DTE

COMPLIANCE TEST REPORT

for

RELATIVE ACCURACY TEST AUDIT (RATA)

CONTINUOUS EMISSIONS MONITORING SYSTEM (CEMS)

FG-TURBINE 1-4SC

Renaissance Power Plant
Carson City, Michigan

August 2024

Prepared By
Environmental Management & Safety
Environmental Compliance – Field Services
DTE Corporate Services, LLC
7940 Livernois Ave. G-4S
Detroit, MI 48210

CONTENTS

Section **Page**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... **III-IV**

1. 0 INTRODUCTION 1

2.0 SOURCE DESCRIPTION 1

3.0 SAMPLING AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES 2

3.1 OXYGEN, OXIDES OF NITROGEN AND CARBON MONOXIDE (USEPA METHODS 3A, 7E AND 10) 3

3.1.1 Sampling Method 3

3.1.2 O_2, NO_x and CO Sampling Train 4

3.1.3 Sampling Train Calibration 4

3.1.4 Sampling Duration & Frequency 4

3.1.5 Quality Control and Assurance (O_2 , NO_x and CO) 4

3.1.6 Data Reduction 5

4.0 OPERATING PARAMETERS 5

5.0 RESULTS 5

6.0 CERTIFICATION STATEMENT 7

RESULTS TABLES

Table No. 1 ..... RENPP Unit 1 O_2, NO_x, and CO CEMS RATA Results

Table No. 2 ..... RENPP Unit 2 O_2, NO_x, and CO CEMS RATA Results

Table No. 3 ..... RENPP Unit 3 O_2, NO_x, and CO CEMS RATA Results

Table No. 4 ..... RENPP Unit 4 O_2, NO_x, and CO CEMS RATA Results

FIGURES

1 Units 1- 4 Stack Drawing & Exhaust Sampling Point Location

2 USEPA Method 3A, 7E and 10 Sampling Train

APPENDICES

A Units 1-4 RM Test Data

B Units 1-4 CEMS Test Data

C EPA Protocol Gas Certification Sheets

D Example Calculations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DTE Energy's Environmental Management and Safety Environmental Field Services Group (DTE) conducted a Relative Accuracy Test Audit (RATA) at the Renaissance Power Plant (RENPP), located in Carson City, Michigan. The fieldwork, performed on August 19-22, 2024, was conducted to satisfy requirements of the Michigan Permit No. MI-ROP-N6873-2020, SRN: N6873, ORIS: 55402.

The results of the RATA testing are highlighted below:

O_2, NO_x and CO RATA Results
Units 1-4 – Renaissance Power Plant
August 19-22, 2024

Parameter	Unit	Date	CEMS	RM	Relative Accuracy	Limit
CO (ppm)	1	8-19	0.2	0.6	0.3	5(1)
CO (ppm@15% O2)	1	8-19	0.5	0.2	0.3	5(1)
NO_x (ppm@15% O_2)	1	8-19	13.2	14.1	7.1	20(2)
NOx (lb/MMBtu)	1	8-19	0.048	0.052	0.003*	<0.015(3)
O2 (%)	1	8-19	14.0	14.3	0.3	1.0(4)
CO (ppm)	2	8-20	0.5	0.5	0.1	5(1)
CO (ppm@15% O2)	2	8-20	0.5	0.5	0.1	5(1)
NO_x (ppm@15% O_2)	2	8-20	12.5	13.7	9.2	20(2)
NOx (lb/MMBtu)	2	8-20	0.046	0.051	0.005**	<0.015(3)

O2 (%)	3	8-20	13.9	13.9	0.0	1.0(4)
Parameter	**Unit**	**Date**	**CEMS**	**RM**	**Relative Accuracy**	**Limit**
CO (ppm)	3	8-21	0.4	0.6	0.2	5(1)
CO (ppm@15% O2)	3	8-21	0.4	0.5	0.1	5(1)
NO_x (ppm@15% O_2)	3	8-21	11.5	12.4	7.9	20(2)
NOx (lb/MMBtu)	3	8-21	0.042	0.046	0.003***	<0.015(3)
O2 (%)	3	8-21	13.9	14.0	0.3	1.0(4)
CO (ppm)	4	8-22	0.3	0.5	0.2	5(1)
CO (ppm@15% O2)	4	8-22	0.3	0.5	0.2	5(1)
NO_x (ppm@15% O_2)	4	8-22	12.4	12.9	4.3	20(2)
NOx (lb/MMBtu)	4	8-22	0.046	0.047	0.002****	<0.015(3)
O2 (%)	4	8-22	14.2	14.0	0.2	1.0(4)

(1) Part 60 (using PS4A alt. criteria of mean diff. plus confidence coefficient) Allowable Limit
(2) Part 60 Allowable Limit
(3) Part 75 Low Emitter Criteria (mean diff. + or – 0.015 lb/MMBtu) Allowable Limit
* A Bias Adjustment Factor (BAF) of 1.070 must be applied to DAHS per Part 75 criteria
** A Bias Adjustment Factor (BAF) of 1.097 must be applied to DAHS per Part 75 criteria
*** A Bias Adjustment Factor (BAF) of 1.082 must be applied to DAHS per Part 75 criteria
**** A Bias Adjustment Factor (BAF) of 1.046 must be applied to DAHS per Part 75 criteria
(4) Part 75 Allowable Limit

DTE

1. 0 INTRODUCTION

DTE Energy's Environmental Management and Safety Environmental Field Services Group (DTE) conducted a Relative Accuracy Test Audit (RATA) at the Renaissance Power Plant (RENPP), located in Carson City, Michigan. The fieldwork, performed on August 19-22, 2024 was conducted to satisfy requirements of the Michigan Permit No. MI-ROP-N6873-2020, SRN: N6873, ORIS: 55402 and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule.

Testing was performed pursuant to Title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 60, Appendix A (40 CFR §60 App. A), Methods 3A, 7E, 10, 19, Part 75 Appendices A & B, and Part 60 Appendix B Performance Specifications 2, 3 and 4A.

The following DTE personnel participated in the testing program: Mark D. Westerberg, Senior Specialist - Environmental, Ken St. Amant and Mark Grigereit, Principal Engineer. Mr. Westerberg was the project leader. Mr. Matthew Kaleyta, Plant Manager at Renaissance Power Plant, provided process coordination for the testing program.

2.0 SOURCE DESCRIPTION

The Renaissance Power Plant is a DTE Energy facility located at 950 North Division Street in Carson City, Michigan. The plant has four (4) simple cycle stationary combustion turbines, referred to as Units 1, 2, 3, and 4. The turbines are Siemens Westinghouse Power Corporation Model 501F units.

Each combustion turbine includes a compressor, combustor, turbine and electric generator with a nominally rated load capacity of 215 megawatts (MW) at perfect conditions in simple cycle operation.

NO_x emissions for each unit are controlled by dry low-NO_x burners. CO emissions are controlled by good combustion practices and SO_2 emissions are controlled by utilizing low sulfur natural gas.

The RATA testing was performed while each Unit operated at full load conditions.

DTE

The exhaust stacks for Units 1 through 4 are rectangular ducts approximately 60 feet tall with an internal equivalent diameter of approximately 24 feet. See Figure 1 for a diagram of Units 1 through 4 sampling locations and stack dimensions.

RENPP utilizes Thermo-Fisher Scientific Continuous Emissions Monitoring Systems (CEMS) to record emissions during unit operations. The following Units were audited:

Unit	Analyzer	Manufacturer / Model	Serial Number
EUTURBINE1SC	NO_x	Thermo-Fisher Sci 42IQ/LS	1182980004
EUTURBINE1SC	O_2/CO	Thermo-Fisher Sci 48IQ	1182980008
EUTURBINE2SC	NO_x	Thermo-Fisher Sci 42IQ/LS	1182980006
EUTURBINE2SC	O_2/CO	Thermo-Fisher Sci 48IQ	1182980009
EUTURBINE3SC	NO_x	Thermo-Fisher Sci 42IQ/LS	1182980007
EUTURBINE3SC	O_2/CO	Thermo-Fisher Sci 48IQ	1182980010
EUTURBINE4SC	NO_x	Thermo-Fisher Sci 42IQ/LS	1182980005
EUTURBINE4SC	O_2/CO	Thermo-Fisher Sci 48IQ	1182980011

3.0 SAMPLING AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

Emissions measurements were obtained in accordance with procedures specified in the USEPA *Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources*. The sampling and analytical methods used in the testing program are indicated in the table below

DTE

Sampling Method	Parameter	Analysis
USEPA Method 3A	Oxygen	Instrumental Analyzer Method
USEPA Method 7E	Oxides of Nitrogen	Chemiluminescent Analyzer
USEPA Method 10	Carbon Monoxide	NDIR Instrumental Analyzer Method

3.1 OXYGEN, OXIDES OF NITROGEN AND CARBON MONOXIDE (USEPA METHODS 3A, 7E AND 10)

3.1.1 Sampling Method

Oxygen (O_2) emissions were evaluated according to Performance Specification (PS) 3 "Specifications and Test Procedures for O_2 and CO_2 Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources" utilizing USEPA Method 3A, "Gas Analysis for Carbon Dioxide, Oxygen, Excess Air, and Dry Molecular Weight (Instrumental Analyzer Method)". The O_2 analyzer utilizes a paramagnetic sensor.

Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) emissions were evaluated according to Performance Specification (PS) 2 "Specifications and Test Procedures for SO_2 and NO_x Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources" utilizing USEPA Method 7E, "Determination of Nitrogen Oxides Emissions from Stationary Sources (Instrumental Analyzer Procedure)". The NO_x analyzer utilizes a Chemiluminescent detector.

Carbon monoxide (CO) emissions were evaluated following the Performance Specification (PS) 4 and 4A "Specifications and Test Procedures for Carbon Monoxide Continuous Emissions Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources" utilizing USEPA Method 10, "Determination of Carbon Monoxide Emissions from Stationary Sources". The CO analyzer utilizes a NDIR detector.

DTE

3.1.2 O_2, NO_x and CO Sampling Train

The EPA Methods 3A, 7E and 10 sampling system (Figure 2) consisted of the following components:

(1) Heated stainless steel sampling probe with heated filter.
(2) Heated Teflon™ sampling line.
(3) Universal® gas conditioner with particulate filter.
(4) Flexible unheated Teflon™ sampling line.
(5) Servomax 1400 O_2/CO_2 gas analyzer TECO 48i Chemiluminescent NO_x gas analyzer and TECO 48C NDIR CO gas analyzer.
(6) USEPA Protocol 1 calibration gases.
(7) Data Acquisition System

3.1.3 Sampling Train Calibration

The O_2 /NO_x/CO sampling trains were calibrated following the procedures outlined in USEPA Methods 3A, 7E and 10. Zero, span, and mid-range calibration gases were introduced directly into the O_2, NO_x and CO analyzers to determine the instruments linearity. A zero and mid-range span gas was then introduced through the entire sampling system to determine sampling system bias for each analyzer. Additional system calibrations were performed at the completion of each test.

3.1.4 Sampling Duration & Frequency

The RATA testing of the Units 1-4 O_2, NO_x and CO CEMS consisted of nine to twelve 21-minute samples at the test platform level of each unit's exhaust stack. Sampling was conducted at three points along a single path across the duct per performance specification 2 (PS2), Section 8.1.3.2. Sampling was performed simultaneously for O_2, NO_x and CO. Data was recorded as 1-minute averages. The results are included in Appendix A.

3.1.5 Quality Control and Assurance (O_2, NO_x and CO)

All sampling and analytical equipment was calibrated following the the guidelines referenced in Methods 3A, 7E and 10. Calibration gases were EPA Protocol 1 gases. The analyzer spans for Units 1-4 RATA testing were 0-18.21% (18.21, 10.04, and zero) for O_2, 0-27.97 ppm (27.97, 13.12, and zero) for NO_x, and 0-8.984 ppm (8.984, 5.052, and zero) for CO. The 10.04% O_2 gas was used to zero the NO_x and CO analyzers and the 13.12 ppm NO_x gas was used to zero the O_2 analyzer.

DTE

Calibration gas certification sheets are included in Appendix C.

3.1.6 Data Reduction

The NO_x and CO emission readings in parts per million, dry (ppm_{dry}) and O_2 emission readings in percent (%) were recorded at 4-second intervals and averaged to 1-minute increments. The O_2, NO_x and CO emissions were drift corrected utilizing pre and post-run calibration data. The O_2 data was used to convert the NO_x and CO ppm data to NO_x and CO ppm @15% O_2. The O_2 data was also used to convert the NO_x ppm data to pounds per million British thermal units (lb/MMBtu).

The RM data collected for the Units 1-4 testing can be found in Appendix A.

Corresponding CEMS data collected during the Units 1-4 testing can be found in Appendix B.

RA calculations are based upon calculations found in USEPA Methods 3A, 7E, 10, 19 and PS2, 3, 4 and 4A. Example calculations can be found in Appendix D.

4.0 OPERATING PARAMETERS

Each Unit was tested at full load conditions which were determined by plant personnel. Load in terms of megawatts (MW) are included with the CEMS data located in Appendix B.

5.0 RESULTS

Tables 1 through 4 present the RATA testing results from Units 1-4, respectively. The O_2, NO_x and CO monitors passed the RATA following the specifications of 40CFR60 – Performance Specification 2, 3, 4 and 4A and 40CFR75. The O_2 relative accuracy, calculated as %, met the criteria of <1.0% mean difference for the 4 units tested (EUTURBINE1SC, EUTURBINE2SC, EUTURBINE3SC and EUTURBINE4SC). The CO relative accuracy, calculated as ppm and ppm@15%O_2, met the criteria of <5 ppm mean difference for the 4 units tested (EUTURBINE1SC, EUTURBINE2SC, EUTURBINE3SC and EUTURBINE4SC). The NO_x relative

DTE

accuracy, calculated as ppm@15%O_2, met the criteria of <20% @15%O_2, and as pounds per million British Thermal units (lb/MMBtu), met the low emitter criteria of <0.015 lb/MMBtu mean difference for the 4 units tested (EUTURBINE1SC, EUTURBINE2SC, EUTURBINE3SC and EUTURBINE4SC). In addition, unit (EUTURBINE1SC) had a bias adjustment factor (BAF) = 1.070, unit (EUTURBINE2SC) has a BAF = 1.097, (EUTURBINE3SC) had a BAF = 1.082, and unit (EUTURBINE4SC) had a BAF = 1.046 per 40CFR75 criteria.

DTE

6.0 CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

"I certify that I believe the information provided in this document is true, accurate, and complete. Results of testing are based on the good faith application of sound professional judgment, using techniques, factors, or standards approved by the Local, State, or Federal Governing body, or generally accepted in the trade."

Mark D. Westerberg
Mr. Mark D. Westerberg, QSTI

This report prepared by: *Mark D. Westerberg*
Mr. Mark D. Westerberg, QSTI
Senior Specialist, Field Services Group
Environmental Management and Safety
DTE Energy Corporate Services, LLC

This report reviewed by: _____
Mr. Mark R. Grigereit, QSTI
Principal Engineer, Field Services Group
Environmental Management and Safety
DTE Energy Corporate Services, LLC

DTE

RESULTS TABLES

DTE

Table 1

Unit 1 CO, NO_x and O_2 CEMS RATA Results

RENAISSANCE POWER PLANT

August 19, 2024

Test No.	Test Times (DAHS)	CO RM (ppm)	CO CEM (ppm)	CO Difference (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 RM (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 CEM (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 Difference (ppm)	O_2 RM (% O2)	O_2 CEM (% O2)	O_2 Difference (ppm)	NO_x RM (ppm)	NO_x RM (ppm) @15%O2	NO_x CEM (ppm) @15%O2	NO_x Difference (ppm)	NO_x RM (lb/MMBtu)	NO_x CEM (lb/MMBtu)	NO_x Difference (lb/MMBtu)
1	8:56-9:17	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.4	14.1	14.0	0.1	16.2	14.1	12.9	1.2	0.052	0.048	0.004
2	9:29-9:50	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	14.2	14.0	0.2	15.8	13.9	13.0	0.9	0.051	0.048	0.003
3	10:01-10:22	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.4	14.3	14.0	0.3	15.7	14.0	13.1	0.9	0.052	0.048	0.003
4	10:34-10:55	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.4	14.3	14.0	0.3	15.7	14.0	13.1	0.9	0.052	0.048	0.003
5	11:09-11:30	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	14.3	14.0	0.3	15.7	14.0	13.1	0.9	0.052	0.048	0.003
6	11:42-12:03	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	14.4	14.0	0.4	15.6	14.2	13.1	1.0	0.052	0.048	0.004
7	12:15-12:36	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	14.4	14.0	0.4	15.6	14.2	13.1	1.0	0.052	0.048	0.004
8	12:49-13:10	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	14.4	14.0	0.4	15.7	14.3	13.2	1.0	0.052	0.049	0.004
9	13:20-13:41	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	14.3	14.0	0.3	15.7	14.0	13.2	0.8	0.052	0.049	0.003
10	13:56-14:17	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	14.3	14.0	0.3	15.7	14.0	13.3	0.8	0.052	0.049	0.003
Avg:		0.6	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.3	14.3	14.0	0.3	15.7	14.1	13.2	0.9	0.052	0.048	0.003
		Standard Deviation:		0.01	Standard Deviation:		0.02	Standard Deviation:		0.09	Standard Deviation:			0.10	Standard Deviation:		0.000
		Confidence Coefficient (CC):		0.01	Confidence Coefficient (CC):		0.01	Confidence Coefficient (CC):		0.07	Confidence Coefficient (CC):			0.08	Confidence Coefficient (CC):		0.000
		[1]RELATIVE ACCURACY:		0.3	[1]RELATIVE ACCURACY:		0.3	RELATIVE ACCURACY:		2.5	RELATIVE ACCURACY:			7.1	[2]RELATIVE ACCURACY:		7.0

0.55

Test not used in Calculation

[1] using PS4A alternate criteria of the absolute difference between the RM and CEMs plus the confidence coefficient (CC).

[2] passes on low emitter criteria - mean difference of + or - 0.015 lb/MMBtu for units emitting <0.200 lb/MMBtu

DTE

Table 2

Unit 2 CO, NO_x and O_2 CEMS RATA Results

RENAISSANCE POWER PLANT

August 20, 2024

Test No.	Test Times (DAHS)	CO RM (ppm)	CO CEM (ppm)	CO Difference (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 RM (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 CEM (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 Difference (ppm)	O_2 RM (% O2)	O_2 CEM (% O2)	O_2 Difference (ppm)	NO_x RM (ppm)	NO_x RM (ppm) @15%O2	NO_x CEM (ppm) @15%O2	NO_x Difference (ppm)	NO_x RM (lb/MMBtu)	NO_x CEM (lb/MMBtu)	NO_x Difference (lb/MMBtu)
1	8:30-8:51	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.3	13.9	13.9	0.0	16.1	13.6	12.3	1.3	0.050	0.045	0.005
2	9:00-9:21	0.7	0.6	0.1	0.6	0.5	0.1	13.9	13.9	0.0	16.1	13.6	12.3	1.3	0.050	0.045	0.005
3	9:33-9:54	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	13.9	13.9	0.0	16.1	13.6	12.3	1.3	0.050	0.045	0.005
4	10:04-10:25	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	13.9	13.9	0.0	16.1	13.6	12.3	1.2	0.050	0.045	0.005
5	10:37-10:58	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	13.9	13.9	0.0	16.2	13.7	12.4	1.3	0.050	0.046	0.005
6	11:09-11:30	0.5	0.6	-0.1	0.4	0.5	-0.1	13.9	13.9	0.0	16.3	13.7	12.5	1.3	0.051	0.046	0.005
7	11:42-12:03	0.4	0.6	-0.2	0.4	0.5	-0.2	13.9	13.9	0.0	16.5	13.9	12.7	1.2	0.051	0.047	0.005
8	12:13-12:34	0.5	0.6	-0.1	0.4	0.5	-0.1	13.9	13.9	0.0	16.5	13.9	12.7	1.2	0.051	0.047	0.005
9	12:46-13:07	0.5	0.6	-0.1	0.4	0.5	-0.1	13.9	13.9	0.0	16.6	14.0	12.8	1.2	0.052	0.047	0.004
10	13:18-13:39	0.5	0.6	-0.1	0.5	0.5	-0.1	13.9	13.9	0.0	16.5	13.9	12.8	1.1	0.051	0.047	0.004
Avg:		0.5	0.6	-0.1	0.5	0.5	-0.1	13.9	13.9	0.00	16.3	13.7	12.5	1.2	0.051	0.046	0.005
			Standard Deviation:	0.1		Standard Deviation:	0.07		Standard Deviation:	0.00			Standard Deviation:	0.0		Standard Deviation:	0.000
			Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.05		Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.05		Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.00			Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.04		Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.000
			[1]RELATIVE ACCURACY:	0.1		[1]RELATIVE ACCURACY:	0.1		RELATIVE ACCURACY:	0.0			RELATIVE ACCURACY:	9.2		[2]RELATIVE ACCURACY:	9.2

Test not used in Calculation

[1] using PS4A alternate criteria of the absolute difference between the RM and CEMs plus the confidence coefficient (CC).

[2] passes on low emitter criteria - mean difference of + or - 0.015 lb/MMBtu for units emitting <0.200 lb/MMBtu

DTE

Table 3
Unit 3 CO, NO_x and O_2 CEMS RATA Results
RENAISSANCE POWER PLANT
August 21, 2024

Test No.	Test Times (DAHS)	CO RM (ppm)	CO CEM (ppm)	CO Difference (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 RM (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 CEM (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 Difference (ppm)	O_2 RM (% O2)	O_2 CEM (% O2)	O_2 Difference (ppm)	NO_x RM (ppm)	NO_x RM (ppm) @15%O2	NO_x CEM (ppm) @15%O2	NO_x Difference (ppm)	NO_x RM (lb/MMBtu)	NO_x CEM (lb/MMBtu)	NO_x Difference (lb/MMBtu)
1	8:12-8:33	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.2	13.9	13.9	0.0	14.8	12.5	11.4	1.1	0.046	0.042	0.004
2	8:44-9:05	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.1	13.9	13.9	0.0	14.5	12.2	11.3	0.9	0.045	0.042	0.003
3	9:15-9:36	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.2	13.9	13.9	0.0	14.4	12.1	11.2	0.9	0.045	0.041	0.003
4	9:46-10:07	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.1	13.9	13.9	0.0	14.4	12.1	11.2	0.9	0.045	0.041	0.003
5	10:17-10:38	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.1	14.0	13.9	0.1	14.4	12.3	11.3	1.0	0.045	0.042	0.004
6	10:49-11:10	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.1	14.0	13.9	0.1	14.4	12.3	11.3	1.0	0.045	0.042	0.004
7	11:19-11:40	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.1	14.0	14.0	0.0	14.7	12.6	11.6	1.0	0.046	0.043	0.004
8	11:52-12:13	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	14.0	14.0	0.0	14.8	12.7	11.8	0.9	0.047	0.043	0.003
9	12:23-12:44	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	14.0	14.0	0.0	14.9	12.7	11.8	0.9	0.047	0.043	0.004
10	12:55-13:16	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.1	14.0	14.0	0.0	14.9	12.7	11.9	0.8	0.047	0.044	0.003
Avg:		0.6	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.14	14.0	13.9	0.0	14.6	12.4	11.5	0.9	0.046	0.042	0.003
			Standard Deviation:	0.0		Standard Deviation:	0.0		Standard Deviation:	0.03			Standard Deviation:	0.1		Standard Deviation:	0.000
			Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.0		Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.0		Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.03			Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.0		Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.000
			[1]RELATIVE ACCURACY:	0.2		[1]RELATIVE ACCURACY:	0.1		RELATIVE ACCURACY:	0.3			RELATIVE ACCURACY:	7.9		[2]RELATIVE ACCURACY:	7.8

Test not used in Calculation

[1] using PS4A alternate criteria of the absolute difference between the RM and CEMs plus the confidence coefficient (CC).

[2] passes on low emitter criteria - mean difference of + or - 0.015 lb/MMBtu for units emitting <0.200 lb/MMBtu

DTE

Table 4
Unit 4 CO, NO_x and O_2 CEMS RATA Results
RENAISSANCE POWER PLANT
August 22, 2024

Test No.	Test Times (DAHS)	CO RM (ppm)	CO CEM (ppm)	CO Difference (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 RM (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 CEM (ppm)	CO @15%O_2 Difference (ppm)	O_2 RM (% O2)	O_2 CEM (% O2)	O_2 Difference (ppm)	NO_x RM (ppm)	NO_x RM (ppm) @15%O2	NO_x CEM (ppm) @15%O2	NO_x Difference (ppm)	NO_x RM (lb/MMBtu)	NO_x CEM (lb/MMBtu)	NO_x Difference (lb/MMBtu)
1	8:52-9:13	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.2	13.9	14.1	-0.2	15.0	12.6	12.1	0.6	0.047	0.045	0.002
2	9:24-9:45	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	14.0	14.2	-0.2	14.7	12.6	12.0	0.6	0.046	0.044	0.002
3	9:56-10:17	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.1	14.0	14.2	-0.2	14.9	12.7	12.2	0.6	0.047	0.045	0.002
4	10:27-10:48	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.1	14.0	14.2	-0.2	15.1	12.9	12.3	0.6	0.048	0.045	0.002
5	11:07-11:28	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.1	14.0	14.2	-0.2	15.1	12.9	12.4	0.5	0.048	0.046	0.002
6	11:37-:11:58	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	14.0	14.3	-0.3	15.2	13.0	12.5	0.5	0.048	0.046	0.002
7	12:10-12:31	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.2	14.0	14.3	-0.3	15.2	13.0	12.5	0.5	0.048	0.046	0.002
8	12:41-13:02	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	14.0	14.3	-0.3	15.2	13.0	12.5	0.5	0.048	0.046	0.002
9	13:12-13:33	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.2	14.0	14.3	-0.3	15.1	12.9	12.5	0.4	0.048	0.046	0.002
10	13:45-15:06	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	14.0	14.3	-0.3	15.2	13.0	12.6	0.4	0.048	0.046	0.002
Avg:		0.5	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	14.0	14.2	-0.2	15.1	12.9	12.4	0.5	0.047	0.046	0.002
			Standard Deviation:	0.1		Standard Deviation:	0.0		Standard Deviation:	0.05			Standard Deviation:	0.1		Standard Deviation:	0.000
			Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.0		Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.0		Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.04			Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.0		Confidence Coefficient (CC):	0.000
			[1]RELATIVE ACCURACY:	0.2		[1]RELATIVE ACCURACY:	0.2		RELATIVE ACCURACY:	2.0			RELATIVE ACCURACY:	4.3		[2]RELATIVE ACCURACY:	4.4

Test not used in Calculation

[1] using PS4A alternate criteria of the absolute difference between the RM and CEMs plus the confidence coefficient (CC).

[2] passes on low emitter criteria - mean difference of + or - 0.015 lb/MMBtu for units emitting <0.200 lb/MMBtu

DTE

FIGURES

DTE

Figure 1 – Sampling Locations
EUTURBINE1SC, EUTURBINE2SC and EUTURBINE3SC – Renaissance Power, LLC
August, 2024



There are corresponding sample ports on the back side of the stack

*drawing not to scale

DTE

Figure 2 – EPA Methods 3A, 7E and 10
EUTURBINE1SC, EUTURBINE2SC and EUTURBINE3SC – Renaissance Power, LLC
August, 2024