

**Four Corners Air Quality Task Force
Special Meeting for Input on Mitigation Option Scenario
Modeling
Wednesday, August 8, 2007 – 10am
Durango, Colorado**

Meeting Report

Attendees:

Kevin Golden, EPA; Win Wright, Southwest Hydrologic; Mike Farley, PNM; Walt Brown, BLM/USFS; Carl Daly, US EPA Reg 8; Bill Hochheiser, DOE; Rita Trujillo, NMED; Andy Berger, NMED; Cindy Cody, EPA; Dale Wirth, BLM; Pat Cummins, WRAP/WGA; Jack Schuenemeyer, Southwest Statistical Consulting; James Temte, SUIT Air Quality; Michael King, Southern Ute Air Quality; Brenda Sakizzie, Southern Ute Air Quality; Sylvia Oliva, Mesa Verde NP; Mike George, NPS; Lee Conger, LWV; Marilyn Brown, LWV; Doug Blewitt; BP; Cindy Cody; EPA; Sara Stratton, Chevron; Dave Schneck, San Miguel County; Richard Grimes, APS; Mark Jones, NMED; Mike Lazaro; Argonne; Mary Uhl, NMED; Jen Mattox; CDPHE; Kim Livo, CDPHE; John Bunyak; NPS; Kevin Briggs; CDPHE; Tom Moore; WRAP; Ralph Morris, ENVIRON; Scott Archer, BLM; Erik Aaboe, NMED; Rebecca Reynolds, RRC

A special meeting was conducted prior to the Task Force plenary session to obtain input from task force participants on the mitigation options they would like to see modeled by the contractor (Environ). The Environ contract with NM provides funding to model two basecase runs (2005 and 2018) and five modeling scenarios to test the air quality effects of mitigating various emission sources in the four corners area. Kevin Golden started the discussion with a powerpoint presentation on the study's overall objectives and technical approach. A number of suggestions were made in the discussion that followed:

Ideas for Mitigation Options/Scenarios for the Modeling Project

- Ammonia can dramatically effect model results (S. Archer)
- NO_x – Sulfur, look at NO_x, SO₂ trends on power plants; pollutant sensitivity (D. Blewitt)
- Public Education/Outreach type mitigation options from EEREC or Power Plants group, can these somehow be considered? (M. Brown)
- What about the idea of doing percentage runs? 20, 40, 60, 80% (C. Daly)
- Ranges for each of the technologies (for O&G, at least) and use, e.g., high effectiveness runs versus low effectiveness (B. Hochheiser)
- By Source category (e.g. Power Plants versus O&G, etc.)
 - Or even a set of sources within a category, like small engines in O&G, or on a specific technology like NSCR

- Possible to get ranges for different mitigation options (high/low) or High low for all options together
 - Which are the largest uncontrolled sources?
- Range would give us the ability to interpolate results within a source (D. Blewitt)
- Input in such a way that the sources are isolated for greater efficiency (C. Daly)
- Model Power Plants options versus Oil and Gas Options (M. Lazaro)
- Determine per each option how much they would reduce; then sort for the ones that will reduce the most. Then model the top one or combinations of them. Some of this has already been done by Cumulative Effects (CE). Contractor can expand on this (M. George)
- Save one run to do a suite of options that we think are the most likely to reduce (M George)
- Consider 80/20 rule: if we can get 80% of the reductions by controlling 20% of the sources, this is the most efficient. Most bang for the buck.
- SJ EIS – Big Drivers
- What is the intent of the modeling exercise?
 - Consider the viability/feasibility of the options before including them (S. Holland)
 - Since we are talking future (2018) perhaps some of the options that are not currently viable may be important to look at.
 - Intent of the exercise is NOT only to determine control measures but also to understand contributions, potential reductions, etc. Then this will inform the action to be taken.
- We may want to do 2-3 initial runs then decide what the 4th & 5th runs should be (D. Blewitt)
- Find out from Environ when they need the modeling run specifics – can we give them in 2 segments as the previous suggestion recommends?
- Concern about VOCs leaks in the field engines – are these addressed? (S Oliva)
A: Yes, these are in inventory, Early Action Compact (M Uhl)
- Look at the 2 big sources (Power Plants and O&G): then apply the 4 levels of reductions; would this give the agencies what they need? Then refer to mitigation options for what will get the reductions. (E Aaboe)
 - Will need to consider the spatial issue.
- Ranges versus Arbitrary Percentages: better to get ranges if possible. Shoot for ranges, but perhaps a hybrid of these (K. Golden)
- O&G: Is there a way to model economies of scale for different sources: dust, engines, collocation/centralization, etc. (W. Brown)
- Modeling Analysis: The purpose is to inform the agencies' decision making
 - Task Force input on which options are the most viable is welcome.
- Suites of options are better than single options (M. George)
- Sensitivity runs
- For Power Plant emissions 2018 base case what level of emissions control to use? BART, presumptive BART?

- NPS Air Resources Division modeling of Desert Rock: get in touch with LD (?) as a resource for this.

For any additional input or questions or to be involved, contact:

Golden.Kevin@epa.gov

Agencies will email what they decide on the runs as soon as possible and will provide an update on progress at the November meeting.

Technical Questions/Issues

- CPU power? State of the art accuracy (S Oliva)
- How does the model work? How do you input into the model? etc.
- How will geographic sensitivity be tested? (Model considers terrain, elevation)
- Can CAMx isolate sources?
- How sensitive is the model to locations of where the reductions will occur?
- Is there an economic component to the modeling project? A: No, not at this time.

ADJOURN: noon