

DRAFT
Possible Emission Inventory Topics for More In-Depth Collaboration Discussions Among
Regional Planning Organizations, EPA, and Federal Land Managers
June 8, 2003
Prepared by Phil Lorang, OAQPS, EPA

This list will be discussed in the monthly emissions inventory discussion call at 11 am Eastern on Wednesday
Call-in Number is 919.420.7944

#	Topic	Issue/Situation/Need	Possible Cross-
1	Wildland Fires	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Best estimation methods (fuel consumption, EF's, etc), probably for alternative levels of quality/specificity b. 2001 and/or 2002 inventory, place and time specific c. Fire activity data system for the long term (should be useable for more than just wildland) d. Better temporal profiles for immediate modeling applications, e.g., monthly by state. e. Projections, especially of prescribed fires f. Treatment of year-to-year variability in attainment projections, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Small group form leading to a meeting in calls and/or to con b. Joint RPO project Use methods from a c. FLM, state & priv d. Use data in 1996 http://www.fi and/or http:// e. FLM advice f. Write issues state and guidance to date
2	Populations/Activities for NH3 inventories	<p>Several RPOs have declared their intent to improve on Census of Agricultural and NASS populations/production data, aiming for more detail on animal types and sizes and/or more resolution within county.</p> <p>EPA has WA in place with ERG, Inc to re-look at how C of A and NASS are used to estimate county-level populations.</p>	<p>Call(s) to discuss sta do this. Since gettin sources, a combined than separate projec what others are doin</p> <p>EPA project welcom products.</p>
3	EGU inventories and EGU projections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. EPA is headed towards more or total reliance on federal data sources for EGUs for 2002, rather than attempting to merge federal and state data as in 1999, for the NEI. However, states may have better data for some data elements especially control equipment, control efficiency, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Focus the 2002 N specific data elemen records? b. EPA is to provide

		<p>etc.</p> <p>b. Midwest RPO has strong interest in hour-by-hour emissions. MRPO has done some work on typical temporal profiles based on this.</p> <p>c. Consistent approaches to projections has attractions in terms of less effort needed to understand and reconcile inconsistencies when exchanging or comparing inventories and model projections.</p>	<p>protocol format. What collaboration?</p> <p>c. Workshop for EPA to identify issues in model</p>
4	2002 MOBILE6 and NONROAD2002 inventories, NMIM	<p>a. EPA is preparing these for first version of 2002 NEI.</p> <p>b. States are required by CERR to submit by June 1, 2004, but have option of endorsing EPA's estimates instead.</p> <p>c. Some RPOs (all but Midwest?) may have a contractor prepare these inventories for all states, but using state-supplied inputs for fuels, age mix, I/M, etc.</p> <p>d. OTAQ is developing NMIM and a data base of county-specific inputs. NONROAD categories for first version of 2002 NEI will be calculated in-house at OTAQ with NMIM.</p> <p>e. When NIF is used to report only tons, it is impossible to make consistent projections, explain assumptions, etc.</p> <p>f. California does not use MOBILE6 and NONROAD2002.</p> <p>g.. NONROAD2002 may be revised in 2003.</p> <p>h. Lots of SCC's for NONROAD sources.</p> <p>i. Emission period issues: annual vs summer day vs. winter day vs. day-by-day in EMS or SMOKE</p>	<p>a. EPA will finish first version of 2003.</p> <p>b - f. Focus the 2003 NEI for most states on getting data rather than on full NIF recalculation to calculate second version.</p> <p>RPOs to support development of framework for this, and process for their state.</p> <p>MRPO and California records, maybe include.</p> <p>g. NMIM could calculate.</p> <p>h. Agree on which geographic data storage without affects modeling?</p> <p>i. Agree on a common format implemented via NMIM for highway, quarter annual and summer</p>
5	Real world mobile source PM2.5 emissions	<p>a. MOBILE6 and NONROAD assume that all vehicles and many/most engines retain certification emission levels in real world operation, despite cycle issues and deterioration. Reasons to be doubtful of this assumption. Testing is in progress to get more data.</p> <p>b. Monitoring data shows large urban increment of PM carbon. Vehicles/engines are suspect.</p> <p>c. California uses different estimates.</p> <p>d. Some areas operate smoking vehicle programs now.</p> <p>e. Difficult to analyze control strategies in this situation, e.g, smoking</p>	<p>Develop a common format for revisions to MOBIL progress test data?</p> <p>Share experiences with (Urban focus may not project)</p>

		vehicle programs, since target emissions are not in the inventory.	
6	Mexico and Canada Inventories	<p>BRAVO project developed and used a more complete EI for Mexico that previous projects.</p> <p>WGA project for national Mexico EI is in progress.</p> <p>EPA and Environment Canada cooperating on creation of better historical and projection inventories.</p>	<p>Obtain, assess, and use for common use?</p> <p>Arrange thorough briefing project and plans.</p>
7	Open burning (yard waste, back yard barrels, land clearing)	<p>NEI has top-down estimates, developed with little outside input or reaction. State submissions may have created inconsistencies among states.</p> <p>EPA will remove land clearing open burning emissions from urbanized counties, to match approach for other two categories. Otherwise, no explicit accounting for burning bans.</p> <p>MANE-VU survey.</p>	<p>Develop consensus on version 2 of 2002 NEI approach?</p> <p>Other RPOs to copy approach?</p>
8	Capturing information on current controls	<p>State submissions to NEI often do not contain source capacities, existing controls, control efficiency, and rule effectiveness. Without these, hard to formulate and model future control strategies. Missing data may be due to confidentiality issues.</p> <p>EPA's Transport Rule is facing this problem now, at least for 1996 NEI.</p>	<p>Assess problem in future?</p> <p>Cooperate on effort to improve sources to improve control strategies?</p>
9	Projections for sources other than EGUs	<p>EPA has used EGAS v 4 in recent rulemakings, plus VMT projection from OTAQ.</p> <p>EPA is starting new CAA section 812 prospective analysis, will be reconsidering projection methods. This may overtake a more slowly moving project to update EGAS.</p> <p>Most RPOs not doing projections yet.</p>	<p>Use consultation on how to formulate as much as possible?</p> <p>What else?</p>
10	Non-point source methods and inventories	<p>Midwest RPO has forged member states agreement on common methods for some categories.</p> <p>EPA estimates top-down emissions for some non-point categories, but sets aside in favor of state submittals (except for residential fuel in draft</p>	<p>Midwest to provide input for consideration.</p> <p>What else?</p>

		<p>v.3 of 1999 NEI). Matching SCCs can be problematic.</p> <p>In the summer of 2002, some RPOs wanted EPA to provide model calculation sheets.</p> <p>There are issues with avoiding duplication with point source inventories.</p>	
11	Tribal inventory handling	<p>Tribes and not states should be inventorying point sources on tribal lands, but not all tribes may be able to do that for 2002.</p> <p>For non-point sources, there are issues in avoiding duplication with county-level emissions submitted by states.</p>	Have a call to exchange information to identify issues and...
12	2001 submissions under the CERR	About one-half of states submitted CERR-required NIF records for large point sources for 2001. EPA funds to examine/incorporate these into first version of 2002 are uncertain.	Share files with RPOs to examine, compare with 1999 NEI, to facilitate version of 2002 NEI...
13	Data exchange	<p>a. RPO data exchange protocols nearing polished form.</p> <p>B. No specific plans for how to exchange actual inventories, keep track of versions, etc.</p>	<p>a. Have conference call to discuss protocols to those not yet developed, discuss additional needs.</p> <p>b. Registry of inventories...</p>
14	2002 inventory development	<p>Each of the 5 RPOs and EPA needs a national EI that it can defend to its leaders and stakeholders. Each feels some risk relying on others in terms of both substance and delivery/schedule, yet wants to avoid duplication where it is not needed.</p> <p>EPA and RPOs now moving forward with little explicit coordination, with awareness of each others' broad plans, but without explicit details.</p> <p>Contractors for sectors are not consistent across RPOs and EPA, adding to potential hand off problems and duplications.</p> <p>Based on EPA's experiences, RPOs may be underestimating time and effort to work with state-submitted NIF files.</p>	Calls or meeting to coordinate work towards harmonized deliverables? Include...
15	OPEM emissions model to	There are continued difficulties with EMS(Cost) and	Convene a conference call with RPO's/ EPA, and...

	replace EMS and SMOKE	SMOKE(Transparency) that can only be solved by creating a new SQL base emissions model. This model will be more transparent than SMOKE and not require SAS like EMS. Midwest RPO is planning on moving forward with some development but we do not have the resource to include all categories or components desired. Midwest RPO hopes to get an RFP out by mid summer depending on outside involvement.	involved in supporting the model. Discussion development, RFP
16	Improved Emissions Models for Ammonia.	It appears that photochemical transport models will need higher temporal resolution ammonia inventories than annual average values. Specifically the seasonal and meteorological issues will be daunting. The work of Rob Pinder at CMU seems to be a way of incorporating these new methods into emissions estimates to build on the fly day specific emission estimates that will provide inventories at the temporal resolution for chemical transport models.	Have all RPO's i Pinder like mode Cattle. Incorporate something that c photochemical tr output.