

AUG 0 6 2019

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AIR QUALITY DIVISION

### RENEWABLE OPERATING PERMIT REPORT CERTIFICATION

Authorized by 1994 P.A. 451, as amended. Failure to provide this information may result in civil and/or criminal penalties.

Reports submitted pursuant to R 336.1213 (Rule 213), subrules (3)(c) and/or (4)(c), of Michigan's Renewable Operating (RO) Permit program must be certified by a responsible official. Additional information regarding the reports and documentation listed below must be kept on file for at least 5 years, as described in General Condition No. 22 in the RO Permit and be made available to the Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division upon request.

Source Name Graphic Packaging International, LLC	County Kalamazoo
Source Address _ 1500 North Pitcher Street City	Kalamazoo
AQD Source ID (SRN) B1678 RO Permit No. MI-ROP-B1678-2015	RO Permit Section No1
Please check the appropriate box(es):	
Annual Compliance Certification (General Condition No. 28 and No. 29 of the RO Pe	rmit)
Reporting period (provide inclusive dates): From To	
1. During the entire reporting period, this source was in compliance with ALL terms and c each term and condition of which is identified and included by this reference. The method(is/are the method(s) specified in the RO Permit.	
2. During the entire reporting period this source was in compliance with all terms and c each term and condition of which is identified and included by this reference, EXCEP enclosed deviation report(s). The method used to determine compliance for each term ar the RO Permit, unless otherwise indicated and described on the enclosed deviation report(	T for the deviations identified on the nd condition is the method specified in
Semi-Annual (or More Frequent) Report Certification (General Condition No. 23 of t	he RO Permit)
<ul> <li>Reporting period (provide inclusive dates): From To</li> <li>1. During the entire reporting period, ALL monitoring and associated recordkeeping required and no deviations from these requirements or any other terms or conditions occurred.</li> <li>2. During the entire reporting period, all monitoring and associated recordkeeping requirer no deviations from these requirements or any other terms or conditions occurred, EXCEPT</li> </ul>	nents in the RO Permit were met and
enclosed deviation report(s).	
Other Report Certification	<u>_</u>
Reporting period (provide inclusive dates): From <u>4/01/19</u> To <u>6/30/1</u> Additional monitoring reports or other applicable documents required by the RO Permit are at	
2019 Relative Accuracy Test Audit Report for Boiler 9 NOx CEMS	

I certify that, based on information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, the statements and information in this report and the supporting enclosures are true, accurate and complete.

Mill Manager	(269) 383-5015
Title	Phone Number
	2/22/2019
	Date

# 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

	RE۱	VIEW AND CERTIFICATION	4
1.0	INT	FRODUCTION	5
	1.1	SUMMARY OF TEST PROGRAM	5
	1.2	KEY PERSONNEL	5
2.0	SU	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	SAI	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	PEND	DIX A REFERENCE METHOD AVERAGES	25
APF	PEND	DIX B FACILITY DATA	36
	APPI	ENDIX B.1 CEMS AVERAGES	37
	APPI	ENDIX B.2 PROCESS DATA	37
	APPI	ENDIX B.X FACILITY CEMS ID VERIFICATION	47
APF	PENC	DIX C FIELD DATA	49
	APPI	ENDIX C.1 FIELD DATA	50
APF	PENC	DIX D CALIBRATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS	60
	APPI	ENDIX D.1 RM ANALYZERS	61
	APPI	ENDIX D.2 FIELD EQUIPMENT	67
	APPI	ENDIX D.3 REFERENCE EQUIPMENT	71
	APPI	ENDIX D.4 MONTROSE STAC AND PERSONNEL CERTIFICATES	87



di di C

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
LIST OF FIGURES	
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:	Antoze	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<sub>x</sub>) and oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>) 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<sub>x</sub> emissions (Ib/MMBtu) (as NO<sub>2</sub>), NO<sub>x</sub> concentration (ppmvd), and O<sub>2</sub> 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<sub>x</sub> emissions (lb/MMBtu) (as NO<sub>2</sub>), NOx concentration (ppmvd), and O<sub>2</sub> 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<sub>x</sub> emissions (lb/MMBtu) (as NO<sub>2</sub>), NO<sub>x</sub> concentration (ppmvd), and O<sub>2</sub> concentration (%-dry). This sampling train measured the stack gas concentrations of O<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>.

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		Sampling Location	US EPA METHOD 3 (O <sub>2</sub> )	US EPA METHOD 7E (NO <sub>x</sub> )		
	No.		Sampling Ti / Duration (m		Sampling Tir / Duration (m	
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	121
4/17/2019	3	Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack	8:07 - 8:28	/ 21	8:07 - 8:28	121
4/17/2019	4	Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack	8:37 - 8:58	/ 21	8:37 - 8:58	12
4/17/2019	5	Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack	9:07 - 9:28	/ 21	9:07 - 9:28	/ 2
4/17/2019	6	Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack	9:38 - 9:59	/ 21	9:38 - 9:59	12
4/17/2019	7	Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack	10:10 - 10:31	/ 21	10:10 - 10:31	12
4/17/2019	8	Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack	10:55 - 11:16	/ 21	10:55 - 11:16	12
4/17/2019	9	Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack	11:27 - 11:48	/ 21	11:27 - 11:48	12
4/17/2019	10	Boiler No. 9 Exhaust Stack	11:58 - 12:19	/ 21	11:58 - 12:19	12

#### 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<sub>x</sub> (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	yes
2	0.027	0.027	0.028	0.028	-0.001	-0.001	106	yes
3	0.026	0.026	0.027	0.027	-0.001	-0.001	106	yes
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<sub>x</sub> (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 Vali Test Run (yes/no)
1	22.581	22.581	23,124	23.124	-0.543	-0.543	yes
2	22.581	22.581	23.095	23.095	-0.514	-0.514	yes
3	21.840	21.840	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	yes
9	21.746	21.746	23.157	23.157	-1.411	-1.411	yes
10	21.649	21.649	23.129	23.129	-1.480	-1.480	yes
Average	21.988	22.011		23.203		-1.192	

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



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

CEMS: Primary Load: >50% RATA: 02 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	2.681	2.681	-0.011	-0.011	yes
2	2.670	2.670	2.783	2.783	-0.113	-0.113	ves
3	2.663	2.663	2.657	2.657	0.006	0.006	ves
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	yes
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 T-Value	0.05361 2.306					
Confide	nce Coefficient	0.04121					

Relative Accuracy (%) 0.054

(Calculated as the Absolute Mean Difference)



#### TABLE 2-5 ANALYZER SPECIFICATIONS

BOILER NO. 9 CEMS			
Parameter	NO <sub>x</sub> Analyzer	O <sub>2</sub> 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 <sub>x</sub> Analyzer	O <sub>2</sub> 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%

