

Ames, Rodger

From: Ryan C. Templeton <Templeton.Ryan@azdeq.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2018 10:13 AM
To: Herron-Thorpe, Farren (ECY); Tom Moore
Cc: Ames, Rodger
Subject: RE: Point Source Stack Parameter review

Sorry Farren, just getting back around to this. I appreciate the feedback and explanation. I will try to sort the data to remove SCCs that are treated as fugitives and focus on those sources/SCCs that are remaining.

Ryan Templeton
Environmental Engineer Specialist
Air Quality Improvement Planning Section
Air Quality Division, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
1110 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 771-4230
rct@azdeq.gov

From: Herron-Thorpe, Farren (ECY) [mailto:fher461@ECY.WA.GOV]
Sent: Friday, August 3, 2018 3:51 PM
To: Ryan C. Templeton <Templeton.Ryan@azdeq.gov>; Tom Moore <tmoore@westar.org>
Cc: Rodger Ames Rodger.Ames@colostate.edu <Rodger.Ames@ColoState.EDU>
Subject: Re: Point Source Stack Parameter review

Hi Ryan,

I've never used AERMOD, so I can't speak for how the emissions processing works. However, I do have experience with the SMOKE emissions processor that CMAQ and CAMx use. Point sources use the default stack parameters based on SCC if stack parameters are not given. If the SCC is not in the lookup list, then the default parameters are basically fugitive. If a source should be treated as fugitive, but the SCC has a non-fugitive lookup, it can be overridden in a couple different ways. So, if you have large sources that are pointing to non-fugitive stack parameters, but they should in fact be fugitive, it would be good to have those listed so the modeling can be done correctly.

-Farren

From: Ryan C. Templeton <Templeton.Ryan@azdeq.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 3, 2018 12:22:54 PM
To: Tom Moore; Herron-Thorpe, Farren (ECY)
Cc: Rodger Ames Rodger.Ames@colostate.edu
Subject: RE: Point Source Stack Parameter review

Hey all,

I just wanted to follow up with the point source missing stack parameter data review. I've dug a little bit deeper into the data and it looks like a high proportion of the parameter data that is missing from the Arizona point sources is coming from fugitive processes (e.g. scc level four descriptors such as: "bulk loading", "fugitive emissions: general", "unpaved

roads”, “paved roads”, storage piles, unloading and loading, etc.). I am not terribly familiar with how CAMx treats these sources within the model but would these sources have all of the attributes you are requesting (e.g. stack diameter, stack velocity, etc.)? If CAMx treats sources similarly to AERMOD, wouldn’t these SCCs be treated as volume or line sources and not have those same parameters you are requesting?

We are looking at requesting missing information from sources but I want to make sure we are requesting the correct information before sending letters to individual sources for feedback. I have attached a workbook that provides SCC descriptors for the non-airport SCCs that were identified in the “2014NElv2_facilities_missing_stack_parameters.xlsx” workbook that was developed.

Ryan Templeton
Environmental Engineer Specialist
Air Quality Improvement Planning Section
Air Quality Division, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
1110 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 771-4230
rct@azdeq.gov

From: Tom Moore [<mailto:tmoore@westar.org>]
Sent: Thursday, August 2, 2018 3:21 PM
To: Ryan C. Templeton <Templeton.Ryan@azdeq.gov>; Herron-Thorpe, Farren (ECY) <fher461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Cc: Rodger Ames Rodger.Ames@colostate.edu <Rodger.Ames@ColoState.EDU>
Subject: RE: Point Source Stack Parameter review

If we could get them by the end of August, that would be great. Thanks for the explanation.

*Tom Moore, WRAP Air Quality Program Manager
Western States Air Resources Council (WESTAR) | e: tmoore@westar.org | o: 970.491.8837
Western Regional Air Partnership | www.wrapair2.org*

From: Ryan C. Templeton <Templeton.Ryan@azdeq.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2018 4:18 PM
To: Herron-Thorpe, Farren (ECY) <fher461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Tom Moore <tmoore@westar.org>
Subject: Point Source Stack Parameter review

Hey Farren and Tom,

I worked some with a coworker to try to get a handle on the why there were so many Arizona sources with missing stack parameter information. We determined that most of the sources missing stack parameters were either airports (which we do not permit) or were originating from fugitive process at the source (we do not request fugitive specific information of our permitted sources). We were thinking of supplying the list of complete and missing stack parameters to our permitted sources for review but that process could take some time. What timeline do you currently have for the point source stack parameter review?

Thanks.

Ryan Templeton