



Minutes for the STMPR Advisory Group Meeting Wednesday, November 8, 2006

1. Welcome and Introduction

Mr. Joe Cassmassi, Planning & Rules Manager, Planning, Rule Development and Area Sources, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and presented a brief overview of the agenda for the meeting. There were no comments on the October 11 meeting minutes.

2. Changes to Emissions

CARB released EMFAC 2007 and OFFROAD models in November 1, 2006 and updated mobile sources emission inventories. The draft 2007 AQMP was developed based on mobile sources emissions previously provided by CARB prior to November 1. Due to significant changes in mobile source inventory estimated by EMFAC 2007 and OFFROAD models, District staff would rerun CEPA and modeling to re-estimate carrying capacities for the final draft 2007 AQMP. Mr. Cassmassi gave an update on the changes in modeling emissions inventory from the draft version of the 2007 AQMP to the final draft version. Overall, VOC baseline inventory decreased (98 tpd in 2005, 76 tpd in 2014, and 60 tpd in 2020), NO_x inventory increased (52 tpd in 2005, 8 tpd in 2014, and 17 tpd in 2020), CO decreased (384 tpd in 2005, 204 tpd in 2014, and 98 tpd in 2020).

3. Update on Sandwich and SMAT

Mr. Cassmassi provided discussions on blank mass and organic compounds (OC) in Sandwich and SMAT. Directly emitted PM_{2.5} are the PM_{2.5} collected on the filter during the tests conducted following federal reference test methods (FRM), and since the standards are based on these test results, contamination of the blank mass is accounted for and therefore blank mass should be part of the standard. Different filter types have different blank mass. The Sandwich approach assumes a blank mass of 0.5 µg/m³, EPA assumes a default blank mass based on survey data, and blank mass is sometimes accounted for as high as 3% of the standard. Therefore, there is no one "accurate" blank mass, and local data should be allowed to be used if they are more "representative". Organic compounds (OC) can be calculated, and is the difference between the total mass of particulate matter collected on the filter during the tests and the measured data of ammonium compounds, sulfate, nitrate, water, elemental carbon, and crustal. The OC can be calculated as negative. Many options can be used to avoid using negative OC including checking the measurements of other components for accuracy, disregarding negative numbers and using an average of non-negative calculated numbers, scaling down the measured OC data, or verifying the blank on the filter. The issues involved in using OC data include how to use them and what is the appropriate carbon factor. The observed carbon factor for urban areas should be in a range of 1.2 – 1.8. The District chose to use 1.3.

4. Overview of Model Performance

Dr. Satoru Mitsutomi provided an update on the ozone modeling status, summary of current CAMx modeling configuration, and performance statistics for CAMx using Lambert Conformal Conic (LCC). CAMx modeling analysis has been conducted using either UTM or LCC. LCC coordinate system has been employed by ARB and it has been suggested that use of LCC is more preferred. The performance statistics using LCC were presented as reference for STMPR members, although there was a difference in boundary concentration and emissions inventory and can not be compared with UTM coordinate system. In addition, 1997 episode performance statistics were presented as a reference. Staff would evaluate historical episodes using the latest emissions inventory. The specification of the boundary concentration was a critical parameter for 8-hour ozone attainment demonstrations. Staff proposed to use WRAP derived boundary concentration for base and apply rollback factor for future year simulation. Questions were raised regarding the selection of the modeling days to be used for RRF calculation, whether or not staff should use data from all stations for performance calculation, or should select certain stations by zone and whether or not 1-hour or 8-hour performance statistics be used as criteria for the selection of RRF. Staff would evaluate all possible approaches and present the results to the committee in the near future.

5. Tentative Modeling Strategy

Mr. Cassmassi indicated that staff would finalize Appendix V, revise modeling emission inventory, review boundary and initial conditions, confirm the MATES III data, rerun the base case scenarios for ozone and PM_{2.5}, conduct sensitive analyses, and re-assess carrying capacities. Expected completion date was December 8.

6. Closing Remarks/Scheduling Next Meeting/Adjourn

There being no additional public comments, Mr. Cassmassi adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:00 p.m.

November 8, 2006 STMPR Advisory Group Meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carol Bohnenkamp, U.S. EPA
Shep Burton, Consultant
John DaMassa, California Air Resources Board
Bill Dennison, California Small Business Alliance
Rob Farber, Southern California Edison
Ralph Morris, ENVIRON
Karen R. Polenske, MIT Dept of Urban Studies & Planning
Mike Wang, Western States Petroleum Association

MEMBERS ABSENT

Ed Avol, USC
Fereidun Feizollahi, California Air Resources Board
Jane Hall, CSUF
Deng Bang Lee, SCAG
Steve Levy, Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy
Fred Lurmann, Sonoma Technology, Inc.
Reza Mahdavi, CARB
Paul Ong, UCLA School of Public Policy & Social Research
George Treyz, Regional Economic Models, Inc.
Frank Wen, SCAG

OTHERS PRESENT

Ajith Kaduwela, California Air Resources Board
Julia Lester, ENVIRON
Christopher Patton, City of Los Angeles

AQMD STAFF

Mark Bassett, Air Quality Specialist
Elaine Chang, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer
Joe Cassmassi, Planning & Rules Manager
Kevin Durkee, Air Quality Specialist
Bong Kim, Air Quality Specialist
Sang-Mi Lee, Air Quality Specialist
Satoru Mitsutomi, Program Supervisor
Minh Pham, Air Quality Specialist
Laki Tisopoulos, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer
Xinqiu Zhang, Air Quality Specialist