

**WRAP Emissions Forum  
Meeting Summary  
February 7-8, 2006  
La Fonda Hotel, Santa Fe, New Mexico**

**Attendees:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Alice Edwards	Alaska DEC
Lee Gribovicz	Wyoming DEQ
Bob Downing	Maricopa Co. AQD
Roy Doyle	Colorado APCD
Dennis Schwehr	WEST Associates
Bob Palzer	Sierra Club
Jenifer Pond	ITEP
Lisa Riener	Quinalt Nation
Ken Cronin (day 1)	NTEC
Brenda Harpring	Nevada DEP
Heather Lancour	NMED
Don Arkell	WESTAR
Stephanie Summers	COA AQD
Danny Zamora	Albuquerque/Bernalillo AQD
Rachel Misra	Navajo Air Quality/Operating Permit
Flowers Espinosa	Taos Pueblo Air Quality
Bob Gruenig	NTEC
Tom Moore	WGA/WRAP

Phone participants during parts of the meeting included:

Jim Carlin, MT  
Tina Suarez-Murias, CA  
Lori Campbell, NV  
David Holoman, EH Pechan  
Steve Boone, EH Pechan  
Jim Wilson, EH Pechan  
Jeff Stocum/Chris ?, OR

**Meeting Summary:**

The WRAP Emission Forum met on February 7-8, 2006 at the La Fonda Hotel in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The main project of the Emission Forum is the Emission Data Management System (EDMS) for managing WRAP emission inventories, consequently it was the main issue discussed at this meeting. ERG completed their Post-Beta Quality Assurance review of the EDMS in December 2005, which revealed problems with the new functionality available since

the beta version release of EDMS; with the solutions to closed (i.e., fixed) bugs, and with bugs classified as enhancements rather than requirements of the EDMS from the hardware/software development plan. On behalf of the Emissions Forum, WGA has issued a January 31<sup>st</sup> letter notifying Pechan of these deficiencies, and demanded that Pechan “fix” these problems “at no cost to the WGA”, with the implied consequence that the Forum will take necessary steps to insure accurate and efficient operation of the EDMS.

David Holoman of Pechan gave a presentation on the status of the EDMS project, beginning with standard statistics on system use. He had no details in response to the forum’s letter, however he did commit that Pechan will undertake a 30-60-90 day plan to address each of the specific issues raised by their current management and the Post-Beta Test Report. A great deal of time was spent on the second day of the meeting, discussing how satisfactory Pechan's response was likely to be, and what preparatory steps the Emission Forum should take in the event that Pechan is unable to deliver acceptable follow up actions.

There were also updates on Inter-RPO Projects; and WRAP Alaska Community EI and Tribal Major Sources Inventory projects. And attendees were brought up to date on Stationary Source Forum discussions for EGU & Other Point Source control options, and the progress on the Attribution of Haze analysis. The features of the Technical Support System (TSS) Beta website were demonstrated on-line, showing the analytic tools and displays available to users.

## **Meeting Details**

### **Emission Data Management System**

David Holoman of Pechan gave a presentation on the status of the EDMS project, the WRAP EI website which was “rolled out” in January 2005. He reported that the system is now showing 202 current registered users, and he provided statistics the usage rate for these users. He noted that EDMS currently has the 2002 Actual Version 1.3 EI installed, along with the 2018 Base Case projection year. There is data processing underway for the adjacent RPO [CENRAP], along with the Mexico Border States and the Pacific Ocean shipping emissions.

WGA sent out a January 31<sup>st</sup> letter on behalf of the EF, notifying Pechan of deficiencies from ERG's Post-Beta test/QA of the EDMS system and other ongoing issues with Pechan's management of the project. The letter requires that Pechan “fix” these problems “at no cost to the WGA”. Tom Moore had a conversation with David February 6<sup>th</sup> regarding the EF requirements. In response, David indicated that will Pechan will undertake a 30-60-90 day plan to address each of the specific issues raised by the EF's correspondence and the Post-Beta Test Report. He noted that since Pechan has just received the report, they weren't yet prepared to provide detailed corrective plans as of this date.

Dennis Schwehr noted that we don't want to have to “re-test” the modifications that Pechan undertakes, so he asked how Pechan might provide the Forum with some sense of comfort that the modifications are successful in addressing the issues. There was a discussion on improving

the quality and tracking of communications about the EDMS and the need for an “As Delivered” EDMS document to show how Pechan and the EF went from the EDMS Hardware/Software Development Plan published in April 2004 to the EDMS we are working with now.

There was a training session held December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2005, and there was discussion of the video made of that session. The forum wants to utilize this video as one of the mechanisms to extend training to interested users. We need to organize the material in a more efficient “package” for future sessions.

### **Tribal EI Update**

Jenifer Pond of ITEP gave the status of Tribal Inventory projects. The objective of the major Stationary sources identification project was to inventory all significant point sources of NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> in Indian Country of the WRAP region, with a special emphasis on Oil and Gas exploration and production (E&P) sources. The report is complete and is being reviewed by ITEP. They are scheduling two TEISS training sessions in February and March, and these sessions are already full.

### **Alaska Representative Community EI Project Update**

Alice Edwards gave an update on the Representative Community EI projects (Appendix III). She previously had noted that Survey information was completed for 13 communities, with emission summaries prepared from the calculations based on the survey results. She gave an example of the draft summary for Buckland, Alaska, where they focused on fuel sources of wood, propane, fuel oil, gasoline and diesel fuel. In this particular community, they found that wood burning and gasoline are responsible for most of the air pollution, with wood burning of particular concern as the dominant source of particulate emissions. Tribal participants at the meeting provided feedback on the draft presentation format which will be incorporated into the final products that are shared with the community.

### **Inter-RPO Projects Status**

Tom Moore then gave a report on inter-RPO activities. Projects include:

- 2002 National Wildfire EI (essentially done - to be reviewed at March FEJF meeting)
- Inter-RPO Emissions Data Warehouse (complementary to EDMS - ERG has completed design and awarded 1 year operations - may require WRAP money in 2007 and onward?)
- GEOS-Chem modeling for CMAQ boundary conditions (completed under VISTAS contract yields 3 scenarios: 1) all emissions including US, 2) zero out US emissions & 3) zero out anthropogenic emissions)
- ConCEPT (new emissions processing model - followed by Patrick Barickman)
- Ammonia emissions model (in ConCEPT, but there is no improved activity data for the WRAP region)

## **SSJF Projects Status**

Tom Moore then gave a report on last week's Stationary Source Forum meeting, where the first 2018 Base Case Version 1 projections were presented in detail. He reviewed some of the 2018 results (see February 3<sup>rd</sup> SSJF Meeting Notes) and summarized a few major point regarding the 2002-2018 inventories. He noted that:

- point and area sources vary up and down by state determination of point source thresholds
- mobile emissions are down noticeably, but commercial marine shipping is exception
- fire scenario forecasts developed are variable by year and location
- dust and other sources were generally held constant
- oil and gas emissions data was first try and showed significant numbers
- Tribal data is becoming more complete

Regarding “Next Steps”, the WRAP is asking the States/Tribes to review and make corrections on the version 1 assumptions used for first 2018 baseline model runs.

## **Update Attribution of Haze/TSS & NO<sub>x</sub>/SO<sub>2</sub>/RPG Workshop**

Tom Moore reviewed the January 10-11<sup>th</sup> workshop on Reasonable Progress & SO<sub>4</sub>/NO<sub>3</sub> Control Options, going on-line to point out where all the PowerPoint presentations reside under the WRAP website “Meetings 2006 - Past Events Calendar”. And he informed attendees of the follow-up Workshop on Fire, Carbon & Dust to be held May 23-24<sup>th</sup> in Sacramento, California.

He also reviewed the January 24-25<sup>th</sup> Attribution of Haze Workgroup meeting, and the associated tasks under the Air Resources AoH contract as described under that meeting's PowerPoint presentations. He described the status of the Technical Support System (TSS) website development, and went to that Beta site to demonstrate the analytic tools and displays that the site will feature.

## **EF Workplan/Budget for EDMS**

In discussing what to do with the EDMS, we found that the EF Budget has around \$125K left in the 2006 Operations fund and \$105K for enhancements (\$230K available for 2006), and \$180K penciled in for 2007. We noted that Pechan currently gets \$10K/month for EDMS operations. And there is another \$5K/month going for hosting (Pechan marks that up and pays CEP something less on the hosting bill). The question was whether we would pay the \$10K while they are “fixing” the current problems. It was clarified that we have committed to pay what's in the current contract, but would not pay anything more for the corrections.

The forum members discussed potential outcomes for improving the system and its efficient operations. The WRAP does own the source code for the EDMS, so it is possible to open the system operations and improvements back for competitive bids. The forum also discussed funding limitations and how to fix costs for operating the system. The idea was raised as to

whether we needed to re-bid the contract, with the inherent problems of trying to transfer the code from the original programmers to another contractor.

The general feeling was that given the potential problems with shifting contractors, Pechan deserved a chance to fix the system under their 90 day plan. The forum felt that it was critical that the system to be fully operational at the end of that 90 day period in order to be available for use during the SIP planning process. The current Pechan contract is extended through the end of 2006, but the forum has only authorized funding through the first quarter of the year. There was a suggestion that we needed to be prepared, just in case Pechan's 90 day results are unsatisfactory.

Priorities for the next 90 Days include:

- Tribal Data Reconciliation
- XML Implementation
- Loading Data New Data
- Fixing Demand Letter Problems

It was decided that we need a group looking at the acceptance plan and the problems Pechan is supposed to resolve in the next 90 days, sort of an EDMS “fix it” crew (Alice Edwards, Dennis Schwehr, Heather Lancour, Bob Downing).

In order to be efficient, another group will look at what the system operations should include and define what we need in a Scope of Work that can be used either with Pechan or for a new RFP (Roy Doyle, Brenda Harpring, Lee Gribovicz, Alice Edwards).

A third group will work towards efficiently reconciling tribal and county data in the EDMS so that tribal data is displayed correctly. Tom Moore will work with Bob Gruenig/Ken Cronin and the TDDWG to look at options for more efficient resolution.

The meeting attendees also discussed future emission forum work. The forum realizes that certain emission sectors can be improved for the next round of plans (e.g. try new ammonia model, area sources, etc). The question is when should that work begin? Another issue is how often we bring together everyone’s data in the EDMS in order to routinely track emissions as required by the Regional Haze rule. The forum felt that at a minimum, data should be requested when large data submittals go to EPA. The forum needs some strategic direction/guidance for on-going implementation/tracking and gearing up to next set of plans. It would be good to start emissions work as early as possible/feasible in order to avoid rushing projects and providing enough time for regional modeling efforts and other analyses.

### **Next Meeting:**

The forum felt that it was important to meet near the end of the EDMS 90 day correction period. The target date is April 18<sup>th</sup> with location to be determined (Pacific Northwest was suggested as a possibility).