BNL-224219-2023-TECH

EIC-ADD-TN-051

Site Ambient Temperatures and Operating Schedules for EIC - Utility CW Considerations

R. Srinivasan

November 2021

Electron-Ion Collider Project

Brookhaven National Laboratory

U.S. Department of Energy

USDOE Office of Science (SC), Nuclear Physics (NP) (SC-26)

Notice: This technical note has been authored by employees of Brookhaven Science Associates, LLC under Contract No.DE-SC0012704 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The publisher by accepting the technical note for publication acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this technical note, or allow others to do so, for United States Government purposes.

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or any third party's use or the results of such use of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof or its contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Site Ambient Temperatures and Operating Schedules for EIC - Utility CW Considerations

Introduction/Background

The heat dissipated by the EIC accelerator system and components is ultimately removed by the conventional water-cooling systems that will be ultimately dissipated the waste heat to the atmosphere. An estimated 45 MW of heat will be dissipated to water during full beam operation and that will need to be effectively rejected to the atmosphere.

Approximately 50% of the heat is required to be rejected to a low temperature heat sink that cannot be achieved by an evaporative cooling tower during summer. To operate during these summer months, a secondary chilled water refrigeration system will be required that would increase the cost of the cooling water system. Further, operating chiller compressor in the summer months will increase the energy consumption of the machine.

This analysis is being prepared to evaluate the impact on operating and capital costs on the cooling system for various summer operating schedules while utilizing the most cost-effective scenario of an evaporative cooling system.

The technology selection for the various heat sinks is addressed in a separate write-up and are not expected to change the conclusions of this write-up.

Evaporative Cooling Supply Temperature Limitations

When designing a new system, the cooling water system supply temperature can be determined from the ambient conditions and reasonable design parameters.

The cooling water supplied at the machine interface (T_{CW}) is determined as the sum of the temperature at the outlet of the tower (T_{TWR}) and the associated system inefficiencies for the heat exchanger (T_{TTD}) as well as loss of performance due to degradation (T_{Degr}). These consider the limitations in the heat transfer process as well as operating and maintenance practices.

$$T_{CW} = T_{TWR} + T_{TTD} + T_{Degr}$$

The cooling tower performance can be simplified utilizing reasonable design parameters as


$$T_{CW}\ (F) = T_{WB} + 10$$

See Appendix 1 for a detailed explanation.

CW Temperature Profile of EIC Loads

The distribution of EIC machine heat loads at various locations are shown below. Of the 46 MW water heat rejection for the EIC, roughly 23 MW is rejected at a water temperature of 77 Deg. F. The remaining is at either 85 Deg. F or above. An alternative scenario is evaluated where the RF PA is rejected at 86 Deg. F temperature.

R. Srinivasan



At the lower temperature (77F), the critical component is the cooling water for the RF Power Amplifer as required to cool the solid state electronics

LOCATION	**SYSTEM**	**COOLING LOAD, TONS**	**CW INLET TEMPERATURE, F**
1010	ESR H1 RF 591 MHz	4828 tons	77 F
1006	Crab 197 MHz RF System	610 tons	77 F
1004	RCS Bunch Merge 1 RF System [295 MHz] SHC ERL Injector Booster [197 MHz]	767 tons	77 F
1002	SHC ERL H1 RF System [591 MHz]	399 tons	77 F
		6604 TONS	

The required inlet and outlet cooling water temperatures are as follows.

$T_{CW}, Inlet$	77F
ΔT $Rise$ e	12 F
$T_{CW}, Outlet$	89 F

Utilizing the previously derived equation to determine a limiting ambient wet bulb condition,

$$T_{WB}(F) = T_{CW} - 10 = 67\ Deg.F$$

This is limiting wet bulb is the threshold above which a reasonably designed cooling tower alone is not sufficient to generate 77 Deg. F water and chillers are required to provide the additional cooling water.

R. Srinivasan

At the higher allowable CWIT, the WB threshold becomes

$$T_{WB}(F) = T_{CW} - 10 = 86 - 10 = 76\ Deg.F$$

Ambient Wet Bulb Temperature and Climatic conditions

It is impractical to utilize an absolute maximum climatic condition for any site and hence statistical methods must be applied to determine the maximum wetbulb temperatures. For this evaluation, the statistical maximum wet bulb temperatures were determined utilizing the methods from Climate Design Conditions in ASHRAE (1). These maximums were determined based on monthly values that are exceeded on average 0.4% (3 hours per month) and 10% (75 hours per month) respectively.

Weather conditions at the BNL site have been recorded locally since August 1948. Temperature measurements are recorded at 85-meter, 10-meter and 2-meter elevations. Temperature and humidity probes located at the 2-m elevation were provided John Heiser (4) and were utilized to determine the 3-hour and 75-hour exceedance values.

Climate Impacts

To account for changes to the ambient conditions through the estimated operation of the EIC, changes were determined over a 30-year period through to 2050 utilizing the.guidance was provided by Michael Jensen (4). The entire reference is included in Attachment 2A.

Two different Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) were considered in the analysis each of which represents a different future climate (4). RCP8.5 is often referred to as the “business as usual” scenario and assumes that emissions of greenhouse gases continue to rise at their current rates through the end of the 21st century. RCP4.5 is often described as an intermediate scenario and assumes that mitigation measures are put in place and greenhouse gas emissions peak around the year 2040 and then start to decline.

Incorporating the ambient data and climate change impacts, the maximum ambient temperatures were evaluated in Attachment 3. These values are compared to the Wetbulb threshold for evaporative cooling for both the 25C(77F) and 30C (86F) CWIT and are presented below. Note that the intermediate scenario is shown in parenthesis. Although the RCP 4.5 wet bulb maximums are lower, these were not large enough to change the monthly exceedances.

SCENARIO A (RF POWER AMPLIFIER INLET CW TEMPERATURE MAX =25C (77F)

	Wetbulb Threshold for Evap. Cooling Deg. F	BNL Site Ambient Projected to 2050*					
		Max Wet Bulb Deg. F 0.4 % Level Exceeded <3 hrs/month			Max Wet Bulb Deg. F 10% Level Exceeded <75 hrs/month		
1-Jan	**67**	58.7	(58.6)		44.6	(44.5)	
1-Feb	**67**	58.6	(58.7)		47.4	(47.5)	
1-Mar	**67**	58.2	(56.7)		48.8	(47.2)	
1-Apr	**67**	66.8	(66.4)		56.5	(56.0)	
1-May	**67**	73.3	(73.1)	Exceeded	65.9	(65.6)	
1-Jun	**67**	77.0	(76.5)	Exceeded	71.9	(71.4)	Exceeded
1-Jul	**67**	82.0	(81.4)	Exceeded	77.8	(77.1)	Exceeded
1-Aug	**67**	82.2	(81.4)	Exceeded	78.4	(77.6)	Exceeded
1-Sep	**67**	80.0	(79.1)	Exceeded	74.0	(73.1)	Exceeded
1-Oct	**67**	74.9	(73.9)	Exceeded	68.5	(67.5)	Exceeded
1-Nov	**67**	68.1	(67.7)	Exceeded	57.1	(56.7)	
1-Dec	**67**	60.9	(60.0)		48.1	(47.3)	

*Values in parenthesis are based on RCP 4.5 an intermediate scenario with climate mitigation measures in place and assumes that mitigation measures are put in place and greenhouse gas emissions peak around the year 2040 and then start to decline.

As seen in the table above with the lower CWIT of 77F, the threshold Wetbulb for evaporative cooling operation is exceeded (7) months in a year at the 0.4% level and this threshold is exceeded (5) months in a year based at the 10% level and a chiller system would be required for operation during the periods where the cooling tower system is not able to handle.

SCENARIO B (RF POWER AMPLIFIER INLET CW TEMPERATURE MAX =30C(86F))

	eQ RFPA CW Temperature <86F	Equipment Option B RFPA Max Temperature <77F
Jan	58.7	58.7
Feb	58.6	58.6
Mar	58.2	58.2
Apr	66.8	66.8
May	73.3	73.3 E
Jun	77.0	77.0 E
Jul	82.0 E	82.0 E
Aug	82.2 E	82.2 E
Sep	80.0 E	80.0 E
Oct	74.9 E	74.9 E
Nov	68.1	68.1 E
Dec	60.9	60.9

As seen in the table above with the higher CWIT of 86F, the threshold Wetbulb for evaporative cooling operation is exceeded (4) months in a year at the 0.4% level and this threshold is exceeded (1) months in


a year based at the 10% level and a chiller system would be required for operation during the periods where the cooling tower system is not able to handle.

Chilled Water System

The conventional alternative to a cooling tower system is to utilize a chilled water system to cool the water to the desired temperature. This can be either a stand-alone chiller that takes the entire cooling load or a supplemental chiller such as in NSLSII where part of the cooling is done in a cooling tower and the rest is done by a chiller.

Illustrating the NSLS-II supplemental chiller concept 77F water leaving the chiller returns at a temperature of 89F as shown. The cooling tower can supply only as good as 87F on a hot summer day.

$T_{CW,TWR} = 89F$.



$T_{CW,TWR} = 89F$

Maximum Heat Rejection Across Cooling Tower	15%
Remaining Heat Rejected by Chiller	85%

Utilizing the NSLSII concept, the cooling tower would only be able to reject about 15% of the load on a hot summer day where the wetbulb temperature is at or above 78 Deg. F Incorporating such a loop would incur additional capital expenditure and introduce a complex system with many operating parts which would not improve the reliability of the system for a 15% reduction in chiller cost. Furthermore, for a given load, the cooling tower operating on a narrow 2F temperature rise is significantly more costly compared to a higher range according to reference 5. This option is not considered and a stand-alone chiller is considered.

Capital Costs

For the purpose of this analysis, the additional capital cost to supply 77 Deg. F during the summer was determined based on installing new chillers instead of the plate and frame heat exchanger system. This change essentially comprises of the following.

The differential cost of installing the new chillers in place of the heat exchangers

This was estimated based on unit costs for a horizontal centrifugal water cooled chiller system including the associated pumps and piping scaled to the required tonnage. Since the chiller system essentially replaces the plate and frame heat exchanger system, the cost for a plate and frame heat exchanger based system from was subtracted from the chiller cost. Details of the estimate are shown in Appendix 5.

Additional substation to handle the additional power requirements of the chillers were added as follows.

(1) 2500 kVA/480V Substations were assumed to handle the additional auxiliary power at Bldg 1010

(3) 1000 kVA/480V Substations were assumed to handle the additional auxiliary power at Bldg 1002, 1004 and 1006.

These costs were determined from the HDR (3).

Additional building square footage due to the installed chillers.

An additional 2,000 sq.ft additional space for 4000 tons of chilling at building 1010 based on TRANE'S Centravac model CVVH with direct drive compressors. The other buildings are estimated to require 400 sq. ft additional space. The unit cost of the additional square footage of $382 was determined and used for this purpose based on the HDR estimate(3).

Utilizing the basis described above, the differential cost estimate was developed and summarized below more details can be found in appendix 5

LOCATION	SYSTEM	COOLING LOAD, TONS	AUX PWR ADD, KW	INCREMENTAL COST FOR CHILLED WATER SYSTEM *
1010	ESR H1 RF 591 MHz	4828 tons	2400 kW	
1006	Crab 197 MHz RF System	610 tons	500 kW	
1004	RCS Bunch Merge 1 RF System [295 MHz] SHC ERL Injector Booster [197 MHz]	767 tons	600 kW	
1002	SHC ERL H1 RF System [591 MHz]	399 tons	300 kW	
		6604 TONS	**3700 KW**	**$ 13.9 MIL**

Additional Electricity Consumption Costs due to the Chiller Compressors.

Furthermore, operating the chiller compressors requires additional electrical energy translated to present value cost of $3.2 million over a 20-year operating life (7).

Analysis of Historical CW Operating Data from RHIC

A comparison was made looking at existing cooling tower performance from Summer 2020 at RHIC. The performance of these cooling towers track well with the Wetbulb determined from Brookhaven Met. Data (5) and the effective approach of the cooling towers to the ambient wet bulb seems to mostly fall within a 5 to 10 Deg. F approach. Various factors such as the load on the system, prevailing wind, recirculation excessive makeup flow and other conditions as well as general performance degradation can affect these operating parameters. See Appendix II cooling tower benchmark with operating performance.

Results and Conclusion

The low cooling water inlet temperature required by the RF power amplifier will require additional installation costs for the chilled water system to be able to operate for year-round operation.

Alternatively, if a decision is made to limit the operation of the chiller, that will require the EIC operation to be curtailed during the summer months. This decision will need to be made in conjunction with the acceptable monthly exceedance.

	With Chillers	Without Chillers	
Scenario A	IA	IIA	IIIA
Desired CW Inlet Temp at RF PA	**77F**		
Wetbulb Threshold	67F		
Average Monthly Exceedance	None	<3 hrs/month	<72 hrs/month
Available Weeks	52	22	30
Months Above WB Threshold	None	May to Nov	Jun to Oct
Additional Costs Above CD-1 ($ mil)	$13.9 mil	$ -	$ -
PV of addnl energy consumption	$3.2 mil	$ -	$ -

	With Chillers	Without Chillers	
Scenario B	IB	IIB	IIIB
Desired CW Inlet at RF PA	**86F**		
Wetbulb Threshold	76F		
Average Monthly Exceedance	None	<3 hrs/month	<72 hrs/month
Available Weeks	52	34	43.3
Months Above WB Threshold	None	Jun to Sep	Jul to Aug
Additional Costs Above CD-1 ($ mil)	$13.9 mil	$ -	$ -
PV of addnl energy consumption	$3.2 mil	$ -	$ -

References.

1. ASHRAE Fundamentals, 2017 Chapter 14: Climatic design information.
2. Power Burns and Roe (2014), Final Report Satellite chiller plant feasibility study prepared for Brookhaven National Lab
3. HDR Estimate HDR BNL Ion Collider - 100% Budget REV3.4 11.05.2020
4. Heiser, John H. Environmental and Climate Sciences Department, RE: Meterological Data at Brookhaven, Hourly Data, Message to Ram Srinivasan. 7 March 2021
5. SPX Cooling Technologies, Inc., Cooling Tower Fundamentals (2009), Second Edition
6. Jensen, Mike. Environmental and Climate Sciences Department, Climate Projections for BNL Electron Ion Collider Cooling Tower Consideration Message to Ram Srinivasan, 3 May 2021)
7. Life Cycle cost evaluation basis for cooling system EIC (In progress)

Appendix 1
Cooling Tower Performance

When designing a new system, the cooling water supplied at the machine interface (T_{CW}) is determined as the sum of the Wet Bulb temperature and the reasonable design parameters for the heat exchangers..


$$T_{CW} = T_{TWR} + T_{TTD} + T_{Degr}$$

The evaporative cooling tower temperature performance T_{TWR} can be determined as the sum of the Air Inlet at the Tower T_{WB}, recirculation effects $T_{RCW} = 2F$, and the cooling tower approach to this temperature T_{Appr} which is a heat exchanger inefficiency.

$$T_{TWR} = T_{WB} + T_{RCW} + T_{Appr}$$

In selecting the design of the cooling tower, its size increases asymptotically as T_{Appr} reaches 5F. Furthermore, cooling tower vendors do not guarantee values less than 5 F. A value of 5F is utilized for the design of the cooling tower and that determines the cooling tower heat exchange/fill surface area.


Cooling Tower Size As A Function of Design Cooling Tower Approach SPX Cooling Technologies(5).




Finally, adding a reasonable design efficiency of the plate and frame heat exchanger $T_{TTD} = 2F$ and degradation effects $T_{Degr} = 1F$, we can determine the CW supply temperature T_{CW} as

$$T_{CW}\ (F) = T_{WB} + T_{RC} + T_{App} + T_{TTD} + T_{Degr} = T_{WB} + 11$$

These cumulative impacts are shown in the typical cooling tower configuration shown in the figure below.





R. Srinivasan

Appendix II

Determination of Maximum Wetbulb Temperatures (Through 2050)

Weather conditions at the Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) site have been recorded since August 1948. Monitoring of current weather conditions at BNL is maintained by Meteorology Services and is reported in real-time. Temperature measurements are recorded at 85-meter, 10-meter and 2-meter elevations. Hourly data for the Temperature and humidity probes located at the 2-m elevation were provided by John Heiser (3).

The dry-bulb temperature and relative humidity values were used to calculate the wet-bulb temperature using the method described in Appendix IIA. These values were compared to the ASHRAE 0.4% and 10% exceedances for the region from the 20-year data for Suffolk County as measured at Long Island McArthur Airport ASHRAE (1). The BNL values bound the ASHRAE values and were utilized in determining the maximum wet bulb temperatures. Furthermore, the BNL meterological data is local to the intended cooling tower location and tracks fairly well with the performance of the existing cooling towers around the RHIC facility.

	ASHRAE Suffolk County Wet Bulb Maximum Historical		**BNL Met (1) Wet Bulb Maximum Historical 2016-2020**	
	< 3 hrs/mth	**< 75 hrs/ mth**	**< 3 hrs/mth**	**< 75 hrs/ mth**
1-Jan	54.9	43.3	56.8	42.7
1-Feb	51.3	41.5	57.0	45.7
1-Mar	58.6	46.9	55.9	46.3
1-Apr	63.3	53.4	65.0	54.5
1-May	71.8	62.4	71.5	63.8
1-Jun	76.1	70.3	74.8	69.8
1-Jul	79.3	74.1	80.1	75.8
1-Aug	78.3	73.8	80.0	76.1
1-Sep	75.6	70.3	77.4	71.5
1-Oct	71.8	63.0	72.1	65.7
1-Nov	62.4	55.4	65.8	54.9
1-Dec	57.2	47.3	58.7	44.6

(1) BNL Met Twr 2m Hrly data (5)

The Maximum Wetbulb temperatures were projected to 2046-2050 utilizing the temperature and humidity guidance provided in Appendix II-A. The maximum wetbulb was calculated for both pathways explained in Appendix 2 A RCP 4.5 Intermediate Case and RCP 8.5 Business As Usual scenarios

	BNL Met (1,2) Wet Bulb Maximum Projected to 2046-50			
	Scenario 1 RCP 8.5 "business as usual"		**Scenario 2 RCP 4.5 "intermediate case"**	
	< 3 hrs/mth	< 75 hrs/ mth	< 3 hrs/mth	< 75 hrs/ mth
1-Jan	58.7	44.6	58.6	44.5
1-Feb	58.6	47.4	58.7	47.5
1-Mar	58.2	48.8	56.7	47.2
1-Apr	66.8	56.5	66.4	56.0
1-May	73.3	65.9	73.1	65.6
1-Jun	77.0	71.9	76.5	71.4
1-Jul	82.0	77.8	81.4	77.1
1-Aug	82.2	78.4	81.4	77.6
1-Sep	80.0	74.0	79.1	73.1
1-Oct	74.9	68.5	73.9	67.5
1-Nov	68.1	57.1	67.7	56.7
1-Dec	60.9	48.1	60.0	47.3

(1) BNL Met Twr 2m Hrly
(2) Global Warming impacts taken into account based on Appendix 2A.

Appendix II-A

Climate Projections for BNL Electron Ion Collider Cooling Tower Consideration

Climate Projections for BNL Electron Ion Collider Cooling Tower Consideration

Prepared by Michael P. Jensen (mjensen@bnl.gov)

In preparation for the construction of the Electron Ion Collider at BNL, particularly the design of the accompanying cooling tower(s), the climate in the Suffolk County region including the temperature and humidity over the projected lifetime of the towers (~30-40 years) should be considered.

Dry-Bulb Temperature

To provide guidance for these considerations, we have culled data from the peer-reviewed literature based on climate model simulations. Data and visualization available from the New York Climate Change Science Clearinghouse (https://nyclimatescience.org) provides information on time series of observations (past) and model-derived projections (future) of dry-bulb air temperature and precipitation amount. The "Climate Data Grapher" (https://nyclimatescience.org/highlights/data_products) is used to visualize these datasets for Suffolk County, Long Island, NY. The model projected data are from the Climate Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5; Taylor et al. 2012) downscaled using the Localized Construct4d Analog method for Suffolk County. Two different Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) are considered in the analysis each of which represents a different future climate (Collins et al. 2013). RCP8.5 is often referred to as the "business as usual" scenario and assumes that emissions of greenhouse gases continue to rise at their current rates through the end of the 21st century. RCP4.5 is often described as an intermediate scenario and assumes that mitigation measures are put in place and greenhouse gas emissions peak around the year 2040 and then start to decline. The higher emission scenario case would be expected to result in greater climate change and warmer temperatures.

Using these the Climate Data Grapher, Table 1 summarizes the model ensemble mean dry bulb temperature projected for the period 2016-2020 and 2046-2050 for the two RCPs discussed above.

	RCP 8.5			RCP 4.5		
Month	*Temp. (16-20)	Temp. (46-50)	Increase	*Temp. (16-20)	Temp. (46-50)	Increase
January	32.9	34.9	2.0	32.8	34.7	1.9
February	34.7	36.5	1.8	33.8	35.7	1.9
March	40.9	43.6	2.7	41.3	42.4	1.1
April	50.4	52.6	2.2	50.4	52.1	1.7
May	60.1	62.4	2.3	60.0	62.0	2.0
June	69.7	72.1	2.4	69.6	71.5	1.9
July	75.1	77.4	2.3	75.5	77.1	1.6
August	74.2	76.8	2.6	74.3	76.0	1.7
September	67.4	70.2	2.8	67.4	69.3	1.9
October	57.0	60.0	3.0	56.9	58.9	2.0
November	47.3	49.7	2.4	47.1	49.1	2.0
December	38.1	40.7	2.6	37.7	39.4	1.7

Table 1 Model Ensemble Mean Dry-Bulb Temperature for Suffolk County, New York (Note: The small differences in the 2016-2020 temperatures for the two scenarios are because these temperatures are based on model simulations that were initialized prior to 2016-2020).

Relative Humidity

Unfortunately, the Climate Data Grapher does not include data on relative humidity. Instead we refer to the work of Byrne and Gorman (2018) who use the Met Office Hadley Centre's observational dataset (HadISDH; Willet et al. 2016) to analyze global trends in relative humidity over land and ocean. Their analysis suggests an decreasing trend in relative humidity of 0.22 % per decade over land.

Methods

These projected changes in temperature and relative humidity are applied as offsets to a 5 year dataset of dry-bulb temperature and relative humidity collected by the BNL Meteorological Services Group (https://www.bnl.gov/weather/). From these climate-adjusted dry-bulb temperature and relative humidity values the wet-bulb temperature is calculated using the empirical equation published by Stull (2011). From the climate-adjusted wet-bulb temperatures, projected times of exceedance can be determined for user defined threshold values.

References

Byrne, M. P. and P. A. O'Gorman, 2018: Trends in continental temperature and humidity directly linked to ocean warming. *Proc. Nat. Acad.. Sci*., **115(**19), 4863-4868. doi:10.1073/pnas.1722312115.

Collins, M., R. Knutti, J. Arblaster, J.-L. Dufresne, T. Fichefet, P. Friedlingstein, X. Gao, W.J. Gutowski, T. Johns, G. Krinner, M. Shongwe, C. Tebaldi, A.J. Weaver and M. Wehner, 2013: Long-term Climate Change: Projections, Com- mitments and Irreversibility. In: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Stull, R., 2011: Wet-bulb temperature from relative humidity and air temperature. *J. Appl. Meteor. Clim*., **50** (11), 2267-2269. doi:10.1175/JAMC-D-11-0143.1.

Taylor, K.E., R.J. Stouffer, G.A. Meehl, 2012: An Overview of CMIP5 and the experiment design. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc*., **93**, 485-498, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1.

Willett KM, et al., 2014: HadISDH land surface multi-variable humidity and temperature record for climate monitoring. *Clim Past,* **10**,1983–2006.

Appendix 3
Comparison of Current Operating Data

Recent operating performance for the cooling towers at RHIC were compared to a hypothetical cooling tower simulation based on a 5 Deg. F approach and a 10 Deg.F approach to Wet Bulb for that day. The performance of the existing cooling towers closely track the site ambient wet bulb (BNL met data) and the CW supply temperatures generally bounded within the 5 Deg. F to 10 Deg. F approach to Wet Bulb temperature.


Various factors such as the load on the system, prevailing wind, recirculation excessive makeup flow and other conditions as well as general performance degradation can effect these operating parameters. Of these towers, the Phenix Tower which does not perform as the other towers has consistently shown to have operating performance issues for various factors that are not considered to impact this evaluation.


The following cooling tower performance were compared.

- Cooling Tower at 2’ O Clock (1002)
- Cooling Tower near 4’ O Clock (RHIC RF Tower)
- Cooling Tower near 6’ O’ Clock (Star Tower and Tower 7)
- Cooling Tower near 8’ O Clock (Phenix Tower)



The operating performance of the cooling towers was downloaded from the historical operating data and the comparisons are shown below.


Site Operating Performance August 12, EDT
Metereological Wet Bulb vs Twr Performance @ 1002, Phenix, Star, RHIC RF, Tower 7
Deg. F
95
90
85
80
75
70
65
60
12:00 AM
2:00 AM
4:00 AM
6:00 AM
8:00 AM
10:00 AM
12:00 PM
2:00 PM
4:00 PM
6:00 PM
8:00 PM
10:00 PM
12:00 AM
2:00 AM
Axis Title
/::[1002]TWRTEMP_SUP
CHANNEL2.PHENIX.TWRTEMP_SUP
CHANNEL2.RHICRF.TWRTEMP_SUP
CHANNEL2.STAR.TWRTEMP_SUP
/::[TOWER 7]TEMP_SUP
2 per. Mov. Avg. (Predicted Performance 5F Approach)
2 per. Mov. Avg. (Predicted Performance 10F Approach)


Compare Prediction to Actual Performance
Site Operating Performance July 5, EDT
Metereological Wet Bulb vs Twr Performance @ 1002, Phenix, Star, RHIC RF, Tower 7
Deg. F
95
90
85
80
75
70
65
60
12:00 AM
2:00 AM
4:00 AM
6:00 AM
8:00 AM
10:00 AM
12:00 PM
2:00 PM
4:00 PM
6:00 PM
8:00 PM
10:00 PM
12:00 AM
2:00 AM
/::[1002]TWRTEMP_SUP
CHANNEL2.PHENIX.TWRTEMP_SUP
CHANNEL2.RHICRF.TWRTEMP_SUP
CHANNEL2.STAR.TWRTEMP_SUP
/::[TOWER 7]TEMP_SUP
2 per. Mov. Avg. (Predicted Performance 5F Approach)
2 per. Mov. Avg. (Predicted Performance 10F Approach)

Appendix 4

Chiller Differential Cost Estimate Summary

Location/Machine	Column1	Item	Size	Units	Unit Rate	Cost	Reference
1010 ESR H1 RF 591 MHz	Add	Horizontal Centrifugal Chiller with pumps and Piping	4828	tons	$ 1,681	$ 8,115,743	Ref, 1
	Subtract	DI With Plate and Frame HX, Piping and Pump System	4828	tons	$ 329	$ (1,588,243)	Ref, 2
	Add	2500 KVA Unit Substation	1		$ 1,061,299	$ 1,061,299	Ref, 3
	Add	For Addnl Building Space	2000	sq.ft	$ 382	$ 764,000	Ref, 5
							$ 8,352,798
1006 Crab 197 MHz RF System	Add	Horizontal Centrifugal Chiller with pumps and Piping	611	tons	$ 1,681	$ 1,026,403	Ref, 1
	Subtract	DI With Plate and Frame HX, Piping and Pump System	611	tons	$ 329	$ (200,866)	Ref, 2
	Add	1000 KVA Unit Substation	1		$ 909,563	$ 909,563	Ref, 4
	Add	For Addnl Building Space	400	sq.ft	$ 382	$ 152,800	Ref, 5
							$ 1,887,900
1004 RCS 295 MHz SHC 197 MHz	Add	Horizontal Centrifugal Chiller with pumps and Piping	767	tons	$ 1,681	$ 1,288,971	Ref, 1
	Subtract	DI With Plate and Frame HX, Piping and Pump System	767	tons	$ 329	$ (252,250)	Ref, 2
	Add	1000 KVA Unit Substation	1		$ 909,563	$ 909,563	Ref, 4
	Add	For Addnl Building Space	400	sq.ft	$ 382	$ 152,800	Ref, 5
							$ 2,099,083
1002 SHC ERL H1 RF 591 MHz	Add	Horizontal Centrifugal Chiller with pumps and Piping	399	tons	$ 1,681	$ 670,742	Ref, 1
	Subtract	DI With Plate and Frame HX, Piping and Pump System	399	tons	$ 329	$ (131,264)	Ref, 2
	Add	1000 KVA Unit Substation	1		$ 909,563	$ 909,563	Ref, 4
	Add	For Addnl Building Space	400	sq.ft	$ 382	$ 152,800	Ref, 5
							$ 1,601,842
Total							**$ 13,941,623**


APPENDIX 5

Water Cooled Centrifugal Chiller Size and Performance
TRANE® CenTraVac™ CVHH 1700

Custom Unit Performance

Custom Unit which is outside of the scope of AHRI Water-Cooled Water Chilling Packages Using Vapor Compression Cycle Certification Program, but is rated in accordance with AHRI Standard 550/590 (I-P).

	Unit	1
Revision Level		230
Unit Model		CVHH
Unit Size		1700
Refrigerant Type		R1233zd
Starter Model		AFDE
Starter Type		UAFD
Circuit 1 Starter Size		1210
Starter Filter		Y
Circuit 1 Stage 1 IGV	°	90
Circuit 1 Impeller Speed	rpm	3000
Circuit 1 Stage 1 Blade Diameter	inch	25.984
Circuit 1 Stage 2 Blade Diameter	inch	25.984
Circuit 1 Motor CPKW		743
Circuit 1 Orifice ORSZ		212
Circuit 1 Condenser Orifice ORSZ		223
Line Hertz	Hz	60
Line Volt	V	480
Motor Hertz	Hz	60
Volt	V	460
Circuit 1 Order RLA	A	927.8
Circuit 1 Motor Order RLA	A	1197
Circuit 1 Line-Side MCA	A	1157
Circuit 1 Line-Side MOP	A	2000
Full Load Cooling Capacity	ton	2500
Circuit 1 Evaporator TONS	ton	2500
Unit Order kW	kW Input	768.74
Order kW/ton	kW/ton	0.3075



CenTraVac™ chiller Models CVHH and CDHH

	Model	Comp Size	Shell Configuration EVAP/COND	Space Envelope Length (E_L) in.	Space Envelope Length (E_L) mm	Space Envelope Terminal Box Only (E_W) in.	Space Envelope Terminal Box Only (E_W) mm	Tube Pull Clearance C_L1 in.	Tube Pull Clearance C_L1 mm	Tube Pull Clearance C_L2 in.	Tube Pull Clearance C_L2 mm	Base Unit Dimensions Length in.	Base Unit Dimensions Length mm	Height in.	Height mm	Width in.	Width mm
60 Hz	Standard CVHH	900/1000/1200	100M/100M	373.0	9474	176.0	4470	166	4216	47	1194	160.0	4064	121.2	3078	122.0	3099
			100L/100L	413.5	10503	176.0	4470	186	4731	47	1194	180.3	4578	121.2	3078	122.0	3099
			130M/130M	373.0	9474	178.0	4521	166	4216	47	1194	160.0	4064	127.9	3248	124.0	3150
			160M/200M	373.0	9474	180.1	4575	166	4216	47	1194	160.0	4064	135.4	3439	126.1	3203
			200L/220L	413.5	10503	185.2	4704	186	4731	47	1194	180.3	4578	137.7	3498	131.2	3332
			220L/220L	413.5	10503	192.1	4878	186	4731	47	1194	180.3	4578	141.6	3597	138.1	3507
		1500/1700	200L/200L	413.5	10503	181.1	4600	186	4731	47	1194	180.3	4578	137.7	3498	127.1	3228
			220L/220L	413.5	10503	192.1	4878	186	4731	47	1194	180.3	4578	141.6	3597	138.1	3507
	Heat Recovery CVHH	900/1000/1200	100M/10HM	373.0	9474	191.8	4872	166	4216	47	1194	160.0	4064	121.2	3078	137.8	3500
			130M/13HM	373.0	9474	194.0	4928	166	4216	47	1194	160.0	4064	127.9	3248	140.0	3556
			160M/20HM	373.0	9474	200.7	5097	166	4216	47	1194	160.0	4064	135.4	3439	146.7	3725
		1500/1700	200L/20HL	413.5	10503	200.3	5177	186	4731	47	1194	180.3	4578	137.7	3498	149.8	3805
			220L/22HL	413.5	10503	222.0	5639	186	4731	47	1194	180.3	4578	141.6	3597	168.0	4267
	Duplex CDHH	2000/2600	400M/440M	698.0	17729	185.2	4704	318	8077	68	1727	312.0	7925	137.7	3498	131.2	3332
		2800/3300	440M/440M	706.0	17932	192.1	4878	318	8077	76	1930	312.0	7925	141.6	3597	138.1	3507
			440X/440X	802.0	20371	192.1	4878	366	9296	76	1930	360.0	9144	141.6	3597	138.1	3507