INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: 12-Oct-1999 09:01am From:

Joseph Kahn TAL

KAHN J

Dept: Air Resources Management

Tel No: 850/921-9519

To: Martin Costello TAL (COSTELLO_M)

Subject: FPC Helper Cooling Towers -- Comments

Marty,

I sent the request for additional information out yesterday without the question regarding why FPC is proposing to cease testing. Thanks for your comments on the incompleteness letter.

I understand that you and Mike Harley recommended that FPC stop testing the tower cells altogether, and favored this approach over approving an ASP for a different test method that FPC proposed some time ago. I would like to get your concurrence that it is acceptable to allow FPC to cease testing these sources, and that at least part of the basis for your opinion is that Method 5 and any other isokinetic method is not appropriate for the cooling towers. understand also that you believe that an operation and maintenance plan is likely to be more effective at minimizing drift emissions than the current requirement to test two of the 36 cells every five years. Please write me back so that I have something on record from the Emissions Monitoring section regarding this permitting action. Thanks.

-Joe

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

Sensitivity: COMPANY CONFIDENTIAL Date: 12-Oct-1999 02:46pm

From: Martin Costello TAL

COSTELLO M

Dept: Air Resources Management

Tel No: 850/488-0114

To: Joseph Kahn TAL (KAHN J) CC: Mike Harley TAL (HARLEY M)

Subject: Re: FPC Helper Cooling Towers -- Comments

You have correctly summarized my opinion on the stack tests for particulates on the Crystal River plant's Helper Cooling Towers. The current stack test requirement should be replaced with an work practice type of compliance method as allowed pursuant to Rule 62-210.200(42), the definition of BACT. The original control efficiency (drift limit) should be retained in the permit. I recommend a permit amendment which would require periodic operating and maintenance standard practices to ensure that the original design control efficiency is maintained. When blockages or broken sections of the drift eliminators are identified, the permittee should correct these problems in a timely manner. The permit language should also identify the number of layers and design type of drift eliminators in the original design (I think the slang terminology is " zig zag zig zag" for a 2 turn type design).

```
Ed's - Marty,
Ed's -
Ed's - I sent the request for additional information out yesterday without the
Ed's - question regarding why FPC is proposing to cease testing. Thanks for
your
Ed's - comments on the incompleteness letter.
Ed's -
Ed's - I understand that you and Mike Harley recommended that FPC stop testing
Ed's - tower cells altogether, and favored this approach over approving an ASP
for a
Ed's - different test method that FPC proposed some time ago. I would like to
Ed's - your concurrence that it is acceptable to allow FPC to cease testing
Ed's - sources, and that at least part of the basis for your opinion is that
Method 5
Ed's - and any other isokinetic method is not appropriate for the cooling
towers. I
Ed's - understand also that you believe that an operation and maintenance plan
Ed's - likely to be more effective at minimizing drift emissions than the
current
Ed's - requirement to test two of the 36 cells every five years. Please write
me back
Ed's - so that I have something on record from the Emissions Monitoring section
Ed's - regarding this permitting action. Thanks.
Ed's -
Ed's - -Joe
```



Department of Environmental Protection

Jeb Bush Governor Twin Towers Office Building 2600 Blair Stone Road Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

David B. Struhs Secretary

October 11, 1999

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. W. Jeffrey Pardue, C.E.P. Director, Environmental Services Florida Power Corporation PO Box 14042, MAC BB1A St. Petersburg, Florida 33733

Re: Request for Additional Information
DEP File No. 0170004-007-AC (PSD-FL-139A)
Crystal River Helper Cooling Towers – Removal of Requirement to Test

Dear Mr. Pardue:

On September 24, 1999 the Department received your application and complete fee for an air construction permit for to revise PSD permit PSD-FL-139 to remove the requirement to test the helper cooling towers at the Crystal River plant. The application is incomplete. In order to continue processing your application, the Department will need the additional information requested below. Should your response to any of the below items require new calculations, please submit the new calculations, assumptions, reference material and appropriate revised pages of the application form.

- 1. Please provide a summary of test results for any of the cells previously tested. Please include the date tested, the results in pounds per hour, an identification of the cell(s) tested and the operating parameters recorded during the test. Our database does not have any records of test results for the helper cooling tower cells, although we understand that testing has been conducted.
- 2. Martin Costello of DEP indicated that he recommended to Mike Kennedy of FPC that consideration for elimination of testing the tower cells would require a proposal for a regular and frequent program of inspection and maintenance to ensure that the drift eliminators are functioning properly and that emissions are limited. Your application did not propose such a plan, and referred only to an annual inspection. Please propose efforts that FPC can undertake on a more frequent basis to ensure proper control of drift.
- 3. Have changes been made to the drift elimination system since its original installation, other than routine repair and replacement of component parts, since construction of the cooling towers? If so, please describe the changes.

The Department will resume processing your application after receipt of the requested information. Rule 62-4.050(3), F.A.C. requires that all applications for a Department permit must be certified by a professional engineer registered in the State of Florida. This requirement also applies to responses to

Mr. Pardue Request for Additional Information Page 2 of 2 October 11, 1999

Department requests for additional information of an engineering nature. Material changes to the application should also be accompanied by a new certification statement by the authorized representative or responsible official. Permit applicants are advised that Rule 62-4.055(1), F.A.C. now requires applicants to respond to requests for information within 90 days. If there are any questions, please call me at 850/921-9519.

Sincerely,

Joseph Kahn, P.E.

New Source Review Section

/jk

cc: Gregg Worley, EPA
John Bunyak, NPS
Bill Thomas, DEP SWD
J. Michael Kennedy, FPC

Z 031 392 019

US Postal Service
Receipt for Certified Mail
No Insurance Coverage Provided.
Do not use for International Mail (See reverse)
Sent 10
S

on the reverse side?	SEN 136. Co. pine item 18.0 or 2 for 18 tional services. Complete items 3, 4a, and 4b. Print your name and address on the reverse of this form so that we can return this card to you. Attach this form to the front of the mailpiece, or on the back if space does not permit. Write "Return Receipt Requested" on the mailpiece below the article number. The Return Receipt will show to whom the article was delivered and the date delivered.		wing services (for an extra fee): 1. Addressee's Address 2. Restricted Delivery Consult postmaster for fee.	
N ADDRESS completed of	Jeffrey Hardue, CEP Director, Env. Serv. FPC PO BOX 14042, MAC BBIA St. Pak, Fl 33733	4a. Article N 2 03 4b. Service ☐ Registere ☐ Express ☐ Return Rec 7. Date of De	1392 Type od Mail ceipt for Merchand	Cortified E
Is your RETUR	5. Received By: (Print Name) 6. Signature: (Addressee of Agent) X	8. Addressee's Address (Only if requested and fee is paid)		
PS Form 3811, December 1994 102595-97-B-0179 Domestic Return Receipt				