Regional Haze Planning Work Group (RHPWG)

Emissions Inventory and Modeling Protocol

May 9, 2019 Conference call

10:00AM – 1100AM PDT

Agenda Notes:

1)     Welcome, Roll Call, Agenda Review – Farren

Roll Call

Alaska – Paul and Molly

Arizona – Pima Cnty; Elias

California – Tina; Mark Hixson;

Colorado – Curt Taipale; Kevin Briggs; Kira Shrunkwhiler; Dale Wells

Nevada – Brenda

N.D. – Angie and David Stroh

Utah – Jay Baker

Washington – Farren and Gary H.; Phil G.

Wyoming – Ben Weigh

WRAP – Tom Moore;

CIRA – Rodger Ames

FLMs – Pat Brewer; Mike Barna;

Gail Tonneson

Ralph Morris

a.      Note taking duties? (note takers: Washington: Gary Huitsing, Phil Gent)

10:04AM PDT: roll call

2)     Review late Spring 2019 Subcommittee work:

a.      Finalize actual 2014 EI input corrections for Shakeout v2 modeling scenario

10:10AM PDT

Farren:

* Data from Yuma county was passed onto EI at UMC

10:11AM PDT

Tom

* Dale and oil and gas states have reviewed V1 data.  V2 data is coming from Ramboll and is in the pipeline for delivery this month to emission model contractor. SCC level changes in version 2.

Mark

* CA wholesale replacement progress.  Mark delivered initial set of FF10 files to BH in mid-April and is working on a few revisions (mobile/*n*onroad/airport).  Merging into EI data is on-going.  Approximately 1 to 1.5 weeks out from delivery everything.  Waiting on some spacial surrogate and speciation data and ocean-going vessel data.  Mark has a manifest used with UMC to use as a checklist.  CA is suppling airport data to BH for use in the EI.

Tom

* Found a miscoded small generating unit power plant into the oil and gas sector.  Request is to review and see if small power plants are not classified into the EGU.  Some power plants out there should be in the EGU sector. States should review for misclassifications.

North Dakota

* Non CAMD (Clean Air Markets Divisiion) units. Some are “other” sources and don’t fit.

Tom

* Rerun GOESCHEM model (2014). International EI for V2.  Then will zero out certain sectors to determine sensitivity for each compared to the whole. To find out how much int’l anthro is present.

Molly

* Alaska has provided non-point point sources to other workgroups and wanted to know if they have or should be discussed here.

Brenda

* (not CAMD). Nevada had a question about EGU coding to ensure that their submitted EGU (in March) had been binned in the EGU bin.  Small cogen – we had a half dozen.

Tom

* Response from Tom was that Nevada’s binning was already done.

2.b.     Each state to review and change from actual 2014 as needed, the EI data for point sources to then use in 2013-17 Current/Representative Baseline modeling scenario (review due date and procedural steps)

10:22AM PDT (C:\Users\ghui461\Pictures\untitled.pnghold musicC:\Users\ghui461\Pictures\untitled.png)

Tom and Farren

* Last meeting established a June 14 deadline for submission of corrections.  This date was pushed out to June 20.
* We are looking for an idea of what each state is planning on doing, so they can ensure correct data is given to modelling contractor.  Request for an email update on status of what is going on wrt representative baseline emissions for pt sources & modeling.
* If non-EGU 2014 EI is being used, what data is being used to make sure that data stays?

David from ND

* We are on-track to submit 2013-2017 rep data late May or early June.  Put together modeling scenario from V2 spreadsheet.  Was replacing the facility 1-6 holders in the spreadsheet with actual ND data.  Updating that column is ‘summer’ work

Brenda from NV

* Is updating the same spreadsheet and putting emissions down for the years.  NV will work with the EPA EIs for updates. Anything else we need to do?

Farren

* Yes. Need annual data but in FF10 format.

Tom

* Brenda, we need the data Farren mentioned. Be very surgical to decide what you need to change from 2014 to more representative data.

Tina CA

* Tina asked about 2028 forecast data for CA.  If we give 2028 forecast data, how important is rep baseline data?

Farren

* The baseline is needed for what is being compared to, so it is very important.

Tom

* We only ask is if the 2014 data is representative for baseline comparison. This is what is used to project toward the 2028 forecast. If not, you may want to change sthe 2014 data as needed. The EGUs have already been analyzed, so this is to look at this – we don’t want non –EGUs in the EGU category.

Farren

* Washington EGU FF10 formats are already complete and do not need to be submitted. Is that right Phil/Gary H.

Phil

* Yes. We’re good.

10:33AM PDT

3)     Review Summer 2019 Subcommittee work:

 a.      Preparing 2028 on the books (OTB) EI inputs – discuss procedures and complete work over the Summer

Tom

* We need to know who will do what (knowing CA has unique issue) mid-August deadline for submission.
* Mobile/MOVES data -> contractor
* Non EGU pt sources to 2018 -> State by state
* I propose a table to show needs to do what. Use a straw person approach to identify what is being provided and whom is doing the work.  Looking at closing or changing facilities.  # of sectors would not change. Example: Biogenic inputs would not change from past to future.  Wind blown dust would not change from baseline to 2028.
* Desire is to distribute table by mid-June and discuss at the next sub committee meeting.

Farren

* Ok. Will distribute when ready

Tom

* For states with non-attainment areas, then additional work would be needed.  Need to make sure projections for areas are in line with plans for the areas.

Elias

* Question about some values not showing any changes.

Tom

* Example is windblown dust.  This is based on disturbance as the MET data is not changing in accordance with EPA guidance.  Thus it is reasonable to hold wind blown dust constant.

Elias

* Biogenics too?

Tom

* Biogenics is function of MET also. So biogenics held contant. Megan/Vice models have some discrepancie to be added also, but generally, we do not change when projecting to future year

10:40AM PDT

b.     Discuss and begin documentation of 2028 source apportionment analysis during Summer

Tom

* Proposal is for a simple overview/white paper of 2028 source apportionment that can be distributed for discussion for mid-June call. Ramboll is the expert. It takes lots of process time. I hope to use this subcommittee to review. A high level review to address regional transport rather than how particulate sources effect eachother.

Farren

* Weighted emissions can be considered also.

Tom

* Great point.

4)     Next Subcommittee call – June 27th, 1200 PM MDT

 Farren

* Next call, we’re back to the last Thursday of the month at 12PM Mountain; 11AM PDT.
* Jay/Utah is schedule for notes for that call

Jay

* Will do.

5)     other

Request for a quick line item of what is being submitted.  Also if nothing is being submitted, please let us know.  If more time is needed, then please let us know.