
HEAT RECOVERY SYSTEMS & CHP

combined heat & power

Editor-in-Chief: **D. A. REAY**



PERGAMON



DOES POSTPONED RETROFITTING SAVE MONEY?

STIG-INGE GUSTAFSSON

IKP/Energy Systems, Institute of Technology, S 581 83 Linköping, Sweden

(Received 20 June 1994)

Abstract—When a building is to be retrofitted, or refurbished, it is always of importance to study the building as a complete energy system. At least in Sweden, the building process is divided between different professional categories, such as HVAC and ordinary building contractors. It is therefore not surprising that the HVAC contractor wants to maximise his profit by installing large and sophisticated equipment at the same time as the builder or architect wants to design a house with very thick walls and high performing windows. These competing interests will often result in a building where the heating system is not adjusted to the rest of the house, but is instead far too powerful. The recommendation from life-cycle cost analyses has therefore always been to study the building as a whole system and to apply an optimal solution at one specific base year; this is probably always the best solution in order to minimise the life cycle cost, but experience shows that the proprietor of the building often hesitates in doing so. The reason for this is his lack of money. Changing the building into an optimal energy system frequently requires a heavy investment in any one specific year, albeit the best solution in the long run. This paper will discuss what happens to the life-cycle cost when retrofits are postponed so as to fit into the proprietor's "10 yr budget".

INTRODUCTION

With the introduction of faster computers more interest has been focused on mathematical simulations of buildings and Life-Cycle Cost (LCC) calculations. One program for such calculations is called OPERA (Optimal Energy Retrofit Advisory) which is used for elaborating the optimal retrofit strategy for a multi-family building. The building is dealt with as an energy system and therefore building ventilation, as well as heating measures, are treated at the same time. The model, or program, has been described in international publications, see e.g. refs [1-4], and will therefore not be described in detail here. Instead, we will show how part of the calculations are elaborated and what happens to the LCC when different energy conserving measures are postponed from the base year, which is almost always assumed to be at the present time. In order to explain how the calculations are made an example is shown for a standard building, also used in ref. [4]. The building, which contains 14 apartments, is now heated by use of an oil boiler of 110 kW. The LCC for this existing building, when no retrofits at all are introduced except for those which are unavoidable, consists of the parts shown in Table 1. Eight Swedish Kronor, SEK, equal about one US dollar. Firstly, in Table 1, the salvage value for the existing boiler is shown. This value is now zero because the existing boiler is changed when it is worn out and must be replaced by a new one. In the standard building this will happen 5 yr from now.

A new boiler is assumed to cost $55,000 + 60 P$ SEK, where P equals the power of the boiler, which is 110 kW as above. Calculations of the heat needed in the building revealed that about 72 kW was sufficient. In the following LCC calculations this lower value is used instead. The cost for a new boiler is therefore 59,318 SEK. However, there is no need to install the new boiler now, and thus net present worth calculations must be used for finding the proper value of the invested money. In our example, the real interest rate equals 5% while the period of optimisation is 50 yr. It is also assumed that the boiler has a new life of 15 yr. The net present worth calculation for the boilers will therefore become

$$59,318 \times (1.05^{-5} + 1.05^{-20} + 1.05^{-35}) = 79,587 \text{ SEK.}$$

Compare this with the value found in Table 1. It is not possible to postpone this retrofit because the boiler is worn out at year number five. It is, however, possible to introduce the retrofit

Table 1. Details of the life-cycle cost for the existing standard building in kSEK

Salvage value for the old boiler	0
Unavoidable retrofit cost	408
New boiler cost	80
Energy cost	989
Total existing life-cycle cost	1477

earlier, for instance at this very moment. The new present worth calculation for that case will change to

$$59,318 \times (1.05^{-0} + 1.05^{-15} + 1.05^{-30} + 1.05^{-45} - 2 \times 1.05^{-50}/3) = 104,729 \text{ SEK.}$$

It is important to note that the existing boiler is taken out of operation before it is actually necessary, which implies that one third of the cost for a new boiler is still present, which equals 20,533 SEK. This cost is called the salvage cost. Here a boiler power of 110 kW has been used because that was the one actually installed. Introducing the boiler retrofit now will therefore lead to a significant increase of the net present cost, i.e. 46 kSEK, which must be balanced by the more efficient heating system.

It is also necessary to emphasise the term unavoidable retrofit cost, in Table 1. The building retrofit cost in OPERA has been divided into three parts, one part showing how much money must be spent if, for instance, the façade must be refurbished. This part does not include any cost for more insulation but rather demolition costs for the old façade, new surface costs, etc. The second part of the retrofit cost shows a step in the cost function when insulation measures are added and the third part shows how much the cost will increase when extra insulation is added. In Table 2 the unavoidable cost is shown in more detail.

As is found in Table 2 all but one retrofit must be dealt with immediately and that specific one does not have a cost component. It is therefore not possible to use the "standard" building as an example. In order to present an example, it is assumed that the external wall retrofit has 10 yr of existing life left. The unavoidable cost will thus decrease from 184,800 to 110,228 SEK. The total will likewise decrease to 333,060 SEK, as will the LCC in Table 1, to 1402 kSEK.

POSTPONING RETROFITS

First, consider what will happen when a retrofit is introduced at the base year, i.e. at this very moment. In the OPERA model, the optimal amount of extra insulation applied at the external wall has been calculated to be 0.07 m. The details of the LCC are shown in Table 3.

The new LCC in Table 3 for year number zero is lower than the one in Table 1 and therefore the retrofit is profitable. Note that the boiler cost has decreased, as well as the energy cost, due to less need for energy and power. However, the retrofit also introduced two new costs, i.e. the insulation cost and the salvage value for the existing external wall. Furthermore, the unavoidable cost has increased to its original value in Table 1. It is now interesting to examine the LCC if the retrofit is postponed by 1 yr. The unavoidable cost will decrease, as well as the insulation cost and the salvage value. At the same time the energy cost will increase but not enough to negate the cost savings. The LCC for the building with a postponed retrofit is therefore lower than the LCC for the base year retrofitted building. In this case it was thus an advantage to postpone the retrofit. The fact is that even if this retrofit is postponed to year number 10, the LCC for the total

Table 2. Unavoidable cost details in SEK for different retrofit measures

Retrofit type	Cost (SEK/m ²)	Area (m ²)	Existing life (yr)	New life (yr)	Present value (SEK)
Attic floor insulation	0.0	273.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Floor insulation	0.0	273.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
External wall insulation	300.0	616.0	0.0	50.0	184,800
Wall insulation, inside	50.0	616.0	0.0	0.0	30,800
Window retrofits, west	1100.0	75.6	0.0	30.0	99,984
Window retrofits, east	1100.0	69.6	0.0	30.0	92,048
Total					407,632

Table 3. Details of the LCC when 0.07 m extra insulation is applied to the external wall at the year number zero or year number one

	Year 0	Year 1
Unavoidable retrofit cost	407,632	398,510
Boilers cost	78,177	78,177
Energy cost	730,813	744,268
Insulation cost	209,440	199,101
Salvage value existing wall	36,960	33,264
Total	1,463,022	1,453,320

Table 4. LCC details for postponed retrofitting of 0.07 m extra external wall insulation to years number 10 and 11. Values in SEK

	Year 10	Year 11
Unavoidable retrofit cost	333,061	444,331
Boilers cost	79,000	79,000
Energy cost	839,910	848,179
Insulation cost	124,925	118,437
Salvage value existing wall	0.0	0.0
Total	1,376,896	1,489,947

optimisation period is lower than those found in Table 3. The LCC details for years number 10 and 11 are found in Table 4.

Some details from Table 4 must perhaps be clarified. The unavoidable cost increases rapidly between years number 10 and 11. This is so because the wall *must* be retrofitted at year number 10, resulting in a present value of 113,451 SEK. When the insulation is added at year number 11 the newly applied façade must be demolished again which, of course, results in a very high cost, calculated to be 108,048 SEK for the unavoidable part and 118,437 SEK for the actual insulation. In Table 2 it is shown that the unavoidable cost, external wall excluded, is 222,832 SEK. Adding the costs at years number 10 and 11 results in the value found on the first line in Table 4. The boiler cost has increased but this happened already at year number five because that was the year when the boiler had to be changed. If the wall was insulated before that year, a smaller boiler could have been chosen. The important thing to notice is, however, that it might be profitable to postpone retrofits until they must be applied for reasons other than energy conservation. Above, it was mentioned that an optimal level of extra insulation was 0.07 m. This amount has been calculated assuming a 50 yr optimisation period. When the retrofit is postponed by 10 yr, as shown above, a period of 40 yr would be more accurate; this will also imply that slightly less extra insulation should be added. Testing with 0.06 m of insulation shows that the LCC will increase, albeit by a very small amount. The influence of those far away years is, of course, very small due to the present value calculations.

CHANGING THE BOILER

Up to now only one, of several, possible heating systems has been tested. By postponing building retrofits the existing thermal power must be prevailed upon until the energy conservation measure actually occurs. This could be disadvantageous if very expensive heating systems are considered. If the building is of some size, say more than 20 apartments, our experience shows that so called bivalent, or dual fuel, heating systems are of interest. In a bivalent system a heat pump is supposed to take care of the base load, while an oil boiler provides the peak. When the energy retrofit is applied, the need for energy will get lower and therefore the boiler will be too large for some years, i.e. until the boiler is changed again. For the case we have examined, it seems that postponing retrofits is more profitable than choosing a boiler of the precise size. The situation could of course be different for other interest rates, insulation levels or escalating energy prices, just to mention a few varying input data.

In Sweden we have state-subsidised renovation loans. The proprietor will only pay a part of the interest rate if certain requests are fulfilled. One such request is that the building has not been renovated using the same type of loans for the last 30 yr. This design makes it very hard to achieve profitability for a postponed retrofit which otherwise would have been optimal.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper it is shown that postponing energy retrofits might result in a lower Life-Cycle Cost (LCC) compared to the scenario when all measures are applied at one specific year. If the proprietor on all occasions when a retrofit is necessary implements the optimal solution, i.e. chooses the optimal level of extra insulation, he will decrease the total LCC in certain steps. However, other circumstances, e.g. escalating energy prices, might change this situation. In Sweden there is a system of subsidised loans for building retrofits which will decrease the interest rate for all measures added

at the time of reconstruction. In such a case the best strategy will be to change the energy system in its entirety on one specific occasion.

REFERENCES

1. S. I. Gustafsson and B. G. Karlsson, Life-cycle cost minimization considering retrofits in multi-family residences. *Energy & Buildings* **14**, 9-17 (1989).
2. S. I. Gustafsson and B. G. Karlsson, Energy conservation and optimal retrofits in multi-family buildings. *Energy Systems Policy* **14**, 37-49 (1990).
3. S. I. Gustafsson and B. G. Karlsson, Natural gas in optimized bivalent heating systems. *Energy* **15**, 993-999 (1990).
4. S. I. Gustafsson, Life-cycle costing related to the refurbishment of buildings. In *Life-cycle Costing for Construction* (Edited by J. W. Bull), pp. 37-52. ISBN 0 7514 0056 4. Blackie, Glasgow, U.K. (1993).

CHANGING THE BOILER

Up to now only one of several possible heating systems has been taken into consideration. The existing thermal power plant is assumed to be replaced upon reconstruction. This could be disadvantageous if the existing boiler is replaced by a more efficient one. The building is of some size, say more than 30 apartments, and a separate boiler or dual fuel boiler system are of interest. In a dual fuel system a heat pump is suggested to take care of the base load, while an oil boiler provides the peak. When the energy retailer is replaced, the need for energy will get lower and therefore the boiler will be too large for some years. In this case the boiler is changed again. For the case we have examined, it seems that postponing a boiler replacement is more profitable than choosing a boiler of the present size. The situation could of course be different for different energy retailer levels or escalating energy prices. Just to mention a few saving input data for the case we have examined, the boiler was replaced in 1990. In Sweden we have state subsidised retrofits of houses. The program will only pay a partial of the cost if certain requirements are fulfilled. One such requirement is that the building has not been replaced using the energy performance for the last 10 years. This means that it is very hard to achieve profitability for a postponed retrofit which otherwise would have been optimal.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper it is shown that postponing energy retrofit might result in a lower life-cycle cost (LCC) compared to the scenario when all measures are applied at one specific year. In the present on all occasions. When a retrofit is necessary, implement the optimal solution. It is obvious that optimal level of extra insulation will decrease the total LCC in certain steps. However, other circumstances, e.g. escalating energy prices, might change this situation. In Sweden there is a system of subsidised loans for building retrofits which will decrease the interest rate for a retrofitted building.

CONTENTS

- P. H. G. ALLEN and
T. G. KARAYIANNIS
- R. BEST, W. RIVERA
and A. OSKAM
- R. BEST, W. RIVERA
and A. OSKAM
- R. BEST, W. RIVERA
and A. OSKAM
- J. C. HO, N. E. WIJEYSUNDERA,
S. RAJASEKAR and
T. T. CHANDRATILLEKE
- S.-I. GUSTAFSSON
- J. E. A. ROY-AIKINS
- A. R. LUKITOBUDI,
A. AKBARZADEH,
P. W. JOHNSON and P. HENDY
- S. V. KONEV, J. L. WANG
and C. J. TU
- Review Paper
- 389 Electrohydrodynamic enhancement of heat transfer and fluid flow
- 425 Thermodynamic design data for absorption heat pump systems operating on water-carrol. Part I: cooling
- 435 Thermodynamic design data for absorption heat pump systems operating on water-carrol. Part II: heating
- 445 Thermodynamic design data for absorption heat pump systems operating on water-carrol. Part III: simultaneous cooling and heating
- 457 Performance of a compact, spiral coil heat exchanger
- 469 Does postponed retrofitting save money?
- 473 An investigation of the factors that determine the attractiveness of cogeneration
- 481 Design, construction and testing of a thermo-siphon heat exchanger for medium temperature heat recovery in bakeries
- 493 Characteristics of a heat exchanger based on a collector heat pipe
- 503 Announcement
- I Software Survey Section



0890-4332(1995)15:5;1-0



Pergamon

HRSEQ 15(5) 389-504 (1995)

Indexed/Abstracted in: *Appl. Mech. Rev.*, *Res. Alert*, *Cam. Sci. Abstr.*,
Chemical Abstracts Service, *Curr. Cont./Eng. Tech. & Appl. Sci.*, *Curr. Tech. Ind.*,
EIC Intell., *Eng. Ind.*, *Metals Abstr.*, *Curr. Cont. SCISEARCH Data.*, *TCEA*