

ASTM Building Energy Performance Assessment (BEPA) Standard E 2797

Presented by:

Anthony J. Buonicore, PE, QEP, BCEE CEO, The Buonicore Group ASTM BEPA Task Group Chairman

Overview:

- Driving Forces
- What's the problem?
- What the BEPA standard accomplishes

Driving Forces:

- Regulatory
 - Building energy use disclosure
 - Benchmarking against peers

Business

Regulatory Driving Forces:

Energy Performance Disclosure in EU

- California AB 1103
- District of Columbia
- Austin, TX
- Washington State
- Seattle, WA
- New York City, NY
- Additional Cities considering
 - Denver, Portland, San Francisco
- Additional States considering
 - IL, MA, MD, MI, MN, OH & OR
- Federal Legislation being discussed

(2003)

- (2007, effective 2011)
- (2008, effective 2010)
- (2008, effective 2011)
- (2009, effective 2011)
- (2010, effective 2011)
- (2009, effective 2011)

Business Driving Forces:

- More energy efficient buildings
 - Lower operating costs
 - Higher net operating income
 - More valuable
 - More attractive to tenants
- Less energy efficient buildings
 - Less competitive in the marketplace
 - In danger of obsolescence

What's the problem?

- Prospective purchasers as part of due diligence are asking what is the "building's energy consumption?"
- Pro Forma provided to lenders by buyers for financing has line item for utilities under building operating costs
 - Lenders want a "reasonable" and "realistic" value here
 - No consistent methodology exists to provide answers

What's the problem? (cont.)

- Significant variability depending on:
 - Period of time chosen over which the data was collected (1 yr, 2 yrs, 3 yrs) and how it was calendarized
 - Whether or not changes in building occupancy was considered
 - How weather conditions were factored in and baseline conditions established
 - How building operating hours were considered
 - Whether or not major building renovations were considered

What does the BEPA Standard accomplish?

- Standardizes the collection and reporting of energy consumption information for a building involved in a real estate transaction
- Provides a supplementary scope of work that can compliment property due diligence (e.g. Phase I or PCA)
- Use of the BEPA standard will facilitate improved benchmarking (by others)

Report Deliverables

- Pro Forma (representative) building energy use
- Pro Forma (representative) building energy cost
- Projected range of building energy use for:
 - lower, upper and average case
- Projected range of building energy *cost* for:
 - lower, upper and average case
- Actual building energy use data for each year collected
- Actual building energy *cost* data for each year collected

Use of BEPAs in the marketplace:

- Likely to be combined with an ASHRAE Level I Energy Audit and/or Benchmarking (BEPA Plus)
- ESCOs energy auditing (BEPA and BEPA Plus)
- Asset management of property portfolios (BEPA Plus)
- Property due diligence in acquisition or disposition (BEPA and BEPA Plus)
- Building energy use regulatory disclosure (BEPA)
- Support "energy efficiency" loans (BEPA Plus)



ASTM BEPA Plus Case Study -Emerging Best Practices

Presented by:

Brian McCarter Chairman & CEO



ASTM BEPA Plus Case Study

Overview of Emerging Best Practice Methodology:

- Stakeholder value received from ASTM BEPA
 - Prospective Buyer
 - Prospective Lender
 - Due Diligence Consultant
- Role of ASTM BEPA Standard
 - Foundational scope of work
 - Baseline & projected energy use & cost calculations
 - Complementary to existing benchmark & rating systems
 - Standardized reporting methodology

ASTM BEPA Emerging Best Practices – Buyer Perspective

Stakeholders value received:

Prospective Buyer – gains visibility to subject property's:

- Baseline and projected / pro forma energy use and cost profile
 - Considers impact of primary independent variables
 - Historical weather, occupancy, operating hours
- Benchmark to peer buildings
 - Energy consumption & cost performance comparisons
- Competitive position of asset compared to local market peer group
- Identify energy efficiency retrofit opportunities with compelling
 - ROI & payback term
 - Asset enhancement value
- Identify potential government & utility economic incentive programs to improve ROI



ASTM BEPA Emerging Best Practices – Lender Perspective

Stakeholders value received:

Prospective Lender – gains visibility to subject property & borrower characteristics:

- Property pro forma energy use & cost profile for lender underwriting
- Potential energy efficiency retrofit opportunities with compelling ROI
 - Incremental energy efficiency based loan opportunities
 - Borrower repayment ability enhanced due to lower operating expenses
 - Collateral value enhanced due to energy efficiency improvements
- Potential government (federal, state, local) & utility economic incentive programs to improve ROI on energy efficiency retrofit initiatives

ASTM BEPA Emerging Best Practices – Consultant Perspective

Stakeholders value received:

Due Diligence Consultant:

- Extension of core due diligence service line (PCA & ESA) to include BEPA
- Leverage installed client base for BEPA services:
 - Lenders (transactions & energy loan program support)
 - Buyers / investors (transactional BEPA)
 - Owners / managers (ongoing portfolio monitoring & optimization)
 - Sellers (energy disclosure compliance)
- Post closing value-add opportunities: (beyond transactional services)
 - Energy efficiency retrofits project management
 - Ongoing property & portfolio level monitoring & optimization
 - Smart deployment of capital improvement budget impacting energy



Collect Building Characteristics Data

- Class A, multi-tenant office building in pre-acquisition due diligence
 - 212,000 Sq. Ft.
 - Norwalk, CT

| Main Space (Office) | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|--|--|
| Name | Value | Units | | |
| Office Gross Floor Area | 212000.0 | ft2 | | |
| Office Weekly Operating Hours | ffice Weekly Operating Hours 85 h | | | |
| Office Main Shift Workers | Office Main Shift Workers 685.0 | | | |
| Office Number of PCs | 625 | | | |
| Office Percent Heated 100 | | | | |
| Office Percent Air Conditioned | 100 | | | |



Collect Historic Monthly Utility Consumption & Cost Data:

- Electricity
- Fuels
- Normalize to Calendar Month



Collect Historic Occupancy & Operating Hours Data

Primary Independent Variables

- Weather
- Occupancy
- Operating Hours





Calculate Energy Baseline per ASTM BEPA Standard Methodology

- Total Energy Use & EUI
- Total Energy Cost & Cost/SF

| Baseline Performance Indicators (for 12 months ending Jan 31, 2010) | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Gross Floor Space: | 203,698 | ft ² | | | | |
| Total Energy Use: | 20,584 | mmBTU | | | | |
| Energy Use Intensity (EUI): | 101.1 | kBTU/ft ² | | | | |
| Total Energy Cost: \$489,174 | | | | | | |
| Energy Cost per SF: | \$2.40 | /ft ² | | | | |

Forecast Energy Use & Cost, considering independent variables impact

- Historic Weather
- Heating & Cooling Degree
 Days (HDD & CDD)
- Statistical Analysis over 10+ year period to determine
 - Best case
 - 25th Percentile
 - Mean
 - 75th Percentile
 - Worst case





Calculate Projected Range of Energy Use – Impact of Weather

- Best case
- 25th Percentile
- Mean
- 75th Percentile
- Worst case

| Weather | Electricity Use (kWh) | Fuel Use (kBTU) | Total Energy Use (kBTU) | CDD | HDD | TOTAL DD |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|----------|
| | | | | | | |
| Best | 3,231,392 | 6,222,550 | 17,249,031 | 440 | 4,096 | 4,536 |
| 25% | 3,337,396 | 7,425,541 | 18,813,738 | 756 | 4,851 | 5,606 |
| Mean | 3,370,049 | 8,041,070 | 19,540,689 | 853 | 5,237 | 6,090 |
| Median | 3,370,995 | 8,143,352 | 19,646,197 | 856 | 5,302 | 6,157 |
| 75% | 3,457,343 | 9,179,836 | 19,940,844 | 1,112 | 5,952 | 7,064 |
| Worst | 3,506,565 | 9,920,751 | 21,886,204 | 1,259 | 6,417 | 7,676 |
| | | | | | | |
| Baseline Data: | | F | | | | |
| Last 12 Mo. | 3,526,749 | 8,550,940 | 20,585,266 | 548 | 5,302 | 5,850 |
| % from Mean | 4.6 | 6.3 | 5.3 | -35.7 | 1.2 | -3.9 |



Range of Energy Use – Impact of Occupancy & Operating Hours

| | Cooli Da | ing Degree ys (CDD) | Heating Degree Days (HDD) | Impact of | Weather |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | Total Energy Use (kBTU) | Total EUI (kBTU/ft ²) |
| Average Weather Year | | 853 | 5,237 | 19,540,689 | 95.93 |
| | ļ | Verage | Ī | | |
| Occupancy Rate (%) Operating Hours/Week | | 89.5 68.0 | 5 | | |
| Energy Use Impact (kBTU) | | 20,680 |) | | |
| EUI Impact (kBTU/ft ²) | | 0.10 |) | | |
| Pro Forma Energy Use (kBTU) | 1 | 19,561,369 | | | |
| Pro Forma EUI (kBTU/ft ²) | | 96.03 | 5 | | |



Calculate Projected Range of Energy Costs

- Best case
- 25th Percentile
- Mean
- 75th Percentile
- Worst case

| Range of Building Energy Cost - Impact of Weather | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|--|
| | CDD Best | CDD 25% | CDD Mean | CDD Median | CDD 75% | CDD Worst | |
| HDD Best | \$432,078 | | | | | | |
| HDD 25% | | \$456,244 | | 1 | | | |
| HDD Mean | | | \$466,139 | | | | |
| HDD Median | | | | \$467,271 | | | |
| HDD 75% | | | | | \$487,522 | | |
| HDD Worst | | | | | | \$500,568 | |
| Baseline Data: Last 12 Mo. % from Mean | \$489,174 4.9 | | | | | | |
| % from Mean | 4.9 | | | | | | |

Calculate Pro Forma Energy Use & EUI

Energy Use & EUI in Average Weather Year with Average Occupancy & Operating Hours

| Pro Forma | Pro Forma | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Building Energy Use | Building Energy Use Intensity (EUI) | |
| 19,561,369 kBTU/yr | 96.03 kBTU/ft ² | |

Calculate Pro Forma Energy Cost

Energy Cost in Average Weather Year with Average Occupancy & Operating Hours

| Pro Forma | Pro Forma |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Building Energy Cost | Building Energy Cost per SF |
| \$464,843 | \$2.28 /ft ² |

Benchmark Against Peer Buildings – Energy Use Intensity (EUI)



Benchmark Against Peer Buildings – Energy Cost per SF

| | Nationwide | Energy Cost | per SF (\$/ft2/yr) | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | (15,655 peer buildings) | | 2.40 | | | |
| Local Markel | | 25% 1.52 | Median 2.40 | 75% 3.79 | | |
| Comporisono | | | • | | | |
| Compansons | Same Climate Region | Energy Cost | ost per SF (\$/ft2/yr) | | | |
| | (3,247 peer buildings) | | 2.40 | | | |
| | | 25% 1.36 | Median 2.11 | 75% 3.10 | | |
| | | · · · | ľ | | | |
| | Same State Energy Cost per SF (\$/ft2/yr) | | | | | |
| | (307 peer buildings) | 2.40 | | | | |
| | | 25% 2.44 | Median 3.54 | 75% 5.08 | | |
| | | - 1 | | 1 | | |
| | Same CBSA Market | Energy Cost Subject Prope | per SF (\$/ft2/yr) erty | | | |
| | (91 peer buildings) | 2.40 | 1 | | | |
| | | 25% 3.00 | Median 4.32 | 75% 6.36 | | |
| | | - 1 | | 1 | | |
| | Same 3-Digit Zip Code | Energy Cost Subject Prope | per SF (\$/ft2/yr) erty | | | |
| | (51 peer buildings) | 2.40 | ·· -2 | | | |
| | | 25% 3.20 | Median 4.79 | 75% 6.85 | | |
| | | | | | | |

Benchmark Against Peer Buildings – Potential Asset Value Impact

| Peer Group Performance Distribution | Subject Property Potential EUI Savings | Subject Property Potential Annual Energy Cost | Subject Property Potential Asset Valuation Impact at Assumed Capitalization Rate | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Distribution | (kBTU/ft ² /yr) | Savings (\$/yr) | 5.0% | 6.0% | 7.0% | 8.0% | 9.0% |
| 25% Percentile | 36.15 | \$197,535 | \$3,950,697 | \$3,292,247 | \$2,821,926 | \$2,469,186 | \$2,194,832 |
| Median | 2.68 | \$14,647 | \$292,937 | \$244,114 | \$209,241 | \$183,086 | \$162,743 |
| Mean | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 75% Percentile | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| CBSA peer group performance data is current through July 2010. | | | | | | | |

Opportunity Quantification from Peer Building Benchmarking:

- Subject property performance lags CBSA peer group median & 25th%
- Potential impact of improving performance to meet CBSA peer group 25th%
 - \$197,535 annual energy cost savings
 - \$2.8 million asset value increase at 7% cap rate assumption

Benchmark Against Peer Buildings – Energy Star Benchmarking





Identify Specific Green Building Attributes that Enhance Asset Value



| U.S. GREEN LEED [®] | BUILDING COUNCIL |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| LEED Certification Type | LEED-EBOM |
| LEED Certification Level | Silver |
| LEED Points | 46 |
| LEED AP | John Green |

Analyze Retrofit Opportunities – ASHRAE Protocol

- ASHRAE Protocol Recommendations for Energy Cost Savings Measures
- Estimate ROI & Payback Term

| Lighting Ret | rofit | Installed Cost: | \$50,000 - \$55,000 |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Upgrade T-12 fluorescent lighting to T-8 lamps and | | Est. Annual Savings: | \$10,000 |
| ballasts. | | Est. Annual CO2 Savings: | 90 tons |
| Difficulty | Moderate | Est. Payback Term: | 2.5 - 3.0 years |
| Impacts | Energy and Atmosphere | Asset Value Increase: | \$112,931 - \$107,931 |
| | | CAP Rate: | 7.25% |
| | | ROI: | 40.0 - 33.3% |

Research Government & Utility Economic Incentive Programs

Local, State & Federal
 Government Incentive Programs

 Utility Company Energy Incentive Programs



Financial Incentives

Industry Recruitment/Support

- <u>CCEF Operational Demonstration Program</u>
- New Energy Technology Program

Leasing Program

<u>CCEF - CT Solar Lease</u>

Local Loan Program

- New Generation Energy Community Food Service Efficiency Lending Program
- New Generation Energy Community Solar Lending Program

Property Tax Incentive

Property Tax Exemption for Renewable Energy Systems

Sales Tax Incentive

- Sales and Use Tax Exemption for Energy-Efficient Products
- Sales and Use Tax Exemption for Solar and Geothermal Systems

State Grant Program

- <u>CCEF Community Innovations Grant Program</u>
- <u>CCEF On-Site Renewable DG Program</u>

State Loan Program

- <u>CHIF Energy Conservation Loan</u>
- DPUC Low-Interest Loans for Customer-Side Distributed Resources

State Rebate Program

- <u>CCEF Geothermal Rebate Program</u>
- CCEF Solar PV Rebate Program
- <u>CCEF Solar Thermal Incentive Program</u>
- CEEIP Commercial and Industrial Rebate Program

Utility Grant Program

- Connecticut Light & Power Energy Conscious Blueprint Grant Program
- The United Illuminating Company Energy Conscious Blueprint Grant Program

BEPA Plus Emerging Best Practice – "How it Works" Case Study Incorporating Industry Best Practice Analytics in BEPA Plus Report

- ASTM BEPA Standard Methodology Baseline & Projected Energy Use & Cost
- Benchmark Against Peer Buildings local, regional & national peer group KPIs
- Energy Star Rating energy efficiency rating to national peer group
- CMP Green Value Score identify green building attributes that add asset value
- LEED Certification Status type, level, category points distribution
- Economic Incentive Programs enhance retrofits ROI & payback
- ASHRAE Level I & II Recommendations Protocol retrofits with compelling ROI
- Carbon Emissions Calculation associated with building's energy use



BEPA Plus Emerging Best Practices – Meeting Stakeholder Needs

BEPA Plus is Good Business – Potential Win/Win/Win for 3 Stakeholders

- Prospective Buyers Visibility to:
 - Projected / pro forma energy use & cost
 - Competitive position of property relative to local peer buildings
 - Energy retrofit opportunities with compelling ROI & payback
- Prospective Lender Visibility to:
 - Risks & opportunities relative to energy performance for loan underwriting
 - Energy efficiency based loan opportunities
 - Increased NOI borrower repayment ability & asset value enhancement
- Due Diligence Consultants:
 - Extend (PCA & ESA) service line to include BEPA to core clients
 - Post closing value-add opportunities beyond transactional services
 - ongoing monitoring & optimization
 - smart deployment of capital improvement budget impacting energy

ASTM BEPA Standard Emerging Best Practices



Presented by:

Brian McCarter

Chairman & CEO