

Department of Environmental Protection

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

Colleen M. Castille Secretary

July 23, 2004

CERTIFIED MAIL- RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. E. O. Morris Vice President Cargill Fertilizer, Inc. 8813 Highway 41 South Riverview, FL 33569

Re: Bartow Plant Title V Renewal DEP File No. 1050046-018-AV Request for Additional Information Regarding CAM and Applicability to 40 CFR 63 Subpart ZZZZ

Dear Mr. Morris,

On June 15, 2004, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency published the Final Rule for 40 CFR 63, Subpart ZZZZ, NESHAP for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines. The rule will be effective August 16, 2004. In the 112(j) notification that you submitted on May 15, 2002, you indicated that your facilities may be subject to Subpart ZZZZ.

Since the 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart ZZZZ requirements may be applicable to the Bartow Plant and with more than 3 (three) years left on the permit, as of the effective date of Subpart ZZZZ, the Department is required to open the Title V Permit for cause and install the applicable requirements in accordance with Rules 62-4.080(1) and 62-213.430(4), F.A.C., and 40 CFR 70.7(f). Since your permit is currently open for renewal, the Department wishes to incorporate all applicable requirements for subpart ZZZZ.

On June 30, 2004, the Department received your additional information of the Title V permit for Cargill Bartow Plant. The Application is still incomplete because not all of the information needed to process the application has been provided. Specifically, the following information remains outstanding:

1. Ammonium/Diammonium Phosphate Plant (EU 001) CAM is applicable for PM. EU 001 is subject to the conditions of 40 CFR 63 Subpart BB, Phosphate Fertilizer Production. The unit is not subject to 40 CFR 63 Subpart AA, Phosphoric Acid Manufacturing Plants. Subpart BB does not regulate PM; therefore EU 001 would be subject to CAM for PM. The choice of scrubber pressure drop and liquid flow rate through the scrubbers are acceptable indicators to monitor. However, indicator ranges must be clearly stated in the monitoring approach table. Per conversations with Debbie Waters, Cargill wishes to use the same parameters as the facility's alternate monitoring plan for compliance with the monitoring requirements of Subpart BB. This is acceptable if the parameters and indicator ranges are indicative of normal operating conditions. The selection of the indicator ranges must also be clearly justified and demonstrate that operation at those levels is protective of the allowable emissions limitations. Please provide a table of test data that correlates the chosen parameters (i.e., pressure differentials and water flow rates or fan amperages and water flow rates) to the tested PM emission levels. From this data, provide a justification of your choices and clearly indicate a maximum and minimum indicator range for the chosen indicators for each of the scrubbers that will assure compliance with the emission limits with a

margin of safety that allows for corrective action to be taken before a permit limit is exceeded. The application can not be deemed complete until these numbers are provided and justified.

Your response, dated June 25, 2004, contained the following:

"Furthermore, based upon recent discussion between Dave Buff of Golder Associates Inc., and the Department, Cargill understands that for CAM purposes the Department has made the determination that acid scrubbers can be considered inherent process equipment since they do recover product and ammonia. Several of the scrubbers used to control emissions at Cargill's facility are acid scrubbers and, are therefore, exempt from CAM requirements."

The above stated determination was made for a specific facility. All exemptions from CAM must be made on a unit and pollutant specific basis. If Cargill wishes to have any control devices considered to be inherent process equipment, a thorough justification must be submitted. In presenting this justification, the following points should be addressed, as well as any other pertinent design information that may be available.

- A. Is the primary purpose of the equipment other than to control emissions relative to the applicable emissions limit (e.g., product recovery, worker safety)?
- B. Would the equipment be installed if there were no applicable emissions limit in place for the pollutant specific emissions unit?
- C. Is the efficiency at which the equipment is operated by design for purposes other than compliance with the applicable emissions limit more than sufficient to assure compliance with the applicable emissions limit (e.g., a significant margin of compliance)?

For CAM purposes, the averaging period should be changed from daily to a 3-hour period to match the requirements of the compliance test method.

2. No.4 Fertilizer Shipping Plant (EU 002) Cargill has confirmed that EU 002 is subject to CAM. However, the summary of test data submitted is insufficient for determining applicable parameters and indicator ranges. Please submit the test results for each of the indicator ranges tested. The choice of scrubber pressure drop and liquid flow rate through the scrubbers are acceptable indicators to monitor. However, indicator ranges must be clearly stated in the monitoring approach table. The selection of the indicator ranges must also be clearly justified and demonstrate that operation at those levels is protective of the allowable emissions limitations. Please provide a table of test data that correlates chosen parameters (i.e., the pressure differentials and water flow rates or fan amperages and water flow rates) to the tested PM emission levels. From this data, provide a justification of your choices and clearly indicate a maximum and indicator range for the chosen indicators for each of the scrubbers that will assure compliance with the emission limits with a margin of safety that allows for corrective action to be taken before a permit limit is exceeded. The application can not be deemed complete until these numbers are provided and justified.

For CAM purposes, the averaging period should be changed from daily to a 3-hour period to match the requirements of the compliance test method.

3. Diammonium Phosphate Fertilizer Plant (EU 021) CAM is applicable for PM. EU 001 is subject to the conditions of 40 CFR 63 Subpart BB, Phosphate Fertilizer Production. The unit is not subject to 40 CFR

63 Subpart AA, Phosphoric Acid Manufacturing Plants. Subpart BB does not regulate PM; therefore EU 001 would be subject to CAM for PM. The choice of scrubber pressure drop and liquid flow rate through the scrubbers are acceptable indicators to monitor. However, indicator ranges must be clearly stated in the monitoring approach table. Per conversations with Debbie Waters, Cargill wishes to use the same parameters as the facility's alternate monitoring plan for compliance with the monitoring requirements of Subpart BB. This is acceptable if the parameters and indicator ranges are indicative of normal operating conditions. The selection of the indicator ranges must also be clearly justified and demonstrate that operation at those levels is protective of the allowable emissions limitations. Please provide a table of test data that correlates the pressure differentials and flow rates to the tested PM and fluoride emission levels. From this data, provide a justification of your choices and clearly indicate a maximum and minimum pressure drop and water flow rate for each of the scrubbers that will assure compliance with the emission limits with a margin of safety that allows for corrective action to be taken before a permit limit is exceeded. The application can not be deemed complete until these numbers are provided and justified.

Your response, dated June 25, 2004, contained the following:

"Furthermore, based upon recent discussion between Dave Buff of Golder Associates Inc., and the Department, Cargill understands that for CAM purposes the Department has made the determination that acid scrubbers can be considered inherent process equipment since they do recover product and ammonia. Several of the scrubbers used to control emissions at Cargill's facility are acid scrubbers and, are therefore, exempt from CAM requirements."

The above stated determination was made for a specific facility. All exemptions from CAM must be made on a unit and pollutant specific basis. If Cargill wishes to have any control devices considered to be inherent process equipment, a thorough justification must be submitted. In presenting this justification, the following points should be addressed, as well as any other pertinent design information that may be available.

- A. Is the primary purpose of the equipment other than to control emissions relative to the applicable emissions limit (e.g., product recovery, worker safety)?
- B. Would the equipment be installed if there were no applicable emissions limit in place for the pollutant specific emissions unit?
- C. Is the efficiency at which the equipment is operated by design for purposes other than compliance with the applicable emissions limit more than sufficient to assure compliance with the applicable emissions limit (e.g., a significant margin of compliance)?

For CAM purposes, the averaging period should be changed from daily to a 3-hour period to match the requirements of the compliance test method.

Mr. E. O. Morris July 23, 2004 Page 4 of 4

Please submit all requested information immediately to Mr. Bobby Bull at FDEP Bureau of Air Regulation, MS 5505, 2600 Blair Stone Road, Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400. In addition, please submit an electronic copy, Word format, along with your response. If you have any questions regarding this request for additional information, please contact Mr. Bull at Robert.Bull@dep.state.fl.us or (850) 921-9585. In the future, if there are any tests used to establish new parameter ranges, please submit a copy to Bobby Bull in addition to the required submittal to the Southwest District. To discuss the specific CAM requirements, please contact Mr. Jonathan Holtom, P.E., at (850)921-9531 Jonathan. Holtom@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Bobby Bull, Engineer II Bureau of Air Regulation

Book Bull

cc: Mr. Jason Waters, FDEP, SWD

Mr. David Buff, P.E., Golder Associates, Inc.

Ms. Debra Waters, Cargill Bartow Plant

	ெ	<u></u>		 .
	F 0	Postage	s	
	37.0	Certified Fee		Postmark
		Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required)		Here
	100	Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required)		
	0.5	Total Postage & Fees	\$	
		Sent Mr. E.O. N	Morris	
	0002	Street, Apt. No.: or PO Bi 8813 High City, State, ZIP+4 Riverview	ox No. Way 41 South , Florida 3350	69
		PS Form 3800. May 2000		See Reverse for Instructions
			1,	
<i>;</i> •			nd .	
	TARE REPORT OF THE			

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
Complete items 1.2 and 3 Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Printy our name and address on the reverse is on the vector return the card to you? Attach this card to the back of the mailplece or on the front if space permits. Article Addressed to the Complete item of the mailplece or on the front if space permits. Article Addressed to the Complete item of the mailplece or on the front if space permits. Article Addressed to the complete item of the mailplece or on the front if space permits. Article Addressed to the complete item of the mailplece or on the front if space permits.	A Signature Agent Agent Agent Address B. Received by (Printed Name). C. Date of Delivis D. Le Common term 17. C. Date of Delivis The Common term 17. C. Date of
Riverview; Floriday 33569	3. Service Type/ (PC Certified Mall) Depress Mall (PC Certified Mall) Depress Mall (PC CERTIFIED Marchandle) Depress Mall (PC CERTIFIED MARCHAND) De
2. Article Number 7000	670700137310979601

