DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	99-AFC-03C
Project Title:	METCALF Energy Center Compliance
TN #:	269492
Document Title:	MEC_Petition_for_Amendment_No_9_VIS-10
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Christopher Scheider
Organization:	Calpine
Submitter Role:	Applicant
Submission Date:	4/15/2026 3:06:21 PM
Docketed Date:	4/15/2026

Metcalf Energy Center, LLC

1 Blanchard Road
Coyote, CA 95013

March 30, 2026

Mr. Anwar Ali
Compliance Project Manager
Systems Assessment & Facility Siting Division
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, MS-2000
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Metcalf Energy Center, LLC
Docket No. 99-AFC-3C
Petition for Amendment No. 9: Revision of Condition of Certification VIS-10

Dear Mr. Ali:

Pursuant to Section 1769 of the California Energy Commission's Regulations, Metcalf Energy Center, LLC ("Project Owner") submits this *Petition for Amendment No. 9*: *Revision of Condition of Certification VIS-10* for the Metcalf Energy Center ("MEC") (99-AFC-3C). Modification of Condition of Certification VIS-10 provides further operational flexibility to ensure that the MEC continues to be available to meet grid reliability needs during all times of year, under all weather conditions.

The amendment fee of $5,000 and the list of affected property owners will be submitted under separate cover. If you have any questions or require more information, please contact Rosemary Silva at rosemary.silva@calpine.com.

Sincerely,

Signed by:
Christopher Schneider
47AF6295ADBF467...

Christopher Schneider
Plant Manager
Metcalf Energy Center, LLC.

Enclosure: Petition for Amendment No. 9

Petition for Amendment No. 9

Metcalf Energy Center
99-AFC-03C

Submitted to
California Energy Commission

Submitted by
Metcalf Energy Center, LLC

March 2026

METCALF ENERGY CENTER (99-AFC-03C)
PETITION FOR AMENDMENT NO. 9: REVISION OF CONDITION OF CERTIFICATION VIS-10

Pursuant to Section 1769 of the California Energy Commission's ("CEC") regulations, Metcalf Energy Center, LLC ("Project Owner") submits this petition ("Petition") to modify Condition of Certification ("COC") VIS-10 regarding the manner of regulation of visible plumes by the Metcalf Energy Center ("MEC").

The proposed modification to COC VIS-10 will provide further operational flexibility to the MEC by facilitating operations under a wider range of operating conditions. This will ensure that the MEC is available to continue providing grid support and reliability services to the Bay Area Local Reliability Area. The proposed change in wording to COC VIS-10 will not result in any physical change in the project or to the environment. The design of the MEC will remain the same. The level of visible plume emissions will continue to be as the Commission Decision stated, "extremely slight", "will occur only in very limited meteorological circumstances for a minimal number of annual hours", and "no significant impact will result from the project's visible plumes to the extent such plumes occur at all." (Decision, p. 369). Therefore, there is no possibility of any significant adverse environmental impacts resulting from the proposed modification of VIS-10. Further, the proposed change to COC VIS-10 will not impact the ability of MEC to comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards ("LORS"). Therefore, the Project Owner requests that the CEC approve this Petition.

1. SECTION 1769 (A)(1)(A): DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE, INCLUDING NEW LANGUAGE FOR ANY CONDITIONS OF CERTIFICATION THAT WILL BE AFFECTED.

The Project Owner proposes to revise Condition of Certification VIS-10 as set forth in Attachment A to this Petition. The proposed revisions will ensure maximum flexibility for MEC operations by replacing the annual hourly limit on visible cooling tower plumes during daylight, non-fog, non-rain hours with a percentage-based approach. Specifically, the Project Owner proposes that visible plumes should be considered significant only if they are predicted to occur more than 20 percent of the time during the daytime hours of November through April with no rain or fog. The modified language mirrors the approach taken by the CEC in proceedings for projects approved after the MEC, including the Russell City Energy Center ("RCEC") and the Los Esteros Critical Energy Facility ("LECEF").

2. SECTION 1769 (A)(1)(B): DISCUSSION OF THE NECESSITY FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGE AND AN EXPLANATION OF WHY THE CHANGE SHOULD BE PERMITTED.

Revision of Condition of Certification VIS-10 will provide maximum operational flexibility for the MEC by ensuring that the facility is able to operate during a wider range of operating conditions. The change should be permitted to ensure that the MEC is available to meet electrical reliability needs, particularly the South Bay-Moss Landing sub-area of the Greater Bay Area Local Reliability Area in which the facility is located.

By way of background, when the MEC was originally licensed, the composition of resources serving California's electrical reliability needs was much different. However, the increasing

integration of renewable energy resources to serve California's electric needs and decarbonization of the grid has resulted in a change in the operational hours for which capacity and electricity from the MEC is needed for dispatch to ensure grid reliability. The MEC is increasingly dispatched during shoulder peaks, including mornings and during cooler hours when the potential for a plume is greater. Condition of Certification VIS-10 currently requires the facility to shut down duct firing when plumes are visible, which then requires the facility to be derated until the atmospheric conditions change. This has occurred on several occasions in the recent calendar year during times the facility was requested to be at maximum load to meet market demands. As a result, the MEC is potentially unavailable for dispatch during colder winter months towards the end of the calendar year when the 14-hour limit is reached due to the current operational restrictions imposed by Condition of Certification VIS-10.

The change should also be permitted because the purpose of Condition of Certification VIS-10 was not to mitigate a potentially significant impact from the MEC, but as a compromise to resolve a disputed issue between the project and CEC Staff. As explained in the Final Decision:

> Applicant has credibly established that its proposed design parameters are feasible and will reduce the potential for visible plume formation to a minimal number of non-fog, non-rain daylight hours per year. We simply cannot accept a characterization that plume formation for such an extremely small number of the 8760 hours in a year would be intolerable. Even if this results in a detectable impact, in our judgment such impact would not reasonably approach any level of significance. . . In sum, much of the discussion of record seems to be concerned with preventing the potential occurrence of visible plumes when the evidence establishes that this potential is extremely slight to begin with and, if it occurs, will occur only in very limited meteorological circumstances for a minimal number of annual hours. We therefore conclude that no significant impact will result from the project's visible plumes to the extent such plumes occur at all… Nevertheless, we recognize the need to ensure that visible plumes are in fact minimized, and that any plume formation is objectively verified. We have therefore modified Condition VIS-10 based on Applicant's suggestions. (Decision, p. 369.)

The proposed change in the wording of Condition of Certification VIS-10 will not require any physical change to the project or the environment. The design of the plant will remain the same. The level of visible plume emissions will continue to be, as the Commission Decision stated, "extremely slight", "will occur only in very limited meteorological circumstances for a minimal number of annual hours", and "no significant impact will result from the project's visible plumes to the extent such plumes occur at all." (Decision, p. 369.)

3. SECTION 1769(A)(1)(C): DESCRIPTION OF ANY NEW INFORMATION OR CHANGE IN CIRCUMSTANCES THAT NECESSITATED THE CHANGE.

Since the licensing of the MEC in 1999, the State has implemented climate change goals, including increasing use of renewable energy resources to serve electricity needs. Following the implementation of these goals, the MEC is increasingly dispatched during shoulder times to provide grid support as renewable resources come and go off-line. The changes proposed to COC VIS-10 ensure that the MEC will be available as needed to support grid reliability and electricity needs.

4. SECTION 1769(A)(1)(D): AN ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS THAT THE PROPOSED CHANGE MAY HAVE ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND PROPOSED MEASURES TO MITIGATE ANY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.

The proposed modification to Condition of Certification VIS-10 will not require a physical change to the MEC or the MEC site or result in a change of operations that will increase emissions above existing permitted levels. Therefore, the proposed modification has no possible potential impact on the following environmental disciplines: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Paleontology, Hazardous Materials Management, Land Use, Noise and Vibration, Public Health, Socioeconomics, Soil and Water Resources, Traffic and Transportation, Waste Management, and Worker Safety and Fire Protection.

Visual Resources: The proposed modification of VIS-10 will change the manner in which visible plumes are addressed in the Thermal Plume Plan but will not change the design or operation of the plant. As with existing operations, the number of visible plumes that will occur from operations is not expected to vary significantly from current or historical levels.

The levels of visible plumes will continue to be slight, minimal and well below the Commission's twenty percent threshold of significance adopted in other proceedings. For example, in both the LECEF and RCEC proceedings, the Staff focused its analysis on the portion of the year when the ambient conditions (i.e., temperature and relative humidity) are such that plumes are most likely to occur (typically November through April). Under that analysis, visible plumes are considered significant only if they are predicted to occur more than twenty percent of the time during daytime hours November through April with no rain or fog. If the proposed plant is not expected to trigger the twenty percent threshold, the CEC Staff recommended that the plant be required to be designed and constructed as proposed. This recommendation was incorporated into the conditions of certification for LECEF and RCEC, specifically VIS-6 and VIS-8, respectively.

Given that MEC already incorporates plume abatement technology, most visual plume formation would occur when ambient temperatures are greater than 30 degrees Fahrenheit with relative humidity less than ninety percent. Provided as Attachment B to this Petition is a statistical analysis of the existing meteorological conditions collected in the project area over the last 10 years. Based on meteorological data for the City of San Jose, the weather conditions where plumes are most

likely to occur are predicted to occur no more than one percent of the time during daytime hours November through April with no rain or fog.[1]

The 10-year data set in the analysis demonstrates the conditions needed to form a visual plume in the project area, for the most part, will not occur. Under these circumstances, the plume abatement design point for the MEC, coupled with the fact that it would be nearly historically possible to have over 432 hours of ambient temperatures less than 30 degrees Fahrenheit, demonstrates that removal of the prescriptive hours-based cap would not result in a significant visual impact. Therefore, the proposed changes to VIS-10 will not have a significant adverse impact to visual resources.

5. SECTION 1769(A)(1)(E): ANALYSIS OF HOW THE PROPOSED CHANGE WOULD AFFECT THE PROJECT'S COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS, ORDINANCES, REGULATIONS, AND STANDARDS.

The proposed change will not impact MEC's compliance with applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards.

6. SECTION 1769(A)(1)(F): DISCUSSION OF HOW THE PROPOSED CHANGE WOULD AFFECT THE PUBLIC.

The proposed change will not adversely affect the public. The proposed change does not result in significant unmitigated impacts to the environment and does not negatively impact air quality or public health.

7. SECTION 1769(A)(1)(G): PROVIDE A LIST OF CURRENT ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS AND OWNERS' NAMES AND ADDRESSES FOR ALL PARCELS WITHIN 500 FEET OF ANY AFFECTED PROJECT LINEARS AND 1000 FEET OF THE PROJECT SITE.

The Project Owner will provide a list of neighboring property owners directly to the Compliance Project Manager ("CPM").

8. SECTION 1769(A)(1)(H): DISCUSSION OF THE POTENTIAL EFFECT ON NEARBY PROPERTY OWNERS, RESIDENTS, AND THE PUBLIC.

The proposed change will have no significant environmental effects and will be in compliance with applicable LORS. Therefore, the proposed change will have no impact on nearby property owners, residents, or the public.

[1] Staff uses a plume's frequency as significant if it is predicted to occur more than 20 percent of the time during critical period hours, defined as daytime hours November through April with no rain or fog.

ATTACHMENT A

METCALF ENERGY CENTER (99-AFC-03C)
PETITION FOR AMENDMENT NO. 9: REVISION OF CONDITION OF CERTIFICATION VIS-10 ATTACHMENT A

VIS-10 The power plant shall be operated in a manner that helps visually integrate it with its surroundings. To accomplish these objectives, the power plant shall be designed and operated to minimize visible plumes. The power plant shall be designed and operated to meet the following plume abatement standards~~:~~

- **The project owner shall reduce visible cooling tower plumes through the use of a plume abated wet/dry cooling tower that has a stipulated plume abatement design point of above 30°F and 90 percent relative humidity. A control system shall be used to ensure that plumes are abated to the maximum extent possible for the stipulated design point**.
- ~~No plume from the HRSG stack shall be visible above the top of a HRSG stack during daylight, non-fog, non-rain hours.~~
- ~~Cooling tower plumes shall not be visible for more than a total of fourteen (14) hours in any calendar year during daylight, non-fog, non-rain hours; provided, however, plumes created during any unplanned outages of the plume abatement control system shall not be counted against the fourteen (14) hour total.~~

The power plant shall be operated in a manner that meets these standards**.** ~~and shall immediately adjust its operations to meet the standards whenever weather or other conditions necessitate adjustments to operation to meet the standards. If more than two (2) violations of any standard or standards occur in any calendar year, the power plant shall prepare and submit a revised operating plan to the CPM that demonstrates how the plant will meet these standards.~~

Protocol: ~~Prior to the start of construction, t~~ **T**he project owner shall submit to the CPM for review and approval and to the City of San Jose for review and comment a plume abatement plan that describes how the power plant will be designed ~~and operated~~ to meet the standards for minimizing visible plumes during daylight, **non-fog, non-rain conditions when the ambient air dry bulb temperature is above 30°F and relative humidity is below 90%**. ~~The plume abatement plan shall also identify any adjustments to operations that will be necessary to meet the standards whenever weather or other conditions necessitate adjustments to operations to meet the standards.~~

~~The plan shall include, but not be limited to:~~

- ~~The plant shall be designed to produce no visible plumes in conditions above 30 degrees Fahrenheit and below 90 percent relative humidity.~~
- ~~Operating procedures of the power plant to meet the standards for abatement of visible plumes during daylight hours.~~
- ~~Operating procedures for immediately adjusting power plant operations to meet the standards whenever weather or other conditions necessitate adjustments to meet the standards.~~
- ~~Procedures for monitoring and reporting the duration and frequency of occurrence of any visible plumes including the installation of monitoring cameras.~~

If the CPM notifies the project owner that revisions to the plume abatement plan are needed before the CPM will approve the plan, within thirty (30) days of receiving that

notification the project owner shall submit to the CPM a revised plan. ~~The project owner shall not start construction of the power plant until the CPM has approved the plume abatement plan.~~ The project owner shall implement the plume abatement plan and shall ensure ~~that the monitoring and reporting are properly conducted~~ **continued compliance with the plan** for the life of the project.

Verification: ~~At least sixty (60) days prior to the start of construction of the power plant,~~ **T**he project owner shall submit the proposed plume abatement plan to the CPM for review and approval and to the City of San Jose for review and comment. The project owner shall submit any required revisions within thirty (30) days of notification by the CPM. ~~The project owner shall not begin construction of the power plant until the project owner receives written notification of approval of the plume abatement plan from the CPM. At least 60 days prior to first turbine roll, the project owner shall provide to the CPM for review and approval the specifications for the automated control systems and related systems that would be used to ensure maximum plume abatement for the wet/dry cooling tower plume abatement systems.~~

ATTACHMENT B

Visual Cooling Tower Plume Formation

Metcalf Energy Center

San Jose, California

Submitted to

California Energy Commission

Submitted by

Metcalf Energy Center, LLC

Prepared by

Atmospheric Dynamics, Inc.

A statistical analysis was made of the existing meteorological conditions collected in the project area over the last 15 years that would tend to favor visual plume formation from the Metcalf Energy Center (MEC) cooling tower. The existing cooling tower incorporates plume abatement technology that suppresses visual plume formation when the ambient temperature is above 30 degrees Fahrenheit (F) and the relative humidity (RH) is below 90 percent (%).

Introduction

In the original California Energy Commission (CEC) proceeding, Calpine's testimony established that the project was designed to potentially produce a visible plume for an extremely limited number of hours –an estimated average of only five hours per year – "during daylight hours when there is not fog or rain having a potential to obscure the plume." (Decision, p. 367.) The CEC decision recognized that:

> "Staff performed an independent analysis and agreed: that the proposed abatement systems will substantially reduce the potential for plume formation; the total number of hours per year with the potential for plume formation will vary with weather conditions; the vast majority of hours during which plumes may form would be at night; and, either low fog or rain would likely occur during many of the daytime hours with the potential for visible plume formation." (Decision, pp. 368-369)

The CEC Commission's original licensing decision for MEC held that the:

> "Applicant has credibly established that its proposed design parameters are feasible and will reduce the potential for visible plume formation to a minimal number of non-fog, non-rain daylight hours per year. We simply cannot accept a characterization that plume formation for such an extremely small number of the 8760 hours in a year would be intolerable. Even if this results in a detectable impact, in our judgment such impact would not reasonably approach any level of significance. . . In sum, much of the discussion of record seems to be concerned with preventing the potential occurrence of visible plumes when the evidence establishes that this potential is extremely slight to begin with and, if it occurs, will occur only in very limited meteorological circumstances for a minimal number of annual hours. We therefore conclude that no significant impact will result from the project's visible plumes, to the extent such plumes occur at all." (Decision, p. 369)

To resolve a contested issue with Staff, the Applicant proposed the version of VIS-10 that was ultimately adopted by the Commission:

> "Nevertheless, we recognize the need to ensure that visible plumes are in fact minimized, and that any plume formation is objectively verified. We have therefore modified Condition VIS-10 based on Applicant's suggestions." (Decision, p. 369.)

The current Condition VIS-10 is listed below:

VIS-10: The power plant shall be operated in a manner that helps visually integrate it with its surroundings. To accomplish these objectives, the power plant shall be designed and operated to minimize visible plumes. The power plant shall be designed and operated to meet the following plume abatement standards:

- *No plume from the HRSG stack shall be visible above the top of a HRSG stack during daylight, non-fog, non-rain hours.*

- *Cooling tower plumes shall not be visible for more than a total of fourteen (14) hours in any calendar year during daylight, non-fog, non-rain hours; provided, however, plumes created during any unplanned outages of the plume abatement control system shall not be counted against the fourteen (14) hour total.*

The power plant shall be operated in a manner that meets these standards and shall immediately adjust its operations to meet the standards whenever weather or other conditions necessitate adjustments to operation to meet the standards. If more than two (2) violations of any standard or standards occur in any calendar year, the power plant shall prepare and submit a revised operating plan to the CPM that demonstrates how the plant will meet these standards.

Protocol: Prior to the start of construction, the project owner shall submit to the CPM for review and approval and to the City of San Jose for review and comment a plume abatement plan that describes how the power plant will be designed and operated to meet the standards for minimizing visible plumes during daylight hours. The plume abatement plan shall also identify any adjustments to operations that will be necessary to meet the standards whenever weather or other conditions necessitate adjustments to operations to meet the standards.

The plan shall include, but not be limited to:

- *The plant shall be designed to produce no visible plumes in conditions above 30 degrees Fahrenheit and below 90 percent relative humidity.*
- *Operating procedures of the power plant to meet the standards for abatement of visible plumes during daylight hours.*
- *Operating procedures for immediately adjusting power plant operations to meet the standards whenever weather or other conditions necessitate adjustments to meet the standards.*
- *Procedures for monitoring and reporting the duration and frequency of occurrence of any visible plumes including the installation of monitoring cameras.*

If the CPM notifies the project owner that revisions to the plume abatement plan are needed before the CPM will approve the plan, within thirty (30) days of receiving that notification the project owner shall submit to the CPM a revised Plan.

The project owner shall not start construction of the power plant until the CPM has approved the plume abatement plan. The project owner shall implement the plume abatement plan and shall ensure that the monitoring and reporting are properly conducted for the life of the project.

***Verification**: At least sixty (60) days prior to the start of construction of the power plant, the project owner shall submit the proposed plume abatement plan to the CPM for review and approval and to the City of San Jose for review and comment. The project owner shall submit any required revisions within thirty (30) days of notification by the CPM. The project owner shall not begin construction of the power plant until the project owner receives written notification of approval of the plume abatement plan from the CPM.*

Analysis

Since the Commission's Decision with respect to MEC, recently licensed combined cycle power plants have adopted a different approach to minimize visible plumes. In these recent proceedings, the Staff uses a plume's frequency as significant if it is predicted to occur more than 20 percent of the time during critical period hours, defined as daytime hours November through April with no rain or fog. Less than 20 percent occurrence are considered to be less than significant. If the proposed plant is not expected to trigger this threshold, the CEC Staff simply recommends that the plant be required to be designed and constructed as proposed – i.e., there is no prescriptive limit on the number of seasonal (November through April) daylight no rain/no fog high visual contrast hours during which visible plumes are permitted to occur.

Since MEC already incorporates plume abatement technology, visual plume formation would only occur during ambient temperatures less than equal to 30° F with RH's equaling or exceeding 90%. There would ne no need to model plume formation during these conditions as the project already incorporates plume abatement. Rather, an analysis was made to determine the actual number of hours per year where the ambient conditions would be favorable to visual plume formation.

A representative ten-year (hourly) data set (2015-2025) was utilized for this analysis:

- Hourly ASOS data from the Reid Hillview County Airport, located 13.56 kilometers (km) north, northwest from MEC that included ambient temperature, relative humidity, wind direction, wind speed, visibility, sky cover, ceiling height, current weather

This airport location collects hourly surface meteorology and is the closest to the MEC project. The Reid Hillview County Airport is north, northwest of the MEC project with a base elevation of 135 feet above sea level. MEC has a site elevation of 256 feet above sea level. The meteorological data is directly upwind from the MEC project site. the Reid Hillview site shares similar climatological/meteorological conditions that includes the blocking effects of terrain to the Pacific Ocean and the land/terrain modification of the diurnal San Francisco Bay sea breeze. Thus, this airport data set is meteorologically representative of the MEC site and can be used to assess the conditions that could cause visible plume formation.

Assuming that only the nighttime hours are to be removed along with fog and rain hours, the following two tables summarize the number of hours where the ambient air temperature is less than or equal to 30°F and the RH equals or exceeds 90%.

San Jose Reid Hillview 2015-2024 Hours with Temperatures ≤ 30 F and Relative Humidity ≥ 90%					
Year	Month	Day	Hour	Temperature (F)	Relative Humidity (%)
2015	12	27	7	28	93
2016	-	-	-	-	-
2017	-	-	-	-	-
2018	-	-	-	-	-
2019	-	-	-	-	-
2020	-	-	-	-	-
2021	-	-	-	-	-
2022	-	-	-	-	-
2023	-	-	-	-	-
2024	-	-	-	-	-

With the San Jose Ried Hillview airport data, there was only one (1) hour over a ten-year period (or 21,600 daylight hours) where the ambient conditions exist to cause a visible plume. Thus, the conditions could only occur at 0.0046 percent over a 10-year period or 0.046 percent on an annual basis.

This 10-year data set demonstrates the conditions needed to form a visual plume in the project area, for the most part, will not occur. Because of the plume abatement design point for the plant, coupled with the fact that it would be nearly historically possible to have over 432 hours of ambient temperatures less than 30 degrees Fahrenheit, the Project Owner proposes that MEC should not be required to adhere to a prescriptive hours-based cap. Instead, the threshold trigger of 20% of November through April daytime hours with no rain or fog hours, which is the adopted methodology for projects licensed after MEC, should be implemented. Therefore, condition of certification VIS-10 should be revised to be consistent with other similarly situated projects that have been licensed after MEC.

The revised condition VIS-10 is proposed as follows:

VIS-10 *The power plant shall be operated in a manner that helps visually integrate it with its surroundings. To accomplish these objectives, the power plant shall be designed and operated to minimize visible plumes. The power plant shall be designed and operated to meet the following plume abatement standards:*

- ***The project owner shall reduce the MEC cooling tower visible plumes through the use of a plume abated wet/dry cooling tower that has a stipulated plume abatement design point of 30°F and 90 percent relative humidity. A control system would be used to ensure that plumes are abated to the maximum extent possible for the stipulated design point****.*
- ~~*No plume from the HRSG stack shall be visible above the top of a HRSG stack during daylight, non-fog, non-rain hours.*~~

- ~~*Cooling tower plumes shall not be visible for more than a total of fourteen (14) hours in any calendar year during daylight, non-fog, non-rain hours; provided, however, plumes created during any unplanned outages of the plume abatement control system shall not be counted against the fourteen (14) hour total.*~~

The power plant shall be operated in a manner that meets these standards. ~~*and shall immediately adjust its operations to meet the standards whenever weather or other conditions necessitate adjustments to operation to meet the standards. If more than two (2) violations of any standard or standards occur in any calendar year, the power plant shall prepare and submit a revised operating plan to the CPM that demonstrates how the plant will meet these standards.*~~

~~*Protocol:*~~ ~~*Prior to the start of construction,*~~ ***T****he project owner shall submit to the CPM for review and approval and to the City of San Jose for review and comment a plume abatement plan that describes how the power plant will be designed* ~~*and operated*~~ *to meet the standards for minimizing visible plumes during daylight hours,* ***non-fog, non-rain conditions when the ambient air dry bulb temperature is above 30°F and relative humidity is below 90%****.* ~~*The plume abatement plan shall also identify any adjustments to operations that will be necessary to meet the standards whenever weather or other conditions necessitate adjustments to operations to meet the standards.*~~

~~*The plan shall include, but not be limited to:*~~

- ~~*The plant shall be designed to produce no visible plumes in conditions above 30 degrees Fahrenheit and below 90 percent relative humidity.*~~
- ~~*Operating procedures of the power plant to meet the standards for abatement of visible plumes during daylight hours.*~~
- ~~*Operating procedures for immediately adjusting power plant operations to meet the standards whenever weather or other conditions necessitate adjustments to meet the standards.*~~
- ~~*Procedures for monitoring and reporting the duration and frequency of occurrence of any visible plumes including the installation of monitoring cameras.*~~

If the CPM notifies the project owner that revisions to the plume abatement plan are needed before the CPM will approve the plan, within thirty (30) days of receiving that notification the project owner shall submit to the CPM a revised plan.

~~*The project owner shall not start construction of the power plant until the CPM has approved the plume abatement plan.*~~ *The project owner shall implement the plume abatement plan and shall ensure* ~~*that the monitoring and reporting are properly conducted*~~ ***continued compliance with the plan*** *for the life of the project*~~*.*~~

Verification: ~~*At least sixty (60) days prior to the start of construction of the power plant,*~~ ***T****he project owner shall submit the proposed plume abatement plan to the CPM for review and approval and to the City of San Jose for review and comment. The project owner shall submit any required revisions within thirty (30) days of notification by the CPM.* ~~*The project owner shall not begin construction of the power plant until the project owner receives written notification of approval of the plume abatement plan from the CPM. At least 60 days prior to first turbine roll, the project owner shall provide to the CPM for review and approval the specifications for the automated control systems and related systems and sensors*~~

~~*that would be used to ensure maximum plume abatement for the wet/dry cooling tower plume abatement systems.*~~

Conclusion

A cooling tower plume is considered to have a *less-than-significant* visual impact if it is predicted to be visible less than 20% of the time during critical period hours as defined above. As the MEC cooling tower already incorporates plume abatement which is designed to control visible plume formation when temperatures are above 30° F and the relative humidity is less than 90 percent, the analyses of the meteorological conditions necessary for visible plume formation (beyond the design points of the plume abatement technology) have clearly shown that these conditions only rarely occur and for far less than the 20 percent significance criteria established by the CEC.

The modification of VIS-10 will change the manner in which visible plumes are regulated but will not change the design or operation of the plant, and the number of visible plumes that will occur in the future is not expected to vary significantly from current or historical levels. The levels of visible plumes will continue to be slight, minimal and well below the Commission's 20 percent threshold of significance. Therefore, the Amendment's changes to VIS-10 will not have a significant adverse impact on visual resources.