

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dan Olson, Air Quality Administrator  
FROM: Lee Gribovicz, Regional Haze Program/E.I. Coordinator  
SUBJECT: WRAP Attribution of Haze Workgroup: Review of Phase I Report  
DATE: February 17, 2005

This date I participated in a telephone conference call for the full WRAP Attribution of Haze (AoH) Workgroup, set for Air Resource Specialists (ARS) to report on the response to comments on the draft Attribution Report, and to provide the Recommendations prepared by the AoH Report Writing subgroup (2/7 & 2/11 call notes) for proceeding under Phase II..

Call Details

To begin the call Joe Adlhoch went over the suggestions that ARS had received (identified in the AAgenda for AoH Call@: Appendix I) and reviewed how the contractor had addressed the more general comments.

Then he went over five specific comments in some detail.

***A. New section detailing the steps required for a SIP or TIP B Is this the right place? Phase II?***

There was a lot of opinion that the AoH workgroup needs to move forward with Phase II, in parallel with the Implementation Workgroup (IWG). There are a lot of gaps in the data (ie/ no evaluation of carbon, PM & etc), and it was clear that Phase I is not a complete report for the development of the SIP's & TIP's. Participants wanted this expressly stated in the introduction to the report.

There was concern that we haven't really Aproofed@ the data, to show what pieces of analysis are missing and where the data might be contradictory. There was a suggestion that we need to select a sample state or Class I area, and go through a detailed review of what the AoH report says about that example.

***B. Add more examples of CIA analyses (section 3.1.2)? If so, what is basis for selection? One per state plus one tribal?***

Cathy Messerschmidt pointed out that one tribal area might not be representative of all six tribal Class I areas. Tom Moore pointed out that they tried to pick five geographically distinct Major Class I areas, and these were intended to be something to show how to pull the data together. I agreed that these samples weren't really intended to represent each jurisdiction, and we really weren't Aleaving anyone out@ by not adding any further examples.

***C. Review language for possible press releases B Is this an issue for Phase I? What steps should be taken at this stage?***

Lee Alter said that he read it with a sensitivity towards what misunderstanding could be conveyed, and he didn't feel that there was

much that could be taken out of context. And the report  
AIntroduction@ now

***D. Need to address uncertainty issues as completely as possible B  
Expecting some support from RMC on this topic. However, some  
recommendations for Phase II call for better identification of  
attribution method uncertainties, so some discussion will have to  
wait for Phase II.***

Joe Adlhoch noted that he could add something regarding uncertainty, but he pointed out that there are some points of uncertainty that really won't be addressed until Phase II. But the Aother@ category for the TSSA results is large and concerns a number of reviewers. RMC will attempt to split out this Aother@ category into something more specific. It was the general consensus that we need to emphasize the AWeight of Evidence@ concept for the conclusions of this report.

***E. Revisions that can=t be fit in under current budget and schedule:  
a) Black and white friendly graphics (information from other  
sources; DRI, RMC, etc)  
b) Other major changes to graphics (may be good candidates for Phase  
II?)  
c) Where comments conflict, ARS will use best judgment and consult  
individual members of AoH workgroup to resolve.***

Regarding black & white graphics, ARS gets a, that are out of their control, and it would be a significant task to undertake. And there was some difference of opinion on this matter, so it was concluded that we won't work to get this done in Phase I and ARS will use their best judgement for future projects.

And the Draft Recommendations for Phase II was distributed to the entire AoH workgroup in the announcement of this call. ARS wants comments on these Recommendations by February 25<sup>th</sup>, and the final report is planned to be released by March 8<sup>th</sup>.

A P P E N D I X I

Call Agenda

A P P E N D I X    I I

Draft Phase II Recommendations