**WRAP RHPWG EI and Modeling Committee Meeting 5/28/2020**

**Agenda w/Notes:**

Note taker for this call: Montana; meeting was recorded. Please refer to recording for more in-depth detail for discussions.

Roll Call:

5/28/2020 EIMP SC Roll Call

Arizona -

California - Tina

Colorado -

Idaho -

Montana - Rhonda

Nevada -

New Mexico -

North Dakota - David

Oregon -

South Dakota -

Utah - Jay

Washington - Farren

Wyoming –

WRAP – Tom, Pat Brewer

Feds – Mike Barna

Ramboll - Tejas

Pima County

EPA –

1. **Status update on RH modeling progress and data transfer to TSS**

Tom: Summarized May 19-20 results roll out. We are processing and running the 2028 PAC run. Those changes in visibility because of the PACs will be presented at the next results meeting (June 23 and 25). Also in June, high level source apportionment which will give us more information on adjusting the glidepath. Ramboll has been providing key results, Pat taking the lead on transferring that data and displaying them on the TSS. We are going to distribute a tracking spreadsheet that shows when we are getting the data from Ramboll and passing it to the TSS and having it ready for display. This table will be a reference that we will routinely distribute so that the states know when to look for things and it will give us some clear markers. Lots coming in June!

1. Status update on TSS emissions sectors’ modeling data displays

Tom: Work with Tejas and Pat to deliver and correctly display the emissions sector data. We got helpful feedback from our May results meeting. One thing that came up was the need to meet the EPA guidance requirements to compare to the NEI data – this is an important part of the SIP. But currently the TSS has the emissions sectors displayed in terms of the emissions modeling inputs, so states can go back and look at what source sectors data were used in all the various modeling scenarios. In addition to this, we are going to implement the NEI data according to the recommendations of this group.

David (ND): we have taken a look at the emissions sector tools on the TSS. ND’s EGU sector looked like there was a double-counting of the EGUs on the RepBase. Tejas - confirmed that there was a mistake and the EGU emissions were double counted in the RepBase display. Will be fixed. The model is correct – it was just the emissions tool displays that need to be fixed for that sector. Tom will send update once the displays are corrected.

Farren: those emissions summaries on the TSS are post-gridded, so there could potentially be some wiggle room around the state borders if that grid cell has more than one state in it.

Tina: 2014 -2017 NEI summaries – you are including the most recent NEI? Tom: We are going to talk about that next. The long and short of it is that we want to be able to display the 2014 NEI (with state updates) and have the 2017 NEI as a reference. We want to have an overall reference there (on the TSS).

1. Review of May 14th OAQPS “Regional Haze Emissions Inventory State Implementation Plan” training (attached) – did people attend?, comments and feedback?

David (ND): I wasn’t able to attend. Would you give us a summary? Or a synopsis of the types of questions Tom was asking EPA (Tom asked a lot of questions). Farren: These trainings were formal in that EPA was describing/following what was in rule and explaining how to implement the training document. Tom: we rely upon EPA for the processing of the inventories for Canada and Mexico, so we are using what they are giving us, but EPA may have more current information that they haven’t shared yet. EPA is trying to make sure that our 2014 base year set of point sources that are eligible for control, is that each state is double checking these sources against the 2017 NEI, so that the 2017 NEI is the latest point of record in our SIPs. So, it’s linked to what sources were included for four factors, and making sure these sources are match what is in 2017. David (ND): Did they address the petition for reconsideration of the final RH guidance? Tom: No, EPA was focused on the technical modeling and inventory guidance. Tom: The petition for reconsideration was submitted by NPCA and other environmental groups. This is a method that is allowed under the CAA for any EPA rule or guidance. No specific process for EPA to respond to that, no deadline for response. We will cover it more on the RHWGP call.

1. Discussion of 2014/2017 NEI summaries to display on TSS (model sector summaries vs NAICS summaries) – See [2014 NEI modeling sectors summary (XLS) [newftp.epa.gov]](https://urldefense.com/v3/__ftp%3A//newftp.epa.gov/Air/emismod/2014/v2/2014fd/reports/2014fd_nata_state_annual_report_all_species.xlsx__;!!GaaboA!5ODRFzx0vlVUO9LKDczb8yZUIyC7jPcTamvnQAUr-c4NtlsCJSn8MGuhwFFihQ$) or [IWDW 2016 MP EI Browser [views.cira.colostate.edu]](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https%3A//views.cira.colostate.edu/iwdw/EIBrowser2016/__;!!GaaboA!5ODRFzx0vlVUO9LKDczb8yZUIyC7jPcTamvnQAUr-c4NtlsCJSn8MGu1j_XsnQ$) vs [IWDW EI Browser using SCC [views.cira.colostate.edu]](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https%3A//views.cira.colostate.edu/iwdw/EIBrowser/__;!!GaaboA!5ODRFzx0vlVUO9LKDczb8yZUIyC7jPcTamvnQAUr-c4NtlsCJSn8MGtSc95ZZg$) vs NAICS. How should they be compared to the RH modeling emissions summaries on TSS Express?

Farren: WA wanted to have a comparison of what was in the modeling compared to the NEI values. Spoke with Tejas about how best to do this. The idea would be to have another column (or download) in the TSS emissions table to have the NEI results for comparison. So, the 2014 NEI has model-ready summaries that we can put into a similar format to what is on the TSS currently.

The 2017 is a little more difficult because there are no model-ready files prepared. There are summaries for point, nonpoint, onroad, but the point, for example, isn’t split up into the ptegu, ptnonipm, oil and gas, etc. So, we could do a slimmer summary for the 2017 EI (group all point sources together) or try to do a split with the NAICS code. It would be close. If you look at the 2014 NEI modeling sectors, you can see how these sectors are split up. The IWDW 2016 browser has the similar breakdowns. We could do it like the IWDW SCC but there might be more processing to complete. Farren would prefer to use the NAICS.

Tom: talking about this as a product, it would be like a data file that we would ingest into the TSS and we’d have a display tool for this product that states could use. We could use an example state, so that others could see how this works. Farren: sure, doing the summaries and the NAICS could split would be fairly easy. I’ll go ahead and do that and share the results for people to comment on.

1. Reminder of upcoming 2nd PAC modeling scenario emissions submittal deadline

Farren: submittal deadline is approaching! July 1st was the deadline. Oregon would like to provide the data by July 15. Mark Jones (NM) would not have it until August 1st. He suggested that we revisit this on the June call. Paul (AK), echo NM – still reviewing 4-factor sources and talking with EPA Region 10 on process, so won’t have the inputs for modeling until mid-July. Tina (CA) needs to provide the data in the gridded format. Onroad mobile needs to be model ready gridded. Mark (CA) will work with Tejas directly. Jay (UT) shooting for July 1st deadline. Aislinn (ID) the later the better – so, end of July would be good. David (ND), recommends August 1st. Farren, get it in the last week of July (August 1st is a Saturday). Mark (NM) recommends August 7th, we don’t want to rush this. Paul (AK) wants to echo that again. Our 4-factors are going to be based on the WEP results which won’t come out until June 30th. Tom (train conductor), realize states don’t have PAC1 results, so if we set a revised due date of August 7th, that would be about 6 weeks of review time for PAC1. Then, the results of PAC2 will be coming along later. Everyone is not on the same schedule. We may want to discuss how to implement PAC2. Farren, on my end – if you are not sure about formatting, let’s clear that up first. If there is someone on the call that needs help on formatting, etc. then please get a hold of me early if you need help.

New deadline – AUGUST 7th, 2020 for PAC2 emissions inputs

1. Reminder of June 23 and 25, and July 22-23 Regional Haze results web meetings.

Tom: Focus on modeling results deliverables including some methodology talks from Ramboll. Show all states the modeling results on TSS. July 22-23 will be the ‘wrap-up’ meeting and will include resources on consultation provided by the Tribal workgroup. Seeking volunteer states to show what they’ve done on the 4-factors.

1. Schedule Next Call (Notes: New Mexico)

June 25th brief check-in: 11:00-11:30 (because of the WRAP June 25 modeling results meeting in the afternoon)

Upcoming Notes Schedule:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| July | Colorado |
| Aug | North Dakota |
| Sept | Arizona |
| Oct | Washington |

1. Next Call – April 30 @ 11 am PDT (Notes: New Mexico)

Action Items:

* Tom Moore will prepare short descriptions of input and purpose of modeling runs and work with modelers to come up with consistent naming conventions to help with stakeholder interactions
* Farren H-T will work with New Mexico on the Oil& gas estimates for Round I sensitivity
* The posted chart will include emphasizing reference to the estimates nature of sensitivity modeling runs, as will the meeting notes
* Sates will get back to Farren H-T on whether they can have reductions ready for “Round 2” by July 1, with consideration of how much of those are confirmed 4-factor reductions (caveat: not likely to extend deadline more than a few weeks)