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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Hazardous materials are often a necessary part of industrial operations. Hazardous materials present potential risks based upon their specific chemical properties and characteristics. A hazard risk analysis evaluates a system or unit using hazardous chemicals by examining the process, the hazardous properties of substances involved with the process, the potential deviations that may affect the process, the potential consequences of a worst-case release scenario, and the appropriate controls and mitigations. Accordingly, this analysis was performed for the Project to address such potential risks.

Various hazardous materials will be used in connection with operation of the Project. This appendix addresses aqueous ammonia, hydrogen, acid gas (45 percent hydrogen sulfide, 55 percent carbon dioxide), methanol, and syngas (which contains water, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, hydrogen, hydrogen sulfide, nitrogen, argon, and trace amounts of ammonia and carbonyl sulfide).

2.0 APPLICABLE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

The Project will comply with applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) pertaining to the storage and use of hazardous materials. The hazardous materials evaluated in this appendix (aqueous ammonia, hydrogen, acid gas [hydrogen sulfide] and syngas) are regulated hazardous materials under the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) program and the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) Risk Management Program (RMP). Additionally, although methanol is not regulated under CalARP and RMP, it is regulated as a hazardous material under various federal and state regulations and is therefore evaluated here.

The CalARP and RMP programs set regulatory thresholds for the aforementioned hazardous materials, with the exception of methanol. The use or storage of any of these substances in excess of their specific regulatory thresholds triggers specific CalARP and RMP program requirements. The specific threshold requirements and regulatory program applicability for the hazardous materials analyzed are provided in Table L-1, Regulatory Program Applicability.

The following sections provide the analysis that was performed for each of these five hazardous materials.

3.0 OFF-SITE CONSEQUENCE ANALYSIS

Off-site consequence analysis (OCA) modeling was performed to address the potential off-site impacts from a worst-case release scenario for each substance. The OCA modeling was used to determine if an accidental chemical release would remain within the Project Site or the Controlled Area, or extend off-site.
# Table L-1
## Regulatory Program Applicability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazardous Chemical</th>
<th>Federal RMP Threshold (pounds)</th>
<th>State CalARP Threshold (pounds)</th>
<th>Regulatory Program Applicability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aqueous Ammonia</td>
<td>20,000&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Project will store 20,000 gallons of 19 percent aqueous ammonia (approximately 28,348 pounds of ammonia) for turbine emissions control (Selective Catalytic Reduction). The aqueous ammonia will be subject to state CalARP program requirements, but will not be subject to federal RMP program requirements based on the concentration of the aqueous ammonia solution (see Note&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>The Project will store 29,000 scf (approximately 150.8 pounds) of hydrogen for electrical generator cooling. The hydrogen will not be subject to either state CalARP or federal RMP program enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syngas (Hydrogen, Hydrogen Sulfide, Methane, Carbon Monoxide, Carbon Dioxide, Ammonia)</td>
<td>Hydrogen 10,000 Hydrogen Sulfide 10,000 Methane 20,000 Ammonia 10,000 Carbon Monoxide N/A Carbon Dioxide N/A</td>
<td>Hydrogen 10,000 Hydrogen Sulfide 500 Methane 10,000 Ammonia 500 Carbon Monoxide N/A Carbon Dioxide N/A</td>
<td>The Project will generate syngas in the gasification block of the facility. The syngas will not be subject to either state CalARP or federal RMP program enforcement (see Note&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid Gas (Hydrogen Sulfide, Carbon Dioxide)</td>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide 10,000 Carbon Dioxide N/A</td>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide 500 Carbon Dioxide N/A</td>
<td>The Project will generate acid gas from the Acid Gas Removal unit of the facility. The quantities of acid gas (hydrogen sulfide) do not trigger regulatory requirements under the state CalARP or federal RMP program enforcement (see Note&lt;sup&gt;(3)&lt;/sup&gt;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methanol</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Project Site will have approximately 550,000 gallons of methanol onsite for use in the Acid Gas Removal unit. 300,000 gallons will be stored within a large aboveground storage tank and approximately 250,000 gallons will be contained within process equipment and piping. Methanol is not regulated under the state CalARP or federal RMP program enforcement. However, methanol is regulated under 29 CFR § 1910, 40 CFR §§ 116, 117, 355, 372, 302.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

<sup>(1)</sup> Federal RMP requirements apply only to aqueous ammonia solutions that are of a concentration of 20 percent or greater by weight. Only hydrogen, hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and methane in the syngas mixture are regulated chemicals under federal RMP or state CalARP regulations. Carbon dioxide is a hazardous substance, but is not regulated by either the federal RMP or state CalARP regulations. Carbon dioxide is not a regulated hazardous substance. The quantities of regulated substances in syngas do not trigger regulatory requirements for the following two reasons: 1) syngas is not stored on site but consumed within the operation as it is produced, and, therefore, is not a stationary source, and 2) quantities are below regulatory thresholds.

<sup>(2)</sup> Acid gas is composed of approximately 55 percent carbon dioxide and 45 percent hydrogen sulfide. Carbon dioxide is not a regulated hazardous substance. Hydrogen sulfide is a regulated substance under federal RMP or state CalARP regulations; however, the Project will not be subject to these regulations for the two following reasons: a) hydrogen sulfide is not stored on site but converted to elemental sulfur within the operation as it is produced, and therefore is not a stationary source; and b) quantities are below regulatory thresholds.

<sup>(3)</sup> Acid gas is composed of approximately 55 percent carbon dioxide and 45 percent hydrogen sulfide. Carbon dioxide is not a regulated hazardous substance. Hydrogen sulfide is a regulated substance under federal RMP or state CalARP regulations; however, the Project will not be subject to these regulations for the two following reasons: a) hydrogen sulfide is not stored on site but converted to elemental sulfur within the operation as it is produced, and therefore is not a stationary source; and b) quantities are below regulatory thresholds.
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The Project Site consists of the 473-acre area directly used for the installation and operation of the Project process equipment (i.e., all equipment related to the operation of the power plant). The Controlled Area consists of an additional 628 acres of land, which surrounds the Project Site on the south, west, and northwest. Both the Project Site and Controlled Area are lands that will be owned by Hydrogen Energy International LLC (HEI). Therefore, HEI has control of all activities and development that may occur in either land. Territory extending beyond both the Project Site and Controlled Area boundaries is considered to be off-site in this analysis.

The OCA models provide an examination of separate hazards: (1) the dispersion of the substances in the form of a vapor cloud; (2) the ignition of the released substance; and/or (3) pool fire. The modeling assumptions for a worst-case release scenario are that the total contents from the largest inventory (e.g., tank or pipe) are accidentally released into the atmosphere.

For dispersion modeling, the calculations also assumed the worst-case atmospheric conditions during such a release, when applicable. These conditions provide conservative results, because these extreme and unlikely climatic conditions maximize the vaporization to create the vapor cloud and minimize its dispersion. The specific atmospheric parameters under which a worst-case release scenario is examined are provided by the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 19 § 2750.2 and consist of the following:

- **Temperature** – The highest temperature 115 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) is recorded for the area in the past 3 years. High temperatures are used because increased temperatures accelerate the vaporization rate of substances upon release.

- **Average Humidity** – 50 percent atmospheric humidity is used when performing the worst-case scenario evaluation. An average humidity of 50 percent is found during months providing the highest temperatures for the area. This level of humidity provides low interference for chemical dispersion, but is still taken into consideration to provide conservative results.

- **Wind Speed** – A 1.5-meter-per-second (m/s) wind speed is used when performing the worst-case scenario evaluation (equivalent to 4.92 feet per second [ft/s]). A low-wind speed prevents the quick dispersion of vapor clouds.

- **Atmospheric Stability** – An atmospheric stability level of F is applied for the worst-case scenario OCA. The F atmospheric stability provides the most stable atmospheric environment where the tendency of the atmosphere is to resist or enhance vertical motion and/or turbulence—this also contributes to minimum dissipation of the vapor cloud.

The U.S. Environmental Agency (USEPA) approved ALOHA® software version 5.4.1 for use in examining the impacts from a hypothetical accidental spill. ALOHA® is a Gaussian plume model that incorporates continuous source and meteorological parameters.

---

1 Level F atmospheric stability: provides the most stable atmospheric environment where the tendency of the atmosphere is to resist or enhance vertical motion and/or turbulence—this also contributes to minimum dissipation of the vapor cloud.
For vapor cloud explosion calculations, USEPA’s RMP OCA guidance was used. The Endpoint selected by the USEPA as a significance criterion is an overpressure of 1.0 pound per square inch (psi) for vapor cloud explosion. An overpressure of 1.0 psi may cause partial demolition of houses and shattering of glass windows. Blast impacts are also of concern wherever flammable materials and ignition sources are present, or where processes operate under high temperatures and pressures.

The potential impact distance from a worst-case release scenario for a vapor cloud explosion was determined through the following equation:

\[
X = 0.0081 \left(0.1 \frac{W_f}{H_{CTNT}} \right)^{0.5} \\
\text{Equation L-1}
\]

where:

- \(X\) = distance to overpressure of 1 psi (miles)
- \(W_f\) = weight of flammable substance (pounds)
- \(H_{CTNT}\) = heat of combustion of trinitrotoluene (4,680 kJ/kg)
- \(H_{CTNT}\) = heat of combustion of flammable substance (kilojoules/kilogram [kJ/kg])

In some cases (e.g., hydrogen), the RMP*Comp software developed by the USEPA and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) was used as an additional tool to determine the 1 psi overpressure impact distance.

For pool fire scenarios, the analysis was conducted in accordance with the appropriate regulatory guidance as follows. The modeling basis for a pool fire estimates the distance from the center of a pool fire to the heat radiation Endpoint (defined as 5 kilowatts per square meter [kW/m²]). The worst-case release that is assumed for the model is as follows: the entire contents of the vessel are released, forming a pool of fire of approximately 1 inch in liquid thickness.

The following equation was used to estimate the possible impact distance from the pool fire:

\[
X = \frac{0.0001A}{\sqrt{5000 \pi (H_v + C_p(T_b - T_a))}} \\
\text{Equation L-2}
\]

where:

- \(X\) = distance to the 5-kilowatt-per-square-meter Endpoint (meters)
- \(H_C\) = heat of combustion of the flammable liquid (joules/kg)
- \(H_V\) = heat of vaporization of the flammable liquid (joules/kg)
- \(A\) = pool area (meters squared [m²])
- \(C_p\) = liquid heat capacity (joules/kg ·°Kelvin [K])
- \(T_B\) = boiling temperature of the liquid (°K)
- \(T_A\) = ambient temperature (°K)
Models considering the ignition of a material (such as hydrogen, syngas, methanol, and acid gas) examine the impact from a vapor cloud explosion of the flammable material, or the heat or radiation derived from the ignition of the material. As stated above, the OCA for these scenarios uses the maximum quantity of the materials and the specific combustion characteristics of the material to conservatively assess the potential impact distance from either an explosion or a pool of fire.

The following sections provide the specific modeling criteria, programs, and procedures applied for each of the materials.

3.1 Modeling Parameters

3.1.1 Aqueous Ammonia (19 percent)

The Project will store approximately 20,000 gallons of aqueous ammonia of 19 percent concentration by weight (approximately 28,348 pounds of ammonia) in a pressurized horizontal aboveground storage tank (AST) with secondary containment. Aqueous ammonia is a reducing agent used for control of nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions from the combustion turbine generators (CTGs). Aqueous ammonia is a colorless liquid with a strong, pungent odor. Ammonia, in particular, is a potentially toxic chemical that will vaporize upon release into a vapor cloud.

Due to its hazardous characteristics, ammonia is regulated by state and federal regulations. As presented in Section 5.12, Hazardous Materials Handling, of this Revised Application for Certification (AFC), the use and/or storage of ammonia is regulated by the federal CAA RMP and the CalARP program. The regulations are found in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 40 Part 68, California Health and Safety Code §§ 25531 to 25543.3, and CCR Title 19, §§ 2735.1 to 2785.1. The aforementioned regulations governing the use and storage of ammonia require facilities using the substance in quantities exceeding the imposed threshold to develop and implement an RMP. As indicated in Section 5.12 of the Revised AFC, a CalARP RMP is required and will be submitted to the Kern County Environmental Health and Safety Department.

A component of the RMP involves the evaluation of potential off-site consequences derived from the accidental worst-case release of ammonia. Following the regulatory guidance for OCAs, an OCA was conducted for a worst-case accidental release under worst-case atmospheric conditions for the Project Site. The worst-case release scenario that was evaluated consisted of a release scenario in which the entire contents from the aqueous ammonia tank is released instantaneously. Under the scenario, all 20,000 gallons of aqueous ammonia are assumed to flow instantaneously into the secondary containment. The secondary containment is designed to be covered by high-density polyethylene (HDPE) floating balls, which reduce the available surface area for vaporization. The HDPE floating ball cover consists of several layers of HDPE floating balls (approximately 3 inches in diameter), which effectively reduces the total exposed surface area of the ammonia in the secondary containment by approximately 90 percent. The exposed ammonia is then vaporized over a 10-minute period, as per regulatory guidelines. The model examines the results of the subsequent dispersion over a 1-hour period. It should be noted that based upon the physical properties of aqueous ammonia, this scenario is very unlikely to occur.
The analysis also assumes the worst-case climate conditions consisting of an ambient temperature of 115 °F (the highest average temperature within the Project area), a 50 percent average humidity, a 1.5 m/s wind speed (i.e., 4.9 ft/s), and a level F atmospheric stability.

During the hypothetical worst-case release scenario, the aqueous ammonia spill is assumed to evaporate in the form of gas via laminar mass transfer. The ALOHA® model examined the effects of the designated wind speed and atmospheric turbulence force that move the released molecules as gas through the air. The examination of the affecting atmospheric parameters allow for an evaluation of the total area impacted.

Three levels of concern were used to evaluate the potential impacts associated with the hypothetical worst-case aqueous ammonia release:

- **Lethal** – The lethal concentration of ammonia is 2,000 parts per million volume (ppmv) averaged over 30 minutes.

- **Immediately Dangerous to Life and Health (IDLH)** – The IDLH concentration from ammonia is 300 ppmv, averaged over 30 minutes (National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health [NIOSH] 1997). This concentration was chosen by NIOSH to ensure that workers can escape without injury or irreversible health effects from an IDLH exposure. Exposure to ammonia at or above the IDLH concentration poses a threat of death or immediate or delayed permanent adverse health effects, or prevents escape from the impacted environment.

- **USEPA/CalARP Toxic Endpoint (the “Endpoint”)** – The CalARP for ammonia concentration, based on USEPA 40 CFR 68, is 200 ppmv (0.14 milligrams per liter [mg/L]) averaged over 1 hour. The Endpoint concentration is the maximum airborne concentration below which it is believed nearly all individuals could be exposed for up to 1 hour without experiencing or developing irreversible or other serious health effects or symptoms that could impair an individual’s ability to take protective action.

The aqueous ammonia modeling results are presented in Section 3.2 of this appendix, titled Results of Modeling.

### 3.1.2 Hydrogen

The unique properties of hydrogen—low density, high specific heat, and thermal conductivity—make it an ideal coolant for electricity generators. Hydrogen is also now being widely used as a coolant for power plants. In a hydrogen-cooled generator, the hydrogen gas is circulated in a closed loop within the generator to remove heat from its active parts; then it is cooled by gas-to-water heat exchangers that are part of the stator frame. The Project will use a hydrogen-cooled generator and store 29,000 standard cubic feet (scf) of compressed hydrogen gas in a pressurized multi-tube trailer as make-up for the loss within the generator.

Although hydrogen gas is not toxic, it is a highly flammable material. The potential risks posed by a hydrogen leak are mainly fire and explosion. Due to its low ignition energy, the potential
impact of a hydrogen-oxygen fire is usually localized. A hydrogen release may also pose an explosion risk, which is generally localized with small-source volumes.

To determine the behavior of hydrogen under a worst-case release scenario, we have examined its properties, along with the historical data, to evaluate the potential impacts in this section. Although the storage amount of hydrogen at the Project Site is far below the federal or state regulatory threshold, a worst-case OCA evaluation was performed in order to assess the potential consequences of a worst-case release scenario, and the need for appropriate controls and mitigations. The examination was performed following instruction from USEPA’s RMP OCA guidance (April 1999) document (USEPA RMP OCA guidance). In addition, the USEPA-approved RMP*Comp software for hazardous chemical release modeling was also used to confirm the results. These results are presented in Section 3.3, Modeling Outputs.

The purpose of the modeling was to estimate the consequences from potential releases of hydrogen gas from the storage vessel. Due to the chemical properties of hydrogen (i.e., ignitability and reactivity) and historical data (obtained from public databases of hydrogen incidents throughout a variety of industries), the hazard caused by explosion is considered to be the most significant potential impact for an accidental hydrogen release. The USEPA vapor cloud explosion method was used for the evaluation (see Equation L-1 in Section 3.0).

The OCA modeling performed for the worst-case release scenario was based on USEPA’s RMP criteria as follows:

The contents of the entire hydrogen tube trailer (29,000 scf) are accidentally released into the atmosphere. For vapor cloud explosions, the total quantity of hydrogen is assumed to form a vapor cloud. (Note: vapor cloud explosions generally are considered unlikely events). The entire cloud is assumed to be within the flammability limits, and the cloud is assumed to explode. ten percent of the flammable vapor in the cloud is assumed to participate in the explosion. The impact is measured as the distance to the 1 psi overpressure level. This is determined using Equation L-1 (from USEPA’s RMP OCA guidance). According to USEPA’s RMP OCA guidance Exhibit C-1, Hc for hydrogen is 119,950 kJ/kg. Other input parameters used in Equation L-1 are provided in Table L-2, Hydrogen Modeling Input Parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical</th>
<th>Storage Type</th>
<th>Volume (scf)</th>
<th>Weight (lbs)</th>
<th>Hc (kJ/kg)</th>
<th>Density (lb/ft³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
<td>Compressed gas</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>119,950</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
scf = standard cubic foot (volume is measured under standard condition 59°F, 1 atm)
kJ/kg = kilojoules per kilogram
lbs = pounds

The weight of the flammable substances, in this case hydrogen, is calculated using the equation below:
where:

\[ W_h = V \rho \]  
\[ (Equation \ L-3) \]

- \( W_h \) = weight of hydrogen (lbs)
- \( V \) = volume of hydrogen (ft\(^3\))
- \( \rho \) = density of hydrogen gas (lb/ft\(^3\))

Because the amount of hydrogen to be stored on site is 29,000 scf, and the density of hydrogen gas at 60°F, 1 atmosphere (atm) is 0.0053 lb/ft\(^3\),

\[ W_h = 29,000 \text{ ft}^3 \times 0.0053 \text{ lb/ft}^3 = 154 \text{ lbs} \]

The hydrogen modeling results are presented in Section 3.2 of this appendix.

### 3.1.3 Acid Gas (45 percent Hydrogen Sulfide)

The Rectisol process will remove acid gas to significantly reduce sulfur dioxide emissions to the atmosphere. Acid gas is removed from shifted syngas to produce low-sulfur hydrogen-rich fuel for low-carbon electrical generation. The acid gas will consist of an approximately 45 percent hydrogen sulfide and 55 percent carbon dioxide mixture. Of the two substances, hydrogen sulfide presents a greater potential hazard due to its toxic and flammable characteristics.

Hydrogen sulfide is classified as a regulated hazardous substance by federal CAA § 112(r) RMP regulations and by CalARP regulations. The regulatory threshold for hydrogen sulfide is 10,000 pounds under CAA RMP regulations, and 500 pounds under CalARP regulations. The toxicity concentration level set by the CAA RMP/CalARP for hydrogen sulfide is 32 parts per million (ppm) (0.042 mg/L). However, the quantities of hydrogen sulfide do not trigger regulatory requirements under CalARP and the federal CAA RMP for worst-case modeling because (1) hydrogen sulfide is not stored on site, but converted to elemental sulfur within the operation as it is produced, thus, there is no stationary source; and (2) quantities are below regulatory thresholds. Nonetheless, the Project performed an OCA for the worst-case release scenario to investigate the potential impact from the explosion and toxicity of a hydrogen sulfide vapor cloud.

The worst-case release scenario for hydrogen sulfide was studied using the USEPA-approved ALOHA® 5.4.1 air dispersion modeling program and with worst-case atmospheric and environmental conditions as provided by CalARP regulations. Worst-case atmospheric conditions under which the hypothetical release was examined were set as follows: wind speed of 1.5 meters per second; an F atmospheric stability level (most stable); atmospheric temperature of 115°F; and atmospheric humidity of 50 percent. These conditions are default settings on the RMP*Comp modeling program per regulatory protocols established by CalARP.

The ALOHA® 5.4.1 model requires calculation of the weight of the regulated chemical. The model assumes the total quantity of hydrogen sulfide released is identical to the volume of hydrogen sulfide found within the piping system. In order to obtain the weight of the hydrogen sulfide found in the acid gas mixture, the ideal gas law was applied for the hydrogen sulfide...
component of the total acid gas within the transfer piping system (i.e., 45 percent of total pipe volume). The HECA acid gas handling system was analyzed to determine the maximum potential volume of hydrogen sulfide within the acid gas. The maximum volume of hydrogen sulfide within this system is equivalent to 305 cubic feet. It is on this basis that the total mass of the system was calculated.

The ideal gas law was used to determine the total amount of moles found for hydrogen sulfide in the acid gas piping system (see equation that follows).

\[ PV = nRT \]

\[ n = \frac{PV}{RT} \]

Weight of Gas = \( n \times \) Molecular Weight of H\(_2\)S (34 lb/lb-mol)

A process pressure of 30 pounds per square inch absolute (psia) and process temperature of 120°F were selected for the equation based on operational conditions that will be found at the power plant. Additionally, the Ideal Gas Constant (R), which is equivalent to 10.73 cubic feet·psia/lb-mol·°R, was also applied to the equation. After calculating the moles of hydrogen sulfide, the weight of hydrogen sulfide in the piping system (50 pounds) was calculated by multiplying the molecular weight of hydrogen sulfide with the moles. The total weight for the hydrogen sulfide gas for the acid gas piping system is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quantities shown in the table above correspond to a maximum pipe length of 864 feet, which was used in the ALOHA® 5.4.1 modeling program, under worst-case scenario conditions, to determine the distance to the Endpoint from the complete release of the pipe contents. ALOHA® 5.4.1 was used to determine the distance to the Endpoint concentration of 32 ppm (0.042 mg/L), as required by CAA § 112 (r) RMP and CalARP regulations. A 10-minute time of release was also selected for the scenario, following CAA § 112 (r) RMP and CalARP regulatory requirements.

Although not regulated as a flammable substance, hydrogen sulfide may present a hazard of producing a flammable vapor cloud upon an accidental release. In order to determine the most significant potential impact that could be developed from a worst-case release scenario for a flammable hydrogen sulfide vapor cloud, USEPA’s RMP OCA guidance document was used for determining the distance to 1 psi overpressure for vapor cloud explosions. The pipeline diameter was the key input parameter for the vapor cloud explosion analysis.

Equation L-1 was then used to calculate the potential impact distance as a result of the worst-case vapor cloud explosion. Results of the hydrogen sulfide modeling are presented in Section 3.2 of this appendix.
### Syngas

The feedstock will be gasified to produce a synthesis gas (syngas) that will be processed and purified to produce a hydrogen-rich gas. This hydrogen-rich gas will be used to fuel the combustion turbine for low-carbon baseload power generation.

Wet-syngas consists primarily of water, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, hydrogen, hydrogen sulfide, nitrogen, and argon, with trace amounts of ammonia and carbonyl sulfide. The approximate quantity of the relevant hazardous compounds for the syngas stream is presented in the Table L-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Quantity in Wet-Syngas (lbs) (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;S</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table L-3
Relevant Hazardous Compounds

**Note:**
1. H<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>S, and NH<sub>3</sub> are all regulated chemicals. However, the mass proportion of each chemical within the syngas is such that the chemicals fall below regulated quantities. Regulated quantity for H<sub>2</sub> > 10,000 pounds, CH<sub>4</sub> > 10,000 lbs, H<sub>2</sub>S > 500 pounds, and NH<sub>3</sub> > 500 pounds, based on CalARP regulations. Because the quantity of the syngas is below the regulated levels, syngas is not considered a regulated substance.
2. Carbon monoxide is a hazardous substance with both toxic and ignitable characteristics.
3. The quantity (by weight) of each component is based on the weight found within the Gasifier System.
4. Additional syngas components have not been included in the table.

Carbon monoxide, hydrogen, hydrogen sulfide, ammonia and methane are considered to be hazardous substances found within syngas. Of these substances, only hydrogen, hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and methane are regulated chemicals under federal and state regulations. Hydrogen and methane are regulated as flammable substances; ammonia and hydrogen sulfide are regulated for toxicity (see 40 CFR 68.130 and 19 CCR 2770.5). However, the quantities of these constituents in the syngas do not trigger regulatory requirements under CalARP and the federal CAA RMP for worst-case modeling because (1) syngas is not stored on site, but consumed within the operation as it is produced; thus, there is not considered to be a stationary source; and (2) quantities are below regulatory thresholds.

Nonetheless, the Project performed an OCA for the worst-case release scenario to investigate the potential impact from the explosion, combustion, and toxicity levels of a syngas vapor cloud. The project considered the release from a source point that would provide a worst-case release scenario. The worst-case syngas release source can be attributed to the gasification section of the
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Project, because it is this zone that will potentially store the highest concentrations of hazardous materials within syngas at any given time. The gasification section includes the gasifier vessel quenched zone, syngas scrubber vessel, and the connecting pipeline for all of the equipment (the largest quantity that can be released is from the Gasifier System).

In order to evaluate the worst-case release scenario for a syngas vapor cloud explosion, a catastrophic release of the syngas from equipment and process piping at the site was assumed based on the volume of the gasifier and downstream equipment up to the closest isolation valve, and the maximum concentrations of each flammable component found in the syngas mixture. Flammable substances including hydrogen, carbon monoxide, and hydrogen sulfide were considered in the modeling calculations. Methane and ammonia were excluded from the calculations, because syngas contains trace amounts of these substances that would not provide a significant contributing factor to trace the vapor cloud explosion impact.

The syngas vapor cloud explosion evaluation was conducted following USEPA’s RMP OCA guidance document (see Equation L-1 in Section 3.0). The purpose of the modeling was to estimate the consequences from a hypothetical worst-case release of syngas at the Project Site. To calculate the heat of combustion of the syngas, the following equation was used:

\[ H_{\text{Syngas}} = \frac{W_{H_2}}{W_{CO+H_2+H_2S}} \times H_{H_2} + \frac{W_{CO}}{W_{CO+H_2+H_2S}} \times H_{CO} + \frac{W_{H_2S}}{W_{CO+H_2+H_2S}} \times H_{H_2S} \]  

(Equation L-4)

where:

\[ W_{H_2} = \text{weight of H}_2 (\text{lbs}) \]
\[ W_{CO} = \text{weight of CO (lbs)} \]
\[ W_{H_2S} = \text{weight of H}_2S (\text{lbs}) \]
\[ H_{H_2} = \text{heat of combustion of H}_2 (\text{joules/kg}) \]
\[ H_{CO} = \text{heat of combustion of CO (joules/kg)} \]
\[ H_{H_2S} = \text{heat of combustion of H}_2S (\text{joules/kg}) \]
\[ H_{\text{Syngas}} = \text{heat of combustion of syngas (joules/kg)} \]

Results provided from the vapor cloud explosion analysis performed tend to be conservative, because they exclusively account for the hydrogen, carbon monoxide, and hydrogen sulfide within the syngas. These three compounds only account for approximately one-third of the syngas components. The remaining syngas components are mainly composed of non-flammable substances (e.g., H\textsubscript{2}O), which may reduce the potential for combustion of the syngas. However, in order to assess the worst-case scenario, non-flammable substances were excluded from the modeling. Results derived from the application of Equation L-1, for the potential impact distance as a result of the worst-case vapor cloud explosion, are presented in Section 3.2 of this appendix.

In order to evaluate the potential impact from a toxic vapor cloud generated from the release of the syngas, the distance to the Endpoint for ammonia, hydrogen sulfide, and carbon dioxide was evaluated. Each hazardous substance was evaluated individually based on the specific quantity found within the syngas.
Ammonia and hydrogen sulfide are regulated hazardous substances. Each substance composes only a small portion of the syngas. However, because both compounds are considered hazardous regulated materials and have been classified as toxic, the impact distance generated from the release of these materials was evaluated through the ALOHA® modeling program. The concentrations of concern modeled for ammonia and hydrogen sulfide were set at 0.14 mg/L and 0.042 mg/L, respectively, as provided by CalARP and federal CAA § 112(r) RMP regulations.

Unlike ammonia and hydrogen sulfide, carbon monoxide is not classified as a regulated hazardous substance by federal CAA § 112(r) RMP regulations or by CalARP regulations. However, carbon monoxide is a hazardous material with toxic characteristics. In order to evaluate the potential health hazards that could be attributed to the carbon monoxide component of the syngas, an OCA was conducted. Table L-4 below provides some regulatory concentration level thresholds that have been established for carbon monoxide.

**Table L-4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Enforcement</th>
<th>Concentrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIOSH REL (ceiling @ 10 minutes)</td>
<td>35 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA PEL (ceiling)</td>
<td>35 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA PEL (maximum peak @ 10 minutes)</td>
<td>50 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGIH TLV TWA</td>
<td>25 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDLH</td>
<td>1,200 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCLO (human @ 30 minutes)</td>
<td>4,000 ppm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. NIOSH REL (ceiling @ 10 minutes) National Institute for Occupation Safety and Health Recommended Exposure Limit.
2. OSHA PEL (ceiling) Occupation Safety and Health Administration Permissible Exposure Limit
3. OSHA PEL (maximum peak @ 10 minutes) Occupation Safety and Health Administration Permissible Exposure Limit
4. ACGIH TLV TWA American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists Threshold Limit Value Time-Weighted Average
5. IDLH Immediately Dangerous to Life and Health
6. LCLO (human @ 30 minutes) Lethal Concentration Low

The vapor cloud dispersion that may occur from the accidental worst-case release scenario for syngas was examined using the USEPA approved ALOHA® 5.4.1 air dispersion modeling program. The concentrations of IDLH and the Lethal Concentration Law (LCLO) were used as Endpoints to estimate the potential maximum impact that could occur. The program was used to examine hypothetical scenarios under which the entire volume of the pipe would be released into the atmosphere under worst-case scenario conditions as provided by CalARP regulations. Worst-case climate conditions were assumed as follows: wind speed of 1.5 meters per second (i.e., 4.9 ft/s), an F atmospheric stability level (most stable), an atmospheric temperature 115°F, and an atmospheric humidity of 50 percent, per regulatory protocols established by CalARP.
3.1.5 Methanol

The Project will use methanol in the process unit, which will be stored in a single 300,000-gallon AST with secondary containment. An additional 250,000 gallons of methanol will also be contained within process vessels, equipment, and piping of the AGR unit. This process inventory is geographically remote from the 300,000-gallon AST, and a pump and isolation valve is placed on the piping between the storage tank and the AGR unit isolating the AST and AGR unit. The 300,000-gallon AST is considered as the major hazardous source because it contains the largest amount of methanol at the Project Site, and is normally isolated from the process inventory of 250,000 gallons.

Methanol is considered to be a hazardous substance due to its flammable and moderately toxic chemical properties. Methanol is listed in the following federal regulations:

- 29 CFR 1910.1200 (OSHA)
- 40 CFR 116 and 40 CFR 117 (USEPA)
- 40 CFR 355, Appendices A and B (USEPA)
- 40 CFR 372 (Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act [SARA] Title III)
- 40 CFR 302 (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act [CERCLA])

Although it is a listed hazardous substance, federal regulations do not require an OCA for the storage of methanol. Additionally, methanol is not regulated under applicable state regulations. Nonetheless, an OCA was conducted to evaluate the potential impact area associated with a worst-case methanol release at the Project Site. Because methanol is a flammable substance, the most severe potential consequence from an accidental worst-case release could be a vapor cloud explosion. The second potential consequence from an accidental worst-case release of methanol could be a pool fire. These two potential worst-case release scenarios were evaluated for the methanol as described in the following paragraphs.

The first worst-case scenario modeled was the formation of a methanol vapor cloud. The hypothetical release assumes a situation where the entire contents of the methanol storage tank (300,000 gallons) are released into the atmosphere. In accordance with regulatory guidance, the methanol was assumed to be released over a 10-minute period and to form a vapor cloud where 10 percent of the flammable vapor explodes. An analysis was undertaken using Equation L-1 to determine the potential impact distance of a pressure wave for a vapor cloud explosion. For Equation L-1, the weight of methanol, \( W_f \), was calculated to be approximately 1,980,000 pounds and the heat of combustion, \( H_{Cf} \), was identified to be 22,700,000 joules/kg.

The second worst-case scenario analyzed was a methanol pool fire, in accordance with the appropriate regulatory guidance. The modeling basis for a pool fire estimates the distance from the center of a pool fire to the heat radiation Endpoint as 5 kilowatts per square meter (kW/m\(^2\)). The worst-case release assumed for the model is as follows: the entire content of one methanol storage tank (300,000 gallons) is released, forming a pool of fire of approximately 1 inch in liquid thickness.
Equation L-2 in Section 3.1.2 was used to estimate the possible impact distance from the pool fire. The input parameters for Equation L-2 in the methanol pool fire case are as follows:

\[ 
\begin{align*}
H_C &= \text{heat of combustion of methanol (joules/kg)} = 22,700,000 \text{ joules/kg} \\
H_V &= \text{heat of vaporization of methanol (joules/kg)} = 1,100,000 \text{ joules/kg} \\
A &= \text{pool area (m}^2) = 44,592 \text{ m}^2 = 479,984 \text{ square feet} \\
C_P &= \text{liquid heat capacity (joules/kg °K)} = 2,482 \text{ joules/kg °K} \\
T_B &= \text{boiling temperature of the liquid (°K)} = 337.8 \text{ °K} \\
T_A &= \text{ambient temperature (°K)} = 320 \text{ °K}
\end{align*}
\]

Neither of the scenarios described above account for the safety systems that will be present at the Project Site, including: nitrogen blanketing of the tanks’ vapor space, automatic fire detection and fire suppressant foam system within the storage tank and surrounding berm area, and fire water system for the Project Site. These safety systems will significantly reduce the likelihood of this event and the possibility of ignition. However, the results of the model presented in Section 3.2 do not take into account any of these safety measures.

### 3.2 Results of Modeling

The following sections provide modeling outputs, calculations, and results of the OCAs conducted for the aqueous ammonia, hydrogen, acid gas, syngas, and methanol at the Project Site.

#### 3.2.1 Aqueous Ammonia

The dispersion analysis does not account for prevailing wind direction and therefore assumes that there is an equal probability of the ammonia vapor cloud dispersing in any direction. Thus, the model results in Figure L-1, Aqueous Ammonia Area of Potential Impact from Worst-Case Scenario, show a circle of equal predicted ammonia concentration around the source for the greatest area of impact. The radius of the circle represents the distance to the 200 ppm (0.14 mg/L) Endpoint concentration threshold provided by CalARP regulations. Higher concentrations would provide circular impact areas of smaller radii.

The distance from the storage equipment to the nearest Project Site boundary is approximately 0.1 mile. The predicted Endpoint is well within the Project Site boundaries. The CalARP regulatory threshold concentrations of 200 ppm (0.14 mg/L) only reached a distance of 189 feet (0.035 mile); the 300 ppm concentration reached a distance of 162 feet (0.03 mile); and the 2,000 ppm concentration reached a distance of 60 feet (0.01 mile), even with worst-case assumptions and conditions. No off-site impact is expected to occur from a worst-case release scenario.

As additional protection measures for ammonia spills, the Project has also equipped the aqueous ammonia AST with automated controls and an alarm system with an emergency beacon and horn. The Project will provide employee training, enforce safe operation procedures, enforce the separate storage of incompatible chemicals, and provide scheduled inspection of equipment. Materials will be handled in accordance with all applicable LORS. Based on the above, the
potential impacts of the use and storage of aqueous ammonia at the Project Site are less than significant.

3.2.2 Hydrogen

USEPA’s RMP*Comp model results (presented in Section 3.3, Modeling Outputs) show that the approximate distance reached by a 1 psi overpressure wave resulting from a worst-case release scenario would be 317 feet (0.06 mile). The potential impact from the vapor cloud explosion resulting from a worst-case 29,000 scf release of hydrogen does not extend outside of the Project Site boundaries.

As an added examination measure, an analysis of the vapor cloud explosion area of impact was also performed following instruction from USEPA’s RMP OCA guidance document. Equation L-1 was applied to determine the approximate distance that would be reached by a hydrogen vapor cloud explosion. The equation was applied in the manner below (equation provided by the USEPA RMP OCA guidance):

\[
X = 0.0081 \left(0.1 \times 153.7 \text{ lbs} \times \frac{119,950 \text{ kJ/kg}}{4,680 \text{ kJ/kg}} \right)^{1/2} = 0.06 \text{ mile} = 317 \text{ feet}
\]

Results from vapor cloud explosion computations reflected those obtained through the RMP*Comp modeling program. Both modeling practices showed a total distance of impact of 317 feet (0.06 mile).

The OCA analysis result shows that even for the worst-case release scenario for hydrogen, the potential impact will be restricted within an area of a 317-foot-radius (0.06 mile) from the center of the storage tube trailer, which will remain within the Project Site boundary. The hydrogen multi-tube trailer is approximately 1,200 feet (0.23 mile) from the Project Site boundary. Any explosion or combustion of a worst-case release scenario for hydrogen at the Project Site would not have any negative impacts off site and would be contained within the Project Site boundaries. Based on the above, the potential impacts of the use and storage of hydrogen at the Project Site are less than significant.

3.2.3 Acid Gas (45 percent Hydrogen Sulfide)

An OCA for the worst-case release of acid gas from the process pipeline between the AGR and SRU was examined. The process pipeline is located approximately 1,050 feet (0.2 mile) from the Project Site boundary, and approximately 2,100 feet (0.4 mile) from the Controlled Area boundary. The acid gas system volume is approximately 677 actual cubic feet, which is equivalent to 864 feet of 12-inch-diameter pipe.

The ideal gas law (PV = nRT) was used to determine the total amount of moles found in the hydrogen sulfide in the acid gas process system. The results were then used to determine the approximate weight of the hydrogen sulfide gas in the process pipeline. The total weight for the hydrogen sulfide gas from the pipeline is shown below:
The weight shown above was input into the ALOHA® 5.4.1 modeling program, under worst-case climate conditions to determine the distance to the Endpoint from the complete release of the pipe contents. The Endpoint concentration for hydrogen sulfide is equivalent to a concentration of 32 ppm (0.042 mg/L), as required by CAA §112 (r) RMP and CalARP regulations. A 10-minute time of release was also selected for the scenario, following CAA § 112 (r) RMP and CalARP regulatory requirements. The distance to the Endpoint generated by an accidental release of hydrogen sulfide from the acid gas is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Capacity (cubic feet)</th>
<th>H₂S Volume (cubic feet)</th>
<th>Moles of H₂S (lb-mol)</th>
<th>Weight of H₂S (pounds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from the ALOHA® 5.4.1 modeling program presented a distance to the Endpoint of 1,974 feet (0.37 mile). The potential impacts from a vapor cloud under the worst-case release scenario will remain within the Controlled Area.

As previously mentioned, in addition to conducting a vapor cloud OCA, the acid gas was also examined for the impacts from a vapor cloud explosion. The same volumetric amount was taken into consideration, and the same weight of hydrogen sulfide. By applying weight and heat of combustion parameters to Equation L-1, the 1 psi overpressure wave impact derived from the acid gas was determined to reach a distance of 108 feet.

Equation L-1 was applied in the manner shown below (equation provided by the USEPA RMP OCA guidance):

\[
X = 0.0081 \left( 0.1 \times 50 \text{ lbs} \times \frac{15,240 \text{ kJ/kg}}{4,680 \text{ kJ/kg}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} = 0.02 \text{ mile} \approx 108 \text{ feet}
\]

The 108-foot distance reached by the vapor cloud explosion from the acid gas worst-case scenario will remain well within the Project Site boundary. As such, the use of acid gas at the Project Site will not have any impacts to the surrounding community and will not present a significant hazard by the Project. Based on the above, the potential impacts from the use of acid gas at the Project Site are less than significant.

### 3.2.4 Syngas

Equations L-1 and L-4 (provided by the USEPA RMP OCA guidance) were applied to determine the approximate distance that would be reached by a syngas vapor cloud explosion. As an initial step, Equation L-4 was applied to determine the combined heat of combustion of flammable syngas components. These flammable materials and their respective heats of combustion are provided in Table L-5:
Table L-5
Flammable Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Syngas Composition</th>
<th>Total Mass (pounds)</th>
<th>Heat of Combustion (kJ/kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen (H₂)</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>119,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>10,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen sulfide (H₂S)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>15,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total heat of combustion for syngas was determined in the manner shown below.

\[ H_{\text{syngas}} = \frac{216 \text{ lbs}}{4,582 \text{ lbs}} \times 119,950 \text{ kJ/kg} + \frac{4,185 \text{ lbs}}{4,582 \text{ lbs}} \times 10,111 \text{ kJ/kg} + \frac{181 \text{ lbs}}{4,582 \text{ lbs}} \times 15,240 \text{ kJ/kg} = 15,492 \text{ kJ/kg} \]

Following the determination of heat of combustion for syngas, Equation L-1 was used to estimate the approximate distance that would be reached by a syngas vapor cloud explosion. The maximum potential impact distance was calculated to be 0.09 mile. The Project Site boundary is approximately 0.23 mile from the Gasifier System (i.e., potential source of syngas release). Based on the above calculations, the syngas would not present an offsite hazard from a vapor cloud explosion. In addition, the impact area may be further reduced by the large concentration of water and carbon dioxide (>50 percent by weight) present within the syngas.

The ALOHA® 5.4.1 model was applied to estimate the potential impact of the toxic chemical components of the syngas from a worst-case scenario release of a syngas vapor cloud. The distance to the Endpoints were examined for ammonia and hydrogen sulfide using the RMP/CalARP criteria. Concentrations examined for carbon monoxide were based on IDLH and LCLO because RMP and CalARP do not regulate carbon monoxide.

The worst-case release scenario also modeled the specific characteristics of the source, including the minimum release height of 70 feet above grade. The height of the equipment was also considered to determine the potential impact at ground level. Input parameters and results obtained from the modeling are provided in Table L-6.

Table L-6
Input Parameters and Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syngas Component</th>
<th>Concentration of Concern</th>
<th>Basis of Concentration</th>
<th>Elevation of Release Source</th>
<th>Distance to Concentration of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia</td>
<td>200 ppm (0.14 mg/L)</td>
<td>CalARP/RMP</td>
<td>70 feet</td>
<td>Not Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide</td>
<td>32 ppm (0.042 mg/L)</td>
<td>CalARP/RMP</td>
<td>70 feet</td>
<td>Not Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>1200 ppm</td>
<td>IDLH</td>
<td>70 feet</td>
<td>Not Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4000 ppm</td>
<td>LCLO</td>
<td>70 feet</td>
<td>Not Exceeded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the modeling results shown in Table L-6, the concentration of concern will not be reached or exceeded at ground level. Therefore, according to the worst-case scenario modeling, potential impacts from the generation and use of syngas at the site will be less than significant.

### 3.2.5 Methanol

The methanol storage area is approximately 0.11 mile from the Project Site boundary and 0.4 mile from the Controlled Area boundary. As discussed in the Section 3.1, Modeling Parameters, two worst-case scenarios were modeled for methanol: (1) pool fire; and (2) vapor cloud explosion. Modeling indicated that a potential methanol pool fire resulting from the worst-case complete release of a single tank may reach a distance of 1,215 feet (0.23 mile) from the center of the methanol pool. The modeling showed that the potential impact distance from a worst-case methanol vapor cloud explosion after a complete release may reach a distance of approximately 4,224 feet (0.8 mile) from the location of the tank.

Results from the worst-case release scenario modeling demonstrated that impact from the methanol pool fire scenario will be maintained within the boundary of the Controlled Area, and the potential impact from the methanol vapor cloud explosion may extend just beyond the Controlled Area. The immediate vicinity surrounding the Project Site and the Controlled Area is composed of rural, agriculturally developed land and undeveloped native terrain. As such, the potential off-site impact modeled for a worst-case methanol vapor cloud explosion will not affect sensitive receptors. Therefore, potential impacts from the use and storage of methanol at the Project Site will be less than significant.

As discussed in Section 3.1, the modeling assumes a highly unlikely event and worst-case conditions. These assumptions do not take into account any safety measures that will be employed for the Project. For example, safety measures in the Project Site will include nitrogen blanketing of the tank vapor space, automatic fire detection, a fire suppressant foam system surrounding the methanol storage tank and within the berm area, and a fire water system. The implementation of these safety measures will significantly reduce the likelihood of a pool fire and/or vapor cloud explosion. The potential impacts from the use and storage of methanol on the Project Site will be less than significant.

### 3.3 Modeling Outputs

#### 3.3.1 Aqueous Ammonia

Outputs from the ALOHA® 5.4.1 dispersion model obtained from the evaluation of the worst-case release scenario for aqueous ammonia are provided below.

Text Summary
**ALOHA® 5.4.1**

**SITE DATA:**
- **Location:** HECA Project Site, California
- **Building Air Exchanges Per Hour:** 0.60 (unsheltered single storied)
Time: February 20, 2009 1120 hours PDT (using computer's clock)

CHEMICAL DATA:
Chemical Name: AQUEOUS AMMONIA
Solution Strength: 19.1 percent (by weight)
Ambient Boiling Point: 120.3° F
Partial Pressure at Ambient Temperature: 0.80 atm
Ambient Saturation Concentration: 813,459 ppm or 81.3 percent
Hazardous Component: AMMONIA
Molecular Weight: 17.03 g/mol
ERPG-1: 25 ppm
ERPG-2: 150 ppm
ERPG-3: 750 ppm
IDLH: 300 ppm
LEL: 160,000 ppm
UEL: 250,000 ppm

ATMOSPHERIC DATA: (MANUAL INPUT OF DATA)
Wind: 1.5 meters/second from southeast at 3 meters
Ground Roughness: open country
Cloud Cover: 0 tenths
Air Temperature: 115° F
Stability Class: F (user override)
No Inversion Height Relative Humidity: 50 percent

SOURCE STRENGTH:
Evaporating Puddle (Note: chemical is flammable)
Puddle Area: 1.102 square feet
Puddle Volume: 20,000 gallons
Ground Type: Concrete
Ground Temperature: 115°F
Initial Puddle Temperature: Ground temperature
Release Duration: ALOHA® limited the duration to 1 hour
Max Average Sustained Release Rate: 0.184 pounds/min (averaged over a minute or more)
Total Amount Hazardous Component Released: 11.0 pounds

THREAT ZONE:
Model Run: Gaussian
Red: 63 yards — (0.14 mg/liter)
Orange: 54 yards — (300 ppm = IDLH)
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
Yellow: 20 yards — (2,000 ppm)
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
3.3.2 Hydrogen

Given the same hydrogen amount, a potential impact distance calculated by USEPA RMP*Comp software is also shown below (the result below is directly imported the USEPA RMP*Comp software):

RMP Modeling Result

RMP*Comp Ver. 1.07
Results of Consequence Analysis
Chemical: Hydrogen
CAS #: 1333-74-0
Category: Flammable Gas
Scenario: Worst-case
Quantity Released: 153.7 pounds
Release Type: Vapor Cloud Explosion
Estimated Distance to 1 psi overpressure: .06 mile (.10 kilometer)

--------Assumptions About This Scenario--------
Wind Speed: 1.5 meters/second (3.4 miles/hour)
Stability Class: F
Air Temperature: 77 degrees F (25 degrees C)
----------------------------------------------

3.3.3 Acid Gas (45 percent Hydrogen Sulfide)

Outputs from the ALOHA® 5.4.1 dispersion model obtained from the evaluation of the worst-case release scenario for acid gas are provided below.

Text Summary
ALOHA® 5.4.1

SITE DATA:
Location: HECA Project Site, California
Building Air Exchanges Per Hour: 0.60 (unsheltered single storied)
Time: April 14, 2009 1021 hours PDT (using computer's clock)

CHEMICAL DATA:
Chemical Name: HYDROGEN SULFIDE
Molecular Weight: 34.08 g/mol
ERPG-1: 0.1 ppm
ERPG-2: 30 ppm
ERPG-3: 100 ppm
IDLH: 100 ppm
LEL: 43,000 ppm
UEL: 455000 ppm
Ambient Boiling Point: -76.8° F
Vapor Pressure at Ambient Temperature: greater than 1 atm
Ambient Saturation Concentration: 1,000,000 ppm or 100.0 percent

ATMOSPHERIC DATA: (MANUAL INPUT OF DATA)
Wind: 1.5 meters/second from east at 3 meters
Ground Roughness: open country
Cloud Cover: 0 tenths
Air Temperature: 115° F
Stability Class: F (user override)
No Inversion Height
Relative Humidity: 50 percent

SOURCE STRENGTH:
Direct Source: 5 pounds/min
Source Height: 0
Release Duration: 10 minutes
Release Rate: 5 pounds/min
Total Amount Released: 50.0 pounds
Note: This chemical may flash boil and/or result in two phase flow.

THREAT ZONE: (GAUSSIAN SELECTED)
Model Run: Gaussian
Red: 658 yards — (0.042 mg/liter)

3.3.4 Syngas

Outputs from the ALOHA® 5.4.1 dispersion model obtained from the evaluation of the worst-case release scenario for syngas are provided below.

Text Summary
ALOHA® 5.4.1

3.3.4.1 Carbon Monoxide

SITE DATA:
Location: HECA Project Site, California
Building Air Exchanges Per Hour: 0.60 (unsheltered single storied)
Time: March 26, 2009 0848 hours PDT (using computer's clock)

CHEMICAL DATA:
Chemical Name: CARBON MONOXIDE
Molecular Weight: 28.01 g/mol
ERPG-1: 200 ppm
ERPG-2: 350 ppm
ERPG-3: 500 ppm
IDLH: 1,200 ppm
LEL: 125,000 ppm
UEL: 740,000 ppm
Ambient Boiling Point: -313.0° F
Vapor Pressure at Ambient Temperature: greater than 1 atm
Ambient Saturation Concentration: 1,000,000 ppm or 100.0 percent

ATMOSPHERIC DATA: (MANUAL INPUT OF DATA)
Wind: 1.5 meters/second from east at 3 meters
Ground Roughness: open country
Cloud Cover: 5 tenths
Air Temperature: 115° F
Stability Class: F (user override)
No Inversion Height
Relative Humidity: 50 percent

SOURCE STRENGTH:
Direct Source: 4,185 pounds
Source Height: 70 feet
Release Duration: 1 minute
Release Rate: 69.7 pounds/sec
Total Amount Released: 4,185 pounds
Note: This chemical may flash boil and/or result in two-phase flow.
Use both dispersion modules to investigate its potential behavior.

THREAT ZONE:
Model Run: Gaussian
Red: LOC is not exceeded — (1,200 ppm = IDLH)
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because the ground level concentrations never exceed the LOC.
Orange: LOC is not exceeded — (4,000 ppm)
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because the ground level concentrations never exceed the LOC.

3.3.4.2 Ammonia

SITE DATA:
Location: HECA Project Site, California
Building Air Exchanges Per Hour: 0.60 (unsheltered single storied)
Time: March 26, 2009 0848 hours PDT (using computer's clock)

CHEMICAL DATA:
Chemical Name: AMMONIA
Molecular Weight: 17.03 g/mol
ERPG-1: 25 ppm
ERPG-2: 150 ppm
ERPG-3: 750 ppm
IDLH: 300 ppm
LEL: 160,000 ppm
UEL: 250,000 ppm
Ambient Boiling Point: -28.7° F
Vapor Pressure at Ambient Temperature: greater than 1 atm
Ambient Saturation Concentration: 1,000,000 ppm or 100.0 percent

ATMOSPHERIC DATA: (MANUAL INPUT OF DATA)
Wind: 1.5 meters/second from east at 3 meters
Ground Roughness: open country
Cloud Cover: 5 tenths
Air Temperature: 115° F
Stability Class: F (user override)
No Inversion Height
Relative Humidity: 50 percent

SOURCE STRENGTH:
Direct Source: 15 pounds
Source Height: 70 feet
Release Duration: 1 minute
Release Rate: 0.25 pound/sec
Total Amount Released: 15.0 pounds
Note: This chemical may flash boil and/or result in two-phase flow.
Use both dispersion modules to investigate its potential behavior.

THREAT ZONE:
Model Run: Gaussian
Red: LOC is not exceeded — (0.14 mg/liter)
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because the ground-level concentrations never exceed the LOC.
Orange: LOC is not exceeded — (300 ppm = IDLH)
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because the ground-level concentrations never exceed the LOC.
Yellow: LOC is not exceeded — (2,000 ppm)
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because the ground-level concentrations never exceed the LOC.

3.3.4.3 Hydrogen Sulfide

SITE DATA:
Location: HECA Project Site, California
Building Air Exchanges Per Hour: 0.60 (unsheltered single storied)
Time: March 26, 2009 0848 hours PDT (using computer's clock)

CHEMICAL DATA:
Chemical Name: HYDROGEN SULFIDE
Molecular Weight: 34.08 g/mol
ERPG-1: 0.1 ppm
ERPG-2: 30 ppm
ERPG-3: 100 ppm
IDLH: 100 ppm
LEL: 43,000 ppm
UEL: 455,000 ppm
Ambient Boiling Point: -77.0° F
Vapor Pressure at Ambient Temperature: greater than 1 atm
Ambient Saturation Concentration: 1,000,000 ppm or 100.0 percent

ATMOSPHERIC DATA: (MANUAL INPUT OF DATA)
Wind: 1.5 meters/second from east at 3 meters
Ground Roughness: open country
Cloud Cover: 5 tenths
Air Temperature: 115° F
Stability Class: F (user override)
No Inversion Height
Relative Humidity: 50 percent

SOURCE STRENGTH:
Direct Source: 181 pounds
Source Height: 70 feet
Release Duration: 1 minute
Release Rate: 3.02 pounds/sec
Total Amount Released: 181 pounds
  Note: This chemical may flash boil and/or result in two-phase flow.

THREAT ZONE: (GAUSSIAN SELECTED)
Model Run: Gaussian
Red: LOC is not exceeded — (0.042 mg/liter)
  Note: Threat zone was not drawn because the ground-level concentrations never exceed the LOC.