

**DOCKETED**

<b>Docket Number:</b>	07-AFC-06C
<b>Project Title:</b>	Carlsbad Energy Center - Compliance
<b>TN #:</b>	232238-2
<b>Document Title:</b>	Opposition to CECL request for carbon emission amendments for ACECP
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	Kerry Siekmann
<b>Organization:</b>	Terramar Association & Self
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Intervenor
<b>Submission Date:</b>	2/26/2020 4:50:27 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	2/26/2020

Mr. Anwar Ali, PhD  
Compliance Project Manager  
California Energy Commission  
1516 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

Dear Dr. Ali,

Air quality has always been the main concern of interveners, Terramar (the neighborhood directly south of the Amended Carlsbad Energy Center Project) and myself (Kerry Siekmann) regarding the Amended Carlsbad Energy Center Project ((Docket 07-AFC-06C) as well as the original Carlsbad Energy Center Project.) Air quality concerns have been made very clear in our docketed history for both the original Carlsbad Energy Center Project (CECP) and the Amended Carlsbad Energy Center Project (ACECP). Regarding the following request made by CECL, the Project Owner:

*Pursuant to California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 20 Section 1769(a)(1) as revised in September 2019, CECL, the Project Owner, is filing this PTA for the following two propose amendments:*

- 1. To request a modification of Condition of Certification (COC) AQ-40 (SDAPCD SA Condition 40) to allow for higher CO emissions during startup; and*
- 2. To make administrative changes to COC AQ-14 (SDAPCD SA Condition 14) as it pertains to the definition of shutdown without a change in emissions*

*The proposed amendments comply with all laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) and do not have a significant environmental impact, as further described in this PTA. The proposed revisions to the COCs will not result in increased permitted maximum hourly, daily, quarterly, or annual emissions and will have no significant impact on property owners, the public, or any other parties.*

Page 6-7, RE: AMENDED CARLSBAD ENERGY CENTER PROJECT (Docket 07-AFC-06C), PETITION TO AMEND AQ-40 AND AQ-14

Terramar and I are docketing our opposition to the proposed amendments. As climate change impacts the world, it is critical that the SDAPCD (San Diego Air Pollution Control District) and the CEC (California Energy Commission) control carbon emissions.

*The purpose of the variances has been to continue operation of the CTGs under a modified permit limit while troubleshooting the CO startup exceedances and implementing modifications as warranted. The CO startup exceedances that*

*precipitated the need for a variance total 12 to date, with the first ones occurring on July 23. There have been no other reported exceedances for other constituents. The Regular Variance specifies a CO startup limit of 17.9 lbs/event from September 19, 2019, through March 1, 2020. The Regular Variance also requires that CECL pursue a permit modification to increase the CO limit, with an application filed no later than October 4, 2019. An ATC application was filed with the SDAPCD on September 20, 2019, to request these changes in compliance with the Regular Variance. In addition, this PTA is also being filed. The Applicant has conducted and continues to conduct extensive troubleshooting in connection with Variance Petitions 4506, 4507, and 4510 to help improve operating conditions and reliability during startups in an attempt to achieve as efficient a startup as reasonably possible to minimize CO emissions. Based on the testing done to date, the Applicant believes that the CTGs are incapable of meeting the permitted limits consistently under expected operating conditions in the absence of a breakdown condition and, therefore, is seeking modification of COC AQ-40 in the Final Decision and SDAPCD FDOC/SA.*

Page 10-11, RE: AMENDED CARLSBAD ENERGY CENTER PROJECT (Docket 07-AFC-06C), PETITION TO AMEND AQ-40 AND AQ-14

The approval of the ACECP (Amended Carlsbad Energy Center Project) was based on the FDOC (Final Determination of Compliance). Now CECL, the Project Owner, is requesting amendments to their permit, to increase allowable carbon emissions. Terramar and I, oppose the permitting of additional emissions.

We request that CECL, the Project Owner, continue work on a solution to the emissions problems. If the SDAPCD must allow the additional emissions, then we request the Project Owner continue to request variances until the problem is solved and not issue amendments to the permit. In this time of climate change CECL, the Project Owner, must try harder.

*E.1.3.8 Rule 20.3(d)(5)-(8): Emission Offsets*

*Emission offsets are required for any project that results in a major modification at an existing major source or results in a new major stationary source by itself for federal nonattainment air pollutants or their precursors. The District is currently only in nonattainment of the federal 8-hour ozone standard. As ozone precursors, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs are the only nonattainment pollutants in the District and the only pollutants for which offsets are required. The proposed modifications are not expected to cause an increase in either NO<sub>x</sub> or VOC emissions; therefore, offsets are not required for the project. Note that the Amended CECP has installed only five of the permitted CTGs. The post-project PTE for the facility for CO (as shown in Table 2) is 75.3 tons per year. The permitted facility PTE for CO is 77.8 tons per year. Thus, the proposed modifications will not cause the facility to exceed the facility cap for CO emissions. The proposed changes are also not expected to increase SO<sub>x</sub> or PM<sub>10</sub> emissions; therefore, offsets are not required for these pollutants.*

Page 24, RE: AMENDED CARLSBAD ENERGY CENTER PROJECT (Docket 07-AFC-06C), PETITION TO AMEND AQ-40 AND AQ-14

Terramar and I, request that the SDAPCD deny the Project Owner's request for amendments.

If the SDAPCD decides to give permission to the CECL to continue to solve the excess carbon emissions, Terramar and I, request that the SDAPCD gives the CECL continued variances with offsets, instead of amending the permit.

Terramar and I, would like to remind the SDAPCD and the CEC that the FDOC was based on the stack height. We are counting on you to protect our air and deny the requested amendments.