

**Appendix B-1****Guidelines on Choice of Models and Model Parameters**

*[The information contained in this Appendix is only meant to assist the Applicant in performing the air quality assessment. The Applicant must exercise professional judgment in applying this general information for the Project.]*

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 To expedite the review process by the Authority and to assist project proponents or environmental consultants with the conduct of air quality modelling exercise which are frequently called for as part of environmental impact assessment studies, this paper describes the usage and requirements of a few commonly used air quality models.

**2. Choice of Models**

- 2.1 The models which have been most commonly used in air quality impact assessments, due partly to their ease of use and partly to the quick turn-around time for results, are of Gaussian type and designed for use in simple terrain under uniform wind flow. There are circumstances when these models are not suitable for ambient concentration estimates and other types of models such as physical, numerical or mesoscale models will have to be used. In situations where topographic, terrain or obstruction effects are minimal between source and receptor, the following Gaussian models can be used to estimate the near-field impacts of a number of source types including dust, traffic and industrial emissions.

<u>Model</u>	<u>Applications</u>
FDM	for evaluating fugitive and open dust source impacts (point, line and area sources)
CALINE4	for evaluating mobile traffic emission impacts (line sources)
ISCST3	for evaluating industrial chimney releases as well as area and volumetric sources (point, area and volume sources); line sources can be approximated by a number of volume sources.

These frequently used models are also referred to as Schedule 1 models (see attached list).

- 2.2 Note that both FDM and CALINE4 have a height limit on elevated sources (20 m and 10m, respectively). Source of elevation above these limits will have to be modelled using the ISCST3 model or suitable alternative models. In using the latter, reference should be made to the 'Guidelines on the Use of Alternative Computer Models in Air Quality Assessment' in Appendix B-3.
- 2.3 The models can be used to estimate both short-term (hourly and daily average) and long-term (annual average) ambient concentrations of air pollutants. The model results, obtained using appropriate model parameters (refer to Section 3) and assumptions, allow direct comparison with the relevant air quality standards such as the Air Quality Objectives (AQOs) for the relevant pollutant and time averaging period.

### 3. Model Input Requirements

#### 3.1 Meteorological Data

3.1.1 At least 1 year of recent meteorological data (including wind speed, wind direction, stability class, ambient temperature and mixing height) from a weather station either closest to or having similar characteristics as the study site should be used to determine the highest short-term (hourly, daily) and long-term (annual) impacts at identified air sensitive receivers in that period. The amount of valid data for the period should be no less than 90 percent.

3.1.2 Alternatively, the meteorological conditions as listed below can be used to examine the worst case short-term impacts:

Day time:

stability class D; wind speed 1 m/s (at 10m height); worst-case wind angle; mixing height 500 m

Night time:

stability class F; wind speed 1 m/s (at 10m height); worst case wind angle; mixing height 500 m

This is a common practice with using the CALINE4 model due to its inability to handle lengthy data set.

3.1.3 For situations where, for example, (i) the model (such as CALINE4) does not allow easy handling of one full year of meteorological data; or (ii) model run time is a concern, the followings can be adopted in order to determine the daily and annual average impacts:

- (i) perform a frequency occurrence analysis of one year of meteorological data to determine the actual wind speed (to the nearest unit of m/s), wind direction (to the nearest 10°) and stability (classes A to F) combinations and their frequency of occurrence;
- (ii) determine the short term hourly impact under all of the identified wind speed, wind direction and stability combinations; and
- (iii) apply the frequency data with the short term results to determine the long term (daily / annual) impacts.

Apart from the above, any alternative approach that will capture the worst possible impact values (both short term and long term) may also be considered.

3.1.4 Note that the anemometer height (relative to a datum same for the sources and receptors) at which wind speed measurements were taken at a selected station should be correctly entered in the model. These measuring positions can vary greatly from station to station and the vertical wind profile employed in the model can be grossly distorted from the real case if incorrect anemometer height is used. This will lead to unreliable concentration estimates.

3.1.5 An additional parameter, namely, the standard deviation of wind direction,  $\sigma_{\theta}$ , needs

to be provided as input to the CALINE4 model. Typical values of  $\sigma_{\theta}$  range from 12° for rural areas to 24° for highly urbanised areas under 'D' class stability. For semi-rural such as new development areas, 18° is more appropriate under the same stability condition. The following reference can be consulted for typical ranges of standard deviation of wind direction under different stability categories and surface roughness conditions.

Ref.(1): Guideline On Air Quality Models (Revised), EPA-450/2-78-027R, United States Environmental Protection Agency, July 1986.

### 3.2 Emission Sources

All the identified sources relevant to a process plant or a study site should be entered in the model and the emission estimated based on emission factors compiled in the AP-42 (Ref. 2) or other suitable references. The relevant sections of AP-42 and any parameters or assumptions used in deriving the emission rates (in units g/s, g/s/m or g/s/m<sup>2</sup>) as required by the model should be clearly stated for verification. The physical dimensions, location, release height and any other emission characteristics such as efflux conditions and emission pattern of the sources input to the model should also correspond to site data.

If the emission of a source varies with wind speed, the wind speed-dependent factor should be entered.

Ref.(2): Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, AP-42, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, United States Environmental Protection Agency, January 1995.

### 3.3 Urban/Rural Classification

Emission sources may be located in a variety of settings. For modelling purposes these are classed as either rural or urban so as to reflect the enhanced mixing that occurs over urban areas due to the presence of buildings and urban heat effects. The selection of either rural or urban dispersion coefficients in a specific application should follow a land use classification procedure. If the land use types including industrial, commercial and residential uses account for 50% or more of an area within 3 km radius from the source, the site is classified as urban; otherwise, it is classed as rural.

### 3.4 Surface Roughness Height

This parameter is closely related to the land use characteristics of a study area and associated with the roughness element height. As a first approximation, the surface roughness can be estimated as 3 to 10 percent of the average height of physical structures. Typical values used for urban and new development areas are 370 cm and 100 cm, respectively.

### 3.5 Receptors

These include discrete receptors representing all the identified air sensitive receivers at their appropriate locations and elevations and any other discrete or grid receptors for supplementary information. A receptor grid, whether Cartesian or Polar, may be used to

generate results for contour outputs.

### 3.6 Particle Size Classes

In evaluating the impacts of dust-emitting activities, suitable dust size categories relevant to the dust sources concerned with reasonable breakdown in TSP ( $< 30 \mu m$ ) and RSP ( $< 10 \mu m$ ) compositions should be used.

### 3.7 NO<sub>2</sub> to NO<sub>x</sub> Ratio

The conversion of NO<sub>x</sub> to NO<sub>2</sub> is a result of a series of complex photochemical reactions and has implications on the prediction of near field impacts of traffic emissions. Until further data are available, three approaches are currently acceptable in the determination of NO<sub>2</sub>:

- (a) Ambient Ratio Method (ARM) - assuming 20% of NO<sub>x</sub> to be NO<sub>2</sub>; or
- (b) Discrete Parcel Method (DPM, available in the CALINE4 model); or
- (c) Ozone Limiting Method (OLM) - assuming the tailpipe NO<sub>2</sub> emission to be 7.5% of NO<sub>x</sub> and the background ozone concentration to be in the range of 57 to 68  $\mu g/m^3$  depending on the land use type (see also the EPD reference paper 'Guidelines on Assessing the 'TOTAL' Air Quality Impacts' in Appendix B-2).

### 3.8 Odour Impact

In assessing odour impacts, a much shorter time-averaging period of 5 seconds is required due to the shorter exposure period tolerable by human receptors. Conversion of model computed hourly average results to 5-second values is therefore necessary to enable comparison against recommended standard. The hourly concentration is first converted to 3-minute average value according to a power law relationship which is stability dependent (Ref. 3) and a result of the statistical nature of atmospheric turbulence. Another conversion factor (10 for unstable conditions and 5 for neutral to stable conditions) is then applied to convert the 3-minute average to 5-second average (Ref. 4). In summary, to convert the hourly results to 5-second averages, the following factors can be applied:

<u>Stability Category</u>	<u>1-hour to 5-sec Conversion Factor</u>
A & B	45
C	27
D	9
E & F	8

Under 'D' class stability, the 5-second concentration is approximately 10 times the hourly average result. Note, however, that the combined use of such conversion factors together with the ISCST results may not be suitable for assessing the extreme close-up impacts of odour sources.

Ref.(3): Richard A. Duffee, Martha A. O'Brien and Ned Ostojic, 'Odor Modeling – Why and How', Recent Developments and Current Practices in Odor Regulations, Controls and Technology, Air & Waste Management Association, 1991.

Ref.(4): A.W.C. Keddie, 'Dispersion of Odours', Odour Control – A Concise Guide, Warren

Spring Laboratory, 1980.

### 3.9 Plume Rise Options

The ISCST3 model provides by default a list of the U.S. regulatory options for concentration calculations. These are all applicable to the Hong Kong situations except for the 'Final Plume Rise' option. As the distance between sources and receptors are generally fairly close, the non-regulatory option of 'Gradual Plume Rise' should be used instead to give more accurate estimate of near-field impacts due to plume emission. However, the 'Final Plume Rise' option may still be used for assessing the impacts of distant sources.

### 3.10 Portal Emissions

These include traffic emissions from tunnel portals and any other similar openings and are generally modelled as volume sources according to the PIARC 91 (or more up-to-date version) recommendations (Ref. 5, section III.2). For emissions arising from underpasses or any horizontal openings of the like, these are treated as area or point sources depending on the source physical dimensions. In all these situations, the ISCST3 model or more sophisticated models will have to be used instead of the CALINE4 model. In the case of portal emissions with significant horizontal exit velocity which cannot be handled by the ISCST3 model, the impacts may be estimated by the TOP model (Ref. 6) or any other suitable models subject to prior agreement with EPD. The EPD's 'Guidelines on the Use of Alternative Computer Models in Air Quality Assessment' should also be referred to in Appendix B-3.

Ref.(5): XIXth World Road Congress Report, Permanent International Association of Road Congresses (PIARC), 1991.

Ref.(6): N. Ukegunchi, H. Okamoto and Y. Ide "Prediction of vehicular emission pollution around a tunnel mouth", Proceedings 4th International Clean Air Congress, pp. 205-207, Tokyo, 1977.

### 3.10 Background Concentrations

Background concentrations are required to account for far-field sources which cannot be estimated by the model. These values, to be used in conjunction with model results for assessing the total impacts, should be based on long term average of monitoring data at location representative of the study site. Please make reference to the paper 'Guidelines on Assessing the 'TOTAL' Air Quality Impacts' in Appendix B-2 for further information.

### 3.11 Output

The highest short-term and long-term averages of pollutant concentrations at prescribed receptor locations are output by the model and to be compared against the relevant air quality standards specified for the relevant pollutant. Contours of pollutant concentration are also required for indicating the general impacts of emissions over a study area.

Copies of model files in electronic format should also be provided for EPD's reference.

## **Schedule 1**

### **Air Quality Models Generally Accepted by Hong Kong Environmental Protection Department for Regulatory Applications as at 1 July 1998\***

**Industrial Source Complex Dispersion Model - Short Term Version 3 (ISCST3)** or the latest version developed by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

**California Line Source Dispersion Model Version 4 (CALINE4)** or the latest version developed by Department of Transportation, State of California, U.S.A.

**Fugitive Dust Model (FDM)** or the latest version developed by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

\* EPD is continually reviewing the latest development in air quality models and will update this Schedule accordingly.

**Appendix B-2****Guidelines on Assessing the 'TOTAL' Air Quality Impacts**

*[The information contained in this Appendix is only meant to assist the Applicant in performing the air quality assessment. The Applicant must exercise professional judgment in applying this general information for the Project.]*

**1. Total Impacts - 3 Major Contributions**

- 1.1 In evaluating the air quality impacts of a proposed project upon air sensitive receivers, contributions from three classes of emission sources depending on their distance from the site should be considered. These are:

Primary contributions:	project induced
Secondary contributions:	pollutant-emitting activities in the immediate neighbourhood
Other contributions: (Background contributions)	pollution not accounted for by the previous two

**2. Nature of Emissions****2.1 Primary contributions**

In most cases, the project-induced emissions are fairly well defined and quite often (but not necessarily) the major contributor to local air quality impacts. Examples include those due to traffic network, building or road construction projects.

**2.2 Secondary contributions**

Within the immediate neighbourhood of the project site, there are usually pollutant emitting activities contributing further to local air quality impacts. For most local scale projects, any emission sources in an area within 500m radius of the project site with notable impacts should be identified and included in an air quality assessment to cover the short-range contributions. In the exceptional cases where there is one or more significant sources nearby, the study area may have to be extended or alternative estimation approach employed to ensure these impacts are reasonably accounted for.

**2.3 Background contributions**

The above two types of emission contributions should account for, to a great extent, the air quality impacts upon local air sensitive receivers, which are often amenable to estimation by the 'Gaussian Dispersion' type of models. However, a background air quality level should be prescribed to indicate the baseline air quality in the region of the project site, which would account for any pollution not covered by the two preceding contributions. The emission sources contributing to the background air quality would be located further afield and not easy to identify. In addition, the transport mechanism by which pollutants are carried over long distances (ranging from 1km up to tens or hundreds of kms) is rather complex and cannot be adequately estimated by the 'Gaussian' type of models.



### 3. Background Air Quality - Estimation Approach

#### 3.1 The approach

In view of the difficulties in estimating background air quality using the air quality models currently available, an alternative approach based on monitored data is suggested. The essence of this approach is to adopt the long-term (5-year) averages of the most recent monitored air quality data obtained by EPD. These background data would be reviewed yearly or biennially depending on the availability of the monitored data. The approach is a first attempt to provide a reasonable estimate of the background air quality level for use in conjunction with EIA air quality assessment to address the cumulative impacts upon a locality. This approach may be replaced or supplemented by superior modelling efforts such as that entailed in PATH (Pollutants in the Atmosphere and their Transport over Hong Kong), a comprehensive territory-wide air quality modelling system currently being developed for Hong Kong. Notwithstanding this, the present approach is based on measured data and their long term regional averages; the background values so derived should therefore be indicative of the present background air quality. In the absence of any other meaningful way to estimate a background air quality for the future, this present background estimate should also be applied to future projects as a first attempt at a comprehensive estimate until a better approach is formulated.

#### 3.2 Categorisation

The monitored air quality data, by 'district-averaging' are further divided into three categories, viz, Urban, Industrial and Rural/New Development. The background pollutant concentrations to be adopted for a project site would depend on the geographical constituency to which the site belongs. The categorisation of these constituencies is given in Section 3.4. The monitoring stations suggested for the 'district-averaging'(arithmetic means) to derive averages for the three background air quality categories are listed as follows:

Urban: Kwun Tong, Sham Shui Po, Tsim Sha Tsui and Central/Western

Industrial: Kwun Tong, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Chung

Rural/New Development: Sha Tin, Tai Po, Junk Bay, Hong Kong South and Yuen Long

The averaging would make use of data from the above stations wherever available. The majority of the monitoring stations are located some 20m above ground.

### 3.3 Background pollutant values

Based on the above approach, background values for the 3 categories have been obtained for a few major air pollutants as follows:

<b>POLLUTANT</b>	<b>URBAN</b>	<b>INDUSTRIAL</b>	<b>RURAL / NEW DEVELOPMENT</b>
NO <sub>2</sub>	59	57	39
SO <sub>2</sub>	21	26	13
O <sub>3</sub>	62	68	57
TSP	98	96	87
RSP	60	58	51

All units are in micrograms per cubic metre. The above values are derived from 1992 to 1996 annual averages with the exception of ozone which represent annual average of daily hourly maximum values for year 1996.

In cases where suitable air quality monitoring data representative of the study site such as those obtained from a nearby monitoring station or on-site sampling are not available for the prescription of background air pollution levels, the above tabulated values can be adopted instead. Strictly speaking, the suggested values are only appropriate for long term assessment. However, as an interim measure and until a better approach is formulated, the same values can also be used for short term assessment. This implies that the short term background values will be somewhat under-estimated, which compensates for the fact that some of the monitoring data are inherently influenced by secondary sources because of the monitoring station location.

Indeed, if good quality on-site sampling data which cover at least one year period are available, these can be used to derive both the long term (annual) and short term (daily / hourly) background values, the latter are usually applied on an hour to hour, day to day basis.

### 3.4 Site categories

The categories to which the 19 geographical constituencies belong are listed as follows:

<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>AIR QUALITY CATEGORY</b>
Islands	Rural / New Development
Southern	Rural / New Development
Eastern	Urban
Wan Chai	Urban
Central & Western	Urban
Sai Kung	Rural / New Development
Kwun Tong	Industrial
Wong Tai Sin	Urban
Kowloon City	Urban
Yau Tsim	Urban
Mong Kok	Urban
Sham Shui Po	Urban
Kwai Tsing	Industrial
Sha Tin	Rural / New Development

Tsuen Wan	Industrial
Tuen Mun	Rural / New Development
Tai Po	Rural / New Development
Yuen Long	Rural / New Development
Northern	Rural / New Development

### 3.5 Provisions for 'double-counting'

The current approach is, by no means, a rigorous treatment of background air quality but aims to provide an as-realistic-as-possible approximation based on limited field data. 'Double-counting' of 'secondary contributions' may be apparent through the use of such 'monitoring-based' background data as some of the monitoring stations are of close proximity to existing emission sources. 'Primary contributions' due to a proposed project (which is yet to be realized) will not be double-counted by such an approach. In order to avoid over-estimation of background pollutant concentrations, an adjustment to the values given in Section 3.3 is possible and optional by multiplying the following factor:

$$(1.0 - E_{\text{Secondary contributions}}/E_{\text{Territory}})$$

where E stands for emission.

The significance of this factor is to eliminate the fractional contribution to background pollutant level of emissions due to 'secondary contributions' out of those from the entire territory. In most cases, this fractional contribution to background pollutant levels by the secondary contributions is minimal.

## 4. Conclusions

- 4.1 The above described approach to estimating the total air quality impacts of a proposed project, in particular the background pollutant concentrations for air quality assessment, should be adopted with immediate effect. Use of short term monitoring data to prescribe the background concentrations is no longer acceptable.

**Appendix B-3****Guidelines on the Use of Alternative Computer Models  
in Air Quality Assessment**

*[The information contained in this Appendix is only meant to assist the Applicant in performing the air quality assessment. The Applicant must exercise professional judgment in applying this general information for the Project.]*

**1. Background**

- 1.1 In Hong Kong, a number of Gaussian plume models are commonly employed in regulatory applications such as application for specified process licences and environmental impact assessments (EIAs). These frequently used models (as listed in Schedule 1 attached; hereafter referred to as Schedule 1 models) have no regulatory status but form the basic set of tools for local-scale air quality assessment in Hong Kong.
- 1.2 However, no single model is sufficient to cover all situations encountered in regulatory applications. In order to ensure that the best model available is used for each regulatory application and that a model is not arbitrarily applied, the project proponent (and/or its environmental consultants) should assess the capabilities of various models available and adopt one that is most suitable for the project concerned.
- 1.3 Examples of situations where the use of an alternative model is warranted include:
  - (i) the complexity of the situation to be modelled far exceeds the capability of the Schedule 1 models; and
  - (ii) the performance of an alternative model is comparable or better than the Schedule 1 models.
- 1.4 This paper outlines the demonstration / submission required in order to support the use of an alternative air quality model for regulatory applications for Hong Kong.

**2. Required Demonstration / Submission**

- 2.1 Any model that is proposed for air quality applications and not listed amongst the Schedule 1 models will be considered by EPD on a case-by-case basis. In such cases, the proponent will have to provide the followings for EPD's review:
  - (i) Technical details of the proposed model; and
  - (ii) Performance evaluation of the proposed model

Based on the above information, EPD will determine the acceptability of the proposed model for a specific or general applications. The onus of providing adequate supporting materials rests entirely with the proponent.

- 2.2 To provide technical details of the proposed model, the proponent should submit documents containing at least the following information:

- (i) mathematical formulation and data requirements of the model;
  - (ii) any previous performance evaluation of the model; and
  - (iii) a complete set of model input and output file(s) in commonly used electronic format.
- 2.3 On performance evaluation, the required approach and extent of demonstration varies depending on whether a Schedule 1 model is already available and suitable in simulating the situation under consideration. In cases where no Schedule 1 model is found applicable, the proponent must demonstrate that the proposed model passes the screening test as set out in USEPA Document "Protocol for Determining the Best Performing Model" (Ref. 1).
- 2.4 For cases where a Schedule 1 model is applicable to the project under consideration but an alternative model is proposed for use instead, the proponent must demonstrate either that
- (i) the highest and second highest concentrations predicted by the proposed model are within 2 percent of the estimates obtained from an applicable Schedule 1 model (with appropriate options chosen) for all receptors for the project under consideration; or
  - (ii) the proposed model has superior performance against an applicable Schedule 1 model based on the evaluation procedure set out in USEPA Document "Protocol for Determining the Best Performing Model" (Ref. 1).
- 2.5 Should EPD find the information on technical details alone sufficient to indicate the acceptability of the proposed model, information on further performance evaluation as specified in Sections 2.3 and 2.4 above would not be necessary.
- 2.6 If the proposed model is an older version of one of the Schedule 1 models or was previously included in Schedule 1, the technical documents mentioned in Section 2.2 are normally not required. However, a performance demonstration of equivalence as stated in Section 2.4 (i) would become necessary.
- 2.7 If EPD is already in possession of some of the documents that describe the technical details of the proposed model, submission of the same by the proponent is not necessary. The proponent may check with EPD to avoid sending in duplicate information.

-----  
--

***Schedule 1***  
***Air Quality Models Generally Accepted by***  
**Hong Kong Environmental Protection Department for**  
**Regulatory Applications as at 1 July 1998\***

**Industrial Source Complex Dispersion Model - Short Term Version 3 (ISCST3)** or the latest version developed by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

**California Line Source Dispersion Model Version 4 (CALINE4)** or the latest version developed by Department of Transportation, State of California, U.S.A.

**Fugitive Dust Model (FDM)** or the latest version developed by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Ref. (1): William M. Cox, "Protocol for Determining the Best Performing Model" Publication No. EPA-454/R-92-025; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC.

\* *EPD is continually reviewing the latest development in air quality models and will update this Schedule accordingly.*