

Conservation Commission Energy Committee Meeting
Thursday, August 9, 2018
Parks and Recreation Conference Room, 2nd Floor, Town Hall

In attendance: Rusty Parker, Robert Brady, Steve Hall

Also in attendance: Patricia Sesto, director; Sarah (Nahabedian) Coccaro, conservation resource manager; Sandy Litvak, Selectman, Alan Monelli, superintendent of buildings; Daniel Watson, director of school facilities; Charles Zsebik, director of purchasing

- 1. Call to order- 9:07 am by Ms. Patricia Sesto**
- 2. Approval of Minutes**
 - a. July 26th, 2018- minutes approved by consensus
- 3. Update on Town Hall audit and other Eversource topics (order changed slightly from agenda)**

Ms. Patricia Sesto started the conversation asking if either Mr. Steve Hall or Mr. Robert Brady had any comments from the final energy audit. Mr. Hall stated that with a Phase 2 audit report, all options for savings, including a package replacement of equipment, including viable yet inefficient equipment, should be listed; there should be a holistic approach to showing the savings on the Town side. This information was not provided and is key to this is making sure accurate costs are listed.

Messrs. Hall and Brady stated the SWA rate lists it as 8¢/kWh, which appears too low and it is likely the distribution cost is not included. If the kWh rate is actually more, the calculations on energy conservation and savings are inaccurate, compromising the basis for recommended action or inaction. Mr. Hall inquired what tariff schedule the Town is under, and who do we pay (a third-party supplier not listed).

Mr. Sandy Litvak asked for the background on the purpose of the audit. The committee explained the purpose of the Town Hall energy audit was to identify mechanisms to create energy efficiency and cost saving. Essentially: what are we paying, what could we be saving? Mr. Rusty Parker and Mr. Brady reiterated the importance of using a correct price/kWh to calculate the savings. The cost seems

about 2/3 lower than expected, which would incorrectly put the savings threshold lower than it should be. Mr. Litvak also pointed out SWA was relying on a contract rate from 2010. The Committee recommended contacting the Town Comptroller, Peter Mynarski to get all-inclusive pricing.

Mr. Parker concluded the report cannot be deemed final; it's not accurate. Ms. Sesto and Ms. Coccaro will follow up with Mr. Mynarski.

Mr. Hall discussed the one Roof Top Unit (RTU) on Town Hall. He recommended SWA look into using a bi-polar ionization RTU, which reduces intake by 30%. This has been done in other parts of Greenwich with success. Mr. Hall explained there are much more efficient RTUs available and we should go back to SWA and inquire. How does that compare to the Reznor unit recommended in the audit?

Mr. Brady went on to ask, "have we exhausted what other things can be done, non-mechanical, non-electrical to make the building more energy efficient?"

Mr. Watson stated that he expects to meet with the solar expert in September to evaluate Glenville School.

Ms. Sesto discussed Mr. Robert Chew's EV charging station presentation from the last meeting. The Town previously set a goal of 20% reduction and asked, with an increase in EV and charging stations, is a 20% reduction still reasonable? Discussion ensued. While charging using solar as an efficiency gain, most people in the near term will use conventional electricity sources.

Mr. Parker asked if EV charging stations were becoming part of the energy report for the Town? Ms. Sesto stated that she felt they are going to be part of our future and discussed our 20% reduction goal associated with Greenwich's designation as a Clean Energy Community. Following the EV movement, the hopes of this Committee are to make a substantial, long-term impact within the community. The report will encompass both what the town can be doing and recommendations for community, too.

Mr. Hall agreed the Committee should consider what impact EVs have on the Town's energy demand. Mr. Parker asked if the town has to facilitate EV chargers? Ms. Sesto responded the recommendations of this committee will have a long-term impact through a new, dedicated committee looking at conserving energy as a whole, not just in building profiles.

Mr. Alan Monelli began a dialogue on the energy section of building code (building management systems), software vs hardware in machinery. He explained difficulties with certain companies and issues with equipment, time it

takes to resolve the issue, personnel...etc. At this point in the meeting, Mr. Charles Zsebik, from Purchasing, arrived.

4. Presentation by Director of Purchasing, Charles Zsebik

The Committee welcomed Mr. Zsebik. Ms. Sesto gave brief history of meetings with Mr. Monelli and Mr. Watson, the Committee's mission, and importance of learning the purchasing process.

Mr. Zsebik reiterated Mr. Monelli's concerns about purchasing and said that there are processes in place to handle emergencies, such as the immediate need to replace large equipment, like a boiler. In the absence of an emergency or other justification, bid processes have to be followed. To alleviate the impact of this process, the threshold for that would trigger it has been raised from \$5,000 to \$15,000. Over \$15,000 and there needs to be a Request for Bid or Request for Proposal issued.

The Committee asked Mr. Zsebik to discuss the process for purchase approvals, with regards to energy improvement equipment. Discussion ensued between the policies and processes differences in RFPs vs. RFBs. RFPs are used if the scope of the project is not yet well defined. The department assembles a committee who then composes the request and review the submissions. They are able to entertain topical presentations, conduct site visits, and pursue whatever they need to educate themselves. However, they cannot have anyone they met with help write the specifications for the projects. In reviewing the proposals, the committee can take into account a broader range of considerations, and not be limited to accepting the low bidder.

RFBs are used when the scope of services or product is well defined. There is no qualitative review; the lowest bidder who satisfies the bid requirements is hired. Discussion ensued regarding the pitfalls of this requirement and the need for the municipality to remain transparent in its transactions. The level specificity in the bid proposal is key to receiving bids for acceptable products and services. Mr. Zsebik stated he welcomes staff to seek out his help to facilitate a successful bidding process.

Mr. Litvak left the meeting.

Mr. Monelli discussed a lighting project for town and the process he anticipates. He will need \$90,000 in lighting fixtures that must be purchased all at once by an Eversource dealer. He is concerned the RFB process will hinder his ability to secure an approved vendor who can warehouse the fixtures. If the low bidder doesn't offer this, the town will lose out on the Eversource rebate. Mr. Zsebik explained the request of bid can include these criteria to ensure the town remains eligible for the rebate.

Mr. Parker explained to Mr. Zsebik the committee has heard complaints, such as being obligated to go with the low bid and the inefficiency of having to work with multiple companies/brands and their workers (delayed work). Mr. Zsebik said some of these issues can be handled by documenting, up front, the lack of service, quality of product, etc. Prior to awarding the contract or making the purchase, background and reference checks are completed by the department requesting the bid.

Mr. Hall asked if it was possible to adopt a common strategy for equipment, like the IT department uses all PC computers? Mr. Zsebik said in a perfect world it could be. Could all the Town or BoE buildings go forward with one manufacturer of HVAC, for example, and could the bid be specific to a named product? Mr. Zsebik explained equipment and RFBs are on a building-by-building basis. Mr. Brady stated that the “low bid” doesn’t include research into lowest cost vs. life cycle cost.

Ms. Sesto asked what prevents the town from deferring to a life cycle cost? Mr. Zsebik stated the decision on the life cycle is a topic to be considered and discussed by the facility directors. All RFB/RFPs have to be completely transparent: no favoritism, no collusion.

Mr. Monelli discussed efficiency issues with his team and the burden of having to write exemptions for purchasing. Mr. Hall asked if there were any buildings projects in the pipe line that will need equipment? Mr. Monelli stated that yes, there are a few; for example, Eastern Greenwich Civic Center.

Mr. Parker asked Mr. Zsebik what the energy rate is for the Town. Mr. Zsebik stated that it is .072¢ per kWh delivered to town and the supplier is TransCanada. The Town is switching to Constellation in January and it will be at a rate of 0.076¢ per kWh.

Mr. Hall inquired about writing an energy service agreement: could this be okay? Essentially the contractor installs, operates, and maintains the system and the contractor guarantees service. Mr. Monelli stated it’s not typically done because you have to let contractors into the building and the issues that can ensue.

Mr. Brady asked for a copy of the electricity contract. Mr. Parker asked for a copy of the most recent electricity bill.

The Committee thanked Mr. Zsebik, Mr. Watson, and Mr. Monelli for their time.

5. Strategic Energy Planning

- a. Report on stakeholder engagement**
 - i. Andy Duus was contacted specifically for today's meeting, but he was out of town this week.

 - b. Identification of desired presentations, needed information**
 - i. Report audit to be finished
- 6. Next meeting – August 23rd, 2018 @ 9:00am**
- 7. Adjourn- 10:35am**