

for energy price escalation for the applicable region, sector, fuel type, and study period consistent with § 436.14, or as calculated by computer software provided or approved by DOE and used with the official discount rate and escalation rate assumptions under § 436.14. When energy costs begin to accrue at a later time, subtract the present value of energy costs over the delay, calculated using the adjusted, modified uniform present worth factor for the period of delay, from the present value of energy costs over the study period or, if using computer software, indicate a delayed beneficial occupancy date.

(c) Each Federal agency shall establish water costs in the base year by multiplying the total units of water used in the base year by the price per unit of water in the base year as determined in accordance with § 436.14(c).

(d) When water costs begin to accrue in the base year, the present value of water costs over the study period is the product of water costs in the base year as established under § 436.17(a), or as calculated by computer software provided or approved by DOE and used with the official discount rate and assumptions under § 436.14. When water costs begin to accrue at a later time, subtract the present value of water costs over the delay, calculated using the uniform present worth factor for the period of delay, from the present value of water costs over the study period or, if using computer software, indicate a delayed beneficial occupancy date.

[55 FR 48220, Nov. 20, 1990, as amended at 61 FR 32650, June 25, 1996]

§ 436.18 Measuring cost-effectiveness.

(a) In accordance with this section, each Federal agency shall measure cost-effectiveness by combining cost data established under §§ 436.16 and 436.17 in the appropriate mode of analysis as described in § 436.19 through § 436.22.

(b) Federal agencies performing LCC analysis on computers shall use either the Federal Buildings Life Cycle Costing (FBLCC) software provided by DOE or software consistent with this subpart.

(c) Replacement of a building energy or water system with an energy or water conservation measure by retrofit to an existing Federal building or by substitution in the design for a new Federal building shall be deemed cost-effective if—

(1) Life cycle costs, as described by § 436.19, are estimated to be lower; or

(2) Net savings, as described by § 436.20, are estimated to be positive; or

(3) The savings-to-investment ratio, as described by § 436.21, is estimated to be greater than one; or

(4) The adjusted internal rate of return, as described by § 436.22, is estimated to be greater than the discount rate as set by DOE.

(d) As a rough measure, each Federal agency may determine estimated simple payback time under § 436.23, which indicates whether a retrofit is likely to be cost effective under one of the four calculation methods referenced in § 436.18(c). An energy or water conservation measure alternative is likely to be cost-effective if estimated payback time is significantly less than the useful life of that system, and of the Federal building in which it is to be installed.

(e) Mutually exclusive alternatives for a given building energy or water system, considered in determining such matters as the optimal size of a solar energy system, the optimal thickness of insulation, or the best choice of double-glazing or triple-glazing for windows, shall be compared and evaluated on the basis of life cycle costs or net savings over equivalent study periods. The alternative which is estimated to result in the lowest life cycle costs or the highest net savings shall be deemed the most cost-effective because it tends to minimize the life cycle cost of Federal building.

(f) When available appropriations will not permit all cost-effective energy or water conservation measures to be undertaken, they shall be ranked in descending order of their savings-to-investment ratios, or their adjusted internal rate of return, to establish priority. If available appropriations cannot be fully exhausted for a fiscal year by taking all budgeted energy or water conservation measures according to their rank, the set of energy or water

§ 436.19

conservation measures that will maximize net savings for available appropriations should be selected.

(g) Alternative building designs for new Federal buildings shall be evaluated on the basis of life cycle costs. The alternative design which results in the lowest life cycle costs for a given new building shall be deemed the most cost-effective.

[55 FR 48220, Nov. 20, 1990, as amended at 61 FR 32650, June 25, 1996]

§ 436.19 Life cycle costs.

Life cycle costs are the sum of the present values of—

(a) Investment costs, less salvage values at the end of the study period;

(b) Non-fuel operation and maintenance costs:

(c) Replacement costs less salvage costs of replaced building systems; and

(d) Energy and/or water costs.

[55 FR 48220, Nov. 20, 1990, as amended at 61 FR 32651, June 25, 1996]

§ 436.20 Net savings.

For a retrofit project, net savings may be found by subtracting life cycle costs based on the proposed project from life cycle costs based on not having it. For a new building design, net savings is the difference between the life cycle costs of an alternative design and the life cycle costs of the basic design.

§ 436.21 Savings-to-investment ratio.

The savings-to-investment ratio is the ratio of the present value savings to the present value costs of an energy or water conservation measure. The numerator of the ratio is the present value of net savings in energy or water and non-fuel or non-water operation and maintenance costs attributable to the proposed energy or water conservation measure. The denominator of the ratio is the present value of the net increase in investment and replacement costs less salvage value attributable to the proposed energy or water conservation measure.

[61 FR 32651, June 25, 1996]

10 CFR Ch. II (1–1–01 Edition)

§ 436.22 Adjusted internal rate of return.

The adjusted internal rate of return is the overall rate of return on an energy or water conservation measure. It is calculated by subtracting 1 from the n th root of the ratio of the terminal value of savings to the present value of costs, where n is the number of years in the study period. The numerator of the ratio is calculated by using the discount rate to compound forward to the end of the study period the yearly net savings in energy or water and non-fuel or non-water operation and maintenance costs attributable to the proposed energy or water conservation measure. The denominator of the ratio is the present value of the net increase in investment and replacement costs less salvage value attributable to the proposed energy or water conservation measure.

[61 FR 32651, June 25, 1996]

§ 436.23 Estimated simple payback time.

The estimated simple payback time is the number of years required for the cumulative value of energy or water cost savings less future non-fuel or non-water costs to equal the investment costs of the building energy or water system, without consideration of discount rates.

[61 FR 32651, June 25, 1996]

§ 436.24 Uncertainty analyses.

If particular items of cost data or timing of cash flows are uncertain and are not fixed under § 436.14, Federal agencies may examine the impact of uncertainty on the calculation of life cycle cost effectiveness or the assignment of rank order by conducting additional analyses using any standard engineering economics method such as sensitivity and probabilistic analysis. If additional analysis casts substantial doubt on the life cycle cost analysis results, a Federal agency should consider obtaining more reliable data or eliminating the building energy or water system alternative.

[55 FR 48220, Nov. 20, 1990, as amended at 61 FR 32651, June 25, 1996]