**Control Measures Subcommittee Meeting Agenda and Draft Notes:**

**February 18, 2020**

1. **Roll call.**

**Attendance:**

* **AZ:** Elias Toon, Tiffany Andersen Volcko
* **CA:** Tina Suarez-Murias
* **CO:** Curt Taipale, Weston Carloss
* **ID:** Aislinn Johns
* **MT:** Rhonda Payne
* **NM:** Mark Jones, Kerwin Singleton
* **ND:** David Stroh
* **NV:** Steven McNeese
* **UT:** Jay Baker
* **OR:** Phil Allen
* **WA:** Farren Herron-Thorpe
* **WESTAR:** Mary Uhl

**2. Volunteer for note taking.**

Weston (CO) and Aislinn (ID) volunteered to take notes.

**3. Approve meeting notes from last two calls.**

* November Notes- approved, no comments
* January Notes- Tina gave comments to fix conversation from CA, ND added Rhannon Thorton to list of attendees.

**4. Discussion on control costs ($/ton) considerations among states**

Question - How are states deciding what is a reasonable cost of control?

Question - Are states setting a specific cost threshold or using ranges?

* Curt asked if there were any follow up questions, there were none.

**5.a Discussion on estimating the emissions reduction for the control scenario**

**5.b Discussion of establishing a firm date for providing emission reduction estimates to the contractor** – **March 16**

* Curt: EI and Modeling group need estimates from states for control scenario modeling March 16th 2020. Some states haven’t received 4-factor Analyses, or are still looking through the so it may be difficult to make firm estimates. Unlike Nonattainment SIPs, the permittable and enforceable requirements for controls may not be as stringent for Regional Haze SIPs. During the first round of Regional Haze, states gave estimates to be modeled and some of those controls were implemented and some were not. So what was actually modeled for the first implementation period was a little different than reality. It may be similar this round. Curt asks where states are in this process and some feedback. Need estimates by March 16th.
  + **CO**- (Curt) Still going through four-factor analyses (4FAs), requested more information from sources. They think they will be submitting baseline projections, because they are not comfortable with submitting control scenario emission reduction estimates at this time. Colorado likely won’t know what controls will actually be put on until fall. Not forecasting any reductions. Colorado will likely see some reductions but won’t firmly commit at this time for modeling.
  + **WA**- (Farren) similar situation as CO, won’t have 4FAs completed by March 16th. WA knows where potential reductions will be coming from two sectors; oil refineries and wood boiler sectors. WA requires a rule to be made if more than 2 sources are involved, so there will be some time before anything is finalized. They plan on making a rough estimate (500-700 tpy reduction) for oil refineries, but won’t report reduction estimates on boilers. Most of their reductions will be coming from coal power plant shut down that was submitted in the OTB OTW run.
  + **AZ**- (Elias) the Regional Haze Rule says that RPG controls need to be based on modeling so they will be making their best guess and hopefully will only have to make small changes to their estimates. AZ has solicited more information from sources. AZ is narrowing in on best controls for their sources using available information for best case, but maybe not getting exact vendor quotes. They are planning to make small tweaks based on best guess for point and nonpoint sources and plan on meeting the deadline of March 16th. Too early to tell whether it’s thousands or hundreds of tons reduction.
  + **CA**- (Tina) during the screening process, CA identified a number of sources that had put on controls since 2016 since moving onto the grid instead of onsite power. Where they are seeing these additional reductions it’s in the hundreds of tons mostly for NOx, and a little SOx). CA has other programs requiring reductions, but might not be as close to a class 1 area to have made the Q/d screening, but they might include those.
  + **Curt**- These reductions are in a SIP and could potentially put you in a backsliding situation if the reductions you put in the SIP are higher than the reductions from actual controls. Curt cautions to make sure states are comfortable with any reductions the put into the SIP.
  + **ID-** (Aislinn) ID just received the last of their 4FAs and is still looking through those. We hope to make the March deadline, but likely any reductions that will be made are in the 100s of tons range.
  + **OR**- Phil, D sent out letters, but hasn’t received any information back and will likely not hear back until summer or fall of 2020.
  + **UT**- Jay: similar to CO, ND is not sure the will be able to give an estimate by the deadline. They are still working through 8 sources and waiting for additional feedback. ND will likely go with OTB/OTW estimates. They’ve had a lot of reductions since 2014 and even 2018 to meet NAAQS that they will look at to make a best guess.
  + **Curt**- CO requirement to adopt rules through the commission and seek legislature approval, so won’t actually know reductions until spring 2021. They have has substantial reductions that they reported in the OTB/OTW from retirements.
  + **UT**-(Jay) wanted to use reductions from ozone SIP in our RH SIP, but the timeline is off. Looking at reductions in oil and gas but UT likely won’t report it in RH SIP but will be in OZONE SIP, so they will mention these reductions in the progress report.
  + **NM-(**Mark) this is new information that some states are going with 2028 OTW/OTB, NM is similar with other states and still analyzing 4FAs.They will provide their best estimates for oil and gas sources and EGUs, using the WRAP oil and gas work group document to identify controls. They have one EGU shutdown (zeroed out emissions), but there is uncertainty with the other EGU on their list. NM has requested a supplemental 4FA but unsure what will happen and how this information will be incorporated this period. They are currently developing rules to reduce ozone precursors that they will report later on in the progress report.
  + **MT**- (Rhonda) agreed with NM about not knowing states could submit 2028 OTB/OTW estimates. Most of their reductions came from Colstrip (25% emissions) shutdown and will submit those estimates. They had 17 sources that they requested 4FAs from, still reviewing and will report on some EGU closures. In some of the 4FAs, some sources will have non air environmental impacts (wood products industry) that prevented some cost effective controls. Likely will go with OTB/OTW estimates.
  + **ND**- (David) same boat as AZ, pretty much ready to go. Will give their best guess and want to know what the best case scenario reductions can be (1000s of tons of reductions).
  + **NV-** (Steven) waiting for one more facility to submit 4FA, 2 facilities of company waiting for final information in March. Hoping to submit in March if they get the information in time.

**6. Update on each state's four-factor work**

No additional comments

**7. Other Topics?**

Feel free to email Curt with Questions and other topics. **Next call in March 23rd 10-11 MST**

Curt: recap, states will be working on emissions for control scenarios estimates. States are going to try but may have to rely on the OTB TW runs in 2028. Please send any topic suggestions to Curt and he will attach to the agenda