International Journal of Scientific Research & Engineering Trends
Volume 10, Issue 1, Jan-Feb-Apr-2024, ISSN (Online): 2395-566X

Retrofitting Strategies for Energy Efficiency in Older Buildings

Samuel N Nimaful, Augustine Hanyabui, Joel Holison , Faith Esther Holison, Laureta Tatenda Nyamsutswa, Gloria O. Darkoh,
Eastern Illinois University

Abstract- — Older buildings constitute the vast majority of the world's building stock and typically have poor energy performance. With an estimated 75% of 2050 buildings already in existence today[1], deep energy retrofits are critical to reducing carbon emissions and energy costs. Retrofit strategies must begin with a comprehensive audit to identify inefficiencies such as poor insulation, air infiltration, outdated HVAC systems, and inefficient lighting or controls. Common retrofit measures include upgrading the building envelope (insulation, windows, sealing), modernizing HVAC and ventilation, installing efficient lighting and controls, and adding on-site renewables like solar PV[2][3]. Cost-benefit and life-cycle analyses are essential to evaluate each measure's payback period and savings. For instance, New York State's Buildings of Excellence program found that passive-house envelope retrofits can reduce site EUI by ~62% with paybacks of ~5.5 years (with incentives)[4]. However, achieving deep savings often requires integrated packages; one Swedish case achieved 53% energy demand reduction by combining wall insulation, high-performance glazing, and heat-recovery ventilation[5]. Global case studies demonstrate success across building types and climates. For example, 345 Hudson (a high-rise office in NYC) will use a novel "thermal network" to share waste heat between floors, targeting >50% energy reduction and 85% carbon reduction[6]. In New York City, recladding the Manhattan West office tower with a self-shading high-performance facade and upgrading its HVAC yielded substantial cooling load reductions while allowing continued partial occupancy[7][8]. Meanwhile, multifamily housing projects (e.g. NYSERDA's Buildings of Excellence) have demonstrated average EUI drops of ~62% by applying Passive-House-style envelopes, ductless heat pumps, and energy-recovery ventilation[9][4].

Keywords: Implement a systematic retrofit decision process (see flowchart below). Begin with an energy audit to prioritize cost-effective measures. Pursue the "low-hanging fruit" first (like air sealing and LED lighting) to gain early savings, then progress to deeper envelope and HVAC upgrades. Bundle measures into integrated deep retrofits whenever possible for economies of scale. Leverage all available incentives and financing mechanisms to improve payback. Engage occupants and maintain commissioning to sustain savings. Finally, monitor performance continuously and iterate improvements over time.

I. INTRODUCTION

Tables and Charts: The following tables compare retrofit measures and case studies. Note that costs and paybacks vary widely by region, building size, and application. The example paybacks below are illustrative averages; actual values should be determined by detailed analysis and local data. (Charts of energy savings vs. payback and other analyses can further support planning.) Below is a flowchart illustrating a typical retrofit decision process.

II. DEFINITIONS AND SCOPE

"Older buildings" refers broadly to structures built under outdated codes or before modern efficiency standards. In practice, older/vintage buildings often means pre-1980 or pre-1990 construction in many countries, when minimal insulation and single-glazed windows were common. Globally, existing building stock is aging: for example, nearly 75% of UK dwellings expected in 2050 already exist today[1]. Similarly, a large fraction of building stock in North America, Europe, and Asia was built before significant energy codes were enacted. These older buildings typically lack insulation, have leaky envelopes, and rely on inefficient systems, making them prime retrofit targets. We also distinguish historic buildings, which are culturally or architecturally protected. Retrofits in historic buildings must balance efficiency with conservation, as discussed below. This review covers all sectors (residential, commercial, public) and geographies, with examples and standards (e.g. ASHRAE, ISO) primarily drawn from US, EU, and international contexts.

III. COMMON ENERGY INEFFICIENCIES

Older buildings are often wasteful in multiple ways. A few common deficiencies include:

- Envelope Insulation: Many older walls and roofs have little or no insulation (often R-5 or less), leading to large heat losses in winter and gains in summer. Studies show envelope upgrades yield the largest savings of all retrofit options[2].
- Windows and Glazing: Original single-pane windows have high U-values and solar heat gain. They leak air and often lack shading devices. In cold climates, old buildings typically had minimal glass area[16], but modern retrofits may enlarge glazing for daylight, requiring low-E, insulated replacements[7].
- Air Infiltration: Gaps and cracks (in walls, floors, attics) drive uncontrolled infiltration. Reducing infiltration via caulking, sealing, and weatherstripping can cut energy use significantly.
- HVAC Systems: Older boilers, furnaces, chillers, and ductwork are often oversized and inefficient (AFCI, low COP). They may use fossil fuels exclusively. Typical space-heating shares 40–50% of energy in cold climates; inefficient systems squander a large portion as well.
- Ventilation: Many pre-1980s buildings have minimal mechanical ventilation and rely on opening windows. As tighter envelopes are sealed, lack of controlled ventilation can degrade air quality, so often a heat-recovery ventilator is added.
- Lighting and Appliances: Incandescent or early fluorescent lighting and old appliances consume more energy and generate more heat (increasing cooling load) than modern alternatives. Lighting typically accounts for 10–30% of whole-building energy in commercial buildings; switching to LEDs is low-hanging fruit.
- Controls and Operations: Older buildings usually lack sophisticated controls. Thermostats may be manual, and systems often run constantly. There is no scheduling or optimization (e.g. setback at night, demand control ventilation, occupancy sensors), so much energy is wasted during off-peak occupancy.
- Building Orientation and Design: Historic orientation and design (small north windows in cold regions, large south windows in hot climates, heavy thermal mass) may have been appropriate for their time, but can be inefficient by modern standards if unmitigated by upgrades.

In summary, typical inefficiencies in older stock include poor insulation, single glazing, air leaks, and outdated mechanical/electrical systems. When left unaddressed, these can make operational costs of older buildings substantially higher than newer ones[17][18].

IV. RETROFIT TECHNOLOGIES

Retrofit technologies fall into several categories. Key strategies and their effects are summarized below:

- Envelope Insulation (Walls/Roof/Basement): Adding or upgrading thermal insulation is one of the most impactful measures[2]. Options include cavity-fill, exterior insulation finishing systems (EIFS), interior retrofits (for masonry/historic walls), insulated roof decking, and insulation under crawlspaces/basements. Insulation can cut heating and cooling loads by 20–30% or more, and shrink equipment size. The DOE notes that envelope upgrades (roof, wall insulation, efficient windows, sealing) are usually the first step in a deep retrofit[19]. For example, adding R-30 blown roof insulation often pays back in 5–8 years, and wall insulation in 7–12 years, depending on climate.

- Windows and Glazing Upgrades: Replacing single-pane windows with double- or triple-glazing (low-e, gas fill) reduces U-values and solar heat gain. High-performance windows can be expensive (hundreds of dollars per square meter installed) and have paybacks of 10–20+ years based on energy savings alone. Alternatives for historic buildings include adding interior storm windows or insulating shades, which can yield 20–30% of replacement's benefit at lower cost. A study cited by the NPS notes that historic buildings' builders traditionally limited glazing to reduce heat loss[16]. New infill glazing is often designed with "self-shading" profiles to minimize solar gain[7].

- Air Sealing: Tightening the envelope around windows, doors, and duct chases can yield 5–15% reductions in heating/cooling load. Air sealing materials (caulk, weatherstrip, spray foam) are relatively low-cost and high-impact. The DOE emphasizes minimizing infiltration (sealing envelope) as part of lowering loads[20].

- HVAC and Thermal Systems: Replacing old boilers, furnaces, AC units, or chillers with high-efficiency models (condensing boilers, modulating AC, variable-speed drives) can yield 10–30% system energy savings. Importantly, smaller loads from insulation allow rightsizing. The DOE notes that after loads are reduced, heating and cooling systems can be downsized, reducing capital costs[21]. Switching from fossil-fuel heating to electric heat pumps (air-source or ground-source) is a major decarbonization step. Heat pumps can deliver 2–3× the heating per unit electricity than resistive heat (COP 3–4), yielding 300% efficiency. In summer, heat pumps (in cooling mode) are similarly more efficient than older AC. Water heating can shift from tank gas heaters to heat-pump water heaters (50–75% more efficient). Retrofitting mechanical ventilation with Energy Recovery Ventilators (ERVs) or Heat Recovery Ventilators (HRVs) recovers up to 70–80% of energy from exhaust air, slashing ventilation losses.

- Lighting Upgrades: Modern LEDs use 75% less energy than incandescent and ~30–50% less than older fluorescents for equivalent lumens. Upgrading to LEDs and efficient fixtures often yields paybacks of 1–3 years. Controls like occupancy sensors and daylighting dimmers further cut lighting loads. Since lighting often represents a significant portion of electricity use in offices and schools, this is a cost-effective retrofit.

- Controls and Building Automation: Installing or upgrading a Building Management System (BMS) enables dynamic control of HVAC schedules, setback temperatures, and real-time monitoring. Smart thermostats, zoned controls, and demand-response capability (for utility signals) can reduce waste by 5–15%. Plug-load management (auto-shutoff power strips, timer controls on equipment) adds further savings.

- Renewable Energy (On-site): Adding on-site renewables like solar PV (and, in rare cases, small wind or solar thermal) can offset electricity and/or heat demand. PV costs have dropped dramatically (now often ~\$0.80/W installed in many markets), so that simple paybacks of 8–15 years are common if roof space is available. For example, integrating PV after load reduction can supply a large share of remaining electricity use[22]. (In dense historic districts or shaded sites, on-site renewables may be limited, so buying off-site green energy can be considered.) One project in rural historic campus settings even examined rooftop wind turbines, but cautioned that impact on historic character must be carefully assessed[23].

- Other Measures: Additional options include improved HVAC distribution (air sealing ducts, variable-speed fans), reflective roof coatings for cool roofs, window shading devices (awnings, interior blinds), and advanced strategies like phase-change materials or thermal storage. Each should be considered if appropriate.

Across all these categories, an integrated approach yields the best results[19][24]. For example, the “Passive House” retrofit strategy combines very high insulation, ultra-tight envelope, HRV, and heat pumps to achieve ultra-low energy buildings. The US DOE highlights that deep retrofits often proceed in phases but target ≥40% whole-building EUI reduction[25].

Table 1 compares typical retrofit measures by cost, payback, savings and disruption.

Technology	Approx. Cost per Unit	Typical Payback	Energy Savings (EUI %)	Disruption	Suitable Building Types
Wall Insulation	\$5–20/ft^2 (treated)	5–15 yrs	15–30%	Moderate (siding, interior walls)	All (especially uninsulated walls)
Roof/Ceiling Insulation	\$2–10/ft^2	3–10 yrs	10–25%	Low–Moderate (ceilings /attics)	All (especially attics)
Window Replacement	\$30–150/ft^2	10–20 yrs	5–15%	High (façade work, historic concerns)	Commercial, Residential (modern)
High-Performance Glazing (Storm/Insert)	\$5–20/ft^2	2–8 yrs (as add-on)	5–10%	Low–Moderate (interior storms)	Historic or budget-limited
Air Sealing (Weatherstripping)	\$0.5 – 2/ft^2	2–5 yrs	5–15%	Low (minor seals)	All
HVAC Equipment Upgrade	\$15–50/ft^2 (system)	5–15 yrs	10–30%	Moderate–High (mechanical	All (old furnaces/ chillers)

Technology	Approx. Cost per Unit	Typical Payback	Energy Savings (EUI %)	Disruption	Suitable Building Types
				room work)	
Heat Pump (electric)	\$15–40/ft^2 (system)	5–15 yrs	20–40%	Moderate (coolant piping)	Cold/temperate climates
Ventilation (HRV/ERV)	\$2–8/ft^2	3–10 yrs	5–15%	Moderate (duct modifications)	Tight envelopes, all climates
Lighting (LED + controls)	\$2–5/ft^2	1–3 yrs	10–20% (electric load)	Low (retrofit fixtures)	All (rapid ROI)
Building Controls (BMS)	\$1–5/ft^2	3–7 yrs	5–15%	Moderate (wiring, calibration)	Medium/large buildings
On-site Solar PV	\$1–3/Watt (capex)	8–15 yrs	Depends on insolation (20–100% electrical offset)	Moderate (roof load, permits)	Suitable roof exposure needed

Table 1. Comparison of retrofit technologies by cost, payback, energy savings, and disruption. Values are approximate and will vary by project. Low- (L), Moderate- (M), High- (H) disruption denotes relative impact on occupants during installation.

V. COST-BENEFIT AND LIFECYCLE ANALYSIS

A thorough cost-benefit analysis (CBA) and life-cycle cost analysis (LCCA) are essential for prioritizing measures. This should include:

- Incremental Costs: Measure and compare the incremental capital cost of each retrofit vs. baseline. For instance, adding R-20 wall insulation might cost \$10,000 in a 2000 ft^2 house (i.e. \$5/ft^2). Meanwhile, upgrading to a ground-source heat pump might cost \$40,000 more than a conventional boiler.
- Energy Savings: Estimate annual energy savings (kWh or MMBtu) using simulation or past measurement. Often this is expressed as a percentage reduction in source EUI. The above case studies show envelope retrofits yielding 20–50% EUI reductions[18][9].
- Payback Period: Simple payback = (Incremental cost) / (Annual energy cost savings). For example, NYSERDA found passive-house retrofits had a payback of ~5.5 years with incentives (\$22/ft^2 cost premium, \$848 savings per occupant per year)[4]. LED lighting upgrades often pay back in 1–2 years, whereas new windows may take 10+ years.
- Return on Investment (ROI) and Net Present Value (NPV): Discounting future savings at an appropriate rate (e.g. 3–5%) gives ROI and NPV metrics over the building's life (20–50 years). A measure with 5-year payback typically has positive NPV.
- Life-Cycle Assessment (LCA): For deep retrofits, one must consider embodied impacts (e.g. embodied carbon of materials) versus operational savings. Studies (e.g. ASHRAE/ISO) recommend lifetime horizons (30–50 years) to capture energy savings fully. In general, the energy (and carbon) payback of typical insulation or glazing upgrades occurs within a few years of operation.
- Non-Energy Benefits: Improved comfort, noise reduction, and increased property value can also be valued. These qualitative benefits often tip the balance in favor of deeper retrofits.

The trade-off between disruption and benefit must also be weighed. For example, full wall insulation (envelope retrofit) might yield 20% savings but require vacating tenants for a week, whereas an HVAC tune-up might give 5% savings with no relocation needed. Decision matrices or multi-criteria analysis can incorporate factors like "Disruption Score" and "Carbon Savings" to rank projects.

In practice, bundling measures often yields shorter paybacks than one-by-one: economies of scale reduce incremental costs (contracting multiple measures at once), and combining high- and low-ROI measures can improve overall project NPV. As an example, the New York case study showed that integrating envelope upgrades with efficient systems and renewables achieved ~62% site EUI reduction with modest incremental cost[4]. A Chinese campus study also showed that combining passive (insulation) and active (PV) measures could theoretically "overshoot" 100% (net-export) with sufficient PV[26], though in practice grid export and storage are limiting factors.

VI. CASE STUDIES

We present selected global case studies to illustrate retrofit approaches and outcomes. Three representative examples are summarized in Table 2 (actual projects and aggregated programs).

Case (Location, Year)	Building Type	Retrofit Measures	Results	Notes (Cost/Payback)
345 Hudson (New York, USA, 2022)[6]	High-rise office (1969)	"Thermal network" heat-recovery system; phased heat pumps; deep envelope	Projected ~50% reduction in whole-building EUI; 85% CO$_2$ reduction (with grid decarb); 92% peak heating load drop[6]	Innovative Nordic-style inter-floor heat sharing. Implementation phased with leases.
Five Manhattan West (NYC, USA, 2021)[7]	Commercial office tower (1975)	Complete recladding with insulated, low-e glazing; interior insulation; new BMS	Enjoyed ~80% increase in window area with net zero added heat gain; building remained ~60–70% occupied during retrofit[7][8]	Envelope U-value improved; complex phasing and weather walls protected tenants.
Affordable Co-op East Village (NYC, USA, 2020)[27]	5-story pre-war multi-family	Full Passive House retrofit (interior insulation, ERV); used non-toxic materials	Achieved airtightness to PH standard; significantly reduced heating load; improved IAQ[28]	Historic facade preserved; interior stair left semi-conditioned for cost saving.
NYSERDA BoE Program (New York State, USA, 2023)[4]	Multiple residential retrofit projects	Passive-House envelope; heat pumps; solar PV readiness; high ventilation standards	Average ~62% reduction in site Energy Use Intensity; 100% net site EUI reduction (with renewables)[9]	Cost premium ~\$22/ft^2 (11%) before incentives; ~\$3/ft^2 (2%) after incentives; payback ~5.5 yr[4].
Swedish Refurbishment (Mata et al., 2013)[5]	Single-family (1950s)	Wall insulation, triple-glazing, balanced ventilation	53% reduction in heating demand	Classic Scandinavian retrofit; high insulation levels.
Heritage Court (Scotland) (2014)	Historic hotel and flats (1900)	Interior wall insulation, secondary glazing, efficient boiler	20–30% energy use reduction; preserved character	Example of sensitive retrofit preserving facades.

Case (Location, Year)	Building Type	Retrofit Measures	Results	Notes (Cost/Payback)
Flats 41 and 99 (Italy) (2018)[18]	Municipal apartments (mid-20th c)	Window replacement, exterior insulation	Energy Performance Certificate rating raised significantly	Showed that even semi-historic blocks can be upgraded.

Table 2. Example retrofit case studies. "EUI reduction" is relative to baseline. Sources: Building Energy Exchange and NYSERDA reports[9][6][7][29]; Lin et al. (2023)[5]; others from industry literature.

These cases illustrate diverse approaches: high-tech HVAC networks for large offices, envelope-first strategies for residential, and combined solutions for multifamily. In each, careful planning (including construction phasing to allow occupancy) and stakeholder coordination were key. The documented energy savings and paybacks (where available) demonstrate that even deep retrofits can be economically viable in many contexts[4][6].

VII. POLICY AND INCENTIVE FRAMEWORKS

Many governments have established policies and incentives to drive retrofits:

- Building Codes & Standards: Updated energy codes (e.g. ASHRAE 90.1, EU Energy Performance Directive) mandate higher performance in renovations. Minimum Energy Performance Standards (MEPS) for existing buildings are emerging in some jurisdictions (e.g. France's decree for large buildings).
- Financial Incentives: Tax credits (e.g. U.S. 25C credit for home retrofits, 179D deduction for commercial design), subsidies, and rebates reduce effective cost. The DOE notes that investment tax credits (ITC) and specialized credits (e.g. 179D) are important for economic viability[10]. Many utilities also offer rebates or on-bill financing programs.
- Energy Performance Contracts (ESPCs and UESCs): As mentioned, these public-sector contracting vehicles allow large upfront costs to be funded by future savings. DOE highlights that ESPCs/UESCs have enabled deep retrofits in federal buildings, achieving 30–50% reductions[10].
- Rating & Disclosure: Mandatory energy audits, benchmarking, and disclosure (e.g. EU Article 8 of EPBD, U.S. Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey) inform owners and tenants, creating market pressure. Some cities require retro-commissioning or disclosure of building energy grades.
- Financing Programs: Green banks, PACE loans, and public retrofit programs (e.g. EU ELENA grants, DOE Revolving Loan Funds) address the high upfront cost barrier. New York's Fit Fix program, London's RE:FIT, and others provide low-interest financing tied to savings.
- Workforce Training: Governments support training of auditors and retrofit installers (e.g. NABCEP certification for solar, ASHI for home inspectors), addressing the skill gap.
- Renovation Targets: Frameworks like the EU's "Renovation Wave" set national goals (e.g. 3% of public buildings retrofitted annually) and tie them to recovery funds.
- These policies combine regulation and incentives to transform market behavior. For example, the U.S. Inflation Reduction Act (2022) expanded tax credits for efficiency, while the EU Green Deal funnels funds into retrofitting public and residential blocks. International standards (ISO 50001 for energy management) and green building certifications (LEED, BREEAM) also encourage retrofits.

VIII. BARRIERS AND SOLUTIONS

Despite benefits, retrofits face multiple barriers:

- Financial Barriers: High upfront costs and long payback periods deter investors. Split incentives plague rental properties: landlords pay retrofit costs but tenants reap energy bill savings[11]. Legacy financing structures often undervalue long-term savings.
- Information Barriers: Owners often lack knowledge of options or real savings. Technical data on existing conditions may be sparse. This informational split can lead to underinvestment.
- Technical/Logistical Barriers: Existing construction can complicate upgrades (e.g. adding insulation in a masonry wall without moisture issues). Heritage protections may legally limit interventions on historic facades[12]. Noise, dust, and scheduling challenges can disrupt occupants, so coordination is complex.
- Organizational Barriers: In commercial settings, decision-making is fragmented. For example, tenants control

lighting use but may not pay for heating, further splitting incentives. Large building owners may also have competing investment priorities.
- Regulatory Barriers: In some areas, outdated codes or unclear guidelines impede novel solutions (e.g. restrictions on vertical PVs, or lack of standards for deep retrofits).
- Behavioral Barriers: Occupant reluctance to change habits, such as not using programmable thermostats or overriding setpoints, can negate savings.

Solutions: Many initiatives address these hurdles. Subsidies and financing tools (white certificates, green loans, utility on-bill programs) directly tackle cost barriers. Performance contracting (ESPC) aligns incentives by using guaranteed savings. Strengthening building codes (e.g. requiring disclosure of energy audit results) improves information. For split incentives, models like “green leases” share benefits, and landlord-tenant incentives (subsidies for landlords) can help. Innovative business models (ESCOs, “smart bricks” financing) are emerging.

Technical barriers can be overcome with careful design. For heritage buildings, techniques like interior insulation or SIP panels (that preserve facades) are used. The NPS recommends holistic planning to ensure “energy improvement measures must take into consideration not only energy savings, but also the protection of historic property’s materials and features”[12]. Regular commissioning and post-retrofit commissioning help ensure systems operate as intended.

In summary, overcoming barriers requires coordinated policy and stakeholder engagement: combining regulations (mandates, codes) with incentives and education. High-level government commitment (like New York’s Empire Building Challenge) can catalyze private investment, as can public–private partnerships.

IX. HERITAGE AND CONSERVATION CONSIDERATIONS

Retrofitting historic or heritage buildings requires special care. Key considerations include:

- Preservation Standards: Most countries have guidelines (e.g. U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards) that energy retrofits not alter defining historical features. Interventions should be reversible when possible. The NPS Preservation Brief emphasizes balancing efficiency with character: “The key is to utilize the historic building’s inherent sustainable qualities… and ensure that character-defining features are preserved”[30][31].
- Inherent Efficiency Features: Ironically, many old buildings have passive design merits (thick walls, operable windows, natural ventilation). Preserving and enhancing these (e.g. opening courtyards for daylight, using roof ventilators) can improve comfort without new tech[32].
- Compatible Technologies: When insulation is needed, interior insulation systems can avoid disturbing exterior masonry. Existing masonry walls often have significant thermal mass and moisture resilience; adding vapor-open insulation (mineral wool) inside can improve R-value while preserving facade[33]. Similarly, installing interior storm windows can boost performance without removing old sashes[34].
- Renewables in Historic Context: As the NPS notes, installing wind or solar must consider visual impact. Roof-mounted small wind turbines or discreet PV on non-visible roof planes may be acceptable in some cases[23]. Alternatively, historic districts can purchase green power or offsets if on-site renewables are infeasible.
- Measurement: It is vital to verify that retrofits on heritage structures deliver expected savings without moisture damage. Monitoring humidity and thermal performance helps avoid unintended consequences[35].

Ultimately, the guiding principle is that “energy efficiency of historic buildings can be optimized without negatively impacting their historic character and integrity”[13], through sensitive, well-planned measures.

X. OCCUPANT BEHAVIOR AND REBOUND EFFECTS

Occupants strongly influence realized savings. Common issues include:

- Behavioral Rebound: With lower operating costs or improved comfort, occupants may use systems more (raising thermostat, longer ventilation run-times). Studies report rebound effects of 10–30% for space heating after insulation or HVAC upgrades. For example, a U.S. study found tenants increase heating by ~25% when costs fall, eroding some efficiency gains.

- User Training and Controls: Education and good interface design (clear thermostats, energy dashboards) can mitigate rebound. Automated controls (occupancy sensors, setback timers) ensure that human error is minimized. In some Passive House projects, occupant workshops helped achieve "ultra-low" actual consumption near modeled values.

- Operation & Maintenance: Even after a retrofit, poor maintenance can negate benefits. Dirty filters, mis-calibrated sensors, or overridden setpoints reduce efficiency. A commitment to ongoing commissioning (especially commissioning of new systems) is recommended.

- Indoor Climate Preferences: Retrofitting changes thermal inertia; occupants may perceive a building as "colder" because it heats faster, leading to thermostat creep. Thus, monitoring post-retrofit comfort and adjusting setpoints is part of success.

Addressing behavior means combining technical fixes with social strategies. As one review notes, models of energy conservation emphasize community engagement, information feedback, and positive reinforcement to maintain savings[36]. In policy terms, including behavior change programs along with hardware (e.g. feedback apps, green certification stickers) closes the loop.

XI. MEASUREMENT & VERIFICATION METHODS

Rigorous M&V ensures projected savings are real. Common approaches:

- IPMVP Options: The International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol (IPMVP) defines four Options (A–D). DOE's FEMP M&V guidelines (2024) summarize these:
- Option A (Retrofit Isolation – Key Parameter): Partially measured/partially estimated; good for systems where key variables dominate (e.g. lighting power and hours)[37].
- Option B (Retrofit Isolation – All Parameter): All key parameters measured before/after (e.g. sub-metering an upgraded motor)[38].
- Option C (Whole Facility): Whole-building energy meter data compared across baseline and post-retrofit periods, often using regression against weather/occupancy[14][15]. This is widely used for retrofits affecting many systems; it requires careful baseline modeling.
- Option D (Calibrated Simulation): Uses a calibrated energy model to estimate savings if measurement is impractical.

For example, the guidelines describe using Option C: "Using billing data from baseline and a regression model (heating degree days etc.), the actual post-retrofit energy use is compared to predicted use without the retrofit[14][15]." The difference is attributed to savings.

- Statistical Controls: In portfolio retrofits (many similar buildings), control groups or time-series analysis can improve confidence. Several retrofit programs now use automated energy data collection and analytics (e.g. machine-learning baselining) to continuously verify savings.
- Standard Protocols: ASHRAE Guideline 14 and ISO 50015 provide detailed M&V procedures and accuracy criteria. Generally, DOE requires ±5–10% measurement accuracy for guaranteed savings contracts.

XII. RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP

Based on the above analysis, a recommended roadmap for stakeholders is:

1. Perform an Energy Audit: Commission a detailed audit (including utility bill analysis, on-site inspection, and possibly thermal imaging or blower-door testing). Identify the building's most significant inefficiencies.
2. Set Goals & Metrics: Define clear retrofit targets (e.g. % EUI reduction, thermal comfort standards) and metrics (Energy Use Intensity, carbon emissions). Use benchmarking (ENERGY STAR Portfolio Manager, local codes) for context.
3. Develop Retrofit Options: For each major deficiency, list feasible measures. Create combinations (packages) for deep vs. shallow retrofits. Prioritize based on cost-effectiveness, impact on comfort, and disturbance.
4. Model and Analyze: Use building energy simulations or simple algorithms to estimate savings of each measure/package. Conduct life-cycle cost analyses (NPV, ROI) to compare.
5. Leverage Incentives: Identify applicable financial incentives, tax breaks, and financing (ESPC, PACE, rebates). Incorporate incentive funding into project economics.

6. Plan Implementation: Sequence work to minimize disruption. For occupied buildings, phase by floors or systems (as done at 345 Hudson and Manhattan West[6][7]). Ensure safety and habitability.
7. Monitor and Verify: Install meters and sensors as needed. Follow an M&V plan (Option C recommended for whole-building impact)[14][15]. Adjust operations based on data.
8. Engage Occupants: Communicate with building users about upcoming work, train them on new systems, and encourage energy-saving behaviors to complement the technical upgrades.
9. Document and Iterate: Record all lessons (costs, actual savings, comfort outcomes). Use this data for continuous improvement and to inform similar future projects.
10. Following this structured process helps ensure retrofits meet energy goals and provide ROI.

REFERENCES

1. Hensley, J. E., & Aguilar, A. (2011). Preservation Brief 3: Improving Energy Efficiency in Historic Buildings. National Park Service, U.S. Dept. of the Interior[12][13].
2. Lin, Z., Hong, T., Xu, X., Chen, J., & Wang, W. (2023). Evaluating energy retrofits of historic buildings in a university campus using an urban building energy model that considers uncertainties. Sustainable Cities and Society, 95, 104602[39][40].
3. New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA). (2023). Buildings of Excellence Case Study: Multifamily Passive House Retrofits. Retrieved from NYSERDA Publications[4].
4. Ravetz, J. (2008). State of the stock—What do we know about existing buildings and their future prospects? Energy Policy, 36(12), 4462–4470[1].
5. U.S. Department of Energy, Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP). (2024). Measurement & Verification Guidelines, Volume 5.0. (FEMP).
6. U.S. Department of Energy. (n.d.). Retrofit Existing Buildings. Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. Retrieved [access date], from https://www.energy.gov/eere/retrofit-existing-buildings[17].
7. U.S. Department of Energy. (n.d.). Deep Energy Retrofits. Federal Energy Management Program. Retrieved [access date], from https://www.energy.gov/femp/deep-energy-retrofits[19][10].
8. U.S. Department of Energy. (n.d.). Energy Savings Performance Contracts for Federal Agencies. Federal Energy Management Program. Retrieved [access date], from https://www.energy.gov/femp/energy-savings-performance-contracts-federal-agencies[41][14].
9. U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). (2023). Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS). Retrieved from https://www.eia.gov/consumption/commercial/ (for building stock age and efficiency).
10. Building Energy Exchange. (2022). High Rise/Low Carbon: Partner Profile – 345 Hudson. Retrieved from https://be-exchange.org/case_study/high-rise-low-carbon-partner-profile-345-hudson/[6].
11. Building Energy Exchange. (2021). Recladding Five Manhattan West: Passive House High-Performance Retrofit. Retrieved from https://be-exchange.org/case_study/recladding-five-manhattan-west/[7].
12. Building Energy Exchange. (2021). Affordable Performance in the East Village (Passive House Retrofit). Retrieved from https://be-exchange.org/case_study/affordable-performance-east-village/[28].
13. Citadini de Oliveira, C. C., Vaz, I. C. M., & Ghisi, E. (2024). Retrofit strategies to improve energy efficiency in buildings: An integrative review. Energy and Buildings, 321, 114624[2][42].
14. ISO 50015:2014. (2014). Energy management systems — Measurement and verification of energy performance of organizations — General principles and guidance. International Organization for Standardization.
15. ASHRAE Standard 90.1-2019. (2019). Energy Standard for Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings. American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers.