RHPWG Emissions Inventory and Modeling Protocol Subcommittee

October 30, 2018

Roll Call:

WA - Farren Herron-Thorpe

AZ - Elias Toon

CA- Martin Johnson, Alex Huth, Jim Cao

CO- Curt Taipale, Dale Wells, Kevin Briggs

MT - Rhonda Payne, Stephen Coe

NV - Brenda Harpring, Frank Forsgren

Denver/NFR RAQC - Amanda Brimmer

NM - Mark Jones, Roslyn Higgin

ND - David Stroh, Angie Seligman

UT - Jay Baker

WY - Ben Way

CSU/CIRA - Rodger Ames

NPS - Mike Barna

AK - Molly Birnbaum

WESTAR-WRAP – Tom Moore

Note Taker: Montana

Agenda:

1. Clarify Stack Parameter Review (Fugitive Sources have Erptype =1)

In the stack parameter lookup spreadsheet, the column Erptype = ‘1’ indicates the source is a fugitive source, and thus stack parameters should be ignored. The modelers will use the fugitive default parameters listed unless states have provided other input data.

1. Clarification on how EI data reported by tribes is handled in this database

Tom added this in – he wanted to clarify for the group how emissions data located in tribal areas are handled. The tribal data contained in the NEI is reported point source data from the tribe. For other data categories such as nonpoint and onroad categories, the county values include the tribal data in the total (such as population numbers or road counts). Then, any point sources reported by the tribe are included. Tom wants to touch on this in the documentation. Main point to remember is that emission sources near reservation/county boundaries but on the reservation are not under the control strategies of the state.

1. MOVES input analysis volunteer request

Volunteer request. Colorado is curious about some of the MOVES inputs that were used…specifically the vehicle fleet use assumptions. It might be worthwhile for states that accepted EPA’s data to evaluate the EPA assumptions. Alison Eyth would be the EPA contact from whom states could request technical memo and supporting data information (where we can find the county age fraction files?). CO, WY, MT, SD, ND, NM and parts of Nevada are using EPA defaults. Information is contained in a 10/3/2018 email chain between EPA/Colorado/WRAP under Table 1 on the wiki page. \*\*\*Montana and Colorado may be able to help in evaluating the inputs for the group.

1. Review EI & MP Review Checklist and 5) Review EI & MP Base Year Inventory documentation

Two documents were added to the agenda: WRAP Regional Haze SIP Emissions Inventory Review Checklist and the WRAP Regional Haze SIP Emissions Inventory Review Documentation. These two documents outline the review of the 2014 base case inventory year for base year modeling. In addition, the documents outline the needs for upcoming projection work. Please review both documents and provide questions/comments/revisions to Farren by November 27th. These documents will comprise the white paper to be presented at TSC WG Co-Chairs meeting December 4-6 in Utah.

1. Point Source Representativeness plans clarification (Tom)

We had some comments from WY, wanting to use a different year for certain facilities because 2014 wasn’t representative. The plan is to maintain a ‘snapshot’ year (i.e., 2014 NEI v2 as reviewed and corrected by this group) for base year modeling, then work on a five-year average for point sources to address concerns regarding representativeness. This will be part of the 2nd round of base year simulations where we could play with the representativeness (i.e., period of average). The Oil and Gas and Fire and Smoke workgroups are finalizing their representativeness for those categories and years. There is a separate project/effort on the electric utility plants to find a representative number.

Question from Elias – are states going to be expected to look through these representativeness for the second round? Tom, yes…related to sources that states want to look at for the 4-factor analysis. Representative emissions are very important for these sources.

Martin from CARB – we have a ‘live’ 2014 database with the more representative data. CARB maintains a dynamic EI database of historic years and projections. In following with the work of this subcommittee, California would follow suit and use a snapshot – 2014 NEI v2. However, If CARB wholesale replaced the inventory in the second round of the baseline modeling, then there would be a much different result. This process needs to be transparent. Tom suggested waiting to answer this questions until the 2nd round modeling efforts begin. Martin from CARB also echoed the concern– it’s a huge process to do rectify the snapshot EI with the more representative, dynamic data. Kevin from CO added a comment – the contractor will use CEMS data, etc. and then create a point source average. Is that right? Tom – it’s really source category by source category. The 2nd round would include EGU, Oil and Gas, Fire, etc. inputs. There is a question about what to average – which categories makes sense to average. The EI and Modeling Protocol Subcommittee will, in the future, discuss that and provide a white paper as to what the averaging will be. However, the model validation will use actual CEMS data and FIRE data. To follow up, Alex with CARB elaborated on the disconnect – the issue is that the NEI includes gap-filling which CARB can’t bring back into our database. So, estimates can’t be resolved within the scope of this project. It would be odd if we’re pairing the NEI base year (with gap filling) with forecasting we do on our side that doesn’t include that gap filling. We could deal with this snapshot database set – when we do our future year 2028 projections, time could be spent to correct it. Provide a base year output for 2014 for the forecast in 2028??? To be used in scaling??? 2016 for projection???

Subcommittee needs some more background on this. Need to finish the snapshot review. Punting to December meeting. When is 2028 needed? WRAP workplan has it in the spring of 2019.

1. Next call date and time

Thursday November 29 at 11 Pacific

Notes - Colorado