

DEEP Comments and questions on NMR GSHP study
1/15/14

1. A November 2012 CEEF Evaluation Consultant status report indicates that CEEF's study cost was \$168,942. Provide the most recent estimate of CEEF's cost of the study. What was the total cost of the study?
2. ES, p. 1. Why wasn't CEEF cost effectiveness of the GSHP program included in the study questions? Were data collected to calculate program cost effectiveness and payback? If so, the results should be reported.
3. ES, pp. I and II and Section 1.2.5.1, p. 26. The Executive Summary doesn't explain why CEFIA and CEEF claimed different baselines. The body of the study does not clarify this. The rationale for selecting different baselines should be explained. Also, the consequence of selecting different baselines should be clarified, i.e., is there an effect in terms of program implementation (project selection) or impact on project cost effectiveness or savings impact results?
4. ES, p. III. Provide more context to and explanation of the energy and demand savings. The numbers are reported as gross savings in Tables ES-1, ES-2, and ES-3. However, is the gross savings, or is it the net savings -- which takes into account the electricity used to run the GSHP system, and net-to-gross effects -- that is the more relevant metric? Tables ES-1, ES-2, and ES-3 display the data on energy and savings, but the report should provide context to the impact of a GSHP. It should report and explain the percent reduction energy and demand and the bill impact on a typical customer.
5. ES, pp. 12 and 13. All of the recommendations are in regard to process and program implementation; no recommendations follow from results on savings impact. Given the findings on energy and demand savings, low net-to-gross ratio and the cessation of CEFIA funding, does NMR/KEMA have any recommendations?