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Conference Call Summary

March 2, 2017

1) Welcome and roll call – Chet Wayland (OAQPS)

*Participants included EPA OAQPS and OAP, WESTAR-WRAP, Utah, MARAMA, OTC, New Hampshire, Maryland, SESARM, North Carolina, LADCO, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, CenSARA*

2) Update on new Base Year recommendations subgroup – Alex Cohan (LADCO)

*Alex summarized the group’s last call, which was about exceptional events (EEs) in 2015 and 2016 with presentations from CARB, TX, and CT. All were fire-related. It was noted that CARB only submits EE demonstrations when the impact is on a regulatory determination. Randy Strait (NC) noted the Fort McMurray fire was larger than the typical EPA 12 km domain and suggested EPA might want to consider enlarging its domain or EEs may be washed up in boundary conditions. Norm Posseil (OAQPS) replied EPA is considering, for new modeling platform, extending the 12 km domain further north to capture some of the fires. Tom Moore (WESTAR-WRAP) added doing that raises a resource question, as it will take more work to categorize Canadian emissions. Alison Eyth (OAQPS) responded that the current emissions are 2010, but Environment Canada may have up to date information to use and usually provides for all source categories.*

 *Norm asked about the timing for the workgroup to come back to EPA with a*

 *Recommendation? Alex replied that he believes they will be done within a month and ready for a full report out during the next collaborative group call.*

3) MJO/State emissions inventory needs for a potential 2015/2016 modeling base year – Julie McDill (MARAMA) for the Inter RPO Inventory Share Group

 *Julie referred to a white paper drafted during the last RPO group call regarding which source categories were most important to update for a future year. The initial question is will/when EPA be able to move forward? LADCO anticipates starting modeling work for their region this summer. The southeast region has no immediate needs, but may in the next year or so. The central region likewise has no immediate needs, though Texas may want for SIP developments. The northeast will need updated modeling in 2018. For Regional Haze, most plan to use 2011, as 2014V2 will not be ready in time. For CenSARA, EPA’s 2028 modeling now underway likely will need to be used. WRAP is similar to LADCO and may use a 2015/2016 base year.*

 *Julie asked to confirm if the 2015 met data is available? Norm responded it is and inquiries could go to him. Jim Boylan (GA) added they’re working with Chris Misenis (OAQPS) to get WRF and MMIF data for 2013, 2014, and 2015 to the MJOs and asked if the 2015 WRF data is the same EPA would be using for photochemical modeling? Norm replied yes and would be willing to work through a similar process for 2016 WRF when ready. Jim reminded the group the first priority is to get the transport modeling drives copied first. Mark Janssen (LADCO) asked when 2016 WRF might be available? Norm replied the modeling is done, but they haven’t had a chance to analyze the outputs and post processing is not completed yet.*

*Julie added LADCO and the Northeast are interested in providing growth factors to EPA for its next modeling platform, but because they tend to age, don’t want to provide too early. Alison reminded the group that the 2015 Ozone NODA asks for comments on projection methodologies. Chet Wayland (OAQPS) added because of uncertainty in EPA’s budget right now there are no resources beyond the NATA modeling (based on 2014). The Continuing Resolution ends April 28th and there is no budget beyond that date (as of today). Per the OMB passback, EPA is also preparing for a 25% cut. Mark said at this point, just knowing whether there would be a comment period for 2015/2016 projections from 2014 would help. Chet suggested if they wanted to be sure EPA receives something to use, sending in now for 2015 and 2016 growth projections would be prudent. Randy (NC) asked if states should then move forward with updating county databases for on and nonroad for 2015 and 2016 projections? Chet responded the Office has received funding to do modeling every year for the Center for Disease Control (CDC) as they fund projects and in such cases, try to use the latest year(s), but reiterated that is not same as regulatory transport modeling. Alison added they could run MOVES with 2016 inputs by adjusting the base year to run additional future year platforms aside from updating activity data. She reminded everyone the comment window for the 2014 NEI V2 is open until May 15th. Julie suggested however states not do projections just yet because of uncertainty of timing for work on the future modeling platform. Alison replied if 2014V2 is as accurate as possible, it could become part of the input data for 2015/16 and need only “massaging”.*

*Julie summarized that the RPOs agree the most important sectors they need EPA to focus on improving are MOVES, NONROAD, and fires and opportunities for early reviews by states would be productive. The IPM/ERTAC differences will also continue to be a high priority.*

4) Status of ERTAC/EPA group activities – Mark Janssen (LADCO)/Serpil Kayin (CAMD)

*Mark said CAMD has been helpful as the group worked its way down the list of original goals from the June meeting. The last is to find ways to work with regional offices to ensure they are ready to accept ERTAC for SIPs. The subgroup should be winding down this summer. Serpil added one result of working with ERTAC is that CAMD is launching a project to compare ERTAC and IPM as part of the Office’s standard processes. Norm asked if the group would have a report of its accomplishments since June? Serpil replied she and Mark could work on something to share with the Collaborative Group.*

5) Status of 2015 Ozone NAAQS modeling platform data transfers to MJOs/states - Norm Posseil (OAQPS) and Jim Boylan (Georgia) and MJO/state coordination of data reviews (see attached) – Theresa Pella (CenSARA)

*Jim said they received the transport modeling platform data yesterday and expect to receive the WRF/MMIF data today. They are currently prioritizing copying the transport data first. Theresa added the MJO modeling files subgroup agreed on a process for discussing state and region reviews of the modeling platform data. A forum has been set up in the Intermountain West Data Warehouse (*[*http://views.cira.colostate.edu/tsdw*](http://views.cira.colostate.edu/tsdw)*). Users are asked to summarize their findings/issues/questions in the spreadsheet (sample included with the call agenda) found in the forum. When someone updates it, users who have signed up to follow the forum will be notified via email. If states have further questions, they should talk to their RPO/MJO.*

6) Next steps regarding February call Q&A of technical questions for 2015 Ozone transport NODA – Norm Posseil/Theresa Pella

*Norm said EPA is reviewing the draft summary of last month’s call and discussion and an agenda item for the May call could be EPA sharing information about comments received. Dave Foerter (OTC) asked that, based on the earlier conversation, they should assume the 2015 Ozone transport modeling would not be rerun without CPP? Norm responded the uncertainty of being able to do so is there. Theresa (CenSARA) suggested that after the February call summary is sent to the Collaborative Group, if anyone would like a follow up call before the comment period ends on Apr. 6th to let her know and she’ll coordinate with Norm to schedule one.*

7) Open mic – *none*

8) Overview of CAMx updates (see attached) – Chris Emery (Ramboll Environ)

*Chris started by saying the latest updates were the results of projects funded by TX (halogen) and EPA (chemistry updates). The halogen updates addressed issues with oceanic halogen emissions and some related speciation issues. Romboll Environ added an emissions code so states don’t need to provide inputs for O3, SST and wind speed. They used the Gulf of Mexico for comparison work. Overall, they found few reactions are important as some augment and some reduce Ozone.*

*Updates for the EPA project included a new version of CB6. CB6r4 combines halogen chemistry results with previous updates to CB6r3. They also added a heterogeneous sulfate component for fine crustal aerosols. These are normally not a big affect until there are huge dust storms. They looked at four Gulf sites to see how the model improved over water and found there are slight improvements in BEIS. The performance for four Atlantic sites was a little better. Land use has historically been #1 in the modeling files and included emissions over water. Now ocean coverage is its own subset - land use #3. However, if a state doesn’t run halogens, they don’t need to use #3. A “watermask” program allows for conversion from #1 to #3. One caveat though, is that WRF CAMx can’t always distinguish between lakes and oceans.*

*The SOAP organic aerosol chemistry was condensed from 17 species to 10. There is now eight for anthropogenic and two for biogenic. They added precursors for anthropogenic, but none for biogenic. A user can run the new SOA structures with the old CAMx if want to, but it tends to under predict. If the new SOA are run with the new CAMx, there tends to be over predictions.*

*They are now updating probing tools such as PSAT with CB6r4, SOAP and RADM-AQ updates. Also did a wet deposition update. The model was changed so that when Ozone is going into and coming out of rain, there’s less vertical effect and more Ozone removal. One result is also a reduction in atmospheric transpiration, as, if you remove more SO2, there’s less in the atmosphere for SO4 creation, so there’s less in deposition.*

*Miscellaneous updates include - the ACM2 solver now runs as fast as other processes and based on Utah’s feedback, updated land parameters for a higher albedo for snow covered lands. VBS has a more scientific way to do SOA classification and is an option in CAMx. The user’s guide has more details.*

*Norm asked Chris if he had any thoughts on the various factors that might be contributing to overprediction of ozone in coastal areas with low concentrations? Chris replied that the southeast seems to be a hot bed for CAMx and other models as global models tend to be biased high for ozone over waters. Other ideas floating around is that biogenic emissions (use MEGAN) have high isoprene levels, based on evidence from satellite data that NOx emissions tend to be too high from mobile sources.*

*Tom (WESTAR-WRAP) asked if there were any more detailed site performance statistics available? Chris replied what they had was included in the report they sent to EPA.*

Next call – Thursday, April 6, 2017, 10:30 – noon eastern