



US Army Corps  
of Engineers


Engineer Research and  
Development Center

CERL Technical Report 99/95  
December 1999

# Performance Analysis of Natural Gas Cooling Technology at Air Force Bases

Youngstown-Warren ARS and Warner-Robins AFB, Fiscal Year 1999

William T. Brown, III



High-efficiency gas-fired cooling equipment is readily available for commercial, institutional, and industrial facilities. Natural gas engine-driven chillers have higher coefficients of performance than any other natural gas cooling system, and can serve as energy efficient alternatives for new electric chillers. This study monitored the performance of natural gas cooling technologies operating at two Air Force bases during the fiscal year 1999 cooling season and compared the actual performance data to theoretical values.

Energy and demand cost analyses were performed to compare each natural gas cooling technology with the energy and demand costs of old and new electric chillers. The study determined that, at the monitored bases, the costs for the natural gas used by the engine-driven chillers were lower than electrical costs used by old and new electric chillers, resulting in an energy cost savings.

19991220 017



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers**  
Engineer Research and  
Development Center

CERL Technical Report 99/95  
December 1999

---

# **Performance Analysis of Natural Gas Cooling Technology at Air Force Bases**

**Youngstown-Warren ARS and Warner-Robins AFB, Fiscal Year 1999**

William T. Brown, III

## Foreword

This study was conducted for the Headquarters, Air Force Civil Engineer Support Agency (HQ AFCESA), under Military Interdepartmental Purchase Request (MIPR) No. N28FY97000081, Work Unit VR7, "Natural Gas Cooling Technology Program." The technical monitor was Freddie Beason, and the contract monitor was Rich Bauman, AFCESA/CESM.

The work was performed by the Energy Branch (CF-E) of the Facilities Division (CF), Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (CERL). The CERL Principal Investigator was William T. Brown, III. Larry Windingland is Chief, CF-E, and Dr. L. Michael Golish is Chief, CF. The technical editor was William J. Wolfe, Information Technology Laboratory - CERL.

The Director of CERL is Dr. Michael J. O'Connor.

### DISCLAIMER

The contents of this report are not to be used for advertising, publication, or promotional purposes. Citation of trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial products. All product names and trademarks cited are the property of their respective owners.

The findings of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

**DESTROY THIS REPORT WHEN IT IS NO LONGER NEEDED. DO NOT RETURN IT TO THE ORIGINATOR.**

# Contents

<b>Foreword.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>List of Figures and Tables.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Background .....	5
Objective .....	7
Approach .....	7
Units of Weight and Measure .....	8
<b>2 Review of Natural Gas Cooling Performance Analysis.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Data Points Required to Monitor for Performance Analysis.....	9
Performance Analysis Calculations .....	9
<i>Chiller Capacity</i> .....	9
<i>Coefficient of Performance</i> .....	9
<i>Energy and Demand Cost Analysis Calculations</i> .....	10
<b>3 Results of Performance Analysis.....</b>	<b>12</b>
Overview of Air Force Facilities Monitored.....	12
<i>Youngstown-Warren ARS, OH</i> .....	12
<i>Warner-Robins AFB, GA</i> .....	12
Comparison of Design and Actual Values .....	13
<i>Results from Youngstown-Warren ARS</i> .....	13
<i>Results from Warner-Robins AFB</i> .....	15
<b>4 Conclusion and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>21</b>
Conclusion.....	21
Recommendations .....	22
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix: Gas Cooling Analysis .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Abbreviations and Acronyms .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Distribution.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Report Documentation Page.....</b>	<b>37</b>

## List of Figures and Tables

### Figures

1	Gas engine-driven chiller. ....	6
2	Youngstown-Warren ARS chiller peak loads. ....	14
3	Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #5 peak loads. ....	16
4	Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #6 peak loads. ....	17
5	Example of peak shaving curve.....	22

### Tables

1	Youngstown-Warren ARS chiller results: demand charges. ....	13
2	Youngstown-Warren ARS Building 407 chiller ton-hours by ton range. ....	14
3	Cost comparison of old vs. new chillers, Youngstown-Warren ARS.....	15
4	Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #5 results. ....	16
5	Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #6 results. ....	16
6	Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #5 ton-hours by ton range. ....	17
7	Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #6 ton-hours by ton range. ....	18
8	Cost comparison of old vs. new chillers, Warner-Robins AFB. ....	20

# 1 Introduction

## Background

Under the Department of Defense (DOD) Natural Gas Cooling Demonstration Program, four Air Force bases have four natural gas engine-driven chiller systems currently in operation: Davis-Monthan Air Force Base (AFB), AZ; Utah Air National Guard (ANG), UT; Youngstown-Warren Air Reserve Station (ARS), OH; and Warner-Robins AFB, GA. Natural gas-fired cooling technology was chosen for these locations for the same reasons that natural gas cooling has become viable in the commercial market:

- the availability of a new generation of more efficient and reliable gas cooling products
- low natural gas prices
- the desire to cut energy costs and eliminate electric peak demand charges
- the desire to bring operating costs down
- the responsiveness to environmental calls to switch to cleaner, chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) free technologies
- the need to improve indoor air quality, economically
- the responsiveness to political calls to use an abundant fuel such as natural gas, 95 percent of which is produced domestically.

Currently, high-efficiency gas-fired cooling equipment is readily available for commercial facilities including hotels, office buildings, warehouses, supermarkets, and retail outlets; institutions including hospitals, nursing homes, and schools; and industrial facilities (American Gas Cooling Center, April 1996, p 7). The three types of natural gas cooling equipment presently on the market are: (1) natural gas engine-driven chillers, (2) absorption cooling systems, and (3) desiccant cooling systems. Of the three types, gas engine-driven chillers have the highest coefficients of performance (COPs) and, in many parts of the United States, have demonstrated the lowest total operating costs.

Engine driven chillers offer important advantages over electric hermetic and electric open drive chillers. The engine-driven chiller (Figure 1) is comprised of a reciprocating engine coupled through a gearbox to an open drive chiller. The electric motor of a hermetic chiller is totally enclosed within a compressor housing, and is cooled by the refrigerant.




Figure 1. Gas engine-driven chiller.

The additional heat load from the motor, when transferred to the refrigerant, adds 3 to 6 percent in energy consumption. In contrast, with an engine-driven chiller, most of the heat that is generated by the engine to drive the compressor can be recovered from the engine's jacket cooling and exhaust systems. This recoverable engine heat does not have to be discharged to the environment through the chiller's condenser (American Gas Cooling Center, April 1996, p 3).

Natural gas engine-driven chillers use three major types of compressors:

1. *Centrifugal* compressors are available for applications over 400 tons and have been built for systems up to 6,000 tons.
2. *Screw* compressors are used for applications from 100 to 4,000 tons.
3. *Reciprocating* compressors are typically applied to engine-driven systems requiring less than 200 tons (American Gas Cooling Center, April 1996, p 4).

Typical COPs of natural gas engine-driven chillers at full load range from 1.2 to 2.0 with no heat recovery, 1.5 to 2.25 with jacket water heat recovery, and from 1.7 to 2.4 with both jacket water and exhaust heat recovery. Heat recovery from the jacket coolant and exhaust gas will boost overall energy utilization (American Gas Cooling Center, April 1996, p 7).

On the other hand, since the majority of facilities in the United States have electric-driven chillers, personnel are already familiar with the maintenance procedures for electric-driven units. The introduction of gas cooling technology into these facilities will require retraining of personnel or the purchase of maintenance agreements. The costs of these agreements are usually a function of the chiller capacity. (Such agreements are not exclusive to gas engine-driven chillers and can also be purchased for electric-driven chillers.)

The maintenance cost of gas engine-driven chillers is somewhat more expensive than that of an electric-driven or absorption chillers, or desiccant dehumidifying systems. Annual maintenance costs are based on the annual equivalent full load hours of operation, maintenance costs, and chiller capacity. The maintenance costs of gas engine-driven chillers are approximately 1.5 to 3 times higher than their electric counterparts; the cost of absorption units and desiccant dehumidifying systems falling somewhere in between (Pedersen and Brown 1997).

The Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (CERL) was tasked with monitoring the performance of the natural gas technologies at each installation during two consecutive cooling seasons, and with comparing the actual performance data to theoretical values. As part of this monitoring effort, energy and demand cost analyses were performed to compare natural gas cooling technologies with the energy and demand costs of old and new electric chillers.

## Objective

The overall objective of this study was to monitor and report on the performance of natural gas cooling technologies at Air Force bases during the fiscal year (FY) 1999 cooling season. Specific objectives of this part of the monitoring effort were to perform energy and demand cost analyses to compare natural gas cooling technology at each Air Force base with the energy and demand costs of old and new electric chillers. This study is a follow-up to CERL Technical Report 99/14, *Performance Analysis of Natural Gas Cooling Technology at Air Force Bases*.

## Approach

CERL representatives were available to supervise and evaluate the acceptance testing results for the installed systems. Monitoring equipment was specified for each facility to record data for either 1 or 2 years. A Hayes-compatible modem was connected to a host computer workstation (at CERL) to enable communication between CERL and the remote computer (at the base). Certain types of



communications software (including HyperTerminal, SYNERNET™, METASYS™, ModemPro™, net files, etc.) were required to be installed on the host computer for compatibility with the appropriate remote computer workstation. The phone numbers and login access parameters for each of the remote sites were obtained during the acceptance testing visits. Technical and economic aspects of system performance were monitored remotely. Collected data were analyzed to evaluate the effectiveness of gas equipment at each demonstration site.

## Units of Weight and Measure

U.S. standard units of measure are used throughout this report. A table of conversion factors for International System of Units (SI) is provided below.

SI conversion factors			
1 in.	=	2.54 cm	1 cu ft = 0.028 m <sup>3</sup>
1 ft	=	0.305 m	1 cu yd = 0.764 m <sup>3</sup>
1 yd	=	0.9144 m	1 gal = 3.78 L
1 sq in.	=	6.452 cm <sup>2</sup>	1 lb = 0.453 kg
1 sq ft	=	0.093 m <sup>2</sup>	°F = (°C x 1.8) + 32
1 sq yd	=	0.836 m <sup>2</sup>	1 ton (refrigeration) = 3.516 kW
1 cu in.	=	16.39 cm <sup>3</sup>	

## 2 Review of Natural Gas Cooling Performance Analysis

### Data Points Required to Monitor for Performance Analysis

Data points used in monitoring the operation of chillers are best sampled every 15 minutes. The following data points are required to obtain a proper performance analysis for natural gas cooling equipment:

- chilled water supply (CHWS) temperature
- chilled water return (CHWR) temperature
- chilled water (CHW) flow in gallons per minute (gpm)
- natural gas flow rate in standard cubic feet per hour (SCFH).

The CHWS temperature, CHWR temperature, and CHW flow are used to calculate the chiller capacity in tons. Once the tons are calculated, the COP of the chiller can be calculated, given the flow rate and higher heating value (HHV) of natural gas (Brown 1998, p 5).

### Performance Analysis Calculations

#### *Chiller Capacity*

The capacity of a chiller, in tons, is determined by the following equation:

$$\text{Tons} = \frac{(\text{CHW Flow}) * (\text{CHWR Temp} - \text{CHWS Temp})}{24} \quad \text{Eq 1}$$

where CHWR Temp and CHWS Temp are expressed in degrees Fahrenheit (°F), and CHW Flow in gpm.

#### *Coefficient of Performance*

The COP of the chiller is the standard calculation for rating the performance of cooling equipment. COPs for engine driven chillers can be determined using the following equation:

$$\text{COP} = \frac{\text{Tons} * 12,000 \text{ BTU/ton-hr}}{\text{Natural Gas Flow (in SCFH)} * \text{HHV}} \quad \text{Eq 2}$$

where HHV is determined from a base gas bill.

### **Energy and Demand Cost Analysis Calculations**

Data was collected from each facility to indicate the peak tonnage produced by the engine-driven chillers each month and the number of hours at various average loads during the entire monitoring period. Peak monthly tonnage information is necessary to estimate the demand charges that would result if electric motor-driven chillers are used instead of natural gas engine-driven chillers. Load duration information is required to estimate energy costs.

If no ratchet is applied:

$$\text{Demand Cost} = \left( \frac{\text{Tons}_{\text{actual}}}{\text{Tons}_{\text{design}}} \right) * \left( \text{Tons}_{\text{actual}} * \left( \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{ton}} \right)_{\text{new}} \right)_{\text{max}} * \text{Demand Charge} \quad \text{Eq 3}$$

where:

$\text{Tons}_{\text{actual}}$  = Monthly peak load

$\text{Tons}_{\text{design}}$  = Full-load capacity of the gas engine-driven chiller

$(\text{kW/ton})_{\text{new}}$  = Efficiency of new electric chiller at full load

$(\text{Tons}_{\text{actual}} * (\text{kW/ton})_{\text{new}})_{\text{max}}$  = Maximum product of monthly peak load and efficiency of new electric chiller over selected monitoring period.

If a ratchet is applied, and the load ratio ( $\text{Tons}_{\text{actual}}/\text{Tons}_{\text{design}}$ ) is greater than the ratchet percentage:

$$\text{Demand Cost} = \text{Tons}_{\text{actual}} * \left( \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{ton}} \right)_{\text{new}} * \text{Demand Charge} \quad \text{Eq 4}$$

If a ratchet is applied, and the load ratio ( $\text{Tons}_{\text{actual}}/\text{Tons}_{\text{design}}$ ) is less than the ratchet percentage:

$$\text{Demand Cost} = \left( \frac{\% \text{ Ratchet}}{100} \right) * \left( \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{ton}} \right)_{\text{new}} * \text{Tons}_{\text{design}} * \text{Demand Charge} \quad \text{Eq 5}$$

Load duration information includes the number of hours a chiller operates within specified ton ranges. Depending on how the ton ranges are grouped, the ton-hours would be computed as:

$$\text{Ton - Hours} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\text{Avg Ton Range} * \text{Hours in Ton Range}) \quad \text{Eq 6}$$

The energy cost would then be computed by the following equation:

$$\text{Energy Cost} = \left( \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{ton}} \right)_{\text{new}} * \text{Ton - Hours} * \text{Energy Charge} \quad \text{Eq 7}$$

### 3 Results of Performance Analysis

#### Overview of Air Force Facilities Monitored

##### *Youngstown-Warren ARS, OH*

Youngstown-Warren ARS currently has one, 140-ton, NAPPS gas engine-driven water-cooled chiller package in operation carrying a refrigerant mixture composed of water and 40 percent ethylene glycol concentration. The chiller provides service to Building 407 (Composite Reserve Forces Operational Training Facility). Data points monitored during its operation are collected using the Johnson Controls METASYS™ Companion system. The chiller has the following design parameters: 1.34 full-load COP, 1.62 COP at 93.64 tons, 1.65 COP at 88.85 tons, 1.79 COP at 84.78 tons, 1.73 COP at 79.44 tons, 44 °F chilled water supply temperature, 54 °F chilled water return temperature, and 330 gpm of chilled water flow. The HHV is 991 Btu/SCF. The Youngstown-Warren ARS Point of Contact (POC) is George Mocker, tel.: (330) 609-1063.

##### *Warner-Robins AFB, GA*

Warner-Robins AFB currently has two, 1310-ton, R-134A York-Caterpillar gas engine-driven water-cooled chillers in operation. The chillers, named Chiller #5 and Chiller #6, respectively, are located at the central energy plant, Building 177. Commissioning of the chillers was completed in July 1999. Data points monitored during its operation are collected using the Johnson Controls METASYS™ Person Machine Interface (PMI) workstation system. The chiller has the following design parameters: 1.83 full-load COP, 2.27 COP at 982.5 tons, 2.53 COP at 655 tons, 1.88 COP at 327.5 tons, 43 °F chilled water supply temperature, 53 °F chilled water return temperature, and 3144 gpm of chilled water flow. The HHV is 1010 Btu/SCF. The Warner-Robins AFB POC is Ray Tuten, tel.: (912) 926-3533, ext. 136.

## Comparison of Design and Actual Values

### Results from Youngstown-Warren ARS

Data for the 140-ton, gas engine-driven chillers was acquired for the months of May through August 1999. Based on part-load COPs at 79.44 tons, 84.78 tons, 88.85 tons, and 93.64 tons, the natural gas flow estimates for different chiller capacities can be determined by interpolation. During this period, the chiller used an estimate of 643 MBtu of natural gas. The unit cost of natural gas is \$4.34/MBtu. Based on the foregoing, the cost for the natural gas by the 140-ton chiller would be \$4.34/MBtu x 643 MBtu = \$2,791. Information from the base indicates there is a charge of \$18.36/kW for demand (with no ratchet applied), and an energy charge of \$0.037/kWh. Table 1 shows the demand charges for the chiller in Building 407 with a full load efficiency of 0.7 kW/ton for a new electric chiller. Figure 2 shows the peak tonnages produced by the engine-driven chillers each month. From Table 1, the total demand charges for the period = \$1,915. Table 2 shows the results of the ton-hour calculations for the entire monitoring period for the chiller.

Table 1. Youngstown-Warren ARS chiller results: demand charges.

Month	Peak Load	COP	When Peak Occurred		Demand Cost
			Date	Time	
May 99	58.45	1.45	5/4/99	15:16	\$466
Jun 99	86.79	1.72	6/15/99	11:41	\$692
Jul 99	64.47	1.54	7/19/99	18:11	\$514
Aug 99	30.51	0.93	8/31/99	21:26	\$243

Using the full load efficiency of 0.7 kW/ton and the appropriate energy charge, the energy cost is:

$$\text{Energy cost} = 0.7 \text{ kW/ton} \times 42,216.57 \text{ ton-hr} \times \$0.037/\text{kWh} = \$1,093$$

The total electrical cost for a new electric chiller for the period would be:

$$\text{Building 407 Chiller: } \$1,915 + \$1,093 = \$3,008$$




Figure 2. Youngstown-Warren ARS chiller peak loads.

Table 2. Youngstown-Warren ARS Building 407 chiller ton-hours by ton range.

Ton Range	Hours	Ton-Hours
4.375	200.75	878.28
13.125	375.00	4,921.88
21.875	432.75	9,466.41
30.625	312.25	9,562.66
39.375	294.75	11,605.78
48.125	101.00	4,860.63
56.875	11.50	654.06
65.625	3.75	246.09
74.375	0.00	0.00
83.125	0.25	20.78
91.875	0.00	0.00
100.625	0.00	0.00
109.375	0.00	0.00
118.125	0.00	0.00
126.875	0.00	0.00
135.625	0.00	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,732.00</b>	<b>42,216.57</b>

The efficiency of the old electric chiller at the central plant was 0.8 kW/ton. Regardless of load, the demand costs would then be:

May 99:	58.45 tons x 0.8 kW/ton x \$18.36/kW	= \$ 859
Jun 99:	86.79 tons x 0.8 kW/ton x \$18.36/kW	= \$1,275
Jul 99:	64.47 tons x 0.8 kW/ton x \$18.36/kW	= \$ 947
Aug 99:	30.51 tons x 0.8 kW/ton x \$18.36/kW	= \$ 448

The total demand costs for each chiller during the monitoring period would be \$3,529.

The electrical energy cost would then be:

$$\text{Energy cost} = 0.8 \text{ kW/ton} \times 42,216.57 \text{ ton-hr} \times \$0.037/\text{kWh} = \$1,250$$

If the old electric chiller were used, the total electrical cost would then be:

$$\text{Building 407 Chiller: } \$3,529 + \$1,250 = \$4,779$$

Table 3 summarizes the costs for Youngstown-Warren ARS. The life cycle economics for Youngstown-Warren ARS is detailed in the Appendix, and includes parasitic electrical requirements for the chiller.

**Table 3. Cost comparison of old vs. new chillers, Youngstown-Warren ARS.**

Chiller	Cost
Old electric chiller	\$4,779
New electric chiller	\$3,008
New gas chiller	\$2,791 (estimate)

### **Results from Warner-Robins AFB**

Data for the two, 1310-ton, gas engine-driven chillers was acquired for the months of July through August 1999. Based on the full-load COP at 1310 tons and part-load COPs at 327.5 tons, 655 tons, and 982.5 tons, the natural gas flow estimates for different chiller capacities can be determined by interpolation. During this period, Chiller #5 used July and August natural gas estimates of 302 MBtu and 308 MBtu, respectively. Likewise, Chiller #6 used July and August natural gas estimates of 78 MBtu and 1,699 MBtu, respectively. It should also be noted that the month of July covered only the period from 29 to 31 July, since the remote monitoring capabilities at CERL were finally established during that time. The unit costs of natural gas for July and August were \$2.47/MBtu and \$2.52/MBtu, respectively. Based on the foregoing, the cost for the natural gas used by Chiller #5 would be  $(\$2.47/\text{MBtu} \times 302 \text{ MBtu}) + (\$2.52/\text{MBtu} \times 308 \text{ MBtu}) = \$1,522$ , and the cost for the natural gas used by Chiller #6 would be



$(\$2.47/\text{MBtu} \times 78 \text{ MBtu}) + (\$2.52/\text{MBtu} \times 1,699 \text{ MBtu}) = \$4,474$ . Information from the base indicates there is an energy charge of  $\$0.03552/\text{kWh}$  for the month of July and an energy charge of  $\$0.04932/\text{kWh}$  for the month of August (due to real-time pricing). There are no demand charges applied at the base. Tables 4 and 5 show the demand charges for Chillers #5 and #6 to be zero. Figures 3 and 4 show the peak tonnages produced by the engine-driven chillers each month. Tables 6 and 7 show the results of the ton-hour calculations for the entire monitoring period for the chiller.

Table 4. Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #5 results.

Month	Peak Load	COP	When Peak Occurred		Demand Cost
			Date	Time	
Jul 99	1258.75	1.87	7/29/99	19:00	\$0.00
Aug 99	1128.63	2.02	8/12/99	15:30	\$0.00

Table 5. Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #6 results.

Month	Peak Load	COP	When Peak Occurred		Demand Cost
			Date	Time	
Jul 99	1247.2	1.89	7/29/99	18:00	\$0.00
Aug 99	1232.18	1.90	8/17/99	16:30	\$0.00




Figure 3. Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #5 peak loads.




Figure 4. Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #6 peak loads.

Table 6. Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #5 ton-hours by ton range.

Ton Range	Jul 99		Aug 99	
	Hours	Ton-Hours	Hours	Ton-Hours
16.375	0.00	0.00	20.50	335.69
49.125	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
81.875	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
114.625	0.00	0.00	0.50	57.31
147.375	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
180.125	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
212.875	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
245.625	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
278.375	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
311.125	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
343.875	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
376.625	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
409.375	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
442.125	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
474.875	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
507.625	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
540.375	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
573.125	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
605.875	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
638.625	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Ton Range	Jul 99		Aug 99	
	Hours	Ton-Hours	Hours	Ton-Hours
671.375	0.00	0.00	0.50	335.69
704.125	0.00	0.00	3.00	2,112.38
736.875	0.00	0.00	3.50	2,579.06
769.625	0.00	0.00	8.00	6,157.00
802.375	0.00	0.00	6.50	5,215.44
835.125	0.50	417.56	5.00	4,175.63
867.875	3.50	3,037.56	2.50	2,169.69
900.625	3.50	3,152.19	7.50	6,754.69
933.375	9.00	8,400.38	8.50	7,933.69
966.125	9.50	9,178.19	7.50	7,245.94
998.875	11.50	11,487.06	4.00	3,995.50
1031.625	9.00	9,284.63	2.00	2,063.25
1064.375	4.00	4,257.50	2.50	2,660.94
1097.125	1.50	1,645.69	1.00	1,097.13
1129.875	1.00	1,129.88	1.00	1,129.88
1162.625	1.00	1,162.63	0.00	0.00
1195.375	0.50	597.69	0.00	0.00
1228.125	0.50	614.06	0.00	0.00
1260.875	0.50	630.44	0.00	0.00
1293.625	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>55.50</b>	<b>54,995.46</b>	<b>84.00</b>	<b>56,018.91</b>

Table 7. Warner-Robins AFB Chiller #6 ton-hours by ton range.

Ton Range	Jul 99		Aug 99	
	Hours	Ton-Hours	Hours	Ton-Hours
16.375	25.50	417.56	22.50	368.44
49.125	0.00	0.00	0.50	24.56
81.875	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
114.625	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
147.375	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
180.125	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
212.875	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
245.625	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
278.375	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
311.125	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
343.875	0.00	0.00	0.50	171.94
376.625	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
409.375	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
442.125	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
474.875	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
507.625	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
540.375	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
573.125	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
605.875	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Ton Range	Jul 99		Aug 99	
	Hours	Ton-Hours	Hours	Ton-Hours
638.625	0.00	0.00	1.00	638.63
671.375	0.00	0.00	0.50	335.69
704.125	0.00	0.00	1.50	1,056.19
736.875	0.00	0.00	6.00	4,421.25
769.625	0.00	0.00	9.50	7,311.44
802.375	0.00	0.00	10.00	8,023.75
835.125	0.00	0.00	20.00	16,702.50
867.875	0.00	0.00	30.00	26,036.25
900.625	0.00	0.00	27.50	24,767.19
933.375	0.00	0.00	47.50	44,335.31
966.125	0.00	0.00	39.50	38,161.94
998.875	1.50	1,498.31	32.00	31,964.00
1031.625	0.50	515.81	26.50	27,338.06
1064.375	1.00	1,064.38	28.00	29,802.50
1097.125	1.50	1,645.69	17.00	18,651.13
1129.875	1.50	1,694.81	18.50	20,902.69
1162.625	1.00	1,162.63	5.00	5,813.13
1195.375	0.50	597.69	1.00	1,195.38
1228.125	1.00	1,228.13	1.00	1,228.13
1260.875	0.50	630.44	0.00	0.00
1293.625	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>34.50</b>	<b>10,455.45</b>	<b>345.50</b>	<b>309,250.10</b>

Using the full load efficiency of 0.55 kW/ton and the appropriate energy charges, the energy costs are:

For Chiller #5:

$$\text{Energy cost} = 0.55 \text{ kW/ton} \times (54,995.46 \text{ ton-hr} \times \$0.03552/\text{kWh} + 56,018.91 \text{ ton-hr} \times \$0.04932/\text{kWh}) = \$2,594$$

For Chiller #6:

$$\text{Energy cost} = 0.55 \text{ kW/ton} \times (10,455.45 \text{ ton-hr} \times \$0.03552/\text{kWh} + 309,250.10 \text{ ton-hr} \times \$0.04932/\text{kWh}) = \$8,593$$

The total electrical cost for each new electric chiller for the period would be:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Chiller \#5:} & \quad \$2,594 + 0 = \$2,594 \\ \text{Chiller \#6:} & \quad \$8,593 + 0 = \$8,593 \end{aligned}$$

The efficiency of the old electric chiller at the central plant was 0.65 kW/ton. Since no demand charges are applied, the demand costs would be zero, regardless of load.

The electrical energy cost would then be:

For Chiller #5:

$$\text{Energy cost} = 0.65 \text{ kW/ton} \times (54,995.46 \text{ ton-hr} \times \$0.03552/\text{kWh} + 56,018.91 \text{ ton-hr} \times \$0.04932/\text{kWh}) = \$3,066$$

For Chiller #6:

$$\text{Energy cost} = 0.65 \text{ kW/ton} \times (10,455.45 \text{ ton-hr} \times \$0.03552/\text{kWh} + 309,250.10 \text{ ton-hr} \times \$0.04932/\text{kWh}) = \$10,155$$

If the old electric chillers were used, the total electrical cost would then be:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Chiller \#5: } & \$3,066 + 0 & = & \$3,066 \\ \text{Chiller \#6: } & \$10,155 + 0 & = & \$10,155 \end{aligned}$$

Table 8 summarizes the cost comparison for Warner-Robins AFB. The life cycle economics for Warner-Robins AFB is detailed in the Appendix, and includes parasitic electrical requirements for the chiller.

**Table 8. Cost comparison of old vs. new chillers, Warner-Robins AFB.**

Chiller Type	Chiller #5	Chiller #6
Old electric chiller	\$3,066	\$10,155
New electric chiller	\$2,594	\$8,593
New gas chiller	\$1,522 (estimate)	\$4,474 (estimate)

## 4 Conclusion and Recommendations


### Conclusion

This study provided performance monitoring data for natural gas cooling technologies operating at two Air Force demonstration facilities, based on the FY99 cooling season. Both theoretical and actual performance values for each natural gas cooling technology were compared for validation of their operation. The technical and economical aspects of operable natural gas cooling equipment performance were monitored on successful commissioning and functional performance testing acceptability. Energy and demand cost analyses were performed to provide a basis for comparison of each natural gas cooling technology with the energy and demand costs of old and new electric chillers.

At the two monitored Air Force bases, the costs for the natural gas used by the engine-driven chillers were lower than electrical costs used by old and new electric chillers, resulting in energy cost savings (Table 3 [p 15] and Table 8 [p 20]).

Hanscom AFB currently has one, 750-ton R-134A York-Caterpillar gas engine-driven chiller under construction at the central plant, Building 1201. The project is scheduled for completion in FY00 due to construction delays.

The engine-driven chiller in a hybrid plant can often be used to reduce or shave the building's electric demand during on-peak hours. One or more electric chillers supply the base cooling load or are shut off during on-peak hours. The savings in peak demand charged by the electric utility can often provide substantial cost savings. Gas cooling can be installed when a significant expansion of a facility is planned, thereby satisfying the need for additional capacity while providing the flexibility to dispatch gas cooling during periods of high electric demand. An example of peak cooling is found in Figure 5.



**Figure 5. Example of peak shaving curve.**

(Source: American Gas Cooling Center, February 1996)

## Recommendations

Gas cooling technologies, such as gas engine-driven chillers, can offer installations and bases environmental and economic benefits. The environmental benefit stems from the fact that engine-driven chillers typically use hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) or hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) with low or zero ozone-depleting potential. The economic benefits of engine-driven chillers can vary since gas chiller equipment costs are higher than conventional electric-driven vapor-compression equipment.

To reduce peak electric demand and increase summer gas sales, many gas and electric utilities offer rebates for unit installations and bases on a per-ton basis. Sometimes these rebates alone make up the equipment cost differential. Some gas utilities also offer reduced rates to facilities using gas for cooling purposes. Some applications reduce costs in other areas by providing energy to produce domestic hot water and/or boiler makeup water. Use of these applications increases the system's overall cost effectiveness.

Chillers are rarely operated at their rated capacities more than a few hundred hours per year. Two or more smaller chillers may result in more efficient operation, lower life-cycle costs, and lower operating costs. In some cases, a hybrid chiller plant makes economic sense. A hybrid plant is a combination of electric- and gas engine-driven chillers and sometimes leads to lower life-cycle and operation costs. The operation of the plants would be cycled to take advantage of the off-demand portion of the electric utility bill. The installation of more than one chiller will also allow for continued service during scheduled and unscheduled maintenance (Pedersen et al. 1996).

It is recommended that data points for CHWS and CHWR temperatures and chilled water flow be documented every 15 minutes. To improve performance and acquire a more accurate savings, it is also recommended that each Air Force facility under the Natural Gas Cooling Technology Program provide minute-by-minute readings of natural gas flow, as opposed to instantaneous values every 15 minutes.

In cases where the remote operator is unavailable to download the trend data on a daily basis due to leave or temporary duty (TDY), it is recommended that the proper communications or datalogger software be used to automatically transfer data to the remote operator's computer workstation. Automatic data transfer should occur in the early mornings every 24 hours via modem from the installation's host operator workstation to the remote monitoring site (including weekends and holidays). Without automatic data transfer, the historical trend data provided by the host workstation may not be stored permanently. If the remote operator does not download the trend data in time, valuable data may be lost. Such missing data could compromise the accuracy of performance and cost results.

Finally, it is recommended that CERL representatives be considered to monitor any facilities that will complete successful commissioning and acceptance testing of natural gas cooling equipment for performance to document the actual savings incurred.



## Bibliography

American Gas Cooling Center, *Applications Engineering Manual for Engine Driven Chillers*, February 1996, p 20.

American Gas Cooling Center, *Natural Gas Cooling Equipment Guide*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Arlington, VA, April 1996).

Brown, William T. III, *Performance Analysis of Natural Gas Cooling Technology at Air Force Bases*, Technical Report (TR) 99/14/ADA359312 (Construction Engineering Research Laboratory [CERL], December 1998).

Caponegro, Michael, William Brown, and Timothy Pedersen, *Advanced Gas Cooling Study for the Hospital at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ*, TR 99/24/ADA361005 (CERL, January 1999).

Cler, Gerald, *Evaluating Gas-Fueled Cooling Technologies for Applications at Army Installations*, TR 96/14/ADA304704 (CERL, November 1995).

Pedersen, Timothy, Michael Brewer, Daryl Matsui, Richard Rundus, Thomas Durbin, Christopher Dilks, Michael Caponegro, and Ralph Moshage, *Gas-Fueled Cooling Technologies at DOD Fixed Facilities*, TR 96/62/ADA309231 (CERL, April 1996).

Pedersen, Timothy, and William Brown, *Advanced Gas Cooling Technology Demonstration Program at Air Force Installations, Fiscal Year 1996*, TR 97/106/ADA327941 (CERL, July 1997).

Sohn, Chang W., William Brown, Richard Rundus, Timothy Pedersen, Thomas Durbin, Michael Caponegro, and Daryl Matsui, *Natural Gas Cooling in DOD Facilities*, TR 97/125/ADA332974 (CERL, August 1997).

# Appendix: Gas Cooling Analysis

<b>Gas Cooling Analysis</b>		<b>Input Data Sheet</b>																																														
<p>&lt; To Print Tables - ctrl t, To Print Charts - ctrl c &gt;</p> <p><b>Notice to Users:</b></p> <p>This spreadsheet is designed to assist the user in performing a preliminary feasibility analysis comparing electric, absorption, and engine driven chillers. Calculations are based on user provided data and results rely on this input data. This spreadsheet calculates the approximate equipment &amp; installation costs along with the annual operating and maintenance costs. Additionally, simple payback is calculated, based on the incremental additional cost of the alternative cooling technology and the annual operating cost savings. Part of the development of this tool was supported by the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP)</p>																																																
<p><b>Input Section</b> <span style="float: right;"><u>Fill in all shaded boxes</u></span></p> <p>Enter Facility Name: <input style="width: 80%;" type="text" value="Youngstown-Warren REG ARPT"/></p> <p>Analyst: <input style="width: 80%;" type="text" value="WTB, 11/2/99"/></p>																																																
<p><b>Cooling Load</b> <span style="float: right;">Building Type: <input style="width: 80%;" type="text" value="~910 Airlift Wing Headquarters"/></span></p> <p>Peak Load: <input style="width: 80px;" type="text" value="140"/> tons</p> <p>Annual Hours of Operation: <input style="width: 80px;" type="text" value="1,732"/> hours</p> <p>Equivalent Full Load Hour Percentage: <input style="width: 80px;" type="text" value="17"/> % (for most air conditioning applications, EFLH = 50 %)</p> <p>Cooling Peak Load/Ave Load Ratio: <span style="float: right;">29.04</span></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Chiller Efficiencies:</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Peak</th> <th style="text-align: center;">IPLV</th> <th style="text-align: center;">COP Ratio</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Parasitic Electrical Requirements:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Existing Electric (kW/ton)</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.80"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.80"/></td> <td rowspan="4" style="vertical-align: middle;">1.14 New/Old Elec 0.19 Abs/New Elc 0.27 Gas/New Elc</td> <td>Existing Elect <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.091"/> kw/tn</td> </tr> <tr> <td>New Electric (kW/ton)</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.70"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.70"/></td> <td>New Elect <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.088"/> kw/tn</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Absorption (COP)</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.97"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.97"/></td> <td>Absorption <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.290"/> kw/tn</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Engine Driven (COP)</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="1.34"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="1.49"/></td> <td>Eng Driven <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.272"/> kw/tn</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="margin-top: 10px;"><b>Monthly Peak Cooling Load (% of peak)</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td>Jan</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/></td> <td>Feb</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/></td> <td>Mar</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/></td> <td>Apr</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>May</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="42"/></td> <td>Jun</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="62"/></td> <td>Jul</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="46"/></td> <td>Aug</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="22"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sep</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/></td> <td>Oct</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/></td> <td>Nov</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/></td> <td>Dec</td><td><input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/></td> </tr> </table> <p style="font-size: small; margin-top: 10px;">Notes: 1 therm = 100,000 Btu; k = 1000 (kW = 1000 W); M = 1,000,000 (MBtu = 1,000,000 Btu) When evaluating steam fired absorption chillers, be sure to account for boiler efficiency when entering chiller COP. This is not done automatically.</p>			Chiller Efficiencies:	Peak	IPLV	COP Ratio	Parasitic Electrical Requirements:	Existing Electric (kW/ton)	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.80"/>	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.80"/>	1.14 New/Old Elec 0.19 Abs/New Elc 0.27 Gas/New Elc	Existing Elect <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.091"/> kw/tn	New Electric (kW/ton)	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.70"/>	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.70"/>	New Elect <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.088"/> kw/tn	Absorption (COP)	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.97"/>	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.97"/>	Absorption <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.290"/> kw/tn	Engine Driven (COP)	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="1.34"/>	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="1.49"/>	Eng Driven <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.272"/> kw/tn	Jan	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Feb	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Mar	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Apr	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	May	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="42"/>	Jun	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="62"/>	Jul	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="46"/>	Aug	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="22"/>	Sep	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Oct	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Nov	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Dec	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>
Chiller Efficiencies:	Peak	IPLV	COP Ratio	Parasitic Electrical Requirements:																																												
Existing Electric (kW/ton)	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.80"/>	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.80"/>	1.14 New/Old Elec 0.19 Abs/New Elc 0.27 Gas/New Elc	Existing Elect <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.091"/> kw/tn																																												
New Electric (kW/ton)	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.70"/>	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.70"/>		New Elect <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.088"/> kw/tn																																												
Absorption (COP)	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.97"/>	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.97"/>		Absorption <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.290"/> kw/tn																																												
Engine Driven (COP)	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="1.34"/>	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="1.49"/>		Eng Driven <input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0.272"/> kw/tn																																												
Jan	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Feb	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Mar	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Apr	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>																																									
May	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="42"/>	Jun	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="62"/>	Jul	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="46"/>	Aug	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="22"/>																																									
Sep	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Oct	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Nov	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>	Dec	<input style="width: 60px;" type="text" value="0"/>																																									

<b>Gas Cooling Analysis</b>		<b>Input Data Sheet</b>		
<b>Facility: Youngstown-Warren REG ARPT</b>				
<b>Utility Rates</b>	Notes: Water Cooled Recip.			
Natural Gas Utility Rates:				
Cooling Rate	<input type="text" value="0.434"/> \$/therm			
Boiler Rate	<input type="text" value="0.434"/> \$/therm			
Elect/Gas Use Cost Ratio	<input type="text" value="2.50"/>			
Electric Utility Rates:				
Summer Demand	<input type="text" value="18.36"/> \$/kW	from <input type="text" value="Jan"/> through <input type="text" value="Dec"/>		
Ratchet	<input type="text" value="0"/> %	from <input type="text" value="Jan"/> through <input type="text" value="Dec"/>		
Winter Demand	<input type="text" value="18.36"/> \$/kW	Demand\$/Use\$ Ratio (hrs)		
Energy	<input type="text" value="0.037"/> \$/kWh	Smr. El/Gas: 1,241 Wntr El/Gas: 1,241		
NOTE: Review demand charge calculations to determine appropriate values to enter for number of applicable months.				
NOTE: The above rates should include any applicable taxes and surcharges.				
<b>Equipment Cost</b>				
	Chiller	Rebate	Installation	Maintenance
	\$/ton	\$/ton	\$/ton	
Electric (existing)	<input type="text" value="270"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="375"/>	<input type="text" value="0.008"/> \$/ton-hr
Electric (new)	<input type="text" value="950"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="415"/>	<input type="text" value="0.006"/> \$/ton-hr
Absorption	<input type="text" value="645"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="829"/>	<input type="text" value="0.0085"/> \$/ton-hr
Engine Driven	<input type="text" value="710"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="912"/>	<input type="text" value="0.012"/> \$/ton-hr
w/o heat recovery	<input type="text" value="0.013"/> \$/ton-hr	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0.013"/> \$/ton-hr
w/ heat recovery	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
<b>Heat Recovery</b>			<b>Engine Waste Heat</b>	
(Engine Driven Chiller only)				
Useful thermal energy	<input type="text" value="0"/> Btu/hr	Engine efficiency	<input type="text" value="35"/> %	
Summer boiler efficiency	<input type="text" value="80"/> %	Recoverable percent	<input type="text" value="75"/> %	
		Max avail thermal energy	549,664 Btu/hr	

# Gas Cooling Analysis

Output Data Sheet

## Facility: Youngstown-Warren REG ARPT

### Existing Electric Chiller Energy Costs

Chiller Peak Efficiency: 0.8 kW/ton Chiller IPLV (seasonal efficiency): 0.8 kW/ton (see note below)

Energy Charge (chiller):	140 tons	x	0.800 kW/ton (IPLV)	x	302 EFLH	x	0.037 \$/kWh	=	\$1,250	
Energy Charge (parasitic):	140 tons	x	0.091 kW/ton	x	1,732 operating hr	x	0.037 \$/kWh	=	\$819	
Peak Demand:	(Monthly and annual peak demand estimates are calculated on the following page)								=	\$3,529
									<b>Total Annual Energy Cost</b>	<b>\$5,598</b>

### New Electric Chiller Energy Costs

Chiller Peak Efficiency: 0.7 kW/ton Chiller IPLV (seasonal efficiency): 0.7 kW/ton (see note below)

Energy Charge (chiller):	140 tons	x	0.700 kW/ton (IPLV)	x	302 EFLH	x	0.037 \$/kWh	=	\$1,094	
Energy Charge (parasitic):	140 tons	x	0.088 kW/ton	x	1,732 operating hr	x	0.037 \$/kWh	=	\$787	
Peak Demand:	(Monthly and annual peak demand estimates are calculated on the following page)								=	\$3,087
									<b>Total Annual Energy Cost</b>	<b>\$4,968</b>

### Absorption Chiller Energy Costs

Chiller Peak Efficiency: 0.97 COP Incremental Parasitic Power Consumption: 0.29 kW/ton (see note below) Chiller IPLV (seasonal efficiency): 0.97 COP -or- 0.124 therms/ton-hr (see note below)

Gas Charge:	140 tons	x	0.124 therms/ton-hr	x	302 EFLH	x	0.434 \$/therm	=	\$2,266	
Energy Charge (parasitic):	140 tons	x	0.290 kW/ton	x	1,732 operating hr	x	0.037 \$/kWh	=	\$2,602	
Peak Demand:	(Monthly and annual peak demand estimates are calculated on the following page)								=	\$2,982
									<b>Total Annual Energy Cost</b>	<b>\$7,849</b>

### Engine Driven Chiller Energy Costs

Chiller Peak Efficiency: 1.34 COP Incremental Parasitic Power Consumption: 0.2715 kW/ton (see note below) Chiller IPLV (seasonal efficiency): 1.49 COP -or- 0.081 therms/ton-hr (see note below)

Gas Charge:	140 tons	x	0.081 therms/ton-hr	x	302 EFLH	x	0.434 \$/therm	=	\$1,475	
Energy Charge (parasitic):	140 tons	x	0.272 kW/ton	x	1,732 operating hr	x	0.037 \$/kWh	=	\$2,436	
Peak Demand:	(Monthly and annual peak demand estimates are calculated on the following page)								=	\$2,791
									<b>Total Annual Energy Cost (without heat recovery)</b>	<b>\$6,702</b>

Savings with Optional Heat Recovery:	Btu/hr	x	1 therm/100,000 Bt	x	302 EFLH	x	0.434 \$/therm	/	80 % boiler efficiency	=	\$6,702
									<b>Total Annual Energy Cost (with heat recovery)</b>	<b>\$6,702</b>	

EFLH = Equivalent Full Load Hours (for most air conditioning applications, EFLH = 0.5 x annual hours of operation)  
 IPLV = Integrated Part Load Value. The IPLV should be used for all seasonal energy calculations, since it represents the seasonal average (non-full load) operating efficiency of the chiller.  
 therms/ton-hr = 12,000 Btu/therm / (100,000 Btu/therm x COP (Btu/hr Cooling / Btu/hr Input))  
 Direct-fired absorption chillers have significantly higher electric parasitic consumption than electric chillers. This is due to greater condenser flow rates, heat rejection, and pressure drops in the heat exchangers. Engine driven chillers have slightly higher parasitics than electric chillers due to the engine heat rejection.

# Gas Cooling Analysis

## Output Data Sheet

Facility: Youngstown-Warren REG ARPT

Month	Demand Charge (\$/kW)		Existing Electric Chiller		New Electric Chiller		Absorption Chiller		Engine Driven Chiller	
	Month	Charge (\$/kW)	Billed Demand (kW)	Monthly Charge (\$)	Billed Demand (kW)	Monthly Charge (\$)	Billed Demand (kW)	Monthly Charge (\$)	Billed Demand (kW)	Monthly Charge (\$)
Jan	18.36									
Feb	18.36									
Mar	18.36									
Apr	18.36									
May	18.36		47	865	41	757	41	745	38	698
Jun	18.36		64	1,170	55	1,015	41	745	38	698
Jul	18.36		51	930	44	812	41	745	38	698
Aug	18.36		31	564	27	503	41	745	38	698
Sep	18.36									
Oct	18.36									
Nov	18.36									
Dec	18.36									
Ave/Sum			16	3,529	14	3,087	14	2,982	13	2,791

Monthly Demand Charge (\$/kW) is determined from the utility rate structure or utility contract.  
 Billed Demand (\$) is calculated based on the utility rate structure. If there is no Ratchet associated with the demand charge, the Billed Demand equals the peak metered demand which occurred during that month.  
 If the utility rate structure has a Ratchet clause, the Billed Demand is equal to the greater of either the actual peak metered demand or the peak demand multiplied by the Ratchet percentage.  
 Monthly Charge (\$) is calculated by multiplying the Monthly Demand Charge by the Billed Demand.  
 The Annual Average/Sum is the average of the monthly Billed Demands and the sum of the Monthly Demand Charges for each of the chiller technologies.  
 The actual meter demand is the sum of the peak output of the chiller during the month in question plus the full kW rating of the parasitic equipment, i.e. the evaporator and condenser water pumps and cooling tower fan motors.

# Gas Cooling Analysis

Output Data Sheet

Facility: **Youngstown-Warren REG ARPT**

## Maintenance Costs

Electric Chiller Maintenance Costs		Maintenance Costs		Annual Operating Costs (Energy + Maintenance)	
Existing	301.64166 EFLH x 140 tons x 0.008 \$/ton-hr =		\$338		\$5,836
New	301.64166 EFLH x 140 tons x 0.006 \$/ton-hr =		\$253		\$5,221
Absorption Chiller Maintenance Costs					
	301.64166 EFLH x 140 tons x 0.0085 \$/ton-hr		\$359		\$8,208
Engine Driven Chiller Maintenance Costs					
w/o heat recovery	301.64166 EFLH x 140 tons x 0.012 \$/ton-hr		\$507		\$7,209
w/heat recovery	301.64166 EFLH x 140 tons x 0.013 \$/ton-hr		\$549		\$7,251

## System Installed Cost

Equipment Cost	Installation Cost	Installed Cost	Utility Rebate	Cost Premium	Incremental Simple Payback
<b>Electric Chiller Installed Costs</b>					
270 \$/ton x 140 tons +	375 \$/ton x 140 tons =	\$90,300		\$0	basecase
<b>Absorption Chiller Installed Costs</b>					
950 \$/ton x 140 tons +	415 \$/ton x 140 tons =	\$191,100		\$100,800	NEVER
<b>Engine Driven Chiller Installed Costs</b>					
w/o heat recovery 645 \$/ton x 140 tons +	829 \$/ton x 140 tons =	\$206,360		\$116,060	NEVER
w/heat recovery 710 \$/ton x 140 tons +	912 \$/ton x 140 tons =	\$227,080		\$136,780	NEVER

Annual Operating Cost = Annual Energy Cost + Annual Maintenance Cost  
 Installed Cost = Chiller Cost per Ton \* Capacity + Installation Cost per Ton \* Chiller Capacity  
 Cost Premium = Installed cost of a specific chiller type - installed cost of an electric chiller  
 Incremental Simple Payback = Cost Premium / (Electric Chiller Annual Operating Cost - Specific Chiller Annual Operating Cost)

# Gas Cooling Analysis Input Data Sheet

< To Print Tables - ctrl t, To Print Charts - ctrl c >

**Notice to Users:**

This spreadsheet is designed to assist the user in performing a preliminary feasibility analysis comparing electric, absorption, and engine driven chillers. Calculations are based on user provided data and results rely on this input data. This spreadsheet calculates the approximate equipment & installation costs along with the annual operating and maintenance costs. Additionally, simple payback is calculated, based on the incremental additional cost of the alternative cooling technology and the annual operating cost savings. Part of the development of this tool was supported by the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP)

**Input Section**

Fill in all shaded boxes

Enter Facility Name: Warner-Robins AFB, CEP

Analyst: WTB 11/4/99

**Cooling Load**

Building Type: Central Plant (Chiller #6)

Peak Load: 1,310 tons  
 Annual Hours of Operation: 380 hours  
 Equivalent Full Load Hour Percentage: 82 % (for most air conditioning applications, EFLH = 50 %)

Cooling Peak Load/Ave Load Ratio: 28.09

Chiller Efficiencies:	Peak	IPLV	COP Ratio	Parasitic Electrical Requirements:
Existing Electric (kW/ton)	0.65	0.65	1.18 New/Old Elec 0.16 Abs/New Elc 0.29 Gas/New Elc	Existing Elect <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0.240</span> kw/tn
New Electric (kW/ton)	0.55	0.55		New Elect <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0.240</span> kw/tn
Absorption (COP)	1.02	1.02		Absorption <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0.315</span> kw/tn
Engine Driven (COP)	1.83	2.37		Eng Driven <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0.255</span> kw/tn

**Monthly Peak Cooling Load (% of peak)**

Jan	0	Feb	0	Mar	0	Apr	0
May	0	Jun	0	Jul	95	Aug	94
Sep	0	Oct	0	Nov	0	Dec	0

Notes: 1 therm = 100,000 Btu; k = 1000 (kW = 1000 W); M = 1,000,000 (MBtu = 1,000,000 Btu)  
 When evaluating steam fired absorption chillers, be sure to account for boiler efficiency when entering chiller COP. This is not done automatically.

# Gas Cooling Analysis Input Data Sheet

**Facility:** Warner-Robins AFB, CEP

## Utility Rates

Notes: Centrifugal Water Cooled, NG and Elec  
 Plant already has (2) 1500 and (1) 750 ton electric units  
 Using report parasitic estimates  
 Base loaded Chiller (100% year round)  
 Engine waste heat considers both exhaust gases and cooling jacket water  
 If boiler fuel not gas, convert \$/MBtu to \$/therm  
 Can not calculate winter type ratchet charges; input directly??  
 Must use month format Xxx (i.e Jan, Feb)

### Natural Gas Utility Rates:

Cooling Rate  \$/therm  
 Boiler Rate  \$/therm  
 Elect/Gas Use Cost Ratio

### Electric Utility Rates:

Summer Demand  \$/kW from  through   
 Ratchet  % from  through   
 Winter Demand  \$/kW Demands/Use\$ Ratio (hrs)  
 Energy  \$/kWh Smr. El/Gas:  Wntr El/Gas:

NOTE: Review demand charge calculations to determine appropriate values to enter for number of applicable months.

NOTE: The above rates should include any applicable taxes and surcharges.

## Equipment Cost

	Chiller	Rebate	Installation	Maintenance
	\$/ton	\$/ton	\$/ton	
Electric (existing)	<input type="text" value=""/>	<input type="text" value=""/>	<input type="text" value=""/>	<input type="text" value="0.008"/> \$/ton-hr
Electric (new)	<input type="text" value="418"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="387"/>	<input type="text" value="0.006"/> \$/ton-hr
Absorption	<input type="text" value="672"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="402"/>	<input type="text" value="0.0085"/> \$/ton-hr
Engine Driven				
w/o heat recovery	<input type="text" value="577"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="328"/>	<input type="text" value="0.012"/> \$/ton-hr
w/ heat recovery	<input type="text" value="606"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="407"/>	<input type="text" value="0.013"/> \$/ton-hr

## Heat Recovery

(Engine Driven Chiller only)

### Engine Waste Heat

Useful thermal energy  Btu/hr  
 Summer boiler efficiency  %  
 Engine efficiency  %  
 Recoverable percent  %  
 Max avail thermal energy  Btu/hr



<b>Gas Cooling Analysis</b>		Output Data Sheet
<b>Facility: Warner-Robins AFB, CEP</b>		
<b>Existing Electric Chiller Energy Costs</b>		
Chiller Peak Efficiency: 0.65 kW/ton		
Chiller IPLV (seasonal efficiency): 0.65 kW/ton (see note below)		
Energy Charge (chiller):	1,310 tons x 0.650 kW/ton (IPLV) x 312 EFLH x 0.038 \$/kWh	= \$10,155
Energy Charge (parasitic):	1,310 tons x 0.240 kW/ton x 380 operating hr x 0.038 \$/kWh	= \$4,569
Peak Demand:	(Monthly and annual peak demand estimates are calculated on the following page)	=
<b>Total Annual Energy Cost</b>		<b>\$14,723</b>
<b>New Electric Chiller Energy Costs</b>		
Chiller Peak Efficiency: 0.55 kW/ton		
Chiller IPLV (seasonal efficiency): 0.55 kW/ton (see note below)		
Energy Charge (chiller):	1,310 tons x 0.550 kW/ton (IPLV) x 312 EFLH x 0.038 \$/kWh	= \$8,593
Energy Charge (parasitic):	1,310 tons x 0.240 kW/ton x 380 operating hr x 0.038 \$/kWh	= \$4,569
Peak Demand:	(Monthly and annual peak demand estimates are calculated on the following page)	=
<b>Total Annual Energy Cost</b>		<b>\$13,161</b>
<b>Absorption Chiller Energy Costs</b>		
Chiller Peak Efficiency: 1.02 COP		
Incremental Parasitic Power Consumption: 0.315 kW/ton (see note below)		
Chiller IPLV (seasonal efficiency): 1.02 COP -or- 0.118 therms/ton-hr (see note below)		
Gas Charge:	1,310 tons x 0.118 therms/ton-hr x 312 EFLH x 0.216 \$/therm	= \$10,382
Energy Charge (parasitic):	1,310 tons x 0.315 kW/ton x 380 operating hr x 0.038 \$/kWh	= \$5,996
Peak Demand:	(Monthly and annual peak demand estimates are calculated on the following page)	=
<b>Total Annual Energy Cost</b>		<b>\$16,378</b>
<b>Engine Driven Chiller Energy Costs</b>		
Chiller Peak Efficiency: 1.83 COP		
Incremental Parasitic Power Consumption: 0.255 kW/ton (see note below)		
Chiller IPLV (seasonal efficiency): 2.37 COP -or- 0.051 therms/ton-hr (see note below)		
Heat Recovery: 0.000 BTU/hr		
Gas Charge:	1,310 tons x 0.051 therms/ton-hr x 312 EFLH x 0.216 \$/therm	= \$4,472
Energy Charge (parasitic):	1,310 tons x 0.255 kW/ton x 380 operating hr x 0.038 \$/kWh	= \$4,854
Peak Demand:	(Monthly and annual peak demand estimates are calculated on the following page)	=
<b>Total Annual Energy Cost (without heat recovery)</b>		<b>\$9,326</b>
Savings with Optional Heat Recovery:	Btu/hr x 1 therm/100,000 Btu x 312 EFLH x 0.216 \$/therm / 80 % boiler efficiency	=
<b>Total Annual Energy Cost (with heat recovery)</b>		<b>\$9,326</b>
<small>EFLH = Equivalent Full Load Hours (for most air conditioning applications, EFLH = 0.5 x annual hours of operation)                      IPLV = Integrated Part Load Value. The IPLV should be used for all seasonal energy calculations, since it represents the seasonal average (non-full load) operating efficiency of the chiller.                      Therms/ton-hr = 12,000 Btu/ton / (100,000 Btu/therm x COP [Btu/hr Cooling / Btu/hr Input])                      Direct-fired absorption chillers have significantly higher electric parasitic consumption than electric chillers. This is due to greater condenser flow rates, heat rejection, and pressure drops in the heat exchangers. Engine driven chillers have slightly higher parasitics than electric chillers due to the engine heat rejection.</small>		

**Gas Cooling Analysis** Output Data Sheet

Facility: Warner-Robins AFB, CEP

Month	Demand Charge (\$/KW)	Existing Electric Chiller		New Electric Chiller		Absorption Chiller		Engine Driven Chiller	
		Billed Demand (kW)	Monthly Charge (\$)	Billed Demand (kW)	Monthly Charge (\$)	Billed Demand (kW)	Monthly Charge (\$)	Billed Demand (kW)	Monthly Charge (\$)
Jan		1,108		983		392		317	
Feb		1,108		983		392		317	
Mar		1,108		983		392		317	
Apr		1,108		983		392		317	
May		1,108		983		392		317	
Jun		1,108		983		392		317	
Jul		1,110		985		413		334	
Aug		1,108		983		413		334	
Sep		1,108		983		392		317	
Oct		1,108		983		392		317	
Nov		1,108		983		392		317	
Dec		1,108		983		392		317	
Ave/Sum		1,108		983		395		320	

Monthly Demand Charge (\$/KW) is determined from the utility rate structure or utility contract.  
 Billed Demand (\$) is calculated based on the utility rate structure. If there is no Ratchet associated with the demand charge, the Billed Demand equals the peak metered demand which occurred during that month.  
 If the utility rate structure has a Ratchet clause, the Billed Demand is equal to the greater of either the actual peak metered demand or the peak demand multiplied by the Ratchet percentage.  
 Monthly Charge (\$) is calculated by multiplying the Monthly Demand Charge by the Billed Demand.  
 The Annual Average/Sum is the average of the monthly Billed Demands and the sum of the Monthly Demand Charges for each of the chiller technologies.

<b>Gas Cooling Analysis</b>		Output Data Sheet
<b>Facility: Warner-Robins AFB, CEP</b>		
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>		
<b>Electric Chiller Maintenance Costs</b>		<b>Annual Operating Costs</b> <small>(Energy + Maintenance)</small>
Existing	311.866 EFLH x 1310 tons x 0.008 \$/ton-hr = \$3,268	<b>\$17,992</b>
New	311.866 EFLH x 1310 tons x 0.006 \$/ton-hr = \$2,451	<b>\$15,612</b>
<b>Absorption Chiller Maintenance Costs</b>		<b>\$19,851</b>
	311.866 EFLH x 1310 tons x 0.0085 \$/ton-hr = \$3,473	
<b>Engine Driven Chiller Maintenance Costs</b>		<b>\$14,229</b>
w/o heat recovery	311.866 EFLH x 1310 tons x 0.012 \$/ton-hr = \$4,903	
w/ heat recovery	311.866 EFLH x 1310 tons x 0.013 \$/ton-hr = \$5,311	<b>\$14,637</b>
<b>System Installed Cost</b>		
	Equipment Cost	Installation Cost
<b>Electric Chiller Installed Costs</b>	418 \$/ton x 1310 tons + 387 \$/ton x 1310 tons = \$1,054,550	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Absorption Chiller Installed Costs</b>	672 \$/ton x 1310 tons + 402 \$/ton x 1310 tons = \$1,406,940	<b>NEVER</b>
<b>Engine Driven Chiller Installed Costs</b>	577 \$/ton x 1310 tons + 328 \$/ton x 1310 tons = \$1,185,550	<b>94.7 yrs</b>
w/ heat recovery	606 \$/ton x 1310 tons + 407 \$/ton x 1310 tons = \$1,327,030	<b>279.4 yrs</b>
<small>Annual Operating Cost = Annual Energy Cost + Annual Maintenance Cost                  Installed Cost = Chiller Cost per Ton * Capacity + Installation Cost per Ton * Chiller Capacity                  Cost Premium = Installed cost of a specific chiller type - installed cost of an electric chiller                  Incremental Simple Payback = Cost Premium / (Electric Chiller Annual Operating Cost - Specific Chiller Annual Operating Cost)</small>		

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

AFB	Air Force Base
AFCESA	Air Force Civil Engineer Support Agency
ANG	Air National Guard
ARS	Air Reserve Station
Btu	British thermal unit
CERL	Construction Engineering Research Laboratory
CFC	chlorofluorocarbon
CHW	chilled water
CHWR	chilled water return
CHWS	chilled water supply
COP	coefficient of performance
DDC	direct digital control
deg F	degrees Fahrenheit
DOD	Department of Defense
FY	fiscal year
gpm	gallons per minute
HCFC	hydrochlorofluorocarbon
HFC	hydrofluorocarbon
HHV	higher heating value
kW	kilowatt
kWh	kilowatt-hour
MBtu	million British thermal units
SCF	standard cubic feet
SCFH	standard cubic feet per hour
TDY	temporary duty

**DISTRIBUTION**

HQ AFCESA, Tyndall AFB  
ATTN: AFCESA/CESM (2)

Chief of Engineers  
ATTN: CEHEC-IM-LH (2)  
ATTN: HECSA Mailroom (2)  
ATTN: CECC-R  
ATTN: CERD-L  
ATTN: CERD-M

Defense Tech Info Center 22304  
ATTN: DTIC-O (2)

11  
11/99

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)	2. REPORT DATE December 1999	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final
----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Performance Analysis of Natural Gas Cooling Technology at Air Force Bases: Youngstown-Warren ARS and Warner-Robins AFB, Fiscal Year 1999	5. FUNDING NUMBERS MIPR N28FY97000081 VR7
6. AUTHOR(S) William T. Brown, III	

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (CERL) P.O. Box 9005 Champaign, IL 61826-9005	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER TR 99/95
--	--

9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Headquarters, Air Force Civil Engineer Support Agency (HQ AFCESA) ATTN: AFCESA/CESM Suite 1 Tyndall AFB, FL 32403-5319	10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER
--	--

9. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES  
Copies are available from the National Technical Information Service, 5385 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161

12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE
---	------------------------

13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)

High-efficiency gas-fired cooling equipment is readily available for commercial, institutional, and industrial facilities. Natural gas engine-driven chillers have higher coefficients of performance than any other natural gas cooling system, and can serve as energy efficient alternatives for new electric chillers. This study monitored the performance of natural gas cooling technologies operating at two Air Force bases during the fiscal year 1999 cooling season and compared the actual performance data to theoretical values.

Energy and demand cost analyses were performed to compare each natural gas cooling technology with the energy and demand costs of old and new electric chillers. The study determined that, at the monitored bases, the costs for the natural gas used by the engine-driven chillers were lower than electrical costs used by old and new electric chillers, resulting in an energy cost savings.

14. SUBJECT TERMS energy consumption cooling systems Air Force bases	energy cost savings natural gas cooling technology cooling systems	15. NUMBER OF PAGES 38
		16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR
---	--	---	-----------------------------------