

<b>DOCKET</b> <b>93-AFC-2</b>
DATE: <b>JAN 18 1994</b>
RECD: <b>JAN 19 1994</b>

# Memorandum

To : Project File

Date : January 18, 1994

Telephone: ATSS ( )  
( )

From : California Energy Commission  
1516 Ninth Street  
Sacramento 95814-5512

*John for*  
- Darrel "H" Woo

Subject : **Data Response Workshop Summary**

At 10:00 a.m., Darrel "H" Woo convened a publicly noticed workshop to discuss the data responses filed by Sacramento Cogeneration Authority on January 3 to the CEC staff data requests filed on December 3, 1994.

Following introductions, Steve Baker commented on the efficiency data responses. Steve stated that due to the configuration of the intermediate pressure steam draw when duct fired, some recalculation would have to be performed to deduct part of the duct burners in the cogeneration calculation, because not all of energy is sequentially used in the production of steam. Based on explanation from the SCA and evaluation by Steve Baker, he subsequently informed the applicant that recalculation would not be necessary. This would not be a concern as it is in Campbell Soup.

In alternatives, Gary Walker stated that the same level of detail must be provided for the response to transmission line alternative 4B, consistent with the other alternatives discussion. Since none was provided, Susan Strachan said that could be supplied by explaining why 4B was different rather than refileing the alternatives section responses.

In hazardous materials management, Alvin Greenberg, staff's consultant, indicated that all responses looked fine with the exception of the newly proposed ammonia drain system. Advance notice was given to the SCA that staff would be preparing a data request addressing this system.

Staff would be seeking information on the ammonia drain system. In particular, this information should be sufficient to address the capability of the ammonia drain system to handle a worse case release of ammonia. Staff would seek information on the size and capacity on the sump, and the capacity/flow rate, and address the drain size and flow rate of the drain. If the drain will not handle a catastrophic release of ammonia, then the applicant will need to address what will happen to the over load back flow.

In air quality, Matt Layton stated that he was satisfied with the responses to his questions. Then turning it over to the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (district), Aleta Kennard stated that she was still awaiting the isopleths from CARB from their photo chemical modelling. The modelling was being performed by Andy Ranzeri's modelling group. She is expecting the isopleths either this week or next. Once received the district will be able to determine the proper VOC for NOx offset ratio. At 2 to 1, there would be about 30 tons per year of unmitigated NOx. The applicant is prepared to address this if the offset ratio is more than their proposed 1 to 1.

As to Air 10, the response was insufficient, regarding the use of methanol in the stand by generators. The district believes that regular diesel engines can burn methanol without the manufacturing of a special engine. The district has seen methanol burning engines in the 400 hp range. The response indicates that manufacturers have been notified. Aleta wanted to know who they were and what questions were asked. Aleta will speak to her "Clean Fuels" people to determine whether methanol can be burned in the 1000 hp engine range and prepare a subsequent data request.

In response to the answer provided in Air 11, Brian Krebs of the district stated that the applicant should not be looking at the incremental NOx reduction cost for justifying the reason not to install SCR to the auxiliary boiler. The cost should be calculated based upon an uncontrolled boiler. Although, Aleta indicated that this methodology is likely to be challenged by EPA and CARB. The use of costs to justify economic infeasibility is tenuous, since SCR technology is feasible. The district will issue new data requests in the next two weeks.

Regarding noise, Kisabuli informed the applicant that because the project was in the city, they would need to review the city of Sacramento noise ordinance since the county noise limits were submitted to the CEC. While the applicant believed that the city limits were the same as the county limits, they would check and inform us in writing. In addition, SCA will determine what if any effect the noise limits will have on the avocado home used as an office, north of the project, across the railroad tracks.

In water resources, Joe O'Hagan questioned the applicant on the NPDES filing. The consultant is preparing the application and is looking to file the application with the Central Valley Water Quality Control District before the end of the month. Wayne Pierson of the district has given them indication that a permit can be obtained 6 months from the filing of a complete application. In addition, the applicant will provide the CEC with a copy of the permit application, when filed. In addition, the applicant will supply Joe a copy of the results of the waste water analysis based upon city water as a source.

Project File  
January 18, 1994  
Page 3

Upon discussion with Gary Walker, the applicant will provide samples of the colors proposed for the project. In addition, the applicant will indicate the type of surfaces these colors will be painted on.

Additionally, Gary Walker indicated that an additional transportation data request would be forthcoming which would be to determine whether the City of Sacramento has exempted the project from its shade tree guidelines for the employee parking lot and whether the project could be modified to allow such shading.

The staff is expected to file their next data request by the end of the week of January 18, 1994.