

Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Green Project Reserve
– Preliminary –



City of Chubbuck Drinking Water Upgrade Project
SRF Loan #DW1602 (pop. 14,125)
\$8,500,000

Preliminary Green Project Reserve Justification

Categorical GPR Documentation

1. NEW BOOSTER PUMP STATION AND WELL REFURBISHMENT WITH PREMIUM ENERGY-EFFICIENT PUMPS AND VFDS (Energy Efficiency). Categorical per GPR 3.2-2: *projects that achieve a 20% reduction in energy consumption; if a project achieves less than a 20% reduction in energy efficiency, then it may be justified using a business case; also, per 3.5-9: VFDS can be justified based upon substantial energy savings (\$200,000).*
2. INSTALLS NEW WATER TRANSMISSION PIPING (Water Efficiency). Business Case GPR per 2.4-3: *Efficient water use...reducing the amount of energy required by a drinking water system...therefore, there are also energy and financial savings; also (Energy Efficiency) Business Case GPR per 3.5-1: Energy efficient...upgrades; and, per 3.5-5: Projects that achieve the remaining increments of energy efficiency. (\$1,000,000).*

1. PREMIUM PUMPS AND VFDs (PRELIMINARY)²

Summary

- As part of the upgrade project, the City of Chubbuck will refurbish a well with an energy efficient pump, and construct a new booster pump station with pumps equipped with premium energy-efficient motors and VFDs.
- Total Loan amount = \$8,500,000
- Estimated energy efficient (green) portion of loan = 2.4% (\$200,000) (preliminary cost estimate)

Background

- The City of Chubbuck water system has three active water supply wells, three storage tanks, one booster pump station, and over 70 miles of distribution system piping ranging in size from 4 inch to 24 inch in diameter.
- The Water System requires increased water production capacity and increased storage capacity to address both immediate and future projected deficiencies.
- A new booster pump station will be equipped with three (3) **centrifugal** pumps with premium energy-efficient XX hp motors with VFDs.
- As part of Well #X refurbishment, a new premium energy efficient pump and VFD will be installed.



GPR Justification

Motors/VFDs:

The Baseline Standard Practice for comparison is a standard Epact motor that is not controlled by a VFD³. Published operating curves by the pump manufacturer provided VFD efficiency data:

- **Proposed Pumps - no VFD, standard efficiency motor**
Type: centrifugal
Efficiency 70%; Flow 3,000 gpm; 4.3 mgd; Head 17 ft
Motor rating = 25 hp; Motor type = standard efficiency (89.3% assumed at 75% of full load⁴)
BHP, existing avg flow = 20.6 hp
% operation = 34% (average day flow/pump output)
Energy usage = 45,239 kW-hr
- **Proposed Pumps - no VFD, with premium efficiency motor**
(93.4% assumed at 75% of full load)
BHP, existing avg flow = 19.7 hp
% operation = 34% (average day flow/pump output)
Energy usage = 43,254 kW-hr
- **Proposed Pumps - VFD operation with premium efficiency motor**
Type centrifugal
Efficiency 70%; Head 12.5 ft;
Motor rating = 25 hp; Motor type = standard efficiency (93.4% assumed at 75% of full load)
BHP, existing avg flow = 4.9 hp
% operation = 100% (VFD control to match flow)

¹ City of Chubbuck Water Facilities Planning Study, Keller Engineers, August 2015

² Text in red font will be replaced with actual design information when the GPR Technical Memorandum is submitted

³ NYS Energy Research and Development Authority, Energy Evaluation Memorandum, Village of Greenport WWTP Upgrade 8-2009.

⁴ http://www.copper.org/environment/sustainable-energy/electric-motors/education/motor_text.html

Energy usage 31,804 kW-hr

- **Energy Reduction - comparing with VFD to without VFD**
Energy usage, w/o VFD 43,254 kW-hr
Energy usage, w/ VFD 31,804 kW-hr
- The premium motors with VFDs result in a **xx%** energy reduction compared to non-VFD, standard efficiency motors

Conclusion

- The combined annual energy savings for utilizing premium pumps and VFDs is estimated to be xxx kWh/year per motor/VFD system - corresponding to an energy reduction of **xx%** when compared to the Baseline Standard Practice.
- The premium energy-efficient pumps/VFDs are categorically GPR eligible as they achieve greater than 20% reduction in energy consumption.
- **GRP Costs Identified:**
Booster Station VFDs (3 @ \$20,000 ea. = \$60,000) + Pumps (3 @ \$25,000 = \$75,000) +
Well Pump (1 @ \$XX) + VFD (1 @ \$XX) = **Total = \$200,000**
- **GPR Justification:**
The Pump/VFD system is Categorically GPR eligible (Energy Efficiency) per Section 3.2-2 page 9⁵: *Projects that achieve a 20% reduction in energy consumption are categorically eligible for GPR; also, per 3.5-9: VFDs can be justified based upon substantial energy savings.*

⁵ Attachment 2. April 21, 2010 EPA Guidance for Determining Project Eligibility

New Water Transmission Line (Preliminary)⁶

Summary

- A new 24" diameter transmission line consisting of 6,000 feet of ductile iron pipe will be installed to increase system reliability, and to reduce energy requirements.
- Loan amount = \$8,500,000
- Energy saving (green) portion of loan = 11.8% (\$1,000,000)

Background

- The water system is experiencing fluctuating high pressure events due to a lack of transmission capacity.
- As part of a water loss management plan, various distribution alternatives were evaluated to identify potential pipeline rehabilitation/replacement projects. A priority alternative selected was the provision of a new transmission line. This project will install 6,000 feet of 24-inch, 16-inch, and 12-inch pipe.

Energy Savings

- By installing xxxx feet of new transmission line, the City anticipates conserving energy.
- The WaterCAD model was used to calculate the cost per MG for a well based on discharge pressures, suction pressures, and flow. Because modified pump curves (to reflect both the drawdown and pump curve) are used, only the difference in cost per MG for the wells is compared. Costs were calculated assuming \$0.07/KW*Hr.
- Due to the new transmission line, an average estimated energy savings of approximately x% is anticipated.
- For the period an estimated annual combined cost savings of at least \$xxx would be realized. Over a 40 year period, this savings would amount to approximately \$xxxxx.

Conclusion

- Energy cost savings of at least \$xxx will be realized over the 40-year life of the new transmission line.
- Additional benefits include reductions in unnecessary pumping and operation and maintenance expenditures.
- **GPR Costs:** xxxx foot transmission line = \$1,000,000
- **GPR Justification:** The project is Business Case GPR-eligible (Water Efficient) per 2.4-3: *Efficient water use...reducing the amount of energy required by a drinking water system...therefore, there are also energy and financial savings*; also (Energy Efficiency) Business Case GPR per 3.5-1: *Energy efficient...upgrades*; and, per 3.5-5: *Projects that achieve the remaining increments of energy efficiency*.

⁶ Text in red font will be replaced with actual design information when the GPR Technical Memorandum is submitted