Conservation Commission Energy Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, September 19, 2018  
Land Use Conference Room, 2nd Floor, Town Hall

In attendance: Steve Hall, Rusty Parker, Robert Brady, Skip Parker, Urling Searle  
Also in attendance: Patricia Sesto, director; Sarah (Nahabedian) Coccaro, conservation resource manager; Andrew Brydges, Eversource, Paula Coutz, Eversource; Amanda Magee (by phone), senior engineer, Steven Winters Associates; Dave Bebrin (by phone) senior engineer, Eversource

1. **Call to order** - 2:00pm by Ms. Patricia Sesto

2. **Approval of Minutes**  
   a. August 23rd, 2018- minutes approved by consensus  
   b. August 9th, 2018- minutes approved by consensus

3. **Update on Town Hall audit and other Eversource topics**  
   Ms. Sesto welcomed Mr. Andy Brydges and Ms. Paula Coutz from Eversource, and those joining on the phone to the meeting. Discussion began with comments by the Energy Committee. Mr. Steve Hall asked why the report didn’t include and quantify additional energy efficiency measures based on savings? He believes the report should have included a comprehensive list of everything that is then presented to the customer (Town of Greenwich). Mr. Andy Brydges asked what measures were not quantified? Mr. Hall gave examples: The Reznor and air handling units.

   Mr. Bob Brady expressed concerns over the report. He stated that the energy cost essentially doubled, which exposes a much larger scope to look at energy efficiency measures. More so, nothing in the report goes after lowering demand use in the building. Nowadays with better computational abilities we should be able regulate more efficiently and have better software. Mr. Dave Bebrin, who reviewed the report from SWA, explained that he didn’t believe the town had a control system to upgrade and that the report only looked at what could be upgraded and consistent with what already exists. Ms. Amanda Magee echoed his comments. There is no centralized control, only localized controls exist in the building.
Mr. Brydges asked Ms. Magee if there was a way to incorporate capital cost into the report?

Mr. Hall stated that the Town Hall is an older building with multiple systems and he anticipates that in the future, there will be equipment that will fail. He asked why don’t we look at a comprehensive package to get a ballpark estimate for cost and cost savings? Ms. Sesto asked SWA if they expressed why or why not to include a total retrofit in the report? Mr. Brydges stated they had not. Mr. Brydges explained that a lighting project combined with other controls was also not incorporated into the report.

Mr. Hall discussed the short payback period (1.9 years) stated in the report, and that if the payback period was longer, a whole lot more could be included. Ms. Sesto stated that it sounded like SWA decided on a payback period without consulting with the Town.

Mr. Brydges again mentioned the lack of lighting mentioned in the report. Normally, phase 2 audits don’t include lighting as a strategic investment as this would have been covered in a phase 1 audit and Eversource has already been working with the Town on a lighting project.

Mr. Rusty Parker asked what happened to looking into the 20-40-year-old equipment? How much life is left in the existing equipment? Ms. Magee stated that all major equipment is original. There are arguments for and against replacing a piece of equipment as a whole or piecemeal.

Mr. Hall asked that the report get a little more “meat” added, with performance proposal upgrades and a better summary of capital improvements. Ms. Magee stated that the report was prepared based off initial discussions when SWA was in the building during the audit. She expressed that it seemed like equipment would be replaced or upgraded over time and a whole building upgrade was not discussed. This may have been driven by cost and the fact that the building is set up piece-meal and every floor has different controls. Mr. Brady and Ms. Sesto agreed that we need to look at what it would take to make the town hall building a mid-21st century building when it was built in early 20th century.

Mr. Hall asked if the Roof Top Unit (RTU) system could be changed to use a bipolar ionization RTU system to reduce air intake? Could the RTU be replaced with a new system and the six air handling units (AHU) be done in isolation? Put in new equipment cost for energy conservation measure items #2 and #3 in audit report (page 4). Mr. Brydges asked what the timeline is for this project? If it’s within two years, then the payback for the recommended energy conservation measures is reasonable.
Mr. Rusty Parker brought up motion sensors and asked why they weren’t included in the report? Mr. Brydges and Ms. Magee stated that occupancy controls for lighting were discussed during the level 1 walk through and again associated the discussions made during this visit as an influence in what was written in the report, as was a lighting project.

Ms. Sesto discussed Mr. Al Monelli’s concerns with using in-house labor and how it didn’t appear to be included in the incentive/grant programs through Eversource. Mr. Brydges and Ms. Coutz said that this was incorrect and will provide a write up to show the town can use in-house labor and still receive an incentive. Mr. Brydges to facilitate contact with lighting contractors if the town would like to proceed with further projects.

Mr. Bebrin recommended not to put all our eggs in one basket with a control system, or building management system. He indicated that when looking down the line at systems, this may limit our options later on.

Mr. Brydges stated that he will regroup with SWA to go over the audit report.

Ms. Sesto recapped the discussion:
- We need a conversation on demand management and control systems to make demand management a point of consideration.
- We need a conversation on wholesale equipment replacement and what could be saved (realizes this could be partly conceptual).
- We would like a longer list of ECMs and to not to take things off the list because you think we don’t want it (or why it’s not included and what is the criteria for removing ideas?).
- We need to have a discussion on equipment’s end of life and the value to replace it.
- What is the payback criteria being used and an explanation why?
- We need a further conversation on motion sensors, vis à vis lighting.
- What haven’t we mentioned?
- Ms. Sesto inquired about timing on this? Mr. Brydges to discuss plan and get back to Ms. Sesto in two days on timeline (due: Friday, September 21st)
- SWA to put together a list of who they worked with and talked to in Town.

4. Strategic Energy Planning
   i. Identification of desired presentations, needed information

5. Next meeting – September 27th, 2018 @ 9:00am
   a. Agenda topics

Previous Action items:
   1. Committee members to compile invite list for Malkin presentation
i. Date and location TBD.
2. Steve will pick a date for presentation on co-gen on fuel cells. Bruce Becker speaker (happy to change time).
3. PS to follow up with Dan Watson

6. **Adjourn**-