# WRAP RHPWG Monitoring & Glide Slope Workgroup

Notes - Conference Call July 12, 2018

1. Roll Call

Ryan Templeton

Cindy Hollenberg

Brandon McGuire

Kristen Martin

Frank Forsgren

Phil Allen

Jay Baker

Pat Brewer

Tina Suarez-Murias

1. Administrative
	1. Current Notes – New Mexico (Nevada will take notes on 7/26 call)
	2. Workgroup/Subcommittee updates

**Shared Database** – Pat Brewer’s presentation on TSS 2 this morning: graphic displays include maps, annual comparisons of haziest days and MID, and daily sorts by calendar date, haziest days, MID; R and Excel tools may stay available without being put on TSS

* 1. Subcommittee Sharefile link: <https://azdeq.sharefile.com/d-sc6c4f002be1402ca>
	2. MID & E3 Estimation Alternatives: <https://azdeq.sharefile.com/d-s86d15e6aae54688b>
	3. Subcommittee Summary Document: <https://azdeq.sharefile.com/d-s42bb94a11d143089>
1. MID, E3, and Natural Conditions Estimation Alternatives Discussion (based on above document)

Various ways to modify the default calculation but that doesn’t mean the results are more accurate

* various modifications considered
* alteration of guidance method (completely different calculation)
* ground-truthing possibilities

Pros and cons added for each approach. No recommendations so far. Would like group to come to consensus. May be useful for states to use at sites where the conventional method doesn’t make sense – can be helpful to understand what’s happening. Not every state will be able to do all of the analysis for every site. Tweaking the E3 threshold doesn’t change the results much. The 95th percentile threshold seems to do a decent job of catching the e3. HI and AK are already looking at different methods because the recommended method doesn’t work for them. We likely won’t have complete regional consistency, even if we have an overall recommended approach. Communication is important. We can also recommend other methods (like adjusting the endpoint) for sites where the 95th percentile method doesn’t make sense. For example, what might happen if we adjust for low-level wildfires that weren’t captured by this methodology? Does it make a difference?

Might there be another metric to consider for modeling? Will need to coordinate with the Modeling/Emissions Inventory Subcommittee. Photochemical modeling delivers the mass concentrations of each species at each monitor; then, there is post-processing. This is where we may want to offer input, such as variables to consider. Do we process according to EPA guidance and let states do further work for apparent anomalies? Each year and each site could be different, based on the events that affect the results. States can “fine tune” the results, but this may or may not affect what goes onto the TSS 2.

We, as a group, should discuss these types of options with states, so that we have as much consistency as possible. We should also update this document with recommendations and suggestions for which options may be more appropriate in different situations.

Is there a way to vary the non-episodic (natural) carbon for some sites? Is this something that we should contract for? Should we develop criteria for judging the recommended metric? e.g., Is the metric picking up all the days with high nitrate and high sulfate? Is there a carbon impact that can’t be explained by anthropogenic activity? Does the adjustment change more than, say, 3 days?

Might there be two metrics (one for monitoring and choosing the MID and one for demonstrating progress)? Dynamic modeling might help us by comparing various model outputs for demonstrating progress.

Should we recommend that states use EPA’s method, then offer states other options if they see that changing the threshold would change more than 3 e3 days? Do we need more research on these other options? We can make recommendations on when some other options may be most appropriate. We may want to define considerations states need to follow (checklist?), such as who to talk to if they don’t follow the recommended method. We don’t need to worry about HI and AK being consistent with the continental U.S. western states, since they are so different.

As states start to dive into the data, there may be more interest in the methodology and how might it be altered. We may need some instruction on the available tools – perhaps at the larger RHPWG meetings.

1. Action Items

Ryan will send out an email asking people to review the MID/e3 document and informing them of the group’s consensus to use the EPA-recommended methodology (with caveats).

1. Next call 7/26/2018 (NV will take notes)