



Department of Environmental Protection

Lawton Chiles
Governor

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

Virginia B. Wetherell
Secretary

September 11, 1995

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Ms. Farzie Shelton, Ch.E.
Environmental Coordinator
City of Lakeland
Department of Water and Electric Utilities
501 East Lemon Street
Lakeland, Florida 33801-5050

Dear Ms. Shelton:

Re: Modification of PSD-FL-008, Petcoke Project
City of Lakeland, C.D. McIntosh Unit No. 3

We have reviewed the information which you provided at the August 11 meeting between City and Department representatives. The City indicated its intent to pursue the petroleum coke (petcoke) project upon amendment of the Final Determination (permit) applicable to C. D. McIntosh Unit 3. The City provided a summary of previous understandings from past meetings with Department personnel and requested a prompt decision on applicability of Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Best Available Control Technology (BACT) to the proposed project.

A Department summary of the early meetings might vary on a few points. In any case, the project will be reviewed in light of the amended PSD permit and the applicable rules in Chapter 62, Florida Administrative Code (FAC).

Actual emissions prior to the petcoke project should be calculated based on the lower of the historical actual emissions or allowable emissions. Since the Unit was apparently operating in excess of allowable sulfur dioxide (SO₂) limits contained in both the previous and amended PSD permits, allowable emissions should be used. We propose to rely on the new SO₂ limits rather than the previous ones which required 85 percent scrubbing efficiency for all grades of coal. This will benefit the City. Annual estimates of emissions prior to the project should be based on actual hours of operation, actual fuel combusted, capacity factors, etc. In the case of pollutants other than SO₂, actual emissions reflecting past operation, should be based on past (or new) compliance tests, CEMS data, applicable inferences from the petcoke test program, engineering estimates, etc.

Ms. Farzie Shelton
September 11, 1995
Page Two

Actual emissions (representative actual annual emissions) following the proposed change should be projected in accordance with the definitions given in FAC 62-212.200(2)(d) and 40 CFR 52.21(b)(33). This method is also favorable to the City since it does not require future annual emissions to be estimated as the Potential-to-Emit. Actual emissions after the change should be estimated from information and inferences derived from the previous petcoke tests, engineering estimates, etc.

We estimate SO₂ emissions before the change (based on present allowable emission rates and recent coal sulfur specifications) to be between 0.6 pounds per million Btu heat input (lb/10⁶ Btu) and 0.75 lb/10⁶ Btu. It appears that the SO₂ emission rate when firing the proposed petcoke blend will be less than or equal to 0.75 lb/10⁶ Btu. Therefore it is possible that there will be a relatively small increase in annual SO₂ emissions.

Sulfuric acid mist emissions may increase because of catalytic transformation of SO₂ to SO₃ in the presence of vanadium, all other factors being equal. We recommend that the City review past records to see if there are any test data upon which to base historical sulfuric acid mist emissions. The data would need to come from tests during which the SO₂ emissions were roughly equal to the present allowable limit. There does not appear to be a way to infer past or future acid mist emissions from the petcoke test program. Since the trigger level is only 7 tons per year, we recommend that methods of control be considered. It is possible that the scrubber will remove the additional mist. In any case, tests are easy to conduct and inexpensive.

Although carbon monoxide (CO) emissions appear to increase when burning petcoke, the City theorizes that the increase is due to the grindability characteristics of low sulfur coal. Testing while burning low sulfur coal (without petcoke) could prove this hypothesis. If true, no increase would be expected in CO following the proposed switch to the petcoke/low sulfur coal blend. Again, CO data are easy and inexpensive to obtain.

With respect to nitrogen oxides (NO_x), we note that there are past compliance test data indicating emission rates of 0.324, 0.473, and 0.434 lb/10⁶ Btu during 1992, 1993, and 1994 respectively. Since these tests were presumably conducted when firing low sulfur coal, it would not be necessary to conduct more tests. Interestingly, it appears that there is no significant difference between the NO_x data obtained when burning low sulfur coal (0.410 lb/10⁶ Btu) and that obtained when burning a petcoke/low sulfur coal blend (0.413 lb/10⁶ Btu). Additionally, the SO₂ emissions were within present allowable levels thus further validating these tests. Similar arguments appear to hold for particulate matter.

Ms. Farzie Shelton
September 11, 1995
Page Three

Ultimately it is up to the City to submit the most appropriate comparisons of actual annual emissions prior to the proposed petcoke switch with representative actual annual emissions following the switch. It may turn out that no increases in emissions are predicted thus exempting the project from PSD and BACT. However the definitions cited above require reporting to determine at future dates if there were increases such that PSD/BACT was triggered. We recommend that the City prepare some basic cost data to control any pollutants which increase as a result of the petcoke project. Please refer to our letter of May 5, 1995 for a description on how such information should be presented.

We look forward to receiving your application and are prepared to discuss these matters with you at your convenience. If you have any questions, please call A. A. Linero, P.E., Administrator, New Source Review Section, at (904)488-1344.

Sincerely,



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

CHF/aal/1

cc: J. Harper EPA
P. Bunyak NPS
H. Rhodes DEP
B. Owen DEP
D. Beason DEP
B. Thomas, SWD
R. Harwood, PCESD
K. Kosky, KBN
A. Morrison, HGSS

is your RETURN ADDRESS completed on the reverse side?

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):

- Addressee's Address
- Restricted Delivery
Consult postmaster for fee.

3. Article Addressed to:
 Garzie Shelton, Ch.E.
 City of Lakeland
 Dept. of Water & Electric Ut.
 501 E. Lemon St.
 Lakeland, FL 33801-5058

4a. Article Number:
 2 392 979 039

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

7. Date of Delivery:
 9/14/95

5. Signature (Addressee)


6. Signature (Agent)
 [Signature]

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

PS Form 3811 December 1991 U.S. GPO: 1993-322-714 **DOMESTIC RETURN RECEIPT**

Thank you for using Return Receipt Service

2 392 979 039

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

PS Form 3800, March 1993

City	Lakeland
Street and no.	501 E. Lemon St.
P.O., State and ZIP Code	Lakeland FL 33801-5058
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-FI-008 9-12-95 Petcoke #3

HOPPING GREEN SAMS & SMITH

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

123 SOUTH CALHOUN STREET

POST OFFICE BOX 6526

TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32314

(904) 222-7500

FAX (904) 224-8551

FAX (904) 425-3415

JAMES S. ALVES
BRIAN H. BIBEAU
KATHLEEN BLIZZARD
ELIZABETH C. BOWMAN
RICHARD S. BRIGHTMAN
PETER C. CUNNINGHAM
RALPH A. DeMEO
THOMAS M. DeROSE
WILLIAM H. GREEN
WADE L. HOPPING
FRANK E. MATTHEWS
RICHARD D. MELSON
DAVID L. POWELL
WILLIAM D. PRESTON
CAROLYN S. RAEPPLE
GARY P. SAMS
ROBERT P. SMITH
CHERYL G. STUART

KRISTIN M. CONROY
CONNIE C. DURRENCE
JONATHAN S. FOX
JAMES C. GOODLETT
GARY K. HUNTER, JR.
JONATHAN T. JOHNSON
ROBERT A. MANNING
ANGELA R. MORRISON
GARY V. PERKO
KAREN M. PETERSON
MICHAEL P. PETROVICH
DOUGLAS S. ROBERTS
LISA K. RUSHTON
R. SCOTT RUTH
JULIE R. STEINMEYER

OF COUNSEL
CARLOS ALVAREZ
W. ROBERT FOKES

September 6, 1995

RECEIVED
SEP 7 1995

Bureau of
Air Regulation

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Kenneth Plante, Esquire
Office of General Counsel
Department of Environmental Protection
3900 Commonwealth Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Re: City of Lakeland, Department of Electric and Water Utilities
Proposed Amendment to PSD Permit Number PSD-FL-008
C.D. McIntosh Power Plant No. 3, Polk County, Florida --
Withdrawal of Request for Extension of Time

Dear Mr. Plante:

The City of Lakeland, Department of Electric and Water Utilities, received a proposed permit amendment to the above referenced Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit on July 17, 1995, for its C.D. McIntosh Power Plant, Unit No. 3, located in Polk County, Florida. The proposed permit amendment was issued by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's Bureau of Air Regulation, and the Intent to Issue was signed by Clair H. Fancy, P.E., Chief of the Bureau of Air Regulation. Pursuant to the Department's Order dated August 16, 1995, the City of Lakeland has until November 1, 1995, to file a petition for administrative proceedings regarding the proposed permit amendment. The Department has since issued a final, revised permit amendment that resolves the City's concerns and that is acceptable to the City.


Therefore, on behalf of the City of Lakeland, I hereby withdrawal the City's request for extension of time in which to file a petition for administrative proceedings regarding the revised permit and accept the permit revision issued on September 1, 1995. By the City's acceptance of the revised permit, we assume that the Department's file on this matter will be closed and that no further action is necessary.

I have attempted without success to contact Douglas Beason of the Department's Office of General Counsel regarding the City's withdrawal of the request for extension of time. The

Kenneth Plante, Esquire
September 6, 1995
Page 2

City of Lakeland appreciates the Department's cooperation and assistance in this matter. Please call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,


Angela R. Morrison

cc: Clair Fancy, DEP BAR
Al Linero, DEP BAR
Douglas Beason, Esquire, DEP OGC
Farzie Shelton, City of Lakeland