**WRAP RHPWG EI and Modeling Subcommittee Notes March 28, 2019**

[Western U.S. regional analysis - emissions inventories for Regional Haze planning](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__views.cira.colostate.edu_wiki_wiki_9191_western-2Dus-2Dregional-2Danalysis-2Demissions-2Dinventories-2Dfor-2Dregional-2Dhaze-2Dplanni&d=DwMFAg&c=teXCf5DW4bHgLDM-H5_GmQ&r=bkf7hEbeKpdBNbAgx46ck8fnjDbZ9vbMqLg85JO8g-k&m=6SzbfhryJG9pwsCm-aFYKnCtEYFjIo2cOGfeqBekjY0&s=kuMCI3b092DqwDz2bz_JLI0z55ISrdxu-9cx9AnejYo&e=) wiki link

Note Taker: Molly Birnbaum (Alaska)

**Roll Call: and Agenda Overview**

Alaska – Molly

Arizona – Janice (Pima)

California – Mark Hixson, Tina

Colorado –

Montana – Rebecca, Kristin, Rhonda

Nevada – Brenda, Frank

New Mexico – Mark

North Dakota – David, Angie

Utah –

Washington – Farren

Wyoming – Ben

WRAP – Tom

CIRA - Rodger

FLM- Pat B. Mike B.

1. **Reminder of state/local data submission deadlines (Farren)**

Deadlines included in February 28, 2019 notes:

* April 26 - comments to V2 base year information
* June 14 - Point source representative dataset
* August 1 - OTW/OTB Future Case
* December 19 - Control Future Case

1. **Disseminate Representative Guidance Document** (Farren)

No comments received to date but a few edits will be discussed in meeting today. (Document was attached to agenda email)

1. **Brief overview of inputs to next 2 Regional Modeling scenarios** (see [Modeling Plan](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.wrapair2.org_pdf_WesternModelingPlan-2520update-2520March27-5F2019.pdf&d=DwMFAg&c=teXCf5DW4bHgLDM-H5_GmQ&r=bkf7hEbeKpdBNbAgx46ck8fnjDbZ9vbMqLg85JO8g-k&m=6SzbfhryJG9pwsCm-aFYKnCtEYFjIo2cOGfeqBekjY0&s=w9edmD1JmBKvdZYYNkNkM6Alqrr5L6MJLh2-Iw0xAyc&e=#_blank))

Tom introduced this session and its purpose was to emphasize 2014 Shakeout v2 and 2013-17

Representative Baseline scenarios

Version 1 Modeling Plan is complete. This document lays out the sequence of the current and future regional modeling scenarios. It is expected that this will continue to evolve but at this time the first step provides a long term view and is meant to establish timeframe and characterize each scenario and objectives.

A meeting will be on April 5th to review these scenarios. The scenarios use data generated from this subcommittee work efforts. The shakeout version 2 will be the second and final model and will include *actual* emissions. The second version will be completed by Memorial Day. The model performance results will be run with very few of the changes and the Geos-chem model will sort out anthropogenic and natural sources using a course grid and does not take long to run. The modelers have been updating all the anthropogenic data in CA, will do a comparative with OG workgroup data and will compare and decide if more changes are needed. Deadline for additional feedback from states as they review the 2014 actual data and V2 baseline cutoff for data changes is April 26. Until then, the modelers will continue to use model figurations from version 1 – chemical speciation, etc.

The next step is model planning which will be a review of the current rate of emission inventory -model operations and new boundary condition values will be applied. The model will have new information from controls on power plants and so that will be a representative data set. Fire/smoke work group will also provide temperature and special representatives of fire. A goal is to have representative data for given sources to be the best representative of current profile.

Aug 1 is point source projections cut off and after then they will be doing control and sensitivity work.

1. **State comments on how they are handling representative and future emissions (North Dakota and others).**

David presented the process laid out on the Excel spreadsheet. Everyone is looking at the same approach. ND is a little ahead of the game as they have already coordinated with point sources and is reviewing and processing information.

1. Xcel spreadsheet overview – The top of the spreadsheet lists 6 examples of facilities for scenarios that states will likely run into. Reviewed 1-6 facility types. Review controls and scenarios and notes on situation.

2. The 2014 emissions column are based on 2014 NEI emissions. 2013-2017 column is where we are at currently (Farren noted that 2013-2017 is a selected and not an average value). The “actual” emissions includes actual events such as plant shutdowns and interruptions, etc.

Tom emphasized that there is no right answer and a state will select what is best for them. He notes that an averaging and adjustment could be done if the state chooses.

A state should look at what is normal and what 2028 will look like. While the state makes the decisions it should be developed with input from the sources. David recommends sharing this spreadsheet with representative sources.

*Question - Nevada.* Why 2028 Future Controls case have notes of no controls.

*Response* – will have to evaluate feasibility of controls but controls may have to be added later after 2028. It will not be the same situation for every facility. Maybe adjustment in notes and column heading to make this clear. It was explained that line 3 is more consistent. In a 4-Factor analysis it shouldn’t be what current emissions are but rather what they expect the emissions to be, all of which is based on good information from the point sources. The information needs to be reasonable and representative. ND is going to all their point sources to establish a good future baseline and determine economic feasibility.

Farren suggested that he could add another column to identify when a state should provide information to WRAP and will add another case where there are no controls. David agrees that the addition would be beneficial. The deadlines in the Feb 28 notes line up well with these scenarios. The August deadline is important to notice so that states start to reach out to their sources. Post 2028 is reliant on good information on the 2028 future controls case. The EGU group is already exposed to this in the workshop. This is a time consuming process and so the August timeframe is really tight.

*Questions???*

Pat Brewer – asked if this has been discussed with the control measures subcommittee (no). Pat said this discussion was well done. Tina thought they had heard the process but had not seen the spreadsheets. Tina recommended that David coordinate with this committee – next meeting is April 22 and suggests that this would be a good discussion at that meeting. Tom will coordinate with that work group.

1. **Discuss need for guidance by EI&MP SC for state projections of future emissions scenarios for 2028 OTB/OTW, for stationary sources (All)**

The previous discussion is helpful for this topic and previously this group talked about developing guidance and maybe the guidance can be expanded for this topic. Is more guidance needed? Pat Brewer suggested that we should start with what we have – suggests starting conversation with information we have in the table. Tom will ask Rebecca – RH Planning workgroup. Wants to send out deadlines to each state and get milestones in everyone’s mind. Farren can work on how to preview the guidance with regards to the deadlines. Rebecca agrees that this ties in well. Tom will send out a simple summary of the dates.

1. **Share Draft** [**Reasonable Progress Source Identification and Analysis Protocol**](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.wrapair2.org_calendar_attachments_24471_21170_WRAP-2520Reasonable-2520Progress-2520Source-2520Identification-2520and-2520Analysis-2520Protocol-2DDraft-2520for-2520consensus-2520approval-2Daccept-252005FEB-2520edits-2520and-2520julie-2520simpson-2520edits-2D27FEB2019.docx&d=DwMFAg&c=teXCf5DW4bHgLDM-H5_GmQ&r=bkf7hEbeKpdBNbAgx46ck8fnjDbZ9vbMqLg85JO8g-k&m=6SzbfhryJG9pwsCm-aFYKnCtEYFjIo2cOGfeqBekjY0&s=A4XHPljvpL5j8sKxyaakBTDv9WG0auJfB_km-NPTaME&e=) **from Control Measures SC (All)**

Tom said he wants everyone to not be surprised if people review this and have any comments since it has been well circulated. While it is marked draft it is really pretty final…… yet open to clarifications over the next month. If clarifications are needed, please get them into Tom ASAP

*Additional comments?* Ben from Wyoming noted he was late to the meeting and had been taking notes.

1. **Next call date and time (All)**

April 25 should be the next meeting but it overlaps with spring business meeting (Tuesday – Thursday). The meeting was rescheduled to **Thursday,** **May 9 –10:00 Pacific time.**

Next meeting notes are assigned to Washington.

**Action -** for the next meeting states should use the spreadsheet in preparation.