CFSSP SF = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Heat Pumps in single-family homes (during system peak hour)

= 72%[[519]](#footnote-523)

CFSSP, MF = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Heat Pumps in multi-family homes (during system peak hour)

= 67%[[520]](#footnote-524)

CFPJM   = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Central A/C (average during PJM peak period)

= 46.6%[[521]](#footnote-525)

CFPJM SF  = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Heat Pumps in single-family homes (average during PJM peak period)

= 46.6%[[522]](#footnote-526)

CFPJM, MF = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Heat Pumps in multi-family homes (average during peak period)

= 28.5%

Algorithm

###### Calculation of Energy Savings

###### Electric Energy Savings

Where:

= Annual heating, cooling + fan savings per area of window by climate zone, see Tables 5-7 below.

= Total area of installed high performance windows. Use site specific value.

Table 5: Air Conditioner with Gas Furnace – electric savings per window area (kWh/ft2)[[523]](#footnote-527)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **NC or TOS** | **EREP:**  **Double Pane** | **EREP:**  **Single Pane** |
| 1 – Rockford | 0.58 | 1.22 | 2.33 |
| 2 – Chicago | 0.61 | 1.20 | 2.24 |
| 3 – Springfield | 0.51 | 1.39 | 2.70 |
| 4 – Belleville | 0.53 | 1.39 | 2.74 |
| 5 – Marion | 0.62 | 1.25 | 2.64 |

Table 6: Air Conditioner with Electric Resistance Heat – electric savings per window area (kWh/ft2)[[524]](#footnote-528)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **NC or TOS** | **EREP:**  **Double Pane** | **EREP:**  **Single Pane** |
| 1 – Rockford | 2.42 | 4.24 | 14.77 |
| 2 – Chicago | 2.79 | 4.04 | 13.43 |
| 3 – Springfield | 2.64 | 3.70 | 11.39 |
| 4 – Belleville | 2.97 | 4.10 | 12.35 |
| 5 – Marion | 2.16 | 3.95 | 9.88 |

Table 7: Heat Pump – electric savings per window area (kWh/ft2)[[525]](#footnote-529)

| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **NC or TOS** | **EREP:**  **Double Pane** | **EREP:**  **Single Pane** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 – Rockford | 1.73 | 7.62 | 19.68 |
| 2 – Chicago | 1.69 | 6.95 | 17.14 |
| 3 – Springfield | 1.92 | 6.24 | 15.01 |
| 4 – Belleville | 1.76 | 6.36 | 14.98 |
| 5 – Marion | 1.43 | 5.90 | 12.62 |

###### Summer Coincident Peak Demand Savings

Where:

= Annual cooling-only electricity savings, based on climate zone and equipment type. See Tables 9-11

= Full load hours of air conditioning

= dependent on location:[[526]](#footnote-530)

| **Climate Zone**  **(City based upon)** | **Single Family** | **Multifamily** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 (Rockford) | 547 | 499 |
| 2 (Chicago) | 709 | 629 |
| 3 (Springfield) | 779 | 707 |
| 4 (Belleville) | 1082 | 982 |
| 5 (Marion) | 956 | 868 |
| Weighted Average[[527]](#footnote-531)  ComEd  Ameren  Statewide | 676 875 731 | 603 791 655 |

CFSSP = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Central A/C (during utility peak hour)

= 68%[[528]](#footnote-532)

CFSSP SF = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Heat Pumps in single-family homes (during system peak hour)

= 72%[[529]](#footnote-533)

CFSSP, MF = Summer System Peak Coincidence Factor for Heat Pumps in multi-family homes (during system peak hour)

= 67%[[530]](#footnote-534)

CFPJM   = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Central A/C (average during PJM peak period)

= 46.6%[[531]](#footnote-535)

CFPJM SF  = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Heat Pumps in single-family homes (average during PJM peak period)

= 46.6%[[532]](#footnote-536)

CFPJM, MF = PJM Summer Peak Coincidence Factor for Heat Pumps in multi-family homes (average during peak period)

= 28.5%

Table 9: Air Conditioner with Gas Furnace – cooling only electric savings per window area (kWh/ft2)[[533]](#footnote-537)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **NC or TOS** | **EREP:**  **Double Pane** | **EREP:**  **Single Pane** |
| 1 – Rockford | 0.35 | 0.60 | 1.24 |
| 2 – Chicago | 0.36 | 0.53 | 1.13 |
| 3 – Springfield | 0.39 | 0.61 | 1.37 |
| 4 – Belleville | 0.40 | 0.60 | 1.38 |
| 5 – Marion | 0.46 | 0.48 | 1.27 |

Table 10: Air Conditioner with Electric Resistance Heat – cooling only electric savings per window area (kWh/ft2)[[534]](#footnote-538)

| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **NC or TOS** | **EREP:**  **Double Pane** | **EREP:**  **Single Pane** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 – Rockford | 0.31 | 0.48 | 2.17 |
| 2 – Chicago | 0.33 | 0.47 | 1.97 |
| 3 – Springfield | 0.35 | 0.43 | 1.65 |
| 4 – Belleville | 0.39 | 0.36 | 1.67 |
| 5 – Marion | 0.44 | 0.36 | 1.31 |

Table 11: Heat Pump – cooling only electric savings per window area (kWh/ft2)[[535]](#footnote-539)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **NC or TOS** | **EREP:**  **Double Pane** | **EREP:**  **Single Pane** |
| 1 – Rockford | 0.31 | 0.56 | 2.27 |
| 2 – Chicago | 0.32 | 0.58 | 2.04 |
| 3 – Springfield | 0.34 | 0.50 | 1.78 |
| 4 – Belleville | 0.39 | 0.41 | 1.67 |
| 5 – Marion | 0.43 | 0.39 | 1.41 |

###### Fossil Fuel Savings

Where:

= Annual heating savings per area of window by climate zone, see Table 12.

= Total area of installed high performance windows. Use site specific value.

Table 12: Gas heating savings per window area by climate zone and baseline window condition (therm/ft2)[[536]](#footnote-540)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IL Degree-Day Zone** | **NC or TOS** | **EREP:**  **Double Pane** | **EREP:**  **Single Pane** |
| 1 – Rockford | 0.12 | 0.22 | 1.27 |
| 2 – Chicago | 0.12 | 0.21 | 1.12 |
| 3 – Springfield | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.91 |
| 4 – Belleville | 0.17 | 0.16 | 0.89 |
| 5 – Marion | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.73 |

For example, a single family residence in Rockford with a gas furnace and air conditioner replaces 10 existing double pane windows with HPW. Each window is 12 square feet, so the total window area is 120 square feet.

1st 13 years savings calculation:

Remaining 27 years savings calculation:

###### Water Impact Descriptions and Calculation

N/A

###### Deemed O&M Cost Adjustment Calculation

N/A

###### Measure Code: RS-SHL-TTWI-V04-240101

###### Review Deadline: 1/1/2028

1. Design Light Consortium – Horticultural Lighting, Testing and Reporting Requirements for LED-Based Horticultural Lighting, version 2.1, effective September 1, 2021. To date, all horticultural lamps certified by the DLC specification are LEDs. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Erik Runkle and Bruce Bugbee “Plant Lighting Efficiency and Efficacy: μmols per joule”. Accessed 4/21/2020. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
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273. Average data from GTI Residential Ozone Laundry Field Demonstration (May 2018). As an add on to existing equipment it is assumed this is a larger capacity than the assumption for new Clothes Washers as old machines tended to have larger capacities. See ‘Residential Ozone Summary Calcs\_2019.xlsx’ and ‘Multifamily Ozone Summary Calcs\_2019.xlsx’ for more information. If utilities have specific evaluation results providing a more appropriate assumption for homes in a particular market or geographical area then that should be used. [↑](#footnote-ref-277)
274. Averaged data from GTI Residential Ozone Laundry Field Demonstration (May 2018). Hot and warm wash cycles were combined because data from the EIA Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) 2015 East North Central Region show that, of the total hot and warm washes that occur, over 96% are warm washes. See ‘Residential Ozone Summary Calcs\_2019.xlsx’ and ‘Multifamily Ozone Summary Calcs\_2019.xlsx’ for more information. [↑](#footnote-ref-278)
275. Table 4 in Chen, et. al., “Calculating Average Hot Water Mixes of Residential Plumbing Fixtures”, June 2020, reports a value of 50.7°F for inlet water temperature for U.S. Census Division 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-279)
276. Weighted average of clothes washer cycles per year (based on 2009 Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) national sample survey of housing appliances section, state of Illinois.

     If utilities have specific evaluation results providing a more appropriate assumption for single-family or Multifamily homes, in a particular market, or geographical area then that should be used. [↑](#footnote-ref-280)
277. DOE Technical Support Document Chapter 6, 2010 <https://www.regulations.gov/contentStreamer?documentId=EERE-2006-STD-0127-0118&attachmentNumber=8&disposition=attachment&contentType=pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-281)
278. Review of AHRI database shows that electric water heaters have a recovery efficiency of 98%. [↑](#footnote-ref-282)
279. Review of AHRI database shows that Electric Heat Pump Water Heaters support this recovery efficiency. For the raw data, and calculations, please see AHRI\_ RES Water Heaters 2022.xlsx. [↑](#footnote-ref-283)
280. GTI Residential Ozone Laundry Field Demonstration (May 2018). See ‘Residential Ozone Summary Calcs\_2019.xlsx’ and ‘Multifamily Ozone Summary Calcs\_2019.xlsx’ for more information. [↑](#footnote-ref-284)
281. Based on a weighted average of 264 clothes washer cycles per year assuming an average load runs for one hour. [↑](#footnote-ref-285)
282. Calculated from Itron eShapes, 8760 hourly data by end use for Missouri, as provided by Ameren. [↑](#footnote-ref-286)
283. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-287)
284. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-288)
285. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-289)
286. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-290)
287. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-291)
288. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-292)
289. DOE Final Rule discusses Recovery Efficiency with an average around 0.76 for Gas Fired Storage Water heaters and 0.78 for standard efficiency gas fired tankless water heaters up to 0.95 for the highest efficiency gas fired condensing tankless water heaters. These numbers represent the range of new units however, not the range of existing units in stock. Review of AHRI Directory suggests range of recovery efficiency ratings for new Gas DHW units of 70-87%. Average of existing units is estimated at 79%. [↑](#footnote-ref-293)
290. Water heating in Multifamily buildings is often provided by a larger central boiler. This suggests that the average recovery efficiency is somewhere between a typical central boiler efficiency of 0.59 and the 0.75 for single family homes. An average efficiency of 0.67 is used for this analysis as a default for Multifamily buildings. [↑](#footnote-ref-294)
291. Based on cost analysis of products available on [www.Jet.com](http://www.Jet.com) and [www.Amazon.com](http://www.Amazon.com). [↑](#footnote-ref-295)
292. ENERGY STAR Version 5.0 Room Air Conditioners Program Requirements [↑](#footnote-ref-296)
293. The Consortium for Energy Efficiency Super Efficient Home Appliance Initiative, Room Air Conditioner Specification, CEE Advanced Tier (CEER), effective May 17, 2022. Please see file “CEE\_RoomAC\_Specification\_17May2022.pdf”. https://cee1.org/images/pdf/CEE\_RoomAC\_Specification\_17May2022.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-297)
294. Measure Life Report, Residential and Commercial/Industrial Lighting and HVAC Measures, GDS Associates, June 2007. [↑](#footnote-ref-298)
295. To promote improved cost effectiveness, it is assumed that the lower cost ENERGY STAR Room AC units would be used. Units between $200-$400 are available dependent on capacity. [↑](#footnote-ref-299)
296. Consistent with Non IQ version of the measure. [↑](#footnote-ref-300)
297. Based on metering of 24 homes with central AC during PY4 and PY5 in Ameren Illinois service territory. [↑](#footnote-ref-301)
298. Based on analysis of Itron eShape data for Missouri, calibrated to Illinois loads, supplied by Ameren. The average AC load over the PJM peak period (1-5pm, M-F, June through August) is divided by the maximum AC load during the year. [↑](#footnote-ref-302)
299. Full load hours for Chicago, Moline and Rockford are provided in “Final Evaluation Report: Central Air Conditioning Efficiency Services (CACES), 2010, Navigant Consulting”, p.33. An average FLH/Cooling Degree Day (from NCDC) ratio was calculated for these locations and applied to the CDD of the other locations in order to estimate FLH. There is a county mapping table in Volume 1, Section 3.7 providing the appropriate city to use for each county of Illinois. Note, full load hours for IQ homes are estimated to be higher than non-IQ homes and are assumed consistent with the Central AC FLH assumption. In a non-IQ home, it is expected that there be multiple Room AC units, many in bedrooms, and therefore the usage for each one would likely be lower. However in an IQ home it is assumed that the Room AC is being used as the main cooling system for the home are run more like a CAC. [↑](#footnote-ref-303)
300. Applied percent change of CDD65, NCEI Annual Normals from 30 yr data set (1981-2010) to more recent 15 yr data (2006-2020) to all FLHcool values. [↑](#footnote-ref-304)
301. *All-Electric Homes PY6 Metering Results: Multifamily HVAC Systems*, Cadmus, October 2015. The multifamily units within this study had undergone significant shell improvements (air sealing and insulation) and therefore this set of assumptions is only appropriate for units that have recently participated in a weatherization or other shell program. Note that the FLHcool where recalculated based on existing efficiencies consistent with the TRM rather than from the metering study. [↑](#footnote-ref-305)
302. Weighting for Ameren is based on electric accounts in each of the cooling zones. Weighting for ComEd and Statewide average is based on number of occupied residential housing units in each zone. ComEd is weighted average of Zones 1-2. Alternative program-weighted assumptions can be used if appropriate. [↑](#footnote-ref-306)
303. Based on maximum capacity average from the RLW Report: Final Report Coincidence Factor Study Residential Room Air Conditioners, June 23, 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-307)
304. Based on Nexus Market Research Inc, RLW Analytics, December 2005; “Impact, Process, and Market Study of the Connecticut Appliance Retirement Program: Overall Report.” [↑](#footnote-ref-308)
305. Since the existing unit will be rated in EER, this factor is used to appropriately compare with the new CEER rating. Version 3.0 of the ENERGY STAR specification provided equivalent EER and CEER ratings and for the most popular size band the EER rating is approximately 1% higher than the CEER. See ‘ENERGY STAR Version 3.0 Room Air Conditioners Program Requirements’. [↑](#footnote-ref-309)
306. Based on metering of 24 homes with central AC during PY4 and PY5 in Ameren Illinois service territory. [↑](#footnote-ref-310)
307. Based on analysis of Itron eShape data for Missouri, calibrated to Illinois loads, supplied by Ameren. The average AC load over the PJM peak period (1-5pm, M-F, June through August) is divided by the maximum AC load during the year. [↑](#footnote-ref-311)
308. Since the new CEER rating includes standby and off power consumption, for peak calculations it is more appropriate to apply the EER rating, but it appears as though new units will only be rated with a CEER rating. Version 3.0 of the ENERGY STAR specification provided equivalent EER and CEER ratings and for the most popular size band the EER rating is approximately 1% higher than the CEER. See ‘ENERGY STAR Version 3.0 Room Air Conditioners Program Requirements’. [↑](#footnote-ref-312)
309. Measure Life Report, Residential and Commercial/Industrial Lighting and HVAC Measures, GDS Associates, June 2007. [↑](#footnote-ref-313)
310. Consistent with DEER 2008 Database Technology and Measure Cost Data ([www.deeresources.com](http://www.ctsavesenergy.org/files/Measure%20Life%20Report%202007.pdf)). [↑](#footnote-ref-314)
311. Review of website cost data for Homedepot.com, Lowes.com, and Menards.com for locations in Peoria, IL. [↑](#footnote-ref-315)
312. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-316)
313. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-317)
314. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-318)
315. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-319)
316. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-320)
317. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-321)
318. Where possible it should be ensured that the R-value of the insulation is at the appropriate mean rating temperature (100F). [↑](#footnote-ref-322)
319. In cases with zero wind, heat loss (and therefore) savings is larger from horizontal pipe configurations than vertical pipe configurations due, perhaps to the way in which convective losses are handled. Given that most DHW pipe insulation installations begin with a vertical orientation from the water heater, an adjustment to the engineering calculation is needed. An analysis of the 3E PLUS tool by NAIMA (<https://insulationinstitute.org/tools-resources/free-3e-plus/>) yielded adjustment factors for horizontal to vertical loss and savings values. See DHW\_PipeInsulationCalcs\_062121.xlsx for details of the analysis and comparisons. [↑](#footnote-ref-323)
320. Assumes 125°F water leaving the hot water tank and average temperature of basement of 65°F. [↑](#footnote-ref-324)
321. Results from Home Energy Worksheets completed by student/families in 2020, 2021, and 2022 were nearly the same as values from: 2020 survey research by Guidehouse, conducted with Peoples Gas income qualified recipients of self-install efficiency kits distributed by mail in late 2019 (with 117 survey respondents) and research from 2021 Ameren Illinois Income Qualified participant survey, available on IL SAG website:

     <https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/AIC-Income-Qualified-Initiative-Participant-Survey-Results-Memo-FINAL-2022-02-01.pdf>. Home Energy Worksheets also establish the fraction of participants who indicate they “will install later” for specific measures. Follow-up research completed by Guidehouse for Nicor Gas in 2022 found that, on average, 51.3% of respondents who initially reported that they hadn’t installed specific kit measures, but “planned to” subsequently had installed the measures. Combining these findings allows for an ISR that accounts for initial and one round of subsequent installations. To maintain a conservative estimate of ISR, the remaining 48.7% are presumed uninstalled. See: EESchoolKitSubsequentInstall\_HEW.xlsx for data and calculations. [↑](#footnote-ref-325)
322. An equal weighted average of Direct Install and Kit ISRs. Interest and applicability of measures confirmed through virtual assessment followed by self-installation without verification of install. [↑](#footnote-ref-326)
323. Electric water heaters have recovery efficiency of 98%. [↑](#footnote-ref-327)
324. See: <https://energy-models.com/pipe-sizing-charts-tables> (last accessed 5/7/21) for copper pipe sizes and <https://www.garagesanctum.com/size-chart/pex-tubing-size-chart/> (last accessed 5/7/21) for PEX pipe sizes. [↑](#footnote-ref-328)
325. Laboratory measured values from Hoeschele and Weitzel (2012), Figure 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-329)
326. Calculated using the average pipe thickness (I.D. + O.D.)\*0.5. [↑](#footnote-ref-330)
327. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-331)
328. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-332)
329. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-333)
330. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-334)
331. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-335)
332. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-336)
333. Review of AHRI Directory suggests range of recovery efficiency ratings for new Gas DHW units of 70-87%. Average of existing units is estimated at 78% [↑](#footnote-ref-337)
334. As recommended in Navigant ‘ComEd Effective Useful Life Research Report’, May 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-338)
335. 2011, Market research average of $3. [↑](#footnote-ref-339)
336. Includes assess and install labor time of $5 (20min @ $15/hr) [↑](#footnote-ref-340)
337. Calculated as follows: Assume 18% aerator use takes place during peak hours (based on: Oreo et al, “The end uses of hot water in single family homes from flow trace analysis”, 2001.) There are 65 days in the summer peak period, so the percentage of total annual aerator use in peak period is 0.18\*65/365 = 3.21%. The number of hours of recovery during peak periods is therefore assumed to be 3.21% \*180 = 5.8 hours of recovery during peak period where 180 equals the average annual electric DHW recovery hours for faucet use including SF and MF homes. There are 260 hours in the peak period so the probability you will see savings during the peak period is 5.8/260 = 0.022 [↑](#footnote-ref-341)
338. This algorithm calculates the amount of energy saved per aerator by determining the fraction of water consumption savings for the upgraded fixture. [↑](#footnote-ref-342)
339. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-343)
340. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-344)
341. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-345)
342. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-346)
343. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-347)
344. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-348)
345. Measurement should be based on actual average flow consumed over a period of time rather than a onetime spot measurement for maximum flow. Studies have shown maximum flow rates do not correspond well to average flow rate due to occupant behavior which does not always use maximum flow. [↑](#footnote-ref-349)
346. 2008, Schultdt, Marc, and Debra Tachibana. Energy related Water Fixture Measurements: Securing the Baseline for Northwest Single Family Homes. 2008 ACEEE Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings. Page 1-265. www.seattle.gov/light/Conserve/Reports/paper\_10.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-350)
347. Based on flow meter bag testing conducted from June 2013 to January 2014 by Franklin Energy. Over 300 residential sites in the Chicago area were tested. [↑](#footnote-ref-351)
348. Average retrofit flow rate for kitchen and bathroom faucet aerators from sources 2, 4, 5, and 7(see source table at end of characterization). This accounts for all throttling and differences from rated flow rates. Assumes all kitchen aerators at 2.2 gpm or less and all bathroom aerators at 1.5 gpm or less. The most comprehensive available studies did not disaggregate kitchen use from bathroom use, but instead looked at total flow and length of use for all faucets. This makes it difficult to reliably separate kitchen water use from bathroom water use. It is possible that programs installing low flow aerators lower than the 2.2 gpm for kitchens and 1.5 gpm for bathrooms will see a lower overall average retrofit flow rate. [↑](#footnote-ref-352)
349. Measurement should be based on actual average flow consumed over a period of time rather than a onetime spot measurement for maximum flow. Studies have shown maximum flow rates do not correspond well to average flow rate due to occupant behavior which does not always use maximum flow. [↑](#footnote-ref-353)
350. 2008, Schultdt, Marc, and Debra Tachibana. Energy related Water Fixture Measurements: Securing the Baseline for Northwest Single Family Homes. 2008 ACEEE Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings. Page 1-265. [↑](#footnote-ref-354)
351. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. This study of 135 single and Multifamily homes in Michigan metered energy parameters for efficient showerhead and faucet aerators. [↑](#footnote-ref-355)
352. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-356)
353. One kitchen faucet plus 2.83 bathroom faucets. Based on findings from a 2009 ComEd residential survey of 140 sites, provided by Cadmus. [↑](#footnote-ref-357)
354. One kitchen faucet plus 1.5 bathroom faucets. Based on findings from a 2009 ComEd residential survey of 140 sites, provided by Cadmus. [↑](#footnote-ref-358)
355. Unknown is based on statewide weighted average of 69% single family and 31% multifamily, based on IL data from 2009 RECS Table HC2.9 Structural and Geographic Characteristics of Homes in Midwest Region, Divisions and States, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-359)
356. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. [↑](#footnote-ref-360)
357. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-361)
358. One kitchen faucet plus 2.83 bathroom faucets. Based on findings from a 2009 ComEd residential survey of 140 sites, provided by Cadmus. [↑](#footnote-ref-362)
359. One kitchen faucet plus 1.5 bathroom faucets. Based on findings from a 2009 ComEd residential survey of 140 sites, provided by Cadmus. [↑](#footnote-ref-363)
360. Unknown is based on statewide weighted average of 69% single family and 31% multifamily, based on IL data from 2009 RECS Table HC2.9 Structural and Geographic Characteristics of Homes in Midwest Region, Divisions and States, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-364)
361. ComEd Energy Efficiency/ Demand Response Plan: Plan Year 2 (6/1/2009-5/31/2010) Evaluation Report: All Electric Single Family Home Energy Performance Tune-Up Program citing 2006-2008 American Community Survey data from the US Census Bureau for Illinois cited on p. 17 of the PY2 Evaluation report. 2.75 \* 93% evaluation adjustment [↑](#footnote-ref-365)
362. Navigant, ComEd PY3 Multifamily Home Energy Savings Program Evaluation Report Final, May 16, 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-366)
363. Unknown is based on statewide weighted average of 69% single family and 31% multifamily, based on IL data from 2009 RECS Table HC2.9 Structural and Geographic Characteristics of Homes in Midwest Region, Divisions and States, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-367)
364. Bedrooms are suitable proxies for household occupancy, and may be preferable to actual occupancy due to turnover rates in residency and non-adult population impacts. [↑](#footnote-ref-368)
365. Because faucet usages are at times dictated by volume, only usage of the sort that would go straight down the drain will provide savings. VEIC is unaware of any metering study that has determined this specific factor and so through consensus with the Illinois Technical Advisory Group have deemed these values to be 75% for the kitchen and 90% for the bathroom. If the aerator location is unknown an average of 79.5% should be used which is based on the assumption that 70% of household water runs through the kitchen faucet and 30% through the bathroom (0.7\*0.75)+(0.3\*0.9)=0.795. [↑](#footnote-ref-369)
366. Based on findings from a 2009 ComEd residential survey of 140 sites, provided by Cadmus. [↑](#footnote-ref-370)
367. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-371)
368. Unknown is based on statewide weighted average of 69% single family and 31% multifamily, based on IL data from 2009 RECS Table HC2.9 Structural and Geographic Characteristics of Homes in Midwest Region, Divisions and States, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-372)
369. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. If the aerator location is unknown an average of 91% should be used which is based on the assumption that 70% of household water runs through the kitchen faucet and 30% through the bathroom (0.7\*93)+(0.3\*86)=91F. [↑](#footnote-ref-373)
370. Table 4 in Chen, et. al., “Calculating Average Hot Water Mixes of Residential Plumbing Fixtures”, June 2020, reports a value of 50.7°F for inlet water temperature for U.S. Census Division 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-374)
371. Electric water heaters have recovery efficiency of 98%. [↑](#footnote-ref-375)
372. ComEd Energy Efficiency/ Demand Response Plan: Plan Year 2 (6/1/2009-5/31/2010) Evaluation Report: All Electric Single Family Home Energy Performance Tune-Up Program Table 3-8. [↑](#footnote-ref-376)
373. Navigant, ComEd-Nicor Gas EPY4/GPY1 Multifamily Home Energy Savings Program Evaluation Report DRAFT 2013-01-28 [↑](#footnote-ref-377)
374. An equal weighted average of Direct Install and Efficiency Kit ISRs. Guidehouse, *In-Service Rates for CY2020 Single Family Virtual Assessment Measures*, August 20, 2020. Interest and applicability of measures confirmed through virtual assessment. Please note, these ISRs do not apply to retail purchases by end user. [↑](#footnote-ref-378)
375. An equal weighted average of Direct Install and Efficiency Kit ISRs. Interest and applicability of measures confirmed through virtual assessment. Please note, these ISRs do not apply to retail purchases by end user. [↑](#footnote-ref-379)
376. A weighted ISR was found by weighting Nicor and Ameren efficiency kit program uptake and their previously found ISRs. This analysis can be found in Faucet Aerators and Showerheads Weighted Average ISR IL TRM.xlsx. [↑](#footnote-ref-380)
377. Average of Guidehouse survey research for Peoples Gas, June 16, 2020 and Research from 2021 Ameren Illinois Income Qualified participant survey, available on IL SAG website: https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/AIC-Income-Qualified-Initiative-Participant-Survey-Results-Memo-FINAL-2022-02-01.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-381)
378. Research from 2018 Ameren Illinois Income Qualified participant survey. [↑](#footnote-ref-382)
379. Results from Home Energy Worksheets completed by student/families in 2020, 2021, and 2022 were nearly the same as values from: Opinion Dynamics and Cadmus. 2018 AIC Residential Program Annual Impact Evaluation Report. April 30, 2019. Results from implementer-administered participant survey. Home Energy Worksheets also establish the fraction of participants who indicate they “will install later” for specific measures. Follow-up research completed by Guidehouse for Nicor Gas in 2022 found that, on average, 51.3% of respondents who initially reported that they hadn’t installed specific kit measures, but “planned to” subsequently had installed the measures. Combining these findings allows for an ISR that accounts for initial and one round of subsequent intallations. To maintain a conservative estimate of ISR, the remaining 48.7% are presumed uninstalled. See: EESchoolKitSubsequentInstall\_HEW.xlsx for data and calculations. [↑](#footnote-ref-383)
380. This factor includes 2571 kWh/MG for water supply based on Illinois energy intensity data from a 2012 ISAWWA study and 2439 kWh/MG for wastewater treatment based on national energy intensity use estimates. For more information please review Elevate Energy’s ‘IL TRM: Energy per Gallon Factor, May 2018 paper’. [↑](#footnote-ref-384)
381. 56.7% is the proportion of hot 120F water mixed with 50.7F supply water to give 90F mixed faucet water. [↑](#footnote-ref-385)
382. Calculated as follows: Assume 18% aerator use takes place during peak hours (based on: Oreo et al, “The end uses of hot water in single family homes from flow trace analysis”, 2001.) There are 65 days in the summer peak period, so the percentage of total annual aerator use in peak period is 0.18\*65/365 = 3.21%. The number of hours of recovery during peak periods is therefore assumed to be 3.21% \*180 = 5.8 hours of recovery during peak period where 180 equals the average annual electric DHW recovery hours for faucet use including SF and MF homes. There are 260 hours in the peak period so the probability you will see savings during the peak period is 5.8/260 = 0.022 [↑](#footnote-ref-386)
383. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-387)
384. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-388)
385. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-389)
386. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-390)
387. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-391)
388. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-392)
389. DOE Final Rule discusses Recovery Efficiency with an average around 0.76 for Gas Fired Storage Water heaters and 0.78 for standard efficiency gas fired tankless water heaters up to 0.95 for the highest efficiency gas fired condensing tankless water heaters. These numbers represent the range of new units however, not the range of existing units in stock. Review of AHRI Directory suggests range of recovery efficiency ratings for new Gas DHW units of 70-87%. Average of existing units is estimated at 78%. [↑](#footnote-ref-393)
390. Water heating in Multifamily buildings is often provided by a larger central boiler. This suggests that the average recovery efficiency is somewhere between a typical central boiler efficiency of 0.59 and the 0.75 for single family homes. An average efficiency of 0.67 is used for this analysis as a default for Multifamily buildings. [↑](#footnote-ref-394)
391. Table C-6, Measure Life Report, Residential and Commercial/Industrial Lighting and HVAC Measures, GDS Associates, June 2007. Evaluations indicate that consumer dissatisfaction may lead to reductions in persistence, particularly in Multifamily. [↑](#footnote-ref-395)
392. Market research average of $7. [↑](#footnote-ref-396)
393. Includes assess and install labor time of $5 (20min @ $15/hr) [↑](#footnote-ref-397)
394. Calculated as follows: Assume 11% showers take place during peak hours (based on: Oreo et al, “The end uses of hot water in single family homes from flow trace analysis”, 2001.). There are 65 days in the summer peak period, so the percentage of total annual aerator use in peak period is 0.11\*65/365 = 1.96%. The number of hours of recovery during peak periods is therefore assumed to be 1.96% \* 369 = 7.23 hours of recovery during peak period, where 369 equals the average annual electric DHW recovery hours for showerhead use including SF and MF homes with Direct Install and Retrofit/TOS measures. There are 260 hours in the peak period so the probability you will see savings during the peak period is 7.23/260 = 0.0278 [↑](#footnote-ref-398)
395. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-399)
396. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-400)
397. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-401)
398. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-402)
399. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-403)
400. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-404)
401. Based on measurements conducted from June 2013 to January 2014 by Franklin Energy. Over 300 residential sites in the Chicago area were tested. [↑](#footnote-ref-405)
402. Representative value from sources 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 (See Source Table at end of measure section) adjusted slightly upward to account for program participation which is expected to target customers with existing higher flow devices rather than those with existing low flow devices. [↑](#footnote-ref-406)
403. Note that actual values may be either a) program-specific minimum flow rate, or b) program-specific evaluation-based value of actual effective flow-rate due to increased duration or temperatures. The latter increases in likelihood as the rated flow drops and may become significant at or below rated flows of 1.5 GPM. The impact can be viewed as the inverse of the throttling described in the footnote for baseline flowrate. [↑](#footnote-ref-407)
404. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. This study of 135 single and Multifamily homes in Michigan metered energy parameters for efficient showerhead and faucet aerators. [↑](#footnote-ref-408)
405. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-409)
406. If household type is unknown, as may be the case for time of sale measures, then single family deemed value shall be used. [↑](#footnote-ref-410)
407. ComEd Energy Efficiency/ Demand Response Plan: Plan Year 2 (6/1/2009-5/31/2010) Evaluation Report: All Electric Single Family Home Energy Performance Tune-Up Program citing 2006-2008 American Community Survey data from the US Census Bureau for Illinois cited on p. 17 of the PY2 Evaluation report. 2.75 \* 93% evaluation adjustment [↑](#footnote-ref-411)
408. ComEd PY3 Multifamily Evaluation Report REVISED DRAFT v5 2011-12-08.docx [↑](#footnote-ref-412)
409. Unknown is based on statewide weighted average of 69% single family and 31% multifamily, based on IL data from 2009 RECS Table HC2.9 Structural and Geographic Characteristics of Homes in Midwest Region, Divisions and States, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-413)
410. Bedrooms are suitable proxies for household occupancy, and may be preferable to actual occupancy due to turnover rates in residency and non-adult population impacts. [↑](#footnote-ref-414)
411. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. [↑](#footnote-ref-415)
412. Based on findings from a 2009 ComEd residential survey of 140 sites, provided by Cadmus. [↑](#footnote-ref-416)
413. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-417)
414. Unknown is based on statewide weighted average of 69% single family and 31% multifamily, based on IL data from 2009 RECS Table HC2.9 Structural and Geographic Characteristics of Homes in Midwest Region, Divisions and States, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-418)
415. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. [↑](#footnote-ref-419)
416. Table 4 in Chen, et. al., “Calculating Average Hot Water Mixes of Residential Plumbing Fixtures”, June 2020, reports a value of 50.7°F for inlet water temperature for U.S. Census Division 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-420)
417. Electric water heaters have recovery efficiency of 98%. [↑](#footnote-ref-421)
418. Weighted average of 98% found in ComEd Energy Efficiency/ Demand Response Plan: Plan Year 2 (6/1/2009-5/31/2010) Evaluation Report: All Electric Single Family Home Energy Performance Tune-Up Program Table 3-8 (quantity surveyed = 163), and 87% from ComEd Single Family Retrofits CY2018 Field Work Memo 2019-07-19, Table 1 (quantity surveyed = 15). Alternative ISRs may be developed for program delivery methods based on evaluation results. [↑](#footnote-ref-422)
419. Navigant, ComEd-Nicor Gas EPY4/GPY1 Multifamily Home Energy Savings Program Evaluation Report FINAL 2013-06-05 [↑](#footnote-ref-423)
420. An equal weighted average of Direct Install and Efficiency Kit ISRs. Interest and applicability of measures confirmed through virtual assessment. Average of homes using 1 Showerhead & 2 Showerhead. [↑](#footnote-ref-424)
421. A weighted ISR was found by weighting Nicor and Ameren efficiency kit program uptake and their previously found ISRs. This analysis can be found in Faucet Aerators and Showerheads Weighted Average ISR IL TRM.xlsx. [↑](#footnote-ref-425)
422. Average of Guidehouse survey research for Peoples Gas, June 16, 2020 and Research from 2021 Ameren Illinois Income Qualified participant survey, available on IL SAG website: https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/AIC-Income-Qualified-Initiative-Participant-Survey-Results-Memo-FINAL-2022-02-01.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-426)
423. Results from Home Energy Worksheets completed by student/families in 2020, 2021, and 2022 were nearly the same as values from: Opinion Dynamics and Cadmus. 2018 AIC Residential Program Annual Impact Evaluation Report. April 30, 2019. Results from implementer-administered participant survey. Home Energy Worksheets also establish the fraction of participants who indicate they “will install later” for specific measures. Follow-up research completed by Guidehouse for Nicor Gas in 2022 found that, on average, 51.3% of respondents who initially reported that they hadn’t installed specific kit measures, but “planned to” subsequently had installed the measures. Combining these findings allows for an ISR that accounts for initial and one round of subsequent intallations. To maintain a conservative estimate of ISR, the remaining 48.7% are presumed uninstalled. See: EESchoolKitSubsequentInstall\_HEW.xlsx for data and calculations. [↑](#footnote-ref-427)
424. This factor includes 2571 kWh/MG for water supply based on Illinois energy intensity data from a 2012 ISAWWA study and 2439 kWh/MG for wastewater treatment based on national energy intensity use estimates. For more information please review Elevate Energy’s ‘IL TRM: Energy per Gallon Factor, May 2018 paper’. [↑](#footnote-ref-428)
425. 72.6% is the proportion of hot 120F water mixed with 50.7F supply water to give 101F shower water. [↑](#footnote-ref-429)
426. Calculated as follows: Assume 11% showers take place during peak hours (based on: Oreo et al, “The end uses of hot water in single family homes from flow trace analysis”, 2001.). There are 65 days in the summer peak period, so the percentage of total annual aerator use in peak period is 0.11\*65/365 = 1.96%. The number of hours of recovery during peak periods is therefore assumed to be 1.96% \* 369 = 7.23 hours of recovery during peak period where 369 equals the average annual electric DHW recovery hours for showerhead use including SF and MF homes with Direct Install and Retrofit/TOS measures. There are 260 hours in the peak period so the probability you will see savings during the peak period is 7.23/260 = 0.0278 [↑](#footnote-ref-430)
427. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-431)
428. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-432)
429. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-433)
430. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-434)
431. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-435)
432. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-436)
433. DOE Final Rule discusses Recovery Efficiency with an average around 0.76 for Gas Fired Storage Water heaters and 0.78 for standard efficiency gas fired tankless water heaters up to 0.95 for the highest efficiency gas fired condensing tankless water heaters. These numbers represent the range of new units however, not the range of existing units in stock. Review of AHRI Directory suggests range of recovery efficiency ratings for new Gas DHW units of 70-87%. Average of existing units is estimated at 78%. [↑](#footnote-ref-437)
434. Water heating in Multifamily buildings is often provided by a larger central boiler. This suggests that the average recovery efficiency is somewhere between a typical central boiler efficiency of 0.59 and the 0.75 for single family homes. An average efficiency of 0.67 is used for this analysis as a default for Multifamily buildings. [↑](#footnote-ref-438)
435. Assumptions based on NY TRM, Pacific Gas and Electric Company Work Paper PGECODHW113, and measure life of low-flow showerhead. [↑](#footnote-ref-439)
436. Based on actual cost of the SS-1002CP-SB Ladybug Water-Saving Shower-Head adapter from Evolve showerheads. [↑](#footnote-ref-440)
437. Estimate for contractor installation time. [↑](#footnote-ref-441)
438. Calculated as follows: Assume 11% showers take place during peak hours (based on: Oreo et al, “The end uses of hot water in single family homes from flow trace analysis”, 2001.). There are 65 days in the summer peak period, so the percentage of total annual use in peak period is 0.11\*65/365 = 1.96%. The number of hours of recovery during peak periods is therefore assumed to be 1.96% \* 29.5 = 0.577 hours of recovery during peak period, where 29.5 equals the average annual electric DHW recovery hours for showerhead use prevented by the device including SF and MF homes with Direct Install and Retrofit/TOS measures. There are 260 hours in the peak period so the probability you will see savings during the peak period is 0.577/260 = 0.0022 [↑](#footnote-ref-442)
439. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-443)
440. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-444)
441. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-445)
442. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-446)
443. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-447)
444. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-448)
445. Based on measurements conducted from June 2013 to January 2014 by Franklin Energy. Over 300 residential sites in the Chicago area were tested. [↑](#footnote-ref-449)
446. Representative value from sources 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 (See Source Table at end of measure section) adjusted slightly upward to account for program participation which is expected to target customers with existing higher flow devices rather than those with existing low flow devices. [↑](#footnote-ref-450)
447. Average of the following sources: ShowerStart LLC survey; “Identifying, Quantifying and Reducing Behavioral Waste in the Shower: Exploring the Savings Potential of ShowerStart”, City of San Diego Water Department survey; “Water Conservation Program: ShowerStart Pilot Project White Paper”, and PG&E Work Paper PGECODHW113. [↑](#footnote-ref-451)
448. If household type is unknown, as may be the case for time of sale measures, then single family deemed value shall be used. [↑](#footnote-ref-452)
449. ComEd Energy Efficiency/ Demand Response Plan: Plan Year 2 (6/1/2009-5/31/2010) Evaluation Report: All Electric Single Family Home Energy Performance Tune-Up Program citing 2006-2008 American Community Survey data from the US Census Bureau for Illinois cited on p. 17 of the PY2 Evaluation report. 2.75 \* 93% evaluation adjustment [↑](#footnote-ref-453)
450. ComEd PY3 Multifamily Evaluation Report REVISED DRAFT v5 2011-12-08.docx [↑](#footnote-ref-454)
451. Unknown is based on statewide weighted average of 69% single family and 31% multifamily, based on IL data from 2009 RECS Table HC2.9 Structural and Geographic Characteristics of Homes in Midwest Region, Divisions and States, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-455)
452. Bedrooms are suitable proxies for household occupancy, and may be preferable to actual occupancy due to turnover rates in residency and non-adult population impacts. [↑](#footnote-ref-456)
453. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. [↑](#footnote-ref-457)
454. Based on findings from a 2009 ComEd residential survey of 140 sites, provided by Cadmus. [↑](#footnote-ref-458)
455. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-459)
456. Unknown is based on statewide weighted average of 69% single family and 31% multifamily, based on IL data from 2009 RECS Table HC2.9 Structural and Geographic Characteristics of Homes in Midwest Region, Divisions and States, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-460)
457. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. [↑](#footnote-ref-461)
458. Table 4 in Chen, et. al., “Calculating Average Hot Water Mixes of Residential Plumbing Fixtures”, June 2020, reports a value of 50.7°F for inlet water temperature for U.S. Census Division 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-462)
459. Electric water heaters have recovery efficiency of 98%. [↑](#footnote-ref-463)
460. Deemed values are from ComEd Energy Efficiency/ Demand Response Plan: Plan Year 2 (6/1/2009-5/31/2010) Evaluation Report: All Electric Single Family Home Energy Performance Tune-Up Program Table 3-8. Alternative ISRs may be developed for program delivery methods based on evaluation results. [↑](#footnote-ref-464)
461. Navigant, ComEd-Nicor Gas EPY4/GPY1 Multifamily Home Energy Savings Program Evaluation Report FINAL 2013-06-05 [↑](#footnote-ref-465)
462. This factor include 2571 kWh/MG for water supply based on Illinois energy intensity data from a 2012 ISAWWA study and 2439 kWh/MG for wastewater treatment based on national energy intensity use estimates. For more information please review Elevate Energy’s ‘IL TRM: Energy per Gallon Factor, May 2018 paper’. [↑](#footnote-ref-466)
463. 72.6% is the proportion of hot 120F water mixed with 50.7F supply water to give 101F shower water. [↑](#footnote-ref-467)
464. Calculated as follows: Assume 11% showers take place during peak hours (based on: Oreo et al, “The end uses of hot water in single family homes from flow trace analysis”, 2001.). There are 65 days in the summer peak period, so the percentage of total annual use in peak period is 0.11\*65/365 = 1.96%. The number of hours of recovery during peak periods is therefore assumed to be 1.96% \* 29.5 = 0.577 hours of recovery during peak period, where 29.5 equals the average annual electric DHW recovery hours for showerhead use prevented by the device including SF and MF homes with Direct Install and Retrofit/TOS measures. There are 260 hours in the peak period so the probability you will see savings during the peak period is 0.577/260 = 0.0022 [↑](#footnote-ref-468)
465. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-469)
466. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-470)
467. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-471)
468. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-472)
469. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-473)
470. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-474)
471. DOE Final Rule discusses Recovery Efficiency with an average around 0.76 for Gas Fired Storage Water heaters and 0.78 for standard efficiency gas fired tankless water heaters up to 0.95 for the highest efficiency gas fired condensing tankless water heaters. These numbers represent the range of new units however, not the range of existing units in stock. Review of AHRI Directory suggests range of recovery efficiency ratings for new Gas DHW units of 70-87%. Average of existing units is estimated at 78%. [↑](#footnote-ref-475)
472. Water heating in Multifamily buildings is often provided by a larger central boiler. This suggests that the average recovery efficiency is somewhere between a typical central boiler efficiency of 0.59 and the 0.75 for single family homes. An average efficiency of 0.67 is used for this analysis as a default for Multifamily buildings. [↑](#footnote-ref-476)
473. Estimate of persistence of behavior change instigated by the shower timer. [↑](#footnote-ref-477)
474. Calculated as follows: Assume 11% showers take place during peak hours (based on: Oreo et al, “The end uses of hot water in single family homes from flow trace analysis”, 2001.). There are 65 days in the summer peak period, so the percentage of total annual aerator use in peak period is 0.11\*65/365 = 1.96%. The number of hours of recovery during peak periods is therefore assumed to be 1.96% \* 369 = 7.23 hours of recovery during peak period, where 369 equals the average annual electric DHW recovery hours for showerhead use including SF and MF homes with Direct Install and Retrofit/TOS measures. There are 260 hours in the peak period so the probability you will see savings during the peak period is 7.23/260 = 0.0278 [↑](#footnote-ref-478)
475. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-479)
476. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-480)
477. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-481)
478. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-482)
479. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-483)
480. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-484)
481. Navigant Elementary Education GPY4 Evaluation Report, dated May 12, 2016. Average of all utilities. [↑](#footnote-ref-485)
482. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. This study of 135 single and Multifamily homes in Michigan metered energy parameters for efficient showerhead and faucet aerators. [↑](#footnote-ref-486)
483. Navigant Elementary Education GPY4 Evaluation Report, dated May 12, 2016. Average of all utilities. [↑](#footnote-ref-487)
484. If household type is unknown, as may be the case for time of sale measures, then single family deemed value shall be used. [↑](#footnote-ref-488)
485. ComEd Energy Efficiency/ Demand Response Plan: Plan Year 2 (6/1/2009-5/31/2010) Evaluation Report: All Electric Single Family Home Energy Performance Tune-Up Program citing 2006-2008 American Community Survey data from the US Census Bureau for Illinois cited on p. 17 of the PY2 Evaluation report. 2.75 \* 93% evaluation adjustment [↑](#footnote-ref-489)
486. ComEd PY3 Multifamily Evaluation Report REVISED DRAFT v5 2011-12-08.docx [↑](#footnote-ref-490)
487. Unknown is based on statewide weighted average of 69% single family and 31% multifamily, based on IL data from 2009 RECS Table HC2.9 Structural and Geographic Characteristics of Homes in Midwest Region, Divisions and States, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-491)
488. Bedrooms are suitable proxies for household occupancy, and may be preferable to actual occupancy due to turnover rates in residency and non-adult population impacts. [↑](#footnote-ref-492)
489. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. [↑](#footnote-ref-493)
490. Navigant Elementary Education GPY4 Evaluation Report, dated May 12, 2016. Average of all utilities. [↑](#footnote-ref-494)
491. Cadmus and Opinion Dynamics Showerhead and Faucet Aerator Meter Study Memorandum dated June 2013, directed to Michigan Evaluation Working Group. [↑](#footnote-ref-495)
492. Table 4 in Chen, et. al., “Calculating Average Hot Water Mixes of Residential Plumbing Fixtures”, June 2020, reports a value of 50.7°F for inlet water temperature for U.S. Census Division 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-496)
493. This factor include 2571 kWh/MG for water supply based on Illinois energy intensity data from a 2012 ISAWWA study and 2439 kWh/MG for wastewater treatment based on national energy intensity use estimates. For more information please review Elevate Energy’s ‘IL TRM: Energy per Gallon Factor, May 2018 paper’. [↑](#footnote-ref-497)
494. 72.6% is the proportion of hot 120F water mixed with 50.7F supply water to give 101F shower water. [↑](#footnote-ref-498)
495. Calculated as follows: Assume 11% showers take place during peak hours (based on: Oreo et al, “The end uses of hot water in single family homes from flow trace analysis”, 2001.). There are 65 days in the summer peak period, so the percentage of total annual aerator use in peak period is 0.11\*65/365 = 1.96%. The number of hours of recovery during peak periods is therefore assumed to be 1.96% \* 369 = 7.23 hours of recovery during peak period where 369 equals the average annual electric DHW recovery hours for showerhead use including SF and MF homes with Direct Install and Retrofit/TOS measures. There are 260 hours in the peak period so the probability you will see savings during the peak period is 7.23/260 = 0.0278 [↑](#footnote-ref-499)
496. Based on the average % electricity used for water heating in Unknown residential structure types across all utilities covered by the IL program. Residence types include: SF, SF LI, MF & MF LI. Utilities included: Ameren, ComEd, People’s Gas, Northshore Gas & Nicor. Please see subsequent table and citations for specific sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-500)
497. Provided by AEG from the 2020 Market Potential Study completed for AIC, as well as AIC Income Qualified Initiative: 2021 Participant Survey Results Memo (February 1, 2022) p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-501)
498. Commonwealth Edison Residential Baseline Study (2020). p.4.4 & 4.19; Section 4-7 Water Heating. Prepared by Itron. [↑](#footnote-ref-502)
499. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey of natural gas for space heating and water heating (2021). Note, Multifamily customers have a residential billing rate code and responded on the survey that they live in an apartment or condominium in a building that has either 2-4 or 5+ units. [↑](#footnote-ref-503)
500. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-504)
501. Comparable service area & customers to NSG, therefore using their survey data. [↑](#footnote-ref-505)
502. DOE Final Rule discusses Recovery Efficiency with an average around 0.76 for Gas Fired Storage Water heaters and 0.78 for standard efficiency gas fired tankless water heaters up to 0.95 for the highest efficiency gas fired condensing tankless water heaters. These numbers represent the range of new units however, not the range of existing units in stock. Review of AHRI Directory suggests range of recovery efficiency ratings for new Gas DHW units of 70-87%. Average of existing units is estimated at 78%. [↑](#footnote-ref-506)
503. Water heating in Multifamily buildings is often provided by a larger central boiler. This suggests that the average recovery efficiency is somewhere between a typical central boiler efficiency of 0.59 and the 0.75 for single family homes. An average efficiency of 0.67 is used for this analysis as a default for Multifamily buildings. [↑](#footnote-ref-507)
504. In some cases, HPWs can have U-values of up to 0.26 in the Northern climate zone if the window meets alternative, performance-based SHGC thresholds. See Table 1 for the specifications. [↑](#footnote-ref-508)
505. ENERGY STAR® Version 7.0 Residential Windows, Doors, and Skylights Final Specification. [↑](#footnote-ref-509)
506. Stephen Selkowitz Consultants. Study of High-Performance Windows Incremental Manufacturing Cost. Prepared for NEEA, Report #E23-336. January 3, 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-510)
507. 2018 International Energy Conservation Code, Fifth Version: November 2021. TABLE R402.1.2*.* <https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/IECC2018P5/chapter-4-re-residential-energy-efficiency> [↑](#footnote-ref-511)
508. 2021 International Energy Conservation Code, Second Version: September 2021. TABLE R402.1.2. <https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/IECC2021P2/chapter-4-re-residential-energy-efficiency> [↑](#footnote-ref-512)
509. Value used in modeling: SHGC=0.30. Engineering judgement made during EnergyPlus modeling by Lili Yu and Robert Hart, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, May 11, 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-513)
510. The Chicago SHGC shown in this table is based on IECC 2021 since--effective November 1, 2022--all first permits for new residential construction in Chicago must be built in accordance with IECC 2021. SHGCs for the other cities shown in this table are based on IECC 2018. Refer to local codes to determine the version of IECC that pertains to a specific municipality or region. [↑](#footnote-ref-514)
511. Value used in modeling: SHGC=0.30. Engineering judgement made during EnergyPlus modeling by Lili Yu and Robert Hart, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, May 11, 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-515)
512. Engineering judgement made during EnergyPlus modeling by Lili Yu and Robert Hart, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, “High Performance Windows - Illinois Modeled Savings Summary,” April 2021. Informed by air sealing and insulation research by Navigant, see Navigant (2018). ComEd and Nicor Gas Air Sealing and Insulation Research Report. Presented to Commonwealth Edison Company and Nicor Gas Company. [↑](#footnote-ref-516)
513. Ibid [↑](#footnote-ref-517)
514. The Northwest Power Plan (NPCC). Please see sheet “Source Summary” within file: Com-Windows-2021P\_V17.xlsx. Link: <https://nwcouncil.app.box.com/s/u0dgjxkoxoj2tttym81uka3wrjcy6bo6/file/655810989510> [↑](#footnote-ref-518)
515. Assumed to be one third of effective useful life. For future TRM versions, recommend RUL be informed from program research. [↑](#footnote-ref-519)
516. Based on US EPA. ENERGY STAR® Windows, Doors, and Skylights Draft 1 Version 7 Stakeholder Webinar. July 27, 2021. <https://www.energystar.gov/sites/default/files/asset/document/V7_Stakeholder%20Meeting_7-27-2021_final.pdf>. Costs on slide 20 were averaged across both SHGC values as both can meet ENERGY STAR v.7 performance specifications. These costs assume a 3’x5’ (15ft2) window. [↑](#footnote-ref-520)
517. $37.82 inflated using 1.91% rate. [↑](#footnote-ref-521)
518. Based on metering of 24 homes with central AC during PY4 and PY5 in Ameren Illinois service territory. [↑](#footnote-ref-522)
519. Based on analysis of metering results from 24 heat pumps in Ameren Illinois service territory in PY5 coincident with AIC’s 2010 system peak; ‘Impact and Process Evaluation of Ameren Illinois Company’s Residential HVAC Program (PY5)’. [↑](#footnote-ref-523)
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