

**ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION**  
**Air Permits Program**

**BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY DETERMINATION**  
**for**  
**Golden Valley Electric Association**  
**North Pole Power Plant**

---

Prepared by: Brittany Crutchfield  
Supervisor: Patrick Dunn  
Preliminary Date: May 10, 2019

## **Table of Contents**

1.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
2.	BACT EVALUATION.....	1
3.	BACT DETERMINATION FOR NO <sub>x</sub> .....	3
3.1	NO <sub>x</sub> BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 1 and 2) .....	4
3.2	NO <sub>x</sub> BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 5 and 6) .....	9
3.3	NO <sub>x</sub> BACT for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine (EU 7) .....	12
3.4	NO <sub>x</sub> BACT for the Propane-Fired Boilers (EUs 11 and 12) .....	15
4.	BACT DETERMINATION FOR PM-2.5.....	19
4.1	PM-2.5 BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 1 and 2) .....	20
4.2	PM-2.5 BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 5 and 6) .....	22
4.3	PM-2.5 BACT for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine (EU 7) .....	23
4.5	PM-2.5 BACT for the Propane-Fired Boilers (EUs 11 and 12).....	27
5.	BACT DETERMINATION FOR SO <sub>2</sub> .....	29
5.1	SO <sub>2</sub> BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 1 and 2).....	30
5.2	SO <sub>2</sub> BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 5 and 6) .....	33
5.3	SO <sub>2</sub> BACT for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine (EU 7) .....	36
5.4	SO <sub>2</sub> BACT for the Propane-Fired Boilers (EUs 11 and 12) .....	38
6.	BACT DETERMINATION SUMMARY .....	41

### Abbreviations/Acronyms

AAC .....	Alaska Administrative Code
AAAQS .....	Alaska Ambient Air Quality Standards
Department .....	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
BACT .....	Best Available Control Technology
CFB.....	Circulating Fluidized Bed
CFR.....	Code of Federal Regulations
Cyclones.....	Mechanical Separators
DFP.....	Diesel Particulate Filter
DLN.....	Dry Low NOx
DOC.....	Diesel Oxidation Catalyst
EPA .....	Environmental Protection Agency
ESP.....	Electrostatic Precipitator
EU.....	Emission Unit
FITR.....	Fuel Injection Timing Retard
GCPs.....	Good Combustion Practices
HAP.....	Hazardous Air Pollutant
ITR.....	Ignition Timing Retard
LEA.....	Low Excess Air
LNB.....	Low NOx Burners
MR&Rs .....	Monitoring, Recording, and Reporting
NESHAPS .....	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NSCR.....	Non-Selective Catalytic Reduction
NSPS .....	New Source Performance Standards
ORL.....	Owner Requested Limit
PSD.....	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
PTE.....	Potential to Emit
RICE, ICE .....	Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engine, Internal Combustion Engine
SCR .....	Selective Catalytic Reduction
SIP .....	Alaska State Implementation Plan
SNCR.....	Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction
ULSD .....	Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel

### Units and Measures

gal/hr.....	gallons per hour
g/kWh.....	grams per kilowatt hour
g/hp-hr .....	grams per horsepower hour
hr/day.....	hours per day
hr/yr .....	hours per year
hp .....	horsepower
lb/hr .....	pounds per hour
lb/MMBtu.....	pounds per million British thermal units
lb/1000 gal.....	pounds per 1,000 gallons
kW .....	kilowatts
MMBtu/hr.....	million British thermal units per hour
MMscf/hr.....	million standard cubic feet per hour
ppmv.....	parts per million by volume
tpy.....	tons per year

### Pollutants

CO .....	Carbon Monoxide
HAP.....	Hazardous Air Pollutant
NOx .....	Oxides of Nitrogen
SO <sub>2</sub> .....	Sulfur Dioxide
PM-2.5.....	Particulate Matter with an aerodynamic diameter not exceeding 2.5 microns
PM-10.....	Particulate Matter with an aerodynamic diameter not exceeding 10 microns

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The North Pole Power Plant (North Pole) is an electric generating facility that combusts distillate fuel in combustion turbines to provide power to the Golden Valley Electric Association (GVEA) grid. The power plant contains two fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas combustion turbines, two fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas combustion turbines, one fuel oil-fired emergency generator, and two propane fired boilers.

In a letter dated April 24, 2015, the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (Department) requested the stationary sources expected to be major stationary sources in the particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 2.5 micrometers (PM-2.5) serious nonattainment area perform a voluntary Best Available Control Technology (BACT) review in support of the state agency's required SIP submittal once the nonattainment area is re-classified as a Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area. The designation of the area as "Serious" with regard to nonattainment of the 2006 24-hour PM-2.5 ambient air quality standards was published in Federal Register Vol. 82, No. 89, May 10, 2017, pages 21703-21706, with an effective date of June 9, 2017.<sup>1</sup>

This report addresses the significant emission units (EUs) listed in the North Pole Power Plant's operating permit AQ0110TVP03. This report provides the Department's review of the BACT analysis for oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, which are precursor pollutants that can form PM-2.5 in the atmosphere post combustion.

The following sections review GVEA's BACT analysis provided for the North Pole Power Plant for technical accuracy and adherence to accepted engineering cost estimation practices.

## **2. BACT EVALUATION**

A BACT analysis is an evaluation of all available control options for equipment emitting the triggered pollutants and a process for selecting the best option based on feasibility, economics, energy, and other impacts. 40 CFR 52.21(b)(12) defines BACT as a site-specific determination on a case-by-case basis. The Department's goal is to: identify BACT for the permanent emission units (EUs) at the GVEA North Pole Power Plant that emit NO<sub>x</sub>, PM-2.5, and SO<sub>2</sub>, establish emission limits which represent BACT, and assess the level of monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting (MR&R) necessary to ensure GVEA applies BACT for the EUs. The Department based the BACT review on the five-step top-down approach set forth in Federal Register Volume 61, Number 142, July 23, 1996 (Environmental Protection Agency). Table A presents the EUs subject to BACT review.

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal Register, Vol. 82, No. 89, Wednesday May 10, 2017  
(<https://dec.alaska.gov/air/anpms/comm/docs/2017-09391-CFR.pdf>)

**Table A: Emission Units Subject to BACT Review**

EU	EU Name	Description of EU	Rating/Size	Installation Date
1	GT#1	GE Frame 7, Series 7001, Fuel Oil-Fired Model BR Regenerative Simple Cycle Gas Turbine	672 MMBtu/hr (60.5 MW)	1976
2	GT#2	GE Frame 7, Series 7001, Fuel Oil-Fired Model BR Regenerative Simple Cycle Gas Turbine	672 MMBtu/hr (60.5 MW)	1977
5	GT#3	GE LM6000PC Combined Cycle Gas Turbine, Fuel 0-GT (naphtha/LSR fuel) Fired (with water injection for NOx control and CO oxidation catalyst)	455 MMBtu/hr (Higher Heating Value) 43 MW (nominal)	2005
6	GT#4	GE LM6000PC Combined Cycle Gas Turbine, Fuel 0-GT (naphtha/LSR fuel) Fired (with water injection for NOx control and CO oxidation catalyst)	455 MMBtu/hr (Higher Heating Value) 43 MW (nominal)	Est. 2015
7	Emergency Generator	IC Engine, Fuel-Oil Fired	400 kW	2005
11	Propane-Fired Boiler	Bryan Steam RV500 Heater, Gas Fuel-Fired	5.0 MMBtu/hr	2005
12	Propane-Fired Boiler	Bryan Steam RV500 Heater, Gas Fuel-Fired	5.0 MMBtu/hr	2005

GVEA did not include BACT analyses for EUs 3 and 4. These emission units are fuel storage tanks and do not have NOx, PM-2.5, or SO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

### Five-Step BACT Determinations

The following sections explain the steps used to determine BACT for NOx, PM-2.5, and SO<sub>2</sub> for the applicable equipment.

#### Step 1 Identify All Potentially Available Control Technologies

The Department identifies all available control technologies for the EUs and the pollutant under consideration. This includes technologies used throughout the world or emission reductions through the application of available control techniques, changes in process design, and/or operational limitations. To assist in identifying available controls, the Department reviews available controls listed on the Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT), BACT, and Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) Clearinghouse (RBLC). The RBLC is an EPA database where permitting agencies nationwide post imposed BACT for PSD sources. It is usually the first stop for BACT research. In addition to the RBLC search, the Department used several search engines to look for emerging and tried technologies used to control NOx, PM-2.5, and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from equipment similar to those listed in Table A.

#### Step 2 Eliminate Technically Infeasible Control Technologies

The Department evaluates the technical feasibility of each control option based on source specific factors in relation to each EU subject to BACT. Based on sound documentation and

demonstration, the Department eliminates control technologies deemed technically infeasible due to physical, chemical, and engineering difficulties.

### **Step 3 Rank the Remaining Control Technologies by Control Effectiveness**

The Department ranks the remaining control technologies in order of control effectiveness with the most effective at the top.

### **Step 4 Evaluate the Most Effective Controls and Document the Results as Necessary**

The Department reviews the detailed information in the BACT analysis about the control efficiency, emission rate, emission reduction, cost, environmental, and energy impacts for each option to decide the final level of control. The analysis must present an objective evaluation of both the beneficial and adverse energy, environmental, and economic impacts. A proposal to use the most effective option does not need to provide the detailed information for the less effective options. If cost is not an issue, a cost analysis is not required. Cost effectiveness for a control option is defined as the total net annualized cost of control divided by the tons of pollutant removed per year. Annualized cost includes annualized equipment purchase, erection, electrical, piping, insulation, painting, site preparation, buildings, supervision, transportation, operation, maintenance, replacement parts, overhead, raw materials, utilities, engineering, start-up costs, financing costs, and other contingencies related to the control option. Sections 3, 4, and 5 present the Department's BACT Determinations for NO<sub>x</sub>, PM-2.5, and SO<sub>2</sub>.

### **Step 5 Select BACT**

The Department selects the most effective control option not eliminated in Step 4 as BACT for the pollutant and EU under review. The Department lists the final BACT requirements determined for each EU in this step. A project may achieve emission reductions through the application of available technologies, changes in process design, and/or operational limitations. The Department reviewed GVEA's BACT analysis and made BACT determinations for NO<sub>x</sub>, PM-2.5, and SO<sub>2</sub> for the North Pole Power Plant. These BACT determinations are based on the information submitted by GVEA in their analysis, information from vendors, suppliers, sub-contractors, RBLC, and an exhaustive internet search.

## **3. BACT DETERMINATION FOR NO<sub>x</sub>**

The NO<sub>x</sub> controls proposed in this section are not planned to be implemented. The optional precursor demonstration (as allowed under 40 C.F.R. 51.1006) for the precursor gas NO<sub>x</sub> for point sources illustrates that NO<sub>x</sub> controls are not needed. DEC is planning to submit with the Serious SIP a final precursor demonstration as justification not to require NO<sub>x</sub> controls. Please see the precursor demonstration for NO<sub>x</sub> posted at <http://dec.alaska.gov/air/anpms/communities/fbks-pm2-5-serious-sip-development>. The PM2.5 NAAQS Final SIP Requirements Rule states if the state determines through a precursor demonstration that controls for a precursor gas are not needed for attaining the standard, then the controls identified as BACT/BACM or Most Stringent Measure for the precursor gas are not required to be implemented.<sup>2</sup> Final approval of the precursor demonstration is at the time of the Serious SIP approval.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2016-08-24/pdf/2016-18768.pdf>

The North Pole Power Plant has two existing 672 MMBtu/hr GE Frame 7, Series 7001 turbines that burn fuel oil, two 455 MMBtu/hr GE LM6000PC gas turbines, one emergency diesel-fired internal combustion engine, and two Bryan Steam RV500 propane heaters subject to BACT. The Department reviewed the control technologies GVEA identified in their analysis and determined NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the EUs listed in Table A. The Department based its NO<sub>x</sub> assessment on BACT determinations found in the RBLC, internet research, and BACT analyses submitted to the Department by Golden Valley Electric Association (GVEA) for the North Pole Power Plant and Zehnder Facility, Aurora Energy, LLC (Aurora) for the Chena Power Plant, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (US Army) for Fort Wainwright, and the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) for the Fairbanks Campus Power Plant.

### 3.1 NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 1 and 2)

Possible NO<sub>x</sub> emission control technologies for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbine were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process code 15.110 for Liquid Fuel-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines (rated at 25 MW or more). The search results for simple cycle gas turbines are summarized in Table 3-1.

**Table 3-1. RBLC Summary of NO<sub>x</sub> Controls for Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits (ppmv)
Selective Catalytic Reduction	2	7
Low NO <sub>x</sub> Burners	12	5 – 15
Good Combustion Practices	3	15

#### **RBLC Review**

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates selective catalytic reduction, low NO<sub>x</sub> burners, and good combustion practices are the principle NO<sub>x</sub> control technologies installed on fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines. The lowest NO<sub>x</sub> emission rate listed in the RLBC is 5 parts per million by volume (ppmv).

#### **Step 1 - Identification of NO<sub>x</sub> Technology for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines**

From Research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for control of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines rated at 25 MW or more:

##### **(a) Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR)**

SCR is a post-combustion gas treatment technique for reducing nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) in the turbine exhaust stream to molecular nitrogen (N<sub>2</sub>), water, and oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>). In the SCR process, aqueous or anhydrous ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) is injected into the flue gas upstream of a catalyst bed. The catalyst lowers the activation energy of the NO<sub>x</sub> decomposition reaction. NO<sub>x</sub> and NH<sub>3</sub> combine at the catalyst surface forming an ammonium salt intermediate, which subsequently decomposes to produce elemental N<sub>2</sub> and water. Depending on the overall NH<sub>3</sub>-to-NO<sub>x</sub> ratio, removal efficiencies are generally 80 to 90 percent. Challenges associated with using SCR on fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines include a narrow window of acceptable inlet and exhaust temperatures (500°F to 800°F), emission of NH<sub>3</sub> into the atmosphere (NH<sub>3</sub> slip) caused by non-stoichiometric reduction reaction, and disposal of depleted catalysts. The Department

considers SCR a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

(b) Water Injection

Water/steam injection involves the introduction of water or steam into the combustion zone. The injected fluid provides a heat sink which absorbs some of the heat of reaction, causing a lower flame temperature. The lower flame temperature results in lower thermal NO<sub>x</sub> formation. Both steam and water injections are capable of obtaining the same level of control. The process requires approximately 0.8 to 1.0 pound of water or steam per pound of fuel burned. The main technical consideration is the required purity of the water or steam, which is required to protect the equipment from dissolved solids. Obtaining water or steam of sufficient purity requires the installation of rigorous water treatment and deionization systems. Water/steam injection is a proven technology for NO<sub>x</sub> emissions reduction from turbines. However, the arctic environment presents significant challenges to water/steam injection due to cost of water treatment, freezing potential due to extreme cold ambient temperatures, and increased maintenance problems due to accelerated wear in the hot sections of the turbines. Moreover, the vendor of the turbines does not recommend using water/steam injection to control NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the turbines because of the extra maintenance problems. The Department considers water/steam injection a technically feasible control technology for the fuel-oil simple cycle gas turbines.

(c) Dry Low NO<sub>x</sub> (DLN)

Two-stage lean/lean combustors are essentially fuel-staged, premixed combustors in which each stage burns lean. The two-stage lean/lean combustor allows the turbine to operate with an extremely lean mixture while ensuring a stable flame. A small stoichiometric pilot flame ignites the premixed gas and provides flame stability. The NO<sub>x</sub> emissions associated with the high temperature pilot flame are insignificant. Low NO<sub>x</sub> emission levels are achieved by this combustor design through cooler flame temperatures associated with lean combustion and avoidance of localized "hot spots" by premixing the fuel and air. DLN is designed for natural gas-fired or dual-fuel fired units and is not effective in controlling NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from fuel oil-fired units. The Department does not consider DLN a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

(d) Limited Operation

Limiting the operation of emission units reduces the potential to emit for those units. EU 1 currently operates under a combined owner requested limit (ORL) with EUs 5 and 6 to restrict the combined NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from these three units to no more than 1,600 tons per 12 month rolling period. EU 2 also operated under an ORL to restrict operation to no more than 7,992 hours per 12 month rolling period. The Department considers limited operation a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.



(e) Good Combustion Practices (GCPs)

GCPs typically include the following elements:

1. Sufficient residence time to complete combustion;
2. Providing and maintaining proper air/fuel ratio;
3. High temperatures and low oxygen levels in the primary combustion zone;
4. High enough overall excess oxygen levels to complete combustion and maximize thermal efficiency.

Combustion efficiency is dependent on the gas residence time, the combustion temperature, and the amount of mixing in the combustion zone. GCPs are accomplished primarily through combustion chamber design as it relates to residence time, combustion temperature, air-to-fuel mixing, and excess oxygen levels. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

**Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible NO<sub>x</sub> Control Technologies for Gas Turbines**

As explained in Step 1 of Section 3.1, the Department does not consider dry low NO<sub>x</sub> as technically feasible technology to control NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

**Step 3 - Rank the Remaining NO<sub>x</sub> Control Technologies for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines**

The following control technologies have been identified and ranked for control of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines:

(a + b)	Selective Catalytic Reduction & Water Injection	(95% Control)
(a)	Selective Catalytic Reduction	(90% Control)
(b)	Water Injection	(70% Control)
(g)	Good Combustion Practices	(Less than 40% Control)
(d)	Limited Operation	(0% Control)

Control technologies already in practice at the stationary source or included in the design of the EU are considered 0% control for the purpose of the SIP BACT for existing stationary sources.

**Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls**

**GVEA BACT Proposal**

GVEA provided an economic analysis of the control technologies available for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines to demonstrate that the use of water injection with SCR, SCR, or water injection in conjunction with limited operation is not economically feasible on these units. A summary of the analysis for EU 1 is shown in Table 3-2, and the summary of the analysis for EU 2 is shown in Table 3-3:

**Table 3-2. GVEA Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible NOx Controls (EU 1)**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
SCR and Water Injection	1,600	1,440	\$31,262,640	\$9,214,910	\$6,872
SCR	1,600	1,630	\$26,213,360	\$5,569,212	\$4,597
Water Injection	1,600	1,168	\$4,600,000	\$3,610,916	\$4,009
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.1424 (7% interest rate for a 10 year equipment life)					

**Table 3-3. GVEA Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible NOx Controls (EU 2)**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
SCR and Water Injection	2,363	2,127	\$31,262,640	\$3,249,764	\$4,221
SCR	2,363	2,009	\$26,213,360	\$825,940	\$2,791
Water Injection	2,363	1,725	\$4,600,000	\$2,503,774	\$1,952
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.1424 (7% interest rate for a 10 year equipment life)					

GVEA contends that the economic analysis indicates the level of NOx reduction does not justify the use of SCR, water injection, or SCR and water injection for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines based on the excessive cost per ton of NOx removed per year.

GVEA proposes the following as BACT for NOx emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines:

- (a) NOx emissions from the operation of the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines will be controlled with good combustion practices; and
- (b) NOx emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines will not exceed 0.88 lb/MMBtu over a 4-hour averaging period.

#### **Department Evaluation of BACT for NOx Emissions from the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines**

The Department revised the emissions tables to reflect the limited operation as the baseline for emissions reduction for the control devices. Additionally, the Department revised the NOx removal efficiency to 95%, 90%, and 70% for SCR with water injection, SCR, and water injection respectively, the interest rate was revised to 5.5% (current bank prime interest rate), the equipment life was revised to 20 years. The PTE for EU 2 was revised based on the most recent source test data which showed a NOx emission rate of 1.39 lb/MMBtu, as opposed to the AP-42 emission factor of 0.88 lb/MMBtu. A summary of the analyses is shown below:

**Table 3-4. Department Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible NO<sub>x</sub> Controls (EU 1)**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
SCR and Water Injection	1,600	1,520	\$31,262,640	\$7,388,635	\$4,861
SCR	1,600	1,440	\$26,213,360	\$4,050,059	\$2,813
Water Injection	1,600	1,120	\$4,600,000	\$3,340,904	\$2,983
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.0944 (7% interest rate for a 20 year equipment life)					

**Table 3-5. Department Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible NO<sub>x</sub> Controls (EU 2)**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
SCR and Water Injection	3,733	3,546	\$31,262,640	\$7,150,274	\$2,016
SCR	3,733	3,360	\$26,213,360	\$4,140,269	\$1,232
Water Injection	3,733	2,613	\$4,600,000	\$3,097,881	\$1,186
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.0944 (7% interest rate for a 20 year equipment life)					

The Department's economic analysis indicates the level of NO<sub>x</sub> reduction justifies the use of SCR and water injection as BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas combustion turbines located in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

### Step 5 - Selection of NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines

The Department's finding is that BACT for NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the simple cycle gas-fired combustion turbines is as follows:

- NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from EUs 1 and 2 shall be controlled by operating and maintaining selective catalytic reduction and water injection at all times the units are in operation;
- NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from EU 1 shall not exceed 0.044 lb/MMBtu averaged over a 3-hour period;
- NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from EU 2 shall not exceed 0.070 lb/MMBtu averaged over a 3-hour period; and
- Maintain good combustion practices by following the manufacturer's operating and maintenance procedures at all times of operation.

Table 3-6 lists the proposed NO<sub>x</sub> BACT determination for this facility along with those for other fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines located in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

**Table 3-6. Comparison of NOx BACT for Simple-Cycle Gas Turbines at Nearby Power Plants**

Facility	Process Description	Capacity	Limitation	Control Method
North Pole	2 Simple Cycle Combustion Gas Turbines	1,344 MMBtu/hr	0.044 – 0.070 lb/MMBtu	Selective Catalytic Reduction Water Injection
Zehnder	2 Simple Cycle Combustion Gas Turbines	536 MMBtu/hr	0.044 lb/MMBtu	Selective Catalytic Reduction Water Injection

### 3.2 NOx BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 5 and 6)

Possible NOx emission control technologies for fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process code 15.290, Combined Cycle Liquid Fuel-Fired Gas Turbines (rated at 25 MW or more). The search results for combined cycle gas turbines are summarized in Table 3-7.

**Table 3-7. RBLC Summary of NOx Controls for Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits
Selective Catalytic Reduction	8	2 – 5 ppmv
Low NOx Burner	8	0.023 - 0.14 (g/hp-hr)
Good Combustion Practices	1	0.01 (g/hp-hr)
No Control Specified	2	0.070 - 0.12 (g/hp-hr)

#### RBLC Review

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates selective catalytic reduction, low-NOx burners, and good combustion practices are the principle NOx control technologies installed on fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines. The lowest NOx emission rate listed in the RBLC is 0.01 g/hp-hr:

#### Step 1 - Identification of NOx Control Technology for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for control of NOx emissions from fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines rated at 25 MW or more:

(a) Selective Catalytic Reduction

The theory of SCR was discussed in detail in the NOx BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. The Department considers SCR a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

(b) Water Injection

The theory of water injection was discussed in detail in the NOx BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. EU 5 currently operates with water injection for NOx emissions controls and EU 6 will also utilize water injection for NOx control when it is installed. The Department considers water injection a feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

(c) Dry Low NO<sub>x</sub>

The theory of DLN was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. DLN is designed for natural gas-fired or dual-fuel fired units and is not effective in controlling NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from fuel oil-fired units. The Department does not consider DLN to be a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

(d) Limited Operation

Limiting the operation of emission units reduces the potential to emit for those units. EUs 5 and 6 currently operate under a combined ORL with EU 1 to restrict the combined NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from these three units to no more than 1,600 tons per 12 month rolling period. The Department considers limited operation a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

(f) Good Combustion Practices

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

**Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible NO<sub>x</sub> Controls for Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

As explained in Step 1 of Section 3.1, the Department does not consider DLN a technically feasible technology to control NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

**Step 3 - Rank the Remaining NO<sub>x</sub> Control Technologies for Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

The following control technologies have been identified and ranked for control of NO<sub>x</sub> from the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines:

- |     |                               |                         |
|-----|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| (a) | Selective Catalytic Reduction | (90% Control)           |
| (g) | Good Combustion Practices     | (Less than 40% Control) |
| (b) | Water Injection               | (0% Control)            |
| (d) | Limited Operation             | (0% Control)            |

Control technologies already in practice at the stationary source or included in the design of the EU are considered 0% control for the purpose of the SIP BACT for existing stationary sources.

**Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls**

**GVEA BACT Proposal**

GVEA provided an economic analysis of the installation of SCR on the combined cycle gas turbines to demonstrate that the use of SCR in conjunction with water injection and limited operation is not economically feasible on these units. A summary of the analysis is shown below:

**Table 3-8. GVEA Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible NOx Controls**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annual Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
SCR	478.8 (per unit)	303 (per unit)	\$8,860,032	\$2,204,632	\$7,278
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.1424 (7% interest rate for a 10 year equipment life)					

GVEA contends that the economic analysis indicates the level of NOx reduction does not justify the use of SCR for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines based on the excessive cost per ton of NOx removed per year.

GVEA proposes the following as BACT for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines:

- NOx emissions from the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines shall be controlled with water injection;
- NOx emissions from the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines shall not exceed 0.24 lb/MMBtu<sup>3</sup> per 4-hour averaging period; and
- Maintain good combustion practices by following the manufacturer's operating and maintenance procedures at all times of operation.

#### **Department Evaluation of BACT for NOx Emissions from the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

The Department revised the cost analysis provided by GVEA for the installation of SCR in conjunction with the existing water injection to reflect limited operation and water injection as the baseline for emissions reduction for the control devices. Additionally, the Department revised the NOx removal efficiency to 90% for SCR combined with the existing Water Injection, an interest rate of 5.5% (current bank prime interest rate), and the equipment life was revised to 20 years. A summary of the analysis is shown below:

**Table 3-9. Department Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible NOx Controls**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annual Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
SCR	478.8 (per unit)	430 (per unit)	\$8,860,032	\$1,697,020	\$3,942
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.094 (7% interest rate for a 20 year equipment life)					

The Department's economic analysis indicates that the level of NOx reduction justifies the installation of SCR for the combined cycle gas combustion turbines located in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

#### **Step 5 - Selection of NOx BACT for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

The Department's finding is that the BACT for NOx emissions from the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines is as follows:

<sup>3</sup> AP-42 Table 3.1-1 for water-steam injection from a distillate oil fired turbine.

- (a) NOx emissions from EUs 5 and 6 shall be controlled by operating and maintaining selective catalytic reduction in conjunction with water injection at all times the units are in operation;
- (b) NOx emissions from EUs 5 and 6 shall not exceed 0.024 lb/MMBtu over a 3-hour averaging period; and
- (c) Maintain good combustion practices by following the manufacturer's operating and maintenance procedures at all times of operation.

### 3.3 NOx BACT for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine (EU 7)

Possible NOx emission control technologies for large engines were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process codes 17.100 to 17.190, Large Internal Combustion Engines (>500 hp). The search results for large diesel-fired engines are summarized in Table 3-11.

**Table 3-11. RBLC Summary of NOx Controls for Large Diesel-Fired Engines**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits (g/hp-hr)
Selective Catalytic Reduction	3	0.5 - 0.7
Other Add-On Control	1	1.0
Federal Emission Standards	13	3.0 - 6.9
Good Combustion Practices	31	3.0 - 13.5
No Control Specified	60	2.8 - 14.1

#### RBLC Review

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates selective catalytic reduction, good combustion practices, and compliance with federal emission standards are the principle NOx control technologies installed on large diesel-fired engines. The lowest NOx emission rate listed in the RBLC is 0.5 g/hp-hr.

#### Step 1 - Identification of NOx Control Technology for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for control of NOx from large diesel-fired engines rated at 500 horsepower or greater:

- (a) Selective Catalytic Reduction  
The theory of SCR was discussed in detail in the NOx BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. The Department considers SCR a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.
- (b) Turbocharger and Aftercooler  
Turbocharger technology involves the process of compressing intake air in a turbocharger upstream of the air/fuel injection. This process boosts the power output of the engine. The air compression increases the temperature of the intake air so an aftercooler is used to reduce the intake air temperature. Reducing the intake air temperature helps lower the peak flame temperature which reduces NOx formation in the combustion chamber. EU ID 7 is currently operating with a turbocharger and aftercooler. The Department

considers turbocharger and aftercooler a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

(c) Fuel Injection Timing Retard (FITR)

FITR reduces NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by the delay of the fuel injection in the engine from the time the compression chamber is at minimum volume to a time the compression chamber is expanding. Timing adjustments are relatively straightforward. The larger volume in the compression chamber produces a lower peak flame temperature. With the use of FITR the engine becomes less fuel efficient, particulate matter emissions increase, and there is a limit with respect to the degree the timing may be retarded because an excessive timing delay can cause the engine to misfire. The timing retard is generally limited to no more than three degrees. Diesel engines may also produce more black smoke due to a decrease in exhaust temperature and incomplete combustion. FITR can achieve up to 50 percent NO<sub>x</sub> reduction. Due to the increase in particulate matter emissions resulting from FITR, this technology will not be carried forward.

(d) Ignition Timing Retard (ITR)

ITR lowers NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by moving the ignition event to later in the power stroke, after the piston has begun to move downward. Because the combustion chamber volume is not at a minimum, the peak flame temperature is not as high, which lowers combustion temperature and produces less thermal NO<sub>x</sub>. Use of ITR can cause an increase in fuel usage, an increase in particulate matter emissions, and engine misfiring. ITR can achieve between 20 to 30 percent NO<sub>x</sub> reduction. Due to the increase in particulate matter emissions resulting from ITR, this technology will not be carried forward.

(e) Federal Emission Standards

RBLC NO<sub>x</sub> determinations for federal emission standards require the engines meet the requirements of 40 C.F.R. 60 NSPS Subpart IIII, 40 C.F.R 63 Subpart ZZZZ, non-road engines (NREs), or EPA tier certifications. NSPS Subpart IIII applies to stationary compression ignition internal combustion engines that are manufactured or reconstructed after July 11, 2005. EU 7 was manufactured prior to July 11, 2005 and has not been reconstructed since. Therefore, EU 7 is not subject to NSPS Subpart IIII. EU 7 is considered a commercial emergency engine and is therefore exempt from NESHAP Subpart ZZZZ. For these reasons federal emission standards will not be carried forward as a control technology.

(f) Limited Operation

EU 7 currently operates under an annual hour limit of no more than 52 hours per 12 month rolling period. The Department considers limited operation a technically feasible emissions control method.

(g) Good Combustion Practices

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.



## Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible NOx Control Technologies for the Large Engine

As explained in Step 1 of Section 3.3, the Department does not consider fuel injection timing retard, ignition timing retard, and federal emission standards as technically feasible technologies to control NOx emissions from the large diesel-fired engine.

## Step 3 - Rank the Remaining NOx Control Technologies for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine

The following control technologies have been identified and ranked for the control of NOx emissions from the large diesel-fired engine.

- (a) Selective Catalytic Reduction (90% Control)
- (g) Good Combustion Practices (Less than 40% Control)
- (b) Turbocharger and Aftercooler (0% Control)
- (f) Limited Operation (0% Control)

Control technologies already in practice at the stationary source or included in the design of the EU are considered 0% control for the purpose of the SIP BACT for existing stationary sources.

## Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls

### GVEA BACT Proposal

GVEA provided an economic analysis for the installation of SCR on the large diesel-fired engine. A summary of the analysis is shown below:

**Table 3-12. GVEA Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible NOx Controls**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
SCR	0.50	0.45	\$100,000	\$14,238	\$31,639
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.1424 (7% interest rate for a 10 year equipment life)					

GVEA contends that the economic analysis indicates the level of NOx reduction does not justify installing SCR on the large diesel-fired engine based on the excessive cost per ton of NOx removed per year.

GVEA proposed the following as BACT for NOx emissions from the large diesel-fired engine:

- (a) NOx emissions from the operation of the large diesel-fired engine shall be controlled by limiting operation to no more than 52 hours per 12 month rolling period;
- (b) NOx emissions from the operation of the large diesel-fired engine shall be controlled by operating a turbocharger and aftercooler; and
- (c) NOx emissions from the diesel-fired engine shall not exceed 0.031 lb/hp-hr over a 4-hour averaging period.

## Department Evaluation of BACT for NOx Emissions from the Large Diesel-Fired Engine

The Department reviewed GVEA's proposal for the large diesel-fired engine and finds that SCR is an economically infeasible control technology. The Department does not agree with some of

the assumptions provided in GVEA's cost analysis that cause an overestimation of the cost effectiveness. However, since EU 7 is limited to 52 hours per year, the Department finds it unnecessary to revise the cost analysis as a decrease in 0.45 tpy of NO<sub>x</sub> from EU 7 will not be cost effective for installing SCR.

### Step 5 - Selection of NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine

The Department's finding is that the BACT for NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the large diesel-fired engine is as follows:

- (a) NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from EU 7 shall be controlled by limiting its operation to no more than 52 hours per 12 month rolling period;
- (b) NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from EU 7 shall be controlled by operating a turbocharger and aftercooler at all times the unit is operating;
- (c) NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from EU 7 shall not exceed 10.9 g/hp-hr<sup>4</sup> over a 3-hour averaging period; and
- (d) Maintain good combustion practices by following the manufacturer's operating and maintenance procedures at all times of operation; and

Table 3-13 lists the proposed NO<sub>x</sub> BACT determination for this facility along those for other diesel-fired engines rated at more than 500 hp located in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

**Table 3-13. Comparison of NO<sub>x</sub> BACT Limits for Large Engines at Nearby Power Plants**

Facility	Process Description	Capacity	Limitation	Control Method
Fort Wainwright	8 Large Diesel-Fired Engines	> 500 hp	3.0 – 10.9 g/hp-hr	Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices Federal Emission Standards
UAF	Large Diesel-Fired Engine	13,266 hp	1.3 g/hp-hr	Selective Catalytic Reduction Turbocharger and Aftercooler Good Combustion Practices Limited Operation
GVEA North Pole	Large Diesel-Fired Engine	600 hp	10.9 g/hp-hr	Turbocharger and Aftercooler Good Combustion Practices Limited Operation
GVEA Zehnder	2 Large Diesel-Fired Engines	11,000 hp (each)	10.9 g/hp-hr	Turbocharger and Aftercooler Good Combustion Practices Limited Operation

### 3.4 NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the Propane-Fired Boilers (EUs 11 and 12)

Possible NO<sub>x</sub> emission control technologies for propane-fired boilers were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process

<sup>4</sup> Table 3.4-1 of US EPA's AP-42 Emission Factors. <https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch03/final/c03s04.pdf>

code 13.310, Gas-Fired Boilers (<100 MMBtu/hr). The search results for gas-fired boilers are summarized in Table 3-14.

**Table 3-14. RBLC Summary of NO<sub>x</sub> Control for Gas-Fired Boilers**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits (lb/MMBtu)
Good Combustion Practices	19	0.011 – 0.05
Low NO <sub>x</sub> Burners	41	0.01 – 0.07
Selective Catalytic Reduction	4	0.006 – 0.06
Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction	1	0.14
No Control Specified	9	0.006 – 0.036

### **RBLC Review**

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates good combustion practices, low NO<sub>x</sub> burners, selective catalytic reduction, and selective non-catalytic reduction are the principle NO<sub>x</sub> control technologies installed on gas-fired boilers. The lowest emission rate listed in the RBLC is 0.006 lb/MMBtu.

### **Step 1 - Identification of NO<sub>x</sub> Control Technology for the Propane-Fired Boilers**

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for control of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the propane-fired boilers:

(a) **Low NO<sub>x</sub> Burners**

Using LNBs can reduce formation of NO<sub>x</sub> through careful control of the fuel-air mixture during combustion. Control techniques used in LNBs includes staged air, and staged fuel, as well as other methods that effectively lower the flame temperature. Experience suggests that significant reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions can be realized using LNBs. The U.S. EPA reports that LNBs have achieved reduction up to 80%. The Department considers LNBs a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(b) **Ultra-Low NO<sub>x</sub> Burners**

Ultra-low NO<sub>x</sub> burners operate on the same principle as LNB described above, but have advanced designs for achieving higher NO<sub>x</sub> destruction efficiencies. Designs that promote superior NO<sub>x</sub> destruction efficiencies often have a higher investment cost than typical LNBs. For smaller EUs manufacturers do not offer ultra-low NO<sub>x</sub> burners because of incremental emissions reduction is not cost effective as compared to standard LNBs. Ultra-low NO<sub>x</sub> burners are not available for EUs 11 and 12. The Department does not consider the use of ultra-low NO<sub>x</sub> burners a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(c) **Selective Catalytic Reduction**

The theory of SCR was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. The RLBC indicated that no applications of SCR have been demonstrated in practice for gas-fired boilers rated at less than 25 MMBtu/hr. EUs 11 and 12 are each rated at 5 MMBtu/hr. The Department does not consider SCR to be a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(d) Flue Gas Recirculation

Flue gas recirculation (FGR) involves recycling a portion of the combustion gases from the stack to the boiler combustion air intake. The combustion products are low in oxygen, and when mixed with the combustion air, lower the overall excess oxygen concentration. This process acts as a heat sink to lower the peak flame temperature as well as the residence time at peak flame temperature. These effects work together to limit thermal NO<sub>x</sub> formation. The typical NO<sub>x</sub> removal efficiency using FGR is 20-25%. The Department considers FGR to be a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(e) Fuel Type

The RBLC identified the use of natural gas or propane as fuel to reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, or the use of gas meeting public utility specifications. Natural gas services are not available in Fairbanks or North Pole, but propane is available and is currently fired in EUs 11 and 12. The Department considers fuel type to be a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(f) Scrubber

The RBLC identified one instance of a scrubber being used for NO<sub>x</sub> emission control on a galvanizing line furnace rated at 98.7 MMBtu/hr. Galvanizing line furnaces operate at very high temperatures, more than 1,000 °F, to promote chemical reactions for the galvanizing process. EUs 11 and 12 are much smaller units, rated at 5 MMBtu/hr, and are used for comfort heating, with a working temperature of approximately 250 °F. NO<sub>x</sub> formation is known to increase with higher operating temperatures. Given the disparity in size, purpose, and operating temperature between these units, the Department does not consider a scrubber a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(g) Limited Operation

Limiting the operation of emission units reduces the potential to emit for those units. EUs 11 and 12 are the only sources of heat for the North Pole Power Plant. Therefore, it is not appropriate to limit the operation of these units. The Department does not consider limited operation a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(h) Good Combustion Practices

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

**Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible NO<sub>x</sub> Technologies for the Propane-Fired Boilers**

As explained in Step 1 of Section 3.5, the Department does not consider Ultra-low NO<sub>x</sub> burners, selective catalytic reduction, scrubbers, and limited operation as technically feasible technology to control NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the propane-fired boilers.

### Step 3 - Rank the Remaining NOx Control Technologies for the Propane-Fired Boilers

The following control technologies have been identified and ranked by efficiency for the control of NOx emissions from the propane-fired boilers.

- (a) Low NOx Burners (80% Control)
- (d) Flue Gas Recirculation (20% - 25% Control)
- (f) Good Combustion Practices (Less than 40% Control)
- (b) Fuel Type (0% Control)

Control technologies already in practice at the stationary source or included in the design of the EU are considered 0% control for the purpose of the SIP BACT for existing stationary sources.

### Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls

#### GVEA BACT Proposal

GVEA provided an economic analysis of the installation of Low NOx Burners on the startup heater. A summary of the analysis is shown in Table 3-15:

**Table 3-15. GVEA Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible NOx Controls**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
Low NOx Burner	3.1	2.4	\$38,650	\$5,503	\$2,276
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.1424 (7% interest rate for a 10 year equipment life)					

GVEA contends that the economic analysis indicates the level of NOx reduction does not justify the use of LNB or FGR for the propane-fired boilers based on the excessive cost per ton of NOx removed per year.

GVEA proposed the following as BACT for the propane-fired boilers:

- (a) Burn only propane as fuel in EUs 11 and 12;
- (b) NOx emissions from the operation of the propane-fired boilers shall be controlled with good combustion practices;
- (c) NOx emissions from the propane-fired boilers shall not exceed 13 lb/kgal over a 4-hour averaging period; and
- (d) Compliance with the emission limit will be demonstrated with records of maintenance following original equipment manufacturer recommendations for operation and maintenance and periodic measurements of O<sub>2</sub> balance.

#### Department Evaluation of BACT for NOx Emissions from the Propane-Fired Boilers

The Department revised the emissions tables to reflect an 80% control efficiency. Additionally, the interest rate was revised to 5.5% (current bank prime interest rate), and the equipment life was revised to 20 years. A summary of the analysis is shown in Table 3-16:

**Table 3-16. Department Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible NO<sub>x</sub> Controls**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
Low NO <sub>x</sub> Burner	3.1	2.5	\$38,650	\$3,234	\$1,304
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.0944 (7% interest rate for a 20 year equipment life)					

The Department's economic analysis indicates the level of NO<sub>x</sub> reduction justifies the installation of low NO<sub>x</sub> burners on the propane-fired boilers located in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

#### Step 5 - Selection of NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the Propane-Fired Boilers

The Department's finding is that the BACT for NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the propane-fired boilers is as follows:

- (a) NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from EUs 11 and 12 shall be controlled by installing low NO<sub>x</sub> burners in conjunction with using propane as fuel at all times the units are in operation;
- (b) NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from EUs 11 and 12 shall not exceed 0.030 lb/MMBtu<sup>5</sup> averaged over a 3-hour period; and
- (c) Compliance with the emission rate limit will be demonstrated with records of maintenance following original equipment manufacturer recommendations for operation and maintenance and periodic measurements of O<sub>2</sub> balance.

Table 3-17 lists the proposed NO<sub>x</sub> BACT determination for this facility along with those for other propane-fired boilers rated at less than 100 MMBtu/hr in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

**Table 3-17. NO<sub>x</sub> BACT Limits for the Propane-Fired Boilers**

Facility	Process Description	Capacity	Limitation	Control Method
GVEA North Pole	Two Small Propane-Fired Boilers	< 100 MMBtu/hr	0.030 lb/MMBtu	Propane as Fuel Low NO <sub>x</sub> Burners Good Combustion Practices

#### 4. BACT DETERMINATION FOR PM-2.5

The Department based its PM-2.5 assessment on BACT determinations found in the RBLC, internet research, and BACT analyses submitted to the Department by GVEA for the North Pole Power Plant and Zehnder Facility, Aurora for the Chena Power Plant, US Army for Fort Wainwright, and UAF for the Combined Heat and Power Plant.

<sup>5</sup> Emission factor derived from AP-42 Table 1.5-1 for propane-fired boilers (13 lb/1,000 gal) converted to lb/MMBtu, and then assumes 80% control efficiency by installing low NO<sub>x</sub> burners.

#### 4.1 PM-2.5 BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 1 and 2)

Possible PM-2.5 emission control technologies for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process code 15.110 Simple Cycle Gas Turbines (rated at 25 MW or more) The search results for simple cycle gas turbines are summarized in Table 4-1.

**Table 4-1. RBLC Summary of PM-2.5 Control for Simple Cycle Gas Turbines**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits
Good Combustion Practices	25	0.0038 – 0.0076 lb/MMBtu
Clean Fuels	12	5 – 14 lb/hr

#### **RBLC Review**

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates restrictions on fuel sulfur contents and good combustion practices are the principle PM control technologies installed on simple cycle gas turbines. The lowest PM-2.5 emission rate listed in the RBLC is 0.0038 lb/MMBtu.

#### **Step 1 - Identification of PM-2.5 Control Technology for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines**

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for control of PM-2.5 emissions from fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines:

(a) Low Sulfur Fuel

Low sulfur fuel has been known to reduce particulate matter emissions. PM-2.5 emission rates for low sulfur fuel are not available and therefore a BACT emissions rate cannot be set for low sulfur fuel. The Department does not consider low sulfur fuel a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

(b) Low Ash Fuel

Residual fuels and crude oil are known to contain ash forming components, while refined fuels are low ash. Fuels containing ash can cause excessive wear to equipment and foul combustion components. EUs 1 and 2 are fired exclusively on distillate fuel which is a form of refined fuel, and potential PM-2.5 emissions are based on emission factors for distillate fuel. The Department considers low ash fuel a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

(c) Limited Operation

Limiting the operation of emission units reduces the potential to emit for those units. Due to EUs 1 and 2 currently operating under limits, the Department considers limited operation as a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

(d) Good Combustion Practices

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of PM. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

## Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible PM-2.5 Technologies for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines

As explained in Step 1 of Section 4.1, the Department does not consider low sulfur fuel as a technically feasible technology to control PM-2.5 emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

## Step 3 - Rank the Remaining PM-2.5 Control Technologies for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines

The following control technologies have been identified and ranked by efficiency for the control of PM-2.5 emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines:

- (d) Good Combustion Practices (Less than 40% Control)
- (b) Low Ash Fuel (0% Control)
- (c) Limited Operation (0% Control)

Control technologies already in practice at the stationary source or included in the design of the EU are considered 0% control for the purpose of the SIP BACT for existing stationary sources.

## Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls

### GVEA BACT Proposal

GVEA proposes the following as BACT for PM-2.5 emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines:

- (a) PM-2.5 emissions from EUs 1 and 2 shall not exceed 0.012 lb/MMBtu over a 4-hour averaging period; and
- (b) Maintain good combustion practices.

## Step 5 - Selection of PM-2.5 BACT for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines

The Department's finding is that BACT for PM-2.5 emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbine is as follows:

- (a) PM-2.5 emissions from EUs 1 and 2 shall be controlled by combusting only low ash fuel;
- (b) Maintain good combustion practices at all times of operation by following the manufacturer's operation and maintenance procedures; and
- (c) PM-2.5 emissions from EUs 1 & 2 shall not exceed 0.012 lb/MMBtu<sup>6</sup> over a 3-hour averaging period.

Table 4-2 lists the proposed PM-2.5 BACT determination for this facility along with those for other fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines located in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

**Table 4-2. Comparison of PM-2.5 BACT for Simple Cycle Gas Turbines at Nearby Power Plants**

Facility	Process Description	Capacity	Limitation	Control Method
GVEA – North Pole	Two Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines	1,344 MMBtu/hr	0.012 lb/MMBtu <sup>6</sup> (3-hour averaging period)	Good Combustion Practices
GVEA – Zehnder	Two Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines	536 MMBtu/hr	0.012 lb/MMBtu <sup>6</sup> (3-hour averaging period)	Good Combustion Practices

<sup>6</sup> Table 3.1-2a of US EPA's AP-42 Emission Factors. <https://www3.epa.gov/ttnchie1/ap42/ch03/final/c03s01.pdf>



## 4.2 PM-2.5 BACT for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 5 and 6)

Possible PM-2.5 emission control technologies for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process code 15.210, Liquid Fuel-Fired Combined Cycle Combustion Turbines (rated at 25 MW or more). The search results for combined cycle gas turbines are summarized in Table 4-3.

**Table 4-3. RBLC Summary for PM-2.5 Control for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits
Good Combustion Practices	9	4 – 19.35 lb/hr
Clean Fuels	12	4.7 – 60.6 lb/hr

### RBLC Review

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates good combustion practices and clean fuels are the principle PM-2.5 control technologies installed on fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines. The lowest NO<sub>x</sub> emission rate listed in the RBLC is 4 lb/hr.

### Step 1 - Identification of PM-2.5 Control Technology for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for control of PM-2.5 emissions from fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines rated at 25 MW or more:

(a) Low Sulfur Fuel

Low sulfur fuel has been known to reduce particulate matter emissions. The Department considers low sulfur fuel a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

(b) Limited Operation

Limiting the operation of emission units reduces the potential to emit for those units. EUs 5 and 6 currently operate under a combined ORL with EU 1 to restrict the combined NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from these three units to no more than 1,600 tons per 12 month rolling period. The Department considers limited operation a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

(c) Good Combustion Practices

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of particulate matter. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle turbines.

### Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible PM-2.5 Controls for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines

As explained in Step 1 of Section 4.1, the Department does not consider low sulfur fuel as technically feasible technology to control PM-2.5 emissions from the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

### Step 3 - Rank the Remaining PM-2.5 Controls for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines

The following control technologies have been identified and ranked by efficiency for the control of PM-2.5 emissions from the combined cycle gas turbines:

- (c) Good Combustion Practices (Less than 40% Control)
- (b) Limited Operation (0% Control)

Control technologies already in practice at the stationary source or included in the design of the EU are considered 0% control for the purpose of the SIP BACT for existing stationary sources.

### Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls

#### GVEA BACT Proposal

GVEA proposes the following as BACT for PM-2.5 emissions from the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines:

- (a) PM-2.5 emissions shall not exceed 0.012 lb/MMBtu over a 4-hour averaging period; and
- (b) Maintain good combustion practices.

### Department Evaluation of BACT for PM-2.5 Emissions from the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines

The Department reviewed GVEA's proposal and found that in addition to maintaining good combustion practices, limited operation is also a technically feasible control technology.

### Step 5 - Selection of PM-2.5 BACT for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines

The Department's finding is that BACT for PM-2.5 emissions from the combined cycle gas turbines is as follows:

- (a) PM-2.5 emissions from EUs 5 and 6 shall be limited by complying with the combined annual NO<sub>x</sub> limit listed in Operating Permit AQ0110TVP03 Condition 13;
- (b) PM-2.5 emissions from EUs 5 and 6 shall not exceed 0.012 lb/MMBtu<sup>6</sup> over a 3-hour averaging period; and
- (c) Maintain good combustion practices by following the manufacturer's operating and maintenance procedures at all times of operation.

### 4.3 PM-2.5 BACT for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine (EU 7)

Possible PM-2.5 emission control technologies for the large diesel-fired engine were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process codes 17.110-17.190, Large Internal Combustion Engines (>500 hp). The search results for large diesel-fired engines are summarized in Table 4-5.

**Table 4-5. RBLC Summary of PM-2.5 Control for Large Diesel-Fired Engines**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits (g/hp-hr)
Federal Emission Standards	12	0.03 – 0.02
Good Combustion Practices	28	0.03 – 0.24
Limited Operation	11	0.04 – 0.17
Low Sulfur Fuel	14	0.15 – 0.17
No Control Specified	14	0.02 – 0.15

## **RBLC Review**

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates that good combustion practices, compliance with the federal emission standards, low ash/sulfur diesel, and limited operation are the principle PM-2.5 control technologies installed on large diesel-fired engines. The lowest PM-2.5 emission rate in the RBLC is 0.02 g/hp-hr.

### **Step 1 - Identification of PM-2.5 Control Technology for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine**

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for controls of PM-2.5 emissions from diesel fired engines rated at 500 hp or greater:

(a) Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF)

DPFs are a control technology that is designed to physically filter particulate matter from the exhaust stream. Several designs exist which require cleaning and replacement of the filter media after soot has become caked onto the filter media. Regenerative filter designs are also available that burn the soot on a regular basis to regenerate the filter media. DPF can reduce PM-2.5 emissions by 85%. The Department considers DPF a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

(b) Diesel Oxidation Catalyst (DOC)

DOC can reportedly reduce PM-2.5 emissions by 30% and PM emissions by 50%. A DOC is a form of “bolt on” technology that uses a chemical process to reduce pollutants in the diesel exhaust resulting in decreased concentrations. They replace mufflers on vehicles, and require no modifications. More specifically, this is a honeycomb type structure that has a large area coated with an active catalyst layer. As CO and other gaseous hydrocarbon particles travel along the catalyst, they are oxidized thus reducing pollution. The Department considers DOC a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

(c) Positive Crankcase Ventilation

Positive crankcase ventilation is the process of re-introducing the combustion air into the cylinder chamber for a second chance at combustion after the air has seeped into and collected in the crankcase during the downward stroke of the piston cycle. This process allows any unburned fuel to be subject to a second combustion opportunity. Any combustion products act as a heat sink during the second pass through the piston, which will lower the temperature of combustion and reduce the thermal NO<sub>x</sub> formation. Positive crankcase ventilation is included in the design of EU 7. The Department considers positive crankcase ventilation a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

(d) Low Sulfur Fuel

Low sulfur fuel has been known to reduce particulate matter emissions. The Department considers low sulfur fuel as a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

(e) Low Ash Diesel

Residual fuels and crude oil are known to contain ash forming components, while refined fuels are low ash. Fuels containing ash can cause excessive wear to equipment and foul engine components. EU 7 is fired exclusively on distillate fuel which is a form of refined fuel. The potential PM-2.5 emissions are based on emission factors for distillate fuel. The Department considers low ash diesel a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

(f) Federal Emission Standards

The theory behind the federal emission standards for EU 7 was discussed in detail in the NOx BACT for the large diesel-fired engine and will not be repeated here. Due to EU 7 not being subject to either 40 C.F.R. 60 Subpart IIII or 40 C.F.R. 63 Subpart ZZZZ the Department does not consider federal emission standards a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

(g) Limited Operation

The theory behind limited operation for EU 7 was discussed in detail in the NOx BACT for the large diesel-fired engine and will not be repeated here. Due to EU 7 currently operating under an annual hour limit of no more than 52 hours per 12 month rolling period, the Department considers limited operation a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

(h) Good Combustion Practices

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NOx BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of NOx emissions. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

**Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible PM-2.5 Control Technologies for the Large Engine**

PM-2.5 emission rates for low sulfur fuel are not available and therefore a BACT emissions rate cannot be set for low sulfur fuel. Low sulfur fuel is not a technically feasible control technology. As explained in Step 1 of Section 4.3, federal emission standards are not technically feasible control technology for control of PM-2.5 emissions from the large diesel-fired engine.

**Step 3 - Rank the Remaining PM-2.5 Control Technologies for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine**

The following control technologies have been identified and ranked by efficiency for the control of PM-2.5 emissions from the large diesel-fired engines:

- |                                    |                         |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| (a) Diesel Particulate Filters     | (85% Control)           |
| (g) Good Combustion Practices      | (Less than 40% Control) |
| (b) Positive Crankcase Ventilation | (0% Control)            |
| (d) Low Ash Diesel                 | (0% Control)            |
| (f) Limited Operation              | (0% Control)            |

Control technologies already in practice at the stationary source or included in the design of the EU are considered 0% control for the purpose of the SIP BACT for existing stationary sources.

#### Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls

##### GVEA Proposal

GVEA provided an economic analysis for the installation of diesel particulate filter. A summary of the analysis for is shown below:

**Table 4-6. GVEA Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible PM-2.5 Controls**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annual Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
Diesel Particulate Filter	0.035	0.03	\$30,229	\$4,304	\$143,008
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.1424 (7% interest rate for a 10 year equipment life)					

GVEA contends that the economic analysis indicates that the level of PM-2.5 reduction does not justify the use of a diesel particulate filter based on the excessive cost per ton of PM-2.5 removed per year.

GVEA proposes the following as BACT for PM-2.5 emissions from the large diesel-fired engine:

- PM-2.5 emissions from EU 7 shall be controlled by operating with positive crankcase ventilation;
- Maintaining good combustion practices;
- PM-2.5 emissions from EU 7 shall be controlled by limiting operation to no more than 52 hours per 12 month rolling period; and
- PM-2.5 emissions from EU 7 shall not exceed 0.0022 lb/hp-hr<sup>7</sup> over a 4-hour averaging period.

##### Department Evaluation of BACT for PM-2.5 Emissions from the Large Diesel-Fired Engine

The Department reviewed GVEA's proposal for the large diesel-fired engine and finds that installing a diesel particulate filter is an economically infeasible control technology. The Department does not agree with some of the assumptions provided in GVEA's cost analysis that cause an overestimation of the cost effectiveness. However, since EU 7 is limited to 52 hours per year, the Department finds it unnecessary to revise the cost analysis as a decrease in 0.03 tpy of PM-2.5 from EU 7 will not be cost effective for installing a diesel particulate filter.

#### Step 5 - Selection of PM-2.5 BACT for the Large Diesel-fired Engine

The Department's finding is that the BACT for PM-2.5 emissions from the large diesel-fired engine is as follows:

- PM-2.5 emissions from EU 7 shall be controlled by operating with positive crankcase ventilation;
- PM-2.5 emissions from EU 7 shall be controlled by limiting operation to no more than 52 hours per 12 month rolling period;

<sup>7</sup> Emissions Inventory Data:

<http://dec.alaska.gov/Applications/Air/airtoolsweb/PointSourceEmissionInventory/XmlInventory?reportingYear=2017&organizationKey=10&facilityKey=110&addEmissionUnits=0&addReleasePoints=0>

- (c) Maintain good combustion practices by following the manufacturer's operating and maintenance procedures at all times of operation; and
- (d) PM-2.5 emissions from EU 7 shall not exceed 0.32 g/hp-hr<sup>8</sup> over a 3-hour averaging period.

Table 4-7 lists the proposed PM-2.5 BACT determination for the facility along with those for other diesel-fired engines rated at more than 500 hp located in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

**Table 4-7. Comparison of PM-2.5 BACT for the Large Engines at Nearby Power Plants**

Facility	Process Description	Capacity	Limitation	Control Method
UAF	Large Diesel-Fired Engine	13,266 hp	0.32 g/hp-hr	Positive Crankcase Ventilation Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices
Fort Wainwright	8 Large Diesel-Fired Engines	> 500 hp	0.15 – 10.9 g/hp-hr	Limited Operation Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel Federal Emission Standards Good Combustion Practices
GVEA North Pole	Large Diesel-Fired Engine	600 hp	0.32 g/hp-hr	Positive Crankcase Ventilation Good Combustion Practices
GVEA Zehnder	2 Large Diesel-Fired Engines	11,000 hp (each)	0.32 g/hp-hr	Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices

#### 4.5 PM-2.5 BACT for the Propane-Fired Boilers (EUs 11 and 12)

Possible PM-2.5 emission control technologies for the propane-fired boilers were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process code 13.310, Gas-Fired Boilers (<100 MMBtu/hr). The search results for gas-fired boilers are summarized in Table 4-8.

**Table 4-8. RBLC Summary of PM-2.5 Control for Gas-Fired Boilers**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits (lb/MMBtu)
Good Combustion Practices	49	0.0019 – 0.0095
Electrostatic Precipitator	3	0.015 – 0.032

#### RBLC Review

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates that good combustion practices and electrostatic precipitators are the principle PM-2.5 control technology determined for propane-fired boilers. The lowest PM-2.5 emission rate listed in the RBLC is 0.0019 lb/MMBtu.

#### Step 1 - Identification of PM-2.5 Control Technology for the Propane-Fired Boilers

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for control of PM-2.5 emissions from propane-fired boilers:

<sup>8</sup> Table 3.4-1 of US EPA's AP-42 Emission Factors (PM).  
<https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch03/final/c03s04.pdf>.

(a) Low Sulfur Fuel

The boilers (EUs 11 and 12) are fired using propane, which is an inherently low sulfur fuel. Condition 11 of AQ0110TVP03 limits the sulfur content of the propane combusted in the boilers to 120 ppmv. Recent tests indicate that the propane fired in the boilers contains less than 3 ppm H<sub>2</sub>S as determined by the length-of-stain methodology. The Department considers low sulfur fuel a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(b) Flue Gas Recirculation

The theory behind FGR was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the propane-fired boilers and will not be repeated here. The Department considers FGR a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(c) Baghouse

Baghouses are comprised of an array of filter bags contained in housing. Air passes through the filter media from the “dirty” to the “clean” side of the bag. These devices undergo periodic bag cleaning based on the build-up of filtered material on the bag as measured by pressure drop across the device. The cleaning cycle is set to allow operation within a range of design pressure drop. Baghouses are characterized by the type of cleaning cycle - mechanical-shaker, pulse-jet, and reverse-air. Fabric filter systems have control efficiencies of 95% to 99.9%<sup>9</sup> and are generally specified to meet a discharge concentration of filterable particulate (e.g., 0.01 grains per dry standard cubic feet). The only entry for a baghouse in the RBLC was for a 30 MMBtu/hr furnace for glass melting at an insulation manufacturing facility and the unit is subject to the PM emission standards under 40 C.F.R. 63 Subpart NNN. EUs 11 and 12 are much smaller units at 5 MMBtu/hr, are used for providing space heating, and have a much lower working temperature. Due to the differences in size, purpose, and operating temperatures, the Department does not consider a baghouse a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(d) Limited Operation

Limiting the operation of emission units reduces the potential to emit for those units. EUs 11 and 12 are the only sources of heat for the North Pole Power Plant. Therefore, it is not appropriate to limit the operation of these units. The Department does not consider the use of limited operation a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(e) Good Combustion Practices

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of PM-2.5 emissions. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boiler.

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/catc/dir1/ff-shaker.pdf>  
<https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/catc/dir1/ff-pulse.pdf>  
<https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/catc/dir1/ff-revar.pdf>

## **Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible PM-2.5 technologies for the Propane-Fired Boilers**

As explained in Step 1 of Section 4.5, the Department does not consider a baghouse and limited operation as technically feasible PM-2.5 control technologies. Flue gas recirculation is not recommended by the vendor as a control technology for EUs 11 and 12, and therefore is not considered a technically feasible control technology.

## **Step 3 - Rank the Remaining PM-2.5 Control Technologies for the Propane-Fired Boilers**

GVEA has accepted the only technically feasible control technology for EUs 11 and 12. Therefore, ranking is not required.

## **Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls**

### **GVEA BACT Proposal**

GVEA proposes the following as BACT for the propane-fired boilers:

- (a) Burn low sulfur fuel in EUs 11 and 12;
- (b) PM-2.5 emissions from EUs 11 and 12 shall not exceed 0.7 lb/1000 gal over a 4-hour averaging period; and
- (c) Compliance with the emission limit will be demonstrated with records of maintenance following original equipment manufacturer recommendations for operation and maintenance and periodic measurements of O<sub>2</sub> balance.

## **Department Evaluation of BACT for PM-2.5 Emissions from the Propane-Fired Boilers**

The Department reviewed GVEA's proposal for EUs 11 and 12 and finds that an emission rate achievable with good combustion practices is also BACT for the propane-fired boilers.

## **Step 5 - Selection of PM-2.5 BACT for the Propane-Fired Boilers**

The Department's finding is that BACT for PM-2.5 emissions from the propane-fired boilers is as follows:

- (a) Burn only propane as fuel in EUs 11 and 12;
- (b) PM-2.5 emissions from the operation of the propane-fired boilers shall be controlled with good combustion practices;
- (c) PM-2.5 emissions from EUs 11 and 12 shall not exceed 0.008 lb/MMBtu<sup>10</sup> over a 3-hour averaging period; and
- (d) Compliance with the emission limit will be demonstrated with records of maintenance following original equipment manufacturer recommendations for operation and maintenance and periodic measurements of O<sub>2</sub> balance.

## **5. BACT DETERMINATION FOR SO<sub>2</sub>**

The Department based its SO<sub>2</sub> assessment on BACT determinations found in the RBLC, internet research, and BACT analyses submitted to the Department by GVEA for the North Pole Power Plant and Zehnder Facility, Aurora for the Chena Power Plant, US Army for Fort Wainwright, and UAF for the Combined Heat and Power Plant.

---

<sup>10</sup> Emission factor derived from AP-42 Table 1.5-1 for propane-fired boilers (0.7 lb/1,000 gal) converted to lb/MMBtu.



## 5.1 SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 1 and 2)

Possible SO<sub>2</sub> emission control technologies for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process code 15.190 for Simple Cycle Gas Turbines (rated at 25 MW or more) The search results for simple cycle gas turbines are summarized in Table 5-1.

**Table 5-1. RBLC Summary of SO<sub>2</sub> Controls for Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits
Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel	7	0.0015 % S by wt.
Fuel Oil (0.05 % S by wt.)	2	0.0026 – 0.055 lb/MMBtu
Good Combustion Practices	3	0.6 lb/hr

### RBLC Review

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates that limiting the sulfur content of fuel and good combustion practices are the principle SO<sub>2</sub> control technologies determined as BACT for fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines. The lowest SO<sub>2</sub> emission rate listed in the RBLC is combustion of ULSD at 0.0015 % S by wt.

### Step 1 - Identification of SO<sub>2</sub> Control Technology for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for control of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines rated at 25 MW or greater:

(a) Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD)

ULSD has a fuel sulfur content of 0.0015 percent sulfur by weight or less. Using ULSD would reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions because the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines are combusting standard diesel that has a sulfur content of up to 0.5 percent sulfur by weight. Switching to ULSD could reach a great than 99 percent decrease in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines. The Department considers ULSD a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

(b) Low Sulfur Fuel

Low sulfur fuel has a fuel sulfur content of 0.05 percent sulfur by weight. Using low sulfur fuel would reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions because the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines are combusting standard diesel that has a sulfur content of up to 0.5 percent sulfur by weight. Switching to low sulfur fuel could reach a 93 percent decrease in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines during non-startup operation. The Department considers low sulfur diesel a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

(c) Limited Operation

The theory behind limited operation for EUs 1 and 2 was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines and will not be repeated here. Due to EUs 1 and 2 currently operating under limits, the Department considers limited operation a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

(d) Good Combustion Practices

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of SO<sub>2</sub>. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

**Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible SO<sub>2</sub> Technologies for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines**

All control technologies identified are technically feasible for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

**Step 3 - Rank the Remaining SO<sub>2</sub> Control Technologies for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines**

The following control technologies have been identified and ranked for control of SO<sub>2</sub> from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines:

- (a) Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (99.7% Control)
- (b) Low Sulfur Diesel (93% Control)
- (d) Good Combustion Practices (Less than 40% Control)
- (c) Limited Operation (0% Control)

Control technologies already in practice at the stationary source or included in the design of the EU are considered 0% control for the purpose of the SIP BACT for existing stationary sources.

**Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls**

**GVEA BACT Proposal**

GVEA provided an economic analysis for switching the fuel combusted in the simple cycle gas turbines to ultra-low sulfur diesel and low sulfur fuel. A summary of the analyses for each of EUs 1 and 2 is shown below:

**Table 5-2. GVEA Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible SO<sub>2</sub> Controls for EU 1**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
ULSD (0.0015 % S wt.)	1,486.4	1,481.9	\$21,750,638	\$20,661,330	\$13,942
Low Sulfur Fuel (0.05 % S wt.)	1,486.4	1,337.8	???	???	???
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.0944 (7% interest rate for a 20 year equipment life)					

**Table 5-3. GVEA Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible SO<sub>2</sub> Controls for EU 2**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
ULSD (0.0015 % S wt.)	1,356.1	1,352.0	\$8,674,362	\$18,978,063	\$14,037
Low Sulfur Fuel (0.05 % S wt.)	1,356.1	1,220.5	???	???	???
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.0944 (7% interest rate for a 20 year equipment life)					

GVEA contends that the economic analysis indicates the level of SO<sub>2</sub> reduction does not justify the fuel switch to ULSD or Low Sulfur Fuel in the simple cycle turbines based on the excessive cost per ton of SO<sub>2</sub> removed per year.

GVEA proposes the following as BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the simple cycle gas turbines:

- (a) SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines will be controlled by complying with NO<sub>x</sub> limits for EUs 1 and 2 listed in Operating Permit AQ0110TVP03 Conditions 13 and 12, respectively;
- (b) SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines will be limited by maintain good combustion practices; and
- (c) Restricting the sulfur content to 500 ppm in fuel.

**Department Evaluation of BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines**

The Department revised the cost analyses provided by GVEA for the fuel switch to ULSD in the simple cycle gas turbines using an interest rate of 5.5% (current bank prime interest rate), assuming a 20 year equipment life, and a fuel cost increase of \$0.2668/gallon. Additionally, the Department reviewed the cost information provided by GVEA to appropriately evaluate the total capital investment of installing two new 1.5 million gallon ULSD storage tanks at GVEA's North Pole Power Plant. A summary of these analyses is shown in Table 5-4 and Table 5-5.

**Table 5-4. Department Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible SO<sub>2</sub> Controls for EU 1**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
ULSD	1,486.4	1481.9	\$10,875,319	\$13,426,413	\$9,060
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.0837 (5.5% interest rate for a 20 year equipment life)					

**Table 5-5. Department Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible SO<sub>2</sub> Controls for EU 2**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
ULSD	1,356.1	1,352.0	\$10,875,319	\$12,367,225	\$9,147
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.0837 (5.5% interest rate for a 20 year equipment life)					

The Department's economic analysis indicates the level of SO<sub>2</sub> reduction justifies the use of ULSD as BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines located in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

### Step 5 - Selection of SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the Simple Cycle Gas Turbines

The Department's finding is that BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines is as follows:

- (a) SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from EUs 1 and 2 shall be controlled by limiting the sulfur content of fuel combusted in the turbines to no more than 0.0015 percent by weight;
- (b) Maintain good combustion practices by following the manufacturer's operating and maintenance procedures at all times of operation; and
- (c) Compliance with the proposed fuel sulfur content limit will be demonstrated with fuel shipment receipts and/or fuel test results for sulfur content.

Table 5-6 lists the proposed SO<sub>2</sub> BACT determination for this facility along with those for other fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines located in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

**Table 5-6. Comparison of SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for Simple Cycle Gas Turbines at Nearby Power Plants**

Facility	Process Description	Capacity	Limitation	Control Method
GVEA – North Pole	Two Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines	1,344 MMBtu/hr	0.0015 % S wt.	ULSD
GVEA – Zehnder	Two Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbines	536 MMBtu/hr	0.0015 % S wt.	ULSD

### 5.2 SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbines (EUs 5 and 6)

Possible SO<sub>2</sub> emission control technologies for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process code 15.290 for Liquid Fuel-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbines rated at 25 MW or more. The search results for combined cycle gas turbines are summarized in Table 5-7.

**Table 5-7. RBLC Summary of SO<sub>2</sub> Control for Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits
Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel	1	6.7 lb/hr

### RBLC Review

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates combustion of ultra-low sulfur diesel is the principle SO<sub>2</sub> control technology installed on fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines. The SO<sub>2</sub> emission rate listed in the RBLC is 6.7 lb/hr.

### Step 1 - Identification of SO<sub>2</sub> Control Technology for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for the control of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines:

(a) Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel

The theory of ULSD was discussed in detail in the SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. The Department considers ULSD a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

(b) Light Straight Run Turbine Fuel (LSR)

EU 5 typically combusts LSR when not in startup. EU 6 will also combust LSR when not in startup when installed. The sulfur content of the LSR is limited to no more than 0.05 percent by weight as required by Condition 15.1 of Operating Report AQ0110TVP03. The Department considers operating LSR a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

(c) Low Sulfur Fuel

The theory of low sulfur fuel was discussed in detail in the SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. The Department considers low sulfur fuel a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

(d) Limited Operation

The theory behind limited operation for EUs 5 and 6 was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines and will not be repeated here. Due to EUs 5 and 6 currently operating under limits, the Department considers limited operation a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines.

(e) Good Combustion Practices

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

**Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible SO<sub>2</sub> Technologies for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

All control technologies identified are technically feasible for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

**Step 3 - Rank the Remaining SO<sub>2</sub> Control Technologies for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

The following control technologies have been identified and ranked by efficiency for control of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines:

- |                                     |                         |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| (a) Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel         | (50% Control)           |
| (e) Good Combustion Practices       | (Less than 40% Control) |
| (b) Light Straight Run Turbine Fuel | (0% Control)            |
| (d) Limited Operation               | (0% Control)            |
| (c) Low Sulfur Fuel                 | (0% Control)            |

Control technologies already in practice at the stationary source or included in the design of the EU are considered 0% control for the purpose of the SIP BACT for existing stationary sources.

Low sulfur fuel is listed as 0% control as it has the same fuel sulfur content requirements as the light straight run turbine fuel that is currently combusted in the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines.

#### **Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls**

##### **GVEA BACT Proposal**

GVEA provided an economic analysis for switching the fuel combusted in the combined cycle gas turbines to ultra-low sulfur diesel. A summary of the analyses for EUs 5 and 6 is shown below:

**Table 5-8. GVEA Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible SO<sub>2</sub> Control for EUs 5 and 6**

<b>Control Alternative</b>	<b>Potential to Emit (tpy)</b>	<b>Emission Reduction (tpy)</b>	<b>Total Capital Investment (\$)</b>	<b>Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)</b>
ULSD	6.0	3.0	--	\$27,846,454	\$9,282,151
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.1424 (7% interest rate for a 10 year equipment life)					

GVEA contends that the economic analysis indicates the level of SO<sub>2</sub> reduction does not justify the use of ULSD or low sulfur fuel based on the excessive cost per ton of SO<sub>2</sub> removed per year.

GVEA proposes the following as BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the combined cycle gas turbines:

- (a) SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from EUs 5 and 6 shall combust Light Straight Run Turbine Fuel (30 ppm S in fuel)

##### **Department Evaluation of BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

The Department reviewed GVEA's proposal for the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines and finds that switching from LSR to ULSD is not economically feasible. The Department does not agree that the cost effectiveness should be based upon the annual cost of ULSD, but on the difference in cost between the current fuel and ULSD. However, due to the reduction in SO<sub>2</sub> from LSR to ULSD only being 3.0 tpy the Department did not revise the cost analysis.

#### **Step 5 - Selection of SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbines**

The Department's finding is that BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the fuel oil-fired combined cycle gas turbines is as follows:

- (a) Except during startup, SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from EUs 5 and 6 shall be controlled by limiting the fuel combusted in the turbines to light straight run turbine fuel (30 ppmw S in fuel);
- (b) Maintain good combustion practices by following the manufacturer's operating and maintenance procedures at all times of operation; and

- (c) Compliance with the proposed fuel sulfur content limit will be demonstrated with fuel shipment receipts and/or fuel test results for sulfur content.

### 5.3 SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine (EU 7)

Possible SO<sub>2</sub> emission control technologies for large engines were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process codes 17.100 to 17.190, Large Internal Combustion Engines (>500 hp). The search results for large diesel-fired engines are summarized in Table 5-9.

**Table 5-9. RBLC Summary Results for SO<sub>2</sub> Control for Large Diesel-Fired Engines**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits (g/hp-hr)
Low Sulfur Diesel	27	0.005 – 0.02
Federal Emission Standards	6	0.001 – 0.005
Limited Operation	6	0.005 – 0.006
Good Combustion Practices	3	None Specified
No Control Specified	11	0.005 – 0.008

#### RBLC Review

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates combustion of low sulfur fuel, limited operation, good combustion practices, and compliance with the federal emission standards are the principle SO<sub>2</sub> control technologies installed on large diesel-fired engines. The lowest SO<sub>2</sub> emission rate listed in the RBLC is 0.001 g/hp-hr.

#### Step 1 - Identification of SO<sub>2</sub> Control Technology for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for control of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from diesel-fired engines rated at 500 hp or greater:

- (a) Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel  
The theory of ULSD was discussed in detail in the SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines and will not be repeated here. The Department considers ULSD a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.
- (b) Federal Emission Standards  
The theory of federal emission standards was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the large diesel-fired engine and will not be repeated here. The Department does not consider federal emission standards a feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.
- (c) Limited Operation  
The theory of limited operation for EU 7 was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the large diesel-fired engine and will not be repeated here. The Department considers limited operation as a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

(d) Good Combustion Practices

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the large diesel-fired engine.

**Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible SO<sub>2</sub> Control Technologies for the Large Engine**

As explained in Step 1 of Section 5.4, the Department does not consider federal emission standards a technically feasible control technology to control SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the large diesel-fired engine.

**Step 3 - Rank the Remaining SO<sub>2</sub> Control Technologies for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine**

The following control technologies have been identified and ranked by efficiency for the control of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the large diesel-fired engine:

- (a) Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel (99% Control)
- (d) Good Combustion Practices (Less than 40% Control)
- (c) Limited Operation (0% Control)

Control technologies already in practice at the stationary source or included in the design of the EU are considered 0% control for the purpose of the SIP BACT for existing stationary sources.

**Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls**

**GVEA BACT Proposal**

GVEA provided an economic analysis of the control technologies available for the large diesel-fired engine to demonstrate that the use of ULSD with limited operation is not economically feasible on these units. A summary of the analysis for EU 7 is shown below:

**Table 5-9. GVEA Economic Analysis for Technically Feasible SO<sub>2</sub> Controls**

Control Alternative	Potential to Emit (tpy)	Emission Reduction (tpy)	Total Capital Investment (\$)	Total Annualized Costs (\$/year)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton)
ULSD	0.01005	0.0099	--	\$444	\$45,072
Capital Recovery Factor = 0.1424 (7% interest rate for a 10 year equipment life)					

GVEA contends that the economic analysis indicates the level of SO<sub>2</sub> reduction does not justify the use of ULSD based on the excessive cost per ton of SO<sub>2</sub> removed per year.

GVEA proposed the following as BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the diesel-fired engine:

- (a) SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the large diesel-fired engine shall not exceed 0.05 weight percent sulfur; and
- (b) Maintain good combustion practices.



### Department Evaluation of BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from the Large Diesel-Fired Engine

The Department reviewed GVEA's proposal for the large diesel-fired engine and finds that ULSD is not an economically feasible control technology. The Department does not agree that the cost effectiveness be based upon the annual cost of USLD, but on the difference in cost between the current fuel and ULSD. However, due to the annual operational limit on EU 7, and the reduction in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by using ULSD only being 0.0099 tpy the Department did not revise the cost analysis.

### Step 5 - Selection of SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the Large Diesel-Fired Engine

The Department's finding is that the BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the diesel-fired engine is as follows:

- (a) SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from EU 7 shall be controlled by combusting fuel that does not exceed 0.05 weight percent sulfur at all time the unit is in operation;
- (b) SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from EU 7 shall be controlled by limiting operation to no more than 52 hours per 12 month rolling period;
- (c) Compliance with the SO<sub>2</sub> emission limit while firing diesel fuel will be demonstrated by fuel shipment receipts and/or fuel test results for sulfur content; and
- (d) Maintain good combustion practices by following the manufacturer's maintenance procedures at all times of operation.

The following table lists the proposed BACT determination for this facility along with those for other diesel-fired engines rated at more than 500 hp in the Serious PM-2.5 nonattainment area.

**Table 5-10. Comparison of SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for Large Diesel-Fired Engines at Nearby Power Plants**

Facility	Process Description	Capacity	Limitation	Control Method
Fort Wainwright	8 Large Diesel-Fired Engines	> 500 hp	15 ppmw S in fuel	Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel
UAF	Large Diesel-Fired Engine	13,266 hp	15 ppmw S in fuel	Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel
GVEA North Pole	Large Diesel-Fired Engine	600 hp	500 ppmw S in fuel	Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices
GVEA Zehnder	2 Large Diesel-Fired Engines	11,000 hp	15 ppmw S in fuel	Good Combustion Practices Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel

### 5.4 SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the Propane-Fired Boilers (EUs 11 and 12)

Possible SO<sub>2</sub> emission control technologies for the propane-fired boilers were obtained from the RBLC. The RBLC was searched for all determinations in the last 10 years under the process code 13.310, Gas-Fired Boilers (<100 MMBtu/hr). The search results for gas-fired boilers are summarized in Table 5-11.

**Table 5-11. SO<sub>2</sub> Control for Gas-Fired Boilers with a Rating < 100 MMBtu/hr**

Control Technology	Number of Determinations	Emission Limits
Low Sulfur Fuel	6	0.03 – 0.12 lb/hr
Good Combustion Practices	4	0.0048 – 0.6 lb/MMBtu
Pipeline Quality Natural Gas	28	0.0006 – 0.0048 lb/MMBtu
No Control Specified	4	0.0021 lb/MMBtu

### **RBLC Review**

A review of similar units in the RBLC indicates that good combustion practices and combustion of low sulfur fuel are the principle SO<sub>2</sub> control technologies installed on propane-fired boilers. The lowest SO<sub>2</sub> emission rate listed in the RBLC is 0.0006 lb/MMBtu.

### **Step 1 - Identification of SO<sub>2</sub> Control Technology for the Propane-Fired Boilers**

From research, the Department identified the following technologies as available for SO<sub>2</sub> control for the propane-fired boilers:

(a) **Low Sulfur Fuel**

The theory of low sulfur fuel was discussed in detail in the PM-2.5 BACT for the propane-fired boilers and will not be repeated here. The Department considers low sulfur fuel a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

(b) **Good Combustion Practices**

The theory of GCPs was discussed in detail in the NO<sub>x</sub> BACT for the fuel oil-fired simple cycle gas turbines and will not be repeated here. Proper management of the combustion process will result in a reduction of SO<sub>2</sub>. The Department considers GCPs a technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers.

### **Step 2 - Eliminate Technically Infeasible SO<sub>2</sub> Technologies for the Propane-Fired Boilers**

All identified control devices are technically feasible technologies for the propane-fired boilers.

### **Step 3 - Rank the Remaining SO<sub>2</sub> Control Technologies for the Propane-Fired Boilers**

GVEA has accepted the only technically feasible control technology for the propane-fired boilers. Therefore, ranking is not required.

### **Step 4 - Evaluate the Most Effective Controls**

#### **GVEA BACT Proposal**

GVEA proposed the following as BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the propane-fired boilers:

- (a) SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the operation of the propane-fired boilers shall be controlled by using low sulfur fuel at all times of operation.
- (b) SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the propane-fired boilers shall not exceed 0.0012 lb/kgal over a 4-hour averaging period.

### **Department Evaluation of BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from the Propane-Fired Boilers**

The Department reviewed GVEA's proposal for the propane-fired boilers and finds that the SO<sub>2</sub> emission rate provided by GVEA was erroneously calculated. The Department used AP-42 Table 1.5-1 emission factor for propane combustion (0.10S lb/1,000 gal, where S = gr/100 scf) and using the existing sulfur limit in Condition 11 of the stationary source's Operating Permit AQ0110TVP03 (120 ppmv) The Department corrected this emission factor to 0.75 lb/1,000 gal, assuming 16 ppmv sulfur = 1 gr/100 scf.

### **Step 5 - Selection of SO<sub>2</sub> BACT for the Propane-Fired Boilers**

The Department's finding is that BACT for SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the propane-fired boilers is as follows:

- (a) SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from EUs 11 and 12 shall be controlled by only combusting gas fuel (propane) with a total sulfur content of no more than 120 ppmv, or direct emissions of 0.75 lb/1,000 gal;
- (b) Maintain good combustion practices by following the manufacturer's operating and maintenance procedures at all times of operation; and
- (c) Compliance with the emission rate limit will be demonstrated with fuel shipment receipts and/or fuel tests for sulfur content.

## 6. BACT DETERMINATION SUMMARY

**Table 6-1. NOx BACT Limits**

EU ID	Description	Capacity	BACT Limit	BACT Control
1	Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbine	672 MMBtu/hr	0.044 lb/MMBtu	Limited Operation Selective Catalytic Reduction Water Injection Good Combustion Practices
2	Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbine	672 MMBtu/hr	0.070 lb/MMBtu	
5	Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbine	455 MMBtu/hr	0.024 lb/MMBtu	
6	Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbine	455 MMBtu/hr	0.024 lb/MMBtu	Limited Operation Selective Catalytic Reduction Water Injection Good Combustion Practices
7	Large Diesel-Fired Engine	619 hp	10.9 g/hp-hr	Turbocharger and Aftercooler Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices
11	Propane-Fired Boiler	5.0 MMBtu/hr	0.030 lb/MMBtu	Propane as Fuel Low NOx Burners Good Combustion Practices
12	Propane-Fired Boiler	5.0 MMBtu/hr	0.030 lb/MMBtu	

**Table 6-2. PM-2.5 BACT Limits**

EU ID	Description	Capacity	BACT Limit	BACT Control
1	Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbine	672 MMBtu/hr	0.012 lb/MMBtu	Low Ash Fuel Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices
2	Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbine	672 MMBtu/hr	0.012 lb/MMBtu	
5	Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbine	455 MMBtu/hr	0.012 lb/MMBtu	Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices
6	Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbine	455 MMBtu/hr	0.012 lb/MMBtu	
7	Large Diesel-Fired Engine	619 hp	0.32 g/hp-hr	Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices
11	Propane-Fired Boiler	5.0 MMBtu/hr	0.008 lb/MMBtu	Propane as Fuel Good Combustion Practices
12	Propane-Fired Boiler	5.0 MMBtu/hr	0.008 lb/MMBtu	

**Table 6-3. SO<sub>2</sub> BACT Limits**

EU ID	Description	Capacity	BACT Limit	BACT Control
1	Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbine	672 MMBtu/hr	15 ppmw S in fuel	Limited Operation Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel Good Combustion Practices
2	Fuel Oil-Fired Simple Cycle Gas Turbine	672 MMBtu/hr	15 ppmw S in fuel	
5	Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbine	455 MMBtu/hr	30 ppmw S in fuel	Limited Operation Light Straight Run Turbine Fuel Good Combustion Practices
6	Fuel Oil-Fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbine	455 MMBtu/hr	30 ppmw S in fuel	
7	Large Diesel-Fired Engine	619 hp	500 ppmw S in fuel	Limited Operation Good Combustion Practices
11	Propane-Fired Boiler	5.0 MMBtu/hr	120 ppmv S in fuel	Propane as Fuel Good Combustion Practices
12	Propane-Fired Boiler	5.0 MMBtu/hr	120 ppmv S in fuel	