

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Further guidance - NA Research Call

Date:Thu, 19 Jun 2008 17:24:53 -0400

From:Parrish Galusky <Parrish.Galusky@NETL.DOE.GOV>

To:Parrish Galusky <Parrish.Galusky@NETL.DOE.GOV>

References:<485A842B.2BD7.0065.0@NETL.DOE.GOV>
<485A8450.2BD7.0065.0@NETL.DOE.GOV>

Additional questions and guidance for application preparation follow.

1) In a response to earlier questions, DOE made it clear that at least 50% of the budget must go to national labs. Each lab places overhead fees onto its subcontracts. Is it possible that these overhead fees could be treated as part of the lab's budget? The lab is essentially paying itself with these fees to cover the administrative costs of putting the contracts in place and managing them.

Response - Overhead fees for administration of necessary subcontracts is acceptable and counts towards the 50% minimum national lab funding criteria. However (as stated previously), the 50% limitation was included to ensure that industry's involvement on the CBDT was not a majority of the cost. The intent is to ensure that a national lab lead is not "being a front" for an industry participant who is actually doing the majority of the CBDT work. Although it could work out mathematically such that a national lab could subcontract the majority of technical functions of the CBDT and still meet the 50% minimum cost criteria in light of these administrative costs, an application proposing this would, most likely, not be rated very high.

Some additional questions regarding the research call entitled, "Commercial Buildings Integration National Accounts Partnerships, Funding Opportunity DE-PS26-08NT04115." The page numbers refer to the pages in the Research Call.

2) Page 23 and 24, last bullet under "Criterion 1: Technical Merit and Implementation," beginning on page 23, reads as follows:

"Degree of energy savings levels expected that exceeds the minimum required under this Research Call (i.e., 30% for retrofit and 50% for new construction focused on Retailer or Commercial Properties; 20% for retrofit and 30% for new construction focused on Energy Smart Hospitals - energy savings above ASHRAE Standard 90.1-2004)."

This criterion indicates that the listed energy savings levels are required minimums. Elsewhere in the Call the texts suggests that these levels are goals, but that NAC business needs could influence just what level of efficiency is attained. For example, see page 3 in the last paragraph, which states the following:

"From DOE's perspective, the ultimate goal is to raise the energy efficiency levels of a significant portion of building stock to 50% or greater energy savings as compared to ASHRAE Standard 90.1-2004. It is recognized, however, that the individual NACs will select a design and associated efficiency level that meet its cost constraints and

operating needs. This challenge puts additional emphasis on the establishment of the NA Team participants with the need of assuring corporate commitment to the NA goals and objectives."

Another example is on page 10, which reads in the last sentence:

"Detailed energy and cost analyses shall be conducted in conjunction with this effort to ensure that proposed changes meet performance expectations and are within the NAC business targets."

Do the efficiency goals allow flexibility to accommodate business targets, performance expectations, cost constraints, and operating needs or are they required minimums?

Response - The application should focus on meeting or exceeding the target minimum energy savings levels stated. Applications that realistically strive to succeed at higher energy savings levels (with all else equal) would rate higher in the evaluation process.

DOE will consider all pertinent issues (e.g., business needs, energy savings) in determining whether or not to proceed to the next stage of a specific subproject for individual NACs. If a good faith effort is made with DOE concurrence to advance to the performance verification stage and energy efficiencies fall short of the target levels, the DOE, CBDT, and industry all benefit from the research knowledge gained. The DOE may determine that sufficient progress has been made towards program goals and the CBDT would proceed to Task 5 (Case Study).

3) Page 24, Under the heading "Criterion 2: Commercial Building Design Team (CBDT) Roles and Capabilities," the last bullet reads as follows:

"Adequacy of the proposed team's expertise pertaining to all necessary elements of building energy efficiency (e.g., HVAC, Lighting, Controls, Monitoring, A/E Design) for the proposed target market. Of particular consideration will be the number of builders, developers, and other design professionals committed to partnering with the CBDT Lead for the National Accounts program."

The inclusion of builders as participants does not seem to fit the definitions provided for CBDTs. For example, the Figure included on page 4 does not mention builders, nor does the description included on page 3. We envision that the CBDT may engage builders as part of the design and construction process, but not have builders on the team. Is DOE's expectation that the CBDTs will have builders as members?

Response - Teaming arrangements are completely up to the applicant and DOE had/has no intention to dictate specific partnerships.

4) Page 25, also under the heading "Criterion 2: Commercial Building Design Team (CBDT) Roles and Capabilities," the second level-one bullet, and it's sub-bullets state the following

- Each CBDT must include employees or subcontracted personnel with the following minimum skills and/or qualifications:

- o a building energy rater simulation expert capable of conducting building performance simulation calculations according using EnergyPlus;

- o an engineer or architect with education and at least five (5) years experience in commercial building design;
- o a professional with at least five (5) years of commercial building construction experience;
- o a professional with at least five (5) years experience in the specification, design, and installation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems in commercial buildings;
- o a professional with at least five (5) years experience in the specification, design, and installation of lighting systems in commercial buildings;
- o a professional with at least five (5) years experience in building science including heat and mass transfer (e.g., moisture and vapor transfer) of commercial buildings.
- o The availability of proposed key personnel to participate in and complete the proposed project.

The term "energy rater simulation expert." does not generally apply to commercial buildings. In the first sub-bullet, can the words "energy rater," and near the end of the sentence the word "according," be deleted? This would leave the requirement of "a building simulation expert capable of conducting building performance simulation calculations using EnergyPlus."

Response - Both suggested deletions are made (i.e., "energy rater", "according").

5) In each of the sub bullets that include the word "installation" is it possible to replace the word "and," just preceding the word "installation," with phrase "and/or." Another approach would be to insert the word "monitoring the" just before "installing." Most design professionals do not actually install the systems listed. In many cases, installation requires credentials, such as being a licensed electrician, or possible union membership. Adding people with these qualifications to the CBDT would be expensive and would not necessarily add substantially to the ability of the team to achieve the DOE energy efficiency improvement goals.

Response - Sub-bullets 4 and 5 are each be revised to reflect "monitoring of the installation" as suggested.

6) The third sub bullet refers to experience in commercial building construction. Does experience in construction oversight such as is provided by an architect or mechanical engineer fulfill this requirement?

Response - Direct oversight of commercial building construction projects is acceptable experience.

7) One potential national account we are in discussion with has raised the question of entering into a CRADA with the national laboratory. The Call does not actually specify any formal arrangement between the national laboratory and national accounts. Does DOE have an expectation for the form that this relationship will take? Is a CRADA a possibility?

Response - The proposed arrangements are up to the applicant, however, programmatic objectives for information sharing should be strongly considered if CRADAs are to be used. DOE will review and must approve CRADAs prior to any award under this Research Call. DOE recognizes, respects, and will protect true competitive business advantages and will not disclose any sensitive information without NAC consent.

Additionally, statements of cost share contribution will have to be provided at least annually.

thanks,
Parrish

Parrish Galusky
US Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
3610 Collins Ferry Road ***** (use this line only for package
delivery)*****
P.O. Box 880 *****(use this line only for regular letter mail)*****
Morgantown, WV 26507

galusky@netl.doe.gov
phone: (304) 285-4358
fax: (304) 285-4403

--
^^
Marcia W. Beck, MS90-90R3027D
Environmental Energy Technologies Division
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
Berkeley, California 94720
phone: 510.486.6156
fax: 510.486.5454
mwbeck@lbl.gov
<http://eetd.lbl.gov>