Facility Name: **Utoy Creek Water Reclamation Center**
City: Atlanta
County: Fulton
AIRS #: 04-13-121-00036

Application #: TV-11945
Date Application Received: October 22, 1996, Final Update: May 4, 2000
Date Application Deemed Administratively Complete: February 25, 1997
Date of Draft Permit:
Permit No: 4952-121-0036-V-01-0

Program	Review Engineers	Review Managers
SSPP/ASU	Kevin White	John Yntema
SSCP/ASU	James Eason	James Eason
ISMP	Bob Scott	Richard Taylor
Toxics	Karen Hays	Heather Abrams

Introduction

This narrative is being provided to assist the reader in understanding the content of the attached draft Part 70 operating permit. Complex issues and unusual items are explained herein simpler terms and/or greater detail than is sometimes possible in the actual permit. This permit is being issued pursuant to: (1) Georgia Air Quality Act, O.C.G.A § 12-9-1, et seq. and (2) Georgia Rules for Air Quality Control, Chapter 391-3-1, and (3) Title V of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. Section 391-3-1-.03(10) of the Georgia Rules for Air Quality Control incorporates requirements of Part 70 of Chapter I of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations promulgated pursuant to the Federal Clean Air Act. The primary purpose of this permit is to consolidate and identify existing state and federal air requirements applicable to Utoy Creek Water Reclamation Center and to provide practical methods for determining compliance with these requirements. The following narrative is designed to accompany the draft permit and is presented in the same general order as the permit. It initially describes the facility receiving the permit, the applicable requirements and their significance, and the methods for determining compliance with those applicable requirements. This narrative is intended as an adjunct for the reviewer and to provide information only. It has no legal standing. Any revisions made to the permit in response to comments received during the public participation and EPA review process will be described in an addendum to this narrative.

I. Facility Description

A. Facility Identification

1. Facility Name: Utoy Creek Water Reclamation Center

2. Parent/Holding Company Name: City of Atlanta

3. Previous and/or Other Name(s): No previous names identified.

4. Facility Location: 800 Selig Drive, SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30336

5. Attainment or Non-attainment Area Location

The Utoy Creek Water Reclamation Center (WRC) is located in a non-attainment area for ozone.

6. Class I Area Impacts

This facility is not located within 100 km of a Class I area.

B. Site Determination

There are no applicable issues with regard to the site determination. There are no other facilities which could possibly be contiguous or adjacent and under common control.

C. Existing Permits

Table 1: List of Current Permits as Amended

Permit Number and/or Purpose of Issuance	Date of Issuance and Date of Amendments (if any)	Comments	
		Yes	No
4952-060-11382	4/13/94		✓
4952-060-9917	June 9, 1988	✓	
4952-060-5746-0	November 11, 1977	✓	

Table 2: Comments on Specific Permits

Permit Number	Comments
4952-060-9917	Incorporated Incinerator # 2 (INC2) into Permit - voided on April 13, 1994
4952-060-5746-0	Incorporated Incinerator # 1 (INC1) into Permit - voided on April 13, 1994

D. Process Description

1. SIC Codes(s)

Major - 4952 (Operation of a Wastewater Treatment Facility)
Other - None.

2. Description of Product(s)

This facility's final product is treated wastewater (reclaimed water).

3. Overall Facility Process Description

The Utoy Creek WRC receives municipal and industrial wastewater. The wastewater is processed through primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment systems and reclaimed water is recovered. Two multiple hearth incinerators are used to combust the sewage sludge (the solids by-product) produced from the treatment process. The reclaimed water is discharged into the nearby Chattahoochee River after treatment.

4. Overall Process Flow Diagram (optional)

A simple flow diagram can be found in Appendix A of the Title V application.

E. Regulatory Status

1. PSD/NSR

The facility is considered a minor source with respect to PSD rules.

2. Title V Major Source Status by Pollutant

Table 3: Title V Major Source Status

Pollutant	Is the Pollutant Emitted?	If emitted, what is the facility's Title V status for the pollutant?		
		Major Source Status	Major Source Requesting SM Status	Non-Major Source Status
PM	Yes			✓
PM_{10}	Yes			✓
SO_2	Yes			✓
VOC	Yes			✓
NO_x	Yes			✓
CO	Yes	✓		
TRS	Yes			
H_2S	Yes			
Individual HAP	Yes			✓
Total HAPs	Yes			✓

3. MACT Standards

Utoy Creek WRC is not currently subject to any MACT standards.

4. Program Applicability

Program Code	Applicable (Yes/No)
Program Code 6 - PSD	no
Program Code 8 – Part 61 NESHAP	yes
Program Code 9 - NSPS	yes
Program Code M – Part 63 NESHAP	no
Program Code V – Title V	yes

Regulatory Analysis

II. Facility Wide Requirements

A. Emission and Operating Caps:

Emission and Operating Caps: The Utoy Creek WRC currently has a facility wide emission limit of 50 tons of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) during any 12 month consecutive month period. The emission limit is in place to avoid the requirements of Georgia Air Quality Control Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(yy)-Nitrogen Oxide Emissions from Major Sources (NO_x RACT). In order to meet this facility limit, the Utoy Creek WRC has accepted the following operating limits per 12 consecutive month period: incinerate no more than 15,500 tons of sewage sludge (calculated on a dry basis), burn no more than 22,000 MMBtu of fuel (natural gas or digester gas) in the facility's digester boilers designated as source codes B1, B2, and B3, and operate the emergency generators (pump station and headworks) no more than 200 hours each. The NO_x emissions from the two six-inch enclosed flares, utilized to burn digester gas, were evaluated assuming maximum flare use or the burning of 78.8 MMccf (50,458 MMBtu) of digester gas per year. It was determined that the NO_x emissions from the two flares is insignificant in comparison to the emissions from other facility sources and therefore no limits are needed.

B. Applicable Rules and Regulations

- Rules and Regulations Assessment: The Utoy Creek WRC is not subject to any facility-wide air quality rules other than the general provisions of Georgia's Rules for Air Quality Control and those in Part 8 of the enclosed Permit.

- Emission and Operating Standards: None Applicable

C. Compliance Status

This facility did not submit any Section 11.10 forms; we therefore presume that they are operating in compliance.

D. Operational Flexibility

There were no operational flexibility requests in the Title V application.

E. Permit Conditions

None Applicable

III. Regulated Equipment Requirements

A. Brief Process Description

The Utoy Creek WRC is a publicly owned treatment works (POTW) that receives municipal and industrial wastewater to be processed using primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment systems. The effluent (reclaimed water) is discharged into the Chattahoochee River. The sludge produced as a by-product of treatment is dewatered and incinerated in one of two multiple hearth incinerators. Each uses a venturi scrubber (SCRUB1 and SCRUB2) to control the emissions of pollutants, including Particulates, Sulfur Dioxide, Beryllium, and Mercury into the atmosphere.

B. Equipment List for the Process

The facility has a wastewater treatment plant that is represented with Emission Unit ID No. WWTP, two natural gas burning, multiple hearth incinerators with Emission Unit ID Nos. INC1 and No. INC2, three 8.4 MMBtu/hr natural gas or waste digester gas fired boilers with Emission Unit ID Nos. B1, B2, and B3, and two waste digester gas flares with Emission Unit ID No. F. The facility also has two diesel fueled emergency generators which are represented in the Title V permit with Division assigned Emission Unit IDs PS and HW.

C. Equipment & Rule Applicability

Emission and Operating Caps –
The facility is not subject to any emission or operating caps outside of those listed in Section II.

Applicable Rules and Regulations -
Rules and Regulations Assessment: Incinerator #1 (INC1) is capable of incinerating a continuous feed of 2,000 pounds of dry sludge per hour while Incinerator #2 (INC2) is capable of incinerating 11,000 pounds of dry sludge per hour. Since incinerator INC2 combusts waste containing more than 10% sewage sludge (dry basis) and/or charges more than 2,205 pounds per day (1,000 kg/day) of municipal sewage sludge (dry basis) and was constructed after the NSPS Subpart O June 11, 1973 effective date (for construction or modification), it is subject to the NSPS Subpart O - Standards of Performance for Sewage Treatment Plants. Incinerator INC1 was constructed before the NSPS Subpart O June 11, 1973 effective date and therefore is not subject

to the requirements of Subpart O. Incinerators INC1 and INC2 are both subject to 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart C, NESHAP - National Emission Standard for Beryllium and 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart E, NESHAP- National Emission Standard for Mercury. Incinerators INC1 and INC2 are also subject to State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(c)-Incinerators. Both INC1 and INC2 are subject to State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(g)-Sulfur Dioxide.

The three natural gas and digester gas fired boilers are each less than 10 MMBtu/hr and constructed or modified after January 1, 1972; they are subject to Georgia State Rules 391-3-1-.02(2)(d)-Fuel-burning Equipment and 391-3-1-.02(2)(g)-Sulfur Dioxide.

Since two diesel fueled generators (PS and HW) are each greater than 100 kW and less than 25 MW, they are subject to Georgia State Rules 391-3-1-.02(2)(mmm)-NO_x Emissions from Stationary Gas Turbines and Stationary Engines Used to Generate Electricity, 391-3-1-.02(2)(b)-Visible Emissions, and 391-3-1-.02(2)(g)-Sulfur Dioxide.

The three six-inch waste digester gas flares are subject to Georgia State Rules 391-3-1-.02(2)(g)-Sulfur Dioxide and 391-3-1-.02(2)(b)-Visible Emissions. Due to the low sulfur content in waste digester gas, Rule (g) will always be complied with. Due to the high destruction efficiency of enclosed flares there will be no visible emissions. Therefore no conditions have been incorporated in the permit concerning these rules.

Emission and Operating Standards: NSPS Subpart O limits the discharge of particulate matter and opacity into the atmosphere from a subject sludge incinerator (INC2). This rule limits the emission of particulate matter to less than or equal to 1.30 lb/ton of dry sludge input (0.65 g/kg dry sludge input) and opacity to less than 20 percent. This regulation requires the owner or operator of any multi hearth, fluidized bed, or electric sludge incinerator to submit a semi-annual report. The requirements of this report are listed in 40 CFR Part 60.155-Reporting.

NESHAP Subpart C limits the emissions from an incinerator not to exceed 10 grams of beryllium over a 24-hour period. Alternatively, the owner or operator may request approval from the administrator to meet an ambient concentration limit of beryllium in the vicinity of their facility of 0.01 ì g/m3, averaged over a 30-day period, rather than meeting the above 10 gram limit. The requirements for approval are listed in 40 CFR 61.32 (1) and (2). No request for the alternative form of the standard has been made.

NESHAP Subpart E limits the emissions to the atmosphere from the facility's incinerators to 3,200 grams of mercury in a 24-hour period.

State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(b)-Visible emissions, subjects the two diesel fueled emergency generators (PS and HW) to an emission opacity of equal to or less than 40 percent.

State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(c)-Incinerators, limits emissions of fly ash and/or particulate matter from the incinerators to 0.20 pounds per 100 pounds of charge and visible emissions to 20 percent opacity except for one six minute period per hour of no more than 27 percent opacity

State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(d)-Fuel-burning Equipment, limits emissions of fly ash and/or particulate matter from the three 8.4 MMBtu/hr natural gas and digester gas fueled boilers to 0.5

pounds per MMBtu input and visible emissions to 20 percent opacity except for one six minute period per hour of no more than 27 percent opacity.
State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(g)-Sulfur Dioxide, limits the fuel burned in the three 8.4 MMBtu/hr boilers (B1, B2, and B3), the three six-inch digester flares (F), the two municipal sewage sludge incinerators (INC1 and INC2), and the two emergency generators (PS and HW) to less than 2.5 percent sulfur, by weight.

State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(mmm)-NO_x Emissions from Stationary Gas Turbines and Stationary Engines Used to Generate Electricity, subjects the two diesel fueled generators PS and HW, installed before April 1, 2000, to the following NO_x emission limit. Starting in the year 2003, the generators shall comply with a NO_x emission limit of 160 ppm at 15 percent oxygen (O_2), dry basis during the period of May 1st through September 30th (Atlanta ozone season). If the generators are only used for emergency power and operate less than 200 hours per year, then the generators are exempt from the NO_x limits of State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(mmm).

D. Compliance Status

According to their Title V application, the facility is currently operating in compliance.

E. Operational Flexibility

Not Applicable

F. Permit Conditions

The Utoy Creek WRC Title V application requested no changes to the permit conditions contained within their SM Permit.

The permit conditions that were incorporated in Section 3 of the Title V application have been developed out of the requirements of the Georgia Air Quality Rules, the NSPS, and the NESHAP.

IV. Testing Requirements (with Associated Record Keeping and Reporting)

A. General Testing Requirements

Condition 4.1.1 of the Permit specifies that a performance test may be required at any specific emission point. The test methods to be used to determine compliance with the emission limitations of Section 3.3 and 3.4 are listed in Condition 4.1.3. A general condition to require notification of any test and for the submission of a test plan is included in Condition 4.1.2.

B. Specific Testing Requirements

A requirement to conduct annual performance tests for mercury and beryllium is included to reconfirm the sludge throughput rate limit which have been set to limit emissions of these pollutants below allowed rates.

V. Monitoring Requirements (with Associated Record Keeping and Reporting)

A. General Monitoring Requirements

This permit specifies that any monitoring systems installed should be in continuous operation and that downtime due to maintenance and quality assurance activities should be minimized.

B. Specific Monitoring Requirements

The Utoy Creek WRC uses two multiple hearth sludge incinerators to combust the sewage sludge produced from the wastewater treatment process. Due to the effective date of 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart O of June 11, 1973, INC2 is the only incinerator at this facility which must meet the federal Rule's requirements. Subpart O contains several monitoring requirements for the operation of a subject sludge incinerator which have been determined to be sufficient to provide a reasonable assurance of compliance for that standard. Due to the two incinerators burning natural gas which has negligible sulfur content with respect to the applicable limitations and their annual fuel consumption being limited, violations of State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(g) are not probable. Therefore, the Division has required no State Rule (g) monitoring in this Permit for the two incinerators (INC1 and INC2).

40 CFR Part 60, Subpart O requires continuous monitoring of each hearth temperature, the fuel flow to the incinerator, the volume or mass of sludge flowing to incinerator INC2 (in accordance with 40 CFR 60.153(a)(1) the source has decided to monitor mass flowrate), the oxygen (O_2) content of the exhaust gases, and the pressure drop of the exhaust gas flow through any associated wet scrubber. The baseline temperature, pressure drop values, and flue gas oxygen content were established during the initial performance test for incinerator INC2. The current performance test values for pressure drop and oxygen content are currently set as follows:

INC2: Pressure drop across scrubber SCRUB2 must be greater than 17.9 inches of water column and flue gas oxygen content must be less than 14.75 percent.

Also, as mentioned in Section III, this source is subject to 40 CFR Part 61, Subparts C and E. Each of the facility's incinerators must meet a limit of 10 grams of beryllium per 24 hour period while the entire wastewater treatment facility must meet a limit of 3,200 grams of mercury per 24 hour period. As noted in Section IV, to provide sufficient assurance of compliance, the source will demonstrate they are meeting these mass limits by performing an annual performance test. Although Subpart E applies to the entire wastewater treatment facility, only the facility's two incinerators are of concern with respect to mercury. Therefore, the permit denotes the two incinerators as being subject to the requirements of Subpart E.

Each of the three natural gas and digester gas burning boilers also must have a non-resettable fuel usage meters or equivalent device acceptable to the Division to monitor the actual natural gas use of the boilers. The facility shall submit a plan to the Division, within 90 days of the issuance of this permit, for its approval, denoting proposed procedures for monitoring the monthly burning of digester gas in the three boilers. Due to the three boilers burning natural gas or digester gas which have negligible sulfur content with respect to the applicable limitations and their annual fuel consumption being limited, violations of State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(d) or (g) are not probable.

Therefore, the Division has required no State Rule (d) or (g) monitoring in this Permit for the three boilers (B1, B2, and B3).

In addition, the facility has two emergency generators (PS and HW) that burn diesel fuel. The Permittee is required to demonstrate compliance with State Rule (g) by certifying that each shipment of fuel oil is distillate oil (ASTM D396 No. 1 or 2). Particulate matter emissions from combustion of distillate fuel oil and natural gas are considered insignificant, and there is no applicable regulation, so the permit does not require any further monitoring for the facility's emergency generators. The facility's two emergency generators must have a non-resettable hour meter or equivalent device acceptable to the Division to monitor the actual hours of generator use.

The two Utoy Creek WRC incinerators are subject to the particulate matter and opacity monitoring requirements of State Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(c)-Incinerators. However, INC2 is also subject to monitoring requirements of 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart O, as indicated above, which has more stringent particulate and opacity limits than State Rule (c). Therefore, the Division has required no State Rule (c) monitoring for INC2. For INC1, which is not subject to Subpart O, the facility must demonstrate compliance with the particulate matter and opacity emission limits of Rule (c) by monitoring, on at least an hourly basis during incinerator operation, the pressure drop and scrubbant (water) flow rate of SCRUB1. Based on operating experience and data review, the following values for pressures drop and scrubbant flow were set:

INC1: Pressure drop across scrubber SCRUB1 must be greater than 4 inches of water column and scrubbant (water) flow rate must be between 100 and 300 gallons per minute (gpm).

No operating specification is made regarding hearth temperature for INC1; this data is reported as discussed in Section VI(B). The monitoring of either volume or mass of sludge flow rate of INC1 is required by State Rule 391-3-1-.02(6)(b)1 and shall be used in the determination of the incinerator's dry sludge charging rate.

C. Record Keeping Requirements

Records, including identification of any deviation from applicable monitoring triggers, the cause of such occurrence, and the corrective action taken, are required to be kept and reported by the Permittee. The Permittee shall maintain monthly records of the hours of operation of the two generators (PS and HW) and natural gas consumption records for the facility's three boilers (B1, B2, and B3). The Permittee shall maintain monthly records of the hours of operation of INC1, the hourly pressure drop, and scrubbant flow rate of SCRUB1. These records shall be retained at the source and made available for inspection or submittal upon request, for a minimum of five years.

Any facility operating a multiple hearth, fluidized bed, or electric sludge incinerator which is subject to the provisions of Subpart O, as is INC2, is required to submit a semi-annual report to the Director. The report shall include the average scrubber pressure drop measurements for each 15 minute period or more during which the pressure drop is less than a specified percent of the average scrubber (SCRUB2) pressure drop measured during the most recent performance test (17.9 inches of water). The specified percentage rate is based on the average particulate matter

emission rate; the method for determining this is provided in 40 CFR 60.155(1)(i) or (ii). Based on the most recent performance test on SCRUB2, particulate matter (PM) emissions are less than 0.75 pounds per ton of sludge inputted, which by the procedures of 40 CFR 60.155(1) means the specified percentage rate is 30 percent. The most recent performance test denoted SCRUB2's pressure drop as 17.9 percent. Therefore, any 15 minute period or more in which the pressure drop of SCRUB2 is less than 12.5 inches of water it must be reported in the semi-annual report. The semi-annual report shall also include a record of the average oxygen content in the incinerator (INC2) exhaust gas for each period of 1-hour or more in which the oxygen content of the exhaust gas exceeds the average oxygen content recorded during the most recent performance test by more than 3 percent. The most recent performance test denoted SCRUB2's O_2 content as 14.75 percent. Therefore, any period of 1-hour or more that the O_2 content is greater than 17.75 percent must be reported in the semi-annual report.

Subpart O also requires the submittal, in the semi-annual report to the Director for INC2, any hourly pressure drop or scrubbant flow rate measurements from SCRUB1, during the operation of INC1, which are less than 4 inches of water column or outside of the range of 100 to 300 gallons per minute (gpm).

VI. Other Record Keeping and Reporting Requirements

A. General Record Keeping and Reporting Requirements

The Permit contains general requirements for the maintenance of all records for a period of five years following the date of entry and requires the prompt reporting of all information related to deviations from the applicable requirements.

B. Specific Record Keeping and Reporting Requirements

The NESHAPs for beryllium (Subpart C) and mercury (Subpart E) both have record keeping requirements. Both Subparts C and E state that records of emission test results and other data needed to determine total emissions shall be retained at the source and made available for inspection, for a minimum of 2 years. However, Part 70 requires that all records be retained and made available for inspection for a minimum of 5 years.

VII. Specific Requirements

A. Operational Flexibility

Not Applicable

B. Alternative Requirements

Not Applicable

C. Insignificant Activities

Utoy Creek has included several insignificant sources of air pollutants noted in Section 4.10 of the Title V application. Those include "Mobile Sources", "Combustion Equipment", "Trade Operations", "Maintenance, Cleaning and Housekeeping", "Laboratories and Testing", and "Storage Tanks and Equipment."

D. Temporary Sources

Not Applicable

E. Short-Term Activities

Not Applicable

F. Compliance Schedule/Progress Reports

Not Applicable

G. Emissions Trading

Not Applicable

H. Acid Rain Requirements

Not Applicable

I. Prevention of Accidental Releases

The Utoy Creek WRC denoted in Section 12.10 of the Title V Permit application that the facility has the quantity on hand such that there is possibility of a release of Chlorine (CAS No. 7782-50-5) above the threshold quantity of 2,500 lbs. Based on the provided information, the Utoy Creek WRC is subject to the Accidental Release Prevention Program required by 112(r).

J. Stratospheric Ozone Protection Requirements

Not Applicable

K. Pollution Prevention

Not Applicable

L. Specific Conditions

Not Applicable

VIII. General Provisions

Generic provisions have been included in this permit to address the requirements in 40 CFR Part 70 that apply to all Title V sources, and the requirements in Chapter 391-3-1 of the Georgia Rules for Air Quality Control that apply to all stationary sources of air pollution.

Addendum to Narrative

The announced comment deadline for the draft permit was March 30, 2001. Written comments, dated March 30, 2001, were received from the City of Atlanta on April 3, 2001 and from the Georgia Center for Law in the Public Interest on April 4, 2001. The initial paragraph of the Georgia Center comments includes a statement that the comments were submitted "on behalf of Georgia Chapter of the Sierra Club..."

Comments from the Georgia Center for Law in the Public Interest

Comment 1: A comment was made that "EPD's public notice procedures fail to comply with applicable federal regulations." The commenter stated that the EPD did not undertake the required public participation activities for this permit. The commenter concludes that "EPD must re-notice the draft permit for a new public comment period that follows, at a minimum, the public participation processes specified in the law."

General Response to this comment: For this draft Title V permit, EPD carried out its standard procedure for public participation that it has used for draft Title V permits for the past few years. EPD has subsequently reviewed its Title V public participation process and has determined that it conforms to the Part 70 requirements. [Note: EPD has incorporated changes requested by the commenter, into future public notices, in order to enhance the public participation process.]

A comment was made that the EPD's public notice stated that all relevant information used in developing the draft Title V permit was available at the Air Protection Branch in Suite 120. The commenter indicated that this might not be accurate, noting that relevant material may be available in the EPD regional office and other agencies, especially in the case of accidental releases under Clean Air Act § 112(r).

Response: All information used in the development of the draft Title V permit is located at the Air Protection Branch as indicated in the public notice.

A comment was made regarding the statement in the Public Notice that the permit "will be enforceable by the Georgia EPD and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency." The commenter states that this statement is incomplete and points out that 42 U.S.C. 7604(a) makes it clear that the permit will be enforceable by any person. The word "person" includes "an individual, corporation, partnership, association, state, municipality, and a political subdivision of a state." The commenter goes on to state that the onus lies with the Division to do all it can to involve people in the regulatory process to demonstrate that the Title V permitting program "is a legitimate means by which the public can participate to achieve the goal of attaining clean air."

Response: The commenter correctly noted that the permit, when issued, would be enforceable by the public. The Division believes that the current, standardized public notice is correct as published and fulfills all the requirements for such notices as set forth by the Act and the U.S. EPA.

A comment was made objecting to the sentence in the public notice, which states that we consider comments, make changes "and issue the Title V operating permit." The commenter counters that, "under certain circumstances, EPD is required to refuse to issue a Title V permit" as per 40 § CFR

70.7(a). The commenter complains that our public notice "could be interpreted as an indication of EPD's predisposition to issue Title V permits regardless of whether the permit complies with the law." The commenter concludes, "Therefore, we suggest that EPD include an additional statement that it will make a determination of whether to issue the permit."

Response: EPD has determined that the language in the public notice meets the Public Notification requirements of 40 CFR 70.7(h)(2). EPD has not received any information to indicate that a Part 70 operating permit should be denied for this facility.

2. A comment was made that “the permit impermissibly limits enforcement to "citizens of the United States in Condition 8.2.1.”

Response: The language of Condition 8.2.1 was derived from 40 CFR § 70.6(b)(1), which states that Part 70 permits "are enforceable by the Administrator and citizens under the Act." The language in Condition 8.2.1 of the permit had read, in part, “all terms and conditions contained herein shall be enforceable by the EPA and citizens of the United States.” The phrase “of the United States” has been deleted from Condition 8.2.1 to reflect the exact language in the Act contained in the phrase, "are enforceable by the Administrator and citizens under the Act."

3. A comment was made that “the permit materials should be made available in the affected community as well as at EPD’s office.” The commenter further states that the EPD does not have a consistent policy of making materials available in the local community.

Response: Availability of all permit materials in the affected community is not required by 40 CFR Part 70 or by the Georgia Rules for Air Quality Control. The EPD’s policy regarding dissemination of permit materials is to post all relevant materials pertaining to Title V permits being proposed, including the Title V application, the permit narrative, the draft permit, and a copy of the public notice, on the Division’s Title V web site. These electronic documents can be accessed by any citizen, from their home, if he or she has a computer and an Internet account, or at county, municipal and college libraries. In addition these documents are also available during office hours (8:30 AM to 4:00 PM, Monday through Friday) at the Air Protection Branch’s office in Atlanta.

In cases when electronic copies of the application forms are not available, paper copies of the permit application, permit narrative and draft permit are provided at the Air Protection Branch’s main offices in Atlanta for sources located within the Atlanta metropolitan area, or at the local courthouse or EPD regional office (if the regional office is in the same county as the source in question) for sources located outside the Atlanta area.

In cases where historical permit files are requested, the Division allows members of the public to review these materials at the Air Protection Branch’s main offices. The Division’s policy on this matter is applied consistently and is fully compliant with the requirements of 40CFR 70.7(h).

The permit has therefore not been modified in response to this comment.

4. A comment was made that “the permit must require the permittee to submit all monitoring information to EPD.”

Response: The section of the United States Code cited by the commenter requires that the Permittee submit, no less than every six months, the results of any required monitoring. 40 CFR 40 §

70.6(a)(3)(iii) and 40 CFR §70.6(a)(3)(i)(A) & (B) do not require the submittal of copies of all monitoring data recorded by the Permittee; rather, they require submittal of reports on the results of this monitoring.

The EPA has noted in a July 7, 1993 document entitled "Questions and Answers on the Requirements of Operating Permits Program Regulations" that the Permittee is not required to submit raw data on monitoring/testing as part of its monitoring reports. The Permittee is required to keep required monitoring data and support information. Support information includes all calibration and maintenance records for continuous monitoring, and copies of all reports required by the permit. Reports are required to contain the results of the monitoring required in the permit.

The permit has therefore not been modified in response to this comment.

5. A comment was made that "the permit cannot limit credible evidence from being used in an enforcement action." Further, the comment also states that the EPD must remove language that purports to limit credible evidence and that EPD should include standard language that explicitly states that anyone can use any credible evidence.

Response: The prescribed performance test methods and procedures, which are incorporated into the Georgia Rules for Air Quality Control, contain clear provisions that, by prescribing such procedures, nothing would preclude the additional use of other credible evidence, either for compliance certifications or for establishing whether or not a source is in violation of any emissions limitation or standard. [See Rule 391-3-1.02(3)(a) and the referenced Procedures for Testing and Monitoring Sources of Air Pollutants at Section 1.3(g).] Even without this direct inclusion, the Rules themselves are cited in all permits issued by the Division.

Furthermore, the Division believes that adequate provisions for consideration of credible evidence have been included in Condition 8.17.1, which states, in part, that "Determination of whether acceptable operating and maintenance procedures are being used will be based on any information available to the Division which may include, but is not limited to, monitoring results, observations of the opacity or other characteristics of emissions, review of operating and maintenance procedures or records, and inspection or surveillance of the source."

The Division has elected not to include any additional language beyond the Rules cited above because it is our belief that any attempt to clarify the rule or define credible evidence will generally produce an impression of limiting of the scope of the rule. This we do not wish to do. The Division believes that any challenge to the authority of the U.S. EPA, State of Georgia, or any citizen with standing to use any credible evidence would easily be turned away. On the other hand, if limiting language such as that offered in the referenced EPA text were to be used, arguments to use such statements to "whither away" at the general principle could and most probably would be made. For instance, petitioners might suggest that the statement was only meant to apply to stated test methods and not work practice or other parts of the applicable standards, including the general provisions to

the rules. Therefore, for the benefit of the enforceability of the standards by using any credible evidence available, the permit need not and is not being modified.

6. A comment was made that "the permit must require the permittee to report all exceedances, excursions and excess emissions."

Response: The Division agrees that all exceedances, excursions and excesses be reported and therefore Condition 6.1.4 of the proposed permit states "The Permittee shall submit a written report containing any excess emissions, exceedances, and/or excursions…" The commenter claims that Condition 6.1.7 limits the exceedances, excursions and excess emissions that Utoy must report. However, EPD believes that Condition 6.1.7, by listing explicitly what constitutes an excess emission, exceedance, and excursion, makes this requirement practically enforceable without, in any way, limiting the requirement to report all exceedances, excursions and excess emissions.

The permit has not been modified in response to this comment.

7. A comment was made that "the permit does not fully include the accidental release requirements."

Response: As indicated in the text of the comment, EPD includes the 112(r) requirements in Condition 7.10.1 of Title V permits. EPD reviewed the language of Condition 7.10.1 for adequacy and modified this template condition. This Title V permit has been modified to reflect this change.

8. The Georgia Center expresses appreciation that Condition 8.13 deals with emergencies rather than startup/shutdown/malfunction.

No action was requested, so the permit has not been modified in response to this comment.

9. A comment was made that "the permit cannot allow the permittee to submit monitoring information after the final permit is issued." The commenter was referring to Condition 5.2.3 which requires the permittee to submit a plan for monitoring monthly usage of digester gas within 90 days after the permit is issued.

Response: Based on this comment EPD revisited this issue and decided to remove the condition requiring the permittee to submit a monitoring plan. The rationale for this action is as follows:

a. Digester gas can easily be measured using a standard gas meter; hence it requires no special hardware or plans to implement.
b. Digester gas combustion emissions are to be included along with the natural gas combustion emissions to calculate total emissions from the facility, using total heat value (btu value) of the gas, to determine compliance with the permit.

10. A comment was made that "the permit does not have adequate provisions to ensure this facility can avoid new source review." The commenter points out that Condition 2.1.1 limits NO_x emissions to 50 tons per year by limiting the hours of operation of the generators, the amount of sludge that can be burned and the amount of fuel that can be used in the boilers, yet the permit does not require monitoring to assure compliance. The commenter requests the inclusion of calculations showing that the operational limitations in the permit will ensure that NO_x emissions will remain below 50tons per year. The commenter also believes that the two digester flares' emissions must be included in the calculation of emissions to assure that emissions do not exceed 50 tpy NO_x.

Response: Based on the comment, EPD has added Condition 5.3.3 requiring Utoy to determine the amount of sludge processed monthly and maintain records of it. EPD is also requiring Utoy to include the monthly usage data for sludge processed, natural gas combusted, digester gas combusted, and generator usage hours, in the semi-annual reports submitted to the EPD.

EPD has already included the NO_x emissions from the two digester flares in the calculation of total emissions. A copy of the calculation is included at the end of this addendum.

11. A comment was made that "the permit must include conditions from the POTW MACT."

Response: POTW MACT regulations are found in 40 CFR Part 63 – National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories, Subpart VVV. These regulations are applicable if the POTW meets both of the following conditions:

- The POTW is a major source of Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP) Emissions (i.e., a source emitting 10 tons per year or more of any individual HAPs or 25 tons per year or more of combined HAPs).
- The POTW is required to develop and implement a pretreatment program as defined by 40 CFR 403.8 (for a POTW owned or operated by a municipality, state or intermunicipal or interstate agency) or the POTW meets the general criteria for development and implementation of a pretreatment program.

Based on the emission calculations, Utoy is not a major source of HAP emissions. Therefore, the POTW MACT does not apply to this facility. The permit has not been modified in response to this comment.

Comments from City of Atlanta, Utoy Creek Water Reclamation Center (Utoy)

1. Regarding Table 3.1 a comment was made that "existing fuel powered generators (PS & HW) meet the criteria for emergency standby gas turbine generators and thus are not subject to Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(mmm)." They request that we use the term "Avoidance" in the permit. They also request that EPD change the description of air pollution control device ID No. SCRUB1 to "wet impingement plate scrubber."

Response: EPD contacted the City of Atlanta to obtain additional information regarding generators PS and HW and to evaluate the request made in the comments. Based on the additional information provided by City of Atlanta, the Division has learned that generators PS and HW are emergency generators and are not hooked up to the power grid to allow them to be used as peak shaving generators. Therefore, these generators do qualify as emergency generators. Based on these conclusions, the Table in Section 3.1 has been updated to reflect the above-requested changes.

2. A comment was made that "condition 3.4.2 be modified to state that generators PS and HW are emergency generators, unless these generators are used in a way inconsistent with the definition of emergency generators."

Response: EPD has revisited the Condition No. 3.4.2 and believes that the condition already makes the point that generators PS and HW are emergency generators to the extent that they conform to the definition. No language changes are needed. However, as requested, the regulatory citation has been modified to add the word "avoidance."

3. A comment has been made regarding Condition 4.2.1 that "the annual source testing for Mercury and Beryllium be eliminated."

Response: The Division has reviewed the compliance test data for Mercury and Beryllium provided by Utoy. Based on the data, the Division has determined that annual testing is not required because the emission levels for Mercury and Beryllium are well below the maximum limits set by NESHAPs. The language in Permit Condition No. 3.3.4, Condition No. 4.1.3(k) and Condition No. 4.1.3(l) are modified to clarify the intent of the EPD regarding the performance tests for Beryllium and Mercury.

4. A comment was made that "Condition No. 5.2.1 be modified to allow an alternate method, proposed by Utoy, to calculate the volume of sludge fed to the incinerators in lieu of utilizing a specific piece of equipment to measure the volume of sludge fed to the incinerators."

Response: EPD contacted Utoy and requested that they submit complete documentation of the proposed method, which Utoy did. EPD has reviewed the documentation submitted by Utoy and is satisfied that the proposed method is effective in measuring the required parameter. Therefore, Condition No. 5.2.1(d) has been modified to allow for the proposed method.

5. A comment was made regarding "Condition No. 5.2.1(f), which requires the use of non-resettable hour meters to continuously monitor and record the actual hours of usage for each generator (PS and HW)." Utoy states that each of the generators is already equipped with a "lapse-time meter that run whenever the engine is run, providing a continuous total the amount of time the engines have run. Readings of these meters are manually recorded during equipment and maintenance checks."

Response: It was the Division's intent to allow the use of totalizers that generators are routinely equipped with and not to require Utoy to install any new equipment to monitor the hours of usage on the generators. To make this intent clear, Condition No. 5.2.1(f) is removed from 5.2.1 and its content included as new Condition No. 5.2.2, thus making it a separate condition and not a part of 5.2.1. Further, the condition has been changed to add that the actual hours "…must be recorded in a form readily available for inspection by the Division."

6. A comment was made that "Condition No. 5.2.1(h) be changed so that Utoy can monitor the combined fuel consumption of boilers B1, B2 and B3, instead of being required to monitor the consumption of fuel in each individual boiler."

Response: Utoy is requesting that the requirement to individually monitor the gas consumption of each boiler be modified to allow for a single meter to measure the total gas being consumed by all boilers. EPD has determined that the requested change can be made because the emission factors for all the boilers are the same so the proposed change would not affect the calculation of total emissions. The condition has been modified to incorporate this requested change.

7. A comment was made requesting removal of "Condition Nos. 5.3.1 (a) and (b), which require Utoy to submit the average scrubber pressure drop measurements from SCRUB2 for each 15-minute period when it is not within the limits of 4 to 12.5 inches of water and the average oxygen content in INC2's exhaust gas for each period of 1-hour or more in which the oxygen exceeds 17.25 percent." The comment requests "consistency in the oxygen-reporting threshold between permit conditions 5.3.1(b) and 6.1.7(c)(iii)."

Response: The requirements listed in Conditions 5.3.1 (a) and (b) are specified by the Federal Regulations as cited in 40 CFR 60.155(a); therefore, the Division cannot change the conditions to accommodate Utoy. However, we have determined that the oxygen content trigger of 17.25 percent was a typographical error; the correct number is 17.75 percent. Therefore, the Division has made that

change. Further, Condition 5.3.1(c) has been removed, since it is same as Condition 6.1.7(c)(iv) and is more appropriate in Section 6.

NOTE: Condition 5.3.1 has been completely revised to better reflect the requirements of 40 CFR 60.155(a).

8. A comment was made that "the averaging times identified in 6.1.7.c.i through 6.1.7.c.iv are the same as the minimum recording time, thus no averaging of values is provided for."

Response: The Division will not be able to change the requirements listed in 40 CFR 60.155. However, the Division has determined that it can authorize use of the testing procedures as proposed by Utoy, to allow them to use alternative methods to calculate mercury and beryllium emissions in lieu of stack testing. To this end, Conditions 6.1.7 and 6.2 are changed to allow for it.

9. A comment was made regarding the Insignificant Activities Checklist in the draft Title V permit, that there should be no stationary engines shown under "combustion equipment" and there should be no boilers shown under the "generic emission groups—description of fuel burning equipment."

Response: The Division has determined that the proposed permit was in error and has made the requested changes to the final permit.

ATTACHMENT TO THE ADDENDUM TO NARRATIVE

COPY OF EMISSIONS CALCULATION

City of Atlanta
Utoy Creek WRC
800 Selig Drive, SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30336

Facility Address: 800 Selig Drive, SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30336
Fulton County

Permit Application No.: TV-11945
Dated: January 4, 2000
Received: January 4, 2000 **Updated:** 5/4/00
Contact: Ms. Tyler Richards

Phone No.: 404/696-7001 **Fax No.**
E-Mail: N/A

NOx Emitting Equipment

Incinerators (INC1 & INC2)
Boilers (B1, B2, & B3 [each 8.4 MMBtu/hr])
Flares (Two - 6 inch enclosed flares)
Two -Emergency Generators (pump station-149.9 kW diesel & headworks-400kW diesel)
201 hp 536.4 hp

NOx Emission Factors (AP-42 and Testing Data)

Incinerators	6 lb/dry ton sludge		
Boilers	100 lb/10^6 ft^3	or	0.10 lb/MMBtu
Flares	0.068 lb/10^6 Btu	or	6.80E-08 lb/Btu
Generators	0.031 lb/hp-hr	or	4.41 lb/MMBtu

Current Operational Permit Limits to Limit NOx Emissions

Dry Sludge Input to Incinerators	15,500 ton/12 consecutive month	(dry basis)
Boiler Fuel Consumption (nat. gas or digester gas)	22,000 MMBtu/12 consecutive months	
Emergency Generators	200 hour/12 consecutive months	
Flares	No Limits	

Potential NOx Emissions Based on Current Permit Limits

Incinerators

(15,500 ton/year)(6 lb/ton sludge)(1 ton/2,000 lb) = **46.50 Ton/Year**

Boilers

(22,000 MMBtu/year)(0.10 lb/MMBtu)(1 ton/2,000 lb) = **1.1 Ton/Year**

Pump Station Generator (149.9 kW/201 hp)

(200 hour/year)(0.031 lb/hp-hour)(201 hp)(1 ton/2,000 lb) = **0.62 Ton/Year**

Headworks Generator (400 kW/536.4 hp)

(200 hour/year)(0.031 lb/hp-hour)(536.4 hp)(1 ton/2,000 lb) = **1.66 Ton/Year**

NOx Emissions From the Flares

The Maximum Hourly Fuel Input into the Flares is 4,500 ft^3/hour and the Digester Gas has a Caloric Value of 640 Btu/ft^3 (based on the TV application).

(2 flares)((4,500 ft^3/hour)(640 Btu/ft^3)(0.068 lb/10^6 Btu)(1 ton/2,000 lb)) = **0.000196 Ton/Year**

TOTAL = 49.89 Ton/Year