

**Notes from Conference Call with SSJF/Projections Work Group
March 15, 2005**

On the call:

Work Group: Pat Cummins, Lee Alter, Tom Moore, Dennis Schwehr, Tina Suarez-Murias, Lori Campbell, Jeff Yockey,

ERG: Paula Fields, Marty Wolf

Agenda:

- Status of “Part F Table” (i.e., compiled results to-date of state/local interviews for new source, regulations, etc.) (attachment: Part F Table_Mar14.xls)
- Status of development of overall projections methodology (attachment: SSJF Projections_roadmap_Mar14.pdf)

Part F Table – Review of Data Collected From Agencies

- Paula reviewed the status of data collected to-date from the state/local agencies as documented on the “Part F Table Mar14” spreadsheet.
- The information collected on specific sources mainly pertains to “major” sources as defined by the states, which in nearly every case examined so far, would be sources emitting 100 tpy or more of a criteria pollutant. The work group agreed that only major sources needed to be examined for purposes of source-level impacts for point source projections. For example, some states permit sources down to 1 tpy, but these will not be examined in the Part F table in order to determine facility-level impacts.
- The work group agreed that new sources currently operating or under construction would be included in the projections as a new facility. Other potentially new sources not yet under construction will not be considered as new facilities for purposes of projections. (Note that after the call, Utah/Colleen Delaney expressed in an e-mail on 3/33/05 that Utah does not want to consider sources under construction as new facilities for purposes of projections, but would rather these be picked up in the sector-level growth projections.)
- Lee requested that a column be added to the spreadsheet to indicate whether information on specific sources will be used to classify them as “in or out” for purposes of projections. For example, the spreadsheet might disclose anecdotal information about a potential new source, but based on the decision to classify as new only if under construction, then the classification would be “out” of the projection as a new source.
- It was agreed to by the work group that facilities would only be considered as retired and removed from the post-2002 inventory if there is written confirmation (e.g., agreement, consent decree, etc.) to ensure that operation of such a facility would not resume at a future date.
- Jeff mentioned the facility-wide emissions limits for Springerville. It was suggested that this would be the best way to quantify future emissions from this plant (versus unit-level reductions via consent order).

- Note after the call, Lee pointed out that there are additional emission limits (e.g., SO₂) for TransAlta/Central plant that need to be added to the table.

Understanding the Effect of EGU Downtime (in 2002) and Capacity Factor on the 2018 Projections

- It was suggested that the Clean Air Markets Division (CAMD) data (i.e., hourly CEMs) for EGUs be used in place of the inventory data submitted by states for 2002. In addition, the CAMD data could be used to “adjust” emissions to account for downtime and normalize emissions over a year (instead of projecting periods of “0” emissions).
- Dennis commented that coal-fired plants generally have scheduled outages for 2 weeks/year, with longer 6-week outages every 5 years. Still, these are not possible to predict with accuracy.
- It is important to try and provide hourly emissions for EGUs for purposes of modeling because of the uncertainties associated with the national hourly “defaults” that would otherwise need to be used for modeling. ERG is reviewing some summary CAMD data and will report back to Tom (under Task 1.A) as to the possibility of using these data in lieu of NEI/EDMS data.
- A related topic is the issue of capacity factor, and how EGU growth is accounted for as a combination of growing existing capacity up to a “factor” (i.e., in the past 85% was used) after which point new plants are “built” (in terms of growth exceeding existing capacity). ERG will review CAMD and EGRID data and report back to the work group with findings that may help understand if the 85% capacity factor can be substantiated or may need to be changed.

Projections Roadmap

- Paula and Marty introduced the various stages of development, data sets, and compilation steps that will comprise the projections task as illustrated on the “roadmap.”
- Tom discussed the need to treat California projections separately. He said that ARB wants WRAP to use ARB-developed emissions and projections. They will provide WRAP will a spreadsheet containing details on calculations, and backup on methods. They have developed a detailed, modeling level, inventory as part of their state 8-hour ozone SIP development. Tom will facilitate future discussions between ARB and ERG to obtain the CA data for projections.
- Tom quickly reviewed the content of the two documents he had sent out earlier: “Evaluation of 2018 Regional Haze Control Strategies,” and “WRAP Emissions Inventories for Regional Haze Planning – discussion draft—3/5/05—*California in italics*”. (The Projection Roadmap is consistent with the information contained on these two documents.)

The next call was scheduled for April 7, 2005 at 1:00 PM PDT.