**WRAP RHPWG EI and Modeling Committee Meeting 03/26/2020**

**Agenda w/Notes:**

Note taker for this call: California; meeting was recorded. Please refer to recording for more in-depth detail for discussions.

Roll Call:

3/26/2020 EIMP SC Roll Call

Arizona - Ryan

California - Tina

Colorado - Curt, Kevin, Weston, Shira

Idaho - Aislinn, Pascal

Montana - Rhonda

Nevada - Stephen, Sig

New Mexico - Mark, Erwin, Neal, Cimber

North Dakota - David

Oregon - Brandy

South Dakota -

Utah - Jay

Washington - Farren

Wyoming - Ben

WRAP - Tom, Mary, Shawn CIRA

Feds - Pat Brewer, Mike Barna

Ramboll - Ralph, Tejas

Pima County

EPA - Gail

**Update on what states submitted for the 2028 PAC run – Farren (presentation posted to website)**

Farren explained the first slide which shows the potential additional reductions of NOx, SOx, and PM provided by seven western states that can be submitted for the upcoming modeling run. The reductions are mostly from Oil& Gas activities and from non-EGU sources. It is suggested that there be a common naming protocol for the various modeling runs to reflect the different purposes (inputs and expected use for outcomes.)

Some states stressed the values in the list are estimates that have not been made enforceable yet, or, were based on percentage reductions rather than absolute reductions. They asked that the chart be posted on the website with amendments/notations that emphasize this and asked the meeting notes reflect clarifications:

* Many states gave estimates based on what they know thus far
* New Mexico submitted estimates of percentage reductions, that were then converted to tons, so the estimates in the list may need to be recalculated.

Other states were concerned that charts posted to the website would be misinterpreted as absolute and enforceable while they are actually estimates for the purpose of a sensitivity run to gauge potential impacts from reductions. The next run (referenced as Round 2 for the time being) would likely have the bulk of reductions from the 4-factor analyses of states.

Colorado asked for clarifications on the purpose of this “Round 1” sensitivity modeling run, since CO did not yet have all the reductions that might come out of 4-factor analyses. Idaho thought estimates were good effort for sensitivity run purposes. California noted that currently known “new” reductions, beyond that submitted as the California 2028 forecast, are small and would be augmented by further 4-factor and other reductions not yet in model-ready format. Not all states have final 4-factor reductions but the ones listed are suitable to be modeled in a sensitivity run.

Tom Moore explained that this Round 1 run could be used for WEP analysis and sector impact analysis through source apportionment. He also mentioned that the Round 2 “summer run” with additional reduction inputs confirmed by states by July could be used to include more definitive reductions (or emissions growth.) There could be an additional run with all “final” reductions in the SIP maybe 6 months later, in 2021, since resources are available. Of concern is when all states will actually be able to quantify every enforceable reduction to be included in their reasonable progress demonstration. Each state also has different time requirements for procedural reviews prior to the SIP due date, which may require them to move forward with whatever modeling results are available.

A discussion followed about how the modeling results from sensitivity scenarios and a potential final run would be used for the RP goals and the reasonable progress demonstrations. Tom emphasized that these two sensitivity modeling runs may not necessarily deliver a precise RPG, but they would inform a state’s decision for setting RPGs. He stated the final decision for RPGs were individual state responsibilities using the regional modeling results and individual state knowledge of enforceable reductions and commitments. The WEP analysis and the source apportionment results that come from the modeling scenarios should also be used as weight of evidence.

Stakeholders will want a clear understanding of how reductions (potential, estimated, and real or enforceable) relate to modeling runs. Tom Moore committed to take on that explanation as an Action Item. Perhaps a future modeling run would be useful for the mid-course Progress Report.

Pat Brewer asked how states would use the study report on potential reductions from oil & gas activities prepared by the Oil & Gas Work Group and whether that analysis fit into Round 1 or Round 2 modeling. Several states said they would use the report to help with the 4-factor analysis because it clearly laid out controls options and costs in an easy-to-use spread sheet tool. New Mexico noted that the study helped them estimate reductions but that final calculations were in the works. That means further reductions and changes to estimates could be included in Round 2. Farren asked what reductions States could have ready by July 1 for Round 2 modeling.

Arizona asked about post-processing and what to do if the runs had very different results because States could have changes in the potential vs. actual (enforceable) reductions. California asked for clarity regarding the timing of the various runs. EPA Region 9 has stressed that modeling and RPGs must be related to enforceable reductions. It was suggested that affected states have a separate discussion with Region 9. States are concerned about SIP approvability based on past experience. The modeling is valuable for confirming impacts of changes in emissions, in addition to providing the foundation for setting progress goals and developing reasonable progress demonstrations, whether or not every single reduction is included.

1. Reminder to attend RTOWG call/WebEx on March 31st at 11 am MDT

Contact Tom Moore for more information. That call will review several items of interest to folks on the EI&MP Subcommittee list. Likely discussion topics are source apportionment from the 2028 OTW/OTB run and WEP results. Send an email to Tom if you would like to be included on the email list.

1. Next Call – April 30 @ 11 am PDT (Notes: New Mexico)

Action Items:

* Tom Moore will prepare short descriptions of input and purpose of modeling runs and work with modelers to come up with consistent naming conventions to help with stakeholder interactions
* Farren H-T will work with New Mexico on the Oil& gas estimates for Round I sensitivity
* The posted chart will include emphasizing reference to the estimates nature of sensitivity modeling runs, as will the meeting notes
* Sates will get back to Farren H-T on whether they can have reductions ready for “Round 2” by July 1, with consideration of how much of those are confirmed 4-factor reductions (caveat: not likely to extend deadline more than a few weeks)