



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RWDI USA LLC (RWDI) was retained by Sebewaing Light and Water (SLW) to complete the source testing program at their Pine Street Power Plant located in Sebewaing, Michigan. SLW operates two (2) engines (referred to as EUGEN2 or Engine 7 and EUGEN1 or Engine 8) that burns natural gas for electrical power generation. Please note that the engines are referred to as Engine 7 and 8 throughout the remainder of the report, tables, and appendices. The test program was conducted to fulfill the requirements of the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) Air Permit to Install (PTI) number 146-17A and 40 CFR Part 60, NSPS Subpart JJJJ. The test included measurements of total oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOCs, defined as non-methane hydrocarbons not including formaldehyde) and formaldehyde (HCOH) on both engines. These emissions were calculated while the engines were operated within 10% of 100% peak load (or highest achievable load) combusting natural gas (~100% of Full Load for each Engine). And lastly, exhaust air flow rate was determined on all engines at the exhaust test ports. Testing was conducted on May 10, 2021 and May 11, 2021.

The following table represents a summary of the stack testing results.

### Summary of Engine#7 Emission Data:

Parameter	Symbol	Units	Average	Corrected to 15% O <sub>2</sub>	Limits
Nitrogen Oxides	NO <sub>x</sub>	ppmvd	63.5	40.2	82
Carbon Monoxide	CO	ppmvd	75.5	47.8	270
VOCs (as propane)	VOC	ppmvd	6.9	4.4	60
Formaldehyde	HCOH	ppmvd	14.4	9.1	-
Oxygen	O <sub>2</sub>	% <sub>dry</sub>	11.5	-	-
Nitrogen Oxides	NO <sub>x</sub>	g/HP-hr	0.43	-	0.5
Carbon Monoxide	CO	g/HP-hr	0.31	-	0.9
VOCs (as propane)	VOC	g/HP-hr	0.04	-	0.7
Formaldehyde	HCOH	lbs/bhp-hr	1.4E-04	-	-





**Summary of Engine#7 Exhaust Data and Power Ratings:**

Parameter	Units	Average
Stack Gas Temperature	°F	596.2
Stack Gas Moisture	%	9.93
Velocity	ft/sec	118.0
Actual Flowrate	cfm	28,141
Dry Reference Flowrate	Dscfm	12,510
Average Horsepower	HP	6025 (100% of Full Load)

**Summary of Engine#8 Emission Data:**

Parameter	Symbol	Units	Average	Corrected to 15% O <sub>2</sub>	Limits
Nitrogen Oxides	NO <sub>x</sub>	ppmvd	60.0	37.3	82
Carbon Monoxide	CO	ppmvd	66.9	41.6	270
VOCs (as propane)	VOC	ppmvd	7.5	4.7	60
Formaldehyde	HCOH	ppmvd	14.2	8.9	-
Oxygen	O <sub>2</sub>	% <sub>dry</sub>	11.4	-	-
Nitrogen Oxides	NO <sub>x</sub>	g/HP-hr	0.43	-	0.5
Carbon Monoxide	CO	g/HP-hr	0.29	-	0.9
VOCs (as propane)	VOC	g/HP-hr	0.05	-	0.7
Formaldehyde	HCOH	lbs/bhp-hr	1.45E-04	-	-

**Summary of Engine#8 Exhaust Flow and Power Rating Data:**

Parameter	Units	Average
Stack Gas Temperature	°F	646.4
Stack Gas Moisture	%	9.70
Velocity	ft/sec	99.1
Actual Flowrate	Cfm	23,638
Dry Reference Flowrate	Dscfm	10,022
Average Horsepower	HP	4,591 (99.8% of Full Load)





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>SOURCE DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Facility Description.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>SAMPLING LOCATION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Sample Location Description .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>SAMPLING METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Stack Velocity, Temperature, and Volumetric Flow Rate Determination .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Continuous Emissions Monitoring for O<sub>2</sub>, CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, HCOH and VOCs.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Quality Assurance/Quality Control Activities .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Discussion of Results .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>OPERATING CONDITIONS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>6</b>





## LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1:** Engine#7 Emission Results
- Table 2:** Engine#8 Emission Results
- Table 3:** Engine#7 Flow Measurements
- Table 4:** Engine#8 Flow Measurements

## LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix A:** State of Michigan Department Environment, Great Lakes & Energy (EGLE) Correspondence
- Appendix B:** Continuous Emission Monitoring (CEM) and Fourier-Transform Infrared (FTIR) Spectroscopy Results
- Appendix C:** Flow Rate Data
- Appendix D:** Field Notes
- Appendix E:** Equipment Calibrations
- Appendix F:** Process Data
- Appendix G:** Example Calculations







# 1 INTRODUCTION

RWDI USA LLC (RWDI) was retained by Sebewaing Light and Water (SLW) to complete the source testing program at their Pine Street Power Plant located in Sebewaing, Michigan. SLW operates two (2) engines (referred to as EUGEN7 or Engine 7 and EUGEN8 or Engine 8) that burns natural gas for electrical power generation. Please note that the engines are referred to as Engine 7 and 8 throughout the remainder of the report, tables, and appendices. The test program was conducted in order to fulfill the requirements of the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) Air Permit to Install (PTI) number 146-17A and 40 CFR Part 60, NSPS Subpart JJJJ. A copy of the PTI is provided in **Appendix A**. The test program included measurements of total oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOCs, defined as non-methane hydrocarbons not including formaldehyde) and formaldehyde (HCOH) on both engines (Engine 7 and 8). These emissions were calculated while the engines were operated within 10% of 100% peak load (or highest achievable load) (each at ~100% load) combusting natural gas. Exhaust air flow rate was determined on both engines during each of the tests.

Testing was conducted on May 10, 2021 and May 11, 2021. Results from the sampling program are presented in the **Tables Section** of the report, with more detailed sampling results provided in the **Appendices**. Copies of the approval letter and related correspondence are provided in **Appendix A**.

This stack testing study consisted of the following parameters:

- Velocity, flow rate and temperature;
- Nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>);
- Carbon Monoxide (CO);
- Oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>);
- Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs);
- Formaldehyde (HCOH); and
- Moisture (%).

## 2 SOURCE DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 Facility Description

SLW- Pine Street Plant is a power generation facility that operates two (2) natural gas fired, four-cycle lean-burn internal combustion reciprocating engines. Both engines are equipped with an oxidation catalyst that controls engine exhaust before venting into the atmosphere. The anticipated exhaust temperature is 260°F. For the purposes of the test protocol, Engine#7 (Emission Unit-EUGEN7 rated at 6,023HP / 4.4MW generation capacity) and Engine#8 (Emission Unit- EUGEN8 rated at 4,601HP / 3.3MW generation capacity) are required to be tested for CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, VOCs and HCOH to determine compliance with the air permit, Michigan Air Toxics Rule R 336.1225 and NSPS Subpart JJJJ regulations.



## 3 SAMPLING LOCATION

### 3.1 Sample Location Description

The sampling locations for each source is located outside. This following table summarizes the sampling locations. Exhaust was analyzed for CO, O<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, VOCs, HCOH, flows and moisture. Samples were extracted from sampling ports in the exhaust stack. The nearest upstream and downstream disturbances met the minimum distance criteria specified in EPA Method 1.

The sampling point selection and stratification test was performed in accordance with EPA Reference Method 7E section 8.1.2. (applicable to instrumental analyzer methods).

## 4 SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

The following section provides an overview of the sampling methodologies used in this program.

### 4.1 Stack Velocity, Temperature, and Volumetric Flow Rate Determination

The exhaust velocities and flow rates were determined following the US EPA Method 2, "Determination of Stack Gas Velocity and Flow Rate (Type S Pitot Tube)". Velocity measurements were taken with a pre-calibrated S-Type pitot tube and incline manometer. Volumetric flow rates were determined following the equal area method as outlined in US EPA Method 1. Temperature measurements were made simultaneously with the velocity measurements and will be conducted using a chromel-alumel type "k" thermocouple in conjunction with a digital temperature indicator.

The dry molecular weight of the stack gas was determined following calculations outlined in US EPA Method 3, "Determination of Molecular Weight of Dry Stack Gas". Stack moisture content was determined using an extractive Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy and according to US EPA Method 320, "Measurement of Vapor Phase Organic and Inorganic Emissions by Extractive Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR Spectroscopy)". Moisture was collected at a single point during each test.

### 4.2 Continuous Emissions Monitoring for O<sub>2</sub>, CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, HCOH and VOCs

Testing for O<sub>2</sub>, CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, HCOH and VOCs was accomplished using continuous emission monitors (CEM) and the FTIR. The exhaust gas sample was sampled by drawing a sample stream of flue gases through a stainless steel probe attached to a heated filter and a heated sample line that is attached to the Automated Sampling Console (ASC-10ST). The ASC-10ST sampling console delivers a continuous sample to the MKS MultiGas 2030 FTIR for analysis.

The heated filter and line were maintained at approximately 375°F and the MKS MultiGas 2030 FTIR and MAX Analytical ASC-10ST gas components were at 375°F. The end of the probe was connected to a heated Teflon sample line, which delivers the sample gases from the stack to the FTIR system. The heated sample line is designed to maintain the gas temperature above 250°F in order to prevent condensation of stack gas moisture within the line. The sample was then routed through a manifold system and introduced to the individual CEM's for measurement. As recommended by EGLE, the sample line and heated filter were heated to 375°F.

The ASC-10ST was used to deliver calibration gases (Calibration Transfer Standard (CTS), QA Spike and Nitrogen) to the FTIR in direct (to analyzer) and system (to probe) modes.

A laptop computer was utilized for operating the MKS MultiGas 2030 FTIR and MAX Analytical ASC-10ST sampling console and logging the multi-gas FTIR data. Data was logged as one minute averages for the actual test period (FTIR PRN files and Spectra). All concentration data were determined using the MKS 2030 MultiGas FTIR software. A typical MKS 2030 FTIR and ASC-10 ST configuration is depicted in **Figure 1**.

For oxygen measurement, an EPA Method 3A compliant Brand Gaus Model 4710 wet O<sub>2</sub> analyzer was used. Prior to testing, sample system bias checks and instrument linearity checks (calibration error) were completed in compliance with EPA Method 3A. In addition, the analysers were calibrated (zeroed and span checked) at the completion of each run. A data logger system programmed to collect and record data at 1- second intervals was used to compute and record one-minute average concentrations. The average was drift corrected using pre and post drift checks and changed from wet to dry using stack moisture content.



**Figure 1: MKS MultiGas 2030 FTIR and ASC-10ST**

## 4.3 Quality Assurance/Quality Control Activities

Applicable quality assurance measures were implemented during the sampling program to ensure the integrity of the results. These measures included detailed documentation of field data, equipment calibrations for all measured parameters, completion of Chain of Custody forms when submitting laboratory samples, and submission of field blank samples to laboratories, where applicable.

Quality control procedures specific to the CEM monitoring equipment included linearity checks to determine the instrument performance and reproducibility checks prior to its use in the field. Regular performance checks on the analyser were also carried out during the testing program by performing hourly zero checks and span calibration checks using primary gas standards. Sample system bias checks were also done. These checks were used to verify the ongoing accuracy of the monitor and sampling system over time. Pollutant-free nitrogen was introduced to perform the zero checks, followed by a known calibration (span) gas into the monitor. The response of the monitor to pollutant-free air and the corresponding sensitivity to the span gas were recorded regularly during the tests.

Pre and post test leak checks were done on the flow system by pressurizing and plugging the positive and negative side of the pitot separately. Daily temperature sensor audits were completed by noting the ambient temperature, as measured by a reference thermometer, and comparing these values to those obtained from the stack sensor.

The FTIR test method follows the US EPA Method 320 test procedures. The primary control check for the FTIR (EPA Method 320) is a Calibration Transfer Standard (CTS) check which was performed before and after each test run.

Initial background spectrum using dry nitrogen gas was obtained per Section 8.5 of EPA Method 320. A CTS was performed pre-test using procedures outlined in Section 8.6.1 of EPA Method 320. A post-test CTS per source was also performed. CTS result averages were measured to be within  $\pm 5\%$  of the calibration gas standard.

In addition, a known calibration spike was introduced into the FTIR once per day for the source to confirm the FTIR is working properly and verify the ability to quantify the target analytes in the presence of the stack gas. Three replicate data sets of QA spike were measured during the testing period.

A known calibration spike gas was introduced prior to the first run to measure FTIR analyzer response as part of the quality assurance (QA) spiking procedure. The FTIR analyzer response will need to be between 70% and 130% of the expected value and as such determined to be acceptable (Section 8.6.2 of EPA Method 320 requires the average QA spiked percent recovery to be between 70% and 130%). Results of this procedure are provided in the final test report.

Acetaldehyde (mixed with SF<sub>6</sub> as a tracer), Propane (mixed with SF<sub>6</sub> as a tracer) and CO/NO<sub>x</sub> (mixed with SF<sub>6</sub> as a tracer) were used as the spiked recovery gas for HCOH, VOC and CO/NO<sub>x</sub> testing. Also, ethylene was used as the CTS gas.

Finally, the off-site QA/QC included a data review and a data comparison using MKS "Method Analyzer" software. Method validation was conducted for each test run by pulling a random spectrum sample and results have been included in the appendices.



## 5 RESULTS

The flow and emissions data for this study are presented in the 'Tables' section of this report. Detailed information regarding each test run can be found in the corresponding appendix. Below is a summary of the applicable Table ID for each corresponding test parameter.

Parameter	Table	Appendix
Stack Gas Characteristics	3 & 4	B and C
Nitrogen Oxides	1 & 2	B
Carbon Monoxide	1 & 2	B
Oxygen	1 & 2	B
Carbon Dioxide	1 & 2	B
Carbon Monoxide	1 & 2	B
VOCs	1 & 2	B
Formaldehyde	1 & 2	B

Field notes are presented in **Appendix D**. All calibration information for the equipment used for the program is included in **Appendix E**. Detailed example calculations for each measured pollutant is provided in **Appendix G**.

### 5.1 Discussion of Results

The measured concentrations for all contaminants were less than the maximum limits outlined in Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Air Permit to Install (PTI) number 146-17A, Michigan Air Toxics Rule R 336.1225 and NSPS Subpart JJJJ regulations.

## 6 OPERATING CONDITIONS

Operating conditions during the sampling were monitored by SLW Operations. SLW Operations recorded the load output (either HP or kW), fuel flow (SCF/hr, if available), engines speed (RPM), catalyst temperature (inlet and outlet, if available) and differential pressure (inches of water) across the catalyst. All process data is provided in **Appendix F**.

Engine torque (%) was not available during the stack test and is not included with the process data.

Radio contact was maintained between the process operators and the sampling team throughout the testing. A member of the RWDI sampling team contacted the operator before each test, to ensure that the process was at normal operating conditions.



## 7 CONCLUSIONS

Testing was successfully completed on May 10<sup>th</sup> and May 11<sup>th</sup> of 2021. All sources were tested in accordance with referenced methodologies following the EGLE approved test protocol.

All specified pollutants were quantified using methods set forth 40 CFR 60 Part A and measured concentrations were within compliance limits.