# WRAP RHPWG Monitoring & Glide Slope Workgroup

Conference Call May 17, 2018

Agenda:

1. Roll Call
	1. AZ (Ryan, Elias), Montana (Kristen, Rebecca), WRAP (Tom), Nevada (Frank), New Mexico (Cindy), Wyoming (Amber), California (Tina)
2. Administrative
	1. Current Notes – Arizona / Idaho
	2. Workgroup/Subcommittee updates
		1. Shared Database Sub
			1. WRAP has hired CERA to improve upon regional haze database. One of the big work group calls they may give a demonstration.
3. Review/update May task schedule
	1. R code for processing monitoring data was sent out last week. Ryan posted it to ADEQ's FTP site so contact Ryan if you are having any issue downloading it.
	2. Ryan: Developing a short term schedule for the rest of the month. Ryan sent out quite a few documents. On the second page of the "Workgroup subcommittee tasks" document, you can see some of the short-term deadlines that Ryan developed. Contact Ryan to make changes or add more tasks once everyone has had a chance to review.
	3. Tom: Outline goals as documentation. Keep them as living documents, then finalize them as we gain more data and tools. Also consider interaction with the IMPROVE committee, may want to have a call with Scott Copeland, Gordon, and Bob Lebens to interface with them.
4. Call for volunteers – technical analyses and drafting summary report
	1. Technical Analyses
		1. Kristen and Ryan volunteered
	2. Drafting Summary Report
		1. Cindy and Tina volunteered
		2. Topics summary document should cover:
			1. What is the most appropriate way to isolate the most impaired days? Are we getting E3 events through some other methods that the EPA metric is not identifying?
			2. Building a list of MID analyses done to date and a review of those analyses (e.g. pros, cons, future work, recommendations, etc).
			3. Discussion of what is the MID, what are the requirements for MID estimation and what is just guidance from EPA.
			4. Outlining subcommittee tasks vs State tasks vs contractor tasks
5. Tom Moore recommended that that the monitoring subcommittee establishes a core group with more people hopefully joining as time goes by.
	1. Identify the goals and objectives of doing the technical analysis in an outline to circulate more broadly. Tina and Jay have a RH planning meeting in June and this may help them to report on.
	2. Frame technical analysis in terms of what questions we’re trying to answer and keeping in mind what needs to be done now vs later
	3. Tom will send an example on how WRAP documented how the monitoring data was treated the last time in the TSS from the last implementation period.
	4. Interact more with the IMPROVE committee who helped create the data to talk about what the committee is thinking of doing
	5. Leverage contractor help as much as possible. Ideally, contractors could work more uniformly and result in more transparency in how the monitoring data was sorted and analyzed in all the different ways that we agreed on so that everyone from the 15 states can get around it and understand how the data was treated.
6. Discuss technical analyses for MID estimation and/or testing E3 threshold
	1. Ryan: Also put together another document called "MID and E3 Estimation Alternatives" that identifies some potential EPA MID alternatives.
		1. We may want to add more, document analyses of these metrics, and then document those decisions in the white paper documentation.
		2. Other ideas?
			1. Frank: Dynamic model evaluations may shed light on how we are going to solve some of these issues.
			2. Frank: looking at HYSPLIT and fire locations data to see what days were impacted to confirm the natural episodic events. Also wondered if WRAP would be doing any dynamic model evaluation and whether these results might feed into the monitoring analysis to help resolve the issue of picking the right method to ID E3s.
			3. Tina: Main reason we are looking at other metrics is that smoke from of the wildfires are far reaching, some of these approaches will not work due to the resources and time constraints. Still in need of a dust incident detection method, recent R code from Kristen does not include an E3 dust threshold.
			4. Tina: Smoke from wildfires can be really far reaching and make the argument for why we may need to change the threshold form 95th percentile. While there’s not enough time to do HYSPLIT on all 85 sites, we can pick a good representative case study or if a state knows that they had a few bad years of wildfires, might rely on HYSPLIT more. We however need to keep analyses fairly similar across states but some states may not have resources to do as much as others.
			5. Tom: Create a uniform plan that all 15 states can depend on. Have to worry about dependencies that may not be weighted when individual states diverge in processing the data. Ideally we would have a contractor perform an analysis on the record.
	2. Tom: In the scoping papers: make some comments about how well you can know whether a day is an E3 day and talk about whether it is objective or not. What are impaired days beyond the dataset?
	3. Ryan: Doing work with the NCII values and carbon. Scott says they are pretty close to finishing the carbon data but stated that they are going to be looking at other tweaks that they make to the calculations. Makes it difficult for us to work with the data if it is changing.
	4. Bob: We can bring up this issue with the IMPROVE committee and let them know our concerns with needing the data frozen at a specific point in time.
7. Action Items
	1. Tom Moore will send out a white paper off the TSS of how the data was handled in the first planning period.
	2. Tom Moore will send out link to the weighted emission tool from the last round.
	3. Ryan will send out an email asking for additional people to help out with the drafting of the documentation and the technical analyses
	4. Ryan will reach out to IMPROVE, Scott, and Bob to coordinate a call/meeting to work together.
8. Next Call
	1. 5/25/2018 at 12:00-1:00pm AZ Time