

July 16, 1999

4APT-ARB

Howard L. Rhodes, Director
Air Resources Management Division
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Mail Station 5500
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

SUBJ: EPA*s Review of Proposed Title V Permit
Florida Power Corporation
Anclote Power Plant
Permit No. 1010017-003-AV

Dear Mr. Rhodes:

The purpose of this letter is to provide comments to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) on the proposed title V operating permit for Florida Power Corporation, Anclote Power Plant, which was posted on DEP*s web site on June 2, 1999. Based on the Environmental Protection Agency*s (EPA*s) review of the proposed permit and the supporting information for this facility, EPA formally objects, under the authority of Section 505(b) of the Clean Air Act (the Act) and 40 C.F.R. * 70.8(c) (see also Florida Regulation 62-213.450), to the issuance of the title V permit for this facility. The basis of EPA*s objection is that the permit does not fully meet the periodic monitoring requirements of 40 C.F.R. *70.6(a)(3)(i), contains conditions which are mislabeled as *Not Federally Enforceable*, and is missing some Acid Rain requirements.

Section 70.8(c) requires EPA to object to the issuance of a proposed permit in writing within 45 days of receipt of the proposed permit (and all necessary supporting information) if EPA determines that the permit is not in compliance with the applicable requirements under the Act or 40 C.F.R. Part 70. Section 70.8(c)(4) and Section 505(c) of the Act further provide that if the State fails to revise and resubmit a proposed permit within 90 days to satisfy the objection, the authority to issue or deny the permit passes to EPA and EPA will act accordingly. Because the objection issues must be fully addressed within the 90 days, we suggest that the revised permit be submitted in advance in order that any outstanding issues may be addressed prior to the expiration of the 90-day period.

Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. * 70.8(c), this letter and its enclosure contain a detailed explanation of the objection issues and the changes necessary to make the permit consistent with the requirements of 40 C.F.R. Part 70. The enclosure also contains general comments applicable to the permit.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss this further, please contact Mr. Gregg Worley, Chief, Operating Source Section at (404) 562-9141. Should your staff need additional information they may contact Ms. Elizabeth Bartlett, Florida Title V Contact, at (404) 562-9122, or Ms. Angelia Souder-Blackwell, Associate Regional Counsel, at (404) 562-9527.

Sincerely,

/s/James Kutzman for

Winston A. Smith
Director
Air, Pesticides & Toxics
Management Division

Enclosure

cc: Mr. W. Jeffrey Pardue, Director
Environmental Services Dept.
Florida Power Corporation

E.Bartlett.7/16/99.objection-Anclote.wpd.x9122

Bartlett	Blackwell- EAD	Worley	Cody	Neeley
Fox	Smith			

Enclosure

**U.S. EPA Region 4 Objection
Proposed Part 70 Operating Permit
Florida Power Corporation
Anclote Power Plant
Permit no. 1010017-003-AV**

I. EPA Objection Issues

1. Applicable Requirements - Based on available information, it appears that Anclote Unit 2 may be subject to 40 C.F.R. 60 Subpart D - *Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired Steam Generators for Which Construction is Commenced After August 17, 1971*. According to the application, initial startup for this unit was October 31, 1978. Please provide verification that construction of Unit 2 commenced prior to August 17, 1971.
2. Appropriate Averaging Times: In order for the emissions standard for particulate matter to be practicably enforceable, an appropriate averaging time must be associated with the emission limit and specified in the permit. For example, specific condition 2. in Permit No. AO51-169340 for Anclote Unit 2, located in Attachment AN-EU2-L12 of the permit application appropriately states that *the maximum particulate emission rate from this source shall be 0.1 pounds per MMBTU heat input over a two hour average.* An approach that can be used to address this deficiency is to include general language in the permit to indicate that the averaging times for all specified emission limits are tied to or based on the run time of the test method(s) used for determining compliance, unless otherwise specified.
3. Federal Enforceability - Condition A.33 contains certain extra limitations and record keeping requirements related to the firing of used oil, and is labeled as not federally enforceable. However, the condition contains documentation, record keeping, and notification requirements for used oil which originate as 40 C.F.R. 279 and 761. Since those conditions are federal requirements, they are automatically federally enforceable. Therefore the individual requirements of this condition should be broken down into federally enforceable and not federally enforceable conditions.
4. Acid Rain Requirements - Language from 40 C.F.R. 70.6(a)(1)(ii) is not addressed in the Acid Rain Part of the permit and does not appear to be included elsewhere in the body of the proposed permit. This condition must be added to the proposed title V permit for this source.

5. Applicable Requirements - Appendix U-1 lists *Surface Coating and Solvent Cleaning* and *Helper Cooling Towers* as unregulated emission units. 40 C.F.R. 63 Subpart T - *National Emission Standards for Halogenated Solvent Cleaning* applies to this unit if the owner or operator uses a solvent in the machine that contains (in total) 5 percent by weight of the following regulated solvents: carbon tetrachloride, chloroform, perchloroethylene, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, trichloroethylene, or methylene chloride. 40 C.F.R. 63 Subpart O - *National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Industrial Cooling Towers* applies to this unit if the industrial cooling tower is operated with chromium based water treatment chemicals on or after September 8, 1994. Please provide additional information to confirm that these units are not subject to MACT standards for these sources.

II. General Comments

6. Statement of Basis - The first paragraph on page 2 provides justification for annual testing of particulate based on five years of data showing emissions at less than half of the allowable limit. Review of the permit application indicates that FPC petitioned for annual particulate testing in accordance with the provisions of 62-296.405(1)(a) F.A.C. so that they would be allowed a visible emissions limit of 40 percent with annual rather than quarterly particulate testing. The statement of basis should be modified to reflect the allowance of annual particulate testing with a 40 percent VE in accordance with the SIP.
7. Placard Page - Attachment TV-1 has been superseded by TV-3. Please incorporate this attachment instead of Attachment TV-1. This is necessary to ensure that language from TV-3, item 51 on compliance certifications, is present in the permit or its attachments as required under 40 C.F.R. 70.6(c)(5)(iii).
8. Methods of Operation - Condition A.3.a. is unclear with regard to allowance of blending on-specification used oil for use during startup and the relationship to the 2 ppm PCB requirement. Blending used oil with detectable concentrations of PCB*s with fuel to reduce PCBs to levels below detection is not appropriate. It is appropriate, however for FPC to blend fuel and used oil to adjust sulfur content. This permit condition should be reworded to ensure that FPC does not blend used oil containing PCBs to achieve non-detect levels for firing during startup or shut down.
9. Minimum Sample Volume for Particulate Testing - Condition A.18. specifies a minimum sample volume of 30 dry standard cubic feet for particulate testing, in accordance with 62-296.405(e)2. F.A.C. of the SIP. Condition A.24.(b) specifies a minimum sample volume of 25 dscf, or other volume as required by rule. Since these permit conditions are contradictory, a permitting note should be added to Conditions A.24.(b) to clarify that the required sample volume is 30 dry standard cubic feet.

10. Record keeping - Conditions B.21 and B.22 address record keeping for the relocatable generators. The permit states that this generator will be operated at six different facilities, five of which are not covered under this permit. This emission unit should also be included in the permits for the other five facilities. Please clarify in the statement of basis whether or not this is the case. The above referenced permit conditions require the source to keep records for the hours of operation as well as the fuel oil sulfur content in order to demonstrate compliance with operational and emission limitations. However, the permit does not indicate whether the records will be transferred with the emission unit when it is moved to another facility, or if each facility will be responsible for maintaining their own records. The permit should specify how these records will be maintained and if record keeping activities must be coordinated among the facilities.