

Enclosure 5

U.S. EPA Region 4 Objection
Proposed Part 70 Operating Permit
Florida Power and Light, Port Everglades Plant

EPA objects to the issuance of this permit due to the following reasons:

- (1) Periodic Monitoring - The permit does not require sufficient periodic monitoring to ensure compliance with the applicable opacity standard. The Port Everglades permit only requires an annual one hour Method 9 visible emissions reading. This does not constitute adequate periodic monitoring to ensure continuous compliance with the opacity standard. Since continuous opacity monitors (COMs) have been installed on units 1 through 4, these monitors should be used to ensure compliance with the opacity standard for these units. Requiring that the opacity monitors be used for conducting periodic monitoring imposes little or no additional burden on FP&L. Please note that while the permit indicates that units 1 through 4 have operational continuous opacity monitors, the "Permit Summary Tables" indicate that there are no "CMS."

The Region is concerned about the lack of periodic monitoring provisions for opacity for the 12 simple cycle turbines (unit #5) in the proposed Port Everglades permit. We question whether an annual visible emissions test alone will provide enough data for certifying compliance with the applicable opacity limit for an entire year, and we question how FP&L will be able to certify compliance with opacity limits, in good faith, in the absence of data to back up the certification. We recommend that the source be required to conduct visible emissions readings on a daily basis when these units burn fuel oil. The State may propose alternative monitoring so long as it yields reliable data that ensure compliance with the opacity standard.

- (2) Periodic Monitoring - Conditions A.15 and B.15 of the proposed permit for Port Everglades Plant indicate that the source is required to maintain hourly fuel records of the amount of fuel fired, the ratio of fuel oil to natural gas if co-fired, the heating value, and sulfur content of each fuel fired. Conditions A.15 and B.15 also describe the methodology by which the sulfur content and heating value of the fuel will be determined. The analysis of the monthly composite of fuel is not adequate to ensure compliance with the applicable SO₂ standard which is based on a three-hour rolling average (see Conditions A.11, B.11). Since the fuel records required in Condition A.15 need to be "of sufficient detail" to identify the testing requirements of Condition A.14 (Operating Conditions During Testing - PM and

VE), and A.11 (sulfur dioxide monitoring operations to demonstrate compliance with the sulfur dioxide limit based on a 3-hour rolling average), a fuel record and sampling protocol similar to the one required in Condition A.19 of the proposed Title V permit for the Florida Power & Light, Turkey Point Fossil Plant, should be required in the proposed permit for the Port Everglades Plant. Condition A.19 of the Turkey Point proposed permit requires the source to take hourly fuel samples and analyze the daily composite on a daily basis.

- (3) Periodic Monitoring - The permit does not require sufficient periodic monitoring to ensure compliance with the applicable particulate matter standard. The Port Everglades Plant permit requires an annual emission test to verify compliance (Conditions A.4, A.10, B.4, B.10) with the applicable three-hour particulate emission standard. It has not been demonstrated that an annual emission test alone will constitute the basis for a credible certification of compliance with the particulate emission standard for Units 1 through 4. If the State believes that no additional monitoring is warranted to ensure compliance with the particulate standard it must provide a technical demonstration in the statement of basis identifying the rationale for basing the compliance certification only on data from a short-term annual test. Otherwise, the permit must be revised to identify additional monitoring that will be conducted in order to ensure compliance with the particulate matter standard. We suggest the following approaches to periodic monitoring:

- a) Correlate COM data to PM standard - this approach would not require additional monitoring equipment to be installed.
- b) Correlate injection rate of specific compounds to ash content of the fuel and emission rate. Recordkeeping would consist of ash content and corresponding injection rate.
- c) Other monitoring approach demonstrated by the permittee to be a valid method for assuring compliance with the applicable three-hour particulate matter standard.

In addition, the permitting notes under Section III, Subsection A and Subsection B of the proposed permit for Port Everglades indicate that units 1 through 4 may inject additives such as magnesium hydroxide and related compounds into each boiler. Information provided to EPA indicates that these injected additives are used to control particulate matter and nitrogen oxide emissions and that the amount of additive is dependent upon the ash content of the fuel. The proposed permit does not, however, address the approval and

use of these additives. These units should be required to operate during compliance tests using an injection rate consistent with normal operations. This could be corrected by adding to the particulate compliance language: "that the tests shall be conducted under both sootblowing and non-sootblowing conditions, and shall be conducted while injecting approved additives consistent with normal operating practices approved by the department."

- (4) Practical Enforceability - A note under Conditions A.14 and B.14 in the proposed permit for Port Everglades, references an "informal agreement" between the facility and Broward County to limit the visible emissions to less than 20% opacity. This condition does not appear to be enforceable and should be removed from the permit. If the source is actually required to maintain opacity below 20% rather than the 40% standard indicated in Condition A.4 and B.4 then an enforceable condition needs to be included in the permit that indicates the correct opacity standard (see comment (5) below).
- (5) Deviation from Applicable Requirement - Florida rule 62-296.405(1)(a) requires fossil fuel steam generators to comply with a 20 percent opacity standard, with the exception that sources electing to test for particulate matter emission compliance quarterly shall be allowed visible emissions of 40 percent opacity. The Port Everglades permit requires compliance with a 40 percent opacity standard; however, it only requires an annual compliance test for particulate matter emissions. We understand that this variance from the SIP's quarterly testing requirement requirements was granted by a State Order. However, this variance was never submitted by the State of Florida as a SIP revision, and therefore, was never approved into the SIP. Therefore, the Port Everglades permit must ensure compliance with the requirements of the SIP as stated in rule 62-296.405(1)(a).
- (6) Deviation from Applicable Requirement - Florida rule 62-296.405(1)(f) 1.a, requires all emissions units to install continuous monitoring systems for monitoring opacity. The only exemption appears to be for units that do not use emission control equipment. Since emissions from these units (units 1 through 4) are controlled with multiple cyclones, it appears that Florida regulations would require the use of COMs to determine compliance with the opacity standard. This applicable requirement must be included in the permit, or clarification must be provided as to why this requirement does not apply.
- (7) Periodic Monitoring - Conditions A.7 and B.7 allow

particulate matter emissions up to an average of 0.3 lbs. per million BTU heat input during a 3-hour period in any 24-hour period for soot blowing and load change. In addition, Condition A.5 allows visible emissions up to 60 percent opacity during soot blowing and load changes. A load change is defined to occur when the operational capacity of a unit is in the 10 percent to 100 percent capacity range, other than startup or shutdown, which exceeds 10 percent of the unit's rated capacity and which occurs at a rate of 0.5 percent per minute or more. There does not, however, appear to be any conditions that require the source to record the time, date, and duration of these events. The permit must require that the facility keep records of these events to ensure compliance with this requirement.

- (8) Exemptions from Permitting: Appendix E-1- It is our understanding that the changes to F.A.C. rules 62-213.300, and 62-213.420-440 addressed in a preliminary draft dated June 2, 1997, were officially adopted by the State on November 13, 1997. Therefore, the State needs to revise the permit, specifically Section II, item 6 and Appendix E-1, to delete the term "exempted from permitting" and replace it with the language contained in rules 62-213.300, and 62-213.420-440. Additionally, as agreed in previous conversations between Regional staff and the State, the State needs to remove the reference to F.A.C. rule 62-4, since it is not related to activities that may be considered "insignificant" under the title V program.

In addition to the above objections, our review has identified the following concern regarding the Port Everglades permit:

1. Conditions A.11 and A.13 indicate that the permittee shall demonstrate compliance with the sulfur dioxide limit using CEMs. Condition A.13 also appears to offer the source the opportunity to use EPA test methods 6, 6A, 6B, 6C for demonstrating compliance with the applicable SO₂ standard. If the source is required to use CEMs as a method of demonstrating compliance, it is unclear why Condition A.13 indicates alternative test methods. The Region recommends that the language in A.13, which allows the above test methods for measuring sulfur dioxide emissions, be removed from Condition A.13 in order to avoid confusion.

Condition A.13 also allows the source to obtain an alternate procedure under the provisions of Rule 62-297.620, F.A.C.. Rule 62-297.620 (Exceptions and Approval of Alternate Procedures and Requirements) does not allow the source to obtain an alternative to continuous monitoring requirements. Therefore, it appears that the language in Condition A.13

which suggests that the source has the option of obtaining an alternative procedure to CEMs for demonstrating compliance with the SO₂ limit should be removed to avoid confusion. Please, refer to the Turkey Point permit which contains requirements for CEMs in conditions A.9 and A.13, but does not include the confusing language mentioned above.