FINAL DETERMINATION

PERMITTEE

Mr. James S. Gordon, Chief Executive Officer
Gainesville Renewable Energy Center (GREC), LLC
20 Park Plaza, Suite 320
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

PERMITTING AUTHORITY

Florida Department of Environmental Protection (Department)
Division of Air Resource Management
Office of Permitting and Compliance
2600 Blair Stone Road, MS #5505
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

PROJECT

Initial Title V Air Operation Permit
Final Permit No. 0010131-004-AV
Gainesville Renewable Energy Center

The purpose of this permitting project is to issue the final Title V permit for the above referenced facility. This is the initial Title V air operation permit for the facility and includes the specific permit conditions that regulate the emissions units. All permit documents for this permitting action can be found at the link below:

http://www.dep.state.fl.us/Air/emission/bioenergy/gainesville.htm

NOTICE AND PUBLICATION

The Department distributed an Intent to Issue Air Permit package on April 29, 2014. The applicant published the Public Notice of Intent to Issue Air Permit in the Gainesville Sun on May 3, 2014. The Department received the proof of publication on May 6, 2014. During the 30-dat comment period, members of the public requested a public meeting. A public meeting was held on August 5, 2014 and the Department accepted additional comments. A proposed permit was issued for EPA review on October 3, 2014.

COMMENTS

On November 17, 2014, comments were received from EPA Region 4 by email the proposed Title V permit within the 45-day comment period. These comments are listed below along with the Department's response.

A. **EPA Comment 1: Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM) Plan**

Since Gainesville Renewable Energy Center requested emission limits from the Bubbling Fluidized Bed (BFB) boiler for hydrochloric acid (HCl) and hydrofluoric acid (HF) emissions of 2.22 pounds per hour (lb/hour) each, the applicant is subject to CAM Requirements in accordance with 40 CFR 64. Based on a review of the permit application, additional information submitted by the applicant and the proposed permit, EPA indicates that some elements of the submittal and the monitoring plan were not included.

a. <u>CAM Submittal</u>:

i. According to 40 CFR 64.4(b), *"As part of the information submitted, the owner or operator shall submit a justification for the proposed elements of the monitoring" and "The owner or operator also shall submit any data supporting the justification, and may refer to generally available sources of information used to support the justification (such as generally available air pollution engineering manuals, or EPA or permitting authority publications on appropriate monitoring for various types of control devices or capture systems)."*

EPA requests the permitting authority to include an explanation in the Statement of Basis or final determination regarding the selection of the monitoring approach (i.e., rationale and data used to

support the decision). EPA provides CAM guidance and illustrations for dry injection fabric filters in the following link: http://www.epa.gov/ttnchie1/mkb/documents/B_13a.pdf .

b. Appendix CAM Content:

i. EPA suggests changing the indicator from "Sorbent Injection" to "Sorbent Injection Rate," which is more appropriate.

ii. Based on 40 CFR 64.6(c)(1)(ii) (refer also to Appendix CAM Condition 2), *"At a minimum, the permit shall specify: (1) The approved monitoring approach that includes all of the following: (ii) The means or device to be used to measure the indicator(s) (such as temperature measurement device, visual observation, or CEMS)."* Therefore, EPA requests the permitting authority to identify the device to measure the rate of injection.

iii. Also, 40 CFR 64.6(c)(2) states that, *"At a minimum, the permit shall specify: (2) The means by which the owner or operator will define an exceedance or excursion for purposes of responding to and reporting exceedances or excursions under §§64.7 and 64.8 of this part. The permit shall specify the level at which an excursion or exceedance will be deemed to occur, including the appropriate averaging period associated with such exceedance or excursion."* Appendix CAM Condition 8, contains a general language regarding detecting an excursion or exceedance; however, EPA recommends the permitting authority to include, in the "Indicator Range" box, a definition on what an excursion or exceedance is based on for this particular monitoring approach and the level at which an excursion or exceedance will be deemed to occur. Additionally, a brief description of the immediate action that would be triggered whenever an excursion or exceedance occurs should be included.

iv. The information about the location of the measuring device in the "Data Representativeness" box was not included. Consider adding this information in the chart.

v. Revise the "QA/QC Practices and Criteria" to read "Calibrate, operate and maintain …"

vi. Please clarify in the "Data Collection Procedures" box the method to record the data (*i.e.*, strip chart or data acquisition system).

Department Response:

a. CAM Submittal: The Department added clarifying text to the Statement of Basis explaining why a CAM plan was required. In addition, the Department explained why the alkaline sorbent injection rate was used in the CAM plan for the BFB boiler as the indicator for HCl and HF emissions.

b. Appendix CAM Content:

i. EPA suggests that the word "rate" be added to the term "sorbent injection". This is not necessary because sorbent injection is the method of control. Text in the CAM plan immediately below the method of control is the term "rate of injection", which is identified as the measurement approach.

ii. EPA requested that the "*device*" that measures the sorbent injection rate be identified in the CAM plan. The Department does not believe this is necessary since it is clear by inference that the injection pump and associated metering system is the measurement device.

iii. The definition and the level at which and excursion or exceedance will occur is already given in the CAM plan (see below).

±5% of sorbent injection rate utilized during last compliance test for HCl and HF if rate is within 90% of limit.

±15% of sorbent injection rate utilized during last compliance test for HCl and HF if rate is within 75% of limit.

Permittee may request lower rate depending on test results.

EPA recommends that the description of the immediate action that would be triggered whenever an excursion or exceedance occurs be included in the CAM plan. The Department does not believe this in necessary because **Specific Condition 8** of the CAM plan described the corrective actions that must be taken.

iv. The location of the measuring device for the sorbent injection rate was not identified in the "Data Representativeness" box since there are numerous acceptable locations for measuring this rate.

v. The term *calibrate* was added to clarify the QA/QC procedures.

vi. To provide flexibility with regard to the recording method for the sorbent injection rate and clarify the expectation, the terms "strip chart or data acquisition system" was added.

B. **EPA Comment 2: Underlying Applicable Requirements**

Pursuant to 40 CFR 70.6(a)(1)(i), "*The permit shall specify and reference the origin of and authority for each term or condition, and identify any difference in form as compared to the applicable requirement upon which the term or condition is based*." The regulations indicate that citation must be to the origin of the requirements contained in the condition. An acceptable citation must include the underlying applicable requirement of the condition (i.e., a preconstruction permit, a rule or regulation and section, or both) in which it is based.

a. Section II, FW 5: Please revise the regulatory citation to the permit application as an underlying applicable requirement in not included.

b. The purpose of the construction permit 0010131-003-AC was to incorporate 40 CFR 63, Subpart DDDDD and other minor changes into the operation permit. However, many of the citations to the original construction permit 0010131-001-AC (PSD-FL-411) were changed to 0010131-003-AC for emission units and/or conditions that were not affected by it. Therefore, EPA requests the permitting authority to revise the following conditions so that the citation refers the appropriate underlying applicable requirement. Please note that for a few of these conditions both construction permits 0010131-001-AC and -003-AC should be cited.

i. Section III, Subsection A, Conditions A.1, A.2, A.5, A.6, and A.7.

ii. Section III, Subsection B, Conditions B.3, B.4, B.5, B.6, B.7, B.10, B.13, B.16, B.17, B.18, B.31, B.46, B.49*, and B.50.

iii. Section III, Subsection C, Conditions C.1, C.2-C.5, C.6, C.7, and C.8.

iv. Section III, Subsection D, Conditions D.6 and D.7.

v. Section III, Subsection E, Conditions E.4*, E.6, and E.7.

vi. Section III, Subsection F, Conditions F.3, F.4, and F.5.

Note: * means that citation for both construction permits should be included.

c. Construction permit 0010131-003-AC was cited in a few conditions; however, it is not clear how the construction permit is the underlying applicable requirements for those conditions since those requirements were not included in the construction permit. Such conditions are Conditions A.3, A.4, B.56, and D.4.

d. Consider adding citation 40 CFR 60.42Da(b) to Condition B.13 as an underlying applicable requirement for Condition B.13.f.

e. Consider adding citation 40 CFR 75, Subpart F and G to Condition B.31.

f. Consider adding citation 40 CFR 75, Appendix F to Condition B.44.

g. Citation was not included in Condition C.12. Please revise as appropriate.

Department Response

The reference to the permit application was unnecessary and was removed from the final permit. Errors to regulatory citations for underlying applicable requirements were corrected in the final permit. Missing regulatory citations were added to the final permit. With regard to the construction permits, No. 0010131-003-AC (PSD-FL-411B) replaced No. 0010131-001-AC (PSD-FL-411) in its entirety. Consequently, the references to this permit in the proposed Title V permit are correct and were not altered in the final permit. Missing references to No. 0010131-003-AC (PSD-FL-411B) in specific conditions were added in the final permit as necessary.

C. **EPA Comment 3: Typographical Errors**

There are some potential typographical errors in the permit and some of the appendices as indicated by review marks and notes. Please review and correct as appropriate in the final permit.

Department Response

Typographical errors identified by EPA in the proposed permit and appendices were corrected in the final permit package.

D. **Other Comments**

GREC indicated that Alachua County was not a party to the settlement agreement. The final Title V permit and the appendices were corrected accordingly.

CONCLUSION

The final action of the Department is to issue the permit with the minor changes and clarifications listed above.