

IPSSA Pool Pump Field Survey for 2008 Title 20 Update
Survey of cost and efficiency of .75 HP (1.25 THP) pumps
Submitted by IPSSA Government Relations Committee

Bob Nichols, Mike Gardner, Celia Hugueley, Terry Snow

July 28, 2008

IPSSA, the Independent Pool and Spa Service Association, initiated a in-field survey to verify data presented to the CEC by PG&E and the Davis Energy Group. The purpose of the study was to compare the energy savings of existing installations of .75 (1.25 THP) single and two-speed pumps of identical design.

* Field data gathered during July 2008.

* Twelve pumps were measured, two were two-speed, nine were single speed.

* To insure a direct comparison of single to two-speed motor performance, all pumps were Pentair Whisperflo, 1.25 THP, a commonly used pump listed in the CEC database in both single and two-speed models.

* Pools are of varying age from less than one year to 40+, in a variety of sizes and plumbing configurations.

* All pools are in-ground, one is indoor

* Pumps are of varying age, from one to nine years. The two-speed pumps were both less than one year old.

* Vacuum readings were measured at the pump pot drain plug. Pressure readings were taken at the pump volute.

* Voltage and amperage measured with Greenlee CM 400A (RMS) meter EI= Volts x amps (apparent power)

* Flow was measured with Blue-White F-300 Flowmeters where possible; if plumbing could not accommodate flow meter installation, flow was calculated using Pentair pump curve and Sta-Rite Engineering Manual. Flow readings in *italics* are measured flow.

* Systems measured in normal operation, without spa, solar or waterfalls/fountains running..

Definitions/ assumptions:

Cost figures for 2 speed upgrade from Davis Energy Group (July 23, 2008)

Comparisons made from field gathered data and CEC database Pool-Pumps.xls dated 5/19/08 (DEG)

LCC = .931 (10 year) (Davis Energy Group)

THP = Total (theoretical) horsepower = Nameplate Horsepower x Service Factor = Max load horsepower

NP = Motor name plate

OHP = operating horsepower = actual horsepower (KW x .746)

PV = Net customer present value

BCR = Benefit cost ratio

Number of pools

12

DOCKET

08-AAEP-1B

JUL 28 2008

DATE

RECD. SEP 02 2008

Analysis of pools surveyed:														
Operations that require minimum 2 hour high speed:														
Pool cleaners with booster pumps							9	75%						
Automatic erosion chlorine feeders (may need more than 2 hrs high speed)							8	67%						
Suction or pressure side cleaners (no booster pump)							3	25%						
Functions that require additional high speed operation:														
Pools with sand filters (require 100% high speed operation)							2	17%						
Pools with solar (usually 4-6 hour/day)(4.66 field pool average)							3	25%						
Pools with auxiliary features such as waterfalls, fountains, heaters and spas							3	25%						
Total number of field study pools unable to utilize two-speed							4	33%						
Field gathered sample inventory of pools with WhisperFlo .75 (1.25 THP) pumps:														
Total pools	Automatic chlorine feeder	Booster pump cleaner	Suction cleaner	Return line cleaner	Floor system	No cleaner	Spa	W.fall	Aux pumps	DE	Sand	Cart	Solar	multi skimmers
0	8	9	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	10	2	0	3	2
Conclusions:														
In addition to the consistent extra use indicated above, pool owners often run the high speed extra time to handle adverse conditions such as wind, algae or heavy use. The assumption of two hour high speed use is a conservative average. The very low vacuum and pressure created by the low speed of the .75 (1.25 THP) pump is not high enough to adequately run features such as automatic chlorination and pool cleaners. Automatic chlorinators have become very common because floating chlorinators may damage plaster and endanger swimmers. These types of chlorinators depend on the high flow and pressure of single or high speed pumping to dissolve the chlorine tablets. When considering the real world demands of a typical existing swimming pool, low speed, low flow and low pressure conditions are often inadequate. When the pump is run more than 2 hours/day on high speed, the energy savings become almost nil. Because most existing pools are plumbed with 1.5 and 2 inch plumbing, which can not safely accommodate much more flow than the amount a .75 (1.25THP) pump can produce, it is clear that the many larger horsepower pumps when replaced with like sized two-speed motors and pumps under PG&E's recommendation, will continue to be oversized; all while the misinformed pool owner, store counter person or field service technician thinks they will save energy without downsizing. Field data proves that .75 (1.25 THP) single speed pumps/motors remain an important energy saving choice for replacement applications.														
Page 2										8/6/2008				

1.25 THP Pool Pump Survey Comparisons for 2008 Title 20 Update	July 28, 2008
---	----------------------

July 28, 2008

Assumptions:		Pump: Pentair WhisperFlo .75 (1.25 THP)					
Base Pump Run time	5	hours, 4.6 hours and 4.2 hours					
High Speed Operation	1	hour (inadequate), 2 hours					
Controls Cost	\$240	(per DEG)					
LCC (10 year)	0.931	\$/kWh (per DEG)					

Davis Energy Group calculated (per CEC pump data 7-10-08) Two-Speed Savings (theoretical)

Total HP	WhisperFlo	Flow (gpm)	Power (W)	EF (G/Wh)	Hours	gal/day	Energy (kWh/yr)	Cost	PV	BCR
1.25	Single-speed	61.0	1550	2.36	5.0	18,300	2829	\$485		
	Two-speed High	61.0	1750	2.09	1.0	3,660	639	\$695		
	Two-speed Low	33.0	349	5.67	7.4	14,640	942	\$240		
	Savings						1248	\$450	\$711.74	2.58

IPSSA field gathered data July 2008

Actual savings/costs

Assumptions for controls cost and LCC unchanged (per Davis Energy Group) measurements from field gathered data

Field gathered data: Two-speed cost/savings one turnover/day (average pool volume per field data)

1.25	Single-speed	66.1	1497	2.65	4.8	18,917	2606	\$485			
	Two-speed high	76.0	1754	2.60	2.0	9,120	1280	\$695			Actual
	Two-speed low	34.0	557	3.66	4.8	9,797	976	\$240	Cost:		kWh/y savings
	Savings						349	\$450	(\$125.45)	0.72	234

Field gathered data: Two-speed cost/savings: 4.6 hour run time (Davis Energy Group)

[illegible]

Field gathered data: Two-speed cost/savings: 2 hour high speed: (actual single speed run time per field data)

1.25	Single-speed	66.1	1497	2.65	4.2	16,657	2294	\$485			
	Two-speed high	76.0	1754	2.60	2.0	9,120	1280	\$695			
	Two-speed low	34.0	557	3.66	3.7	7,537	751	\$240	Cost:		
	Savings						263	\$450	(\$205.58)	0.54	176

33% of field study pools would be unable to utilize two-speed pumping; actual kWh/yr savings figures must be reduced by 33%.

Above are examples of various run times/pool volumes to compare average costs/savings to replace single speed WFE 3 with its two-speed replacement, WFDS 3. Note that none of the scenarios create a net customer savings in the present. Field data indicates single speed WhisperFlo pumps operate at much higher flows and lower energy consumption than indicated on calculations from PG&E and Davis Energy Group and CEC curve A. The CEC pump curve A calculations do not appear to be a good predictor of energy savings or pump performance in typical existing pool pump installations. Actual OHP is significantly lower than (THP) averaging only slightly over 1 HP at 1.12. If a direct comparison of the .75 (1.25 THP) single and two-speed pumps yield such minimal energy savings, it is clear that there will be much less energy savings when this pump is compared to the higher consumption of the larger horsepower 2-speeds. In the straight replacement scenario, significant savings opportunities will be lost when rather than downsizing, the choice of a same size 2-speed replacement is made. All those oversized pumps will continue to overpump their plumbing, underperform, and most importantly waste energy.
--

IPSSA Field Gathered Data July 2008

[illegible]

[illegible]

Pool Pump Calculations for 2008 Title 20 Update										
Leo Rainer										
Davis Eng 7/10/2008										
Assumptions:										
Base Pump Run time		5	hours							
High Speed Operation		1	hours							
Controls Cost		\$240								
LCC (10 year)		0.931	\$/kWh							
Two-Speed Savings										
Total HP	Pump	Flow (gpm)	Power (W)	EF	Hours	gal/day	Energy (kV)	Cost	PV	BCR
1.25	Single-speed	57.0	1360	2.51	5.0	17100	2482	\$485		
	Two-speed High	58.1	1488	2.34	1.0	3489	543	\$722		
	Two-speed Low	32.1	334	5.77	7.1	13611	861	\$240		
	Savings		1028				1077	\$477	\$526	2.10
1.65	Single-speed	60.9	1615	2.26	5.0	18263	2948	\$580		
	Two-speed High	61.6	1810	2.04	1.0	3695	661	\$740		
	Two-speed Low	32.8	426	4.62	7.4	14568	1152	\$240		
	Savings		1190				1135	\$400	\$657	2.64
2.2	Single-speed	63.0	1958	1.93	5.0	18900	3573	\$629		
	Two-speed High	65.5	1880	2.09	1.0	3930	686	\$865		
	Two-speed Low	33.4	405	4.96	7.5	14970	1103	\$240		
	Savings		1553				1784	\$476	\$1,185	3.49
2.6	Single-speed	67.8	2202	1.85	5.0	20325	4019	\$708		
	Two-speed High	69.0	2149	1.93	1.0	4140	784	\$1,015		
	Two-speed Low	36.0	468	4.61	7.5	16185	1280	\$240		
	Savings		1734				1954	\$547	\$1,273	3.33