

500 Capitol Mall Suite 1600 Sacramento California 95814 main 916 447 0700 fax 916 447 4781 www.stoel.com

Melissa A. Foster Direct (916) 319-4673 mafoster@stoel.com

June 22, 2012

VIA EMAIL

Mr. Eric Solorio, Siting Project Manager California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 **California Energy Commission**

DOCKETED 11-AFC-1

TN # 65907

JUN 22 2012

Re: Pio Pico Energy Center Project (11-AFC-01)

Applicant's Response to EPA's Questions re PM BACT for Cooling System re PSD Permit Applicant dated November 8, 2011

Dear Mr. Solorio:

On behalf of Applicant Pio Pico Energy Center, LLC, please find enclosed herein for docketing Applicant's Response to EPA's Questions re PM BACT for Cooling System re PSD Permit Applicant dated November 8, 2011 related to Applicant's PSD Permit Application for the Pio Pico Energy Center Project.

Should you have any questions regarding this submittal, please contact me directly.

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa A. Foster

MAF:jmw Enclosure

cc: See Proof of Service List

November 8, 2011

Mr. Gerardo Rios Chief. Permits Office USEPA Region IX 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105 sierra research

1801 J Street Sacramento, CA 95811 Tel. (916) 444-6666 Fax (916) 444-8373 Ann Arbor, MI Tel. (734) 761-6666 Fax. (734) 761-6755

Subject: Pio Pico Energy Center PSD Permit Application

BACT for Cooling System

Dear Mr. Rios:

As requested by EPA in emails from Roger Kohn to Steve Hill dated October 12, 2011, and November 3, 2011, and a telephone conversation between Roger Kohn and Steve Hill on November 3, 2011, we are submitting clarifying information on behalf of Pio Pico Energy Center, LLC.

October 12, 2011 Email

In the application, PPEC proposes the use of a high efficiency drift eliminator for particulate BACT for the cooling towers, and a drift rate of 0.001% or less (see pages 4.52 and App-1.94). Please note that the drift rate in our proposed Palmdale permit is one half this rate. We need PPEC to evaluate this higher level of control for its project as part of the top down BACT analysis. Also, in the top down analysis, PPEC should provide the equivalent hourly emission rate and concentration of measured TDS, as these values are needed to propose enforceable particulate permit conditions limiting emissions. Please submit a revised top down particulate BACT analysis for the cooling tower with this additional information.

Response:

The cooling tower at Palmdale is a large (130,000 gpm circulation rate) evaporative cooler. It is sized to condense the steam from the steam turbine in this combined cycle power plant.

The cooling system used by PPEC is not a cooling tower, it is a partial dry cooling system comprised of two components: a dry cooling component that provides necessary cooling most of the time and has zero emissions; and a small (7,000 gpm circulation rate) wet cooling component that supplements the dry cooling component when ambient temperatures are too high for the dry cooling system to function effectively. The PPEC cooling system is sized to provide intercooling for the simple-cycle turbines, and is much smaller than a system designed for condensing steam from a combined cycle unit.

As demonstrated in the BACT analysis submitted with the reformatted PSD permit application, the PPEC cooling system is a different basic technology with inherently

lower emissions than the cooling technology approved in the Palmdale permit. Because it is much smaller, and because it is not a recirculating water cooling tower, the PPEC cooling system is a different class/category of source than the Palmdale cooling tower. The BACT analysis also documents that the drift rates achievable in large evaporative coolers have not been demonstrated in, and are not applicable to, much smaller units such as the PPEC system.

We have contacted the vendor to determine whether a guarantee of 0.0005% drift is available, and if so, at what price. Based on information provided by the cooling system vendor, the estimated incremental cost of control would be:

Capital cost (\$)	\$2.1 MM
Annualized capital cost (\$/yr, 0.11 recovery factor)	\$231.000
Operating cost (\$/yr)	
Total incremental cost (\$/yr)	\$231.000
Emission reductions (TPY PM/PM ₂₀ /PM ₂₅) = 1.4 TPY - 0.7 TPY	=0.7 TPY
Cost effectiveness = $($231,000/yr)/(0.7 \text{ TPY})$	= \$330.000/ton

The TDS levels for the wet cooling component are provided in the PSD application at page PSD-4.29. The hourly emission rate from the cooling tower is provided in the PSD application at page PSD -App-1.53.

October 12, 2011 Email

Can you tell me at what temperature the PPEC SCR units will start to be effective, and at what temperature the units will be fully effective?

Response:

The SCR inlet flue gas temperature must be equal to or above the limit temperature of 570 degrees F before ammonia may be injected. This is also the temperature at which the SCR unit will be capable of achieving the emission limits. There will be a time delay of a few minutes while the SCR catalyst is saturated with ammonia, but there no difference between the two temperatures. Maximum allowable gas temperature into the SCR catalyst is 870 degrees F.

The turbines will be in compliance with NOx limits for normal operations immediately after the end of the startup period (i.e., the NOx concentration and mass emission rate for the first hourly average after the end of the startup period will meet the applicable limits).

October 12, 2011 telephone conversation

Please confirm that PPEC will use only PUC-quality natural gas in the turbines.

Response:

PPEC will use only PUC-quality natural gas in the turbines.

If you have any questions regarding this application, please contact the applicant's representative David Jenkins at (317) 431-1004, or Gary Rubenstein or me at (916) 444-6666

Sincerely,

Steve Hill

ce: John McKinsey, Stoel Rives LLP David Jenkins, Apex Power Group Steve Moore, SDAPCD

BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 1-800-822-6228 – www.energy.ca.gov

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION
FOR THE PIO PICO ENERGY CENTER, LLC

Docket No. 11-AFC-1 PROOF OF SERVICE (Revised 3/20/12)

Pio Pico Energy Center, LLC Applicant's Response dated June 22, 2012 to EPA's Questions re PM BACT for Cooling System re PSD Permit Applicant dated November 8, 2011

APPLICANT

Gary Chandler, President
Pio Pico Energy Center
P.O. Box 95592
South Jordan, UT 84095
grchandler@apexpowergroup.com

David Jenkins, Project Manager Pio Pico Energy Center, LLC 1293 E. Jessup Way Mooresville, IN 46158 dienkins@apexpowergroup.com

APPLICANT'S CONSULTANTS

Maggie Fitzgerald Sierra Research 1801 J Street Sacramento, CA 95811 MFitzgerald@sierraresearch.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

John A. McKinsey
Melissa A. Foster
Stoel Rives, LLP
500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1600
Sacramento, CA 95814
jamckinsey@stoel.com
mafoster@stoel.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO
e-mail service preferred
e-recipient@caiso.com

PETITIONERS

April Rose Sommer Attorney for Rob Simpson P.O. Box 6937 Moraga, CA 94570 e-mail service preferred aprilsommerlaw@yahoo.com

ENERGY COMMISSION-DECISIONMAKERS

CARLA PETERMAN
Commissioner and Presiding Member
cpeterma@energy.state.ca.us

KAREN DOUGLAS
Commissioner and Associate Member

e-mail service preferred kldougla@energy.state.ca.us

Raoul Renaud Hearing Adviser rrenaud@energy.state.ca.us Jim Bartridge

Presiding Member's Adviser jbartrid@energy.state.ca.us

Galen Lemei

Associate Member's Adviser e-mail service preferred glemei@energy.state.ca.us

ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF

Eric Solorio
Siting Project Manager
esolorio@energy.state.ca.us

Kevin W. Bell Staff Counsel

kwbell@energy.state.ca.us

Eileen Allen Commissioners' Technical Advisor for Facility Siting e-mail service preferred eallen@energy.state.ca.us

ENERGY COMMISSION - PUBLIC ADVISER

Jennifer Jennings
Energy Commission Public Adviser
e-mail service preferred
publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us

DECLARATION OF SERVICE