EPA-450/4-82-015

REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON AIR QUALITY MODELING: A SUMMARY REPORT

APRIL 1981

(Revised 1982)

SOURCE RECEPTOR ANALYSIS BRANCH
MONITORING AND DATA ANALYSIS DIVISION
OFFICE OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING AND STANDARDS
U. S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NORTH CAROLINA

This report has been reviewed by the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, EPA, and approved for publication. Mention of trade names or commercial products is not intended to constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The requirements placed on air quality control agencies by the Clean Air Act have dramatically increased the need for improved air quality modeling. The resulting increase in the use of models has also led to a substantial increase in the number and complexity of situations in which models are employed. The modeling guideline (Guideline on Air Quality Models, EPA-450/2-78-027, April 1978) addresses many of the problems in this relatively new and growing field, but much is left to the discretion of the reviewing agency since many complex problems are best solved on a case-by-case basis. However, because of the variety of technically correct solutions to any complex problem, different approaches with differing results have led to inconsistency in model applications from Region to Region. In an effort to improve consistency in the use of modeling techniques, three in-house workshops have been held since 1978. These workshops provide a forum for the Regional Office and Headquarters groups to discuss common problem areas and arrive at generally acceptable solutions.

Many recommendations were made in the course of the workshops. These have been reviewed by OAQPS and some have necessarily been modified and supplemented to ensure consistency with other modeling policies. This report clarifies preferred data bases and procedures for the application of specific models and modeling techniques in situations where the guideline permits a case-by-case analysis.

Recommendations contained in this report should be followed by the EPA Regional Offices until such time as the 1978 guideline is formally revised. Issues concerning the use of models not specified in this summary report or in the 1978 guideline, should be directed to the OAQPS Model Clearinghouse for review. The current procedures for submitting issues are provided in the Clearinghouse Operating Plan.

2.0 DATA BASES

2.1 Discussion

Estimated concentrations can vary widely depending on the source, meteorological, and air quality data used in preparing the estimates. Thus the need for consistency in the use of data and in the selection of data bases is apparent. Also, an accurate and reliable air quality data base is needed to evaluate the performance of a model.

Inconsistencies occur because adequate data frequently are not available for model input. Requirements for pre-application monitoring under PSD have alleviated some of the inconsistencies in data collection and use. However, additional guidance is still needed in the collection and interpretation of meteorological data.

Also, appropriate source data to reflect short-term variations in emissions are often unavailable. The relationship of source emission data to worst-case conditions can be another area of inconsistency.

This section identifies a few of the more frequent problem areas and provides recommendations to ensure consistency in the selection and use of data.

2.2 Recommendations

2.2.1 Acquisition of Data Bases

Guidance provided in the "Ambient Monitoring Guidelines for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)," EPA-450/4-80-012, November 1980 should be used for the establishment of a special monitoring network for air quality analyses, including both air quality and meteorological monitoring techniques. Additional information is available in 40CFR Part 58 and in the quality assurance and site selection EPA guidance documents published on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis. The EPA Regional Office should review the network design prior to operation.

2.2.2 Background Concentrations

Techniques discussed in the Guideline on Air Quality Models should be used in establishing background concentrations.

2.2.3 Source Data

The load or operating condition of a plant that causes the highest ground-level concentrations should be determined through a screening analysis and this load should be used to establish emission limitations. As a minimum all sources should be modeled using 100 percent design capacity; however, when modeling large sources, e.g., 500 MW power plants or equivalent, 50 and 75 percent capacity should also be modeled.

Hourly sequential emissions determined for existing sources from continuous in-stack monitoring should be used in model evaluation where possible. Hourly emissions are critical where short-term concentrations are of concern in such evaluations.

2.2.4 Meteorological Data

Five years of representative meteorological data should be used when estimating concentrations with an air quality model. Consecutive years from the most recently available five-year period are preferred. The meteorological data may be data collected either on-site or at the nearest National Weather Service (NWS) station. If the source is large, e.g., emissions equivalent to a 500 MW power plant, the use of five years of NWS meteorological data or at least one year of on-site data is required.

Five years of on-site data are often not available. When considering shorter periods of meteorological data, care must be taken to ensure that the data used contain the appropriate worst-case conditions. On-site data should also be subjected to quality assurance procedures that will ensure that the data is at least as accurate and in as much detail as NWS data.

Hourly average wind directions reported to the nearest degree should be used where on-site data are used. The CRSTER randomization sequence (i.e., the established sequential random number set designated for use with the meteorological preprocessor to CRSTER) should be used with NWS wind data.

The surface wind reference height used in the model should be defined to agree with the actual height of the surface wind sensor. When wind is monitored at heights closer to plume height, the wind direction should be used to define the plume transport and the speed should be utilized to develop the appropriate vertical wind speed profile.

Guidance provided in Appendix A should be followed in the design of site-specific, on-site meteorological data collection programs.

3.0 FLAT TERRAIN MODELS

3.1 Discussion

Flat terrain, as used here, is considered to be an area where terrain features are all lower in elevation than the top of the stack of the source in question. Most Gaussian models perform adequately in such situations.

A number of models have been made available by EPA and others for those applications where receptors are located at elevations less than the top of the stack. However, inconsistencies have resulted from the use of these models. Such inconsistencies occur in part because models may be developed at different times for specific applications and the various algorithms are improved, changed or added to accommodate a specific problem or to reflect recent research. This section provides recommendations to resolve these inconsistencies without limiting the range of applicability of flat terrain models.

3.2 Recommendations

3.2.1 Screening Techniques

Screening techniques and options as provided in "Guidelines for Air Quality Maintenance Planning and Analysis Volume 10 (R): Procedures for Evaluating Air Quality Impact of New Stationary Sources" should be used.

Where possible, screening procedures should be site and problem specific. Consideration should be given to: (1) terrain; (2) urban or rural dispersion coefficients; and (3) worst-case conditions when representative meteorological data or applicable detailed modeling techniques are not available. If screening is the sole basis for the analysis, adequate justification and documentation should be required for the use of averaging time factors.

3.2.2 Refined Analytical Techniques

The following table lists the preferred models for the indicated applications. These models should be used in Regional Office applications of models. For use of models and in applications that do not appear in this table or in the 1978 guideline, Regional Offices should follow Section 7 of this report.

Table 1. Preferred Model Use

SHORT TERM		MODEL
Single Source	Rural	CRSTER
	Urban	RAM
Multiple Source	Rural	MPTER
	Urban	RAM
Industrial Complexes	Rural/Urban	ISC
LONG TERM		
Single Source	Rural	CRSTER
	Urban	CDMQC or RAM*
Multiple Source	Rural	MPTER
	Urban	CDMQC or RAM*
Industrial Complexes	Rural/Urban	ISC

For all model applications in a rural area, the CRSTER techniques for wind speed profile, plume rise and terrain adjustment should be used unless other techniques can be shown on a case-by-case basis to provide more appropriate and accurate estimates.

Dispersion coefficients appropriate to either urban or rural settings should be used in accordance with Section 6.2.5. Sector averaging should be accepted only for seasonal or annual estimates where estimates are based on statistically summarized meteorological data.

---

*The choice of RAM or CDMQC in urban applications is a function of the number of sources and the size of the area to be modeled, e.g., if only three or four sources in an urban area are to be modeled, RAM should be used.

3.2.3 Model Options

The options that are found in the ISC, CRSTER, MPTER, and PTPLU models have greatly increased the technical options available. To ensure consistency in the use of these options, Regional Office users should follow the guidance below:

a. Stack Tip Downwash (CRSTER, MPTER, ISC, PTPLU*)

This option should not be used unless demonstrated to be applicable on a case-by-case basis. Although there is evidence that this phenomenon can occur, there are no data to support wide use of the option.

b. Plume Rise (CRSTER, MPTER, ISC, PTPLU)

In all cases, except for close-in receptors during stable conditions in complex terrain or when the downwash (building wake) algorithm of ISC is employed, the final plume rise option should be used. The restriction on the use of gradual plume rise is based upon the lack of specific data needed to quantify the dispersion during plume rise. In complex terrain where plume impaction is the identified problem, the use of transitional plume rise, during stable conditions, may be required to ensure that impaction on close-in terrain is considered. When building downwash is considered a problem, transitional plume rise calculations are used only to determine whether the plume will be affected by building wake. If so, dispersion is handled by appropriate modified dispersion parameters.

c. Rural/Urban Options (ISC)

The selection of the rural or urban option should be based upon the determinations as outlined in Section 6.2.5 for determining whether an area is urban or rural.

d. Momentum Plume Rise (ISC, CRSTER, MPTER, PTPLU)

This is optional in the CRSTER and MPTER models and an integral part of the ISC and PTPLU models. It should be used in the CRSTER and MPTER models.

e. Deposition (ISC)

The deposition algorithm in ISC may be used whenever deposition is considered to be a factor in the analysis.

---

*PTPLU is found in UNAMAP (Version 4a) and is a replacement for PTMAX.

4.0 COMPLEX TERRAIN MODELING

4.1 Discussion

Although the need for a refined complex terrain dispersion model has been acknowledged for several years, such a model has not yet been developed. The lack of extensive data bases and basic knowledge concerning the behavior of atmospheric variables in the vicinity of complex terrain presents a considerable obstacle to the solution of the problem and the development of a refined model.

A first step toward the solution of this problem has been taken. The Environmental Sciences Research Laboratory initiated the multi-year Complex Terrain Model Development project in 1979. The first field study was conducted at Cinder Cone Butte and the first milestone report describing this effort was issued in April 1982 (EPA-600/3-82-036). This report includes an initial evaluation of three screening techniques. This portion of the study represents the initial acquisition of basic data needed to define the meteorological variables and plume behavior in complex terrain. Until the behavior of plumes in various complex terrain situations can be documented and new mathematical constructs developed, the existing dispersion algorithms adapted to complex terrain must be used.

For the purpose of this report, complex terrain is defined as any terrain exceeding the height of the stack being modeled.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Screening Techniques

Two screening techniques are currently preferred: Valley and Complex I. It is suggested that a two-tiered screening approach be followed for complex terrain analyses.

4.2.1.1 Initial Screening Technique

The initial screen is the use of the Valley Model. For buoyant sources, the BID option in Valley may be used. The following worst-case assumptions should be used in Valley to determine 24-hour averages: (1) P-G stability "F"; (2) wind speed of 2.5 m/s; (3) 6 hours of occurrence.

Multiple sources should be treated individually in the Valley Model and the concentrations for specific wind directions summed. Only one wind direction should be used for 24-hour averages (see User's Manual, pages 2-15) even if individual runs are made for each source.

The receptor grid found in the Valley Model User's Guide may not be sufficient for all analyses if only one geographical scale factor is used. The Valley Model is very sensitive to ground-level elevation at the receptor, and the use of the standard polar grid could miss the worst-case receptor. If this situation occurs, the user should choose an additional set of receptors at appropriate downwind distances whose elevations are equal to plume height minus 10 meters.

4.2.1.2 Second-Level Screening Technique

If a violation of any NAAQS or the controlling increment is indicated, a second-level screening technique may be used. An on-site data base of at least 1 full year of meteorological data, collected in accordance with the recommendations in Appendix A, is preferred for use with the second-level screening technique. All meteorological data used in the analysis must be reviewed for both spatial and temporal representativeness.

At this time Complex I, available in UNAMAP Version 4a, is the preferred second-level screening technique. Complex I is the result of modifying the MPTER Model to incorporate the Valley Model algorithm. As such it is a multi-source screening technique that accepts hourly meteorological input. It differs from the Valley Model only in its use of hourly data and a plume height correction. In Complex I hourly wind direction input is specified to the nearest whole degree (and the plume vectored accordingly), but the 22-1/2° Valley crosswind sector averaging has been retained. During nonstable conditions Complex I permits the plume to be transported horizontally relative to sea level. As terrain elevation increases with distance, the plume height above ground is allowed to decrease to no less than half its height above plant grade. Beyond the point at which the height is halved, the plume centerline parallels the terrain.

4.2.1.3 Restrictions

For screening analyses, the use of a sector greater than 22-1/2° should not be allowed and full ground reflection should always be used.

4.2.1.4 Options

For buoyant sources the option for buoyancy-induced dispersion should be exercised.

Complex I requires the specification of an approach distance and a 10-meter approach distance should be selected.

The Complex I program has five separate complex terrain plume specification procedures in the designated IOPT option 25. Only the standard procedure labeled "1" should be selected, (i.e., IOPT (25) = 1).

The option in the Valley model to use the 2.6 stable plume rise factor should be selected.

4.2.2 Refined Analytical Techniques

When the results of the screening analysis demonstrate a possible violation of NAAQS or the controlling PSD increments, a more refined analysis should be conducted. Since there are no refined techniques currently recommended for complex terrain applications, a nonguideline model may be applied in accordance with Section 7. In the absence of an appropriate refined model, screening results may be acceptable.

5.0 MOBILE SOURCE MODELS

Regional meteorologists have not been involved in significant consistency problems with carbon monoxide or ozone models. Some guidance is found in the 1978 Guideline on Air Quality Models, and additional guidance with respect to the use of models and data bases for SIP revisions is contained in the Federal Register Volume 46, No. 14, p. 7182, entitled, "State Implementation Plans: Approval of 1982 Ozone and Carbon Monoxide Plan Revisions for Areas Needing an Attainment Date Extension."

6.0 GENERAL MODELING ISSUES

6.1 Discussion

This section contains recommendations concerning a number of different issues. The problem areas addressed are not specific to any one program or modeling area but need resolution in nearly all modeling situations.

6.2 Recommendations

6.2.1 Design Concentrations

If 5 years of NWS data are used in an analysis or if 1 year of on-site meteorological data are used, then the highest, second-highest short-term concentration estimate should be used to determine the impact of the source. If less than 5 years of NWS data or less than 1 year of on-site data are used, then the highest concentration estimate should be used as an approximation to the second-highest short-term concentration.

Block averaging times should continue to be used for modeling purposes.

6.2.2 Critical Receptor Sites

Receptor sites should be utilized in sufficient detail to allow estimates of the highest concentrations and the probability of a violation of a NAAQS or a PSD increment. The procedures listed below should be followed to locate receptor sites when a large source, such as a 500 MW power plant, is being modeled.

a. Apply PTPLU to identify the distance to the highest estimated concentration for each combination of atmospheric stability class and wind speed. PTPLU should be run using 0.10, 0.15, 0.20, 0.25, 0.30, and 0.30 as wind profile exponents for the six stability Classes A through F respectively. The receptor elevation in PTPLU should be set to the highest terrain elevation above stack base and below stack top found within a 1-kilometer radius of the stack. Identify the distance to the highest concentration listed in the PTPLU output for each stability class. Select the smallest of these distances obtained from PTPLU as the first receptor distance.

b. Select eight more distances by multiplying the first receptor distance by each of the following constants: 1.3, 1.7, 2.3, 3.0, 3.9, 5.2, 6.8, and 9.0. This geometric progression allows the user to most closely approximate the location of maximum concentration. There is no need for a receptor spacing closer than 0.1 kilometer. A tenth receptor distance may be used to locate receptors in a potentially high concentration area beyond the ninth receptor distance.

c. Check the PTPLU output to be sure that high concentrations with P-G D stability are not expected beyond the last receptor distance. If high concentrations are expected beyond the last receptor distance, then add additional rings to include those cases.

d. If the elevation of individual receptors is significant, those elevations should be specified as the greatest terrain elevation along the appropriate 10 degree arc for the receptor distance of concern; the height should not be limited to the center of the 10 degree sector. In some instances it may be desirable to locate receptors at the plant boundary. Additional rings may be needed for this.

For models capable of using a rectangular grid, including multi-source models, a one-kilometer square receptor grid extended outward in all directions from the source to a distance of 10 kilometers, or about 400 receptor sites, should be used. The grid should be extended farther if maximum 1-hour concentrations are estimated to occur beyond 10 kilometers. For urban models, this grid should cover the entire area being modeled. In addition, to identify concentrations that might be missed by the spacing of the rectangular grid, individual isolated receptor sites should be located downwind from the major source(s) for prevailing wind directions during conditions of maximum concentration. For each direction, four downwind distances associated with maximum one-hour concentrations for Pasquill-Gifford stability Classes A, B, C, and D as determined by PTPLU should be selected. Receptor sites should also be located at sites where monitored air quality data are available and sites where plume interactions from multiple sources are likely to be greatest. If the height of individual receptors is significant, those should be specified as the actual terrain height at the receptor location.

For sources smaller than those equivalent to a 500 MW power plant, receptors should be located following the above procedures, but in the actual model runs it may not be necessary to include all receptors for all directions and all distances. The selection of receptor sites is left to the discretion of the Regional Office, but should be based on wind roses for the area and the results of calculations using PTPLU or other comparable screening procedures.

6.2.3 Long-Range Transport

Long-range transport should be considered where impact on Federal Class I areas is possible. The application of simple Gaussian models for downwind transport distances greater than 50 km should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Models that are more appropriate at these transport distances should be evaluated as alternatives to the simple Gaussian models. Models for long-range transport included in the references to the 1978 Guideline on Air Quality Models can be used as screening techniques. More complex and thoroughly documented models such as MESOPUFF, MESOPLUME or MESOGRID may be considered on a case-by-case basis for use as refined models within their established limitations.

6.2.4 Pollutant Half-life

Pollutant half-life should not be used in screening analyses.

For a refined analysis, if the need for half-life for SO_2 can be demonstrated, site-specific data should be used to define a rate of conversion of SO_2. Otherwise only those refined models with built-in conversion provisions should be used where conversion appears to be an obvious problem.

For nitrogen oxides, complete conversion from NO to nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) should be used in screening analyses. In refined analyses, case-by-case half-life conversion rates should be determined on the basis of scientific technical studies appropriate to the site in question. The methods suggested by Cole and Summerhays* should be considered.

An infinite half-life should be used for estimates of total suspended particulate concentrations when simple Gaussian models with exponential decay terms are employed. Deposition and removal should be directly considered in the model if it is a significant factor.

6.2.5 Urban/Rural Classification

The selection of either rural or urban dispersion coefficients in a specific application should follow the procedure below using land use or population density.

Land Use Procedure: (1) Classify the land use within the total area, A_o, circumscribed by a 3 km radius circle about the source using the meteorological land use typing scheme proposed by Auer**; (2) If land use types I1, I2, C1, R2, and R3 account for 50 percent or more of A_o, use urban dispersion coefficients; otherwise, use appropriate rural dispersion coefficients.

---

* Cole, H. S., and J. E. Summerhays, A Review of Techniques for Estimating Short Term NO_2 Concentrations, JAPCA, Vol. 29, No. 8, pp. 812-817, 1979.

**Auer, A. H., Correlation of Land Use and Cover with Meteorological Anomalies, JAM, Vol. 17, pp 636-643, 1978.

Population Density Procedures: (1) Compute the average population density, $\overline{p}$, per square kilometer with A_o as defined above; (2) If $\overline{p}$, is greater than 750 people/km^2, use urban dispersion coefficients; otherwise, use appropriate rural dispersion coefficients.

The land use procedure is considered the most definitive. Population density should be used with caution, especially in a highly industrialized area where the population density may be low but the area is sufficiently built up so that the land use criteria would be satisfied. Impacts from sources beyond the three (3) kilometers should be included in the background.

For analyses of urban complexes, the entire area should be modeled as an urban region if most of the sources are located in areas classified as urban.

6.2.6 General Model Evaluation

A model evaluation study should assess how closely the mathematical assumptions inherent to the model describe the physics and/or chemistry of the atmosphere. The process of model evaluation should consider all of the following: (1) assumptions inherent to design/algorithms of model; (2) purpose/objective of model; (3) purpose/objectives of monitors(s); (4) applicability of monitored data for comparison; (5) comparison of model estimates with monitor observations for upper end of frequency distribution, statistical analyses, and analyses of weakness in individual algorithms; and (6) analyses of critical meteorological and source conditions and their effect on individual algorithms. An analysis should also be made of the sensitivity of the algorithms to the meteorological input data.

For short-term model evaluation, all input data should be based on measured hourly averages. This includes mass emission rates, stack dynamic operating parameters and meteorological input. The spatial applicability of measured air quality data and tracer studies should be consistent with the scale of the model comparisons.

Calibration for short-term air quality concentrations is not recommended. Determination of the need for calibration and calibration procedures are contained in the 1978 guideline.

7.0 NONGUIDELINE MODELS

7.1 Discussion

Only a limited number of models or modeling techniques have undergone a sufficient evaluation to be considered "guideline" models, or to be recommended procedures for modeling certain aspects of plume behavior. There remain a large number of circumstances when no recommended technique is available and no guideline model is totally applicable. There are also circumstances when a model other than a recommended model may appear suitable. In those cases the Regional Office must decide on the acceptable procedures and approve or disapprove specific nonguideline modeling approaches for use in each specific situation.

7.2 Definition of Guideline vs. Nonguideline Models

Guideline models are those models specifically recommended for (general) use in the 1978 Guideline on Air Quality Models. All other models require review and evaluation on a case-by-case basis.

Changes made to a guideline model that do not affect the concentration estimates do not change the guideline status of that model. Examples of such changes are those required to run the program on a different computer or those that affect only the format of the model results. When such changes are made, the Regional Offices may require a test case example to demonstrate that the concentrations are not affected.

Use of a guideline model with other than recommended options changes the status of the model to nonguideline. Similarly, if a guideline model has been revised or changed such that it produces concentrations different from the original model for the same input data, the status of the model is changed to nonguideline.

7.3 Model Clearinghouse

A Model Clearinghouse has been established within OAQPS for the purpose of assisting Regional Offices in the technical and consistency reviews of nonguideline techniques or models. Regional Offices may directly request assistance from the Clearinghouse once they have completed an initial evaluation and prepared recommendations. The Clearinghouse will also review all formal Federal Register proposals and final rule-making packages to ensure modeling and data base consistency and to evaluate the adequacy of nonguideline procedures. The Clearinghouse will also maintain a log of precedent-setting policy and technical decisions and determine the transferability of models and data bases to other situations. Details concerning the Clearinghouse and its operation are found in the OAQPS document, "Model Clearinghouse: Operational Plan," February 1981. Analyses using guideline techniques will not be reviewed by the Clearinghouse.

7.4 Recommendations

The determination of the acceptability of a nonguideline model is a Regional Office responsibility. Proposed models should be evaluated from both a theoretical and a performance perspective. Proper support and documentation for the use of a nonguideline model will normally include air quality and meteorological data that have been collected using appropriate techniques and procedures as outlined in the "Ambient Monitoring Guideline for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)" EPA 450/4-80-012, November 1980. Data bases for other than the specific site in question may be acceptable if it can be shown that the data available represent similar topography, climatology, and source configurations. Any data base used must include appropriate periods of worst-case conditions.

Procedures and techniques for determining the acceptability of a nonguideline model on a case-by-case basis are contained in a document entitled, "Interim Procedures for Evaluating Air Quality Models," August 1981. In June 1982 an example application of these procedures, prepared by TRC Environmental Consultants, Inc., was distributed to the Regional Offices. Procedures outlined in these documents should be followed, as appropriate, when evaluating nonguideline techniques.

8.0 USE OF MEASURED AIR QUALITY DATA IN LIEU OF MODEL ESTIMATES

8.1 Discussion

Dispersion model estimates, especially with air monitoring support, are the preferred basis for air quality demonstration decisions. Nevertheless, there may arise instances where the performance of recommended dispersion modeling techniques may be demonstrated by observed air quality data to be less than acceptable. Occasionally there may be no recommended modeling procedure. In these instances, air pollutant emission limitations may be established on the basis of observed air quality data.

8.2 Recommendations:

Modeling is the preferred method for determining emission limitations for both new and existing sources. Where a well-accepted, well-verified model is available, model results alone are sufficient. Monitoring will normally not be accepted as the sole basis for emission limitation determination in flat terrain areas. In some instances where the modeling technique available is only a screening technique, the addition of air quality data to the analysis may lend credence to model results.

In some instances a model that is applicable to the situation may not be available. Measured data may have to be used. Examples of such situations are: (1) complex terrain locations, (2) aerodynamic downwash situations, (3) land/water interface areas, and (4) urban locations with a large fraction of particulate emissions from non-traditional sources. However, only in the case of an existing source would monitoring data alone be an acceptable basis for emission limits. In addition, there are other requirements for the acceptance of an analysis based only on monitoring:

a. A monitoring network exists for the pollutants and averaging times of concern;

b. It can be demonstrated that the monitors in the network are located as close as possible to all points of maximum concentration;

c. The monitoring network and the data reduction and storage procedures meet all EPA monitoring and quality assurance requirements;

d. The data set and the analysis identify conclusively each individual source impact if more than one source or emission point is involved;

e. At least one full year of valid ambient data is available and a demonstration that the year was not sufficiently atypical to influence the resulting emission limits;

f. A demonstration that EPA recommended models are not applicable through the comparison of the monitored data with model results.

Sources should obtain approval from the Regional Office for the monitoring network prior to the start of monitoring to ensure that the situation requires the use of monitoring and to obtain approval of the monitoring network design and procedures.

The following are examples for some common situations where monitored data might be considered. It should be noted, however, that since the adequacy of a network is a function of the source configuration as well as the topography and the meteorology of the site, a large number of designs may need to be considered and no set pattern is applicable to any one of the problem areas.

a. For aerodynamic downwash, consider one or two background monitors plus two to four downwind monitors. The number of downwind monitors should be determined by a consideration of the frequency of the downwash events, the expected magnitude of the impact, and the areal extent of the impact.

b. For shoreline conditions consider one to two background monitors and three to eight downwind monitors. The number of downwind monitors should be determined by considering site characteristics, the magnitude and the areal extent of the predicted impact. It may be necessary to complement the stationary monitoring network with mobile sampling and plume tracking techniques.

c. For complex terrain, the air quality monitors should assess the maximum impacts for each averaging period for which an air quality violation is expected to occur. Approximately three to eight monitors should be considered necessary to monitor for each such averaging time. The exact number depends on the magnitude and extent of expected violations. At least two monitors for each contiguous area where violations are expected to occur is necessary except where these areas are large. In this case, more than two monitors could be required. As a guide, a 22-1/2° sector should define the maximum size of a large contiguous area. Based upon meteorological judgment, additional monitors may be required to evaluate the source impact depending on the complexity of the terrain.

d. For urban situations where the concern is particulates and the sources of violations appear to be fugitive and/or reentrained dust, extensive monitoring and receptor models may be needed to accurately assess the problem.

9.0 REVIEW OF PSD PERMIT APPLICATIONS

9.1 Discussion

Certain procedures with respect to the review and analysis of PSD permits also should be standardized to ensure consistency. A few of these are discussed below.

9.2 Recommendations

In those Regions where the Regional Office has the responsibility for permitting new sources, the Regional Office should provide permit applicants with a uniform PSD/NSR guidance package, including screening and modeling requirements. The attached Air Quality Analyses Checklist (Appendix B) is recommended as a standardized set of data and a standard basic degree of analysis to be required of PSD and SIP revision applicants. This checklist suggests a level of detail, including the necessary grid resolution, required to assess both PSD increments and the NAAQS. Special cases may require additional guidance.

A pre-application meeting between source owner and Regional Office staff should be the norm and the Regional Meteorologist should be represented.

PSD air quality analyses should be based on information considered valid for the start-up date for the new or modified source.

The Regional Office should allow permit applicants to use "Procedures for Evaluating Air Quality Impact of New Stationary Sources" (EPA-450/4-77-001) for screening purposes. Air quality concentration estimates obtained using procedures in that Guideline on screening techniques or using the refined analytical techniques incorporating Pasquill-Gifford or McElroy-Pooler sigmas, are equivalent to one-hour values. Time-scaling of such estimates from any period shorter than one hour is generally not acceptable. Time-scaling of one hour estimates to longer period averages is not acceptable when the purpose is to obtain the highest or highest, second-highest concentration estimates and a refined analytical technique is appropriate for making one-hour estimates.

Regional Offices should require permit applicants to incorporate the pollutant contributions of all sources into their analysis. This should include emissions associated with area growth within the area of the new or modified source's impact. PSD air quality assessments should consider the amount of the allowable air quality increment that has already been granted to any other new sources. The most recent source applicant should be allowed the prerogative to re-model the existing or permitted sources in addition to the one currently under consideration.

This would permit the use of newly acquired data or improved modeling techniques if such have become available since the last source was permitted. When remodeling, the worst case conditions used in the previous modeling analysis must be one set of conditions modeled in the new analysis. All sources must be modeled for each set of meteorological conditions selected and for all receptor sites used in the previous applications as well as new sites specific to the new source.

APPENDIX A

ACQUISITION OF SITE SPECIFIC METEOROLOGICAL DATA

Models recommended in the 1978 Guideline on Air Quality Models require as input the following parameters:

- ° transport wind speed and direction;
- ° ambient air temperature;
- ° Pasquill-Gifford stability category.

Wind Measurements

In addition to 10 m surface wind measurements, the transport wind speed and direction should be measured at an elevation as close as possible to the effective stack height. To approximate this, if a source has a stack (or stacks) below 100 m, select the stack top height as a wind measurement height. For sources with stacks extending above 100 m, a 100 m tower is suggested unless the stack top is significantly above 100 m (200 m or more). For cases with stacks 200 m or above, the Regional Meteorologist should determine the appropriate measurement height on a case-by-case basis. Remote sensing may be a feasible alternative.

For routine tower measurements and surface measurement the wind speed should be measured using an anemometer and the wind direction measured using a horizontal vane. The specifications for wind measuring instruments contained in the "Ambient Monitoring Guidelines for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)," EPA 450/4-80-012, November 1980 should be followed. Wind direction should be reported to the nearest degree.

Temperature

The temperature should be measured at or near standard instrument shelter height. Ambient temperature can be reliably measured using good quality linear thermistors or platinum resistance devices.

Stability Category

The Pasquill-Gifford (P-G) stability categories, as originally defined, incorporate subjectively determined insolation assessments based on hourly cloud cover observations. In lieu of such observations it is recommended that the P-G stability category be estimated using Table A-I. Use of this table requires the direct measurement of the elevation angle of the vertical wind direction. Measurements of elevation angle are difficult to make without a substantial commitment in maintenance, hence it is recommended that σ_ϕ be determined using the transform:

$$\sigma_\phi = \sigma_\omega / u$$

Where: σ_ϕ = the standard deviation of the vertical wind direction fluctuations averaged for a one-hour period;

σ_ω = the standard deviation of the vertical wind speed fluctuations observed for a one-hour period;

u = the average horizontal wind speed for a one-hour period.

It is recommended that a vertically mounted anemometer be used to measure the vertical wind speed fluctuations. The instrument should meet the specifications given in the Ambient Monitoring Guidelines referenced above. The instrument should compute σ_ω directly, one value each hour using 3600 to 360 values, based on a recommended readout interval of 1 to 10 seconds.

If σ_ϕ is computed using the output of the anemometer by other than direct application of the formula for a variance, the method should be demonstrated to be equivalent to direct computation.

Both the vertical wind speed fluctuations and the horizontal wind speed should be measured at the same level. Moreover, these measurements should be made at a height of 10 m for valid use in estimating the PG stability category. Trees or land use might preclude measurements as low as 10 m and in such cases the measurements will have to be made at heights above 10 m

If on-site measurements of either σ_ϕ or σ_ω are not available, stability categories may be determined using the horizontal wind direction fluctuation, σ_θ, as outlined by Mitchell and Timbre*. This method uses the NRC Safety Guide 1.23 categories of σ_θ listed in Table A as an initial estimate of the P-G stability category. This relationship is considered adequate for daytime use. During the nighttime (one hour prior to sunset to one hour after sunrise) the adjustments given in Table A-III should be applied. As with σ_ϕ, σ_θ should be adjusted for surface roughness by multiplying the measured σ_θ, by the average surface roughness length within 1 to 3 km of the source.

If, due to maintenance or instrument failure, σ_ω and σ_θ values are missing, the P-G stability categories can be estimated from the lower level wind speed (if tower measurements are used) with estimates of sky

*Mitchell, A. Edger Jr., and K. O. Timbre, Atmospheric Stability Class from Horizontal Wind Fluctuation, 72nd Annual Meeting APCA, Cincinnati, Ohio, June 24, 1979.

cover and cloud heights from some suitable NWS site (or obtained on-site) using the CRSTER preprocessor. However, the σ_ϕ categories and the modified σ_θ categories are anticipated to be better correlated to the actual dispersion, especially in complex terrain, than employing either estimates or measurements of insolation to estimate the P-G stability category.

Table A-I

P-G Stability Category Versus
Vertical Wind Direction Fluctuation, σ_ϕ

P-G Stability Category	*Standard Deviation of Vertical Wind Direction, σ_ϕ
A	$> 12°$
B	$10° - 12°$
C	$7.8° - 10°$
D	$5° - 7.8°$
E	$2.4° - 5°$
F	$< 2.4°$

From: Smith, T. B. and S. M. Howard, "Methodology for Treating Diffusivity," in MRI 72 FR-1030 6 September 1972.

*Where it is anticipated that there may be increased dispersion because of surface roughness, a factor of $(z_o/15\ \text{cm})^{0.2}$, where z_o is the average surface roughness in centimeters within a radius of 1-3 km of the source, may be applied to the table values. It should be noted that this factor, while theoretically sound, has not been subjected to rigorous testing and may not improve the estimates in all circumstances. A table of z_o values that may be used as a guide to estimating surface roughness is given in: A. Smedman-Hogstrom and U. Hogstrom (1978). "A Practical Method for Determining Wind Frequency Distributions for the Lowest 200 m from Routine Meteorological Data" JAM, Vol. 17, p. 942.

Table A-II

PG Stability Categories Versus
Horizontal Wind Direction Fluctuations, σ_θ

PG Stability Category	Range of Standard Deviation, Degrees*
A	$\sigma_\theta \geq 22.5$
B	$22.5 > \sigma_\theta \geq 17.5$
C	$17.5 > \sigma_\theta \geq 12.5$
D	$12.5 > \sigma_\theta \geq 7.5$
E	$7.5 > \sigma_\theta \geq 3.8$
F	$3.8 > \sigma_\theta \geq$

Adapted from Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Regulatory Guide 1.23, 1972.

* Where it is anticipated that there may be increased dispersion because of surface roughness, a factor of $(z_0/15\ \text{cm})^{0.2}$, where z_0 is the average surface roughness in centimeters within a radius of 1-3 km of the source, may be applied to the table values. It should be noted that this factor, while theoretically sound, has not been subjected to rigorous testing and may not improve the estimates in all circumstances. A table of z_0 values that may be used as a guide to estimating surface roughness is given in: A. Smedman-Hogstrom and U. Hogstrom (1978), "A Practical Method for Determining Wind Frequency Distributions for the Lowest 200 m from Routine Meteorological Data" JAM, Vol. 17, p. 942.

Table A-III

Night Time P-G Stability Categories Based on σ_θ

If the σ_θ stability class is	And if the 10m wind speed, u, is		Then the stability class is
	m/s	mi/hr	
A	$u<2.9$	$u<6.4$	F
	$2.9\leq u<3.6$	$6.4\leq u<7.9$	E
	$3.6\leq u$	$7.9\leq u$	D
B	$u<2.4$	$u<5.3$	F
	$2.4\leq u<3.0$	$5.3\leq u<6.6$	E
	$3.0\leq u$	$6.6\leq u$	D
C	$u<2.4$	$u<5.3$	E
	$2.4\leq u$	$5.3\leq u$	D
D	wind speed not considered		D
E	wind speed not considered		E
F	wind speed not considered		F

Adapted from Mitchell and Timbre (1979)

APPENDIX B

AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST*

1. Source location map(s) showing location with respect to:

   - Urban areas**
   - PSD Class I areas within 100 km
   - Nonattainment areas**
   - Topographic features (terrain, lakes, river valleys, etc.)**
   - Other major existing sources**
   - Other major sources subject to PSD requirements
   - NWS meteorological observations (surface and upper air)
   - On-site/local meteorological observations (surface and upper air)
   - State/local/on-site air quality monitoring locations**
   - Plant layout on a topographic map covering a 1-km radius of the source with information sufficient to determine GEP stack heights

2. Information on urban/rural characteristics:

   - Land use within 3 km of source classified according to Auer, A. H. (1978): Correlation of land use and cover with meteorological anomalies, J. of Applied Meteorology, Vol. 17 p. 636-643.
   - Population
     - total
     - density
   - Based on current guidance determination of whether the area should be addressed using urban or rural modeling methodology

---

* The "Guidelines for Air Quality Maintenance and Analyses," Volume 10 (Revised), EPA-450/4-77-001, October 1977 (OAQPS No. 1.2-029R) should be used a screening tool to determine whether modeling analyses are required. Screening procedures should be refined by the user to be site/problem specific.

**Within 50 km or distance to which source has a significant impact, whichever is less.

3. Emission inventory and operating/design parameters for major sources within region of significant impact of proposed site (same as required for applicant:

- o Actual and allowable annual emission rates (g/s) and operating rates*

- o Maximum design load short-term emission rate (g/s)*

- o Associated emissions/stack characteristics as a function of load for maximum, average, and nominal operating conditions if stack height is less than GEP or located in complex terrain. Screening analyses as footnoted on B1 or detailed analyses, if necessary, must be employed to determine the constraining load condition (e. g., 50%, 75%, 100% load) to be relied upon in the short-term modeling analysis.

  - location (UTM's)
  - height of stack (m) and grade level above MSL
  - stack exit diameter (m)
  - exit velocity (m/s)
  - exit temperature (°K)

- o Area source emissions (rates, size of area, height of area source)*

- o Location and dimensions of buildings (plant layout drawing)

  - to determine GEP stack height
  - to determine potential building downwash considerations for stack heights less than GEP

- o Associated parameters

  - boiler size (megawatts, pounds/hr. steam, fuel consumption, etc.)
  - boiler parameters (% excess air, boiler type, type of firing, etc.)
  - operating conditions (pollutant content in fuel, hours of operation, capacity factor, % load for winter, summer, etc.)
  - pollutant control equipment parameters (design efficiency, operation record, e.g., can it be bypassed?, etc.)

- o Anticipated growth changes

---

*Particulate emissions should be specified as a function of particulate diameter and density ranges.

4. Air quality monitoring data:

   o Summary of existing observations for latest five years (including any additional quality assured measured data which can be obtained from any state or local agency or company)*

   o Comparison with standards

   o Discussion of background due to uninventoried sources and contributions from outside the inventoried area and description of the method used for determination of background (should be consistent with the Guideline on Air Quality Models)

5. Meteorological data:

   o Five consecutive years of the most recent representative sequential hourly National Weather Service (NWS) data, or one or more years of hourly sequential on-site data

   o Discussion of meteorological conditions observed (as applied or modified for the site-specific area, i.e., identify possible variations due to difference between the monitoring site and the specific site of the source)

   o Discussion of topographic/land use influences

6. Air quality modeling analyses:

   o Model each individual year for which data are available with a recommended model or model demonstrated to be acceptable on a case-by-case basis

     - urban dispersion coefficients for urban areas
     - rural dispersion coefficients for rural areas

   o Evaluate.downwash if stack height is less than GEP

   o Define worst case meteorology

   o Determine background and document method

     - long-term
     - short-term

   o Provide topographic map(s) of receptor network with respect to location of all sources

---

*See ** on page B1 of checklist.

- o Follow current guidance on selection of receptor sites for refined analyses
- o Include receptor terrain heights (if applicable) used in analyses
- o Compare model estimates with measurements considering the upper ends of the frequency distribution
- o Determine extent of significant impact--provide maps
- o Define areas of maximum and highest, second-highest impacts due to applicant source (refer to format suggested in Air Quality Summary Tables)
  - long-term
  - short-term

7. Comparison with acceptable air quality levels:
   - o NAAQS
   - o PSD increments
   - o Emission offset impacts if nonattainment

8. Documentation and guidelines for modeling methodology:
   - o Follow guidance documents
     - Guideline on Air Quality Models, EPA-450/2-78-027, April 1978
     - Workbook for Comparison of Air Quality Models, EPA-450/2-78-028a,b, May 1978
     - Guidelines for AQMA, Vol. 10(R), EPA-450/4-77-001, October 1977
     - Technical Support Document for Determination of Good Engineering Practice Stack Height (Draft), EPA, July 1978
     - Ambient Air Monitoring Guidelines for PSD, EPA-450/2-78-019, May 1978
     - Requirements for the Preparation, Adoption and Submittal of Implementation Plans; Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans, Federal Register, Volume 43, No. 118, pp 52676-52748, August 1980.

AIR QUALITY SUMMARY

For New Source Alone

Pollutant ________*	________**			________**	
	Highest	Highest 2nd High	Highest	Highest 2nd High	Annual
Concentration Due to Modeled Source ($\mu g/m^3$)					
Background Concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)					
Total Concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)					
Receptor Distance (Km) (or UTM Easting)					
Receptor Direction (°) (or UTM Northing)					
Receptor Elevation (m)					
Wind Speed (m/s)					
Wind Direction (°)					
Mixing Depth (m)					
Temperature (°K)					
Stability					
Day/Month/Year of Occurrence					

*Use separate sheet for each pollutant (SO_2, TSP, CO, NO_x, HC, Pb, Hg, Asbestos, etc.)

**List all appropriate averaging period (1-hr, 3-hr, 8-hr, 24-hr, 30-day, 90-day, etc.) for which an air quality standard exists

Surface Air Data From ________ Surface Station Elevation (m) ________

Anemometer Height Above Local Ground Level (m) ____________________

Upper Air Data From ____________________

Period of Record Analyzed ____________________

Model Used ____________________

Recommended Model ____________________

AIR QUALITY SUMMARY

For All New Sources

Pollutant ________ *	________ **		________ **		
	Highest	Highest 2nd High	Highest	Highest 2nd High	Annual
Concentration Due to Modeled Source ($\mu g/m^3$)					
Background Concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)					
Total Concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)					
Receptor Distance (Km) (or UTM Easting)					
Receptor Direction (°) (or UTM Northing)					
Receptor Elevation (m)					
Wind Speed (m/s)					
Wind Direction (°)					
Mixing Depth (m)					
Temperature (°K)					
Stability					
Day/Month/Year of Occurrence					

*Use separate sheet for each pollutant (SO_2, TSP, CO, NO_x, HC, Pb, Hg, Asbestos, etc.)

**List all appropriate averaging period (1-hr, 3-hr, 8-hr, 24-hr, 30-day, 90-day, etc.) for which an air quality standard exists

Surface Air Data From ________ Surface Station Elevation (m) ________

Anemometer Height Above Local Ground Level (m) ________________

Upper Air Data From ________________

Period of Record Analyzed ________________

Model Used ________________

Recommended Model ________________

AIR QUALITY SUMMARY

For All Sources

Pollutant ________ *	________ **		________ **		
	Highest	Highest 2nd High	Highest	Highest 2nd High	Annual
Concentration Due to Modeled Source ($\mu g/m^3$)					
Background Concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)					
Total Concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)					
Receptor Distance (Km) (or UTM Easting)					
Receptor Direction (°) (or UTM Northing)					
Receptor Elevation (m)					
Wind Speed (m/s)					
Wind Direction (°)					
Mixing Depth (m)					
Temperature (°K)					
Stability					
Day/Month/Year of Occurrence					

*Use separate sheet for each pollutant (SO_2, TSP, CO, NO_x, HC, Pb, Hg, Asbestos, etc.)

**List all appropriate averaging period (1-hr, 3-hr, 8-hr, 24-hr, 30-day, 90-day, etc.) for which an air quality standard exists

Surface Air Data From ________ Surface Station Elevation (m) ________

Anemometer Height Above Local Ground Level (m) ________________

Upper Air Data From ________________

Period of Record Analyzed ________________

Model Used ________________

Recommended Model ________________

<u>STACK PARAMETERS FOR ANNUAL MODELING</u>

Stack No.	Serving	Emission Rate for each Pollutant (g/s)	Stack Exit Diameter (m)	Stack Exit Velocity (m/s)	Stack Exit Temperature (°K)	Physical Stack Height (m)	GEP Stack Height (m)	Stack Base Elevation (m)

B-8

STACK PARAMETERS FOR SHORT TERM MODELING*

Stack No.	Serving	Emission Rate for each Pollutant (g/s)	Stack Exit Diameter (m)	Stack Exit Velocity (m/s)	Stack Exit Temperature (°K)	Physical Stack Height (m)	GEP Stack Height (m)	Stack Base Elevation (m)

*Separate tables for 50%, 75%, 100% of full load operating condition (and any other operating conditions as determined by screening or detailed modeling analyses to represent constraining operating conditions) should be provided.

ADDENDUM

to

REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON AIR QUALITY MODELING: A SUMMARY REPORT,

EPA-450/4-82-015, (PB 83-150573), April 1981

Replace the cover and pages 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 10a, 15, A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, A-5, A-6, A-7, with the attached revised pages. Add new pages 5a, 15a, A-8, A-9, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, C-5 and C-6.

October 1983

B-10

EPA-450/4-82-015

REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON AIR QUALITY MODELING: A SUMMARY REPORT

APRIL 1981

Source Receptor Analysis Branch
Monitoring and Data Analysis Division
Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina

6-11

2.2.2 Background Concentrations

Techniques discussed in the Guideline on Air Quality Models should be used to establishing background concentrations.

2.2.3 Source Data

The load or operating condition of a plant that causes the highest ground-level concentrations should be determined through a screening analysis and this load should be used to establish emission limitations. As a minimum all sources should be modeled using 100 percent design capacity; however, when modeling large sources, e.g., 500 MW power plants or equivalent, 50 and 75 percent capacity should also be modeled.

Hourly sequential emissions determined for existing sources from continuous in-stack monitoring should be used in model evaluation where possible. Hourly emissions are critical where short-term concentrations are of concern in such evaluations.

2.2.4 Meteorological Data

2.2.4.1 Period of Record

Five years of representative meteorological data should be used when estimating concentrations with an air quality model. Consecutive years from the most recently available five-year period are preferred. The meteorological data may be data collected either on-site or at the nearest National Weather Service (NWS) station. If the source is large, e.g., a 500 MW power plant, the use of five years of NWS meteorological data or at least one year of on-site data is required. As many years of on-site data as are available should be used.

Five years of on-site data are often not available. When considering shorter periods of meteorological data, care must be taken to ensure that the data used contain the appropriate worst-case conditions. On-site data should also be subjected to quality assurance procedures that will ensure that the data are at least as accurate and in as much detail as NWS data.

2.2.4.2 Wind Direction

Hourly average wind directions reported to the nearest degree should be used where on-site data are used. The CRSTER randomizaton sequence (i.e., the established sequential random number set designated for use with the meteorological preprocessor to CRSTER) should be used with NWS wind data.

2.2.4.3 Reference Height

The surface wind reference height used in the model should be defined to agree with the actual height of the surface wind sensor. When wind is monitored at heights closer to plume height, the wind direction should be used to define the plume transport and the speed should be utilized to develop the appropriate vertical wind speed profile.

2.2.4.4 Collection of Field Data

Guidance provided in Appendix A should be followed in the design of site-specific, on-site meteorological data collection programs.

2.2.4.5 Use of National Weather Service (NWS) Calms

This section should be applied to situations where: (1) the available data are hourly NWS records or comparable military or FAA data, (2) the model of choice is Gaussian.

Wind speeds less than 2 knots are herein defined as calm. Although the estimated concentrations based on using the "calm" data as model input may be significant, Gaussian models cannot realistically handle these near zero wind conditions. Therefore, the hourly concentrations calculated using the calm data should not be considered valid concentrations; the wind and concentration data for these hours should be considered missing.

The model output containing concentrations calculated using the existing CRSTER procedure for handling calms should be examined for critical concentrations. If a critical concentration has been calculated using a calm, then recalculate the concentration considering the hours using the calms as missing. The new 3, 8 and 24-hour average critical concentrations should be calculated by dividing the total concentration for the period by the number of valid or non-missing hours. If the total number of valid hours is less than 18 for 24-hour averages, less than 6 for 8-hour averages or less than 3 for 3-hour averages, the total concentration should be divided by 18 for the 24-hour average, 6 for the 8-hour average and 3 for the 3-hour average. For annual averages, the sum of all valid hourly concentrations is divided by the number of non-calm hours during the year.

Computer software ("CALMPRO") has been developed by Region I and may be used to process either the meteorological input data or the output from CRSTER, MPTER, ISC, RAM or Complex I according to the procedures in this section.

These procedures do not apply to annual average concentrations determined with a model using "STAR" data input. The treatment of calms in such joint frequency distributions should not be changed.

2.2.4.6 Use of On-Site "Calm" or Light Wind Data

Measured on-site wind speeds of less than 1 m/s should be set equal to 1 m/s when used as input to Gaussian models. Wind direction for these low wind speed hours may be determined on a case-by-case basis from the available on-site records. If the wind is indeterminate with respect to speed or direction, it should be treated as missing data and short term averages may then be calculated as in 2.2.4.5 above.

2.2.4.7 Extended Periods of Calms

Stagnant conditions that include extended periods of calms often produce high concentrations over wide areas for relatively long averaging periods. The standard Gaussian models are often not applicable to such situations. When stagnation conditions are of concern, other modeling techniques may be considered on a case-by-case basis.

3.0 FLAT TERRAIN POINT SOURCE MODELS

3.1 Discussion

Flat terrain, as used here, is considered to be an area where terrain features are all lower in elevation than the top of the stack of the source in question.

A number of models have been made available by EPA and others for those applications where receptors are located at elevations less than the top of the stack. However, inconsistencies have resulted from the use of these models. Such inconsistencies occur in part because models may be developed at different times for specific applications and the various algorithms are improved, changed or added to accommodate a specific problem or to reflect recent research. This section provides recommendations to resolve these inconsistencies without limiting the range of applicability of flat terrain models.

3.2 Recommendations

3.2.1 Screening Techniques

Screening techniques and options as provided in "Guidelines for Air Quality Maintenance Planning and Analysis Volume 10 (R): Procedures for Evaluating Air Quality Impact of New Stationary Sources" should be used.

Where possible screening procedures should be site and problem specific. Consideration should be given to: (1) terrain; (2) urban or rural dispersion coefficients; (3) building downwash potential (see Sections 3.2.3f, 6.2.7 and Appendix C); and (4) worst-case conditions when representative meteorological data or applicable detailed modeling techniques are not available. If screening is the sole basis for the analysis, adequate justification and documentation should be required for the use of averaging time factors.

3.2.2 Refined Analytical Techniques

The following table lists the preferred models for the indicated applications. These models should be used in Regional Office

3.2.3 Model Options

The options that are found in ISC, CRSTER, MPTER, and PTPLU* have greatly increased the technical options available. To ensure consistency in the use of these options, Regional Office users should follow the guidance below:

a. Stack Tip Downwash (CRSTER, MPTER, ISC, PTPLU)

This option should not be used unless demonstrated to be applicable on a case-by-case basis. Although there is evidence that this phenomenon can occur, there are no data to support wide use of the option.

b. Plume Rise (CRSTER, MPTER, ISC, PTPLU)

In all cases, except when the downwash (building wake) algorithm of ISC is employed, the final plume rise option should be used. The restriction on the use of gradual plume rise is based upon the lack of specific data needed to quantify the dispersion during plume rise. When building downwash is considered a problem, transitional plume rise calculations are used only to determine whether the plume will be affected by building wake. If so, dispersion is then handled by appropriate modified dispersion parameters.

c. Rural/Urban Options (ISC)

The selection of the rural or urban option should be based upon the determinations as outlined in Section 6.2.5 for determining whether an area is urban or rural.

d. Momentum Plume Rise (ISC, CRSTER, MPTER, PTPLU)

This is optional in the CRSTER and MPTER models and an integral part of the ISC and PTPLU models. It should be used in the CRSTER and MPTER models.

e. Deposition (ISC)

The deposition algorithm in ISC should be used whenever deposition is considered to be a factor in the analysis.

f. Building Wake Effects (ISC)

The building wake effects option in ISC should be used whenever the height of the stack to be modeled is less than Good Engineering Practice (GEP) stack height. (See also Section 6.2.7)

*PTPLU is found in UNAMAP (Version 5)(PB 83-244 368) and is a replacement for PTMAX.

4.2.1.1 Initial Screening Technique

The initial screen is the use of the Valley Model Screening Technique. The following worst-case assumptions should be used in the Valley Screening Technique to determine 24-hour averages: (1) P-G stability "F"; (2) wind speed of 2.5 m/s; (3) 6 hours of occurrence.

Multiple sources should be treated individually in the Valley Model Screening Technique and the concentrations for specific wind directions summed. Only one wind direction should be used for 24-hour averages (see User's Manual, pages 2-15) even if individual runs are made for each source.

The receptor grid found in the Valley Model User's Guide may not be sufficient for all analyses if only one geographical scale factor is used. The Valley Model is very sensitive to ground-level elevation at the receptor, and the use of the standard polar grid could miss the worst-case receptor. If this situation occurs, the user should choose an additional set of receptors at appropriate downwind distances whose elevations are equal to plume height minus 10 meters.

4.2.1.2 Second Level Screening Technique

If a violation of any NAAQS or the controlling increment is indicated, a second-level screening technique may be used. An on-site data base of at least 1 full year of meteorological data, collected in accordance with the recommendations in Appendix A, is preferred for use with the second-level screening technique. All meteorological data used in the analysis must be reviewed for both spatial and temporal representativeness.

At this time, Complex I, available in UNAMAP Version 5, is the preferred second-level screening technique. Complex I is the result of modifying the MPTER Model to incorporate the Valley Model algorithm. As such it is a multi-source screening technique that accepts hourly meteorological input. It differs from the Valley Model in that it uses hourly sequential meteorological data. In Complex I, hourly wind direction input is specified to the nearest whole degree (and the plume vectored accordingly), but the 22 1/2° Valley Model crosswind sector averaging has been retained.

4.2.1.3 Restrictions

For screening analyses, the use of a sector greater than 22-1/2° should not be allowed and full ground reflection should always be used.

4.2.1.4 Options

Complex I should be used with the following input:

Card 5:

(1) select terrain adjustment IOPT(1) = 1

(2) select buoyancy induced dispersion IOPT(4) = 1

(3) set IOPT(25) = 1

Card 6:

(4) use the following terrain adjustment values: 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.0, 0.0.

(5) set ZMIN = 10.

If gradual plume rise is used to estimate concentrations at nearby elevated receptors, each of the concentrations listed in the model output table of high values should be carefully examined prior to regulatory application. The gradual plume rise option in COMPLEX I is not specific to stable conditions and the high concentrations could be the result of the larger dispersion coefficients assigned to unstable or neutral conditions and plume touchdown on other than elevated terrain. Only those concentrations specifically recorded at receptors above plume height should be used.

The option in the Valley Model to use the 2.6 stable plume rise factor should be selected and for buoyant sources the option for buoyancy-induced dispersion should be exercised.

4.2.2 Refined Analytical Techniques

When the results of the screening analysis demonstrate a possible violation of NAAQS or the controlling PSD increments, a more refined analysis should be conducted. Since there are no refined techniques currently recommended for complex terrain applications, a nonguideline model may be applied in accordance with Section 7. In the absence of an appropriate refined model, screening results may be acceptable.

Population Density Procedures: (1) Compute the average population density, p, per square kilometer with A_o as defined above; (2) If p, is greater than 750 people/km^2, use urban dispersion coefficients; otherwise, use appropriate rural dispersion coefficients.

The land use procedure is considered the most definitive. Population density should be used with caution, especially in a highly industrialized area where the population density may be low but the area is sufficiently built up so that the land use criteria would be satisfied. Impacts from sources beyond the three (3) kilometers should be included in the background.

For analyses of urban complexes, the entire area should be modeled as an urban region if most of the sources are located in areas classified as urban.

6.2.6 General Model Evaluation

A model evaluation study should assess how closely the mathematical assumptions inherent to the model describe the physics and/or chemistry of the atmosphere. The process of model evaluation should consider all of the following: (1) assumptions inherent to design/algorithms of model; (2) purpose/objective of model; (3) purpose/objectives of monitor(s); (4) applicability of monitored data for comparison; (5) comparison of model estimates with monitor observations for upper end of frequency distribution, statistical analyses, and analyses of weakness in individual algorithms; and (6) analyses of critical meteorological and source conditions and their effect on individual algorithms. An analysis should also be made of the sensitivity of the algorithms to the meteorological input data.

For short-term model evaluation, all input data should be based on measured hourly averages. This includes mass emission rates, stack dynamic operating parameters and meteorological input. The spatial applicability of measured air quality data and tracer studies should be consistent with the scale of the model comparisons.

Calibration for short-term air quality concentrations is not recommended. Determination of the need for calibration and calibration procedures are contained in the 1978 guideline.

6.2.7 GEP and Downwash Analysis

All SIP revisions and PSD permits for major sources (potential to emit greater than 100 tons per year) should include a GEP analysis for each stack. For area-wide SIPs, where a GEP analysis for each source may prove impractical, those major sources with known or suspected downwash problems, and all large sources (e.g. emissions equivalent to a 500 MW power plant), should have GEP analyses. All GEP analyses should be performed in accordance with the "Guideline for Determination of Good Engineering Practice Stack Height (Technical Support for the Stack Height Regulations)," EPA-450/4-80-023, July 1981. If the analysis indicates that the stack is below the GEP height, a downwash analysis should be performed. Detailed downwash screening procedures are provided in Appendix C.

APPENDIX A

ACQUISITION OF SITE SPECIFIC METEOROLOGICAL DATA

Models recommended in the 1978 Guideline on Air Quality Models require as input the following parameters:

- transport wind speed and direction;
- ambient air temperature;
- Pasquill-Gifford stability category.

Transport Wind Speed and Direction

For stacks below 100 m, select the stack top height as the transport wind speed and direction measurement height. For sources with stacks extending above 100 m, a 100 m tower is suggested unless the stack top is significantly above 100 m (200 m or more). For cases with stacks 200 m or above, the Regional Meteorologist should determine the appropriate measurement height on a case-by-case basis. Remote sensing may be a feasible alternative.

The wind speed should be measured using an anemometer and the wind direction measured using a vane with a vertical tail. The specifications for wind measuring instruments contained in the "Ambient Monitoring Guidelines for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)," EPA 450/4-80-012, November 1980 should be followed. Wind direction should be reported to the nearest degree.

Ambient Air Temperature

Ambient temperature should be measured at or near standard instrument shelter height. Temperature can be reliably measured using good quality linear thermistors or platinum resistance devices.

Pasquill-Gifford Stability Category

The Pasquill-Gifford (P-G) stability categories, as originally defined, couple near-surface measurements of wind speed with subjectively determined insolation assessments based on hourly cloud cover and ceiling observations. The wind speed measurements are made at or near 10 m. The insolation rate is typically assessed using the cloud cover and ceiling height criteria outlined by Turner (1964)*. Often the cloud cover data are not available in site-specific data sets. In the absence of such observations, it is recommended that the P-G stability category be estimated using Table A-I. This table requires σ_E, the standard deviation of the vertical wind direction fluctuations. If the surface roughness of the area surrounding the source is different from the 15 cm roughness length upon which the table is based, an adjustment may be made as indicated in footnote 2 of Table A-I. σ_E is computed from direct measurements of the elevation angle of the vertical wind directions.

If measurements of elevation angle are not available, σ_E may be determined using the transform:

$$\sigma_E \text{ (radians)} = \sigma_W/u$$

where: σ_E = the standard deviation of the vertical wind direction fluctuations over a one-hour period;

---

*Turner, D. B., 1964. A Diffusion Model for an Urban Area. Journal of Applied Meteorology, 3(1):83-91.

σ_w = the standard deviation of the vertical wind speed fluctuations over a one-hour period;

u = the average horizontal wind speed for a one-hour period.

Since both σ_w and u are in meters per second, σ_E is in radians. To use σ_E in Table A-I, σ_E must be converted to degrees. It is recommended that a vertically mounted propeller anemometer be used to measure the vertical wind speed fluctuations. The instrument should meet the specifications given in the Ambient Monitoring Guidelines referenced above. Compute σ_w directly each hour using at least 3600 values based on a recommended readout interval of 1 second. If σ_E is computed using the output of the anemometer by other than direct application of the formula for a variance, the method should be demonstrated to be equivalent to direct computation. Both the vertical wind speed fluctuations and the horizontal wind speed should be measured at the same level. Moreover, these measurements should be made at a height of 10 m for use in estimating the P-G stability category. Where trees or land use preclude measurements as low as 10 m, measurements should be made at a height above the obstructions.

If on-site measurement of either σ_E or σ_w are not available, stability categories may be determined using the horizontal wind direction fluctuation, σ_A, as outlined by John Irwin in Dispersion Estimate Suggestion No. 8. He includes the Mitchell and Timbre* method that uses

---

*Mitchell, A. Edgar, Jr., and K. O. Timbre, Atmospheric Stability Class from Horizontal Wind FLuctuation, 72nd Annual Meeting APCA, Cincinnati, Ohio, June 24, 1979 the NRC Safety Guide 1.23 categories of σ_A listed in Table A-II as an initial estimate of the P-G stability category. This relationship is considered adequate for daytime use. During the nighttime (one hour prior to sunset to one hour after sunrise) the adjustments given in Table A-III should be applied to these categories. As with σ_E in Table A-I, an hourly average σ_A may be adjusted for surface roughness by multiplying the table values of σ_A by a factor based on the average surface roughness length determined within 1 to 3 km of the source. The need for such adjustments should be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Wind direction meander may, at times, lead to an erroneous determination of P-G stability category based on σ_A. To minimize wind direction meander contributions, σ_A may be determined for each of four 15-minute periods in an hour. To obtain the σ_A for stability determinations in these situations, take the square root of one-quarter of the sum of the squares of the four 15-minute σ_A's. While this approach is acceptable for determining stability category, σ_A's calculated in this manner are not likely to be suitable for input to models under development that are designed to accept on-site hourly σ's based on 60-minute periods.

There has not been widespread use of σ_E and σ_A to determine P-G categories. As mentioned in the footnotes to Tables A-I and A-II, the techniques outlined have not been extensively tested. The criteria listed in Tables A-I, A-II, and A-III are for σ_E and σ_A values at 10m. For best results, the σ_E and σ_A values should be for heights near the surface as close to 10 m as practicable. Obstacles and large roughness elements may preclude measurements as low as 10 m. If circumstances preclude measurements below 30 m, the Regional Meteorologist should be consulted to determine the appropriate measurements to be taken on a case-by-case basis. The criteria listed in Tables A-I, A-II, and A-III result from studies conducted in relatively flat terrain in rather ideal circumstances. For routine applications where conditions are often less than ideal, it is recommended that a temporary program be initiated at each site to spot-check the stability class estimates. Irwin's method using σ_E or σ_A should be compared with P-G stability class estimates using on-site wind speed and subjective assessments of the insolation based on ceiling height and cloud cover observations. The Regional Meteorologist should be consulted when using the spot-check results to refine and adjust the preliminary criteria outlined in Tables A-I, A-II, and A-III.

In summary, when on-site data sets are being used, Pasquill-Gifford stability categories should be determined from one of the following schemes listed in the order of preference:

(1) Turner's 1964 method using on-site data which include cloud cover, ceiling height and surface (~ 10m) winds.

(2) σ_E from on-site measurements and Table A-I.
(σ_E may be determined from elevation angle measurements or may be estimated from measurements of σ_W according to the transform: $\sigma_E = \sigma_W/u$ (see page A-2).)

(3) σ_A from on-site measurements and Table A-II and A-III.

(4) Turner's 1964 method using on-site wind speed with cloud cover and ceiling height from a nearby NWS site.

Table A-I

P-G Stability Category Versus Standard Deviation of Vertical Wind Direction Fluctuation, σ_E

P-G Stability Category	Standard Deviation of Vertical Wind Direction Fluctuations (in degrees)[1,2]
A	> 11.5°[3]
B	10° to 11.5°
C	7.8° to 10°
D	5° to 7.8°
E	2.4° to 5.0°
F	< 2.4°

Adapted from: Irwin, John, 1980. Estimation of Pasquill Stability Categories, Dispersion Estimate Suggestion No. 8, Environmental Applications Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC.

[1]Care should be taken that the wind sensor is responsive enough for use in measuring vertical wind direction fluctuations.

[2]A surface roughness factor of $(z_0/15\text{ cm})^{0.2}$, where z_0 is the average surface roughness in centimeters within a radius of 1-3 km of the source, may be applie to the table values. It should be noted that this factor, while theoretically sound, has not been subjected to rigorous testing and may not improve the estimates in all circumstances. A table of z_0 values that may be used as a guide to estimating surface roughness is given in: A. Smedman-Hogstrom and U. Hogstrom (1978). "A Practical Method for Determining Wind Frequency Distributions for the Lowest 200 m from Routine Meteorological Data." Journal of Applied Meteorology, 17(7):942-953.

[3]These criteria were adapted from those presented by Smith and Howard (1972).* It would seem reasonable to restrict the possible categories to A through D during daytime hours and to categories D through F during the nighttime hours. During daytime hours for wind speeds above 6 m/s, conditions are neutral. During the night, conditions are neutral for wind speeds equal to or greater than 5 m/s.

*Smith, T. B. and S. M. Howard, 1972. Methodology for Treating Diffusivity. MRI 72FR-1030. Meteorology Research, Inc, 464 W. Woodbury Road, Altadena, CA.

Table A-II

P-G Stability Categories Versus Standard Deviation of Horizontal Wind Direction Fluctuations, σ_A

P-G Stability Category	Standard Deviation of the Horizontal Wind Direction Flunctuations (in degrees)[1,2]
A	> 22.5[3]
B	17.5 to 22.5
C	12.5 to 17.5
D	7.5 to 12.5
E	3.8 to 7.5
F	< 3.8

Adapted from: Irwin, John, 1980. Estimation of Pasquill Stability Categories, Dispersion Estimate Suggestion No. 8, Environmental Applications Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC.

[1]Care should be taken that the wind sensor is responsive enough for use in measuring wind direction fluctuations.

[2]A surface roughness factor of $(z_0/15\ \text{cm})^{0.2}$, where z_0 is the average surface roughness in centimeters within a radius of 1-3 km of the source, may be applied to the table values. It should be noted that this factor, while theoretically sound, has not been subjected to rigorous testing and may not improved the estimates in all circumstances. A table of z_0 values that may be used as a guide to estimating surface roughness is given in: A Smedman-Hogstrom and U. Hogstrom (1978). "A Practical Method for Determining Wind Frequency Distributions for the Lowest 200 m from Routine Meteorological Data." Journal of Applied Meteorology, 17(7):942-953.

[3]These criteria are from NRC Safety Guide 1.23. It would seem reasonable to restrict the possible categories to A through D during daytime hours with a restriction that for wind speeds above 6 m/s, conditions are neutral. Likewise, during the nighttime hours, some restrictions, as in Table A-III, are needed to preclude occurrences of categories A through C.

Table A-III

Nighttime[1] P-G Stability Categories Based on σ_A from Table A-II

If the σ_A stability class is	And if the 10 m wind speed, u, is m/s	mi/hr	Then the stability class is
A	$u<2.9$	$u<6.4$	F
	$2.9<u<3.6$	$6.4<u<7.9$	E
	$3.6\leq u$	$7.9\leq u$	D
B	$u<2.4$	$u<5.3$	F
	$2.4<u<3.0$	$5.3<u<6.6$	E
	$3.0\leq u$	$6.6\leq u$	D
C	$u<2.4$	$u<5.3$	E
	$2.4\leq u$	$5.3\leq u$	D
D	wind speed not considered		D
E	wind speed not considered[2]		E
F	wind speed not considered[3]		F

Adapted from: Irwin, John 1980. Estimation of Pasquill Stability Categories Dispersion Estimate Suggestion No. 8, Environmental Applications Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC.

[1]Nighttime is 1 hour before sunset to 1 hour after sunrise.

[2]The original Mitchell and Timbre (1979)* table had no wind speed restrictions; however, the original Pasquill criteria suggest that for wind speeds above 5 m/sec, neutral conditions would be appropriate.

[3]The original Mitchell and Timbre (1979)* table had no wind speed restrictions; however the original Pasquill criteria suggest that for wind speeds greater than or equal to 5 m/sec, the D category would be appropriate, and for wind speeds between 3 m/sec and 5 m/sec, the E category would be appropriate.

*Mitchell, Jr., A. E. and K. O. Timbre, 1979. Atmospheric Stability Class from Horizontal Wind Fluctuation. Presented at 72nd Annual Pollution Control Association, Cincinnati, Ohio, June 24-29, 1979.

APPENDIX C

BUILDING DOWNWASH SCREENING PROCEDURES

When a GEP analysis indicates that a stack is less than the GEP height, the following screening procedures should be applied to assess the potential for air quality problems. The building downwash screening procedure is divided into two major areas of concern. Within the cavity region (up to 3L downwind, where L = the lesser of the building height or projected width), a series of simple hand calculations can be used. Within the wake region (3L to 10L downwind), the ISC model can be used in a screening mode. Details on both procedures are provided below.

Cavity Region

The cavity effects screening procedure consists of four sequential steps.

Step 1. Compare the stack height to the cavity height. Calculate the cavity height h_c:

$$h_c = H + 0.5(L),$$

where: H = height of structure (m) and

L = lesser dimension (height or projected width) of structure (m).

If the stack height is greater than or equal to the cavity height, then it may be assumed that maximum impacts will be dominated by the wake effects, and no further cavity analysis is required. Proceed to perform the wake effects analysis. If the stack height is less than the cavity height, proceed to Step 2.

Step 2. Estimate the momentum plume rise for neutral atmospheric conditions. First compute the momentum flux, Fm:

$$F_m = (T_a/T_s)\, v^2 d^2/4$$

where T_a = ambient air temperature (°K) (assume 293°K),

T_s = stack exit temperature (°K),

v = stack exit velocity (m/s) and

d = stack inner diameter (m).

Next, compute the momentum plume rise h_m:

$$h_m = \left| \frac{3F_m(x)}{b^2\ u^2} \right|^{1/3}$$

where $b = (1/3 + u/v_s)$,

u = critical wind speed (m/s) (assume 7.5 m/s),

x = downwind distance (m) (assume 2 building heights downwind).

The plume height can be calculated by adding the momentum plume rise to the stack height. If the plume height is greater than or equal to the cavity height calculated in Step 1, then it may be assumed that maximum impacts will be dominated by the wake effects and no further cavity analysis is required. Proceed to the wake effects analysis. If the plume height is less than the cavity height, proceed to Step 3.

Step 3. Estimate the downwind extent of the cavity. Compute the cavity length (x_r), measured from the lee side of the building:

for short buildings (Y/H<2):

$$x_r = \frac{(A)(W)}{1.0 + B(W/H)},$$

for long buildings (Y/H $\geq$ 2):

$$x_r = \frac{1.75(W)}{1.0 + 0.25(W/H)},$$

where: H = building height (m)

Y = alongwind building dimension (m),

W = crosswind building dimension (m),

$A = -2.0 + 3.7(Y/H)^{-1/3}$ and

$B = -0.15 + 0.305(Y/H)^{-1/3}$.

Next, compare the cavity length to the closest distance to the plant property line. Consider only plant property to which public access is precluded. If the cavity does not exceed this distance, then it may be assumed that cavity effects will not impact ambient air, and no further cavity analysis is required. Proceed to the wake effects analysis. If the cavity extends beyond plant property, proceed to Step 4.

Step 4. Estimate impacts within the cavity. "Worst case" concentration impacts (X) can be estimated by the following approximation:

$$X = \frac{Q}{1.5(A)(u)},$$

where: Q = emission rate (g/s),

A = cross-sectional area of building normal to wind (m^2) and

u = wind speed (m/s).

For u, one should choose the lowest wind speed likely to result in entrainment of most or all of the pollutant into the cavity. If no data are available from which the minimum speed can be estimated, assume a worst case wind speed of 3 m/s.

This concludes the cavity effects screening procedure. It is considered to be conservative. If this conservative estimate proves unacceptable, one may wish to consider a field study or fluid modeling demonstration to show maintenance of the NAAQS or PSD increments within the cavity. If such options are pursued, prior agreement on the study plan and methodology should be reached with the Regional Office.

Wake Region

Wake effects screening can be performed with ISC using a set of representative "worst case" meteorological conditions. The procedure consists of three steps.

Step 1. Determine the "worst case" building dimensions for input to the model. To model "worst case" conditions, care should be taken to use the same critical building dimensions (maximum projected width and/or height) that gave the greatest stack height in the GEP analysis. The way ISC is constructed, the user inputs a building length and width, instead of the projected width used in the GEP analysis. The model calculates an area based on this length and width and then determines the diameter of a circle with equal area. This so called "effective diameter" (D) is used in all other model calculations as the projected width of the building.

Thus ISC assumes:

$$(L)(W) = (\pi/4)\ D^2.$$

To model the projected width determined in the GEP analysis, set D equal to the projected width and solve the above equation assuming L = W. The calculated value should then be used as inputs to ISC for L and W. For example, if a building is 60 m tall, 40 m long and 30 m wide, the greatest GEP height is found by maximizing the projected width (using the 50 m diagonal). In this case, set D = 50 and solve the above equation to find L = W = 44 m. This dimension is then used as the input for L and W in ISC.

Step 2. Calculate maximum hourly concentrations using ISC. The following procedures should be followed:

A. Use the wake effects option with building dimensions determined in Step 1, transitional plume rise (ISW(24)=2), and no stack tip downwash (ISW(25)=1).

B. With the source at the center of the grid, place receptors downwind along a single radial. Receptors should be spaced no more than 100 m apart within 2000 m of the source. Additional receptors may be needed on a case specific basis to ensure prediction of the maximum concentration.

C. A set of representative "worst case" meteorological conditions should be used in conjunction with the model option that reads hourly data in card image format (ISW(19)=2). The following combinations of stability class and wind speed should be used in the model to insure use of the "worst case" meteorological conditions:

Stability Class	Wind Speed (m/s)
A	1, 3
B	1, 3, 5
C	1, 3, 5, 10
D	1, 3, 5, 10, 20
E	1, 3, 5
F (rural only)	1, 3, 5

A temperature of 293°K, a mixing height of 5000 m, and a wind direction along the line of receptors should be used for each hour. If other combinations of parameters (stability, wind speed, temperature, etc) are known or suspected to cause problems, they should also be modeled.

Step 3. Obtain concentration estimates for the averaging times of concern. The maximum 1-hour concentration is the highest of the concentrations estimated in Step 2. Maximum concentrations for longer averaging times should be estimated using the procedures described in EPA's "Guidelines for Air Quality Maintenance Planning and Analysis, Volume 10 (Revised): Procedures for Evaluating Air Quality Impact of New Stationary Sources." EPA-450/4-77-001, October 1977 (pp 4-20 thru 4-22).

TECHNICAL REPORT DATA
(Please read Instructions on the reverse before completing)

1. REPORT NO. EPA-450/4-82-015	2.	3. RECIPIENT'S ACCESSION NO. PB83 150573
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Regional Workshops on Air Quality Modeling A Summary Report		5. REPORT DATE April 1981
		6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE
7. AUTHOR(S) Monitoring and Data Analysis Division Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Research Triangle Park, N. C. 27711		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.
		11. CONTRACT/GRANT NO.
12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS Same as box 9.		13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED 1979 - 1982
		14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE

15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

EPA Project Officer: C. J. Hopper

16. ABSTRACT

The requirements placed on air quality control agencies by the Clean Air Act have dramatically increased the need for improved air quality modeling. The resulting increase in the use of models has also led to a substantial increase in the number and complexity of situations in which models are employed. The modeling guideline (Guideline on Air Quality Models, EPA-450/2-78-027, April 1978) addresses many of the problems in this relatively new and growing field, but much is left to the discretion of the reviewing agency since many complex problems are best solved on a case-by-case basis. However, because of the variety of technically correct solutions to any complex problem, different approaches with differing results have led to inconsistency in model applications from Region to Region. In an effort to improve consistency several workshops were held to provide a forum for the Regional Office and Headquarters groups to discuss common problem areas and arrive at generally acceptable solutions. Many recommendateions were made in the course of the workshops. These were reviewed by OAQPS and some have necessarily been modified and supplemented to ensure consistency with other modeling policies. This report clarifies preferred data bases and procedures for the application of specific models and modeling techniques in situations where the guideline permits a case-by-case analysis.

17. KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

a. DESCRIPTORS	b. IDENTIFIERS/OPEN ENDED TERMS	c. COSATI Field/Group
Air Pollution Atmospheric Models Atmospheric Diffusion Meteorology Air Pollution Abatement	Implementation Air Pollution Planning Diffusion Modeling Gaussian Plume Models Clean Air Act	13B

18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT unlimited release	19. SECURITY CLASS (This Report) none	21. NO. OF PAGES 44
	20. SECURITY CLASS (This page) none	22. PRICE

EPA Form 2220-1 (9-73)