



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

AUG 19 1988

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Use of VVDM in Telluride
FROM: *Dean A. Wilson*
Dean A. Wilson, Meteorologist
Source Receptor Analysis Branch, TSD (MD-14)
TO: John Notar, Meteorologist
Region VIII (8AT-AP)

In response to your request, the Model Clearinghouse has reviewed the additional material submitted by the Colorado Department of Health (CDH) supporting the use of VVDM in Telluride. We agree with your position that no substantive new information is presented and that the EPA technical position should remain the same, i.e., the use of WYNDvalley is optimum at the present time.

One point you make in your memorandum that is worth emphasizing is "... dispersion modeling is dynamic in that new techniques based on better physics are constantly replacing old and less creditable models or techniques...". This statement is especially true in the case of PM-10 problems where the modeling community is facing a number of relatively new types of regulatory modeling problems. We are on a learning curve where adjustments/changes in technical direction need to be frequently made. Thus we hope our position that WYNDvalley should be substituted for VVDM does not discourage CDH. In fact, we encourage CDH to continue to stay abreast of the dispersion modeling problems for PM-10 and make suggestions along the way.

In that vein, I recommend that you not decide on your own how WYNDvalley should be applied to Telluride (and other Region VIII areas) but that you consult with all those who have experience in applying the model, e.g., H. Harrison, Region X, PSAPCA, CDH, etc. before deciding on the appropriate input, verification, and correlation with other dispersion modeling results, i.e., from ISCST/ISCLT. As you know, agencies in Region X have learned a great deal about applying the model and it is important that you benefit from their experience to keep the Telluride and other applications optimum.

Rather than sending a copy of this response to CDH, we request that you forward the information to them. If you have any questions, please contact me.

cc: R. Eskridge
S. Reinders
K. Woodard

FY88 MODEL CLEARINGHOUSE MEMORANDA

<u>Date</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Subject</u>
10/8/87	VI	Albuquerque Carbon Monoxide Modeling
10/14/87	V	Adjustment of Monitored Concentrations in Rollback Calculations for the Gibson Generating Station
10/23/87	X	Review of WYNDvalley, GRID and Ventilated Valley Model
10/29/87	I	Regulatory Guidance on Complex I
11/5/87	V	Koch Refinery Model Evaluation
11/9/87	I	Connecticut Ambient Impact Analysis Guideline
11/17/87	III	Indiana County PA Performance Evaluation Protocol
1/2/88	IV	Region IV Modeling Survey
1/27/88	VIII	Utah Request to use ISCST for Urban Wide PM ₁₀ SIP
1/27/88	V	Meteorological Preprocessor Program
2/29/88	V	Miami Fort SO ₂ Modeling Analysis
3/4/88	VI	Four Corners Power Plant NO _x SIP Variance Model Clearinghouse Referral
3/21/88	IV	Model Protocol for Dayco
3/25/88	III	Response to TSP SIP Revision (Bauman to Baskerville)
4/12/88	II	Carbon Monoxide Hot Spot Modeling in New Jersey
4/14/88	IV	Use of RTDM for Ashland Petroleum
4/15/88	VIII	PM ₁₀ Modeling Methodologies for Colorado
5/11/88	VII	Stack-Structure Relationships
5/24/88	I	S.D. Warren Paper Company PSD Analysis
6/9/88	X	Ketchikan Pulp Company (KPC) Use of ISC Model Codes
7/5/88	III	Air Quality Analysis for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) (Emison to Maslany)
8/16/88	IV	Review of Modeling Protocol for Champion International Corporation, Canton, North Carolina

<u>Date</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Subject</u>
8/16/88	X	Review of Draft Memo on Centralia Power Plant Monitoring
8/16/88	VIII	Use of VVDM in Telluride