Final Determination

City of Lakeland-Charles Larsen Power Plant Lakeland, Florida

120 MW Combined Cycle Gas Turbine System

Permit Number: AC 53-190437 PSD-FL-166

Department of Environmental Regulation Division of Air Resources Management Bureau of Air Regulation

STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION NOTICE OF PERMIT

In the matter of an Application for Permit by:

City of Lakeland 501 East Lemon Street Lakeland, Florida 33801-5050 DER File No. AC 53-190437 PSD-FL-166 Polk County

Enclosed is Permit Number AC 53-190437/PSD-FL-166 to install a combined cycle gas turbine plant at the existing Charles Larsen power plant in Lakeland, Polk County, Florida, issued pursuant to Section(s) 403, Florida Statutes.

Any party to this Order (permit) has the right to seek judicial review of the permit pursuant to Section 120.68, Florida Statutes, by the filing of a Notice of Appeal pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure, with the Clerk of the Department in the Office of General Counsel, 2600 Blair Stone Road, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400; and by filing a copy of the Notice of Appeal accompanied by the applicable filing fees with the appropriate District Court of Appeal. The Notice of Appeal must be filed within 30 days from the date this Notice is filed with the Clerk of the Department.

Executed in Tallahassee, Florida.

STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

C. H. Fancy, P.E., Chief Bureau of Air Regulation 2600 Blair Stone Road Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400 3904-488-1344

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned duly designated deputy agency clerk hereby certifies that this NOTICE OF PERMIT and all copies were mailed before the close of business on (a-Q) to the listed persons.

Clerk Stamp

FILING AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT FILED, on this date, pursuant to \$120.52(11), Florida Statutes, with the designated Department Clerk, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged.

Copies furnished to:

- J. Harper, EPA S. Day, B&V
- H. Kerns, SW District
- D. Schultz, B&V C. Shaver, NPS

Final Determination

The Technical Evaluation and Preliminary Determination for the permit to install a combined cycle gas turbine at the City of Lakeland-Charles Larsen power plant in Lakeland, Polk County, Florida, was distributed on March 15, 1990. The Notice of Intent to Issue was published in the Lakeland Ledger on April 3, 1991. Copies of the evaluation were available for public inspection at the Department's Tampa and Tallahassee offices.

The City of Lakeland's (City) permit application has been reviewed and the Final Determination made by the Division of Air Resources Management. EPA Region IV indicated in their April 4 letter (attachment 2) that they had no adverse comments on the Technical Evaluation and Preliminary Determination (TE & PD). Comments were received from the City of Lakeland dated April 3 and May 15, 1991 (see attachments 1 and 4) and from the National Park Service (NPS) dated May 3, 1991 (attachment 3). The Division concurs with the City's comments concerning the narrative portion of the TE & PD and the comments will become part of the permit file. The NPS and the City's comments which pertain to BACT and Air Quality Analysis are addressed as follows:

BACT

The City would like a 33 percent instead of the proposed 25 percent capacity limit when using oil. In their May 15 letter they provided several supporting reasons as follows:

- a. Limiting the oil to a maximum sulfur content of 0.2 percent is lower than recent permit applications of 0.3 to 0.5 percent sulfur.
- The planned improvements will retire an existing 2.5 percent subject to the same facility.

أأأواج أأفوا المشعفة وولوجوه وما وشعيت الساليسيسية يتباسا يستحييه

- c. The higher capacity limit is consistent with permit conditions being revised for the City of Vero Beach, should low NOx burners be installed.
- d. Most 25 percent capacity limitations on other Florida projects have 65 ppmvd instead of the 42 ppmvd limit on the City's proposed facility.
- e. Increased concern for natural gas capacity given existing uses and proposals to build new facility with generation exceeding 3500MW over the next 8-10 years.

Considering the use of low NOx burners (emission rate of 42 ppmvd) and the use of 0.2 percent maximum sulfur No. 2 fuel oil to limit the SO₂ emissions, DER is willing to allow up to 33% capacity limit for oil firing or 2925 hours per year.

Air Quality Analysis

NPS found the City's dispersion modeling analysis to be deficient since it lacked cumulative Class I increment analysis including all increment consuming sources impacting Chassahowitzka Wilderness Area. The NPS is becoming increasingly concerned about the cumulative impact of emissions on resources, such as lichens and bryophytes, that are known to be particularly sensitive to SO₂. They are also concerned about the acidification of surface water in the Wilderness Area due to increased sulfur and nitrogen deposition. They state that, "Acidification can have serious implications not only to invertebrates and fish but... species higher on the food chain... such as alligator, pelican, and bald eagle."

The Department agrees on the necessity to evaluate the total ambient pollution levels in the Wilderness Area. The Department agrees that future applicants will be required to perform a cumulative analysis for all increment consuming sources impacting the Chassahowitzka Wilderness Area.

The final action of the Department will be to issue construction permit AC 53-190437/PSD-FL-166 as proposed in the Technical Evaluation and Preliminary Determination.



Florida Department of Environmental Regulation

Twin Towers Office Bldg. ● 2600 Blair Stone Road ● Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Lawton Chiles, Governor

Carol M. Browner, Secretary . . .

PERMITTEE: City of Lakeland 501 E. Lemon Street Lakeland, Florida 32961 Permit Number: AC 53-190437 Expiration Date: March 30, 1993

County: Polk

Latitude/Longitude: 28°02'56"N

81°55'25"W

Project: 120 MW Combined Cycle

Gas Turbine

This permit is issued under the provisions of Chapter 403, Florida Statutes, and Florida Administrative Code Chapters 17-2 and 17-4. The above named permittee is hereby authorized to perform the work or operate the facility shown on the application and approved drawings, plans, and other documents attached hereto or on file with the Department and made a part hereof and specifically described as follows:

For the construction of a 120 MW combined cycle gas turbine to be located at the City of Lakeland-Charles Larsen Power Plant in Lakeland, Florida. The turbine will fire natural gas as the primary fuel and have limited hours firing No. 2 fuel oil. The turbine is a GE PG7111 (EA) Frame 7 unit with water injection to reduce NOx emissions. Fuel flow rate for natural gas is 17,333 scfm @ ISO and 124.2 gal/min @ ISO wfor No. 2 fuel oil. The UTM coordinates are 409.185 km East and 3102.754 km North.

source shall be constructed in accordance with the permit application, plans, documents, amendments and drawings; except as otherwise noted in the General and Specific Conditions.

Attachments are listed below:

- City of Lakeland-Charles Larsen Power Plant's letter dated April 3, 1991.
- EPA Region IV letter dated April 4, 1991. 2.
- National Park Service's letter dated May 3, 1991.
- 4. City of Lakeland's letter dated May 15, 1991.

Permit Number: AC 53-190437 Expiration Date: March 30, 1993

GENERAL CONDITIONS:

- 1. The terms, conditions, requirements, limitations, and restrictions set forth in this permit are "Permit Conditions" and are binding and enforceable pursuant to Sections 403.161, 403.727, or 403.859 through 403.861, Florida Statutes. The permittee is placed on notice that the Department will review this permit periodically and may initiate enforcement action for any violation of these conditions.
 - 2. This permit is valid only for the specific processes and operations applied for and indicated in the approved drawings or exhibits. Any unauthorized deviation from the approved drawings, exhibits, specifications, or conditions of this permit may constitute grounds for revocation and enforcement action by the Department.
 - 3. As provided in Subsections 403.087(6) and 403.722(5), Florida Statutes, the issuance of this permit does not convey any vested rights or any exclusive privileges. Neither does it authorize any injury to public or private property or any invasion of personal rights, nor any infringement of federal, state or local laws or regulations. This permit is not a waiver of or approval of any other Department permit that may be required for other aspects of the total project which are not addressed in the permit.
- This permit conveys no title to land or water, does not constitute State recognition or acknowledgement of title, and does not constitute authority for the use of submerged lands unless herein provided and the necessary title or leasehold interests have been obtained from the State. Only the Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund may express State opinion as to title.
 - 5. This permit does not relieve the permittee from liability for harm or injury to human health or welfare, animal, or plant life, or property caused by the construction or operation of this permitted source, or from penalties therefore; nor does it allow the permittee to cause pollution in contravention of Florida Statutes and Department rules, unless specifically authorized by an order from the Department.

Permit Number: AC 53-190437 Expiration Date: March 30, 1993

GENERAL CONDITIONS:

6. The permittee shall properly operate and maintain the facility and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) that are installed or used by the permittee to achieve compliance with the conditions of this permit, as required by Department rules. This provision includes the operation of backup or auxiliary facilities or similar systems when necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of the permit and when required by Department rules.

- 7. The permittee, by accepting this permit, specifically agrees to allow authorized Department personnel, upon presentation of credentials or other documents as may be required by law and at a reasonable time, access to the premises, where the permitted activity is located or conducted to:
 - a. Have access to and copy any records that must be kept under the conditions of the permit;
 - b. Inspect the facility, equipment, practices, or operations regulated or required under this permit; and
- c. Sample or monitor any substances or parameters at any location reasonably necessary to assure compliance with this permit or Department rules.

Reasonable time may depend on the nature of the concern being investigated.

- 8. If, for any reason, the permittee does not comply with or will be unable to comply with any condition or limitation specified in this permit, the permittee shall immediately provide the Department with the following information:
 - a. a description of and cause of non-compliance; and
 - b. the period of noncompliance, including dates and times; or, if not corrected, the anticipated time the non-compliance is expected to continue, and steps being taken to reduce, eliminate, and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance.

Permit Number: AC 53-190437 Expiration Date: March 30, 1993

GENERAL CONDITIONS:

The permittee shall be responsible for any and all damages which may result and may be subject to enforcement action by the Department for penalties or for revocation of this permit.

- 9. In accepting this permit, the permittee understands and agrees that all records, notes, monitoring data and other information relating to the construction or operation of this permitted source which are submitted to the Department may be used by the Department as evidence in any enforcement case involving the permitted source arising under the Florida Statutes or Department rules, except where such use is prescribed by Sections 403.73 and 403.111, Florida Statutes. Such evidence shall only be used to the extent it is consistent with the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure and appropriate evidentiary rules.
- 10. The permittee agrees to comply with changes in Department rules and Florida Statutes after a reasonable time for compliance, provided, however, the permittee does not waive any other rights granted by Florida Statutes or Department rules.
- 11. This permit is transferable only upon Department approval in accordance with Florida Administrative Code Rules 17-4.120 and 17-30.300, F.A.C., as applicable. The permittee shall be liable for any non-compliance of the permitted activity until the transfer is approved by the Department.
- 12. This permit or a copy thereof shall be kept at the work site of the permitted activity.
- This permit also constitutes:
 - (x) Determination of Best Available Control Technology (BACT)
 - (x) Determination of Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)
 - (x) Compliance with New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)
 - 14. The permittee shall comply with the following:
 - a. Upon request, the permittee shall furnish all records and plans required under Department rules. During enforcement actions, the retention period for all records will be extended automatically unless otherwise stipulated by the Department.

Permit Number: AC 53-190437 Expiration Date: March 30, 1993

GENERAL CONDITIONS:

- b. The permittee shall hold at the facility or other location designated by this permit records of all monitoring information (including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation) required by the permit, copies of all reports required by this permit, and records of all data used to complete the application for this permit. These materials shall be retained at least three years from the date of the sample, measurement, report, or application unless otherwise specified by Department rule.
- c. Records of monitoring information shall include:
 - the date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements;
 - the person responsible for performing the sampling or measurements;
 - the dates analyses were performed;
 - the person responsible for performing the analyses;
 - the analytical techniques or methods used; and
 - the results of such analyses.
- When requested by the Department, the permittee shall within a reasonable time furnish any information required by law which is needed to determine compliance with the permit. If the permittee becomes aware that relevant facts were not submitted or were incorrect in the permit application or in any report to the Department, such facts or information shall be corrected promptly.

SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

Emission Limits

- 1. The maximum allowable emissions from this facility shall not exceed the emission rates listed in Table 1.
- 2. Unless the Department has determined other concentrations are required to protect public health and safety, predicted acceptable ambient air concentrations (AAC) of the following pollutants shall not be exceeded:

Permit Number: AC 53-190437 Expiration Date: March 30, 1993

SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

Pollutant	Acceptable Ambient Concentrations ug/m ³			
	8-hrs	24-hrs	Annual	
Beryllium	0.02	0.005	0.0004	
Lead	1.5	0.36	0.09	
Inorganic mercury compounds, all forms		_	0.3	
of vapor, as Hg			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

3. Visible emissions shall not exceed 10% opacity.

Operating Rates

- 4. This source is allowed to operate continuously (8760 hours per year).
- 5. This source is allowed to use natural gas as the primary fuel and No. 2 distillate oil as the secondary fuel (limited as shown in Specific Condition 6 below).
- 6. The permitted materials and utilization rates for the combined cycle gas turbine shall not exceed the values as follows:
 - Maximum No. 2 fuel oil consumption shall not exceed either of the following limitations: 8,190 gals/hr; 23,914,800 gals/yr.
 - Maximum annual firing using No. 2 fuel oil shall not exceed 1/3 of the annual capacity factor.
 - Maximum sulfur (S) content in the No. 2 fuel oil shall not exceed 0.20 percent by weight.
 - Maximum heat input shall not exceed 1055 MMBtu/hr (gas) or 1040
 MMBtu/hr No. 2 fuel (oil).
- 7. Any change in the method of operation, equipment or operating hours shall be submitted to the DER's Bureau of Air Regulation and Southwest District offices.
- 8. Any other operating parameters established during compliance testing and/or inspection that will ensure the proper operation of this facility shall be included in the operating permit.

Permit Number: AC 53-190437 Expiration Date: March 30, 1993

only 1 cT

SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

Compliance Determination

9. Initial (I) compliance tests shall be performed on each CT using both fuels. The stack test for each turbine shall be performed within 10 percent of the maximum heat rate input for the tested operating temperature. Annual (A) compliance tests shall be performed on each CT with the fuel(s) used for more than 400 hours in the preceding 12-month period. Tests shall be conducted using EPA reference methods in accordance with the November 2, 1989,

- a. 5 or 17 for PM (I, A, for oil only)
- b. 10 for CO (I)
- c. 9 for VE (I, A)
- d. 20 for NO_X (I, A)

version of 40 CFR 60 Appendix A:

- e. Trace elements of Beryllium (Be) shall be tested (I, for oil only) using EMTIC Interim Test Method. As an alternative, Method 104 may be used; or Be may be determined from fuel sample analysis using either Method 7090 or 7091, and sample extraction using Method 3040 as described in the EPA solid waste regulations SW 846.
- f. Mercury (Hg) shall be tested using EPA Method 101 (40 CFR 61, Appendix B) (I, for oil only) or fuel sampling analysis using methods acceptable to the Department.

Other DER approved methods may be used for compliance testing after prior Departmental approval.

- 10. Method 5 or 17 must be used to determine the initial compliance status of this unit. Thereafter, the opacity emissions test may be used unless 10% opacity is exceeded.
- 11. Compliance with the SO_2 emission limit can also be determined by calculations based on fuel analysis using ASTM D2880-71 for the sulfur content of liquid.
- 12. Compliance with the total volatile organic compound emission limits will be assumed, provided the CO allowable emission rate is achieved; specific VOC compliance testing is not required.

Permit Number: AC 53-190437 Expiration Date: March 30, 1993

SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

13. During performance tests, to determine compliance with the proposed NO $_{\rm X}$ standard, measured NO $_{\rm X}$ emission at 15 percent oxygen will be adjusted to ISO ambient atmospheric conditions by the following correction factor:

$$NO_X = (NO_{X \text{ obs}}) (\frac{P_{\text{ref}}}{P_{\text{obs}}})^{0.5} e^{19(H_{\text{obs}} - 0.00633)} (\frac{288 \text{°K}}{T_{\text{AMB}}})^{1.53}$$

where:

 NO_X = Emissions of NO_X at 15 percent oxygen and ISO standard ambient conditions.

 $NO_{X \text{ obs}}$ = Measured NO_{X} emission at 15 percent oxygen, ppmv.

Pref = Reference combustor inlet absolute pressure at 101.3 kilopascals (1 atmosphere) ambient pressure.

P_{obs} = Measured combustor inlet absolute pressure at test ambient pressure.

Hobs = Specific humidity of ambient air at test.

e = Transcendental constant (2.718).

TAMB = Temperature of ambient air at test.

- 14. Test results will be the average of 3 valid runs. The Southwest District office will be notified at least 30 days in advance of the compliance test. The source shall operate between 90% and 100% of permitted capacity during the compliance test. Compliance test results shall be submitted to the Southwest District office no later than 45 days after completion.
- 15. Water injection shall be utilized for NOx control. The water to fuel ratio at which compliance is achieved shall be incorporated into the permit and shall be continuously monitored. In addition, the Permittee shall install a duct module suitable for future installation of SCR equipment.
- 16. To determine compliance with the capacity factor condition for oil firing, the Permittee shall maintain daily records of fuel usage. All records shall be maintained for a minimum of three years after the date of each record and shall be made available to representatives of the Department upon request.

Permit Number: AC 53-190437 Expiration Date: March 30, 1993

SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

17. Sulfur, nitrogen content and lower heating value of the fuel being fired in the gas turbine shall also be recorded per fuel oil shipment. These records shall also be kept by the company for at least three years and made available for regulatory agency's inspection.

18. Compliance with the acceptable ambient concentrations for Be, Lead, and Hg emissions shall be demonstrated based on calculations certified by a Professional Engineer registered in Florida, using actual operating conditions. Determination of the ambient concentrations for chemical compounds shall be determined by Department approved dispersion modeling. This compliance determination shall be made available upon request.

Rule Requirements

- 19. This source shall comply with all applicable provisions of Chapter 403, Florida Statutes and Chapters 17-2 and 17-4, Florida Administrative Code.
- 20. This source shall comply with all requirements of 40 CFR 60, Subpart GG and F.A.C. Rule 17-2.660(2)(a), Standards of Performance for Stationary Gas Turbines.
- 21. Issuance of this permit does not relieve the facility owner or operator from compliance with any applicable federal, state, or local permitting requirements and regulations (F.A.C. Rule 17-2.210(1)).
 - 22. This source shall comply with F.A.C. Rule 17-2.700, Stationary Point Source Emission Test Procedures.
- 23. Pursuant to F.A.C. Rule 17-2.210(2), Air Operating Permits, the permittee is required to submit annual reports on the actual operating rates and emissions from this facility. These reports shall include, but are not limited to the following: sulfur, nitrogen content and lower heating value of the fuel being fired, fuel usage, hours of operation, air emissions limits, etc. Annual reports shall be sent to the Department's Southwest District office.
- 24. The permittee, for good cause, may request that this construction permit be extended. Such a request shall be submitted to the Bureau of Air Regulation prior to 60 days before the expiration of the permit (F.A.C. Rule 17-4.090).

Permit Number: AC 53-190437 Expiration Date: March 30, 1993

SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

25. An application for an operation permit must be submitted to the Southwest District office at least 90 days prior to the expiration date of this construction permit or within 45 days after completion of compliance testing, whichever occurs first. To properly apply for an operation permit, the applicant shall submit the appropriate application form, fee, certification that construction was completed noting any deviations from the conditions in the construction permit, and compliance test reports as required by this permit (F.A.C. Rule 17-4.220).

Issued this 25 th day of July 1991

STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

Carol M. Browner, Secretary

TABLE 1
ALLOWABLE EMISSION LIMITS
Combined Cycle Combustion Turbine

	Standar	Standards		Gas Turbine and HRSG ^(a)	
Pollutant	Gas Firing	No. 2 Fuel Oil Firing	Tons Per		Basis
			Gas	Oil	
NO x	25 ppm at 15% oxygen on a dry basis	42 ppmv at 15 percent oxygen on a dry basis	425	· 244	BACT
	•	A. Carrier		•	
$_{2}^{\mathrm{so}}$	Natural gas as fuel	0.2 percent S by weight	2.6	307	BACT
PM/PM ₁₀	0.006 lb/MMBtu	0.025 lb/MMBtu	: 22	22	васт
VOC 10	-	rain de la companya	9 .	6.7	BACT
CO	-		232	79	BACT
Mercury (Hg	· –	$3.0 \times 10^{-6}_{-5}$ lbs/MMBtu		.003	Est. by Appl.
Lead (Pb)	- ·	2.8 x 10 10 1bs/MMBtu		0.03	' n n
Beryllium () Sulfuric	pe) –	2.8 x 10 ⁻⁵ lbs/MMBtu 2.5 x 10 lbs/MMBtu	- /-	.003	BACT
Acid Mist	Natural gas as fuel	Low sulfur content oil		3.2 x 1	0 ⁻³ BACT

⁽a) Emissions rates based on 100 percent capacity factor for natural gas and 1/3 capacity factor for oil firing.

Best Available Control Technology (BACT) Determination City of Lakeland-Charles Larsen Power Plant Polk County

The applicant proposes to install a combustion turbine generator at their facility in Lakeland. The generator system will consist of a single nominal 80 megawatt (MW) combustion turbine, and a single heat recovery steam generator (HRSG) which will be used to repower an existing nominal 40 MW steam turbine.

The combustion turbine will be capable of both combined cycle and simple cycle operation. The applicant requested that the combustion turbine use either natural gas or distillate oil. The applicant has indicated the maximum annual tonnage of regulated air pollutants emitted from the facility based on 100 percent capacity and type of fuel fired at ISO conditions to be as follows:

Pollutant	Poter Emissions		PSD Significant Emission Rate (tons/yr)
	Natural <u>Gas</u>	Fuel Oil	
NOx	425	732	40
so ₂	2.6	920 ·	40
PM	22.0	66	25
_PM ₁₀	22.0	66	` 15
co	232	237	100
VOC	9	20.0	40
H ₂ SO ₄	0.8	27.4	7
_ Be	0.0	0.01	0.0004
Hg	0.0	0.01	0.1
Pb	0.0	0.12	: .: .: .: .: .: .: .: .: .: .:

Florida Administrative Code Rule 17-2.500(2)(f)(3) requires a BACT review for all regulated pollutants emitted in an amount equal to or greater than the significant emission rates listed in the previous table.

Date of Receipt of a BACT Application

December 17, 1990

BACT Determination Requested by the Applicant

<u>Pollutant</u>	<u>Determination</u>
NOx	25 ppmvd @ 15% O ₂ (natural gas burning) 42 ppmvd @ 15% O ₂ (diesel oil firing)
so ₂	Firing of natural gas or No. 2 fuel oil with a maximum sulfur content of 0.20%
PM and PM ₁₀	Combustion control
H ₂ SO ₄	Firing of No. 2 fuel oil with a maximum sulfur content of 0.20%.
Be	Firing of No. 2 fuel oil

BACT Determination Procedure

In accordance with Florida Administrative Code Chapter 17-2, Air Pollution, this BACT determination is based on the maximum degree of reduction of each pollutant emitted which the Department, on a case by case basis, taking into account energy, environmental and economic impacts, and other costs, determines is achievable through application of production processes and available methods, systems, and techniques. In addition, the regulations state that in making the BACT determination the Department shall give consideration to:

- (a) Any Environmental Protection Agency determination of Best Available Control Technology pursuant to Section 169, and any emission limitation contained in 40 CFR Part 60 (Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources) or 40 CFR Part 61 (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants).
- (b) All scientific, engineering, and technical material and other information available to the Department.
- (c) The emission limiting standards or BACT determinations of any other state.
- (d) The social and economic impact of the application of such technology.

The EPA currently stresses that BACT should be determined using the "top-down" approach. The first step in this approach is to determine for the emission source in question the most stringent control available for a similar or identical source or source category. If it is shown that this level of control is technically or economically infeasible for the source in question, then the next most stringent level of control is determined and similarly evaluated. This process continues until the BACT level under consideration cannot be eliminated by any substantial or unique technical, environmental, or economic objections.

The air pollutant emissions from combined cycle power plants can be grouped into categories based upon what control equipment and techniques are available to control emissions from these facilities. Using this approach, the emissions can be classified as follows:

- o Combustion Products (Particulates and Heavy Metals).
 Controlled generally by good combustion of clean fuels.
- o Products of Incomplete Combustion (CO, VOC, Toxic Organic Compounds). Control is largely achieved by proper combustion techniques.
- o Acid Gases (SOx, NOx, HCl, Fl). Controlled generally by gaseous control devices.

Grouping the pollutants in this manner facilitates the BACT analysis because it enables the equipment available to control the type or group of pollutants emitted and the corresponding energy, economic, and environmental impacts to be examined on a common in the BACT basis. Although all of the pollutants addressed analysis may be subject to a specific emission limiting standard as result of PSD review, the control of "nonregulated" air pollutants is considered in imposing a more stringent BACT limit on "regulated" pollutant (i.e., particulates, sulfur dioxide, fluorides, sulfuric acid mist, etc,), if a reduction in "nonregulated" air pollutants can be directly attributed to the control device selected as BACT for the abatement of the "regulated" pollutants.

Combustion Products

Service Control of the Control of th

The City of Lakeland's projected emissions of particulate matter, PM_{10} , and beryllium surpass the significant emission rates given in Florida Administrative Code Rule 17-2.500, Table 500-2 for No. 2 fuel oil firing only.

A PM/PM₁₀ emissions limitation of .025 lb/MMBtu for No. 2 fuel oil firing is reasonable as BACT for the Lakeland facility.

In general, the BACT/LAER Clearinghouse does not contain specific emission limits for beryllium from turbines. BACT for these heavy metals is typically represented by the level of particulate control. As this is the case, the emission factor of .025 lb/MMbtu for particulate matter PM_{10} is judged to also represent BACT for beryllium.

Products of Incomplete Combustion

The emissions of carbon monoxide exceeds the significant level and therefore requires a BACT analysis.

At the proposed BACT NO_X emissions of 25/42 ppmvd (gas/oil) the turbine will be capable of maintaining CO emission rates of 25 ppmvd for either natural gas or No. 2 fuel oil. The applicant states that catalytic reduction could be installed at a levelized cost of 1.0 million/year to further reduce the CO emissions by 140 tons/year while burning natural gas (8760 hrs/yr). The incremental removal cost of using such control would be approximately \$7340/ton of CO removed. This cost exceeds that which is consistent with BACT and is not economically justifiable.

Acid Gases

The emissions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and sulfuric acid mist, represent a significant proportion of the total emissions and need to be controlled if deemed appropriate. Sulfur dioxide emissions from combustion turbines are directly related to the sulfur content of the fuel being combusted.

The applicant has proposed the use of natural gas and No. 2 fuel oil with a maximum sulfur content of 0.20% to control sulfur dioxide emissions. A review of the latest edition (1990) of the BACT/LAER Clearinghouse indicates that sulfur dioxide emissions from combustion turbines have been controlled by limiting fuel oil sulfur content to a range of 0.1 to 0.3%, with the average for the facilities listed being approximately 0.24 percent. As this is the case, the applicant's proposal to use No. 2 fuel oil with a maximum sulfur content of 0.20% is judged to represent BACT.

The applicant has stated that BACT for nitrogen oxides will be met by using wet (water or steam) injection necessary to limit emissions to 42 ppmvd or 25 ppmvd at 15% oxygen when burning No. 2 fuel oil or natural gas, respectively.

A review of the EPA's BACT/LAER Clearinghouse indicates that the lowest NOx emission limit established to date for a combustion turbine is 4.5 ppmvd at 15% percent oxygen. This level of control was accomplished through the use of water injection and a selective catalytic reduction (SCR) system.

Selective catalytic reduction is a post-combustion method for control of NOx emissions. The SCR process combines vaporized ammonia with NOx in the presence of a catalyst to form nitrogen and water. The vaporized ammonia is injected into the exhaust gases prior to passage through the catalyst bed. The SCR process can achieve up to 90% reduction of NOx with a new catalyst. As the catalyst ages, the maximum NOx reduction will decrease to approximately 86 percent.

Given the applicant's proposed BACT level for nitrogen oxides control stated above, an evaluation can be made of the cost and associated benefit of using SCR as follows:

The applicant has indicated that the total levelized annual cost (operating plus amortized capital cost) to install SCR for natural gas firing at 100 percent capacity factor is \$2,190,000. Taking into consideration the total levelized annual cost, a cost/benefit analysis of using SCR can now be developed.

Based on the information supplied by the applicant, it is estimated that the maximum annual NOx emissions with wet injection from the Lakeland facility will be 425 tons/year. Assuming that SCR would reduce the NOx emissions by an additional 80-85%, the SCR would control at least 340 tons of NOx annually for natural gas firing. When this reduction is taken into consideration with the total levelized annual cost of \$2,190,000, the cost per ton of controlling NOx is \$6,441. This calculated cost is higher than has previously been approved as BACT.

Since SCR has been determined to be BACT for several combined cycle facilities, the EPA has clearly stated that there must be unique circumstances to consider the rejection of such control on the basis of economics.

In a recent letter from EPA Region IV to the Department regarding the permitting of a combined cycle facility (Tropicana Products, Inc.), the following statement was made:

"In order to reject a control option on the basis of economic considerations, the applicant must show why the costs associated with the control are significantly higher for this specific project than for other similar projects that have installed this control system or in general for controlling the pollutant."

A review of the combined cycle facilities in which SCR has been established as a BACT requirement indicates that the majority of these facilities are also intended to operate at high capacity factors. As this is the case, the proposed project is similar to other facilities in which SCR has been established as BACT, thereby supporting SCR as BACT for the proposed facility.

For fuel oil firing, the cost associated with controlling NOx emissions must take into account the potential operating problems that can occur with using SCR in the oil firing mode.

A concern associated with the use of SCR on combined cycle projects is the formation of ammonium bisulfate. For the SCR process, ammonium bisulfate can be formed due to the reaction of sulfur in the fuel and the ammonia injected. The ammonium bisulfate formed has a tendency to plug the tubes of the heat recovery steam generator leading to operational problems. As this is the case, SCR has been judged to be technically infeasible for oil firing in some previous BACT determinations.

The latest information available now indicates that SCR can be used for oil firing provided that adjustments are made in the ammonia to NOx injection ratio. For natural gas firing operation NOx emissions can be controlled with up to a 90 percent efficiency using a 1 to 1 or greater injection ratio. By lowering the injection ratio for oil firing, testing has indicated that NOx can be controlled with efficiencies ranging from 60 to 75 percent. When the injection ratio is lowered there is not a problem with ammonium bisulfate formation since essentially all of the ammonia is able to react with the nitrogen oxides present in the combustion gases.

Based on this strategy SCR has been both proposed and established as BACT for oil fired combined cycle facilities with NOx emission—limits ranging from 11.7 to 25 ppmvd depending on the efficiency of control established.

Assuming that the lowered ammonia injection ratio strategy was used to control NOx emissions by 65%, the SCR would control 386 tons of NOx annually for oil/gas firing, assuming a maximum capacity factor of 33 percent on oil. When this reduction is taken into consideration with the total annual cost of \$2,190,000, the cost per ton of controlling NOx is \$5,674. This cost is lower than that determined for natural gas firing alone; however, it is still higher than what has been previously accepted as BACT.

Environmental Impact Analysis

The predominant environmental impacts associated with this proposal are related to the use of SCR for NOx control. The use of SCR results in emissions of ammonia, which may increase with increasing levels of NOx control. In addition, some catalysts may contain substances which are listed as hazardous waste, thereby creating an additional environmental burden. Although the use of SCR does have some environmental impacts, the disadvantages do not outweigh the benefit which would be provided by reducing nitrogen oxide emissions by 80 percent. The overwhelming benefit of NOx control by using SCR is substantiated by the fact that nearly one half of all BACT determinations have established SCR as the control measure for nitrogen oxides over the last five years.

In addition to the criteria pollutants, the impacts of toxic pollutants associated with the combustion of natural gas and No. 2 fuel oil have been evaluated. Beryllium for oil fired operation exceeds PSD significant levels. Other toxics are expected to be emitted in minimal amounts, with the total emissions combined to be less than 0.1 tons per year.

Although the emissions of the toxic pollutants could be controlled by particulate control devices such as a baghouse or scrubber, the amount of emission reductions would not warrant the added expense. As this is the case, the Department does not believe that the BACT determination would be affected by the emissions of the toxic pollutants associated with the firing of natural gas or No. 2 fuel oil.

Potentially Sensitive Concerns

With regard to controlling NOx emissions with SCR, the applicant has identified the following technical limitations:

- 1. SCR would reduce output of combustion turbines by one percent.
- 2. SCR could result in the release of unreacted quantities of ammonia to the atmosphere.
- 3. SCR would require handling of ammonia by plant operators. Since it is a hazardous material, there is a concern about safety and productivity of operators.
- 4. SCR results in contaminated catalyst from flue gas trace elements which could be considered hazardous. Safety of operators and disposal of spent catalyst is a concern.

BACT_Determination by DER

NOx Control

A review of the permitting activities for combined cycle proposals across the nation indicates that SCR has been required and most recently proposed for installations with a variety of operating conditions (i.e., natural gas, fuel oil, capacity factors ranging from low to high). However, the cost and other concerns expressed by the applicant are valid.

The information that the applicant presented and Department calculations indicates that the incremental cost of controlling NOx (\$6,441/ton) for natural gas is high compared to other BACT determinations which require SCR. However, the cost of controlling NOx emissions for oil firing (\$4,600/ton) could be considered reasonable. Based on the information presented by the applicant and the studies conducted, the Department believes that the use of SCR for NOx control is not justifiable at this time as BACT. Therefore, the Department is willing to accept low NOx combustors with the firing of natural gas as the primary fuel. However, No. 2 distillate oil firing must be limited to 1/3 of the annual capacity factor. The applicant is also expected to design the facility to accomodate SCR should additional oil usage become necessary and SCR becomes a BACT requirement in the future.

SO₂ Control

For sulfur dioxide BACT is represented by firing natural gas or No. 2 fuel oil with an average sulfur content not to exceed 0.20 percent.

Other Emissions Control

The emission limitations for PM and PM₁₀, are based on previous BACT determinations for similar facilities, with the heavy metal beryllium being addressed through the particulate limitation and sulfuric acid mist being addressed through the sulfur dioxide limitation.

The emission limits for the City of Lakeland project are thereby established as follows:

Pollutant	Emissior Natural Gas Firing	
NOx	25 ppmvd @ 15% O ₂	42 ppmvd @ 15% O ₂ *
so ₂	Natural gas as fuel	Sulfur content not to exceed 0.20%
co	25 ppmvd @ 15% O ₂	25 ppmvd @ 15% O ₂
PM & PM ₁₀	0.006 lb/MMBtu	0.025 lb/MMBtu
Sulfuric Acid Mist	Emissions limited by na fuel oil firing	tural gas and No. 2
Beryllium	Emissions limited by na fuel oil firing	tural gas and No. 2
		· ·

^{*} No. 2 fuel oil usage limited to 1/3 of the total heat input on an annual basis.

Details of the Analysis May be Obtained by Contacting:

Preston Lewis, P.E., BACT Coordinator Department of Environmental Regulation Bureau of Air Regulation 2600 Blair Stone Road Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Recommended by:	Approved by:
	Ita harlwood
C. H. Fancy, P.E., Chief Bureau of Air Regulation	Carol M. Browner, Secretary Dept. of Environmental Regulation
July 19 1991	<u>July 26</u> 1991
Date '	Date ℓ /·

SENDER:	TOTAL CHARGE CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR
Complete items 1/and/or/2 for additional services.	also wish to freceive the
Complete items 3, and 4a & b	Tollowing services (for an extra 25)
that we can return this card to you was said to	SCHOOL MORE WALLS AND SOME THE PARTY OF THE
Attach this form to the front of the mallpiece, or o	n the 1. Addressee's Address
Mack if space does not permit X が ジャー・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・	
• Write , Return Receipt Requested from the mailpiec	
the article number.	Consult postmaster for fee.
3. Article Addressed to:	4a.VArticle Number
Mr. Alfred M. Dodd P.E.	P 832 9539 827 4 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
This & W. Engineering Manager, W. W.	4b Service Type No. 35 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15
City of Lakeland	☐ Registered ☐ Insured # 100 \$ 100
Dept. of Electrics Water Util:	Certified Say O COD
501 E. Lemon Street	Express Mail Return Receipt for
在中国人名英格兰·阿尔克斯特的1915年的英国的大型国际共和国的特殊的特殊的基础的特殊的企业的基础的基础。2015年1916年1916年1916年1916年19	Merchandise Marchandise
Lakeland, FI 33801 5050	7.*Date of Delivery
TO SEE SOME OF SERVICE OF THE SERVIC	CHEST ENGLANDS OF THE STATE OF
5. Signature (Addressee)	8. Addressee's Address (Only if requested
	and fee is paid)
6. Signature (Agent)	
and into	
PS Form 3811, October 1990, 100 (8 GPC) 1990, 2774	And the second s
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	DOMESTIC RETURN RECEIPT
	一种原则是一种原则的一种原则
	是这个是一个,这个是一个是一个是一个是一个是一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一

APIS
UPDATED
FOR AC53-190437
By
MIRZA.

	_ r 032 539	827
	No Insurance Cov. Do not use for Interest (See Reverse)	ail Receipt verage Provided ernational Mail
	Mr. Alfred M. Doo Street & No. Lat 501 E. Lemon St.	celand
	Lakeland, FL 3380 Postage	
	Special Delivery Fee	
	Restricted Delivery Fee	
6	Return Receipt Showing to Whom & Date Delivered	
June 1	Return Receipt Showing to Whom, Date, & Address of Delivery	
00	TOTAL Postage & Fees \$	
PS Form 3800, June 1990	Postmark or Date Mailed: 7-26-91 Permit: AC 53-1904	37



State of Florida DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

For Routing To Other Than The Addresses		
To:	Location:	
То:	Location:	
To:	Location:	
From:	Date:	

Interoffice Memorandum

TO: Carol M. Browner

FROM: Steve Smallwood

DATE: July 19, 1991

SUBJ: Approval of Construction Permit AC 53-190437/PSD-FL-166

City of Lakeland - Charles Larsen Power Plant

Attached for your approval and signature is a permit and corresponding Best Available Control Technology (BACT) determination prepared by the Bureau of Air Regulation for the above mentioned company to install a combined cycle gas turbine plant at the existing Charles Larsen power plant in Lakeland, Polk County, Florida.

Comments were received from the National Park Service and the City of Lakeland.

I recommend your approval and signature.

CF/PL/plm

Attachments