February 2021



Master Planning for Cost-Effective Energy Management





Tracy Chouinard 978.983.2047 Tchouinard@BrwnCald.com



Jordan Damerel Lexi Valenti



Adam Ross Kenny Klittich



• AGENDA

- **1.** FSSD Introduction
- 2. Biogas alternatives
- **3.** NPV results and general themes
- 4. Relating prices in New England



Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District



Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District





Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District



Average Electricity Demand 1290 kW



Existing Electricity Production



25 kW



1MW Peak Capacity 180 kW







GOALS:

- 1. Determine utilization options that have positive NPV compared to status quo
- 2. Establish alternatives to be carried through into the Master Plan phase



Biogas Utilization Alternatives



Biogas Utilization Alternatives

- 0. "Status Quo" @ 200 scfm
- 1. New Engines
- 2. Microturbines
- 3. Rehab Existing Engine
- 4. Biomethane Pipeline Injection
- 5. Onsite Vehicle Fuel (CNG) + Existing Engine
- 6. Onsite Vehicle Fuel + Existing Engine Rehab
- 7. Onsite Vehicle Fuel + Microturbines

Gas Production: A - LOW B - MEDIUM C - HIGH



Feedstock/Process Evaluation: How much gas?

	Low	Medium	High
Value:	200 scfm	350 scfm	550 scfm
Works with:	 Status quo +10% for growth or small HSW Works within existing systems and thresholds 	 Meso digestion w/ recuperative or co- thickening Sub-15-day Meso Up to 25,000 gpd HSW New flare optional/recommended New HSW receiving facility 	 2 digesters in service Sub-13-day thermo TWAS Bypass 25,000+ gpd HSW New flare required New HSW receiving facility



Net Present Value Results



Assumptions

- NPV period of 20 years
- Value of electricity only scaled by inflation (3%)
- Discount rate of 4%
- Current RINs and LCFS credit values used
 - Renewable Identification Numbers (RINs) Available Nationwide
 - Low Carbon Fuel Standard California Only
 - Designated to reduce greenhouse gas emissions for fuels used for transportation



NPV Results for all Alternatives with respect to status quo





Theme 1: Low gas production alternatives (A) do not offer benefit





Theme 2: "Hybrid" alternatives (6 and 7) do not offer benefit at (A) or (B) gas production





Brown and Caldwell

Clarity: Alternatives 1 thru 5 at (B) gas production





Pairwise: New Cogen [1B] vs Microturbines [2B] Conclusion – Engines are a better solution than Microturbines





Pairwise: New Cogen [1B] vs Rehab Existing [3B] Conclusion – New engine is a better solution than rehab





Pairwise: Pipeline Injection [4B] vs Onsite Vehicle Fuel [5B] Conclusion – Onsite VF is a better solution than pipeline injection





Pairwise: New Cogen [1B] vs Onsite Vehicle Fuel [5B] Conclusion – Onsite VF is a better solution than a new engine*





New Combined Heat and Power Engines



Risks:

- Air permitting process
 - Schedule
 - Gas production limit
- Existing building
 - Space
 - Suitability
- Plant demand and coordination with solar and microgrid (value of electricity)

Opportunities:

- Grant funding
 - SGIP
 - CWSRF Green Project
 Reserve
- Natural gas blending
- Advanced microgrid
- BioMAT?
- Existing engine remains for standby and additional capacity



Onsite Vehicle Fueling



Risks:

- Vehicle fuel partnership
- RIN/LCFS value
- New Legislation
 - Gov. Newsom executive order to phase out gasoline-powered cars

Opportunities:

- Grant funding
 - CEC, Air District



Other considerations



Discussions with Fleet Providers

Sale of fuel drops from \$2.50/gallon to \$1.62/gallon





Impact of No RINs or LCFS



Cogen is the most cost-effective option!





How Relates to New England



New England

Sale of fuel \$2.20/gallon D5 RINs \$0.59/RIN Electricity Cost \$0.139/kW Electricity Sale \$0.10/kW



Small Changes can have large impacts





Thank you. Questions?

Tracy Chouinard tchouinard@brwncald.com

