

1 **Q. In Hydro's response to PUB 8 NLH, Hydro states that ..."by the autumn**
2 **of 2005, Hydro determined that a staged reduction of the sulphur levels**
3 **in the HFO would result in continued emissions in excess of the**
4 **permitted levels as determined by the modeling used in the**
5 **administration of the Air Pollution Control Regulations, 2004."**
6 **Please provide details as to the nature and extent of the exceedance of**
7 **permitted levels of emissions and current forecast cost and rate impact**
8 **differences under such a plan.**

9

10

11 **A.** This was partially answered by the previous response to PUB 9 NLH which
12 stated in part:

13

14 "The Department of Environment and Conservation's Guidance
15 Document GD-PPD-009.2 *Determination of Compliance with the*
16 *Ambient Air Quality Standards* specifies that where the maximum
17 predicted ground-level concentration under all operating scenarios is
18 below the associated ambient air quality standard for the given
19 timeframe, the facility will be deemed to be compliant for that particular
20 pollutant. Therefore, all modeled scenarios for sulphur dioxide would
21 be required to have resultant ground-level concentrations below 900
22 ug/m³ for a one-hour period. The completed air dispersion modeling
23 for the Holyrood Thermal Generating Station's 2004 emissions
24 indicated a maximum one-hour ground-level concentration of 3147
25 ug/m³ for sulphur dioxide.

26

27 The Department of Environment and Conservation has specified that,
28 in calculating volumetric emissions of sulphur dioxide from HTGS, a

1 98% conversion of sulphur concentration in fuel to sulphur dioxide in
2 emissions must be used. Assuming this relationship, then a reduction
3 in maximum sulphur content in the fuel burned from 2% to 1% would
4 result in a near 50% reduction in the sulphur dioxide emission rate for
5 any individual production rate. In air dispersion modeling algorithms
6 the emission rate has a direct proportional affect on the resulting
7 predicted ground level concentration. As the maximum ground level
8 concentration predicted by the 2004 modeling would have to be
9 reduced by 71% to achieve a level below 900 ug/m³, the sulphur
10 content required to achieve a predicted maximum ground level
11 concentration in compliance with the standard would have had to be
12 as low as 0.6%. However, the frequency for which the 2004 modeled
13 ground-level concentrations were predicted to exceed the government
14 standard was very low, indicating that the combination of
15 emission/production rates with meteorological conditions that result in
16 such maximum ground-level concentrations may be relatively
17 infrequent. Therefore, it may not be necessary to reduce the emission
18 rate to the maximum projected if the infrequent meteorological
19 condition is avoided. This will have to be tested by future modeling
20 and monitoring of ground level concentrations over time.”

21
22 Cost and rate impacts reflecting a staged reduction in sulphur levels are
23 shown in the table below. These amounts are indicative of the magnitude of
24 the changes in rates, but detailed cost of service studies and fuel costing
25 reflecting fuel inventory impacts have not been performed.

CA 9 NLH
Application for Approval of Recovery of Costs
of 1% Sulphur Fuel through the RSP

Cost and Rate Impacts

Year	Fuel Sulphur Content	Premium per barrel over 2% s	Incremental Annual Cost \$ 000	Estimated Rate Impacts over 2% s	
				Island Industrial	End Consumer
2006	1.75%	\$0.35	883	0.3%	0.1%
2007	1.50%	\$1.00	2,722	0.8%	0.4%
2008	1.25%	\$1.65	4,575	1.4%	0.7%
2009	1.00%	\$2.40	6,646	2.0%	1.0%