DATA ACCURACY ASSESSMENT REPORT

BOILER NO. 9

Annual Quality Assurance Relative Accuracy Test Audit (RATA)

Performance Specification 2 and 3 Utilizing EPA Reference Methods 3A, 7E, and 19

Test Date(s): April 17, 2019 Facility ID: MIB1678 Source Location: Kalamazoo, Michigan Permit: EGLE Permit No. MI-ROP-B1678-2015

Prepared For:

Graphic Packaging International, LLC 1500 North Pitcher Street • Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Prepared By:

Montrose Air Quality Services, LLC P.O. Box 41156 • Cleveland, OH 44141 Phone: (440) 262-3760

Document Number: M011AS-554631-RT-3R0 Document Date: May 13, 2019 Scope ID / Project: 11658 / 190401





TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION

PAGE

| | RE\ | | 4 |
|-----|------|--|----|
| 1.0 | INI | | 5 |
| | 1.1 | SUMMARY OF TEST PROGRAM | 5 |
| | 1.2 | KEY PERSONNEL | 5 |
| 2.0 | SUI | MMARY AND DISCUSSION OF TEST RESULTS | 6 |
| | 2.1 | OBJECTIVES AND TEST MATRIX | 6 |
| | 2.2 | FIELD TEST CHANGES AND PROBLEMS | 6 |
| | 2.3 | PRESENTATION OF RESULTS | 6 |
| | 2.4 | RELATIVE ACCURACY CALCULATION | 15 |
| 3.0 | SA | MPLING AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES | 15 |
| | 3.1 | TEST METHODS | 15 |
| | | 3.1.1 US EPA METHOD 3A | 15 |
| | | 3.1.2 US EPA METHOD 7E | 15 |
| | | 3.1.3 US EPA METHOD 19 | 15 |
| | | 3.1.4 PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATION 2 | 15 |
| | | 3.1.5 PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATION 3 | 16 |
| | 3.2 | PROCEDURES FOR OBTAINING PROCESS DATA | 16 |
| 4.0 | INT | ERNAL QA/QC ACTIVITIES | 17 |
| | 4.1 | QA AUDITS | 17 |
| | 4.2 | QA/QC PROBLEMS | 17 |
| | 4.3 | QUALITY STATEMENT | 17 |
| APF | PEND | DIX CHECKLIST | 24 |
| APF | PENE | DIX A REFERENCE METHOD AVERAGES | 25 |
| APF | PENE | DIX B FACILITY DATA | 36 |
| | APP | ENDIX B.1 CEMS AVERAGES | 37 |
| | APP | ENDIX B.2 PROCESS DATA | 37 |
| | APP | ENDIX B.X FACILITY CEMS ID VERIFICATION | 47 |
| APF | PEND | DIX C FIELD DATA | 49 |
| | APP | ENDIX C.1 FIELD DATA | 50 |
| APF | PEND | DIX D CALIBRATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS | 60 |
| | APP | ENDIX D 1 RM ANALYZERS | 61 |
| | APP | | 67 |
| | | | 71 |
| | | ENDIX D 4 MONTROSE STAC AND PERSONNEL CERTIFICATES | 87 |
| | | ENDIX D.4 MONTROSE STAC AND LERGONNEL CERTIFICATES | 07 |



| SECTION | PAGE |
|--|------|
| APPENDIX D.5 EGLE APPROVAL LETTER / TEST PROTOCOL | 94 |
| | |
| LIST OF TABLES | |
| TABLE 2-1 RATA SAMPLING MATRIX | 8 |
| TABLES 2-2 to 2-4 RELATIVE ACCURACY RESULTS-PRIMARY CEMS | 9 |
| TABLE 2-5 ANALYZER SPECIFICATIONS | 12 |
| TABLE 2-6 US EPA PROTOCOL GAS CERTIFICATIONS | 13 |
| TABLES 4-1 to 4-4 RM ANALYZER CALIBRATIONS AND QA | 18 |
| TABLE 4-5 US EPA METHOD 7E NOX CONVERTER CHECK | 22 |
| | |
| | |
| FIGURE 2-2 EXHAUST CEMS TRAVERSE POINT LOCATION DRAWING | 14 |



REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION

The results of the Data Accuracy Assessment for Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems (CEMS) conducted on April 17, 2019 are a product of the application of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) Stationary Source Sampling Methods listed in 40 CFR Part 60, Appendix A, that were in effect at the time of this test in accordance with 40 CFR Part 60, Appendices B and F.

All work, calculations, and other activities and tasks performed and presented in this document were carried out by me or under my direction and supervision. I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, Montrose operated in conformance with the requirements of the Montrose Quality Management System and ASTM D7036-04 during this test project.

| Signature: | Antoz | Date: | 5/13/2019 | |
|------------|------------|--------|-----------------------|--|
| Name: | Jack Hoard | Title: | Field Project Manager | |

I have reviewed, technically and editorially, details, calculations, results, conclusions, and other appropriate written materials contained herein. I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the presented material is authentic, accurate, and conforms to the requirements of the Montrose Quality Management System and ASTM D7036-04.

| Signature: | robert j lisy jr | Date: | 05/13/2019 | |
|------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|--|
| | | | | |
| Name: | Robert J. Lisy, Jr. | Title: | District Manager | |



1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 SUMMARY OF TEST PROGRAM

Graphic Packaging International, LLC (Facility ID: MIB1678), located in Kalamazoo, Michigan, contracted Montrose Air Quality Services (Montrose) of Cleveland, Ohio, to conduct the Annual Quality Assurance (QA) Relative Accuracy Test Audit (RATA) for the Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems (CEMS) associated with their Boiler No. 9. Testing was performed on April 17, 2019, for the purpose of evaluating the quality of the emissions data produced by Graphic Packaging International, LLC's CEMS in accordance with 40 CFR Part 60, Appendices B and F, and Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE) Permit No. MI-ROP-B1678-2015.

Reference Method (RM) sampling for nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and oxygen (O₂) was performed at >50% load conditions in accordance with Performance Specification 2 (PS-2) and Performance Specification 3 (PS-3) to determine the Relative Accuracy (RA) of the CEMS associated with the Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack. RAs were determined for NO_x emissions (lb/MMBtu) (as NO₂), NO_x concentration (ppmvd), and O₂ concentration (%-dry).

For the RATA, ten (10) NO_x and O_2 runs were performed, and nine (9) were utilized in the RA calculations. Each concentration run was 21-minutes in duration.

The test methods that were conducted during this test were US EPA Reference Methods 3A, 7E, and 19 following the procedures contained within PS-2 and PS-3.

1.2 KEY PERSONNEL

The key personnel who coordinated this test program (and their phone numbers) were:

- Donald Krug, Environmental Engineer, Graphic Packaging International, LLC, 269-383-5000
- Loretta Lehrman, Air Toxics, US EPA Region 5, 312-886-5482
- David Patterson, Environmental Quality Analyst, Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE), 517-241-7469
- Karen Kajiya-Mills, Environmental Manager, Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE), 517-256-0880
- Monica Brothers, Environmental Quality Analyst, Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE), 269-567-3552
- Cody Yazzie, Environmental Engineer, Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE), 269-567-3554
- John Hoard QI, Field Project Manager, Montrose, 800-372-2471

2.0 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF TEST RESULTS

2.1 OBJECTIVES AND TEST MATRIX

The purpose of this test was to conduct the Annual QA RATA for the CEMS associated with Boiler No. 9. Ten (10) NO_x and O_2 RATA runs were performed at >50% load conditions in accordance with PS-2 and PS-3 to determine the RA between the CEMS and the applicable RMs. Testing was performed for the purpose of evaluating the quality of the emissions data produced by Graphic Packaging International's CEMS in accordance with 40 CFR Part 60, Appendices B and F, and EGLE Permit No. MI-ROP-B1678-2015.

The specific test objectives for this test were as follows:

- Measure the concentration of NO_x and O_2 at the Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack at >50% load conditions in accordance with PS-2, PS-3, and U.S. EPA Reference Methods 3A and 7E.
- Utilize the above variables, in conjunction with EPA Method 19, to calculate the corresponding RA of the CEMS for NO_x emissions (lb/MMBtu) (as NO₂), NOx concentration (ppmvd), and O₂ concentration (%-dry) and evaluate the RAs against 40 CFR Part 60 requirements.

Table 2-1 presents the sampling matrix log for this test.

2.2 FIELD TEST CHANGES AND PROBLEMS

No field test changes or problems occurred during the performance of this test that would bias the accuracy of the results of this test.

2.3 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

A single sampling train was utilized at >50% load conditions to determine the RA of the CEMS for NO_x emissions (Ib/MMBtu) (as NO₂), NO_x concentration (ppmvd), and O₂ concentration (%-dry). This sampling train measured the stack gas concentrations of O₂ and NO_x.

Tables 2-2 to 2-4 display the results of this RATA.

Table 2-5 displays the specifications of the Boiler No. 8 CEMS and Reference Method analyzers utilized.

Table 2-6 displays the US EPA Protocol Gas Cylinders utilized to calibrate the Reference Method analyzers during this RATA.

Figure 2-1 schematically illustrates the concentration traverse point location utilized for this test.

2.4 RELATIVE ACCURACY CALCULATIONS

Confidence Coefficient =T-Value * Standard Deviation / Square Root of Number of Runs

0.00036 = 2.306 * 0.00046 / SQRT 9

RA = ((ABS (Mean Difference) + Confidence Coefficient) / Emission Standard) * 100

2.845 = ((ABS (-0.0014) + 0.00036) / 0.06) * 100



| Date | Run No. | Sampling Location | US EPA METHOD 3 (O ₂) Sampling Tin / Duration (m | US EPA METHOD 3A (O ₂) Sampling Time / Duration (min) | | E me nin) |
|-----------|------------|----------------------------|--|---|---------------|-----------------|
| 4/17/2019 | 1 | Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack | 7:04 - 7:25 | / 21 | 7:04 - 7:25 | / 21 |
| 4/17/2019 | 2 | Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack | 7:35 - 7:56 | / 21 | 7:35 - 7:56 | / 21 |
| 4/17/2019 | 3 | Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack | 8:07 - 8:28 | / 21 | 8:07 - 8:28 | / 21 |
| 4/17/2019 | 4 | Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack | 8:37 - 8:58 | / 21 | 8:37 - 8:58 | / 21 |
| 4/17/2019 | 5 | Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack | 9:07 - 9:28 | / 21 | 9:07 - 9:28 | / 21 |
| 4/17/2019 | 6 | Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack | 9:38 - 9:59 | / 21 | 9:38 - 9:59 | / 21 |
| 4/17/2019 | 7 | Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack | 10:10 - 10:31 | / 21 | 10:10 - 10:31 | / 21 |
| 4/17/2019 | 8 | Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack | 10:55 - 11:16 | / 21 | 10:55 - 11:16 | / 21 |
| 4/17/2019 | 9 | Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack | 11:27 - 11:48 | / 21 | 11:27 - 11:48 | / 21 |
| 4/17/2019 | 10 | Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack | 11:58 - 12:19 | / 21 | 11:58 - 12:19 | / 21 |

TABLE 2-1 >50% LOAD RATA - SAMPLING MATRIX OF TEST METHODS UTILIZED

All times are Facility Time.



TABLE 2-2 PRIMARY CEMS - >50% LOAD - NO_x (Ib/MMBtu) RELATIVE ACCURACY

CEMS: Primary Load: >50% RATA: NOx RATA Units: Ib/MMBtu RA Criteria: 10% RATA Label: >50%-NOx-Ib/MMBtu

| Run Number | RM All Ib/MMBtu | RM Used Ib/MMBtu | CEMS All Ib/MMBtu | CEMS Used Ib/MMBtu | Difference All Ib/MMBtu | Difference Used Ib/MMBtu | klb/hr Steam Flow | Used as Valid Test Run (yes/no) |
|------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | 0.027 | 0.027 | 0.028 | 0.028 | -0.001 | -0.001 | 106 | Ves |
| 2 | 0.027 | 0.027 | 0.028 | 0.028 | -0.001 | -0.001 | 106 | ves |
| 3 | 0.026 | 0.026 | 0.027 | 0.027 | -0.001 | -0.001 | 106 | ves |
| 4 | 0.026 | 0.026 | 0.028 | 0.028 | -0.002 | -0.002 | 107 | yes |
| 5 | 0.026 | 0.026 | 0.028 | 0.028 | -0.002 | -0.002 | 107 | yes |
| 6 | 0.026 | | 0.028 | | -0.002 | | | no |
| 7 | 0.026 | 0.026 | 0.028 | 0.028 | -0.002 | -0.002 | 106 | yes |
| 8 | 0.027 | 0.027 | 0.028 | 0.028 | -0.001 | -0.001 | 107 | yes |
| 9 | 0.026 | 0.026 | 0.028 | 0.028 | -0.002 | -0.002 | 107 | yes |
| 10 | 0.026 | 0.026 | 0.028 | 0.028 | -0.002 | -0.002 | 107 | yes |
| Average | 0.026 | 0.026 | | 0.028 | | -0.0014 | 106 | |

| Relative Accuracy (%) | 2.8450 | (Based on an Applicable Emission Standard of 0.06 lb/MMBtu) |
|------------------------|---------|---|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.00036 | |
| T-Value | 2.306 | |
| Standard Deviation | 0.00046 | |



TABLE 2-3 PRIMARY CEMS - >50% LOAD - NO_x (ppm) RELATIVE ACCURACY

CEMS: Primary Load: >50% RATA: NOx RATA Units: ppm RA Criteria: 20% RATA Label: >50%-NOx-ppm

| Run Number | RM All ppm | RM Used ppm | CEMS All ppm | CEMS Used ppm | Difference All ppm | Difference Used ppm | Used as Valid Test Run (yes/no) |
|------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | 22 581 | 22 581 | 23 124 | 23 124 | 0.543 | 0.543 | NOS |
| 2 | 22.001 | 22.001 | 23.124 | 23.124 | -0.543 | -0.543 | yes |
| 2 | 22.001 | 22.001 | 23.080 | 23.080 | 1 270 | -0.514 | yes |
| 3 | 21.040 | 21.040 | 23.119 | 23.119 | -1.279 | -1.279 | yes |
| 4 | 21.869 | 21.869 | 23.090 | 23.090 | -1.222 | -1.222 | yes |
| 5 | 21.951 | 21.951 | 23.281 | 23.281 | -1.330 | -1.330 | yes |
| 6 | 21.787 | | 23.352 | | -1.565 | | no |
| 7 | 21.971 | 21.971 | 23.438 | 23.438 | -1.467 | -1.467 | yes |
| 8 | 21.909 | 21.909 | 23.390 | 23.390 | -1.482 | -1.482 | ves |
| 9 | 21.746 | 21.746 | 23.157 | 23.157 | -1.411 | -1.411 | ves |
| 10 | 21.649 | 21.649 | 23.129 | 23.129 | -1.480 | -1.480 | yes |
| Average | 21.988 | 22.011 | | 23.203 | | -1.192 | |

| Relative Accuracy (%) | 6.767 | (Based on the Reference Method Mean) |
|------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|
| Confidence Coefficient | 0.29748 | |
| T-Value | 2.306 | |
| Standard Deviation | 0.38701 | |



TABLE 2-4PRIMARY CEMS - >50% LOAD - O2 (%) RELATIVE ACCURACY

CEMS: Primary Load: >50% RATA: O2 RATA Units: % RA Criteria: 1% RATA Label: >50%-O2-%

| Run Number | RM All % | RM Used % | CEMS AII % | CEMS Used % | Difference All % | Difference Used % | Used as Valid Test Run (yes/no) |
|------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | 2,670 | 2.670 | 2 691 | 2 691 | 0.011 | 0.011 | |
| | 2.070 | 2.070 | 2.001 | 2.001 | -0.011 | -0.011 | yes |
| 2 | 2.670 | 2.670 | 2.703 | 2.703 | -0.113 | -0.113 | yes |
| 3 | 2.003 | 2.003 | 2.007 | 2.007 | 0.006 | 0.006 | yes |
| 4 | 2.662 | 2.662 | 2.700 | 2.700 | -0.038 | -0.038 | yes |
| 5 | 2.671 | 2.671 | 2.681 | 2.681 | -0.010 | -0.010 | yes |
| 6 | 2.668 | 2.668 | 2.748 | 2.748 | -0.079 | -0.079 | yes |
| 7 | 2.664 | 2.664 | 2.681 | 2.681 | -0.017 | -0.017 | yes |
| 8 | 3.394 | | 2.662 | | 0.732 | | no |
| 9 | 2.645 | 2.645 | 2.795 | 2.795 | -0.151 | -0.151 | ves |
| 10 | 2.646 | 2.646 | 2.724 | 2.724 | -0.078 | -0.078 | yes |
| Average | 2.735 | 2.662 | | 2.717 | | -0.054 | |
| Stan | dard Deviation | 0.05361 | | | | | |
| | T-Value | 2.306 | | | | | |
| Confider | nce Coefficient | 0.04121 | | | | | |
| Relative | Accuracy (%) | 0.054 | (Calculated a | s the Absolute | Mean Differen | ice) | |

TABLE 2-5 ANALYZER SPECIFICATIONS

| BOILER NO. 9 CEMS | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Parameter | NO _x Analyzer | O ₂ Analyzer | | | | |
| Analyzer Manufacturer | Horiba | Horiba | | | | |
| Analyzer Model Number Analyzer Serial Number | CMA-EC622 42108510081 | CMA-EC622 42108510081 | | | | |
| System Type | Straight-Extractive | Straight-Extractive | | | | |
| Analyzer Span Value | 100-ppm | 25.00% | | | | |

REFERENCE METHOD CEMS

| Parameter | NO _x Analyzer | O ₂ Analyzer |
|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Analyzer Manufacturer | Thermo | Servomex |
| Analyzer Model Number Analyzer Serial Number Analyzer Type | 42C 42CHL-66127-351 Extractive | 1400 01440D1/4049 Extractive |
| Analyzer Technique | Chemiluminescent Reaction | Paramagnetic |
| Analyzer Span Value | 112.3-PPM | 22.93% |



TABLE 2-6US EPA PROTOCOL GAS CERTIFICATIONS

| Component | Certified | Cylinder | Certification | Expiration |
|------------------|------------------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| | Concentration | Number | Date | Date |
| Oxygen | 14.07 ± 0.14% | XC031575B | 3/13/2018 | 3/13/2026 |
| | 22 93 + 0 22% | CC72446 | 12/31/2018 | 12/31/2026 |
| Nitrogen Dioxide | 50.39 ± 1.00 PPM | CC501876 | 3/27/2018 | 3/27/2021 |
| Nitrogen Oxides | 112.3 ± 1.45 PPM | CC29760 | 1/11/2019 | 1/11/2027 |





FIGURE 2-1 BOILER NO. 9 EXHAUST TRAVERSE POINT LOCATION DRAWING



3.0 SAMPLING AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

3.1 TEST METHODS

3.1.1 US EPA Method 3A: "Determination of Oxygen and Carbon Dioxide Concentrations in Emissions from Stationary Sources (Instrumental Analyzer Procedure)"

Principle: A gas sample is continuously extracted from the effluent stream. A portion of the sample stream is conveyed to an instrumental analyzer(s) for determination of O_2 and CO_2 concentration(s). Performance specifications and test procedures are provided to ensure reliable data. This method was utilized in its entirety as per the procedures outlined in 40 CFR Part 60, Appendix A.

3.1.2 US EPA Method 7E: "Determination of Nitrogen Oxides Emissions from Stationary Sources (Instrumental Analyzer Procedure)"

Principle: A gas sample is continuously extracted from the effluent stream. A portion of the sample stream is conveyed to an instrumental analyzer for determination of NO_x concentration. NO and NO_2 may be measured separately or simultaneously. For the purposes of this method, NO_x is the sum of NO and NO_2 . Performance specifications and test procedures are provided to ensure reliable data. This method was utilized in its entirety as per the procedures outlined in 40 CFR Part 60, Appendix A.

3.1.3 US EPA Method 19: "Determination of Sulfur Dioxide Removal Efficiency and Particulate Matter, Sulfur Dioxide, and Nitrogen Oxides

Principle: This method is applicable for (a) determining Particulate Matter (PM), Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂), and Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x) emission rates; (b) determining sulfur removal efficiencies of fuel pretreatment and SO₂ control devices; (c) determining overall reduction of potential SO₂ emissions from steam generating units or other sources as specified in applicable regulations; and (d) determining SO₂ rates based on fuel sampling and analysis procedures.

3.1.4 US EPA Performance Specification 2: "Specifications and Test Procedures for SO₂ and NO_x Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources"

Principle: This specification is for evaluating the acceptability of SO_2 and NO_x continuous emission monitoring systems (CEMS) at the time of installation or soon after and whenever specified in the regulations. The CEMS may include, for certain stationary sources, a diluent (O_2 or CO_2) monitor. This specification was utilized as per the procedures outlined in 40 CFR Part 60, Appendix B.





3.1.5 US EPA Performance Specification 3: "Specification and Test Procedures for O₂ and CO₂ Continuous Emissions Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources"

This specification is for evaluating acceptability of O_2 and CO_2 continuous emission monitoring systems (CEMS) at the time of installation or soon after and whenever specified in an applicable subpart of the regulations. This specification applies to O_2 or CO_2 monitors that are not included under Performance Specification 2 (PS-2). This method was utilized in its entirety as per the procedures outlined in 40 CFR Part 60, Appendix B.

3.2 PROCEDURES FOR OBTAINING PROCESS DATA

All relevant process and CEMS data was recorded by personnel and was furnished to Montrose at the conclusion of this testing event.



4.0 INTERNAL QA/QC ACTIVITIES

4.1 QA AUDITS

Tables 4-1 to 4.5 illustrate the QA audits that were performed during this test.

Tables 4-1 to 4-4 illustrate the analyzer calibration audits which were performed during this test (and integral to performing U.S. EPA Method 3A and 7E correctly) were all within the Measurement System Performance Specifications of $\pm 3\%$ of span for the Zero and Calibration Drift Checks, $\pm 5\%$ of span for the System Calibration Bias Checks, and $\pm 2\%$ of span for the Calibration Error Checks.

Table 4-5 displays the NO₂ to NO converter efficiency check. The converter efficiency check was conducted as per the procedures contained in US EPA Method 7E, Section 8.2.4.1 which require a conversion of at least 90%. As shown, an average converter efficiency of 98.02% was achieved for the NO_x analyzer utilized at the Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack.

4.2 QA/QC PROBLEMS

No QA/QC problems occurred during this test event.

4.3 QUALITY STATEMENT

Montrose is qualified to conduct this test program and has established a quality management system that led to accreditation with ASTM Standard D7036-04 (Standard Practice for Competence of Air Emission Testing Bodies). Montrose participates in annual functional assessments for conformance with D7036-04 which are conducted by the American Association for Laboratory Accreditation (A2LA). All testing performed by Montrose is supervised on site by at least one Qualified Individual (QI) as defined in D7036-04 Section 8.3.2. Data quality objectives for estimating measurement uncertainty within the documented limits in the test methods are met by using approved test protocols for each project as defined in D7036-04 Sections 7.2.1 and 12.10. Additional quality assurance information is presented in the report appendices.



TABLE 4-1US EPA REFERENCE METHOD 3A (O2) ANALYZER CALIBRATION AND QA

| OXYGEN ANALYZER | RUN 1 | Acceptable | RUN 2 | Acceptable | RUN 3 | Acceptable | RUN 4 | Acceptable | RUN 5 | Acceptable |
|---|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|
| Analyzer Span During Test Run (%) | 22.9 | YES |
| Initial System Calibration Response for Zero Gas (%) | 0.21 | N/A | 0.20 | N/A | 0.18 | N/A | 0.19 | N/A | 0.17 | N/A |
| Final System Calibration Response for Zero Gas (%) | 0.20 | N/A | 0.18 | N/A | 0.19 | N/A | 0.17 | N/A | 0.18 | N/A |
| Actual Concentration of the Upscale Calibration Gas (%) | 11.00 | N/A |
| Initial System Calibration Response for Upscale Gas (%) | 11.01 | N/A | 11.00 | N/A | 10.98 | N/A | 10.98 | N/A | 10.96 | N/A |
| Final System Calibration Response for Upscale Gas (%) | 11.00 | N/A | 10.98 | N/A | 10.98 | N/A | 10.96 | N/A | 10.96 | N/A |
| Initial System Calibration Bias for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.87 | YES | 0.83 | YES | 0.74 | YES | 0.78 | YES | 0.70 | YES |
| Final System Calibration Bias for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.83 | YES | 0.74 | YES | 0.78 | YES | 0.70 | YES | 0.74 | YES |
| Initial System Calibration Bias for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | -0.22 | YES | -0.26 | YES | -0.35 | YES | -0.35 | YES | -0.44 | YES |
| Final System Calibration Bias for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | -0.26 | YES | -0.35 | YES | -0.35 | YES | -0.44 | YES | -0.44 | YES |
| System Drift for Zero Gas (% of Span) | -0.04 | YES | -0.09 | YES | 0.04 | YES | -0.09 | YES | 0.04 | YES |
| System Drift for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | -0.04 | YES | -0.09 | YES | 0.00 | YES | -0.09 | YES | 0.00 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.04 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for Mid-Level Gas (% of Span) | 0.26 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for High-Level Gas (% of Span) | -0.04 | YES |



TABLE 4-2US EPA REFERENCE METHOD 3A (O2) ANALYZER CALIBRATION AND QA

| OXYGEN ANALYZER | RUN 6 | Acceptable | RUN 7 | Acceptable | RUN 8 | Acceptable | RUN 9 | Acceptable | RUN 10 | Acceptable |
|---|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|--------|------------|
| Analyzer Span During Test Run (%) | 22.9 | YES | 22.9 | YES | 22.9 | YES | 22.9 | YES | 22.9 | YES |
| Initial System Calibration Response for Zero Gas (%) | 0.18 | N/A | 0.17 | N/A | 0.21 | N/A | 0.17 | N/A | 0.17 | N/A |
| Final System Calibration Response for Zero Gas (%) | 0.17 | N/A | 0.21 | N/A | 0.17 | N/A | 0.17 | N/A | 0.17 | N/A |
| Actual Concentration of the Upscale Calibration Gas (%) | 11.00 | N/A | 11.00 | N/A | 11.00 | N/A | 11.00 | N/A | 11.00 | N/A |
| Initial System Calibration Response for Upscale Gas (%) | 10.96 | N/A | 10.98 | N/A | 10.99 | N/A | 10.95 | N/A | 10.94 | N/A |
| Final System Calibration Response for Upscale Gas (%) | 10.98 | N/A | 10.99 | N/A | 10.95 | N/A | 10.94 | N/A | 10.95 | N/A |
| Initial System Calibration Bias for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.74 | YES | 0.70 | YES | 0.87 | YES | 0.70 | YES | 0.70 | YES |
| Final System Calibration Bias for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.70 | YES | 0.87 | YES | 0.70 | YES | 0.70 | YES | 0.70 | YES |
| Initial System Calibration Bias for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | -0.44 | YES | -0.35 | YES | -0.31 | YES | -0.48 | YES | -0.52 | YES |
| Final System Calibration Bias for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | -0.35 | YES | -0.31 | YES | -0.48 | YES | -0.52 | YES | -0.48 | YES |
| System Drift for Zero Gas (% of Span) | -0.04 | YES | 0.17 | YES | -0.17 | YES | 0.00 | YES | 0.00 | YES |
| System Drift for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | 0.09 | YES | 0.04 | YES | -0.17 | YES | -0.04 | YES | 0.04 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.04 | YES | 0.04 | YES | 0.04 | YES | 0.04 | YES | 0.04 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for Mid-Level Gas (% of Span) | 0.26 | YES | 0.26 | YES | 0.26 | YES | 0.26 | YES | 0.26 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for High-Level Gas (% of Span) | -0.04 | YES | -0.04 | YES | -0.04 | YES | -0.04 | YES | -0.04 | YES |



TABLE 4-3 US EPA REFERENCE METHOD 7E ANALYZER CALIBRATION AND QA

| NITROGEN OXIDES ANALYZER | RUN 1 | Acceptable | RUN 2 | Acceptable | RUN 3 | Acceptable | RUN 4 | Acceptable | RUN 5 | Acceptable |
|---|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|
| Analyzer Span During Test Run (ppm) | 112 | YES |
| Initial System Calibration Response for Zero Gas (ppm) | 0.54 | N/A | 0.48 | N/A | 0.83 | N/A | 0.51 | N/A | 0.75 | N/A |
| Final System Calibration Response for Zero Gas (ppm) | 0.48 | N/A | 0.83 | N/A | 0.51 | N/A | 0.75 | N/A | 0.80 | N/A |
| Actual Concentration of the Upscale Calibration Gas (ppm) | 55.0 | N/A |
| Initial System Calibration Response for Upscale Gas (ppm) | 55.1 | N/A | 56.3 | N/A | 56.4 | N/A | 56.6 | N/A | 56.5 | N/A |
| Final System Calibration Response for Upscale Gas (ppm) | 56.3 | N/A | 56.4 | N/A | 56.6 | N/A | 56.5 | N/A | 56.3 | N/A |
| Initial System Calibration Bias for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.27 | YES | 0.21 | YES | 0.53 | YES | 0.24 | YES | 0.45 | YES |
| Final System Calibration Bias for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.21 | YES | 0.53 | YES | 0.24 | YES | 0.45 | YES | 0.50 | YES |
| Initial System Calibration Bias for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | -0.07 | YES | 1.01 | YES | 1.05 | YES | 1.26 | YES | 1.13 | YES |
| Final System Calibration Bias for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | 1.01 | YES | 1.05 | YES | 1.26 | YES | 1.13 | YES | 0.98 | YES |
| System Drift for Zero Gas (% of Span) | -0.05 | YES | 0.31 | YES | -0.28 | YES | 0.21 | YES | 0.04 | YES |
| System Drift for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | 1.08 | YES | 0.04 | YES | 0.21 | YES | -0.13 | YES | -0.15 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.21 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for Mid-Level Gas (% of Span) | 0.16 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for High-Level Gas (% of Span) | -0.06 | YES |



TABLE 4-4 US EPA REFERENCE METHOD 7E ANALYZER CALIBRATION AND QA

| NITROGEN OXIDES ANALYZER | RUN 6 | Acceptable | RUN 7 | Acceptable | RUN 8 | Acceptable | RUN 9 | Acceptable | RUN 10 | Acceptable |
|---|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|--------|------------|
| Analyzer Span During Test Run (ppm) | 112 | YES | 112 | YES | 112 | YES | 112 | YES | 112 | YES |
| Initial System Calibration Response for Zero Gas (ppm) | 0.80 | N/A | 0.78 | N/A | 0.49 | N/A | 0.85 | N/A | 0.84 | N/A |
| Final System Calibration Response for Zero Gas (ppm) | 0.78 | N/A | 0.49 | N/A | 0.85 | N/A | 0.84 | N/A | 0.85 | N/A |
| Actual Concentration of the Upscale Calibration Gas (ppm) | 55.0 | N/A | 55.0 | N/A | 55.0 | N/A | 55.0 | N/A | 55.0 | N/A |
| Initial System Calibration Response for Upscale Gas (ppm) | 56.3 | N/A | 56.2 | N/A | 56.2 | N/A | 56.0 | N/A | 55.8 | N/A |
| Final System Calibration Response for Upscale Gas (ppm) | 56.2 | N/A | 56.2 | N/A | 56.0 | N/A | 55.8 | N/A | 55.7 | N/A |
| Initial System Calibration Bias for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.50 | YES | 0.48 | YES | 0.22 | YES | 0.54 | YES | 0.53 | YES |
| Final System Calibration Bias for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.48 | YES | 0.22 | YES | 0.54 | YES | 0.53 | YES | 0.54 | YES |
| Initial System Calibration Bias for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | 0.98 | YES | 0.91 | YES | 0.94 | YES | 0.75 | YES | 0.54 | YES |
| Final System Calibration Bias for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | 0.91 | YES | 0.94 | YES | 0.75 | YES | 0.54 | YES | 0.49 | YES |
| System Drift for Zero Gas (% of Span) | -0.02 | YES | -0.26 | YES | 0.32 | YES | -0.01 | YES | 0.01 | YES |
| System Drift for Upscale Gas (% of Span) | -0.07 | YES | 0.04 | YES | -0.20 | YES | -0.20 | YES | -0.05 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for Zero Gas (% of Span) | 0.21 | YES | 0.21 | YES | 0.21 | YES | 0.21 | YES | 0.21 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for Mid-Level Gas (% of Span) | 0.16 | YES | 0.16 | YES | 0.16 | YES | 0.16 | YES | 0.16 | YES |
| Analyzer Calibration Error for High-Level Gas (% of Span) | -0.06 | YES | -0.06 | YES | -0.06 | YES | -0.06 | YES | -0.06 | YES |



| | TABLE | 4-5 | |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| US EPA METHOD | $7E NO_x$ | CONVERTER | CHECK |

| Date / Time | Certified Cylinder Concentration (ppm NO ₂) | Analyzer Concentration (ppm NO _x) | Conversion Efficiency (%) | Required Conversion Efficiency (%) | Acceptable |
|----------------|---|---|---------------------------------|---|------------|
| 4/16/2019 8:30 | 50.39 | 48.30 | 95.85 | 90.00 | Yes |
| 4/16/2019 8:31 | 50.39 | 49.18 | 97.60 | 90.00 | Yes |
| 4/16/2019 8:32 | 50.39 | 49.63 | 98.49 | 90.00 | Yes |
| 4/16/2019 8:33 | 50.39 | 49.79 | 98.81 | 90.00 | Yes |
| 4/16/2019 8:34 | 50.39 | 50.05 | 99.33 | 90.00 | Yes |
| AVERAGE | 50.39 | 49.39 | 98.02 | 90.00 | Yes |

Analyzer Serial Number: 42CHL-66127-351 Cylinder Number: CC501876





APPENDIX



APPENDIX CHECKLIST - M011AS-554631-RT-3R0

| A-REFERENCE METHOD AVERAGES | D-CALIBRATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS (continued) |
|--|---|
| US EPA Reference Method Averages | D.3-REFERENCE EQUIPMENT/STANDARDS |
| | Calibration Gas Certifications |
| B-FACILITY DATA | Calibration Gas Diluter Certifications |
| | True Primary Flow Standard Cartification |
| | |
| | |
| CEINS Averages-LOVV LOAD | Field Balance Calibration Weights Certifications |
| Facility CEMS Information Verification | Field / Shop Balance Calibration Certifications |
| Process Data | Daily Field/Shop Balance Audit |
| | |
| C-FIELD DATA | Micromanometer Certificate |
| Calculation Spreadsheet(s) and Example Calculations | |
| | Reference Meter Calibration |
| Test Log (CEMS Methods) | Reference Field Hygrometer Calibration |
| Sample Recovery & Calibration Check Data | |
| US EPA Method 3 / Dry MW Calculation | VE Azimuth Tables |
| US EPA Method 2 Flow Data Sheets | |
| LIS EPA Method 1 Cyclonic Elow | |
| | |
| US EPA Method 1 Preliminary Field Data | |
| | Reference Digital Pressure Gauge Certification |
| D-GALIBRATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS | Reference Thermometer (Omega) Certification |
| D.1-CEMS ANALYZERS | Reference Ruler Certification |
| Analyzer Calibration Error, System Bias, and System Drift | Reference Protractor Certification |
| US EPA Method 7E Converter Efficiency Check | Reference Caliper Certification |
| US EPA Method 205 Calibration Gas Dilution System Evaluation | |
| | D.4-MONTROSE STAC & PERSONNEL |
| D.2-FIELD EQUIPMENT | Montrose - Accreditation Certificate |
| Pre-Test Pitot Tube / Probe Inspections | Montrose Personnel - OI/OSTI Certificates/Conformance |
| Post-Test Pitot Tube / Probe Inspections | |
| | Documenta |
| Pre-Test Thermocounte System Audit | D.5. ITT / TEST PROTOCOL / TEST PLAN |
| Post-Test Thermocourle Check | Soft / Test FROTOCOL / Test FLAN |
| | |
| 10-Minute Calibrations | |
| Dro Tost Motor Pay Calibration | |
| Des Test Des Ose Mater (Osifice Osifice I) | |
| Pre-Test Dry Gas Meter / Orifice Calibration | |
| | |
| Post-Test Dry Gas Meter / Orifice and Console Calibration | |
| | |
| Post-Test Mini Meter / Orifice and Console Calibration | |
| 5 2 | |
| Calibration Kit (C-CTK-002) Audit | |
| | |
| Digital Pressure Gauge / Barometer Audit | |
| Thermometer Audit | |
| | |
| Equipment Calibration Histories | |
| | |

