

EMP Coordinating Committee Call

September 11, 2024

Agenda:

- Analytic year inventory review kick off webinar on September 23 (webinar outline, slide deck, assignments)
- Starting planning for the November 6 quarterly outreach webinar
- Analytic year data package contents and review products
- Collaborative workgroup updates

Notes

Alison is out until tomorrow. Jeff is taking over Alison's role as co-chair of the Coordinating Committee (while Alison is on detail).

September 23 kick-off for the analytic year review.

Next quarterly outreach webinar on November 6.

During the last Projections Work Group call, we talked about the growth and control packets that would also be available for review.

Eventually, we need to talk about Version 2 of the EMP.

Inventory Review Kick-Off Webinar

views.cira.colostate.edu/wiki/Attachments/2022%20Collaborative/quarterly/2022v1_Base_Year_Data_Rev... ☆

EPA Paychex Flex CitiBusiness Online GoToMyPC LADCO One Drive Feedly ASAP.gov Login Air Pollution Traini...

2 / 26 100%

Purpose of Today's Meeting

- Review the needs and schedule for developing the 2022v1 EMP.
- Review how stakeholders can access the 2022v1 EMP emissions and related analysis products.
- Review how stakeholders can submit questions or make comments on the 2022v1 EMP.
 - What is the scope of comments we are expecting?
 - How will we address comments that are submitted?

2

Above: Slide deck for the base year review kick-off meeting. Starting point for slide deck for AY review kick-off meeting.

Zac – Are we planning on having the analytic year inventories available for review using the Data Retrieval tool. Jeff – I don't know whether that is the plan. Karl Seltzer – It is already under way. For the tool, we are adding three additional columns (2026, 2032, and 2038).

Karl – the same mechanism for collecting comments will be used (Sharefile). People who commented on the base year will already have access.

Greg DeAngelo – during an AAPCA meeting, Scott Mathias (and Chet) commented that there was a plan to push back the SIP submittal date and that the 2038 analytic year inventories were likely to be de-emphasized. (Or, perhaps, we will not move forward with the 2038 inventory at all.) The question is: How do we want to represent that for 2038? Have the EPA EMP folks received feedback on EPA management's plans for 2038?

Jeff – I wasn't at the AAPCA meeting, but I have heard about this discussion. We have put a lot of effort into the 2038 inventory. Currently, we are planning to complete inventories, but not planning on developing model-ready files. The latter effort requires a lot of additional effort. Since the inventories are close, the discussion is that there would be value in releasing the inventories even without model-ready files.

Zac – there is merit in having projections and being able to review an emissions inventory (even if that inventory is not ultimately used for AQ modeling in support of SIP work).

Byeong – it will be important to share this information (the importance of having a properly vetted inventory) with the states. Otherwise, we may end up with different levels of quality in the different analytic years.

Zac – I think that message needs to come from EPA.

Jeff – are you saying that, when people are reviewing the data, they may put less effort into reviewing 2038 than they put into reviewing 2026 and 2032 data? One concern is that often catch problems with other years when you review all of the analytic years.

Zac – I don't think it is our role to speculate on what the AY inventories will be used for. (Whether for AQ modeling or for other purposes.) That isn't the message of this collaborative.

Tom Moore – the visibility protection rule applies to every single state. The data we are presenting are highly uncertain in any event. This is part of the dialog we are having on how meaningful projections are when we look that far into the future.

Zac – we can be upfront with our discussions regarding probable use of the AY inventories, but we don't want to just restate the information that was shared at the AAPCA meeting.

Byeong – If we elect to build a 2038 inventory, I hope that it receives the same level of scrutiny as the other AYs. I think we are on the same page.

Zac – at the last kick-off meeting, Karl provided live demos of the Data Review Tool. Are you thinking about doing a demo for the kick-off meeting? Karl – The tools should be ready as long as the inventories are ready.

Zac – the slides we already have are a good starting point. What other considerations should we emphasize during the AY review kick-off meeting.

Tom Moore – Are there sectors where we want to identify the changes that may be made in Version 2? Zac – do we know that? Other than for the oil and gas sector.

Jeff – it is a somewhat strong possibility for oil and gas. Tom Moore – what about nonroad? Jeff – I am not aware of any new changes that may be made in Version 2.

Discussion of what we should say about Version 2.

Zac – We know that there will likely be changes (e.g., due to MOVES5 and different projections approaches for oil and gas) and we could tee up that discussion.

What is different in our emphasis for the AY kick-off meeting when compared to what we emphasized for the base year review kick-off.

Suggestion that focusing on the growth and control packets and other resources (workbooks) might be helpful for reviewers. Change in emphasis from the greater reliance on the data review tool (for the base year review) to a focus on growth and control packets and workbooks used to generate growth and control packets (for the AY review).

Zac and Jeff – discussion of how we would do that in the kick-off meeting.

Zac – will the growth and control packets for all sectors be available? Jeff – probably not. There will likely be one or two that are behind the others. But we should have a good chunk of the packets available by September 23.

Jeff – For suggestions on slides: it is pretty easy for some participants to know which sectors are projected (growth and controls) and which aren't being projected. It would be helpful to be explicit about that.

Jeff – In addition, during the review period, states can recommend alternative projections approaches or different emission factors in future years, but that might be something that we need to relay to others. That might best be addressed during the comment method slides.

Zac – Any other suggestions? It will most likely be a summary of data available, the data retrieval tool, availability of growth and control packets, which sectors will be projected and which will not, how to submit comments, possible different approaches for Version 2, and a discussion of the AYs suggested and why.

Zac will build a template and will put in assignments for sections for people to add content. Goal: content contributions by September 19 so Zac can finalize the slide deck.

Next Quarterly Outreach Call

Looking at plots of the base and future year inventories would be appropriate. Show the differences. Start talking about what Version 2 will look like.

Mary Uhl – we haven't really had a detailed retrospective look at v1 and consideration of what we might want to adjust for v2. Maybe we want to set aside some time (in October) for this group to share thoughts.

Zac – that is a good idea. We also will want to look at AQ modeling results to help inform our evaluation of v1 and consideration of what changes we might want to make in v2.

There is a Collaborative Meeting that conflicts with a NACAA meeting.

We may want to open up this discussion to a wider group (than just the Coordinating Committee). Solicit broader feedback from the community. Ask about concerns about the schedule, etc. Qualitative feedback.

Timing of this meeting: When would we hold this?

Zac – we could solicit feedback regarding the process. We could also use a survey to gather feedback. Possibly an in-line survey during the Quarterly Outreach.

Discussion of the subjects of the Outreach. It would be helpful to have initial modeling results.

Joey Huang – we will not have a modeling TSD ready in time to share by November 6. It will likely be the end of this year or early next year. Zac – We can mention that schedule and give a quick overview of the modeling work that is underway (model performance evaluation).

Joey – the 36 km modeling will likely be finished and we could provide some initial discussion of those results.

Zac – we can get working on the slide deck in October. May need to reschedule our Coord Comm call later so it doesn't conflict with the NACAA meeting.

Analytic Year Data Package Contents and Review Products

Zac – need to think about how this information is shared. Do we create a shared directory that gets pointed to as part of the platform package? What are the expectations? For example, Susan McCusker put together a complicated spreadsheet for the industrial point projections. May not want to burden Susan with the requirement to answer a huge volume of questions regarding the spreadsheet.

Zac – could we hand off those materials to Jeff for posting on the EPA ftp site? Jeff – that sounds like a good idea, but need to check with Alison. Zac – concerned about documentation. How much is that available? Lindsay – the collaborative wiki already contains quite a bit of documentation.

Zac – do we gather all the information and park it on the ftp site? Or do we move the supporting information to the wiki?

Jeff – we could post control packets and related information. People could reach out to sector co-leads if they have questions. The co-leads could point people to the information (README, alternative documentation, the wiki, etc.) that would be helpful.

Susan – if the control packets could include a column with a brief description of the underlying data that had been used to develop the factor, would that be enough?

Zac – if EPA has time to add that information, that would be helpful. But do we want to be pro-active and post the additional information in a single location in advance?

Susan – for industrial point, we could post the underlying data (AEO data but also information that may have been used to supplement the AEO data). Susan will think more about the information that could be posted and how much additional work that might require.

Zac – what is the form of the spreadsheets and supporting data that were used for nonpoint? Lindsay – that information is available in a workbook. We could share those data.

Zac – it sounds like our request is to post the information and suggest that people reach out to the sector co-leads if they have questions.

Next call – October 16.

Zac should have a slide deck template ready by tomorrow.

Meeting ended at 2:00 pm Central.