

MX75 FILL

THE COMPARISON

MARLEY® MX75		BRENTWOOD® XF75
Replacing with Marley MX75 fill will deliver thermal performance equivalent to original design specifications (see Warranty Certificate at proofinperformance.com)	THERMAL PERFORMANCE	Brentwood XF75 fill can reduce performance by increasing cold water temperature up to 17% compared to Marley MX fill* (see "Reference" at bottom of MBX Head-to-Head comparison page)
Marley MX75 fill retains energy cost of chiller operation per the original design specifications of the cooling tower	ENERGY SAVINGS	Brentwood XF75 fill can result in up to a \$5,256 increase in annual energy costs due to increased load on the chiller motor***
OEM Marley MX75 hanging fill is the only means of maintaining your FM Approval	FM APPROVAL	Brentwood XF75 fill does NOT maintain your original FM Approval, which could lead to increased insurance costs under FM
The only means of maintaining your CTI Certification is by replacing with Marley MX75 fill	CTI CERTIFICATION	Using Brentwood fill will VOID your entire tower's CTI Certification, which could lead to increased operating costs due to decreased performance of the overall system
Guaranteed drift levels matching original tower performance, reducing impact on neighboring properties and prolonging life of the mechanical equipment	DRIFT	Brentwood XF75 fill exhibited a higher number of drift particles and larger drift particle size**
Marley MX75 hanging fill standard thickness is 11 mil after forming	SHEET THICKNESS	Brentwood XF75 fill has options for 8, 10 or 15 mil after forming, so be sure that you understand what they are quoting to get a true cost comparison

REFERENCE:

* Based on test results measuring the approach temperature at the SPX CT Development Center. Model NC8306K operating at 50hp and 1746 gallons per minute. HW/CW/WB conditions of 95/85/78 degrees F.

** Based on Drift Particle size sampling at the SPX CT Development Center.

*** The 17% reduction in thermal performance yields approximately 1 degree F higher temperature exiting the cooling tower (assuming 95/85/78 degrees F conditions). This can affect the chiller by 2% in lost energy performance due to increased load on the chiller motor. The extra load is required to reject sufficient heat to maintain the same target air temperature. The resulting energy cost increase can be calculated as follows:

Chiller motor = 400hp • Lost chiller performance = 2% • 400hp X 2% = 8hp = 6 kilowatts • 6 kilowatts X 8,760 hours per year = 52,560 kW per year • Use average price of electricity in your region to calculate cost per year
http://www.eia.gov/electricity/monthly/epm_table_grapher.cfm?t=epmt_5_6_b • Assuming cost of \$0.10 per kW hour: Cost = 52,560 X 0.10 = \$5,256 annual cost for energy loss of 1 degree F cooling water temperature