Department of Environmental Protection

Lawton Chiles
Governor

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

Virginia B. Wetherell
Secretary

April 20, 1995

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Willis M. Kitchen
President
Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc.
1901 North 66th Street
Tampa, Florida 33619

RE: Construction Permit Application for Blast Furnace
AC29-209018/PSD-FL-215

Dear Mr. Kitchen:

The Department has not received a reply to our June 28, 1994, letter requesting additional information for processing the referenced permit application. Therefore, the permit will be denied unless the Department receives the requested information by May 26, 1995. If there are any questions, please call Al Linero or John Reynolds of our staff at 904-488-1344.

Sincerely,

4/20

for C. H. Fancy, P.E.
Chief
Bureau of Air Regulation

CHF/AL/t

cc: W. Thomas, SWD
D. Beason, OGC
L. Deken, EPCHC
J. Harper, EPA
J. Bunyak, NPS
L. Carlson, Lake Eng.

Fold at line over top of envelope to the

SENDER:
- Complete items 1 and/or 2 for additional services.
- Complete items 3, and 4a & b.
- 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.

I also wish to receive the following services (for an extra fee):
1. ☐ Addressee's Address
2. ☐ Restricted Delivery

Consult postmaster for fee.

3. Article Addressed to:
Willis M. Kitchen, Pres.
Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc
1901 N. 66th Street
Tampa, FL 33619

4a. Article Number
Z 311 902 917

4b. Service Type
☐ Registered ☐ Insured
☒ Certified ☐ COD
☐ Express Mail ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise

7. Date of Delivery
4-24-95

5. Signature (Addressee)

8. Addressee's Address (Only if requested and fee is paid)

6. Signature (Agent)

PS Form **3811**, December 1991 *U.S. GPO: 1993—352-714 **DOMESTIC RETURN RECEIPT**

Is your RETURN ADDRESS completed on the reverse side?

Thank you for using Return Receipt Service.

Z 311 902 917

Receipt for Certified Mail
No Insurance Coverage Provided
Do not use for International Mail
(See Reverse)

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

PS Form **3800**, March 1993

Sent to Willis Kitchen	
Street and No. Gulf Coast Recyc.	
P.O., State and ZIP Code Tampa, FL	
Postage	$
Certified Fee	
Special Delivery Fee	
Restricted Delivery Fee	
Return Receipt Showing to Whom & Date Delivered	
Return Receipt Showing to Whom, Date, and Addressee's Address	
TOTAL Postage & Fees	$
Postmark or Date 4-20-95	

AC 29-209015/ISO
FI-215

al ✓

MACFARLANE AUSLEY FERGUSON & MCMULLEN

John R ✓

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

111 MADISON STREET, SUITE 2300
P.O. BOX 1531 (ZIP 33601)
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33602
(813) 273-4200 FAX (813) 273-4396

227 SOUTH CALHOUN STREET
P.O. BOX 391 (ZIP 32302)
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301
(904) 224-9115 FAX (904) 222-7560

400 CLEVELAND STREET
P. O. BOX 1669 (ZIP 34617)
CLEARWATER, FLORIDA 34615
(813) 441-8966 FAX (813) 442-8470

IN REPLY REFER TO:

RECEIVED
DEC 13 1995
BUREAU OF
AIR REGULATION

December 11, 1995

William B. Taylor, IV
Post Office Box 1531
Tampa, Florida 33601

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Ms. Virginia Wetherell
Secretary
Florida Department of Environmental Regulation
Twin Towers Office Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Re: Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc.
DEP File No.: PSD-FL-215
AC 29-209018

Dear Ms. Wetherell:

Enclosed for filing is the original and one copy of Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc.'s Third Request for Extention of Time to File its formal Petition For Administrative Hearing. Please date stamp the copy and return it to my office in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Signed in Mr. Taylor's absence
to avoid delay in mailing.

William B. Taylor, IV

WBT:kkb
Enclosures
cc: Mr. Willis Kitchen

STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

In the Matter of an
Application for permit by:

DEP File No. PSD-FL-215
AC 29-209018
Hillsborough County

Mr. Willis Kitchen
President
Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc.

THIRD REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

TO: Virginia Wetherell, Secretary
Department of Environmental Protection
2600 Blair Stone Road
Twin Towers Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

GULF COAST RECYCLING, INC. ("Gulf Coast"), pursuant to Chapter 17-103.070, F.A.C., hereby requests a third extension of time to file its formal Petition For Administrative Hearing, and in support hereof says:

1. Gulf Coast previously requested an extension of time to file an administrative petition. Since that time Gulf Coast has been in communication with its consultant retained to advise it regarding the permit application and to respond to an information request submitted by the Department dated November 21, 1995 by A. A. Linero, P.E., Administrator, New Source Review Section. The consultant advises that the necessary information should be given to Gulf Coast by December 24, 1995. It will take approximately two (2) weeks to review that information and compile a responsive document. Therefore, an extension until February 1, 1996 is requested.

2. In the event this request for extension is not granted, then this shall serve as notice of intent by Gulf Coast to seek a formal administrative review pursuant to Section 120.57, Florida Statutes.

WHEREFORE, Gulf Coast respectfully requests an extension of time until February 1, 1996 to file its Petition for Administrative Hearing, pursuant to Section 120.57, Florida Statutes.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the original of the foregoing has been filed, via Federal Express, with Virginia Wetherell, Secretary of the Department of Environmental Protection, and copies sent to Office of General Counsel, Department of Environmental Protection, 2600 Blair Stone Road, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400 and to the C. H. Fancy, P.E., Chief, Bureau of Air Regulation, State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection, 2600 Blair Stone Road, Tallahassee, Florida 32399, this 11th day of December, 1995.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM B. TAYLOR, IV, ESQUIRE
Fla. Bar No. 144329
SCOTT C. DAVIS, ESQUIRE
Fla. Bar No. 022799
Macfarlane Ausley Ferguson
& McMullen
Post Office Box 1531
Tampa, Florida 33601
(813) 273-4228
Attorney for Petitioner

cc: Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc.

KKB****\WBTMAIN\GCR\ADMINIST.HRG\120-57PET.Ex3

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
1875 Century Boulevard
Atlanta, Georgia 30345

NOV 28 1995

IN REPLY REFER TO:

RECEIVED
DEC 4 1995
BUREAU OF
AIR REGULATION

Mr. Clair H. Fancy
Chief, Bureau of Air Regulation
Department of Environmental Regulation
Twin Towers Office Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dear Mr. Fancy:

We have reviewed the October 10, 1995, letter from Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc., to your office, in which Gulf Coast addresses concerns we expressed in a July 13, 1994, letter to you. We are pleased that Gulf Coast has proposed a substantially lower sulfur dioxide emission rate (175 lb/hr instead of the originally proposed 374 lb/hr), but still have some concerns regarding the project. The enclosed Technical Review Document prepared by our Air Quality Branch in Denver, Colorado, summarizes these concerns.

We understand that your office has advised Gulf Coast that their application remains incomplete, and you have requested additional information to satisfy our concerns.

If you have any further questions, please contact Ms. Ellen Porter of our Air Quality Branch in Denver at 303/969-2617.

Sincerely yours,

For Noreen K. Clough
Regional Director

Enclosure

Technical Review of the
Additional Information
Submitted October 10, 1995,
by Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc.
Hillsborough County, Florida

by

Air Quality Branch, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado

On October 10, 1995, Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc. (Gulf Coast), submitted responses to concerns expressed in our July 13, 1994, letter. In that letter, we informed the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) that Gulf Coast's Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit application was incomplete. The application was for a blast furnace at the Gulf Coast lead-acid battery recycling facility in Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida, 75 km south-southeast of Chassahowitzka Wilderness Area (WA). Although the blast furnace was actually installed in 1984, Gulf Coast did not apply for a PSD permit then. FDEP subsequently informed Gulf Coast that a PSD review was required, and Gulf Coast submitted an application in 1994.

The following comments summarize our position regarding Gulf Coast's responses to the concerns expressed in our July 13, 1994, letter.

Best Available Control Technology (BACT)

Our July 13, 1994, letter noted that the best available control technology (BACT) analysis for the project was incomplete and that similar facilities had achieved substantially lower sulfur dioxide (SO_2) emission rates than those initially proposed by Gulf Coast. We are pleased that Gulf Coast is now proposing a much lower SO_2 emission rate: 175 pounds per hour (lb/hr) instead of 374 lb/hr. However, Gulf Coast has still not provided adequate information to determine whether the proposed level of control represents BACT.

Also, Gulf Coast has not adequately addressed our concerns regarding their proposed lead emission rates. Source testing indicates actual lead emissions are far below the requested emission limit of 0.59 ton per year. We request that FDEP establish an emission limit more representative of actual rates, as opposed to an artificially high limit. If FDEP sets a limit of 0.59 ton per year, we agree the Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standard procedures for monitoring lead emissions are sufficient to ensure lead emissions do not exceed the PSD threshold; however, we request that FDEP not wait until the MACT compliance date to require monitoring. The monitoring procedures must be in place before the MACT compliance date to ensure the 0.59 ton per year emission limit is enforceable.

Air Quality Modeling Analysis

We noted that although the MESOPUFF II air quality modeling analysis predicted that Gulf Coast would not contribute significantly to exceedances of the Class I SO_2 24-hour increment, the analysis was not complete because it used only one upper air meteorological station. Therefore, we requested that Gulf Coast be required to use two additional upper air stations to adequately address the wind flow from other sources within the State. Because Gulf Coast has now proposed a substantially lower SO_2 emission rate, we will accept the initial modeling analysis (which was based on the much higher emission rate of 374 lb/hr SO_2). However, future applicants should use three upper air stations when evaluating potential impacts to Chassahowitzka WA: Tampa/Ruskin, Florida; West Palm Beach, Florida; and Waycross, Georgia.

Air Quality Related Values (AQRV) Analysis

We requested a more detailed air quality related values (AQRV) analysis. Gulf Coast replied by stating that because they do not significantly contribute to any modeled exceedance of the Class I increments, impacts on AQRVs are insignificant. Please advise Gulf Coast that the AQRV analysis is independent of the Class I increment analysis. AQRVs may be affected even though the increment is not exceeded. Because Gulf Coast has reduced proposed emissions significantly, we will not require them to submit another analysis. However, future applicants should consult with our office regarding any question of the need for a detailed AQRV analysis.

VISCREEN Analysis

We originally noted that Gulf Coast did not perform a visibility analysis. However, we are now satisfied that Gulf Coast has submitted this analysis, which indicates that the project will have low potential to cause visible plume impacts at Chassahowitzka WA.

Contact: Ellen Porter
(303) 969-2617

Department of
Environmental Protection

Lawton Chiles
Governor

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

Virginia B. Wetherell
Secretary

November 21, 1995

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Willis M. Kitchen, President
Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc.
1901 North 66th Street
Tampa, Florida 33619

Re: Construction Permit Application (PSD-FL-215)

Dear Mr. Kitchen:

Additional information will be required for processing the revised application. As you know, this permitting action began as an effort to permit the 1984 replacement of two blast furnaces retroactively according to federal PSD requirements, on the assumption that no major modifications or physical changes were being made in the interim. Recently, the application was amended to cover higher production and emission rates and now contains the newly-proposed desulfurization and afterburner projects. Although the revised application mentions that a subsequent application will be filed once a specific system is selected, these projects must undergo permitting review at this time since Gulf Coast has proposed emission limits based on their installation. Thus, the construction permit must cover these projects as if they were being installed concurrently with the blast furnace replacement.

We should also point out that several sections of the revised application must be redone. For example, the "internal offset" approach discussed on page 25 as a way of avoiding ozone non-attainment new source review puts the "cart before the horse" since the "offset" from installing the project would be obtained before the unit undergoes permitting review. The process does not work that way. The incinerator installation must be the consequence of the permitting review process rather than vice versa.

In other words, Gulf Coast's existing emissions (before desulfurization and incineration are installed) must determine the type of review required, and the necessary controls are then determined based on the rules that apply to the current emission levels. For this reason, a Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) analysis is required pursuant to F.A.C. Rules 62-212.500(4)(a) and 62-212.510 for current VOC emissions in the ozone non-attainment area. This will mean that the incinerator must be designed to achieve a LAER emission limit, and that limit is to be determined by the Department after being proposed by Gulf Coast.

Additional information will also be needed as a result of the EPA's 40 CFR 63 Subpart X standards promulgated on June 23, 1995. Although Gulf Coast will have until June 23, 1997 to comply with Subpart X requirements, they must be included in the construction permit at this time since they are presently applicable with two years for final compliance.

Therefore, the following incompleteness items are requested:

1. The SO2 emission limit proposed by Gulf Coast has been reduced to 175 lbs/hr from the previous 374 lbs/hr on the basis of installing desulfurization technology. The 175 lbs/hr estimate is based on a material balance calculation that assumes 80% of the feed is recovered as scrap lead that is then desulfurized, leaving 1% of the tonnage as sulfur (primarily in the form of lead sulfate) that oxidizes to SO2 in the furnace, with 20% of that 1% remaining in the furnace slag. It is not clear how the desulfurization step enters into this calculation. The 1% sulfur obtained as a result of the desulfurization step appears to be a rough estimate at best and may vary considerably. Rather than basing the SO2 emission limit on such broad assumptions, we must rely on actual data from installations using this technology. The application mentions three new lead recovery plants that have successfully demonstrated desulfurization, but does not identify them or present any data. To provide the Department with reasonable assurance that the proposed emission limit has a sound factual basis, please provide actual data for these three plants from the manufacturer or other sources as shown below:

				Actual SO2 Emissions(pph)	
Plant	Location	Date Desulf. Installed	Charge Rate	Before Desulf.	After Desulf.
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-

2. The rationale for the particulate matter analysis (page 22) is incorrect since new source review applicability depends on a comparison of the proposed allowable emissions with the actual emissions averaged over the most recent two year period that is representative of normal operation. In this case the averaging period would be the two years prior to the replacement of the two blast furnaces in 1984. Please revise the application accordingly.

3. As stated earlier, a control strategy must be the result of permitting review based on current emissions and not "offsets" from a control strategy the applicant has proposed prior to permitting review. Thus, the VOC section must be redone to include a LAER analysis and a proposed LAER emission limit.

4. Please revise the application to cover all applicable provisions of the 40 CFR 63 Subpart X regulations and indicate a schedule for compliance by June 23, 1997.

5. Please address all concerns discussed and make revisions as necessary pursuant to the enclosed comments submitted by the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County on November 21, 1995.

6. We need a copy of the SO2 Maxi-File comparison programs and outputs to confirm your modeling results.

If you have any questions, please contact me, John Reynolds, or Cleve Holladay at 904-488-1344.

Sincerely,

11/21

A. A. Linero, P.E.
Administrator
New Source Review Section

Enclosure

cc: W. Thomas, SWD
L. Deken, EPCHC
J. Harper, EPA
J. Bunyak, NPS
L. Carlson, Lake Eng.

Memorandum

Florida Department of
Environmental Protection

Fold at line over top of envelope to the right of the return address

SENDER:
- Complete items 1 and/or 2 for additional services.
- Complete items 3, and 4a & b.
- 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.

I also wish to receive the following services (for an extra fee):
1. ☐ Addressee's Address
2. ☐ Restricted Delivery

Consult postmaster for fee.

3. Article Addressed to:
Willis N. Kitchen, Pres.
Gulf Coast Recycling
1901 N. 66th St.
Tampa, Fl 33619

4a. Article Number
Z 127 632 578

4b. Service Type
☐ Registered ☐ Insured
☒ Certified ☐ COD
☐ Express Mail ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise

7. Date of Delivery
11-28-95

5. Signature (Addressee)

8. Addressee's Address (Only if requested and fee is paid)

6. Signature (Agent)
Gwen Phillips

PS Form 3811, December 1991 ☆U.S. GPO: 1993—352-714 **DOMESTIC RETURN RECEIPT**

Is your RETURN ADDRESS completed on the reverse side?

Thank you for using Return Receipt Service.

Z 127 632 578

Receipt for Certified Mail
No Insurance Coverage Provided
Do not use for International Mail
(See Reverse)

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

Sent to: Willis Kitchen
Street and No.: Gulf Coast
P.O., State and ZIP Code: Tampa 1-1

Postage	$
Certified Fee	
Special Delivery Fee	
Restricted Delivery Fee	
Return Receipt Showing to Whom & Date Delivered	
Return Receipt Showing to Whom, Date, and Addressee's Address	
TOTAL Postage & Fees	$
Postmark or Date	PSD-FL215 11-22-95

PS Form 3800, March 1993

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES, LEGAL & WATER MANAGEMENT DIVISION
1900 - 9TH AVENUE
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33605
TELEPHONE (813) 272-5960
FAX (813) 272-5157

AIR MANAGEMENT DIVISION
TELEPHONE (813) 272-5530

WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION
TELEPHONE (813) 272-5788

WETLANDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION
TELEPHONE (813) 272-7104

November 21, 1995

John Reynolds
Division of Air Resources Management
Florida Department of Environmental
Protection
Twin Towers Office Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400

Re: Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc. (GCR) - PSD Application

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

I have reviewed the revised application submitted by GCR on October 27, 1995. Based on my review of the material submitted, I have the following comments:

1. This facility's operations are subject to Rule 62-296.600, F.A.C. (Lead RACT) and GCR was required to obtain a federally enforceable permit to incorporate the applicable provisions. I am enclosing a copy of the permit for your information. In the revised PSD application they requested an emission limitation which is substantially different from what is required in their Lead RACT permit. The Lead RACT rule was not listed in the rule applicability portion of the application. This rule needs to be taken into account when establishing the allowables for the blast furnace operation.

2. In the application, the permittee also indicated that blast furnace operations are not subject to particulate matter RACT because of the exemption stated in Rule 62-296.700(2)a, F.A.C. (facility emissions less than 5 lbs./hr. and 15 tons/yr.). GCR's blast furnace existing operating permit does have the RACT exemption included as a specific condition. However, after the operating permit for the furnace was issued, the facility was required to obtain a construction permit for their refining operation. The construction permit was issued in Tallahassee and a determination was made that the operation was subject to particulate RACT. The particulate matter

emissions for the refining operation alone are more than 4 lbs./hr. and 12 tons/yr. The furnace operations therefore can't be exempted using the 5 lbs./hr. and 15 tons/yr. facility exemption. This issue needs to be addressed in this permit.

3. Also, in the construction permit that was issued to address the Lead RACT issues and their current operating permit, they currently charge 88% of the total maximum process rate as lead scrap. In the revised submittal all of the calculations were done for the SO_2 and CO based on charging 80% lead scrap. There seems to be a change in the ratio of the different materials charged. If they plan to reduce the lead scrap charge to 80%, which of the other constituents do they plan to increase (i.e., limestone, coke, iron, etc.)? If they plan to continue charging the furnace with the current ratio of lead scrap and other materials, then they need to revise their calculations to account for the increased charge (88%).

4. In a recent compliance test at the facility, GCR reported the process rate for the SO_2 test at 6.56 tons/hr. In the current revised application under review they have requested a maximum process rate of 6.5 tons/hr. How is GCR going to show compliance with this limitation and what reasonable assurance does the Department have that GCR will not exceed that rate?

5. In the SO_2 calculations the permittee used an emission factor of 80 lbs./ton from AP-42 for the blast furnace. Based on the test data from the facility, the emission rate of SO_2 has exceeded the value of 80 lbs./ton. I have attached a table summarizing the test data from the facility for your use. The rate of emissions is important since we are trying to establish an appropriate emission limitation and level of reduction.

6. For your information, Gulf Coast Recycling is currently under enforcement. There are two open enforcement cases against GCR. I have attached the Consent Order for one and an NOI for the more recent case. The NOI addresses two successive quarterly exceedances of the Lead NAAQS at a monitor located just north of the facility and process rate exceedance of the furnace operations. Should you need more information regarding these cases please let us know. We will be evaluating additional control measures GCR can undertake to reduce lead emissions from the facility.

7. Also, for your information, the EPC has received a number of complaints regarding GCR from people working just south of the facility at the CSX railyard. The complaints are primarily concerning odors from the operation. The complainants are reporting a burning and irritating odor. They also indicate they can also taste it (leaves a taste in their mouth). We are still investigating these complaints and have verified some of the complaints. It is undetermined at this point whether the complaints can be attributed to SO_2, SAM, or other emissions. In order to adequately address this issue we will be looking for additional control measures from GCR.

8. The permit application also did not identify MACT as an applicable rule on page 23. The requirements of this rule will need to be incorporated into the issued permit.

9.a) The revised application that was submitted to the Department does not indicate whether a search was conducted for recent RACT/BACT/LAER determinations for SO_2 emissions from lead smelting operations. In order to provide the Department with reasonable assurance that the control technologies evaluated in the application are the best available, documentation needs to be provided on similar projects. In addition, the average cost effectiveness must be provided for each of the control technologies identified and used in the determination. Results of this type of analysis should be included in the BACT analysis in the application.

b) Pursuant to available guidance material on conducting BACT determinations (i.e., Draft 1990 version of NSR Workshop Manual), the average cost effectiveness for each control technology evaluated must be provided. In addition, the incremental cost effectiveness must be determined to evaluate the difference in costs between a control technology and the next best control technology. No incremental cost effectiveness numbers were provided in the application.

c) On page 24 of the application, a table is shown which identifies results of a search of the RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse for CO emissions. As stated above, for the different control technologies, an average cost effectiveness was not provided. In addition, an incremental cost effectiveness was not provided for the difference in control efficiencies (i.e., proposed 90% reduction but table on page 24 shows higher efficiencies).

10. Also, for you information, we would request that any permit issued for the blast furnace require emission testing which demonstrates the control efficiencies for the operation.

Should you have any questions or need more information concerning these comments please call me at Suncom 543-5530.

Sincerely,

Liz Deken

Liz Deken
Chief, Air Toxics Section

bm

SO_2 Stack Test Summary

Test Date	SO_2 lbs./hr.	Production tons/hr.	Emissions lbs. SO_2/ton Pb produced
November 1994	337.9	4.11	82.2
November 1993	377.6	2.90	130.2
December 1992	341	2.90	117.6
October 1991	260	2.90	89.7
February 1990	326	2.55	127.8
February 1989	339	2.55	132.9
February 1988	377	2.62	143.9
March 1987	353	2.47	142.9
February 1986	92	2.63	35
February 1985	313	2.8	111.8

Department of Environmental Protection

Lawton Chiles
Governor

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

Virginia B. Wetherell
Secretary

November 8, 1995

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Willis M. Kitchen, President
Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc.
1901 North 66th Street
Tampa, Florida 33619

Re: Completeness Review - Construction Permit Application
PSD-FL-215

Dear Mr. Kitchen:

The Department received your additional submittal regarding the subject permit application on October 27. Since that submittal may impact the overall review of the application, the completeness review period will be extended for 30 days following October 27. Therefore, if the Department requires any additional information, an incompleteness letter will be mailed to you by November 24.

If you have any questions, please call me or John Reynolds at 904-488-1344.

Sincerely,

A. A. Linero, P.E.
Administrator
New Source Review Section

AAL/JR/t

CC: L. Deken, EPCHC
W. Thomas, SWD
L. Carlson, Lake Engineering

Fold at line over top of envelope to the

SENDER:
- Complete items 1 and/or 2 for additional services.
- Complete items 3, and 4a & b.
- 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.

I also wish to receive the following services (for an extra fee):
1. ☐ Addressee's Address
2. ☐ Restricted Delivery

Consult postmaster for fee.

3. Article Addressed to:
Willis M. Kitchen, Pres.
Gulf Coast Recycling
1901 N. 66th St.
Tampa, Fl 33619

4a. Article Number
Z 127 632 566

4b. Service Type
☐ Registered ☐ Insured
☒ Certified ☐ COD
☐ Express Mail ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise

7. Date of Delivery
11-10-95

5. Signature (Addressee)
Jammie Thompson

6. Signature (Agent)

8. Addressee's Address (Only if requested and fee is paid)

Is your RETURN ADDRESS completed on the reverse side?

Thank you for using Return Receipt Service.

PS Form 3811, December 1991 ☆U.S. GPO: 1993—352-714 **DOMESTIC RETURN RECEIPT**

Z 127 632 566

Receipt for Certified Mail
No Insurance Coverage Provided
Do not use for International Mail
(See Reverse)

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

Sent to: Willis Kitchen	
Street and No.: Gulf Coast Recy.	
P.O., State and ZIP Code: Tampa, Fl	
Postage	$
Certified Fee	
Special Delivery Fee	
Restricted Delivery Fee	
Return Receipt Showing to Whom & Date Delivered	
Return Receipt Showing to Whom, Date, and Addressee's Address	
TOTAL Postage & Fees	$
Postmark or Date: 11-8-95 PDO-F1-315	

PS Form 3800, March 1993

LAKE
ENGINEERING, INC.

October 25, 1995

Mr. C.H. Fancy
Chief, Bureau of Air Regulation
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Twin Towers Office Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

RE: GULF COAST RECYCLING, INC. AC 29-209018, PSD-FL-215

Dear Mr. Fancy:

Enclosed are six identical diskettes containing the results of the refined modeling that was required in the DEP's June 28, 1994 letter to Gulf Coast. This letter concerned the completeness review for the initial PSD application (May 1994) and included comments received from the various reviewing agencies.

Specifically, the refined modeling was required per item number two on the first page of the letter. Item number two stated that refined modeling should be performed using a finer mesh receptor grid centered over any critical receptors identified in the screening phase. Critical receptors were defined as those receptors where exceedances of the AAQS were predicted when emissions from all 68 sources were modeled. A finer mesh grid of 100 meter spacing out to a distance of 500 meters was then placed around those critical receptors. The model was re-run (at the revised requested SO_2 emission rate of 175 lbs/hr) to further determine if Gulf Coast was significantly contributing to the modeled exceedances at the increased number of receptors. Gulf Coast would be significantly contributing if emissions from Gulf Coast only resulted in impacts greater than the significant impact levels at the same receptors and for the same averaging periods as the modeled AAQS exceedances.

To accomplish the refined modeling, each Maxi-File (.OVR files), that contained the values exceeding the respective AAQS minus the background value, from the modeling results submitted with the revised PSD application (October 1995) were analyzed to locate the critical receptors (where modeled AAQS exceedances occurred). Please note that no AAQS exceedances

SUITE 500, 35 GLENLAKE PARKWAY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30328
(770) 395-0464 FAX: (770) 395-0474

were predicted for the 3-hour averaging period for years 1982-85 and the annual averaging period for 1983. New receptor grids were then centered around the critical receptors to incorporate the required 1000 m^2 mesh size. These new data files (.DTA files) were then re-run using ISCST3.

New Maxi-Files were generated using the same thresholds as before (AAQS minus background value for modeling all sources and significant impact level for modeling Gulf Coast's emissions only). The Maxi-Files for all sources were compared with the Maxi-Files for Gulf Coast only to determine if there were any instances where the AAQS were being exceeded at the same time and at the same receptors that the respective significant impact level was also being exceeded (e.g.:REF83-24.OVR was compared to REFG83-24.OVR, and so on. See below for file name descriptions.). The results show there are no instances where both the AAQS and the significant impact levels are being exceeded at the same time and receptors, indicating Gulf Coast is not significantly contributing to any of the modeled AAQS exceedances.

Following are descriptions of the filename prefixes used for the refined modeling. All files are included on the diskette and are in zipped format.

REF821-24.*	1982 met data, 24-hour averaging period, run 1 of 2 (large no. of receptors)
REF822-24.*	1982 met data, 24-hour averaging period, run 2 of 2 (large no. of receptors)
REF83-24.*	1983 met data, 24-hour averaging period
REF84-24.*	1984 met data, 24-hour averaging period
REF851-24.*	1985 met data, 24-hour averaging period, run 1 of 2 (large no. of receptors)
REF852-24.*	1985 met data, 24-hour averaging period, run 2 of 2 (large no. of receptors)
REF86-24.*	1986 met data, 24-hour averaging period
REF86-3.*	1986 met data, 3-hour averaging period
REF82-AN.*	1982 met data, annual averaging period
REF84-AN.*	1984 met data, annual averaging period
REF85-AN.*	1985 met data, annual averaging period
REF86-AN.*	1986 met data, annual averaging period

For the Maxi-Files (.OVR), "REFG" was used to denote the file contained exceedances of the respective significant impact level (Gulf Coast emissions only).

Thank you for your patience regarding the submittal of this additional modeling. This exercise was very time consuming due to the large degree of data comparison required to

generate the refined receptor grids and compare the Maxi-Files. If you have any questions regarding these modeling results or require additional information please contact me at (770) 395-0464.

Sincerely,

LAKE ENGINEERING, INC.

Larry G. Carlson
Air Pollution Compliance Specialist

LGC:cpc
Attachments

cc: Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc. w/attachment

460.2.1
\460-95\1025fanc.231

Cindy, FYI
John G
10/23
John R.
FYI
— Cindy

GULF COAST RECYCLING, INC.

1901 NORTH 66th STREET • TAMPA, FLORIDA 33619
PHONE: (813) 626-6151 FAX: (813) 622-8388

October 17, 1995

Mr. John Glunn
Florida Department of
Environmental Protection
Twin Towers Office Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400

Subject: Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc.
Initial Notification
Applicability of 40 CFR 63, Subpart X
NESHAPS from Secondary Lead Smelting

Dear Mr. Glunn:

This notification is being submitted in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR 63.9(b), regarding the above referenced NESHAPS.

(i) The name and address of the owner or operator:

Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc.
1901 N. 66th Street
Tampa, Florida 33619

(ii) The physical location/address of the affected source:

The source is located at the address indicated above in Hillsborough County, Florida.

(iii) An identification of the relevant standard, or other requirement, that is the basis of the notification and the source's compliance date:

The source is subject to the recently promulgated NESHAPS from Secondary Lead Smelting pursuant to 40 CFR 63, Subpart X and the General Provisions in 40 CFR 63, Subpart A. The source's compliance date is June 23, 1997.

(iv) A brief description of the nature, size, design, and method of operation of the source, including its design capacity and an identification of each point of emission for each hazardous air pollutant:

Gulf Coast Recycling recycles discarded automotive and industrial lead-acid storage batteries. The batteries are crushed and

mechanically separated into various components. The lead-bearing components are fed into a blast furnace for lead recovery. The lead is refined further and eventually combined with alloying metals in refining kettles. Finished lead from the kettles is cast into ingots for shipment. The daily lead production rate of the GCR facility is about 90 tons.

A list of the HAP emission points at the site include the blast furnace, slag tapping, furnace charging, lead refining and slag processing. Fugitive emissions result from battery breaking, raw material storage, smelter building, dross storage and vehicle traffic.

(v) A statement whether the affected source is a major source or an area source:

Based on emission data from reference documents, the GCR facility is a major source of HAPs at the present time. However, GCR is expected to become an area source upon installation of an afterburner presently under FDEP air permitting review.

If you have any questions, please call George Townsend or me.

Very truly yours,

Willis M. Kitchen

Willis M. Kitchen
President

WK:par

c: J. Koogler, Koogler & Associates
J. Campbell, EPC of HC

by the Administrator in order to meet the compliance demonstration date specified in this section or the relevant standard.

(5) *Approval of request to use alternative monitoring method.* (i) The Administrator will notify the owner or operator of approval or intention to deny approval of the request to use an alternative monitoring method within 30 calendar days after receipt of the original request and within 30 calendar days after receipt of any supplementary information that is submitted. Before disapproving any request to use an alternative monitoring method, the Administrator will notify the applicant of the Administrator's intention to disapprove the request together with—

(A) Notice of the information and findings on which the intended disapproval is based; and

(B) Notice of opportunity for the owner or operator to present additional information to the Administrator before final action on the request. At the time the Administrator notifies the applicant of his or her intention to disapprove the request, the Administrator will specify how much time the owner or operator will have after being notified of the intended disapproval to submit the additional information.

(ii) The Administrator may establish general procedures and criteria in a relevant standard to accomplish the requirements of paragraph (f)(5)(i) of this section.

(iii) If the Administrator approves the use of an alternative monitoring method for an affected source under paragraph (f)(5)(i) of this section, the owner or operator of such source shall continue to use the alternative monitoring method until he or she receives approval from the Administrator to use another monitoring method as allowed by §63.8(f).

(6) *Alternative to the relative accuracy test.* An alternative to the relative accuracy test for CEMS specified in a relevant standard may be requested as follows:

(i) *Criteria for approval of alternative procedures.* An alternative to the test method for determining relative accuracy is available for affected sources with emission rates demonstrated to be less than 50 percent of the relevant standard. The owner or operator of an affected source may petition the Administrator under paragraph (f)(6)(ii) of this section to substitute the relative accuracy test in section 7 of Performance Specification 2 with the procedures in section 10 if the results of a performance test conducted according to the requirements in §63.7, or other tests performed following the criteria in §63.7, demonstrate that the emission rate of the pollutant of interest in the units of the relevant standard is less than 50 percent of the relevant standard. For affected sources subject to emission limitations expressed as control efficiency levels, the owner or operator may petition the Administrator to substitute the relative accuracy test with the procedures in section 10 of Performance Specification 2 if the control device exhaust emission rate is less than 50 percent of the level needed to meet the control efficiency requirement. The alternative procedures do not apply if the CEMS is used continuously to determine compliance with the relevant standard.

(ii) *Petition to use alternative to relative accuracy test.* The petition to use an alternative to the relative accuracy test shall include a detailed description of the procedures to be applied, the location and the procedure for conducting the alternative, the concentration or response levels of the alternative relative accuracy materials, and the other equipment checks included in the alternative procedure(s). The Administrator will review the petition for completeness and applicability. The Administrator's determination to approve an alternative will depend on the intended use of the CEMS data and may require specifications more stringent than in Performance Specification 2.

(iii) *Rescission of approval to use alternative to relative accuracy test.* The Administrator will review the permission to use an alternative to the CEMS relative accuracy test and may rescind such permission if the CEMS data from a successful completion of the alternative relative accuracy procedure indicate that the affected source's emissions are approaching the level of the relevant standard. The criterion for reviewing the permission is that the collection of CEMS data shows that emissions have exceeded 70 percent of the relevant standard for any averaging period, as specified in the relevant standard. For affected sources subject to emission limitations expressed as control efficiency levels, the criterion for reviewing the permission is that the collection of CEMS data shows that exhaust emissions have exceeded 70 percent of the level needed to meet the control efficiency requirement for any averaging period, as specified in the relevant standard. The owner or operator of the affected source shall maintain records and determine the level of emissions relative to the criterion for permission to use an alternative for relative accuracy testing. If this criterion is exceeded, the owner or operator shall notify the Administrator within 10 days of such occurrence and include a description of the nature and cause of the increased emissions. The Administrator will review the notification and may rescind permission to use an alternative and require the owner or operator to conduct a relative accuracy test of the CEMS as specified in section 7 of Performance Specification 2.

(g) *Reduction of monitoring data.* (1) The owner or operator of each CMS shall reduce the monitoring data as specified in this paragraph. In addition, each relevant standard may contain additional requirements for reducing monitoring data. When additional requirements are specified in a relevant standard, the standard will identify any unnecessary or duplicated requirements in this paragraph that the owner or operator need not comply with.

(2) The owner or operator of each COMS shall reduce all data to 6-minute averages calculated from 36 or more data points equally spaced over each 6-minute period. Data from CEMS for measurement other than opacity, unless otherwise specified in the relevant standard, shall be reduced to 1-hour averages computed from four or more data points equally spaced over each 1-hour period, except during periods when calibration, quality assurance, or maintenance activities pursuant to provisions of this part are being performed. During these periods, a valid hourly average shall consist of at least two data points with each representing a 15-minute period. Alternatively, an arithmetic or integrated 1-hour average of CEMS data may be used. Time periods for averaging are defined in §63.2.

(3) The data may be recorded in reduced or nonreduced form (e.g., ppm pollutant and percent O_2 or ng/J of pollutant).

(4) All emission data shall be converted into units of the relevant standard for reporting purposes using the conversion procedures specified in that standard. After conversion into units of the relevant standard, the data may be rounded to the same number of significant digits as used in that standard to specify the emission limit (e.g., rounded to the nearest 1 percent opacity).

(5) Monitoring data recorded during periods of unavoidable CMS breakdowns, out-of-control periods, repairs, maintenance periods, calibration checks, and zero (low-level) and high-level adjustments shall not be included in any data average computed under this part.

§63.9 Notification requirements.

(a) *Applicability and general information.* (1) The requirements in this section apply to owners and operators of affected sources that are subject to the provisions of this part, unless specified otherwise in a relevant standard.

(2) For affected sources that have been granted an extension of compliance under subpart D of this part, the requirements of this section do not apply to those sources while they are operating under such compliance extensions.

(3) If any State requires a notice that contains all the information required in a notification listed in this section, the owner or operator may send the Administrator a copy of the notice sent to the State to satisfy the requirements of this section for that notification.

(4)(i) Before a State has been delegated the authority to implement and enforce notification requirements established under this part, the owner or operator of an affected source in such State subject to such requirements shall submit notifications to the appropriate Regional Office of the EPA (to

the attention of the Director of the Division indicated in the list of the EPA Regional Offices in §63.13).

(ii) After a State has been delegated the authority to implement and enforce notification requirements established under this part, the owner or operator of an affected source in such State subject to such requirements shall submit notifications to the delegated State authority (which may be the same as the permitting authority). In addition, if the delegated (permitting) authority is the State, the owner or operator shall send a copy of each notification submitted to the State to the appropriate Regional Office of the EPA, as specified in paragraph (a)(4)(i) of this section. The Regional Office may waive this requirement for any notifications at its discretion.

(b) *Initial notifications.* (1)(i) The requirements of this paragraph apply to the owner or operator of an affected source when such source becomes subject to a relevant standard.

(ii) If an area source that otherwise would be subject to an emission standard or other requirement established under this part if it were a major source subsequently increases its emissions of hazardous air pollutants (or its potential to emit hazardous air pollutants) such that the source is a major source that is subject to the emission standard or other requirement, such source shall be subject to the notification requirements of this section.

(iii) Affected sources that are required under this paragraph to submit an initial notification may use the application for approval of construction or reconstruction under §63.5(d) of this subpart, if relevant, to fulfill the initial notification requirements of this paragraph.

(2) The owner or operator of an affected source that has an initial startup before the effective date of a relevant standard under this part shall notify the Administrator in writing that the source is subject to the relevant standard. The notification, which shall be submitted not later than 120 calendar days after the effective date of the relevant standard (or within 120 calendar days after the source becomes subject to the relevant standard), shall provide the following information:

(i) The name and address of the owner or operator;

(ii) The address (i.e., physical location) of the affected source;

(iii) An identification of the relevant standard, or other requirement, that is the basis of the notification and the source's compliance date;

(iv) A brief description of the nature, size, design, and method of operation of the source, including its operating design capacity and an identification of each point of emission for each hazardous air pollutant, or if a definitive identification is not yet possible, a preliminary identification of each point of emission for each hazardous air pollutant; and

(v) A statement of whether the affected source is a major source or an area source.

(3) The owner or operator of a new or reconstructed affected source, or a source that has been reconstructed such that it is an affected source, that has an initial startup after the effective date of a relevant standard under this part and for which an application for approval of construction or reconstruction is not required under §63.5(d), shall notify the Administrator in writing that the source is subject to the relevant standard no later than 120 days after initial startup. The notification shall provide all the information required in paragraphs (b)(2)(i) through (b)(2)(v) of this section, delivered or postmarked with the notification required in paragraph (b)(5).

(4) The owner or operator of a new or reconstructed major affected source that has an initial startup after the effective date of a relevant standard under this part and for which an application for approval of construction or reconstruction is required under §63.5(d) shall provide the following information in writing to the Administrator:

(i) A notification of intention to construct a new major affected source, reconstruct a major affected source, or reconstruct a major source such that the source becomes a major affected source with the application for approval of construction or reconstruction as specified in §63.5(d)(1)(i);

(ii) A notification of the date when construction or reconstruction was commenced, submitted simultaneously with the application for approval of construction or reconstruction, if construction or reconstruction was commenced before the effective date of the relevant standard;

(iii) A notification of the date when construction or reconstruction was commenced, delivered or postmarked not later than 30 days after such date, if construction or reconstruction was commenced after the effective date of the relevant standard;

(iv) A notification of the anticipated date of startup of the source, delivered or postmarked not more than 60 days nor less than 30 days before such date; and

(v) A notification of the actual date of startup of the source, delivered or postmarked within 15 calendar days after that date.

(5) After the effective date of any relevant standard established by the Administrator under this part, whether or not an approved permit program is effective in the State in which an affected source is (or would be) located, an owner or operator who intends to construct a new affected source or reconstruct an affected source subject to such standard, or reconstruct a source such that it becomes an affected source subject to such standard, shall notify the Administrator, in writing, of the intended construction or reconstruction. The notification shall be submitted as soon as practicable before the construction or reconstruction is planned to commence (but no sooner than the effective date of the relevant standard) if the construction or reconstruction commences after the effective date of a relevant standard promulgated in this part. The notification shall be submitted as soon as practicable before startup but no later than 60 days after the effective date of a relevant standard promulgated in this part if the construction or reconstruction had commenced and initial startup had not occurred before the standard's effective date. The notification shall include all the information required for an application for approval of construction or reconstruction as specified in §63.5(d). For major sources, the application for approval of construction or reconstruction may be used to fulfill the requirements of this paragraph.

(c) *Request for extension of compliance.* If the owner or operator of an affected source cannot comply with a relevant standard by the applicable compliance date for that source, or if the owner or operator has installed BACT or technology to meet LAER consistent with §63.6(i)(5) of this subpart, he/she may submit to the Administrator (or the State with an approved permit program) a request for an extension of compliance as specified in §63.6(i)(4) through §63.6(i)(6).

(d) *Notification that source is subject to special compliance requirements.* An owner or operator of a new source that is subject to special compliance requirements as specified in §63.6(b)(3) and §63.6(b)(4) shall notify the Administrator of his/her compliance obligations not later than the notification dates established in paragraph (b) of this section for new sources that are not subject to the special provisions.

(e) *Notification of performance test.* The owner or operator of an affected source shall notify the Administrator in writing of his or her intention to conduct a performance test at least 60 calendar days before the performance test is scheduled to begin to allow the Administrator to review and approve the site-specific test plan required under §63.7(c), if requested by the Administrator, and to have an observer present during the test.

(f) *Notification of opacity and visible emission observations.* The owner or operator of an affected source shall notify the Administrator in writing of the anticipated date for conducting the opacity or visible emission observations specified in §63.6(h)(5), if such observations are required for the source by a relevant standard. The notification shall be submitted with the notification of the performance test date, as specified in paragraph (e) of this section, or if no performance test is required or visibility or other conditions prevent the opacity or visible emission observations from being conducted concurrently with the initial performance test required under §63.7, the owner or operator shall deliver or post-

mark the notification not less than 30 days before the opacity or visible emission observations are scheduled to take place.

(g) *Additional notification requirements for sources with continuous monitoring systems.* The owner or operator of an affected source required to use a CMS by a relevant standard shall furnish the Administrator written notification as follows:

(1) A notification of the date the CMS performance evaluation under §63.8(e) is scheduled to begin, submitted simultaneously with the notification of the performance test date required under §63.7(b). If no performance test is required, or if the requirement to conduct a performance test has been waived for an affected source under §63.7(h), the owner or operator shall notify the Administrator in writing of the date of the performance evaluation at least 60 calendar days before the evaluation is scheduled to begin;

(2) A notification that COMS data results will be used to determine compliance with the applicable opacity emission standard during a performance test required by §63.7 in lieu of Method 9 or other opacity emissions test method data, as allowed by §63.6(h)(7)(ii), if compliance with an opacity emission standard is required for the source by a relevant standard. The notification shall be submitted at least 60 calendar days before the performance test is scheduled to begin; and

(3) A notification that the criterion necessary to continue use of an alternative to relative accuracy testing, as provided by §63.8(f)(6), has been exceeded. The notification shall be delivered or postmarked not later than 10 days after the occurrence of such exceedance, and it shall include a description of the nature and cause of the increased emissions.

(h) *Notification of compliance status.* (1) The requirements of paragraphs (h)(2) through (h)(4) of this section apply when an affected source becomes subject to a relevant standard.

(2)(i) Before a title V permit has been issued to the owner or operator of an affected source, and each time a notification of compliance status is required under this part, the owner or operator of such source shall submit to the Administrator a notification of compliance status, signed by the responsible official who shall certify its accuracy, attesting to whether the source has complied with the relevant standard. The notification shall list—

(A) The methods that were used to determine compliance;

(B) The results of any performance tests, opacity or visible emission observations, continuous monitoring system (CMS) performance evaluations, and/or other monitoring procedures or methods that were conducted;

(C) The methods that will be used for determining continuing compliance, including a description of monitoring and reporting requirements and test methods;

(D) The type and quantity of hazardous air pollutants emitted by the source (or surrogate pollutants if specified in the relevant standard), reported in units and averaging times and in accordance with the test methods specified in the relevant standard;

(E) An analysis demonstrating whether the affected source is a major source or an area source (using the emissions data generated for this notification);

(F) A description of the air pollution control equipment (or method) for each emission point, including each control device (or method) for each hazardous air pollutant and the control efficiency (percent) for each control device (or method); and

(G) A statement by the owner or operator of the affected existing, new, or reconstructed source as to whether the source has complied with the relevant standard or other requirements.

(ii) The notification shall be sent before the close of business on the 60th day following the completion of the relevant compliance demonstration activity specified in the relevant standard (unless a different reporting period is specified in a relevant standard, in which case the letter shall be sent before the close of business on the day the report of the relevant testing or monitoring results is required to be delivered or postmarked). For example, the notification shall be sent before close of business on the 60th (or other required) day following completion of the initial performance test and again before the close of business on the 60th (or other required) day following the completion of any subsequent required performance test. If no performance test is required but opacity or visible emission observations are required to demonstrate compliance with an opacity or visible emission standard under this part, the notification of compliance status shall be sent before close of business on the 30th day following the completion of opacity or visible emission observations.

(3) After a title V permit has been issued to the owner or operator of an affected source, the owner or operator of such source shall comply with all requirements for compliance status reports contained in the source's title V permit, including reports required under this part. After a title V permit has been issued to the owner or operator of an affected source, and each time a notification of compliance status is required under this part, the owner or operator of such source shall submit the notification of compliance status to the appropriate permitting authority following completion of the relevant compliance demonstration activity specified in the relevant standard.

(4) [Reserved]

(5) If an owner or operator of an affected source submits estimates or preliminary information in the application for approval of construction or reconstruction required in §63.5(d) in place of the actual emissions data or control efficiencies required in paragraphs (d)(1)(ii)(H) and (d)(2) of §63.5, the owner or operator shall submit the actual emissions data and other correct information as soon as available but no later than with the initial notification of compliance status required in this section.

(6) Advice on a notification of compliance status may be obtained from the Administrator.

(i) *Adjustment to time periods or postmark deadlines for submittal and review of required communications.* (1)(i) Until an adjustment of a time period or postmark deadline has been approved by the Administrator under paragraphs (i)(2) and (i)(3) of this section, the owner or operator of an affected source remains strictly subject to the requirements of this part.

(ii) An owner or operator shall request the adjustment provided for in paragraphs (i)(2) and (i)(3) of this section each time he or she wishes to change an applicable time period or postmark deadline specified in this part.

(2) Notwithstanding time periods or postmark deadlines specified in this part for the submittal of information to the Administrator by an owner or operator, or the review of such information by the Administrator, such time periods or deadlines may be changed by mutual agreement between the owner or operator and the Administrator. An owner or operator who wishes to request a change in a time period or postmark deadline for a particular requirement shall request the adjustment in writing as soon as practicable before the subject activity is required to take place. The owner or operator shall include in the request whatever information he or she considers useful to convince the Administrator that an adjustment is warranted.

(3) If, in the Administrator's judgment, an owner or operator's request for an adjustment to a particular time period or postmark deadline is warranted, the Administrator will approve the adjustment. The Administrator will notify the owner or operator in writing of approval or disapproval of the request for an adjustment within 15 calendar days of receiving sufficient information to evaluate the request.

(4) If the Administrator is unable to meet a specified deadline, he or she will notify the owner or operator of any significant delay and inform the owner or operator of the amended schedule.

(j) *Change in information already provided.* Any change in the information already provided under this section shall be provided to the Administrator in writing within 15 calendar days after the change.

§63.10 Recordkeeping and reporting requirements.

(a) *Applicability and general information.* (1) The requirements of this section apply to owners or operators of affected sources who are subject to the provisions of this part, unless specified otherwise in a relevant standard.

lations, or the regulations codified in this chapter to implement the Federal title V permit program (42 U.S.C. 7661), whichever regulations are applicable.

§ 63.2 Definitions.

The terms used in this part are defined in the Act or in this section as follows:

Act means the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*, as amended by Pub. L. 101-549, 104 Stat. 2399).

Actual emissions is defined in subpart D of this part for the purpose of granting a compliance extension for an early reduction of hazardous air pollutants.

Administrator means the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency or his or her authorized representative (e.g., a State that has been delegated the authority to implement the provisions of this part).

Affected source, for the purposes of this part, means the stationary source, the group of stationary sources, or the portion of a stationary source that is regulated by a relevant standard or other requirement established pursuant to section 112 of the Act. Each relevant standard will define the "affected source" for the purposes of that standard. The term "affected source," as used in this part, is separate and distinct from any other use of that term in EPA regulations such as those implementing title IV of the Act. Sources regulated under part 60 or part 61 of this chapter are not affected sources for the purposes of part 63.

Alternative emission limitation means conditions established pursuant to sections 112(i)(5) or 112(i)(6) of the Act by the Administrator or by a State with an approved permit program.

Alternative emission standard means an alternative means of emission limitation that, after notice and opportunity for public comment, has been demonstrated by an owner or operator to the Administrator's satisfaction to achieve a reduction in emissions of any air pollutant at least equivalent to the reduction in emissions of such pollutant achieved under a relevant design, equipment, work practice, or operational emission standard, or combination thereof, established under this part pursuant to section 112(h) of the Act.

Alternative test method means any method of sampling and analyzing for an air pollutant that is not a test method in this chapter and that has been demonstrated to the Administrator's satisfaction, using Method 301 in Appendix A of this part, to produce results adequate for the Administrator's determination that it may be used in place of a test method specified in this part.

Approved permit program means a State permit program approved by the Administrator as meeting the requirements of part 70 of this chapter or a Federal permit program established in this chapter pursuant to title V of the Act (42 U.S.C. 7661).

Area source means any stationary source of hazardous air pollutants that is not a major source as defined in this part.

Commenced means, with respect to construction or reconstruction of a stationary source, that an owner or operator has undertaken a continuous program of construction or reconstruction or that an owner or operator has entered into a contractual obligation to undertake and complete, within a reasonable time, a continuous program of construction or reconstruction.

Compliance date means the date by which an affected source is required to be in compliance with a relevant standard, limitation, prohibition, or any federally enforceable requirement established by the Administrator (or a State with an approved permit program) pursuant to section 112 of the Act.

Compliance plan means a plan that contains all of the following:

(1) A description of the compliance status of the affected source with respect to all applicable requirements established under this part;

(2) A description as follows: (i) For applicable requirements for which the source is in compliance, a statement that the source will continue to comply with such requirements;

(ii) For applicable requirements that the source is required to comply with by a future date, a statement that the source will meet such requirements on a timely basis;

(iii) For applicable requirements for which the source is not in compliance, a narrative description of how the source will achieve compliance with such requirements on a timely basis;

(3) A compliance schedule, as defined in this section; and

(4) A schedule for the submission of certified progress reports no less frequently than every 6 months for affected sources required to have a schedule of compliance to remedy a violation.

Compliance schedule means: (1) In the case of an affected source that is in compliance with all applicable requirements established under this part, a statement that the source will continue to comply with such requirements; or

(2) In the case of an affected source that is required to comply with applicable requirements by a future date, a statement that the source will meet such requirements on a timely basis and, if required by an applicable requirement, a detailed schedule of the dates by which each step toward compliance will be reached; or

(3) In the case of an affected source not in compliance with all applicable requirements established under this part, a schedule of remedial measures, including an enforceable sequence of actions or operations with milestones and a schedule for the submission of certified progress reports, where applicable, leading to compliance with a relevant standard, limitation, prohibition, or any federally enforceable requirement established pursuant to section 112 of the Act for which the affected source is not in compliance. This compliance schedule shall resemble and be at least as stringent as that contained in any judicial consent decree or administrative order to which the source is subject. Any such schedule of compliance shall be supplemental to, and shall not sanction noncompliance with, the applicable requirements on which it is based.

Construction means the on-site fabrication, erection, or installation of an affected source.

Continuous emission monitoring system (CEMS) means the total equipment that may be required to meet the data acquisition and availability requirements of this part, used to sample, condition (if applicable), analyze, and provide a record of emissions.

Continuous monitoring system (CMS) is a comprehensive term that may include, but is not limited to, continuous emission monitoring systems, continuous opacity monitoring systems, continuous parameter monitoring systems, or other manual or automatic monitoring that is used for demonstrating compliance with an applicable regulation on a continuous basis as defined by the regulation.

Continuous opacity monitoring system (COMS) means a continuous monitoring system that measures the opacity of emissions.

Continuous parameter monitoring system means the total equipment that may be required to meet the data acquisition and availability requirements of this part, used to sample, condition (if applicable), analyze, and provide a record of process or control system parameters.

Effective date means: (1) With regard to an emission standard established under this part, the date of promulgation in the FEDERAL REGISTER of such standard; or

(2) With regard to an alternative emission limitation or equivalent emission limitation determined by the Administrator (or a State with an approved permit program), the date that the alternative emission limitation or equivalent emission limitation becomes effective according to the provisions of this part. The effective date of a permit program established under title V of the Act (42 U.S.C. 7661) is determined according to the regulations in this chapter establishing such programs.

Emission standard means a national standard, limitation, prohibition, or other regulation promulgated in a subpart of this part pursuant to sections 112(d), 112(h), or 112(f) of the Act.

Emissions averaging is a way to comply with the emission limitations specified in a relevant standard, whereby an affected source, if allowed under a subpart of this part, may create emission credits by reducing emissions from specific points to a level below that required by the relevant standard, and those credits are used to offset emis-

sions from points that are not controlled to the level required by the relevant standard.

EPA means the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Equivalent emission limitation means the maximum achievable control technology emission limitation (MACT emission limitation) for hazardous air pollutants that the Administrator (or a State with an approved permit program) determines on a case-by-case basis, pursuant to section 112(g) or section 112(j) of the Act, to be equivalent to the emission standard that would apply to an affected source if such standard had been promulgated by the Administrator under this part pursuant to section 112(d) or section 112(h) of the Act.

Excess emissions and continuous monitoring system performance report is a report that must be submitted periodically by an affected source in order to provide data on its compliance with relevant emission limits, operating parameters, and the performance of its continuous parameter monitoring systems.

Existing source means any affected source that is not a new source.

Federally enforceable means all limitations and conditions that are enforceable by the Administrator and citizens under the Act or that are enforceable under other statutes administered by the Administrator. Examples of federally enforceable limitations and conditions include, but are not limited to:

(1) Emission standards, alternative emission standards, alternative emission limitations, and equivalent emission limitations established pursuant to section 112 of the Act as amended in 1990;

(2) New source performance standards established pursuant to section 111 of the Act, and emission standards established pursuant to section 112 of the Act before it was amended in 1990;

(3) All terms and conditions in a title V permit, including any provisions that limit a source's potential to emit, unless expressly designated as not federally enforceable;

(4) Limitations and conditions that are part of an approved State Implementation Plan (SIP) or a Fed[illegible] plementation Plan (FIP);

(5) Limitations and conditio[illegible] are part of a Federal construct[illegible] mit issued under 40 CFR 52.21 [illegible] construction permit issued under [illegible] lations approved by the EPA in [illegible] ance with 40 CFR part 51;

(6) Limitations and conditio[illegible] are part of an operating permit [illegible] pursuant to a program approved [illegible] EPA into a SIP as meeting the [illegible] minimum criteria for Federal en[illegible] ability, including adequate noti[illegible] opportunity for EPA and public[illegible] ment prior to issuance of the fin[illegible] mit and practicable enforceability

(7) Limitations and conditio[illegible] State rule or program that has [illegible] approved by the EPA under sub[illegible] of this part for the purposes of [illegible] menting and enforcing section 11[illegible]

(8) Individual consent agreem[illegible] that the EPA has legal authorit[illegible] create.

Fixed capital cost means the c[illegible] needed to provide all the depreci[illegible] components of an existing source.

Fugitive emissions means those [illegible] sions from a stationary source [illegible] could not reasonably pass throug[illegible] stack, chimney, vent, or other [illegible] tionally equivalent opening. Under [illegible] tion 112 of the Act, all fugitive em[illegible] sions are to be considered in determ[illegible] ing whether a stationary source [illegible] major source.

Hazardous air pollutant means any [illegible] pollutant listed in or pursuant to [illegible] tion 112(b) of the Act.

Issuance of a part 70 permit [illegible] occur, if the State is the permitt[illegible] authority, in accordance with the [illegible] quirements of part 70 of this chap[illegible] and the applicable, approved State [illegible] mit program. When the EPA is the [illegible] mitting authority, issuance of a title [illegible] permit occurs immediately after [illegible] EPA takes final action on the final p[illegible] mit.

Lesser quantity means a quantity [illegible] hazardous air pollutant that is or [illegible] be emitted by a stationary source [illegible] the Administrator establishes in ord[illegible] to define a major source under an [illegible] plicable subpart of this part.

Major source means any station[illegible] source or group of stationary sourc[illegible] located within a contiguous area [illegible] common control that emits or [illegible] e potential to emit considering [illegible] ols, in the aggregate, 10 tons per [illegible] or more of any hazardous air pol[illegible] or 25 tons per year or more of [illegible] combination of hazardous air pol[illegible] ts, unless the Administrator es[illegible] hes a lesser quantity, or in the [illegible] of radionuclides, different criteria [illegible] those specified in this sentence.

Malfunction means any sudden, infre[illegible] , and not reasonably preventable [illegible] re of air pollution control equip[illegible] , process equipment, or a process [illegible] perate in a normal or usual man[illegible] Failures that are caused in part by [illegible] maintenance or careless operation [illegible] ot malfunctions.

New source means any affected source [illegible] construction or reconstruction of [illegible] h is commenced after the Adminis[illegible] r first proposes a relevant emis[illegible] standard under this part.

One-hour period, unless otherwise de[illegible] in an applicable subpart, means [illegible] 60-minute period commencing on [illegible] hour.

Opacity means the degree to which [illegible] sions reduce the transmission of [illegible] t and obscure the view of an object [illegible] the background. For continuous [illegible] ity monitoring systems, opacity [illegible] ns the fraction of incident light [illegible] t is attenuated by an optical me[illegible] m.

Owner or operator means any person [illegible] owns, leases, operates, controls, or [illegible] ervises a stationary source.

Part 70 permit means any permit is[illegible] d, renewed, or revised pursuant to [illegible] 70 of this chapter.

Performance audit means a procedure [illegible] analyze blind samples, the content [illegible] which is known by the Adminis[illegible] tor, simultaneously with the analy[illegible] of performance test samples in [illegible] er to provide a measure of test data [illegible] ility.

Performance evaluation means the [illegible] duct of relative accuracy testing, [illegible] ibration error testing, and other [illegible] surements used in validating the [illegible] tinuous monitoring system data.

Performance test means the collection [illegible] data resulting from the execution of [illegible] st method (usually three emission [illegible] t runs) used to demonstrate compli[illegible] e with a relevant emission standard as specified in the performance test section of the relevant standard.

Permit modification means a change to a title V permit as defined in regulations codified in this chapter to implement title V of the Act (42 U.S.C. 7661).

Permit program means a comprehensive State operating permit system established pursuant to title V of the Act (42 U.S.C. 7661) and regulations codified in part 70 of this chapter and applicable State regulations, or a comprehensive Federal operating permit system established pursuant to title V of the Act and regulations codified in this chapter.

Permit revision means any permit modification or administrative permit amendment to a title V permit as defined in regulations codified in this chapter to implement title V of the Act (42 U.S.C. 7661).

Permitting authority means: (1) The State air pollution control agency, local agency, other State agency, or other agency authorized by the Administrator to carry out a permit program under part 70 of this chapter; or

(2) The Administrator, in the case of EPA-implemented permit programs under title V of the Act (42 U.S.C. 7661).

Potential to emit means the maximum capacity of a stationary source to emit a pollutant under its physical and operational design. Any physical or operational limitation on the capacity of the stationary source to emit a pollutant, including air pollution control equipment and restrictions on hours of operation or on the type or amount of material combusted, stored, or processed, shall be treated as part of its design if the limitation or the effect it would have on emissions is federally enforceable.

Reconstruction means the replacement of components of an affected or a previously unaffected stationary source to such an extent that:

(1) The fixed capital cost of the new components exceeds 50 percent of the fixed capital cost that would be required to construct a comparable new source; and

(2) It is technologically and economically feasible for the reconstructed source to meet the relevant standard(s) established by the Administrator (or a State) pursuant to section 112 of the

Act. Upon reconstruction, an affected source, or a stationary source that becomes an affected source, is subject to relevant standards for new sources, including compliance dates, irrespective of any change in emissions of hazardous air pollutants from that source.

Regulation promulgation schedule means the schedule for the promulgation of emission standards under this part, established by the Administrator pursuant to section 112(e) of the Act and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Relevant standard means:

(1) An emission standard;

(2) An alternative emission standard;

(3) An alternative emission limitation; or

(4) An equivalent emission limitation established pursuant to section 112 of the Act that applies to the stationary source, the group of stationary sources, or the portion of a stationary source regulated by such standard or limitation.

A relevant standard may include or consist of a design, equipment, work practice, or operational requirement, or other measure, process, method, system, or technique (including prohibition of emissions) that the Administrator (or a State) establishes for new or existing sources to which such standard or limitation applies. Every relevant standard established pursuant to section 112 of the Act includes subpart A of this part and all applicable appendices of this part or of other parts of this chapter that are referenced in that standard.

Responsible official means one of the following:

(1) For a corporation: A president, secretary, treasurer, or vice president of the corporation in charge of a principal business function, or any other person who performs similar policy or decision-making functions for the corporation, or a duly authorized representative of such person if the representative is responsible for the overall operation of one or more manufacturing, production, or operating facilities and either:

(i) The facilities employ more than 250 persons or have gross annual sales or expenditures exceeding $25 million (in second quarter 1980 dollars); or

(ii) The delegation of authority to such representative is approved in advance by the Administrator.

(2) For a partnership or sole proprietorship: a general partner or the proprietor, respectively.

(3) For a municipality, State, Federal, or other public agency: either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For the purposes of this part, a principal executive officer of a Federal agency includes the chief executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., a Regional Administrator of the EPA).

(4) For affected sources (as defined in this part) applying for or subject to a title V permit: "responsible official" shall have the same meaning as defined in part 70 or Federal title V regulations in this chapter (42 U.S.C. 7661), whichever is applicable.

Run means one of a series of emissions or other measurements needed to determine emissions for a representative operating period or cycle as specified in this part.

Shutdown means the cessation of operation of an affected source for any purpose.

Six-minute period means, with respect to opacity determinations, any one of the 10 equal parts of a 1-hour period.

Standard conditions means a temperature of 293 K (68° F) and a pressure of 101.3 kilopascals (29.92 in. Hg).

Startup means the setting in operation of an affected source for any purpose.

State means all non-Federal authorities, including local agencies, interstate associations, and State-wide programs, that have delegated authority to implement: (1) The provisions of this part and/or (2) the permit program established under part 70 of this chapter. The term State shall have its conventional meaning where clear from the context.

Stationary source means any building, structure, facility, or installation which emits or may emit any air pollutant.

Test method means the validated procedure for sampling, preparing, and analyzing for an air pollutant specified in a relevant standard as the performance test procedure. The test method

include methods described in an ndix of this chapter, test methods rporated by reference in this part, ethods validated for an application ugh procedures in Method 301 of ndix A of this part.

tle V permit means any permit isd, renewed, or revised pursuant to eral or State regulations established to implement title V of the Act U.S.C. 7661). A title V permit issued a State permitting authority is ed a part 70 permit in this part.

sible emission means the observan of an emission of opacity or opti- density above the threshold of vi-

Units and abbreviations.

sed in this part are abbreviations symbols of units of measure. These defined as follows:

(a) *System International (SI) units of asure:*

= ampere
gram
= hertz
= joule
= degree Kelvin
= kilogram
= liter
= meter
= cubic meter
= milligram = 10^{-3} gram
= milliliter = 10^{-3} liter
m = millimeter = 10^{-3} meter
= megagram = 10^{6} gram = metric ton
J = megajoule
ol = mole
= newton
= nanogram = 10^{-9} gram
m = nanometer = 10^{-9} meter
a = pascal
= second
= volt
= watt
= ohm
= microgram = 10^{-6} gram
l = microliter = 10^{-6} liter

(b) *Other units of measure:*

tu = British thermal unit
C = degree Celsius (centigrade)
al = calorie
m = cubic feet per minute
c = cubic centimeter
ft = cubic feet
= day
cf = dry cubic feet
dcm = dry cubic meter
dscf = dry cubic feet at standard conditions
dscm = dry cubic meter at standard conditions
eq = equivalent
°F degree Fahrenheit
ft = feet
ft^2 = square feet
ft^3 = cubic feet
gal = gallon
gr = grain
g-eq = gram equivalent
g-mole = gram mole
hr = hour
in. = inch
in. H_2O = inches of water
K = 1,000
kcal = kilocalorie
lb = pound
lpm = liter per minute
meq = milliequivalent
min = minute
MW = molecular weight
oz = ounces
ppb = parts per billion
ppbw = parts per billion by weight
ppbv = parts per billion by volume
ppm = parts per million
ppmw = parts per million by weight
ppmv = parts per million by volume
psia = pounds per square inch absolute
psig = pounds per square inch gage
°R = degree Rankine
scf = cubic feet at standard conditions
scfh = cubic feet at standard conditions per hour
scm = cubic meter at standard conditions
sec = second
sq ft = square feet
std = at standard conditions
v/v = volume per volume
yd^2 = square yards
yr = year

(c) *Miscellaneous:*

act = actual
avg = average
I.D. = inside diameter
M = molar
N = normal
O.D. = outside diameter
% = percent

§ 63.4 Prohibited activities and circumvention.

(a) *Prohibited activities.* (1) No owner or operator subject to the provisions of this part shall operate any affected

est expected calendar-month average temperature of the stored product may be used to determine the maximum true vapor pressure from nomographs contained in API Bulletin 2517 (incorporated by reference—see §60.17), unless the Administrator specifically requests that the liquid be sampled, the actual storage temperature determined, and the Reid vapor pressure determined from the sample(s).

(ii) The true vapor pressure of each type of crude oil with a Reid vapor pressure less than 13.8 kPa or with physical properties that preclude determination by the recommended method is to be determined from available data and recorded if the estimated maximum true vapor pressure is greater than 3.5 kPa.

(3) For other liquids, the vapor pressure:

(i) May be obtained from standard reference texts, or

(ii) Determined by ASTM Method D2879–83 (incorporated by reference—see §60.17); or

(iii) Measured by an appropriate method approved by the Administrator; or

(iv) Calculated by an appropriate method approved by the Administrator.

(f) The owner or operator of each vessel storing a waste mixture of indeterminate or variable composition shall be subject to the following requirements.

(1) Prior to the initial filling of the vessel, the highest maximum true vapor pressure for the range of anticipated liquid compositions to be stored will be determined using the methods described in paragraph (e) of this section.

(2) For vessels in which the vapor pressure of the anticipated liquid composition is above the cutoff for monitoring but below the cutoff for controls as defined in §60.112b(a), an initial physical test of the vapor pressure is required; and a physical test at least once every 6 months thereafter is required as determined by the following methods:

(i) ASTM Method D2879–83 (incorporated by reference—see §60.17); or

(ii) ASTM Method D323–82 (incorporated by reference—see §60.17); or

(iii) As measured by an appropriate method as approved by the Administrator.

(g) The owner or operator of each vessel equipped with a closed vent system and control device meeting the specifications of §60.112b is exempt from the requirements of paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section.

§60.117b Delegation of authority.

(a) In delegating implementation and enforcement authority to a State under section 111(c) of the Act, the authorities contained in paragraph (b) of this section shall be retained by the Administrator and not transferred to a State.

(b) Authorities which will not be delegated to States: §§60.111b(f)(4), 60.114b, 60.116b(e)(3)(iii), 60.116b(e)(3)(iv), and 60.116b(f)(2)(iii).

[52 FR 11429, Apr. 8, 1987, as amended at 52 FR 22780, June 16, 1987]

Subpart L—Standards of Performance for Secondary Lead Smelters

§60.120 Applicability and designation of affected facility.

(a) The provisions of this subpart are applicable to the following affected facilities in secondary lead smelters: Pot furnaces of more than 250 kg (550 lb) charging capacity, blast (cupola) furnaces, and reverberatory furnaces.

(b) Any facility under paragraph (a) of this section that commences construction or modification after June 11, 1973, is subject to the requirements of this subpart.

[42 FR 37937, July 25, 1977]

§60.121 Definitions.

As used in this subpart, all terms not defined herein shall have the meaning given them in the Act and in subpart A of this part.

(a) *Reverberatory furnace* includes the following types of reverberatory furnaces: stationary, rotating, rocking, and tilting.

(b) *Secondary lead smelter* means any facility producing lead from a leadbearing scrap material by smelting to the metallic form.

(c) *Lead* means elemental lead or alloys in which the predominant component is lead.

[39 FR 9317, Mar. 8, 1974; 39 FR 13776, Apr. 17, 1974]

§60.122 Standard for particulate matter.

(a) On and after the date on which the performance test required to be conducted by §60.8 is completed, no owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart shall discharge or cause the discharge into the atmosphere from a blast (cupola) or reverberatory furnace any gases which:

(1) Contain particulate matter in excess of 50 mg/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf).

(2) Exhibit 20 percent opacity or greater.

(b) On and after the date on which the performance test required to be conducted by §60.8 is completed, no owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart shall discharge or cause the discharge into the atmosphere from any pot furnace any gases which exhibit 10 percent opacity or greater.

[39 FR 9317, Mar. 8, 1974, as amended at 40 FR 46259, Oct. 6, 1975]

§60.123 Test methods and procedures.

(a) In conducting the performance tests required in §60.8, the owner or operator shall use as reference methods and procedures the test methods in Appendix A of this part or other methods and procedures as specified in this section, except as provided in §60.8(b).

(b) The owner or operator shall determine compliance with the particulate matter standards in §60.122 as follows:

(1) Method 5 shall be used to determine the particulate matter concentration during representative periods of furnace operation, including charging and tapping. The sampling time and sample volume for each run shall be at least 60 minutes and 0.90 dscm (31.8 dscf).

(2) Method 9 and the procedures in §60.11 shall be used to determine opacity.

[54 FR 6667, Feb. 14, 1989]

Subpart M—Standards of Perfo ance for Secondary Brass Bronze Production Plants

§60.130 Applicability and design of affected facility.

(a) The provisions of this subpar applicable to the following affecte cilities in secondary brass or br production plants: Reverberatory electric furnaces of 1,000 kg (2205 l greater production capacity and (cupola) furnaces of 250 kg/h (550 or greater production capacity. naces from which molten bra bronze are cast into the shape o ished products, such as foundry naces, are not considered to be aff facilities.

(b) Any facility under paragra of this section that commences struction or modification after Ju 1973, is subject to the requiremer this subpart.

[42 FR 37937, July 25, 1977, as amende FR 43618, Oct. 30, 1984]

§60.131 Definitions.

As used in this subpart, all tern defined herein shall have the me given them in the Act and in subp of this part.

(a) *Brass or bronze* means any alloy containing copper as its pre nant constituent, and lesser an of zinc, tin, lead, or other metals.

(b) *Reverberatory furnace* includ following types of reverberator naces: Stationary, rotating, ro and tilting.

(c) *Electric furnace* means any f which uses electricity to produc 50 percent of the heat required production of refined brass or bro

(d) *Blast furnace* means any f used to recover metal from slag.

[39 FR 9318, Mar. 8, 1974]

§60.132 Standard for particulat ter.

(a) On and after the date on the performance test required conducted by §60.8 is complet owner or operator subject to the sions of this subpart shall disch cause the discharge into the phere from a reverberatory furna gases which:

Emission unit | [illegible]

Emission Unit

EU ID	Stat	Description
[illegible]	A	[illegible]
002	A	THREE 52 TON MELT KETTLES W/ BGHSE ONLY 2 OPERATE AT A TIME
004	A	BAGHOUSE FOR SLAG/LEAD TAP BLAST FURNACE-SLAG TAP SLAGGING F
006	A	BGHSE CONTROLS GHARGING OF BLAST FURNACES(PT#1) SKIP HOIST B
007	C	CRUSHER OPERATION WITH BAGHOUSE
008	C	SODA ASH SILO WITH BAGHOUSE
009	C	BUILDING ENCLOSURE
010	C	CEMENT STORAGE SILO
005	I	78 TON REFINING KETTLE FIRED BY NATURAL GAS.

Press [ENTER] to Select this Emission Unit

Count: *9 <Replace>

10-13-95

I N T E R O F F I C E M E M O R A N D U M

Date: 13-Oct-1995 09:31am EST
From: Elizabeth Deken TPA
DEKEN_E@A1@EPIC66
Dept: Hillsborough County
Tel No: 813/272-5530
SUNCOM:

TO: Alvaro Linero TAL (LINERO_A@A1@DER)

Subject: Gulf Coast Recycling

I received your message regarding GCR's application amendment. I will try to get any comments I have to John R. as soon as I receive and review the changes. With regard to the MACT, the standard was promulgated in June of 1995. So the standard has been out for a while and I know GCR has been aware of that. I also know that they had a very good idea about how the standard was going to affect them prior to promulgation because they received the proposal and Joyce M. from GCR worked through her trade organization on the development of the rule. In other words, GCR was not surprised or unprepared for any requirements from the MACT when it was promulgated in June. Because the rule has been promulgated for a few months now, the notification deadline for GCR to inform the Department that they are subject to the standard is due this month I believe. You should probably check with Cindy Phillips to get details regarding the MACT and notification process. I believe we should act on the amendment or changes to the application as soon as we can and I will work with John R. on any issues that may arise regarding the application.

I N T E R O F F I C E M E M O R A N D U M

Date: 13-Oct-1995 10:21am EST
From: Alvaro Linero TAL
LINERO_A
Dept: Air Resources Management
Tel No: 904/921-9532
SUNCOM: 291-9532

TO: Cindy Phillips TAL (PHILLIPS_C)

CC: John Reynolds TAL (REYNOLDS_J)

Subject: FWD: Gulf Coast Recycling

Update of MACT applicability to GCR as seen by HCEPC.

Al

You, John R
: I need to
come to a
consensus on
this
Clair

10-11-95

I N T E R O F F I C E M E M O R A N D U M

Date: 11-Oct-1995 04:25pm EST
From: Alvaro Linero TAL
LINERO_A
Dept: Air Resources Management
Tel No: 904/921-9532
SUNCOM: 291-9532

TO: See Below

Subject: Gulf Coast Recycling - Battery Recycling Facility

We received a revised application from Gulf Coast Recycling who have been operating for quite some time without a proper PSD permit.

They have continued to operate while replying slowly to our requests for more information to evaluate their original application. Lately, they claimed to want to see how proposed EPA MACT rules for this industry turn out. I'm not sure to what extent this is addressed in the new application. In any case, they still keep operating while we have to review a revised project.

We will very shortly send to everyone (including EPA and NPS) a copy of the revised application. We would appreciate your prompt review and response so we can send them a completeness letter as soon as possible and so they will get into compliance as soon as possible.

John Reynolds is coordinating this one. Thanks.

Distribution:

TO:	Elizabeth Deken TPA	(DEKEN_E @ A1 @ EPIC66)
TO:	Jerry N. Campbell TPA	(CAMPBELL_JN @ A1 @ EPIC66)
TO:	Bill Thomas TPA	(THOMAS_B @ A1 @ TPA1)
CC:	Clair Fancy TAL	(FANCY_C)
CC:	John Brown TAL	(BROWN_J)
CC:	Cindy Phillips TAL	(PHILLIPS_C)
CC:	John Reynolds TAL	(REYNOLDS_J)

al
Thanks
Clair

10-11-95

I N T E R O F F I C E M E M O R A N D U M

Date: 11-Oct-1995 05:17pm EST
From: Alvaro Linero TAL
LINERO_A
Dept: Air Resources Management
Tel No: 904/921-9532
SUNCOM: 291-9532

TO: Doug Beason TAL (BEASON_D)

CC: John Reynolds TAL (REYNOLDS_J)
CC: Clair Fancy TAL (FANCY_C)

Subject: Gulf Coast Recycling

Doug. We received revised application from Gulf Coast. After internal discussions we ask that you not issue a final denial at this time. Feel free to call. Thanks.