# WRAP RHPWG Monitoring & Glide Slope Workgroup

Conference Call July 26, 2018

Agenda:

1. Roll Call

*Ryan Templeton, Tina Suarez-Murias, Brandon McGuire, Kristen Martin, Pat Brewer, Frank Forsgren, Cindy Hollenberg, Phil Allen, Bob Lebens*

1. Administrative
   1. Current Notes – Nevada (Washington will take notes on 8/9 call)
   2. Workgroup/Subcommittee updates

*The Control Measures Subcommittee has established regular calls on the 4th Wednesday of the month.*

* 1. Subcommittee Sharefile link: <https://azdeq.sharefile.com/d-sc6c4f002be1402ca>
     1. Subcommittee Summary Document: <https://azdeq.sharefile.com/d-s42bb94a11d143089>
     2. MID & E3 Estimation Alternatives: <https://azdeq.sharefile.com/d-s86d15e6aae54688b>

1. Discussion on MID and E3 Conditions Estimations
   1. Criteria for States to evaluate EPA metric?

*Reviewed jpeg and graph documenting the change in the days included by 36 various extreme episodic event (E3) thresholds noting sites dominated by natural events are most sensitive to variations of the threshold. California noted three criteria for metric; Is it picking up all high SO2/NOx days?, Is it removing all high fire days?, and Is it pulling out prescribed fire days? Pat reminded group that some fire signatures will remain since the process removes only the atypical fire impacts.*

*Evaluating the remaining anthropogenic carbon and dust on non-E3 days may inform metric decision. Noted that E3 threshold only evaluated for carbon, not dust. Montana noted general low level smoke impacts during summer months not removed by E3 threshold. Generally, the EPA method is working but further investigation at some individual sites may reveal carbon and dust spikes that require explanation or the need to make site specific modifications to the metric. Montana to evaluate how “bad” days influence annual deciview and speciated extinction, which may inform a delta deciview threshold for modifying EPA’s MID approach.*

*Discussed potential criteria to inform the need to adjust the E3 threshold under specific conditions identified by host state and suggested development of a comparative analysis evaluation matrix to compare EPA method with varying thresholds. Noted that different E3 thresholds could complicate post-processing of model output. Noted need to explore resolution of monitor data and model output with Regional Technical Operations Work Group. New Mexico committed to performing additional analyses to determine if MID selection is adequate or if days need to be removed from the dataset. Started discussion of routine natural conditions.*

* 1. Subcommittee recommended alternatives to EPA’s metric (when needed)?

*Not discussed due to time constraints.*

* 1. Future Work (specifically contractor tasks)

*Discussed potential contractor tasks to further develop MID datasets and explore metric options.*

1. Natural Conditions review timeline/tasks (as time permits)

*Not discussed due to time constraints.*

1. Action Items

*Not discussed due to time constraints.*