


UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards  
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711

AUG 23 2010

**MEMORANDUM**

SUBJECT: Guidance Concerning the Implementation of the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program

FROM:  Stephen D. Page, Director  
Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards

TO: Regional Air Division Directors

On June 2, 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced a new 1-hour sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (hereinafter, either the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS or 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard) of 75 ppb, which is attained when the 3-year average of the annual 99th-percentile of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations does not exceed 75 ppb at each monitor within an area. EPA revised the primary SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS to provide the requisite protection of public health. The final rule for the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS was published in the Federal Register on June 22, 2010 (75 FR 35520), and the standard becomes effective on August 23, 2010. In the same notice, we also announced that we are revoking both the existing 24-hour and annual primary SO<sub>2</sub> standards. However, as explained in this guidance, those SO<sub>2</sub> standards, as well as the 24-hour and annual increments for SO<sub>2</sub>, remain in effect for a while further and must continue to be protected.

EPA interprets the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) provisions of the Clean Air Act and EPA regulations to require that any federal permit issued under 40 CFR 52.21 on or after that effective date must contain a demonstration of source compliance with the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. We anticipate that some new major stationary sources or major modifications, especially those involving relatively short stacks, may experience difficulty demonstrating that emissions from proposed projects will not cause or contribute to a modeled violation of the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. We also anticipate problems that sources may have interpreting the modeled 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> impacts if the form of the hourly standard is not properly addressed. To respond to these and other related issues, we are providing the attached guidance, in the form of two memoranda, for implementing the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS under the PSD permit program.

The first memorandum, titled "General Guidance for Implementing the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standard in Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permits, Including an Interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> Significant Impact Level," includes guidance for the preparation and review of PSD permits with respect to the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard. That

guidance memorandum sets forth a recommended interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> significant impact level (SIL) that states may consider for carrying out the required PSD air quality analysis for SO<sub>2</sub>, until EPA promulgates a 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL via rulemaking, and addresses the continued use of the existing SO<sub>2</sub> Significant Emissions Rate (SER) and Significant Monitoring Concentration (SMC) to implement the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard.. The second memorandum, titled “Applicability of Appendix W Modeling Guidance for the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standard,” includes specific modeling guidance for estimating ambient SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations and determining compliance with the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard.

This guidance does not bind state and local governments and permit applicants as a matter of law. Nevertheless, we believe that state and local air agencies and industry will find this guidance useful for carrying out the PSD permit process and it will provide a consistent approach for estimating SO<sub>2</sub> air quality impacts from proposed construction or modification of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions sources. For the most part, the attached guidance focuses on how existing policy and guidance is relevant to and should be used for implementing the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

Please review the guidance included in the two attached memoranda. In the event of questions regarding the general implementation guidance contained in the first memorandum, please contact Raj Rao ([rao.raj@epa.gov](mailto:rao.raj@epa.gov)). For questions pertaining to the modeling guidance in the second memorandum, please contact Tyler Fox ([fox.tyler@epa.gov](mailto:fox.tyler@epa.gov)). We are continuing our efforts to address permitting issues related to the implementation of new and revised NAAQS, and will issue additional guidance to address the NAAQS as appropriate.

Attachments:

1. Memorandum from Anna Marie Wood, Air Quality Policy Division, to EPA Regional Air Division Directors, “General Guidance for Implementing the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standard in Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permits, Including an Interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> Significant Impact Level” (August 23, 2010).
2. Memorandum from Tyler Fox, Air Quality Modeling Group, to EPA Regional Air Division Directors, “Applicability of Appendix W Modeling Guidance for the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standard” (August 23, 2010).

cc: Anna Marie Wood  
Richard Wayland  
Lydia Wegman  
Raj Rao  
Tyler Fox  
Dan deRoeck  
Roger Brode  
Rich Ossias  
Elliott Zenick  
Brian Doster

**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**  
**Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards**  
**Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711**

**August 23, 2010**

**MEMORANDUM**

**SUBJECT:** General Guidance for Implementing the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standard in Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permits, Including an Interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> Significant Impact Level

**FROM:** Anna Marie Wood, Acting Director /s/  
Air Quality Policy Division

**TO:** Regional Air Division Directors

**INTRODUCTION**

We are issuing the following guidance to explain and clarify the procedures that may be followed by applicants for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permits, and permitting authorities reviewing such applications, to properly demonstrate that proposed projects to construct and operate will not cause or contribute to a modeled violation of the new 1-hour sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (hereinafter, either the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS or 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard) that becomes effective on August 23, 2010. The EPA revised the primary SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS by promulgating a 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS to provide the requisite protection of public health. Under section 165(a)(3) of the Clean Air Act (the Act) and sections 52.21(k) and 51.166(k) of EPA's PSD regulations, to obtain a permit, a source must demonstrate that its proposed emissions increase will not cause or contribute to a violation of "any NAAQS."

This guidance is intended to (1) highlight the importance of a 1-hour averaging period for setting an emissions limitation for SO<sub>2</sub> in the PSD permit (2) reduce the modeling burden to implement the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard where it can be properly demonstrated that a source will not have a significant impact on ambient 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, and (3) identify approaches that allow sources and permitting authorities to mitigate, in a manner consistent with existing regulatory requirements, potential modeled violations of the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS, where appropriate. Accordingly, the techniques described in this memorandum may be used by permit applicants and permitting authorities to perform an acceptable 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS compliance modeling assessment and/or properly configure projects and permit conditions in order that a proposed source's emissions do not cause or contribute to modeled 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS violations, so that permits can be issued in accordance with the applicable PSD program requirements.

This guidance discusses existing provisions in EPA regulations and guidance, and focuses on the relevancy of this information for implementing the new NAAQS for SO<sub>2</sub>. Importantly, however, this guidance also sets forth a recommended interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> significant impact level (SIL) that EPA will use when it evaluates applications and issues permits under the federal PSD program, and that states may choose to rely upon to implement their PSD programs for SO<sub>2</sub> if they agree that the value represents a reasonable threshold for determining a significant ambient impact, and they incorporate into each permit record a rationale supporting this conclusion. This interim SIL is a useful screening tool that can be used to determine whether or not the predicted ambient impacts caused by a proposed source's emissions increase will be significant and, if so whether the source's emissions should be considered to "cause or contribute to" modeled violations of the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

## **BACKGROUND**

On August 23, 2010, the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS will become effective. Regulations at 40 CFR 52.21 (the federal PSD program) require permit applicants to demonstrate compliance with "any" NAAQS that is in effect on the date a PSD permit is issued. (See, e.g., EPA memo dated April 1, 2010, titled "Applicability of the Federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Requirements to New and Revised National Ambient Air Quality Standards.") Due to the promulgation of this short-term averaging period (1-hour) for the SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS, we anticipate that some new major stationary sources or major modifications, especially those involving relatively short stacks may experience increased difficulty demonstrating that emissions from proposed project will not cause or contribute to a modeled violation.

We believe that, in some instances, preliminary predictions of violations could result from the use of maximum modeled concentrations that do not adequately take into account the form of the 1-hour standard. To the extent that is the case, ambient SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the form of the new 1-hour NAAQS should be estimated by applying the recommended procedures that account for the statistical form of the standard. See EPA Memorandum from Tyler Fox, Air Quality Modeling Group, to EPA Regional Air Division Directors, "Applicability of Appendix W Modeling Guidance for the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (August 23, 2010) for specific modeling guidance for estimating ambient SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations consistent with the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

It is EPA's expectation that currently available SO<sub>2</sub> guidance, including the guidance presented in this memorandum, will assist in resolving some of the issues arising from preliminary analyses that show potential exceedances of the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS that would not be present under more refined modeling applications. In addition, the techniques described in this memorandum may also help avoid violations of the standard through design of the proposed source or permit conditions, consistent with existing regulatory requirements. Moreover, the interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL that is included in this guidance will provide a reasonable screening tool for effectively implementing the PSD requirements for an air quality impact analysis.

The following discussion provides guidance for establishing a 1-hour emissions limitation to demonstrate compliance with the new NAAQS, and for possibly mitigating

modeled violations using any of the following: air quality-based permit limits more stringent than what the Best Available Control Technology provisions may otherwise require, air quality offsets, “good engineering practice” (GEP) stack heights, and an interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL. The continued use of the existing SO<sub>2</sub> Significant Emissions Rate (SER) and Significant Monitoring Concentration (SMC) to implement the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard is also discussed.

## **SCREENING VALUES**

In the final rule establishing the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard, EPA discussed various implementation considerations for the PSD permitting program. 75 FR.35520 (June 22, 2010). That discussion included the following statements regarding particular screening values that have historically been used on a widespread basis to facilitate implementation of the PSD permitting program:

We agree with the commenters that there may be a need for EPA to provide additional screening tools or to revise existing screening tools that are frequently used under the NSR/PSD program for reducing the burden of completing SO<sub>2</sub> ambient air impact analyses. These screening tools include the SILs, as mentioned by the commenter, but also include the SER for emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> and the SMC for SO<sub>2</sub>. The existing screening tools apply to the periods used to define the existing NAAQS for SO<sub>2</sub>, including the annual, 24-hour, and 3-hour averaging periods. EPA intends to evaluate the need for possible changes or additions to each of these useful screening tools for SO<sub>2</sub> due to the revision of the SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS to provide for a 1-hour standard. We believe it is highly likely that in order to be most effective for implementing the new 1-hour averaging period for NSR purposes, new 1-hour screening values will be appropriate.

75 FR 35579. EPA intends to conduct an evaluation of these issues and submit our findings in the form of revised significance levels under notice and comment rulemaking if any revisions are deemed appropriate. In the interim, for the reasons provided below, we recommend the continued use of the existing SER for SO<sub>2</sub> emissions as well as an interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL that we are setting forth today for conducting air quality impact analyses for the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. As described in the section titled Introduction, EPA intends to implement the interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL contained herein under the federal PSD program and offers states the opportunity to use it in their PSD programs if they choose to do so. EPA is not addressing the significant monitoring concentration (SMC) for SO<sub>2</sub> in this memorandum; the existing SMC for SO<sub>2</sub>, at 40 CFR 52.21(i)(5)(i) should continue to be used.

## **SIGNIFICANT EMISSIONS RATE**

The PSD regulations define SER for various regulated NSR pollutants. When a proposed new source’s potential to emit a pollutant, or a modified source’s net emissions increase of a pollutant, would be less than the SER, the source is not required to undergo the requisite PSD analyses (BACT and air quality) for that particular emissions increase. Under the terms of existing EPA regulations, the applicable SER for SO<sub>2</sub> is 40 tons per year (tpy). 40 CFR 52.21(b)(23); 40 CFR 51.166(b)(23). Each of the significant emissions rates defined in those regulations is specific to an individual pollutant with no differentiation by averaging time with

regard to NAAQS. The NAAQS for SO<sub>2</sub> have included standards with 3-hour and 24-hour and annual averaging times for many years. The EPA has applied the 40 tpy SER for SO<sub>2</sub> across all of these averaging times, and we are aware of no reason why it should not be used for the 1-hour averaging period for the present time. Therefore, until the evaluation described above and any associated rulemaking are completed, we will use 40 tpy as the SER for the 1-hour standard.

Under existing regulations, an ambient air quality impact analysis is required for “each pollutant that [a source] would have the potential to emit in significant amounts.” [40 CFR 52.21(m)(1)(i)(a); 40 CFR. 51.166(m)(1)(i)(a)]. For modifications, these regulations require this analysis for “each pollutant for which [the modification] would result in a significant net emissions increase.” 40 CFR.52.21(m)(1)(i)(b); 40 CFR.51.166(m)(1)(i)(b). EPA construes this regulation to mean that an ambient impact analysis is not necessary for pollutants with emissions rates below the significant emissions rates in paragraph (b)(23) of the regulations. No additional action by EPA or permitting authorities is necessary at this time to apply the 40 tpy significant emissions rate in existing regulations to the hourly SO<sub>2</sub> standard.

### **INTERIM 1-HOUR SO<sub>2</sub> SIGNIFICANT IMPACT LEVEL**

Under the PSD program, a proposed new major stationary source or major modification must, among other things, complete an air quality impact analysis that involves performing an analysis of air quality modeling and ambient monitoring data, where appropriate, to demonstrate compliance with applicable NAAQS. In order to implement this requirement, EPA traditionally has provided a screening tool known as the Significant Impact Level (SIL) to help applicants and permitting authorities determine whether a source’s modeled ambient impact is significant so as to warrant a comprehensive, cumulative air quality analysis to demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS. Accordingly, where a proposed source’s modeled impact is deemed insignificant, or *de minimis*, using the SIL as a threshold for significance, the applicant is not required to model anything besides its own proposed emissions increase to show that the proposed source or modification will not cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS.<sup>1</sup>

If, on the other hand, the source’s modeled impact is found to be significant, based on the SIL, the applicant will need to complete a comprehensive, cumulative air quality impact analysis to demonstrate that the source’s emissions will not cause or contribute to a modeled violation of any NAAQS. To make this demonstration, EPA has recommended that a cumulative analysis cover a circular area measuring out from the source to the maximum distance where the source’s impact is equal to the SIL. Within this modeling area, the source should also model the impacts of other sources (existing and newly permitted), including applicable SO<sub>2</sub> sources located outside the circular area described above, to account for the cumulative hourly SO<sub>2</sub> air quality impacts

---

<sup>1</sup> When a proposed source’s impact by itself is not considered to be “significant,” EPA has long maintained that any further effort on the part of the applicant to complete a cumulative source impact analysis involving other source impacts would only yield information of trivial or no value with respect to the required evaluation of the proposed source or modification. The concept of a SIL is grounded on the *de minimis* principles described by the court in *Alabama Power Co. v. Costle*, 636 F.2d 323, 360 (D.C. Cir. 1980); See also *Sur Contra La Contaminacion v. EPA*, 202 F.3d 443, 448-49 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 2000) (upholding EPA’s use of SIL to allow permit applicant to avoid full impact analysis); *In re: Prairie State Gen. Co.*, PSD Appeal No. 05-05, Slip. Op. at 139 (EAB 2006).

that are predicted to occur. The applicant may also have to gather ambient monitoring data as part of the total air quality analysis that is required for demonstrating compliance with the NAAQS.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, the source will evaluate its contribution to any modeled violation of the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS to determine whether the source's emissions contribution will cause or contribute to the modeled violation at any receptor. Note that in the accompanying modeling guidance memorandum we are providing recommended procedures and guidance for completing the modeling analysis to demonstrate compliance with the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

We plan to undertake rulemaking to adopt a 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL value. However, until such time as a 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL is defined in the PSD regulations, we are providing an interim SIL of 3 ppb, which we intend to use as a screening tool for completing the required air quality analyses for the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS under the federal PSD program at 40 CFR 52.21. We are also making the interim SIL available to States with EPA-approved implementation plans containing a PSD program to use at their discretion. To support the application of this interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL in each instance, a permitting authority that utilizes it as part of an ambient air quality analysis should include in the permit record the analysis reflected in this memorandum and the referenced documents to demonstrate that a modeled air quality impact is *de minimis*, and thereby would not be considered to cause or contribute to a modeled violation of the NAAQS.<sup>3</sup>

States may also elect to choose another value that they believe represents a significant air quality impact relative to the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. The EPA-recommended interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL is not intended to supersede any interim SIL that any state chooses to rely upon to implement a state PSD program that is part of an approved SIP, or to impose the use of the SIL concept on any state that chooses to implement the PSD program—in particular the ambient air quality analysis—without using a SIL as a screening tool. Accordingly, states that implement the PSD program under an EPA-approved SIP may choose to use this interim SIL, another value that may be deemed more appropriate for PSD permitting purposes in the state of concern, or no SIL at all. The application of any SIL that is not reflected in a promulgated regulation should be supported by a record in each instance that shows the value represents a *de minimis* impact on the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard, as described above.

As indicated above, using the interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL, the permit applicant and permitting authority can determine: (1) whether, based on the proposed increase in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, a cumulative air quality analysis is required; (2) the area of impact within which a cumulative air quality analysis should focus; and (3) whether, as part of a cumulative air quality analysis, the proposed source's SO<sub>2</sub> emissions will cause or contribute to any modeled violation of the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

---

<sup>2</sup> A screening tool known as the Significant Monitoring Concentration (SMC) for SO<sub>2</sub> already exists in the PSD regulations. EPA plans to evaluate the existing SMC in light of the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS; however, the existing value of 13 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, 24-hour average, should continue to be used until and unless a revised value is issued through rulemaking.

<sup>3</sup> Where the cumulative air quality analysis identifies a modeled violation of the NAAQS or increments, and the proposed source is issued its permit by virtue of the fact that its proposed emissions increase is not considered to cause or contribute to the modeled violation, it is still the permitting authority's responsibility to address such modeled violations independently from the PSD permitting process to determine the nature of the problem and to mitigate it accordingly,

As mentioned above, we are providing an interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL value of 3 ppb to implement the federal PSD program. To determine initially whether a proposed project's emissions increase will have a significant impact (resulting in the need for a cumulative air quality analysis), this interim SIL should be compared to either of the following:

- The highest of the 5-year averages of the maximum modeled 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations predicted each year at each receptor, based on 5 years of National Weather Service data; or
- The highest modeled 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> concentration predicted across all receptors based on 1 year of site-specific meteorological data, or the highest of the multi-year averages of the maximum modeled 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations predicted each year at each receptor, based on 2 or more, up to 5 complete years of available site-specific meteorological data.

Additional guidance will be forthcoming for the purpose of comparing a proposed source's modeled impacts to the interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL in order to make a determination about whether that source's contribution is significant when a cumulative air quality analysis identifies violations of the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS (i.e., "causes or contributes to" a modeled violation).

We derived this interim 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL by using an impact equal to 4% of the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS (which is 75 ppb). On June 29, 2010, we issued an interim 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> SIL that used an impact equal to 4% of the 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> standard. As explained in the June memorandum, we have chosen this approach because we believe it is reasonable to base the interim 1-hour SIL directly on consideration of impacts relative to the corresponding 1-hour NAAQS. In 1980, we defined SER for each pollutant subject to PSD. 45 FR 52676 (August 7, 1980) at 52705-52710. For PM and SO<sub>2</sub>, we defined the SER as the emissions rate that resulted in an ambient impact equal to 4% of the applicable short-term NAAQS. The 1980 analysis focused on levels no higher than 5% of the primary standard because of concerns that higher levels were found to result in unreasonably large amounts of increment being consumed by a single source. Within the range of impacts analyzed, we considered two factors that had an important influence on the choice of the significant impact levels: (1) cumulative effect on increment consumption of multiple sources in an area, each making the maximum *de minimis* emissions increase; and (2) the projected consequence of a given significant impact level on administrative burden. As explained in the preamble to the 1980 rulemaking and the supporting documentation,<sup>4</sup> EPA decided to use 4% of the 24-hour primary NAAQS for PM and SO<sub>2</sub> to define the significant emissions rates (SERs) for those pollutants. See 45 FR 52708. Looking now at a 1-hour NAAQS for SO<sub>2</sub>, we believe that it is reasonable as an interim approach to use a SIL value that represents 4% of the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. EPA will consider other possible alternatives for developing a 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> SIL in a future rulemaking that will provide an opportunity for public participation in the development of a SIL as part of the PSD regulations.

## **AIR-QUALITY BASED EMISSIONS LIMITATIONS**

---

<sup>4</sup> EPA evaluated *de minimis* levels for pollutants for which NAAQS had been established in a document titled "Impact of Proposed and Alternative De Minimis Levels for Criteria Pollutants"; EPA-450/2-80-072, June 1980.



Once a level of control is determined by the PSD applicant via the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) top-down process, the applicant must model the proposed source's emissions at the BACT emissions rate(s) to demonstrate that those emissions will not cause or contribute to a violation of any NAAQS or PSD increment. However, the EPA 1990 Workshop Manual (page B.54) describes circumstances where a proposed source's emissions based on levels determined via the top-down process may not be sufficiently controlled to prevent modeled violations of an increment or NAAQS. In such cases, it may be appropriate for PSD applicants to propose a more stringent control option (that is, beyond the level identified via the top-down process) as a result of an adverse impact on the NAAQS or PSD increments. In addition, the use of certain dispersion techniques is permissible for certain proposed projects for SO<sub>2</sub> that may need to be considered where emissions limitations alone may not enable the source to demonstrate compliance with the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. This is discussed in greater detail below in the section addressing GEP stack height requirements.

Because compliance with the new SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS must be demonstrated on the basis of a 1-hour averaging period, the reviewing authority should ensure that the source's PSD permit defines a maximum allowable hourly emissions limitation for SO<sub>2</sub>, regardless of whether it is derived from the BACT top-down approach or it is the result of an air-quality based emissions rate. Hourly limits are important because they are the foundation of the air quality modeling demonstration relative to the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. For estimating the impacts of existing sources, if necessary, existing SO<sub>2</sub> emission inventories used to support modeling for compliance with the 3-hour and 24-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standards should serve as a useful starting point, and may be adequate in many cases for use in assessing compliance with the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard. The PSD applicant's coordination with the reviewing authority is important in this matter to obtain the most appropriate estimates of maximum allowable hourly SO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

## **DEMONSTRATING COMPLIANCE WITH THE NAAQS AND INCREMENTS & MITIGATING MODELED VIOLATIONS WITH AIR QUALITY OFFSETS**

A 1988 EPA memorandum provides procedures to follow when a modeled violation is identified during the PSD permitting process. [See Memorandum from Gerald A. Emison, EPA OAQPS, to Thomas J. Maslany, EPA Air Management Division, "Air Quality Analysis for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)." (July 5, 1988.)] In cases where the air quality analysis predicts violations of the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS, but the permit applicant can show that the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions increase from the proposed source will not have a significant impact *at the point and time of any modeled violation*, the permitting authority has discretion to conclude that the source's emissions will not contribute to the modeled violation. As provided in the July 5, 1988 guidance memo, because the proposed source only has a *de minimis* contribution to the modeled violation, the source's impact will not be considered to cause or contribute to such modeled violations, and the permit could be issued. This concept continues to apply, and the significant impact level (described further below) may be used as part of this analysis. A 2006 decision by the EPA Environmental Appeals Board (EAB) provides detailed reasoning that demonstrates the permissibility of a finding that a PSD source would not be considered to cause or contribute to a modeled NAAQS violation because its estimated air quality impact was

insignificant at the time and place of the modeled violations.<sup>5</sup> [See *In re Prairie State Gen. Co.*, 13 E.A.D. \_\_\_, \_\_\_, PSD Appeal No. 05-05, Slip. Op. at 137-144 (EAB 2006)]

However, where it is determined that a source's impact does cause or contribute to a modeled violation, a permit cannot be issued without some action to mitigate the source's impact. In accordance with 40 CFR 51.165(b)<sup>6</sup>, a major stationary source or major modification (as defined at §51.165(a)(1)(iv) and (v)) that locates in a SO<sub>2</sub> attainment area for the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS and would cause or contribute to a violation of the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS may "reduce the impact of its emissions upon air quality by obtaining sufficient emission reductions to, at a minimum, compensate for its adverse ambient [SO<sub>2</sub>] impact where the major source or major modification would otherwise cause or contribute to a violation ...." An applicant can meet this requirement for obtaining additional emissions reductions either by reducing its emissions at the source (e.g., promoting more efficient production methodologies and energy efficiency) or by obtaining air quality offsets (see below). [See, e.g., *In re Interpower of New York, Inc.*, 5 E.A.D. 130, 141 (EAB 1994)].<sup>7</sup> A State may also provide the necessary emissions reductions by imposing emissions limitations on other sources through an approved SIP revision. These approaches may also be combined as necessary to demonstrate that a source will not cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS.

Unlike emissions offset requirements in areas designated as nonattainment, in addressing the air quality offset concept, it may not be necessary for a permit applicant to fully offset the proposed emissions increase if an emissions reduction of lesser quantity will mitigate the adverse air quality impact where the modeled violation was originally identified. ("Although full emission offsets are not required, such a source must obtain emission offsets sufficient to compensate for its air quality impact where the violation occurs." 44 FR 3274, January 16, 1979, at 3278.) To clarify this, the 1988 guidance memo referred to above states that:

offsets sufficient to compensate for the source's significant impact must be obtained pursuant to an approved State offset program consistent with State Implementation Plan (SIP) requirements under 40 CFR 51.165(b). Where the source is contributing to an existing violation, the required offset may not correct the violation. Such existing violations must be addressed [through the SIP].

Note that additional guidance for this and other aspects of the modeling analysis for the impacts of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions on ambient concentrations of SO<sub>2</sub> are addressed in EPA modeling guidance, including the attached August 23, 2010 Memorandum titled "Applicability of Appendix W Modeling Guidance for the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standard."

---

<sup>5</sup> While there is no 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> significant impact level (SIL) currently defined in the PSD regulations, we believe that states may adopt interim values, with the appropriate justification for such values, to use for permitting purposes. In addition, we are recommending an interim SIL as part of this guidance for implementing the SO<sub>2</sub> requirements in the federal PSD program, and in state programs where states choose to use it.

<sup>6</sup> The same provision is contained in EPA's Interpretative Ruling at 40 CFR part 51 Appendix S, section III.

<sup>7</sup> In contrast to Nonattainment New Source Review permits, offsets are not mandatory requirements in PSD permits if it can otherwise be demonstrated that a source will not cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS. See, *In re Knauf Fiber Glass, GMBH*, 8 E.A.D. 121, 168 (EAB 1999).

Although EPA announced that it is revoking the annual and 24-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS, the June 22, 2010 preamble to the final rule announcing the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS explained that those standards will remain in effect for a limited period of time as follows: for current SO<sub>2</sub> nonattainment areas and SIP call areas, until attainment and maintenance SIPs are approved by EPA for the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS; for all other areas, for one year following the effective date of the initial designations under section 107(d)(1) for the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. Accordingly, the annual and 24-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS must continue to be protected under the PSD program for as long as they remain in effect for a PSD area. There is a more detailed discussion of the transition from the existing SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS to a revised SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS in that preamble. Also, the same preamble includes a footnote listing the current nonattainment areas and SIP call areas. 75 FR 35520, at 35580-2.

In addition, the existing SO<sub>2</sub> increments (class I, II and III) for the annual and 24-hour averaging periods will not be revoked in conjunction with our decision to revoke the corresponding SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. Instead, the annual and 24-hour SO<sub>2</sub> increments (Class I, II and III increments) will remain in effect because they are defined in the Clean Air Act at title I, part C, section 163. The annual and 24-hour SO<sub>2</sub> increments in section 163 are considered part of the suite of statutory increments applicable to sulfur dioxide that Congress expressly included in the statutory provisions for PSD. As such, those increments cannot be revoked simply because we have decided to revoke the annual and 24-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS, upon which the SO<sub>2</sub> increments are based. Consequently, sources must continue to demonstrate that their proposed emissions increases of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions will not cause or contribute to any modeled violation of the existing annual and 24-hour SO<sub>2</sub> increments for as long as those statutory increments remain in effect. Increments for the 1-hour averaging period do not yet exist; the Act provides a specific schedule for the promulgation of additional regulations, which may include new increments, following the promulgation of new or revised NAAQS. EPA plans to begin that rulemaking process in the near future to consider the need for such increments.

## **“GOOD ENGINEERING PRACTICE” STACK HEIGHT AND DISPERSION TECHNIQUES**

If a permit applicant is unable to show that the source’s proposed emissions increase will not cause or contribute to a modeled violation of the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS, the problem could be the result of plume downwash effects causing high ambient concentrations near the source. In such cases, a source may be able to raise the height of its existing stacks (or designed stacks if not yet constructed) to a “good engineering practice” (GEP) stack height, or at least 65 meters, measured from the ground-level elevation at the base of the stack.

While not necessarily eliminating the full effect of downwash in all cases, raising stacks to GEP height may provide substantial air quality benefits in a manner consistent with statutory provisions (section 123 of the Act) governing acceptable stack heights to minimize excessive concentrations due to atmospheric downwash, eddies or wakes. Permit applicants should also be aware of the regulatory restrictions on stack heights for the purpose of modeling for compliance with NAAQS and increments. Section 52.21(h) of the PSD regulations currently prohibits the use of dispersion techniques, such as stack heights above GEP, merged gas streams, or intermittent controls for setting SO<sub>2</sub> emissions limits to meet the NAAQS and PSD increments.

However, stack heights in existence before December 31, 1970, and dispersion techniques implemented before then, are not affected by these limitations. EPA's general stack height regulations are promulgated at 40 CFR 51.100(ff), (gg), (hh), (ii), (jj), (kk) and (nn), and 40 CFR 51.118.

a. *Stack heights*: A source can include only the actual stack height up to GEP height when modeling to develop the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions limitations or to determine source compliance with the SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS and increments. This is not a limit on the actual height of any stack constructed by a new source or modification, however, and there may be circumstances where a source owner elects to build a stack higher than GEP height. However, such additional height may not be considered when determining an emissions limitation or demonstrating compliance with an applicable NAAQS or PSD increment. Thus, when modeling, the following limitations apply in accordance with §52.21(h):

- For a stack height less than GEP, the actual stack height must be used in the source impact analysis for emissions;
- For a stack height equal to or greater than 65 meters the impact may be modeled using the greater of:
  - A *de minimis* stack height equal to 65 meters, as measured from the ground-level elevation at the base of the stack, without demonstration or calculation (40 CFR 51.100(ii)(1));
  - The refined formula height calculated using the dimensions of nearby structures in accordance with the following equation:

**GEP = H + 1.5L**, where H is the height of the nearby structure and L is the lesser dimension of the height or projected width of the nearby structure (40 CFR 51.100(ii)(2)(ii)).<sup>8</sup>

- A GEP stack height exceeding the refined formula height may be approved when it can be demonstrated to be necessary to avoid “excessive concentrations” of SO<sub>2</sub> caused by atmospheric downwash, wakes, or eddy effects by the source, nearby structures, or nearby terrain features. (40 CFR 51.100(ii)(3), (jj), (kk));
- For purposes of PSD, “excessive concentrations” means a maximum ground-level concentration from a stack due in whole or in part to downwash, wakes, and eddy effects produced by nearby structures or nearby terrain features which individually is at least 40 percent in excess of the maximum concentration experienced in the absence of such effects and (a) which contributes to a total concentration due to emissions from all sources that is greater than the applicable NAAQS or (b) greater than the applicable PSD increments. (40 CFR 51.100(kk)(1)).

---

<sup>8</sup> For stacks in existence on January 12, 1979, the GEP equation is  $GEP = 2.5 H$  (provided the owner or operator produces evidence that this equation was actually relied on in establishing an emission limitation for SO<sub>2</sub> (40 CFR 51.100(ii)(2)(i))

Reportedly, for economic and other reasons, many existing source stacks have been constructed at heights less than 65 meters, and source impact analyses may show that the source's emissions will cause or contribute to a modeled violation of the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. Where this is the case, sources should be aware that it is permissible for them to increase their stack heights up to 65 meters without a GEP demonstration.

b. *Other dispersion techniques*: The term “dispersion technique” includes any practice carried out to increase final plume rise, subject to certain exceptions (40 CFR 51.100(hh)(1), (2)(i) – (v)). Beyond the noted exceptions, such techniques are not allowed for getting credit for modeling source compliance with the NAAQS and PSD increments. One such exception is for sources of SO<sub>2</sub>. Section 51.100(hh)(2)(v) provides that identified techniques that increase final exhaust gas plume rise are not considered prohibited dispersion techniques pursuant to section 51.100(hh)(1)(iii) “where the resulting allowable emissions of sulfur dioxide from the facility do not exceed 5,000 tons per year.” Thus, proposed modifications that experience difficulty modeling compliance with the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS when relying on BACT or an air quality-based emissions limit alone may permissibly consider techniques to increase their final exhaust gas plume rise consistent with these provisions.

The definition of “dispersion technique” at 40 CFR 51.100(hh)(1)(iii) describes techniques that are generally prohibited, but which do not apply with respect to the exemption for SO<sub>2</sub>. Accordingly, it is permissible for eligible SO<sub>2</sub> sources to make adjustments to source process parameters, exhaust gas parameters, stack parameters, or to combine exhaust gases from several existing stacks into one stack, so as to increase the exhaust gas plume rise. It is important to remember that the exemption applies to sources that have facility-wide allowable SO<sub>2</sub> emissions of less than 5,000 tpy resulting from the increase in final exhaust gas plume rise. Thus, proposed modifications should not base their eligibility to use dispersion on the amount of the proposed net emissions increase, but on the total source emissions of SO<sub>2</sub>.

The EPA does not recommend or encourage sources to rely on dispersion to demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS; however, we acknowledge the fact that certain SO<sub>2</sub> sources may legally do so. For example, while increasing stack height is a method of dispersion, EPA's rules allow use of that approach to the extent the resulting height meets EPA's requirements defining “good engineering practice (GEP)” stack height. See 40 CFR 50.100(hh)(1)(i), 50.100(ii)(1)-(3). Nevertheless, EPA encourages PSD applicants to seek other remedies, including the use of the most stringent controls (beyond top-down BACT) feasible or the acquisition of emissions reductions (offsets) from other existing sources, to address situations where proposed emissions increases would result in modeled violations of the SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

## **GENERAL START-UP CONDITIONS**

We do not anticipate widespread problems associated with high short-term SO<sub>2</sub> emissions resulting from start-up/shutdown conditions. Many sources are capable of starting a unit with natural gas or low-sulfur fuel to avoid significant start-up emissions problems. However, some sources could experience short-term peaks of SO<sub>2</sub> during start-up or shutdown that could adversely affect the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. The EPA currently has no provisions for exempting emissions occurring during equipment start-up/shutdown from the BACT

requirements or for air quality analyses to demonstrate compliance with the SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS and increments. Therefore, such emissions should be addressed in the required BACT and air quality analyses.

There are approaches to addressing issues related to start-up/shutdown emissions. For example, sources may be willing to accept enforceable permit conditions limiting equipment start-up/shutdown to certain hours of the day when impacts are expected to be lower than normal. Such permit limitations can be accounted for in the modeling of such emissions. Applicants should direct other questions arising concerning procedures for modeling start-up/shutdown emissions to the applicable permitting authority to determine the most current modeling guidance.

In the event of questions regarding the general implementation guidance contained in this memorandum, please contact Raj Rao ([rao.raj@epa.gov](mailto:rao.raj@epa.gov)).

cc: Raj Rao, C504-01  
Dan deRoeck, C504-03  
Tyler Fox, C439-01  
Roger Brode, C439-01  
Richard Wayland, C304-02  
Lydia Wegman, C504-02  
Elliott Zenick, OGC  
Brian Doster, OGC  
EPA Regional NSR Contacts

**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**  
**Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards**  
**Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711**

**August 23, 2010**

**MEMORANDUM**

**SUBJECT:** Applicability of Appendix W Modeling Guidance for the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standard

**FROM:** Tyler Fox, Leader /s/  
Air Quality Modeling Group, C439-01

**TO:** Regional Air Division Directors

**INTRODUCTION**

On June 2, 2010, EPA announced a new 1-hour sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS or 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard) which is attained when the 3-year average of the 99th-percentile of the annual distribution of daily maximum 1-hour concentrations does not exceed 75 ppb at each monitor within an area. The final rule for the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS was published in the Federal Register on June 22, 2010 (75 FR 35520-35603), and the standard becomes effective on August 23, 2010 (EPA, 2010a). This memorandum clarifies the applicability of current guidance in the *Guideline on Air Quality Models* (40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W) for modeling SO<sub>2</sub> impacts in accordance with the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit requirements to demonstrate compliance with the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard.

**SUMMARY OF CURRENT GUIDANCE**

Current modeling guidance for estimating ambient impacts of SO<sub>2</sub> for comparison with applicable NAAQS is presented in Section 4 of Appendix W under the general heading of “Traditional Stationary Source Models.” This guidance acknowledges the fact that ambient SO<sub>2</sub> impacts are largely a result of emissions from stationary sources. Section 4.2.2 provides specific recommendations regarding “Refined Analytical Techniques,” stating that “For a wide range of regulatory applications in all types of terrain, the recommended model is AERMOD” (see Section 4.2.2.b). As described in Section 4.1.d, the AERMOD dispersion model “employs best state-of-practice parameterizations for characterizing the meteorological influences and dispersion” (Cimorelli, *et al.*, 2004; EPA, 2004; EPA, 2009).

Section 7.2.6 of Appendix W addresses the issue of chemical transformation for modeling SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, stating that:

The chemical transformation of SO<sub>2</sub> emitted from point sources or single industrial plants in rural areas is generally assumed to be relatively unimportant to the estimation of maximum concentrations when travel time is limited to a few hours. However, in urban areas, where synergistic effects among pollutants are of considerable consequence, chemical transformation rates may be of concern. In urban area applications, a half-life of 4 hours may be applied to the analysis of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Calculations of transformation coefficients from site specific studies can be used to define a “half-life” to be used in a steady-state Gaussian plume model with any travel time, or in any application, if appropriate documentation is provided. Such conversion factors for pollutant half-life should not be used with screening analyses.

The AERMOD model incorporates the 4 hour half-life for modeling ambient SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in urban areas under the regulatory default option.

General guidance regarding source emission input data requirements for modeling ambient SO<sub>2</sub> impacts is provided in Section 8.1 of Appendix W and guidance regarding determination of background concentrations for purposes of a cumulative ambient air quality impact analysis is provided in Section 8.2.

## **APPLICABILITY OF CURRENT GUIDANCE TO 1-HOUR SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS**

The current guidance in Appendix W regarding SO<sub>2</sub> modeling in the context of the previous 24-hour and annual primary SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS and the 3-hour secondary SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS is generally applicable to the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard. Since short-term SO<sub>2</sub> standards ( $\leq 24$  hours) have been in existence for decades, existing SO<sub>2</sub> emission inventories used to support modeling for compliance with the 3-hour and 24-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standards should serve as a useful starting point, and may be adequate in many cases for use in assessing compliance with the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard, since issues identified in Table 8-2 of Appendix W related to short-term vs. long-term emission estimates may have already been addressed. However, the PSD applicant and reviewing authority may need to reassess emission estimates for very short-term emission scenarios, such as start-up and shut-down operations, for purposes of estimating source impacts on the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard. This is especially true if existing emission estimates for 3-hour or 24-hour periods are based on averages that include zero (0) or reduced emissions for some of the hours.

Given the form of the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard, we are providing clarification regarding the appropriate data periods for modeling demonstrations of compliance with the NAAQS vs. demonstrations of attainment of the NAAQS through ambient monitoring. While monitored design values for the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard are based on a 3-year average (in accordance with Section 1(c) of Appendix T to 40 CFR Part 50), Section 8.3.1.2 of Appendix W addresses the length of the meteorological data record for dispersion modeling, stating that “[T]he use of 5 years of NWS [National Weather Service] meteorological data or at least 1 year of site specific data is required.” Section 8.3.1.2.b further states that “one year or more (including partial years), up to five years, of site specific data . . . are preferred for use in air quality analyses.” Although the monitored design value for the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard is defined in terms of the 3-year average, this definition does not preempt or alter the Appendix W requirement for use of 5 years of NWS



meteorological data or at least 1 year of site specific data. The 5-year average based on use of NWS data, or an average across one or more years of available site specific data, serves as an unbiased estimate of the 3-year average for purposes of modeling demonstrations of compliance with the NAAQS. Modeling of “rolling 3-year averages,” using years 1 through 3, years 2 through 4, and years 3 through 5, is not required. Furthermore, since modeled results for SO<sub>2</sub> are averaged across the number of years modeled for comparison to the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard, the meteorological data period should include complete years of data to avoid introducing a seasonal bias to the averaged impacts. In order to comply with Appendix W recommendations in cases where partial years of site specific meteorological data are available, while avoiding any seasonal bias in the averaged impacts, an approach that utilizes the most conservative modeling result based on the first complete-year period of the available data record vs. results based on the last complete-year period of available data may be appropriate, subject to approval by the appropriate reviewing authority. Such an approach would ensure that all available site specific data are accounted for in the modeling analysis without imposing an undue burden on the applicant and avoiding arbitrary choices in the selection of a single complete-year data period.

The form of the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard also has implications regarding appropriate methods for combining modeled ambient concentrations with monitored background concentrations for comparison to the NAAQS in a cumulative modeling analysis. As noted in the March 23, 2010 memorandum regarding “Modeling Procedures for Demonstrating Compliance with PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS” (EPA, 2010b), combining the 98<sup>th</sup> percentile monitored value with the 98<sup>th</sup> percentile modeled concentrations for a cumulative impact assessment could result in a value that is below the 98<sup>th</sup> percentile of the combined cumulative distribution and would, therefore, not be protective of the NAAQS. However, unlike the recommendations presented for PM<sub>2.5</sub>, the modeled contribution to the cumulative ambient impact assessment for the 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard should follow the form of the standard based on the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile of the annual distribution of daily maximum 1-hour concentrations averaged across the number of years modeled. A “first tier” assumption that may be applied without further justification is to add the overall highest hourly background SO<sub>2</sub> concentration from a representative monitor to the modeled design value, based on the form of the standard, for comparison to the NAAQS. Additional refinements to this “first tier” approach based on some level of temporal pairing of modeled and monitored values may be considered on a case-by-case basis, subject to approval by the reviewing authority, with adequate justification and documentation.

Section 8.2.3 of Appendix W provides recommendations regarding the determination of background concentrations for multi-source areas. That section emphasizes the importance of professional judgment by the reviewing authority in the identification of nearby and other sources to be included in the modeled emission inventory, and establishes “a significant concentration gradient in the vicinity of the source” under consideration as the main criterion for this selection. Appendix W also indicates that “the number of such [nearby] sources is expected to be small except in unusual situations.” See Section 8.2.3.b.

The representativeness of available ambient air quality data also plays an important role in determining which nearby sources should be included in the modeled emission inventory. Key issues to consider in this regard are the extent to which ambient air impacts of emissions from nearby sources are reflected in the available ambient measurements, and the degree to

which emissions from those background sources during the monitoring period are representative of allowable emission levels under the existing permits. The professional judgments that are required in developing an appropriate inventory of background sources should strive toward the proper balance between adequately characterizing the potential for cumulative impacts of emission sources within the study area to cause or contribute to violations of the NAAQS, while minimizing the potential to overestimate impacts by double counting modeled source impacts that are also reflected in the ambient monitoring data.

We would also caution against the literal and uncritical application of very prescriptive procedures for identifying which background sources should be included in the modeled emission inventory for NAAQS compliance demonstrations, including those described in Chapter C, Section IV.C.1 of the draft *New Source Review Workshop Manual* (EPA, 1990), noting again that Appendix W emphasizes the importance of professional judgment in this process. While the draft workshop manual serves as a useful general reference that provides potential approaches for meeting the requirements of New Source Review (NSR) and PSD programs, it is not the only source of EPA modeling guidance. The procedures described in the manual may be appropriate in some circumstances for defining the spatial extent of sources whose emissions may need to be considered, but not in others. While the procedures described in the NSR Workshop Manual may appear very prescriptive, it should be recognized that “[i]t is not intended to be an official statement of policy and standards and does not establish binding regulatory requirements.” See, Preface.

Given the range of issues involved in the determination of an appropriate inventory of emissions to include in a cumulative impact assessment, the PSD applicant should consult with the appropriate reviewing authority early in the process regarding the selection and proper application of appropriate monitored background concentrations and the selection and appropriate characterization of modeled background source emission inventories for use in demonstrating compliance with the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standard.

## SUMMARY

To summarize, we emphasize the following points:

1. Current guidance in Appendix W for modeling to demonstrate compliance with the previous 24-hour and annual primary SO<sub>2</sub> standards, and 3-hour secondary SO<sub>2</sub> standard, is generally applicable for the new 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.
2. While the 1-hour NAAQS for SO<sub>2</sub> is defined in terms of the 3-year average for monitored design values to determine attainment of the NAAQS, this definition does not preempt or alter the Appendix W requirement for use of 5 years of NWS meteorological data or at least 1 year of site specific data.

## REFERENCES

Cimorelli, A. J., S. G. Perry, A. Venkatram, J. C. Weil, R. J. Paine, R. B. Wilson, R. F. Lee, W. D. Peters, R. W. Brode, and J. O. Paumier, 2004. AERMOD: Description of Model Formulation with Addendum, EPA-454/R-03-004. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research

Triangle Park, NC.

EPA, 1990. New Source Review Workshop Manual: Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Nonattainment Area Permitting – DRAFT. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC.

EPA, 2004. User's Guide for the AMS/EPA Regulatory Model – AERMOD. EPA-454/B-03-001. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC.

EPA, 2009. Addendum – User's Guide for the AMS/EPA Regulatory Model – AERMOD. EPA-454/B-03-001. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC.

EPA, 2010a. Applicability of the Federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Requirements to New and Revised National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Stephen D. Page Memorandum, dated April 1, 2010. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC.

EPA, 2010b. Modeling Procedures for Demonstrating Compliance with PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. Stephen D. Page Memorandum, dated March 23, 2010. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC.

cc: Richard Wayland, C304-02  
Anna Marie Wood, C504-01  
Lydia Wegman, C504-02  
Raj Rao, C504-01  
Roger Brode, C439-01  
James Thurman, C439-01  
Dan deRoeck, C504-03  
Elliott Zenick, OGC  
Brian Doster, OGC  
EPA Regional Modeling Contacts