

RHPWG - Emissions Inventories and Modeling Protocols Subcommittee

Conference call 8/30/2018 11am PST

wiki page link: <http://views.cira.colostate.edu/wiki/wiki/9191>

Agenda

1. Welcome, Roll Call, Note Taking – Farren

Note Taker: Brenda Harpring, NV

WA – Farren Herron-Thorpe

AZ – Ryan Templeton

Pima County – Sarah Reitmeyer, **who else from Pima County was on the call?**

OR – None from Oregon

NM – Cindy Hollenberg, Roslyn Higgin

CO – Dale Wells, Curt Taipale, Jeremy Neustifter, Kevin Briggs

MT – Stephen Coe, Rhonda Payne

NV – Brenda Harpring, Frank Forsgren

UT – Jay Baker

WRAP-WESTAR – Tom Moore

NPS – Pat Brewer

WY – Tyler Ward

CIRA – Rodger Ames

ND – Rob White, David Stroh

CA – Stephanie Huber, Alex Huth

NPS – Mike Barna

AK – Molly Birnbaum (late)

2. Who submits minor source data to EPA? How does this vary by state in the NEI? Is this an issue for Regional Haze planning? When and to what degree to address? – Farren

Farren - Minor Source data – who submits to EPA? Before we make it a homework assignment, is this an issue for RH planning? Jay (UT) asked do you mean something different than emission factors that are already worked in? Farren – in NEI, in point source sector there are major sources that are required to report, and airports. The concern is whether or not any of the minor sources, that aren't required to be reported, are they being reported? Do we want any of the minor sources included? For WA there are two they want to be included. How does this vary across states? CA – reports everything every 3 years. NV reports all sources every 3 years. AZ, UT have to check but think they are similar to NV. NV reports all sources every 3 years, but Farren asked about gas stations - Pima County reports only Title V sources. Colorado has a low threshold down to 1 ton. Farren said maybe put this in a spreadsheet, include reporting thresholds. Farren will use these notes as a starting point and then send around to states. Tom Moore said Curt (CO) may want to share documentation he is working on for additional controls, and plug in minor source data into the inventory. Tom said maybe just run 2014 NEI version they have now and then in a few months make a version 2 of NEI model run that includes minor source information. Jay – said if one state is reporting smaller sources and one is not, does that vary for states that have to evaluate? Tom wants to defer to Curt. Tom - If not in modeling inventory, then can't know how it will affect. Frank (NV) – asked area sources vs minor source point sources. Dale (CO) – area sources are nonpoint, and are reported separately; Colorado doesn't double count. If a state doesn't

report nonpoint data, EPA will report for the state. Tom suggested a survey question - states to look at EPA Minor source data. Farren said they had to resubmit some of their nonpoint data because a couple of small sources weren't subtracted. Roslyn (NM) – they are moving forward on doing a minor source inventory, they haven't done one since 2002, and plan to do one for 2020. They have 150 submittals for minor sources in NM. They have thousands of minor sources in NM. The limitations in NM were due to EI staff which is just one person. She is curious what other states have for staff.

	Minors Submitted to EPA?	Minors to include in Modeling?
Alaska		
Arizona	Pima County says No – Others?	
California	Yes - All minors submitted for NEI years	
Colorado	Yes - All sources down to 1 ton	
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Montana		
Nevada	Yes - All minors submitted for NEI years	
New Mexico	No	
North Dakota	No	
Oregon		
South Dakota		
Utah		
Washington	No	2 minors being considered due to proximity to CIA
Wyoming		

3. Next steps for Unpaved Road Dust analysis - Farren

Farren - If go into wiki for this workgroup and into July 26 materials list, "Comparison of 2011 to 2014 NEI v2 PM10 for unpaved road dust: Map of 2014 NEI v2 PM10 unpaved road dust"; Farren did calculations. Western OR is 2-8 tons of PM10/sq km, and is stark contrast with WA and CA borders of Oregon. WA and CA submitted their own unpaved road dust numbers. So big contrast. Northwest ID has big contrast with East border of WA. Farren wants OR to update their numbers, because doesn't look right. After speaking with Oregon offline, they don't have resources to do an unpaved road dust update but would like Washington to do it for them. NM has high unpaved road dust also. State borders show big contrast. Roslyn – default data for NM, they've never submitted unpaved road dust. CO not sure what submitted. Cindy (NM) asked when EPA decided to estimate this, did they take into account the number or square miles of unpaved road? She assumes that is what EPA did, since CO and NM have big difference. A possibility is that NM may have more unpaved roads. She said there are differences when cross border from NM to CO. Dale said Colorado DOT has unpaved road information, if ADT > 50 then mitigations measures must be taken. Farren, said looking at the list: Washoe County, Maricopa County, California, and Washington submitted their own unpaved numbers. Farren suggested NM look at their numbers, and he will reach out to Oregon (who is not on this call) and see why big contrast. Farren thinks rest of the map looks ok. Molly said AK did not submit to EPA, and

they have a big road dust problem, even though it doesn't show on the map. Approx. 30% reduction from EPA, she would expect AK to look more like OR. Molly needs to look at EPA's methodology. Roslyn, wants to know if we can get anyone from EPA online. Farren asked if Roslyn looked like at EPA's methodology? Roslyn said she did and thought it was general. Farren said there are folks at EPA he can contact on NOMAD committee and see if they can give us more detailed information. Farren also said there was a difference in NMIM vs MOVES. Farren asked Rodger to post unpaved road dust methodology to wiki. Molly asked about how this is used in modeling? Is this a big factor, it should be more accurate. Tom – in photochemical modeling for lower 48, these county level emissions will be gridded to 12km cells and those emissions are released in first layer of the model, there is a Transport Factor, EPA asks modelers to use, turns down transport based on vegetation and density, approved light extinction equation 1 unit of fine soil = 1 unit of light extinction, vs 1 unit of coarse material = .6 units of light extinction. Dale – database on NOMAD share point site of Colorado's data. Jennifer Snyder, EPA, has upcoming training in September on NOMAD.

4. Oil & Gas Notice of Intent sources to be included in modeling for future scenario (NM has 3500 NOIs) – Farren and Roslyn Higgin

Roslyn, - NOI – not a permit (Notice of Intent, not necessarily a permit), how are emissions coming? NOI if have < 100 tons/ year of VOCs and 10-25 of Criteria Pollutants. Do other states have something similar of this permit or NOI and how we deal with it? Dale (CO) they have notices and they have to file those. General permit for O&G and they permit all O&G facilities that have emissions. Curt – said if want to get baseline correct, need to deal with all sources, particularly with O&G don't want to plug in all NOI's because often all don't end up being drilled. Cindy (NM) this is reason want to do this minor source inventory, it's not real information, it's just possibilities, not just O&G sources, they are doing all minor source inventory – comprehensive – synthetic minors. Tom – O&G minor source question is being addressed by group Mark Jones is leading, and equipment they are all operating, ex. Engines that are only tallied at county level, and if don't have that information not accounting for everything. Rhonda said that MT does do minor source inventories > 25 tons / year, so have good inventory, they charge fees. MT has a registration program for O&G (1800 sources).

5. Summary of emissions updates provided to the RHPWG EI & MP Subcommittee – is more review needed? – Rodger Ames and Farren

Besides what has been provided, posted on wiki, Rodger – summarized totals across major parameters, pulled from NEIv2 and put that in Table 1. Rodger said for CA updates for 9 facilities – what Rodger sees is that updates are not that much different from what is in NEI except for ammonia. He can use all sector database from NEI, Rodger asked if numbers look right? CA – said the person from CA who provided updates to Rodger, she believes is done. Still nonpoint issues. Alex on her staff will be reaching out to Rodger, and Rodger said yes he has that information on wiki. Rodger said AZ – photochemical modeling for eastern Pima county, updates are lower, he pulled from NEI for whole Pima county, a request for GIS readme file from AZ (this is in the table). Rodger said for ID – Gary Reinbold identified residential wood sector, only reporting PM, not speciated VOC? Gary was not on call, Rodger was surprised PM numbers were higher, he expected them to be the same, he may follow-up with Gary. Rodger said he talked to Farren and numbers looked good, and for WY – two facilities not included in NEI at all. WY said – looked at facilities with variable throughputs and wondered if anything has been done in modeling yet, and Rodger said not yet, but he has that information from WY, and Rodger not sure what Tom wants to do with that.

6. Next steps on [Regional Modeling Platform](#) – seeking volunteers to review draft RFP and evaluate bidder responses – Tom

Tom seeking volunteers. Wrong link above, seeking bidders to perform regional modeling. Tom also seeking State and Federal agencies volunteers to review language in draft RFP, and then review bids that they will get. He already has 10 volunteers. Stephanie from CA said no one from their modeling group on this call, and suggest to send out email asking for volunteers. Tom will send email to Leo in CA. Tom said there are several people in CA, emissions modeling, air quality modeling, source apportionment activities, and **one more?**

7. Next call and agenda items – Farren and all

Farren – Next call is scheduled same time as NOMAD training in September, so should we cancel September or reschedule? Tom said best to reschedule in late September. Tom would like recommendations of v1 of 2014 NEI, there needs to be a document drafted, and then use that in the call in late September to review document. Farren said had a 9 am call initially, he will send out a doodle poll. Next call is scheduled for 2 pm Pacific Time on September 26 (Wednesday).

Brenda asked about timing of providing stack parameter information? Tom said Round 1 review is complete, is ideal to complete and then have document that says that? Rhonda – interested in specific stack parameter data for MT also. Since file is large (50 MB) for all states, Farren will send out specific detailed information for NV and MT. Farren said the modelers may decide to run the fugitive sources, as fugitive sources and not as point sources. To be decided.

Materials

1. [EI Updates Summary Table](#)