

# Life Cycle Costing

will justify the Simple Saver System

Savings in heating, cooling or a combination of both will generally justify the added cost of the Simple Saver System when compared to lower performing systems that are installed over-the-purlins.

With today's high cost of energy and potential continued increases in the future owners designers and builders are focusing their attention on designing more energy efficient metal buildings. By using the Simple Saver System it is possible to design/build a pre-engineered metal building that is truly energy efficient. No longer do your metal building projects have to carry the reputation of being cold in the winter and hot in the summer.

## The real **Bonuses** come from the trade-offs

Simple Saver System is seldom higher priced when compared on an installed R-value basis. It is never higher priced when "Project Cost Trade-offs" are available and taken into consideration to offset the cost difference.

Below are some project cost trade-offs and a range of their values.

* Mechanical Equipment reductions/savings	Range \$.30 - \$1.00 / s.f.
* Through Fall Protection (OSHA accepted)	Range \$.20 - \$.35 / s.f.
* Painting/Finishing Savings (Purlins encapsulated)	Range \$.25 - \$.45 / s.f.
* Standing Seam Roof Savings (low clip detail)	Range \$.05 - \$.15 / s.f.
* Lighting & Acoustic Treatment Savings	Range \$.00 - \$1.00+ / s.f.
* Suspended Ceiling System (Replace - if applicable)	Range \$1.50 - \$3.00 / s.f.

As you can see from the above display, the Simple Saver System could actually provide enough project cost trade-offs to cover the entire installed cost difference. If all of the cost difference can be covered by trade-offs, then 100% of the annual energy savings can be added to owner profit for the life of the building. We recognize that not all projects involve enough trade-offs to cover the entire difference. However, some trade-offs are usually applicable thus shortening the payback period derived from energy savings.

Seldom does something that first appears to cost more actually have the potential to cost very little more, about the same or even less...before needing to look at the value of life cycle costing to justify its use.