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Federal/State Technical Work Collaboration Group

Conference Call Summary

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Welcome and roll call – Chet Wayland (OAQPS)

*Participating organizations included EPA OAQPS and OAP; WESTAR-WRAP; UT, MARAM;, OTC; NH, NY, MD, SESARM; NC; VA; GA; LADCO; IL; MN; CenSARA; TX; MO*

Status of EPA NODA comments review and prep work to potentially remodel for 2015 Ozone Transport – Chet and Norm

Initial discussion items - all

       If EPA remodels, should the air quality analyses (i.e., receptors and linkages) be updated? If so, what is most useful to states?

       Should EPA identify cost of potential reductions and/or identify tools/analyses states could use?

       What factors should be considered that would cause EPA to address transport differently in the East versus the West?

*Chet Wayland – staff has no official direction yet but indications are for staff to not do new modeling for 2015 ozone transport so the Office is focusing on work to prepare for modeling with a 2016 baseyear. Thus, EPA may need to rely on the work MJOs are doing for 2015 Ozone, along with the NODA work. Norm Posseil added for a 2016 modeling platform development of the met data is in progress; the plan is to use the 2014 NEI data with 2015 point and any 2016 emissions data MJOs/states can provide. Plan is by summer have a V1 of the platform done using data now in house. Then, if resources are in place, do a V2 platform.*

*John Hornback asked for clarification of when V1 of the 2016 platform will be done. Norm replied the plan is to have by this summer.*

*Rob Sliwinski (NY) asked if a pending court (U.S. Dist. Ct., Northern Dist. of California, Civil Case No. 3:15-CV-4328-JD) decision that may require EPA to complete a 2008 Ozone FIP for Kentucky could presumably apply to other states and possibly help with the 2015 Ozone transport SIPs? Norm said the court decision implications could mean EPA must do a final rule by next summer. What types of controls that might be included in the FIP is unknown at this time. Part of the work will be looking at NOx reductions from EGUs and non-EGUs, not just for Kentucky, but other states in the CSAPR update program. David Risley (OAP) agreed some analysis for Kentucky could be informative for other states’ SIPs/FIPs. He reminded attendees that a FIP obligation doesn’t preclude states from submitting 2008 Ozone transport SIPs before FIPs are effective. And, what’s included in those may be informative for 2015 Ozone. Rob agreed that with EPA’s work done next summer (court date June 2018), one would think the results would be informative for 2015 Ozone. Norm added it would be helpful for EPA to know, on the topic of additional controls, what states needed, rather than EPA doing analyses from what it has….hoping states would be willing to help build on the knowledge base.*

*John Hornback asked who would need to take the first step – the state EPA is developing a FIP for? David Risley replied that to some extent, the same type of conversations happening with Kentucky is needed with other states. Dave Foerter (OTC) asked about implications beyond Kentucky? Norm replied – yes, the work could impact FIP calls for other states. David added that was true, though, the only deadline that was being litigated was for Kentucky.*

*Susan Wierman (MARAMA)– if EPA was interested in potential NOx reductions states have done, MANE-VU has been holding calls to assess sectors and controls for the next phase of Regional Haze SIPs that may be helpful. Norm will follow up with Joseph Jakuta (OTC) and may be the Group could revisit the topic on next month’s call. Risley said the interest applies to EGUs as well as non-EGUs as the CSAPR update focused on 2017 and there may be post-2017 controls in place or coming. Julie McDill (MARAMA) highlighted the continued need to keep in mind mobile NOx reductions.*

*On the topic of addressing transport differently in the west vs. east, Jeb Stackhouse (OAP) noted Anna Wood’s presentation for the WESTAR/WRAP meeting included the four-step policy framework and thinks it is still the right way to ask what may or may not be different in the east/west. Mary Uhl (WESTAR-WRAP) added they haven’t had a conversation with states yet, but will try before June 1st. She’ll touch base with Norm.*

Update on incorporating state survey results on existing non-EGU control measures into EIS:

*Robin Langdon (OAQPS) mentioned state emission inventory points and the MJOs received an email in early March explaining that EPA uploaded into the EIS all state provided changes for control measures and unit designs. She reminded states that for future EIS submittals to use design capacity or the system would overwrite what EPA input.*

Overview of Action Plan status:

*Theresa Pella (CenSARA) explained draft updates to the Plan were made to reflect progress since the June 2016 workshop. Please submit comments to her by May 18th; then, the group could do walk through on the June or July call.*

Status of Final report out by ERTAC/EPA subgroup and revised EGU Projection Guidance language:

*Serpil Kayin (OAP) said from the earlier discussion, the final report may need to be edited, but the intent is to continue to build on the cooperative work so far to understand how budgets are built and modeled. Mark Janssen (LADCO) agreed the group plans to continue talking as new comment periods and deadlines arise.*

*Serpil mentioned the purpose of the Guidance is to provide a logical policy framework to help build solutions. The draft was shared in January and they received feedback in April – the latest version reflects that feedback. The group is also working on what an ERTAC product should look like if submitted under the guidance as part of a SIP. The Guidance does lay out relevant information about different data sources to consider in a SIP context and includes examples of EPA projection tools – none should be seen as being preferred over others. She added they’ve seen several presentations by MJOs about how and when controls beyond “on the books” –can be modeled for different purposes. ERTAC is helping CAMD learn their tool and how to run it.*

*Theresa asked if calls/webinars have been scheduled yet to update EPA regional offices? Mark responded that the Group still has work to do and recognized if they pull them in too soon, it may be difficult to explain the tools and their differences. Julie added they are planning on a webinar and looking for the list of appropriate people to invite – Serpil will send the contacts they have to Theresa, who’ll share with the MJOs to get updates. Beth Palma (OAQPS) said there is a regional office workgroup that includes some folks with appropriate responsibilities who should attend. Theresa will include Beth when she sends the list out.*

Review of MJOs/States’ 2015 Ozone NAAQS modeling platform data drive gaps list and next steps:

*Theresa updated the Group that a call is scheduled to talk through the process for EPA to upload missing data identified by the states/MJOs into the IWDW. Norm thanked the states and MJOs for their timely review of the drives.*

*Norm mentioned the IWDW might be one place to share other data, such as the 2014 NEI data. The June or July call may be timely to talk about that particular set of data. Julie mentioned that states/MJOs are hearing that the delay of the 2014 NEI V2 until the end of this year means it won’t be of much value, however, there is interest by states/MJOs to obtain the data. Norm replied he understood the 2014 NEIV2 is of interest and will follow up with the EI folks to be sure they are aware of that.*

*Tom Moore (WESTAR\_WRAP) inquired if the 2028 results for Regional Haze were available? Norm replied that they are analyzing the model results and trying to schedule internal briefings with EPA management.*

Progress reports by LADCO and OTC on regional work:

*Rob Kaleel said LADCO is working on benchmarking the CAMx modeling results with other CAMx users to be sure they are matching EPA’s results. Also, working with their members to plan a series of source apportionment runs using OSAT and plan their first run to be the same as EPA’s to be sure they are matching the upwind/downwind linkages. Then they’ll look at various source categories and replace IPM inputs with ERTAC inputs. Norm asked if a decision on the source category breakout would be by state and specific SCCs? Rob responded they plan to first do basic EI categories, then categories by state using the same domain as EPA. Norm said such results could be useful and will touch base with Rob offline.*

*Joseph Jakuta said the OTC is planning to do source apportionment modeling as well and will talk specifics at an internal meeting in week or two. Modeling 2017/2020 or 2023 is one debate. Whatever the emission inventory years they will replace IPM with ERTAC and other point source files because of issues surrounding which sources are included in IPM and ERTAC. They are not sure yet if they will use EHk or EHl files yet. They need to get Ek from EPA (from 2008 Ozone work). They plan to tag all the sources in the domain, which is halfway through the CenSARA region. They are still thinking about what to tag separately or put as one. They may have an issue with the tools they are using to create a domain and are hoping EPA has a tool that can adjust the domain without losing the tags. The sources are the same as in the pre-emerge files. The Region has an interest in HDDT, so may need another tool to analyze that category. Using CAMx, OSAT or APCA - not sure yet. Also looking for a tool to help process the results. Norm replied EPA is willing to help with existing post-processing tools that can show contributions on an hourly basis. Alex Cohan (LADCO) added EPA does have a tool for retagging that may be included with the new data drives.*

EPA’s plans for global modeling:

*Pat Dolwick (OAQPS) said they are six to18 months out to have global model outputs that could be suitable for typical modeling simulations. They are also working on potentially developing a suitable model test bed for various models. Thirdly, they are actively participating in various community comparison work – ex: HQAST or WESTAR with eye towards improving global models. More specifically, two parallel tracks with GEOSCHEM (a lot of in house work is the first step is to run 2016 with GESOCHEM 11 and GEOSP?? and currently available emissions). Hope a “quick and dirty” 2016 GEOSCHEM run to be the results that can be used for the 2016 platform initial work. May have something in Spring 2017. Also, will test Colorado State’s by Daven Henze. Also working with ORD to model with CMAQ and CMAQ5.2 with initial results in the summer 2017. Hoping to do model evaluations with more scrutiny than in the past. See regional modeling differences from global model results outside of the U.S. Looking to use as many sonde results as can get as well as aircraft and satellite data.*

*Julie said Maryland has sonde data available. She also suggested they verify U.S. emissions inventories are updated before they use them. Pat responded they do haves sonde data from Wallops Island in VA and will follow up to get the Maryland data.*

*Tom Moore inquired if there was a document that walks through the various platforms EPA is using including the global models using with each. Pat asked for clarification – a one or two pager about global model applications (doable) or something larger, like a description of NATA and related global and regional modeling applications? Norm added that for 2011/2012/2013 EPA leveraged existing GOESCHEM runs, starting with the 2011 MET platform. Will verify if that’s true for 2014. Moving forward, EPA hopes to do year-specific GEOSCHEM runs. John Hornback mentioned that EPRI is getting ready to do international modeling for regional haze purposes and asked if there was a way for EPA to collaborate with the private sector? Pat said he received the invitation from EPRI and is waiting to hear from management whether he can participate.*

*Shantha Daniel (TCEQ) mentioned at an earlier conference EPA gave an overview of work to compare three different global models and asked if the results were available? Pat responded there was a recent meeting in RTP of the HTAQ group where there may have been a presentation. There is also the HTAP group. EPA is interested in partnering with whomever on whatever global model is of interest.*

Next call – Thursday, June 1, 2017, 10:30 – noon eastern