



CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
& SCIENTISTS

Tel: 519.823.1311  
Fax: 519.823.1316

RWDI AIR Inc.  
4510 Rhodes Drive, Suite 530  
Windsor, Ontario, Canada  
N8W 5K5  
Email: [solutions@rwdi.com](mailto:solutions@rwdi.com)



**RECEIVED**

DEC 16 2016

**AIR QUALITY DIV.**

**Detroit Renewable Power**  
Detroit, Michigan

# Final Report

## 2016 Source Testing Program (Boiler 12)

RWDI # 1600272  
December 15, 2016

### SUBMITTED TO

**Ms. Wilhemina McLemore**  
District Supervisor, Detroit District  
[mclemorew@michigan.gov](mailto:mclemorew@michigan.gov)

**Michigan Department of Environmental Quality**  
Cadillac Place, 3058 West Grand Blvd, Suite 2-300  
Detroit, Michigan 48202-6058

**Ms. Karen Kajiya-Mills**  
Dept. of Environmental Quality – ADQ  
[kajiya-millsk@michigan.gov](mailto:kajiya-millsk@michigan.gov)

**Michigan Department of Environmental Quality**  
Constitution Hall, 3 North  
525 West Allegan  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7760

**Detroit Renewable Power**  
Tabetha Peebles  
Environmental Manager  
[tpeebles@detroitrenewable.com](mailto:tpeebles@detroitrenewable.com)

### SUBMITTED BY

**Brad Bergeron, A.Sc.T., d.E.T.**  
Senior Project Manager/Principal  
[Brad.Bergeron@rwdi.com](mailto:Brad.Bergeron@rwdi.com)

**Kirk Easto, d.E.T.**  
Senior Specialist  
[Kirk.Easto@rwdi.com](mailto:Kirk.Easto@rwdi.com)


**Jon Galsworthy, P.Eng, P.E.**  
Director  
[Jon.Galsworthy@rwdi.com](mailto:Jon.Galsworthy@rwdi.com)

**RWDI AIR Inc.**  
**Consulting Engineers & Scientists**  
4510 Rhodes Drive, Suite 530  
Windsor, ON  
N8W 5K5

T: (519) 974-7384, ext. 2428  
F: (519) 823-1316

This document is intended for the sole use of the party to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and/or confidential. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately.

® RWDI name and logo are registered trademarks in Canada and the United States of America



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RWDI AIR Inc. (RWDI) was retained by Detroit Renewable Power to conduct emission sampling on the exhaust of Boiler 12 (EUBOILER012) at their facility located at 5700 Russell Street, Detroit, Michigan. The test program was conducted in order to fulfill the requirements of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Title V Renewable Operating Permit (ROP) # MI-ROP-M4148-2011a dated August 19, 2011.

The Sampling Plan for this testing program was submitted August 25, 2016 to the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ). Approval for the testing program was granted by the MDEQ on September 23, 2016. The 2016 sampling program was completed from October 3 to October 18, 2016. Testing was conducted on Boiler 12 (EUBOILER012) from October 13, 2016 to October 18, 2016. A copy of the MDEQ approval letter can be found in Appendix B.

The following table represents a summary of the stack testing results and compares the testing results to the limits set out in Detroit Renewable Power's Renewable Operating Permit.


Parameter	Stack Testing Results <sup>[1]</sup>	ROP Limit <sup>[1][2]</sup>
Limits from ROP: MI-ROP-M4148-2011a	EUBOILER012	
Particulate Matter (PM)	0.004	0.010 gr/dscf
Cadmium	0.83	37 µg/dscm
Hexavalent Chromium	< 0.11	4.2 µg/dscm
Total Chromium	2.90	200 µg/dscm
Lead	0.024	0.440 mg/dscm
Mercury	1.3	80 µg/dscm
Dioxins/Furans (CDD/CDF)	0.62	30 ng/dscm
Hydrogen Chloride (HCl)	5.13	25 ppmv
Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	15	29 ppmv
Total Fluoride	< 0.091	5 ppmv
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	56	200 ppmv
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	3	65 ppmv
Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )	222	247 ppmv

**Notes:**

[1] Concentration values are expressed at 101.3 kPa, 68 °F, and 7% oxygen

[2] Refer to Appendix A for Renewable Operating Permit: MI-ROP-M4148-2011a

The results of the testing indicate that all parameters are in compliance with respect to the ROP limits. A summary of all testing results can be found in the Tables section of the report with detailed sampling results in the Appendices.



CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
& SCIENTISTS

## 1. INTRODUCTION

---

RWDI AIR Inc. (RWDI) was retained by Detroit Renewable Power to conduct emission sampling on the exhaust of Boiler 12 (EUBOILER012) at their facility located at 5700 Russell Street, Detroit, Michigan. The test program was conducted in order to fulfill the requirements of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Title V Renewable Operating Permit (ROP) # MI-ROP-M4148-2011a dated August 19, 2011.

The Sampling Plan for this testing program was submitted August 25, 2016 to the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Approval for the testing program was granted by the MDEQ on September 23, 2016. The 2016 sampling program was completed from October 3 to October 18, 2016. Testing was conducted on Boiler 12 (EUBOILER012) from October 13, 2016 to October 18, 2016. A copy of the MDEQ approval letter can be found in Appendix B.

This stack testing study consisted of the following parameters:

- Total particulate matter (TPM);
- Velocity, flow rate and temperature;
- Metals;
- Dioxins and furans (PCDDs and PCDFs);
- Total Fluoride;
- Hexavalent Chromium;
- Hydrogen chloride (HCl);
- Nitrogen oxides (NOX);
- Sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>);
- Oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>);
- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>);
- Carbon monoxide (CO); and
- Total Hydrocarbons (THC).



CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
& SCIENTISTS

## 2. SOURCE DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 Facility Description

Detroit Renewable Power is a refuse-derived fuel (RDF) plant that began commercial operation in October 1991. The facility is permitted to receive up to 20,000 tons of municipal solid waste (MSW) per week. The MSW is processed into RDF, which is then combusted in the furnaces, producing a maximum 362,800 pounds of steam per hour per unit. The steam is used to generate up to 68 megawatts of electricity and supply export steam at a rate of up to 550,000 pounds per hour. The energy products are sold to DTE Corporation and Detroit Thermal.


### 2.2 Process Description


Detroit Renewable Power is located in Detroit, Michigan. The facility consists of three (3) identical Combustion Engineering (VU40) refuse derived fuel (RDF) fired boilers or municipal waste combustors (MWC). Normal operation of the facility consists of two (2) boilers on-line with one boiler in stand-by mode.

Refuse is prepared and purged of non-processible and non-combustible materials through a series of conveyors and shredders. Waste is then combusted in furnaces at temperatures exceeding 1,800 degrees Fahrenheit and reduced to an inert ash residue.

Flue gases pass through each MWC unit pollution control system before exhausting through a separate flue stack in a common stack. The air pollution equipment for each independent train includes lime injection dry flue gas scrubbers for controlling acid gases and fabric filter baghouses for particulate removal. Each unit is also equipped with a continuous emission monitoring system to demonstrate compliance and to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the air pollution control (APC) equipment.

Figure 2.1: Process Flow Diagram





CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
 & SCIENTISTS


### 3. SAMPLING LOCATION

#### 3.1 Compliance Source Sample Location Description

The outlet sampling locations for each stack are identical for EUBOILERS011, 012 and 013. Each stack had an inside diameter of 92 inches. Each flue had two sampling ports, 90 degrees apart and 4 inches in diameter. The sampling ports were located 9 duct diameters upstream from the ID fan and 19.8 duct diameters downstream before the stack outlet.


Table 3.1: Summary of Sampling Program – EUBOILERS012

Boiler 12-(EUBOILER012)	
<b>Emission Unit Description</b> (Including Process Equipment & Control Device(s))	EUBOILERS011, 012 & 013 consisted of three (3) identical Refused Derived Fuel (RDF) fired spreader-stoker boilers rated at 520 MMBTU/hr heat input, 390,000 lb/hr steam at 900 psig and 825°F. The units operated an electric generator with a nameplate capacity of 68 MWe to convert unsold steam into power for internal consumption and for sale to the grid. Air emissions were controlled using a lime slurry injection from the top of each unit followed by a baghouse fabric filter system.
<b>Parameter Tested</b>	Particulate matter, hydrogen chloride, mercury, lead, cadmium, total chromium, hexavalent chromium, dioxins/furans, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, oxygen, total fluorides, nitrogen oxides, opacity, in addition to stack gas velocity, stack gas composition, and moisture.
<b>Operating Conditions / Stack Dimensions</b>	320°F / 92 inches
<b>Testing Monitoring Methods</b>	Refer to Section 4.0
<b>Testing Schedule</b>	Refer to Table 2 of the Tables Section




CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
& SCIENTISTS

**Figure 3.1a:** Diagram of Flow Disturbance Distance and Stack Diameters for EUBOILERS011, 012, and 013



**Figure 3.1b:** Photo of Stack Exit Point for EUBOILERS011, 012 and 013





CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
& SCIENTISTS

## 4. SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

---

The following section provides an overview of the sampling methodologies used in this program. Table 1, located in the **Tables** section, summarizes the testing parameters and corresponding methodologies.

### 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 2. Temperature measurements were made simultaneously with the velocity measurements and were 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 through direct condensation and according to US EPA Method 4, "Determination of Moisture Content of Stack Gas".

### 4.2 Sampling for Total Particulate Matter (TPM) and Metals


Sampling for TPM in the exhaust stacks was performed in accordance with US EPA Method 5, "Sampling of Total Particulate Matter from Stationary Sources". Sampling was conducted using an Environmental Supply C-5000 Source Sampling System. Triplicate sampling runs were conducted for each stack. Particulate matter concentrations and emission rates were determined utilizing EPA Method 5. Mercury, Lead, Chromium, and Cadmium concentrations and emission rates were determined utilizing Method 29. Particulate and metals were sampled using combined trains as follows:

The combined sample train consisted of a glass nozzle, a heated glass probe, a heated tared quartz filter, two chilled impingers each with 100 mL of 5% HNO<sub>3</sub>/10% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, an empty impinger, two chilled impingers each with 100 mL of 4% KMnO<sub>4</sub>/10% H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, an impinger with 200 grams of silica gel, and a dry gas metering console. The temperature of the filter was monitored and controlled to 248 + 250F.

At the end of each test run, the nozzle, probe, and filter front half were first rinsed and brushed with acetone into a sample jar. The nozzle, probe, and filter front half were then rinsed with 100 mL of 0.1 N nitric acid into a second sample jar. The filter was then recovered into the original labeled petri dish.

The contents of the 5% HNO<sub>3</sub>/10% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> impinger were poured back into the original reagent jar. Any condensate in the empty impinger was poured into a sample jar. The 4% KMnO<sub>4</sub>/10% H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> impingers were then recovered into another sample jar.

The moisture catch was then determined gravimetrically. The filter back half and 5% HNO<sub>3</sub>/10% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> impingers were rinsed with 100 mL of 0.1 N nitric acid into a sample jar.



CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
& SCIENTISTS

Detroit Renewable Power  
FINAL - 2016 Source Testing Program (Boiler 12)  
RWDI#1600272  
December 15, 2016

The empty impinger was rinsed with 100 mL of 0.1 nitric acid into a sample jar. The 4%  $\text{KMnO}_4$ /10%  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  impingers were then rinsed with 100 mL 4%  $\text{KMnO}_4$ /10%  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  and 100 mL of DI water into the jar containing the 4%  $\text{KMnO}_4$ /10%  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  reagent. The 4%  $\text{KMnO}_4$ /10%  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  impingers and connecting glassware were rinsed with 25 mL of 8 N HCl if any brown residue remained. This HCl rinse was added to a jar containing 200 mL of DI water.

Samples were then packaged for transport to Maxxam Analytical Services in Mississauga, Ontario for analysis.

### 4.3 Sampling for Total Fluorides and Hexavalent Chromium

Total fluorides as hydrogen fluoride and hexavalent chromium concentrations and emission rates were determined utilizing a combined EPA Method 13B and CARB Method 425 sampling train. The sampling train consisted of a glass nozzle, a heated glass probe, a heated filter (with stainless steel frit), and two chilled impingers each with 100mL of 0.5N NaOH, an empty impinger, an impinger with 200 grams of silica gel, and a dry gas metering console. The equipment was operated in accordance with EPA Method 13B and CARB Method 425.

At the end of each test run, the contents of the first three impingers were collected into a sample jar. The moisture catch was then determined gravimetrically. The nozzle, probe, filter holder, impingers, and connecting glassware were rinsed with DI into the sample jar. The filter was placed into the sample jar.

The samples were analyzed in accordance with EPA Method 13B for total fluorides as hydrogen fluoride. The samples were analyzed in accordance with CARB Method 425 for hexavalent chromium.


Samples were packaged for transport to Element One, Inc. in Wilmington, North Carolina for analysis.

### 4.4 Sampling for Dioxins (PCDD) and Furans (PCDF)

The concentrations and emissions rates of polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins/polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/PCDF) or dioxins/furans) were determined utilizing EPA Method 23. The EPA Method 23 sampling train consisted of a glass nozzle, a heated glass probe, a heated glass filter, a condenser, and XAD resin trap, an empty impinger, two chilled impingers each with 100mL of DI water, an empty impinger, an impinger with 200 grams of silica gel, and a dry gas metering console.

Methylene Chloride was not used for recovery, as per approval from MDEQ. At the end of each test run, the nozzle, probe and filter front half were rinsed with acetone into a sample jar. The filter was recovered dry into a glass petri dish. The filter backhalf, and condenser were rinsed with acetone into a sample jar. All of the components listed above up to the XAD resin trap were then rinsed again with toluene into a sample jar. The XAD resin trap was sealed and placed into a chilled ice chest. The contents of the first three impingers were poured back into the original reagent jar. The silica gel was poured back into its original container.





CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
& SCIENTISTS

Detroit Renewable Power  
FINAL - 2016 Source Testing Program (Boiler 12)  
RWDI#1600272  
December 15, 2016

Page 7

The moisture catch was then determined gravimetrically. The samples were analyzed in accordance with EPA Method 23 for dioxins/furans.

Samples were then packaged for transport to Maxxam Analytical Services in Mississauga, Ontario for analysis.

#### **4.5 Sampling for Hydrogen Chloride**

Hydrogen chloride concentrations and emission rates were determined utilizing EPA Method 26 modified to use large impingers. The EPA Method 26 sampling train consisted of a heated glass probe, a heated quartz filter, and two chilled impingers each with 100mL of 0.1N H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, one empty impinger, an impinger with 200 grams of silica gel, and a dry gas metering console.

At the end of each test run, the contents of the impingers were poured into a sample jar. The silica gel was returned to its original container. The moisture catch in the train components was then determined gravimetrically. The filter backhalf and H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> impingers were rinsed with DI water into the H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> reagent jar.

The H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> portion of the sample was analyzed in accordance with EPA Method 26 for hydrogen chloride.

Samples were then packaged for transport to Maxxam Analytical Services in Mississauga, Ontario for analysis.

#### **4.6 Sampling for Total Hydrocarbons (as Methane)**

Testing for THC (as methane) was accomplished using continuous emission monitors (CEM). The exhaust gas sample was drawn from a single point at the center of the stack using a stainless steel probe. The sample then proceeded to a heated filter, where particulate matter was removed, and then transferred via a heated Teflon line that was heated to 320°F to prevent any condensation. The stack gas was routed through a manifold system and introduced to the CEM's for measurement.

Prior to testing, sample system bias checks and instrument linearity checks (calibration error) were conducted. In addition, the analyzers were calibrated (zeroed and span checked) at the completion of each run. Data acquisition was provided using a data logger system that generates one minute averages concentrations.



CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
& SCIENTISTS

#### **4.7 Sampling for Gases (O<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub>)**

RWDI operated continuous emission monitors in accordance with the applicable US EPA reference method. Prior to testing, a 3-point analyzer calibration error check was conducted using US EPA protocol gases. The calibration error check was performed by introducing zero, mid and high level calibration gases directly into the analyzer. The calibration error check was performed to confirm that the analyzer response was within  $\pm 2\%$  of the certified calibration gas introduced. Prior to each test run, a system-bias test was performed where known concentrations of calibration gases were introduced at the probe tip to measure if the analyzers response was within  $\pm 5\%$  of the introduced calibration gas concentrations. At the conclusion of each test run a system-bias check was performed to evaluate the percent drift from pre and post-test system bias checks. The system bias checks confirmed that the analyzer did not drift greater than  $\pm 3\%$  throughout a test run.

Data acquisition was provided using a data logger system programmed to collect and record data at one second intervals. Average one minute concentrations were calculated from the one second measurements.

RWDI recorded data is presented in the tables section and appendices. For comparison with the facilities permit the DRP CEM's data was used.


#### **4.8 Sampling for Opacity**

Opacity (visible emissions) data will be collected by the facility Continuous Opacity Monitors (COMs) in lieu of Method 9 observations.

#### **4.9 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 the laboratories. Table 2 presents a sample log and summarizes the sampling times, sample ID's, filter ID's, and XAD trap ID's.

Stationary Source Audit Samples (SSAS) were provided from ERA and sent to Maxxam Analytics for analysis. The results of SSAS program showed all results were acceptable. The Final report of the SSAS program is provided in Appendix K.



CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
 & SCIENTISTS

Quality control procedures specific to the CEM monitoring 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 (zero) air 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.

Leak checks were performed on the Method 5 sampling train by plugging the sample inlet and pulling a representative vacuum. This check was done before and after each test. Similar leak check procedures for pitot tube and pressure lines were also conducted. 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. Leak checks for each test were documented on the field data sheets presented in the applicable appendices for each sample parameter.

## 5. RESULTS

The average emission results for this study are presented in the **Tables** section of this report. Table 2 presents a summary of test dates and times. A minimum of three (3) tests on the stack was performed for all of the parameters tested in the study. Detailed information regarding each test run can be found in the corresponding Appendix. Below is a summary of the applicable Table and Appendix ID with corresponding test parameter.

Parameter	Table	Appendix
Stack Gas Characteristics	3	C/D/E
Total Particulate Matter and Selected Metals	4	C
Dioxins and Furans	5	D
Total Fluoride and Hexavalent Chromium	6	E
Hydrogen chloride	7	F
Opacity	8	G
Continuous Emission Monitoring	9/10	H
ROP Limit Comparison	11	-

All calibration information for the equipment used for this study is included in Appendix J. All laboratory results are included in Appendix K.



CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
& SCIENTISTS

## 5.1 Discussion of Results

Results for Boiler 12 indicated that all parameters are in compliance with respect to the ROP limits.

When the laboratory reported values less than their method detection limit for a specific component, the respective concentration and emission rates were calculated using this method detection limit. This method is a conservative approach when calculating the emissions.

Table 11 shows a comparison of the sampling results to the incinerator performance limits defined in the ROP.

## 6. OPERATING CONDITIONS

---

Operating conditions during the sampling were monitored by Detroit Renewable Power personnel. All equipment was operated under normal maximum operating conditions.

Radio contact was kept between the process operators and the sampling team. A member of the RWDI sampling team contacted the operator before each test, to ensure that the process was at normal operating conditions. Appendix L contains the process information supplied by Detroit Renewable Power.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

---

Testing was successfully completed on October 13 through 18, 2015 on Boiler 12. All sources were tested in accordance with referenced methodologies following the MDEQ approved Sampling Plan submitted August 25, 2016.

**Table 1: Summary of Sampling Parameters and Methodology**

Source Location	No. of Tests per Stack	Sampling Parameter	Sampling Method
Boiler 12	9	Velocity, Temperature and Flow Rate	U.S. EPA <sup>[1]</sup> Methods 1-4
	3	Total Particulate Matter	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 5
	3	Metals	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 29
	3	4-8 PCDD/PCDF	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 23
	3	Fluoride	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 13B
	3	CR <sup>+6</sup> Hexavalent Chromium	CARB <sup>[1]</sup> Method 425
	3	Hydrogen Chloride	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 26
	3	Sulphur Dioxide	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 6C (CEM)
	3	Total Oxides of Nitrogen	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 7E (CEM)
	3	Oxygen	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 3A (CEM)
	3	Carbon Dioxide	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 3A (CEM)
	3	Carbon Monoxide	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 10 (CEM)
	3	Total Hydrocarbons (THC)	U.S. EPA <sup>[2]</sup> Method 25A (CEM)

**Notes:**

[1] CARB- California Environmental Protection Agency

[2] U.S. EPA - United States Environmental Protection Agency

**Table 2: Sampling Summary and Sample Log  
Boiler #12**

Source and Test #	Sampling Date	Start Time	End Time	Filter ID / Trap ID	Lab Sample ID
<b>Velocity / Total Particulate / Metals</b>					
Blank	13-Oct-16	-	-		DHW297
Test #1	13-Oct-16	3:01 PM	5:06 PM	16092011	DHW298
Test #2	14-Oct-16	7:40 AM	9:50 AM	16092012	DHW299
Test #3	14-Oct-16	10:01 AM	12:05 PM	16082406	DHW300
<b>Velocity / Dioxins and Furans</b>					
Blank	17-Oct-16	-	-		DHW890
Test #1	17-Oct-16	8:16 AM	2:52 PM	Maxxam #6	DHW891
Test #2	18-Oct-16	7:49 AM	12:07 PM	Maxxam #7	DHW892
Test #3	18-Oct-16	12:08 PM	4:36 PM	Maxxam #2	DHW893
<b>Velocity/ Fluoride/ Hexavalent Chromium</b>					
Blank	17-Oct-16	-	-	N/A	e28424-8
Test #1	17-Oct-16	11:21 AM	1:52 PM	N/A	e28424-5
Test #2	17-Oct-16	3:20 PM	5:29 PM	N/A	e28424-6
Test #3	18-Oct-16	8:30 AM	11:00 AM	N/A	e28424-7
<b>Hydrogen Chloride</b>					
Blank	17-Oct-16	-	-	N/A	DHW500
Test #1	17-Oct-16	2:22 PM	3:22 PM	N/A	DHW501
Test #2	17-Oct-16	3:52 PM	4:52 PM	N/A	DHW502
Test #3	17-Oct-16	4:55 PM	5:55 PM	N/A	DHW503

**Table 3: Sampling Summary - Flow Characteristics**  
**Boiler #12**

Stack Gas Parameter	Testing Date	Test No. 1			Test No. 2			Test No. 3			TOTAL AVERAGE
		SVOC <sup>[1]</sup>	TPM <sup>[2]</sup>	Fluoride, CR <sup>[3]</sup>	SVOC <sup>[1]</sup>	TPM <sup>[2]</sup>	Fluoride, CR <sup>[3]</sup>	SVOC <sup>[1]</sup>	TPM <sup>[2]</sup>	Fluoride, CR <sup>[3]</sup>	
Stack Temperature	°F	17-Oct-16	13-Oct-16	17-Oct-16	18-Oct-16	14-Oct-16	17-Oct-16	18-Oct-16	14-Oct-16	18-Oct-16	-
	°C	324	320	325	322	313	324	329	314	322	321
Moisture	%	162	160	163	161	156	162	165	157	161	161
Velocity	ft/s	17.4%	15.9%	18.8%	17.3%	17.8%	17.0%	17.7%	16.2%	18.8%	17.4%
	m/s	130.05	133.45	128.05	122.05	121.48	126.60	126.07	127.87	122.85	126.50
Actual Flow Rate	CFM	39.64	40.67	39.03	37.20	37.03	38.59	38.42	38.97	37.44	38.55
	m <sup>3</sup> /s	360,227	369,628	354,679	338,048	336,484	350,669	349,182	354,168	340,270	350,373
Referenced Flow Rate <sup>[3]</sup>	CFM	198,022	211,058	191,573	186,110	190,469	193,943	189,688	204,004	184,124	194,332
	m <sup>3</sup> /s	93.43	99.58	90.34	87.81	89.87	91.51	89.50	96.26	86.88	91.69
Sampling Isokinetic Rate	%	104	102	103	103	103	103	101	103	103	103

**Notes:**

[1] SVOC = Sampling for Dioxins, and Furans

[2] TPM = Sampling for total particulate matter and metals

[3] Referenced flow rate expressed as dry at 101.3 kPa, 68 °F, and Actual Oxygen

Detailed sampling results including individual test results can be found in Appendix C and D

**Table 4: Total Particulate Matter and Metals – Averaged Results**

Boiler #12	Concentration Actual O <sub>2</sub>	@	Concentration @ 7% O <sub>2</sub>	Emission Rate
<b>Particulate</b>	<b>(gr/dscf)</b>		<b>(gr/dscf)</b>	<b>(lbs/hr)</b>
Total Particulate Matter	0.003		0.004	4.6
<b>Metals</b>	<b>(ug/m<sup>3</sup>)</b>		<b>(ug/m<sup>3</sup>)</b>	<b>(mg/sec)</b>
Total Cadmium (Cd)	0.62		0.83	0.0590
Total Chromium (Cr)	2.20		2.90	0.210
Total Lead (Pb)	18.0		24.0	1.70
<b>Metals</b>	<b>(ug/m<sup>3</sup>)</b>		<b>(ug/m<sup>3</sup>)</b>	<b>(mg/sec)</b>
Total Mercury (Hg)	< 1.0		1.3	0.10

**Notes:**

[1] Sampling followed U.S. EPA Method 5 (TPM) and U.S. EPA Method 29 (Metals)

[2] All referenced concentration values are expressed as dry at 101.3 kPa, 68 °F, and 7% Oxygen

[3] When laboratory analysis was below the reportable detection limit, this detection limit was used to calculate the concentration and emission rate

Detailed sampling results including individual test results can be found in Appendix C



**Table 5: Dioxins and Furans - Average Results**

Boiler #12	Concentration @ Actual O <sub>2</sub>	Concentration @ 7% O <sub>2</sub>	Emission Rate
Parameter	(pg/m <sup>3</sup> )	(ng/m <sup>3</sup> )	(ng/s)
2,3,7,8-Tetra CDD *	2.4	0.00	0.2
1,2,3,7,8-Penta CDD *	8.6	0.01	0.8
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexa CDD *	10.4	0.01	0.9
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexa CDD *	37.0	0.05	3.4
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexa CDD *	27.0	0.03	2.4
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Hepta CDD *	130.0	0.16	12.0
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-Octa CDD *	130.0	0.16	12.0
2,3,7,8-Tetra CDF **	11.0	0.01	1.0
1,2,3,7,8-Penta CDF **	16.0	0.02	1.4
2,3,4,7,8-Penta CDF **	26.0	0.03	2.3
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexa CDF **	31.0	0.04	2.8
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexa CDF **	0.0	0.00	0.0
2,3,4,6,7,8-Hexa CDF **	16.0	0.02	1.5
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexa CDF **	0.0	0.00	0.0
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Hepta CDF **	43.0	0.05	3.9
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-Hepta CDF **	4.2	0.01	0.4
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-Octa CDF **	0.0	0.00	0.0
<b>Total =</b>		<b>0.62</b>	

**Notes:**

[1] Sampling followed U.S. EPA Method 23; average of three tests

[2] Concentration values are expressed at 101.3 kPa, 68 °F, and at 7 % oxygen

\*CDD = chlorodibenzo-p-dioxin

\*\*CDF = chlorodibenzo-p-furan

Detailed sampling results including individual test results can be found in Appendix D

**Table 5: Dioxins and Furans - Average Results**

Boiler #12	Concentration @ Actual O <sub>2</sub>	Concentration @ 7% O <sub>2</sub>	Emission Rate	TEF <sup>[3]</sup> (WHO <sup>[4]</sup> 2005)	Toxicity Equivalent (TEQ)
Parameter	(pg/m <sup>3</sup> )	(ng/m <sup>3</sup> )	(ng/s)	TEF	(pg TEQ/m <sup>3</sup> )
2,3,7,8-Tetra CDD *	2.4	0.00	0.2	1.00	3.0
1,2,3,7,8-Penta CDD *	8.6	0.01	0.8	1.00	10.8
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexa CDD *	10.4	0.01	0.9	0.100	1.3
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexa CDD *	37.0	0.05	3.4	0.100	4.7
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexa CDD *	27.0	0.03	2.4	0.100	3.4
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Hepta CDD *	130.0	0.16	12.0	0.0100	1.6
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-Octa CDD *	130.0	0.16	12.0	0.000300	0.0
2,3,7,8-Tetra CDF **	11.0	0.01	1.0	0.100	1.4
1,2,3,7,8-Penta CDF **	16.0	0.02	1.4	0.0300	0.6
2,3,4,7,8-Penta CDF **	26.0	0.03	2.3	0.300	9.7
1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexa CDF **	31.0	0.04	2.8	0.100	3.9
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexa CDF **	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.100	0.0
2,3,4,6,7,8-Hexa CDF **	16.0	0.02	1.5	0.100	2.0
1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexa CDF **	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.100	0.0
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Hepta CDF **	43.0	0.05	3.9	0.0100	0.5
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-Hepta CDF **	4.2	0.01	0.4	0.0100	0.1
1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9-Octa CDF **	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.000300	0.0
<b>Total =</b>		<b>0.62</b>			

**Notes:**

[1] Sampling followed U.S. EPA Method 23; average of three tests

[2] Concentration values are expressed at 101.3 kPa, 68 °F, and at 7 % oxygen

[3] TEF= Toxic Equivalency Factor, TEQ= Toxic Equivalency Quotient

[4] WHO (2005): The 2005 World Health Organization, Human and Mammalian Toxic Equivalency Factors for Dioxins and Dioxin-like Compounds

\*CDD = chlorodibenzo-p-dioxin

\*\*CDF = chlorodibenzo-p-furan

Detailed sampling results including individual test results can be found in Appendix D

**Table 6: Total Fluoride and Hexavalent Chromium - Average Results**

Boiler #12	Concentration Actual O <sub>2</sub>	Concentration @ 7% O <sub>2</sub>	Concentration @ 7% O <sub>2</sub>	Emission Rate
Parameter	(ug/m3)	(ug/m3)	(ppm)	(mg/s)
Hexavalent Chromium	< 0.09	< 0.11	-	< 0.008
Total Fluoride	< 57	< 72	< 0.091	< 5.1

**Notes:**

[1] Sampling followed U.S. EPA Method 13B and CARB Method 425 ; average of three tests

[2] Concentration values are expressed at 101.3 kPa, 68 °F, and at 7 % oxygen

Detailed sampling results including individual test results can be found in Appendix E

**Table 7: Hydrogen Chloride - Average Results**

Boiler #12	Concentration Actual O <sub>2</sub>	Concentration @ 7% O <sub>2</sub>	Concentration @ 7% O <sub>2</sub>	Emission Rate
Parameter	(mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	(mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	(ppm)	(mg/s)
Hydrogen Chloride	3.96	5.13	3.38	360

**Notes:**

[1] Sampling followed U.S. EPA Method 26 (non-isokinetic); average of three tests

[2] Concentration values are expressed at 101.3 kPa, 68 °F, and at 7 % oxygen

[3] Emissions rate calculated based on average volumetric flow rate of all isokinetic tests

Detailed sampling results including individual test results can be found in Appendix E

**Table 8: Opacity- Averaged Results**

Boiler 11	Opacity				Average Opacity
	13-Oct-16	14-Oct-16	17-Oct-16	18-Oct-16	
Parameter	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Opacity	1	1	2	1	1

**Notes:**

[1] Values from Detroit Renewable Power Opacity Meter

[2] Concentration values are expressed at 101.3 kPa, 68 °F, and at 7 % oxygen

Detailed sampling results including individual test results can be found in Appendix G

**Table 9 - RWDI CEM - Averaged Results**

Boiler #12	Average Test Concentration				Emission Rate	
	Reference Conditions --> Units -->	68°F and actual O <sub>2</sub> (ppm)	68°F and actual O <sub>2</sub> (mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	68°F and 7% O <sub>2</sub> (ppm)		68°F and 7% O <sub>2</sub> (mg/m <sup>3</sup> )
Nitrogen Oxides, expressed as NO <sub>2</sub> (NO <sub>x</sub> )		153	288	200	377	26.41
Sulphur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )		10.6	28	14	36	2.54
Total Hydrocarbons (expressed as Methane)		2.6	1.7	3	2.2	0.16
Carbon Monoxide (CO)		41.4	47	54	62	4.35
		%				
Oxygen (O <sub>2</sub> )		10.3	-		-	-
Carbon Dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> )		9.5	-		-	-

**Notes:**

[1] Sampling followed U.S. EPA Method 3 (O<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>), Method 10 (CO), Method 6C (SO<sub>2</sub>), Method 7E (Nox), and Method 25A (THC)

[2] All referenced concentration values are expressed at 101.3kPa, 68°F

[3] Average of three tests

[4] Emissions rate calculated based on average volumetric flow rate of all isokinetic tests

[6] Corrected O<sub>2</sub> to 7% equation  $a*((21-7)/(21-b))$  a = concentration @ original O<sub>2</sub> b = original O<sub>2</sub>%

Detailed sampling results including individual test results can be found in Appendix G

**Table 10: 24 Hour Averaged CEM Data**

<b>Boiler 11</b>	<b>13-Oct-16</b>	<b>14-Oct-16</b>	<b>17-Oct-16</b>	<b>18-Oct-16</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>Parameter</b>	<b>(ppm)</b>	<b>(ppm)</b>	<b>(ppm)</b>	<b>(ppm)</b>	<b>(ppm)</b>
Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )	224.4	226.3	235	201	221.7
Sulphur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	10.9	17.8	11	21	15.2
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	60.8	60.3	47.0	55.0	55.80

**Notes:**

[1] Data from Detroit Renewable Power Continuous Emissions Monitors

[2] Concentration values are expressed at 101.3 kPa, 68 °F, and at 7 % oxygen

Detailed sampling results including individual test results can be found in Appendix H

**Table 11: ROP Limit Comparisons**

Parameter	Stack Testing Results [1]	ROP Limit [2]
<b>Limits from ROP: MI-ROP-M4148-2011a</b>	<b>EUBOILER012</b>	
Particulate Matter (PM)	0.004	0.010 gr/dscf
Cadmium	0.83	37 µg/dscm
Hexavalent Chromium	< 0.11	4.2 µg/dscm
Total Chromium	2.90	200 µg/dscm
Lead	0.024	0.440 mg/dscm
Mercury	1.3	80 µg/dscm
Dioxins/Furans (CDD/CDF)	0.62	30 ng/dscm
Hydrogen Chloride (HCl)	5.13	25 ppmv
Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )- 24 hour average	15	29 ppmv
Total Fluoride	< 0.091	5 ppmv
Carbon Monoxide (CO)- 24 hour average	56	200 ppmv
Volatil Organic Compoundsd (VOC)	3	65 ppmv
Nitrogen Oxides (Nox) <sup>[2]</sup>	222	247 ppmv

**Notes:**

[1] Concentration values are expressed at 101.3 kPa, 68 °F, and 7% oxygen

[2] Refer to Appendix A for Renewable Operating Permit: MI-ROP-M4148-2011a

**RECEIVED**  
 DEC 16 2016  
 AIR QUALITY DIV.