

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

	Central Schul	02	
	SUPETAPA CAS	TXXX.	
	PARILLER -	ΓX	
	Postage	\$	
	Certified Fee		
	Special Delivery Fee		
	Restricted Delivery Fee	TAYLOR	
98	Return Receipt Showing to Whom & Date Delivered	st lucio	,
nue	Return Receipt Showing to Whom, Date, and Addressee's Address		
rorm <b>3000</b> , June	TOTAL Postage & Fees	\$	
000		2-93	
E	AC 62-229: AC 56-230129 P50	319-PiPI	pe ji
7	1 40 56-2501 4-7 1950	-FI-203	
_ [	•	ĺ	

77a51-118	Express Mail Return Receipt f Merchandise  7. Data of Delivery 1203
	8. Addressee's Address (Only if request and fee is paid)
	77a5/-//& dressee) AVIS HENRY December 1991 **u.s. GPO: 10

# STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION NOTICE OF PERMIT

In the matter of an Application for Permit by:

Mr. Carl D. Schulz, Vice President Florida Gas Transmission Company P. O. Box 1188 Houston, Texas 77251-1188

DER File No. AC 56-230129 St. Lucie County PSD-FL-203

Enclosed is Permit Number AC 56-230129 to construct a 4,000 bhp reciprocating engine at the Florida Gas Transmission Company's facility located at 8701 Orange Avenue in Fort Pierce, St. Lucie County, Florida. This permit is 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 PROTECTION

C. H. Fancy, P.E., Chief Bureau of Air Regulation 2600 Blair Stone Road Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400 904-488-1344

#### 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 to the listed persons. 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:

I. Goldman, SE District B. Andrews, P.E., ENSR J. Harper, EPA J. Bunyak, NPS

# Final Determination

Florida Gas Transmission Company St. Lucie County Fort Pierce, Florida Station No. 20

Natural Gas Compressor Engine Permit No. AC 56-230129 PSD-FL-203

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

Pollutant	lbs/hr	tons/yr	Emission Factor
Nitrogen Oxides	17.4	77.26	2.0 g/bhp-hr
Carbon Monoxide	18.52	81.12	2.8 g/bhp-hr
Volatile Organic Compounds	5.29	23.18	1.7 g/bhp-hr
(non-methane)			2, 1
Particulate Matter (TSP)	0.13	0.57	5 lbs/MMscf
Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	0.13	0.57	5 lbs/MMscf
Sulfur Dioxide	0.70	3.33	10 gr/100scf

#### TO:

# Emission Limits

1. The maximum allowable emissions\* from this unit shall not exceed the emission rates as follows:

<u>Pollutant</u>	lbs/hr	tons/yr	Emission Factor
Nitrogen Oxides	17.4	77.26	2.0 g/bhp-hr
Carbon Monoxide	18.52	81.12	2.8 g/bhp-hr
Volatile Organic Compounds	5.29	23.18	1.7 g/bhp-hr
(non-methane)			J,
Particulate Matter (TSP)	0.16	0.68	5 lbs/MMscf
Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	0.16	0.68	5 lbs/MMscf
Sulfur Dioxide	0.84	4.00	10 gr S/100scf
tRacod on 100% load condition			

<sup>\*</sup>Based on 100% load conditions.

The final action of the Department will be to issue construction permit  ${\bf AC}$  56-230129, PSD-FL-203 with the changes noted above.



# Florida Department of Environmental Protection

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

Virginia B. Wetherell Secretary

PERMITTEE:

Florida Gas Transmission Company P. O. Box 1188

Houston, Texas 77251-1188

Permit Number: AC 56-230129

PSD-FL-203

Expiration Date: June 30, 1995

County: St. Lucie

Latitude/Longitude: 27°26'43"N

80°24'47"W

Project: Natural Gas

Natural Gas Compressor Engine (Unit No. 2005)

Station No. 20

This permit is issued under the provisions of Chapter 403, Florida Statutes, and Florida Administrative Code Chapters 17-210, 212, 272, 275, 296, and 297; 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 one natural gas fired engine to be located at 8701 Orange Avenue, Fort Pierce, Florida. The UTM coordinates are Zone 17, 558.01 km East and 3035.68 km North.

The 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:

 Application to Construct/Operate Air Pollution Sources DEP Form 17-1.202(1). PERMITTEE: Florida Gas Transmission Company

Permit Number: AC 56-230129

PSD-FL-203

Expiration Date: June 30, 1995

#### 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 403.141, 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.
- 4. 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.
- 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.

PERMITTEE: Florida Gas Transmission Company

Permit Number: AC 56-230129 PSD-FL-203

Expiration Date: June 30, 1995

#### **GENERAL CONDITIONS:**

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.

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

PERMITTEE: Florida Gas Transmission Company Permit Number: AC 56-230129

PSD-FL-203

Expiration Date: June 30, 1995

### GENERAL | CONDITIONS:

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 17-730.300, 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.
- 13. This permit also constitutes:
  - (x) Determination of Best Available Control Technology (BACT)
  - (x) Determination of Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)
  - ( ) 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.
  - 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 Number: AC 56-230129

PSD-FL-203

Expiration Date: June 30, 1995

#### GENERAL CONDITIONS:

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.
- 15. 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 unit shall not exceed the emission rates as follows:

Pollutant	lbs/hr	tons/yr	Emission Factor
Nitrogen Oxides	17.4	77.26	2.0 g/bhp-hr
Carbon Monoxide	18.52	81.12	2.8 g/bhp-hr
Volatile Organic Compounds (non-methane)	5.29	23.18	1.7 g/bhp-hr
Particulate Matter (TSP)	0.16	0.68	5 lbs/MMscf
Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	0.16	0.68	5 lbs/MMscf
Sulfur Dioxide	0.84	4,00	10 qr_S/100scf
*Based on 100% load condition	s.		

2. Visible emissions shall not exceed 10% opacity.

#### Operating Rates

3. This source is allowed to operate continuously (8760 hours per year).

PERMITTEE: Permit Number: AC 56-230129 Florida Gas Transmission Company PSD-FL-203

Expiration Date: June 30, 1995

#### SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

This source is allowed to burn natural gas only.

- 5. The permitted operating parameters and utilization rates for this natural gas compressor engine shall not exceed the values stated in the application. The parameters include, but are not limited to:
  - Maximum natural gas consumption shall not exceed 0.0320 MMcf/hr (based on a fuel heating value of 1040 BTU/CF).
     Maximum heat input shall not exceed 33.36 MMBtu/hr.

- 6. Any change in the method of operation, equipment or operating hours shall be submitted to the DEP's Bureau of Air Regulation and Southeast District offices.
- 7. 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.

### Compliance Determination

- 8. Compliance with the allowable emission limits shall be determined within 60 days after achieving the maximum production rate at which this facility will be operated, but not later than 180 days after initial start-up and annually thereafter except as provided in Specific Condition 10, below, by the following reference methods as described in 40 CFR 60, Appendix A (July 1992 version) and adopted by reference in Chapter 17-297, F.A.C.
- Sample and Velocity Traverses
- Volumetric Flow Rate
- Method 1. Method 2. Method 3 Gas Analysis
- or 3A - Method 7E Determination of Nitrogen Oxide Emissions from Stationary Source
- Method 9. Determination of the Opacity of the Emissions from Stationary Sources
- Method 10. Determination of the Carbon Monoxide Emissions from Stationary Sources
- Method 18. Measurements of Gaseous Organic Compound Emissions by Gas Chromatography
- Method 25A. Determination of Total Gaseous Organic Concentrations Using a Flame Ionization Analyzer
- 9. Other DEP approved methods may be used for compliance testing after prior Department approval. Compliance with the SO2 emission limit can be determined by calculations based on fuel analysis using ASTM D1072-80, D3031-81, D4084-82, or D3246-81 for sulfur content of gaseous fuels.

PERMITTEE: Florida Gas Transmission Company

Permit Number: AC 56-230129 PSD-FL-203

Expiration Date: June 30, 1995

#### SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

10. Initial compliance with the volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions limits will be demonstrated by EPA Method 25A or Method 18. Thereafter, except as provided in F.A.C. Rule 17-297.340(2), compliance with the VOC emission limits will be assumed, provided the CO allowable emission rate is achieved.

- 11. Stack sampling facilities shall be required and shall comply with the requirements of F.A.C. Rule 17-297.345. Tests results will be the average of 3 valid runs. The Southeast District office will be notified at least 30 days in writing in advance of the compliance test(s). The source shall operate between 90% and 100% of maximum capacity for the ambient conditions experienced during compliance test(s). Compliance test results shall be submitted to the Southeast District office no later than 45 days after completion.
- 12. The permittee shall annually perform a visual inspection of the turbine compressor engine, filters, associated piping system for rust spots, cracks, leaks and odors. Also ensure that safety valves and the stack are in proper order and working properly. The permittee shall document the findings and corrective action taken.
- 13. When the Department, after investigation, has good reason (such as odor complaints, increased visible emissions, excess emissions, etc.), to conclude that any applicable emission standard contained in this permit is being violated, it may require the owner or operator of the facility to conduct compliance tests which identify the nature and quantity of air pollutant emissions from the facility and to provide a report of said tests to the Department (F.A.C. Rule 17-297.340(2)).

#### Rule Requirements

- 14. This source shall comply with all applicable provisions of Chapter 403, Florida Statutes, Chapters 17-210, 212, 275, 296, 297 and 17-4, Florida Administrative Code and 40 CFR 60 (July, 1992 version).
- 15. 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 17-210.300(1)).
- 16. No person shall cause, suffer, allow, or permit the discharge of air pollutants which cause or contribute to an objectionable odor pursuant to F.A.C. Rule 17-296.320(2). Objectionable odor is defined as any odor present in the outdoor atmosphere which by itself or in combination with other odors, is or may be harmful or injurious to human health or welfare, which unreasonable interferes with the comfortable use and enjoyment of life or property, or which creates a nuisance pursuant to F.A.C. Rule 17-296.200(123).

PERMITTEE:
Florida Gas Transmission Company

Permit Number: AC 56-230129

PSD-FL-203

Expiration Date: June 30, 1995

#### SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

17. This source shall be in compliance with all applicable provisions of F.A.C. Rules 17-210.650: Circumvention; 17-210.700: Excess Emissions; Chapter 17-297: Stationary Sources-Emissions Monitoring; Chapter 17-296: Stationary Source- Emission Standards and, 17-4.130: Plant Operation-Problems.

- 18. If construction does not commence within 18 months of issuance of this permit, then the permittee shall obtain from the Department a review and, if necessary, a modification of the control technology and allowable emissions for the unit(s) on which construction has not commenced (40 CFR 52.21(r)(2)).
- 19. Fugitive dust emissions, during the construction period, shall be minimized by covering or watering dust generation areas.
- 20. Pursuant to F.A.C. Rule 17-210.300(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: fuel usage, hours of operation, RPM, air emissions limits, etc. Annual reports shall be sent to the Department's Southeast District office by March 1 of each calendar year.
- 21. 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).
- 22. An application for an operation permit must be submitted to the Southeast District office at least 90 days prior to the expiration date of this construction permit. 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. Rules 17-4.055 and 17-4.220).

Iss	ued this	27	day
of	September		1993

STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Virginia B. Wetherell, Secretary

#### Best Available Control Technology (BACT) Determination Florida Gas Transmission Company St. Lucie County-PSD-FL-203

The applicant proposes to expand its existing natural gas pipeline compressor station No. 20 near the town of Ft. Pierce, St. Lucie County, Florida. The proposed expansion consists of adding one new Cooper- Bessemer 4,000 brake horsepower (BHP) natural-gas-fired, reciprocating internal engine.

The applicant has indicated the maximum total annual tonnage of regulated air pollutants emitted from the proposed turbine engine based on 8,760 hrs/year operation and ISO standard conditions to be as follows:

	Max. Net Increase	PSD Significant
<u>Pollutant</u>	in Emissions (TPY)	Emission Rate (TPY)
NOx	77.26	40
SO <sub>2</sub>	3.33	40
PM/PM <sub>10</sub>	0.57	25/15
co	81.12	100
VOC	23.18	40

Rule 17-212.400(2)(f)(3) of the Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) 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. In this case, BACT is only required for nitrogen oxides (NOx).

# BACT Determination Requested by the Applicant

The BACT Determination requested by the applicant is given below:

<u>Pollutant</u>	<u>Determination</u>
NOx	2.0 g/bhp-hr

# Date of Receipt of a BACT Application

April 23, 1993

#### Review Group Members

This determination was based upon comments received from the applicant and the Permitting and Standards Section.

#### BACT DETERMINATION PROCEDURE

In accordance with F.A.C. Chapter 17-212, 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

BACT-FGTC Page Two

account energy, environmental and economic impacts, and other costs, determines is achievable through application of production processes and available control methods, systems and techniques. In addition, the regulations require 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.

## BACT ANALYSIS FOR NITROGEN OXIDES (NOX)

#### CONTROL TECHNOLOGY REVIEW

The uncontrolled emissions of nitrogen oxides (424.9 TPY) represent a significant proportion of the total emissions generated by this project, and need to be controlled if deemed appropriate. As such, the applicant presented an extensive analysis of the different available technologies for NOx control.

All potentially applicable control technologies for reciprocating engines were evaluated in the application. These technologies can be separated into major groups.

- engine modifications, and
- add-on control technology

BACT - FGTC Page Three

A summary of technical feasibility of NOx emission control technologies is presented in Table I.

In addition to the technical feasibility of each one of the control technologies presented, the applicant has examined the energy and economic impacts of using ignition timing retardation, derating power output and exhaust gas recirculation. In each case these alternatives resulted in emissions that were essentially equivalent to that proposed or provided little benefit for the associated expense. As this is the case, none of these control strategies will be elaborated upon in this determination.

The analysis presented has evaluated three of the technically feasible control alternatives or possible BACT for this project, the rich-burn engine with non-selective catalytic reduction (NSCR), the lean burn engine with SCR and the lean burn engine technology (air-to-fuel ratio change). An analysis of these technologies as stated by the applicant follows:

### o Analysis of Lean-Burn Technology (air-to-fuel ratio change)

The proposed turbocharged reciprocating engine will operate according to the manufacturer's specified operation parameters. The engine's state-of-the-art design includes small pre-ignition chambers in which a rich fuel mixture is spark-ignited. The hot gases then enter the main combustion chambers and create spontaneous combustion of the lean fuel mixture. As a result, the overall combustion process is conducted under very lean fuel conditions. Operating on the lean side of the air-to-fuel ratio allows the proposed engine to obtain peak fuel economy.

In general, thermal NOx formation is directly proportional to the combustion temperature and residence time of the combustion gases. The high mass flow rate at full-load, as indicated by the 80,640 pounds per hour of exhaust mass flow rate, reduces the residence time of the combustion gases compared to a rich-burn engine, which operates at an air-to-fuel ratio near unity. High mass flow rate also means the engine operates below the peak temperature region for thermal NOx formation. The exhaust temperature for the proposed engine is 540°F, which falls in the range of typical exhaust temperatures for reciprocating engines.

# o Analysis of Rich-Burn Engine/NSCR

Because they operate at near stoichiometric air-to-fuel ratios, rich-burn engines generate cylinder temperatures in the range of 1,200° to 1,300°F. Engine manufacturers have found that such high temperatures do not allow high engine loading. For greater power output, engine manufacturers have found that engine modifications

BACT-FGTC Page Four

(i.e.) turbocharged engines which can produce more power enhancements with lower emission levels) are a better choice than building larger engine blocks.

Normally, rich-burn engine/NSCR combination applications are found only on small engines of approximately 1,000 bhp or less. The application of NSCR to an engine the size to be installed at Compressor Station No. 20 may pose unforeseen technical problems not encountered in installations on smaller units.

# o Analysis of Lean-Burn Engine with SCR

As the most effective NOx abatement process in terms of removal efficiency, SCR technology has been applied for control of NOx emissions from state-of-the-art reciprocating engines. However, the reliability of SCR's performance on reciprocating engines has not been consistently demonstrated. Data on sustained NOx reduction performance for reciprocating engines are very limited.

Selective catalytic reduction is a post-combination 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.

The effect of exhaust gas temperature on NOx reduction depends on the specific catalyst formulation and reactor design. Most commercial SCR systems operate over a temperature range of about 600-750°, although recently developed zeolite-based catalysts are claimed to be capable of operating at temperatures as high as 950°. At levels above and below this window, the specific catalyst formulation will not be effective and NOx reduction will decrease. Operating at high temperatures can permanently damage the catalyst through sintering of surfaces.

For this type of engine, technical concerns involved in SCR use are the narrow operating temperature range and the possible damage to the catalyst and downstream equipment. A stack gas reheat system would be required to heat the exhaust gases to the SCR's operating temperature. The integration of a reheat system adds another design criteria to an already complex system consisting of SCR components and an ammonias handling system.

A review of the BACT/LAER Clearinghouse determinations made to date on gas-fired reciprocating engines reveals that SCR has never been

BACT-FGTC Page Five

applied specifically to any large-bore (i.e., greater than 1,000 bhp) and low-speed (i.e., 300 rpm) lean-burn engines due to their already low Nox emission rate.

#### BACT EVALUATION BY THE DEPARTMENT

Although technically feasible, the applicant has rejected using lean burn engine with SCR and rich-burn engine with NSCR on this type of engine because of economic, energy and environmental impacts. The following limitations, identified by the applicant, have been evaluated by the Department:

#### Energy Impact

The addition of SCR to a lean-burn engine imposes a fuel requirement of 36,733 MMBtu/yr for stack gas reheat. In addition, electrical power is required for the ammonia vaporizer and injection system. The rich-burn engine with NSCR has the highest energy requirements. Operating a rich-burn engine requires an additional 36,792 MMBtu/yr of heat input compared to using an engine with lean-burn technology. The lean-burn engine shows a savings of 36,792 MMBtu/yr in heat input over the rich-burn engine because of its inherent fuel efficient design. Therefore, a lean burn engine has no energy impact compared to the other BACT options evaluated.

### Economic Impacts

When the three feasible NOx control alternatives are compared in terms of total cost effectiveness, the lean-burn engine/SCR technology has the highest cost effectiveness value of \$1,723 per ton of NOx removed. The rich-burn engine/NSCR technology is the next highest with \$537 per ton of NOx removed. The lean-burn engine has a nominal total cost effectiveness value of -\$49 per ton of NOx removed.

The incremental cost effectiveness values for the lean-burn engine/SCR technology and the rich-burn engine/NSCR technology are \$19,205 and \$6,415 per ton of NOx removed, respectively. The lean-burn engine has an incremental cost effectiveness of -\$49 per ton of NOx removed. Therefore, the lean-burn engine is the most cost effective control option for this project.

#### Environmental Impacts

SCR poses the greatest potential for toxic impacts due to ammonia handling and storage and ammonia slip. When the alternatives are compared in terms of adverse environmental impacts the lean-burn

BACT-FGTC Page Six

engine with SCR is the worst due to potential ammonia release and disposal of the catalyst. The rich-burn engine with NSCR will also require disposal of catalyst. The lean-burn engines does not create any waste; therefore, it is the best alternative in terms of the environmental impact analysis.

In addition to nitrogen oxides and ammonia, the impacts of toxic pollutants associated with the combustion of natural gas have been evaluated. These toxics (formaldehyde and polycyclic organic matter) common to the combustion of natural gas, are expected to be emitted in minimal amounts and will not have an impact on air quality or this BACT analysis.

#### BACT DETERMINATION BY DEP

Based on the information presented by the applicant and the studies conducted, the Department believes that the NOx control technology proposed (lean-burn technology) satisfies the BACT requirement for nitrogen oxides. Although engine modifications and add-on control (SCR) could be used to provide additional control, the benefits that would be obtained do not warrant the cost. The emission limit for this compressor engine is thereby established as follows:

Pollutant Emissions Limit
NOx 2.0 grams/bhp-hr

Details of the Analysis May be Obtained by Contacting:

Doug Outlaw, P.E., BACT Coordinator Department of Environmental Protection Bureau of Air Regulation Twin Towers Office Building 2600 Blair Stone Road Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

2600 Blair Stone Road Tallahassee, Florida 32399-240	00
Recommended by:	Approved by:
Chren	Digino B. Wetherell
C. H. Fancy, P.E., Chief	Virginia B. Wetherell, Secretary
Bureau of Air Regulation	Dept. of Environmental Protection
<u> </u>	September 27
Date	Date

TABLE I
Summary of Technical Feasibility of NO<sub>x</sub> Emission Controls for Reciprocating Engines

Control Technology	NO <sub>x</sub> Controlled Emission Rate	Technical Feasibility	Comments
Engine Modification Alternatives			
Steam Injection	Not Applicable	No	Technically infeasible due to irreversible structural damage to engine block.
Air-to-fuel Ratio Change (or Lean-Burn Technology)	2.0 g/bhp-hr	Yes	Lowest emission rate achievable by engine modification, at least 80% control efficiency.
Retarding Ignition Timing Rich-burn Engine Lean-burn Engine	9.4 g/bhp-hr Not Applicable	Yes No	Engine timing retard between 2*and 6*; average 15% NO <sub>x</sub> reduction.
Derating Power Output Rich-burn Engine Lean-burn Engine	7.2 g/bhp-hr 1.3 g/bhp-hr	Yes Yes	Average 35% NO <sub>x</sub> reduction at 25% of engine power derated for gas-fired engines as a group. NO <sub>x</sub> reductions for turbo charged engines are less due to the lower effect on air-to-fuel ratio.
Exhaust Gas Recirculation Rich-burn Engine Lean-burn Engine	7.3 g/bhp-hr Not Applicable	Yes No	Maximum 34% NO <sub>x</sub> reduction from standard engine. Ineffective for lean-burn engine.
Add-on Control Technology*		, , , , ,	
NO <sub>x</sub> OUT Process	Not Applicable	No	Technically infeasible (1000-1600°F), cost prohibitive for high temperature auxiliary equipment.
THERMAL DeNO <sub>x</sub>	Not Applicable	No	Technically infeasible (above 1000°F), cost prohibitive for high temperature auxiliary equipment.
Lean-Burn Engine/NSCR	Not Applicable	No	Technically infeasible for lean-burn engine, require <4% 0 <sub>2</sub> conc. in the exhaust stream.
Lean-Burn Engine/SCR	0.4 g/bhp-hr	Yes	Applicable to lean-burn engine with control efficiency of 80 percent.
Rich-Burn Engine/NSCR	1.1 g/bhp-hr	Yes	Applicable to rich-burn engine only, required greater than 4% 0 <sub>2</sub> conc. In exhaust gas stream. Control efficiency of 90%.

<sup>\*</sup> Except for the rich-burn engine/NSCR option, all add-on control technologies are for lean-burn engines

Source: FGTC's air pollution permit application (1993)

TO: Virginia B. Wetherell

FROM: Howard L. Rhodes

DATE: September 23, 1993

SUBJ: Approval of Construction Permit

Florida Gas Transmission Company Air Permit AC 62-229319/PSD-FL-202

Natural Gas Compressor Station No. 15, Taylor County

Attached for your approval and signature is a permit and a BACT prepared by the Bureau of Air Regulation for the above mentioned company to construct a 12,600 bhp natural gas fired turbine.

The FGTC Phase III expansion project will be increasing the natural gas transport capacity of the existing Florida gas pipeline system. The scope of the work for Phase III includes expansions by the addition of state-of-the-art compressor engines at four existing compressor stations and two new proposed compressor stations. The proposed unit will be used to drive a gas compressor that is a part of a new gas transmission line that will transport natural gas from source wells in Texas and Louisiana. The proposed turbine will incorporate dry, low NOx combustion technology. The proposed engines would be used solely for the purpose of transporting natural gas in the pipeline for distribution in Florida.

No adverse comments were received during the public notice period. This project is not controversial.

I recommend your approval and signature.

HLR/TH/bjb

Attachments