

Appendix C

Emission Offsets

Pursuant to District Regulation 2, Rule 2, Section 302, offsets are required only for permitted sources. Therefore, emission offsets will be required for the NO_x, POC and PM₁₀ emission increases associated with S-55 Gas Turbine, S-56 HRSG, S-57 Gas Turbine and S-58 HRSG.

Table C-1 Emission Offset Summary

	NO _x	CO	POC	PM ₁₀	SO ₂
BAAQMD Calculated New Source Emission Increases ^a (ton/yr)	178.5	262.9	49.1	110.6	26.2
Offset Requirement Triggered	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	No
Offset Ratio	1.15 ^b	N/A	1.15 ^c	1.00	N/A
Offsets Required (tons)	205.3	0	56.5	110.6^d	0

^aSum of Gas Turbine (S-55 and S-57) and HRSG (S-56 and S-58) emission increases.

^bPursuant to District Regulation 2-2-302, the applicant must provide emission offsets at a ratio of 1.15 to 1.0 since the proposed facility NO_x emissions from permitted sources will exceed 50 tons per year.

^cPursuant to District Regulation 2-2-302, an offset ratio of 1.15 applies since the facility POC emissions are greater than 50 tons per year (present plant #26 has POC emissions of 11.7 tons/year).

^dPM₁₀ will be offset with SO₂ and PM₁₀ at a ratios of 3:1 and 1:1, respectively. See Appendix C Attachment.

Appendix C Attachment

Author: Thomas Perardi at cc fs1 Date: 2/6/01 3:26 PM Priority: Normal

TO: Weyman Lee at cc fs3

CC: Rob Demandel, Glen Long, ronald.kino@mirant.com at INTERNET, Peter Hess, William Deboisblanc at cc fs3

Subject: Interpollutant Offset Ratio for Potrero Unit 7 Project

Weyman --You got a copy of Ronald Kino's 1/30/01 letter to me re their proposed interpollutant offset ratio for the Potrero Unit 7 project.

While we do not agree with their analytical approach, we feel that a 3:1 ratio is acceptable.

The reasons we don't accept their approach are: 1) it is based on annual average data rather than winter PM episodes, and 2) it is based only upon emissions from San Francisco County. During the wintertime conditions that produce high particulate concentrations in San Francisco, emissions from upwind sources in Contra Costa County probably contribute more than local emissions in San Francisco.

We feel that we can accept the 3 to 1 ratio because it is consistent with our previous action, and with the findings in the 1992 SAI report for Contra Costa County. --Tom