

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
April 24, 1986

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
AMENDMENTS TO 35 ILL. ADM.) R84-28
CODE 214, SULFUR LIMITATIONS)

ADOPTED RULE.

FINAL OPINION AND ORDER OF THE BOARD (by J. D. Dumelle):

This matter comes before the Board upon a July 13, 1984 proposal to amend 35 Ill. Adm. Code 214, Subpart C: Existing Solid Fuel Combustion Emission Sources, filed on behalf of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (Agency). That proposal was amended by the Central Illinois Light Company (CILCO) on August 23, 1984, and further amended by joint motion of the Agency and Caterpillar Tractor Company on September 10, 1985. Hearings were held on August 30, 1984, in Peoria; September 5, 1984, in Chicago; and September 18, 1985, in Peoria. By letter of December 4, 1985, the Department of Energy and Natural Resources informed the Board of its determination that no formal economic impact study would be necessary in this proceeding. First notice was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 1985 (9 Ill. Reg. 17728), and the first notice period ended on January 2, 1986. The second notice period commenced on March 3, 1986, and ended April 17, 1986.

The Agency's original proposal would have established a new Subpart G of Part 214 setting forth sulfur dioxide emission limitations applicable to sources located in the City of East Peoria and in Hollis Township (both of which are located in the Peoria major metropolitan area) which were equipped with flue gas desulfurization (FGD) systems as of December 1, 1980. Proposed Section 214.XXX (later numbered as 214.140) would have simply set forth the scope of Subpart G.* Proposed Section 214.XXY (later numbered as 214.141(c)) would have established a one hour limitation of 1.4 pounds of sulfur dioxide per million Btu actual heat input for new or existing FGD sources in East Peoria. Proposed Section 214.XXZ (later numbered as 214.141(d)) would have established a 0.6 pound standard for new FGD sources in Hollis Township. It would have also modified the 5.5 pound standard of 35 Ill. Adm. Code 214.141(b) for sources located in

* The Agency did not propose specific section numbers, but rather proposed generic numbers 214.XXX, 214.XXY and 214.XXZ and left it to the Board to assign specific numbers. The placement of the rules is discussed below. 214.XXX becomes 214.140, 214.XXY becomes 214.141(c) and 214.XXZ becomes 214.141(d).

the City of Peoria which did not have FGD systems as of December 1, 1980, to make the applicability of that standard contingent upon a stack height of 47 meters or more. CILCO's amendment would have added subsection (c) to Section 214.141 to provide that Units 1 and 3 at CILCO's E. D. Edwards Electric Generating Station cannot emit more than 6.6 pounds of sulfur dioxide per million Btu of actual heat input. Finally, the joint amended proposal filed by Caterpillar and the Agency would have modified the originally proposed Section 214.XXZ (later numbered as 214.141(d)) to allow FGD-equipped sources in Hollis Township to emit 1.1 rather than 0.6 pounds per million Btu.

The primary purpose of this rulemaking is to assure that the sulfur dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are achieved and maintained in the Peoria major metropolitan area (MMA) thereby allowing the state to obtain federal approval for its State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Board had hoped that its present rules (adopted under R80-22 on February 24, 1983, at 51 PCB 217) would result in an approvable SIP. That, however, has not happened. Peoria, Hollis and Groveland Townships have remained non-attainment for sulfur dioxide. Therefore, the Agency has done additional modeling of the Peoria MMA using a wider and more detailed data base than was available to the Agency when similar rules were proposed (and rejected by the Board) in the R80-22 proceeding. This modeling, however, continues to predict potential violations of the NAAQS under existing rules. Therefore, the Agency analyzed the predicted violations for culpability and identified the critical contributors. The Agency's original proposal in this proceeding was developed to eliminate the potential violations.

CILCO's August 23, 1984, proposed amendment was allowed into this proceeding since the Agency's modeling which supports the Agency's proposal also serves to support CILCO's request for a relaxation of the sulfur dioxide limitation applicable to Units 1 and 3 at its E. D. Edwards Station to 6.6 pounds per million Btu. In PCB 83-100 (57 PCB 417, April 19, 1984) CILCO sought similar relief which was rejected by the Board based upon its conclusion that the modeling data presented failed to adequately support the requested relief. CILCO believes that the present modeling and proposed rules fully support its request.

The September 10, 1985, joint motion to amend the proposal arose as a result of a site-specific study conducted by Caterpillar for its Mapleton Plant. Caterpillar believed that the Agency's modeling which supported the originally proposed 0.6 pounds per million Btu standard was flawed with respect to revised data regarding topography, background air quality and plant boundaries. Using the Agency's model and this revised data, Caterpillar and the Agency believe that a 1.1 pound standard is appropriate for Section 214.XXZ (later numbered as 214.141(d)) rather than the 0.6 pound standard.

RULE PLACEMENT

The proposal includes amendments to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 214.141 and the addition of new Subpart G. Placement of these rules as proposed runs counter to the format established for Part 214. Therefore, the Board proposes a placement of the proposed rules which is consistent with that format.

Pursuant to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 214.120, Subparts B through F of Part 214 are to contain general rules for sulfur emissions, which in turn are to be modified by industry and site-specific rules in Subparts N, et seq. CILCO's proposal to add a site-specific rule as a subsection of Section 214.141 is, therefore, inappropriate: it is properly placed in Subpart N, et seq. The Board proposes to add CILCO's proposed rule to new Subpart X: Utilities, which is proposed to cover industry and site-specific rules for electric, gas and sanitary services. A section regarding the scope of that Subpart will be proposed as new Section 214.560. CILCO's proposed rule will be at Section 214.561. Also, present Section 214.141(c) regarding the Village of Winnetka's electric utility plant will be deleted.*

Adding the remaining proposed rules as a new Subpart G is also inappropriate. Since those rules are more in the nature of general rules rather than industry or site-specific standards, they are properly placed in Subparts B through F. Subpart C is clearly the appropriate subpart and Section 214.141 is the appropriate section. Since these rules will not be proposed as a new subpart, proposed Section 214.XXX regarding the scope of the rules will become 214.140. Proposed Section 214.XXY regarding sources in East Peoria will become Section 214.141(c) and proposed Section 214.XXZ will become Section 214.141(d). Some non-substantive rewording of the proposed rules will be made to conform with the present structure of Section 214.141.

SECTION 214.141

The proposed changes to Section 214.141 include "housekeeping" measures, a stack height limitation on subsection (b) and the proposed limitations for FGD-equipped facilities in the Peoria MMA. The "housekeeping" changes simply consist of converting the present limitations, expressed in kg/mw-hr to nanograms per joule which would make the rules consistent with

* That section exempted the Winnetka plant from the general sulfur dioxide rules pending final action in R80-22 which has now been completed. This rule, therefore, no longer serves any purpose and is proposed to be deleted as unnecessary.

common practice. (R. I, pp. 77-79).* The stack height limitation of 47 meters in subsection (b) is proposed to be added to avoid possible NAAQS violations caused by Westinghouse Air Brake Company (WABCO). The Agency's model shows that due to downwash WABCO would have to limit its emissions to 1.8 pounds per million Btu to avoid potential NAAQS violations based upon the Industrial Source Complex model. However, if the stack height were raised to 47 meters, a 5.5 pound standard would assure acceptable air quality. (R. I, pp. 47-48 and 79-82). Thus, WABCO (apparently the only affected facility) has the option of meeting the general 1.8 pound standard or raising its stack sufficiently to take advantage of the relaxed standard. WABCO has not objected to this amendment and apparently has been meeting the 1.8 pound standard since 1973. (R. I, pp. 82).

Proposed Subsections 214.141(c) and (d), despite being written as general rules, are intended by the Agency to specifically limit sulfur dioxide emissions from the East Peoria and Mapleton (Hollis Township) coal burning boilers of Caterpillar. As written, they apply to fuel combustion emission facilities equipped with flue gas desulfurization systems as of December 1, 1980. Subsection (c) which is applicable to facilities located in East Peoria establishes a sulfur dioxide limitation of 1.4 pounds per million Btu. Subsection (d) which is applicable to sources located in Hollis Township was amended to establish a standard of 1.1 pounds per million Btu.

The levels originally proposed by the Agency were developed through computer modeling in an attempt to assure attainment of the NAAQS for sulfur dioxide and to evaluate possible sulfur dioxide limitations that would enhance the use of Illinois coal. (See Exhibit 5). The Agency used the RAMU and MPTER models recommended by USEPA, five years of hourly meteorological data from the Weather Service Station at the Greater Peoria Airport, an emissions inventory including all major sulfur dioxide sources in Peoria, Woodford and Tazewell counties (all assumed to be operating at their currently allowed maximum rates) and background concentrations determined from continuous monitoring in the Peoria area during 1976 and 1977. (Ex. 5, pp. 3-12).

The first step in analyzing the data was to identify potential violations of the primary and secondary NAAQS. (Ex. 5, p. 12). Next, culpability was investigated to determine the

* The transcripts of each hearing are numbered consecutively beginning with page 1. To distinguish references to those transcripts, references to the August 30, 1984, transcript will be in the form of (R. I, pp. ___), references to the September 25, 1984 transcript will be (R. II, pp. ___), and references to the September 5, 1985, transcript will be (R. III, pp. ___).

primary sources which were responsible for the potential violations. (Ex. 5, p. 12). Finally, the violation for each such source which caused the most restrictive rate for that source which was necessary to assure compliance with the standards was determined. (Ex. 5, pp. 12-13).

As a result of this analysis, the Agency reached several conclusions which it used as the basis for its original proposal:

- The current emissions regulations are not sufficient to ensure attainment of the SO₂ national ambient air quality standards in all portions of the Peoria area.
- Violations of the NAAQS for SO₂ are possible north of Caterpillar's Mapleton facility at the current allowable emissions limit of 1.8 lb/MBtu for boiler 1 and with the limit of 1.2 lb/MBtu for boilers 2 through 5. The violations are the result of plume impaction on the bluffs north of the Illinois River Valley.
- Emissions limits of 1.4 lb/MBtu as applied to the coal-fired boilers at Caterpillar's East Peoria facility and 0.6 lb/MBtu as applied to Caterpillar's Mapleton facility would be sufficient to attain the NAAQS in the vicinity of those facilities.
- An emissions limit of 1.8 lb/MBtu at WABCO would ensure maintenance of the NAAQS in the vicinity of that facility.
- The SO₂ emissions limit of 5.5 lb/MBtu for all coal-fired industrial boilers, with the exception of those Caterpillar and WABCO facilities already mentioned, will ensure attainment and maintenance of the SO₂ NAAQS in the Peoria area.

(Ex. 5, p. 14)

While none of the participants in this proceeding have questioned the Agency's methodology used to develop its original proposal, questions have been raised regarding some of the underlying data. Caterpillar's amended proposal, which establishes a 1.1 pound per million Btu standard for sources located in Hollis Township rather than the originally proposed 0.6 pound standard is premised upon disagreement with the Agency's data concerning the terrain elevations, base elevations of the stacks, and background levels, as well as inclusion of receptors located on Caterpillar property. (R. III, p. 29). At Caterpillar's request, ETA, Inc. performed dispersion modeling in the vicinity of the Mapleton plant using corrected factors and taking into consideration the mandated derating of boilers 2 through 5 to 249.9 million Btu maximum rated heat input. (R.

III, pp. 29-30 and Ex. 15).* Other than these changes, the methodology and data used were the same as those used by the Agency. Background levels were established using the Agency's Pekin Derby Street monitor data from 1982 and 1983. (R. III, p. 34). This monitor was chosen due to its proximity to the Mapleton plant. (R. III, p. 34). Survey data was used to establish stack height and topography. (R. III, pp. 31-32).

Using this corrected data, ETA concluded that Caterpillar could assure attainment of the sulfur dioxide standards by reducing its emission by 6.94% of the modeled 1.2 pounds per million Btu. (R. III, p. 35). As Alan Jurik, Manager of Environmental Services for ETA, testified, "an appropriate way to do this would be to reduce the allowable sulfur dioxide emission rate to 1.1 pounds per million Btu for boilers 2, 3, 4, and 5." (R. III, pp. 35-36). The Agency, through the testimony of John Schrock of the Air Quality Planning Section of the Division of Air Pollution Control, found ETA's "modeling methodology to be correct and consistent with USEPA's modeling guidelines as well as prior IEPA studies." (R. III, pp. 40-41). He concluded that the Agency concurs with Caterpillar's conclusions that the proposed SO₂ limits for Mapleton's boilers will not cause or contribute to an air quality violation." (R. III, p. 42).

The Board concludes that the amendments to Section 214.141 are justified by the record and will adopt the amendments as submitted, and amended, with two exceptions. First, the reference to "new or existing" sources will be deleted from Section 214.141(c). Since these terms have caused confusion in the past, and they do not appear to be necessary, they have been deleted in the amended proposal to Section 214.141(d). Second, the Agency's original proposal would have established a new Subpart G of Part 214 setting sulfur dioxide emission limitations applicable to sources located in the City of East Peoria and in Hollis Township which were equipped with flue gas desulfurization systems as of December 1, 1980. As noted above the Board concluded that placement of those rules as proposed was inconsistent with the format established for Part 214 and instead placed them at Section 214.141(c) and (d). However, in its comments the Agency points out that by placing the proposed rules in Section 214.141 the Board has inadvertently made the coal-averaging provision of Section 214.101(c) applicable to them. It, therefore, recommends that the language of the proposed rules be modified such that the coal-averaging provision is made specifically inapplicable. The Agency alleges that the coal

* Caterpillar entered into a consent decree with USEPA [Caterpillar Tractor Co., v. Adamkus, Central District of Illinois, Civil Action No. 83-1083 (1985)] which requires this derating and physical changes to the boilers to insure that the maximum rated heat input is not exceeded.

averaging provisions were not contemplated by the original proposal and that its suggested modification would increase the likelihood of USEPA approval of the rules. In P.C.#4, however, Caterpillar opposes the Agency's proposed modification, contending that it would limit management options and that the issue was not addressed at hearing.

By placing the proposed rules in Section 214.141 the Board did not intend to make any substantive changes in the proposal: the change was for consistency of format, nothing more. Clearly, the coal-averaging provision would have been inapplicable to the rule as proposed by the Agency (and as agreed to by Caterpillar). Further, as Caterpillar notes, this issue was not addressed at hearing; however, the Board draws the opposite conclusion from that fact. Since the original proposal would not have invoked the coal-averaging provision and since there is nothing in the record to support the applicability of that provision, that provision should not be made applicable. Therefore, in adopting this section the Board will amend its first notice proposal by making the word "Section" plural and adding the words "and 214.101(c)" after the number "214.122" in subsections 214.141(c) and (d).

SUBPART X

In the Agency's model the CILCO Edwards boilers 1 and 3 were assumed to be operating at 6.6 pounds per million Btu, as requested in PCB 83-100, since that proposal had not been acted upon by the Board at the time the study was done. (Ex. 5, p. 13). The Agency made the following findings regarding that facility:

Although the CILCO Edwards facility at the proposed rate of 6.6 lb/MBtu interacts with the CAT East Peoria and WABCO facilities to produce violations on some days, it is not a significant factor during the critical violations. In other words, the CILCO proposal does not affect the emissions limits computed to meet the standard for CAT East Peoria or WABCO. However, if CILCO would have been allowed the 6.6 lb/MBtu for boilers 1 and 3 as per their petition to the Illinois Pollution Control Board, it would have required the rate at the Bemis facility to be lowered to 5.0 lb/MBtu instead of the limit presently allowed by the IPCB of 5.5 lb/MBtu. A rate of 3.8 lb/MBtu for the CILCO Edwards boilers 1 and 3 would protect the NAAQS and would not affect the emissions limit at Bemis.

(Ex. 5, p. 13).

CILCO disagreed with the Agency, and it also prepared a new study to investigate the sulfur dioxide emissions rate which would have to be met by boilers 1 and 3 of its Edwards Station to meet the NAAQS. The Agency's analysis (Ex. 5) predicted

violations to which CILCO contributed based upon presently allowable emissions rather than on emissions which would be allowed under the Agency's present proposal. Since the proposal is more restrictive than the present limitations, CILCO argues that the Agency's modeling would establish that it could be allowed to emit 6.6 pounds per million Btu without causing NAAQS violations if the modeling took into consideration the proposed regulatory changes.

CILCO commissioned Enviroplan to perform such a study. (R. II, p. 64). Mr. Howard Ellis, President of Enviroplan, testified concerning that study. Enviroplan reviewed the Agency's modeling and adjusted the maximum emission rates to reflect the proposed limits. (R. II, pp. 64-66 and Exs. 8-11). This analysis showed "that all violations are eliminated with Edwards Units 1 and 3 at 6.6 pounds SO₂ per million Btu and other sources at the IEPA proposed emission limits." (R. II, p. 66). A second analysis was conducted to review all predicted NAAQS violations from Enviroplan's earlier studies of CILCO to determine whether those violations would also be eliminated. The study found that they are eliminated when the new standard applicable to WABCO is included and corrected stack location co-ordinates are used for Bemis. (R. II, pp. 67-68). Furthermore, allowing a relaxed standard of 6.6 pounds per million Btu for CILCO was found to have no effect on the appropriate standards for other facilities affected by this proceeding. (R. II, pp. 71-77).

However, during the first notice period Citizens for a Better Environment (CBE) filed two public comments in which it objected to the first notice proposal to relax the emission limit for CILCO's E. D. Edwards Station "because the modeling analysis underestimated the impact of the plant's emissions on air quality in the Peoria area." (P.C.#1). CBE argues that a running average approach should have been used to demonstrate attainment rather than a block average approach. CILCO responded to CBE's objection in P.C.#2 and #5 arguing, essentially, that for a period of time block averages were required, that they remain federally acceptable, and that given the conservative aspects of the modeling presented, its proposal is adequately supported.

The National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for sulfur dioxide sets maximum allowable concentration limitations for any 24-hour period and specifies that such limits may not be exceeded more than once each year. In order to demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS for sulfur dioxide at its proposed emission rate of 6.6 pounds per million Btu of actual heat input, CILCO presented a modeling analysis based upon a midnight-to-midnight block average. However, as CBE points out:

The NAAQS established by EPA for SO₂ set maximum allowable concentration limits for any 24-hour period and specify that such concentration limits may not be

exceeded more than once per year. The regulations specify the duration periods as "24-hour" concentrations rather than "daily." This is consistent with the health basis for the short-term standard since the adverse effects are associated with exposures for 24-hour periods without reference to the time of day that exposure begins.

Repeated exposures at levels above the 24-hour standard is prohibited, regardless of when exposure begins. The state must be equally concerned about a peak exposure that occurs between 3 p.m. one day and 3 p.m. the next day, as about concentrations occurring between midnight and midnight. Suppose that SO₂ levels at some location are low in the morning of a given day, rise to over 365 micrograms per cubic meter by afternoon, remain high until noon of the following day, and then fall. Such an event could produce a 24-hour SO₂ concentration exceeding 365 micrograms that would be overlooked if only midnight-to-midnight periods were examined.

CBE's position is well taken, and the Board agrees with CBE that the running average approach is preferable to a block average approach in that it more accurately reflects the realities of sulfur dioxide exposure. The Board would gladly consider modeling based on the running average approach. However, no such study has been presented to the Board.

What the Board must consider in this proceeding is whether the record contains sufficient evidence to support the adoption of the proposed rule. The Board concludes that it does. While CILCO has not presented the most preferable modeling study, it has presented an acceptable one. The Agency has had an opportunity to examine the study and has supported it. USEPA will have an opportunity to examine it when it is submitted as part of the revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP). While CBE has made much of the fact that the study is not consistent with the Clean Air Act, USEPA does not require the use of running averages and, in fact, when it attempted to impose such a requirement upon PPG Industries, that requirement was struck down. [PPG Industries, Inc. v. Costle, 659 F. 2d 1239].

Ultimately, CBE is contending that the best evidence is not before the Board. The Board agrees; however, it must base its decisions on what is before it. In determining that the record supports the adoption of CILCO's proposal, the Board is mindful of Section 9.2 of the Environmental Protection Act which states:

The Agency shall review all Illinois sulfur dioxide emission standards for existing fuel combustion stationary emission sources located within the Chicago, St. Louis (Illinois), and

Peoria major metropolitan areas and, if appropriate following such review, propose amendments to such standards to the Board... The standards proposed by the Agency shall be designed to enhance the use of Illinois coal, consistent with the need to attain and maintain the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for sulfur dioxide and particulate matter.

There is no evidence in the record to indicate that adoption of the proposed rules would be inconsistent with the attainment or maintenance of the NAAQS, while there is considerable evidence that it would be consistent. Therefore, while the Board appreciates CBE's concerns, it will not require that new modeling be done using a running average basis.

The Board finds that the record supports a 6.6 pound per million Btu standard for CILCO's E. D. Edwards Station Units 1 and 3, and it will adopt the amendment as submitted as new Section 214.561. The Board will also add new Section 214.560 which will indicate the scope of new Subpart X: Utilities, which will include industry and site-specific exceptions to the otherwise applicable sulfur dioxide rules.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

No economic impact statement has been prepared for this proceeding and none is necessary. On December 4, 1985 the Board received a letter from the Department of Energy and Natural Resources (DENR) which included a negative declaration. In making that determination the DENR concluded:

"that a Negative Declaration is appropriate in this case on the basis of the following statutory criteria:

1. The net economic impact of the regulation is favorable and the costs of compliance are small or are borne entirely by the proponent of the regulation;
2. The cost of making a formal study is economically unreasonable in relation to the value of the study to the Board in determining the adverse economic impact of the regulation."

The economic Technical Advisory Committee concurred in that determination at its December 6, 1985 meeting.

There was no testimony at hearing regarding any adverse economic impact: i.e., there is no compliance cost. Each of the affected facilities is presently emitting below the emission limits the Board is adopting today. (See Ex. 11). This also

demonstrates that meeting the limitations is technically feasible. In addition, the rules will give support for the redesignation of the Peoria-Pekin area as attainment for purposes of the Clean Air Act, thereby avoiding any federal sanctions, and benefiting the state's economy. Finally, as the Board recognized in PCB 83-100, granting the requested relief to CILCO "would likely result in increased coal usage of about 850,000 tons annually, creating direct benefits to the state of 200 to 300 new jobs and additional revenues of over \$20 million." (57 PCB 418). Mr. Gerald Hawkins, legislative director for the United Mine Workers in the State of Illinois testified that the UMW strongly supported these rules in order to aid the Illinois mining industry. (R. II, pp. 8-10).

FORMAT AND TYPOGRAPHICAL CHANGES

In P.C.#2 CILCO noted minor typographical errors and requested clarification of two statements contained in the October 10, 1985 Proposed Opinion. Further, the Administrative Code Division noted some minor format inconsistencies. None of these matters, however, are substantive, and the Board has, for the most part, made the requested changes. Finally, based upon a recommendation by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, the Board has added the language "in any one hour period" to Section 214.141(a) and (b).

ORDER

The Board hereby adopts the following amendments to:

TITLE 35: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
SUBTITLE B: AIR POLLUTION
CHAPTER I: POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
SUBCHAPTER c: EMISSION STANDARDS AND
LIMITATIONS FOR STATIONARY SOURCES

PART 214
SULFUR LIMITATIONS
SUBPART C: EXISTING SOLID FUEL
EMISSION SOURCES

Section 214.140 Scope

This Subpart contains rules which establish general sulfur emissions standards for existing solid fuel emission sources. These may be modified by industry and site-specific rules in Subparts N, et seq.

Section 214.141 Sources Located in Metropolitan Areas

This section applies to existing fuel combustion sources located in the Chicago, St. Louis (Illinois) or Peoria major metropolitan

areas. Except as otherwise provided in this Part Section, no person shall cause or allow the emission of sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere in any one hour period from any existing fuel combustion source, burning solid fuel exclusively, located in the Chicago, St. Louis (Illinois) or Peoria major metropolitan areas, to exceed ~~2.79 kg~~ 1.8 pounds of sulfur dioxide per MW hr mm Btu of actual heat input (774 nanograms per joule).

- a) Sources located in Kankakee or McHenry Counties shall not exceed 6.8 pounds of sulfur dioxide per mm b Btu of actual heat input (~~10.5 kg/MW Hr~~) (2924 nanograms per joule) in any one hour period.
- b) Existing industrial sources, not equipped with flue gas desulfurization systems as of December 1, 1980, located in the Peoria major metropolitan area, shall not exceed 5.5 pounds of sulfur dioxide per mm b Btu of actual heat input (~~8.51 kg/MW hr~~) (2,365 nanograms per joule); in any one hour period, provided the emissions from any such source located in the City of Peoria exit from a stack which is at least 154 feet (47 meters) in height.
- e) This Section will not apply to the Village of Winnetka Electric Utility Plant until final action on R80-22, Becket B, is taken by the Pollution Control Board (Board).
- c) Sections 214.122 and 214.101(c) shall not apply to any fuel combustion emission sources equipped with flue gas desulfurization systems as of December 1, 1980, and located in the City of East Peoria as the city boundaries were then defined. No person shall cause or allow the emission of sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere in any one hour period from any such sources to exceed 1.4 pounds of sulfur dioxide per mm Btu of actual heat input (602 nanograms per joule).
- d) Sections 214.122 and 214.101(c) shall not apply to any fuel combustion emission sources which are capable of firing solid fuel at a heat input of more than 125 mm Btu per hour (36.6 megawatts) and which as of December 1, 1980, are equipped with flue gas desulfurization systems and are located in Hollis Township, Peoria County, as the township boundaries were then defined. No person shall cause or allow the emission of sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere in any one hour period from any such source to exceed 1.1 pounds of sulfur dioxide per mm Btu of actual heat input (473 nanograms per joule).

SUBPART X: UTILITIES

Section 214.560 Scope

- a) This Subpart contains rules which modify the general sulfur emission rules of Subparts A through M as applied to a given industry or at a given site. General rules include:
1. Subparts B through I: Fuel combustion emission sources and incinerators;
 2. Subparts K through M: Process emission sources.
- b) These rules have been grouped for the convenience of the public; the scope of each is determined by its language and history. Rules placed in this Subpart include those which appear to be primarily directed at the following major industry groups: electric, gas and sanitary services.


Section 214.561 E. D. Edwards Electric Generating Station

Units 1 and 3 at the E. D. Edwards Electric Generating Station shall not exceed 6.6 pounds of sulfur dioxide per mm Btu of actual heat input (2,838 nanograms per joule). Aggregate emissions from the E. D. Edwards Electric Generating Station, on a 24-hour average basis shall not exceed 34,613 pounds of sulfur dioxide per hour.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Board Member B. Forcade concurred.

I, Dorothy M. Gunn, Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, hereby certify that the above Opinion and Order was adopted on the 24th day of April, 1986 by a vote of 7-0.


Dorothy M. Gunn, Clerk
Illinois Pollution Control Board