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Federal/State Technical Work Collaboration Group

Conference Call Summary

January 5, 2017

Welcome and roll call

*Participating organizations included EPA OAQPS and OAP; WESTAR-WRAP, Utah, MARAMA, OTC, Nez Perce Tribe, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, SESARM, Georgia, LADCO, Minnesota, Illinois, Texas, Maryland, Missouri, and CenSARA*

Review of technical aspects in EPA’s NODA for 2015 ozone NAAQS - <https://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/notice-availability-preliminary-interstate-ozone-transport-modeling-data-2015-ozone-naaqs>

 (see attached)

*Norm Possiel (OAQPS) mentioned the NODA should be published in the Federal Register on Friday (Jan. 6th) and will have a 90-day comment period. To help coordinate reviews a process whereby the MJOs/states work together on a list of questions to send EPA prior to the Feb. call was suggested. One primary purpose of the Feb. call would then be to talk about the questions received (the call would probably be open to any state that wanted to participate). This could happen as a parallel to the process getting underway to transfer the platform data to the MJOs/states, so it’s understood MJOs/states may not have specific data prior to then. John Hornback (SESARM) agreed understanding what’s in the TSD would be helpful, then asked if, after comments, EPA will rerun 2023 for states to use in their I-SIPs? Norm responded that was not the intent, but states could use the EPA work as is for their submittals, revise as needed, or supplement with other work. Chet Wayland (OAQPS) added they need to wait for direction from the new administration before additional future work gets underway.*

*Susan Wierman (MARAMA) asked if EPA will use the 2014 NEI for future modeling platforms and how that would relate to the 2028 modeling underway for regional haze? Norm replied future work is independent of the 2028 modeling, which is building off the 2011 modeling platform. Theresa Pella (CenSARA) asked to clarify whether comments on the NODA will be reflected in the 2028 modeling? Norm replied that they would not because the timing to complete the 2028 work is prior to the end of the NODA comment period. Comments will, however, be reflected in future modeling and one area EPA is seeking input is how to project emission inventories, growth and control information. The recent control measures survey results, though not in the 2028 modeling, will be used to update the 2014 NEI V2.*

*Susan asked about the inclusion of the Clean Power Plan (CPP) in the NODA. Norm confirmed it is part of the 2023 (and will be part of the 2028) run, based on IPM5.16. David Risley (OAP) added because it is currently an “on the books” rule including it is consistent with previous modeling approaches. Jim Boylan (GA) asked what would happen if a state included the CPP in its I-SIP and the rule is ultimately invalidated? Chet replied that until a legal decision is final, it must be considered valid. Susan inquired if there was a way to identify how the CPP changed model inputs. David responded OAP can say directionally it reduces NOx, but specific tons are unknown. The CPP is in the EGU sector as well in MOVES (though with miniscule differences, per Alison Eyth). Susan then asked if a state could substitute ERTAC modeling in their I-SIP? EPA replied yes and understood the ERTAC/EPA subgroup would be looking at the differences between ERTAC and IPM data as it did for the 2008 Ozone transport rule. Susan suggested EPA should consider doing a modeling run for states with CPP removed for states use because of the resource efforts necessary to do. Rob Kaleel added LADCO plans to do regional modeling with the CPP removed.*

*Tom Moore (WESTAR-WRAP) asked which AEO scenario was used for the oil and gas sector? Alison E. replied it was the 2016 with CPP scenario for all but the MARAMA region (provided own inputs), again with minimal impact in 2028. Alison added the latest emissions modeling files are labeled 2023el.*

Update on MJO subgroup recommendations for 2015 Ozone NAAQS modeling platform data transfers to MJOs/states:

*Theresa updated the group that the MJO/states subgroup held a call with Norm and Alison to review the data needs list and agreement was reached and one set, the WRF data was confirmed by Byeong Kim (GA) to be the latest. Jim (GA) mentioned Mark Janssen (LADCO) sent two 6 TB drives to Alison for copying and asked that MJOs send similar drives to Georgia to allow for smooth data transfers.*

*Tom (WESTAR-WRAP) asked about the timing for when the modeling platform will be deemed “final” to help with timing of data reviews. Norm replied because EPA does not expect to do additional work with the platform (outside of the 2028 regional haze work underway) it can be considered “final” now. The modeling satisfies EPA’s commitment in Janet McCabe’s earlier memo to provide states with some technical work they could use, if they wanted, to avoid getting FIPed for the 2015 Ozone transport requirement. Mike Sheehan (NY) asked how EPA would react, though, if a state did rely on the work and a fatal flaw was discovered after a SIP submittal? Chet replied that EPA is confident in the modeling, one reason is because they relied on the comments received for the 2008 Ozone NODA to help frame the latest modeling.*

Status of EPA 2028 modeling for regional haze

*Brian Timin (OAQPS) reported the modeling is underway as an extension of the 2023 modeling with hopes of completing in February. The platform will then be made available to the MJOs/states in the same process underway for the 2011 and 2023 data. It includes two runs – one without source apportionment and one with (using PM in CAMx). The work also includes MOVES and IPM runs for 2028.*

*Susan asked if it’d be possible to show results on an extinction, as well as dv, basis for the 20% most anthropogenic impaired days? Brian responded that they could consider doing that, but at least need to follow what will be in the final guidance. Tom M. suggested one way to do what Susan would like is to do baseyear modeling performance evaluations for each of the different metrics proposed and decided on. Brian added the data can be looked at in different ways with specific work done by MJOs.*

*Theresa asked Brian if the source apportionment mix stayed the same as the list previously sent to MJOs for feedback. He replied the only comment he received was to break out non-EGUs, which they were not able to do, so yes it is the same. Theresa then asked Beth Palma if a known release timeframe for the guidance was known – Beth replied not yet.*

Update on new Base Year recommendations subgroup

*Rob Kaleel (LADCO) said the subgroup continues to discuss aspects that may lead toward a solid recommendation to EPA to use 2015 or 2016 or if regional base years may work the best. The next calls are scheduled for Jan. 18th to talk about meteorology and Feb. 1st for an emissions inventory discussion.*

Brief overview of Appendix W revisions

*George Bridgers (OAQPS) said only about 10% of what was in the proposal was changed in the final, with one notable action that the beta option in AERMOD was not finalized as a regulatory model. The proposal to replace CALINE3 with AERMOD for transportation conformity modeling was one of the biggest areas that received comment. The final rule still removes CALINE3 but with a three year window AND after EPA does a rulemaking. There is also a coding error fix in AERMOD that impacts fugitives. The rule should be published in the Federal Register prior to January 20th, with an effective date of March 21 (update since the January 5th meeting). If an area needs to submit something before the effective date, they should work with their regional office. A webinar will be held on February 16th (update since the January 5th meeting).*

Transferring MMIF data to MJOs/states

*Chris Misenis (OAQPS) referred to the handout about the new tool that can take WRF data and transfer it into dispersion models. This can be helpful when a national weather station is too far away from a source. EPA has completed meteorological modeling using WRF for the 2013-2015 period at a 12 km CONUS level. Model performance evaluation was completed for each year. Once the data is transferred to MJOs/states, they can do their own analyses. Each year is about 2 TB of data, so a 6 TB drive would be needed. Jim (GA) said they would be willing to be the transferee if that works for the other MJOs. Theresa added they can confirm that on the next MJO subgroup call.*

Update on model performance objectives and CMAQ/CAMx update

*Norm mentioned as a follow up to the discussion held during the October CMAS conference, EPA sees model performance evaluation happening in three ways in the near future 1) as part of the NODA review and comments received; 2) as the next modeling platform work gets underway; and, 3) as updates to the photochemical modeling guidance are completed. Tom noted the paper he sent to the group is intended to complement Norm’s paper and the group’s discussions.*

*The ORD webinar on CMAQ updates is scheduled for January 31st, 11-12:30 eastern. The Ramboll-Environ update on CAMx (v 6.40) will take place during the February or March fed/state tech work collaboration group call. It was released in December.*

Open mic

*none*

Action items and wrap up

*Theresa said the main action item was for the MJO subgroup to schedule a call to run through a few items prior to next month’s call.*

Next call – February 2, 2017, 10:30 – noon eastern