

## Department of Environmental Protection

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

Virginia B. Wetherell Secretary

January 12, 1995

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. David A. Buff, P.E. KBN Engineering and Applied Sciences, Inc. 6241 N.W. 23rd Street Gainesville, Florida 32653-1500

Dear Mr. Buff:

RE: Cargill Fertilizer, Inc.
Bartow Units Nos. 4, 5 and 6 Sulfuric Acid Plants
AC53-216288/PSD-FL-191
Request for Permit Amendment

The Department's Bureau of Air Regulation has reviewed the above referenced request from you for the above referenced company and emission units and determined that it will require a permit amendment and a \$750 processing fee (\$250 for each emission unit). As soon as the fee is received, we will be begin processing your request. In addition to the processing fee due, please provide the following information:

- o The original permit was issued to Seminole Fertilizer Corporation. It appears that Cargill Fertilizer, Inc. is now the owner. Please provide the change of ownership request; and, provide the acknowledgement letter from the Department.
- o As a condition of the permit, Specific Condition No. 4, there was a requirement that each plant be tested for  $NO_X$  to verify the emission factor that was used. Please provide the test results for this.

If you have any questions, please call Patty Adams (fee) or Willard Hanks (permit) at (904)488-1344 or write to me at the above address.

Sincerely,

John C. Brown, Jr., P.E

Administrator

Air Permitting and Standards Bureau of Air Regulation

CHF/pa

cc: B. Thomas, SWD



December 19, 1994

RECEIVED

JAN 11 1995

Bureau of Air Regulation

Mr. Bill Thomas
Air Permitting
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
3804 Coconut Palm Drive
Tampa, FL 33619-8218

Re: Cargill Fertilizer, Inc. AC53-216288; PSD-FL-191 AO53-243295

Bartow Nos. 4, 5 & 6 Sulfuric Acid Plants

Dear Mr. Thomas:

In a recent phosphate industry meeting with FDEP Tallahassee (John Brown, Larry George Bruce Mitchell, Harry Kearns), there was discussion on the issue of permit conditions which are not necessary or are not based on regulatory requirements. It was Tallahassee's view that such permit conditions should be removed from the permit, at the permittee's request. A specific example discussed was that of NO<sub>x</sub> and ammonia emissions in the phosphate industry permits. In regards to NO<sub>x</sub>, no specific requirement was identified which would require NO<sub>x</sub> emission limits to be specified in a permit (unless the applicant was trying to escape PSD review, or due to a BACT analysis). It was further indicated that any changes of this nature needed in construction or operating permits should be requested and received prior to the Title V application due date (April 2, 1995, for most phosphate facilities).

On behalf of Cargill Fertilizer, I am requesting a change to the above referenced permits issued by the Department. The air construction permit for the Cargill Riverview sulfuric acid plants contains a limit on NO<sub>x</sub> emissions (Specific Condition 4). Specific Condition 4 of the draft permit places a limit upon NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the sulfuric acid plants, in terms of lb/ton 100 percent sulfuric acid produced, lb/hr and tons/year. It is requested that this condition be deleted since there is no regulatory basis for any limit for NO<sub>x</sub>. The estimated NO<sub>x</sub> emissions are low, i.e., less than 100 TPY from each plant. PSD review was not triggered for the modification, and no synthetic restrictions were placed on the operation to avoid PSD review for NO<sub>x</sub>. There are no state or federal emission limiting standards for NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from sulfuric acid plants.



To reiterate, Cargill requests that the NO<sub>x</sub> emission limits contained in the above referenced permits be deleted. Please call if you have any questions concerning this information, and please advise if any permit application fee is required to process this request.

Sincerely,

David A. Buff, P.E.

Principal Engineer

John Brown, FDEP-TALL File (2)

DB/mlb



December 19, 1994

Mr. Bill Thomas
Air Permitting
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
3804 Coconut Palm Drive
Tampa, FL 33619-8218

Re: Cargill Fertilizer, Inc. AC53-216288; PSD-FL-191 AO53-243295

Bartow Nos. 4, 5 & 6 Sulfuric Acid Plants

D.E.P.

DEC 21 1994

- Gormof Tangah

ost-It* brand fax transmittal: * B. MITCHELL	From J. KISSEL
B. Peter Circo	Co.
ept.	Phone #
Fax !	Fax #

## Dear Mr. Thomas:

In a recent phosphate industry meeting with FDEP Tallahassee (John Brown, Larry George Bruce Mitchell, Harry Kearns), there was discussion on the issue of permit conditions which are not necessary or are not based on regulatory requirements. It was Tallahassee's view that such permit conditions should be removed from the permit, at the permittee's request. A specific example discussed was that of NO<sub>x</sub> and ainmonia emissions in the phosphate industry permits. In regards to NO<sub>x</sub>, no specific requirement was identified which would require NO<sub>x</sub> emission limits to be specified in a permit (unless the applicant was trying to escape PSD review, or due to a BACT analysis). It was further indicated that any changes of this nature needed in construction or operating permits should be requested and received prior to the Title V application due date (April 2, 1995, for most phosphate facilities).

On behalf of Cargill Fertilizer, I am requesting a change to the above referenced permits issued by the Department. The air construction permit for the Cargill Riverview sulfuric acid plants contains a limit on NO, emissions (Specific Condition 4). Specific Condition 4 of the draft permit places a limit upon NO, emissions from the sulfuric acid plants, in terms of lb/ton 100 percent sulfuric acid produced, lb/hr and tons/year. It is requested that this condition he deleted since there is no regulatory basis for any limit for NO,. The estimated NO, emissions are low, i.e., less than 100 TPY from each plant. PSD review was not triggered for the modification, and no synthetic restrictions were placed on the operation to avoid PSD review for NO,. There are no state or federal emission limiting standards for NO, emissions from sulfuric acid plants.

14393 A 1/2

. . . د ا د . ه

KEN ENGINEERING AUC APPLIED SCIENCES, INC

6241 Northwest 23rd Street, Suite 500 Gamesville, Florida 32853-1500 994-336-8600 FAX 904-336-8603 5405 Wost Cypress Street, Suite 215 Timps, Florida 23007 813-287-1717 FAX 813-287-1718 1801 Clint Moore Road, Suite 105 5000 Razon, Florida 33457 407-994-5910 FAX 407-994-9303 7785 Beymsadows Wey, Suite 105 Jacksonvillo, Florida 32256 904-739-5600 - FAX 904-739-7777 1616 'P' Street N.V., Suite 450 Washington, D.C. 20036 202-462-1100 FAX 202-462-2270



## Department of Environmental Protection

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

Virginia B. Wetherell Secretary

Hole captled

AC Carrill

AC Carrill

January 3, 1995

Mr. William Thomas Southwest District 3804 Coconut Palm Drive Tampa, Florida 33619-8218

Dear Mr. Thomas:

This letter is in response to your faxed note with a letter from KBN engineering dated December 1994. KBN is requesting that  ${\rm NO_X}$  limits be removed from Cargill permits (Bartow Nos. 4, 5 and 6 sulfuric acid plants).

As indicated at the phosphate industry meeting last month, there are some important things to remember about eliminating any conditions from a permit. The applicant must make the case that there is no legal requirements for the condition and that the applicant was not given the condition to preclude public concern or for any other advantage during the preconstruction review. Limitations imposed to limit toxic pollutants under the permitting process (air toxics strategy) are valid permitting conditions that should not be eliminated. Chapter 403.021(3), F.S. is the legal authority for those limitations. The condition needs to be revisited by the source that issued the air construction permit and the AC permit needs to be revised first, followed by revision of the AO permit by the AO issuing office, if such revision is appropriate.

Please forward the request to this office for review since we issued the AC permit.

Sincerely,

John C. Brown, Jr., P.E.

Administrator

Air Permitting and Standards

JCB/bjb

cc: David Jellerson KBN Engineering