

### **Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Oxidizer #1**

This cost effectiveness study was performed on a Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer (RTO) rated at 8.67 mmBtu/hr, which serves as the start-up burner to bring the ceramic media of the RTO to operating temperature. The RTO is utilized to control process emissions from the lens coating and drying processes from a sunglass manufacturing plant.

Health and Safety Code 40440.11 requires an incremental cost-effectiveness study if a more stringent emission limit is proposed over an existing lowest achievable limit. The existing NOx BACT limit of 60 ppm is from Rule 1147. The proposed new BACT limit is 30 ppm NOx at 3% O<sub>2</sub>. Both limits apply to the burner only. Only new or replacement costs are analyzed as retrofit costs are considered part of a BARCT analysis and not a BACT requirement.

Average cost-effectiveness per SCAQMD BACT Guidelines Part C analyzes the cost of applying BACT to an uncontrolled case. This BACT update is only targeting the secondary emissions from a control device, therefore average cost effectiveness does not apply.

A Low NOx burner equipped oxidizer was implemented as the control technology in this specific case. The incremental equipment cost is the cost differential between an oxidizer that achieves 30 ppm NOx and one that can only achieve 60 ppm NOx. Installation costs do not differ as the units are identical except for the burner.

Incremental operating cost consists of two components. Additional fuel use is needed from the less efficient Low NOx equipment. Also, incremental electricity cost was examined for the fan to bring extra combustion air for the Low NOx burner. Both were calculated and included as part of the annual operating cost.

The incremental cost/ton values from this analysis is below the NOx incremental threshold value from 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2016, the time the control equipment was implemented.

## Oakley RTO Cost Effectiveness Calculations

Use R1147 limit of 60 ppm NOx @ 3% O2 as baseline, and reduction is to 30 ppm

### Oxidizer Info

Manufacturer: Adwest Technologies  
 Model: Retox 30.0 RTO-97  
 Rating: **8.67** MM Btu/hr  
 Operation Schedule: **1.5** hr/day **300** days/yr  
 Life **20** years  
 Interest rate: **4** %

### Capital Cost - Incremental

Equipment (cost of 30 ppm oxidizer - cost of 60 ppm oxidizer) **\$12,111**  
 Direct & Indirect Installation **\$0**  
 Total Capital **\$12,111**

### Annual Operating Cost - Incremental

Additional fuel use **\$1,157** (from incremental gas use sheet)  
 Additional electricity use **\$301** (from incremental electricity use sheet)  
 Total Annual Operating Cost (Incremental) **\$1,458**

PVF 13.590  
 Present Value of Capital Costs **\$12,111**  
 Present Value of Annual Costs (20 years @ 4%) **\$19,815**  
**Total 20-Year Capital Cost** **\$31,926**

**Emissions reduction (lbs/day)** **0.48**  
 Emissions reduction (tons/Life) 1.44  
 Cost per ton of NOx reduction **\$22,116**

MSBACT maximum cost effectiveness NOx (\$/ton) **\$80,321** **INCREMENTAL 1st Qtr 2016**

### Notes:

- Calculations were based on equipment cost info provided by the facility and by the manufacturer
- Annual operating costs calculated using information from the facility and the engineering permit file
- Maximum allowed cost effectiveness was based on 1st quarter 2016 Marshall & Swift index, during the time of the project.
- Incremental cost effectiveness uses the difference in cost and emissions between the proposed MSBACT and current BACT
- In accordance with H&SC 40440(c) the proposed MSBACT must be less than the District's established Incremental cost-effectiveness value

### NOx Reduction Calculation

|                   | Emission Factor | Daily heat input<br>(mmbtu/hr)<br>1.5 hr @ 100% | NOx lb day  |
|-------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
|                   | lb NOx/mmBtu    | Load  |             |
| For 60 ppm@3%O2   | 0.073           | 13.005  | 0.95        |
| For 30 ppm@3%O2   | 0.036           | 13.005  | 0.47        |
| lb/day Reduction: |                 |   | <b>0.48</b> |

Incremental Gas use and cost analysis for Oakley Inc RTO

Assumptions: Ambient temp = 70 degrees F and the burner needs to reach a temp. of 1500 F (per permit condition)

|  |                                   | 60 ppm burner                      | 30 ppm Low NOx burner                         |                         |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 8.67 mmbtu/hr burner at 100% load  | amount of air for stoichiometry   | 30% excess air for 60 ppm burner   | ppm Low Nox burner (e.g. MAXON KINNEDIZER LE) |                         |
| DIVIDE heat input rate by 1000 scf/btu and by 1hr/60 min to get cfm of nat gas | Multiply by 9.6 to get cfm of air | air needed for 60 ppm burner (cfm) | air needed for low nox burner (cfm)           |                         |
| 144.50   | 1,387.20                          | 1,803.36                           | 2,219.52                                      |                         |
|  | 0                                 | 416.16                             | 832.32  | Actual excess air (cfm) |
|  |                                   | 30.00%                             | 60.00%  | Excess air Percent      |

Extra Energy Needed for Lo NOx burner

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| energy needed to heat above amount of air flow | energy needed to heat above amount of air flow | energy needed to heat above amount of air flow |
| cfm x 1.08 x delta T                           | cfm x 1.08 x delta T                           | cfm x 1.08 x delta T                           |
| 0  | 642718   | 1285435  |
| btu/hr needed                                  | btu/hr needed                                  | btu/hr needed                                  |

Subtract 60 ppm unit energy from 30 ppm unit

642718 btu/hr more energy needed  
 Divide by 1000 to convert to scf/hr  
 642.72 scf/hr more gas needed

|                       |         |        |        |
|-----------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| Combustion efficiency | 100.00% | 93.57% | 87.15% |
|-----------------------|---------|--------|--------|

RTO Startup burner operates 1.5 hr/day, 300 days/yr  
 289222.88 scf more nat gas a year  
 convert to therms  
 2892.23 more therms per year  
 at cost of 40cents/therm  
 \$1,156.89 more gas cost per year

## Incremental Cost Analysis - Thermal Oxidizer (RTO) Oakley Inc.

### Additional Electrical cost from using Lo NOx oxidizer

Power Consumption by fan (bhp) =  $Q \text{ (cfm)} \times \text{Pressure (inch WC)} / (6356 \text{ (constant for unit conversions)} \times \text{Fan efficiency Coeff})$

- use 0.8 as fan efficiency coefficient

- Pressure values (in Water Column) are taken from burner specification sheets

*cfm figures based on incremental gas use analysis worksheet results*

Bhp needed for 60 ppm equipment =  $1803 \text{ cfm} \times 28 \text{ in WC} / 6356 \times 0.8$

Bhp needed for 60 ppm equipment = **9.93** bhp

Bhp needed for 30 ppm equipment =  $2219 \text{ cfm} \times 32 \text{ in WC} / 6356 \times 0.8$

Bhp needed for 30 ppm equipment = **13.96** bhp

Difference of  $13.96 - 9.93 =$  **4.036** bhp

Multiply bhp by .7457 = **3.01** Kw

Divide by 0.9 motor efficiency **3.344** kw

usage is 1.5 hours a day and 300 days a year **1504.951** kwh per year incremental electricity cost

Use 20 cents/kWh -  $1504.95 \text{ kWh} \times 20 \text{ cents/kWh}$  **\$300.99** incremental electricity cost of fan use