Bissell Residence East Montpelier, VT

		Components	Area	SQ/FT cos Material	t sq	/FT cost Labor	Total Construction Cost	Incremental Construction Cost	Annual Energy Loss (MRTH)	Annual Energy Sociology (1BTU)	Cost/MBTU of Incremental Savings	Energy Costs (@\$25.69 of propane/MBTU)	Annual Incremental Savings	Incremental Payback (years)
Foundat	tion foot wal	l/under slab insul.					JY				пе	PV		
Base	R-10	2" xps	3791	\$ 1.0	15 \$	0.26	4,966.21		10.50			\$269.75		
1	P.15	3" xps	∵ z:∎1	\$ 1/	0 5	0.26	6 624 25	er a na	2.40	2.10	\$ 704.20	\$315.90	652 OC	20.9
-	R-20	h h					C22.42	2,98.7	37		5 734.30	Inc	\$59.35	47.5
	R-25			5 2		0.54	5 11000.46	\$1.668.04	4.90	0.80	\$ 2.085.05		\$20.55	81.2
2	R-30	6"	3791	\$ 3.	00 \$	0.52	\$ 13,344.32	\$1,743.86	4.30	0.60	\$ 2,906.43	\$110.47	\$15.41	113.1
Above g	rade walls				r	Δ	l i	mi	+2					
	R-13	2x4 Dense Pak in Cavity	2279	\$ 0.	ļ,	0.37	\$ 1,230.66		20.00			\$667.94		
	R-20	2x6 Dense Pak in Cavity	2279	\$ 0.3	8 \$	0.46	\$ 1,686.45		17.70			\$454.71		
Base	R-13	2" ISO	2279	\$ 1	5 \$	0.50	\$ 3,532.45	\$0.00	17.50	0.00		\$449.58		
0	R-19.5	3" ISO 🛛 🗖	nnanR	ahil	\$	Bla	ck Riv	ver D	esig	n Ai	rchite	Cts \$357.09	\$92.48	16.5
1	R-26	4" ISO	2279	\$ 2.	10 \$	1.00	\$ 7,064.90	\$2,005.52	10.00	3.90	\$ 514.24	\$256.90	\$100.19	20.0
	R-32.5	5" ISO	2279	\$ 2.	7 \$	1.00	\$ 8,591.83	\$1,526.93	8.30	1.70	\$ 898.19	\$213.23	\$43.67	35.0
2	R-39	6" ISO	2279	\$ 3.	14 \$	1.00	\$ 10,118.76	\$1,526.93	7.20	1.10	\$ 1,388.12	\$184.97	\$28.26	54.0
Adding	Rigid Polyiso	to Cavity Insulation												
2	R-41	R26+R13(2x4 cavity and 4" ISO)	2279	\$ Z.	0 \$	1.00	\$8,295.56	\$7,064.90	7.90	18.10	\$ 390.33	\$202.95	\$464.99	15.2
2	R-47	R-26 +R19(2x6 cavity and 4" ISO)	2279	\$ 2.	0 5	1.00	\$8,751.36	\$7,064.90	7.00	10.70	\$ 660.27	\$179.83	\$274.88	25.7
Adding	Cavity Insula	tion to Rigid Polyiso												
2	R-41	R26+R13(4" ISO and 2x4 cavity)	2279	\$ 0.	7 \$	0.37	\$8,295.56	\$1,230.66	7.90	2.10	\$ 586.03	\$202.95	\$53.95	22.8
2	R-47	R-26 +R19(4" ISO and 2x6 cavity)	2279	\$ 0.3	8 \$	0.46	\$8,751.36	\$1,686.46	7.00	3.00	\$ 562.15	\$179.83	\$77.07	21.9
Adding	a second wai	I to the R-13 2x4 Dense Pak in Cavity	Wall											
2	R-40	Double stud Wall 11 1/2"	2279		\$	5.20	\$ 11,850.80	\$ 10,620.14	7.70	10.00	\$ 1,016.43	\$197.81	\$256.90	41.3







The title should be:

How to design an energy efficient building, responsibly

- Introduction Much has changed in the last 40 years
- Why is energy savings important?
- History of sustainable/green building
 - Phase 1 Energy generation phase
 - Phase 2 Energy savings phase
 - Phase 3 Mature phase
- What is a good investment?
- Methodology for balancing energy investments
- Summary

How Americans spent their income in 2010:



Housing is our greatest expense

Annual Load(MMBtu/yr)	UDRH
Heating	52.7
Cooling	0.0
Water Heating	10.1
Water Heating w/out Tank Loss	6.3

Annual Consumption(MMBtu/yr)

Heating	63.9
Cooling	0.0
Water Heating	12.1
Lights & Appliances	16.7
Photovoltaics	-0.0
Total	92.7

Annual Energy Cost (\$/yr)

Heating	1714
Cooling	0
Water Heating	318
Lights & Appliances	862
Photovoltaics	-0
Service Charges	147
Total	3041

Design Loads (kBtu/hr)

Space Heating	24.9
Space Cooling	0.0

Utility Rates

Electricity	WEC 4/16	
Propane	LP, \$2.41, 4/16	

In New England, we are heating driven

1970's – Lots of exciting stuff going on in Vermont



Solar, but...



Solar Alternatives: Flush mounted, integrated, domestic hot-water panels elegant

Phase 1: Sustainable meant Solar





1973 Hood House

Near Net Zero, but...









Oil prices were predicted to rise significantly in the 1970's

Energy Costs

Energy Source Prices (\$ / million BTU & inflation-adjusted 1990 \$ / million BTU)



Electricity is the highest priced energy source, yet costs have risen less than the rate of inflation (US CPI). Gasoline and distillates prices have outpaced inflation.



Use of electricity for heating was a bad idea, discouraged

Phase 2: Many changes since the early days

- Building Science appears:
 - Independent
 - Critical
 - Science was involved in analysis of failures
 - Understanding of what works, what doesn't work, and why
- Energy modeling becomes available
- Focus on improving the envelope, rather than depending on a renewable (solar) energy source







Enck senser/hone varies/	- 22	4
Drained cavity	22	a .
Extension regist insultation — extituded— polystymene, expanded polystymene, exceptionarile, rock wool. Relegions		4
Membrane or bowel on or spory applied vapor barrier (Class I vapor retartler), al bainer and downage klane (Impermeatile)	STATE OF	1
Concrete black	<u>62</u>	4
Webs charmer at wood furling Sypsum board		1
Latas paint or sapor some		A



"More is better"

More insulation leads to moisture problems



WUFI software predicts moisture behavior

Phase 3: "Mature" phase Technology has changed



Wall mounted heat pump



Passive House: Technologically feasible



Stiebel Eltron Act Water Heater, 240

Item #: T9FB1120977 Sold By: globalindustrial.co Usually ships in 3 to 6 c

Price: \$2,499.00

DHW heat pump



Split system heat pump

Phase 3: "Mature" phase

PV System Capital Cost



Amon Han, "Efficiency Of Solar PV, Then, Now And Future" https://sites.lafayette.edu/egrs352-sp14-pv/

PV cost continues to fall

Fuel costs have been dropping recently



Vermont Fuel Report, 2016

	Average Re	etail Petrole	um Prices (\$	per gallon)	
	Feb' 16	Jan' 16	% Change	Feb '15	% Change
No. 2 Fuel Oil	\$1.86	\$2.01	-7.4%	\$2.61	-28.8%
Kerosene	\$2.38	\$2.59	-8.0%	\$3.20	-25.6%
Propane	\$2.52	\$2.50	1.1%	\$2.93	-14.0%
Reg. Unleaded Gasoline	\$1.97	\$2.09	-5.7%	\$2.33	-15.5%
Diesel	\$2.45	\$2.53	-3.2%	\$3.21	-23.5%

Vermont Fuel Price Report

November 2016

Type of Energy	BTU/unit	Typical Efficiency	\$/unit	\$/MMBtu	High Efficiency	\$/MMBtu
Fuel Oil, gallon	138,200	80%	\$2.23	\$20.14		
Kerosene, gallon	136,600	<mark>80%</mark>	\$2.80	\$25.65		2
Propane, gallon	91,600	80%	\$2.54	\$34.64		
Natural Gas, Ccf	100,000	80%	\$1.41	\$17.67 *		
Electricity, kWh (resistive)	3,412	100%	\$0.15	\$43.46		
Electricity, kWh (heat pump)	3,412		\$0.15	#	eservice of the second s	
Wood, cord (green)	22,000,000	60%	\$227	\$17.21 ^		
Pellets, ton	16,400,000	<mark>80%</mark>	\$275	\$20.96 ^		

Vermont Fuel Report, 2016

Electric heating is no longer a "crazy" option

Vermont Fuel Price Report

November 2016

Type of Energy	BTU/unit	Typical Efficiency	\$/unit	\$/MMBtu	High Efficiency	\$/MMBtu
Fuel Oil, gallon	138,200	80%	\$2.23	\$20.14	95%	\$16.96
Kerosene, gallon	136,600	80%	\$2.80	\$25.65		
Propane, gallon	91,600	80%	\$2.54	\$34.64	95%	\$29.17
Natural Gas, Ccf	100,000	80%	\$1.41	\$17.67 •	95%	<mark>\$14.8</mark> 8
Electricity, kWh (resistive)	3,412	100%	\$0.15	\$43.46		\sim
Electricity, kWh (heat pump)	3,412		\$0.15	#	240%	\$18.32
Wood, cord (green)	22,000,000	60%	\$227	\$17.21 ^		w
Pellets, ton	16,400,000	80%	\$275	\$20.96 ^		

Vermont Fuel Report, 2016

Electric heating is no longer a "crazy" option

Net Zero Under Living Building Challenge Class of '66 Environmental Center at Williams College





- PVs changed our thinking
- It is sustainable
- Relatively permanent (avoids speculation)
- Net Zero is easy to understand

Phase 3: "Mature Phase"



3- "Mature Phase"

• We have the tools to both be green and use our money wisely

Understanding when to stop investing in energy savings on an individual project allows for greater state-wide impact.

Efficiency Vermont is moving beyond the early adopters to have a greater impact on overall energy use

High R-Values Doubling Code Requirements





The R-value code requirements in Philadelphia (Climate Zone 4) are R-13 for walls and R-38 for ceilings or roofs. Newer code requirements would increase the wall values from R-13 to R-20. In general we are aiming to double code

requirements for wall and ceiling/roof insulation in

our homes. This means we are aiming for around R-40 in our walls and R-70 in our roofs.

We did not come up with these figures arbitrarily. There are a couple of key reasons that we pack this much fluffy stuff into our walls and roofs. Let's make a bulleted list of them:

- This amount of insulation is the backbone of our strategy to cut energy usage by a minimum of 50% over a code house. That means a HERs rating of 50 or better.
- Passive House Modeling We've modeled multiple projects using the Passive House Performance Spreadsheet with a number of certified consultants. They all lead us to this level of insulation (among many other details) in order to achieve the stringent Passive House standard for extreme energy efficiency.

Phil: Let's get back to residential for one second. Have you heard anything about the Pretty Good House movement? Is that on your radar? And what do you think about it?

John: Yes, and I love it. I love the concept. I don't know much about the particular targets, but I think it's a sign of maturity. Things like net-zero homes or Passivhaus show us how we can get to really high performance and low energy use. But that does not mean they are necessarily what everyone can and should build, or is able to build. We at Building Science Corporation have often had the opinion that we could go off and build 10 or 20 net-zero energy homes a year, but from the of point of impact on the environment, they are virtually nonexistent. Nothing happens. If you have 10 or 20 houses that are zero energy, who cares?

It only matters when thousands and thousands of homes are done. We've spent a lot of our time — and been criticized for it — making 5,000 houses a year that use 30% less energy. And from an impact on the environment, an impact on energy security, and carbon, that's a much bigger deal. If we can demonstrate that 30% reductions can be achieved by three tract builders, well, then it makes everyone else look bad.

The fact that a bunch of highly motivated, well-funded zealots can produce net-zero energy houses – well, we know we can do that! Those net-zero energy and Passivhaus things are really about us learning where the extreme is or where the next generation is. They don't necessarily inform – although they may inspire – the current generation or the next 10 years.

So, we're constantly flitting between getting awful buildings to good, more so than getting the good buildings to great. Great buildings get much better press. But the real impact is making good buildings. If we could get the idea of a Pretty Good Building, or a Pretty Good Home, out to tens of thousands of people, that's success. Then, over time, we could change "pretty good" to a lower and lower energy number or a higher and higher comfort number.

We need to try to avoid making these high-performance houses just technology demonstrations. It's like concept cars — I don't care how many concept cars GM produces this year. What I care about is that the Sierra pickup gets 6 miles more per gallon this year than last year.

Interview with John Straube

MUSINGS OF AN energy nerd BY MARTIN HOLLADAY



Musings of an Energy Nerd" showcases the best of Martin Holladay's weekly blog at GreenBuilding Advisor.com, where he provides common sense advice about energy issues to residential design ers and builders. His conclusions usually fall between minimum code compliance and the Passive House standard. which often makes them controversial to both buildingscience geeks and everyday builders.

Green Building Advisor

Green Building Advi-

sor is for designers,

engineers, builders,

and homeowners

who craft energy-

efficient and environ

mentally responsible

How much insulation is too much?

dding insulation in a house saves energy, but with each extra inch, the savings per inch diminishes. At some point, the cost of adding more insulation becomes hard to justify.

At this year's BuildingEnergy conference in Boston, three energy experts explored two questions regarding high-performance houses: At what point are envelope improvements a waste of money? And what metrics should we use to

determine when enough insulation is enough? One point to these questions was to determine whether the thick levels of insulation required by the Passive House standard, an approach to superinsulation developed in Germany that is gaining traction in the United States, were justified. Because of the declining cost of PV, all three reached the same conclusion: They are not. The three presenters were David White, an energy consultant from Brooklyn; Marc Rosenbaum, director of engineering at South Mountain Company in Massachusetts; and Rachel Wagner, a designer at Wagner Zaun Architecture in Duluth, Minn.



energy-independent house. White tag, t was a consultant on the project. woul White started by comparing the annual energy savings attributable some

Int

The most remarkable thing about the annual energy use of these very different houses is how little difference there is between the worst house and the best house. "Energy used for hot water is constant, and energy used for plug loads, lights, and appliances is constant," Rosenbaum noted.

If a homeowner wanted to add enough PV to achieve net zero, the worst house would require a PV system rated at 7.0kw, while the best house would require a PV system rated at 5.9kw. The smaller PV system required for the super-duper house would save only \$3850 compared to the cost of installing the larger PV system needed for the code-minimum house. Needless to say, the cost to install R-60 wall insulation. R-90 roof insulation, and low-U-factor windows would be far more than \$3850.

Some new questions:

- How do I balance first cost with long term operating expense?
- How do I <u>balance</u> my investment between the various energy impacting components of the envelope?
- With solar PVs coming down in price, when is it cheaper to purchase energy rather than invest in saving energy?





5 Steps to Balancing Your Investment

- 1. Have an energy model done, so you can see where your energy is going
- 2. Put a cost on each increment of each energy improvement
- 3. Decide what your idea of a good investment is for you.
- Push insulation levels (and other energy saving components) to a point after which it is no longer a good investment.
- 5. Balance this approach for each component

Step 1: Energy modeling



Should I add insulation in the cavity?

Infiltration: A significant component of heat

Heating Season	MMBtu/yr	% of total	
Ceilings/Roofs	10.5	14	
Rim/Band Joists	1.1	1.5	
Above Grade Walls	8.6	11.5	
Foundation walls	0.6	0.8	
Doors	1.2	1.6	
Windows/Skylights	17.2	23	
Frame Floors	0	0	
Crawl Space/Unht Bsmt	0	0	
Slab Floors	11.5	15.3	
Infiltration	22.1	29	
Mechanical Ventilation	2.9	3.3	
Ducts	0	0	
Active Solar	0	0	
Sunspace	0	0	
Internal Gains	-16.3	0	
Total	59.4	100	
	+ 16.3		
	75.6		





Airtightness is achievable. Infiltration is the low hanging fruit.

Step 2: Assessing what's right for you *How do you define using your money "most wisely"*

I want to meet a target (EUI, Passive House, Code)

High-performance homes have many cool features that are not always obvious to buyers. As a builder, you want the effort and expense you've invested in the home to be effectively represented to potential buyers. That means engaging real estate brokers and appraisers who have the training, knowledge, and experience to recognize these features and communicate the benefits effectively.

Learn More about Zero Energy Homes

- What does it cost to build zero energy?
- Speaking of cost, never mention "payback" if you want to make the sale.
- 12 easy steps to building zero energy homes.
 http://zeroenergyproject.org/

Or

I want to balance my investment and get maximum benefit

Step 3: Criteria for a good investment

DESCRIPTION	QTY	COST	TOTAL	
Sunmodule sw250 Mono	10	338.00	3,380.00	
end clamp	8	4.55	36.40	
Ironridge rail 12 foot sections	6	36,25667	217.54	Letter Production
(-fret (4-nack)	5	14,756	73.78	
nidelamp - grounding	18	3.90	70.20	
Weeh grounding washer	25	1.5732	39 33	+11
ronRidge ground strap and splice	2	11.70	23.40	
Veeb grounding lug		7.02	28.08	
Including lug	10	215.80	2 158 00	\sim
ingrase Cable for Inverter	10	31.20	312.00	
Branch terminator	10	22.43	22.43	
Cable Clins - 10pk	2	11 375	22.75	
M215 Disconnect tool	1	6.50	6.50	
AC let Box bracket	1	16 74	16 74	
Color Surge protection 300 v	i i	102 70	102.70	
niscallaneous wire/conduit/labele/ground rod/boxes/fasteners	1 î	340.00	340.00	
lissonnest unfusible	1	54.60	54.60	
Astar basa far KWU mater		75.40	75.40	
recurd bit for disconnect	1	7.62	7.62	
round kit for disconnect	1	568 75	568 75	
Jours of Installation Labor	16	50.00	800.00	
ours of installation Labor	10		800.00	
hipping	1	450.00	450.00	
otal System Cost before incentives or credits	3	1 202302	8,806.22	oct ofte
/T Small Scale Renewable Energy Incentive @ .25/watt		-687.00	-687.00	
ay to Sustainable Solutions			8,119.22	rohates
	Savings		64700000000	i Charles
ederal Tax Credit		-30.00%	-3,435.74	
After all incentives and credit			5,683.45	and tax
stimated Solar Value = \$523 (see spreadshee)	1 1	8		
5683/523 = 10.8 years 9.2%ROI	1		\sim	1
				credits
TC	ΤΔΙ	<u>(4)</u>	\$5,683,45	

Simple Payback Method - Is this a good investment?

Net Cash Flow Method



The law of diminishing returns

The Diminishing Returns of More Insulation

4400 HDD, 1000 sf wall area



From this we can draw our first conclusion:

Important Lesson: Adding any insulation to uninsulated homes can save more energy than adding more insulation to already-

Alison Bailes, "The Diminishing Returns of Adding More Insulation" http://www.energyvanguard.com

Evaluating Viability by Incremental Increases



\$138/year maximum savings via walls



How much money does it make sense to spend to save up to \$138/year? What would you do?



How do we get the lowest "long-term" cost (1st cost + operating expenses)



Step 4: Model energy loss of a base case and establish increments of investment on every type of energy saving measure

Locations Above Grade \	<u> </u>	To	tal Cost	Di	ference	<u>MMBtu</u> Saved/year	<u>Cost</u> save	<u>Per mmbtu</u> d/year	mmb with	<u>tu/year</u> PV array
Option 1	2	\$	14,746.20			27.4				
Mass Stretch Min	3	\$	22,119.30			33.8				
Difference				\$	7,373.10				\$	1,598.16
Option 3	4	\$	29,492.40			26.8				
Difference				\$	7,373.10	7	\$	1,053.30	\$	1,598.16
Option 4	5	\$	36,865.50			22.3				
Difference				\$	7,373.10	4.5	\$	1,638.47	\$	1,598.16
Option 2	8	\$	58,984.80			15.2				
Difference				\$	22,119.30	7.1	\$	3,115.39	\$	1,598.16

Step 5: Balance investment between measures

Locations Ceiling/Roofs	# Inches	<u>Io</u>	al Cost	Difference	MMBtu Saved/vear	50	ost Per mmbtu wed/vear	Cost to produce mmbtu/year with PV array	Energy Cost kwh	Arrary in KW	<u>Co</u>	ist in PV array Diff	fference	Energy modeling
Option 1	1	2 5	7,404.60		13.	4	1		392	3	.6 \$	21,415.44		of everv
Mass Stretch Min	1	4 5	14,809.20		13.1	9		r –	407	i a	7 5	22,214.53		- , , ,
Differenc	e			\$ 7,404.60	0.	5 5	14,809.20	5 1,598.16				\$	799.08	comnonent
Option 3		5 5	18,511.50	\$ 3 703 30	11.	5	3 305 78	2 1 500 16	3365	3	1 5	18,378.93	03 259 E	component
Option 4	0	6 5	22,213,80	-> -=,102,30	9	1 2	3,323-74	\$ 1,398.10	287	2	6 5	15.662.04	3,633.00	
Differenc	e	16		\$ 3,702.30	1	75	4,791.21	\$ 1,598.16			1	\$	2,716.88	
Option 2	-	8 5	29,618.40		6	1			178	1	6 5	9,748.82	(all instrum) in	
Above Grade	의 Walls			\$ 7,404.60	3.	1.5	2.001.24					,	5,913.22	
Option 1	T I	2 \$	14,746.20		27.	4	1		802	7	3 \$	43,789.79		Sweet snots
Manuel Chamberly Million	1	5.10	22 110 25		22						0.0	E4.044.04		Sweet spots
Mass Stretch Min Differenc	-	3 3	12,119.30	5 7.373.10	53.	4		5 1.598.16	990.	9	0 5	54,018.06	(10.228.27)	where
Option 3		4 5	29,492.40		26.	8			785	7	1 5	42,830.89	A CONTRACTOR OF	VVIIEIE
Differenc	e			\$ 7,373.10	P	7 3	1,053.30	\$ 1,598.16				\$	11,187.17	— investor and in
Option 4		5.5	36,865.50	6 7 373 10	22.	8	1 636 47	6 1 509 16	653	5	9.5	35,639.13	7 101 75	investment in
Option 2		8 \$	58,984.80	2 1,272.45	15.	2	4,030.47	5 1,556.10	445	4	0 5	24,292.15	7,131.73	
Differenc	e			\$ 22,119.30	7.	1 5	3,115.39	\$ 1,598.16			-	\$	11,346.99	savina a BTU is
Foundation W	/alls							a	5.) 					
Option I	2	5 5	5,180.23		11.	3			331	3	0 \$	18,059.29		🖉 equivalent to the
Mass Stretch Min	1	5 \$	3,315.34		17.	2			504	1	55	27,488.48		,
Option 3	0	3 4	6,716,27	5 (1,864.88	2.	7	310.08	5 1,598.1tt	\$1.9		9 5	17 100 29	(8,829.19)	investment in
Differenc	e	-	Upa a dist. P	\$ 2,900.93	6.	5 5	981.85	5 1,598.16			-	5	10,388.99	me councile m
Option 4		4 5	8,288.36		9.			1	266/	2	4 5	14,543,32		making a BTU
Differenc	e	0 6	10 536 33	\$ 2,072.09	L	6-5	2,849.12	5 1,598.16	1.40		1.	A 150.05	2,557.07	muking u bro.
Difference	e	0 2	10,570.72	\$ 8,288,36	3	4.5	2.072.09	5 1.398.16	1429	1	-	6,130.05	6.392.67	
Slab/Floors	-			L. SA			5 (<u>2</u>)	1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 -						
Option 1	2	5 5	7,248.50	-	6.	6		12 7	193	1	.8 5	10,547.91		
Mass Stretch Min	1	5 5	4,639 84		8	8			288	1	55	13,286.62		
Differenc	e	3 2	0.740.55											
Option 3 Difference		3 5	8,638.20	5 4.059.16	D	2	1.572.06	5 1 598 16	2003	1		10,943.83	4 347 79	
Option 4		4 5	11,597.60		5	2			1654	1	5 5	9,033.01		
Differenc	e .			\$ 2,899.40	1	15	5,798.80	\$ 1,598.16				\$	1,910.83	
Option 2		8 5	23,195.20	6 11 60 9		3	F 535 / 1		87	9	8 5	4,794.50	1 339 55	
Differenc	e			⇒ 11,597.60	2.	1.5	5,271.64	> 1,598.16		└ <u></u>	ιų.	5	4,238.50	
Doors	r	-				-					_			
Option 1 Option 2	-	-		-	-	╋			/	1	+			
Windows/Sky	lights	8									-			
Oction 1	T	15	74.052.00	-	63	7		r —	1827	16	7 6	66.803.40		
Option 2		3	108.900.00	Second and the	2	9		S	791	7	25	28,767.01		31
New York Street		-		\$ 34,848.00	35.	7 5	2,147.50	5 1,598.16				\$	38,036.38	

Impact on Envelope



Roof / wall: 5" polyiso Windows: R-5 Below grade walls: 5" XPS Slab: 3" XPS



Bissell Residence 1,500 sf of heated space







There are lots of variables:

Construction cost

"Starting point/"base case

Assumptions in energy model Fuel choice

		Components	Area	SQ/F Mat	T cost cerial	SQ/FT co Labor	st	Total Construction Cost	Construction Cost	Annual Energy Loss (MBTU)	Annual Energy Savings (MBTU)	Cost Inc S	r/MBTU of remental Savings	Energy Costs (@\$25.69 of propane/MBTU)	Annual Incremental Savings	Incremental Payback (years)
Foundat	ion foot wall	l/under slab insul.	·													
Base	R-10	2" xps	3791	s	1.05	\$ 0.	26	\$ 4.966.21		10.50				\$269.75		
1	R-15	3" xps (additional 1" thickness)	3791	\$	1.49	\$ 0	26	\$ 6,634.25	\$1,668.04	8.40	2.10	\$	794.30	\$215.80	\$53.95	30.9
	R-20	4"	3791	\$	2.10	\$ 0.	52	\$ 9,932.42	\$3,298.17	5.70	2.70	\$	1,221.54	\$146.43	\$69.36	47.5
	R-25	5"	3791	\$	2.54	\$ 0.	52	\$ 11,600.46	\$1,668.04	4.90	0.80	\$	2,085.05	\$125.88	\$20.55	81.2
2	R-30	6"	3791	\$	3.00	\$ 0.	52	\$ 13,344.32	\$1,743.86	4.30	0.60	\$	2,906.43	\$110.47	\$15.41	113.1
Above g	rade walls			1												
	R-13	2x4 Dense Pak in Cavity	2279	\$	0.17	\$ 0.	37	\$ 1,230.66		26.00				\$667.94	~	
	R-20	2x6 Dense Pak in Cavity	2279	\$	0.28	\$ 0.	46	\$ 1,686.46		17.70				\$454.71		
Base	R-13	2" ISO	2279	\$	1.05	\$ 0.	50	\$ 3,532.45	\$0.00	17.50	0.00			\$449.58		
	R-19.5	3" ISO	2279	\$	1.72	\$ 0.	50	\$ 5,059.38	\$1,526.93	13.90	3.60	\$	424.15	\$357.09	\$92.48	16.5
1	R-26	4" ISO	2279	\$	2.10	\$ 1.	00	\$ 7,064.90	\$2,005.52	10.00	3.90	\$	514.24	\$256.90	\$100.19	20.0
	R-32.5	5" ISO	2279	s	2.77	\$ 1.	00	\$ 8,591.83	\$1,526.93	8.30	1.70	s	898.19	\$213.23	\$43.67	35.0
2	R-39	6" ISO	2279	\$	3.44	\$ 1.	00	\$ 10,118.76	\$1,526.93	7.20	1.10	\$	1,388.12	\$184.97	\$28.26	54.0
Adding I	Rigid Polyiso	to Cavity Insulation														
2	R-41	R26+R13(2x4 cavity and 4" ISO)	2279	\$	2.10	\$ 1.	00	\$8,295.56	\$7,064.90	7.90	18.10	5	390.33	\$202.95	\$464.99	15.2
2	R-47	R-26 +R19(2x6 cavity and 4" ISO)	2279	\$	2.10	\$ 1.	00	\$8,751.36	\$7,064.90	7.00	10.70	s	660.27	\$179.83	\$274.88	25.7
Adding	Cavity Insulat	tion to Rigid Polyiso														
2	R-41	R26+R13(4" ISO and 2x4 cavity)	2279	\$	0.17	\$ 0.	37	\$8,295.56	\$1,230.66	7.90	2.10	\$	586.03	\$202.95	\$53.95	22.8
2	R-47	R-26 +R19(4" ISO and 2x6 cavity)	2279	\$	0.28	\$ 0.	46	\$8,751.36	\$1,686.46	7.00	3.00	5	562.15	\$179.83	\$77.07	21.9
Adding	a second wal	I to the R-13 2x4 Dense Pak in Cavity	Wall													
2	R-40	Double stud Wall 11 1/2"	2279			\$ 5	20	\$ 11,850.80	\$ 10,620.14	7.70	10.00	\$	1,016.43	\$197.81	\$256.90	41.3

۲

Bissell Residence East Montpelier, VT

		Components	Area	SQ/FT cost Material	SQ/FT cost Labor	Total Construction Cost	Incremental Construction Cost	Annual Energy Loss (MBTU)	Annual Energy Savings (MBTU)	Cost/MBTU of Incremental Savings	Energy Costs (@\$25.69 of propane/MBTU)	Annual Incremental Savings	Incremental Payback (years)
Ceiling/I	Roof insulation	n											
Ceiling	R-26	4" iso(2) Layers of 2"	2913	\$ 1.58	\$ 1.00	\$ 7,515.54	\$0.00	8.40			\$215.80	12	-
	R-32.5	5"(2) Layers, 2", 3"	2913	\$ 2.58	\$ 1.00	\$ 10,428.54	\$2,913.00	7.40	1.00	\$ 2,913.00	\$190.11	\$25.69	113.4
	R-39	6"	2913	\$ 3.58	\$ 1.00	\$ 13,341.54	\$2,913.00	6.30	2.10	\$ 1,387.14	\$161.85	\$28.26	103.1
1	R-48.7	7 1/2"	2913	\$ 5.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 17,478.00	\$4,136.46	5.10	3.30	\$ 1,253.47	\$131.02	\$30.83	134.2
2	R-61.75	9 1/2"	2913	\$ 6.50	\$ 1.50	\$ 23,304.00	\$5,826.00	4.10	4.30	\$ 1,354.88	\$105.33	\$25.69	226.8
Ceiling	R-24	4" spray between joists	2913	\$ 3.15		\$ 9,175.95	\$1,660.41	10.90	(2.50)	\$ (664.16)	\$280.02	-\$64.23	-25.9
	R-40	6 1/2" spray	2913	\$ 4.73		\$ 13,778.49	\$3,349.95	7.10	1.30	\$ 2,576.88	\$182.40	\$97.62	34.3
Window	s	×									ç		
	U.29	D.G Marvin Integrity				\$ 15,866.00		11.10			\$285.16		
1	U.27	D.G w/Argon Low E				\$ 17,223.00	\$1,357.00	9.30	1.80	\$754	\$238.92	\$46.24	29.3
2	U.19	Triple Pane				\$ 26,081.00	\$8,858.00	4.60	6.50	\$1,363	\$118.17	\$120.74	73.4
ACH - AI	R CHANGES	PER HOUR		1									<u>к ()</u>
	6	Ordinary Construction				\$ -		17.10			\$439.30		
1	3	Easily Achievable				\$ 600.00	\$600.00	8.60	8.50	\$71	\$220.93	\$218.37	2.7
2	1	Additional work/care required				\$ 1,800.00	\$1,200.00	2.90	5.70	\$211	\$74.50	\$146.43	8.2
	0.6					\$ 2,600.00	\$800.00	1.70	1.20	\$667	\$43.67	\$30.83	26.0

Assumptions:

- Costs are for insulation only (assume framing and plywood is in place) unless additional framing is required.

- Drainage plane is not included is any system

- Incremental costs are typically the cost to add an increment of insulation(note exceptions)

Performance Report

Property Rahill , VT Weather:Montpelier, VT Rahill P076p Rahill BGJ version.blg	Organization VT Energy Investment Corp 888-921-5990 Bruce Courtot Builder	HERS Projected Rating 5/31/16 Rating No:6038P076 Rater ID:5851998	Vermont Energy I Corporat	nvestment ion
Annual Load(MMBtu/yr)	UDRH	Rahil	ll Savings	%Saved
Heating	52.7	24.	9 27.8	52.8%
Cooling	0.0	0.0	D	
Water Heating	10.1	9.1	5 0.6	6.1%
Water Heating w/out Tank Loss	6.3	6.1	3	
Annual Consumption(MM	ABtu/yr)			
Heating	63.9	26.3	3 37.7	58.9%
Cooling	0.0	0.0	D	
Water Heating	12.1	9.9	9 2.1	17.8%
Lights & Appliances	16.7	14.1	8 1.9	11.4%
Photovoltaics	-0.0	-0.0	0	
Total	92.7	51.0	0 41.7	45.0%
Annual Energy Cost (\$/y	r)			
Heating	1714	69	7 1017	59.3%
Cooling	0		0	
Water Heating	318	26	1 57	17.8%
Lights & Appliances	862	719	9 143	16.6%
Photovoltaics	-0	-1	0	
Service Charges	147	14	7	
Total	3041	182-	4 1217	40.0%
Design Loads (kBtu/hr)				
Space Heating	24.9	14.0	0 10.9	43.8%
Space Cooling	0.0	0.0	0	
Utility Rates				
Electricity WEC 4	/16			
Propane IP \$2	41 4/16			

What are the different requirements and where does your project fit in?

Certification Requirements	Choose your base case	Efficiency Vermont Certified: Base Level*	Efficiency Vermont Certified: High Performance Level
Energy Code Compliance		Meet Vermont energy code a	and file RBES certificates
Foundation Wall Insulation- Minimum R-Value		R-15 continuous or R-20 cavity	R-30
Slab Edge Insulation (when within 12" finished grade)		R-15 Must extend a total of 4 ft. vertical or horizontal	R-30; slab on grade R-20; unheated fully below grade Footing: ≥ R-8
Insulation Under Slab		R-15 under heated slab only	R-20: unheated below grade R-30: unheated on grade R-30: all heated slabs
Floor Insulation (exposed)		R-38 or R-30 + R-5 continuous	R-40
Wall Insulation (above grade & band joist)- Minimum R-Value		R-20 cavity or R-13 cavity + R-10 continuous	R-40
Ceiling Insulation (flat & sloped)- Minimum R-Value		R-49 sloped R-60 flat	R-60
Insulation Installation— Installation quality (using RESNET Grading System) will be verified by Efficiency Vermont at pre- drywall inspection		Grade II	Grade I
Thermal Enclosure Inspection		Must pass visual inspectior prior to drywall	by Efficiency Vermont, installation

REM/Rate - Residential Energy Analysis and Rating Software v15.2 Vermont This information does not constitute any warranty of energy cost or savings. © 1985-2016 Noresco, Boulder, Colorado.

Component Consumption

Property Rahill , VT Weather:Montpelier, VT Rahill P076p Rahill BGJ version.blg	Organization VT Energy Investment Corp 888-921-5990 Bruce Courtot Builder	HERS Projected Rating 5/31/16 Rating No:6038P076 ID:5851998	×	Vermont Energy In Corporat	ivestment ion
Heating Season(MMBtu/yr)	UDRH		Rahill	Savings	%Saved
Ceilings/Roofs	7.9		5.7	2.2	27.8%
Rim/Band Joists	0.0		0.0		
Above Grade Walls	24.8		7.7	17.2	69.2%
Foundation Walls	0.0		0.0		
Doors	1.9		1.1	0.8	40.0%
Windows/Skylights	15.7		9.8	5.9	37.9%
Floors	0.0		0.0		
Crawl Space/Unht Bsmt	0.0		0.0		
Slab Floors	13.2		6.2	7.0	52.9%
Infiltration	5.0		3.1	1.9	38.4%
Mechanical Ventilation	8.9		3.0	5.9	66.6%
Ducts	0.0		0.0		
Active Solar	0.0		0.0		
Sunspace	0.0		0.0		
Internal Gains	-13.5		-10.3	-3.3	-24.1%
Total	63.9		26.3	37.7	58.9%



REM/Rate - Residential Energy Analysis and Rating Software v15.2 Vermont This information does not constitute any warranty of energy cost or savings. © 1985-2016 Noresco, Boulder, Colorado.

What if my chosen payback was 15 years?

										· · ·				
		Components	Area	SQ/FT co Materia	st :	SQ/FT cost Labor	Total Construction Cost	Incremental Construction Cost	Annual Energy Loss (MBTU)	Annual Energy Savings (MBTU)	Cost/MBTU of Incremental Savings	Energy Costs (@\$25.69 of propane/MBTU)	Annual Incremental Savings	Incremental Payback (years)
Foundat	tion foot wal	l/under slab insul.	59 55					432 A 272 A						1
Base	R-10	2" xps	3791	\$ 1.	05 \$	\$ 0.26	\$ 4,966.21		10.50			\$269.75		
1	R-15	3" xps (additional 1" thickness)	3791	\$ 1.	49 \$	\$ 0.26	\$ 6,634.25	\$1,668.04	8.40	2.10	\$ 794.30	\$215.80	\$53.95	30.9
0	R-20	4"	3791	\$ 2	10 \$	5 0.52	\$ 9,932.42	\$3,298.17	5.70	2.70	\$ 1,221.54	\$146.43	\$69.36	47.5
	R-25	5"	3791	\$ 2	.54 \$	\$ 0.52	\$ 11,600.46	\$1,668.04	4.90	0.80	\$ 2,085.05	\$125.88	\$20.55	81.2
2	R-30	6"	3791	\$ 3	.00 \$	5 0.52	\$ 13,344.32	\$1,743.86	4.30	0.60	\$ 2,906.43	\$110.47	\$15.41	113.1
Above g	rade walls													-
	R-13	2x4 Dense Pak in Cavity	2279	\$ 0	17 \$	5 0.37	\$ 1,230.66		26.00			\$667.94		5 2
	R-20	2x6 Dense Pak in Cavity	2279	\$ 0	28 \$	\$ 0.46	\$ 1,686.46		17.70			\$454.71		
lase	R-13	2" ISO	2279	\$ 1	.05 \$	0.50	\$ 3,532.45	\$0.00	17.50	0.00		\$449.58		-
	R-19.5	3" ISO	2279	\$ 1	72 \$	\$ 0.50	\$ 5,059.38	\$1,526.93	13.90	3.60	\$ 424.15	\$357.09	\$92.48	16.5
1	R-26	4" ISO	2279	\$ 2	10 \$	\$ 1.00	\$ 7,064.90	\$2,005.52	10.00	3.90	\$ 514.24	\$256.90	\$100.19	20.0
	R-32.5	5" ISO	2279	\$ 2	77 \$	5 1.00	\$ 8,591.83	\$1,526.93	8.30	1.70	\$ 898.19	\$213.23	\$43.67	35.0
2	R-39	6" ISO	2279	\$ 3	44 \$	\$ 1.00	\$ 10,118.76	\$1,526.93	7.20	1.10	\$ 1,388.12	\$184.97	\$28.26	54.0
dding	Rigid Polyiso	to Cavity Insulation	17											
2	R-41	R26+R13(2x4 cavity and 4" ISO)	2279	\$ 2	10 \$	\$ 1.00	\$8,295.56	\$7,064.90	7.90	18.10	\$ 390.33	\$202.95	\$464.99	15.2
2	R-47	R-26 +R19(2x6 cavity and 4" ISO)	2279	\$ 2	10 \$	\$ 1.00	\$8,751.36	\$7,064.90	7.00	10.70	\$ 660.27	\$179.83	\$274.88	25.7
dding	Cavity Insula	tion to Rigid Polyiso						H.	X					÷ 1
2	R-41	R26+R13(4" ISO and 2x4 cavity)	2279	\$ 0	17 \$	5 0.37	\$8,295.56	\$1,230.66	7.90	2.10	\$ 586.03	\$202.95	\$53.95	22.8
2	R-47	R-26 +R19(4" ISO and 2x6 cavity)	2279	\$ 0	28 \$	5 0.46	\$8,751.36	\$1,686.46	7.00	3.00	\$ 562.15	\$179.83	\$77.07	21.9
dding	a second wal	I to the R-13 2x4 Dense Pak in Cavity	Wall											
2	R-40	Double stud Wall 11 1/2"	2279		\$	5.20	\$ 11,850.80	\$ 10,620.14	7.70	10.00	\$ 1,016.43	\$197.81	\$256.90	41.3

★ 15 year payback

Bissell Residence East Montpelier, VT

★ 15 year payback

		Components	Area	SQ/FT cost Material	SQ/FT cost Labor	Total Construction Cost	Incremental Construction Cost	Annual Energy Loss (MBTU)	Annual Energy Savings (MBTU)	Cost/MBTU of Incremental Savings	Energy Costs (@\$25.69 of propane/MBTU)	Annual Incremental Savings	Incremental Payback (years)	3
Ceiling/F	toof insulati	on						Lorisson						
Ceiling	R-26	4" iso(2) Layers of 2"	2913	\$ 1.58	\$ 1.00	\$ 7,515.54	\$0.00	8.40			\$215.80			\star
	R-32.5	5"(2) Layers, 2", 3"	2913	\$ 2.58	\$ 1.00	\$ 10,428.54	\$2,913.00	7.40	1.00	\$ 2,913.00	\$190.11	\$25.69	113.4	
	R-39	6"	2913	\$ 3.58	\$ 1.00	\$ 13,341.54	\$2,913.00	6.30	2.10	\$ 1,387.14	\$161.85	\$28.26	103.1	
1	R-48.7	7 1/2"	2913	\$ 5.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 17,478.00	\$4,136.46	5.10	3.30	\$ 1,253.47	\$131.02	\$30.83	134.2	
2	R-61.75	9 1/2"	2913	\$ 6.50	\$ 1.50	\$ 23,304.00	\$5,826.00	4.10	4.30	\$ 1,354.88	\$105.33	\$25.69	226.8	
Ceiling	R-24	4" spray between joists	2913	\$ 3.15		\$ 9,175.95	\$1,660.41	10.90	(2.50)	\$ (664.16)	\$280.02	-\$64.23	-25.9	
	R-40	6 1/2" spray	2913	\$ 4.73		\$ 13,778.49	\$3,349.95	7.10	1.30	\$ 2,576.88	\$182.40	\$97.62	34.3	
Window	s					115			1					ž
	U.29	D.G Marvin Integrity				\$ 15,866.00		11.10			\$285.16			
1	U.27	D.G w/Argon Low E	2			\$ 17,223.00	\$1,357.00	9.30	1.80	\$754	\$238.92	\$46.24	29.3	
2	U.19	Triple Pane				\$ 26,081.00	\$8,858.00	4.60	6.50	\$1,363	\$118.17	\$120.74	73.4	
ACH - AI	R CHANGES	PER HOUR				-								3
	6	Ordinary Construction				\$-		17.10			\$439.30			1
1	3	Easily Achievable				\$ 600.00	\$600.00	8.60	8.50	\$71	\$220.93	\$218.37	2.7	\star
2	1	Additional work/care required	0 2			\$ 1,800.00	\$1,200.00	2.90	5.70	\$211	\$74.50	\$146.43	8.2	
	0.6	-				\$ 2,600.00	\$800.00	1.70	1.20	\$667	\$43.67	\$30.83	26.0	
Assumpti - Costs a - Draina - Increm	ons: re for insulat ge plane is no ental costs ai	ion only (assume framing and plywood is t included is any system re typically the cost to add an increment	s in place) unle of insulation(n	ss additional frai	ming is required	I	<u>.</u>			1			I	
						ſ	\$8844					\$829	9.7	
						-		_					-	-

Total added cost

Savings Payback

What if my chosen payback was 30 years?

									🕇 1	5 year	[.] payback		30 year p	ayback
		Components	Area	SQ/FT o Mater	ost ial	SQ/FT cost Labor	Total Construction Cost	Incremental Construction Cost	Annual Energy Loss (MBTU)	Annual Energy Savings (MBTU)	Cost/MBTU of Incremental Savings	Energy Costs (@\$25.69 of propane/MBTU)	Annual Incremental Savings	Incremental Payback (years)
undati	ion foot wa	Il/under slab insul.												
Base	R-10	2" xps	3791	\$	1.05	\$ 0.26	\$ 4,966.21		10.50			\$269.75		
1	<u>R-15</u>	3" xps (additional 1" thickness)	3791	\$ 1	1.49	\$ 0.26	\$ 6,634.25	\$1,668.04	8.40	2.10	\$ 794.30	\$215.80	\$53.95	30.9
	R-20	4"	3791	\$	2.10	\$ 0.52	\$ 9,932.42	\$3,298.17	5.70	2.70	\$ 1,221.54	\$146.43	\$69.36	47.5
	R-25	5"	3791	\$	2.54	\$ 0.52	\$ 11,600.46	\$1,668.04	4.90	0.80	\$ 2,085.05	\$125.88	\$20.55	81.2
2	R-30	6"	3791	\$	3.00	\$ 0.52	\$ 13,344.32	\$1,743.86	4.30	0.60	\$ 2,906.43	\$110.47	\$15.41	113.1
bove gr	ade walls		8				-							-
	R-13	2x4 Dense Pak in Cavity	2279	\$	0.17	\$ 0.37	\$ 1,230.66		26.00			\$667.94		
	R-20	2x6 Dense Pak in Cavity	2279	\$	0.28	\$ 0.46	\$ 1,686.46		17.70			\$454.71		
se	R-13	2" ISO	2279	\$	1.05	\$ 0.50	\$ 3,532.45	\$0.00	17.50	0.00		\$449.58		
	R-19.5	3" ISO	2279	\$	1.72	\$ 0.50	\$ 5,059.38	\$1,526.93	13.90	3.60	\$ 424.15	\$357.09	\$92.48	16.5
1	R-26	4" ISO	2279	\$	2.10	\$ 1.00	\$ 7,064.90	\$2,005.52	10.00	3.90	\$ 514.24	\$256.90	\$100.19	20.0
	R-32.5	5" ISO	2279	\$	2.77	\$ 1.00	\$ 8,591.83	\$1,526.93	8.30	1.70	\$ 898.19	\$213.23	\$43.67	35.0
2	R-39	6" ISO	2279	\$	3.44	\$ 1.00	\$ 10,118.76	\$1,526.93	7.20	1.10	\$ 1,388.12	\$184.97	\$28.26	54.0
ding R	igid Polyiso	to Cavity Insulation	7.											
2	R-41	R26+R13(2x4 cavity and 4" ISO)	2279	\$	2.10	\$ 1.00	\$8,295.56	\$7,064.90	7.90	18.10	\$ 390.33	\$202.95	\$464.99	15.2
2	R-47	R-26 +R19(2x6 cavity and 4" ISO)	2279	\$	2.10	\$ 1.00	\$8,751.36	\$7,064.90	7.00	10.70	\$ 660.27	\$179.83	\$274.88	25.7
lding C	avity Insula	tion to Rigid Polyiso						111	X					
2	R-41	R26+R13(4" ISO and 2x4 cavity)	2279	\$	0.17	\$ 0.37	\$8,295.56	\$1,230.66	7.90	2.10	\$ 586.03	\$202.95	\$53.95	22.8
2	R-47	R-26 +R19(4" ISO and 2x6 cavity)	2279	\$	0.28	\$ 0.46	\$8,751.36	\$1,686.46	7.00	3.00	\$ 562.15	\$179.83	\$77.07	21.9
lding a	second wa	II to the R-13 2x4 Dense Pak in Cavity	Wall				πk.		0	<i></i>				
2	R-40	Double stud Wall 11 1/2"	2279			\$ 5.20	\$ 11,850.80	\$ 10,620.14	7.70	10.00	\$ 1,016.43	\$197.81	\$256.90	41.3
Ĩ														

Bissell Residence East Montpelier, VT

★ 15 year payback

30 year payback

		Components	Area	SQ/FT cost Material	SQ/FT cost Labor	Total Construction Cost	Incremental Construction Cost	Annual Energy Loss (MBTU)	Annual Energy Savings (MBTU)	Cost/MBTU of Incremental Savings	Energy Costs (@\$25.69 of propane/MBTU)	Annual Incremental Savings	Incremental Payback (years)
Ceiling/I	Roof insulation	on											
Ceiling	R-26	4" iso(2) Layers of 2"	2913	\$ 1.58	\$ 1.00	\$ 7,515.54	\$0.00	8.40			\$215.80		
	R-32.5	5"(2) Layers, 2", 3"	2913	\$ 2.58	\$ 1.00	\$ 10,428.54	\$2,913.00	7.40	1.00	\$ 2,913.00	\$190.11	\$25.69	113.4
	R-39	6"	2913	\$ 3.58	\$ 1.00	\$ 13,341.54	\$2,913.00	6.30	2,10	\$ 1,387.14	\$161.85	\$28.26	103.1
1	R-48.7	7 1/2"	2913	\$ 5.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 17,478.00	\$4,136.46	5.10	3.30	\$ 1,253.47	\$131.02	\$30.83	134.2
2	R-61.75	9 1/2"	2913	\$ 6.50	\$ 1.50	\$ 23,304.00	\$5,826.00	4.10	4.30	\$ 1,354.88	\$105.33	\$25.69	226.8
Ceiling	R-24	4" spray between joists	2913	\$ 3.15		\$ 9,175.95	\$1,660.41	10.90	(2.50)	\$ (664.16)	\$280.02	-\$64.23	-25.9
	R-40	6 1/2" spray	2913	\$ 4.73		\$ 13,778.49	\$3,349.95	7.10	1.30	\$ 2,576.88	\$182.40	\$97.62	34.3
Window	s												
	U.29	D.G Marvin Integrity				\$ 15,866.00		11.10			\$285.16		
1	U.27	D.G w/Argon Low E				\$ 17,223.00	\$1,357.00	9.30	1.80	\$754	\$238.92	\$46.24	29.3
2	U.19	Triple Pane				\$ 26,081.00	\$8,858.00	4.60	6.50	\$1,363	\$118.17	\$120.74	73.4
ACH - AI	R CHANGES	PER HOUR											
	6	Ordinary Construction				\$ -		17.10			\$439.30		
1	3	Easily Achievable				\$ 600.00	\$600.00	8.60	8.50	\$71	\$220.93	\$218.37	2.7
2	1	Additional work/care required	1			\$ 1,800.00	\$1,200.00	2.90	5.70	\$211	\$74.50	\$146.43	8.2
	0.6		2			\$ 2,600.00	\$800.00	1.70	1.20	\$667	\$43.67	\$30.83	26.0
Assumpt - Costs a - Draina - Increm	ons: ire for insulati ge plane is no iental costs ar	ion only (assume framing and plywood is it included is any system re typically the cost to add an increment	in place) unle of insulation(n	ss additional fra ote exceptions)	ming is required					1			
							\$9,155					\$765	12.3

Total added cost

Savings Payback

Summary: We have come a long way

- 1. We know how to insulate
- 2. Heating/cooling technology continues to advance
- 3. PVs have dropped in price to such an extent that the are part of the economic equation
- 4. We have shown that with enough dollars we can achieve net zero
- 5. We have the tools to balance our investments to use our energy savings dollars most economically

How to make the best financial decision

- 1. Have an energy model done, so you can see where your energy is going
- 2. Put a cost on each increment of each energy improvement
- 3. Decide what your idea of a good investment is for you.
- 4. Push insulation levels (and other energy saving components) to a point after which it is no longer a good investment.
- 5. Balance this approach for each component
- 6. Figure out at what point it makes better sense to invest in PVs
- 7. Only then, add your own prejudices

Thank you. Questions?

