DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
ACTIVITY REPORT: On-site Inspection

B147772744

FACILITY: Holcim (US) Inc. DBA Lafarge Alpena Plant		**SRN / ID:** B1477
LOCATION: 1435 Ford Avenue, ALPENA		**DISTRICT:** Cadillac
CITY: ALPENA		**COUNTY:** ALPENA
CONTACT: Mallory Miller ,		**ACTIVITY DATE:** 07/19/2024
STAFF: David Bowman	**COMPLIANCE STATUS:** Compliance	**SOURCE CLASS:** MAJOR
SUBJECT: Records review and compliance with D/F testing requirements.		
RESOLVED COMPLAINTS:		

On 19 July 2024 I, David Bowman MI EGLE AQD, conducted an onsite records review of FG MACT KILNS (kiln 19,20, 21, 22 and 23) bag house (BH) inlet temperature records that relate to the monitoring of D/F emissions for B1477 Holcim (US) located in Alpena MI. BH inlet temperature is tested and used for compliance with the D/F emission limits at a minimum of every 30 months from the previous testing date. The testing establishes the maximum operating temperature, and the requirement is to stay below that temperature.

When the NOC was submitted the BH inlet temperature had at times been above the temperature that had been established at the most recent testing conducted 9 to 16 April 2024. This would have indicated that Holcim was in violation of the BH inlet temperature. The argument was that until the NOC was submitted that the previous test results were in effect.

In most cases the results of emissions testing is effective the date of the test. This special case that is different due to the interpretation of 40 CFR Part 63 Subpart LLL Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry: National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP), commonly referred to as the PC MACT (maximum achievable control technology).

When the results were initially submitted AQD Staff believed that the results of the testing were effective from date of the test. Holcim's position was that the results were not effective until the NOC was submitted. They argued that 40 CFR 63.1348(a) supported their conclusion. AQD Staff's counter argument was the 40 CFR 63.1348 (a) was for initial testing purposes and that 40 CFR 63.134 8(b) was for continuous monitoring and that was the type of testing they were conducting. Therefore the test results would be effective from date of the test.

I sent the question to the US EPA for clarification. The response from US EPA was that since 40 CFR 63.1348(b) did not have specific language written to determine the date of compliance with the testing that they referred to 40 CFR 1348(a) language. They said that the language in 40 CFR 1348(a) was not specific and referenced 40 CFR Part 63 Subpart EEE NESHAP for Hazardous Waste Combustors as having specific language that the NOC was the starting date for compliance with the test results. 40 CFR Part 63 subpart LLL does reference 40 CFR Part 63 Subpart EEE since many kilns do burn hazardous waste, though Holcim does not burn hazardous waste. US EPA agreed with AQD Staff that 40 CFR Part 63.1348(b) was the correct part of the regulation for determining compliance, but since the language was not specific they utilized the language from the other previously discussed regulations to determine that compliance with the test results begins with the NOC submission.

There is a special condition in the ROP -- MI-ROP-B1477-202C FG MACT KILNS III. PROCESS/OPERATIONAL RESTRICTION(S) 2. The temperature of the gas at the inlet of the baghouse dust collector for each kiln shall not exceed the temperature established during the most recent performance test conducted pursuant to 40 CFR 63.1349(b)(3)(iv) – that US EPA said was a determination that the State of Michigan had to determine if it applied. This means that AQD Staff could make and support an argument that the testing date was when the BH inlet temperature was effective, this condition was more stringent than the Federal Regulation and therefore was most likely a legal requirement. Before a determination was made, I wanted to know if there was any chance for exceedance of the D/F limit from between the time that the testing occurred in April2024 to the NOC submission in June 2024.

I reviewed the previous three previous test reports and there is a correlation between the temperature and the D/F emission. The higher the temperature the more D/F emitted. As long as the BH inlet temperatures were below the previous tested temperature there was reasonable belief that the D/F emission did NOT exceed the limit.

I reviewed the BH inlet temperatures from 1 Jan 2024 to 30 June 2024, randomly selecting different days. I reviewed the 3-hour averages, calculated every one minute for the dates of 17 Jan 24, 8 Feb 24, 21 Mar 24, 1 Apr 24, 28 May 24, and the 26 Jun 24. This information has also been submitted via required excess emission report required quarterly reporting and no report of exceedance was noted during the first two quarters of 2024. There was no indication that the BH inlet temperature was higher than the previous tested temperature, or that after the NOC was submitted 19 June 2024 that it was above that newly established limit.

I have consulted AQD's Enforcement Unit with the facts of the inspection and it was determined that at this time that AQD is not pursuing any violation of enforcement actions.

NAME DJB DATE 7-29-24 SUPERVISOR Shane Nixon