

Appendix G

Air Quality

Impact

Assessment







Newcastle Power Station

Air Quality Impact Assessment

30 October 2019

Project No.: 0468623/AQIA/R4

Document details	
Document title	Newcastle Power Station
Document subtitle	Air Quality Impact Assessment
Project No.	0468623
Date	30 October 2019
Version	7.0
Author	James Grieve
Client Name	Aurecon Australia Pty Ltd

Document history

Version	Revision	Author	Reviewed by	ERM approval to issue		Comments
				Name	Date	
Draft	D1	James Grieve	Damon Roddis	Damon Roddis	04.07.2019	Draft for Client Review
Draft	D2	James Grieve	Damon Roddis	Damon Roddis	20.08.2019	Revised Draft incorporating AGL comments
Draft	D3	James Grieve	Damon Roddis	Damon Roddis	28.08.2019	Revised Draft incorporating AGL comments
Final	R1	James Grieve	Damon Roddis	Damon Roddis	06.09.2019	Finalised
Final	R2	James Grieve	Damon Roddis	Damon Roddis	03.10.2019	Revised Final
Final	R3	James Grieve	Damon Roddis	Damon Roddis	11.10.2019	Revised Final
Final	R4	James Grieve	Damon Roddis	Damon Roddis	30.10.2019	Revised Final

Signature Page

30 October 2019

Newcastle Power Station

Air Quality Impact Assessment



James Grieve
Senior Consultant



Damon Roddis
Partner

ERM Australia Pacific Pty Ltd

© Copyright 2019 by ERM Worldwide Group Ltd and / or its affiliates ("ERM").
All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form,
or by any means, without the prior written permission of ERM.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 Proposal Location	3
1.2 Assessment Scope	3
2. PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION	5
2.1 Overview	5
2.2 Power station	5
2.2.1 Gas Turbine Technology	5
2.2.2 Reciprocating Engine Technology	6
2.2.3 Ancillary Facilities	6
2.3 Construction Activities and Construction Staging	6
2.4 Emissions to Air	7
2.4.1 Key Pollutants	8
3. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	10
3.1 Regulatory Emission Limits	10
3.2 Impact Assessment Criteria	11
4. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT	12
4.1 Climate and Meteorology	12
4.2 Ambient Air Quality	18
4.2.1 Nitrogen dioxide	18
4.2.2 Carbon Monoxide	20
4.2.3 Sulfur dioxide	21
4.2.4 Particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometres	23
4.2.5 Particulate matter less than 10 micrometres	25
4.3 Summary	26
5. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	27
5.1 Model Selection	27
5.2 Dispersion Meteorology	27
5.3 Model Receptors	27
5.4 Emission Parameters	30
5.5 Building Downwash Effects	30
5.6 NO ₂ Conversion	31
5.6.1 Ozone Limiting Method	32
5.6.2 In-Stack NO ₂ :NO _x Ratio	32
5.7 Predictions for Sub-hourly Averaging Periods	33
5.8 Background Air Quality Dataset	34
6. EMISSION ESTIMATION	35
6.1 Overview	35
6.2 Estimation Methods	35
6.3 Fuel Consumption	35
6.4 US EPA AP-42 Emission Factors	36
6.5 Sulfur Dioxide Emission Factors	36
6.6 Summary of Modelled Emission Rates	37
7. RESULTS	38
7.1 Assessment Summary	38
7.2 NO ₂	41
7.3 PM _{2.5}	47
7.4 Acrolein and Formaldehyde	53

8. LOCAL CUMULATIVE ASSESSMENT	58
9. CONCLUSIONS	62
10. REFERENCES	64

List of Tables

Table 1.1: SEARs relevant to air quality	3
Table 2.12.2: Summary of anticipated construction equipment by construction stage.....	7
Table 2.3 provides a summary of these key pollutants and their basis of formation. Table 2.3: Summary of key pollutants and basis of formation	9
Table 3.1: Summary of Clean Air Regulation emission limits – Gas Turbine Option	10
Table 3.2: Summary of relevant Clean Air Regulation emission limits – Reciprocating Engine Option	10
Table 3.3: Summary of relevant air quality criteria	11
Table 4.1: Summary of climate statistics for Newcastle University weather station (#061390)	12
Table 4.2: Summary of nearby AQMS and weather stations with proximity to Proposal	13
Table 4.3: OEH Beresfield - Summary of wind monitoring parameters (2013 – 2018)	14
Table 5.1: Summary of discrete receptors	28
Table 5.2: Summary of modelled emission parameters	30
Table 5.3: Summary of excluded PM events	34
Table 5.4: Summary of adopted 2018 pollutant background concentrations.	34
Table 6.1: Summary of emission estimation basis by pollutant and technology type.....	35
Table 6.2: Summary of fuel emission estimates	36
Table 6.3: Summary of adopted US EPA AP-42 emission factors	36
Table 6.4: Derivation of fuel-specific SO ₂ emission factor for natural gas operation	37
Table 6.5: Derivation of fuel-specific SO ₂ emission factor for distillate operation	37
Table 6.6: Summary of modelled emission rates.....	37
Table 7.1: Assessment Summary – Gas Turbine Option	39
Table 7.2: Assessment Summary – Reciprocating Engine Option	40
Table 7.3: Summary of model predictions - Maximum 1 hour average NO ₂ (µg/m ³).....	41
Table 7.4: Summary of model predictions - Annual average NO ₂ (µg/m ³)	42
Table 7.5: Summary of model predictions – Maximum 24 hour average PM _{2.5}	47
Table 7.6: Summary of model predictions – Annual average PM _{2.5}	48
Table 7.7: Summary of model predictions – 99.9 th percentile 1 hour average acrolein and formaldehyde	53
Table 8.1: Annualised air emission quantities for sources near to the Proposal	58

List of Figures

Figure 4.1: Location of OEH AQMS' within the Newcastle region.	13
Figure 4.2: Annual and seasonal windroses - OEH Beresfield 2014, 2015.....	15
Figure 4.3: Annual and seasonal windroses - OEH Beresfield 2016, 2017.....	16
Figure 4.4: Annual and seasonal windroses - OEH Beresfield, 2018.....	17
Figure 4.5: Time series plot of hourly ambient NO ₂ measurements within the Newcastle region (2014- 2018)	18
Figure 4.6: Summary statistics for Newcastle region ambient NO ₂ measurements (2014-2018)	19
Figure 4.7: Time series plot of hourly ambient CO measurements at the Newcastle AQMS (2014- 2018)	20
Figure 4.8: Summary statistics for Newcastle region ambient CO measurements (2014-2018).....	20
Figure 4.9: Time series plot of hourly ambient SO ₂ measurements within the Newcastle region (2014- 2018)	21
Figure 4.10: Summary statistics for Newcastle region ambient SO ₂ measurements (2014-2018).....	22
Figure 4.11: Time series plot of 24-hour average ambient PM _{2.5} measurements within the Newcastle region (2014-2018).....	23

Figure 4.12: Summary statistics for Newcastle region ambient PM _{2.5} measurements (2014-2018)	24
Figure 4.13: Time series plot of 24-hour average ambient PM ₁₀ measurements within the Newcastle region (2014-2018).....	25
Figure 4.14: Summary statistics for Newcastle region ambient PM ₁₀ measurements (2014-2018)	26
Figure 5.1: Aerial image showing discrete receptors, gridded receptor domain extent and Proposal boundary	29
Figure 5.2: Aerial image showing reciprocating engine building representation (blue) and point sources (red)	31
Figure 5.3: ISR vs in-stack NO _x concentration from filtered US EPA ISR database.....	33
Figure 7.1: Maximum incremental 1 hour average NO ₂ predictions – Gas Turbine Option (µg/m ³).....	43
Figure 7.2: Maximum incremental 1 hour average NO ₂ predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option (µg/m ³).....	44
Figure 7.3: Annual average incremental NO ₂ predictions – Gas Turbine Option (µg/m ³)	45
Figure 7.4: Annual average incremental NO ₂ predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option (µg/m ³).....	46
Figure 7.5: Maximum incremental 24 hour average PM _{2.5} * predictions – Gas Turbine Option (µg/m ³).....	49
Figure 7.6: Maximum incremental 24 hour average PM _{2.5} predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option (µg/m ³).....	50
Figure 7.7: Incremental annual average PM _{2.5} predictions – Gas Turbine Option (µg/m ³).....	51
Figure 7.8: Incremental annual average PM _{2.5} predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option (µg/m ³)	52
Figure 7.9: 99.9 th percentile incremental 1 hour average acrolein predictions – Gas Turbine Option (µg/m ³).....	54
Figure 7.10: 99.9 th percentile incremental 1 hour average acrolein predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option (µg/m ³)	55
Figure 7.11: 99.9 th percentile incremental 1 hour average formaldehyde predictions – Gas Turbine Option (µg/m ³)	56
Figure 7.12: 99.9 th percentile incremental 1 hour average formaldehyde predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option (µg/m ³).....	57
Figure 8.1: 99.9 th percentile 1 hour average SO ₂ predictions, reciprocating engine, natural gas (µg/m ³).....	61

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Meaning
Approved Methods	<i>The Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in New South Wales</i> (EPA, 2016)
AQIA	Air Quality Impact Assessment
AQMS	Air Quality Monitoring Station
Atm.	Atmosphere (unit of pressure)
B(a)P	Benzo(a)Pyrene
CO	Carbon Monoxide
GJ	Gigajoule
g/s	grams/second
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutant
ISR	In-Stack (NO ₂ :NO _x) Ratio
K	Degrees Kelvin
kV	Kilovolt
mg/Nm ³	milligrams per normal cubic metre.
MMBTU	Million British Thermal Units
MW	Megawatt
NGSF	Newcastle Gas Storage Facility
Nm ³	Normal cubic metre (i.e. 1 cubic metre at conditions of 273K and 1 atm)
NO	Nitric oxide
NO ₂	Nitrogen dioxide
NO _x	Oxides of nitrogen
O ₂	Oxygen
PAH	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon
PM	Particulate Matter (general – inclusive of all size fractions)
PM ₁₀	Particulate Matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter.
PM _{2.5}	Particulate Matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter.
SCR	Selective Catalytic Reduction
SO ₂	Sulfur dioxide
TAPM	The Air Pollution Model
µg/m ³	Microgram per cubic metre
US EPA	United States Environment Protection Agency
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ERM Australia Pacific Pty Ltd (ERM) was commissioned by Aurecon Australasia Pty Ltd (Aurecon), on behalf of AGL, to undertake an Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) for the AGL Newcastle Power Station (the Proposal), located near Tomago, NSW.

AGL is seeking to construct and operate a peaking power station of approximately 250 MW capacity, comprising either aeroderivative gas turbine (gas turbine) or reciprocating gas engine (reciprocating engine) generator technology.

The assessment considered potential air quality impacts associated with construction and operation of the Proposal. The assessment used a quantitative dispersion modelling analysis to estimate compliance of operational phase emissions with the New South Wales Environment Protection Authority (NSW EPA) impact assessment criteria.

The existing environment was characterised in terms of climate, meteorology and ambient air quality, with identification of key meteorological patterns, and the status of ambient air quality compliance:

- Ambient air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), carbon monoxide (CO) and sulphur dioxide (SO₂) are currently met at all Office of Environment (OEH) ambient air quality monitoring locations across the last five years reviewed, with significant margin between peak measurements and the corresponding standards.
- Short term (24 hour average) ambient air quality standards for particulate matter (PM); i.e. particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometres in aerodynamic diameter (PM_{2.5}) and particulate matter less than 10 micrometres in aerodynamic diameter (PM₁₀) are exceeded at all locations across the five years reviewed.
- The long term (annual average) PM_{2.5} ambient air quality standard¹ is reached at Wallsend, and exceeded at all other locations within the five years reviewed. The long term (annual average) PM₁₀ ambient air quality standard is exceeded at Carrington, Stockton and Mayfield, and met at Wallsend, Beresfield and Newcastle. A review of these exceedances noted the dominance of extraneous events such as dust storms and bushfire activity.

Manufacturer data and United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) emission factors were then used to estimate emissions for representative gas turbine and reciprocating engine technology options. Both natural gas and distillate fuels have been assessed resulting in a total of 4 assessment scenarios.

These emissions were applied on a continuous basis in the NSW EPA-approved CALPUFF dispersion modelling package, in conjunction with regional background air quality and meteorological datasets for the year 2018. Modelling predictions were processed into the concentration statistics required for assessment against NSW EPA impact assessment criteria.

Pollutants with a Proposal contribution in excess of 10% of relevant impact assessment criteria are confined to NO₂ and PM (both technology options), as well as acrolein and formaldehyde (reciprocating engine option only):

- Cumulative NO₂ predictions were estimated using the ozone limiting method, in conjunction with hourly time varying ozone and NO₂ concentrations sourced from the OEH Beresfield air quality monitoring station. The maximum 1 hour average cumulative NO₂ prediction was 123 µg/m³, equal to 50% of the criterion.
- Peak 24-hour average PM_{2.5} predictions were approaching criteria, with a peak incremental PM_{2.5} prediction of 7.6 µg/m³. When added to the peak background concentration of 17.1 µg/m³, this results in a (maximum + maximum) cumulative concentration of 24.7 µg/m³, which is approaching

¹ Annual average standards apply on a calendar year basis.

the NSW EPA 24-hour criterion of 25 µg/m³. Refinement of the analysis through use of a time varying background would likely produce predictions well below those presented in this report.

- Exceedances of acrolein were predicted for the reciprocating engine option when operational on natural gas fuel, with the peak prediction across the modelling domain a factor of three times above the NSW EPA acrolein criterion. This prediction was based on US EPA emission factor-based estimates of acrolein emissions, for a 4-stroke lean burn gas engine in conjunction with a conservative estimate of oxidation catalyst control efficiency.

To further investigate the potential for acrolein emissions to produce adverse air quality impacts, a review of the NSW EPA and internationally available screening criteria was conducted. Based on assessment against these additional criteria, all predictions were estimated to be within respective screening criteria, as formulated to be protective of adverse public health outcomes.

Accordingly, the analysis conducted within this assessment indicates that the potential for the Proposal to generate exceedances is low, and manageable through effective operation of the proposed emission controls.

Lastly, a review of potential cumulative impacts with other local sources of air emissions was conducted using the National Pollutant Inventory database. This review identified the Tomago Aluminium Smelter as the key emission source of interest in terms of potential localised cumulative impacts. Accordingly, a review of the smelter's local air quality monitoring data was conducted. On the basis of this review, the potential for smelter and the Proposal to collectively generate localised exceedances of air quality standards is considered minor, with broader cumulative impacts having been addressed through the incorporation of background monitoring data in the dispersion modelling analysis.

1. INTRODUCTION

Environmental Resources Management Australia Pacific Pty Ltd (ERM) has been commissioned by Aurecon Australia Pty Ltd (Aurecon) on behalf of AGL, to undertake an air quality impact assessment (AQIA) for the Newcastle Power Station (the Proposal). AGL proposes to construct and operate a dual-fuel (gas/diesel) power station (approximately 250-megawatt (MW)) and associated infrastructure, including gas supply and electricity transmission connections.

This report provides an assessment of potential air quality impacts associated with the Proposal, in accordance with the *Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in New South Wales* (EPA, 2016).

1.1 Proposal Location

The Proposal is proposed to be constructed at Tomago, approximately 14 km north-west of Newcastle within the Port Stephens Council Local Government Area (Figure 1.1). The Proposal Area is approximately 96 ha in size and encompasses the following lots:

- Lot 2 DP1043561;
- Lot 3 DP1043561;
- Lot 4 DP1043561 (partial lot);
- Lot 202 DP1173564 (partial lot); and
- Lot 1203 DP1229590 (partial lot).

The north-west boundaries of Lot 2 DP1043561, Lot 3 DP1043561, and Lot 4 DP1043561 as well as the western boundary of Lot 1203 DP1229590 abut the Pacific Highway. The southern boundaries of Lot 2 DP1043561, Lot 3 DP1043561, and Lot 202 DP1173564 adjoin industrial estates. Lot 202 DP1173564 is bounded to the east and north by lots displaying dense vegetation.

The power station aspect of the Proposal would be constructed on land within Lot 3, which is located within the western extent of the proposal area.


1.2 Assessment Scope

The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) (Ref: SSI 9837) were issued by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) on 18 February 2019 and form the basis of the environmental impact assessment for the Proposal.

Table 1.1 outlines the SEARs relevant to air quality, as well as the section of the report within which they have been addressed.

Table 1.1: SEARs relevant to air quality

Requirement	Section Addressed
An assessment of the likely air quality impacts of the project in accordance with the Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW (EPA, 2016);	This report
Ability to comply with the relevant regulatory framework, specifically the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 and the Protection of the Environment Operations (Clean Air) Regulation 2010.	Section 3



F1.1

Site Location

Drawing No: 0466625_MW_G001_R0.mxd
 Date: 23/04/2019
 Drawing Size: A3
 Drawn By: GC/VN
 Reviewed By: RT

Client: Aurecon

This figure may be based on best available data or data which has not been verified by ERM and it may not be to scale. Unless expressly agreed otherwise, this figure is intended as a guide only and ERM does not warrant its accuracy.

0 50 100m

N

Legend

- Project Boundary
- Cadastre (Lot)

Data Source:
 Project Boundary: Client Provided (February 2019)
 Neatmap Imagery: January 2019



2. PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

2.1 Overview

The Newcastle Power Station would be a dual fuel (gas and diesel) fast-start peaking power station with a nominal operating capacity of 250MW at Tomago in NSW. The Newcastle Power Station would supply electricity to the grid at short notice during periods of high electricity demand, and/or low supply, particularly during periods where intermittent renewable energy supply is low or during supply outages. This operation is aligned with AGL's move to a renewable energy mix. While the primary role of the Newcastle Power Station would be to provide firming or peaking capacity to the National Electricity Market, to maximise operational flexibility each unit of the power station would be designed for continuous operation. This impact assessment considers both the peaking load operation and the continuous operation.

The Proposal would also involve the construction and operation of gas pipelines and an electricity transmission line. The pipelines would supply the proposed power station with gas from the eastern Australia gas transmission pipelines via the Jemena network and, as an option, the Newcastle Gas Storage Facility (NGSF). A new electricity transmission line would transfer the electricity produced by the proposed power station to the national electricity network via connection to the existing 132kV Transgrid switchyard. The Proposal has a capital investment value of approximately \$400 million and is anticipated to be operational in the year 2022.

The main elements of the Proposal are as follows:

- Power station, necessary supporting ancillary equipment and supporting infrastructure. The power station would be capable of operating with diesel fuel, if necessary.
- 132kV electricity transmission line to the existing TransGrid switching yard.
- Gas transmission pipelines and receiving station, compressor units, and ancillary infrastructure.
- Storage tanks and laydown areas.
- Water management infrastructure including pond(s), and a connection to Hunter Water potable service in line with Hunter Water requirements.
- Diesel storage and truck unloading facilities.
- Site access road.
- Office / administration, amenities, workshop / storage areas and car parking.

2.2 Power station

The power station would be a dual fuel power plant, capable of generating about 250 MW of electricity. The proposed power station would either consist of large reciprocating engine generators or aero-derivate gas turbine generators. Generation units would be dual fuel capable, meaning they would be able to be supplied by natural gas and/or liquid fuel.

The decision to install gas turbines or reciprocating engine technology will be made based on a range of environmental, social, engineering and economic factors that will be considered as the power station design progresses.

2.2.1 Gas Turbine Technology

Electricity would be generated by gas turbine technology through the combustion of natural gas and/or liquid fuel in turbines. With its heritage in the airline industry, aero derivative gas turbine units consist of a compressor, combustion chamber, turbine and generator. Air is compressed to a high pressure before being admitted into the combustion chamber. Fuel (natural gas or diesel as required) is injected into the combustion chamber where combustion occurs at very high temperatures and the gases

expand. The resulting mixture of hot gas is admitted into the turbine causing the turbine to turn, generating power. In an open cycle configuration, hot exhaust gas is vented to the atmosphere through an exhaust stack, without heat recovery.

The turbines will be fitted with emission controls as required to meet regulatory emission limits under both natural gas and distillate oil ('distillate') operation.

2.2.2 Reciprocating Engine Technology

With its heritage in the shipping industry and a form of internal combustion engine, reciprocating engines used for power generation harness the controlled ignition of gas and/or diesel to drive a piston within a cylinder. A number of pistons move sequentially to rotate a crank shaft which turns the generator.

Manufacturers have identified the requirement for selective catalytic reduction (SCR) and oxidation catalysts in order to meet regulatory pollution control requirements.

2.2.3 Ancillary Facilities

The power station, regardless of chosen technology, would require supporting ancillary facilities. These would include:

- Natural gas reception yard potentially including gas metering, pressure regulation, compression, heating stations, pigging facilities and provision for flaring.
- Generator circuit breakers, generator step-up transformers and switchyard including overhead line support gantry.
- Water collection and treatment facilities.
- Water storage tanks and ponds.
- Truck loading/unloading facilities.
- Liquid fuel storage tanks.
- Emergency diesel generators with associated fuel storage.
- Closed circuit cooling systems.
- Control room.
- Offices and messing facilities.
- Electrical switch rooms.
- Occupational health and safety systems including an emergency warning and evacuation system.
- Workshop and warehouse.
- Firefighting system.
- Communication systems.
- Security fence, security lighting, stack aviation warning lights (if required) and surveillance system.
- Landscaped areas and staff parking areas.
- Concrete foundations, bitumen roadways, concrete pads in liquid fuel unloading station and gas turbine or engine unit maintenance areas.
- Concrete bund areas with drains for liquid fuel tanks, liquid chemicals store, oil filled transformers (if installed) and other facilities where contaminated liquids could leak.
- Level construction and laydown area.
- Engineered batters to support and protect the power plant platform.
- Sedimentation pond and associated diversion drain and earth bund.

2.3 Construction Activities and Construction Staging

Key construction activities for the Proposal would include:

- Clearing of vegetation at the proposed power station site and as required along the electrical transmission and gas pipeline(s) easements.
- Demolition of an existing house if not repurposed during construction and operation.

- Installation of gas pipeline(s) and electrical transmission line infrastructure.
- Earthworks to prepare the power station site and construction areas.
- Installation of foundations and underground services.
- Installation of aboveground civil, mechanical and electrical plant and equipment.
- Commissioning and testing.

2.4 Emissions to Air

Operational Phase

Potential air emission sources associated with operation of the Proposal include:

- Main generator plant (comprising either gas turbine or reciprocating technology).
- Distillate storage tanks.
- Gas reception infrastructure including heating stations, compressors (if not electrically powered) and flaring (if required).
- Emergency diesel generators.

The main generator plant forms the critical focus of this assessment. At the time of preparation, limited detail is available for gas reception and emergency diesel generators. Whilst potential air quality impacts from these sources are typically minor, consideration should be made as the plant design is progressed and such detail becomes available.

Emissions from distillate storage tanks would comprise volatile organic compounds. Distillate proposed for the project would be of conventional automotive diesel grade, and compliant with the *Fuel Quality Standards (Automotive Diesel) Determination 2019* (AG, 2019). Accordingly, emissions would be highest during tank filling, where emissions would be similar in nature to those which occur from storage tank filling operations at a retail service station when tanker filling occurs. Given the large buffer distance surrounding this infrastructure, potential air quality impacts are likely to be negligible, and accordingly have not been considered further within this assessment.

Construction Phase

During the construction phase, there is the potential for dust to be generated due to the excavation and handling of soils, site grading activities, and vehicle movements. Table 2.1 provides a summary of anticipated construction equipment by construction stage.

Table 2.1: Summary of anticipated construction equipment by construction stage

Construction Stage	Equipment
S1: Site Preparation and Earthworks	Excavator
	Bulldozer
	Grader
	Roller
	Loader
	Dump truck
S2: Concrete Foundation Works	Concrete truck
	Concrete mixer
	Compactor
	Crane
S3: Building Construction	Crane
	Delivery trucks

Construction Stage	Equipment
	Pneumatic tools
	Electric tools
	Power generators
	Hammers
S4: Pre-Pipeline Construction	Excavator
	Track trencher
	Crushing Machine
	Truck
	Crane
S5: Pipeline Construction	Welding/Bending Machine
	Pipe layer
	Bulldozer
	Padding machine
S6: Transmission Line Construction	Excavator
	Track trencher
	Crushing Machine
	Truck
	Crane

Noting the scale of construction and presence of buffers between the plant footprint and the site boundaries, it is considered appropriate that potential air quality impacts be addressed via the implementation of conventional management measures for construction operations. Specifically, the minimisation and control of dust emissions during the construction period should be detailed within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the Proposal, through the implementation of considered measures that address the management and mitigation of potential air quality impacts.

2.4.1 Key Pollutants

The operational phase of the Proposal involves the combustion of natural gas and distillate fuels in either gas turbine or 4-stroke dual-fuel reciprocating engine technologies. Potential air emissions have been reviewed based on the Chapter 3 of the *US EPA AP-42 Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors* (USEPA, 2005), as well as manufacturer information. From this review, the following key air pollutant emissions have been identified:

- Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x), inclusive of nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂).
- Carbon monoxide (CO)
- Sulfur dioxide (SO₂)
- Particulate matter (PM) inclusive of :
 - Particulate Matter less than 2.5 µm in aerodynamic diameter (PM_{2.5})
 - Particulate Matter less than 10 µm in aerodynamic diameter (PM₁₀).
- Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) inclusive of:
 - Acrolein, benzene, formaldehyde and other volatile organic compounds (VOCs).
 - polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)

- ammonia (residual from Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR)).

Table 2.2 provides a summary of these key pollutants and their basis of formation.

Table 2.2: Summary of key pollutants and basis of formation

Pollutant	Formation/Emission Basis
NO _x	Oxidation of atmospheric nitrogen in high temperature combustion reactions
CO	Incomplete oxidation of fuel-bound carbon
SO ₂	Oxidation of fuel-bound sulfur
PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Incomplete oxidation of fuel-bound carbon.- Oxidation of fuel-bound sulfur to sulphate.- Emission of residual ash material within distillate fuel.
Acrolein	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Incomplete oxidation of fuel-bound carbon.
Formaldehyde	
Benzene	
PAHs	
Ammonia*	Residual ammonia from SCR operation.

Note: *Applicable to reciprocating engine option for which SCR is proposed.

3. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Potential air quality impacts from industrial sources are managed in NSW via a collection of regulatory instruments, which prescribe operating conditions, plant emission limits and ambient air quality criteria to be applied in the assessment and management of industrial operations.

These instruments include:

- The NSW *Protection of the Environment Operations Act (1997)* ‘the POEO Act’, which includes provisions for the minimisation of air pollution and odour, as well as specifying scheduled activities for which operators must carry an environment protection licence.
- The NSW *Protection of the Environment Operations (Clean Air) Regulation 2010* ‘the Clean Air regulation’ (as amended January 2019), which provides statutory emission limits and operating requirements for industrial plant and activities.
- The *Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in New South Wales* (EPA, 2017), ‘the Approved Methods’, as invoked in the SEARs, (and more broadly by the Clean Air Regulation), and specify methods for the assessment of air emission sources, including impact assessment criteria.

A summary of these instruments, as relevant to the Proposal, is provided in the following sections.

3.1 Regulatory Emission Limits

The Clean Air Regulation provides emission limits for both the gas turbine and reciprocating engine plant options being considered for the Proposal. These emission limits apply within the exhaust stack for periods in which the plant is operational (i.e. excluding startup and shutdown conditions).

Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 provide a summary of emission limits relevant to gas turbine and reciprocating engine options (respectively).

Table 3.1: Summary of Clean Air Regulation emission limits – Gas Turbine Option

Substance	Fuel Type		Units / Reference Conditions
	Natural Gas	Distillate	
Solid Particles (Total)	-	50	mg/m ³ , dry, 273K, 101.3 kpa 15% O ₂
Nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂) or Nitric oxide (NO) or both, as NO ₂ equivalent	70	90	
Smoke	-	Ringelmann 1 or 20% Opacity	-

Note: Limits do not apply to startup and shutdown periods.

Table 3.2: Summary of relevant Clean Air Regulation emission limits – Reciprocating Engine Option

Substance	Fuel Type		Units / Reference Conditions
	Natural Gas	Distillate	
Solid Particles (Total)	50		mg/m ³ , dry, 273K, 101.3 kpa 3% O ₂
Nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂) or Nitric oxide (NO) or both, as NO ₂ equivalent	450		
Volatile organic compounds (VOCs), as n-propane, or Carbon Monoxide (CO)*	40 125	1,140 5,880	
Smoke	Ringelmann 1 or 20% Opacity		-

Notes: These limits do not apply to startup and shutdown periods.

*The standard for volatile organic compounds or carbon monoxide is satisfied if either of those standards is met.

AGL proposes to procure plant that complies with the requirements of the POEO Act and Clean Air Regulation, and have sought manufacturer assurances on the capabilities of prospective plant options to address the requirements outlined in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2.

Within this assessment, the development of emission estimates has been undertaken within these requirements. Further discussion of this process is provided in Section 6.

3.2 Impact Assessment Criteria

The Approved Methods specify impact assessment criteria relevant for the assessment of impacts from air pollution. These criteria form the basis for the quantitative aspect of this assessment.

These criteria are primarily human health-based (i.e. they are set at levels to protect against health effects), and are also protective against adverse amenity and ecological impacts in cases where such impacts are limiting.

Table 3.3 summarises the air quality criteria for atmospheric emissions relevant to this assessment.

Table 3.3: Summary of relevant air quality criteria

Pollutant	Assessment Statistic	Concentration ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Assessment Basis
NO ₂	1 hour maximum	246	Cumulative (including background)
	Annual mean	62	
CO	15 minute maximum	100,000	
	1 hour maximum	30,000	
	8 hour maximum	10,000	
SO ₂	10 minute maximum	712	
	1 hour maximum	570	
	24 hour maximum	228	
	Annual mean	60	
PM _{2.5}	24-hour maximum	8	
	Annual mean	25	
PM ₁₀	24-hour maximum	50	
	Annual mean	25	
Formaldehyde	99.9 th percentile, 1 hour maximum	20	Incremental (Proposal in isolation)
Acrolein		0.42	
Benzene		29	
PAHs (B[a]P TEQ)*		0.4	
Ammonia		330	

Note: *PAHs as Benzo(a)Pyrene equivalent.

4. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

This report section provides a summary of the existing environment including climate, meteorology and ambient air quality. These factors are relevant to the consideration of atmospheric dispersion, as well as the existing condition of the airshed, which forms an important consideration in the prediction of total pollutant concentrations, for assessment against cumulative air quality criteria.

4.1 Climate and Meteorology

The Newcastle region has a humid sub-tropical climate with warm summers and mild winters. Precipitation is typically heaviest in the first half of the year when east coast lows can bring very heavy falls and damaging winds. The region is influenced by land- and seabreeze flows, which have significant implications for air quality when extended anticyclonic conditions occur (PAEHolmes, 2011).

Table 4.1 presents a summary of compiled climate statistics for the Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) Newcastle University Weather Station, which is located approximately 9 km to the south of the Proposal.

Table 4.1: Summary of climate statistics for Newcastle University weather station (#061390)

Parameter	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
Twice daily temperature observations (°C)													
9am mean	23.3	22.6	20.7	18.5	14.8	12.3	11.3	13.0	16.7	19.3	20.2	22.3	17.9
3pm mean	27.3	26.5	25.0	22.1	19.5	17.0	16.6	18.2	21.1	22.7	23.7	26.0	22.1
Twice daily relative humidity observations (%)													
9am mean	72	78	78	77	78	79	77	69	65	62	71	70	73
3pm mean	57	62	60	61	59	60	54	48	48	50	58	58	56
Temperature Range (°C)													
Mean maximum	29.5	28.5	26.9	24.2	21.2	18.3	18.0	19.7	22.7	24.9	26.0	28.0	24.0
Mean minimum	19.5	19.4	17.6	14.1	10.5	8.8	7.3	8.0	10.7	13.4	15.9	17.9	13.6
Rainfall													
Mean Rainfall (mm)	84.5	133.1	124.4	127.3	88.3	131.7	54.8	57.5	66.9	66.2	109.2	69.4	1147.1
Mean rain days	10.2	12.3	12.1	11.8	10.7	12.7	10.7	8.9	8.5	9.5	11.8	11.1	130.3
Sky Condition													
Mean clear days	9.3	6.1	8.3	8.1	11.4	10.0	11.5	12.0	12.3	9.9	6.3	6.6	111.8
Mean cloudy days	9.8	10.9	8.9	8.0	7.8	7.9	8.0	5.8	5.4	8.2	11.5	9.5	101.7

Source: http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/averages/tables/cw_061390.shtml (accessed June 2019).


January is the warmest month with an average maximum temperature of 29.5°C. July is the coolest month with an average minimum temperature of 7.3°C. February through April produces the highest average monthly rainfall, whilst the number of rain days is relatively consistent across all months of the year. Winters are generally drier with the highest prevalence of clear conditions.

The NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) operate 6 air quality monitoring stations (AQMS'), within the Newcastle region, the closest of which is the Beresfield AQMS, located approximately 4.5 km WNW of the Proposal. These AQMS collect both meteorological and ambient air quality data. Table 4.2 presents a summary of these AQMS locations, with proximity to the Proposal, whilst Figure 4.1 shows these locations overlaid on aerial imagery.

Table 4.2: Summary of nearby AQMS and weather stations with proximity to Proposal

AQMS Location	Easting (kmE, MGA94)	Northing (kmN, MGA94)	Distance from Proposal / Bearing
Beresfield	374.627	6370.449	4.5 km WNW
Stockton	386.306	6358.923	12 km SE
Wallsend	375.623	6359.638	9.5 km WSW
Newcastle	384.038	6355.662	14 km SSE
Mayfield	381.057	6360.752	8.0 km SSE
Carrington	384.350	6358.050	12 km SSE

Figure 4.1: Location of OEH AQMS' within the Newcastle region.



Note: Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.

Table 4.3 presents a summary of wind monitoring parameters for the OEH Beresfield AQMS over the most recent six years of monitoring.

Table 4.3: OEH Beresfield - Summary of wind monitoring parameters (2013 – 2018)

Year	Average Wind Speed (m/s)	Percent Calms (wind speed < 0.5 m/s)	Data Completeness
2014	2.4	4.9%	99.1%
2015	2.5	4.0%	98.9%
2016	2.8	4.2%	98.6%
2017	2.3	4.7%	85.4%
2018	2.4	4.9%	99.7%
All Years (2014 – 2018)	2.5	4.5%	95.6%

Figure 4.2 through Figure 4.4 provide annual and seasonal wind roses for the OEH Beresfield AQMS across this period.

As shown in these figures, and Table 4.3, winds are generally consistent between years, possessing an average wind speed of 2.5 m/s with calm conditions occurring approximately 5% of the time. Dominant winds on the north-westerly / south-easterly axis are consistent with those seen near to the Hunter river, and show the influence of the Hunter Valley topography. North-westerly winds are dominant during winter, whilst south-easterly winds are dominant during summer. Winds in autumn and spring are blended around the valley axis, with strong north-westerly winds present during early spring.




Figure 4.2: Annual and seasonal windroses - OEH Beresfield 2014, 2015




Figure 4.3: Annual and seasonal windroses - OEH Beresfield 2016, 2017

Annual and seasonal windroses for
OEH Beresfield
January - December 2018




Figure 4.4: Annual and seasonal windroses - OEH Beresfield, 2018

4.2 Ambient Air Quality

An understanding of existing ambient air quality is required to allow an estimate of total pollutant concentrations, as required for assessment against cumulative air quality impact assessment criteria. Air quality within the region is considered typical of coastal settings, with influences from transport, industrial, domestic and biogenic sources contributing to total background pollutant levels.

This section provides a brief overview of ambient air quality monitoring results within the Newcastle region.

4.2.1 Nitrogen dioxide

Continuous hourly average ambient NO₂ concentrations are measured at 6 locations within the Newcastle region (Figure 4.1). Figure 4.5 provides a visual representation of these measurements over the period 2014 – 2018.




Figure 4.5: Time series plot of hourly ambient NO₂ measurements within the Newcastle region (2014-2018)

As shown in Figure 4.5, all measured concentrations are within the EPA 1hr NO₂ criterion of 246 µg/m³. With the exception of 2 measurements (out of approximately 200,000 measurements), peak concentrations are below 100 µg/m³, with higher measurements observed during the winter months.

Figure 4.6 provides a summary of NO₂ monitoring statistics for Newcastle region ambient NO₂ measurements (2014-2018).




Figure 4.6: Summary statistics for Newcastle region ambient NO₂ measurements (2014-2018)

As shown in Figure 4.6, trends are generally consistent within the last five years, with peak concentrations being approximately five times higher than average concentrations. Five year average concentrations are highest at Mayfield (18.0 µg/m³), closely followed by Beresfield (17.9 µg/m³). Averages at other locations range from 14.2 µg/m³ (Stockton) to 16.8 µg/m³ (Carrington).

4.2.2 Carbon Monoxide

Continuous hourly average ambient CO concentrations are measured at the OEH Newcastle AQMS (Figure 4.1), CO is not measured at other locations. Figure 4.7 provides a visual representation of these measurements over the period 2014 – 2018.




Figure 4.7: Time series plot of hourly ambient CO measurements at the Newcastle AQMS (2014-2018)

As shown in Figure 4.7, all measured concentrations are within the EPA 1hr CO criterion of 30,000 µg/m³. Peak concentrations are generally below 2,500 µg/m³, with higher concentrations observed during the winter months.

Figure 4.8 shows a summary of CO monitoring statistics for Newcastle AQMS (2014-2018).




Figure 4.8: Summary statistics for Newcastle region ambient CO measurements (2014-2018)

As shown in Figure 4.8, trends in peak values possess a slight downward trend over the 5 years, whilst average values are variable between years.

4.2.3 Sulfur dioxide

Continuous hourly average ambient SO₂ concentrations are measured at six locations within the Newcastle region (Figure 4.1). Figure 4.9 provides a visual representation of these 1 hour average measurements over the period 2014 – 2018.




Figure 4.9: Time series plot of hourly ambient SO₂ measurements within the Newcastle region (2014-2018)

As shown in Figure 4.9, all measured concentrations are within the EPA 1hr SO₂ criterion of 570 µg/m³. With the exception of three measurements (out of approximately 200,000 measurements), peak concentrations are below 200 µg/m³. A clear seasonal or temporal trend is not apparent. Figure 4.10 shows a summary of SO₂ monitoring statistics for Newcastle region (2014-2018).




Figure 4.10: Summary statistics for Newcastle region ambient SO₂ measurements (2014-2018)

As shown in Figure 4.10, trends are generally consistent within the last five years, with peak concentrations being approximately 30 times higher than average concentrations. Five year average concentrations are highest at Stockton (7.7 µg/m³), followed by Carrington (6.3 µg/m³), which is possibly due to an influence from shipping emissions. The five year average at Beresfield (4.0 µg/m³) is equal to that at Newcastle, and slightly higher than that at Wallsend (3.6 µg/m³).

4.2.4 Particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometres

Continuous hourly average ambient PM_{2.5} concentrations are measured at six locations within the Newcastle region (Figure 4.1). Figure 4.11 provides a visual representation of 24 hour averaged measurements over the period 2014 – 2018.




Figure 4.11: Time series plot of 24-hour average ambient PM_{2.5} measurements within the Newcastle region (2014-2018)

As shown in Figure 4.11, peak measurements exceed the EPA 24 hour PM_{2.5} criterion of 25 µg/m³ at all locations. These measurements primarily relate to interregional dust storms, hazard reduction burns, and bushfire events. Figure 4.12 shows a corresponding summary of PM_{2.5} monitoring statistics for Newcastle region (2014-2018).




Figure 4.12: Summary statistics for Newcastle region ambient PM_{2.5} measurements (2014-2018)

As shown in Figure 4.10, trends are varied within the last five years, with peak concentrations being approximately four times higher than average concentrations. Inter-annual variability in peak statistics is primarily driven by the influence of exceptional events such as dust storms and bushfire activity

In 2016, extensive hazard reduction burns were the major influences on elevated PM_{2.5} concentrations throughout NSW. All exceedances of the 24 hour average PM_{2.5} were linked to hazard reduction burns (OEH, 2018).

Five year average concentrations are highest at Stockton (9.8 µg/m³), followed by Carrington (8.3 µg/m³). The five year average at Beresfield (7.7 µg/m³) is near to that at Newcastle and Mayfield (7.8 µg/m³), and slightly higher than Wallsend (7.3 µg/m³).

4.2.5 Particulate matter less than 10 micrometres

Continuous hourly average ambient PM₁₀ concentrations are measured at six locations within the Newcastle region (Figure 4.1). Figure 4.11 provides a visual representation of 24 hour averaged measurements over the period 2014 – 2018.




Figure 4.13: Time series plot of 24-hour average ambient PM₁₀ measurements within the Newcastle region (2014-2018)

As shown in Figure 4.11, peak measurements exceed the EPA 24 hour PM₁₀ criterion of 50 µg/m³ at all locations. These measurements primarily relate to interregional dust storms, hazard reduction burns, and bushfire events.

Of interest, the OEH Lower Hunter Particle Characterisation Study (OEH, 2016) identifies that samples collected at Stockton contained approximately 12 µg/m³ more annual average PM₁₀ sea salt than Mayfield, with differences most prevalent during the summer months when onshore winds are present. The effect is less pronounced in PM_{2.5} due to the coarser makeup of coastal sea salt.

Figure 4.12 shows a corresponding summary of PM₁₀ monitoring statistics for Newcastle region (2014-2018).




Figure 4.14: Summary statistics for Newcastle region ambient PM₁₀ measurements (2014-2018)

As shown in Figure 4.10, trends are varied within the last five years, with peak concentrations being approximately four times higher than average concentrations. Five year average concentrations are highest at Stockton (38 µg/m³), followed by Carrington (24 µg/m³), and Mayfield (24 µg/m³). The five year average at Beresfield (20 µg/m³) is near to that at Newcastle (22 µg/m³), and higher than Wallsend (17 µg/m³). Inter-annual variability in peak statistics is primarily driven by the influence of exceptional events such as dust storms and bushfire activity. A detailed review of these events is provided in Section 5.8.

4.3 Summary

Based on this review the following

- Ambient air quality standards for NO₂, CO and SO₂ are met at all locations across the 5 years reviewed, with significant margin between peak measurements and the relevant standards.
- Short term (24 hour average) ambient air quality standards for PM (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) are exceeded at all locations across the 5 years reviewed, due to environmental events; such as, dust storms and bushfires.
- The long term (annual average) PM_{2.5} ambient air quality standard is reached at Wallsend, and exceeded at all other locations within the 5 years reviewed. The long term (annual average) PM₁₀ ambient air quality standard is exceeded at Carrington, Stockton and Mayfield, and met at Wallsend, Beresfield and Newcastle.
- Ambient air quality is generally consistent within the region, with influence of sources such as shipping and coastal sea salt evident in the data.

5. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

This section provides an overview of the technical approaches applied within the assessment.

5.1 Model Selection

Given the presence of buoyant air emissions within a coastal region, the use of a non-steady-state model such as CALPUFF provides a distinct advantage in the treatment of calm conditions over steady-state models (such as AERMOD or AUSPLUME), and is also able to address changes in meteorology that occur with changing land use, including coastal fumigation.

The height of the atmospheric boundary layer is driven by turbulence, which is generated either mechanically via air motion over rough obstacles, or convectively, through heating of the earth's surface. Noting the low surface roughness of water, and the ability of water to absorb and distribute solar radiation, the levels of atmospheric turbulence are lower over water. CALPUFF addresses this through the incorporation of algorithms that are able to treat these effects.

5.2 Dispersion Meteorology

The regional meteorology has been modelled using CALMET. CALMET is a meteorological pre-processor that includes a wind field generator containing objective analysis and parameterised treatments of slope flows, terrain effects and terrain blocking effects. The pre-processor produces fields of wind components, air temperature, relative humidity, mixing height and other micro-meteorological variables to produce the three-dimensional meteorological fields that are utilised in the CALPUFF dispersion model (i.e. the CALPUFF dispersion model requires meteorological data in three dimensions). CALMET uses the meteorological inputs in combination with land use and geophysical information for the modelling domain to predict gridded meteorological fields for the region.

A one year meteorological dataset was compiled for CALPUFF for the calendar year 2018. The year 2018 has been selected based on a review of the last 5 years of meteorological data for OEH Beresfield AQMS (Section 4). 2018 was noted to be the most consistent with the 5 year average wind speed and percent calms, whilst also exhibiting data completeness above 90% required for use in dispersion modelling (99.7% complete). Ambient air quality data for this year is also generally consistent with other years.

The compiled dataset includes hourly spatially-varying fields of meteorological variables relevant to the estimation of pollutant dispersion.

CALMET has been run using six surface stations each augmented by corresponding upper air pseudo-stations from the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation's (CSIRO's) 'The Air Pollution Model' (TAPM). These TAPM runs have incorporated assimilation into the lowest 3 layers in order to control winds within the surface layer to reflect observed values, whilst providing vertical blending of the surface observations with the TAPM upper air predictions. TAPM surface observations have then been discarded within CALPUFF in place of actual observations.

This approach ensures the appropriate weighting of measured data, and addresses the spatial variability in meteorology and boundary layer development across the domain. Most importantly, this approach also minimises the production of assimilation boundaries that are a critical limitation of a hybrid approach involving the incorporation of 3-dimensional prognostic wind fields alongside surface observations.

5.3 Model Receptors

The model configuration requires designation of the spatial location of model receptors, which are points at which model concentration outputs are generated. The model has used both gridded and discrete receptors as per the following:

- Gridded receptors have been incorporated on a 30 x 30 km receptor grid equating to a total of 14,641 gridded receptors across 900 square kilometres. This domain extent is considered adequate for the capture of peak model predictions.
- 36 discrete receptors have been allocated to localities across the gridded modelling domain.

Table 5.1 lists the discrete receptors with corresponding coordinates. Figure 5.1 shows the gridded receptor domain extent and corresponding discrete receptor locations.

Table 5.1: Summary of discrete receptors

Receptor	Locality	Easting (kmE)	Northing (kmN)
01	Tomago	379.326	6367.022
02	Hexham	376.901	6367.022
03	Beresfield	374.324	6369.986
04	Heatherbrae	381.323	6371.779
05	Williamtown	392.366	6369.398
06	Fullerton Cove	391.008	6365.382
07	Fern Bay	387.228	6362.173
08	Kooragang	385.102	6360.795
09	Stockton	386.134	6358.129
10	Carrington	384.556	6357.861
11	Mayfield	382.100	6359.338
12	Hamilton	383.027	6356.672
13	Newcastle	385.895	6356.151
14	Merewether	383.491	6354.499
15	Adamstown	381.231	6354.847
16	New Lambton	379.927	6356.614
17	Jesmond	377.725	6358.787
18	Warabrook	380.227	6360.347
19	Sandgate	379.360	6362.211
20	Maryland	374.470	6360.837
21	Cameron Park	370.071	6357.697
22	Cardiff	374.701	6354.655
23	Glendale	372.825	6355.473
24	Black Hill	370.379	6365.841
25	Thornton	372.524	6372.596
26	Ashtonfield	369.596	6372.990
27	East Maitland	367.807	6375.432
28	Millers Rest	379.546	6374.370
29	Raymond Terrace	382.306	6374.446
30	Maitland	364.839	6377.335
31	Morpeth	371.583	6378.304
32	Osterley	378.130	6378.482
33	Medowie	393.082	6376.761
34	Largs	369.012	6380.994
35	Brandy Hill	377.714	6381.904
36	Eagleton	383.569	6380.321




Figure 5.1: Aerial image showing discrete receptors, gridded receptor domain extent and Proposal boundary

5.4 Emission Parameters

Emission parameters have been compiled based on indicative manufacturer information for the modelled plant options. Indicative stack locations have been estimated for both engine types, by overlaying selected generic plant layouts onto the centre of the generator yard within the site layout.

Adjustment to stack design and locations will occur with progression of the design due to detailed consideration of spatial requirements, and/or adoption of alternative vendor options. The influence of design or location changes within the generator yard area are unlikely to be material when considered in the context of source-receptor distances of interest.

Table 5.2 presents a summary of modelled emission parameters adopted for each plant option.

Table 5.2: Summary of modelled emission parameters

Emission Source	Stacks per Cluster ¹	Stack Height (mAGL)	Effective Diameter (m)	Exit Velocity (m/s) NG / DO	Exit Temperature (K) NG / DO	Easting (kmE MGA94)	Northing (kmN MGA94)
Gas Turbine Option							
Gas turbine exhaust 1	N/A	20	2.782	60 / 59	679 / 681	378.984	6368.576
Gas turbine exhaust 2		20	2.782	60 / 59	679 / 681	378.985	6368.598
Gas turbine exhaust 3		20	2.782	60 / 59	679 / 681	378.987	6368.620
Gas turbine exhaust 4		20	2.782	60 / 59	679 / 681	378.988	6368.642
Reciprocating Engine Option							
Exhaust stack cluster 1	4	32	3.6	26 / 30	593 / 561	378.949	6368.561
Exhaust stack cluster 2	4	32	3.6	26 / 30	593 / 561	378.951	6368.597
Exhaust stack cluster 3	5	32	4.025	26 / 30	593 / 561	378.956	6368.659

Note:

- ¹Reciprocating engine stacks merged to a single effective source per stack cluster and modelled with unity emission rate assumptions corrected to the stack / cluster values (i.e. 4, 4 and 5 g/s for each respective cluster, thus allowing scaling using individual stack emission rates).
- 'NG / DO': Natural Gas / Distillate Oil values (respectively).
- mAGL: metres above ground level.
- All sources modelled at a base elevation of 15 mAHD (m Australian Height Datum).

5.5 Building Downwash Effects

Aerodynamic wakes are produced as air travels over irregular objects such as building structures. Within these wakes, there is a high level of turbulence and vertical mixing. In instances where exhaust plumes interact with these wakes, pollutants can be mixed downward to ground level, producing locally elevated concentrations, and otherwise reducing the scale of plume rise at distances downwind of the source. Within dispersion modelling, this effect is referred to as building downwash.

For this study, emission sources were screened for potential interaction with building wakes, where wakes extend:

- by a distance of 5 x L from the leeward edge of a wake producing structure, where L is the lesser of the structure height or the projected structure width.
- to a height of 2.5 times the height of the structure.

Based on generic site layouts, the reciprocating engine plant emission stacks (~30 m high) will be located within the zone of influence of the generator hall, which is approximately 18 m high at its peak. Figure 5.2 shows the proximity of these structures, as represented within the building downwash model.




Image sourced from Google Earth Pro.

Figure 5.2: Aerial image showing reciprocating engine building representation (blue) and point sources (red).

5.6 NO₂ Conversion

Oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) are emitted primarily as nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). At the point of emission, NO_x will primarily comprise NO which has the ability to be progressively oxidised to NO₂ by atmospheric ozone over periods in the time scale of hours. Given that NO₂ is the principal species in terms of potential human health effects, a method for the estimation of NO₂ conversion is required.

Several approaches are available to estimate the transformation of NO to NO₂. The Approved Methods provide the following techniques, in descending order of conservatism:

- *Method 1: 100% conversion of NO to NO₂.*
- *Method 2: NO to NO₂ conversion limited by ambient ozone concentration (OLM)*
- *Method 3: NO to NO₂ conversion using empirical relationship.*

For this assessment, the Ozone Limiting Method (OLM) (Method 2) has been used to estimate NO₂ concentrations, as this allows a conservative representation of conversion, whilst also refining predictions beyond Method 1.

5.6.1 Ozone Limiting Method

In its default form, the OLM assumes that 10% of the NO_x emissions occur as NO₂, with the remaining NO being converted over to NO₂ until all of the ambient ozone is consumed. In this respect, the conversion is limited by the availability of ozone. Equation 5.1 provides the basis for the OLM calculation applied in this assessment:

$$NO_2total = \{ISR \times NO_{xp}\} + \text{minimum}\{[(1 - ISR) \times NO_{xp}] \text{ or } [(46/48) \times O_3bg]\} + NO_2bg$$

Equation 5.1

Where:

- NO_2total = total NO₂ concentration inclusive of project and background (µg/m³)
- ISR = in-stack NO₂:NO_x ratio
- NO_{xp} = predicted NO_x concentration (µg/m³)
- O_3bg = measured background ozone concentration (µg/m³)
- NO_2bg = background NO₂ concentration (µg/m³)

The ozone concentrations applied were based on hourly monitoring data from the Beresfield AQMS. Ozone and NO₂ data were 93% and 94% complete (respectively) for the year 2009. Data gaps of up to two hours were filled by linear interpolation which brought the data availability to 98%. Remaining missing values were substituted with data from Wallsend to provide a complete dataset.

The OLM calculations were performed on an hourly basis for each of the 8,760 hours of the model run. Hourly NO₂ predictions were processed using the OLM in conjunction with corresponding hourly ozone and NO₂ background data.

5.6.2 In-Stack NO₂:NO_x Ratio

As outlined in Section 5.6.1 the default OLM contains the implicit assumption that 10% of NO_x emissions exist as NO₂ at the point of release, i.e. the emissions possess an in-stack NO₂:NO_x ratio (ISR) of 0.1. This ISR is generally appropriate for combustion sources, which typically feature ISRs of 0.05 to 0.1. Manufacturer information for the reciprocating engines indicates that this assumption may not be appropriate for lean burn gas engines using SCR to control NO_x emissions to low levels.

To estimate an ISR suitable for application in this assessment, a review of the US EPA In-Stack Ratio (ISR) database (US EPA, 2017) was undertaken. This database consists of over 2,000 source tests across a range of combustion plant types, with detail of a range of emission and test parameters. The database was filtered for the following properties:

- Reciprocating internal combustion engines
- 4-stroke lean burn combustion
- Natural gas fuel
- Emission concentration less than 150 mg/Nm³ at 15 %O₂ (equivalent to 450 mg/Nm³ a 3% O₂).
- Catalytic emission control with exhaust oxygen content > 8%².

In addition, a range of anomalous results were removed (such as oxygen content greater than 20% or discrepancies in NO_x addition). This results in a dataset of approximately 391 ISR measurements, which are presented in Figure 5.3.

² Oxygen criterion applied to remove any inadvertently included rich burn engines with 3-way catalysts, or samples for which oxygen was not reported.




Figure 5.3: ISR vs in-stack NO_x concentration from filtered US EPA ISR database

These data show that for In-stack NO_x values within the manufacturer specification of 150 mg/Nm³, ISRs are generally below 0.2, averaging 0.11 across the filtered dataset. It is noted that the three highest values (shown in maroon) are from a single set of three consecutive tests performed on the same unit within one day, and are suspected to be erroneous (with two of three test results reporting NO of 0.0 ppm). These values have been retained for clarity.

Across the dataset, over 90% of ISR values below this concentration fall within a 30 mg/Nm³ in-stack NO₂ concentration (i.e. the area bounded by the red dashed line). This indicates that the assumption of emissions occurring at the manufacturer specification with an ISR of 0.2 would accommodate variability against the average ISR of 0.11, and also higher ISRs that may be present at lower NO_x ranges, under which case a conservative representation of available NO is implied.

Accordingly, an ISR of 0.2 has been adopted for reciprocating engines operating on natural gas, and the default of 0.1 applied for other sources. Manufacturer information indicates that an ISR of 0.1 is appropriate for reciprocating engines operating on distillate fuel.

5.7 Predictions for Sub-hourly Averaging Periods

Where required, hourly averaged model predictions and background data have been converted to sub-hourly averaging periods using the power law conversion provided in the EPA Victoria draft guideline *Guidance notes for using the regulatory air pollution model AERMOD in Victoria* (EPAV, 2013). This conversion accounts for fluctuations in pollutant levels within the larger averaging period, and is provided in Equation 5.2.

$$C_{n \text{ min}} = C_{1 \text{ hour}} \times \left(\frac{60}{n}\right)^{0.2}$$

Equation 5.2

Where:

$C_{1 \text{ hour}}$ is the 1 hour average prediction.

$C_{n \text{ min}}$ is the n minute average prediction.

5.8 Background Air Quality Dataset

Background data has been sourced from the OEH Beresfield AQMS based on the data presented in Section 4. This station has been selected given proximity to the Proposal, and representativeness within the surrounding modelling domain in terms of surrounding land uses, separation from the coast and alignment within the Hunter Valley axis.

Particulate matter data have been reviewed to remove exceptional events, based on information provided in OEH quarterly air quality monitoring summaries for the Newcastle region (OEH, 2018b; 2018c; 2018d; 2018e; 2018f). This allows the assessment of the Proposal excluding extraneous events.

The quarterly reports were reviewed with identification of a total of seven exceptional events relating to bushfire and dust storm activity. The remaining peak 24 hour PM_{2.5} concentration was measured on 15 July 2018, at a time when regional dust events were reported. The retention of this data point is considered conservative to the assessment. Table 5.3 provides a summary of excluded PM events.

Table 5.3: Summary of excluded PM events

Date/s	Description	Reference
14-16/02/2018	Interregional dust storm, bushfire activity at Wollemi National Park	OEH (2018b)
19-20/03/2018	Long range dust transport	OEH (2018c)
15/04/2018		
18-19/07/2018	Long range dust transport (Victorian Mallee region)	OEH (2018d)
04/08/2018	Long range dust transport	
6/11/2018	Long-range dust transport from north-western NSW	
21-23/11/2018	Long range dust transport (South Australia), Port Stephens bushfire activity.	OEH (2018e)

Table 5.4 presents a summary of adopted 2018 pollutant background concentrations, as based on data from the OEH Beresfield AQMS.

Table 5.4: Summary of adopted 2018 pollutant background concentrations.

Pollutant	Assessment Statistic	Adopted Background Concentration (µg/m ³)	Impact Assessment Criterion (µg/m ³)
NO ₂	1 hour maximum	82*	246
	Annual mean	18.1	62
CO	15 minute maximum	1,980**	100,000
	1 hour maximum	1,500	30,000
	8 hour maximum	1,125	10,000
SO ₂	10 minute maximum	286	712
	1 hour maximum	200	570
	24 hour maximum	20	228
	Annual mean	4.7	60
PM _{2.5}	24-hour maximum	17.1	25
	Annual mean	8.1	8
PM ₁₀	24-hour maximum	40.6	50
	Annual mean	20.0	25

Note: *Maximum hourly value shown. Time varying background concentration applied in analysis.

**Value converted using power law.

Adopted PM background concentrations exclude 7 exceptional events when interregional dust storms and/or bushfires were present.

6. EMISSION ESTIMATION

6.1 Overview

Proposal emissions have been estimated using manufacturer data supplemented by US EPA AP-42 emission factors (US EPA, 2006) and fuel specifications. For pollutants where manufacturer information is not available, emission factors allow the estimation of individual pollutant emissions on the basis of fuel consumption and generator technology.

AGL is proposing to employ either gas turbine or reciprocating engine generation technology for the Proposal. ERM has been provided with vendor specifications for a range of gas turbine and reciprocating engine options being considered for the Proposal. ERM has reviewed the technical data for these options, and progressed detailed modelling of one gas turbine and one reciprocating engine option, as representative of the proposed generator technologies and the scale of the Proposal output.

In addition, all emission estimates have been scaled upward by 10% to accommodate minor variability in plant specifications that may exist within each technology option.

6.2 Estimation Methods

Manufacturer data has been used to estimate NO_x and CO emissions (both plant options), as well as formaldehyde and SO₂ emissions for reciprocating engines. Where based on manufacturer data, the modelled emissions reflect control of emissions either to, or within POEO limits.

Manufacturer emission data for PM is limited to filterable particulate. Accordingly, PM emissions for reciprocating engines have been estimated based on manufacturer's data for the filterable fraction, and supplemented by the US EPA AP-42 PM emission factors, (which represent an average of test data), for the condensable fraction.

The use of oxidation catalysts on the reciprocating engines is anticipated to provide a reduction of condensable material through oxidation of soluble organic fraction PM (MECA, 2015), thus resulting in a reduction against the uncontrolled emissions factors featured in the US EPA (2006). As a conservative measure, this effect has not been incorporated into the emission estimation.

A control efficiency of 40% has been incorporated into the estimation of acrolein emissions for reciprocating engines under natural gas operation. This is based on a theoretical estimate from the manufacturer which includes conservatism to reflect uncertainty in measurement of post-control concentrations near to method detection limits.

Table 6.1 outlines the basis of pollutant emission estimates by technology and pollutant.

Table 6.1: Summary of emission estimation basis by pollutant and technology type

Parameter	Technology Type	
	Gas Turbine Option	Reciprocating Engine Option
NO _x as NO ₂	Manufacturer data	
CO		
SO ₂	Fuel specification	Manufacturer data
PM	Manufacturer data (filterable fraction), US EPA AP-42 Emission Factors (condensable fraction)	
Acrolein	US EPA AP-42 Emission Factors*	
Benzene		
Formaldehyde	US EPA AP-42 Emission Factors	Manufacturer data
PAH	US EPA AP-42 Emission Factors	

Notes: *Vendor estimate of oxidation catalyst efficiency incorporated into reciprocating engine estimate (natural gas fuel).

6.3 Fuel Consumption

Fuel consumption estimates have been provided by Aurecon and are detailed in Table 6.2. These values have been converted to units of million British thermal units per second (mmBTU/s) on a higher heating value (HHV) basis, for use in conjunction with the US EPA AP-42 emission factors, which apply on this basis.

Table 6.2: Summary of fuel emission estimates

Parameter	Gas Turbine		Reciprocating Engine		Units / Basis
	Natural Gas	Distillate	Natural Gas	Distillate	
Fuel Consumption	2272	2265	2071	2168	GJ/hr (LHV, Plant)
	158	157	44	46	MW _{th} (LHV, Unit*)
HHV / LHV Conversion	1.10	1.07	1.10	1.07	-
Fuel Consumption	174	168	49	50	MW _{th} (HHV, Unit*)
	0.174	0.157	0.049	0.050	GJ/s (HHV, Unit*)
	0.165	0.149	0.046	0.047	mmBTU/s (HHV)

Notes:

- LHV: Lower Heating Value,
- HHV: Higher Heating Value,
- GJ: Gigajoules, MW_{th} – megawatt (thermal).
- *Refers to a single generator unit (i.e. an individual turbine/reciprocating engine).

6.4 US EPA AP-42 Emission Factors

The US EPA AP-42 database has been referenced for the emission factors outlined in Table 6.3.

Table 6.3: Summary of adopted US EPA AP-42 emission factors

Substance	Gas Turbine Option ^(a)		Reciprocating Engine Option	
	Natural Gas	Distillate	Natural Gas ^(b)	Distillate ^(c)
PM _{2.5} , PM ₁₀ (condensable)	4.70E x 10 ⁻⁰³	7.20E x 10 ⁻⁰³	9.91E x 10 ⁻⁰³	7.70E x 10 ⁻⁰³
Acrolein	6.40 x 10 ⁻⁰⁶	6.4 x 10 ⁻⁰⁶	5.14 x 10 ⁻⁰³	7.88 x 10 ⁻⁰⁶
Benzene	1.20 x 10 ⁻⁰⁵	5.50 x 10 ⁻⁰⁵	4.40 x 10 ⁻⁰⁴	7.76 x 10 ⁻⁰⁴
Formaldehyde	7.10 x 10 ⁻⁰⁴	2.80 x 10 ⁻⁰⁴	N/A	
PAHs (B[a]P TEQ)(d)	9.00 x 10 ⁻⁰⁷ (e)	5.00 x 10 ⁻⁰⁶ (e)	1.67 x 10 ⁻⁰⁷ (d)	1.39 x 10 ⁻⁰⁴ (d)

Notes:

- (a) US EPA (2006) – 3.1 Stationary Gas Turbines
- (b) US EPA (2006) – 3.2 Natural Gas-Fired Reciprocating Engines (4 stroke lean burn values adopted) in absence of dual-fuel factors.
- (c) US EPA (2006) – 3.4 Large Stationary Diesel and All Dual-Fuel Reciprocating Engines.
- (d) PAH value converted to B(a)P equivalent using the Potency Equivalent Factors (PEFs) from the Approved Methods (Table 7.2c)
- (e) In absence of speciated PAHs or B(a)P TEQ, emission factor estimated as Total PAHs minus naphthalene.

N/A – Not Applicable: Emission estimate based on manufacturer data.

6.5 Sulfur Dioxide Emission Factors

SO₂ emission factors have been prepared based on conservation of mass principles, assuming the complete oxidation of fuel-bound sulfur into SO₂. Fuel-bound sulfur content has been defined by the following relevant fuel specifications:

- AEMO 2017, *Gas Quality Guidelines*, (Network notification threshold adopted).
- AG 2019, *Fuel Quality Standards (Automotive Diesel) Determination 2019*, (Fuel standard maximum value adopted).

Table 6.4 and Table 6.5 provide detail of the derivation of fuel-specific SO₂ emission factors for natural gas and distillate operation (respectively).

Table 6.4: Derivation of fuel-specific SO₂ emission factor for natural gas operation

Parameter	Value	Units	Source / Basis
Sulfur content	50	mg/m ³ @15°C, 1 atm.	AEMO, 2017
Gas density	0.755	kg/m ³	AGL, 1995
Sulfur content	66.2	mg/kg	Calculated
Energy density	51.4	MJ/kg	AGL, 1995
Sulfur content	1.29	mg/MJ	Calculated
Sulfur dioxide emissions	2.57	g/GJ	

AGL 1995, Natural Gas Technical Data Handbook, AGL 1995.

Table 6.5: Derivation of fuel-specific SO₂ emission factor for distillate operation

Parameter	Value	Units	Source / Basis
Energy density	45.6	MJ/kg (HHV)	ABARE, 2008
Sulfur content	10.0	mg/kg	AG, 2019
	0.22	mg/MJ (HHV)	Calculated
Sulfur dioxide emissions	0.44	g/GJ (HHV)	

6.6 Summary of Modelled Emission Rates

Table 6.6 presents a summary of modelled emission rates by technology, fuel type and pollutant. Emission rates have been applied on a continuous basis for the 2018 meteorological dataset.

Table 6.6: Summary of modelled emission rates

Substance	Modelled Emission Rate (g/s - stack)			
	Gas Turbine Option		Reciprocating Engine Option	
	Natural Gas	Distillate	Natural Gas	Distillate
NO _x	8.3	14.0	6.0	6.5
CO	15.7	36.3	1.7	1.8
SO ₂	0.5	0.1	0.49	0.48
PM	1.046	2.626	0.511	0.8998
Acrolein	0.0005	0.0005	0.071	0.0002
Benzene	0.001	0.004	0.010	0.018
Formaldehyde	0.0583	0.0208	0.602	0.652
PAHs (B[a]P TEQ)*	0.00007	0.00037	0.000001	0.000015
Ammonia	N/A		0.457	0.476

Note: - N/A – Not applicable as ammonia/urea injection within SCR-based NO_x emission controls is limited to reciprocating engine plant.

- Modelled gas turbine plant comprises 4 stacks. Modelled reciprocating engine plant comprises 13 stacks.

7. RESULTS

This section provides a summary of the results of the dispersion modelling, with comparison against NSW EPA air quality impact assessment criteria. Assessment results have been provided in both tabulated form, and as contour isopleths for select modelling scenarios.

The dispersion modelling has considered the following operational scenarios:

1. Gas turbine option – Natural Gas Fuel
2. Gas turbine option – Distillate Fuel
3. Reciprocating Engine option – Natural Gas Fuel
4. Reciprocating Engine option – Distillate Fuel.

Modelling predictions for these scenarios have been screened for all pollutants assessed, on the basis of maximum values at discrete and gridded receptors within an assessment summary.

Based on the scale of these predictions, contour isopleths and receptor lists of modelling results have been prepared across these four scenarios for the following pollutant and averaging period combinations:

- NO₂:
 - maximum 1 hour average
 - annual average
- PM_{2.5}:
 - maximum 24 hour average
 - annual average
- Acrolein: 99.9th percentile 1 hour average
- Formaldehyde: 99.9th percentile 1 hour average.

All results have presented in the mass-based units of micrograms per cubic metre ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). Contour isopleths have been prepared using geometric spacing (e.g. 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

Incremental predictions represent the influence of emissions from the Proposal in absence of background sources. Cumulative predictions represent the combined influence of the Proposal and existing background concentrations.

7.1 Assessment Summary

Table 7.1 and Table 7.2 present a summary of maximum gridded and discrete receptor predictions for gas turbine and reciprocating engine options (respectively), for all pollutants and scenarios. All predictions are compliant with assessment criteria with the exception of the VOC acrolein (reciprocating engine option under natural gas operation; shown in bold) and annual average PM_{2.5}, due to elevated background levels.

Table 7.1: Assessment Summary – Gas Turbine Option

Substance	Averaging Period	Prediction at Maximum Impacted Receptor ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)				Maximum Incremental Prediction ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Background* ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Maximum Cumulative Prediction ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Criterion ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
		Natural Gas Fuel		Distillate Fuel					
		Discrete	Gridded	Discrete	Gridded				
NO ₂	1 hour maximum	58	61	63	84	84	82*	100	246
	Annual mean	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	18.1	18.5	62
CO	15 minute maximum	139	535	292	1,198	1,198	1,980	3,178	100,000
	1 hour maximum	174	669	365	1,498	1,498	1,500	2,998	30,000
	8 hour maximum	63	133	139	295	295	1,125	1,420	10,000
SO ₂	10 minute maximum	8	30	1	4	30	286	316	712
	1 hour maximum	5	21	1	3	21	200	221	570
	24 hour maximum	0.8	1.5	0.1	0.2	1.5	20	21	228
	Annual mean	0.01	0.02	0.002	0.003	0.02	4.7	4.7	60
PM _{2.5}	24-hour maximum	1.6	3.1	3.9	7.6	7.6	17.1	24.7	25
	Annual mean	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.10	0.10	8.1*	8.2*	8.0
PM ₁₀	24-hour maximum	1.6	3.1	3.9	7.6	7.6	40.6	48.0	50
	Annual mean	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.10	0.10	20.0	20.1	25
Acrolein	1 hour 99.9 th percentile	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.003	-	0.003	0.42
Benzene	1 hour 99.9 th percentile	0.002	0.005	0.01	0.02	0.02	-	0.02	29
Formaldehyde	1 hour 99.9 th percentile	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.3	-	0.3	20
PAHs	1 hour 99.9 th percentile	0.0003	0.0004	0.001	0.002	0.002	-	0.002	0.4

Note: Totals may appear non additive due to rounding of reported intermediate values.

*Time varying background concentration applied in contemporaneous analysis. Maximum 1 hour background value shown.

Table 7.2: Assessment Summary – Reciprocating Engine Option

Substance	Averaging Period	Prediction at Maximum Impacted Receptor ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)				Maximum Incremental Prediction ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Background* ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Maximum Cumulative Prediction ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Criterion ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
		Natural Gas Fuel		Distillate Fuel					
		Discrete	Gridded	Discrete	Gridded				
NO ₂	1 hour maximum	76	113	71	95	113	82 ¹	123	246
	Annual mean	0.6	1.0	0.6	1.0	1.0	18.0	19.1	62
CO	15 minute maximum	21	98	26	104	104	1,980	2,084	100,000
	1 hour maximum	26	123	32	130	130	1,500	1,630	30,000
	8 hour maximum	8	30	11	29	30	1,125	1,155	10,000
SO ₂	10 minute maximum	11	52	12	50	52	286	338	712
	1 hour maximum	8	36	9	35	36	200	236	570
	24 hour maximum	1.0	4.3	1.3	3.4	4.3	20	24	228
	Annual mean	0.05	0.10	0.05	0.08	0.10	4.7	5	60
PM _{2.5}	24-hour maximum	1.1	4.5	2.5	6.4	6.4	17.1	23	25
	Annual mean	0.05	0.10	0.09	0.16	0.16	8.1*	8.3*	8
PM ₁₀	24-hour maximum	1.1	4.5	2.5	6.4	6.4	40.6	47.0	50
	Annual mean	0.05	0.10	0.09	0.16	0.16	20.0	20	25
Acrolein	1 hour 99.9 th percentile	0.68*	1.25*	0.001	0.003	1.25*	-	1.25*	0.42
Benzene	1 hour 99.9 th percentile	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	-	0.3	29
Formaldehyde	1 hour 99.9 th percentile	6	11	5	9	11	-	11	20
PAHs	1 hour 99.9 th percentile	0.00001	0.00001	0.0001	0.0002	0.0002	-	0.0002	0.4
Ammonia	1 hour 99.9 th percentile	4	9	4	7	9	-	9	330

Notes: Exceedances shown in **bold font** and marked with an asterisk.
Totals may appear non-additive due to rounding of reported intermediate values.
¹Time varying background concentration applied in contemporaneous analysis. Maximum 1 hour background shown.

7.2 NO₂

Table 7.3 and Table 7.4 present a summary of maximum 1 hour and annual average NO₂ predictions (respectively). Figure 7.1 through Table 7.4 present contour isopleths for the corresponding incremental predictions. All NO₂ predictions are within relevant impact assessment criteria.

Table 7.3: Summary of model predictions - Maximum 1 hour average NO₂ (µg/m³)


Receptor	Locality	Gas Turbine Option				Reciprocating Engine Option			
		Natural Gas		Distillate		Natural Gas		Distillate	
		Incremental	Cumulative	Incremental	Cumulative	Incremental	Cumulative	Incremental	Cumulative
01	Tomago	24	82	37	82	46	82	52	82
02	Hexham	58	82	63	82	76	82	71	82
03	Beresfield	16	82	23	82	28	82	32	82
04	Heatherbrae	24	82	27	82	39	82	32	82
05	Williamtown	5	82	9	82	17	82	19	82
06	Fullerton Cove	7	82	8	82	14	82	16	82
07	Fern Bay	14	82	26	82	37	82	38	82
08	Kooragang	10	82	19	82	27	82	22	82
09	Stockton	11	82	12	82	18	82	18	82
10	Carrington	14	82	16	82	21	82	18	82
11	Mayfield	9	82	16	82	15	82	17	82
12	Hamilton	11	82	15	82	12	82	16	82
13	Newcastle	12	82	14	82	19	82	16	82
14	Merewether	9	82	15	82	12	82	17	82
15	Adamstown	8	82	11	82	17	82	15	82
16	New Lambton	7	82	11	82	16	82	20	82
17	Jesmond	12	82	23	82	15	82	15	82
18	Warabrook	15	82	21	82	43	82	47	82
19	Sandgate	8	82	14	82	20	82	27	82
20	Maryland	28	82	41	82	13	82	28	82
21	Cameron Park	11	82	21	82	25	82	40	82
22	Cardiff	8	82	14	82	12	82	14	82
23	Glendale	15	82	25	82	13	82	14	82
24	Black Hill	9	82	15	82	35	82	36	82
25	Thornton	31	82	59	82	30	82	34	82
26	Ashtonfield	20	82	32	82	70	84	56	82
27	East Maitland	17	82	30	82	38	82	43	82
28	Millers Rest	16	82	28	82	31	82	38	82
29	Raymond Terrace	20	82	22	82	33	82	30	82
30	Maitland	9	82	16	82	24	82	29	82
31	Morpeth	5	82	9	82	30	82	27	82
32	Osterley	8	82	14	82	25	82	25	82
33	Medowie	11	82	14	82	18	82	19	82
34	Largs	8	82	11	82	15	82	18	82
35	Brandy Hill	9	82	16	82	29	82	33	82
36	Eagleton	12	82	14	82	17	82	25	82
Maximum by Receptor Type									
Discrete	-	58	82	63	82	76	84	71	82
Gridded	-	61	82	84	100	113	123	95	119
Criterion	-	-	246	-	246	-	246	-	246

Table 7.4: Summary of model predictions - Annual average NO₂ (µg/m³)

Receptor	Locality	Gas Turbine Option				Reciprocating Engine Option			
		Natural Gas		Distillate		Natural Gas		Distillate	
		Incremental	Cumulative	Incremental	Cumulative	Incremental	Cumulative	Incremental	Cumulative
01	Tomago	0.2	18.2	0.3	18.3	0.5	18.6	0.6	18.6
02	Hexham	0.2	18.3	0.4	18.4	0.6	18.6	0.6	18.7
03	Beresfield	0.1	18.1	0.2	18.2	0.3	18.3	0.3	18.4
04	Heatherbrae	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.2
05	Williamtown	0.0	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.1	18.2
06	Fullerton Cove	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.3	0.2	18.3
07	Fern Bay	0.1	18.1	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.3	0.2	18.3
08	Kooragang	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.3	0.2	18.3
09	Stockton	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.2
10	Carrington	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.2
11	Mayfield	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.2
12	Hamilton	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2
13	Newcastle	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.1	18.2
14	Merewether	0.0	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2
15	Adamstown	0.0	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2
16	New Lambton	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.1	18.2
17	Jesmond	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.2
18	Warabrook	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.2
19	Sandgate	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.3
20	Maryland	0.1	18.1	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.3	0.3	18.3
21	Cameron Park	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.2
22	Cardiff	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.2
23	Glendale	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.2
24	Black Hill	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.3	0.3	18.3
25	Thornton	0.1	18.1	0.2	18.2	0.3	18.3	0.3	18.3
26	Ashtonfield	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.3
27	East Maitland	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.3
28	Millers Rest	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.3	0.3	18.3
29	Raymond Terrace	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.3
30	Maitland	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2
31	Morpeth	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.2	18.2
32	Osterley	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.2	18.2	0.2	18.2
33	Medowie	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.1	18.2
34	Largs	0.0	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2
35	Brandy Hill	0.0	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2
36	Eagleton	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.1	0.1	18.2	0.1	18.2
Maximum by Receptor Type									
Discrete	-	0.2	18.3	0.4	18.4	0.6	18.6	0.6	18.7
Gridded	-	0.3	18.3	0.4	19	1.0	19.1	1.0	19.1
Criterion	-	-	62	-	62	-	62	-	62


Notes: - Predictions based on continuous operation. Annual average predictions at estimated (14%) operating duty would be approx. 7 times lower than those presented.

Figure 7.1: Maximum incremental 1 hour average NO₂ predictions – Gas Turbine Option (µg/m³)




Notes: - Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
- Contour Levels: 10, 20, 50, 100 µg/m³.

Figure 7.2: Maximum incremental 1 hour average NO₂ predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option (µg/m³)




Notes: - Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
- Contour Levels: 10, 20, 50, 100 µg/m³.

Figure 7.3: Annual average incremental NO₂ predictions – Gas Turbine Option (µg/m³)



- Notes:
- Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
 - Contour Levels: 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1.0 µg/m³.
 - Predictions based on continuous operation. Annual average predictions at estimated (14%) operating duty would be approx. 7 times lower than those presented.

Figure 7.4: Annual average incremental NO₂ predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option (µg/m³)



7.3 PM_{2.5}

Table 7.5 and Table 7.6 present a summary of maximum 24 hour and annual average PM_{2.5} predictions (respectively). Figure 7.5 through Figure 7.8 present corresponding contour isopleths for incremental PM_{2.5} predictions.

Table 7.5: Summary of model predictions – Maximum 24 hour average PM_{2.5}


Receptor	Locality	Gas Turbine Option				Reciprocating Engine Option			
		Natural Gas		Distillate		Natural Gas		Distillate	
		Incremental	Cumulative	Incremental	Cumulative	Incremental	Cumulative	Incremental	Cumulative
01	Tomago	0.4	17.8	1.2	18.6	0.8	18.2	1.3	18.7
02	Hexham	1.6	19.0	3.9	21.3	1.1	18.5	2.5	19.9
03	Beresfield	0.3	17.7	0.7	18.1	0.6	18.0	1.0	18.4
04	Heatherbrae	0.5	17.9	1.4	18.8	0.9	18.3	1.6	19.0
05	Williamtown	0.2	17.6	0.4	17.8	0.4	17.8	0.7	18.1
06	Fullerton Cove	0.2	17.6	0.5	17.9	0.5	17.9	0.8	18.2
07	Fern Bay	0.3	17.7	0.7	18.1	0.6	18.0	1.0	18.4
08	Kooragang	0.3	17.7	0.8	18.2	0.5	17.9	0.8	18.2
09	Stockton	0.2	17.6	0.6	18.0	0.3	17.7	0.5	17.9
10	Carrington	0.2	17.6	0.6	18.0	0.3	17.7	0.6	18.0
11	Mayfield	0.1	17.5	0.4	17.8	0.2	17.6	0.3	17.7
12	Hamilton	0.1	17.5	0.4	17.8	0.2	17.6	0.3	17.7
13	Newcastle	0.2	17.6	0.4	17.8	0.3	17.7	0.4	17.8
14	Merewether	0.1	17.5	0.4	17.8	0.2	17.6	0.3	17.7
15	Adamstown	0.1	17.5	0.3	17.7	0.2	17.6	0.3	17.7
16	New Lambton	0.1	17.5	0.2	17.6	0.2	17.6	0.4	17.8
17	Jesmond	0.2	17.6	0.6	18.0	0.2	17.6	0.4	17.8
18	Warabrook	0.1	17.5	0.3	17.7	0.3	17.7	0.5	17.9
19	Sandgate	0.1	17.5	0.4	17.8	0.2	17.6	0.4	17.8
20	Maryland	0.4	17.8	0.8	18.2	0.2	17.6	0.5	17.9
21	Cameron Park	0.2	17.6	0.5	17.9	0.2	17.6	0.4	17.8
22	Cardiff	0.1	17.5	0.3	17.7	0.2	17.6	0.3	17.7
23	Glendale	0.1	17.5	0.3	17.7	0.1	17.5	0.2	17.6
24	Black Hill	0.3	17.7	0.7	18.1	0.3	17.7	0.5	17.9
25	Thornton	0.4	17.8	1.0	18.4	0.5	17.9	0.8	18.2
26	Ashtonfield	0.3	17.7	0.7	18.1	0.3	17.7	0.5	17.9
27	East Maitland	0.3	17.7	0.7	18.1	0.6	18.0	1.0	18.4
28	Millers Rest	0.2	17.6	0.5	17.9	0.3	17.7	0.5	17.9
29	Raymond Terrace	0.5	17.9	1.1	18.5	0.4	17.8	0.7	18.1
30	Maitland	0.2	17.6	0.5	17.9	0.4	17.8	0.7	18.1
31	Morpeth	0.2	17.6	0.4	17.8	0.2	17.6	0.3	17.7
32	Osterley	0.2	17.6	0.4	17.8	0.3	17.7	0.5	17.9
33	Medowie	0.2	17.6	0.6	18.0	0.3	17.7	0.5	17.9
34	Largs	0.1	17.5	0.3	17.7	0.2	17.6	0.3	17.7
35	Brandy Hill	0.1	17.5	0.4	17.8	0.3	17.7	0.5	17.9
36	Eagleton	0.4	17.8	1.1	18.5	0.2	17.6	0.3	17.7
Maximum by Receptor Type									
Discrete	-	1.6	19.0	3.9	21.3	1.1	18.5	2.5	19.9
Gridded	-	3.1	20.5	7.6	25.0	4.5	21.9	6.4	23.8
Criterion	-	-	25	-	25	-	25	-	25

Table 7.6: Summary of model predictions – Annual average PM_{2.5}

Receptor	Locality	Gas Turbine Option				Reciprocating Engine Option			
		Natural Gas		Distillate		Natural Gas		Distillate	
		Inc.	Cum.	Inc.	Cum.	Inc.	Cum.	Inc.	Cum.
01	Tomago	0.02	8.1*	0.06	8.2*	0.05	8.1*	0.08	8.2*
02	Hexham	0.03	8.1*	0.08	8.2*	0.05	8.2*	0.09	8.2*
03	Beresfield	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.04	8.1*
04	Heatherbrae	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
05	Williamstown	0.01	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
06	Fullerton Cove	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
07	Fern Bay	0.01	8.1*	0.04	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.04	8.1*
08	Kooragang	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.04	8.1*
09	Stockton	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
10	Carrington	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
11	Mayfield	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
12	Hamilton	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
13	Newcastle	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
14	Merewether	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
15	Adamstown	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
16	New Lambton	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
17	Jesmond	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
18	Warabrook	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
19	Sandgate	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
20	Maryland	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
21	Cameron Park	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
22	Cardiff	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
23	Glendale	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
24	Black Hill	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
25	Thornton	0.02	8.1*	0.04	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.04	8.1*
26	Ashtonfield	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
27	East Maitland	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
28	Millers Rest	0.01	8.1*	0.03	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.03	8.1*
29	Raymond Terrace	0.02	8.1*	0.04	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.04	8.1*
30	Maitland	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
31	Morpeth	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
32	Osterley	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
33	Medowie	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
34	Largs	0.01	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
35	Brandy Hill	0.01	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.01	8.1*
36	Eagleton	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*	0.01	8.1*	0.02	8.1*
Maximum by Receptor Type									
Discrete	-	0.03	8.1*	0.08	8.2*	0.05	8.2*	0.09	8.2*
Gridded	-	0.04	8.1*	0.10	8.2*	0.10	8.2*	0.16	8.3*
Criterion	-	-	8.0	-	8.0	-	8.0	-	8.0

Notes: - Exceedances shown in **bold font** and marked with an asterisk. Background exceedances result in exceedances for all predictions.
- PM emissions assumed to occur as PM_{2.5}, hence incremental PM_{2.5} results are equal to incremental PM₁₀ results.
- Predictions based on continuous operation. Annual average predictions at estimated (14%) operating duty would be approx. 7 times lower than those presented.


Figure 7.5: Maximum incremental 24 hour average PM_{2.5}* predictions – Gas Turbine Option (µg/m³)



Notes:


- Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
- Contour Levels: 1, 2, 5 µg/m³.
- Noting that all PM emissions have been assumed to occur as PM_{2.5}, these contour isopleths are also representative of incremental PM₁₀ predictions.

Figure 7.6: Maximum incremental 24 hour average PM_{2.5} predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option (µg/m³)




- Notes:
- Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
 - Contour Levels: 1, 2, 5 µg/m³.
 - All PM emissions have been assumed to occur as PM_{2.5}, hence these contour isopleths also represent of incremental PM₁₀ predictions.

Figure 7.7: Incremental annual average PM_{2.5} predictions – Gas Turbine Option (µg/m³)



- Notes:
- Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
 - Contour Levels: 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1.0 µg/m³.
 - All PM emissions have been assumed to occur as PM_{2.5}, hence these contour isopleths also represent of incremental PM₁₀ predictions.
 - Predictions based on continuous operation. Annual average predictions at estimated (14%) operating duty would be approx. 7 times lower than those presented.

Figure 7.8: Incremental annual average PM_{2.5} predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option (µg/m³)



- Notes:
- Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
 - Contour Levels: 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1.0 µg/m³.
 - Predictions based on continuous operation. Annual average predictions at estimated (14%) operating duty would be approx. 7 times lower than those presented.

7.4 Acrolein and Formaldehyde


Table 7.7 presents a summary of 99.9th percentile 1 hour average acrolein and formaldehyde predictions. Figure 7.9 and Figure 7.10 present contour isopleths of these predictions.

Table 7.7: Summary of model predictions – 99.9th percentile 1 hour average acrolein and formaldehyde

Receptor	Locality	Acrolein				Formaldehyde			
		Gas Turbine Option		Reciprocating Engine Option		Gas Turbine Option		Reciprocating Engine Option	
		Natural Gas	Distillate	Natural Gas	Distillate	Natural Gas	Distillate	Natural Gas	Distillate
01	Tomago	0.001	0.001	0.48*	0.001	0.1	0.0	4.1	4.3
02	Hexham	0.002	0.002	0.68*	0.001	0.2	0.1	5.8	5.2
03	Beresfield	0.001	0.000	0.28	0.001	0.1	0.0	2.4	2.4
04	Heatherbrae	0.001	0.000	0.24	0.001	0.1	0.0	2.0	2.1
05	Williamtown	0.000	0.000	0.13	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1
06	Fullerton Cove	0.000	0.000	0.13	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1
07	Fern Bay	0.001	0.001	0.25	0.001	0.1	0.0	2.1	2.2
08	Kooragang	0.001	0.000	0.22	0.001	0.1	0.0	1.9	2.0
09	Stockton	0.000	0.000	0.16	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.6
10	Carrington	0.000	0.000	0.13	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1
11	Mayfield	0.000	0.000	0.14	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.3
12	Hamilton	0.000	0.000	0.11	0.000	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.1
13	Newcastle	0.000	0.000	0.13	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1
14	Merewether	0.000	0.000	0.11	0.000	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.0
15	Adamstown	0.000	0.000	0.14	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.3
16	New Lambton	0.000	0.000	0.15	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3
17	Jesmond	0.000	0.000	0.12	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.1
18	Warabrook	0.000	0.000	0.20	0.000	0.1	0.0	1.7	1.5
19	Sandgate	0.000	0.000	0.15	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.5
20	Maryland	0.000	0.000	0.11	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
21	Cameron Park	0.000	0.000	0.09	0.000	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.9
22	Cardiff	0.000	0.000	0.09	0.000	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.8
23	Glendale	0.000	0.000	0.09	0.000	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.9
24	Black Hill	0.000	0.000	0.14	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.3
25	Thornton	0.001	0.000	0.20	0.001	0.1	0.0	1.7	2.0
26	Ashtonfield	0.001	0.001	0.16	0.000	0.1	0.0	1.3	1.7
27	East Maitland	0.000	0.000	0.22	0.001	0.1	0.0	1.9	1.9
28	Millers Rest	0.000	0.000	0.15	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.4
29	Raymond Terrace	0.001	0.001	0.41	0.001	0.1	0.0	3.4	3.0
30	Maitland	0.000	0.000	0.19	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.5
31	Morpeth	0.000	0.000	0.10	0.000	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.8
32	Osterley	0.000	0.000	0.13	0.000	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.9
33	Medowie	0.000	0.000	0.17	0.000	0.1	0.0	1.5	1.5
34	Largs	0.000	0.000	0.07	0.000	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.7
35	Brandy Hill	0.000	0.000	0.09	0.000	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7
36	Eagleton	0.001	0.000	0.13	0.000	0.1	0.0	1.1	0.9
Maximum by Receptor Type									
Discrete	-	0.002	0.002	0.68*	0.001	0.2	0.1	5.8	5.2
Gridded	-	0.003	0.002	1.25*	0.003	0.3	0.1	10.6	9.3
Criterion	-	0.42				20			


Note: Exceedances shown in **bold font** and marked with an asterisk.

Figure 7.9: 99.9th percentile incremental 1 hour average acrolein predictions – Gas Turbine Option ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)




Notes: - Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
- Contour Levels: 0.001, 0.002, 0.005 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

Figure 7.10: 99.9th percentile incremental 1 hour average acrolein predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)




Notes: - Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
- Contour Levels: 0.001, 0.002, 0.005, 0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

Figure 7.11: 99.9th percentile incremental 1 hour average formaldehyde predictions – Gas Turbine Option ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)



Notes: - Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
- Contour Levels: 0.05, 0.1, 0.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

Figure 7.12: 99.9th percentile incremental 1 hour average formaldehyde predictions – Reciprocating Engine Option ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)



Notes: - Base image sourced from Google Earth Pro.
- Contour Levels: 1, 2, 5, 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

8. LOCAL CUMULATIVE ASSESSMENT

The assessment has addressed potential air quality impacts across a 30 x 30 km region. The cumulative contribution of regional air pollution sources has been addressed at a broad scale through the review and incorporation of regional ambient air quality data into the assessment predictions.

To understand potential isolated impacts from the cumulative impact of the Proposal and existing local emission sources, a review of local air emission sources was conducted. The National Pollutant Inventory (NPI) air emission database³ was reviewed in order to identify the presence and relative scale of air emission sources with pollutants common to the Proposal.

Table 8.1 shows a summary of these sources, with proximity to the Proposal, and annualised emission quantities for relevant pollutants.

Table 8.1: Annualised air emission quantities for sources near to the Proposal

Facility	Distance / Bearing from Proposal	Annualised Air Emissions – NPI 2017/18 Reporting Year (kg)			
		NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM _{2.5}
Hunter Galvanising	1 km SSE	2,500	2,400	27	200
Tomago Aluminium Smelter	1.5 km SE	350,000	47,000,000	11,000,000	53,000
Newcastle Gas Storage Facility	2 km E	2,900	3,200	29	34
Proposal*	-	49,000	115,000	2,100	8,100

Note: *Assuming 14% annual average operating duty, maximum of both technology options, 50/50 fuel mix (natural gas/distillate).

These inventories identify the Tomago Aluminium Smelter ('the smelter') as a key existing emission source of interest in terms of potential localised cumulative air quality impacts. The smelter is operated by Tomago Aluminium Corporation (TAC).

Emissions from the NGSF have been assessed within the Project Approval and subsequent modifications, and been shown to be minor including:

- Maximum (non-emergency) incremental 1 hour average NO₂ sensitive receptor predictions of approximately 2 µg/m³ (assuming a NO₂:NO_x ratio of 0.2).
- Peak 1 hour average SO₂ sensitive receptor predictions of approximately 1 µg/m³.
- Peak 24 hour average PM_{2.5} sensitive receptor predictions of approximately 0.1 µg/m³.


These incremental contributions are all less than 1% of their respective criteria, and hence are not considered material in terms of potential cumulative impacts. Emissions from the Hunter Galvanising facility are anticipated to be of a similar level of significance.

To gain understanding of potential scale of cumulative impacts with the smelter, ERM has been provided with ambient monitoring data from the local SO₂ monitoring network operated by TAC. These data include annualised summaries of monitoring data collected at five sites within the network dating back to 2009, and inclusive of the following:

- Maximum, 99th, 90th and 75th percentile statistics.
- 10 minute, 1 hour and 24 hour averages.
- Annual number of exceedances.

Figure 8.1 shows the location of the five continuous real-time ambient air quality monitoring stations at which SO₂ monitoring is currently undertaken, whilst Table 8.2 through Table 8.4 provide the annual maximum monitoring results for 10 minute, 1 hour and 24 hour averages (respectively).

³ <http://www.npi.gov.au/npidata/action/load/map-search> (accessed June 2019).



Source: Adapted from TAC provided image.

Figure 8.1: Location of TAC SO₂ monitoring stations relative the Proposal and smelter.

Table 8.2: Annual maximum 10 minute average SO₂ concentrations from TAC monitoring network

Year	Maximum 10 minute average SO ₂ Measurement (µg/m ³)				
	Farm	Highway	Laverick Ave	Met Station	Site 179
2014	561	314	361	423	364
2015	554	308	304	356	543
2016	448	324	320	344	437
2017	576	280	463	403	402
2018	553	320	365	367	384
Criterion	712				

Table 8.3: Annual maximum 1 hour average SO₂ concentrations from TAC monitoring network

Year	Maximum 1 hour average SO ₂ Measurement (µg/m ³)				
	Farm	Highway	Laverick Ave	Met Station	Site 179
2014	454	239	263	320	273
2015	480	299	232	284	349
2016	405	265	241	276	320
2017	433	171	252	296	294
2018	498	248	248	318	295
Criterion	570				

Table 8.4: Annual maximum 24 hour average SO₂ concentrations from TAC monitoring network

Year	Maximum 24 hour average SO ₂ Measurement (µg/m ³)				
	Farm	Highway	Laverick Ave	Met Station	Site 179
2014	225	82	76	174	44
2015	217	113	82	126	140
2016	248	131	84	73	128
2017	237 (2)	52	109	151	96
2018	269 (1)	97	88	206	99
Criterion	228				

Note: Exceedances shown in **bold text**. Number of exceedances shown in italicised brackets.

As shown in Table 8.2 through Table 8.4, ambient SO₂ concentrations are elevated above the concentrations measured at Beresfield, but within NSW EPA impact assessment criteria, with the exception of the years 2017 and 2018, which contain three recorded exceedances of the 24 hour average criterion.

The risk of material cumulative impacts from the Proposal is primarily mitigated by the regulation of sulfur content within proposed fuels. Peak 1 hour average incremental SO₂ contributions in the order of 30 µg/m³ (assuming no sulfate emissions, and continuous operation at 100% plant load and fuel specification) limit the potential for the Proposal to form a material contribution to SO₂ concentrations that either approach or exceed the ambient air quality standards for SO₂.

As additional context, the 99.9th percentile (i.e. maximum hour in 1,000 hours) Proposal contours were reviewed for the scenario with greatest 1 hour SO₂ impact (reciprocating engine, natural gas). This percentile statistic is considered a conservative representation of peak impacts from a source that is anticipated to operate on an intermittent basis. These results contain a grid maximum of 9 µg/m³, with predictions in excess of 5 µg/m³ confined to small regions near to the Proposal as outlined in Figure 8.2. These predictions comprise approximately 1% of the criterion, and are predicted to occur 0.1% of the time (based on continuous operation), thus reinforcing the limited potential for the Proposal to form a material contribution to cumulative SO₂ concentrations.



Figure 8.2: 99.9th percentile 1 hour average SO₂ predictions, reciprocating engine, natural gas (µg/m³)

9. CONCLUSIONS

This assessment has considered potential air quality impacts associated with construction and operation of the AGL Newcastle Power Station. The assessment has used a quantitative dispersion modelling analysis to estimate compliance of operational phase emissions with the NSW EPA impact assessment criteria.

The existing environment has been characterised in terms of climate, meteorology and ambient air quality, with identification of key meteorological patterns, and the status of ambient air quality compliance:

- Ambient air quality standards for NO₂, CO and SO₂ are currently met at all OEH monitoring locations across the 5 years reviewed, with significant margin between peak measurements and the corresponding standards.
- Short term (24 hour average) ambient air quality standards for PM (i.e. PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) are exceeded at all locations across the 5 years reviewed.
- The long term (annual average) PM_{2.5} ambient air quality standard is reached at Wallsend, and exceeded at all other locations within the 5 years reviewed. The long term (annual average) PM₁₀ ambient air quality standard is exceeded at Carrington, Stockton and Mayfield, and met at Wallsend, Beresfield, and Newcastle. A review of these exceedances noted the dominance of extraneous events such as dust storms and bushfire activity.

Manufacturer data and US EPA emission factors have been used to estimate emissions for representative gas turbine and reciprocating engine technology options. Both natural gas and distillate fuels have been assessed resulting in a total of 4 assessment scenarios. These emissions were applied on a continuous basis in the NSW EPA-approved CALPUFF dispersion modelling package, in conjunction with regional background air quality and meteorological datasets for the year 2018.

Modelling predictions were processed into the concentration statistics required for assessment against NSW EPA impact assessment criteria.

Pollutants with a project contribution in excess of 10% of relevant impact assessment criteria are confined to NO₂ and particulate matter (both technology options), as well as acrolein and formaldehyde (reciprocating engine option only):

- Cumulative NO₂ predictions were estimated using the ozone limiting method, in conjunction with hourly time varying ozone and NO₂ concentrations sourced from the OEH Beresfield AQMS. The maximum 1 hour average cumulative NO₂ predictions was 123 µg/m³, equal to 50% of the criterion.
- Peak PM_{2.5} predictions were approaching criteria, with a peak incremental PM_{2.5} prediction of 7.6 µg/m³. When added to the peak background concentration of 17.1 µg/m³, results in a (maximum + maximum) cumulative concentration of 24.7 µg/m³, which is approaching the NSW EPA criterion of 25 µg/m³. Refinement of the analysis through the use of a time varying background would likely produce predictions well below those presented in this report.
- Exceedances of acrolein were predicted for the reciprocating engine option when operational on natural gas fuel, with the peak prediction across the modelling domain a factor of three times above the NSW EPA acrolein criterion. This prediction is based on US EPA emission factor-based estimates of acrolein emissions, for a 4-stroke lean burn gas engine with a conservative estimate of oxidation catalyst control efficiency.

To further investigate the potential for acrolein emissions to produce adverse air quality impacts, a review of the NSW EPA and international screening criteria was conducted. Based on assessment against these additional criteria, all predictions were estimated to be within respective screening criteria, as formulated to be protective of adverse public health outcomes.

Accordingly, the analysis conducted within this assessment indicates that the potential for the Proposal to generate exceedances is low, and manageable through effective operation of the proposed emission controls.

Lastly, a review of potential cumulative impacts with other local sources of air emissions was conducted using the National Pollutant Inventory database. This review identified the Tomago Aluminium Smelter as the key emission source of interest in terms of potential localised cumulative impacts. Accordingly, a review of the smelter's local air quality monitoring data was conducted. On the basis of this review, the potential for smelter and the Proposal to collectively generate localised exceedances of air quality standards is considered minor, with broader cumulative impacts having been addressed through the incorporation of background monitoring data in the dispersion modelling analysis.

10. REFERENCES

- ABARE 2011, *Energy in Australia 2011*, Australian Government Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism, 2008, http://data.daff.gov.au/data/warehouse/pe_abares99001789/Energy_in_Aust_2011_13f.pdf (accessed June 2019).
- AEMO 2017, *Gas Quality Guidelines*, Australian Energy Market Operator, September 2017, <https://www.aemo.com.au/-/media/Files/Gas/DWGM/2017/Gas-Quality-Guidelines-Version-10.pdf> (accessed May 2019).
- AG 2019, *Fuel Quality Standards (Automotive Diesel) Determination 2019*, Australian Government, 18 March 2019, <https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/F2019L00456> (accessed May 2019).
- ATSDR 2017 *Minimal Risk Levels (MRLs) August 2018*, United States Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/mrls/pdfs/atsdr_mrls.pdf, August 2018, (accessed October 2019).
- EPA 2016, *The Approved methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in New South Wales*, NSW Environment Protection Authority, December 2016, <https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/-/media/epa/corporate-site/resources/air/approved-methods-for-modelling-and-assessment-of-air-pollutants-in-nsw-160666.pdf?la=en&hash=D4131297808565F94E13B186D8C70E7BD02B4C3D> (accessed April 2019).
- EPAV 2005, Ausplume Dispersion Model, Version 6.0, EPA Victoria, 2005.
- GoV 2001, State Environment Protection Policy (Air Quality Management), Victoria Government Gazette, No. S 240, Government of Victoria, Friday, 21 December 2001, <https://www.epa.vic.gov.au/-/media/Publications/S240.pdf> (accessed October 2019).
- Lanier et al. 2004, *Development Of Fine Particulate Emission Factors and Speciation Profiles for Oil- and Gas-Fired Combustion Systems: Technical Memorandum: Conceptual Model Of Sources Of Variability In Combustion Turbine PM₁₀ Emissions Data*, March 2004. <https://www.nyserda.ny.gov/-/media/Nyserda/Files/Reports/2004/Fine-Particulate-Emission-Conceptual-Model.pdf> (accessed July 2019).
- MECA 2015, *Emission Control Technology for Stationary Internal Combustion Engines*, Manufacturers of Emission Controls Association, May 2015, http://www.meca.org/resources/MECA_stationary_IC_engine_report_0515_final.pdf (accessed May 2019).
- MoE 2019, *Ontario's Ambient Air Quality Criteria – Sorted by Contaminant Name*, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Published December 10, 2016, Updated April 30 2019, <https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontarios-ambient-air-quality-criteria-sorted-contaminant-name> (accessed October 2019).
- NPI, 2019 *National Pollutant Inventory Database* (website), Australian Government, Department of the Environment and Energy, <http://www.npi.gov.au/npidata/action/load/map-search> (accessed June 2019).
- OEH 2016, *Lower Hunter Particle Characterisation Study, Final Report to the NSW Environment Protection Authority*, Office of Environment and Heritage, CSIRO, ANSTO, April 2016, <https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Air/lower-hunter-particle-characterisation-study-final-report-160243.pdf>, (accessed May 2019).
- OEH 2018a, *New South Wales Annual Compliance Report 2016, National Environment Protection (Ambient Air Quality) Measure*, Office of Environment and Heritage, February 2018, <https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Air/national-environment-protection-measure-ambient-air-quality-nsw-compliance-report-2016-180076.pdf>, (accessed August 2019).
- OEH 2018b, *Air Quality in Newcastle: Summer 2017-18*, Office of Environment and Heritage, July 2018, <https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Air/air-quality-monitoring-network-newcastle-summer-2017-18-180289.pdf> (accessed June 2019).

OEH 2018c, *Air Quality in Newcastle: Autumn 2018*, Office of Environment and Heritage, September 2018, <https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Air/air-quality-monitoring-network-newcastle-autumn-2018-180437.pdf> (accessed June 2019).

OEH 2018d, *Air Quality in Newcastle: Winter 2018*, Office of Environment and Heritage, December 2018, <https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Air/air-quality-monitoring-network-newcastle-winter-2018-180622.pdf> (accessed June 2019).

OEH 2018e, *Air Quality in Newcastle: Spring 2018*, Office of Environment and Heritage, February 2019, <https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Air/air-quality-monitoring-network-newcastle-spring-2018-190049.pdf> (accessed June 2019).

OEH 2018f, *Air Quality in Newcastle: Summer 2018-19*, Office of Environment and Heritage, April 2019, <https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Air/air-quality-monitoring-network-newcastle-summer-2019-190150.pdf> (accessed June 2019).

OEHHA 2015, *Air Toxics Hot Spots Program, Risk Assessment Guidelines – Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments*, Air, Community, and Environmental Research Branch, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, California Environmental Protection Agency, February 2015, <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/cnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf> (accessed October 2019).

PAEH 2011, *Review of Meteorology in the Newcastle Inner City and Port Neighbourhood*, PAEHolmes 29 July 2011, <https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/-/media/epa/corporate-site/resources/nccce/revmeteorologynewcastle.pdf> (accessed June 2019).

PAEH 2011, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment – Newcastle Gas Storage Facility*, PAEHolmes, 17 January 2011 <https://majorprojects.accelo.com/public/714c19ce84b7252dc734c3b83a950ee5/Vol%205%20App%2014%20Pt%201%20of%201%20-%20Air%20Quality%20&%20Greenhouse%20Gas%20Assmnt.pdf> (accessed June 2019).

SWA 2019, *Draft Evaluation Report, Worker Exposure Standard – Acrolein*, Worksafe Australia, 2019 <https://engage.swa.gov.au/48690/documents/113502> (accessed October 2019).

TCEQ 2018, *Air Quality Modelling Guidelines*, APDG 6232, Air Permits Division, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, September 2018, <https://www.tceq.texas.gov/assets/public/permitting/air/Modeling/guidance/airquality-mod-guidelines6232.pdf>, (accessed October 2019).

TCEQ 2019, *Texas Commission on Environmental Quality – Effects Screening Levels, Acrolein, via Texas Air Monitoring Information System (TAMIS)*, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, <https://www17.tceq.texas.gov/tamis/index.cfm?fuseaction=home.welcome>, (accessed October 2019).

US EPA 2006, *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors – Chapter 3: Stationary Internal Combustion Sources, AP-42*, Fifth Edition, Volume I, United States Environmental Protection Agency, <https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch03/index.html> (accessed May 2018).

US EPA 2017, *NO₂/NO_x In-Stack Ratio (ISR) Database*, United States Environmental Protection Agency, https://www3.epa.gov/scram001/no2_isr_database.htm (accessed April 2019).

APPENDIX A DETAILED ACROLEIN ASSESSMENT

A1.1 Overview

The dispersion modelling has predicted that maximum offsite 1 hour average 99.9th percentile acrolein predictions would result in a threefold exceedance of the NSW EPA impact assessment criterion. In order to permit a more refined assessment of potential adverse air quality impacts, additional acrolein assessment has been undertaken, involving the following tasks:

- A review of the background and basis of derivation for the NSW EPA acrolein criterion.
- A review of contemporary public health-endpoint based screening criteria.
- An expanded assessment of acrolein predictions against alternative screening criteria.

Detail of this analysis is provided in the following sections.

A2.1 NSW Approved Methods Acrolein Criterion

The Approved Methods provide a range of air quality impact assessment criteria for application in the assessment of air emissions from new or modified pollutant sources. The document contains criteria for ‘principal toxic pollutants’, inclusive of acrolein, which are to be applied against the incremental 99.9th percentile 1 hour average predictions for the facility of interest, in isolation. These criteria are applicable at and beyond the boundary of the facility under assessment.

These criteria have been referenced from EPA Victoria “design criteria” for Class 3 indicator pollutants (GoV, 2001) which in turn, were developed from (current as of 2001) occupational exposure standards as per the following process:

“Design Criteria... (for Class 2 indicator pollutants) ...have been derived from the current Worksafe Australia Occupational Health and Safety TWA values divided by a safety factor of 30. This safety factor accounts for extrapolation from a healthy adult exposed over their working life to the general population potentially exposed over a lifetime. This extrapolation takes into account the protection of sensitive groups including the elderly and children.”

“Design criteria for Class 3 indicators are derived in a similar manner to those for toxicity based Class 2 indicators. An additional safety factor of 10 is applied due to the seriousness of the potential health effects arising from exposure to these pollutants”

Table A.1 shows the basis derivation for the NSW EPA acrolein criterion from the corresponding occupational criterion.

Table A.1: Basis of derivation for NSW EPA acrolein impact assessment criterion

Parameter	Value	Units	Source
Australian 8 hour occupational standard (TWA) – Circa. 2001*	100	ppb	(SWA, 2019)
VIC EPA design criterion TWA conversion (safety) factor	300	-	(GoV, 2001)
VIC EPA design criterion (3 minute average)	0.33	ppb	
Conversion factor (3 minute to 1 hour)	1.82	-	(EPAV, 2005)
NSW EPA impact assessment criterion	0.18	ppb	(EPA, 2017)
	0.42	µg/m ³	

Note: *This standard is current, has been in place since 1991 and is understood to be under review (SWA, 2019).

A3.1 Review of Additional Acrolein Screening Criteria

A brief review of contemporary public health endpoint-based assessment standards has been undertaken in order to provide a more consolidated range of criteria for consideration in the assessment of potential acrolein impacts.

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Effects Screening Levels (TCEQ; 2018, 2019)

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) provide a diverse range of Effects Screening Levels (ESLs) for use in dispersion modelling assessment of new and modified sources of air pollution. TCEQ (2018) provides the following context on the ESLs.

“Effects Screening Level (ESL): Guideline concentrations derived by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) and used to evaluate ambient air concentrations of constituents. Based on a constituent’s potential to cause adverse health effects, odor nuisances, vegetation effects, or materials damage. Health-based screening levels are set at levels lower than those reported to produce adverse health effects, and are set to protect the general public, including sensitive subgroups such as children, the elderly, or people with existing respiratory conditions. If an air concentration of a constituent is below the screening level, adverse effects are not expected. If an air concentration of a constituent is above the screening level, it is not indicative that an adverse effect will occur, but rather that further evaluation is warranted.”

TCEQ (2019) also outlines a tiered methodology for the application of the ESL’s. Of these, Tier II represents an intermediate (screening level) which involves assessment of maximum 1 hour average sensitive receptor predictions (e.g. a residence) against the ESL, and assessment of maximum 1 hour average industrial receptor predictions against a level equal to double that of the ESL. The guidance also outlines a Tier III assessment, which involves more detailed consideration of potential impacts should exceedances be predicted within the Tier II assessment.

The 1 hour average and annual average acrolein ESLs are 3.2 µg/m³ and 0.82 µg/m³ (respectively).

Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change Ambient Air Quality Criteria (MoE, 2019)

The Ontario Ambient Air Quality Criteria (AAQCs) comprise air quality criteria intended for use in environmental assessment and assessment of ambient air quality data, where an AAQC is defined as “a desirable concentration of a contaminant in air and is used to assess general air quality resulting from all sources of a contaminant to air” (MoE, 2019).

The 1 hour average and 24 hour average acrolein AAQCs are 4.5 µg/m³ and 0.4 µg/m³ (respectively).

Agency for Toxic Substances and Diseases Registry (ATSDR) Minimal Risk Levels (MRLs), (ATSDR, 2019)

ATSDR MRLs are provided as a human health risk assessment screening tool for assessing cases where potential health effects should be considered more closely. They are based on the ‘no observed adverse effect level/uncertainty factor’ (NOAEL/UF) approach to derivation MRLs for hazardous substances.

They are set below levels that, based on current information “might cause adverse health effects in the people most sensitive to such substance-induced effects.” MRLs are derived for acute (1-14 days), intermediate (>14-364 days), and chronic (365 days and longer) exposure durations, and for both oral and inhalation exposure routes.

The acute and intermediate MRLs for acrolein are 7.0 µg/m³ and 0.1 µg/m³ (respectively).

California EPA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program – Reference Exposure Levels (OEHHA, 2015)

The Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment program provides a framework for the assessment of extent of airborne emissions from stationary sources and the potential public health impacts of those emissions.

This framework includes an acute, 8 hour and chronic Reference Exposure Levels (RELs) for a range of substances as per the following (respective) definitions:

- “an acute REL is an exposure that is not likely to cause adverse health effects in a human population, including sensitive subgroups, exposed to that concentration (in units of micrograms per cubic meter or $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) for the specified exposure duration on an intermittent basis.”
- “an 8-hour REL is an exposure that is not likely to cause adverse health effects in a human population, including sensitive subgroups, exposed to that concentration (in units of micrograms per cubic meter or $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) for an 8-hour exposure duration on a regular (including daily) basis
- “A chronic REL is a concentration level (expressed in units of micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) for inhalation exposure... ..at or below which no adverse health effects are anticipated following long-term exposure.”

The acute, 8 hour and chronic acrolein RELs are 2.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, 0.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and 0.35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (respectively).

Summary of Screening Criteria

Table A.2 presents a summary of acrolein screening criteria identified as relevant to this assessment.

Table A.2: Summary of acrolein criteria

Default Application	Exposure Duration	Criterion Type	Value	Assessment Statistic	Applicability
Dispersion Modelling Assessment	Acute	NSW EPA IAC	0.42	1 hour (99.9 th percentile)	At and beyond boundary
		TCEQ ESL	3.2	1 hour (maximum)	
		Ontario AAQC	4.5	1 hour	
	Sub-Acute		0.4	24 hour	
	Chronic	TCEQ ESL	0.82	Annual	
Human Health Risk Assessment – Screening*	Acute	OEHHA REL	2.5	1 hour	At sensitive receptors**
			0.7	8 hour	
	Sub-Acute / Intermediate	ATSDR MRL	7.0	24 hour	
			0.1	1 – 14 day	
	Chronic	OEHHA REL	0.35	Annual	

*For cases where an emission source is not pre-existing, these figures are regularly used in the evaluation of dispersion modelling results.

**In the case of TCEQ-ESLs, Tier II assessment requires application of the ESL at residential receptors, with a doubling of the ESL at off-site industrial receptors (OEHHA, 2019).

A4.1 Acrolein Assessment

Table A.3 presents the results of the Proposal dispersion modelling (reciprocating engine, natural gas option) against the range of criteria identified in Section A3.1.

A contour isopleth of the maximum 1 hour average acrolein prediction is also provide in Figure A.1.

Table A.3: Assessment of model predictions against reviewed acrolein criteria

Criterion Type	Model Prediction ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Criterion ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Assessment Statistic	Applicable Result
NSW EPA IAC	1.25	0.42	1 hour (99.9 th percentile)	Grid Maximum
TCEQ ESL	2.0	3.2	1 hour maximum	Maximum Residential Receptor*
Ontario AAQC		4.5		
OEHHA REL		2.5		
OEHHA REL	0.5	0.7	8 hour maximum	
Ontario AAQC	0.2	0.4	24 hour maximum	
ATSDR MRL		7.0	24 hour maximum	
ATSDR MRL	0.05	0.1	7 day maximum**	
TCEQ ESL	0.01	0.82	Annual	
OEHHA REL		0.35		

Note: *Maximum residential receptor results interpolated from gridded receptor predictions.

**1 – 14 day MRL treated as applicable to maximum 7 day average prediction.

These results indicate the following:

- As shown in Table A.3, with exception of the NSW EPA criterion, all other predictions are within respective assessment criteria, as formulated to be protective of adverse public health outcomes.
- Model predictions are approaching both acute and sub-acute OEHHA RELs.
- Annual average model predictions are significantly lower than respective (chronic) criteria.




Figure A.1: Maximum 1 hour average acrolein prediction ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)

APPENDIX B METEOROLOGICAL MODELLING

TAPM is a three dimensional meteorological and air pollution model produced by the CSIRO Division of Atmospheric Research (Hurley, 2002a, 2002b; Hurley et al., 2002a, 2002b; Hibberd et al., 2003; Luhar & Hurley, 2003). TAPM solves the fundamental fluid dynamics and scalar transport equations to predict meteorology and pollutant concentrations. It consists of coupled prognostic meteorological and air pollution dispersion components.

TAPM has been used to provide upper-air meteorological for the CALMET meteorological pre-processor. TAPM incorporates the following databases for input to its computations:

- Gridded database of terrain heights on a latitude/longitude grid of 30 second grid spacing, (around one kilometre). This default dataset is supplemented by a finer resolution dataset at nine second spacing (around 270 metres) for this assessment.
- Australian vegetation and soil type data at three minute grid spacing, (around five kilometres).
- Rand's global long term monthly mean sea-surface temperatures on a longitude/latitude grid at one degree grid spacing (around 100 kilometres).
- Six-hourly synoptic scale analyses on a latitude/longitude grid at 0.75-degree grid spacing, (around 75 kilometres), derived from the local analysis and prediction system (LAPS) data from the Bureau of Meteorology.

TAPM (V4.0.5) was run as per the configuration outlined in Table 4.1.

Table A.1: Summary of TAPM model configuration

Parameter	Value
Centre of TAPM Analysis	151.7167 °E, 32.825 °S
	379 876 mE, 6367 384 mN (MGA94, Zone 56H)
Number of grids	4
Grid spacing	30 km, 10 km, 3 km, 1km
Number of grid points	33 x 33 x 25
Period of analysis	29/12/2017 – 01/01/2019
Terrain information	AUSLIG 9 second DEM data
Mode	Meteorology
Wind assimilation	6 Sites influencing 3 levels, with a 7,500 m radius of influence: Beresfield, Williamtown, Stockton, Newcastle, Mayfield, Wallsend.
Data export	Data extracted as upper air format (UP.DAT) at all 6 assimilation sites.

A5.1 CALMET

CALMET V6.5.0 was configured as detailed below:

- Grid dimensions: 121 x 121 points at 250 m resolution (30 x 30 km), with grid origin: 363.875 kmE, 6352.875 kmN (MGA 94).
- Cell faces at: 0, 20, 30, 70, 130, 270, 530, 970, 1,530, 2,470, 3,530, 4,970 mAGL.
- Terrain information sourced from the 3 arc-second NASA SRTM terrain database.
- Land use data manually generated from aerial photography (see Figure A.1).
- Temperature from surface and upper air stations.
- Diagnostic wind module used with:
 - Extrapolation of winds using similarity theory.

- Horizontally and vertically varying winds with divergence minimisation. Froude number adjustment and slope flows incorporated with a radius of influence (TERRAD) of 3 km.
- No calculation of kinematic effects.
- R1 = 3 km, R2 = 40 km.




Figure A.1: Aerial image showing land use codes

Table A.2: Summary of land use types

Land Use Code	Description
10	Urban or built up land
30	Rangeland
40	Forest land
51	Streams and canals
54	Bays and estuaries
55	Oceans and seas
61	Forested wetland
70	Barren land

ERM has over 160 offices across the following countries and territories worldwide

Argentina	The Netherlands
Australia	New Zealand
Belgium	Norway
Brazil	Panama
Canada	Peru
Chile	Poland
China	Portugal
Colombia	Puerto Rico
France	Romania
Germany	Russia
Guyana	Singapore
Hong Kong	South Africa
India	South Korea
Indonesia	Spain
Ireland	Sweden
Italy	Switzerland
Japan	Taiwan
Kazakhstan	Tanzania
Kenya	Thailand
Malaysia	UK
Mexico	US
Mozambique	Vietnam
Myanmar	

ERM Sydney

Environmental Resources Management
Australia Pacific Pty Ltd
Level 15, 309 Kent Street
Sydney NSW 2000 Australia

Telephone +61 2 8584 8888
Facsimile +61 2 9299 7502

www.erm.com