

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dan Olson, Air Quality Administrator  
FROM: Lee Gribovicz, Regional Impacts/E.I. Coordinator  
SUBJECT: WRAP TOC Monthly Call  
DATE: March 7, 2003

On March 7, 2003, I Co-Chaired the monthly TOC telephone conference call. The call Agenda is attached under Appendix I. The status report on Technical Forum activities is attached under Appendix II.

Participants included:

<u>TOC Members</u>	<u>WRAP</u>	<u>Emissions</u>	<u>Fire</u>
Lee Gribovicz	Pat Cummins	Dennis Schwehr	Pete Lahm
Rich Fisher	Tom Moore		Ron Klein
Steve Arnold	<u>Tribal Liaison</u>	<u>Modeling</u>	
Wayne Leipold	Bob Gruenig	Kevin Briggs	

★ Modeling Center Contract ★

Tom Moore gathered the comments from the February 10<sup>th</sup> Scottsdale TOC meeting, then in consultation with Modeling Co-Chairs Kevin & Mary Uhl, he tried to "shape" the RMC's February 10<sup>th</sup> workplan into five major focus areas:

- a. **Finish \$309 Modeling & TSD** . . . . . \$ 35K
- b. **QA Procedure Development/Documentation** . . . . . \$ 43K
- c. **Source Apportionment Tool(s)** . . . . . \$ 50K
- d. **Emissions Processing Upgrades** . . . . . \$ 159K
  - i. SMOKE operations
  - ii. Ammonia EI improvement
  - iii. Windblown Dust algorithm testing
  - iv. Chemical Speciation/Temporal Allocation - Point/Area Sources
- e. **Visibility Modeling Upgrades** . . . . . \$ 295K
  - i. New chemical mechanism
  - ii. New model code
  - iii. New/improved meteorological data
  - iv. Model performance evaluation criteria

The costs in the "text" of the RMC February 10<sup>th</sup> Workplan which provided some detail of what each of the tasks entailed, did not always match the costs in the "spreadsheet" accompanying that Workplan, however. Thus Tom explained that he had assumed that the costs for individual pieces of the proposal were more accurate, and so he totaled these numbers into the five sums shown at the right of the table above. That total comes out to **\$634K**.

In addition, the TOC had decided in Scottsdale to reserve the training funds in the WRAP budget for future use when training would be more useful. Thus he had removed an additional **\$50K** from the RMC budget proposal.

With the \$634K shown in the itemized list, and the \$50K for training, the

RMC's requests appeared to total to **\$684K**. However the Summary Spreadsheet had shown a total of **\$736K**, resulting in a **discrepancy of about \$50K**.

Tom further explained that there were some Task Revisions not addressed in RMC's initial proposal, including "Finishing the \$309 Modeling" (w/ corrected '96 & 2018 base cases). He noted that in his summary, he had taken the \$35K listed for that task, from the maximum Training Figure of \$85K. He felt that since the Training Figure was given as a range between \$41-85K, that reserving \$50K in the WRAP budget for Training was reasonable.

Pat Cummins was concerned however, noting that he felt we were pretty specific in Scottsdale for holding back training monies totaling to the full \$85K. He felt that the WRAP Tribal interests would be concerned with accounting adjustment, and he didn't want the training budget shorted.

Pat noted that the WRAP budget has \$651K for the RMC (proposed \$736K minus the \$85K training), and he suspected that the RMC was going to want every penny of that fund.

I noted that it was clear that the RMC had been pushed to develop the February 10<sup>th</sup> proposal in a hurry, and that led to the noted discrepancies between their spreadsheet summary and the written task descriptions. And it was clear that the responsibility for making a clear and accurate proposal is on the RMC. Therefore, it was concluded that Tom should present RMC Director, Gail Tonnesen with our observations of the inconsistencies, and have the Contractor clear up the errors (quickly).

In addition, Dennis Schwehr was concerned with the lack of detail in the RMC proposal. He was concerned that there was very limited description of what specific activities the RMC would engage in, and he felt that would most likely lead to conflict down the road in assessing whether the modeling center had fully completed all their tasks. In his response to RMC, Tom intends to ask Dr. Tonnesen to provide some more detail on just what activities the modeling center will undertake.

Dennis also noted that since there was some new tasks that were being requested of the RMC, that they could (if they so chose) obtain the services of some sub-contractor that we were not familiar with. He wanted to be assured that the WRAP still has approval of any sub-contractor hired by the RMC. Tom will confirm with Rich Halvey, as to just where that type of oversight authority resides.

★ Causes of Haze ★

Marc Pitchford was not on the call this date, but Marc had notified Tom Moore that DRI has hired a 1½ FTE's for scientists to do the Causes of Haze analysis. The Monitoring Forum is meeting in Santa Fe, and more information on the project will be available at that time.

★ NONROAD 2002 Modeling ★

Pat Cummins & Tom Moore have been giving feed back to Environ on remodeling the non-road mobile sector using the new NONROAD 2002 model released by the EPA. Using this new model, Environ will re-project the 1996 inventory, using the assumption that ultra-low sulfur fuel (15ppm Sulfur) will be available in 2008 for non-road sources. Those results will be included in the TSD.

There was some concern that NONROAD lumps all non-road equipment into one category that includes everything from construction equipment to commercial marine vessels. Pat suggested that Environ therefore must breakout the non-road inventory for individual states, to see what the localized impact might be. And he wanted to look at what it might happen if ultra-low sulfur fuel does not become available in the future, in order to bound the possible outcomes.

Pat & Tom will be following this issue and assuring that the work proceeds expeditiously.

★ Windblown Dust Project ★

Dennis Schwehr noted that Environ had completed Task #1 (review wind tunnel studies for information on threshold wind velocity & sediment fluxes), with a January 15<sup>th</sup> report. Environ is also producing monthly status reports, and it was agreed that Tom Moore should get those documents posted on the Emission Forum webpage.

Task #2 involves actually developing emission factors for soil types (classify the land types & the soils characteristics). The question now before Environ was how to aggregate all those categories in order maintain a workable total for calculations. On the call earlier this morning, it had been decided that they need to retain a factor for forested areas. They also talked about urbanized areas, but with 4 KM data aggregated to a 12 KM grid, it was decided that will accommodate variations that may occur within major cities.

This project is heading towards a June '03 completion date.

★ TSD ★

At the Arizona workshop, it was clear that we had to slow down a little. The WRAP will complete §309 modeling in the first half of March, and then we will spend the balance of the month, and on into April writing up the results. It is the intent to send the draft TSD out in May to get comments, then get the final document published by about July 1<sup>st</sup> this year.

★ April, 2003 WRAP Board Meeting ★

Pat Cummins noted that he will get a draft Board Meeting agenda out later today. There will be an hour on the agenda for Technical presentations, and Pat suggested that the TOC Co-Chairs could use about 20 minutes in

presentation, with 10-15 minutes left for discussion.

Items to be covered will include the status of the TSD, and it was suggested that this might update might be appropriately presented along with information on the on STIP-2 project. Other ideas for presentation included:

- status of §309 modeling completion
- status 2003 RMC contract
- status of cause of haze
- status TEISS project
- emission database project

There didn't seem to be inventory questions that could be prepared for this Board Meeting, but Pete Lahm did raise one Fire Inventory question for consideration. He noted that in figuring how to address wildfire, The WRAP states are going to need fire information for both §309 & §308 SIP's. He has had discussions with a national Fire Manager's association, an organization that sets the standards for national reporting forms for State & Local Foresters. They have agreed that they might make changes the national forms to support EI data collection, if they received a request from a major organization like the WRAP. He wondered if the Board would be interested in supporting a such a letter.

Pat Cummins felt that the WRAP most surely would support anything so basic as improving emission data collection, but he suggested that the Fire Forum should present the details to the TOC first, with the TOC actually making a recommendation on how to proceed. Pete agreed to outline the issue for the TOC to get it to Tom Moore for distribution and review.

Regarding the actual Board presentation Lee & Lewis McLeod will work with Tom to prepare a draft, which would be circulated to Forum Co-Chairs before being finalized.

★ Results of Modeling Errors ★

Dennis Schwehr asked about the status of the remodeling work going on to address the "layer fraction" and "fire version" errors that were recently discovered by the RMC. He wanted to know what effect these errors might have on state SIP preparation. It was noted that although the modelers are working feverishly on the remodeling, conclusions haven't been really drawn as yet. The RMC is planning on providing a report to Modeling Forum in Santa Fe, and it is hoped that many of the questions will be answered then. But it was clear that until we see those conclusions, we can't really determine what new obstacles are facing the states.

★ Next Call ★

The next TOC call is scheduled for April 11, 2003 at 2:00 PM Mountain Time.

A P P E N D I X I

WRAP March 7, 2003 TOC Conference Call Agenda

A P P E N D I X   I I

WRAP March 5, 2003 Tech Forums Status Report