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The situation

Tippecanoe Laboratories is Lilly’s most important site
- Process development/process optimization
- Initial launch of new products
- Bulk scale production of existing products
- Backup site for other sites
- Ability to change is critical – many products and intermediate compounds made at site

Site anticipated significant change and growth with several new products

Site anticipated replacement of several existing production operations

Site subject to complex air quality regulatory requirements
- Large number of old permits and synthetic minor limits
- Multiple MACT rules/overlapping MACT, NSPS, RACT requirements
- NSR requirements and Title V revisions affect site’s ability to change quickly and create administrative costs with little benefit
Site characteristics

Multiple emission points routed through few control devices
  • RTOs [Regenerative Thermal Oxidizers]
  • Small fume incinerators
  • 2 waste incinerators

Control devices achieve high degree of removal efficiency

Process development role leads to significant pollution prevention efforts
  • Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Award Winner in 1999
The process

Discussions with USEPA and IDEM about a flexible permit began in early 1990s; negotiations began in earnest in September 2000

Joint Title V and PSD permit process used

Lilly solicited input from two external advisory groups [community advisory panel and environmental advisory group] during the development of the permit and months before public comment period.

Lilly invited community leaders and site advisory groups to participate in public comment process

Public hearing held during comment period [no one attended]

Permit received favorable local media coverage
The flexible permit

Combined Title V and PSD permit

BACT controls for 5 pollutants with advance approval/notification provisions for future changes
  • Overlapping MACT, NSPS, RACT requirements streamlined into BACT requirements

Emission caps on 5 pollutants to ensure air quality and increment protection

Rigorous compliance monitoring – primarily with CEMS
  • 2/3 of emissions measured with CEMS [CO, NOx, and SO2 significantly higher %]
Reducing complexity of old permits

Old permits eliminated

PSD BACT requirements enabled elimination of old synthetic minor limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 100 Permits for Site</td>
<td>• 1 Permit for Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50 Permits for BPM</td>
<td>• 1 Section of 1 Permit for BPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 13 Permits for Tank Additions/Replacements</td>
<td>• Pre-Approved Conditions for Tank Additions/Replacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 11 Permits with SO₂ Limits</td>
<td>• 1 SO₂ Limit for BPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4 SO₂ Compliance Methods</td>
<td>• 1 SO₂ Compliance Method</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complex SO2 limits

Before

Tk 1
Tk 2
Tk 3
Tk 4
Tk 5
Tk 6
Tk 7
Tk 8

Limit Tks 1, 3, 8 to 39 tpy SO2; Comply by limiting Lots
Limit Tk 2 to 16.7 tpy SO2; Comply by limiting SCCs
Limit Tks 4 & 5 to 38.2 tpy SO2; Comply by limiting Methane Thiol

After

Tk 1
Tk 2
Tk 3
Tk 4
Tk 5
Tk 6
Tk 7
Tk 8

One Limit for All Tanks
One Compliance Method
Where did permit exceed basics?

Previous practice for site was to obtain synthetic minor permits – no BACT
  • BACT for 5 pollutants on 4 systems

Upgraded SO2 emission controls on waste incinerators to meet BACT

Higher degree of VOC/HAP control
  • Applied new source MACT requirements to existing production operations [98% control vs. as low as 93%]
  • Applied 98% BACT/MACT requirement to areas previously subject only to NSPS or RACT requirements
  • Leak Detection and Repair program applies in areas where not previously required

CEMS used where not previously required
Internal benefits

Eliminate NSR applicability uncertainty

Quicker implementation of projects

Reduced administrative costs
  • Fewer internal applicability determinations
  • 4 projects that would have required minor NSR permits [savings of 800+ person-hours]

Growth allowed without iterative major NSR review

Compliance is more simple
  • Improved change management process
  • Reduced number of emission limits and monitoring schemes
  • Streamlining of overlapping requirements reduces complexity
External/environmental benefits

Provide public and regulatory agencies with better understanding of plant site and changes that occur
  • Holistic approach versus incremental permitting

Emissions capped at levels significantly lower than previous allowable

Higher degree of emission controls [SO2 and VOC/HAP]

Compliance verification predominantly with CEMS
## Air quality benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air quality impacts</th>
<th>Potential to emit/allowable emissions</th>
<th>Emission caps in flexible permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon monoxide emissions</td>
<td>~ 750 tons per year</td>
<td>150 tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorides emissions</td>
<td>No limitations/PTE difficult to calculate</td>
<td>6 tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen oxide emissions</td>
<td>~ 700 tons per year</td>
<td>300 tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur dioxide emissions</td>
<td>~ 500 tons per year</td>
<td>300 tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile organic compound emissions</td>
<td>~ 8500 tons per year</td>
<td>300 tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous air pollutant emissions</td>
<td>~ 1300 to ~1600 tons per year</td>
<td>No cap in permit – emissions expected &lt; 100 tons per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Administrative Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative impacts</th>
<th>Old system</th>
<th>Flexible permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of permits</td>
<td>63 (and growing)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of permit modifications/new permits</td>
<td>4-6 per year</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More analyzed but no permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title V could increase # of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>revisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of emission limits from permits</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parametric limits</td>
<td>~40</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Estimated financial benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before flexible permit</th>
<th>After flexible permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Time:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50 day internal evaluation/project</td>
<td>10 day notification requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 day IDEM review/project</td>
<td>No significant time restraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resources:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 200 person hours per application and permit</td>
<td>&lt; 10 person hours per notification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>