





Business

Financing your project

Compare options

Compressed air

Case study: Compressed air

Find out how a processing plant using an Environmental Upgrade Agreement (EUA) to finance an energy efficient compressed air system determined that they would be better off by about \$90,000 over 15 years if they invested in an energy-efficient system.

Situation

A processing plant is looking at replacing their existing air compressor with a new unit. The compressor runs 8,400 hrs. p.a. at an average load of 50%. They have the option of purchasing a standard screw compressor (55kW) with load/unload type of control or an energy-efficient VSD compressor (55kW) with higher efficiency components.

How does the energy-efficient (EE) system compare to the standard system?

Equipment type	Standard	EE
Cost to install (\$)	\$27,000	\$50,000
Operation and maintenance costs (\$ p.a.)	\$6,300	\$4,800

Electricity use (kWh p.a.)	333,667	256,667
Equipment life (years)	15	15
Electricity cost reduction in first year from the system (\$)		\$15,400
Simple payback period for the system (years)		4.7
Simple payback period for the system (years), with marginal capital ¹ (years)		2.2

Item	NPV
Standard	-\$494,742 >
EE system	-\$404,640
Difference	\$90,102

Finance option selected: Environmental upgrade agreement (EUA).

The company decides to seek an EUA to finance their energy efficiency compressed air system, as this would result in the highest expected

NPV.

¹This is the payback period for the energy-efficient (EE) option using the difference in capital outlay between the standard and EE equipment, rather than the full capital outlay for the EE equipment.



Page last updated: 27 February 2015

Downloads

Download the case study and a cash flow model.

Case study (PDF 249KB)

Cash flow model (XLSX 676KB)

Checklist

Check if an environmental upgrade agreement is the right option for your business.

Download the checklist (PDF 2MB)

Contact us

Phone 1300 361 967

Email Energy Saver