

Mindy Ochs Environmental Committee Meeting November 6, 2010

Recap: Cement MACT Organic Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs)

- Based on data from 11 CEMS-equipped kilns
 - 30 days of data collected from each kiln (PCA: increased variability with smaller data sets)
- Floor based on best performing 12% (2 kilns)
 - Average emissions from 2 top kilns = 5.2 ppm
 - Adjusted to account for variability; 99th percentile
 - Standard = 24 ppm (30-day rolling avg., 7% O₂)
- Standard applies during start-up, shutdown, and malfunction periods

Why Form a CEMS Taskforce?

- Revised Lime MACT will likely include organic HAPs standards
- For lime, CO will be surrogate for organic HAPs rather than THC
 - No THC CEMS in lime industry
 - CO used in the Boiler MACT
- Six CO CEMS-equipped lime kilns, at 4 plants representing 3 companies
 - Absent NLA Advocacy, floor will be based on one kiln

CEMS Taskforce: Initial Charter

- Representatives from the 3 companies with CO CEMS-equipped kilns participated
- CO, NOx and opacity CEMS data analyzed
 - This presentation focuses solely on CO results
- Examined the trade-off of a longer averaging period (30-day) vs. lower numeric limit
 - Goal: determine which scenario resulted in fewest exceedances

Characteristics of Evaluated Kilns

- Two pre-heaters, one straight rotary
- All utilize low organic, hical stone
- Low NOx levels
 - below 3.95 lb/ton lime on 30-day rolling average
- All have bluff body burners
- One kiln relatively new & operating below capacity

Round 1: Based on Proposed Cement MACT

- To account for long term variability of best performers, EPA used a statistical method due to small dataset
 - Predict permit limit where 99% of future readings would fall below
- NLA Task Force used an Avg + 3 SD approach
 - Similar to EPA's approach (next slide)

NLA Data Analysis

- 12 continuous months of data evaluated from each participating company
 - Excluded data points from SSM, monitor malfunction, and analyzer calibration periods
- CO data normalized to lb/ton lime
- Computed 30-day rolling averages on all kilns; block averages evaluated for one kiln
- Average plus three standard deviations (Avg. + 3 SD) used as rough proxy for 99th percentile

Hourly, Monthly, Annual CO Ib/ton lime



CO lb/ton lime Avg. + 3 SD Emission Comparisons



24-hr Averages vs. Avg+3 SD Limit



10

30-day Averages vs. Avg+3 SD Limit



11

Round 2: Based on Final Cement MACT

- PCA submitted larger dataset
- EPA changed method to reflect real data
 - Directly calculate 99th percentile
- Task Force likewise used EPA's new approach
 - Exactly like EPA's approach

Method Matters



CO lb/ton lime





Analysis Conclusions

- Similar kilns can have significantly different average CO emissions and data variability
- Evidence suggests longer averaging period even with lower numeric limit could result in fewer exceedances
- Based on evaluation of "best" performing kiln, MACT floor (30-day rolling avg) would be
 - 1.66 CO lb/ton lime "predicted" 99th percentile
 - 2.67 CO lb/ton lime calculated 99th percentile

Something to Ponder

- Limit set at 99th Percentile
- Conversely 1% of emissions will be in violation

Ongoing Discussions

- New entrants to the Task Force, primarily operations personnel
 - Provide expertise on kiln design, fuel availability, and product specs for future interactions with EPA
- Kiln Y's low emissions and small data spread
 - PID loops?
- Kiln X's relatively high emissions
 - Organic content of stone?
 - to be measured w/ modified ASTM test method
 - Operations below capacity?
 - Absence of stack O₂ analyzer?

Next Steps

- Examine emissions during startup
- Scrutinize data exclusion approaches for monitor malfunction/calibration periods
- Analyze emissions from kilns higher organic content stone
- Further investigate averaging periods
 - Evidence suggests move to longer roll period or block averages may further decrease number of exceedances
- Eventually may need to retain statistician

NLA CEMS Task Force Contributions

- Each participant committed valuable resources to this phase of the project, including data gathering & standardization, computations, and results presentation
- Collaboration of participants allowed a means for the group to evaluate existing data in a manner similar to EPA method for setting MACT limits
- Each company equally shared throughout the process, which created a mutual learning environment



Thank You Task Force Members!