

By Lew Hinkle P.E. and Dave Metzger P.E.

Why we do what we do?

<u>Sizing</u>

Selection Type



Efficiency/Financial



MG Energy Group 100 West 6th Street Mansfield, Ohio 44902

CHILLER TYPES



Air Cooled Scroll



Air Cooled Screw



Water Cooled Scroll



Water Cooled Screw

Chiller Types



Air Cooled Centrifugal (Magnetic Bearing Chiller)



Water Cooled Centrifugal (Magnetic Bearing Chiller)



Water Cooled Centrifugal Chiller (Non-Magnetic Bearing Chiller)

Chiller Relative Costs and Efficiency

Each design decision has first-cost implications. Because of this complexity, products on the market have a wide variety of performance characteristics. The following discussion and comparison chart lay out the broad performance and efficiency issues and provide information that will help in selecting the appropriate equipment for the job.

Chiller Type	Capacity ⁽¹⁾ Range (tons)	First Cost ⁽²⁾ Range (\$/ton)	COP Range	IPLV Range (COP)
Reciprocating/Scroll	50 - 230 (400)	\$200 - \$250	4.2 - 5.5	4.6 - 5.8
Screw	70 - 400 (1250)	\$225 - \$275	4.9 - 5.8	5.4 - 6.1
Centrifugal	200 - 2000 (10,000)	\$180 - \$300	5.8 - 7.1	6.5 - 7.9
Single-Effect Absorption	100 - 1700	\$300 - \$450	0.60 - 0.70	0.63 - 0.77
Double-Effect Absorption	100 - 1700	\$300 - \$550	0.92 - 1.20	1.04 - 1.30
Engine Driven	100 - 3000 (10,000)	\$450 - \$600	1.5 - 1.9	1.8 - 2.3

⁽¹⁾ Capacities in parentheses are maximum sizes available

(2) First cost includes allowance for contractor mark-ups

Chiller Case Comparison

QUANTECH EER 9.7 IPLV=1.2369KW/Ton 170 tons \$62,000

Performance at AHRI Conditions								
Evaporator	Data	Condense	er Data	Performance Data				
EWT ("F)	54.00	Ambient Temp. (*F)	95.0	EER (Btu/W-h)	9.701			
LWT (*F)	44.00	Altitude (ft)	0.000	IPLV.IP (Btu/W-h)	15.47			
Flow Rate (USGPM)	404.9			Net Cooling Capacity (ton R)	169.6			
Pressure Drop (ft H2O)	21.9							
Fluid	Water							
Fouling Factor (h.ft*.F/Btu)	0.000100							
Fluid Volume (USGAL)	10.04							

SMARDT EER 23.48 IPLV = .5111 KW/ton 170 tons \$135,000

IPLV : 0.5111 kW/tonsR (EER 23.48 (Btu/W*h))

% Load	Capacity	Pert	kW	Fan kW	Fan Speed	Chw Flow	Chw In	Chw Out	Ambient
100	170.0	1.017	172.9	18.79	100%	406.2	54.00	44.00	95.0
75	127.5	0.7276	92.77	10.74	82%	406.2	51.50	44.00	80.0
50	85.00	0.4574	38.88	4.690	62%	406.2	49.00	44.00	65.0
25	42.50	0.3110	13.22	1.630	43%	406.2	46.50	44.00	55.0















Ohio Code 3318-3-03

- 3318-3-03 Requirements.
- (A) All new construction, renovation, repairs, and replacements of state funded facilities shall
- employ cost-effective, energy-efficient, green building practices to the maximum extent possible.
- (B) Each state agency shall:
- (1) Design and construct state funded facilities achieving the following minimum standards:
- (a) New construction shall be designed so that the fossil-fuel, greenhouse gas emitting,
- · energy consumption of the facility is reduced, as compared to the regional average for
- that building type as defined in CBECS, by the percentage specified as follows:
- (i) Fifty per cent for designs completed on and after February 16, 2010;
- (ii) Sixty-five per cent for designs completed on and after January 1, 2015;
- (iii) Eighty per cent for designs completed on and after January 1, 2020;
- (iv) Ninety per cent for designs completed on and after January 1, 2025; and
- (v) One-hundred per cent for designs completed on and after January 1, 2030.
- (b) Renovation projects shall be designed so that the fossil-fuel, greenhouse gas
- emitting, energy consumption of the facility is reduced, as compared to the regional
- average for that building type as defined in CBECS, by fifty per cent.

Ohio Code 3318-3-03

- 3318-3-04 Procedures and guidelines for new and renovated facilities.
- (A) During the facility's preliminary schematic design stage, a state agency shall require the
- designer to:
- (1) Develop practical alternative design concepts, considering passive and/or active
- building components, for the purpose of minimizing future energy consumption.
- (2) Estimate the annual energy consumption and associated energy costs of each
- · alternative, analyze their impact on facility life-cycle costs and incorporate into the final
- facility design alternatives which are cost effective.
- (3) Re-evaluate life-cycle cost as additional alternatives to be considered during the
- continuing design development to assure their cost effective implementation.
- (B) The energy consumption calculations shall be performed in accordance with
- established engineering practices and currently accepted methodology including
- computerized simulation techniques approved by the Ohio facilities construction
- commission.
- Effective: 1/10/2016
- Five Year Review (FYR) Dates: 10/26/2015 and 01/10/2021
- Promulgated Under: 119.03 Statutory Authority: 123.21, 123.22(D) Rule Amplifies: 123.22 Prior Effective Dates: 12/30/1980, 02/16/2010, 4/2/2012
- •

CHILLER LIFE CYCLE ANALYSIS

Courthouse & Park Building Chiller Replacement Projects

		Courthouse & Par	k Building Chiller F	Projects Bid Sheet		
Courthouse Chiller Bide	Bid Package #1	Bid Package #1	Bid Package #2	Bid Package #2	Bid Package #2	
Courthouse Chiller Blus	Smardt Chiller	Add/Deduct	Add/Deduct	Add/Deduct	Add/Deduct	
	315,230.00	11.850.00	-84.030.00	-71,730.00	11,850.00	
Standard Plumbing & Heating	334,910.00	10,185.00	-70,000.00	-55,000.00	17,000.00	
Universal	360,000.00	5,500.00	-105,000.00	-95,000.00	5,500.00	
H & A Mechanical						
	Base Bid	Unit Price	Alternate Jace			
ParkBuilding Chiller Bids	Dunham Bush	York/Johnson	System Extension			
the second second second second second		Add/Deduct	Add/Deduct			
	172,100.00	6,000.00	7,705.00			
Standard Plumbing & Heating	165,138.00	8,400.00	21,000.00			
Universal	190,000.00	5,000.00	6,700.00			
H & A Mechanical						
		Courthouse & Pa	ark Building Chiller	Project Options		
	Option #1	Option #2	Option#3	Option #4	Option #5	Option #6
Courthouse Chiller Options	Smardt Chiller	Smardt Chiller with	Dunham Bush Chiller	Dunham Bush Chiller	York/Johnson Chiller	York/Johnson Chiller
•	Package Only	Vykon/Jace Controls	Package Only	with Jace Controls	Package Only	with Jace Controls
	315,230.00	327,080.00	231,200.00	243,050.00	243,500.00	255,350.00
Standard Plumbing & Heating	334,910.00	345,095.00	264,910.00	281,910.00	279,910.00	296,910.00
Universal	360,000.00	365,500.00	255,000.00	260,500.00	265,000.00	270,500.00
H & A Mechanical						
	Option #1	Option #2	Option#3	Option #4		
ParkBuilding Chiller Options	Dunham Bush Chiller	Dunham Bush Chiller	York/Johnson Chiller	York/Johnson Chiller		
ParkBuilding Chiller Options	Dunham Bush Chiller Package Only	Dunham Bush Chiller with Jace Extension	York/Johnson Chiller Package Only	York/Johnson Chiller with Jace Extension		
ParkBuilding Chiller Options Standard Plumbing & Heating	Dunham Bush Chiller Package Only 172,100.00	Dunham Bush Chiller with Jace Extension 179,805.00	York/Johnson Chiller Package Only 178,100.00	York/Johnson Chiller with Jace Extension 185,805.00		
ParkBuilding Chiller Options Standard Plumbing & Heating Universal	Dunham Bush Chiller Package Only 172,100.00 165,138.00	Dunham Bush Chiller with Jace Extension 179,805.00 186,138.00	York/Johnson Chiller Package Only 178,100.00 173,538.00	York/Johnson Chiller with Jace Extension 185,805.00 194,538.00		



MG Energy Group 100 West Sixth Street Mansfield, Ohio 44902 Office: (419) 522-2700 Fax: (419) 522-2730 Email: dmetzger@metzger-engineering.com

Richland Co. Courthouse Chiller & Condenser





Richland Co. Courthouse Chiller & Condenser –180 Nominal Tons





Chiller Performance and Modeling with Carrier HAP Software

📸 Chiller Properties - [Sample]

	General			Design Inputs				Performance			
_	Cooling	Mode									
					Input Powe	er [kW/Ton]					
	ECWT	Max Cap	100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%	40%	30%	Condenser Temp. Rows
	115.0	0.810	0.810	0.787	0.771	0.770	0.780	0.813	0.905	1.041	8
	100.0	0.705	0.705	0.684	0.672	0.671	0.677	0.708	0.788	0.910	
	90.0	0.635	0.635	0.617	0.606	0.605	0.610	0.638	0.710	0.821	Part Load Columns
	85.0	0.600	0.600	0.583	0.573	0.572	0.576	0.603	0.671	0.777	10
	80.0	0.565	0.565	0.550	0.540	0.539	0.543	0.568	0.632	0.732	
	75.0	0.531	0.531	0.516	0.507	0.506	0.510	0.533	0.594	0.687	Deferments
	70.0	0.496	0.496	0.483	0.474	0.473	0.477	0.499	0.555	0.642	Performance
	60.0	0.427	0.427	0.415	0.408	0.407	0.410	0.429	0.478	0.553	
	•									E I	a = -0.00880 1/°F
											b = 0.00000 1/°F ²
											Capacity LCHWT
			Αι	ıto-Size	Capacity	Option i	s In Effe	ct.			Factors
											a = 0.00000 1/°F
											b = 0.00000 1/°F ²

 \times

Financial Analysis with Carrier Engineering Economic Software

	Lifecycle Summary	
oject: Richland County Courthouse Revis epared By: MG Energy Group	ed 3.75%	12/9/20 11:12:33 A
Part = 27	Simple Payback Analysis	
Type of Analysis Type of Design Alternative Length of Analysis Discount Rate	SPublic Se	ctor Lifecycle Analysis Mutually Exclusive 20 yrs
Total Present Worth (\$)	Annual Operating Cost (\$)	First Cost (\$)
DunhamBush-	DunhamBush-	DunhamBush-
Smardt-\$2,452,10	Smardt-\$115,200	Smardt-

Table 1. Executive Summary

Economic Criteria	Best Design Case for Each Criteria	Value (\$)
Incremental SIR Analysis	Court House Richland County Smardt Chiller	-
Lowest Total Present Worth	Court House Richland County Smardt Chiller	\$2,452,101
Lowest Annual Operating Cost	Court House Richland County Smardt Chiller	\$115,200
Lowest First Cost	Court House Richland County Dunham Bush	\$231,200

Table 2. Design Cases Ranked by First Cost

Design Case Name	Design Case Short Name	Total Present Worth (\$)	Annual Operating Cost (\$/yr)	First Cost (\$)
Court House Richland County Dunham Bush	DunhamBush	\$2,571,036	\$126,142	\$231,200
Court House Richland County Smardt Chiller	Smardt	\$2,452,101	\$115,200	\$315,230

Table 3. Incremental Analysis Data

Challenger	Base Case	Additional	NPW Savings	SIR	Payback
		First Cost (\$)	(\$)		Period (yrs)
Smardt [Winner]	DunhamBush	\$84,030	\$118,936	2.415	7.9

Wake Up, Time to Go Home But first ask a question or two

