

Ohio EPA
Division of Air Pollution Control
Air Quality Modeling and Planning Section
Engineering Guide #69
Air Dispersion Modeling Guidance

2003

October 2013

The Division of Air Pollution Control (DAPC) has received several questions concerning computer modeling of air pollution sources. This guide is intended to respond to those questions. Below is a list of all of the questions. The rest of the Guide contains the Division's responses. The Division welcomes comments on the application of this Guide and additional questions related to air dispersion modeling.

This document will answer the most commonly asked questions to provide a basis for consistent model application although many other questions require case-specific responses. The answers in this document do not reflect a rule or regulation, are not intended to be treated as a rule or regulation, and are subject to change on a case-by-case basis. The information within is provided so that permitting personnel, regulated entities and the public will have an understanding of the expected outcome of the situations described in this document. If you have additional questions on modeling, or comments on this guide, you should contact the Division of Air Pollution Control (614-644-2270).

Table of Contents

Questions and Answers.....pg **25**

APPENDIX A.....pg **2938**

APPENDIX B.....pg **44**

TABLES

Table 1; Meteorological Assignments and Mappg **2429**

Formatted: Top: 0.88"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Table 2; National Weather Service Anemometer
Heights and Station Numbers.....
.....pg 2735

Table 3; ~~Threshold~~ Federal and State Modeling Standards and
Significant Emission Rates and
Target Concentrationspg
2836

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", Hanging: 0.63",
Tab stops: 1.63", Left

Question 1: What specific modeling requirements are incorporated by Ohio EPA in the review of air contaminant sources?

Question 2: What models are to be used?

Question 2.1: Can Screening models be used for more than one source?

Question 3: What meteorological data sets are to be used?

Question 4: What modeled emission rate(s) should be used?

Question 4.1: Are fugitive emissions modeled?

Question 4.2: Are there any exceptions to the modeling thresholds for modeling criteria pollutants and toxics contained in Table 3?

Question 4.3: Should sources be modeled that emit pollutants listed in the ACGIH book, do not have a TWA, but do have a Ceiling or STEL?

Question 4.4: Are minor and exempt sources included in the modeling for a project which exceeds the thresholds in Table 3?

Question 4.5: Do you model sources within a building that have no direct vent to the outside or do not have an identified control device for capture, control and release of the emissions from the unit?

Question 5: Is building downwash required for state modeling?

Question 5.1: What building height do I use if the building has a pitched roof?

Question 6: ~~Reserved/Deleted~~ Is there any special guidance for nonstandard point source emissions?

Formatted: Font: Bold

~~Question 7: Is there any special guidance for nonstandard point source emissions?~~

~~Question 7~~Question 6.1: How do I model rain caps and horizontal releases?

~~Question 7~~6.2: How do I model flares?

~~Question 7~~6.3: What special modeling considerations are necessary for modeling combustion turbines?

~~Question 8: Reserved/Deleted~~

~~Question 9~~7: What receptor grids must I use?

~~Question 4~~08: What are the state significant emission rates which trigger modeling?

~~Question 4~~0.58.1: Can a source modification trigger a requirement for modeling even where there is no increase in emission rate?

~~Question 4~~19: What are the state target concentrations for acceptable incremental impacts?

~~Question 4~~210: What special requirements exist for sources of fluoride?

~~Question 4~~311: How do I obtain background values when performing NAAQS analyses in Ohio?

~~Question 4~~412: What sources do I include in a major source PSD and/or NAAQS analysis?

~~Question 4~~513: How do I model major sources in nonattainment areas to demonstrate net air quality improvement?

~~Question 46: Can I use SCREEN to model multiple sources?~~

14

~~Question 47~~: If multiple pollutants are being emitted, does an individual model run have to be performed for each pollutant?

~~Question 4~~815: For PSD and non-PSD sources, can facilities be installed if modeling shows that more than ½ the available PSD increment is consumed?

~~Question 4~~916: What determines whether a locale is rural or urban?

Question 17.....

: How do you model PM2.5 secondary formation for PSD?

Question 28: Which averaging times should I use?

Question 19: Are modeling protocols required?

Question 20: Does start up and shutdown emissions need to be modeled?

Question 21: When is a Class I Modeling Analysis required?

Question 22: Will Ohio EPA do air dispersion modeling for my facility?

Question 23: What files need to be submitted to Ohio EPA for a modeling review?

Question 24: Do I need to model Greenhouse Gases?

Question 25: How do I evaluate Ozone?

.....

DRAFT

Question 1: What specific modeling requirements are incorporated by Ohio EPA in the review of air contaminant sources?

Answer 1: The following is intended to identify current Ohio EPA, ~~Division of Air Pollution Control~~**DAPC** requirements for air pollution control modeling applications within Ohio. Where applicable, Ohio EPA is consistent with U.S. EPA guidance. In real world applications, the ~~U.S.~~**U.S.** EPA Guideline on Air Quality Models ~~–(Appendix W of 40 CFR Part 51)~~ and supplementary guidance does not always address detailed problems that confront modelers.

The purpose of air dispersion modeling is to predict pollutant concentrations resulting from a source or group of sources under various meteorological conditions. Modeling is necessary to demonstrate that the subject source or sources will not 1) cause or significantly contribute to a violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS); 2) cause ambient concentrations which exceed allowable ~~PSD~~**Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)** increments; 3) comply with Ohio EPA's policy of no new source consuming more than one half of the available PSD increment (one half the increment is the effective goal for all new source modeling of criteria pollutants, regardless of the size or location of the new source.); and/or 4) cause ground level concentrations which exceed ~~Ohio EPA's maximum allowable ground level concentration~~**the Maximum Allowable Ground Level Concentration (MAGLC)** for toxic air ~~pollutants-contaminants identified in Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) rule 3745-114-01.~~ For criteria pollutants which do not have identified PSD increments, maximum incremental impact of new source emissions is limited to one quarter of the NAAQS.

The combined emission increases from all of the new or modified sources must be evaluated to determine the maximum incremental impact if the total emissions exceed the amounts indicated in Table 3. For criteria pollutants, the incremental impact cannot exceed one half of any PSD increment or, if no PSD increment exists, one quarter of the NAAQS. There is no requirement to model ~~Volatile Organic Compound (VOC)~~ emissions for incremental impact on ozone concentrations¹ (although specific VOC constituents may require air toxic modeling). **For exceptions to the one half PSD increment policy, see Answer 4815.**

New or ~~increased~~**modified sources with** emissions of toxics that exceed the levels identified in Table 3 must be evaluated to determine the maximum ~~incremental~~ impact of these emissions for comparison with the MAGLC as ~~described~~**required by the procedures** in ~~Ohio EPA's current procedure for reviewing new sources~~**division (F)(4) of air toxics section 3704.03 of the Revised Code.**

Where the permit includes both emission increases and decreases (generally restricted

¹ A non-modeling VOC analysis may be necessary in certain cases, see Answer 25.

Formatted: Font: Bold

to a contemporaneous 5-~~or 10~~-year period), the net increase should be modeled. Ohio EPA must approve the 'netting' emissions prior to modeling.

Question 2: What models are to be used?

Answer 2: The specific source/receptor situation dictates the appropriate model for determining ambient concentrations for comparison with NAAQS, PSD increments, short or long term exposure limits, etc. The size and complexity of the source, the toxicity of the emissions along with other factors will dictate whether a screening model or a refined model is appropriate.

Screening models are generally the first level tools for evaluating air quality impacts. High predicted concentrations from a screening model may indicate the need for further refined modeling. Larger more significant sources and groups of sources will require the application of a refined model.

Sources in areas where terrain elevation is significant relative to the stack height will require evaluation using receptor elevations. Where terrain exceeds the stack height, a complex or intermediate terrain modeling analysis is necessary. This applies to both criteria and toxic pollutants.

Generally, the most recent version of a model is to be used. The most recent model versions of models contained in The Guideline on Air Quality Models (~~GAQM- (Appendix W of 40 CFR Part 51)~~) can be obtained by accessing the U.S. EPA Support Center for Regulatory Air Models-(SCRAM), Technology Transfer Network at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/scram> ~~http://www.epa.gov/ttn/scram/dispersion_prefrec.htm~~.

The SCRAM web page also provides model users manuals, ancillary programs, meteorological data and additional model application information. This Engineering Guide ~~and is available on the Ohio EPA DAPC web page located at~~ <http://epa.ohio.gov/portals/27/engineer/eguides/guide69.pdf>. In addition, meteorological data for Ohio sources are available on the Ohio EPA DAPC web page located at <http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dapc/aqmp/aqmp.htm> ~~http://epa.ohio.gov/dapc/model/modeling/metfiles.aspx~~.

~~**Note: The Guideline on Air Quality Models (Appendix W of 40 CFR Part 51) will be revised. AERMOD has been identified as the replacement for the ISC models. Federal guidance has indicated that both AERMOD and ISC will be acceptable for no more than one year after the final rule is published. At which time ISC will no longer be acceptable for PSD and SIP related modeling. Ohio EPA will continue to accept ISC for state-only permits and modeling projects until further notice.**~~

Screening models:

Formatted: Strikethrough

~~Note: There is currently no screening version of AERMOD to replace SCREEN3. Until further notice, SCREEN3 will still be accepted by Ohio EPA for state-only permit modeling.~~

The current recommended model for screening point or area sources in simple terrain is the most recent version of ~~SCREEN3 (or its successor), AERSCREEN~~, for criteria pollutants or for applications where maximum ambient concentrations of neutral buoyancy pollutants are desired. A fundamental assumption for pollutants being modeled with traditional Gaussian models is that the concentration of the pollutant in the plume will not make the plume disperse or diffuse differently than air.

AERSCREEN is the required screening model for all PSD projects. SCREEN3 will still be accepted by Ohio EPA for state-only permit modeling until December 31, 2013. After that, SCREEN3 will no longer be accepted and AERSCREEN will be the required model for state-only permit modeling.

Applications requiring an evaluation of emergency release scenarios or sources emitting 'light' or 'heavy' plumes may use one of the commercially available toxic release models to determine if ambient impacts exceed the applicable MAGLC. Most routine releases, even of heavy compounds, will have a density close to that of air due to high dilution.

Point sources with stacks less than good engineering height (discussed below) must be evaluated for downwash impacts using the ~~SCREEN3 or SCREEN3C model (or their successors)~~required screening model.

Initial screening estimates of source impacts involving intermediate or complex terrain should utilize ~~SCREEN3 or CTSCREEN (or their successors)~~SCREEN3 is available as an interactive program by itself or within the TSCREEN model set the required screening model.

The output from these models identifies short term (1-hour) maximum impacts. The following are the conversion factors to be used to convert these short term estimates to the averaging time of concern. Separate conversion factors have been recommended by U.S. EPA for terrain below stack tip (simple terrain) and terrain above stack tip (complex terrain).

Conversion Factors

	Desired Averaging Period						
Model output	1-hr	3-hr	8-hr	24-hr	month	qtr	ann
Simple 1-hr:	1.000	0.900	0.700	0.400	0.180	0.130	0.080
Complex 1-hr	1.000	0.700	0.500	0.150		0.060	0.030

Model Output	Desired Averaging Period						
	1-hr	3-hr	8-hr	24-hr	Month	Quarter	Annual
Simple	1	0.9	0.7	0.4	0.18	0.13	0.08
Complex	1	0.7	0.5	0.15	-	0.06	0.03

Additional guidance on the use of AERSCREEN and SCREEN and TSCREEN is provided in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively, of this document.

~~Complex and intermediate terrain screening for state-only permit requirements can also be performed using ISC3 with five years of NWS data.~~

Refined models:

~~The most commonly used AERMOD is the required refined model for point, area and volume sources involving simple, intermediate and complex terrain are the most recent versions of ISCST3 and ISGLT3 (or their successors), using representative meteorological data in the regulatory default modes. ISC is no longer accepted by Ohio. Several commercial versions of these models have been granted model equivalency by U.S. EPA and are therefore also acceptable. For refined toxic analyses, the same procedures used for criteria pollutants are used to determine ambient concentrations. There are currently no requirements for deposition calculations.~~

~~Modeling involving pollutant transformations (ozone, nitrates, sulfates) is not generally required for new or modified sources and is not addressed in this guide.~~

Question 2.1: Can Screening models be used for more than one source?

Answer 2.1: Yes, screening models can be used to determine the maximum modeled concentration from more than once source. While screen modeling is a single-source model, it can be used to develop a conservative estimate of the peak potential impact of emissions from multiple egress locations.

The modeler may either model the worst case stack parameters from each of the sources and model those at the source located closest to the fenceline or the modeler may model each source individually and sum the maximum modeled concentrations before comparing the results to the applicable standard.

Formatted: Font: Bold

A conservative approach combines the peak impact from each individual run as if the peak impact from each emission point occurred at the same point in space.

In the case of multiple identical stacks, all of the emissions can be assumed to come from one stack (modeled using the combined emission rate with the stack flow parameters for a single stack).

If the stacks are not identical, all of the emission could be assumed to be emitted from the 'worst case' emission point. Sometimes the determination of worst case is straightforward (e.g., shortest, coldest, lowest flow stack). In other situations, the choice may not be clear and the Local Air Agency, District Office or Central Office should be consulted.

The approaches described above will result in conservative estimates. If the source(s) does not pass using the above assumptions, less conservative approaches can be considered in consultation with the Local Air Agency, District Office or Central Office. A multisource refined model may also be appropriate to use to model the actual separation of emission points and estimate their combined peak impact.

Formatted: Font: Bold, Font color: Black

Question 3: What meteorological data sets are to be used?

Answer 3:

Short Term: ISC

AERMOD Data Sets: Hourly surface observations are combined with twice-daily mixing-height measurement to create a RAMMET meteorological input file. RAMMET data files can be created using on-site tower measurements or off-site or National Weather Service (NWS) two minute surface data sets. are combined with local surface characteristics and upper air observations within the AERMET preprocessor program to create the needed modeling meteorological data sets for AERMOD.

Formatted: Underline

If the modeling is for NAAQS or PSD analyses, at least one year of on-site or ~~the most~~ recent available five years of representative off-site NWS data are required. If the source of concern is located in intermediate or complex terrain, U.S. EPA believes that NWS data are not representative for the above stack portion of the analysis and are therefore not acceptable. For state-only modeling requirements, ~~5~~ five years of NWS data are considered acceptable for use in a conservative screening analysis.

Formatted: Strikethrough

The most recent Recent five-year off-site NWS data sets currently available from Ohio EPA are for the period ~~1987-1994~~ 2007-2011. These data are acceptable. Later NWS data are also acceptable but not required. Off-site NWS data sets are assigned by county. Table 1 identifies the appropriate data set for each county in Ohio.

~~Certain southeastern counties of the state have been assigned Parkersburg/Huntington-RAMMET and STAR data for modeling. For counties assigned 'Parkersburg' surface data, 1973-1977 data are the most recent available. This surface site is the most representative available for modeling in this region of Ohio and the older data set is considered more representative for these counties than more recent Huntington or Pittsburgh data.~~

~~Approved meteorological files can be found at:
<http://epa.ohio.gov/dapc/model/modeling/metfiles.aspx>~~

NOTE: While the State of Ohio accepts NWS data for use in modeling in both simple and complex terrain for state-only modeling requirements, U.S. EPA has a more restrictive interpretation of 'representative' meteorological data when modeling impacts at receptors with elevations above the stack tip. For this and other reasons, it is important when preparing to model major PSD or nonattainment sources, that a protocol is developed and approved to assure that acceptable model calculations will be obtained for each source/receptor relationship.

~~AERMOD Data Sets: On-site or NWS surface data sets are combined with local surface characteristics and upper air observations within the AERMET preprocessor program to create the needed modeling meteorological data sets for AERMOD. The latest five-year data sets for use in Ohio will be provided on the Ohio EPA web page at <http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dapc/aqmp/aqmp.html> after Appendix W is finalized and final guidance is issued by U.S. EPA.~~

~~**Long term:** Long term (e.g., monthly, quarterly, annually) meteorological data sets are developed from short term on-site or off-site (NWS) surface data sets. These long term STAR (STability ARray) data sets are necessary to run ISCLT3 or other ISCLT3-based long term models.~~

~~ISCST3 and AERMOD can also be used for long term modeling periods by modeling specific blocks of days and selecting appropriate n-day average concentrations.~~

Question 4: What modeled emission rate(s) should be used?

Answer 4: Tables 9-1 and 9-2 in the Guideline on Air Quality Models (Appendix W of 40 CFR Part 51) identify the various emission rates to be used in modeling a source. In general, the short term maximum potential (allowable) emission rate is used in the evaluation of a short term standard. If the permit does not list a short-term limit for the pollutant, then the short-term state and/or federally enforceable controlled potential to emit shall be used. For an existing source, a representative long term actual emission rate can be used to evaluate a longer term (quarterly or annual) standard. An annual permit restriction can also be used to develop a long term average emission rate to be used in evaluating a long term standard for a new source.

Formatted: No underline

For state permit ~~modeling, including Ohio air toxics~~ modeling, the peak short term increase which the permit will allow is the emission rate to be modeled to determine the peak ambient impact this permit action will allow. Specifically for modeling of toxic air contaminants, the maximum hourly rate of emissions from the source shall be modeled. Modeling shall be based on information including, but not limited to, any emission control devices or methods, operational restrictions, stack parameters, and emission dispersion devices or methods that may affect ground level concentrations, either individually or in combination. This could involve the combined peak impact of several sources if there are several sources included in the same project.

Formatted: Font color: Auto

For a federal netting or synthetic minor permit, the difference between ~~existing baseline~~ actuals emissions and permit allowable emissions, as determined in the netting calculation, is modeled for comparison to the Ohio ~~acceptable incremental impacts~~. Acceptable Incremental Impacts (All). For state-only netting modeling evaluations, the allowable to allowable difference is usually acceptable, but must be agreed upon in a modeling protocol. For PSD or federal netting, though, modeled emissions should be consistent with the netting evaluation performed for the permit.

Formatted: Strikethrough

For a modification which involves an emission increase only, the net change allowed by the permit is evaluated. For PSD and other federal analyses, the net change is the difference between the existing actual emissions and the new potential allowable emissions. For state-only review, modeling the difference in allowables is usually acceptable, but must be agreed upon in a modeling protocol.

For a modification involving a change in stack parameters which could increase the ambient impact due to the source(s), the emissions affected by the modification (potential allowable) are modeled to determine if the impact of the modification is below the Ohio acceptable incremental impacts. If necessary, the present (before modification) emissions can be modeled as negatives in a refined analysis to determine the net impact of the permitted modification for comparison to the Ohio acceptable incremental impacts.

Like-kind replacements would not need modeling if all emissions parameters remain the same since there would be no increase in impact due to the permit action. If, however, the replacement involves the use of a shorter stack, lower temperatures, etc., the replacement may cause an increased peak impact which would need evaluation. As noted above, if the replacement, when viewed alone, exceeds the Ohio acceptable incremental impacts as identified in Table 3, the source being replaced can be modeled with a negative emission rate in a refined modeling analysis to determine the net peak impact for comparison to the Ohio acceptable incremental impacts. Also, see Question 4412 for additional information on emission inventories.

Question 4.1: Are fugitive emissions modeled?

Answer 4.1: Major new source PSD and Nonattainment Review includes all significant sources, including fugitive sources such as storage piles and roadways.

In minor source state permit modeling, though, only the boiler or process source criteria and toxic emissions increases (both controlled and fugitive) are to be modeled. Non-process fugitive sources such as roadways and parking lots, material storage and material transfer operations are not modeled. Grinding, crushing, mixing and screening operations are considered processes and should be modeled. An evaluation of all project emissions may be required in a state analysis if circumstances warrant.

Question 4.2: Are there any exceptions to the modeling thresholds for modeling criteria pollutants and toxics contained in Table 3?

Answer 4.2: There are several new source emissions scenarios which Ohio EPA has historically not reviewed for state-only permits. These scenarios generally involve fugitive emissions from parking lots, roadways, material handling and storage piles. These scenarios usually represent situations where modeling results often indicate potential problems due to unreliable emission factors and/or unusual or extreme source configurations. Field experience with these sources, though, indicates that normal operating practices and compliance with required controls result in acceptable ambient impacts as demonstrated by ambient monitoring, field measurements of visible emissions or a lack of verified complaints by local citizens.

Division (F)(4)(f) of section 3704.03 of the Revised Code, effective August 3, 2006, specifically provides an exemption from toxic air contaminant modeling for “parking lots, storage piles, storage tanks, transfer operations, grain silos, grain dryers, emergency generators, gasoline dispensing operations, air contaminant sources that emit air contaminants solely from the combustion of fossil fuels, or the emission of wood dust, sand, glass dust, coal dust, silica, and grain dust.”

Therefore, the following list of source/pollutant scenarios will not be required to perform an air quality analysis in support of a state-only permit **unless factors such as source size, tons of emissions, particle size, pre-existing concerns or proximity to other sources or citizen populations indicate that a modeling review is warranted**²:

²Division (F)(4)(f)(ii) of section 3704.03 of the Revised Code, effective August 3, 2006, provides for the director to request additional information from a source for the purposes of air toxic contaminant modeling if there is reason to believe the source will

Toxic or criteria pollutants from parking lots
Toxic or criteria pollutants from storage piles
Toxic or criteria pollutants from storage tanks
Toxic or criteria pollutants from transfer operations
Toxic or criteria pollutants from grain silos ~~or dryers~~ or grain dryers
Toxic or criteria pollutants from emergency generators
Toxic or criteria pollutants from gasoline dispensing operations

Toxic pollutants from sources emitting air contaminants solely from the combustion of fossil fuels

In addition, the following pollutants will be treated as PM but not as a toxic for modeling purposes:

Wood dust
Sand
Glass dust
Coal dust
Silica
Grain dust

potentially cause an increase in ground level concentration beyond the facility's boundary that exceeds the MAGLC.

Source/toxic Pollutant air contaminant combinations subject to a MACT, NESHAP residual risk standard under section 112 of the CAA, or an NSPS identified in 40 CFR 51.166(b)(23) where BACT or LAER has been required, that would restrict the amount of that pollutant that could be released are not subject to toxics modeling. Toxics modeling is also not required for pollutants subject to a NAAQS (e.g., lead), unless factors such as source size, tons of emissions, particle size, pre-existing concerns or proximity to other sources or citizen populations indicate that a modeling review is warranted.

Question 4.3: Should sources be modeled that emit pollutants listed in the ACGIH book, do not have a TWA, but do have a Ceiling or STEL?

Answer 4.3: Yes, pollutants not having a listed TWA are addressed by multiplying the Ceiling or STEL by 0.737 and then following the procedures in 'Option A' to develop a MAGLC.

Option A can be found on the Ohio EPA web page at <http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dapc/atu.aspx>

Question 4.4: Are minor and exempt sources included in the modeling for a project which exceeds the thresholds in Table 3?

Answer 4.4: All sources or units contained in the permits that make up a project are initially considered significant with respect to the potential impact due to the project. Many small sources, while individually insignificant, could combine to cause or contribute to an ambient problem. Smaller sources can be removed from the modeling analysis if it can be demonstrated that their emissions are insignificant relative to the rest of the project. Sources not included in the modeling must be agreed upon in a modeling protocol before they can be eliminated from the modeling.

Question 4.5: Do you model sources within a building that have no direct vent to the outside or do not have an identified control device for capture, control and release of the emissions from the unit?

Answer 4.5: Sources can be located within an enclosure or building with no obvious control and/or vent moving the emissions to the outside. It must be assumed that all emissions coming from the device are either captured and controlled or are escaping to ambient air. If they are not being captured and controlled (with the cleaned air being reintroduced to the work area), the emissions must be escaping the building and the modeler must determine how the emissions are being removed from the building or enclosure to the ambient air. The emission rate leaving the building or enclosure is

assumed to be the same as the emission rate from the source(s). Any credit for some portion of the emissions being retained in the building due to “building capture” must be supportable and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Often the emissions are removed by the building ventilation system. In other situations, the only exchange between indoor and outdoor air occurs through open doors and windows. In any event, the modeler must identify the egress point(s) and characterize the releases as one of the available modeling release scenarios (i.e., point, area or volume). If best engineering ~~judgement~~judgment justifies assigning a fraction of the total emissions through specific egress points, the individual points can be modeled with their assigned emission rates. When using a single source screening model, the individual modeled peaks are then added together.

If it is unclear which potential egress point the emissions are actually venting through, the worst case egress point is assumed. If it is not clear which egress point is worst case, each scenario should be tested modeled and the highest results should be compared to the applicable standard.

Question 5: Is building downwash required for state modeling?

Answer 5: Any stack source file must include building dimension data if the stack is not at or above good engineering practice (GEP) stack height. GEP is determined by evaluating all nearby structures using the formula $GEP = H + 1.5L$ where H is the height of the structure and L is the lesser of the height or projected width of the structure. The GEP height is the highest height calculated for any nearby structure (a structure is ‘nearby’ if it is within five times the lesser of its height or width from the stack). If direction specific building dimensions (discussed below) are not calculated, the most conservative dimensions should be used for all directions. The most conservative building dimensions are usually associated with the height and diagonal width of the tallest nearby building.

Direction specific building dimensions may be determined for 36 wind directions for ~~ISCST or AERMOD~~ and ~~16 wind directions for ISGLT~~. This allows the model to include the effects of the critical structure for each wind direction. Direction specific building dimensions are calculated using facility plot plans and manually determining the dominant structure dimensions for each wind direction for each stack. Alternatively, the BPIP program provided by the U.S. EPA, as well as several commercial software packages, are available which will calculate the dimensions for each wind direction from a single building or group of buildings for each stack.

Buildings with multiple segments can be viewed as multiple buildings. For example, a predominantly flat one story building is interrupted by a three-story tower, the flat, one story building is evaluated and the ‘four story’ building (1 + 3), with lateral dimensions of

the tower is also evaluated.

Building dimensions are not contained in state or federal emissions data bases. These data need to be obtained from facility personnel if sources at that facility are subject to building downwash. Distant background sources might be modeled without downwash with Ohio EPA permission since this would most likely maximize those sources' impact in the study area and therefore be 'conservative'.

Question 5.1: What building height do I use if the building has a pitched roof?

Answer 5.1: Pitched roofs present a nonstandard modeling scenario. The horizontal dimensions at the peak are reduced to a single line. A conservative approach is to assume that the entire horizontal dimensions are covered by a flat roof at the elevation of the peak of the pitched roof. An acceptable alternative is to assume a building height one half the distance up the pitched roof and the corresponding horizontal dimensions below that 'roof' (i.e., one horizontal dimension would also be halved).

Question 76: Is there any special guidance for nonstandard point source emissions?

Answer 76: Nonstandard source emissions are not specifically addressed in the above screening or refined models. For example, if emissions do not exit the stack in an upward (vertical) direction, alternative characterizations of the source should be developed to more accurately represent the release point. If a 'point source' is still assumed, even though the exit velocity is blocked or diverted sideways or downward (such as in a rain cap, discussed below), an exit velocity of 0.001 m/s should be input to the model so that a fictitious upward momentum is not credited to that source.

If the temperature of the release is near ambient, a characterization as an area or volume source might be appropriate. If temperature is significant, a virtual stack might be created to represent the emission point. Alternative characterizations should be discussed with Ohio EPA staff prior to modeling.

Question 76.1: How do I model rain caps and horizontal releases?

Answer 76.1: U.S. EPA has provided a specific solution to address hot stack plumes that are interrupted by a rain cap or which are released horizontally. U.S. EPA requires that these sources reduce their stack exit velocity to 0.001 m/s.

While it would be conservative to simply reduce the velocity, the source would lose the effect of the buoyancy that the volume of hot gas would normally have. The Ohio EPA recommended adjustment provides for retention of the buoyancy while addressing the impediment to the vertical momentum of the release. The procedure is as follows (stack parameters' units are assumed to be in metric units):

- 1) The stack exit velocity (V_s) is set equal to 0.001 m/s (V_s')
- 2) Stack diameter (d_s) is adjusted using the equation

$$d_s' = 31.6 * d_s * (V_s)^{0.5}$$

(Where V_s is the actual stack exit velocity, NOT 0.001 m/s)

- 3) Use V_s' and d_s' in the model

The results of this approach can create an extremely large modeled stack diameter. Receptors should not be placed within the calculated diameter, d_s' .

Question 76.2: How do I model flares?

Answer 76.2: For screening purposes, the flare option in SCREEN3 or ~~TSCREEN~~**AERSCREEN** is acceptable. For refined modeling, it is necessary to compute equivalent emission parameters, i.e., adjusted values of temperature and stack height and diameter. Several methods appear in the literature, none of which seems to be universally accepted. Ohio EPA/DAPC has used the following procedure, which is believed to be consistent with SCREEN3 and AERSCREEN:

- 1) compute the adjustment to stack height as a function of heat release Q in MMBtu/hr:

$$H_{\text{equiv.}} = H_{\text{actual}} + 0.944(Q)^{0.478} \quad (a)$$

Where H has units of meters;

- 2) assume temperature of 1273 deg. K;
- 3) assume exit velocity of 20 meters/sec;
- 4) assume the following buoyant flux:

$$F_b = 1.162(Q)$$

- 5) back-calculate the stack diameter that corresponds to the above assumed parameters. Recall the definition of buoyant flux:

$$F_b = 3.12(V)(T_{\text{stack}} - T_{\text{ambient}})/T_{\text{stack}}$$

Where V is the volumetric flow rate, actual m³/sec.

Substituting for F_b and solving for the equivalent stack diameter d_{equiv.}:

$$d_{\text{equiv.}} = 0.1755(Q)^{0.5}$$

This method pertains to the “typical” flare, and will be more or less accurate depending on various parameters of the flare in question, such as heat content and molecular weight of the fuel, velocity of the ~~uncombusted~~un-combusted fuel/air mixture, presence of steam for soot control, etc. Hence, this method may not be applicable to every situation, and the applicant may submit his own properly documented method in a modeling protocol.

(a) Beychok, M., 1979. Fundamentals of Stack Gas Dispersion, Irvine, CA.

Question 76.3: What special modeling considerations are necessary for modeling combustion turbines?

Answer 76.3: Combustion turbines are unique in that stack temperatures and flow rates, as well as emission rates, are ~~dependant~~dependent on ambient conditions, especially ambient temperature. Determining a worst case operating scenario resulting in peak source impacts involves evaluating the source at multiple loads (50%, 75% and 100%) as well as average and extreme ambient temperatures. Three general approaches are normally followed to establish the worst case operating scenario. The approaches described below address a PSD application.

Approach 1: Each scenario is modeled using ~~SCREEN3~~AERSCREEN. If each scenario results in insignificant impact, then the demonstration is complete. If one or more scenarios result in significant impact, the worst case scenario is carried forward into the PSD and NAAQS analyses using ~~ISC-or~~ AERMOD. If there is no clear cut worst case scenario, multiple scenarios may need to be carried forward into the subsequent comprehensive analyses. All other things being equal, it is preferable to move forward with a 100% load scenario rather than a reduced load scenario.

Approach 2: Each scenario is modeled with ~~ISC-or~~AERMOD using the latest year of meteorology. The worst case scenario(s) is then run with five years of meteorology to determine if the proposed project will have a significant impact. If there is a significant impact, then the worst case scenarios are carried forward into the PSD and NAAQS

analyses.

Approach 3: Worst case emission rates and stack parameters from all scenarios are used to estimate a worst case impact. This virtual worst case stack can be used through all phases of the analysis.

The same approaches can be followed for state-only (e.g., synthetic minors) modeling, with the only goal to be achieved being the Ohio Acceptable Incremental Impacts.

Question 9:7: What receptor grids must I use?

Answer 97: Sufficient receptors are necessary in the vicinity of projected maximum concentrations to assure that the peak concentration(s) has been found. For most applications, the spacing should be 100 meters at the 'hotspot', determined from the preliminary modeling results (either ISC, AERMOD or a screening model), out to a distance sufficient to assure that the maximum concentration has been found. Additional receptors should also be placed in areas of special concern (e.g., areas of source interaction and areas of significant terrain). It is also important that the extent of the grid covers the entire area of significant impact from the proposed project.

Receptor elevations are required unless a demonstration that the study area is flat is made. The absence of terrain above stack height is not sufficient to ignore terrain heights. 'Simple' terrain does not mean 'flat' terrain. Topographical data indicating no significant terrain features in the expected significant impact area of the source(s) or indicating flat but gently sloping terrain could justify not including terrain heights for the receptors in that study area.

Receptor elevation information as well as source and receptor location information can be ~~derived from information contained on United States Geological Service topographical maps as well as from internet sources such as www.topozone.com. Information is also available from Digital Elevation Model (DEM) files which are also available from various host sites on the internet. DEM files are available free of charge at <http://data.geocomm.com/dem/downloaded> from the USGS site at <http://ned.usgs.gov/>~~

Formatted: Font color: Auto

AERMOD receptor grids must be exclusively developed using the AERMAP preprocessor using ~~DEM~~ data. Receptor information must contain calculated information concerning the relative height of the nearby terrain (receptor height scales) in addition to the location and elevation of the receptor. ~~A maximum of one arc second data should be used to determine the elevation of the receptor.~~

Question 408: What are the state significant emission rates which trigger modeling?

Answer 408: A comprehensive list of emission rates which trigger state and federal modeling requirements is contained in Table 3 under the heading “Ohio Modeling Significant Emission Rates.” The emissions increase which will be allowed by this permit action (potential allowable increase) are compared to these levels.

Question 40.58.1: Can a source modification trigger a requirement for modeling even where there is no increase in emission rate?

Answer 40.58.1: OAC 3745-31-01(~~vvqqq~~)(1)(b) defines “modification” to include “Any physical change in, or change in the method of operation of any significant air contaminant source that, for the specific air contaminant . . . for which the source is classified as significant, results in an increase in the ambient air quality impact . . . greater than certain values specified in the rule. Thus, if the source is “significant” (as defined in OAC 3745-31-01(~~rrrlllll~~)) and the proposed incremental impact at any receptor exceeds the specified value (listed under the “3745-31-01(~~vvqqq~~)(1)(b)” heading in Table 3) then the change is a modification requiring a permit-to-install, notwithstanding the fact that it may entail no increase in emissions.

Formatted: Strikethrough

It should be kept in mind that the provisions for OAC 3745-31-01(~~vvqqq~~)(1)(b) were promulgated for the sole purpose of ensuring that the ambient air quality standards are protected. If this provision is triggered, BAT is not required. Also, this provision is not required under any federal regulation and has not been submitted to U.S. EPA for approval as part of the SIP.

Formatted: Strikethrough

It should also be noted that the concentrations ~~vv(qqq)~~ are only trigger concentrations and are not maximum allowable impacts. The ambient air quality standards and, if applicable, the PSD increments would be the limiting factor.

An example is a coal-fired boiler where a scrubber is proposed to be installed to remove sulfur dioxide. Even though the actual and allowable emissions of NOx might not increase, the reduced stack temperature and velocity associated with the scrubber could result in an increase of ambient concentration at some receptor exceeding the 15 ug/m³ limit under ~~vv(qqq)~~(1)(b), thereby triggering the requirement to obtain a PTI before beginning construction. Another example is any reduction of stack height. For either example the need for modeling is apparent, to resolve the PTI question. A screening model may be used, or if a refined model is selected, the controlling concentration will be the high-high increase of concentration anywhere on the receptor grid, for the relevant averaging period, using five years of off-site or one-year of on-site meteorological data.

Question 419: What are the state target concentrations for acceptable incremental impacts?

Answer 419: Table 3 also contains a listing of ~~national ambient air quality standards~~NAAQS and PSD increments as well as state target ambient concentrations for criteria pollutants and specific toxic emissions subject to the ~~state air toxic policy air contaminants review requirements~~. The state target concentrations for criteria and toxic pollutants listed under the heading “Ohio Acceptable Incremental Impact” represent the acceptable incremental impact of the new emissions which are the subject of a state permit requirement. The Ohio significant impacts under OAC 3745-31-01 (~~VAQQQ~~)(1)(b) identify modeled impact levels which trigger permit to install requirements for a source modification (including stack height changes).

Question 4210: What special requirements exist for sources of fluoride?

Answer 4210: The potential for secondary impacts due to fluorides is greater than the probability for primary human health effects. Therefore, there may be observable impacts and actual complaints of damage to plants and property when the MAGLC has not been exceeded.

The approach to follow when evaluating the secondary impacts due to fluorides is as follows. The secondary 'target' is 0.5 ug/m³ as a 30-day average. The screening approach is to model a 1-hour concentration using ~~SCREENAERSCREEN~~ and convert it to a 'monthly' average using the 0.18 conversion. Monthly averages can also be modeled directly using ~~ISGST or ISCLT or~~ AERMOD. The incremental impact of the new emissions is modeled.

This 'secondary' approach would also be appropriate for any other pollutants where it is determined that there may be significant non health related impacts at levels below the MAGLC.

Question 4311: How do I obtain background values when performing NAAQS analyses in Ohio?

Answer 13- Modeling11: ~~PSD and NAAQS modeling~~ analyses ~~which must~~ estimate total concentrations of a pollutant (~~e.g., PSD analyses which evaluate the NAAQS~~)and must account for those sources which are either too small or too distant to be included in the modeling analysis. This is accomplished by adding a background value to the modeled concentrations.

A separate background value is needed for each NAAQS pollutant and for each NAAQS

averaging time. Actual monitored data for the most recent year, from a representative monitoring site(s) are the basis for acceptable background values. Ideally, the monitor should not be impacted by any major sources or any local smaller sources. If an ~~unimpacted~~~~un-impacted~~ monitor is available, the second highest value for each short-term period would represent the short term backgrounds. The annual average is the annual background. The ~~highest quarterly~~rolling three-month average would be used for lead.

If an ~~unimpacted~~~~un-impacted~~ monitor is not available, ~~nonimpacted~~~~non-impacted~~ values from monitors which are near a limited number of sources and which have ~~nonimpacted~~~~non-impacted~~ sectors (no upwind sources) can be used to develop background values. **Unadjusted impacted monitor values can also be used as a conservative background.**

A ~~nonimpacted~~~~non-impacted~~ value is a monitored value measured during a period when the wind was not blowing from a 90-degree sector centered on a line between the monitor and the potentially impacting source. For a 3-hour value, no winds should be from the impacting sectors. For 24-hour values, no more than two hours should have winds from the impacting sectors. For short term backgrounds, the second highest ~~nonimpacted~~~~non-impacted~~ value is chosen as a fixed background. Long term background values are the average of the ~~nonimpacted~~~~non-impacted~~ values for the specific averaging time period.

Please contact Ohio EPA for a representative background for your project. If you would like to suggest a background, it must be approved in a modeling protocol.

Question 1412: What sources do I include in a major source PSD and/or NAAQS analysis?

Answer 14: ~~14:~~ 12:

Major Source NAAQS Analysis: All sources within the significant impact area (SIA) of the emissions increase with potential allowable emissions greater than the PSD significant emission rates (listed in Table 3), -must be included in a new source review NAAQS analyses. SIA is defined as the region over which any exceedance of a PSD significant impact increment (listed in Table 3) occurs, based on each high-high concentration over five years of modeling (one year if on-site, representative data are available). In addition, all major sources with potential allowable emissions greater than 100 tons~~yr~~ per year (tpy) outside of the SIA and within 50 km must also be included if they interact with the new source.

Whether to include a potentially interacting source can be determined using the '20D' approach. Under this approach, the modeler may exclude sources whose potential allowable emissions in ~~tons/yr~~tpy are less than 20 times the distance between the two

sources in kilometers. Prior to commencement of final modeling, though, Ohio EPA must be advised as to what sources the modeler chooses to exclude using the 20D method. Ohio EPA reserves the right to require any or all of these sources to be included in a final analysis if Ohio EPA believes that any or all are potentially significant.

Major Source PSD Increment Analysis: All PSD sources located within an area where PSD baseline has been triggered or within the SIA of the new source, whichever is larger, must be included in the PSD increment analysis modeling inventory. PSD sources located outside of the baseline area or SIA which interacts with the new source must also be included. These sources may be screened using the 20D approach.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Inventory data should be obtained from the state emissions inventory system or the AIRS national data base system. Basic modeling source parameters (stack height or release height, diameter, temperature, exit velocity or volume flow, emission rate, etc.) are contained in these data systems.

The DAPC emissions inventory unit has placed several data sets on the Ohio EPA web page at:

<http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dapc/aqmp/eiu/eiu.html>. <http://epa.ohio.gov/dapc/aqmp/eiu/eiu.aspx>. While the later data sets have significant amounts of current information, it is important to check the 1990 and 1995 data bases which contain information on short term allowable emission rates. The short term allowable rates and source capacities are included in these earlier data sets. These are important for determining maximum short term allowable emission rates for the significant sources consistent with Section 9.1 of the GAQM. If source information is missing or is suspect, you will need to contact the local air pollution agency or field office to obtain current, correct information. The most recent emissions inventory should be used in the modeling analysis.

Question 4513: How do I model major sources in nonattainment areas to demonstrate net air quality improvement?

Answer 4513: OAC 3745-31-25 discusses the requirements for determination of net air quality benefit for major sources wishing to locate in a nonattainment area (NAA). Both the rule and U.S. EPA guidance indicate the need for demonstrating area-wide benefit and progress toward attainment.

VOC emissions are not required to be modeled for net air quality benefit. ~~All major PM and SO₂ (However, in some cases a non-modeling analysis may be required. See Answer # 25). All major nonattainment pollutant~~ emissions increases and corresponding offsetting emissions will need to be modeled for a net air quality benefit. ~~The entire state is attainment for CO, NO_x and Pb so no net air quality benefit modeling is required.~~

In general, ~~PM and SO₂~~all NAAs have undergone SIP modeling at some time and the state has identified receptor areas which were key for the SIP attainment demonstrations. In cases where the potential offsets could impact critical receptors, those receptors must show impacts less than or equal to zero. For the remaining receptors, the receptors within the significant impact area of the increasing emissions must, on average, show no net increase for each averaging period.

If greater than zero impacts at critical receptors or net area-wide increases are modeled, the applicant may present a complete NAAQS demonstration for the significant impact area of the project.

Question 16: Can I use SCREEN to model multiple sources?

~~Answer 16: While the SCREEN model is a single source model, it can be used to develop a conservative estimate of the peak potential impact of emissions from multiple egress locations.~~

~~A conservative approach combines the peak impact from each individual SCREEN run as if the peak impact from each emission point occurred at the same point in space.~~

~~In the case of multiple identical stacks, all of the emissions can be assumed to come from one stack (modeled using the combined emission rate with the stack flow parameters for a single stack).~~

~~If the egress points are not identical, all of the emission could be to assume to be emitted from the 'worst case' emission point. Sometimes the determination of worst case is straightforward (e.g., shortest, coldest, lowest flow stack). In other situations, the choice may not be clear and the Local Air Agency, District Office or Central Office should be consulted.~~

~~The approaches described above will result in conservative estimates. If the source(s) does not pass using the above assumptions, less conservative approaches can be considered in consultation with the Local Air Agency, District Office or Central Office. A multisource refined model may also be appropriate to use to model the actual coparation of emission points and estimate their combined peak impact.~~

Question 1714: If multiple pollutants are being emitted, does an individual model run have to be performed for each pollutant?

Answer 1714: If the emission characteristics are identical for each pollutant (all of the pollutants are emitted in the same proportion from each of the egress points) one run can be performed and the results can be adjusted. Gaussian models such as

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Font color: Black

AERMOD, ~~SCREENAERSCREEN~~ and ~~ISCSCREEN3~~ are 'linear' models in that the impacts will vary proportionally to the emission rate. Therefore, in this example case, if one pollutant is being emitted at twice the rate of another pollutant, the impact of the second pollutant will be twice as high.

In the case of multiple pollutants being emitted from a single emission point, an emission rate of ~~4-one~~ gram per second can be modeled and the results multiplied by each allowable emission rate (expressed in grams per second) to determine the predicted ambient concentration of each of the pollutants.

If emission characteristics vary for different pollutants, or the pollutants do not vary proportionately from each egress point, ~~-then~~ a separate modeling analysis for each pollutant is necessary.

Question 4815: For PSD and non-PSD sources, can facilities be installed if modeling shows that more than ½ the available PSD increment is consumed?

Answer 4815: The purpose of PSD is to keep clean areas clean. The intent of the one half increment portion of the policy is to allow future growth by preventing any single emissions increase from consuming all of the available increment.

Non-PSD sources still consume increment and increase background concentrations. Therefore, these emissions can also threaten future growth.

As such, it is Ohio EPA's practice that any new source, whether PSD or not, will not consume more than one half the available PSD increment (In application, state-only permits do not involve modeling which would assess available increment, therefore, one half the increment is the effective goal ~~->-~~).

In some cases, Ohio EPA will grant exceptions to this policy for new PSD or non-PSD sources where modeling predicts exceedances of one half of, but less than 83 percent of the available increment. (For example: If the available increment were 30 ug/m³, between 15 and 25 ug/m³.) Exceptions will be granted on a case-by-case basis (but only when public health will not be adversely affected or where modeling ~~is-~~ results are suspect). The following are examples of where exceptions will be granted:

- 1) Modeling shows that the exceedance of the one half of the available increment occurs in a very localized area near the emissions source either due to the source parameters or due to downwash and, in the Ohio EPA's ~~judgement~~ ~~judgment~~, it is unlikely that other new sources located near the facility will significantly impact the same exceedance locations. In other words, if it is unlikely that another source would be negatively impacted by the exceedance then the Ohio EPA may grant the exception. An example of this would be a

fugitive source with low release points having close proximity maximum impact areas that in the Ohio EPA's ~~judgement~~judgment would not be areas that other facilities would impact.

- 2) If the source is located such that it is unlikely in the Ohio EPA's ~~judgement~~judgment that any other major source would locate in the same area (for instance, in an extremely remote, rural area).
- 3) If the source is temporary and the increment consumed will become available in the near future for future growth (for instance, at a clean-up site where the source will be operated for only a couple of years.)
- 4) If the source is locating in a 'brownfield' area and otherwise would locate in a greenfield site.

Question 1916: What determines whether a locale is rural or urban?

Answer 1916: The Guideline on Air Quality Models (Appendix W of 40 CFR Part 51) outlines two methods by which an area can be categorized as either 'urban' or 'rural'. These methods rely on evaluating either the land use or population density within a three-kilometer radius circle around the subject source. Either of these methods is acceptable for the determination of the proper classification for that source, although the land use approach is preferred.

Formatted: Strikethrough

In Ohio, many counties have had significant SIP development modeling performed which included sources from across the county. Due to the inability of the models used to incorporate both rural and urban in a single run, a single, predominate classification was assigned for the entire county. Therefore, if multiple facilities over a wider area are being modeled as part of a PSD or NAAQS analysis, the Central Office should be consulted as to the historic classification for the overall analysis so that a consistent approach will be maintained.

~~WFS/JTT/wfs~~

July 1, 2003

~~SCREEN/TSCREEN~~

Question 17: How do you model PM2.5 secondary formation for PSD?

Answer 17: AERMOD does not account for chemistry involved in PM2.5 secondary formation. In order to account for the secondary formation Ohio EPA follow's U.S. EPA's four assessment cases to determine which level of analysis must be submitted. The cases are as follows:

Case 1: If direct PM2.5 emissions are less than 10 tpy, and both NOx and SO2 emissions are individually less than 40 tpy, then no PM2.5 secondary formation compliance demonstration is required.

Case 2: If direct PM2.5 emissions are greater than or equal to 10 tpy and both NOx and SO2 emissions are individually less than 40 tpy, then a PM2.5 compliance demonstration is required for direct PM2.5 emission only, based on dispersion modeling. No accounting of the impacts for secondary formation is required.

Case 3: If direct PM2.5 emissions are greater than or equal to 10 tpy and either NOx or SO2 emissions are individually greater than 40 tpy, then a compliance demonstration is required for direct PM2.5 emissions based on dispersion modeling, AND the applicant must account for the impact of precursor emissions from the project source.

- Case 3 could involve a strictly qualitative analysis, a hybrid qualitative/quantitative analysis, or photochemical modeling. Please contact Ohio EPA if Case 3 is required.

Case 4: If direct PM2.5 emissions are less than 10 tpy and either NOx or SO2 emissions are individually greater than 40 tpy, then a PM2.5 compliance demonstration for direct PM2.5 emissions is not required. However, an analysis of precursor emission impacts on secondary PM2.5 formation is required, as in Case 3, above.

- Case 4 could involve a strictly qualitative analysis, a hybrid qualitative/quantitative analysis, or photochemical modeling. Please contact Ohio EPA if Case 4 is required.

These four assessment cases are discussed in greater detail in U.S. EPA's March 4, 2013 Draft Guidance for PM2.5 Permit Modeling which can be found on the web at: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/scram/guidance/guide/Draft_Guidance_for_PM25_Permit_Modeling.pdf.

Question 28: Which averaging times should I use?

Answer 28: Modeled averaging times should be consistent with the standard. Please see Table 3 for averaging times and standards.

Question 19: Are modeling protocols required?

Answer 19: Modeling protocols are not required for state-only modeling if all default options are used, except for reasons stated elsewhere in this engineering guide. Modeling protocols are required for all Nonattainment Review and PSD projects and projects where non-default options are used. It is also recommended that complex modeling or modeling that is highly unusual in nature includes obtaining an approved modeling protocol before final modeling is conducted and submitted.

Modeling protocols should be submitted for approval by Ohio EPA in advance of the final modeling submittal.

Question 20: Does start up and shutdown emissions need to be modeled?

Answer 20: Startup and shutdown emissions might need to be modeled if the emissions from startup/shutdown operations are greater than non-startup/shutdown maximum emission rates. Discuss this issue with the field office if the startup/shutdown emissions are higher. Ohio EPA will make a case-by-case decision concerning the need for these emissions to be modeled.

Question 21: When is a Class I Modeling Analysis required?

Answer 21: A Class I Modeling Analysis is required for any PSD facility that is within 300 km of a Class I Area and when the equation below is greater than 10:

The annual steady state emission rate of permitted total tpy of SO₂ + NO_x + PM₁₀ + H₂SO₄ / Distance to closest Class I Area in km

Model Application Guidance

Point Sourcepg 29
Area Sourcepg 30
Volume Sourcepg 30

TABLES

Table 1; Meteorological Assignmentspg 24
Table 2; National Weather Service Anemometer
— Heights and Station Numberspg 27
Table 3; Threshold Emission Rates and
— Target Concentrationspg 28

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Centered

DRAFT

Table 1

METEOROLOGICAL ASSIGNMENTS

(meteorological years 1987-1991 unless otherwise specified)

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>SURFACE</u>	<u>MIXING HEIGHT</u>
ADAMS		Huntington
	ALLEN	Huntington
Dayton		Dayton
	ASHLAND	
AKRON		Pittsburgh
ASHTABULA		Eric
ATHENS		Parkersburg
		Huntington (1973-1977)
AUGLAIZE		Dayton
BELMONT		Pittsburgh
	BROWN	Pittsburgh
Cincinnati		Dayton
BUTLER		Cincinnati
CARROLL		Pittsburgh
CHAMPAIGN	Dayton	Dayton
CLARK		Dayton
CLERMONT		Cincinnati
CLINTON		Cincinnati
COLUMBIANA		Pittsburgh
COSHOCTON		Columbus
CRAWFORD		Columbus
CUYAHOGA		Cleveland
DARKE		Dayton
DEFIANCE		Fort Wayne
DELAWARE		Columbus
ERIE		Cleveland
FAIRFIELD		Columbus
FAYETTE		Columbus
FRANKLIN		Columbus
	FULTON	
Toledo		Flint
GALLIA		Huntington
GEAUGA		Cleveland

Formatted: Font: Calibri, 11 pt

GREENE	Dayton	Dayton
GUERNSEY	Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh
HAMILTON	Cincinnati	Dayton
HANCOCK	Toledo	Dayton
HARDIN	Dayton	Dayton

METEOROLOGICAL ASSIGNMENTS

HARRISON	Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh
HENRY	Toledo	Flint
HIGHLAND	Cincinnati	Dayton
HOCKING	Columbus	Huntington
HOLMES	Akron	Pittsburgh
HURON	Cleveland	Buffalo
JACKSON	Huntington	Huntington
JEFFERSON	Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh
KNOX	Columbus	Dayton
LAKE	Cleveland	Buffalo
LAWRENCE	Huntington	Huntington
LICKING	Columbus	Dayton
LOGAN	Dayton	Dayton
LORAIN	Cleveland	Buffalo
LUCAS	Toledo	Flint
MADISON	Columbus	Dayton
MAHONING		
Youngstown	Pittsburgh	
MARION	Columbus	Dayton
MEDINA	Akron	Pittsburgh
MEIGS	Parkersburg	Huntington (1973-1977)
MERGER	Fort Wayne	Dayton
MIAMI	Dayton	Dayton
MONROE	Parkersburg	Pittsburgh (1973-1977)
MONTGOMERY	Dayton	Dayton
MORGAN	Parkersburg	Huntington (1973-1977)
MORROW	Columbus	Dayton
MUSKINGUM	Columbus	Pittsburgh

Formatted: Font: Calibri, 11 pt

NOBLE ————— Parkersburg ————— Pittsburgh (1973-1977)
 OTTAWA ————— Toledo ————— Flint
 PAULDING ————— Fort Wayne ————— Dayton
 PERRY ————— Columbus ————— Huntington
 PICKAWAY ————— Columbus ————— Dayton
 PIKE ————— Huntington ————— Huntington
 PORTAGE ————— Akron ————— Pittsburgh
 PREBLE ————— Dayton ————— Dayton
 PUTNAM ————— Fort Wayne ————— Dayton
 RICHLAND ————— Columbus ————— Dayton
 ROSS ————— Columbus ————— Dayton

METEOROLOGICAL ASSIGNMENTS

SANDUSKY ————— Toledo ————— Flint
 SCIOTO ————— Huntington ————— Huntington
 SENECA ————— Toledo ————— Dayton
 SHELBY ————— Dayton ————— Dayton
 STARK ————— Akron ————— Pittsburgh
 SUMMIT ————— Akron ————— Pittsburgh
 TRUMBULL ————— Youngstown ————— Pittsburgh
 TUSCARAWAS ————— Akron ————— Pittsburgh
 UNION ————— Columbus ————— Dayton
 VAN WERT ————— Fort Wayne ————— Dayton
 VINTON ————— Huntington ————— Huntington
 WARREN ————— Cincinnati ————— Dayton
 WASHINGTON ————— Parkersburg ————— Huntington (1973-1977)
 WAYNE ————— Akron ————— Pittsburgh
 WILLIAMS ————— Toledo ————— Flint
 WOOD ————— Toledo ————— Flint
 WYANDOT ————— Columbus ————— Dayton

Table 2

**National Weather Service Anemometer Heights
and Station Number**

<u>Site</u>	<u>Anemometer Height</u>	<u>Station Number</u>
	Akron/	
Canton	20 feet	14895
Cincinnati/Covington	20 feet	93814
Cincinnati/Abbe Obs.	51 feet	93890
Cleveland		
	10 meters	
		14820
Columbus	20 feet	14821
Dayton		
	22 feet	
		93815(surface)
Dayton (Wright Pat)		NA
		13840(upper-air)
Mansfield	20 feet	14891
Toledo	30 feet	94830
Youngstown	20 feet	
	14852	
Buffalo, NY	10 meters	
	14733	
Erie, Pa.	20 feet	14860
Flint, Mi.	21 feet	
	14826	
Fort Wayne, In.	20 feet	14827
Huntington, WV	20 feet	03860
Charleston WV	117 feet	13866
Elkins WV	20 feet	13729
Pittsburgh, Pa.	20 feet	94823
Parkersburg, WV	100 feet	13867

Formatted: Font: Calibri, 11 pt

Table 3
Federal and State Modeling Standards and Significant Emission-Rates Distances From Ohio Cities to Nearby Class I Areas (km)

POLLUTANT	Area	AVERAGING PERIOD	National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) (ug/m ³)			OHIO	OHIO	OHIO
			Dolly Sods/Otter Creek	Keyhole	Summit			
	Mammoth Cave		PSD	PSD	PSD	MONITORING	DEMINIMIS	EMISSION
			CLASS II	SIGNIFICANT	MONITORING	SIGNIFICANT	IMPACT	INCREASE

- Formatted Table**
- Formatted:** Widow/Orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers
- Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 16 pt
- Deleted Cells**
- Deleted Cells**
- Deleted Cells**
- Split Cells**
- Deleted Cells**
- Deleted Cells**
- Formatted:** Centered, Widow/Orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers
- Split Cells**
- Split Cells**
- Split Cells**
- Split Cells**
- Formatted:** Centered, Widow/Orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers
- Formatted:** Centered, Widow/Orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers
- Formatted:** Centered, Widow/Orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers
- Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 11 pt, Bold
- Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 11 pt, Bold
- Formatted:** Left, Widow/Orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers
- Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 11 pt
- Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 11 pt, Bold
- Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 11 pt, Bold

If a Class I Modeling Analysis is required, please contact Ohio EPA for more information.

Question 22: Will Ohio EPA do air dispersion modeling for my facility?

Answer 22: No, Ohio EPA only reviews the dispersion modeling submitted in support of a permit. Each facility is responsible for conducting and submitting their own modeling analysis. Please contact your local district office for information.

Question 23: What files need to be submitted to Ohio EPA for a modeling review?

Answer 23: The following files need to be submitted to Ohio EPA for a modeling review submittal to be deemed complete:

- o Approved modeling protocol (when applicable)
- o All AERMOD input files
- o All AERMET input files (if using meteorological data not supplied by Ohio EPA)
- o All AERSURFACE input files (if using meteorological data not supplied by Ohio EPA)
- o All downwash files
- o All AERMOD output files
- o All AERMET output files (if using meteorological data not supplied by Ohio EPA)
- o All AERSURFACE output files (If using meteorological data not supplied by Ohio EPA)
- o All AERMAP output files
- o Modeling report

Question 24: Do I need to model Greenhouse Gases?

Answer 24: No, Ohio EPA does not require you to model Greenhouse Gases.

Question 25: How do I evaluate Ozone?

Question 25: Ohio EPA does not require modeling for ozone. If NO_x and/or VOC emissions exceed 40 tpy a qualitative analysis is required. The qualitative analysis must show that increases in NO_x and/or VOC emissions will not cause or contribute to an ozone exceedance. Please contact Ohio EPA for more information should you need

[to submit an ozone analysis.](#)

DRAFT

October 2013

DRAFT

Table 1
Meteorological Assignments and Map

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>SURFACE</u>	<u>MIXING HEIGHT</u>
<u>ADAMS</u>	<u>Huntington</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>ALLEN</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>ASHLAND</u>	<u>Akron</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>ASHTABULA</u>	<u>Erie</u>	<u>Buffalo</u>
<u>ATHENS</u>	<u>Parkersburg</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>AUGLAIZE</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>BELMONT</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>BROWN</u>	<u>Cincinnati</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>BUTLER</u>	<u>Cincinnati</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>CARROLL</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>CHAMPAIGN</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>CLARK</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>CLERMONT</u>	<u>Cincinnati</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>CLINTON</u>	<u>Cincinnati</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>COLUMBIANA</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>COSHOCTON</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>CRAWFORD</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>CUYAHOGA</u>	<u>Cleveland</u>	<u>Buffalo</u>
<u>DARKE</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>DEFIANCE</u>	<u>Fort Wayne</u>	<u>Detroit KDTX</u>
<u>DELAWARE</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>

Table 1
Meteorological Assignments and Map

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>SURFACE</u>	<u>MIXING HEIGHT</u>
<u>ERIE</u>	<u>Cleveland</u>	<u>Buffalo</u>
<u>FAIRFIELD</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>FAYETTE</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>FRANKLIN</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>FULTON</u>	<u>Toledo</u>	<u>Detroit KDTX</u>
<u>GALLIA</u>	<u>Huntington</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>GEAUGA</u>	<u>Cleveland</u>	<u>Buffalo</u>
<u>GREENE</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>GUERNSEY</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>HAMILTON</u>	<u>Cincinnati</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>HANCOCK</u>	<u>Toledo</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>HARDIN</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>HARRISON</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>HENRY</u>	<u>Toledo</u>	<u>Detroit KDTX</u>
<u>HIGHLAND</u>	<u>Cincinnati</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>HOCKING</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>HOLMES</u>	<u>Akron</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>HURON</u>	<u>Cleveland</u>	<u>Buffalo</u>
<u>JACKSON</u>	<u>Huntington</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>JEFFERSON</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>KNOX</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>LAKE</u>	<u>Cleveland</u>	<u>Buffalo</u>
<u>LAWRENCE</u>	<u>Huntington</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>

Table 1
Meteorological Assignments and Map

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>SURFACE</u>	<u>MIXING HEIGHT</u>
<u>LICKING</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>LOGAN</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>LORAIN</u>	<u>Cleveland</u>	<u>Buffalo</u>
<u>LUCAS</u>	<u>Toledo</u>	<u>Detroit KDTX</u>
<u>MADISON</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>MAHONING</u>	<u>Youngstown</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>MARION</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>MEDINA</u>	<u>Akron</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>MEIGS</u>	<u>Parkersburg</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>MERCER</u>	<u>Fort Wayne</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>MIAMI</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>MONROE</u>	<u>Parkersburg</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>MONTGOMERY</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>MORGAN</u>	<u>Parkersburg</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>MORROW</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>MUSKINGUM</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>NOBLE</u>	<u>Parkersburg</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>OTTAWA</u>	<u>Toledo</u>	<u>Detroit KDTX</u>
<u>PAULDING</u>	<u>Fort Wayne</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>PERRY</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>PICKAWAY</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>

Table 1
Meteorological Assignments and Map

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>SURFACE</u>	<u>MIXING HEIGHT</u>
<u>PIKE</u>	<u>Huntington</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>PORTAGE</u>	<u>Akron</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>PREBLE</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>PUTNAM</u>	<u>Fort Wayne</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>RICHLAND</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>ROSS</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>SANDUSKY</u>	<u>Toledo</u>	<u>Detroit KDTX</u>
<u>SCIOTO</u>	<u>Huntington</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>SENECA</u>	<u>Toledo</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>SHELBY</u>	<u>Dayton</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>STARK</u>	<u>Akron</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>SUMMIT</u>	<u>Akron</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>TRUMBULL</u>	<u>Youngstown</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>TUSCARAWAS</u>	<u>Akron</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>UNION</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>VAN WERT</u>	<u>Fort Wayne</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>VINTON</u>	<u>Huntington</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>WARREN</u>	<u>Cincinnati</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>
<u>WASHINGTON</u>	<u>Parkersburg</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>WAYNE</u>	<u>Akron</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
<u>WILLIAMS</u>	<u>Toledo</u>	<u>Detroit KDTX</u>

Table 1
Meteorological Assignments and Map

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>SURFACE</u>	<u>MIXING HEIGHT</u>
<u>WOOD</u>	<u>Toledo</u>	<u>Detroit KDTX</u>
<u>WYANDOT</u>	<u>Columbus</u>	<u>Wilmington</u>

DRAFT

Ohio Surface and Mixing Height Station Assignments



Surface Station

Erie	Akron	Dayton
Youngstown	Pittsburgh	Parkersburg
Cleveland	Columbus	Huntington
Toledo	Fort Wayne	Cincinnati

Mixing Height

Buffalo
Pittsburgh
Detroit KDTX
Wilmington

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Bold, Font color: Black

Table 2
National Weather Service Anemometer Heights and Station Numbers

<u>Site</u>	<u>Anemometer Height</u>	<u>Station Number</u>
<u>Akron/Canton</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>14895</u>
<u>Cincinnati/Covington</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>93814</u>
<u>Cincinnati/Abbe Obs</u>	<u>51 feet</u>	<u>93890</u>
<u>Cleveland</u>	<u>10 meters</u>	<u>14820</u>
<u>Columbus</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>14821</u>
<u>Dayton</u>	<u>22 feet</u>	<u>93815(surface)</u>
<u>Dayton (Wright Pat)</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>13840(upper air)</u>
<u>Mansfield</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>14891</u>
<u>Toledo</u>	<u>30 feet</u>	<u>94830</u>
<u>Youngstown</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>14852</u>
<u>Buffalo, NY</u>	<u>10 meters</u>	<u>14733</u>
<u>Erie, Pa.</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>14860</u>
<u>Flint, Mi.</u>	<u>21 feet</u>	<u>14826</u>
<u>Fort Wayne, In.</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>14827</u>
<u>Huntington, WV</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>03860</u>
<u>Charleston WV</u>	<u>117 feet</u>	<u>13866</u>
<u>Elkins WV</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>13729</u>
<u>Pittsburgh, Pa</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>94823</u>
<u>Parkersburg, WV</u>	<u>100 feet</u>	<u>13867</u>

Table 3
Federal and State Modeling Standards and Significant Emission Rates

Pollutants	Averaging Period	National Ambient Air Quality Standards (ug/m3)		Class I PSD Increment (ug/m3)	PSD Class I significant Impact Levels (ug/m3)	PSD Significant Emission Rate (tpy)	Class II PSD Increments (ug/m3)	PSD Class II Significant Impact Levels (ug/m3)	PSD Monitoring De Minimis Concentrations (ug/m3)	Ohio Modeling Significant Emission Rates (tpy)	Ohio Acceptable Incremental Impact (ug/m3)(l)
		Primary Standard	Secondary Standard								
PM2.5	Annual	15 (c)	15 (c)	1 (h)	0.06 (h)	PM2.5 - 10 SO2 - 40 NOx - 40	4 (h)	0.3 (h)	-----	10	2
	24-hr	35 (d)	35 (d)	2 (a)	0.07 (h)		9 (a)	1.2 (h)	4 (h)		4.5
PM10	Annual	-----	-----	4 (a)	0.2 (h)	15	17 (a)	1 (h)	-----	15	8.5 (h)
	24-hr	150 (a)	150 (a)	8 (a)	0.3 (h)		30 (a)	5 (h)	10 (h)		15 (a)
Sulfur Dioxide	Annual	80 (h)	80 (h)	2 (h)	0.1 (h)	40	20 (h)	1 (h)	-----	40	10 (h)
	24-hr	365 (a)	365 (a)	5 (a)	0.2 (h)		91 (a)	5 (h)	13 (h)		45.5 (a)
	3-hr	-----	1300 (a)	25 (a)	1.0 (h)		512 (a)	25 (h)	-----		256 (a)
	1-hr	196 (f)	-----	-----	-----		TBD	-----	-----		196
Nitrogen Dioxide	Annual	100 (h)	100 (h)	2.5 (h)	0.1 (h)	40	25 (h)	1 (h)	14 (h)	40	12.5 (h)
	1-hr	188 (b)	-----	-----	-----		TBD	10 (h)	-----		188
Ozone	8-hr	0.075 ppm (e)	0.075 ppm (e)	-----	-----	40 (i)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	1-hr	0.12 ppm (g)	0.12 ppm (g)	-----	-----		-----	-----	-----		-----
Carbon Monoxide	8-hr	10,000 (a)	-----	-----	-----	100	-----	500 (h)	575 (h)	100	2500 (a)
	1-hr	40,000 (a)	-----	-----	-----		-----	2000 (h)	-----		10000 (a)
Lead	Rolling 3-Month	0.15 (h)	0.15 (h)	-----	-----	0.6	-----	-	-----	0.6	0.0375
Toxics	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1	(h) & (i)

- (a) Not to be exceeded more than once per year.
- (b) The 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hr average at each monitor must not exceed the NAAQS
- (c) The 3-year average of the weighted annual mean PM2.5 concentrations must not exceed the NAAQS
- (d) The 3-year average of the 98th percentile of 24-hr concentrations must not exceed the NAAQS
- (e) The 3-year average of the fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hr average ozone concentrations must not exceed the NAAQS
- (f) The 3-year average of the 9th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hr average at each monitor within an area must not exceed the NAAQS
- (g) Not to be exceeded on more than one day per year, three year average.
- (h) Concentration not to be exceeded.
- (i) Value calculated by procedures outlined in current version of the Ohio EPA Division of Air Pollution Control document entitled "Review of New Sources of Air Toxic Emissions"
- (j) Emissions of VOC
- (k) Please contact Ohio EPA for more details
- (l) Please note that the Director always reserves the right to request modeling for projects that fall below these thresholds if it is believed that they may cause or contribute to an exceedance.

References

- A NAAQS are found in 40 CFR Part 50
- B PSD Class I and Class II Ambient Air Increments are found in 40 CFR 52.21(c).
- C PSD Significant Emission Rates are found in 40 CFR 52.21(b)(23)(i).
- D The PM2.5 Class I and Class II Significant Impact Levels are from 40 CFR 52.21(k)(2).
- E The PM10, SO2 and NO2 Class I Significant Impact Levels are based on the July 23, 1996 Proposed Rulemaking (61 FR 38249).
- F The Class II Significant Impact Levels are found in 40 CFR 51.165(b)(2).
- G The PSD Monitoring De minimis Concentrations are found in 40 CFR 52.21(i)(5)(i).
- H The Ohio Modeling Significant Emission Rates and the Ohio Acceptable Incremental Impact are found in Ohio EPA's Engineering Guide No. 69.

Appendix A

AERSCREEN Model Application Guidance

AERSCREEN is the recommended screening model and is based on AERMOD. The model will produce estimates of "worst-case" 1-hour concentrations for a single source, without the need for hourly meteorological data, and also includes conversion factors to estimate "worst-case" 3-hour, 8-hour, 24-hour, and annual concentrations.

AERSCREEN is intended to produce concentration estimates that are equal to or greater than the estimates produced by AERMOD with a fully developed set of meteorological and terrain data, but the degree of conservatism will vary depending on the application.

The AERSCREEN model consists of two main components: 1) the MAKEMET program, which generates a site-specific matrix of meteorological conditions for input to the AERMOD model; and 2) the AERSCREEN command-prompt interface program. AERSCREEN interfaces with MAKEMET for generating the meteorological matrix, and also interfaces with AERMAP and BPIPPRM to automate the processing of terrain and building information, respectively. It interfaces with the AERMOD model utilizing the SCREEN option to perform the modeling runs.

AERSCREEN Input

The type of AERSCREEN source to be chosen is dependent on how the emissions leave the source (if the source is not enclosed) or how they leave the building or enclosure if emitted within a building or enclosure. Once the egress points are identified and characterized, one of the following source types is applied to the emissions at the point of egress (stack, window, vent, etc.). The AERSCREEN program is currently limited to modeling a single point, capped stack, horizontal stack, rectangular area, circular area, flare, or volume source.

The following information identifies the AERSCREEN model choices to be used when modeling for Ohio new source review. Since the AERSCREEN model does not directly identify which release scenarios lead to the use of the AERSCREEN model, "AERSCREEN pathways" are identified to assist AERSCREEN users in making scenario choices, and the determination of the desired source type.

The input data summary shows the inputs as they appear in the AERSCREEN input file. The summary is updated after each change to the inputs, as well as when a file is opened. Inputs required by AERSCREEN are as following:

- Source parameters – the source type appears first, followed by input parameters for the source type
- Building parameters – whether building downwash is used in the model and the inputs for a single building
- Met data – inputs to the MAKEMET program that creates meteorological data files
- Discrete receptors – whether to use discrete receptors and the file containing discrete receptor distances

Formatted: Font: 14 pt

Formatted: Tab stops: 0", Left + 0.5", Left + 1", Left + 1.5", Left + 2", Left + 2.5", Left + 3", Left + 3.5", Left + 4", Left + 4.5", Left + 5", Left + 5.5", Left + 6", Left + 6.5", Left

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Centered

- Terrain data – whether terrain is applied and the source location and elevation
- Urban area – whether the source is located in a rural or urban area and the distance from the source to the fenceline.
- Output file – location of the AERSCREEN output file
- Run title – title for the AERSCREEN model run
- NO₂ Chemistry – shows NO₂ chemistry options if NO₂ is being modeled with OLM or PVMRM

Source parameters:

The parameters differ by source type, but an emission rate must be entered for any source type selected for modeling. The source types are:

- Point – releases from stacks and isolated vents
- Flare – releases from flares
- Volume – releases from a variety of industrial sources, such as building roof monitors, multiple vents, and conveyor belts
- Rectangular area – low level or ground level releases with no plume rise (e.g., storage piles, slag dumps, and lagoons)
- Circular area – low level or ground level releases from a source having a circular shape

Point source

Stack parameters for point (vertical stacks with no caps), capped stacks, and horizontal stacks are the same. Point sources are denoted by the term “** STACK DATA” in the input file in the line above the source parameters. Capped stacks are denoted by the term “** POINTCAP DATA” in the input file and horizontal stacks are denoted by the term “** POINTHOR DATA” in the input file. Source inputs for these three source types are shown with English and metric units in parentheses:

- Emission rate (lb/hr or g/s)
- Stack height (feet or meters)
- Stack diameter (inches or meters)
- Stack temperature (degrees Fahrenheit or Kelvin)
- Stack velocity (ft/s or m/s) or flow rate (ACFM)

The rest of the parameters are similar to the parameters in the AERMOD model. Entering 0 Kelvin for temperature will make AERSCREEN use ambient temperature from the meteorological data files.

Flare source

Flare sources are denoted by the term “** FLARE DATA” in the input file in the line above the source parameters. Flare source inputs are, with English and metric units:

- Emission rate (lb/hr or g/s)
- Stack height (feet or meters)
- Total heat release rate (cal/sec)

- Radiative heat loss fraction

The heat loss fraction can be entered if known, or the default value of 0.55 can be used. AERSCREEN will process the flare in AERMOD as a POINT source type. For the exit velocity and exit temperature, AERSCREEN defaults these values to 20 m/s and 1,273 K, respectively. The stack diameter and effective stack height used in AERMOD are calculated from the inputs as:

$$D = 9.8 \times 10^{-4} \times \sqrt{HR \times (1 - HL)}$$
$$H_{eff} = H_s + 4.56 \times 10^{-3} \times HR^{0.478}$$

where D is effective stack diameter, HR is the heat release rate, HL is the heat loss fraction, H_{eff} is effective stack height, and H_s is the stack height.

Volume sources

Volume sources are denoted by the term “** VOLUME DATA” in the input file in the line above the source parameters. Volume source inputs are, with English and metric units:

- Emission rate (lb/hr or g/s)
- Release height, i.e. center of volume (feet or meters)
- Initial lateral dimension of the volume (feet or meters)
- Initial vertical dimension of the volume (feet or meters)

Rectangular area sources

Rectangular area sources are denoted by the term “** AREA DATA” in the input file in the line above the source parameters. Rectangular area source inputs are, with English and metric units:

- Emission rate (lb/hr or g/s)
- Release height above ground (feet or meters)
- Long and short dimensions of area (feet or meters)
- Initial vertical dimension of plume (feet or meters)

It is very important to note that the emission rate for a rectangular area source in AERSCREEN is specified in g/s or lb/hour, not an emission rate per unit area, as is used in AERMOD modeling applications. AERSCREEN automatically calculates the emission rate per unit area. The angle of the source relative to north is automatically set to 0 degrees. Note that the long dimension of the area source is in the x-direction and short dimension in the y-direction.

Circular area sources

Circular area sources are denoted by the term “** AREACIRC DATA” in the input file in the line above the source parameters. Circular area source inputs are, with English and metric units:

- Emission rate (lb/hr or g/s)
- Release height above ground (feet or meters)
- Radius of circle (feet or meters)
- Initial vertical dimension of plume (feet or meters)

As with rectangular area sources, the emission rate is specified by the user in g/s or lb/hour, not as an emission rate per unit area.

NO₂ Chemistry

Starting with AERSCREEN version 11060, AERSCREEN has the option of modeling NO_x to NO₂ conversion using the OLM and PVMRM methods of the AERMOD model. This option is not selected by default. When entering data via the prompts, the user is asked to enter an option for modeling NO_x to NO₂ conversion:

- No chemistry or pollutant is not NO₂
- Use Ozone Limiting Method (OLM)
- Use Plume Volume Molar Ratio Method (PVMRM)

If option two or three is chosen, the user is prompted for the NO₂/ NO_x in-stack ratio (AERMOD card CO NOSTACK) and a representative ozone background concentration (AERMOD card CO OZONEVAL). The NO₂/ NO_x in-stack ratio can range from zero to one and units of the background concentration can be parts per million (ppm), parts per billion (ppb) or micrograms per cubic meter (ug/m³). For PVMRM the NO₂EQUIL ratio is set at the default value of 0.9. For OLM use, since only one source is being modeled, the OLMGROUP keyword is not needed.

Building parameters: Downwash

Building downwash only applies to point, capped stack, horizontal stack, and flare sources. Building parameter data are denoted by the term “** BUILDING DATA” in the input file in the line above the building dimensions. Several parameters are needed by AERSCREEN for input into BPIPPRM. These are:

- Include downwash (Y=use building downwash, N=no downwash)
- Option to use an existing BPIPPRM input file or,
- Building height (feet or meters)
- Maximum building dimension (feet or meters)
- Minimum building dimension (feet or meters)
- Degrees from North of maximum building horizontal dimension (0-179 degrees)
- Degrees from North of stack location relative to building center (0-360 degrees)
- Distance between stack and building center (feet or meters)

Meteorology and Surface characteristics

AERSCREEN uses the meteorological data pre-processor MAKEMET to create surface and profile meteorological data files for an AERSCREEN model run. For inputs to MAKEMET, the user enters the following:

- Minimum and maximum ambient air temperatures (Fahrenheit or Kelvin)
- Minimum wind speed (m/s)
- Anemometer height (m)

Surface characteristics (user-entered, AERMET tables, or surface characteristics listed in an external file)

Urban area

The urban area input parameter is used to indicate whether the source is located in an urban area or a rural area. The rural area option is selected by default. If the urban area option is selected, the population for the area must be entered.

Receptors

AERSCREEN generates a receptor grid based on the values specified by the user in the Receptors form. The probe distance is the distance from the source to the farthest receptor to be included in the grid. The larger this distance, the more receptors there will be in the grid. AERSCREEN places receptors 25 meters apart up to 5 kilometers from the source, and farther apart for distances greater than 5 kilometers from the source. The ambient distance is the distance from the source to the fenceline of the facility being modeled. No receptors will be generated that are closer to the source than the ambient distance. The flagpole height is the height of all receptors above ground level.

Discrete receptors: Starting with AERSCREEN version 11060, the mode has the option of entering up to ten discrete receptor distances. These distances will be used to generate receptors in addition to the receptor grid automatically created by AERSCREEN. The distances are from the source being modeled to the receptor. These could include distances to specific locations near a source such as a monitor, school, residential area, etc. AERSCREEN will read all of the locations input by the user but will only process receptors that are between the ambient distance and probe distance. Distances can be entered as:

- FEET or FT for feet
- METERS for meters
- KILOMETERS, KILO-METERS, or KM for kilometers
- MILES for miles

Terrain

AERSCREEN provides the option for incorporating terrain impacts on the screening analysis. For terrain processing in AERMAP, the user enters the following:

- Include terrain processing (yes=include terrain, no=do not include terrain effects)
- Probe distance (meters)
- Include discrete receptor distances (beginning with version 11060)
- Source coordinates (geographic or UTM)
- Flagpole receptors
- Source elevation or use AERMAP to determine source elevation
- NAD datum (NAD 27 or 83)

- UTM zone (if UTM coordinates entered)

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED PROCEDURES FOR ESTIMATING
INITIAL LATERAL DIMENSIONS (σ_{y0}) AND
INITIAL VERTICAL DIMENSIONS (σ_{z0}) FOR VOLUME SOURCES

<u>Description of Source</u>	<u>Initial Dimension</u>
<u>(a) Initial Lateral Dimensions (σ_{y0})</u>	
<u>Single Volume Source</u>	<u>$\sigma_{y0} =$ length of side divided by 4.3</u>
<u>(b) Initial Vertical Dimensions (σ_{z0})</u>	
<u>Surface-Based Source ($h_e \sim 0$)</u>	<u>$\sigma_{z0} =$ vertical dimension of source divided by 2.15</u>
<u>Elevated Source ($h_e > 0$) on or Adjacent to a Building</u>	<u>$\sigma_{z0} =$ building height divided by 2.15</u>
<u>Elevated Source ($h_e > 0$) not on or Adjacent to a Building</u>	<u>$\sigma_{z0} =$ vertical dimension of source divided by 4.3</u>

Appendix B

SCREEN/TSCREEN Model Application Guidance

The type of SCREEN source to be chosen is ~~dependant~~dependent on how the emissions leave the source (if the source is not enclosed) or how they leave the building or enclosure if emitted within a building or enclosure. Once the egress points are identified and characterized, one of the following source types is applied to the emissions at the point of egress (stack, window, vent, etc.)

The following information identifies the SCREEN/TSCREEN model choices to be used when modeling for Ohio new source review. Since the TSCREEN model does not directly identify which release scenarios lead to the use of the SCREEN model, "TSCREEN pathways" are identified to assist TSCREEN users in making scenario choices that will lead to the SCREEN model and the desired source type.

Point Source

TSCREEN pathways; There are several TSCREEN release scenarios which utilize the SCREEN3 point source option including Gaseous Release Type, Stacks, Vents, Conventional Point Sources or Particulate Matter Release Type, Stacks, Vents.

- Emission rate (g/s)
- Stack Height (above ground, not roof (m))
- Stack inside diameter (m, diameter of equivalent area circle if stack is not round)
- Stack exit velocity (m/s) or flow rate (ACFM or m³/s)
- Stack gas temperature (K)
- Ambient temperature (use default of 293 K)
- Receptor height above ground (use 0, ground level)
- Urban/Rural (based on land use within 3 km of the source)
- Building downwash (Building information is necessary if stack is within the influence of a building: i.e., within five times the lesser building dimension)
- Do not consider building cavity calculations. **Note:** After mmm dd, 2002, AERMOD will replace ISC and be the only acceptable refined model. This model does incorporate building wake and cavity effects. After mmm dd, 2002, users of SCREEN will also need to consider the building cavity calculations when determining peak impacts.
- Complex terrain (yes if terrain above stack height is present in the potential impact area of the source)
- Simple or flat (yes for simple: if terrain above stack base is present in the potential impact area of the source. When in doubt, say yes and perform the analysis)
- Choice of meteorology (option 1, full meteorology)
- Automated distance array (yes, minimum distance (m) begins at "ambient air" (usually the fence line) and should extend to a point which ensures that the

Formatted

- maximum concentration has been found, up to a maximum of 50,000 m)
- Discrete distance option (used for informational purposes only)
 - Fumigation Option (fumigation calculations are not used for state permit modeling)

Area Source

TSCREEN pathway; There are several TSCREEN pathways which utilize the SCREEN3 area source option including Particulate Matter Release Type, Fugitive/Windblown Dust Emissions or Storage Piles or Gaseous Release Type, Multiple Fugitive Sources. The TSCREEN pathways **do not** allow the characterization of non-square area sources which is now an option with SCREEN3.

General option choices are the same as for point source except for the following;

- Emission rate (g/s/m²)
- Source height (mean height of source, m)
- Length of longer side of rectangular area, (m)
- Length of shorter side of rectangular area, (m)
- Wind direction search (yes)

Volume Source

TSCREEN pathway:(the SCREEN volume source option is not available through TSCREEN)

General options choices are the same as for point source except for the following;

- Initial lateral dimension (modified per table below (m))
- Initial vertical dimension (modified per table below (m))
- Height of release (the midpoint of the opening (m))

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED PROCEDURES FOR ESTIMATING
INITIAL LATERAL DIMENSIONS (σ_{y0}) AND
INITIAL VERTICAL DIMENSIONS (σ_{z0}) FOR VOLUME SOURCES

Description of Source	Initial Dimension
(a) Initial Lateral Dimensions (σ_{y0})	
Single Volume Source	$\sigma_{y0} =$ length of side divided by 4.3
(b) Initial Vertical Dimensions (σ_{z0})	
Surface-Based Source ($h_e \sim 0$)	$\sigma_{z0} =$ vertical dimension of source divided by 2.15
Elevated Source ($h_e > 0$) on or Adjacent to a Building	$\sigma_{z0} =$ building height divided by 2.15
Elevated Source ($h_e > 0$) not on or Adjacent to a Building	$\sigma_{z0} =$ vertical dimension of source divided by 4.3

DRAFT

Formatted: Font color: Black