

**Notes from Conference Call with SSJF/Projections Work Group
January 11, 2005**

On the call:

Work Group: Pat Cummins, Lee Alter, Tom Moore, Lori Campbell, Dennis Schwehr, Jeff Yockey, Bob Downing

ERG: Paula Fields, Mae Thomas

Agenda:

- C Review ERG's scope of work and schedule
- C Review ERG's initial work plan
- C Discuss potential overlaps with other forums/contract/objectives

Review of ERG's scope of work and schedule

- C Paula quickly reviewed the SOW and schedule from ERG's contract
- C No particular issues were noted

Review of ERG's initial work plan

- C Paula walked through the steps (A-K of the work plan). She suggested that the deadlines for the A-F memo (summarizing findings and analysis of new projection variables) be delayed to mid-March, while the G memo (summarizing findings of new regulations impacting post-2002 emissions) is moved up to Jan. 28. The work group agreed to this change.
- C **Assumption of 85% capacity factor for EGUs.**
 - o Pat: This needs to be evaluated for 2018. Historical data are not available for EGUs in the west (2000-2001) that may reveal <85% capacity factors. This assumption was valid/appropriate for setting Section 309 milestones, but may not be appropriate for estimating 2018 baseline emissions. Get data from EPA/Acid Rain webpage and look at trends on generation based on existing units.
 - o Dennis: 85% is old and mainly applies to coal-fired units. Developed as a function of economic growth as much as generation increases.
- C **Emissions projections for California.**
 - o Tom/Pat: CA will provide their own projections. They are working on plans for compliance with CA standards, so projections will be updated, as well as their 2002 inventory; will use CEIDARS and other CA-based tools. Tina has committed to providing 2018 projections (without effects of new regulations) within the next couple of months. Entire process to be coordinated through the TOC. Tom/Lee will set up a call with Tina to discuss this process, schedule.
- C **Alaska, source categories in/out of scope.**
 - o Alaska point/area sources are in the scope of the projections task, however different methods/data will be needed as compared to those for lower-48. A call with Alice Edwards should be made to discuss the details of this process.

- Source categories not in the scope of the projections task include: fires, windblown dust, paved/unpaved roads, non- and on-road mobile.
- C **Selecting categories, setting priorities for improving projections methods/data.**
 - Pat: Regarding using land use projections to adjust future agricultural emissions, cautioned against “over-thinking” the problem, trying to force methods/data that may not be appropriate especially when there is high uncertainty in the 2002 emissions estimate. Might want to ask ourselves what level of confidence do we have in the 2002 estimates for each category as a basis for conducting research to make projections.
 - Dennis: It would be important to consider those categories impacted by new regulations (2002-2004).
 - Early Action Compacts (Denver and San Juan Co., NM) for ozone don’t really impact visibility pollutants.
 - Land use data, how they are applied to various categories, availability of projections:
 - Tom: It’s not clear if we have a single set of land use data put together for multiple uses for the WRAP. Might want to investigate the various sources in use by WRAP, availability of data needed to compile a consistent data set (e.g., satellite data). Suggest talking to Gerry Mansell (ENVIRON) on data used for windblown dust model. The data used for the Section 309 projections were problematic.
 - Action item: ERG to prepare a table by point/area source category, and various criteria/data elements affecting projections (e.g., confidence in 2002 estimates, impacts by new 2002-2004 regulations, data needed and available to project growth, control, retirement, new sources, etc.). Include fires, and dust in the table for now.
 - Tom: Consider “distributed generation” impacts on ICE projections. The effects from increased use of back-up generators in 2002 were probably not accounted for accurately in 2002 inventory. Opportunities for improvement?
- C **Projecting new growth (not replacements)**
 - Tom: Spatial allocation of new growth can be problematic. May need to use centroid of county, or other method TBD. Must be careful based on location of population centers relative to location assigned to new-growth facilities/emissions. Methodology should be applied in 2 steps: (1) based on foreseeable future (permits should identify locations of new plants), and (2) unforeseeable future (method should consider centroids of areas vs. population centers to the extent possible).
- C **Identification of new laws/regulations affecting 2002-2004 emissions**
 - Paula: ERG has already search EPA region websites and pulled SIPs/rules in timeframes of concern. Looked at EACs for Denver, San Juan Co., as well as MACT standards (much lesser of an impact).

- Tom: Don't forget about Natural Events Action Plans, requiring BACT for area sources (e.g., Pima and Yuma counties).
- C **Population and other growth indicators**
 - ERG should contact states/local agencies to determine those with own population growth projections that should be used in lieu of national data sets (e.g., Utah, Maricopa Co., Boise, Tucson, Phoenix, Reno)
 - Put specific states in table before distribution to work group
 - Also, check with MPOs. Alison Pollack (ENVIRON) compiled list of MPOs for mobile sources forum that may be useful. (Tom distributed via email.)
 - Lee: BBC, EAF contractor, might be able to interview MPOs/collect data for joint effort.
- C **Integrating future controls in CA:**
 - These would be part of the control strategy analysis, and not the 2018 baseline calculation.
- C **Accounting for Impacts of SO2 Annex:**
 - Will need to treat the "cap" as a future control impact, already in place. Thus, should move to F. in the work plan (identify laws and regulations 2002-2004).
 - Paula to make this change, along with others noted above, and send revised work plan to Lee and Brad (webmaster) to post on work group webpage
- C **Next call is scheduled for Monday, January 24 at 3:00 p.m. PST (subject to final scheduling by Lee).** Paula to distribute initial prioritization table for discussion during the call.

Post Script to the Notes:

- C Fred Roach, LANL, called Paula for debrief of call since he couldn't make it. Highlights of Fred's comments ERG work plan and approach are as follows:
 - DOE should be first source for EGU projections data. MTF data is fairly old.
 - EAF is interested in consistency in economics data used by WRAP. If we substitute state data and use with national/state-level data, then we should normalize to obtain consistent growth factors.
 - MPO population projections may be inconsistent with state projections, worried about using MPO projections.
 - State data should be best source, since they are responsible for SIPs, which would be a metric for consistency. Also, any state agency that makes econ/population projections for legislative-review purposes would be a good source to contact. Check with states in 309 plan to incorporate reliable projections data (AZ, NM, OR, UT, WY).
 - Use state data (i.e., rather than MPO data) because it is cheaper and more consistent between states.