### ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.

CHRISTOPHER T. ELLISON
ANNE J. SCHNEIDER
JEFFERY D. HARRIS
DOUGLAS K. KERNER
ROBERT E. DONLAN
ANDREW B. BROWN
MARGARET G. LEAVITT, OF COUNSEL

#### ATTORNEYS AT LAW

2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814-3109
TELEPHONE (916) 447-2166 FAX (916) 447-3512

TRENTON M. DIEHL JEDEDIAH J. GIBSON LYNN M. HAUG PETER J. KIEL CHRISTOPHER M. SANDERS JONATHAN R. SCHUTZ GREGGORY L. WHEATLAND

January 10, 2006

WEC 2006-001

Lance Shaw Compliance Project Manager 02-AFC-4C California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814

## RE: WALNUT ENERGY CENTER AUTHORITY WALNUT ENERGY CENTER - CONDITIONS OF CERTIFICATION AQ-70 & 71

Dear Mr. Shaw:

Conditions of Certification AQ-70 and AQ-71 for the Walnut Energy Center (WEC) provide emission limits for SOx and PM10 during project commissioning. We have identified transcription errors in the commissioning limits for these two pollutants in these Conditions. Specifically, in Condition AQ-71 it appears that the SOx and PM10 daily emission limits are reversed. Similarly, Condition AQ-70 also has a SOx hourly emission limit that is lower than the non-commissioning SOx hourly limit in Condition AQ-30, indicating an error. Please find attached hereto proposed conforming revisions to Conditions AQ-70 and 71 to correct these discrepancies.

Further, the attached letter from the Turlock Irrigation District to Jim Swaney of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) provides an explanation of the existing permit conditions and the proposed revisions. Please note that while the conditions are identical, the SJVAPCD Authority to Construct (ATC) condition numbers are different than the CEC air quality permit condition numbers. SJVAPCD ATC Condition 87 corresponds to CEC Condition 70 and SJVAPCD ATC Condition 88 corresponds to CEC Condition 71.

We believe that the Staff has the discretion to process these changes as an insignificant project change. There are no changes to the underlying air quality analyses or the conclusions reached in the Commission's Decision. If, however, Staff decides to process these changes as an amendment, this filing is consistent with the requirements of Section 1769 of the California Energy Commission regulations. Specifically, the information presented herein provides a complete description of the proposed modifications, including the new language for the affected Conditions AQ-70 and AQ-71 (SJVAPCD Conditions 87 and 88), as required by Section 1769(a)(1)(A). This filing also includes a discussion of the necessity of the proposed changes,

Lance Shaw January 10, 2006 Page 2

per Section 1769(a)(1)(B). This filing is based on information that was not known during the time of the certification, and it does not undermine the assumptions, rationale, findings, or other bases for the final decision, per Sections 1769(a)(1)(C) and 1769(a)(1)(D). As discussed above, the revisions to the AQ-70 and AQ-71 condition language do not have the potential to create any significant impacts on the environment, and the project remains consistent with all applicable LORS, per Sections 1769(a)(1)(E) and 1769(a)(1)(F). The proposed revisions will not adversely affect the public, per Section 1769(a)(1)(G). In addition, the proposed revisions will have no adverse effects on nearby property owners, per Section 1769(a)(1)(H) and 1769(a)(1)(I).

Should you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 916-447-2166.

Sincerely,

Jeffery D Harris Attorneys for WECA

Attachments (2) Revisions to Conditions Letter to James Swaney

### **REVISIONS TO CONDITIONS AQ-70 & AQ-71**

- **AQ-70** The emission rates during the commission period shall not exceed any of the following:  $\dots Sox \frac{0.94}{1.05} \frac{1.05}{lb/hr}, \dots$
- **AQ-71** .... Combined emission rates from permit units N-7172-1 and N-7172-2, during the commissioning period, shall not exceed any of the following limits:
  .... Sox 336.0 50.3 lb/day; PM10 47.8-336.0 lb/day.

TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Don Pedro Dam and Powerhouse

333 EAST CANAL DRIVE
POST OFFICE BOX 949

TURLOCK, CALIFORNIA 95381
(209) 883-8300

December 30, 2005

Mr. Jim Swaney San Joaquin Valley APCD 4800 Enterprise Way Modesto, CA 95356-8718

Subject:

Correction of Erroneous ATC Commissioning Limits

Dear Mr. Swaney:

We have identified errors in the Authority to Construct ("ATC") commissioning emission limits for the Walnut Energy Center Authority's Walnut Energy Center ("WEC") located in Turlock, California. The SOx and  $PM_{10}$  daily emission limits in Condition 88 of ATCs N-7172-1-0 and N-7172-2-0 appear to be reversed, resulting in an unnecessarily restrictive limit on  $PM_{10}$  emissions during commissioning activities. Also, Condition 87 has a SOx hourly emission limit that is lower than the non-commissioning SOx hourly limit in Condition 36.

Condition 88 limits SOx emissions to 336.0 lb/day and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions to 47.8 lb/day during commissioning for both turbines combined. These limits are incorrect for several reasons. First, these daily limits are inconsistent with the hourly commissioning limits in Condition 87 of 0.94 lb/hr for SOx and 7.0 lb/hr for PM<sub>10</sub>. Based on these hourly limits and 24 hours of operation, the daily SOx limit should be 0.94 x 24 x 2 turbines = 45.1 lb/day SOx and 7.0 x 24 x 2 turbines = 336.0 lb/day PM<sub>10</sub>. These are roughly the opposite of the Condition 88 limits (336.0 lb/day SOx and 47.8 lb/day SOx), indicating that there was probably a transcription error

Second, the Condition 88 SOx and  $PM_{10}$  commissioning limits are lower than the daily non-commissioning (normal operation) limits in Condition 35 (168.0 lb/day  $PM_{10}$  per turbine) and Condition 36 (25.2 lb/day SOx per turbine). Condition 36 also limits non-commissioning SOx emissions to 1.05 lb/hr, which is higher than the commissioning limit in Condition 87 of 0.94 lb/hr. Commissioning emission limits for SOx and  $PM_{10}$  should be the same as the normal turbine operating limits, because commissioning activities generally do not affect turbine SOx and  $PM_{10}$  emission rates.

Finally, we note that the maximum daily emission rates submitted in the permit application for the WEC project were 50.3 lb/day SOx and 336.0 lb/day PM<sub>10</sub> for two turbines combined (see attached Table 8.1-18, page 8.1-38 of the November 21, 2002 permit application). The application also indicates that SOx emissions will be 1.0 lb/hr (Table 8.1-18).



Therefore, we request that the SOx and PM<sub>10</sub> emission limits in Conditions 87 and 88 be corrected to the accurate values reflected in other ATC conditions and the permit application as follows:

- 87. The emission rates during the commissioning period shall not exceed any of the following: . . .  $SOx \frac{0.94}{1.05}$  lb/hr, . . .
- 88. . . . Combined emission rates from permit units N-7172-1 and N-7172-2, during the commissioning period, shall not exceed any of the following limits: . . . SOx 336.0 50.3 lb/day; PM10 47.8 336.0 lb/day.

We request that these permit corrections be processed in the most expeditious manner possible, because the WEC turbines are currently undergoing commissioning operations and could exceed the current incorrect SOx and PM<sub>10</sub> limits on high firing days. We understand that we will be billed for any permit fees associated with this application.

Please contact myself, or Jeff Adkins of Sierra Research at (916) 444-6666 with any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

George A. Davies IV

Cc: Susan Strachan

Jeff Adkins, Sierra Research

WEC Files

### San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

www.valleyair.org

# Permit Application For: AUTHORITY TO CONSTRUCT (ATC) - New Emission Unit.

. ,	STRUCT (ATC) STRUCT (ATC)	<ul> <li>Modification Of Emission Unit With Valid PTO/Valid ATC.</li> <li>Renewal of Valid Authority to Construct.</li> <li>Existing Emission Unit Now Requiring a Permit to Operate.</li> </ul>				
1. PERMIT TO BE ISSUED TO: Walnut E	nergy Center	Authority				
2. MAILING ADDRESS: 600 South Water	ashington Roa	d				
CITY: Turlock	No. of Charles and Charles and Charles	STATE:	CA	9-DIGIT ZIP CODE: <b>9538</b>	31	
3. LOCATION WHERE THE EQUIPMENT W STREET: 600 South Washington Road	ILL BE OPERATED	:			WITHIN 1,000 SCHOOL? [ ] Y	
/4 SECTION T	OWNSHIP	RANGE		_	S.I.C. CODE(S) OF (If known):	FACILITY
4. GENERAL NATURE OF BUSINESS: Power Production and Water Supply				INSTALL DATE: 2005		
5. TITLE V PERMIT HOLDERS Do yo ONLY:	u request a COC (EPA	A Review) prior t	o receivii	ng your ATC?	[ ] YES	[ <b>/</b> ] NO
application. Revised values should b SOx = 1.05 lb/hr, 50.3 lb/day PM10 = 336.0 lb/day	e as follows:					
7. HAVE YOU EVER APPLIED FOR AN ATO PTO IN THE PAST?	[ C/PTO #: <u>N-717</u>	J NO <b>2-1,2</b>	Optiona 10 CHECK WHETH PARTICIPANT IN	SPARE		
B. IS THIS PROPERTY ZONED PROPERLY FOR THE PROPOSED USE? [✔] YES		[	] NO	"SPARE	THE AIR"	≫AIR a1
9. IS THIS APPLICATION SUBMITTED AS T RESULT OF EITHER A NOTICE OF VIOLATION OR A NOTICE TO COMPLY	[ ] YES	[ <b>✓</b> //NTC #:	] NO	[ ]Yes [ ]No [ ]Send info  "INSPECT" [ ]Yes [ ]No [ ]Send info		
11. TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF APPLICANT:  George A. Davies IV				TITLE OF APPLICANT:  Combustion Turbine Division Manager		
12. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT: DATE:				PHONE #: (209) 883-3451 FAX #: (209) 656-2142 E-MAIL: gadavies@tid.org		
OR APCD USE ONLY:						
DATE STAMP		\$ CHECK #:				
		: FACILITY ID:				

- Each turbine operates at full load for 19 hours; and
- Fire pump is tested.

### For SO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>:

- Each turbine operates at full load for 24 hours;
- Fire pump is tested; and
- Cooling tower operates at maximum output.

### **Maximum Annual Emissions:**

### For NOx, CO, and VOC:

- Each turbine operates in startup or shutdown mode for 250 hours per year;
- Each turbine operates at full load for 8,510 hours; and
- Fire pump engine operates for 100 hours per year.

### For SO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>:

- Each turbine operates at full load for 8,760 hours per year;
- Cooling tower operates at maximum output for 8,760 hours per year; and
- Fire pump engine operates for 100 hours per year.

Detailed emission calculations appear in Appendix 8.1A. Emissions from the cooling tower were calculated from the maximum cooling water TDS level.

TABLE 8.1-18
Emissions from New Equipment<sup>a</sup>

	NO <sub>x</sub>	SO₂	СО	voc	PM <sub>10</sub>
Maximum Hourly Emissions, lb/hr					
Turbines	126.6	2.1	138.3	17.8	14.0
Fire Pump Engine	3.4	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Cooling Tower	<u> -</u>	<b>-</b> · ·	•	. 2	1.3
Total Project, pounds per hour	130.0	2.2	138.4	17.9	15.4
Maximum Daily Emissions, lb/day				,	• 1
Turbines	888.6	50.3	1,117.4	165.7	336.0
Fire Pump Engine	3.4	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Cooling Tower	-		•		30.9
Total Project, pounds per day	892.0	50.4	1,117.6	165.8	366.9
Maximum Annual Emissions, tpy					
Turbines	90.8	8.7	106.5°	18.8	61.3
Fire Pump Engine	0.2	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Cooling Tower	-	-	•		5.6
Total Project, tons per year <sup>b</sup>	91.0	8.7	106.5°	18.8	67.0

See Appendix 8.1A for detailed calculations.

Numbers may not add directly due to rounding.

Project CO emissions will be limited to less than 100 tons per year.