



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

April 19, 1988

RECEIVED

APR 25 1988

Air Quality Planning Branch  
U.S. EPA Region V

SUBJECT: Indiana County Performance Network Design  
FROM: Joseph A. Tikvart, Chief *Jo Tikvart*  
Source Receptor Analysis Branch (MD-14)  
TO: Alan Cimorelli, Regional Modeling Contact  
Region III (3AM12)

The Model Clearinghouse has completed its technical review of your Region's position on the SO<sub>2</sub> monitoring network design in Indiana County. We are basically in agreement with your proposal but offer the following points of clarification. The three items below correspond to the items in your request.

Item 1.

We are convinced by the TRC analysis and your interpretation of that analysis that the addition of one monitor on Laurel Ridge as you propose will be adequate for purposes of the performance evaluation. You still might want to consider whether a monitor at the location of maximum impact could prove useful in the future to help answer potential questions about the actual attainment status of the area.

Item 2.

Basically we agree that your three options are technically supportable. We do think that some aspects of Option 2c need to be clarified. First, we are not sure why you are introducing a performance measure (the highest 25) as part of this option; we really don't have the information to agree or disagree that this measure is appropriate. Second, it is our understanding that what is being proposed here is that the applicability of the "winning" model will be limited to an area near the Laurel Ridge top and that, for purposes of establishing emission limits, all contributing sources would be modeled with that winning model for receptors in that area. Conversely, on the Laurel Ridge hillside no performance evaluation results are applicable and all sources would be modeled with RTDM/MPTER. Option 2c is not clear as to what happens in other areas, e.g. Chestnut Ridge.

Item 3.

We don't believe we have enough information available to us to clearly judge whether one additional monitor or its proposed location(s)

are supportable. However, we do recognize that concentration estimates are considerably lower on this ridge than on Laurel Ridge and thus not as much of a concern. Thus, we defer to your technical judgment that the placement of one monitor at either Receptor 22, 25, or 26 will be sufficient and supportable.

If there are questions on the comments, please contact Dean Wilson or me.

cc: R. Bauman  
W. Keith  
W. Laxton  
S. Reinders  
D. Wilson