

# City of Albuquerque

# **Environmental Health Department**

Timothy M. Keller, Mayor Interoffice Memorandum

January 12, 2018

To: Jeff Stonesifer, Senior Environmental Health Scientist

From: Regan Eyerman, Environmental Health Scientist

Subject: Review of model for Southwest Concrete Paving Company, Inc.

**Permit #** 3337-EP

## Site Location

Near Taxiway Pad 5 on Kirtland AFB

Easting: 358,000m Northing: 3,878,050m Zone:13

#### **Overview of Facilities**

Southwest Concrete Paving Company (SWCPC) has been contracted by Kirtland AFB to establish a temporary portable concrete batch plant near Taxiway Pad 5. The plant will have a maximum throughput capacity of 680 tons per hour and a maximum mixer unloading rate of 800 tons per hour. Power to operate the concrete is available on site from line power. In other words, there will be no electric generators operated at this site.

## **Conclusions of Dispersion Modeling**

Modeling was performed for TSP, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, CO, and SO<sub>2</sub> using AERMOD. Compliance was demonstrated for NAAQS and NMAAQS.

## Assumptions used in the modeling review

- 1. Operating hours: 24/7/365
- Haul roads into and from the facility are paved and will be sprayed with water as necessary to further control dust.
- 3. Visible accumulation of dirt, dust, or aggregate on the haul roads shall be cleaned as soon as possible. If visible fugitive emissions are observed from paved haul roads, all traffic activities shall be shut down until control measures can be taken to eliminate fugitive emissions from the roads.
- 4. A fence or some other barrier restricts access to the property.
- 5. No generators were modeled. The concrete batch plant will operate off of PNM power.
- All equipment and piles must remain at least 1425 meters from the fence that restricts access to Kirtland AFB.

Modeling conducted in-house demonstrates compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. Modeling files are archived, are part of the public record for this permit application, and are available for printing. No modeling protocol was submitted.

## **Modeling Parameters**

- Rural dispersion coefficients and regulatory default parameters
- Backgrounds not entered into the model
- No gravitational settling
- No hourly factors
- No building downwash

Emission rates used in the review can be seen below in Tables 1 & 2.

**Table 1: Particulate Emission Rates for sources** 

Source ID	Emission Unit Description	TSP (lbs/hr)	PM10 (lbs/hr) 0.03	PM2.5 (lbs/hr)
1	Aggregate storage pile	0.10		0.01
2	Feed Bin loading	4.69	2.24	0.29
3	Aggregate Feed Bin to Aggregate Transfer Conveyors	4.69	2.24	0.29
4	Aggregate Transfer Conveyor to Aggregate Storage Bin	4.69	2.24	0.29
5	Aggregate Storage Bin to Weigh Hopper #1	3.26	1.90	0.25
6	Weigh Hopper #1 to Aggregate Feed Conveyor	4.69	2.24	0.29
7	Aggregate feed conveyor to mixer	12.51	3.74	0.49
8	Cement silo loading	0.10	0.04	0.005
10	Flyash silo loading	0.14	0.08	0.01
12	Weigh hopper #2 to mixer	2.21	0.66	0.09
14	Boiler/Water heater	0.01	0.01	0.01
	Totals	37.09	15.42	2.025

**Table 2: Combustion Gas Emission Rates** 

Course ID	Saurea Description	NO.		SO <sub>2</sub>
Source 12	Source Description	Inc/pri	(lbs/hr)	(lbs/hr)
14	Boiler/Water Heater	0.11	0.09	0.001

# **Receptor Grid**

Receptor spacing was 50 meters along the fenceline. Beyond the fence, receptor spacing was 100 meters out to at least 500 meters. Some special receptors were included inside the Kirtland property.

## Meteorological Data

2001 – 2005 NWS Albuquerque Airport AERMET v16216

# **Adjacent Sources**

There are other sources on Kirtland AFB that were not included in this model. Those sources are a significant distance away from the proposed location for the concrete batch plant. A quick look at the results for recent Title V modeling of Kirtland AFB confirm the lack of need for a model with other Kirtland sources.

## **Terrain Used**

USGS NED files

## **Modeling Results**

Table 3: Impact of emissions vs. Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Modeled Impact (μg/m³)	Background (µg/m³)	Model + Background (µg/m³)	Most stringent Standard (µg/m³)	Pass/Fail
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-hour	1.34	Modeled impacts not significant		188	P
$NO_2$	Annual	0.01			94	P
CO	1-hour	1.3	Modeled impacts not		15007	P
CO	8-hour	0.3	significant		9967	P
$SO_2$	1-hour	SO <sub>2</sub> emissions are negligible		196.4	n/a	
$SO_2$	Annual			52	n/a	
TSP	24-hour	47.2	31	78.2	150	P
TSP	Annual	4.4	31	35.4	60	P
$PM_{2.5}$	24-hour	1.1	Modeled impacts not		35	P
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Annual	0.2	significant		12	P

#### Discussion

The results reported by SWCPC for annual modeling were obtained by using TPY emissions. Section 4.1.1 of the New Mexico Environment Department's 08Aug2017 Dispersion Modeling Guideline states, "All averaging periods shall be modeled using the maximum short-term emission rate allowed in the permit." However, the modeling file for short-term standards also modeled annual standards with the appropriate emission rates. The results for annual modeling with appropriate emission rates are listed in Table 3. They are quite different from the results reported by SWCPC, however still pass the standards.

There was some concern over the dimensions that were chosen for the volume sources. It is preferred that consultants follow the dimensions recommended by the NMED Guidelines. The chosen dimensions were unlikely to be a problem, however, since it has been observed before that AERMOD isn't usually all that sensitive to changes in initial horizontal dimension  $(\sigma_y)$  and initial vertical dimension  $(\sigma_z)$ . A test was performed with TSP by changing  $\sigma_y$  and  $\sigma_z$  as well as release heights to better match a past concrete plant model which more closely followed the NMED Guideline regarding volume source dimensions. There was no change to the annual TSP results and the 24-hour TSP maximum increased by 1  $\mu$ g/m³. In addition to the lack of sensitivity to volume source dimensions, the distance of more than 500 meters to the nearest receptor may also have been a reason why the results weren't sensitive to the changes in inputs (see Figure 1). Regardless of the reason, this batch plant will not violate the ambient air quality standards.

Other facilities at Kirtland AFB were not included in this modeling for the temporary, portable concrete batch plant most likely due to the distance to other facilities. Comparing the results of recent Title V modeling for Kirtland AFB to the results for this model confirms that excluding the other facilities at Kirtland was acceptable for this modeling.

The modeling report submitted on behalf of Southwest Concrete Paying Company states

- 1. The maximum throughput capacity of the plant is 640 tons per hour.
- 2. The maximum mixer unloading rate is 800 tons per hour.
- 3. The anticipated total concrete production is not expected to exceed 25,000 cubic yards.

SO2 emissions were negligible and did not need to be modeled. PM10 is not listed in Table 3 because compliance with the 24-hour TSP standard also demonstrates compliance with the PM10 standard.

The Technical Analysis Section recommends accepting this model.





None of S.

Scalc 1 = 313.0 Meters

Figure 1: TSP 24-hour results