Record Number: 97-I -03 Fiscal Year: 1997 Region: 01 Last Update:
Name: Use of CALGRID for O3 Modeling-Nov 96
10/21/97

State(s):	CONNECTICUT MAINE MASSACHUSETTS NEW HAMPSHIRE RHODE ISLAND
Pollutant(s):	O3
Regulation(s):	SIP
Source(s):	Mixed/Multiple Sources
Model(s):	CALGRID
Subject(s):	Emissions Characterization Performance Evaluations Reactive Pollutant Modeling/Chemical Transformations
Urban/Rural:	Both Urban and Rural
Oral/Written:	Oral
Terrain:	Low Terrain (below stack height)
Guideline:	Non-guideline
Database:	Off-site
Involvement:	Review and Comment

Record Comments:
From: ELLEN BALDRIDGE
To: R1CONGRESS1.R1WATER2.COHEN-IAN
Date: 11/20/96 3:41pm
Subject: CALGRID
OAQPS has no problem with the NE using the CALGRID model provided it can be demonstrated that it is an improvement over UAM-IV for predicting air quality concentrations. We reviewed the Technical Justification for CALGRID as an Alternative to the UAM-IV Model in the New England Domain , report dated October 18, 1996 as requested in your November 1, 1996 memorandum. We feel the document should be updated to address the following three items:
1) Model performance for a minimum of three primary episode days is required.
The single episode presented in the report is not sufficient to make the determination that one model performs better than the other. Performance for all primary days should be included in the report.
2) The report indicates BEIS2 was used with UAM-IV. Through the OTAG process it hasbeen determined that UAM-IV chemistry does not handle the increased isoprene in theBEIS2 inventory correctly. EPA guidance recommends using the BEIS with UAM-IV. BEIS2 may be used to perform a sensitivity check. The accuracy/credibility of modeling to date, using UAM-IV and BEIS2 has been questioned. UAM-IV should be run using BEIS. Otherwise, the report should address why BEIS2 is appropriate and should be accepted.

3) The report indicates eddy diffusivity was set to .02 m2/s in UAM-IV and 1
m2/s in CALGRID. Is it appropriate for these models to use different values? The
report should provide rationale why the models need different values. Otherwise,
it might appear this parameter was changed to give one model an advantage over
the other
CC: TIKVART-JOE MEYER-NED

Date: 07/31/00
Page: 9

Model Clearinghouse Information Storage and Retrieval System

Record Information Report

Record Number: 97-II -07 Fiscal Year: 1997 Region: 02 Last Update:
Name: Kodak-July 97
08/27/97

State(s):	NEW YORK
Pollutant(s):	Unspecified Non-criteria
Regulation(s):	RCRA
Source(s):	Incineration
Model(s):	COMPDEP
Subject(s):	Technical Credibility of Nonguideline Techniques
Urban/Rural:	Rural Only
Oral/Written:	Oral
Terrain:	Low Terrain (below stack height)
Guideline:	Non-guideline
Database:	Not Relevant
Involvement:	Review and Comment

Record Comments:

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION

x___TELEPHONE CALL ___MEETING ___CONFERENCE CALL ___OTHER
INFORMATION COPIES TO: Joe Dennis
TO: Bob Kelly, R-II
FROM: J. Touma, D. Wilson
DATE: 7/30/97
TIME:
SUBJ: Kodak
SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATION:
In answer to Bob's previous question about what the requirements are regarding the use of the Guideline models for RCRA permits we have not tracked that in recent years. Recommended that Bob talk to Mr. Shiva Garg in RCRA for an interpretation.
The more important issue is that the COMPDEP model, that was used in WTI, has some serious faults, and its use is discouraged. R-II should try to
find out more details on the proposal to use it
and see why the superior ISCST3 model should not be used instead.
FOLLOWUP ANTICIPATED: