





# Growth, Managing Costs and Reducing Carbon at Mayo Clinic by Leveraging DERs

Brett Gorden Section Head - Facilities Management, Mayo ClinicSteve Willins Director, Electric Services, World Kinect Energy Services









### Purpose

- Why did Mayo Clinic pursue this DER Evaluation?
  - Cost Reduction
  - Growth
  - Sustainability
  - Resiliency









### • Established Priorities

- Cost Savings
- Carbon Reduction
- Reliability & Resilience

### • Established Financial Assumptions

- As a Non-Profit, Mayo Clinic can NOT take advantage of Federal Tax-based Incentives; i.e.
  - Investment Tax Credit (ITC)
  - Modified Accelerated Cost Recovery System (MACRS) with Bonus Depreciation
- Discount Rate = 7.5%
- Utility Cost Escalator = 2.0% annually
- Project Life = 20 years









#### • Data Gathering

- Rates, Invoices, Contracts for Electricity, Natural Gas, Steam
- Utility Supplied Electric Interval Data
- Hourly Onsite Generated Power
- Daily Nat Gas Consumption
- Hourly Steam Production for Downtown Campus
- Daily Steam Production for St. Mary's Hospital Campus









#### • Dealing with Complexities

#### Data Integrity

- Some data provided hourly
- Some data provided daily
- Matching Metered data (hourly and daily) to Invoice data (electric, natural gas, steam)

#### Current System Understanding

- Boilers, HRSG, Purchased Steam
- Gas Turbines, Steam Turbines
- Only Evaluate Current Boiler Steam & Associated NG for Displacing with new CHP
  - Do NOT use Current GT Gas and HRSG Steam
- Downtown & St. Mary's Campuses tied electrically but separate thermally
- Satellite Campuses
  - Scope Creep Identifying and Limiting which facilities to include
- Limited Rooftop or Land for BTM Solar
- **Check for Nat Gas Supply Constraints** *Found no concerns for these facilities*









#### • Establish Current State

- Electric Loop Connects Downtown and St. Mary's Campuses
- **Downtown Campus** (includes Franklin Heating Station & Prospect Utility Plant):
  - Four (4) Steam Boilers with Steam Turbine-Generators
  - Emergency Diesel Backup Generators (7 x 2.4 MW)

#### • St. Mary's Campus:

- One (1) Combustion Turbine with HRSG
- One (1) Steam Turbine-Generator
- Three (3) Boilers for additional steam
- Emergency Diesel Backup Generators (3 x 2.5 MW)









• Establish Current State: Downtown Campus Aerial View











• Establish Current State: St. Mary's Hospital Campus Aerial View











#### • Established Current State: Electric Supply

Downtown	Campus	St. I	St. Mary's Campus			COMBINED					
ENERGY	MAX	ENE	RGY	MAX		ENERGY		Coincident	Diversity		
(MWh)	(MW)	(MV	Vh)	(MW)		(MWh)	MAX (MW)	MAX (MW)	Factor		
			T	<b>OTAL CAM</b>	PUS	LOAD					

		TOTAL CAMPUS LOAD												
Annual Total:	163,440	31.7	67,630	14.6	231,070	46.2	44.2	96%						
Mo/Hrly Avg:	13,620	18.7	5,640	7.7	19,260	26.4								

	PURCHASED POWER												
Annual Total:	96,420	23.4	9,990	8.4	106,410	29.0	26.6	92%					
Mo/Hrly Avg:	8,040	11.0	830	1.1	8,870	12.1							
	59.0%		14.8%		46.1%								

	GENERATED POWER												
Annual Total:	67,020	13.4	57,640	11.3	124,660	24.1	22.4	93%					
Mo/Hrly Avg:	5,590 7.7		4,800 6.6		10,390 14.2								
	41.0%		85.2%		53.9%								









#### • Established Current State: Steam Supply

	Downtown	Campus		St. Mary's	Campus		COMBINED					
	STEAM	MAX		STEAM	MAX		STEAM	MAX				
	(kp)	(kpph)		(kp)	(kpph)		(kp)	(kpph)				
			1	TOTAL CAMP	<b>US STEAM</b>							
Annual Total:	1,402,280	280		517,760	100		1,920,040	350				
Mo/Hrly Avg:	116,900	160		43,100	60		160,000	220				

	PURCHASED STEAM											
Annual Total:	291,870	120	-	-	291,870	120						
Mo/Hrly Avg:	24,300	30	-	0	24,300	30						
	20.8%		0.0%		15.2%							

	GENERATED STEAM											
Annual Total:	1,110,400	210	517,760	100	1,628,160	300						
Mo/Hrly Avg:	92,500	130	43,100	60	135,700	190						
	79.2%		100.0%		84.8%							









- Established Current State: Satellite Facilities
  - Which to include in Evaluation No Existing DERs
    - Mayo Support Center
    - Mayo Inventory Center
    - Superior Drive Support Center
    - 41st St. NW
    - Marvin Building
    - 3939 Warehouse
  - Numerous additional facilities were not included in this evaluation









#### Modeled Energy Rates

- Electric Distribution and Supply from Rochester Public Utilities (RPU)
- Natural Gas Distribution from Minnesota Energy Resources Corp (MERC)
- Natural Gas Transportation from Northern Natural Gas (NNG)
- Natural Gas Supply from multiple vendors
- Steam Supply (partial) from RPU (through 2025)

### • Utilized HOMER Grid software

- 100's of iterative scenarios run
- Optimized Results based on Net Present Cost (NPC)
  - Combined DERs
  - Individual DERs









#### Potential DER Solutions Evaluated

- Solar Generation
  - Solar Photovoltaic (PV) System
- Peak Shaving Generator
  - Reciprocating Engine System
- Combined Heat and Power (CHP)
  - Combustion Turbine System
- Battery Storage System
  - Lithium Ion Battery considered as at present that is the most widely used solution to provide energy storage
- Wind Generation
  - Wind Turbine System









#### • Findings & Recommendations: Downtown & St. Mary's Campuses

- New DERs Optimized on Net Present Cost (NPC)
  - 11 MW of additional Combined Heat & Power (CHP)
  - 2 MW of Solar Photovoltaic (Solar PV)
  - 3 MWh of Battery Storage
- Projected Financial Performance
  - 20 Year NPC Reduction = \$22 million
  - Annual Operating Cost Savings = \$4.5 million
  - Annual CO2e Emissions Reduction = 31,460 metric tons
  - Capital Investment = \$32 million
  - Simple Payback = 5.3 years
  - 20 Year ROI = 9.1%
  - 20 Year IRR = 13.4%



**Recall:** These results assume Mayo Clinic, as a Non-Profit, can NOT take advantage of Tax-based incentives; i.e. ITC, MACRS with Bonus Depreciation







#### • Alternative Findings & Recommendations: Downtown & St. Mary's Campuses

Case	Solar PV (kW)	CHP (kW)	Battery Storage (kWh)	Net Present Cost (\$)	Operating Cost (\$/yr)	Initial Capital Cost (\$)	Fuel cost (\$/yr)	CO <sup>2</sup> e Emissions (tonne/yr)	CO <sup>2</sup> e Emissions Reduction (tonne/yr)	CO <sup>2</sup> e Emissions Reduction (%)	Return on Investmen t (%)	Internal Rate of Return (%)	Simple Payback (yr)	Utility Bill Savings (\$/yr)
Base Case	-	-	-	\$ 232,370,200	\$19,270,970	\$-	\$ 7,360,062	169,123	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2,000	11,000	3,000	\$ 210,265,200	\$14,783,930	\$32,000,000	\$ 8,567,900	137,661	31,462	18.6%	9.1%	13.4%	5.26	\$ 8,283,308
Top 3 NPC	-	11,000	3,000	\$ 211,393,200	\$15,126,280	\$29,000,000	\$ 8,576,406	138,969	30,153	17.8%	9.3%	13.9%	5.04	\$ 7,963,876
	2,000	11,000	-	\$ 211,762,700	\$15,032,520	\$30,500,000	\$ 8,568,386	137,644	31,479	18.6%	8.9%	13.3%	5.26	\$ 7,978,001
	2,000	-	-	\$ 231,092,600	\$18,916,220	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 7,360,062	167,587	1,535	0.9%	7.2%	9.8%	8.89	\$ 340,346
Solar PV Only	1,500	-	-	\$ 231,362,600	\$19,000,820	\$ 2,250,000	\$ 7,360,062	167,971	1,152	0.7%	7.4%	10.0%	8.75	\$ 259,354
	500	-	-	\$ 232,003,100	\$19,178,330	\$ 750,000	\$ 7,360,062	168,738	384	0.2%	7.8%	10.4%	8.49	\$ 89,041
	-	11,000	-	\$ 212,730,800	\$15,361,600	\$27,500,000	\$ 8,576,841	138,954	30,169	17.8%	9.2%	13.8%	5.01	\$ 7,671,415
CHP Only	-	10,000	-	\$ 212,872,600	\$15,580,690	\$25,000,000	\$ 8,504,064	140,684	28,439	16.8%	9.8%	14.5%	4.87	\$ 7,148,822
	-	12,000	-	\$ 213,000,500	\$15,176,640	\$30,000,000	\$ 8,640,925	137,492	31,631	18.7%	8.6%	13.1%	5.15	\$ 8,151,848
Detterre	-	-	3,000	\$ 231,044,700	\$19,036,650	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 7,360,062	169,127	(5)	0.0%	10.8%	15.2%	5.73	\$ 291,896
Battery Storage Only	-	-	4,000	\$ 231,124,900	\$19,001,840	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 7,360,062	169,130	(7)	0.0%	8.6%	12.5%	6.54	\$ 345,899
	-	-	5,000	\$ 231,316,700	\$18,976,270	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 7,360,062	169,132	(9)	0.0%	7.0%	10.3%	7.34	\$ 390,655









#### • Findings & Recommendations: Satellite Facilities

- New DERs Optimized on Net Present Cost (NPC)
  - 2.1 MW of Solar Photovoltaic (Solar PV)
  - 1.0 MW NG Recip Engine
  - 2.0 MWh of Battery Storage
- Projected Financial Performance
  - 20 Year NPC Reduction = \$1.8 million
  - Annual Operating Cost Savings = \$500,000
  - Annual CO2e Emissions Reduction = 1,640 metric tons
  - Capital Investment = \$4.25 million
  - Simple Payback = 8.9 years
  - 20 Year ROI = 7.2%
  - 20 Year IRR = 9.8%



**Recall:** These results assume Mayo Clinic, as a Non-Profit, can NOT take advantage of Tax-based incentives; i.e. ITC, MACRS with Bonus Depreciation







#### • Alternative Findings & Recommendations: Satellite Facilities

Case	Solar PV (kW)	Wind Turbine (kW)	NG Recip (kW)	Battery Storage (kWh)	Net Present Cost (\$)	Operating Cost (\$/yr)	Initial Capital Cost (\$)	Fuel co (\$/yr)	st CO <sup>2</sup> e Emissio (tonne/y			Return on Investmen t (%)	Internal Rate of Return (%)	Simple Payback (yr)	Utility Bill Savings (\$/yr)
Base Case	-	-	-	-	\$42,237,770	\$ 3,502,872	-	-	19,15	2 -	-	-	-	-	-
	2,100	-	1,000	2,000	\$40,457,460	\$ 3,002,765	\$ 4,250,000	\$ 37,0	83 17,513	1,639	8.6%	7.2%	9.8%	8.9	\$ 528,879
Top 3 NPC	2,100	-	1,000	-	\$40,556,220	\$ 3,019,249	\$ 4,150,000	\$ 47,2	67 17,496	5 1,656	8.6%	7.0%	9.6%	9.0	\$ 520,778
	-	-	1,500	2,000	\$41,000,750	\$ 3,267,592	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 55,0	92 19,10	6 <b>45</b>	0.2%	10.1%	13.2%	7.0	\$ 295,992
	2,100	-	-	-	\$41,552,280	\$ 3,184,786	\$ 3,150,000	\$ -	17,540	1,612	8.4%	5.5%	7.7%	10.5	\$ 302,960
Solar PV Only	2,000	-	-	-	\$41,553,180	\$ 3,197,301	\$ 3,000,000	\$ -	17,61	' 1,535	8.0%	5.6%	7.8%	10.4	\$ 291,165
	1,800	-	-	-	\$41,554,990	\$ 3,222,330	\$ 2,700,000	\$ -	17,770	1,381	7.2%	5.8%	8.1%	10.2	\$ 267,576
	-	750	-	-	\$42,926,640	\$ 3,435,604	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	18,620	526	2.7%	-0.5%	-	-	\$ 82,269
Wind Turbine Only	-	1,000	-	-	\$43,179,830	\$ 3,415,134	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	18,45	701	3.7%	-0.6%	-	-	\$ 107,738
Only	-	1,250	-	-	\$43,447,380	\$ 3,395,857	\$ 2,500,000	\$ -	18,276	876	4.6%	-0.7%	-	-	\$ 132,015
	-	-	1,500	-	\$41,092,910	\$ 3,283,528	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 63,7	52 19,092	2 60	0.3%	10.0%	13.1%	7.1	\$ 286,568
NG Recip Only	-	-	1,250	-	\$41,115,650	\$ 3,306,147	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 40,0	20 19,114	37	0.2%	11.4%	14.1%	6.8	\$ 232,215
	-	-	1,750	-	\$41,201,680	\$ 3,271,815	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 84,4	83 19,073	3 79	0.4%	8.4%	11.6%	7.8	\$ 325,315
	-	-	-	200	\$42,131,540	\$ 3,485,769	\$ 100,000	\$ -	19,152	2 (0)	0.0%	12.3%	17.0%	5.3	\$ 20,942
Battery Storage Only	-	-	-	300	\$42,135,690	\$ 3,481,967	\$ 150,000	\$ -	19,152	2 (0)	0.0%	9.1%	13.1%	6.3	\$ 26,663
Only	-	-	-	400	\$42,154,660	\$ 3,479,393	\$ 200,000	\$ -	19,152	2 (1)	0.0%	6.9%	10.2%	7.4	\$ 31,156









#### • What did Mayo Clinic get from the Evaluation?

- Confirmation?
- Direction?
- Alternatives?









#### Lessons Learned

- Data Gathering
  - The most time consuming part of the process
  - Introduces the most inaccuracies and errors *must correlate to invoiced cost and usage*
  - Different data sources often come in different formats *must translate to a single format for modeling* 
    - e.g., utility electric interval data typically 15 or 30 minute; other metered data may be hourly or daily, etc.
- Modeling
  - HOMER Grid has advantages but any "off the shelf" tool requires some customization or "trickery"
  - I still like to run my own Excel based templates to confirm some data and results, and to present as I like

#### • Clarifications

- Iterative communication with your client to ensure accuracies
  - Current System
  - Data
  - Future Planning









- Follow-up / Next Steps
  - What Does Mayo Clinic plan to do with these results?
    - Short-term
    - Long-term









- The Future Changing World Creating New Opportunities & Risks
  - RPU Renewable Energy Goals
    - 100% Renewable by 2030
  - Changing Market Cost of Power and Nat Gas
  - Technology Changes
    - Declining Costs for Solar, Battery Storage, Other Storage
  - Regulatory Changes
  - Potential Price on Carbon









## Thank you!!

#### For further discussion, please contact:

Brett Gorden Section Head - Facilities Management Mayo Clinic Phone: 507-538-5810 Email: gorden.brett@mayo.edu

#### **Steve Willins**

Director, Electric Services World Kinect Energy Services Phone: 513-293-3476 Email: swillins@world-kinect.com

#### **Bruce Hoffarber**

Vice President, Market Development World Kinect Energy Services Phone: 763-543-4625 Email: bhoffarber@world-kinect.com

