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Fugitive Dust Emissions

- Highly fluctuating plume impacts at emission measurement site
- PM concentrations vary from background to plume core values
- Emissions depend on energy inputs and properties of emitting surface material
Road Dust Plume Concentrations
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AP-42 Emission Factors

- Predictive equations with particle size multipliers
- Historically, particle size multipliers based on data from high-volume cyclone/cascade impactors
- Potential for particle size bias in overpredicting fine fractions
Discrepancy in Fine Fraction Data

• Emission data from the high-volume cyclone/impactor system have provided the basis for a $\text{PM}_{2.5}/\text{PM}_{10}$ of $\sim 0.20$ for many fugitive dust sources in EPA’s AP-42

• Ambient air monitoring data suggest that $\text{PM}_{2.5}/\text{PM}_{10}$ may be less than 0.10
MRI
Cyclone/ Cascade Impactor System
Plume Characterization Options

- Field studies produce highly variable results because of wind variations
- Laboratory exposure chambers can produce nearly steady-state conditions
- Confounding factors can be reduced in controlled laboratory flow settings
EPA Field Study in 1990s

- Purpose to resolve fine fraction emission biases for paved and unpaved roads
- Geographic distribution of test sites
- Cyclone/Impactor biases evident
- New AP-42 fine fractions were averages between cyclone/impactor and dichotomous sampler results
C/I Biases from Prior Field Study
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Revisions to AP-42 Fine Fractions

- PM2.5/PM10 ratio for unpaved roads (dominated by fugitive dust) was reduced from 0.26 to 0.15
- PM2.5/PM10 ratio for paved roads was reduced from 0.46 to 0.25
- Non-dust component of paved road emissions assigned a PM2.5/PM10 ratio of 0.76, accounting for vehicle exhaust and brake and tire wear
Purpose of Controlled Lab Study

• Collect new controlled data from collocated reference PM monitors with MRI high-volume cyclone/impactor system

• Determine extent of any bias in the PM$_{2.5}$/PM$_{10}$ ratio as determined by the cyclone/impactor system
Looking through tunnel toward Inlet flow straighteners
Viewing Window with Continuous PM Mass Monitor
Ref. Method Sampling Equipment
Phase I Testing

• Purpose: Determine potential bias in PM-2.5 concentration as measured by cyclone/impactor system

• RFM: Partisol Model 2000 for PM-2.5

• Test materials: ISO 12103-1 Arizona Test Dusts—fine and coarse grades; Owens Dry Lake surface soil
## Air Samplers: Phase I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Sampler</th>
<th>Manufacturer/ model</th>
<th>Flow rate</th>
<th>Particle size cutpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cyclone pre-separators</td>
<td>Sierra Model 230 CP</td>
<td>20 acfm</td>
<td>10.2 μmA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multistage impactor</td>
<td>Sierra Model 230</td>
<td>20 acfm</td>
<td>2.1 μmA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partisol</td>
<td>R&amp;P Model 2000</td>
<td>16.7 alpm</td>
<td>2.5 μmA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DustTRAK</td>
<td>TSI Model 8520</td>
<td>5 alpm</td>
<td>2.5 μmA and 10 μmA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MRI Cyclone for Sampling of PM-10 in Fugitive Dust
Exposure Chamber with Sampler Inlets
Phase II Testing

• Purpose: Determine PM-2.5/PM-10 ratios for a variety of western surface materials
• FRMs: Partisol Model 2000 for PM-2.5 and PM-10
• Test materials: Soils, aggregates, and unpaved road surface materials
• Aerosolization system: Constant flow energy
## Air Samplers: Phase II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Sampler</th>
<th>Manufacturer/ model</th>
<th>Flow rate</th>
<th>Particle size cutpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partisol</td>
<td>R&amp;P Model 2000</td>
<td>16.7 alpm</td>
<td>2.5 μmA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partisol</td>
<td>R&amp;P Model 2000</td>
<td>16.7 alpm</td>
<td>10 μmA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DustTRAK</td>
<td>TSI Model 8520</td>
<td>5 alpm</td>
<td>2.5 μmA and 10 μmA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contributors of Test Samples

- Great Basin UAPCD—Owens Dry Lake
- CH2M Hill—Salton Sea
- WY AQD—Thunder Basin mine
- NM AQB—South-Central New Mexico
- Alaska DEC—Matanuska Valley
- Arizona DEQ—Maricopa & Pima Counties
## Properties of Test Soils/Surface Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of material</th>
<th>Moisture content (%)</th>
<th>Dry silt content (%)</th>
<th>Dry Silt rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Standard Test Dust—Fine</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Standard Test Dust—Coarse</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>MAT-SU Knik River Bed</td>
<td>Sediments</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZal</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Phoenix Area</td>
<td>Alluvial Channel</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZag</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Phoenix Area</td>
<td>Agricultural Soil</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMr</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Las Cruces Landfill</td>
<td>Road Dust</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMz</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Radium Springs</td>
<td>Grazing Soil</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Owens Dry Lake</td>
<td>Lakebed Soil</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Salton Sea</td>
<td>Shoreline Soils</td>
<td>5.46*</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Thunder Basin Mine</td>
<td>Barrow Pit for Access Road Surface Material</td>
<td>2.47*</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wind Erodibility Groups

- WEG values developed by USDA/NRCS to indicate the susceptibility of surface soil to blowing (Nine WEG values)

- Soil blowing correlated with:
  - Soil texture
  - Organic matter content
  - Effervescence due to carbonate reaction with HCl
  - Rock and pararock fragment content
  - Mineralogy
  - Soil moisture and frozen soil
PM-10 Emission Categories vs. Wind Erodibility Groups

- 1 – Silty Sand & Clay (WEG 4 and 5)
- 2 – Sandy Silt (WEG 2 and 3)
- 3 – Loam (WEG 4L)
- 4 – Sand (WEG 1)
- 5 – Silt (WEG 6 and 7)

Note: USDA provides national soil database (SSURGO) with WEG values for GIS analysis.
Soil Texture Triangle
Test Soils
Results of Controlled Wind Tunnel Study

- PM2.5 concentrations measured by the high-volume cyclone/impactor were factor-of-2 higher than measured by reference-method samplers.
- Geometric mean bias of 2.01
- Arithmetic mean bias of 2.15
Comparability of Field and Laboratory Test Results

- PM2.5 bias of cyclone/impactor system
  - Measured under controlled laboratory conditions
  - Closely replicated by the bias observed in the prior EPA-funded field study
  - Both studies used reference method samplers for comparison
Reporting Process

• Test Plan--with opportunity to observe laboratory wind tunnel facility
• Draft Test Report--with independent peer reviewers
• Comment/Response Log--for each review comment
• Revised Test Report
C/I Biases from Lab Study
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Recommended AP-42 Fine Fractions

- Paved Roads [13.2.1]
- Unpaved Roads (Public & Industrial) [13.2.2]
- Construction & Demolition [13.2.3]
- Aggregate Handling & Storage Piles [13.2.4]
- Industrial Wind Erosion [13.2.5]
- Agricultural Tilling
- Open Area Wind Erosion
Paved Roads

• Current PM2.5/PM10 Ratios
  – Dust component: 0.25
  – Non-dust component: 0.76

• Proposed Change
  – Dust component: 0.15

• Justification
  – Factor of 2 bias in cyclone/impactor data
Unpaved Roads

- Current PM2.5/PM10 ratio: 0.15
- Proposed PM2.5/PM10 ratio: 0.1

- Justification
  - Controlled wind tunnel test results
  - Field test results
Construction & Demolition

• AP-42 recommends referring to other sections (e.g., unpaved roads)

• Category emissions normally dominated by travel over unpaved surfaces

• Proposed PM2.5/PM10 ratio: **0.1** (ref. earlier justification)

• Large cleared areas possible significant source of wind erosion (ref. section on open area wind erosion)
Aggregate Handling and Storage Piles

- Open storage pile emissions usually dominated by traffic on unpaved surfaces around piles
- Proposed PM2.5/PM10 ratio: 0.1 (ref. earlier justification)
- Proposed PM2.5/PM10 ratio for transfer operations: 0.15 (justification based on factor-of-two bias in cyclone/impactor system)
Industrial Wind Erosion

- Examples include open tailings piles or raw material storage piles
- Proposed PM2.5/PM10 ratio: 0.15
- Justification based on
  - Controlled wind tunnel test results
  - Prior tests with portable wind tunnel
Agricultural Tilling

- Original AP-42 section “under review”
- WRAP Handbook recommends PM2.5/PM10 ratio of 0.2
- Ratio of 0.2 consistent with controlled wind tunnel results, considering lower plume concentrations generated by slow moving implements
Open Area Wind Erosion

- Examples are disturbed soils such as agricultural fields
- Prior portable wind tunnel tests show ratios in the range of 0.3
- Proposed PM2.5/PM10 ratio: 0.15
- Justification:
  - Factor-of-two bias in C/I system
  - Owens Lake plume data
## Summary of Proposed Fine Fractions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fugitive dust source category</th>
<th>AP-42 section</th>
<th>$\text{PM}<em>{2.5}/\text{PM}</em>{10}$ Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Roads</td>
<td>13.2.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved Roads (Public &amp; Industrial)</td>
<td>13.2.2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Demolition</td>
<td>13.2.3</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Handling &amp; Storage Piles</td>
<td>13.2.4</td>
<td>0.314 (transfer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Wind Erosion</td>
<td>13.2.5</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Tilling</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Area Wind Erosion</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• Tested materials showed consistent particle size characteristics under constant energy input

• Tests results consistent with prior field study

• Sound basis for proposed revisions to PM2.5/PM10 ratios in AP-42