## performed for

Holland Board of Public Works 1 Energy Park Way Holland, MI 49423 Contact: Trista Gregorski Telephone: (616) 355-1210 Cell: (231) 557-9246

e-mail: tgregorski@hollandbpw.com

### performed at

Holland Board of Public Works Holland Energy Park 1 Energy Park Way Holland, MI 49423

### performed by

Network Environmental, Inc. 2629 Remico Street, SW Suite B Grand Rapids, MI 49519 Contact: Stephan K. Byrd Telephone: (616) 530-6330 Fax: (616) 530-0001 e-mail: netenviro@aol.com

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

		<u>Page</u>
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Presentation of Results	2-9
	II.1 Table 1 – Unit 10 NO <sub>x</sub> Lbs/MMBTU Relative Accuracy Determination	2
	II.2 Table 2 - Unit 10 NO <sub>x</sub> PPM @ 15% O <sub>2</sub> Relative Accuracy Determination	3
	II.3 Table 3 – Unit 10 CO PPM @ 15% O₂ Relative Accuracy Determination	4
	II.4 Table 4 - Unit 10 %O₂ Relative Accuracy Determination	. 5
	II.5 Table 5 - Unit 11 NO <sub>x</sub> Lbs/MMBTU Relative Accuracy Determination	6
	II.6 Table 6 - Unit 11 NO <sub>x</sub> PPM @ 15% O <sub>2</sub> Relative Accuracy Determination	7
	II.7 Table 7 - Unit 11 CO PPM @ 15% O₂ Relative Accuracy Determination	8
	II.8 Table 8 - Unit 11 %O₂ Relative Accuracy Determination	9
III.	Discussion of Results	10-12
IV.	CEMS Specifications	12
٧.	Sampling and Analytical Protocol	12-14
	Figure 1 - NO <sub>x</sub> , CO & O₂ Sampling Train	15
	Appendices	
	Reference Method DAS & Calibration Data	Α
	CEM Data	В
	Analyzer Specifications & Calibration Gas Certifications	C

D

Ε

Calculations

Raw Data

### I. INTRODUCTION

Network Environmental, Inc. was retained by the Holland Board of Public Works to perform Relative Accuracy Test Audits (RATA's) on the Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems (CEMS's) that service Units 10 and 11 at the Holland Energy Park.

The CEMS on Units 10 and 11 are for oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO) and oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>).

The RATA's were performed over the period of May 9-10, 2021. Stephan K. Byrd and David D. Engelhardt of Network Environmental, Inc. conducted the RATA's in accordance with Parts 60 and 75 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The following reference test methods were employed to conduct the RATA sampling:

- Oxides of Nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) U.S. EPA Method 7E
- Carbon Monoxide (CO) U.S. EPA Method 10
- Oxygen (O₂) U.S. EPA Method 3A

Assisting with the RATA was Ms. Trista Gregorski of the Holland Board of Public Works. Mr. Trevor Drost of the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) - Air Quality Division was present to observe the sampling and source operation.

### **II. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS**

## II.1 TABLE 1 NO<sub>x</sub> RELATIVE ACCURACY DETERMINATION (LBS/MMBTU) UNIT 10 HOLLAND BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS HOLLAND, MICHIGAN MAY 9, 2023

Run #	Time -	RE	FERENCE ME	THOD	CEM .	
Null #	Tille	NO <sub>x</sub> <sup>(1)</sup>	O <sub>2</sub> <sup>(2)</sup>	Lbs/MMBTU	Lbs/MMBTU	0.000 0.000 0.000 -0.001 0.000
1	09:09-09:34	3.1	14.4	0,010	0.010	0.000
2	09:50-10:15	3.0	14.4	0.010	0.010	0.000
3	10:24-10:49	3.1	14.3	0.010	0.010	0.000
4	10:59-11:24	3.1	14.3	0.010	0.011	-0.001
5	11:33-11:58	3.1	14.3	0.010	0.010	0.000
6	12:07-12:32	3.2	14.3	0.011	0.010	0,001
7	12:40-13:05	3.2	14.3	0.010	0.010	0.000
8	13:13-13:38	3.2	14.3	0.010	0.010	0.000
9	13:47-14:12	3.1	14,3	0.010	0.010	0.000

Mean Reference Value = <u>0.01011</u>

Mean of the Differences = 0.00000

Standard Deviation = 0.00050

Confidence Co-efficient = 0.00038

Relative Accuracy = 3.80% of the mean of the reference method

Bias Adjustment = No Bias Required

Relative Accuracy Needs To Be < 10% **Or** Mean Of The Differences ≤ 0.020

- (1) = Concentration in terms of PPM by volume on a dry basis
- (2) = Concentration in terms of % by volume on a dry basis

RECEIVED

JUL 1 1 2023

# II.2 TABLE 2 NO<sub>x</sub> RELATIVE ACCURACY DETERMINATION (PPM @ 15%O<sub>2</sub>) UNIT 10 HOLLAND BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS HOLLAND, MICHIGAN MAY 9, 2023

Run #	Time	REFERENCE METHOD	CEM	
ixun π	THIIC	PPM @ 15%O <sub>2</sub>	PPM @ 15% O <sub>2</sub>	DIFF
1	09:09-09:34	2.8	2.8	0.0
2	09:50-10:15	2.7	2.7	0.0
3	10:24-10:49	2.8	2.8	0.0
4	10:59-11:24	2.8	2.8	0.0
5	11:33-11:58	2.8	2.8	0.0
6	12:07-12:32	2.9	2.8	0,1
7	12:40-13:05	2.8	2.8	0.0
8	13:13-13:38	2.8	2.8	0.0
9	13:47-14:12	2.7	2,8	-0.1

Mean Reference Value = 2.78889

Mean of the Differences = 0.00000

Standard Deviation = 0.05000

Confidence Co-efficient = 0.03843

Relative Accuracy = 1.38% of the mean of the reference method

Bias Adjustment = Not Applicable

# II.3 TABLE 3 CO RELATIVE ACCURACY DETERMINATION (PPM @ 15%O<sub>2</sub>) UNIT 10 HOLLAND BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS HOLLAND, MICHIGAN MAY 9, 2023

Run #	Time	REFERENCE METHOD	CEM	
ixali #	mac	PPM @ 15%O <sub>2</sub>	PPM @ 15% O <sub>2</sub>	DIFF
1	09:09-09:34	0,3	0.5	-0.2
2	09:50-10:15	0.3	0.4	-0.1
3	10:24-10:49	0.3	0.4	-0.1
4	10:59-11:24	0,3	0.4	-0.1
5	11:33-11:58	0.6	0.4	0.2
6	12:07-12:32	0.6	0.4	0.2
7	12:40-13:05	0.5	0.4	0,1
8	13:13-13:38	0.4	0.4	0.0
9	13:47-14:12	0.4	0.4	0.0

Mean Reference Value = <u>0.41556</u>

Mean of the Differences = 0.00444

Standard Deviation = 0.14205

Confidence Co-efficient = 0.10919

Relative Accuracy =  $\underline{2.84\%}$  of the emission limit (4.0 PPM @ 15%O<sub>2</sub>)

Bias Adjustment = Not Applicable

# II.4 TABLE 4 O<sub>2</sub> RELATIVE ACCURACY DETERMINATION (% O<sub>2</sub>) UNIT 10 HOLLAND BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS HOLLAND, MICHIGAN MAY 9, 2023

Run #	Time	REFERENCE METHOD	CEM -	
	Time	% O <sub>2</sub>	% O <sub>2</sub>	DIFF
1	09:09-09:34	14.4	14,4	0.0
2	09:50-10:15	14.4	14.4	0.0
3	10:24-10:49	14.3	14.3	0.0
4	10:59-11:24	14.3	14.3	0.0
5	11:33-11:58	14.3	14.3	0.0
6	12:07-12:32	14.3	14.3	0.0
7	12:40-13:05	14,3	14.3	0.0
8	13:13-13:38	14.3	14.3	0.0
9.	13:47-14:12	14.3	14.3	0.0

Mean Reference Value = 14.32222

Mean of the Differences = 0.00000

Standard Deviation = 0.00000

Confidence Co-efficient = 0.00000

Relative Accuracy = 0.00% of the mean of the reference method

Bias Adjustment = Not Applicable

Relative Accuracy Needs To Be < 10%  ${\bf Or}$  Mean Of The Differences  $\leq 1.0$ 

## II.5 TABLE 5 NO<sub>x</sub> RELATIVE ACCURACY DETERMINATION (LBS/MMBTU) UNIT 11 **HOLLAND BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS** HOLLAND, MICHIGAN MAY 10, 2023

Run #	Time -	RE	FERENCE ME	THOD	CEM	
rxurr#	IIIIC	NO <sub>x</sub> <sup>(1)</sup>	O <sub>2</sub> <sup>(2)</sup>	Lbs/MMBTU	Lbs/MMBTU	-0.001 -0.001 -0.001 -0.001 -0.001 -0.001
1	08:04-08:29	2.7	14.3	0.009	0.010	-0.001
2	08:39-09:04	2.8	14.3	0.009	0.010	-0.001
3	09:12-09:37	2.7	14.3	0.009	0.010	-0.001
4	09:46-10:11	2,7	14,3	0.009	0.010	-0.001
5	10:20-10:45	2.8	14.3	0.009	0.010	-0.001
6	10:54-11:19	2.7	14.3	0.009	0.010	-0.001
7	11:29-11:54	2.8	14.3	0.009	0.010	-0.001
8	12:03-12:28	2.7	14.3	0.009	0.010	-0.001
9	12:38-13:03	2.7	14.3	0.009	0.010	-0.001

Mean Reference Value = 0.00900

Mean of the Differences = -0.00100

Standard Deviation = 0.00000

Confidence Co-efficient = 0.00000

Relative Accuracy = 11.11% of the mean of the reference method

Bias Adjustment = No Bias Required

Relative Accuracy Needs To Be < 10% **Or** Mean Of The Differences ≤ 0.020

- (1) = Concentration in terms of PPM by volume on a dry basis
- (2) = Concentration in terms of % by volume on a dry basis

RECEIVED JUL 1 1 2023

# II.6 TABLE 6 NO<sub>x</sub> RELATIVE ACCURACY DETERMINATION (PPM @ 15%O<sub>2</sub>) UNIT 11 HOLLAND BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS HOLLAND, MICHIGAN MAY 10, 2023

Run #	Time	REFERENCE METHOD	CEM .	
Kuii #	Time	PPM @ 15%O <sub>2</sub>	PPM @ 15% O <sub>2</sub>	DIFF
1	08:04-08:29	2.4	2,7	-0.3
2	08:39-09:04	2.5	2.8	-0.3
3	09:12-09:37	2.5	2.8	-0.3
4	09:46-10:11	2.5	2.8	-0.3
5	10:20-10:45	2.5	2.8	-0.3
6	10:54-11:19	2.5	2.8	-0,3
7	11:29-11:54	2.5	2.8	-0.3
8	12:03-12:28	2.4	2.8	-0.4
9	12:38-13:03	2,4	2.8	-0.4

Mean Reference Value = 2.46667

Mean of the Differences = -0.32222

Standard Deviation = 0.04410

Confidence Co-efficient = 0.03390

Relative Accuracy = 14.44% of the mean of the reference method

Bias Adjustment = Not Applicable

# II.7 TABLE 7 CO RELATIVE ACCURACY DETERMINATION (PPM @ 15%O<sub>2</sub>) UNIT 11 HOLLAND BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS HOLLAND, MICHIGAN MAY 10, 2023

Run #	Time	REFERENCE METHOD	CEM	
Null #	Time	PPM @ 15%O <sub>2</sub>	PPM @ 15% O₂	DIFF
1	08:04-08:29	0.2	0.3	-0.1
2	08:39-09:04	0.3	0.3	0.0
3	09:12-09:37	0.2	0.3	-0.1
4	09:46-10:11	0.2	0.3	-0.1
5	10;20-10:45	0.2	0.3	-0,1
6	10:54-11:19	0.2	0.3	-0.1
7	11:29-11:54	0.2	0.3	-0.1
8	12:03-12:28	0.2	0.3	·-0.1
-9	12:38-13:03	0.2	0.3	-0.1

Mean Reference Value = 0.21111

Mean of the Differences = -0.08889

Standard Deviation = 0.03333

Confidence Co-efficient = 0.02562

Relative Accuracy =  $\underline{2.86\%}$  of the emission limit (4.0 PPM @ 15%O<sub>2</sub>)

Bias Adjustment = Not Applicable

# II.8 TABLE 8 O<sub>2</sub> RELATIVE ACCURACY DETERMINATION (% O<sub>2</sub>) UNIT 11 HOLLAND BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS HOLLAND, MICHIGAN MAY 10, 2023

Run #	Time	REFERENCE METHOD	CEM	
IXUII #	Hine.	% O <sub>2</sub>	% O₂	DIFF
1	08:04-08:29	14.3	14.8	-0.5
2	08:39-09:04	14.3	14.7	-0.4
3	09:12-09:37	14.3	14.7	-0.4
4	09:46-10:11	14.3	14.8	-0.5
5	10:20-10:45	14.3	14.8	-0.5
6	10:54-11:19	14.3	14.8	-0.5
7	11:29-11:54	14.3	14.8	-0.5
8	12:03-12:28	14.3	14.8	-0.5
9	12:38-13:03	14.3	14.8	-0.5

Mean Reference Value = 14.30000

Mean of the Differences = -0.47778

Standard Deviation = 0.04410

Confidence Co-efficient = 0.03390

Relative Accuracy = 3.58% of the mean of the reference method

Bias Adjustment = Not Applicable

Relative Accuracy Needs To Be < 10%  ${
m Or}$  Mean Of The Differences  $\leq 1.0$ 

### III. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

#### III.1 Unit 10

**III.1.1 NO**<sub>x</sub> **Lbs/MMBTU** - The results of the Unit 10 NO<sub>x</sub> RATA in terms of Lbs/MMBTU can be found in Table 1 (Section II.1). The relative accuracy calculations were performed in terms of Lbs/MMBTU in accordance with U.S. EPA Reference Method 19. The reference method results were corrected using Eq. 7E-5. The Lbs/MMBTU results were calculated using the formula found in Section 2.1 of Method 19 for  $O_2$  on a dry basis. The F factor used was 8,710. Nine (9) - twenty five (25) minute samples were collected from the Unit 10 exhaust.

The  $NO_x$  (Lbs/MMBTU) relative accuracy was 3.80% of the mean of the reference method. The average difference was 0.0000. There is no Bias Adjustment required for Unit 10.

**III.1.2** NO<sub>x</sub> PPM @15% O<sub>2</sub> - The results of the Unit 10 NO<sub>x</sub> RATA in terms of PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub> can be found in Table 2 (Section II.2). The relative accuracy calculations were performed in terms of PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub> (parts per million corrected to 15% oxygen). The reference method results were corrected using Eq. 7E-5. Nine (9) - twenty five (25) minute samples were collected from the Unit 10 exhaust.

The  $NO_x$  (PPM @ 15%  $O_2$ ) relative accuracy was 1.38% of the mean of the reference method.

III.1.3 CO PPM @15% O<sub>2</sub> - The results of the Unit 10 CO RATA in terms of PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub> can be found in Table 3 (Section II.3). The relative accuracy calculations were performed in terms of PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub> (parts per million corrected to 15% oxygen). The reference method results were corrected using Eq. 7E-5. Nine (9) - twenty five (25) minute samples were collected from the Unit 10 exhaust.

The CO (PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub>) relative accuracy was 2.84% of the emission limit (4.0 PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub>).

**III.1.4** %  $O_2$  - The results of the Unit 10  $O_2$  RATA in terms of %  $O_2$  can be found in Table 4 (Section II.4). The relative accuracy calculations were performed in terms of %  $O_2$ . The reference method results were corrected using Eq. 7E-5. Nine (9) - twenty five (25) minute samples were collected from the Unit 10 exhaust.

The % O<sub>2</sub> relative accuracy was 0.00% of the mean of the reference method.

#### III.2 Unit 11

**III.2.1** NO<sub>x</sub> Lbs/MMBTU - The results of the Unit 11 NO<sub>x</sub> RATA in terms of Lbs/MMBTU can be found in Table 5 (Section II.5). The relative accuracy calculations were performed in terms of Lbs/MMBTU in accordance with U.S. EPA Reference Method 19. The reference method results were corrected using Eq. 7E-5. The Lbs/MMBTU results were calculated using the formula found in Section 2.1 of Method 19 for  $O_2$  on a dry basis. The F factor used was 8,710. Nine (9) - twenty five (25) minute samples were collected from the Unit 11 exhaust.

The  $NO_x$  (Lbs/MMBTU) relative accuracy was 11.11% of the mean of the reference method. The average difference was -0.0010. There is no Bias Adjustment required for Unit 11.

**III.2.2** NO<sub>x</sub> PPM @15% O<sub>2</sub> - The results of the Unit 11 NO<sub>x</sub> RATA in terms of PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub> can be found in Table 6 (Section II.6). The relative accuracy calculations were performed in terms of PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub> (parts per million corrected to 15% oxygen). The reference method results were corrected using Eq. 7E-5. Nine (9) - twenty five (25) minute samples were collected from the Unit 11 exhaust.

The NO<sub>x</sub> (PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub>) relative accuracy was 14,44% of the mean of the reference method.

III.2.3 CO PPM @15% O<sub>2</sub> - The results of the Unit 11 CO RATA in terms of PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub> can be found in Table 7 (Section II.7). The relative accuracy calculations were performed in terms of PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub> (parts per million corrected to 15% oxygen). The reference method results were corrected using Eq. 7E-5. Nine (9) - twenty five (25) minute samples were collected from the Unit 11 exhaust.

The CO (PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub>) relative accuracy was 2.86% of the emission limit (4.0 PPM @ 15% O<sub>2</sub>).

**III.2.4** %  $O_2$  - The results of the Unit 11  $O_2$  RATA in terms of %  $O_2$  can be found in Table 8 (Section II.8). The relative accuracy calculations were performed in terms of %  $O_2$ . The reference method results were corrected using Eq. 7E-5. Nine (9) - twenty five (25) minute samples were collected from the Unit 11 exhaust.

The % O<sub>2</sub> relative accuracy was 3.58% of the mean of the reference method.

### IV. CEMS SPECIFICATIONS

Location	Parameter	Manufacturer / Model #	Serial #
Holt #10	NO <sub>x</sub> / O <sub>2</sub>	Thermo Electron Model 42i-LS	1152020016
Unit #10	CO	Thermo Electron Model 48i	JC1515901569
11n% #11	NO <sub>x</sub> , O <sub>2</sub>	Thermo Electron Model 42i-LS	1151970010
Unit #11	CO	Thermo Electron Model 48i	JC1515901575

### V. SAMPLING AND ANALYTICAL PROTOCOL

The RATA's were performed in accordance with 40 CFR Parts 60 and 75.

The sampling methods used for the reference method determinations were as follows:

**V.1 Oxides of Nitrogen -** The  $NO_x$  sampling was conducted in accordance with U.S. EPA Reference Method 7E. A Thermo Environmental Model 42H gas analyzer was used to monitor the exhausts. A heated teflon sample line was used to transport the exhaust gases to a gas conditioner to remove moisture and reduce the temperature. From the gas conditioner stack gases were passed to the analyzer. The analyzer produces instantaneous readouts of the  $NO_x$  concentrations (PPM).

The analyzer was calibrated by direct injection prior to the testing. A span gas of 25.1 PPM was used to establish the initial instrument calibration. A calibration gas of 12.2 PPM was used to determine the calibration error of the analyzer. The sampling system (from the back of the stack probe to the analyzer) was injected using the 12.2 PPM gas to determine the system bias. After each sample, a system zero and system injection of 12.2 PPM were performed to establish system drift and system

RECEIVED
JUL 1 1 2023

bias during the test period. All calibration gases were EPA Protocol 1 Certified.

The analyzer was calibrated to the output of the data acquisition system (DAS) used to collect the data from the unit. All reference method data was corrected using Equation 7E-5 from U.S. EPA Method 7E. A schematic diagram of the sampling train is shown in Figure 1.

**V.2 Carbon Monoxide** - The CO sampling was conducted in accordance with U.S. EPA Reference Method 10. A Thermo Environmental Model 48 gas analyzer was used to monitor the exhausts. A heated teflon sample line was used to transport the exhaust gases to a gas conditioner to remove moisture and reduce the temperature. From the gas conditioner stack gases were passed to the analyzer. The analyzer produces instantaneous readouts of the CO concentrations (PPM).

The analyzer was calibrated by direct injection prior to the testing. A span gas of 15.0 PPM was used to establish the initial instrument calibration. A calibration gas of 7.1 PPM was used to determine the calibration error of the analyzer. The sampling system (from the back of the stack probe to the analyzer) was injected using the 7.1 PPM gas to determine the system bias. After each sample, a system zero and system injection of 7.1 PPM were performed to establish system drift and system bias during the test period. All calibration gases were EPA Protocol 1 Certified.

The analyzer was calibrated to the output of the data acquisition system (DAS) used to collect the data from the unit. All reference method data was corrected using Equation 7E-5 from U.S. EPA Method 7E. A schematic diagram of the sampling train is shown in Figure 1.

**V.3 Oxygen -** The  $O_2$  sampling was conducted in accordance with U.S. EPA Reference Method 3A. A heated teflon sample line was used to transport the exhaust gases from the stack to a gas conditioner to remove moisture and reduce the temperature. From the gas conditioner the stack gases were passed to a Servomex Series 1400  $O_2$  analyzer. This analyzer produces instantaneous readouts of the oxygen concentrations (%).

The analyzer was calibrated by direct injection prior to the testing. A span gas of 20.85% was used to establish the initial instrument calibration. Calibration gases of 6.03% and 12.0% were used to determine the calibration error of the analyzer. The sampling system (from the back of the stack probe to the analyzer) was injected using the 12.0% gas to determine the system bias. After each

sample, a system zero and system injection of 12.0% were performed to establish system drift and system bias during the test period. All calibration gases were EPA Protocol 1 Certified.

The analyzer was calibrated to the output of the data acquisition system (DAS) used to collect the data. All reference method data was corrected using Equation 7E-1 from U.S. EPA Method 7E. A schematic diagram of the sampling train is shown in Figure 1.

This report was prepared by:

David D. Engelhardt Vice President This report was reviewed by:

Stephan K. Byrd President

Figure 1

NO<sub>x</sub>, CO & O<sub>2</sub> Sampling Train