



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION IV

345 COURTLAND STREET
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30365

RECEIVED

AUG 31 1989

DER-BAQM

4APT/APB-aes

AUG 28 1989

Ms. Patty Adams, Planner
Bureau of Air Quality Management
Florida Department of Environmental
Regulation
Twin Towers Office Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Re: Seminole Kraft Corporation Kraft Recovery Boiler (PSD-FL-141)

Dear Ms. Adams:

We have reviewed the above application submitted to us in your August 14, 1989, letter. As discussed with Pradeep Raval of DER on August 22, 1989, we have the following comments to offer:

1. The determination of best available control technology (BACT) performed on the proposed recovery boiler for oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) did not give adequate consideration to more stringent emission limits. The applicant's rejection of lower NO_x emission limits was based on an apparent lack of vendor guarantees for the lower emission limits. This is an unacceptable argument for BACT purposes. The following sources have been found to have more stringent NO_x emission limits than proposed by Seminole Kraft:

<u>Source</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>*NO_x Limit</u>
Willamette Ind.	Bennettsville, SC	150 ppm
Mead Coated Board	Cottonton, AL	112 ppm
Union Camp	Eastover, SC	150 ppm

*All limits corrected to 8% oxygen.

The applicant should be required to justify why the above emission limits are unachievable for their proposed recovery boiler.

2. Seminole Kraft has taken emission credit for particulate matter reductions from the replacement of a hydrator in 1988. The new hydrator allegedly has better particulate control and will result in a net decrease of 134.5 tons per year (TPY) for total particulate and 126.0 TPY for PM₁₀. In order to be creditable, this decrease must be federally enforceable at and after the time that actual construction on that particulate change occurred.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Since the permit for the new hydrator was not included in the PSD application, we have no way of verifying that the requirement for reducing uncontrolled particulate emission from the new hydrator by at least 95% is federally enforceable. A copy of said permit should be included in the preliminary determination, when issued.

3. Since netting was used to escape PSD for some pollutants, the applicant should confirm that no other contemporaneous increases/decreases have occurred other than those stated in the application.
4. It appears that the applicant has not performed an analysis of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for NO_x, including the contribution from nearby sources.

Your consideration of these comments is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please call Mark Armentrout of my staff at (404) 347-2864.

Sincerely,

Bruce P. Miller

Bruce P. Miller, Chief
Air Programs Branch
Air, Pesticides, and Toxics
Management Division

cc: Seminole Kraft Corporation

*copied to: P. Paval
T. Andrews
S. Chen
J. Cole
R. Esteban
CHF/BT*