

**APPLICATION FOR POSTPONEMENT OF THE MINIMUM EMISSION STANDARDS
COMPLIANCE TIMEFRAMES AND REQUEST FOR ALTERNATIVE LIMITS FOR PARTICULATE
MATTER, SULPHUR DIOXIDE AND NITROGEN OXIDES AT TUTUKA POWER STATION**

Date: November 2018

Table of Contents

1	List of Tables.....	2
2	List of Figures.....	2
3	List of Acronyms	3
4	Executive Summary	3
5	Introduction	6
6	Legal Basis for Decision Making	8
6.1	Overview.....	8
6.2	Regulatory requirements.....	9
6.3	Request for condonation of late submission of MES application.....	9
6.4	Changes in regulatory framework.....	10
6.5	The need to amend variation requests	10
7	Previous postponement application.....	11
7.1	Previous commitments	11
8	Reasons motivating this postponement application	12
8.1	Current PM, NO _x and SO ₂ emissions.....	12
8.2	Technology options for emission reduction	15
8.2.1	PM emission reduction	15
8.2.2	NO _x emission reduction.....	17
8.2.3	Sulphur dioxide emission reduction	17
8.3	Abatement technology retrofit schedule	18
8.3.1	Milestones towards complete abatement technology installation and optimisation .	18
8.3.2	Current schedule to reach compliance with new plant PM standards	20
8.3.3	Current schedule to reach compliance with new plant NO _x standards	20
8.4	Interim solutions to reduce emissions	22
8.5	Impact on ambient air quality	22
8.6	Health implications	23

9	Requested limits	24
10	Public Participation	25
11	Air Quality Offsets.....	25
12	Conclusion	26

1 List of Tables

Table 1	Overview of scenarios modelled for the atmospheric impact assessment as independently conducted in support of Tutuka’s MES postponement application.....	5
Table 2	Minimum Emission Standards for Category 1: Combustion Installations, sub-category 1, 1: Solid Fuel Combustion Installation.....	7
Table 3	Point source maximum emission rates as listed in Tutuka Power Station’s AEL, which represent the NAQO’s decision on the last postponement application. These are different to the limits listed in the MES.	7
Table 4	Requested emission limits as per Tutuka Power Station’s last postponement application (2014)	11
Table 5	Requested emission limits for Tutuka Power Station	24

2 List of Figures

Figure 1	Committed emission abatement retrofits and power station decommissioning dates to illustrate Eskom’s overall atmospheric emissions reduction plan as presented in Eskom’s last postponement application to the NAQO.....	12
Figure 2	Daily average PM emissions (mg/Nm ³) as measured at all six units at Tutuka Power Station from January to November 2017 against respective PM limits.....	13
Figure 3	Daily average NO _x emissions (mg/Nm ³) as measured at all six units at Tutuka Power Station from January to December 2017 against respective NO _x limits.....	14
Figure 4	Daily average SO ₂ emissions (mg/Nm ³) as measured at all six units at Tutuka Power Station from January to December 2017 against respective SO ₂ limits.....	15
Figure 5	Schematic illustration of the placement of SO ₃ injection, electro-static precipitator (ESP) and fabric filter plant (FFP), respectively, on a typical Eskom coal-fired power station. Note that the control options are either ESP and SO ₃ injection or FFP, not both	16
Figure 6	Simplified schematic presentation of a low NO _x burner. The incoming air is controlled in such a way that flame temperature is reduced, thereby limiting the formation of NO _x formation (SE Solutions (Pty) Ltd, 2013).....	17
Figure 7	Process-flow diagram outlining the simplified process from abatement technology concept design approval to compliance of unit’s emissions with ‘new plant’ standards	19

Figure 8 Committed emission abatement retrofits and power station decommissioning dates to illustrate Eskom’s overall atmospheric emissions reduction plan as presented in this current postponement application process..... 21

3 List of Acronyms

AIR	Atmospheric Impact Report
AEL	Atmospheric Emission License
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ESP	Electrostatic Precipitator
FGD	Flue gas desulphurisation
GNR	Government Notice No.
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAQO	National Air Quality Officer
NEM:AQA	National Environment Management: Air Quality Act, 2004 (Act No. 39 of 2004)
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998)
PM	Particulate Matter
PM10	Particulate Matter with a diameter of less than 10 µm
SO ₂	Sulphur dioxide
NOx	Nitrogen oxides
WHO	World Health Organisation

4 Executive Summary

Eskom herewith formally makes an application to the National Air Quality Officer (NAQO) for postponement¹ of the compliance timeframes associated with the Minimum Emission Standards (MES) and asks for alternative limits for particulate matter (PM) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) and sulphur dioxide (SO₂) for its Tutuka Power Station. This application also asks for reconsideration of the limits granted to Eskom in response to Tutuka Power Station’s previous postponement application that was made in 2014.

Tutuka is installing a Fabric Filter Plant (FFP) to reduce particulate emissions as per its previous postponement request but due to delays this will only be completed by 2027. An alternate daily PM emission limit of 300 mg/Nm³ or a monthly limit of 200 mg/Nm³ is thus requested until 2027, the station will comply with the MES limit once the FFP is installed. In order to reduce NOx emissions the station is planning to install low NOx burners. This project will be completed by 2026 and an alternative limit of 1200 mg/Nm³ is requested

¹ This application is a continuation/ reapplication of the 2014 postponement application made by Tutuka Power Station wherein Eskom indicated its plant design challenges that make it impossible to comply with the MES until relevant abatement technology has been installed on all of its units.

until then, the station will comply with the NOx MES once the project is complete. To reduce SO₂ to the new plant level of 1000 mg/Nm³ would require the installation of Flue Gas Desulphurisation (FGD) which is not considered appropriate for Tutuka and an alternate limit of 3000 mg/Nm³ is requested for the station until decommissioning.

In 2014, Tutuka Power Station applied for postponement from the 'existing plant' MES, for SO₂, NOx and PM for a period of five years motivated by the fact that the plant was not able to comply with such strict emission limits until relevant abatement technology installations had been completed on all units and in the belief that there would be increased opportunity for load reduction. The decision received on the postponement application, as made by the NAQO, granted postponement for SO₂ and only partially achievable limits for NOx and PM emissions:

Consequently, Tutuka complies with the approved emission limits, as stipulated in section 7.2 of its Atmospheric Emission Licence (AEL), but the station will be unable to comply with the more stringent limits (of a daily average PM limit of 200 mg/Nm³ from 1 January 2019 and a daily average NOx limit of 750 from 1 April 2020 as well as a daily average SO₂ limit of 500 from 1 January 2026). It is for this reason that this postponement application and alternative limits are requested for PM, NOx and SO₂.

Ambient air quality measurements from Grootdraai monitoring station, which is in close proximity to Tutuka Power Station, indicate that there is currently compliance with ambient air quality standards for PM, NOx and SO₂ on the ground. A dispersion modelling exercise was conducted by independent consultants (**Annexure A**) to predict ground-level ambient concentrations for various emission scenarios. The modelling reveals predicted ambient PM, NOx and SO₂ concentrations for three scenarios. Scenario 1, for current emissions, and Scenario 3, for 'new plant' emissions, both predict compliance with all ambient air quality standards on the ground. Scenario 2, for worst-case emissions, shows compliance with all ambient air quality standards except for the hourly and daily SO₂ limit in a small unpopulated area, which lies 9 km to the east of the power station. Overall the independently conducted study indicates that this application will have negligible measured and modelled health and environmental impacts on the ground. Indeed, Scenario 2, is the scenario that will not occur, it assumes 100% load factor which is not aligned to the operating philosophy of power stations. The current load factor is 54.41% (FY2018/19) which is less than the 100% as estimated in scenario 2. (Table 1). Furthermore scenario 2 was based on a request to maintain emissions at existing plant standard levels not the better alternative limits now requested given the MES regulation changes.

Table 1 Overview of scenarios modelled for the atmospheric impact assessment as independently conducted in support of Tutuka’s MES postponement application

Pollutant	Code	Scenario 1- Current actual emissions	Scenario 2 - Requested emission limits *	Scenario 3 - New plant compliance
		Rate (t/annum)	Rate (t/annum)	Rate (t/annum)
NO _x	Stack 1	47,166	119,368	74,605
	Stack 2	47,166	119,368	74,605
SO ₂	Stack 1	80,108	348,157	49,737
	Stack 2	80,108	348,157	49,737
PM	Stack 1	8,581	29,842	4,974
	Stack 2	8,581	29,842	4,974

* Scenario 2 was based on a request to maintain emissions at existing plant standard levels not the better alternative limits now requested given the MES regulation changes.

Eskom is aware that Tutuka is situated within the Highveld Priority Area and is, as such making a substantial financial investment into reducing emissions from Tutuka’s operations, through the installation of a fabric filter plant (FFP) and low NO_x burners (LNB) on each of the station’s units. The complete installation of these technologies will bring the station into full compliance with the ‘new plant’ standards for PM and NO_x, respectively.

Reasonable measures are being taken to ensure that emissions are maintained to levels below the current limits until the relevant abatement technology is installed on each unit. These measures include, but are not limited to taking load losses, undertaking frequent inspections of the ESP, fuel oil efficiencies and testing of the use of brine injection. The implementation of SO₂ abatement technology at Tutuka would cost an estimated R 38 billion and substantially increase the station’s water use, with, based on the modelling discussed above, limited improvement in the level of local ambient air quality compliance. As such, Eskom submits that investment into SO₂ abatement technology is not warranted, given the socio-techno-economic and environmental implications.

This application and public consultation in respect of it was completed prior to the publication of the updated MES regulations GNR 1207 on 31 October 2018. This application is already delayed and any further delays place the continued legal operation of Tutuka from 1 January 2019 at significant risk. As such the wording of this motivation has been revised in terms of wording of GNR 1207 but no changes to the supporting documents to the application have been made given time constraints. The changes to the motivation are not substantive and additional public participation on the application is not considered necessary. During the public participation process Eskom specifically reserved it’s right to amend the application based on changes to the regulatory framework. To request any further public consultation which delays the administrative processing of this application would be argued to be administratively unfair due to the far advanced state of the application at the time of publication of GNR 1207.

Eskom submits that the detail in this report and its appendices provides enough information for the NAQO to grant this postponement application and the proposed alternate limits since there is compliance with ambient standards on the ground and since plans are progressing for the installation of relevant abatement technology to reduce PM and NOx emissions to 'new plant' standard levels. Eskom believes that it has met the administrative and substantive requirements for the granting of a postponement application and as such requests that the NAQO approve the request as submitted.

5 Introduction

Eskom's Tutuka Power Station is a large coal-fired power station (with an installed capacity of 3600 MW) situated near Thuthukani and Standerton, in the Mpumalanga Province. Tutuka Power Station is located within the Highveld Priority Area (HPA) in terms of the NEMAQA. Tutuka's units were commissioned between 1985 and 1990, with an electrostatic precipitator (ESP) technology to reduce PM emissions. No further emissions abatement technology was included in the original design of the power station, and as such, NOx and SO₂ emissions released from the station have always been emitted unabated.

In terms of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act, 2004 (Act No. 39 of 2004) (NEMAQA), all of Eskom's coal and liquid fuel-fired power stations are required to meet the Minimum Emission Standards (MES) contained in GNR 893 on 22 November 2013 (as updated by GNR 1207 on 31 October 2018) which was promulgated in terms of Section 21 of the NEMAQA. GNR 893 (as amended by GNR 1207) provides for transitional arrangements in respect of the requirement for existing plants to meet the MES and provides that less stringent 'existing plant' limits must be achieved by existing plants by 1 April 2015, and more stringent 'new plant' limits must be achieved by existing plants by 1 April 2020 (**Table 2**).

Tutuka Power Station falls into the 'existing plant' category, and would be expected to meet the 'new plant' standards from 2020, however, as part of Tutuka's previous postponement application from the 'existing plant' standards, as submitted in 2014, the station was granted different limits for PM, NOx and SO₂ than those stipulated in the MES (**Table 3**).

Table 2 Minimum Emission Standards for Category 1: Combustion Installations, sub-category 1, 1: Solid Fuel Combustion Installation

Description:		Solid fuels combustion installations used primarily for steam raising or electricity generation.	
Application:		All installations with design capacity equal to or greater than 50 MW heat input per unit, based on the lower calorific value of the fuel used	
Substance or mixture of substances		Plant status	mg/Nm³ under normal conditions of 10% O₂, 273 Kelvin and 101,3 kPa.
Common name	Chemical symbol		
Nitrogen oxides	NO _x	Existing	1100
Nitrogen oxides	NO _x	New	750
Sulphur dioxide	SO ₂	Existing	3500
Sulphur dioxide	SO ₂	New	1000
Particulate matter	PM	Existing	100
Particulate matter	PM	New	50

Table 3 Point source maximum emission rates as listed in Tutuka Power Station's AEL, which represent the NAQO's decision on the last postponement application. These are different to the limits listed in the MES.

Pollutant Name	Maximum release rate		
	Limit value (mg/Nm³)	Date to be achieved by	Average period
PM	350	1 April 2015 – 31 December 2018	Daily
	200	1 January 2019 – 31 December 2019	Daily
	100	From 1 January 2020	Daily
SO₂	3400	1 April 2020 – 31 December 2025	Daily
NO_x	1200	1 April 2015-31 March 2020	Daily
	750	From 1 April 2020	Daily

Tutuka Power Station complies with the current emission limits for all of the listed pollutants. As the planned PM and NO_x abatement technology has not been installed to date and load reduction opportunities are less than anticipated, the station cannot comply with the more stringent PM emission limits that come into effect from 1 January 2019, and the more stringent NO_x emission limits that come into effect from 1 April 2020. Similarly, as it is not considered substantially environmentally beneficial or appropriate from a cost

benefit perspective to implement the abatement technology for the SO₂ 'new plant' limits, the station will not comply with the more stringent limits in 2026. This document represents Eskom's application for postponement of the 'existing'- and 'new plant' PM and NOx emission standards compliance timeframes, as well as the 'new plant' SO₂ compliance timeframes for Tutuka Power Station and requests alternate emission limits. This application also asks for reconsideration of the limits granted to Eskom in response to Tutuka Power Station's previous postponement application that was made in 2014: A daily PM emission limit of 300 mg/Nm³ or a monthly limit of 200 mg/Nm³, and a daily NOx emission limit of 1200 mg/Nm³ is being requested until relevant abatement technology has been fully installed. Finally, a limit of 3000 mg/Nm³ is also being requested for SO₂ (see Table 4 for details of these requests).

The legal basis for the application is outlined below, setting the scene for the requirements to be adhered to for an application of this nature. These requirements include the details of the postponement request as well as the substantiation of the reasons and motivations supporting the application.

An Atmospheric Impact Report (AIR), developed by an independent consultant, and a detailed summary of the public participation processes that were undertaken to bring Eskom's intentions to the attention of all interested and/or affected parties are attached as **Annexures A and B**, respectively².

6 Legal Basis for Decision Making

6.1 Overview

In terms of Section 14(1) of the NEMAQA, the Minister of Environmental Affairs ("Minister") must designate an officer in the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) as the National Air Quality Officer. In this regard, Dr Thuli Khumalo has been designated by the Minister as the current National Air Quality Officer. Section 14(4)(b) of the NEMAQA provides that the National Air Quality Officer may delegate a power or assign a duty to an official in the service of his/her administration. It is our understanding that no such delegation has been made for the area of jurisdiction in which the power station is located. Accordingly, Eskom submits this Application to the National Air Quality Officer (NAQO). This application is accompanied by a request for a variation of Tutuka's Atmospheric Emission Licence, in terms of section 46 of the NEMAQA, which is submitted to the licencing authority in the Gert Sibande District Municipality (**Annexure C**).

² This postponement application is being submitted prior to the postponement submission for the remaining Eskom fleet. These submissions will include a thorough cost benefit analysis as well as a cumulative atmospheric impact assessment. The non-availability of these additional documents for the Tutuka application is not considered in any way material to the legal completeness of this application.

6.2 Regulatory requirements

In terms of Paragraph (11)(a) – (c) of GNR 1207 of 31 October 2018 (the Regulations), the postponement or suspension application must include:

1. An air pollution impact assessment compiled in accordance with the regulations prescribing the format of an Atmospheric Impact Report (AIR) (as contemplated in Section 30 of the NEMAQA), by a person registered as a professional engineer or as a professional natural scientist in the appropriate category;
2. A detailed justification and reasons for the Application; and
3. A concluded public participation process undertaken as specified in the National Environmental Management Act and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations made under section 24(5) of the afore mentioned Act.

In respect of these requirements, the documents listed below accompany this motivation:

1. As Annexure A, a copy of the AIR, as well as its Appendices, prepared in respect of the station. The AIR provides, inter alia, an assessment of how ambient air quality is likely to be affected by Tutuka Power Station's point source emissions;
2. Detailed justifications and reasons for the Application (see Section 8 below); and,
3. As Annexure B, a copy of the detailed report outlining public participation process undertaken as part of this application.

6.3 Request for condonation of late submission of MES application

The National framework for Air Quality Management section 5.4.3.3 indicates that any postponement application must be submitted to the NAQO at least one year before the specified compliance date.

Eskom initiated the project to submit the Tutuka postponement request in January 2018 with the first round of public meetings being held in February 2018. Due to project delays, and the well documented significant financial pressures and organisational challenges it was necessary for Eskom to formally revise its approach in respect of the MES postponements. As such, a revised Eskom Air Quality strategy was approved by the new Eskom Board in June 2018 and based on this, Eskom was able to further engage on its postponement applications with external parties. Given the need for comprehensive and defensible administrative processes, Eskom will only be able to submit the MES postponement application for Tutuka in November 2018 (two months before the specified compliance date).

If the processing of the postponement is delayed as a result of the late submission is such that the stations operations are limited, this would limit the nationally available electricity capacity which would, under present circumstances, increase the risk of load shedding nationally.

Furthermore the station is a crucial station for Eskom's grid stability, as it is key component of the grid black start system. As such, closure of the station would place an unacceptable risk on the recovery of the national grid in the case of national or regional load shedding or blackouts.

Eskom apologises for the late submission of this postponement and asks that the authorities condone the late submission of this MES application given the history and issues described above.

6.4 Changes in regulatory framework

This application and public consultation in respect of it was completed prior to the publication of the updated MES regulations GNR 1207 on 31 October 2018. This application is already delayed and any further delays place the continued legal operation of Tutuka from 1 January 2019 at significant risk. As such the wording of this motivation has been revised in terms of wording of GNR 1207 compared to what was originally shared during the participation process. No changes to the supporting documents to the application have been made due to time constraints. The changes to the motivation are not substantive and additional public participation on the application is not considered necessary. During the public participation process Eskom specifically reserved it's right at amend the application based on changes to the regulatory framework. To request any further public consultation which delays the administrative processing of this application would be argued to be administratively unfair due to the far advanced state of the application at the time of publication of GNR 1207.

6.5 The need to amend variation requests

In terms of timing, Eskom is required to submit an AEL variation request parallel to the MES postponement application. The variation request is prepared based on the assumption that the requested MES postponement is granted by the NAQO. If the NAQO decision is substantially different from the requested postponement, Eskom reserves its right to amend its variation request.

7 Previous postponement application

In February 2014, in response to Tutuka’s design-based inability to meet the MES, Eskom requested postponement from the ‘existing-’ and the ‘new plant’ standards for PM, NO_x and SO₂. As part of these applications, it was requested that Tutuka’s SO₂ emission limit be relaxed indefinitely and that the site’s PM and NO_x limits be relaxed until the completion of the relevant abatement technology would bring the station into full compliance with the ‘new plant’ standards (**Table 4**).

Table 4 Requested emission limits as per Tutuka Power Station’s last postponement application (2014)

	Requested emission limits	
	Limit value (mg/Nm ³)	Averaging period
PM	350 until 31 March 2024	Daily
	50 from 1 April 2024	Daily
SO ₂	3400 until decommissioning	Daily
NO _x	1200 until 31 March 2025	Daily
	750 from 1 April 2025	Daily

The decision on the postponement application received from the NAQO in February 2015 (**Table 3**), granted Tutuka Power Station leniency in terms of the SO₂ emission limit until 2025, however, the granted leniency for PM and NO_x was not in line with the abatement technology retrofit timelines as presented in the postponement application. Instead, it presented more stringent limits that need to be complied with earlier than Eskom’s committed retrofit programme’s completion date (**Figure 1**). The station is unable to comply with the ‘new plant’ NO_x standard until after the installation of LNBS at each of its units has been completed, and the ‘new plant’ PM standard until after the full installation of a fabric filter plant on each of its units.

7.1 Previous commitments

As part of Tutuka Power Station’s postponement application of the ‘existing plant’ emission standards, commitments were made that the station would, in time, conduct LNB and FFP retrofits to ensure that the plant would come into full compliance with the ‘new plant’ standards for NO_x and PM from 1 April 2025 and 1 April 2024, respectively (**Figure 1**). These commitments did not include technology installation for SO₂ abatement. Implementation of this programme is being tracked and reported to the NAQO.

The timelines associated with the retrofits and the phased manner in which the retrofits would be effected (one unit is retrofitted per year) mean that, though Tutuka would see a progressive reduction of total NO_x and PM emissions year after year. Each unit has the

technology installed in sequential years, and so the power station in its totality, would only be able to fully comply with the ‘new plant’ limits after the retrofits have been completed, and after technology optimization has been completed, on *each* of the units. The units that have not been retrofitted yet would continue operating unabated, whilst the abated units would comply with the limit. In other words, each *unit* will be able to comply with the required limits once it has been fitted with the respective technology types, but the entire *station* will only be able to comply once all 6 (six) units have been completed.




Figure 1 Committed emission abatement retrofits and power station decommissioning dates to illustrate Eskom’s overall atmospheric emissions reduction plan as presented in Eskom’s last postponement application to the NAQO

8 Reasons motivating this postponement application

8.1 Current PM, NO_x and SO₂ emissions

Particulate matter (PM) emissions are a function of the installed abatement technology against the amount of coal that is burnt and the amount of ash in that coal. Depending on the energy content of the coal (i.e. the calorific value), more or less coal is burnt to achieve specific energy output. In 2017, Tutuka’s daily average PM emissions ranged between 65 and 500 mg/Nm³, with more than half of its daily average PM emissions reaching levels above 200 mg/Nm³ (Figure 2).




Figure 2 Daily average PM emissions (mg/Nm³) as measured at all six units at Tutuka Power Station from January to November 2017 against respective PM limits

Thermal NO_x formation occurs when oxygen reacts with nitrogen at high temperatures during combustion processes in coal fired power station boilers. NO_x emission levels are a direct function of the combustion temperature, and so the higher the combustion temperature, the higher the NO_x emissions. Similarly, thermal NO_x formation is a function of the quantity of oxygen in the combustion zone. The nitrogen content of the coal that is burnt will also contribute to the formation of NO_x in a flue gas chamber, fuel-bound NO_x formation, however, is not limited to high temperature combustion processes.

By the mere fluctuating nature of the factors that determine the combustion process as outlined above, it follows that NO_x emissions at Tutuka Power Station would fluctuate at each unit. Consequently, daily average NO_x emissions at Tutuka units typically ranged between 200 and 1400 mg/Nm³ in 2017 and were above 770 mg/Nm³ 50% of the time (Figure 3).




Figure 3 Daily average NOx emissions (mg/Nm³) as measured at all six units at Tutuka Power Station from January to December 2017 against respective NOx limits

SO₂ emissions are highly dependent on the sulphur content of the coal that is burnt and this causes SO₂ emissions to be highly variable in time. The station's historical SO₂ averages are generally below a limit of 3500 mg/Nm³, however, if it were necessary in future for Tutuka to receive coal from other sources, with a higher sulphur content, this could result in the station exceeding the current emission trend. FGD is the only abatement technology that would reduce SO₂ emissions to levels that comply with the new plant standards. Given the socio-economic considerations, as well as the fact that load losses and coal beneficiation practices will not substantially reduce the emissions, Eskom is requesting a limit of 3500mg/Nm³ (**Figure 4**).




Figure 4 Daily average SO₂ emissions (mg/Nm³) as measured at all six units at Tutuka Power Station from January to December 2017 against respective SO₂ limits

8.2 Technology options for emission reduction

8.2.1 PM emission reduction

Eskom's fleet currently utilises two different methods to reduce the particulate matter: 1) Electrostatic precipitators (ESP) and 2) Fabric filter plants (FFP).

1) An ESP removes particles from the flue stream using the force of an induced electrostatic charge on the ash particle that is then attracted to, and held on, a plate (**Figure 5**). The efficiency of ESPs is dependent on the electrical resistivity and the size of the ash particles. Eskom introduced sulphur trioxide (SO₃) injection, which decreases the resistivity of the particles, and significantly improves the performance of the ESP. With the exception of Tutuka power station, all of Eskom's existing ESP stations have been retrofitted with SO₃ flue gas conditioning plants.

ESPs have formed the backbone of Eskom's PM control efforts and have resulted in significant reductions in PM emissions from various power stations in the fleet. That notwithstanding, ESPs do not provide the same level of performance a fabric filters do, which present a physical barrier to the PM in the gas stream. Importantly 'poor' ESP performance translates into direct emissions to atmosphere, but 'poor' fabric filter plant performance means that filter bags have to be replaced more frequently (increasing operating costs) without necessarily translating into increased emissions to atmosphere.

Despite the improvements brought about by SO₃ injection, the effectiveness of ESPs is dependent on maintaining a range of process parameters specifically temperature, velocity, ash loading and ensuring adequate residence time. It is the difficulty in controlling all of these parameters that limit the effectiveness of this technology type in reducing PM emissions.




Figure 5. Schematic illustration of the placement of SO₃ injection, electro-static precipitator (ESP) and fabric filter plant (FFP), respectively, on a typical Eskom coal-fired power station. Note that the control options are either ESP and SO₃ injection or FFP, not both

2) An FFP is made up of long, cylindrically shaped bags (tubes) which are made of synthetic fabric, which act as a filter to the dust-laden flue gas that is drawn through each of the bags. FFPs are very efficient particulate emission collectors because of the dust cake that is formed on the surface of the bags.

Unlike an ESP, where particulate matter emission reduction performance may vary significantly depending on process parameters, functioning FFPs, typically, have a particulate collection efficiency of 99% or better, even when particle size is very small. This means that, once Tutuka has installed FFPs on each unit, it will be able to meet the 'new plant' standard of 50mg/Nm³, which its current ESPs are not able to accomplish. Tutuka is working towards completing a full FFP retrofit to ensure compliance with the 'new plant' emission limit of 50 mg/Nm³. Eskom is further considering non-FFP solutions to bring the plant into compliance with the new plant standards.

In addition to the above technology solutions it is possible to reduce particulate emissions by reducing the load or output of the station.

8.2.2 NOx emission reduction

NOx formation minimisation is best achieved by reducing flame temperature, reducing excess oxygen in the system and by burning coal with low nitrogen content. For Eskom's power stations specifically, NOx control is about managing the in-furnace process and controlling NOx formation as a function of the burning process and the coal devolatilization process, through the introduction of Low NOx Burners (LNB) and, sometimes, over fire air.

Low NOx burners operate on the principle of staging the amount of air available for combustion thereby reducing the temperature and the amount of oxygen available for conversion of nitrogen (N_2) to nitrogen oxide (NO) (**Figure 6**). The burner is a series of tubes that carry different fuel types required for combustion, with gas in the middle (used to start the combustion process), then fuel oil (also part of the start-up process), pulverized fuel and air (for maintaining the combustion). The tubes carrying air into the burner can be positioned in such a way as to control fuel and air mixing that result in larger, more branched flames with lower peak temperatures (SE Solutions (Pty) Ltd, 2013).




Figure 6 Simplified schematic presentation of a low NOx burner. The incoming air is controlled in such a way that flame temperature is reduced, thereby limiting the formation of NOx formation (SE Solutions (Pty) Ltd, 2013)

Tutuka Power Station currently emits unabated NOx emissions as the station's original design did not include LNB technology. Tutuka is working towards completing a full LNB retrofit to ensure compliance with the 'new plant' emission limit of 750 mg/Nm^3 , with which the station is currently not complying with most of the time.

8.2.3 Sulphur dioxide emission reduction

The power stations forming part of the postponement application have no direct form of SO_2 control. SO_2 emissions are released as a result of the sulphur content in the coal. Flue gas desulphurisation (FGD) technology is the only effective control measure to reduce SO_2 emissions. The FGD is a process which passes flue gas through alkaline solution/media. FGD technology is expensive, requires significant quantities of water, creates a new waste

stream and increases greenhouse gases. Only the new power stations, namely Kusile and Medupi, are scheduled for being equipped with FGD Plants, while a pilot project is being executed to determine the correct technology to install at Matimba and Kendal power station. Tutuka Power Station currently emits unabated SO₂ emissions as the station's original design did not include FGD technology.

8.3 *Abatement technology retrofit schedule*

8.3.1 Milestones towards complete abatement technology installation and optimisation

Upgrading a power station's technology to include specific pollutant abatement equipment requires achievement of numerous strategic milestones (**Figure 7**):

Simplistically spoken, an upgrade of this type requires years of planning, which precedes a six month installation process, as well as substantial capital funding and power station down-time. The planning process involves Eskom internal processes that allow for technology concept and -design approval after which significant funds need to be allocated to the project. Being a state owned entity, government approval for projects of such a nature is also required which lead to the additional project development time-lines. Contracts to commence the project are only put in place once carefully regulated tender processes have been completed. Over and above the aforementioned milestones, the actual commencement of the installation of the abatement technology at a unit needs to be carefully scheduled to fit into a six-month unit outage time, which is usually planned alternatingly for each unit (i.e. one unit per year) as part of an official longer term outage schedule.

Once a unit is taken down for maintenance, it is not operational, and thus does not contribute power to the grid. Unit down-time needs to take into account fleet generation capacity and can only take place, if Eskom is sure the country's energy demands can be met. Once the pollutant specific abatement technology has been installed, it takes months for the relevant technology to function optimally (optimisation period), as test-runs and assessments take place to ensure the equipment functions to its design capacity (in this case for NO_x and PM to meet 'new plant' emission standards). The optimisation period for FFPs is typically 9 months and the optimisation period for LNBs can typically take up to a year, emphasising that abatement technology installation completion does not automatically signify immediate full compliance.




Figure 7 Process-flow diagram outlining the simplified process from abatement technology concept design approval to compliance of unit's emissions with 'new plant' standards

The process outlined above can typically take years to complete from start to finish, and because the successful completion of the entire project requires the conclusion of a myriad of factors it is often difficult to predict, with certainty, the associated execution and completion timelines.

8.3.2 Current schedule to reach compliance with new plant PM standards

Full-scale pilot SO₃ flue gas conditioning tests at a unit at Tutuka showed reduced emissions. While the reduction was significant in itself, Tutuka was still required to reduce emissions to below 50 mg/Nm³ at full load operating conditions, which the SO₃ injection would not achieve. Such a reduction would have required a major upgrade of the existing ESP together with SO₃ injection. As a function of a life cycle assessment of the upgraded ESP/SO₃ injection option versus an FFP retrofit, the decision was made to retrofit Tutuka with an FFP. This decision was communicated in Tutuka's MES postponement application as submitted in 2014 where FFP installation was scheduled to see completion and optimisation by 1 April 2024. Various delays to the project have shifted the optimisation date of the final unit 1 April 2027.

The current delays set back the original schedule by 2 years and 6 months. The incurred delays have been associated with investment and procurement, budget confirmation and commercial delays and the approval of the PFMA from DPE. Eskom is currently in the stakeholder approval and funding acquisition phase for this project. Current plans to bring the station into compliance with 'new plant' PM limits, as well as the associated timelines are outlined in **Figure 8**.

8.3.3 Current schedule to reach compliance with new plant NOx standards

Tutuka's previous postponement application included overarching timelines associated with the successful installation of LNBs on all of the site's units. At the time of the application, it was foreseen that Tutuka, in its entirety, would be able to comply with the 'new plant' NOx standard of 750mg/Nm³ from 1 April 2025. The current schedule sees a slight delay, and aims to bring the station into full compliance with the stringent emission limit from 1 April 2026. It should also be kept in mind that the completion of the installation of the technology does not immediately equate full compliance with the targeted emission limit, as an optimisation period follows the installation. Additional reasons for the delays are associated with approval and procurement timelines. Eskom is currently in the tender process phase for this project. Current plans to bring the station into compliance with 'new plant' NOx limits, as well as the associated timelines are outlined in detail for every unit in **Figure 8**.

Station	Tech already installed	Pollutant to be abated	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	50-year life
Kusile	Full Compli	N/A																
Medupi	FFP, LNB	SO ₂																2064-
Majuba	FFP	NOx																2046-2051
Kendal	ESP + FGC	PM																2038-2043
Kendal	ESP + FGC	SO ₂																2038-2043
Matimba	ESP + FGC	SO ₂																2037-2041
Matimba	ESP + FGC	PM																2037-2041
Lethabo	ESP + FGC	PM																2035-2040
Tutuka	ESP	PM																2035-2040
Tutuka	ESP	NOx																2035-2040
Duvha	ESP 4,5,6	PM																2030-2034
Matla	ESP + FGC	PM																2029-2033
Matla	None for NOx	NOx																D 2029-2033
Kriel	ESP + FGC	PM																2026-2029
Arnot	FFP	N/A																2021-2029
Hendrina	FFP	N/A																2020-2026
Camden	FFP	NOx																2020-2023
Grootvlei	FFP All unit	N/A																2025-2028
Komati	ESP + FGC	N/A																2024-2028

Legend	
Completed projects	Green
Future projects	Blue
Decommissioning	D
Shut downs	SD
Investment approval dates	Diagonal lines
Previous commitment	White

Abbreviations:
CFB-FGD = Circulating Fluidised Bed – Flue Gas Desulphurisation to reduce SO₂
ESP = Electrostatic Precipitator to reduce PM
FFP = Fabric Filter Plant to reduce PM
FGC = Flue Gas Conditioning to reduce SO₂
HFPS = High Frequency Power Supply to reduce PM
LNB = Low NOx Burner to reduce NOx

*These decommissioning dates have been aligned with the 50 year life expectancy of these plants according to the draft 2018 IRP and the Medium Term Outlook

Figure 8 Committed emission abatement retrofits and power station decommissioning dates to illustrate Eskom’s overall atmospheric emissions reduction plan as presented in this current postponement application process

Tutuka’s compliance to the 2019 commitments in respect of particulates limits was considered possible at that time of the original MES decision based on an expectation that

the station would be able to take increased load losses, an assumption which has subsequently been shown to be incorrect, given the national demand.

8.4 Interim solutions to reduce emissions

During times when Eskom's coal-fired power stations experience high PM emission levels, reducing load directly assists in decreasing the PM emissions by reducing the air flow through the electrostatic precipitator and thus improving the efficiency, and by reducing the burden on the dust handling plant. Tutuka Power Station regularly takes load losses when a unit's PM emissions reach a threshold level, and so PM emissions are successfully reduced to remain below the emission limit specified in its AEL.

When experiencing high NO_x emissions, however, reducing load has proven to have no impact on the NO_x concentrations emitted from a unit, as NO_x emissions are simply a function of flame temperature and oxygen concentrations and to a lesser degree the coal. When load is dropped, less coal is burnt and volumetric flow rate drops proportionately, hence NO_x emission concentrations remain the same. This makes it very difficult to instantaneously manage high NO_x emissions. Shutting down a unit with high NO_x emissions also does not easily solve the problem as the same combustion conditions will likely prevail when the unit is commissioned again. Tutuka currently does not employ any high NO_x emission mitigation methods.

8.5 Impact on ambient air quality

The impact of Tutuka's emissions on ambient air quality has been comprehensively assessed for numerous scenarios in the accompanying, independently compiled Atmospheric Impact Report and its Appendices which have been attached to this report (**Annexure A** to this report).

The dispersion modelling exercise that was conducted to predict ground-level ambient concentrations for various emission scenarios shows that ambient air quality measurements, at the monitoring station, indicate that there is currently compliance with ambient air quality standards for SO₂, NO_x and PM on the ground. The modelling reveals predicted ambient SO₂, NO₂ and PM concentrations for three scenarios: Scenario 1, for current emissions, and Scenario 3, for 'new plant' emissions, both predict compliance with all ambient air quality standards on the ground. Scenario 2, for worst case emissions, shows compliance with all ambient air quality standards except for the hourly and daily SO₂ in a small unpopulated area, which is 9 km to the east of the power station. This worst case scenario is however unlikely to ever occur, as it would assume that Tutuka would

continuously operate at these high emissions. The current load factor is 60% less than estimated in scenario 2 (Table 1). Furthermore scenario 2 was based on a request to maintain emissions at existing plant standard levels not the better alternative limits now requested given the MES regulation changes.

8.6 Health implications

The assumption is that the MES are set to ensure that the NAAQS are met and that the NAAQS in turn are set to protect human health. As such, the argument stands that, if the NAAQS can still be met, even if the emissions exceed the MES on occasion, that such emissions should be considered acceptable.

Ambient air quality measurements, as taken at Grootdraai Dam monitoring station, indicate that there is full compliance with the ambient standards on the ground around Tutuka Power Station. Modelling has indicated a few pockets of non-compliance with the daily SO₂ standard modelled to occur to the east of the station during a hypothetical and highly unlikely worst case scenario in which Tutuka would be continuously emitting 3500mg/Nm³ of SO₂ into the atmosphere. As this scenario is almost certainly not going to materialise (Tutuka's SO₂ emissions are on average below the 3500 mg/Nm³ mark), it is Eskom's considered view that the emissions from its Tutuka Power Station pose negligible health risks to the people and the environment around the site. Significantly, the pockets of non-compliance that have been modelled to occur to the east of the station are focused to an area that is sparsely populated.

SO₂ from the power station, even at concentrations above the MES, poses far less of a health risk to people than PM from localised sources such as domestic fuel use, unpaved roads, waste burning and so forth, with a resultant non-compliance with the NAAQS for PM. Furthermore, it is Eskom's view that, if the overarching requirement of the MES is to reduce the number of premature deaths and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs), then a much greater reduction in risk can be achieved by addressing local (ground level) emissions of PM. One of the most significant ways in which such risk reductions can be bought about is by supplying affordable electricity that negates the need for at least domestic fuel use for cooking. Eskom is currently in the process of rolling out air quality offset interventions in qualifying low income communities around some of its coal fired power stations to reduce the ground level emissions from the use of domestic fuels (Section 11 of this report). If the cost of electricity is increased as a result of the cost of complying with the MES, then the net effect will be that people who are poor will be forced to continue to use domestic fuels for energy, and in such circumstances would be generally worse off than if they could afford electricity. The provision of affordable electricity to many who are then able to forgo the requirement of burning domestic fuels, more than offsets the health risks brought about by occasional non-compliance with the MES.

Air quality is influenced by a myriad of factors, and the severity of the effect this air quality has on human health is also a function of the general health status of the people affected. Eskom acknowledges that power stations do contribute negatively to ambient air quality, however, so do local activities. Nonetheless, Eskom takes full accountability for its contribution to emissions and is working with the identified local communities towards gradual reduction in ambient air pollution levels by targeting its highest polluting stations with technology interventions and by addressing air pollution on the ground, through air quality offsets, where the people breathe dirty air.

9 Requested limits

As requested in its previous postponement application, Eskom formally requests that leniency be granted to Tutuka Power Station from complying with the more stringent PM and NO_x emission limits that come into effect on 1 January 2018 (PM) and 1 April 2020 (NO_x), respectively, until LNBS and FFPs have been successfully installed and optimised on all units. Additionally, Eskom requests that leniency be granted from complying with a more stringent SO₂ emission limit from 1 April 2020. The picture painted above, of the status of the site's current emissions tangibly illustrates that the site is currently unable to meet more stringent limits, even if due diligence and load losses are prioritised.

Tutuka requests that the following alternate emission limits apply to its operations (**Table 5**).

Table 5 Requested emission limits for Tutuka Power Station

Pollutant Name	Maximum release rate		
	Limit value (mg/Nm ³)	Date to be achieved by	Average period
PM	300 (daily) OR 200 (monthly)	1 January 2019 – 31 March 2027	Daily OR Monthly
	50	From 1 April 2027 onwards	Daily
SO ₂	3000	1 April 2020 – 31 March 2025	Daily
	3000	From 1 April 2025 – onwards	Daily
NO _x	1200	1 April 2020-31 March 2026	Daily
	750	From 1 April 2026 onwards	Daily

Eskom has requested alternative limits from 2019 and has as such understood there is no need to request for postponement between 2019/2020 and 2025. If Eskom's understanding in this matter is incorrect it also formally requests postponement to the new plant limits between 2019 and 2025 at the alternative limits indicated above.

10 Public Participation

A detailed public participation process, as stipulated within the NEMA EIA Regulations, was conducted for the purposes of this postponement application. As indicated the public consultation in respect of the application was completed prior to the publication of the updated MES regulations GNR 1207 on 31 October 2018. The wording of this motivation has been revised in terms of wording of GNR 1207 compared to what was originally shared with the public. No changes to the supporting documents to the application have been made due to time constraints. The changes to the motivation are not substantive and additional public participation on the application is not considered necessary. During the public participation process Eskom specifically reserved it's right to amend the application based on changes to the regulatory framework.

For details pertaining to the public participation process, the reader is referred to **Annexure B** of this Application.

11 Air Quality Offsets

As a condition of the approved 2014 fleet postponement, Eskom has to implement air quality offsets in populated areas where power stations impact significantly on ambient air quality, and where there is non-compliance with ambient air quality standards. Eskom is of the view that in many cases, household or community emission offsets are a more effective way of reducing human exposure to harmful levels of air pollution, than is retrofitting power stations with emission abatement technology at exorbitant costs. Emission retrofits at power stations also increase the cost of electricity, which may make electricity unaffordable for more people, resulting in an increase in the domestic use of fuels and deterioration in air quality in low income areas.

Eskom is planning to roll out interventions in qualifying households around Tutuka Power Station aimed at improving ambient air quality in low income communities. The plans for Eskom's offsets have been made available to the public on Eskom's website.

12 Conclusion

Eskom is committed to ensuring that it manages and operates its coal-fired power stations in such a manner that risks to the environment and human health are minimised.

As required in terms of section 5.4.3.3 of the National Framework for Air Quality Management Eskom has:

- (i) Provided an air pollution impact assessment compiled in accordance with the prescribed regulations.
- (ii) Through this AIR it has demonstrated that Tutuka's current and proposed air emission are and will have negligible measured and modelled health and environmental impacts on the surrounding environment. Eskom's commitment to reducing emissions and obtaining compliance where practical is also illustrated.
- (iii) Concluded an independently run public participation process as prescribed in the NEMA EIA regulations for the Tutuka MES.

Eskom has further apologised for the late submission of this postponement and asked that the authorities condone the late submission of this MES application given the history and issues described.

Eskom believes that it has met the administrative and substantive requirements for the granting of a postponement application and as such request that the NAQO should approve the request as submitted.