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## Brookhaven National Laboratory A passion for discovery



5321 acres
350 buildings
$\sim 4.2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$

| FY 08 | FY 09 | FY 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 532 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 880 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 700 \mathrm{M}$ |

29 miles paved roads

12 miles sidewalks
>4000 guest users per year

> Brookhaven National Laboratory

Energy Use
FY 2009
Process


Note: Vehicle fuels ~ 99,000 Gal/year (includes 25,000 gallons of diesel)

## Transportation Vehicle- Overview

- 292 Vehicles of mixed use on site: ~35\% are Alternative Fuel
- Compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling infrastructure installed 2001
- 75 CNG vehicles displaced 23,900 GGE (~25\% of total) in 2010
- BNL provides compressed natural gas refueling to local governments that partner with DOE Clean Cities
- E85 refueling infrastructure operational late 2010
- 27 Vehicles
- Biodiesel displacing about 20\% of the vehicle diesel consumption
- Started early 2010
- Neighborhood electric vehicles to replace some conventional-fuel vehicles



## CNG - Overview

- CNG Facility - Installed late 2001
- 3000 / 3600 PSI fueling pressure - Fast fill @ ~ 600 SCFM (5 GGE/min)
- 1 Bauer 40 SCFM ( 30 HP ) compressor
- 30,000 SCF storage
- Tulsa fuel dispensers with card readers
- Enclosure for compressor(s), controls, drier
- \$378,000 construction contract. \$575,000 Total Project Cost
- Second Compressor - Added 2005
- 1 Bauer 40 SCFM compressor
- Controls upgrade/conversion to Allen-Bradley PLC
- \$215,000



## CNG - Original Estimate

## Natural Gas Vehicles Updated: 6/4/2000

| End of Year | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{c\|} \text { No. } \\ \text { Vehicles } \end{array}\right.$ | Ave. <br> Miles <br> per year | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Ave. } \\ \text { Miles } \\ \text { per gge } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 52 \mathrm{wks} \\ \text { gge } \\ \text { per year } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Average: 7 Days, $24 \mathrm{hrs} / \mathrm{day}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Therms per year | Cubic Feet per year | Nat GasCost | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Nat. Gas } \\ \text { Fuel } \\ \text { Savings } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Incremental <br> Vehicle <br> Cost$\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Infrastructure } \\ \text { Cost } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { gge } \\ \text { per week } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { gge } \\ \text { per day } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathrm{Nat.}^{\text {Gas }} \\ \mathrm{Ft}^{3} \mathrm{Wk} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Nat. Gas } \\ \mathrm{Ft}^{3} \text { /day } \end{gathered}$ | Nat. Gas CFM |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 20 | 4,000 | 12 | 6,667 | 128 | 18 | 0.76 | 15,385 | 2,192 | 1.52 | 8,333 | 800,000 | \$3,823 | \$1,577 | \$30,177 |  |
| 2001 | 32 | 4,000 | 13 | 9,600 | 185 | 26 | 1.10 | 22,154 | 3,156 | 2.19 | 12,000 | 1,152,000 | \$5,506 | \$2,270 | \$24,800 | \$580,000 |
| 2002 | 44 | 4,000 | 13 | 13,200 | 254 | 36 | 1.51 | 30,462 | 4,340 | 3.01 | 16,500 | 1,584,000 | \$7,570 | \$3,122 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2003 | 56 | 4,000 | 13 | 16,800 | 323 | 46 | 1.92 | 38,769 | 5,523 | 3.84 | 21,000 | 2,016,000 | \$9,635 | \$3,973 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2004 | 68 | 4,000 | 13 | 20,400 | 392 | 56 | 2.33 | 47,077 | 6,707 | 4.66 | 25,500 | 2,448,000 | \$11,699 | \$4,825 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2005 | 80 | 4,000 | 13 | 24,000 | 462 | 66 | 2.74 | 55,385 | 7,890 | 5.48 | 30,000 | 2,880,000 | \$13,764 | \$5,676 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2006 | 92 | 4,000 | 13 | 27,600 | 531 | 76 | 3.15 | 63,692 | 9,074 | 6.30 | 34,500 | 3,312,000 | \$15,829 | \$6,527 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2007 | 104 | 4,000 | 13 | 31,200 | 600 | 85 | 3.56 | 72,000 | 10,258 | 7.12 | 39,000 | 3,744,000 | \$17,893 | \$7,379 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2008 | 116 | 4,000 | 13 | 34,800 | 669 | 95 | 3.97 | 80,308 | 11,441 | 7.95 | 43,500 | 4,176,000 | \$19,958 | \$8,230 | \$24,800 | \$375,000 |
| 2009 | 128 | 4,000 | 13 | 38,400 | 738 | 105 | 4.38 | 88,615 | 12,625 | 8.77 | 48,000 | 4,608,000 | \$22,022 | \$9,082 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2010 | 140 | 4,000 | 13 | 42,000 | 808 | 115 | 4.79 | 96,923 | 13,808 | 9.59 | 52,500 | 5,040,000 | \$24,087 | \$9,933 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2011 | 152 | 4,000 | 13 | 45,600 | 877 | 125 | 5.21 | 105,231 | 14,992 | 10.41 | 57,000 | 5,472,000 | \$26,152 | \$10,784 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2012 | 164 | 4,000 | 13 | 49,200 | 946 | 135 | 5.62 | 113,538 | 16,175 | 11.23 | 61,500 | 5,904,000 | \$28,216 | \$11,636 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2013 | 176 | 4,000 | 13 | 52,800 | 1,015 | 145 | 6.03 | 121,846 | 17,359 | 12.05 | 66,000 | 6,336,000 | \$30,281 | \$12,487 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2014 | 188 | 4,000 | 13 | 56,400 | 1,085 | 155 | 6.44 | 130,154 | 18,542 | 12.88 | 70,500 | 6,768,000 | \$32,345 | \$13,339 | \$24,800 |  |
| 2015 | 200 | 4,000 | 13 | 60,000 | 1,154 | 164 | 6.85 | 138,462 | 19,726 | 13.70 | 75,000 | 7,200,000 | \$34,410 | \$14,190 | \$24,800 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \$303,190 | \$125,030 | \$402,177 |  |

## CNG - Performance



Note: BNL GGE for 2010 was 23,913. The balance was consumed by others.

## CNG Fueling Facility Highlights






## CNG - Lessons Learned

- OEM Manufacturers extremely limited
- Most have left the market
- Mainly pick-up trucks and vans
- Retrofits for new vehicles are very expensive
- Conversions $\sim \$ 18,000 /$ vehicle in addition to vehicle cost
- May/will void manufacturers warranty
- CNG Vehicles
- Require annual inspections of fuel systems
- Storage tanks lasting ~5 years - Many fail inspection process
- Parts have become expensive, with some increasing by $3 x$ in 5 years
- Less range than conventional fuel vehicles


## CNG Summary

- CNG vehicles are a practical, albeit expensive alternative to gasoline versions
- Try to take advantage of grants and other incentives
- Clean cities, NYSERA, etc.
- CNG better suited for:
- Fleet operations and high usage per vehicle
- Large infrastructure investment softened on a unit cost basis
- Areas were low emissions are particularly important
- Populated areas, long idling time, etc.
- Must budget for additional maintenance and capital investments
- Compressor rebuild/replacements
- Tank certification and replacements
- Higher vehicle first cost

