

DRAFT

Technical Support Document (TSD)
Preparation of Emissions Inventories for the Version 6.0,
2011 Emissions Modeling Platform

February 26, 2014

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Air and Radiation
Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
Air Quality Assessment Division

Contacts:

Rich Mason, Alison Eyth, Alexis Zubrow, Darin DeVecchio

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	IV
LIST OF FIGURES	VI
LIST OF APPENDICES	VI
ACRONYMS	VII
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 2011 EMISSION INVENTORIES AND APPROACHES	3
2.1 2011 NEI POINT SOURCES (PTEGU, PTEGU_PK, PT_OILGAS AND PTNONIPM)	8
2.1.1 EGU non-peaking units sector (<i>ptegu</i>).....	9
2.1.2 EGU peaking units sector (<i>ptegu_pk</i>).....	11
2.1.3 Point source oil and gas sector (<i>pt_oilgas</i>).....	11
2.1.4 Non-IPM sector (<i>ptnonipm</i>).....	13
2.2 2011 NONPOINT SOURCES (AFDUST, AG, NP_OILGAS, RWC, NONPT)	14
2.2.1 Area fugitive dust sector (<i>afdust</i>)	16
2.2.2 Agricultural ammonia sector (<i>ag</i>).....	20
2.2.3 Nonpoint source oil and gas sector (<i>np_oilgas</i>).....	21
2.2.4 Residential wood combustion sector (<i>rw</i> c).....	21
2.2.5 Other nonpoint sources sector (<i>nonpt</i>).....	22
2.3 2011 ONROAD MOBILE SOURCES (ONROAD, ONROAD_RFL).....	23
2.3.1 Onroad non-refueling (<i>onroad</i>).....	23
2.3.2 Onroad refueling (<i>onroad_rfl</i>).....	26
2.4 2011 NONROAD MOBILE SOURCES (C1C2RAIL, C3MARINE, NONROAD)	26
2.4.1 Class 1/Class 2 Commercial Marine Vessels and Locomotives and (<i>c1c2rail</i>)	26
2.4.2 Class 3 commercial marine vessels (<i>c3marine</i>)	28
2.4.3 Nonroad mobile equipment sources: (<i>nonroad</i>).....	30
2.5 "OTHER EMISSIONS": OFFSHORE CLASS 3 COMMERCIAL MARINE VESSELS AND DRILLING PLATFORMS AND NON-U.S. SOURCES	31
2.5.1 Point sources from offshore C3 CMV and drilling platforms and Canada and Mexico (<i>othpt</i>)	32
2.5.2 Area and nonroad mobile sources from Canada and Mexico (<i>othar</i>).....	32
2.5.3 Onroad mobile sources from Canada and Mexico (<i>othon</i>).....	33
2.6 FIRES (PTFIRE).....	33
2.7 BIOGENIC SOURCES (BIOG)	34
2.8 SMOKE-READY NON-ANTHROPOGENIC INVENTORIES FOR CHLORINE	34
3 EMISSIONS MODELING SUMMARY	36
3.1 EMISSIONS MODELING OVERVIEW	36
3.2 CHEMICAL SPECIATION	39
3.2.1 VOC speciation	41
3.2.2 PM speciation.....	49
3.2.3 NO _x speciation.....	51
3.3 TEMPORAL ALLOCATION.....	52
3.3.1 Use of FF10 format for finer than annual emissions	53
3.3.2 Electric Generating Utility temporalization (<i>ptegu, ptegu_pk</i>).....	54
3.3.3 Residential Wood Combustion Temporalization (<i>rw</i> c)	56
3.3.4 Agricultural Ammonia Temporal Profiles (<i>ag</i>)	60
3.3.5 Onroad mobile temporalization (<i>onroad, onroad_rfl</i>).....	61
3.3.6 Additional sector specific details (<i>afdust, beis, c1c2rail, c3marine, nonpt, ptfire</i>).....	67
3.4 SPATIAL ALLOCATION.....	68
3.4.1 Spatial Surrogates for U.S. emissions	69
3.4.2 Allocation method for airport-related sources in the U.S.	72
3.4.3 Surrogates for Canada and Mexico emission inventories	73

DRAFT

4	DEVELOPMENT OF 2018 BASE-CASE EMISSIONS	78
4.1	STATIONARY SOURCE PROJECTIONS: EGU SECTORS (PTEGU, PTEGU_PK)	84
4.2	STATIONARY SOURCE PROJECTIONS: NON-EGU SECTORS (AFDUST, AG, NONPT, NP_OILGAS, PTNONIPM, PT_OILGAS, RWC) 84	
4.2.1	<i>RFS2 upstream future year inventories and adjustments (nonpt, ptnonipm)</i>	86
4.2.2	<i>Upstream agricultural and Livestock adjustments (afdust, ag, nonpt, ptnonipm)</i>	95
4.2.3	<i>Residential wood combustion growth (nonpt)</i>	97
4.2.4	<i>Oil and Gas projections (np_oilgas, pt_oilgas)</i>	99
4.2.5	<i>RICE NESHAP (nonpt, ptnonipm, np_oilgas, pt_oilgas)</i>	104
4.2.6	<i>Fuel sulfur rules (nonpt, ptnonipm)</i>	106
4.2.7	<i>Industrial Boiler MACT reconsideration (ptnonipm)</i>	108
4.2.8	<i>Portland Cement NESHAP projections (ptnonipm)</i>	110
4.2.9	<i>State comments and consent decrees/settlements (nonpt, ptnonipm)</i>	113
4.2.10	<i>Aircraft projections (ptnonipm)</i>	118
4.2.11	<i>Remaining non-EGU controls and closures (ptnonipm)</i>	120
4.3	MOBILE SOURCE PROJECTIONS	121
4.3.1	<i>Onroad mobile (onroad and onroad_rfl)</i>	121
4.4	NONROAD MOBILE SOURCE PROJECTIONS (C1C2RAIL, C3MARINE, NONROAD).....	125
4.4.1	<i>Locomotives and Class 1 & 2 commercial marine vessels (c1c2rail)</i>	125
4.4.2	<i>Class 3 commercial marine vessels (c3marine)</i>	128
4.4.3	<i>Other nonroad mobile sources (nonroad)</i>	129
4.5	“OTHER EMISSIONS”: OFFSHORE CLASS 3 COMMERCIAL MARINE VESSELS AND DRILLING PLATFORMS, CANADA AND MEXICO (OTHPT, OTHAR, AND OTHON)	130
4.5.1	<i>Point sources from offshore C3 CMV and drilling platforms and Canada and Mexico (othpt)</i>	130
4.5.2	<i>Area, nonroad mobile and onroad mobile sources from Canada and Mexico (other, othon)</i>	130
5	EMISSION SUMMARIES	131
6	REFERENCES	141

List of Tables

Table 1-1. List of cases in the 2011 Version 6 Emissions Modeling Platform	2
Table 2-1. Platform sectors for the 2011 emissions modeling platform	4
Table 2-2. Summary of significant changes between 2011 platform and 2011NEIv1 by sector	6
Table 2-3. Point source oil and gas sector SCCs	11
Table 2-4. Corn Ethanol Plant Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (grams per gallon produced)	13
Table 2-5. Toxic-to-VOC Ratios for Corn Ethanol Plants	14
Table 2-6. 2011NEIv1 nonpoint sources removed from the 2011 platform	15
Table 2-7. SCCs in the afdust platform sector	16
Table 2-8. Total Impact of Fugitive Dust Adjustments to Unadjusted 2011 Inventory	17
Table 2-9. Livestock SCCs extracted from the NEI to create the ag sector	20
Table 2-10. Fertilizer SCCs extracted from the NEI for inclusion in the “ag” sector	21
Table 2-11. SCCs in the Residential Wood Combustion Sector (rwc)*	22
Table 2-12. Onroad emission modes	25
Table 2-13. 2011NEIv1 SCCs extracted for the starting point in c1c2rail development	26
Table 2-14. Growth factor adjustment factors to project the 2002 ECA-IMO inventory to 2011	29
Table 2-15. 2011 Platform SCCs representing emissions in the ptfire modeling sector	33
Table 3-1. Key emissions modeling steps by sector	37
Table 3-2. Descriptions of the platform grids	38
Table 3-3. Emission model species produced for CB05 with SOA for CMAQ5.0.1 and CAM _x *	40
Table 3-4. Integration approach for BAFM and EBAFM for each platform sector	43
Table 3-5. VOC profiles for WRAP Phase III basins	45
Table 3-6. National VOC profiles for oil and gas	45
Table 3-7. Counties included in the WRAP Dataset	46
Table 3-8. Select VOC profiles 2011 versus 2018	48
Table 3-9. PM model species: AE5 versus AE6	49
Table 3-10. MOVES exhaust PM species versus AE5 species	50
Table 3-11. NO _x speciation profiles	51
Table 3-12. Temporal settings used for the platform sectors in SMOKE	52
Table 3-13. Mapping of MOVES to SMOKE road types	65
Table 3-14. U.S. Surrogates available for the 2011 modeling platform	69
Table 3-15. Spatial Surrogates for WRAP and Marcellus Shale Oil and Gas Data	70
Table 3-16. Total CAP emissions by sector for U.S. Surrogates	71
Table 3-17. Canadian Spatial Surrogates	73
Table 3-18. CAPs Allocated to Mexican and Canadian Spatial Surrogates	75
Table 4-1. Control strategies and growth assumptions for creating the 2018 base-case emissions inventories from the 2011 base case	80
Table 4-2. Subset of CoST Packet Matching Hierarchy	83
Table 4-3. Summary of non-EGU stationary projections subsections	85
Table 4-4. Renewable Fuel Volumes Assumed for Stationary Source Adjustments	86
Table 4-5. 2011 and 2018 corn ethanol plant emissions [tons]	87
Table 4-6. Emission Factors for Biodiesel Plants (Tons/Mgal)	87
Table 4-7. 2018 biodiesel plant emissions [tons]	88
Table 4-8. PFC emissions for 2011 and 2018 [tons]	89
Table 4-9. Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors for Cellulosic Plants (Tons/RIN gallon)	89
Table 4-10. Toxic Emission Factors for Cellulosic Plants (Tons/RIN gallon)	89
Table 4-11. 2018 cellulosic plant emissions [tons]	90
Table 4-12. 2018 VOC working losses (Emissions) due to ethanol transport [tons]	90
Table 4-13. RVPs Assumed for 2018 ethanol and gasoline volumes with EISA	92

DRAFT

Table 4-14. RVPs Assumed for 2018 ethanol and gasoline volumes without EISA	92
Table 4-15. Storage and Transport Vapor Loss Emission Factors (g/mmBtu)	93
Table 4-16. Adjustment factors applied to storage and transport emissions	93
Table 4-17. 2018 adjustment factors applied to petroleum pipelines and refinery emissions associated with gasoline and diesel fuel production.	95
Table 4-18. Impact of refinery adjustments on 2011 emissions [tons]	95
Table 4-19. Adjustments to modeling platform agricultural emissions for the Tier 3 reference case	96
Table 4-20. Composite NH ₃ projection factors to year 2018 for animal operations	96
Table 4-21. Non-West Coast RWC projection factors to year 2018	98
Table 4-22. National RWC impacts for PM _{2.5} and NO _x from 2011 to 2018	99
Table 4-23. AEO-based 2018 Projection Factors	101
Table 4-24. Oil and Gas sector VOC 2018 Projection Factors for NSPS sources	102
Table 4-25. Projected national Oil and Gas sector 2011 and 2018 emissions, summed point and nonpoint	103
Table 4-26. Projected by-state NO _x and VOC 2011 and 2018 Oil and Gas sector emissions	103
Table 4-27. Summary RICE NESHAP SI and CI percent reductions prior to 2011 NEIv1 analysis	105
Table 4-28. National by-sector reductions from RICE Reconsideration Controls	106
Table 4-29. Summary of fuel sulfur rules by state	108
Table 4-30. Facility types potentially subject to Boiler MACT reductions	109
Table 4-31. Default Boiler MACT fuel percent % reductions by ICR fuel type	109
Table 4-32. Summary of Boiler MACT reductions (tons) compared to Reconsideration RIA reductions	110
Table 4-33. Locations of new ISIS-generated cement kilns	111
Table 4-34. U.S. Census Division ISIS-based projection factors for existing kilns	112
Table 4-35. ISIS-based cement industry change (tons/yr)	112
Table 4-36. Impacts of most non-EGU point source state comments received in 2013	114
Table 4-37. Minor source ptnonipm sector NAICS-level projections for Texas	115
Table 4-38. Minor source nonpt sector projections for Texas	115
Table 4-39. Target company-wide reductions from OECA consent decree information	117
Table 4-40. Default national-level factors used to project 2011 base-case aircraft emissions to 2018	118
Table 4-41. Increases in aircraft emissions by year 2018 from airport-specific and national-level methods	119
Table 4-42. Reductions from all EIS-based and remaining information facility/unit-level closures	121
Table 4-43. Projection factors for 2018 VMT (in millions of miles)	122
Table 4-44. Comparison of MOVES runs for 2018	123
Table 4-45. CA LEVIII program states	123
Table 4-46. Non-California year 2018 intermediate projection factors for locomotives and Class 1 and Class 2 Commercial Marine Vessel Emissions	126
Table 4-47. EISA mandate emission adjustments in 2018	127
Table 4-48. Difference in c1c2rail sector emissions between 2011 and 2018	128
Table 4-49. Growth factors to project the 2011 ECA-IMO inventory to 2018	128
Table 5-1. National by-sector CAP emissions summaries for 2011 evaluation case	132
Table 5-2. National by-sector CAP emissions summaries for 2018 base case	133
Table 5-3. National by-sector CO emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences	134
Table 5-4. National by-sector NH ₃ emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences	135
Table 5-5. National by-sector NO _x emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences	136
Table 5-6. National by-sector PM _{2.5} emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences	137
Table 5-7. National by-sector PM ₁₀ emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences	138
Table 5-8. National by-sector SO ₂ emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences	139
Table 5-9. National by-sector VOC emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences	140

List of Figures

Figure 2-1. January PM _{2.5} afdust emissions: raw 2008 NEI (top), after application of transport fraction (middle) and final post-meteorological adjusted (bottom).....	19
Figure 2-2. Illustration of regional modeling domains in ECA-IMO study.....	30
Figure 2-3. Annual NO emissions output from BEIS 3.14 for 2011.....	35
Figure 2-4. Annual isoprene emissions output from BEIS 3.14 for 2011.....	35
Figure 3-1. Air quality modeling domains.....	38
Figure 3-2. Process of integrating BAFM with VOC for use in VOC Speciation.....	42
Figure 3-3. IPM Regions for EPA Base Case v5.13.....	55
Figure 3-4. Example of RWC temporalization in 2007 using a 50 versus 60 °F threshold.....	57
Figure 3-5. RWC diurnal temporal profile.....	58
Figure 3-6. Diurnal profile for OHH, based on heat load (BTU/hr).....	59
Figure 3-7. Day-of-week temporal profiles for OHH and Recreational RWC.....	59
Figure 3-8. Annual-to-month temporal profiles for OHH and recreational RWC.....	60
Figure 3-9. Example of new animal NH ₃ emissions temporalization approach, summed to daily emissions.....	61
Figure 3-10. Example of SMOKE-MOVES temporal variability of NO _x emissions.....	62
Figure 3-11. Previous onroad diurnal weekday profiles for urban roads.....	63
Figure 3-12. Variation in MOVES diurnal profiles.....	63
Figure 3-13. Use of submitted versus new national default profiles.....	64
Figure 3-14. Updated national default profiles for LDGV vs. HHDDV, urban restricted weekday.....	66
Figure 3-15. Agricultural burning diurnal temporal profile.....	68
Figure 4-1. Map of Petroleum Administration for Defense Districts (PADD).....	92
Figure 4-2. Oil and Gas NEMS Regions.....	100
Figure 4-3. Cement sector trends in domestic production versus normalized emissions.....	111

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Nonpoint Oil and Gas NEI SCCs

Appendix B: Mapping of Fuel Distribution SCCs to BTP, BPS and RBT

Appendix C: Crosswalk between AE6 Profile Codes and SPECIATE 4.3 Profile Codes

Appendix D: Memo Describing the Differences in MOVES speciated PM and CMAQ PM

Appendix E: CAP emissions by surrogate and sector

Appendix F: SMOKE Input Data Files and Parameters Used in the 2011 Evaluation and 2018 Base Cases

Appendix G: Future Animal Population Projection Methodology, Updated 07/24/12

Appendix H: Boiler MACT ICR Fuels Cross-Reference to NEI SCCs

DRAFT
Acronyms

ACI	Activated Carbon Injection
AE5	CMAQ Aerosol Module, version 5, introduced in CMAQ v4.7
AE6	CMAQ Aerosol Module, version 6, introduced in CMAQ v5.0
AEO	Annual Energy Outlook
AIM	Architectural and Industrial Maintenance (coatings)
ARW	Advanced Research WRF
BAFM	Benzene, Acetaldehyde, Formaldehyde and Methanol
BEIS3.14	Biogenic Emissions Inventory System, version 3.14
BELD3	Biogenic Emissions Land use Database, version 3
Bgal	Billion gallons
BPS	Bulk Plant Storage
BTP	Bulk Terminal (Plant) to Pump
C1/C2	Category 1 and 2 commercial marine vessels
C3	Category 3 (commercial marine vessels)
CAEP	Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection
CAIR	Clean Air Interstate Rule
CAMD	EPA's Clean Air Markets Division
CAM_x	Comprehensive Air Quality Model with Extensions
CAP	Criteria Air Pollutant
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CB05	Carbon Bond 2005 chemical mechanism
CBM	Coal-bed methane
CEC	North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation
CEMS	Continuous Emissions Monitoring System
CEPAM	California Emissions Projection Analysis Model
CISWI	Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration
Cl	Chlorine
CMAQ	Community Multiscale Air Quality
CMV	Commercial Marine Vessel
CO	Carbon monoxide
CSAPR	Cross-State Air Pollution Rule
E0, E10, E85	0%, 10% and 85% Ethanol blend gasolines, respectively
EBAFM	Ethanol, Benzene, Acetaldehyde, Formaldehyde and Methanol
ECA	Emissions Control Area
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EF	Emission Factor
EGU	Electric Generating Units
EIS	Emissions Inventory System
EISA	Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EMFAC	Emission Factor (California's onroad mobile model)
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAPRI	Food and Agriculture Policy and Research Institute
FASOM	Forest and Agricultural Section Optimization Model
FCCS	Fuel Characteristic Classification System
FF10	Flat File 2010
FIPS	Federal Information Processing Standards
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration

DRAFT

HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutant
HCl	Hydrochloric acid
HDGHG	Heavy-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas
Hg	Mercury
HMS	Hazard Mapping System
HPMS	Highway Performance Monitoring System
HWC	Hazardous Waste Combustion
HWI	Hazardous Waste Incineration
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ICI	Industrial/Commercial/Institutional (boilers and process heaters)
ICR	Information Collection Request
IDA	Inventory Data Analyzer
I/M	Inspection and Maintenance
IMO	International Marine Organization
IPAMS	Independent Petroleum Association of Mountain States
IPM	Integrated Planning Model
ITN	Itinerant
LADCO	Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium
LDGHG	Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas
LPG	Liquified Petroleum Gas
MACT	Maximum Achievable Control Technology
MARAMA	Mid-Atlantic Regional Air Management Association
MATS	Mercury and Air Toxics Standards
MCIP	Meteorology-Chemistry Interface Processor
Mgal	Million gallons
MMS	Minerals Management Service (now known as the Bureau of Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement (BOEMRE))
MOVES	Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (2010b) -- OTAQ's model for estimation of onroad mobile emissions -- replaces the use of the MOBILE model
MSA	Metropolitan Statistical Area
MSAT2	Mobile Source Air Toxics Rule
MTBE	Methyl tert-butyl ether
MWRPO	Mid-west Regional Planning Organization
NCD	National County Database
NEEDS	National Electric Energy Database System
NEI	National Emission Inventory
NESCAUM	Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management
NESHAP	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NH₃	Ammonia
NIF	NEI Input Format
NLCD	National Land Cover Database
NLEV	National Low Emission Vehicle program
nm	nautical mile
NMIM	National Mobile Inventory Model
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NODA	Notice of Data Availability
NONROAD	OTAQ's model for estimation of nonroad mobile emissions
NO_x	Nitrogen oxides
NSPS	New Source Performance Standards
NSR	New Source Review

DRAFT

OAQPS	EPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
OHH	Outdoor Hydronic Heater
OTAQ	EPA's Office of Transportation and Air Quality
ORIS	Office of Regulatory Information System
ORD	EPA's Office of Research and Development
ORL	One Record per Line
OTC	Ozone Transport Commission
PADD	Petroleum Administration for Defense Districts
PF	Projection Factor, can account for growth and/or controls
PFC	Portable Fuel Container
PM_{2.5}	Particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns
PM₁₀	Particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns
ppb, ppm	Parts per billion, parts per million
RBT	Refinery to Bulk Terminal
RFS2	Renewable Fuel Standard
RIA	Regulatory Impact Analysis
RICE	Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engine
RRF	Relative Response Factor
RWC	Residential Wood Combustion
RPO	Regional Planning Organization
RVP	Reid Vapor Pressure
SCC	Source Classification Code
SEMAP	Southeastern Modeling, Analysis, and Planning
SESARM	Southeastern States Air Resource Managers
SESQ	Sesquiterpenes
SMARTFIRE	Satellite Mapping Automated Reanalysis Tool for Fire Incident Reconciliation
SMOKE	Sparse Matrix Operator Kernel Emissions
SO₂	Sulfur dioxide
SOA	Secondary Organic Aerosol
SI	Spark-ignition
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SPDPRO	Hourly Speed Profiles for weekday versus weekend
SPPD	Sector Policies and Programs Division
TAF	Terminal Area Forecast
TCEQ	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
TOG	Total Organic Gas
TSD	Technical support document
ULSD	Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VOC	Volatile organic compounds
VMT	Vehicle miles traveled
VPOP	Vehicle Population
WGA	Western Governors' Association
WRAP	Western Regional Air Partnership
WRF	Weather Research and Forecasting Model

1 Introduction

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) developed an air quality modeling platform for 2011 based on the 2011 National Emissions Inventory, version 1 (2011NEIv1). The air quality modeling platform consists of all the emissions inventories and ancillary data files used for emissions modeling, as well as the meteorological, initial condition, and boundary condition files needed to run the air quality model. This document focuses on the emissions modeling component of the 2011 modeling platform, which includes the emission inventories, the ancillary data files, and the approaches used to transform inventories for use in air quality modeling. Many emissions inventory components of this air quality modeling platform are based on the 2011NEIv1, although there are some differences between the platform inventories and the 2011NEIv1 emissions.

This 2011 modeling platform includes all criteria air pollutants and precursors (CAPs) and the following hazardous air pollutants (HAPs): chlorine (Cl), hydrogen chloride (HCl), benzene, acetaldehyde, formaldehyde and methanol. The latter four HAPs are also abbreviated as BAFM. This platform is called the “CAP-BAFM 2011-Based Platform, version 6” because it is primarily a CAP platform with BAFM species included. Here, “version 6” denotes an evolution from the 2007-based platform, version 5, with substantial improvements due to the use of newer data and methods. For the rest of this document, the platform that is described is referred to as the “2011 platform” or “2011v6”. Future updates to the 2011 platform will include a version qualifier such as “2011 Platform v6.1”, and so on.

The first use of the 2011 platform is for the proposed rule related to the transport of ozone that will focus on helping states in the eastern United States meet the 2008 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone. The air quality model used for this rule is the Comprehensive Air Quality Model with Extensions (CAM_x) model (<http://www.camx.com/>), version 6.10; however, emissions are first processed for the Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) model (<http://www.epa.gov/AMD/CMAQ/>), version 5.0.1 and then converted to CAM_x-ready format. Both CAM_x and CMAQ support modeling ozone (O₃) and particulate matter (PM), and require as input hourly and gridded emissions of chemical species that correspond to CAPs and specific HAPs. The chemical mechanism used by CAM_x for this platform is called Carbon Bond 2005 (CB05) with chlorine chemistry. CB05 allows explicit treatment of BAFM and includes HAP emissions of HCl and Cl.

The 2011 platform consists of two ‘complete’ emissions cases: the 2011 base case (i.e., 2011ed_v6) and the 2018 base case (i.e., 2018ed_v6). In the case abbreviations, the 2011 and 2018 are the year represented by the emissions; the “e” stands for evaluation, meaning that year-specific data for fires and EGUs are used, and the “d” represents that this was the fourth set of emissions modeled for the 2011v6 platform. Table 1-1 provides more information on these emissions cases. The purpose of the 2011 base case is to represent the year 2011 in a manner consistent with the methods used in corresponding future-year cases, including the 2018 future year base case, as well as any additional future year control and source apportionment cases.

For regulatory applications, the outputs from the 2011 base case are used in conjunction with the outputs from the 2018 base case in the relative response factor (RRF) calculations to identify future areas of nonattainment. For more information on the use of RRFs and air quality modeling, see “Guidance on the Use of Models and Other Analyses for Demonstrating Attainment of Air Quality Goals for Ozone, PM 2.5, and Regional Haze”, available from <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/scram/guidance/guide/final-03-pm-rh-guidance.pdf>. This document is available on EPA’s Emissions Modeling Clearinghouse website, <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/emch/>, under the section entitled “2011-based Modeling Platform (2011v6 Platform)”.

Table 1-1. List of cases in the 2011 Version 6 Emissions Modeling Platform

Case Name	Abbreviation	Description
2011 base case	2011ed_v6	2011 case relevant for air quality model evaluation purposes and for computing relative response factors with 2018 scenario(s). Uses 2011NEIv1 and some other inventory data, with hourly 2011 continuous emissions monitoring System (CEMS) data for Electrical Generating Units (EGUs), hourly onroad mobile emissions, and 2011 day-specific wild and prescribed fire data.
2018 base case	2018ed_v6	2018 “base case” scenario, representing the best estimate for the future year that incorporates estimates of the impact of current “on-the-books” regulations, without including implementation of controls needed to attain current PM _{2.5} annual and 24-hour standards (35 ppm and 15 ppm, respectively) and ozone 8-hour standard (75 ppb).

A brief summary of the emissions data used in the 2011v6 platform follows:

- 1) Point and nonpoint sources are based on the 2011NEIv1.
- 2) Onroad mobile sources are based on year 2011 emissions computed using the Sparse Matrix Operator Kernel Emission (SMOKE) interface to emission factors developed with the version of Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (MOVES) that represents the proposed Tier 3 Vehicle Emission and Fuel Standards (<http://www.epa.gov/OTAQ/tier3.htm>).
- 3) Nonroad mobile sources are based on the 2011NEIv1, except for some additions of VOC in California where there were HAP emissions but no VOCs in 2011NEIv1.
- 4) Commercial marine vessels (CMV) are based on the 2011NEIv1 except for 2011 California Air Resources Board (CARB) inventory in California, 2010 regional planning organization (RPO) inventories in the Midwest, and a separate year-2002-based (projected to 2011) inventory for Class 3 CMV vessels. Additional minor changes were made to point sources as described in Section 2.1.

The primary emissions modeling tool used to create the air quality model-ready emissions was SMOKE modeling system (<http://www.smoke-model.org/>). SMOKE version 3.5.1 was used to create emissions files for a 12-km national grid that includes all of the contiguous states “12US2”, shown in Figure 3-1. Boundary conditions for this grid were obtained from a 2011 run of GEOS-Chem (<http://geos-chem.org/>). Electronic copies of the data used as input to SMOKE for the 2011 Platform are available from the Emissions Modeling Clearinghouse website, <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/emch/>.

The gridded meteorological model used for the emissions modeling was developed using the Weather Research and Forecasting Model (WRF, <http://wrf-model.org>) version 3.4, Advanced Research WRF (ARW) core (Skamarock, et al., 2008). The WRF Model is a mesoscale numerical weather prediction system developed for both operational forecasting and atmospheric research applications. WRF was run for 2011 over a domain covering the continental United States at a 12km resolution with 35 vertical layers. The data was collapsed to 25 layers prior to running the emissions and air quality models.

This document contains five sections and several appendices. Section 2 describes the 2011 inventories input to SMOKE. Section 3 describes the emissions modeling and the ancillary files used with the emission inventories. Section 4, describes the development of the 2018 inventory (projected from 2011). Data summaries comparing the 2011 base case and 2018 base case are provided in Section 5. Section 6 provides references. The Appendices provide additional details about specific technical methods.

2 2011 Emission Inventories and Approaches

This section describes the 2011 emissions data that make up the 2011 platform. The starting point for the 2011 stationary source emission inputs is the 2011NEIv1. Emissions of NO_x, SO₂, VOC and PM emissions decrease from values in the 2008 NEI version 3 for most source sectors, with a couple of notable exceptions including increased industrial NO_x, VOC and CO associated with increased oil and gas sector emissions and improved emission estimates; slightly increased VOC, CO and NH₃ from fuel combustion; and increased wildfire emissions. Documentation for the 2011NEIv1, including a Technical Support Document (TSD), is available at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/net/2011inventory.html#inventorydoc>.

The NEI data for CAPs are largely compiled from data submitted by state, local and tribal (S/L/T) air agencies. HAP emissions data are also from the state data, but are often augmented by EPA because they are voluntarily submitted. EPA uses the Emissions Inventory System (EIS) to compile the NEI. EIS includes hundreds of automated QA checks to help improve data quality, and also supports tracking release point (e.g., stack) coordinates separately from facility coordinates. EPA collaborated extensively with S/L/T agencies to ensure a very high quality of data in the 2011NEIv1. Tangible benefits of this collaboration are seen in improved data quality from past first version inventories, improved completeness and avoided duplication between point and nonpoint source categories such as industrial boilers. Onroad mobile source emissions in the 2011NEIv1 were developed using MOVES2010b; however, the 2011 emissions modeling platform used a different version of MOVES, hence forth referred to as “MOVESTier3NPRM”, that facilitated the representation of the proposed Tier 3 standards in future years. When given the same inputs, these two versions of MOVES produce similar emissions estimates for the year 2011.

The 2011 NEI includes five data categories: point sources, nonpoint (formerly called “stationary area”) sources, nonroad mobile sources, onroad mobile sources, and events consisting of fires. The 2011NEIv1 uses 60 sectors to further describe the emissions, with an additional biogenic sector generated from a summation of the gridded, hourly 2011 biogenic data used in the modeling platform. In addition to the NEI data, emissions from the Canadian and Mexican inventories and several other non-NEI data sources are included in the 2011 platform. As explained below, the non-NEI emissions component to the 2011 platform primarily includes: different version of MOVES-based onroad mobile source emissions, non-meteorologically-adjusted road dust, year-2010 commercial marine vessel (CMV) emissions in the Midwest (<http://www.ladco.org/>), and Class 3 CMV data developed by EPA.

Fire emissions in 2011NEIv2 were developed based on Version 2 of the Satellite Mapping Automated Reanalysis Tool for Fire Incident Reconciliation (SMARTFIRE) system (Sullivan, et al., 2008). SMARTFIRE 2 was the first version of SMARTFIRE to assign all fires as either prescribed burning or wildfire categories. In past inventories, a significant number of fires were published as unclassified, which impacted the emissions values and diurnal emissions pattern. Recent updates to SMARTFIRE include improved emission factors for prescribed burning.

For the purposes of preparing the air quality model-ready emissions, the 2011NEIv1 was split into finer-grained sectors used for emissions modeling. The significance of an emissions modeling or “platform sector” is that the data are run through all of the SMOKE programs except the final merge (Mrgrid) independently from the other sectors. The final merge program then combines the sector-specific gridded, speciated, hourly emissions together to create CMAQ-ready emission inputs. For CAMx applications, the CMAQ-ready emissions are then converted into the format needed by CAMx by a convertor program.

Table 2-1 presents the sectors in the 2011 platform and how they generally relate to the 2011NEIv1 as a starting point. As discussed in greater detail in Table 2-2, the emissions in some of these sectors were modified from the 2011NEIv1 emissions for the 2011 modeling platform. The platform sector abbreviations are provided in italics. These abbreviations are used in the SMOKE modeling scripts, inventory file names, and throughout the remainder of this document.

Table 2-1. Platform sectors for the 2011 emissions modeling platform

Platform Sector: <i>abbreviation</i>	NEI Data Category	Description and resolution of the data input to SMOKE
EGU non-peaking units: <i>ptegu</i>	Point	2011 NEI point source EGUs determined to operate as non-peaking units based on criteria discussed in Section 2.1. For future year emissions, these units are mapped to the Integrated Planning Model (IPM) model using the National Electric Energy Database System (NEEDS) version 5.13. The 2011NEIv1 emissions are replaced with hourly 2011 CEMS values for NO _x and SO ₂ , where the units match. Other pollutants are scaled from 2011NEIv1 using CEMS heat input. Emissions for all non-CEMS sources come from 2011NEIv1. Annual resolution for non-CEMS sources, hourly for CEMS sources.
EGU peaking units: <i>ptegu_pk</i>	Point	Same as ptegu sector, but limited to EGUs that are determined to operate as peaking units, as discussed in Section 2.1. All sources in this sector have CEMS data for 2011 and are therefore hourly.
Point source oil and gas: <i>pt_oilgas</i>	Point	2011NEIv1 point sources with oil and gas production emissions processes.
Remaining non- EGU point: <i>ptnonipm</i>	Point	All 2011NEIv1 point source records not matched to the ptegu, ptegu_pk, and pt_oilgas sectors, except for offshore point sources that are in the othpt sector. Includes all aircraft emissions and some rail yard emissions. Annual resolution.
Agricultural: <i>ag</i>	Nonpoint	NH ₃ emissions from 2011NEIv1 nonpoint livestock and fertilizer application, county and annual resolution.
Area fugitive dust: <i>afdust</i>	Nonpoint	PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} from fugitive dust sources from the 2011NEIv1 nonpoint inventory including building construction, road construction, and agricultural dust, and road dust; however, unpaved and paved road dust emissions differ from the NEI in that do not have a precipitation adjustment. Instead, the emissions modeling adjustment applies a transport fraction and a meteorology-based (precipitation and snow/ice cover) zero-out. County and annual resolution.
Nonpoint source oil and gas: <i>np_oilgas</i>	Nonpoint	2011NEIv1 nonpoint sources from oil and gas-related processes. County and annual resolution.
Residential Wood Combustion: <i>rwc</i>	Nonpoint	2011NEIv1 NEI nonpoint sources with Residential Wood Combustion (RWC) processes. County and annual resolution.
Class 1 & 2 CMV and locomotives: <i>c1c2rail</i>	Nonpoint	Locomotives and primarily category 1 (C1) and category 2 (C2) commercial marine vessel (CMV) emissions sources from the 2011NEIv1 nonpoint inventory. Midwestern states' CMV emissions, including Class 3 sources, are from a separate year 2010 emissions inventory. County and annual resolution.

DRAFT

Platform Sector: <i>abbreviation</i>	NEI Data Category	Description and resolution of the data input to SMOKE
commercial marine: <i>c3marine</i>	Nonpoint	Category 3 (C3) CMV emissions projected to 2011 from year 2002 values. These emissions are not from the NEI, but rather were developed for the rule called “Control of Emissions from New Marine Compression-Ignition Engines at or Above 30 Liters per Cylinder”, usually described as the Emissions Control Area- International Maritime Organization (ECA-IMO) study: http://www.epa.gov/otaq/oceanvessels.htm . (EPA-420-F-10-041, August 2010). U.S. states-only emissions (zero in Midwest); see othpt sector for all non-U.S. emissions. Treated as point sources to reflect shipping lanes, annual resolution.
Remaining nonpoint: <i>nonpt</i>	Nonpoint	2011NEIv1 nonpoint sources not otherwise removed from modeling or included in other platform sectors; county and annual resolution.
Nonroad: <i>nonroad</i>	Nonroad	2011NEIv1 nonroad equipment emissions developed with the National Mobile Inventory Model (NMIM) using NONROAD2008 version NR08a. NMIM was used for all states except California and Texas, which submitted their own emissions to the 2011NEIv1. County and monthly resolution.
Onroad non-refueling: <i>onroad</i>	Onroad	2011 onroad mobile source gasoline and diesel vehicles from parking lots and moving vehicles. Includes the following modes: exhaust, extended idle, evaporative, permeation, and brake and tire wear. For all states except California and Texas, based on monthly MOVES emissions tables from MOVESTier3NPRM. Texas emissions are from the 2011NEIv1 based on MOVES 2010b, and California emissions are based on Emission Factor (EMFAC). MOVES-based emissions computed for each hour and model grid cell using monthly and annual activity data (e.g., VMT, vehicle population).
Onroad refueling: <i>onroad_rfl</i>	Onroad	2011NEIv1 onroad mobile gasoline and diesel vehicle refueling emissions for all states. Based on MOVES 2010b emissions tables. Computed hourly based on temperature and for each model grid cell.
Point source fires: <i>ptfire</i>	Fires	Point source day-specific wildfires and prescribed fires for 2011 computed using SMARTFIRE 2, except for Georgia-submitted emissions. Consistent with 2011NEIv1.
Other point sources not from the 2011 NEI: <i>othpt</i>	N/A	Point sources from Canada’s 2006 inventory and Mexico’s Phase III 2012 inventory, annual resolution. Mexico’s inventory is year 2012 and grown from year 1999 (ERG, 2009; Wolf, 2009). Also includes all non-U.S. C3 CMV and U.S. offshore oil production, which are unchanged from the 2008 NEI point source annual emissions.
Other non-NEI nonpoint and nonroad: <i>othar</i>	N/A	Annual year 2006 Canada (province resolution) and year 2012 (grown from 1999) Mexico Phase III (municipio resolution) nonpoint and nonroad mobile inventories.
Other non-NEI onroad sources: <i>othon</i>	N/A	Year 2006 Canada (province resolution) and year 2012 (grown from 1999) Mexico Phase III (municipio resolution) onroad mobile inventories, annual resolution.
Biogenic: <i>beis</i>	Nonpoint	Year 2011, hour-specific, grid cell-specific emissions generated from the BEIS3.14 model with SMOKE, including emissions in Canada and Mexico.

Table 2-2 provides a brief by-sector overview of the most significant differences between the 2011 emissions platform and the 2011NEIv1. Only those sectors with significant differences between the 2011NEIv1 and the 2011 emissions modeling platform are listed. For some sectors, such as non-EGU point (ptnonipm), these changes are very minor and localized. In contrast, other sectors such as C3 commercial marine (c3marine) are either completely replaced or have significant and detailed edits based on review of available alternative data. The specific by-sector updates to the 2011 platform are described in greater detail later in this section under each by-sector subsection. A spreadsheet quantifying the differences between the 2011NEIv1 and modeling platform is available on CHIEF under ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/2011NEIv1_versus_2011ed_differences.xlsx.

Table 2-2. Summary of significant changes between 2011 platform and 2011NEIv1 by sector

Platform Sector	Summary of Significant Inventory Differences of 2011 Platform vs. 2011NEIv1
IPM sectors: <i>ptegu & ptegu_pk</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Based on 2011NEIv1 and 2011 CEMS data analysis, added ORIS Boiler IDs to some units (greater than 1,000 tons of NO_x or SO₂) with missing or incorrect values to allow for hourly CEMS data processing. 2) Added CEMS matches to additional units identified as CEMS sources. 3) Hourly NO_x and SO₂ CEMS data replaces annual NO_x and SO₂ NEI data in the air quality model inputs.
Remaining non-EGU (IPM) sector: <i>ptnonipm</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Based on items above (ptegu & ptegu_pk), made additional matches to IPM_YN codes and ORIS facility codes that caused several sources to move into the ptegu and ptegu_pk sectors. This edit prevents double counting of EGU emissions in the future years. 2) Included 2011 ethanol plant facilities from EPA's Office of Transportation and Air Quality (OTAQ) that were not identified in the 2011 NEIv1.
Area fugitive dust: <i>afdust</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Replaced EPA-provided emission estimates for paved and unpaved road dust with "non-met-adjusted" emissions; i.e., the meteorology/precipitation reduction included in the 2011NEIv1 is backed-out. 2) All emissions in this sector are processed (adjusted) to reflect land use (transport) and meteorological effects such as rain and snow cover that significantly reduce PM emissions input to the air quality model. These adjusted emissions are known as the afdust_adj emissions.
Remaining nonpoint sector: <i>nonpt</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Split the 2011NEIv1 nonpoint file into the platform sectors afdust, ag, np_oilgas, rwc, c3marine, and c1c2rail. 2) Used agricultural fires emissions from daily inventory aggregated to monthly values, whereas the NEI only stores annual values.
Class 1 & 2 CMV and locomotives: <i>c1c2rail</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Replaced Midwest RPO states c1c2 CMV emissions with comprehensive year 2010 RPO inventory. 2) Replaced all California estimates with year-2011 CARB estimates.
C3 commercial marine: <i>c3marine</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Used non-2011NEIv1-based data. Rather used year-2011 point sources as projected from 2002 from the ECA-IMO project. 2) Midwest RPO states replaced with 2010 RPO inventory (see c1c2rail sector).
Nonroad sector: <i>nonroad</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) States other than Texas: monthly rather than annual + small VOC adjustments in California. 2) Texas: replaced with annual 2011 Texas data apportioned to months using EPA's 2011 nonroad estimates.

Platform Sector	Summary of Significant Inventory Differences of 2011 Platform vs. 2011NEIv1
Onroad non-refueling: <i>onroad</i>	1) For all states except California and Texas: Year 2011 emissions for all pollutants and modes (exhaust, evaporative, permeation, tire and brake wear) ² from all vehicle types are based on emission factors from the version of MOVESTier3NPRM, as opposed to MOVES 2010b which was used for the 2011NEIv1. Processed with 2011 meteorology using SMOKE-MOVES (discussed later). 2) For California and Texas: merged in 2011 California and Texas data to post-adjust SMOKE-MOVES data (discussed later).
Onroad non-refueling: <i>onroad_rfl</i>	For all states including California: Year 2011 emissions for all pollutants AND all vehicle types are based on MOVES2010b emission factor tables processed with 2011 meteorology using SMOKE-MOVES (discussed later). Therefore, these emissions are identical to the 2011NEIv1 for states that did not submit refueling emissions, but are inconsistent with 2011NEIv1 for states that did submit point and nonpoint refueling since the 2011NEIv1 kept state-submissions over EPA data.

The emission inventories in SMOKE input format for the 2011 base case are available from the Emissions Modeling Clearinghouse website <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/emch/index.html#2011>. The inventories “readme” file indicates the particular zipped files associated with each platform sector. A number of reports were developed for the 2011 platform. Descriptions of the available data and reports are available from the FTP site at <ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform>. The types of reports include state summaries of inventory pollutants and model species by modeling platform sector for 2011 and 2018 in the Microsoft® Excel® files “2011ed_v6_11f_state_sector_totals.xlsx” and “2018ed_v6_11f_state_sector_totals.xlsx”, with a comparison of the emissions in two cases in the file “2011ed_2018ed_comparison_6jan2014.xlsx”. CAP emission totals by county, month, and modeling platform sector are available in the files “2011ed_county_monthly_report_CAPs.xlsx” and “2018ed_county_monthly_report_CAPs.xlsx”. Summaries by state and source classification code (SCC), including SCC descriptions, by modeling sector for 2011 and 2018 are available at the FTP site: <ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/State-SCC-Summaries/>. A comparison of the complete list of inventory files, ancillary files, and parameter settings for the 2011 and 2018 modeling cases is available in the file “2011ed_2018ed_case_inputs.xlsx”.

The remainder of Section 2 provides details about the data contained in each of the 2011 platform sectors. Different levels of detail are provided for different sectors depending on the availability of reference information for the data, the degree of changes or manipulation of the data needed to prepare it for input to SMOKE, and whether the 2011 platform emissions are significantly different from the 2011NEIv1.

² For the extended idle mode, used MOVES2010b emissions factors. See onroad section below for details.

2.1 2011 NEI point sources (ptegu, ptegu_pk, pt_oilgas and ptnonipm)

Point sources are sources of emissions for which specific geographic coordinates (e.g., latitude/longitude) are specified, as in the case of an individual facility. A facility may have multiple emission release points, which may be characterized as units such as boilers, reactors, spray booths, kilns, etc. A unit may have multiple processes (e.g., a boiler that sometimes burns residual oil and sometimes burns natural gas). With a couple of minor exceptions, this section describes only NEI point sources within the contiguous United States. The offshore oil platform (othpt sector) and category 3 CMV emissions (c3marine and othpt sectors) are processed by SMOKE as point source inventories, as described in Section 2.5.1 and Section 2.4.2, respectively. A comprehensive description on how EGU emissions were characterized and estimated in the 2011 NEI can be found in Section 3.10 in the 2011NEIv1 TSD.

The point source file used for the modeling platform is exported from EIS into the Flat File 2010 (FF10) format that is compatible with SMOKE (see <http://www.cmascenter.org/smoke/documentation/3.5.1/html/ch08s02s10.html#d0e44906>). After moving offshore oil platforms into the othpt sector, initial versions of the other four platform point source sectors were created from the remaining 2011NEIv1 point sources. The point sectors are: the EGU sector for non-peaking units (ptegu), the EGU sector for peaking units (ptegu_pk), point source oil and gas extraction -related emissions (pt_oilgas) and the remaining non-EGU sector also called the non-IPM (ptnonipm) sector. The EGU emissions are split out to facilitate the use of distinct SMOKE temporal processing and future-year projection techniques. The EGU sectors are further split into “peaking” (ptegu_pk) and non-peaking units to allow for better analysis of the impact of peaking units. The oil and gas sector emissions (pt_oilgas) were processed separately for summary tracking purposes and unique future-year projection techniques from the remaining non-EGU emissions (ptnonipm).

In addition to the emissions summaries described in Section 1, two other specialized point source summaries are available on the Emissions Modeling Clearinghouse website. A summary report of stack parameters for the point source sectors, including cross references to CEMS data via ORIS IDs, can be found in the file ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/2011_emissions/2011ec_stack_parameter_report.xlsx. A comparison of the 2011NEIv1 EGU emissions with the 2011 CEMS data is available in the same directory in the file “2011_EGUs_NEI_CEMS.xlsx”.

The inventory pollutants processed through SMOKE for both all point source sectors were: CO, NO_x, VOC, SO₂, NH₃, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} and the following HAPs: HCl (pollutant code = 7647010), and Cl (code = 7782505). The inventory BAFM from these sectors was not used, instead VOC was speciated to these pollutants without any use (i.e., integration) and the VOC HAP pollutants from the inventory were ignored (VOC integration is discussed in detail in Section 3.2.1.1).

The ptnonipm and pt_oilgas sector emissions were provided to SMOKE as annual emissions. For those ptegu and ptegu_pk sources with CEMS data (that could be matched to the 2011NEIv1), 2011 hourly CEMS NO_x and SO₂ emissions were used (rather than NEI emissions) and for all other pollutants annual emissions were used as-is from the NEI, but were allocated to hourly values using heat input CEMS data. For the non-CEMS sources in the ptegu and ptegu_pk sectors, daily emissions were created using an approach described in Section 2.1.1, and IPM region- and pollutant-specific diurnal profiles were applied to create hourly emissions.

DRAFT

Changes made to the point-based sectors from the 2011 NEI v1 for the 2011 platform were briefly described in Table 2-2. One of these changes involved splitting the stacks, units and facilities into the ptnonipm, pt_oilgas, ptegu and ptegu_pk sectors. Sources were included in the ptegu or ptegu_pk sectors only when it was determined that these sources were reflected in the future-year IPM output data. These changes and other updates to the point source sectors for the 2011 platform are discussed in the following sections.

2.1.1 EGU non-peaking units sector (ptegu)

The ptegu and ptegu_pk (see Section 2.1.2) sectors contain emissions from EGUs in the 2011 NEI v1 point inventory that could be matched to units found in the NEEDS v5.13 database. It was necessary to put these EGUs into separate sectors in the platform because IPM projects future emissions for the EGUs defined in the NEEDS database, and emissions for sources in the ptegu and ptegu_pk sectors are replaced with IPM outputs in the future year modeling case. Sources not matched to units found in NEEDS are placed into the pt_oilgas (see Section 2.1.3) or ptnonipm sector (see Section 2.1.4) and are projected to the future year using projection and control factors. It is important that the matching between the NEI and NEEDS database be as complete as possible because there can be double counting of emissions in the future year if emissions for units are projected by IPM are not properly matched to the units in the NEI.

In the SMOKE point flat file, emission records for sources that have been matched to the NEEDS database have a value filled into the IPM_YN column. Many of these matches are stored within EIS. In some cases, it was difficult to match the sources between the databases due to different facility names in the two data systems and due to differences in how the units are defined, thereby resulting in matches that are not always one-to-one. Some additional matches were made in the modeling platform to accommodate some of these situations as described later in this section. The NEEDS v5.13 database can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/powersectormodeling/BaseCasev513.html>, along with additional information about IPM.

Some units in the ptegu and ptegu_pk sectors are matched to CEMS data via ORIS facility codes and boiler ID. For these units, SMOKE replaces the 2011 emissions of NO_x and SO₂ with the CEMS emissions, thereby ignoring the annual values specified in the NEI. For other pollutants, the hourly CEMS heat input data are used to allocate the NEI annual emissions to hourly values. All stack parameters, stack locations, and SCC codes for these sources come from the NEI. Because these attributes are obtained from the NEI, the chemical speciation of VOC and PM_{2.5} for the sources is selected based on the SCC or in some cases, based on unit-specific data. If CEMS data exists for a unit, but the unit is not matched to the NEI, the CEMS data for that unit is not used in the modeling platform. However, if the source exists in the NEI and is just not matched to a CEMS unit, the emissions from that source would still be modeled using the annual emission value in the NEI. EIS stores many matches from EIS units to the ORIS facility codes and boiler IDs used to reference the CEMS data. Some additional matches were made in the modeling platform as described later in this section.

In the SMOKE point flat file, emission records for point sources matched to CEMS data have values filled into the ORIS_FACILITY_CODE and ORIS_BOILER_ID columns. The CEMS data in SMOKE-ready format is available at <http://ampd.epa.gov/ampd/> near the bottom of the “Prepackaged Data” tab. Many smaller emitters in the CEMS program are not identified with ORIS facility or boiler IDs that can be matched to the NEI due to inconsistencies in the way a unit is defined between the NEI and CAMD datasets, or due to uncertainties in source identification such as inconsistent plant names in the two data systems. Also, the NEEDS database of units modeled by IPM includes many smaller emitting EGUs

DRAFT

that are not included in the CAMD hourly CEMS programs. Therefore, there will be more units in the NEEDS database than have CEMS data.

For sources not matched to CEMS data (“non-CEMS” sources), daily emissions were computed from the NEI annual emissions using average CEMS data profiles specific to fuel type, pollutant³, and IPM region. To allocate to hour, diurnal profiles were created using average CEMS data for heat input specific to fuel type and IPM region. For future-year scenarios, there are no CEMS data available for specific units, but the shape of the CEMS profiles is preserved for sources that are carried into the future year. This method keeps the temporal behavior of the base and future year cases as consistent as possible. See Section 3.3.2 for more details on the temporalization approach for ptegu sources.

Finding additional matches between the NEI, NEEDS, and CEMS data

Several analytical steps were performed to better link the NEEDS units to the 2011NEIv1, along with implementing better matching to the CEMS data cross-referenced using “ORIS” facility and boiler IDs. The steps described in the 2011NEIv1 TSD have some detail on how the values in the IPM_YN column were assigned. For the modeling platform, an initial ptipm/ptnonipm split was determined using the values in the SMOKE point source flat file variable “IPM_YN”, which is populated based on an EIS alternative facility identifier. Because EIS expects the matches to be one-to-one for an entire unit, if the units are not defined in the same way in EIS and NEEDS, it is not possible to store the match in EIS. Some IPM_YN values in the SMOKE input file were therefore manually updated based on units that had been matched to IPM units in past modeling platforms, but for which the alternative facility IDs in EIS did not include a code for IPM matching. These additions were usually needed due to one-to-many or many-to-one relationships between units in the EIS and the NEEDS databases.

Additional matches between the NEI and NEEDS were identified by identifying units in IPM outputs that were not yet matched to NEI data, and by looking for units identified in the NEI with facility type codes identifying them as EGUs or facility names that indicated they were EGUs. In each case, priority was given to units with larger emissions (e.g., > 300TPY of NO_x or SO₂). The units in each data set that did not yet have matches within the same county were compared to one another on the basis of their plant names and locations. In some cases, IDs were similar but were mismatched only due to a missing leading zero in one of the databases. In other cases, a facility level match was specified, but a unit/boiler level match was not yet identified and therefore the units at the facility were compared to one another on the basis of design capacity and naming. For any new matches that were found, values that represented the NEEDS IDs were filled in to the IPM_YN in the modeling platform flat files. When possible, these matches were loaded into EIS.

A similar matching process was used to identify additional matches between the 2011NEIv1 and CEMS data. To determine whether a NEI unit matched a CEMS unit, the CEMS units were compared to facilities in the NEI that were not yet identified as a CEMS unit on the basis of their county FIPS codes, locations, and total emissions of NO_x and SO₂. Additional CEMS matches that were found were applied to the FF10 file by specifying values for ORIS_FACILITY_CODE, ORIS_BOILER_ID. Because IPM uses a concatenation of the ORIS facility code and boiler ID, values were also filled in to the IPM_YN field for these units.

³ The year to day profiles use NO_x and SO₂ CEMS for NO_x and SO₂, respectively. For all other pollutants, they use heat input CEMS data.

DRAFT

As a result of identifying additional matches through this analysis, many EGUs that otherwise would have remained in the ptnonipm sector were moved to the ptegu sector. Some of the new CEMS assignments were loaded into EIS for use in future inventories, but some could not be loaded into EIS because they were not one-to-one matches (e.g. multiple EIS units corresponding to a single CEMS unit). Note that SMOKE is more flexible when associating CEMS data with the inventory than EIS is, and can perform matches down to the stack or release point level.

2.1.2 EGU peaking units sector (ptegu_pk)

The ptegu_pk sector includes sources identified by EPA as peaking units. The units were separated into this sector to facilitate analyses of the impact of peaking units. Aside from their inclusion in this sector, in all other ways they are treated in the same way as CEMS sources in the ptegu sector because all of them are matched to CEMS data. To identify units for inclusion in this sector, EPA made sure they satisfied two tests: (1) the capacity factor was less than 10% over a 3 year average (2010-2012), and (2) the capacity factor was less than 20% in each of the 3 years. Here, “capacity factor” means either: (1) The ratio of a unit's actual annual electric output (expressed in MWe/hr) to the unit's nameplate capacity (or maximum observed hourly gross load (in MWe/hr) if greater than the nameplate capacity) times 8760 hours; or (2) The ratio of a unit's annual heat input (in million BTUs or equivalent units of measure) to the unit's maximum rated hourly heat input rate (in million BTUs per hour or equivalent units of measure) times 8,760 hours. The list of units in the ptegu_pk sector is provided in the file (see the file

ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/2011_emissions/Peakers_CAMD_2011.080_213_NEI_IPM_match.xls).

2.1.3 Point source oil and gas sector (pt_oilgas)

The pt_oilgas sector includes sources with the SCCs specified in the list in Table 2-3. The emissions and other source characteristics in the pt_oilgas sector are submitted by states, while EPA developed a dataset of nonpoint oil and gas emissions for each county in the U.S. with oil and gas activity that was available for states to use. The nonpoint emissions can be found in the np_oilgas sector. More information on the development of the 2011 oil and gas emissions can be found in Section 3.21 of the 2011NEIv1 TSD.

Table 2-3. Point source oil and gas sector SCCs

SCC	SCC Description*
31000309	IP;OGP;Natural Gas Processing Facilities;Compressor Seals
31000310	IP;OGP;Natural Gas Processing Facilities;Pump Seals
31000311	IP;OGP;Natural Gas Processing Facilities;Flanges and Connections
31000321	IP;OGP;Natural Gas Processing Facilities;Glycol Dehydrators: Niagaran Formation (Mich.)
31000322	IP;OGP;Natural Gas Processing Facilities;Glycol Dehydrators: Prairie du Chien Formation (Mich.)
31000323	IP;OGP;Natural Gas Processing Facilities;Glycol Dehydrators: Antrim Formation (Mich.)
31000324	IP;OGP;Natural Gas Processing Facilities;Pneumatic Controllers Low Bleed
31000325	IP;OGP;Natural Gas Processing Facilities;Pneumatic Controllers High Bleed >6 scfm
31000401	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Distillate Oil (No. 2)
31000402	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Residual Oil
31000403	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Crude Oil
31000404	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Natural Gas

DRAFT

SCC	SCC Description*
31000405	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Process Gas
31000406	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Propane/Butane
31000411	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Distillate Oil (No. 2): Steam Generators
31000412	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Residual Oil: Steam Generators
31000413	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Crude Oil: Steam Generators
31000414	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Natural Gas: Steam Generators
31000415	IP;OGP;Process Heaters;Process Gas: Steam Generators
31000502	IP;OGP;Liquid Waste Treatment;Liquid - Liquid Separator
31000503	IP;OGP;Liquid Waste Treatment;Oil-Water Separator
31000504	IP;OGP;Liquid Waste Treatment;Oil-Sludge-Waste Water Pit
31000506	IP;OGP;Liquid Waste Treatment;Oil-Water Separation Wastewater Holding Tanks
31088801	IP;OGP;Fugitive Emissions;Specify in Comments Field
31088802	IP;OGP;Fugitive Emissions;Specify in Comments Field
31088803	IP;OGP;Fugitive Emissions;Specify in Comments Field
31088804	IP;OGP;Fugitive Emissions;Specify in Comments Field
31088805	IP;OGP;Fugitive Emissions;Specify in Comments Field
31088811	IP;OGP;Fugitive Emissions;Fugitive Emissions
31700101	Industrial Processes;NGTS;Natural Gas Transmission and Storage Facilities;Pneumatic Controllers Low Bleed
40400300	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Fixed Roof Tank: Flashing Loss
40400301	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Fixed Roof Tank: Breathing Loss
40400302	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Fixed Roof Tank: Working Loss
40400303	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;External Floating Roof Tank with Primary Seals: Standing Loss
40400304	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;External Floating Roof Tank with Secondary Seals: Standing Loss
40400305	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Internal Floating Roof Tank: Standing Loss
40400306	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;External Floating Roof Tank: Withdrawal Loss
40400307	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Internal Floating Roof Tank: Withdrawal Loss
40400311	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Fixed Roof Tank, Condensate, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400312	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Fixed Roof Tank, Crude Oil, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400313	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Fixed Roof Tank, Lube Oil, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400314	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Fixed Roof Tank, Specialty Chem-working+breathing+flashing losses
40400315	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Fixed Roof Tank, Produced water, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400316	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Fixed Roof Tank, Diesel, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400321	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;External Floating Roof Tank, Condensate, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400322	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;External Floating Roof Tank, Crude Oil, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400323	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;External Floating Roof Tank, Lube Oil, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400324	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;External Floating Roof Tank, Specialty Chem-working+breathing+flashing losses
40400325	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;External Floating Roof Tank, Produced water, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400326	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;External Floating Roof Tank, Diesel, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400331	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Internal Floating Roof Tank, Condensate, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400332	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Internal Floating Roof Tank, Crude Oil, working+breathing+flashing losses
40400334	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Internal Floating Roof Tank, Specialty Chem-working+breathing+flashing losses

SCC	SCC Description*
40400335	PSE;PLS;OGFSWT;Internal Floating Roof Tank, Produced water, working+breathing+flashing losses

*IP;OGP = Industrial Processes;Oil and Gas Production and PSE;PLS;OGFSWT=Petroleum and Solvent Evaporation;Petroleum Liquids Storage (non-Refinery);Oil and Gas Field Storage and Working Tanks

2.1.4 Non-IPM sector (ptnonipm)

Except for some minor exceptions, the non-IPM (ptnonipm) sector contains the 2011NEIv1 point sources included in the modeling platform that are not in the ptegu, ptegu_pk, or pt_oilgas sectors. For the most part, the ptnonipm sector reflects the non-EGU sources of the NEI point inventory; however, it is likely that some small low-emitting EGUs not matched to the NEEDS database or to CEMS data are present in the ptnonipm sector. The sector also includes some ethanol plants that have been identified by EPA but are not in 2011NEIv1.

The ptnonipm sector contains a small amount of fugitive dust PM emissions from vehicular traffic on paved or unpaved roads at industrial facilities, coal handling at coal mines, and grain elevators. Some point sources in the 2011NEIv1 that are not included in any modeling sectors are:

- Sources with state/county FIPS code ending with “777”. These sources represent mobile (temporary) asphalt plants that are only reported for some states, and are generally in a fixed location for only a part of the year and are therefore difficult to allocate to specific places and days for modeling. Therefore, these sources are dropped from the point-based sectors in the modeling platform.
- Offshore oil records with FIPS=85000 were not updated from the 2008NEIv3 and are processed in the othpt sector as discussed in Section 2.5.1.

Additional Ethanol facilities

Another difference between the 2011NEIv1 data and the modeling platform is the addition of some ethanol production facilities identified by EPA but were not found in the NEI. For some rule development work, EPA developed a list of corn ethanol facilities for 2011. Many of these ethanol facilities were included in the 2011NEIv1, but those that were not matched were added to the ptnonipm sector in a separate FF10-format inventory file. Locations and FIPS codes for these ethanol plants were verified using web searches and Google Earth. EPA believes that some of these sources are not included in the NEI as point sources because they do not meet the 100 ton/year potential-to-emit threshold for NEI point sources. In other cases, EPA is following up with states to evaluate whether the state data should include these point sources.

Emission rates for the ethanol plants were obtained from EPA’s updated spreadsheet model for upstream impacts developed for the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS2) rule (EPA, 2010a). Plant emission rates for criteria pollutants used to estimate impacts for years 2011 and 2018 are given in Table 2-4.

Table 2-4. Corn Ethanol Plant Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (grams per gallon produced)

Corn Ethanol Plant Type	VO C	CO	NO x	PM ₁ 0	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂	NH 3
Dry Mill Natural Gas (NG)	2.29	0.58	0.99	0.94	0.23	0.01	0.00
Dry Mill NG (wet distillers grains with solubles (DGS))	2.27	0.37	0.63	0.91	0.20	0.00	0.00

DRAFT

Corn Ethanol Plant Type	VO C	CO	NO x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂	NH ₃
Dry Mill Biogas	2.29	0.62	1.05	0.94	0.23	0.01	0.00
Dry Mill Biogas (wet DGS)	2.27	0.39	0.67	0.91	0.20	0.00	0.00
Dry Mill Coal	2.31	2.65	4.17	3.81	1.71	4.52	0.00
Dry Mill Coal (wet DGS)	2.31	2.65	2.65	2.74	1.14	2.87	0.00
Dry Mill Biomass	2.42	2.55	3.65	1.28	0.36	0.14	0.00
Dry Mill Biomass (wet DGS)	2.35	1.62	2.32	1.12	0.28	0.09	0.00
Wet Mill NG	2.35	1.62	1.77	1.12	0.28	0.09	0.00
Wet Mill Coal	2.33	1.04	5.51	4.76	2.21	5.97	0.00

Air toxic emission rates were estimated by applying toxic to VOC ratios in Table 2-5 were multiplied by facility production estimates for 2011 and 2018 based on analyses performed for the industry characterization described in Chapter 1 of the RFS2 final rule regulatory impact analysis. For air toxics except ethanol, the toxic-to-VOC ratios were developed using emission inventory data from the 2005 NEI (EPA, 2009a).

Table 2-5. Toxic-to-VOC Ratios for Corn Ethanol Plants

	Acetaldehyde	Acrolein	Benzene	1,3-Butadiene	Formaldehyde
Wet Mill NG	0.02580	0.00131	0.00060	2.82371E-08	0.00127
Wet Mill Coal	0.08242	0.00015	0.00048	2.82371E-08	0.00108
Dry Mill NG	0.01089	0.00131	0.00060	2.82371E-08	0.00127
Dry Mill Coal	0.02328	0.00102	0.00017	2.82371E-08	0.00119

2.2 2011 nonpoint sources (afdust, ag, np_oilgas, rwc, nonpt)

Several modeling platform sectors were created from the 2011NEIv1 nonpoint inventory. This section describes the *stationary* nonpoint sources. Locomotives, C1 and C2 CMV, and C3 CMV are also included the 2011NEIv1 nonpoint data category, but are mobile sources that are described in Sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 as the c1c2rail and c3marine sectors, respectively. The 2011NEIv1 TSD available from <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/net/2011inventory.html> includes documentation for the nonpoint sector of the 2011NEIv1.

The nonpoint tribal-submitted emissions are dropped during spatial processing with SMOKE due to the configuration of the spatial surrogates. Part of the reason for this is to prevent possible double-counting with county-level emissions and also because spatial surrogates for tribal data are not currently available. These omissions are not expected to have an impact on the results of the air quality modeling at the 12-km scales used for this platform.

DRAFT

The emissions modeling sector inventories start with the NEI data. Several source categories were not included in the modeling platform inventories for the following reasons: 1) these sources are only reported by a small number of states or agencies, 2) these sources are ‘atypical’ and have small emissions, and/or 3) EPA has have other data the Agency believes to be more accurate. Table 2-6 provides a list of SCCs removed from the nonpoint sectors, justification for their removal, and the national annual NO_x, VOC and NH₃ emission totals. The following subsections describe how the remaining sources in the 2011NEIv1 nonpoint inventory were separated into 2011 modeling platform sectors, along with any data that were updated replaced with non-NEI data.

Table 2-6. 2011NEIv1 nonpoint sources removed from the 2011 platform

SCC	Description	Reason for Removal	NO _x *	VOC*	NH ₃ *	
2280003100	Marine Vessels, Commercial; Residual; Port emissions	Replaced with OTAQ ECA-	62,906	2,411	23	
2280003200	Marine Vessels, Commercial; Residual; Underway emissions	IMO dataset -see Section 2.4.2	817,367	30,846	151	
2294000000	Paved Roads; All Paved Roads; Total: Fugitives	Replaced with emissions NOT reduced via precipitation – see Section 2.2.1				
2294010000	Paved Roads; All Other Public Paved Roads; Total: Fugitives					
2501060100	Gasoline Stage 2 refueling: Total	Replaced with MOVES 2010b--based estimates – see Section 2.3.2		154,349		
2501060101	Gasoline Stage 2 refueling: Displacement Loss/Uncontrolled			6,731		
2501060102	Gasoline Stage 2 refueling: Displacement Loss/Controlled			6,890		
2501060103	Gasoline Stage 2 refueling: Spillage			2,771		
2810005001	Managed Burning, Slash (Logging Debris);Pile Burning	Replaced with SMARTFIRE 2 estimates -see Section 2.6	84.5	95		
2810005002	Managed Burning, Slash (Logging Debris);Broadcast Burning		0	0		
2810020000	Prescribed Rangeland Burning; Unspecified					
2810090000	Open Fire; Not categorized					
2275087000	Aircraft; In-flight (non-Landing-Takeoff cycle);Total	Dropped because they are atypical and sparsely-reported categories with small emissions				
2806010000	Domestic Animals Waste Emissions; Cats; Total				294	
2806015000	Domestic Animals Waste Emissions; Dogs; Total				1,674	
2807020001	Wild Animals Waste Emissions; Bears; Black Bears				3	
2807020002	Wild Animals Waste Emissions; Bears; Grizzly Bears				0	
2807025000	Wild Animals Waste Emissions; Elk; Total				1,425	
2807030000	Wild Animals Waste Emissions; Deer; Total				1,431	
2807040000	Wild Animals Waste Emissions; Birds; Total				0	
2810003000	Cigarette Smoke; Total			2	43	4
2810010000	Human Perspiration and Respiration; Total					2,742
2830000000	Catastrophic/Accidental Releases; All; Total			0	167	0
2830010000	Catastrophic/Accidental Releases; Transportation Accidents; Total				0	
2862000000	Swimming Pools; Total (Commercial, Residential, Public);Total				198	

* Emission units are short tons

2.2.1 Area fugitive dust sector (afdust)

The area-source fugitive dust (afdust) sector contains PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emission estimates for nonpoint SCCs identified by EPA staff as dust sources. Categories included in the afdust sector are paved roads, unpaved roads and airstrips, construction (residential, industrial, road and total), agriculture production, and mining and quarrying. It does not include fugitive dust from grain elevators, coal handling at coal mines, or vehicular traffic on paved or unpaved roads at industrial facilities because these are treated as point sources so they are properly located.

The afdust sector is separated from other nonpoint sectors to allow for the application of a “transport fraction,” and meteorological/precipitation reductions. These adjustments are applied with a script that applies land use-based gridded transport fractions followed by another script that zeroes out emissions for days on which at least 0.01 inches of precipitation occurs or there is snow cover on the ground. The land use data used to reduce the NEI emissions determines the amount of emissions that are subject to transport. This methodology is discussed in (Pouliot, et. al., 2010), http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/conference/ei19/session9/pouliot_pres.pdf, and in “Fugitive Dust Modeling for the 2008 Emissions Modeling Platform” (Adelman, 2012). The purpose of applying the transport fraction and meteorological adjustments is to reduce the overestimation of fugitive dust in the grid modeling as compared to ambient observations. Both the transport fraction and meteorological adjustments are based on the gridded resolution of the platform (e.g., 12km grid cells); therefore, different emissions will result if the process were applied to different grid resolutions. A limitation of the transport fraction approach is the lack of monthly variability that would be expected with seasonal changes in vegetative cover. While wind speed and direction are not accounted for in the emissions processing, the hourly variability due to soil moisture, snow cover and precipitation is accounted for in the subsequent meteorological adjustment.

The sources in the afdust sector are for SCCs and pollutant codes (i.e., PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) that are considered to be “fugitive” dust sources. These SCCs are provided in Table 2-7.

Table 2-7. SCCs in the afdust platform sector

SCC	SCC Description
2275085000	Industrial Processes;Construction: SIC 15 - 17;All Processes;Vehicle Traffic
2294000000	Industrial Processes;Construction: SIC 15 - 17;Industrial/Commercial/Institutional;Total
2294005000	Industrial Processes;Construction: SIC 15 - 17;Residential;Total
2294010000	Industrial Processes;Construction: SIC 15 - 17;Road Construction;Total
2296000000	Industrial Processes;Construction: SIC 15 - 17;Special Trade Construction;Total
2296005000	Industrial Processes;Mining and Quarrying: SIC 14;All Processes;Total
2296010000	Industrial Processes;Mining and Quarrying: SIC 14;Crushed and Broken Stone;Total
2311000070	Industrial Processes;Mining and Quarrying: SIC 14;Sand and Gravel;Total
2311010000	Miscellaneous Area Sources;Agriculture Production - Crops;Agriculture - Crops;Harvesting
2311020000	Miscellaneous Area Sources;Agriculture Production - Crops;Agriculture - Crops;Planting
2311030000	Miscellaneous Area Sources;Agriculture Production - Crops;Agriculture - Crops;Tilling
2311040000	Miscellaneous Area Sources;Agriculture Production - Crops;Agriculture - Crops;Total
2325000000	Miscellaneous Area Sources;Agriculture Production - Crops;Agriculture - Crops;Transport
2325020000	Miscellaneous Area Sources;Agriculture Production - Livestock;Beef cattle - finishing operations on feedlots (drylots);Dust Kicked-up by Hooves (use 28-05-020, -001, -002, or -003 for Waste

DRAFT

SCC	SCC Description
2325030000	Mobile Sources;Aircraft;Unpaved Airstrips;Total
2801000000	Mobile Sources;Paved Roads;All Other Public Paved Roads;Total: Fugitives
2801000002	Mobile Sources;Paved Roads;All Paved Roads;Total: Fugitives
2801000003	Mobile Sources;Paved Roads;Interstate/Arterial;Total: Fugitives
2801000005	Mobile Sources;Unpaved Roads;All Unpaved Roads;Total: Fugitives
2801000008	Mobile Sources;Unpaved Roads;Industrial Unpaved Roads;Total: Fugitives
2805001000	Mobile Sources;Unpaved Roads;Public Unpaved Roads;Total: Fugitives

The dust emissions in the modeling platform are not the same as the 2011NEIv1 emissions because the NEI paved and unpaved road dust emissions include a built-in precipitation reduction that is based on average meteorological data, which is at a coarser temporal and spatial resolution than the modeling platform meteorological adjustment. Due to this, in the platform paved and unpaved road emissions data was used that did not include any precipitation-based reduction. This allows the entire sector to be processed consistently so that the same grid-specific transport fractions and meteorological adjustments can be applied. Where states submitted afdust data, the state-submitted data was used assuming that it was not met-adjusted and therefore the meteorological adjustments were still applied. Thus, it is possible that these sources may have been adjusted twice. Even with that possibility, air quality modeling shows that in general, dust is frequently overestimated in the air quality modeling results.

The total impacts of the transport fraction and meteorological adjustments for 2011NEIv1 are shown in Table 2-8, where the starting inventory numbers include unadjusted paved and unpaved road dust, so they do not match the NEI values which include a different type of adjustment. The amount of the reduction ranges from about 6% in New Hampshire to almost 73% in Nevada. Figure 2-1 shows the impact of each step of the adjustment for January 2008, using the 2008 NEI as an example. The raw NEI afdust PM_{2.5} emissions – prior to transport fraction meteorological adjustments – are shown at the top of Figure 2-1. The afdust emissions after the application of the transport fraction, but prior to meteorological adjustments are shown in the middle of Figure 2-1. Finally, the resulting emissions after both transport fraction and meteorological adjustments are shown at the bottom of Figure 2-1. The top and middle plots show how the transport fraction has a larger reduction effect in the east where forested areas are more effective at reducing PM transport than in many western areas. Comparing the bottom and middle plots shows how the meteorological impacts of precipitation, along with snow cover in the north, further reduce the dust emissions.


Table 2-8. Total Impact of Fugitive Dust Adjustments to Unadjusted 2011 Inventory

State	Unadjusted PM10	Unadjusted PM2_5	Change in PM10	Change in PM2_5	PM10 Reduction	PM2_5 Reduction
Alabama	378,873	47,158	-310,412	-38,554	18.1%	18.2%
Arizona	237,361	30,015	-78,365	-9,757	67.0%	67.5%
Arkansas	421,958	58,648	-305,667	-40,779	27.6%	30.5%
California	255,889	38,664	-119,728	-18,039	53.2%	53.3%
Colorado	244,630	40,421	-130,902	-21,038	46.5%	48.0%
Connecticut	29,067	4,393	-26,045	-3,938	10.4%	10.4%
Delaware	11,477	2,046	-8,004	-1,437	30.3%	29.8%
District of Columbia	2,115	337	-1,597	-254	24.5%	24.6%
Florida	292,797	39,636	-181,252	-24,357	38.1%	38.5%

DRAFT

State	Unadjusted PM10	Unadjusted PM2_5	Change in PM10	Change in PM2_5	PM10 Reduction	PM2_5 Reduction
Georgia	733,478	90,041	-593,397	-71,996	19.1%	20.0%
Idaho	432,116	49,294	-295,315	-33,293	31.7%	32.5%
Illinois	763,665	123,680	-478,200	-76,944	37.4%	37.8%
Indiana	603,153	85,151	-440,718	-61,488	26.9%	27.8%
Iowa	590,528	96,070	-342,678	-55,397	42.0%	42.3%
Kansas	748,652	118,902	-353,498	-54,883	52.8%	53.8%
Kentucky	199,744	29,496	-160,887	-23,547	19.5%	20.2%
Louisiana	236,787	35,730	-162,460	-24,039	31.4%	32.7%
Maine	50,547	7,016	-44,059	-6,137	12.8%	12.5%
Maryland	49,225	8,361	-37,212	-6,290	24.4%	24.8%
Massachusetts	205,561	22,444	-179,580	-19,567	12.6%	12.8%
Michigan	462,324	61,969	-360,229	-48,087	22.1%	22.4%
Minnesota	336,791	64,253	-221,558	-42,026	34.2%	34.6%
Mississippi	956,702	107,965	-781,604	-86,622	18.3%	19.8%
Missouri	1,064,146	130,995	-781,001	-94,632	26.6%	27.8%
Montana	385,541	50,583	-270,346	-34,134	29.9%	32.5%
Nebraska	591,457	85,206	-317,684	-45,301	46.3%	46.8%
Nevada	152,191	19,538	-44,038	-5,350	71.1%	72.6%
New Hampshire	25,540	3,766	-23,951	-3,532	6.2%	6.2%
New Jersey	24,273	5,412	-19,282	-4,270	20.6%	21.1%
New Mexico	924,497	95,871	-352,163	-36,350	61.9%	62.1%
New York	274,114	37,493	-239,314	-32,394	12.7%	13.6%
North Carolina	186,650	33,409	-146,997	-26,199	21.2%	21.6%
North Dakota	354,107	59,113	-224,340	-37,233	36.6%	37.0%
Ohio	414,902	64,609	-324,179	-49,996	21.9%	22.6%
Oklahoma	733,749	87,864	-385,316	-44,579	47.5%	49.3%
Oregon	348,093	40,596	-272,169	-30,935	21.8%	23.8%
Pennsylvania	208,246	30,344	-181,086	-26,319	13.0%	13.3%
Rhode Island	4,765	731	-3,679	-572	22.8%	21.7%
South Carolina	259,350	31,494	-198,329	-24,020	23.5%	23.7%
South Dakota	262,935	44,587	-158,320	-26,623	39.8%	40.3%
Tennessee	139,732	25,357	-108,109	-19,543	22.6%	22.9%
Texas	2,573,682	304,550	1,275,075	-145,799	50.5%	52.1%
Utah	196,554	21,589	-114,478	-12,534	41.8%	41.9%
Vermont	67,690	7,563	-61,971	-6,917	8.4%	8.5%
Virginia	131,797	19,374	-108,734	-15,900	17.5%	17.9%
Washington	174,969	27,999	-101,341	-15,685	42.1%	44.0%
West Virginia	85,956	10,652	-79,843	-9,900	7.1%	7.1%
Wisconsin	239,851	41,669	-166,313	-28,920	30.7%	30.6%
Wyoming	434,090	45,350	-267,536	-27,773	38.4%	38.8%

Figure 2-1. January $PM_{2.5}$ afdust emissions: raw 2008 NEI (top), after application of transport fraction (middle) and final post-meteorological adjusted (bottom)



2.2.2 Agricultural ammonia sector (ag)

The agricultural NH₃ (ag) sector includes livestock and agricultural fertilizer application emissions from the 2011NEIv1 nonpoint inventory. The livestock and fertilizer emissions in this sector are based only on the SCCs listed in Table 2-9 and Table 2-10. The “ag” sector includes all of the NH₃ emissions from fertilizer from the NEI. However, the “ag” sector does not include all of the livestock ammonia emissions, as there are also a small amount of NH₃ emissions from livestock feedlots in the ptnonipm inventory (as point sources) in California (175 tons) and Wisconsin (125 tons).

Table 2-9. Livestock SCCs extracted from the NEI to create the ag sector

SCC	SCC Description*
2805001100	Beef cattle - finishing operations on feedlots (drylots);Confinement
2805001200	Beef cattle - finishing operations on feedlots (drylots);Manure handling and storage
2805001300	Beef cattle - finishing operations on feedlots (drylots);Land application of manure
2805002000	Beef cattle production composite;Not Elsewhere Classified
2805003100	Beef cattle - finishing operations on pasture/range;Confinement
2805007100	Poultry production - layers with dry manure management systems;Confinement
2805007300	Poultry production - layers with dry manure management systems;Land application of manure
2805008100	Poultry production - layers with wet manure management systems;Confinement
2805008200	Poultry production - layers with wet manure management systems;Manure handling and storage
2805008300	Poultry production - layers with wet manure management systems;Land application of manure
2805009100	Poultry production - broilers;Confinement
2805009200	Poultry production - broilers;Manure handling and storage
2805009300	Poultry production - broilers;Land application of manure
2805010100	Poultry production - turkeys;Confinement
2805010200	Poultry production - turkeys;Manure handling and storage
2805010300	Poultry production - turkeys;Land application of manure
2805018000	Dairy cattle composite;Not Elsewhere Classified
2805019100	Dairy cattle - flush dairy;Confinement
2805019200	Dairy cattle - flush dairy;Manure handling and storage
2805019300	Dairy cattle - flush dairy;Land application of manure
2805020000	Cattle and Calves Waste Emissions;Milk Total
2805021100	Dairy cattle - scrape dairy;Confinement
2805021200	Dairy cattle - scrape dairy;Manure handling and storage
2805021300	Dairy cattle - scrape dairy;Land application of manure
2805022100	Dairy cattle - deep pit dairy;Confinement
2805022200	Dairy cattle - deep pit dairy;Manure handling and storage
2805022300	Dairy cattle - deep pit dairy;Land application of manure
2805023100	Dairy cattle - drylot/pasture dairy;Confinement
2805023200	Dairy cattle - drylot/pasture dairy;Manure handling and storage
2805023300	Dairy cattle - drylot/pasture dairy;Land application of manure
2805025000	Swine production composite;Not Elsewhere Classified (see also 28-05-039, -047, -053)
2805030000	Poultry Waste Emissions;Not Elsewhere Classified (see also 28-05-007, -008, -009)
2805030001	Poultry Waste Emissions;Pullet Chicks and Pullets less than 13 weeks old
2805030002	Poultry Waste Emissions;Pullets 13 weeks old and older but less than 20 weeks old
2805030003	Poultry Waste Emissions;Layers
2805030004	Poultry Waste Emissions;Broilers
2805030007	Poultry Waste Emissions;Ducks
2805030008	Poultry Waste Emissions;Geese
2805030009	Poultry Waste Emissions;Turkeys
2805035000	Horses and Ponies Waste Emissions;Not Elsewhere Classified
2805039100	Swine production - operations with lagoons (unspecified animal age);Confinement
2805039200	Swine production - operations with lagoons (unspecified animal age);Manure handling and storage
2805039300	Swine production - operations with lagoons (unspecified animal age);Land application of manure

DRAFT

SCC	SCC Description*
2805040000	Sheep and Lambs Waste Emissions;Total
2805045000	Goats Waste Emissions;Not Elsewhere Classified
2805045002	Goats Waste Emissions;Angora Goats
2805045003	Goats Waste Emissions;Milk Goats
2805047100	Swine production - deep-pit house operations (unspecified animal age);Confinement
2805047300	Swine production - deep-pit house operations (unspecified animal age);Land application of manure
2805053100	Swine production - outdoor operations (unspecified animal age);Confinement

* All SCC Descriptions begin “Miscellaneous Area Sources;Agriculture Production – Livestock”

Table 2-10. Fertilizer SCCs extracted from the NEI for inclusion in the “ag” sector

SCC	SCC Description*
2801700001	Anhydrous Ammonia
2801700002	Aqueous Ammonia
2801700003	Nitrogen Solutions
2801700004	Urea
2801700005	Ammonium Nitrate
2801700006	Ammonium Sulfate
2801700007	Ammonium Thiosulfate
2801700008	Other Straight Nitrate
2801700009	Ammonium Phosphates
2801700010	N-P-K (multi-grade nutrient fertilizers)
2801700011	Calcium Ammonium Nitrate
2801700012	Potassium Nitrate
2801700013	Diammonium Phosphate
2801700014	Monoammonium Phosphate
2801700015	Liquid Ammonium Polyphosphate
2801700099	Miscellaneous Fertilizers

* All descriptions include “Miscellaneous Area Sources; Agriculture Production – Crops; Fertilizer Application” as the beginning of the description.

2.2.3 Nonpoint source oil and gas sector (np_oilgas)

The nonpoint oil and gas (np_oilgas) sector contains onshore and offshore oil and gas emissions. EPA estimated emissions for all counties with 2011 oil and gas activity data with the Oil and Gas Tool, and many S/L/T agencies also submitted nonpoint oil and gas data. The types of sources covered include drill rigs, workover rigs, artificial lift, hydraulic fracturing engines, pneumatic pumps and other devices, storage tanks, flares, truck loading, compressor engines, and dehydrators. For more information on the development of the oil and gas emissions in the 2011NEIv1, see Section 3.21 of the 2011NEIv1 TSD. A complete list of SCCs for the np_oilgas modeling platform sector is provided in Appendix A. See the pt_oilgas sector (section 2.1.3) for more information on point source oil and gas sources.

2.2.4 Residential wood combustion sector (rwc)

The residential wood combustion (rwc) sector includes residential wood burning devices such as fireplaces, fireplaces with inserts (inserts), free standing woodstoves, pellet stoves, outdoor hydronic heaters (also known as outdoor wood boilers), indoor furnaces, and outdoor burning in firepots and chimeneas. Free standing woodstoves and inserts are further differentiated into three categories:

DRAFT

conventional (not EPA certified); EPA certified, catalytic; and EPA certified, noncatalytic. Generally speaking, the conventional units were constructed prior to 1988. Units constructed after 1988 had to meet EPA emission standards and they are either catalytic or non-catalytic. For more information on the development of the residential wood combustion emissions, see Section 3.14 of the 2011NEIv1 TSD. The SCCs in the rwc sector are shown in Table 2-11.

Table 2-11. SCCs in the Residential Wood Combustion Sector (rwc)*

SCC	SCC Description
2104008100	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Fireplace: general
2104008210	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Woodstove: fireplace inserts; non-EPA certified
2104008220	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Woodstove: fireplace inserts; EPA certified; non-catalytic
2104008230	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Woodstove: fireplace inserts; EPA certified; catalytic
2104008300	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Woodstove: freestanding, general
2104008310	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Woodstove: freestanding, non-EPA certified
2104008320	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Woodstove: freestanding, EPA certified, non-catalytic
2104008330	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Woodstove: freestanding, EPA certified, catalytic
2104008400	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Woodstove: pellet-fired, general (freestanding or FP insert)
2104008510	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Furnace: Indoor, cordwood-fired, non-EPA certified
2104008610	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Hydronic heater: outdoor
2104008700	SSFC;Residential;Wood;Outdoor wood burning device, NEC (fire-pits, chimneys, etc)
2104009000	SSFC;Residential;Firelog;Total: All Combustor Types

* SSFC=Stationary Source Fuel Combustion

2.2.5 Other nonpoint sources sector (nonpt)

Stationary nonpoint sources that were not subdivided into the afdust, ag, np_oilgas, or rwc sectors were assigned to the “nonpt” sector. Locomotives and CMV mobile sources from the 2011NEIv1 nonpoint inventory are described in Section 2.4.1. There are too many SCCs to list all of them individually, but the types of sources in the nonpt sector include:

- stationary source fuel combustion, including industrial, commercial, and residential;
- chemical manufacturing;
- industrial processes such as commercial cooking, metal production, mineral processes, petroleum refining, wood products, fabricated metals, and refrigeration;
- solvent utilization for surface coatings such as architectural coatings, auto refinishing, traffic marking, textile production, furniture finishing, and coating of paper, plastic, metal, appliances, and motor vehicles;
- solvent utilization for degreasing of furniture, metals, auto repair, electronics, and manufacturing;
- solvent utilization for dry cleaning, graphic arts, plastics, industrial processes, personal care products, household products, adhesives and sealants;
- solvent utilization for asphalt application and roofing, and pesticide application;
- storage and transport of petroleum for uses such as portable gas cans, bulk terminals, gasoline service stations, aviation, and marine vessels;
- storage and transport of chemicals;

- waste disposal, treatment, and recovery via incineration, open burning, landfills, and composting;
- agricultural burning and orchard heating;
- miscellaneous area sources such as cremation, hospitals, lamp breakage, and automotive repair shops.

Most sources in this sector have annual emissions that are temporally allocated to hourly values using temporal profiles. The annual agricultural burning estimates are treated as monthly values. The annual values in the 2011NEIv1 were split into monthly emissions by aggregating the data up to monthly values from daily estimates of emissions.

2.3 2011 onroad mobile sources (onroad, onroad_rfl)

Onroad mobile sources include emissions from motorized vehicles that are normally operated on public roadways. These include passenger cars, motorcycles, minivans, sport-utility vehicles, light-duty trucks, heavy-duty trucks, and buses. The sources are further divided between diesel and gasoline vehicles. The sector characterizes emissions from off-network processes (e.g. starts, hot soak, and extended idle) as well as from on-network processes (i.e., from vehicles moving along the roads). For the 2011 platform, as indicated in Table 2-1, the 2011 onroad emissions are separated into two sectors: (1) “onroad” and (2) “onroad_rfl”. The onroad and onroad_rfl sectors are processed separately to allow for different spatial allocation to be applied to onroad refueling, which is allocated using a gas station surrogate, versus onroad vehicles, which are allocated using surrogates based on roads and population. Except for California and Texas, all onroad and onroad refueling emissions are generated using the SMOKE-MOVES emissions modeling framework that leverages MOVES generated outputs (<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/models/moves/index.htm>) and hourly meteorology. All tribal data from the mobile sectors have been dropped because the emissions are small, the emissions could be double-counted with state-provided onroad emissions, all tribal data was developed using the older model MOBILE6, and because spatial surrogate data is not currently available.

2.3.1 Onroad non-refueling (onroad)

For the continental U.S., EPA used a modeling framework that took into account the temperature sensitivity of the on-road emissions. Specifically, EPA used MOVES inputs for representative counties, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle population (VPOP) data for all counties, along with tools that integrated the MOVES model with SMOKE. In this way, it was possible to take advantage of the gridded hourly temperature information available from meteorology modeling used for air quality modeling. The “SMOKE-MOVES” integration tool was developed by EPA in 2010 and is in use by states and regional planning organizations for regional air quality modeling of onroad mobile sources. SMOKE-MOVES requires that emission rate “lookup” tables be generated by MOVES which differentiate emissions by process (i.e., running, start, vapor venting, etc.), vehicle type, road type, temperature, speed, hour of day, etc. To generate the MOVES emission rates that could be applied across the U.S., EPA used an automated process to run MOVES to produce emission factors by temperature and speed for a series of “representative counties,” to which every other county was mapped. Using the MOVES emission rates, SMOKE selects appropriate emissions rates for each county, hourly temperature, SCC, and speed bin and multiplied the emission rate by activity (VMT (vehicle miles travelled) or VPOP (vehicle population)) to produce emissions. These calculations were done for every county and grid cell, in the continental U.S. for each hour of the year.

Using SMOKE-MOVES for creating the model-ready emissions requires numerous steps:

DRAFT

- 1) Determine which counties will be used to represent other counties in the MOVES runs
- 2) Determine which months will be used to represent other month's fuel characteristics
- 3) Create MOVES inputs needed only by MOVES. MOVES requires county-specific information on vehicle populations, age distributions, and inspection-maintenance programs for each of the representative counties.
- 4) Create inputs needed both by MOVES and by SMOKE, including a list of temperatures and activity data
- 5) Run MOVES to create emission factor tables
- 6) Run SMOKE to apply the emission factors to activity data (VMT and VPOP) to calculate emissions
- 7) Aggregate the results to the county-SCC level for summaries and quality assurance

The onroad emissions inputs are similar to the emissions in the onroad data category of the 2011NEIv1, described in more detail in Section 4.6 of the 2011NEIv1 TSD. Specifically the platform and 2011NEIv1 have identical:

- MOVES County databases (CDBs)
- Fuels
- Representative counties
- Fuel months
- Meteorology
- Activity data (VMT, VPOP, speed)
- Extended idle adjustments

Despite the commonalities, there are some key differences between the two onroad emission inventories:

- The 2011NEIv1 used MOVES2010b to create the emission factor (EF) tables, while the 2011 platform used the MOVESTier3NPRM (specifically, model "Moves20110414a" and the default database "movestier3db20110512") for most EFs. The exceptions are that refueling (described in the next section) and extended idle EFs were generated using the MOVES2010b model for both inventories because MOVESTier3NPRM did not create these emission rates for these modes.
- The 2011 platform used a different post-processor to create EFs for SMOKE because the pollutants needed for speciation and running CMAQ are different than what is needed for the NEI. For example, the NEI needs a much larger set of HAPs and the modeling platform requires emissions for the components of PM_{2.5}.
- The treatment of Texas and California emissions differs between the two inventories (see below for more details).
- The list of emission modes differ between the two inventories. Both SMOKE-MOVES runs were generated at the same level of detail, but the NEI emissions were aggregated into 4 all-inclusive modes: exhaust (including extended idle), evaporative (including permeation), brake wear, and tire wear. The list of modes and the corresponding MOVES processes mapped to them are listed in Table 2-12.

DRAFT

Table 2-12. Onroad emission modes

Mode	Description	MOVES process IDs
EXH	Exhaust, including running and starts, excluding extended idle	1;2;15;16
EXT	Extended idle exhaust from long-haul trucks	17;90
EVP	Evaporative emissions, including vapor venting and fuel leaks, excluding permeation	12;13
EPM	Evaporative permeation	11
RFL	Refueling	18;19
BRK	Brake wear	9
TIR	Tire wear	10

For more detailed information on methods used to develop the onroad emissions and input data sets and on running SMOKE-MOVES, see the 2011NEIv1 TSD.

The California and Texas onroad emissions were created through a hybrid approach of combining state-supplied annual emissions (from the 2011NEIv1) with EPA developed SMOKE-MOVES runs. Through this approach, the platform was able to reflect California’s unique rules and Texas’ detailed modeling, while leveraging the more detailed SCCs and the highly resolved spatial patterns, temporal patterns, and speciation from SMOKE-MOVES. The basic steps involved in temporally allocating California’s and Texas’ onroad emissions based on SMOKE-MOVES results were:

- 1) Run CA/TX using EPA inputs through SMOKE-MOVES to produce hourly 2011 emissions hereafter known as “EPA estimates”. These EPA estimates for CA/TX are run in a separate sector called “onroad_catx”.
- 2) Calculate ratios between state-supplied emissions and EPA estimates⁴. For Texas, these ratios were calculated for each county/SCC7 (fuel and vehicle type)/pollutant combination. For California, these were calculated for each county/SCC3 (fuel type)/pollutant combination. These were not calculated at a greater resolution because California’s emissions did not provide data for all vehicle types.
- 3) Create an adjustment factor file (CFPRO) that includes EPA-to-state estimate ratios. For extended idle adjustments, each specific state ratio (county/SCC Group (7 or 3)/pollutant) was multiplied by the extended idle adjustment factor (see the 2011NEIv1 TSD for details).
- 4) Rerun CA/TX through SMOKE-MOVES using EPA inputs and the new adjustment factor file.

Through this process, adjusted model-ready files were created that sum to California’s and Texas’ annual totals, but have the temporal and spatial patterns reflecting the highly resolved meteorology and SMOKE-MOVES. After adjusting the emissions, this sector is called “onroad_catx_adj”. Note that in emission summaries, the emissions from the “onroad” and “onroad_catx_adj” sectors are summed and designated as the emissions for the onroad sector.

⁴ These ratios were created for all matching pollutants. These ratios were duplicated for all appropriate modeling species. For example, EPA used the NO_x ratio for NO, NO₂, HONO and used the PM_{2.5} ratio for PEC, PNO₃, POC, PSO₄, and PMFINE (For more details on NO_x and PM speciation, see Sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.2). For VOC model-species, if there was an exact match (e.g., BENZENE), EPA used that HAP pollutant ratio. For other VOC-based model-species that didn’t exist in the NEI inventory, EPA used VOC ratios.

2.3.2 Onroad refueling (onroad_rfl)

Onroad refueling is modeled very similarly to other onroad emissions. As noted in the onroad section (Section 2.3.2), the refueling emissions were generated via MOVES2010b. The onroad_rfl emissions are spatially allocated to gas station locations (see Section 3.4.1). . Because the refueling emission factors use the same SCCs as the other onroad models, refueling was run in a separate sector from the other onroad mobile sources to allow for the different spatial allocation. To facilitate this, the refueling EFs were separated from the other emission factors into rate-per-distance (RPD) refueling and rate-per-vehicle (RPV) refueling tables⁵. SMOKE-MOVES was run using these EF tables as inputs, and spatially allocated using a gas stations spatial surrogate. Lastly, the SMOKE program Mrggrid combined RPD refueling and RPV refueling into a single onroad_rfl model ready output for final processing with the other sectors prior to use in CMAQ. EPA SMOKE-MOVES generated emissions for onroad refueling were used without any adjustments for all states, including California and Texas. These emissions were used instead of state submissions to provide a consistent approach nationwide and also because most states did not submit refueling emissions for diesel fuel. Since the 2011NEIv1 includes the state-submitted emissions, the platform and the NEI refueling emissions in the nonpoint category are consistent for states that did not submit emissions, but are inconsistent for states that submitted refueling emissions.

2.4 2011 nonroad mobile sources (c1c2rail, c3marine, nonroad)

The nonroad mobile source emission modeling sectors consist of nonroad equipment emissions (nonroad) and locomotive and commercial marine vessel (CMV) emissions divided into two nonroad sectors: “c1c2rail” and “c3marine”.

2.4.1 Class 1/Class 2 Commercial Marine Vessels and Locomotives and (c1c2rail)

The c1c2rail sector contains locomotive and smaller CMV sources, except for railway maintenance locomotives and C3 CMV sources outside of the Midwest states. The “c1c2” portion of this sector name refers to the Class 1 and 2 CMV emissions, not the railway emissions. Railway maintenance emissions are included in the nonroad sector. The C3 CMV emissions are in the c3marine sector. All emissions in this sector are annual and at the county-SCC resolution.

The starting point for the c1c2rail sector is the 2011NEIv1 nonpoint inventory for all but specific Midwest states, which are instead derived from the Great Lakes 2010 CMV inventory. As discussed in Table 2-1 and Table 2-2, the modeling platform emissions for the c1c2rail SCCs were extracted from the NEI nonpoint inventory. For more information on CMV sources in the NEI, see Section 4.3 of the 2011NEIv1 TSD. For more information on locomotives, see Section 4.4 of the 2011NEIv1 TSD. Table 2-13 lists the NEI SCCs included in the c1c2rail sector of the modeling platform.

Table 2-13. 2011NEIv1 SCCs extracted for the starting point in c1c2rail development

SCC	Description: Mobile Sources prefix for all
2280002100	Marine Vessels; Commercial; Diesel; Port
2280002200	Marine Vessels; Commercial; Diesel; Underway
2285002006	Railroad Equipment; Diesel; Line Haul Locomotives: Class I Operations
2285002007	Railroad Equipment; Diesel; Line Haul Locomotives: Class II / III Operations
2285002008	Railroad Equipment; Diesel; Line Haul Locomotives: Passenger Trains (Amtrak)

⁵ The Moves2smk post-processing script has command line arguments that will either consolidate or split out the refueling EF.

DRAFT

2285002009	Railroad Equipment; Diesel; Line Haul Locomotives; Commuter Lines
2285002010	Railroad Equipment; Diesel; Yard Locomotives

Some differences exist between the 2011NEIv1 and the modeling platform for this sector due to the availability of alternative data. The differences follow.

Replaced California C1/C2 CMV and rail data with CARB data

As discussed in Section 2.4, the CARB provided year 2011 and corresponding future year emissions for all mobile sources, including C1/C2 CMV and locomotives. These emissions were documented in a staff report available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2010/offroadlsi10/offroadisor.pdf>.

The C1/C2 CMV emissions obtained from the CARB nonroad mobile dataset include the 2011 regulations to reduce emissions from diesel engines on commercial harbor craft operated within California waters and 24 nautical miles of the California baseline. These emissions were developed using Version 1 of the California Emissions Projection Analysis Model (CEPAM) that supports various California off-road regulations. The locomotive emissions were obtained from the CARB trains dataset "ARMJ_RF#2002_ANNUAL_TRAINS.txt". Documentation of the CARB offroad mobile methodology, including c1c2rail sector data, is provided at:

http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/categories.htm#offroad_motor_vehicles. The TOG in the CARB inventory was mapped to VOC by dividing the inventory TOG by the available VOC-to-TOG speciation factor according to the SCC of the source. See Section 3.2.1.3 for more details on c1c2rail speciation. The RPO and CARB inventories did not include HAPs; therefore, all non-NEI source emissions in the c1c2rail sector were processed using VOC speciation only, rather than use the inventory BAFM.

Replaced all CMV in the Midwest RPO

Year-2010 emissions were received from the Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium for tug boats, Great Lakes vessels ("Lakers") and inland waterways for states within the Midwest RPO and Minnesota, hereafter simply referred to as "MWRPO" (<http://www.ladco.org/>). The states in the MWRPO are: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin. These MWRPO CMV emissions include coverage for bordering states/counties along the inland waterways such as the Mississippi and Ohio rivers in Iowa, Missouri, Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania and New York. The LADCO 2010 inventory was used to replace EPA-estimated CMV emissions in the MWRPO states, but was not used to replace the 2011NEIv1 emissions in the bordering non-MWRPO states.

Some modifications to the MWRPO CMV data were made prior to SMOKE processing:

- Emissions provided at the level of NEI Shape IDs were aggregated to county-level.
- The 2011NEIv1 was used to determine which counties had ports; for those counties that had ports, 90% of emissions in the MWPRO inventory were assigned as underway (SCC=2280002200) and 10% were assigned as port emissions (SCC=2280002100).
- Emissions were converted to short tons and PM2.5 was added by assuming it is equal to 92% of PM10 at the suggestion of the MWRPO.
- Tugs were assigned a unique SCC (2280002021) to allow for unique spatial allocation (see Section 3.4.1).
- Tugs were assigned from MWRPO total to counties based on 2011NEIv1 county-level activity information for tug vessels.

DRAFT

Because the Great Lakes vessels include all CMV activity on the Great Lakes, EPA-estimated C3 CMV (c3marine) sector emissions (discussed in the following section) in the MWRPO states were removed to avoid potential double-counting of C3 CMV with the LADCO inventory in the MWRPO states.

2.4.2 Class 3 commercial marine vessels (c3marine)

The U.S. C3 CMV inventory was developed based on a 4-km resolution ASCII raster format dataset used since the Emissions Control Area-International Marine Organization (ECA-IMO) project began in 2005, then known as the Sulfur Emissions Control Area (SECA). The ECA-IMO data are used instead of the 2011NEIv1 data for the modeling platform because accompanying estimates of emission projections for future years are available. In addition, the inventory preserves shipping lanes in federal waters while these are not stored within the NEI data. Keeping the sources in this sector separate from smaller CMV sources allows for the emissions to be elevated above the surface layer within the AQ model. The ECA-IMO data are used for all states with C3 CMV emissions. For the MWPRO states, the ECA-IMO C3 CMV emissions in the Great Lakes are assumed to be misclassified as C3 vessels for which emissions are included in the c1c2rail sector as part of the LADCO inventory, therefore the ECA-IMO emissions are not included in the c3marine sector.

The development of this ECA-IMO-based C3 CMV inventory is discussed below; however, all non-U.S. emissions (Canadian emissions and emissions farther offshore than U.S. waters) are processed in the “othpt” sector, discussed later in Section 2.5.1. This splitting of the C3 CMV emissions from the farther offshore emissions allows for easier summaries of U.S.-only and state or county total emissions.

The ECA-IMO emissions consist of large marine diesel engines (at or above 30 liters/cylinder) that until recently, were allowed to meet relatively modest emission requirements, and often burn residual fuel. The emissions in this sector are comprised of primarily foreign-flagged ocean-going vessels, referred to as C3 CMV ships. The c3marine inventory includes these ships in several intra-port modes (i.e., cruising, hoteling, reduced speed zone, maneuvering, and idling) and an underway mode, and includes near-port auxiliary engine emissions. An overview of the C3 ECA Proposal to the International Maritime Organization (EPA-420-F-10-041, August 2010) project and future-year goals for reduction of NO_x, SO₂, and PM C3 emissions can be found at:

<http://www.epa.gov/oms/regs/nonroad/marine/ci/420r09019.pdf>. The resulting ECA-IMO coordinated strategy, including emission standards under the Clean Air Act for new marine diesel engines with per-cylinder displacement at or above 30 liters, and the establishment of Emission Control Areas is at: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/oceanvessels.htm>.

The ECA-IMO emissions data were converted to SMOKE point-source ORL input format as described in <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/conference/ei17/session6/mason.pdf>. As described in the paper, the ASCII raster dataset was converted to latitude-longitude, mapped to state/county FIPS codes that extended up to 200 nautical miles (nm) from the coast, assigned stack parameters, and monthly ASCII raster dataset emissions were used to create monthly temporal profiles. Counties were assigned as extending up to 200nm from the coast because this was the distance to the edge of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), a distance that defines the outer limits of ECA-IMO controls for these vessels.

The base year ECA inventory is 2002 and consists of these CAPs: PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, CO₂, NH₃, NO_x, SO_x (assumed to be SO₂), and hydrocarbons (assumed to be VOC). EPA developed regional growth (activity-based) factors that were applied to create the 2011 inventory from the 2002 data. These growth factors are provided in The emissions were converted to SMOKE point source inventory format,

DRAFT

allowing for the emissions to be allocated to modeling layers above the surface layer. All non-US, non-EEZ emissions (i.e., in waters considered outside of the 200 nm EEZ, and hence out of the U.S. and Canadian ECA-IMO controllable domain) were simply assigned a dummy state/county FIPS code=98001, and were projected to year 2011 using the “Outside ECA” factors in **Error! Not a valid bookmark self-reference.** The SMOKE-ready data have been cropped from the original ECA-IMO entire northwestern quarter of the globe to cover only the large continental U.S. 36-km “36US1” air quality model domain, the largest domain used by EPA in recent years.


. The geographic regions listed in the table are shown in Figure 2-2. The East Coast and Gulf Coast regions were divided along a line roughly through Key Largo (longitude 80° 26’ West). The Canadian near-shore emissions were assigned to province-level FIPS codes and paired those to region classifications for British Columbia (North Pacific), Ontario (Great Lakes) and Nova Scotia (East Coast).

Table 2-14. Growth factor adjustment factors to project the 2002 ECA-IMO inventory to 2011

Region	EEZ FIPS	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	VOC (HC)	CO	SO ₂
East Coast (EC)	85004	1.301	0.500	0.496	1.501	1.501	0.536
Gulf Coast (GC)	85003	1.114	0.428	0.423	1.288	1.288	0.461
North Pacific (NP)	85001	1.183	0.467	0.458	1.353	1.353	0.524
South Pacific (SP)	85002	1.367	0.525	0.521	1.565	1.562	0.611
Great Lakes (GL)	n/a	1.072	0.394	0.390	1.177	1.176	0.415
Outside ECA	98001	1.341	1.457	1.457	1.457	1.457	1.457

* Technically, these are not really “FIPS” state-county codes, but are treated as such in the inventory and emissions processing.

The assignment of U.S. state/county FIPS codes was restricted to state-federal water boundaries data from the Mineral Management Service (MMS) that extend approximately 3 to 10 nautical miles (nm) off shore. Emissions outside the 3 to 10 mile MMS boundary, but within the approximately 200 nm EEZ boundaries in Figure 2-2, were projected to year 2011 using the same regional adjustment factors as the U.S. emissions; however, the state/county FIPS codes were assigned as “EEZ” codes and these emissions processed in the “othpt” sector (see Section 2.5.1). Note that state boundaries in the Great Lakes are an exception, extending through the middle of each lake such that all emissions in the Great Lakes are assigned to a U.S. county or Ontario. This holds true for MWRPO states and other states such as Pennsylvania and New York. The classification of emissions to U.S. and Canadian FIPS codes is needed to avoid double-counting of C3 CMV U.S. emissions in the Great Lakes because, as discussed in the previous section, all CMV emissions in the Midwest RPO are processed in the “c1c2rail” sector.

Figure 2-2. Illustration of regional modeling domains in ECA-IMO study

The emissions were converted to SMOKE point source inventory format, allowing for the emissions to be allocated to modeling layers above the surface layer. All non-US, non-EEZ emissions (i.e., in waters considered outside of the 200 nm EEZ, and hence out of the U.S. and Canadian ECA-IMO controllable domain) were simply assigned a dummy state/county FIPS code=98001, and were projected to year 2011 using the “Outside ECA” factors in **Error! Not a valid bookmark self-reference.** The SMOKE-ready data have been cropped from the original ECA-IMO entire northwestern quarter of the globe to cover only the large continental U.S. 36-km “36US1” air quality model domain, the largest domain used by EPA in recent years⁶.

The original ECA-IMO inventory did not delineate between ports and underway emissions (or other C3 modes such as hoteling, maneuvering, reduced-speed zone, and idling). However, a U.S. ports spatial surrogate dataset was used to assign the ECA-IMO emissions to ports and underway SCCs 2280003100 and 2280003200, respectively. This had no effect on temporal allocation or speciation because all C3 CMV emissions, unclassified/total, port and underway, share the same temporal and speciation profiles. See Section 3.2.1.3 for more details on c3marine speciation and Section 3.3.6 for details on temporal allocation.

2.4.3 Nonroad mobile equipment sources: (nonroad)

The nonroad equipment emissions are equivalent to the emissions in the nonroad data category of the 2011NEIv1, with the exception that the modeling platform emissions also include monthly totals. All nonroad emissions are compiled at the county/SCC level. NMIM (EPA, 2005) creates the nonroad emissions on a month-specific basis that accounts for temperature, fuel types, and other variables that vary by month. The nonroad sector includes monthly exhaust, evaporative and refueling emissions from nonroad engines (not including commercial marine, aircraft, and locomotives) that EPA derived from

⁶ The extent of the “36US1” domain is similar to the full geographic region shown in Figure 3-1. Note that this domain is not specifically used in this 2011 platform, although spatial surrogates that can be used with it are provided.

DRAFT

NMIM for all states except California and Texas. Additional details on the development of the 2011NEIv1 nonroad emissions are available in Section 4.5 the 2011NEIv1 TSD.

California year 2011 nonroad emissions were submitted to the 2011NEIv1 and are also documented in a staff report (ARB, 2010a). The nonroad sector emissions in California were developed using a modular approach and include all rulemakings and updates in place by December 2010. These emissions were developed using Version 1 of the CEPAM which supports various California off-road regulations such as in-use diesel retrofits (ARB, 2007), Diesel Risk-Reduction Plan (ARB, 2000) and 2007 State Implementation Plans (SIPS) for the South Coast and San Joaquin Valley air basins (ARB, 2010b).

The CARB-supplied 2011NEIv1 nonroad annual inventory emissions values were converted to monthly values by using the aforementioned EPA NMIM monthly inventories to compute monthly ratios by county, SCC7 (fuel, engine type, and equipment type group), mode, and pollutant. SCC7 ratios were used because the SCCs in the CARB inventory did not align with many of the SCCs in EPA NMIM inventory. By aggregating up to SCC7, the two inventories had a more consistent coverage of sources. Some VOC emissions were added to California to account for situations when VOC HAP emissions were included in the inventory, but there were no VOC emissions. These additional VOC emissions were computed by summing benzene, acetaldehyde, and formaldehyde for the specific sources.

Texas year 2011 nonroad emissions were also submitted to the NEI. The 2011NEIv1 nonroad annual inventory emissions values were converted to monthly values by using EPA's NMIM monthly inventories to compute monthly ratios by county, SCC7, mode, and poll⁷.

2.5 "Other Emissions": Offshore Class 3 commercial marine vessels and drilling platforms and non-U.S. sources

The emissions from Canada, Mexico, and non-U.S. offshore Class 3 Commercial Marine Vessels (C3 CMV) and drilling platforms are included as part of three emissions modeling sectors: othpt, othar, and othon.

The "oth" refers to the fact that these emissions are usually "other" than those in the U.S. state-county geographic FIPS, and the third and fourth characters provide the SMOKE source types: "pt" for point, "ar" for "area and nonroad mobile", and "on" for onroad mobile.

For Canada, year-2006 Canadian emissions were the starting point with the addition of several modifications to these inventories. The SCCs in these inventories were changed to the generic 39999999 and the industrial code information was removed to preserve confidentiality. The Canadian point sources are split into three inventory files:

- ptinv_canada_point_2006_orl_13aug2013_v3_orl.txt: contains point sources for all pollutants except VOC;
- ptinv_canada_point_cb5_2006_orl_13aug2013_v1_orl.txt: contains VOC emissions split into CB05 species;
- ptinv_canada_point_uog_2006_orl_02mar2009_v0_orl.txt: contains oil and gas-related sources.

⁷ If there was no match at county/SCC7/mode/poll, the allocation would fall back to state/SCC7/mode/poll. If that did not find a match, then state/SCC7 was used. For a few situations, that would also fail to match and the monthly emissions were allocated with a similar SCC7.

DRAFT

For Mexico, emissions for year 2012 are projections of their 1999 inventory originally developed by Eastern Research Group Inc., (ERG, 2006; ERG, 2009; Wolf, 2009) as part of a partnership between Mexico's Secretariat of the Environment and Natural Resources (Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales-SEMARNAT) and National Institute of Ecology (Instituto Nacional de Ecología-INE), the U.S. EPA, the Western Governors' Association (WGA), and the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC). This inventory includes emissions from all states in Mexico. A background on the development of year-2012 Mexico emissions from the 1999 inventory is available at: <http://www.wrapair.org/forums/ef/inventories/MNEI/index.html>.

2.5.1 Point sources from offshore C3 CMV and drilling platforms and Canada and Mexico (othpt)

As discussed in Section 2.4.2, the ECA-IMO-based C3 CMV emissions for non-U.S. states are processed in the othpt sector. These C3 CMV emissions include those assigned to Canada, those assigned to the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ, defined as those emissions just beyond U.S. waters approximately 3-10 miles offshore, extending to about 200 nautical miles from the U.S. coastline), and all other offshore emissions –far offshore and non-U.S. These emissions are included in the othpt sector for simplicity of creating U.S.-only emissions summaries. Otherwise, these emissions are developed in the same way as the U.S. C3 CMV emissions in the c3marine sector.

For Canadian point sources, other than some minor formatting changes, the Canada-provided year-2006 emissions were modified as follows:

- i. Speciated VOC emissions from the Acid Deposition and Oxidant Model (ADOM) chemical mechanism were not included because EPA modeling uses speciated emissions from the CB5 chemical mechanism, which Canada also provided.
- ii. Excessively high CO emissions were removed from Babine Forest Products Ltd (British Columbia SMOKE plantid='5188') in the point inventory. This change was made at EPA's discretion because the value of the emissions was impossibly large.
- iii. The county part of the state/county FIPS code field in the SMOKE inputs were modified in the point inventory from "000" to "001" to enable matching to existing temporal profiles.
- iv. An update to the 2007 platform version was the removal of three units that closed in 2010: Grand Lake Generating Station in New Brunswick (PLANTID='1708', POINTID='130011'), Raffinerie de Montreal-Est in Quebec (PLANTID='3127', POINTID='53202982') and Kidd Metallurgical Site in Ontario (PLANTID='2815', POINTID='ON500004').

Mexico point-format year-2012 inventories projected from the 1999 Mexico NEI were used essentially as-is with only minor formatting changes. The othpt sector also includes point source offshore oil and gas drilling platforms that are beyond U.S. state-county boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico. For these offshore emissions, the 2008 NEI version 3 point source inventory data were used because the 2011 data were not yet available. This is consistent with the 2011NEIv1. Updated offshore oil and gas drilling emissions are expected to be incorporated into version 2 of the 2011 NEI. The 2008-based offshore emission sources were provided by the Mineral Management Services (MMS).

2.5.2 Area and nonroad mobile sources from Canada and Mexico (othar)

For Canada, year-2006 emissions provided by Canada and unchanged from EPA 2007 platform were used. Inventory files were provided for area fugitive dust, agricultural, commercial marine, railroad, nonroad, aircraft, and other area sources. The following adjustments were made to the original files:

DRAFT

- i. Wildfires or prescribed burning were not included because Canada does not include these inventory data in their modeling. Note that SMARTFIRE 2 is used for U.S. sources only.
- ii. In-flight aircraft emissions were not included because these sources are not included in the U.S. modeling.
- iii. A 75% reduction (“transport fraction”) was applied to PM for the road dust, agricultural, and construction emissions in the Canadian “afdust” inventory. This approach is more simplistic than the county-specific approach used for the U.S., but a comparable approach was not available for Canada.
- iv. Wind erosion (SCC=2730100000) and cigarette smoke (SCC=2810060000) emissions were removed from the nonpoint (nonpt) inventory because these emissions are not modeled in the U.S. inventory.
- v. Quebec PM_{2.5} emissions (2,000 tons/yr) were removed for one SCC (2305070000) for Industrial Processes, Mineral Processes, Gypsum, Plaster Products due to corrupt fields after conversion to SMOKE input format.
- vi. C3 CMV SCCs (22800030X0) records were removed because, as discussed in Section 2.5.1, these emissions are included in the (ECA-IMO derived) othpt sector, which covers not only emissions close to Canada but also emissions far at sea. Canada was involved in the inventory development of the ECA-IMO C3 CMV inventory.

For Mexico nonpoint-format year-2012 inventories, the only significant modification was the removal of domestic ammonia (SCC=5555555555) (ERG, 2009; Wolf, 2009).

2.5.3 Onroad mobile sources from Canada and Mexico (othon)

Both year-2006 Canada and year-2012 Mexico inventories (ERG, 2009; Wolf, 2009) were converted from their original SMOKE One-Record per Line (ORL) and Inventory Data Analyzer (IDA) formats, respectively, into the SMOKE Flat File 2010 (FF10) inventory format:

<http://www.cmascenter.org/smoke/documentation/3.5/html/ch08s02s07.html>. Otherwise, these inventories were used as-is. The emission values in the Canada-provided Canadian inventories were unchanged from the 2007 platform.

2.6 Fires (ptfire)

Wildfire and prescribed burning emissions are contained in the ptfire sector. The ptfire sector has emissions provided at geographic coordinates (point locations) and has daily emissions values. The ptfire sector excludes agricultural burning and other open burning sources that are included in the nonpt sector. Emissions are day-specific and include satellite-derived latitude/longitude of the fire’s origin and other parameters associated with the emissions such as acres burned and fuel load, which allow estimation of plume rise. Emissions for the SCCs listed in Table 2-15 are treated as point sources and are consistent with the fires stored in the Events data category of the 2011NEIv1. For more information on the development of the 2011NEIv1 fire inventory, see Section 5.1 of the 2011NEIv1 TSD.

Table 2-15. 2011 Platform SCCs representing emissions in the ptfire modeling sector

SCC	SCC Description*
2810001000	Other Combustion; Forest Wildfires; Total
2810015000	Other Combustion; Prescribed Burning for Forest Management; Total
2811015000	Other Combustion-as Event; Prescribed Burning for Forest Management; Total
2811090000	Other Combustion-as Event; Prescribed Forest Burning ;Unspecified

DRAFT

* The first tier level of the SCC Description is “Miscellaneous Area Sources”

The point source day-specific emission estimates for 2011 fires rely on SMARTFIRE 2 (Sullivan, et al., 2008), which uses the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA’s) Hazard Mapping System (HMS) fire location information as input. Additional inputs include the CONSUMEv3.0 software application (Joint Fire Science Program, 2009) and the Fuel Characteristic Classification System (FCCS) fuel-loading database to estimate fire emissions from wildfires and prescribed burns on a daily basis. The method involves the reconciliation of ICS-209 reports (Incident Status Summary Reports) with satellite-based fire detections to determine spatial and temporal information about the fires. A functional diagram of the SMARTFIRE 2 process of reconciling fires with ICS-209 reports is available in the documentation (Raffuse, et al., 2007). Once the fire reconciliation process is completed, the emissions are calculated using the U.S. Forest Service’s CONSUMEv3.0 fuel consumption model and the FCCS fuel-loading database in the BlueSky Framework (Ottmar, et. al., 2007).

SMARTFIRE 2 estimates were used directly for all states except Georgia and Florida. For Georgia, the satellite-derived emissions were removed from the ptfire inventory and replaced with a separate state-supplied ptfire inventory. Adjustments were also made to Florida as described in Section 5.1.4 of the 2011NEIv1 TSD. These changes made the data in the ptfire inventory consistent with the data in the 2011NEIv1.

2.7 Biogenic sources (biog)

The biogenic emissions were computed based on 2011 meteorology data using the Biogenic Emission Inventory System, version 3.14 (BEIS3.14) model within SMOKE. The BEIS3.14 model creates gridded, hourly, model-species emissions from vegetation and soils. It estimates CO, VOC (most notably isoprene, terpene, and sesquiterpene), and NO emissions for the U.S., Mexico, and Canada. The BEIS3.14 model is described further in:

http://www.cmascenter.org/conference/2008/slides/pouliot_tale_two_cmas08.ppt.

The inputs to BEIS include:

- Temperature data at 2 meters, which were obtained from the meteorological input files to the air quality model,
- Land-use data from the Biogenic Emissions Land use Database, version 3 (BELD3). BELD3 data provides data on the 230 vegetation classes at 1-km resolution over most of North America.

To provide a sense of the scope and spatial distribution of the emissions, plots of annual BEIS outputs for isoprene and NO for 2011 are shown in Figure 2-3 and Figure 2-4, respectively.

2.8 SMOKE-ready non-anthropogenic inventories for chlorine

The ocean chlorine gas emission estimates are based on the build-up of molecular chlorine (Cl₂) concentrations in oceanic air masses (Bullock and Brehme, 2002). Data at 36 km and 12 km resolution were available and were not modified other than the model-species name “CHLORINE” was changed to “CL2” to support CMAQ modeling.

Figure 2-3. Annual NO emissions output from BEIS 3.14 for 2011





Figure 2-4. Annual isoprene emissions output from BEIS 3.14 for 2011



3 Emissions Modeling Summary

Both the CMAQ and CAM_x models require hourly emissions of specific gas and particle species for the horizontal and vertical grid cells contained within the modeled region (i.e., modeling domain). To provide emissions in the form and format required by the model, it is necessary to “pre-process” the “raw” emissions (i.e., emissions input to SMOKE) for the sectors described above in Section 2. In brief, the process of emissions modeling transforms the emissions inventories from their original temporal resolution, pollutant resolution, and spatial resolution into the hourly, speciated, gridded resolution required by the air quality model. Emissions modeling includes temporal allocation, spatial allocation, and pollutant speciation. In some cases, emissions modeling also includes the vertical allocation of point sources, but many air quality models also perform this task because it greatly reduces the size of the input emissions files if the vertical layer of the sources does not need to be included.

As seen in Section 2, the temporal resolutions of the emissions inventories input to SMOKE vary across sectors, and may be hourly, daily, monthly, or annual total emissions. The spatial resolution, which also can be different for different sectors, may be individual point sources, county/province/municipio totals, or gridded emissions. This section provides some basic information about the tools and data files used for emissions modeling as part of the modeling platform. In Section 2, the emissions inventories and how they differ from the 2011NEIv1 were described. In Section 3, the descriptions of data are limited to the ancillary data SMOKE uses to perform the emissions modeling steps. Note that all SMOKE inputs for the 2011v6 platform are available from the CHIEF Emissions Modeling Clearinghouse website (see Section 1).

SMOKE version 3.5.1 was used to pre-process the raw emissions inventories into emissions inputs for CMAQ. For projects that used CAM_x, the CMAQ emissions were converted into the CAM_x formats using CAM_x convertor programs. For sectors that have plume rise, the in-line emissions capability of the air quality models was used, which allows the creation of source-based and two-dimensional gridded emissions files that are much smaller than full three-dimensional gridded emissions files. For quality assurance of the emissions modeling steps, emissions totals by specie for the entire model domain are output as reports that are then compared to reports generated by SMOKE on the input inventories to ensure that mass is not lost or gained during the emissions modeling process.

3.1 Emissions modeling Overview

When preparing emissions for the air quality model, emissions for each sector are processed separately through SMOKE, and then the final merge program (Mrggrid) is run to combine the model-ready, sector-specific emissions across sectors. The SMOKE settings in the run scripts and the data in the SMOKE ancillary files control the approaches used by the individual SMOKE programs for each sector. Table 3-1 summarizes the major processing steps of each platform sector. The “Spatial” column shows the spatial approach used: here “point” indicates that SMOKE maps the source from a point location (i.e., latitude and longitude) to a grid cell; “surrogates” indicates that some or all of the sources use spatial surrogates to allocate county emissions to grid cells; and “area-to-point” indicates that some of the sources use the SMOKE area-to-point feature to grid the emissions (further described in Section 3.4.2). The “Speciation” column indicates that all sectors use the SMOKE speciation step, though biogenics speciation is done within the Tmpbeis3 program and not as a separate SMOKE step. The “Inventory resolution” column shows the inventory temporal resolution from which SMOKE needs to calculate hourly emissions. Note that for some sectors (e.g., onroad, beis), there is no input inventory;

DRAFT

instead, activity data and emission factors are used in combination with meteorological data to compute hourly emissions.

Finally, the “plume rise” column indicates the sectors for which the “in-line” approach is used. These sectors are the only ones with emissions in aloft layers based on plume rise. The term “in-line” means that the plume rise calculations are done inside of the air quality model instead of being computed by SMOKE. The air quality model computes the plume rise using the stack data and the hourly air quality model inputs found in the SMOKE output files for each model-ready emissions sector. The height of the plume rise determines the model layer into which the emissions are placed. The c3marine, othpt, and ptfire sectors are the only sectors with only “in-line” emissions, meaning that all of the emissions are placed in aloft layers and there are no emissions for those sectors in the two-dimensional, layer-1 files created by SMOKE.


Table 3-1. Key emissions modeling steps by sector.

Platform sector	Spatial	Speciation	Inventory resolution	Plume rise
afdust	Surrogates	Yes	annual	
ag	Surrogates	Yes	annual (some monthly)	
beis	Pre-gridded land use	in BEIS3.14	computed hourly	
c1c2rail	Surrogates	Yes	annual	
c3marine	Point	Yes	annual	in-line
nonpt	Surrogates & area-to-point	Yes	annual (some monthly)	
nonroad	Surrogates & area-to-point	Yes	monthly	
np_oilgas	Surrogates	Yes	annual	
onroad	Surrogates	Yes	monthly activity, computed hourly	
onroad_rfl	Surrogates	Yes	monthly activity, computed hourly	
othar	Surrogates	Yes	annual	
othon	Surrogates	Yes	annual	
othpt	Point	Yes	annual	in-line
pt_oilgas	Point	Yes	annual	in-line
ptegu	Point	Yes	daily & hourly	in-line
ptegu_pk	Point	Yes	daily & hourly	in-line
ptfire	Point	Yes	daily	in-line
ptnonipm	Point	Yes	annual	in-line
rwc	Surrogates	Yes	annual	

SMOKE has the option of grouping sources so that they are treated as a single stack when computing plume rise. For the 2011 platform, no grouping was performed because grouping combined with “in-line” processing will not give identical results as “offline” processing (i.e., when SMOKE creates 3-dimensional files). This occurs when stacks with different stack parameters or lat/lons are grouped, thereby changing the parameters of one or more sources. The most straightforward way to get the same results between in-line and offline is to avoid the use of grouping.

SMOKE was run for the smaller 12-km Continental United States “CONUS” modeling domain (12US2) shown in Figure 3-1 and boundary conditions were obtained from a 2011 run of GEOS-Chem.

Figure 3-1. Air quality modeling domains



Both grids use a Lambert-Conformal projection, with Alpha = 33°, Beta = 45° and Gamma = -97°, with a center of X = -97° and Y = 40°. Table 3-2 describes the grids for the two domains.

Table 3-2. Descriptions of the platform grids

Common Name	Grid Cell Size	Description (see Figure 3-1)	Grid name	Parameters listed in SMOKE grid description (GRIDDESC) file: projection name, xorig, yorig, xcell, ycell, ncols, nrows, nthik
Continental 12km grid	12 km	Entire conterminous US plus some of Mexico/Canada	12US1_459X299	'LAM_40N97W', -2556000, -1728000, 12.D3, 12.D3, 459, 299, 1
US 12 km or “smaller” CONUS-12	12 km	Smaller 12km CONUS plus some of Mexico/Canada	12US2	'LAM_40N97W', -2412000, -1620000, 12.D3, 12.D3, 396, 246, 1

Section 3.4 provides the details on the spatial surrogates and area-to-point data used to accomplish spatial allocation with SMOKE.

3.2 Chemical Speciation

The emissions modeling step for chemical speciation creates the “model species” needed by the air quality model for a specific chemical mechanism. These model species are either individual chemical compounds or groups of species, called “model species.” The chemical mechanism used for the 2011 platform is the CB05 mechanism (Yarwood, 2005). The same base chemical mechanism is used within both CMAQ and CAM_x, but the implementation differs slightly between the two models. The specific versions of CMAQ and CAM_x used in applications of this platform include secondary organic aerosol (SOA) and HONO enhancements.

From the perspective of emissions preparation, the CB05 with SOA mechanism is the same as was used in the 2007 platform. Table 3-3 lists the model species produced by SMOKE for use in CMAQ and CAM_x. It should be noted that the BENZENE model species is not part of CB05 in that the concentrations of BENZENE do not provide any feedback into the chemical reactions (i.e., it is not “inside” the chemical mechanism). Rather, benzene is used as a reactive tracer and as such is impacted by the CB05 chemistry. BENZENE, along with several reactive CB05 species (such as TOL and XYL) plays a role in SOA formation.

The TOG and PM_{2.5} speciation factors that are the basis of the chemical speciation approach were developed from the SPECIATE4.3 database (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/software/speciate>) which is EPA's repository of TOG and PM speciation profiles of air pollution sources. However, a few of the profiles used in the v6 platform will be published in later versions of the SPECIATE database after the release of this documentation. The SPECIATE database development and maintenance is a collaboration involving EPA's ORD, OTAQ, and the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS), in cooperation with Environment Canada (EPA, 2006a). The SPECIATE database contains speciation profiles for TOG, speciated into individual chemical compounds, VOC-to-TOG conversion factors associated with the TOG profiles, and speciation profiles for PM_{2.5}.

Speciation profiles and cross-references for this platform are available in spreadsheet form from ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/speciation_profiles/. The profiles are in the Excel files “gspro_2011.xlsx” and “gspro_combo_2011.xlsx, gsref_2011.xlsx”. The cross reference information is in “gsref_2011.xlsx”, and differences between 2011 and 2018 speciation profiles are shown in “2011ed_2018ed_gspro_differences.xlsx”. A spreadsheet showing emission totals for each speciation profile by modeling sector is available in the file “2011ed_speciation_profile_CAPs_feb112014.xlsx”.

DRAFT

Table 3-3. Emission model species produced for CB05 with SOA for CMAQ5.0.1 and CAM_x*

Inventory Pollutant	Model Species	Model species description
Cl ₂	CL2	Atomic gas-phase chlorine
HCl	HCL	Hydrogen Chloride (hydrochloric acid) gas
CO	CO	Carbon monoxide
NO _x	NO	Nitrogen oxide
	NO2	Nitrogen dioxide
	HONO	Nitrous acid
SO ₂	SO2	Sulfur dioxide
	SULF	Sulfuric acid vapor
NH ₃	NH3	Ammonia
VOC	ALD2	Acetaldehyde
	ALDX	Propionaldehyde and higher aldehydes
	BENZENE	Benzene (not part of CB05)
	CH4	Methane ⁸
	ETH	Ethene
	ETHA	Ethane
	ETOH	Ethanol
	FORM	Formaldehyde
	IOLE	Internal olefin carbon bond (R-C=C-R)
	ISOP	Isoprene
	MEOH	Methanol
	OLE	Terminal olefin carbon bond (R-C=C)
	PAR	Paraffin carbon bond
	TOL	Toluene and other monoalkyl aromatics
XYL	Xylene and other polyalkyl aromatics	
VOC species from the biogenics model that do not map to model species above	SESQ	Sesquiterpenes
	TERP	Terpenes
PM ₁₀	PMC	Coarse PM > 2.5 microns and ≤ 10 microns
PM _{2.5} ⁹	PEC	Particulate elemental carbon ≤ 2.5 microns
	PNO3	Particulate nitrate ≤ 2.5 microns
	POC	Particulate organic carbon (carbon only) ≤ 2.5 microns
	PSO4	Particulate Sulfate ≤ 2.5 microns
	PMFINE	Other particulate matter ≤ 2.5 microns
Sea-salt species (non – anthropogenic) ¹⁰	PCL	Particulate chloride
	PNA	Particulate sodium
<p>*The same species names are used for the CAM_x model with exceptions as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CL2 is not used in CAM_x 2. CAM_x particulate sodium is NA (in CMAQ it is PNA) 3. CAM_x uses different names for species that are both in CBO5 and SOA for the following: TOLA=TOL, XYLA=XYL, ISP=ISOP, TRP=TERP. They are duplicate species in CAM_x that are used in the SOA chemistry. CMAQ uses the same names in CB05 and SOA for these species. 4. CAM_x uses a different name for sesquiterpenes: CMAQ SESQ = CAM_x SQT 5. CAM_x uses particulate species uses different names for organic carbon, coarse particulate matter and other particulate mass as follows: CMAQ POC = CAM_x POA, CMAQ PMC = CAM_x CPRM, CMAQ PMFINE= CAM_x FCRS, and CMAQ 		

⁸ Technically, CH₄ is not a VOC but part of TOG. Although emissions of CH₄ are derived, the AQ models do not use these emissions because the anthropogenic emissions are dwarfed by the CH₄ already in the atmosphere.

⁹ For CMAQ 5.0, PM_{2.5} is speciated into a finer set of PM components. Listed in this table are the AE5 species

¹⁰ These emissions are created outside of SMOKE

3.2.1 VOC speciation

3.2.1.1 The combination of HAP BAFM (benzene, acetaldehyde, formaldehyde and methanol) and VOC for VOC speciation

The VOC speciation includes HAP emissions from the 2011NEIv1 in the speciation process. Instead of speciating VOC to generate all of the species listed in Table 3-3, emissions of four specific HAPs: benzene, acetaldehyde, formaldehyde and methanol (collectively known as “BAFM”) from the NEI were “integrated” with the NEI VOC. The integration process (described in more detail below) combines these HAPs with the VOC in a way that does not double count emissions and uses the HAP inventory directly in the speciation process. The basic process is to subtract the specified HAPs emissions mass from VOC emissions mass and to then use a special “integrated” profile to speciate the remainder of VOC to the model species excluding the specific HAPs. EPA believes that generally, the HAP emissions from the NEI are more representative of emissions of these compounds than their generation via VOC speciation.

The BAFM HAPs (benzene, acetaldehyde, formaldehyde and methanol) were chosen because, with the exception of BENZENE, they are the only explicit VOC HAPs in the base version of CMAQ 5.0.1 (CAPs only with chlorine chemistry) model. Explicit means that they are not lumped chemical groups like the other CB05 species. These “explicit VOC HAPs” are model species that participate in the modeled chemistry using the CB05 chemical mechanism. The use of these HAP emission estimates along with VOC is called “HAP-CAP integration”. BENZENE was chosen because it is a model species in the base version of CMAQ 5.0.1, and there was a desire to keep its emissions consistent between multi-pollutant and base versions of CMAQ.

For specific sources, especially within the onroad and onroad_rfl sectors, the integration included ethanol. To differentiate when a source was integrating BAFM versus EBAFM (ethanol in addition to BAFM), the speciation profiles that do not include ethanol are referred to as an “E-profile” (to be used when the ethanol comes from the inventory pollutant). For example, use E10 headspace gasoline evaporative speciation profile 8763 when ethanol is speciated from VOC, but use 8763E when ethanol is obtained directly from the inventory.

The integration of HAP VOC with VOC is a feature available in SMOKE for all inventory formats other than PTDAY (the format used for the ptfire sector). SMOKE allows the user to specify both the particular HAPs to integrate via the INVTABLE and the particular sources to integrate via the NHAPEXCLUDE file (which actually provides the sources to be *excluded* from integration¹¹). For the “integrated” sources, SMOKE subtracts the “integrated” HAPs from the VOC (at the source level) to compute emissions for the new pollutant “NONHAPVOC.” The user provides NONHAPVOC-to-NONHAPTOG factors and NONHAPTOG speciation profiles¹². SMOKE computes NONHAPTOG and then applies the speciation profiles to allocate the NONHAPTOG to the other air quality model VOC species not including the integrated HAPs. After determining if a sector is to be integrated, if all sources


¹¹ In SMOKE version 3.5, the options to specify sources for integration are expanded so that a user can specify the particular sources to include or exclude from integration, and there are settings to include or exclude all sources within a sector. In addition, the error checking is significantly stricter for integrated sources. If a source is supposed to be integrated, but it is missing BAFM or VOC, SMOKE will now raise an error.

¹² These ratios and profiles are typically generated from the Speciation Tool when it is run with integration of a specified list of pollutants, for example BAFM.

have the appropriate HAP emissions, then the sector is considered fully integrated and does not need a NHAPEXCLUDE file. If on the other hand, certain sources do not have the necessary HAPs, then an NHAPEXCLUDE file must be provided based on the evaluation of each source's pollutant mix. EPA considered CAP-HAP integration for all sectors and developed "integration criteria" for some of them (see Section 3.2.1.3 for details).

The process of partial integration for BAFM is illustrated in Figure 3-2 that the BAFM records in the input inventories do not need to be removed from any sources in a partially integrated sector because SMOKE does this automatically using the INVTABLE configuration. For EBAFM integration, this process is identical to that shown in the figure except for the addition of ethanol (E) to the list of subtracted HAP pollutants. For full integration, the process would be very similar except that the NHAPEXCLUDE file would not be used and all sources in the sector would be integrated.

Figure 3-2. Process of integrating BAFM with VOC for use in VOC Speciation



In SMOKE, the INVTABLE allows the user to specify both the particular HAPs to integrate. Two different types of INVTABLE files are included for use with different sectors of the platform. For sectors that had no integration across the entire sector (see Table 3-4), EPA created a "no HAP use" INVTABLE in which the "KEEP" flag is set to "N" for BAFM pollutants. Thus, any BAFM pollutants in the inventory input into SMOKE are automatically dropped. This approach both avoids double-counting of these species and assumes that the VOC speciation is the best available approach for these species for sectors using this approach. The second INVTABLE, used for sectors in which one or more sources are integrated, causes SMOKE to keep the inventory BAFM pollutants and indicates that they are to be integrated with VOC. This is done by setting the "VOC or TOG component" field to "V" for all four HAP pollutants. This type of INVTABLE is further differentiated into a version for those sectors that integrate BAFM and another for those that integrate EBAFM, such as the onroad and onroad_rfl sectors.

Table 3-4. Integration approach for BAFM and EBAFM for each platform sector

Platform Sector	Approach for Integrating NEI emissions of Benzene (B), Acetaldehyde (A), Formaldehyde (F), Methanol (M), and Ethanol (E)
ptegu	No integration
ptegu_pk	No integration
ptnonipm	No integration
ptfire	No integration
othar	No integration
othon	No integration
ag	N/A – sector contains no VOC
afdust	N/A – sector contains no VOC
biog	N/A – sector contains no inventory pollutant "VOC"; but rather specific VOC species
nonpt	Partial integration (BAFM and EBAFM)
np_oilgas	Partial integration (BAFM)
pt_oilgas	Partial integration (BAFM)
rwc	Partial integration (BAFM)
nonroad	Partial integration (BAFM)
c1c2rail	Partial integration (BAFM)
othpt	Partial integration (BAFM)
c3marine	Full integration (BAFM)
onroad	Full integration (EBAFM and BAFM)
onroad_rfl	Full integration (EBAFM and BAFM)

More details on the integration of specific sectors and additional details of the speciation are provided in Section 3.2.1.3.

3.2.1.2 County specific profile combinations (GSPRO_COMBO)

SMOKE can compute speciation profiles from mixtures of other profiles in user-specified proportions. The combinations are specified in the GSPRO_COMBO ancillary file by pollutant (including pollutant mode, e.g., EXH_VOC), state and county (i.e., state/county FIPS code) and time period (i.e., month). This feature was used to speciate onroad and nonroad mobile and gasoline-related related stationary sources that use fuels with varying ethanol content. In these cases, the speciation profiles require different combinations of gasoline profiles, e.g. E0 and E10 profiles. Since the ethanol content varies spatially (e.g., by state or county), temporally (e.g., by month) and by modeling year (future years have more ethanol) the GSPRO_COMBO feature allows combinations to be specified at various levels for different years. SMOKE computes the resultant profile using the fraction of each specific profile assigned by county, month and emission mode.

The GSREF file indicates that a specific source uses a combination file with the profile code "COMBO". Because the GSPRO_COMBO file does not differentiate by SCC and there are various levels of integration across sectors, sector specific GSPRO_COMBO files are used. For the onroad and onroad_rfl sectors, the GSPRO_COMBO uses E-profiles (i.e. there is EBAFM integration). Different profile combinations are specified by the mode (e.g. exhaust, evaporative, refueling, etc.) by changing the pollutant name (e.g. EXH_NONHAPTOG, EVP_NONHAPTOG, RFL_NONHAPTOG). For the nonpt sector, a combination of BAFM and EBAFM integration is used. Due to the lack of SCC-specificity in the GSPRO_COMBO, the only way to differentiate the sources that should use BAFM integrated profiles versus E-profiles is by changing the pollutant name. For example, EPA changed the pollutant name for the PFC future year inventory so the integration would use EVP_NONHAPVOC to

correctly select the E-profile combinations, while other sources used NONHAPVOC to select the typical BAFM profiles.

3.2.1.3 Additional sector specific details

The decision to integrate HAPs into the speciation was made on a sector by sector basis. For some sectors there is no integration (VOC is speciated directly), for some sectors there is full integration (all sources are integrated), and for other sectors there is partial integration (some sources are not integrated and other sources are integrated). The integrated HAPs are either BAFM (BAFM HAPs subtracted from VOC) or EBAFM (ethanol and BAFM HAPs subtracted from VOC). Table 3-4 summarizes the integration for each platform sector.

For the c1c2rail sector, EPA integrated BAFM for most sources from the 2011NEIv1. There were a few sources that had zero BAFM; therefore, they were not integrated. The MWRPO and CARB inventories (see Section 2.4.1) did not include HAPs; therefore, all non-NEI source emissions in the c1c2rail sector were not integrated. For California, the CARB inventory TOG was converted to VOC by dividing the inventory TOG by the available VOC-to-TOG speciation factor.

For the othpt sector, the C3 marine sources (see Section 2.4.2) are integrated. HAPs in this sector are derived identically to the U.S. c3marine sector. The rest of the sources in othpt are not integrated, thus the sector is partially integrated.

For the onroad and onroad_rfl sectors, there are series of unique speciation issues. First, SMOKE-MOVES (see Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2) is used to estimate these sectors, meaning both the MEPROC and INVTABLE files are involved in controlling which pollutants are ingested and speciated. Second, these sectors have estimates of TOG as well as VOC; therefore, TOG can be speciated directly. Third, the gasoline sources use full integration of EBAFM (i.e. use E-profiles) and the diesel sources use full integration of BAFM. Fourth, the onroad sector utilizes 6 different modes for speciation: exhaust, extended idle, evaporative, permeation (gasoline vehicles only), brake wear, and tire wear (See Table 2-12 for more details). The onroad_rfl sector utilizes an additional mode: refueling. Fifth, the gasoline exhaust profiles were updated to 8750a (revision to Gasoline Exhaust - Reformulated gasoline) and 8751a (revision to Gasoline Exhaust - E10 ethanol gasoline)¹³. Sixth, for California and Texas, EPA applied adjustment factors to SMOKE-MOVES to produce California and Texas adjusted model-ready files (see Section 2.3.1 for details). By applying the ratios through SMOKE-MOVES, the CARB and Texas inventories are essentially speciated to match EPA estimated speciation grid cell by grid cell. The future year CARB inventories did not have BAFM, so EPA estimates of BAFM were adjusted using VOC adjustment factors for California only.

For the nonroad sector, CNG or LPG sources (SCCs beginning with 2268 or 2267) are not integrated because NMIM computed only VOC and not any HAPs for these SCCs. All other nonroad sources were integrated except in California. For California, the CARB inventory TOG was converted to VOC by dividing the inventory TOG by the available VOC-to-TOG speciation factor. SMOKE later applies the same VOC-to-TOG factor prior to computing speciated emissions. The CARB-based nonroad data includes exhaust and evaporative mode-specific data for VOC, but does not contain refueling. The CARB inventory does not include HAP estimates for all sources; therefore, the sources which have VOC but do not have BAFM or BAFM is greater than VOC are not integrated. The remaining sources are integrated. The future year CARB inventories did not have BAFM so all sources for California were

¹³ These revised profiles are expected to be in the yet to be released SPECIATE 4.4.

DRAFT

not integrated. Similar to onroad, the gasoline exhaust profiles were updated to 8750a and 8751a (this is true nation-wide).

For the ptnonipm sector, the 2011 and 2018 runs were not integrated. This was an oversight— it should have been partial integration because the 2011 ethanol inventory (SCC 30125010) provided by OTAQ includes BAFM. In the future year, ptnonipm should be partially integrated because both the ethanol and biodiesel inventories (SCC 30125010) provided by OTAQ include BAFM. Aircraft emissions use the profile 5565b which is chemically equivalent to 5565 (aircraft exhaust) in SPECIATE 4.3 database. The profile numbers are differentiated from each other because a draft version of 5565 was used in previous modeling platforms.

For most sources in the rwc sector, the VOC emissions were greater than or equal to BAFM, and BAFM was not zero, so those sources were integrated, although a few specific sources that did not meet these criteria could not be integrated.

For the oil and gas sources in np_oilgas and pt_oilgas, the basins studied in WRAP Phase III have basin-specific VOC speciation that takes into account the distinct composition of gas. ENVIRON developed these basin-specific profiles using gas composition analysis data obtained from operators through surveys. ENVIRON separated out emissions and speciation from conventional/tight sands/shale gas from coal-bed methane (CBM) gas sources. Table 3-5 lists the basin and gas composition specific profiles used for the sources in the WRAP Phase III basins. For oil and gas sources outside of the WRAP Phase III basins, the profiles did not vary by region or basin (see Table 3-6). Table 3-7 lists the WRAP Phase III counties.

Table 3-5. VOC profiles for WRAP Phase III basins

Profile Code	Description
DJFLA	D-J Basin Flashing Gas Composition for Condensate
DJVNT	D-J Basin Produced Gas Composition
PNC01	Piceance Basin Gas Composition at Conventional Wells
PNC02	Piceance Basin Gas Composition at Oil Wells
PNC03	Piceance Basin Flashing Gas Composition for Condensate
PRBCO	Powder River Basin Produced Gas Composition for Conventional Wells
PRM01	Permian Basin Produced Gas Composition
SSJCO	South San Juan Basin Produced Gas Composition for Conventional Wells
SWE01	Wyoming Flashing Gas Composition
SWFLA	SW Wyoming Basin Flash Gas Composition
SWVNT	SW Wyoming Basin Vented Gas Composition
UNT02	Uinta Basin Gas Composition at Conventional Wells
UNT03	Uinta Basin Flashing Gas Composition for Oil
UNT04	Uinta Basin Flashing Gas Composition for Condensate
WRBCO	Wind River Basin Produced Gas Composition for Conventional Wells

Table 3-6. National VOC profiles for oil and gas

profile	Description
0000	Over All Average
0001	External Combustion Boiler - Residual Oil

DRAFT

profile	Description
0002	External Combustion Boiler - Distillate Oil
0003	External Combustion Boiler - Natural Gas
0004	External Combustion Boiler - Refinery Gas
0007	Natural Gas Turbine
0008	Reciprocating Diesel Engine
0051	Flares - Natural Gas
0296	Fixed Roof Tank - Crude Oil Production
1001	Internal Combustion Engine - Natural Gas
1010	Oil and Gas Production - Fugitives - Unclassified
1011	Oil and Gas Production - Fugitives - Valves and Fittings - Liquid Service
1012	Oil and Gas Production - Fugitives - Valves and Fittings - Gas Service
1207	Well Heads (Water Flood) Composite
2487	Composite of 7 Emission Profiles from Crude Oil Storage Tanks - 1993
2489	Composite of 15 Fugitive Emission Profiles from Petroleum Storage Facilities - 1993

Table 3-7. Counties included in the WRAP Dataset

FIPS	State	County
08001	CO	Adams
08005	CO	Arapahoe
08007	CO	Archuleta
08013	CO	Boulder
08014	CO	Broomfield
08029	CO	Delta
08031	CO	Denver
08039	CO	Elbert
08043	CO	Fremont
08045	CO	Garfield
08051	CO	Gunnison
08059	CO	Jefferson
08063	CO	Kit Carson
08067	CO	La Plata
08069	CO	Larimer
08073	CO	Lincoln
08075	CO	Logan
08077	CO	Mesa
08081	CO	Moffat
08087	CO	Morgan
08095	CO	Phillips
08097	CO	Pitkin
08103	CO	Rio Blanco
08107	CO	Routt
08115	CO	Sedgwick
08121	CO	Washington

FIPS	State	County
08123	CO	Weld
08125	CO	Yuma
30003	MT	Big Horn
30075	MT	Powder River
35005	NM	Chaves
35015	NM	Eddy
35015	NM	Lea
35031	NM	Mc Kinley
35039	NM	Rio Arriba
35041	NM	Roosevelt
35043	NM	Sandoval
35045	NM	San Juan
48003	TX	Andrews
48033	TX	Borden
48079	TX	Cochran
48081	TX	Coke
48103	TX	Crane
48105	TX	Crockett
48107	TX	Crosby
48109	TX	Culberson
48115	TX	Dawson
48125	TX	Dickens
48135	TX	Ector
48141	TX	El Paso
48151	TX	Fisher
48165	TX	Gaines

FIPS	State	County
48169	TX	Garza
48173	TX	Glasscock
48219	TX	Hockley
48227	TX	Howard
48229	TX	Hudspeth
48235	TX	Irion
48263	TX	Kent
48269	TX	King
48301	TX	Loving
48303	TX	Lubbock
48305	TX	Lynn
48317	TX	Martin
48329	TX	Midland
48335	TX	Mitchell
48353	TX	Nolan
48371	TX	Pecos
48383	TX	Reagan
48389	TX	Reeves
48413	TX	Schleicher
48415	TX	Scurry
48431	TX	Sterling
48435	TX	Sutton
48445	TX	Terry
48451	TX	Tom Green
48461	TX	Upton
48475	TX	Ward

FIPS	State	County
48495	TX	Winkler
48501	TX	Yoakum
49007	UT	Carbon
49009	UT	Daggett
49013	UT	Duchesne
49015	UT	Emery
49019	UT	Grand
49043	UT	Summit

FIPS	State	County
49047	UT	Uintah
56001	WY	Albany
56005	WY	Campbell
56007	WY	Carbon
56009	WY	Converse
56011	WY	Crook
56013	WY	Fremont
56019	WY	Johnson

FIPS	State	County
56023	WY	Lincoln
56025	WY	Natrona
56027	WY	Niobrara
56033	WY	Sheridan
56035	WY	Sublette
56037	WY	Sweetwater
56041	WY	Uinta
56045	WY	Weston

For the biog sector, the speciation profiles used by BEIS are not included in SPECIATE. The 2011 platform uses BEIS3.14, which includes a new species (SESQ) that was mapped to the model species SESQT. The profile code associated with BEIS3.14 profiles for use with CB05 uses the profile: “B10C5.”

For the nonpt sector, where VOC emissions were greater than or equal to BAFM and BAFM was not zero, the sources were integrated. For portable fuel containers (PFCs) and fuel distribution operations associated with the bulk-plant-to-pump (BTP) distribution, ethanol may be mixed into the fuels; therefore, county- and month-specific COMBO speciation was used (via the GSPRO_COMBO file). Refinery to bulk terminal (RBT) fuel distribution and bulk plant storage (BPS) speciation are considered upstream from the introduction of ethanol into the fuel; therefore a single profile is sufficient for these sources. No refined information on potential VOC speciation differences between cellulosic diesel and cellulosic ethanol sources was available, therefore cellulosic diesel and cellulosic ethanol sources used the same SCC (30125010: Industrial Chemical Manufacturing, Ethanol by Fermentation production) for VOC speciation as was used for corn ethanol plants. For the future year, PFC and the cellulosic sources were integrated EBAFM (i.e. used E-profiles) because ethanol was present in those inventories.

3.2.1.4 Future year speciation

The VOC speciation approach used for the future year case is customized to account for the impact of fuel changes. These changes affect the onroad, onroad_rfl, nonroad, and parts of the nonpt and ptnonipm sectors.

Speciation profiles for VOC in the nonroad, onroad and onroad_rfl sectors account for the changes in ethanol content of fuels across years. A description of the actual fuel formulations for 2011 can be found in the 2011NEIv1 TSD, and for 2018 see Section 4.3. For 2011, EPA used “COMBO” profiles to model combinations of profiles for E0 and E10 fuel use. For 2018, EPA used “COMBO” profiles to model combinations of E10 and E85 fuel use. The speciation of onroad exhaust VOC also accounts for a portion of the vehicle fleet meeting Tier 2 standards in that different exhaust profiles are available for pre-Tier 2 versus Tier 2 vehicles. Thus for onroad gasoline, VOC speciation uses different COMBO profiles to take into account both the increase in ethanol use, and the increase in Tier 2 vehicles in the future case.

The speciation changes from fuels in the nonpt sector are for PFCs and fuel distribution operations associated with the BTP distribution. For these sources, ethanol may be mixed into the fuels, in which case speciation would change across years. The speciation changes from fuels in the ptnonipm sector

DRAFT

include BTP distribution operations inventoried as point sources. RBT fuel distribution and BPS speciation does not change across the modeling cases because this is considered upstream from the introduction of ethanol into the fuel. For PFCs, ethanol was present in the future inventories and therefore EBAFM profiles were used to integrate ethanol in the speciation. The mapping of fuel distribution SCCs to PFC, BTP, BPS, and RBT emissions categories can be found in Appendix B.

Table 3-8 summarizes the different profiles utilized for the fuel-related sources in each of the sectors for 2011 and the future year case. This table indicates when “E-profiles” were used instead of BAFM integrated profiles. The term “COMBO” indicates that a combination of the profiles listed was used to speciate that subcategory using the GSPRO_COMBO file.

Table 3-8. Select VOC profiles 2011 versus 2018

Sector	subcategory	2011		2018	
onroad	gasoline exhaust	COMBO:		COMBO:	
		8750aE	Pre-Tier 2 E0 exhaust	8751E	Pre-Tier 2 E10 exhaust
		8751aE	Pre-Tier 2 E10 exhaust	8757E	Tier 2 E10 Exhaust
		8756E	Tier 2 E0 Exhaust	8758E	Tier 2 E15 Exhaust
		8757E	Tier 2 E10 Exhaust	8855E	Tier 2 E85 Exhaust
onroad	gasoline evaporative	COMBO:		COMBO	
		8753E	E0 Evap	8754E	E10 Evap
		8754E	E10 Evap	8872E	E15 Evap
				8934E	E85 Evap
onroad	gasoline permeation	COMBO:		COMBO	
		8766E	E0 evap perm	8769E	E10 evap perm
		8769E	E10 evap perm	8770E	E15 evap perm
				8934E	E85 Evap
onroad_rfl	gasoline refueling	COMBO:		COMBO	
		8869E	E0 Headspace	8870E	E10 Headspace
		8870E	E10 Headspace	8871E	E15 Headspace
				8934E	E85 Evap
onroad	diesel exhaust	87710	Weighted diesel exhaust for 2010	877P0	Weighted diesel exhaust for 2020
onroad	diesel extended idle	877P0	Weighted diesel exhaust for 2020	877EIT3	Weighted diesel extended idle for 2018
onroad	diesel evaporative	4547	Diesel Headspace	4547	Diesel Headspace
onroad_rfl	diesel refueling	4547	Diesel Headspace	4547	Diesel Headspace
nonroad	gasoline exhaust	COMBO:		8751a	
		8750a	Pre-Tier 2 E0 exhaust	Pre-Tier 2 E10 exhaust	
		8751a	Pre-Tier 2 E10 exhaust		
nonroad	gasoline evaporative	COMBO:		8754	E10 evap
		8753	E0 evap		

DRAFT

Sector	subcategory	2011		2018	
		8754	E10 evap		
nonroad	gasoline refueling	COMBO: 8869	E0 Headspace	8870	E10 Headspace
		8870	E10 Headspace		
nonroad	diesel exhaust	8774	Pre-2007 MY HDD exhaust	8774	Pre-2007 MY HDD exhaust
nonroad	diesel evaporative	4547	Diesel Headspace	4547	Diesel Headspace
nonroad	diesel refueling	4547	Diesel Headspace	4547	Diesel Headspace
nonpt/ptnonipm	PFC	COMBO: 8869E	E0 Headspace	COMBO 8870E	E10 Headspace
		8870E	E10 Headspace	8871E	E15 Headspace
				8934E	E85 Evap
nonpt/ptnonipm	BTP	COMBO: 8869	E0 Headspace	COMBO 8870	E10 Headspace
		8870	E10 Headspace	8871	E15 Headspace
				8934	E85 Evap
nonpt/ptnonipm	BPS/RBT	8869	E0 Headspace	8869	E0 Headspace

3.2.2 PM speciation

3.2.2.1 AE5 versus AE6 speciation

In addition to VOC profiles, the SPECIATE database also contains the PM_{2.5} speciated into both individual chemical compounds (e.g., zinc, potassium, manganese, lead), and into the “simplified” PM_{2.5} components used in the air quality model. For CMAQ 4.7.1 modeling, these “simplified” components (AE5) are all that is needed. For CMAQ 5.0.1, there is a new thermodynamic equilibrium aerosol modeling tool (ISORROPIA) v2 mechanism that needs additional PM components (AE6), which are further subsets of PMFINE (see Table 3-9). EPA speciated PM_{2.5} so that it included both AE5 and AE6 PM model species without causing any double counting. Therefore, emissions from this platform can be used with either CMAQ 4.7.1 or CMAQ 5.0.1.

Table 3-9. PM model species: AE5 versus AE6

species name	species description	AE5	AE6
POC	organic carbon	Y	Y
PEC	elemental carbon	Y	Y
PSO4	sulfate	Y	Y
PNO3	nitrate	Y	Y
PMFINE	unspeciated PM _{2.5}	Y	N
PNH4	ammonium	N	Y
PNCOM	non-carbon organic matter	N	Y
PFE	iron	N	Y
PAL	aluminum	N	Y

DRAFT

species name	species description	AE5	AE6
PSI	silica	N	Y
PTI	titanium	N	Y
PCA	calcium	N	Y
PMG	magnesium	N	Y
PK	potassium	N	Y
PMN	manganese	N	Y
PNA	sodium	N	Y
PCL	chloride	N	Y
PH2O	water	N	Y
PMOTHR	PM _{2.5} not in other AE6 species	N	Y

The majority of the 2011 platform PM profiles come from the 911XX series which include updated AE6 speciation¹⁴. Appendix C contains a crosswalk between AE6 profile codes and SPECIATE 4.3 profile codes. Summaries of 2011 and 2018 emissions by county, month, and sector speciated according to AE5 and AE6 speciation profiles are available from <ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/> in the files 2011ed_county_monthly_report_PM_AE5.xlsx, 2011ed_county_monthly_report_PM_AE6.xlsx, 2018ed_county_monthly_report_PM_AE5.xlsx, and 2018ed_county_monthly_report_PM_AE6.xlsx. In addition, the file 2011ed_speciation_profiles_6feb2014.xlsx shows the total PM_{2.5} apportioned to each sector.

3.2.2.2 Onroad PM speciation

Unlike other sectors, the onroad sector has pre-speciated PM. This speciated PM comes from the MOVES model and is processed through the SMOKE-MOVES system (see Section 2.3.1). Unfortunately, the MOVES speciated PM does not map 1-to-1 to the AE5 speciation (nor the AE6 speciation) needed for CMAQ modeling. Table 3-10 shows the relationship between MOVES¹⁵ exhaust PM_{2.5} related species and CMAQ AE5 PM species.

Table 3-10. MOVES exhaust PM species versus AE5 species

MOVES2010b Pollutant Name	Variable name for Equations	Relation to AE5 model species
Primary Exhaust PM _{2.5} – Total	PM25_TOTAL	
Primary PM _{2.5} - Organic Carbon	PM25OM	Sum of POC, PNO3 and PMFINE
Primary PM _{2.5} - Elemental Carbon	PM25EC	PEC
Primary PM _{2.5} - Sulfate Particulate	PM25SO4	PSO4

MOVES species are related as follows:

$$PM25_TOTAL = PM25EC + PM25OM + PSO4$$

The five CMAQ AE5 species also sum to total PM_{2.5}:

¹⁴ The exceptions are 5674 (Marine Vessel – Marine Engine – Heavy Fuel Oil) used for c3marine and 92018 (Draft Cigarette Smoke – Simplified) used in nonpt.

¹⁵ The Tier3 NPRM MOVES model has the same PM components as MOVES2010b. MOVES2014 is expected to have a one-to-one mapping of PM species to CMAQ PM species.

DRAFT

$$PM_{2.5} = POC + PEC + PNO3 + PSO4 + PMFINE$$

The basic problem is to differentiate MOVES species “PM25OM” into the component AE5 species (POC, PNO3 and PMFINE). The Moves2smkEF post-processor script takes the MOVES species (EF tables) and calculates the appropriate AE5 PM_{2.5} species and converts them into a format that is appropriate for SMOKE (see <http://www.cmascenter.org/smoke/documentation/3.5.1/html/ch05s02s04.html> for details on the Moves2smkEF script). For a more detailed discussion of the derivation of these equations, see Appendix D.

For brake wear and tire wear PM, total PM_{2.5} (not speciated) comes directly from MOVES. These PM modes are speciated by SMOKE. PMFINE from onroad exhaust is further speciated by SMOKE into the component AE6 species.

For California and Texas, adjustment factors were applied to SMOKE-MOVES to produce California and Texas adjusted model-ready files (see Section 2.3.1 for details). California and Texas did not supply speciated PM, therefore the adjustment factors applied to PM_{2.5} were also applied to the speciated PM components. By applying the ratios through SMOKE-MOVES, the CARB and Texas inventories are essentially speciated to match EPA estimated speciation grid cell by grid cell.

3.2.3 NO_x speciation

NO_x can be speciated into NO, NO₂, and/or HONO. For the non-mobile sources, EPA used a single profile “NHONO” to split NO_x into NO and NO₂. For the mobile sources except for onroad (including nonroad, c1c2rail, c3marine, othor sectors) and for specific SCCs in othar and ptonipm, the profile “HONO” splits NO_x into NO, NO₂, and HONO. Table 3-11 gives the split factor for these two profiles.

Table 3-11. NO_x speciation profiles

profile	pollutant	species	split factor
HONO	NOX	NO2	0.092
HONO	NOX	NO	0.9
HONO	NOX	HONO	0.008
NHONO	NOX	NO2	0.1
NHONO	NOX	NO	0.9

The onroad sector does not use the “HONO” profile to speciate NO_x. MOVES2010b produces speciated NO, NO₂, and HONO by source, including emission factors for these species in the emission factor tables used by SMOKE-MOVES. Within MOVES, the HONO fraction is a constant 0.008 of NO_x. The NO fraction varies by heavy duty versus light duty, fuel type, and model year. The NO₂ fraction = 1 – NO – HONO. For more details on the NO_x fractions within MOVES, see <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/models/moves/documents/420r12022.pdf>. HONO is not calculated directly by the Tier 3 proposal version of MOVES. For these EF tables, the calculation of HONO and the NO₂ fraction are calculated externally by the moves2smk script¹⁶. The SMOKE-MOVES system then models these species directly without further speciation.

¹⁶ A specific version of the moves2smk script was developed to do this calculation of HONO. The typical version assumes that HONO was calculated directly by MOVES2010b.

3.3 Temporal Allocation

Temporal allocation (i.e., temporalization) is the process of distributing aggregated emissions to a finer temporal resolution, thereby converting annual emissions to hourly emissions. While the total emissions are important, the timing of the occurrence of emissions is also essential for accurately simulating ozone, PM, and other pollutant concentrations in the atmosphere. Many emissions inventories are annual or monthly in nature. Temporalization takes these aggregated emissions and if needed distributes them to the month, and then distributes the monthly emissions to the day and the daily emissions to the hour. This process is typically done by applying temporal profiles to the inventories in this order: monthly, day of the week, and diurnal.

The temporal profiles and associated cross references used to create the hourly emissions inputs for the 2011 air quality modeling platform were similar to those used for the 2007 platform. The temporal factors applied to the inventory are selected using some combination of country, state, county, SCC, and pollutant. Table 3-12 summarizes the temporal aspects of emissions modeling by comparing the key approaches used for temporal processing across the sectors. In the table, “Daily temporal approach” refers to the temporal approach for getting daily emissions from the inventory using the SMOKE Temporal program. The values given are the values of the SMOKE L_TYPE setting. The “Merge processing approach” refers to the days used to represent other days in the month for the merge step. If this is not “all”, then the SMOKE merge step runs only for representative days, which could include holidays as indicated by the right-most column. The values given are those used for the SMOKE M_TYPE setting (see below for more information).

Table 3-12. Temporal settings used for the platform sectors in SMOKE

Platform sector short name	Inventory resolutions	Monthly profiles used?	Daily temporal approach	Merge processing approach	Process Holidays as separate days
ptegu	Daily & hourly		all	all	Yes
ptegu_pk	Daily & hourly		all	all	Yes
ptnonipm	Annual	yes	mwdss	mwdss	Yes
pt_oilgas	Annual	yes	mwdss	mwdss	Yes
ptfire	Daily		all	all	Yes
othpt	Annual	yes	mwdss	mwdss	
nonroad	Monthly		mwdss	mwdss	Yes
othar	Annual	yes	week	week	
c1c2rail	Annual	yes	mwdss	mwdss	
c3marine	Annual	yes	aveday	aveday	
onroad	Annual & monthly ¹		all	all	Yes
onroad_rfl	Annual & monthly ²		all	all	Yes
othon	Annual	yes	week	week	
nonpt	Annual & monthly	yes	all	all	Yes
np_oilgas	Annual	yes	mwdss	mwdss	Yes
rwc	Annual	no	met-based	All	Yes
ag	Annual	yes	all	all	Yes

DRAFT

Platform sector short name	Inventory resolutions	Monthly profiles used?	Daily temporal approach	Merge processing approach	Process Holidays as separate days
afdust_adj	Annual	yes	week	all	Yes
beis	Hourly		n/a	all	Yes

1. Note the annual and monthly “inventory” actually refers to the activity data (VMT and VPOP) for onroad. The actual emissions are computed on an hourly basis.
2. Note the annual and monthly “inventory” actually refers to the activity data (VMT and VPOP) for onroad_rfl. The actual emissions are computed on an hourly basis.

The following values are used in the table: The value “all” means that hourly emissions computed for every day of the year and that emissions potentially have day-of-year variation. The value “week” means that hourly emissions computed for all days in one “representative” week, representing all weeks for each month. This means emissions have day-of-week variation, but not week-to-week variation within the month. The value “mwdss” means hourly emissions for one representative Monday, representative weekday (Tuesday through Friday), representative Saturday, and representative Sunday for each month. This means emissions have variation between Mondays, other weekdays, Saturdays and Sundays within the month, but not week-to-week variation within the month. The value “aveday” means hourly emissions computed for one representative day of each month, meaning emissions for all days within a month are the same. Special situations with respect to temporalization are described in the following subsections.

Spreadsheets summarizing the temporal profiles and cross-references used in the modeling are available with the other 2011 platform reports in ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/temporal_profiles/ with the profiles in the files tpro_2011.xlsx, tpro_onroad_2011.xlsx, tpro_rwc_2011.xlsx, and the cross references in tref_2011.xlsx. The file 2011ed_temporal_profiles_CAPs_feb112014.xlsx shows the emissions assigned to each of the profiles for sectors other than onroad, ptegu, and ptegu_pk.

In addition to the resolution, temporal processing includes a ramp-up period for several days prior to January 1, 2011, which is intended to mitigate the effects of initial condition concentrations. The ramp-up period was 10 days (December 22-31, 2010). For most sectors, emissions from December 2011 were used to fill in surrogate emissions for the end of December 2010. In particular, December 2011 emissions (representative days) were used for December 2010. For biogenic emissions, December 2010 emissions were processed using 2010 meteorology.

3.3.1 Use of FF10 format for finer than annual emissions

The Flat File 2010 format (FF10) inventory format for SMOKE provides a more consolidated format for monthly, daily, and hourly emissions inventories than previous formats supported. Previously, to process monthly inventory data required the use of 12 separate inventory files. With the FF10 format, a single inventory file can contain emissions for all 12 months and the annual emissions in a single record. This helps simplify the management of numerous inventories. Similarly, daily and hourly FF10 inventories contain individual records with data for all days in a month and all hours in a day, respectively.

SMOKE 3.5.1 prevents the application of temporal profiles on top of the “native” resolution of the inventory. For example, a monthly inventory should not have annual to month temporalization applied to it; rather, it should only have month-to-day and diurnal temporalization. This becomes particularly important when specific sectors have a mix of annual, monthly, daily, and/or hourly inventories (e.g. the nonpt sector). The flags that control temporalization for a mixed set of inventories are discussed in the

SMOKE documentation. The modeling platform sectors that make use of monthly values in the FF10 files are nonroad, onroad, and the ag burning inventory within the nonpt sector.

3.3.2 Electric Generating Utility temporalization (ptegu, ptegu_pk)

3.3.2.1 Base year temporal allocation of EGUs

The 2011NEIv1 annual EGU emissions are allocated to hourly emissions using the following 3-step methodology: annual value to month, month to day, and day to hour. The temporal allocation procedure is differentiated by whether or not the source could be directly matched to a CEMS unit via ORIS facility code and boiler ID. Prior to temporal allocation, as many sources as possible were matched to CEMS data via ORIS facility code and boiler ID. EIS stores a base set of previously matched units via alternate facility and unit IDs. For any units not yet matched, reports were generated by unit to identify potential matches with the NEI. The reports included FIPS state/county code, facility name, and NO_x and SO₂ emissions. Units were considered matches if the FIPS state/county code matched, the facility name was similar, and the NO_x and SO₂ emissions were similar.

For sources not matched to CEMS measurements, the first two steps of the allocation are done outside of SMOKE. For sources in the ptegu and ptegu_pk sectors that are matched to CEMS data, annual totals of the emissions may be different than the annual values in 2011NEIv1 because the CEMS data actually replaces the inventory data. All units in the ptegu_pk sector with non-zero emissions for 2011 were matched to CEMS data.

For units not matched to CEMS data, the allocation of the inventory annual emissions to months is done using average fuel-specific season-to-month factors generated for each of the 64 IPM regions shown in Figure 3-3. These factors are based 2011 CEMS data only. In each region, separate factors were developed for the fuels coal, natural gas, and “other”, where the types of fuels included in “other” vary by region. Separate profiles were computed for NO_x and SO₂, and heat input. An overall composite profile was also computed and was used in a few cases in which the fuel-specific profile was too irregular, or there were no CEMS units with the specified fuel in the region containing the unit. For both CEMS and non-CEMS matched units, NO_x and SO₂ CEMS data are used to allocate NO_x and SO₂ emissions, while CEMS heat input data is used to allocate all other pollutants.

Daily “temporal allocation” of units with CEMS was performed using a procedure similar to that in the first step in that the CEMS data replaces the inventory data for each pollutant. For units without CEMS data, emissions were allocated from month to day using IPM-region and fuel-specific average month-to-day factors based on the 2011 CEMS data. Separate allocation factors were computed for NO_x, SO₂, and heat input for the fuels coal, natural gas, and other. For both CEMS and non-CEMS matched units, NO_x and SO₂ CEMS data are used to allocate NO_x and SO₂ emissions, while CEMS heat input data is used to allocate all other pollutants.

For units with associated CEMS data, hourly emissions use the hourly CEMS values as described above for NO_x and SO₂, while other pollutants are allocated according to heat input values. For units without CEMS data, temporal profiles from days to hours are computed based on the region- and fuel-specific average day-to-hour factors derived from the CEMS data for those fuels and regions using data from the entire year. For non-CEMS matched units, CEMS heat input data is used to allocate all pollutants (including NO_x and SO₂). SMOKE then allocates the daily emissions data to hours using the profiles obtained from the CEMS data for the analysis base year.

DRAFT

there were previously no units with that fuel in the specific region. Except for the season-to-month allocation, the procedure for allocating the emissions of non-CEMS matched units is the same as the base year.

Units with year-specific impacts in the season-to-month allocations, such as long-duration downtimes for maintenance or installation of controls that occur only in one year were temporalized using average profiles instead of using the anomalous profile for the base year. These situations are determined by analysis of the base and future year data. Note that IPM uses load data (reflecting the shape of demand) corresponding to the load in each IPM region that occurred in the base year of the air quality modeling analysis, such as 2011.

Some refinements to the above approach were made in some special cases:

- When emissions were substantially higher for units with limited hours of operation in the base year, an averaged profile was used.
- When a unit switched fuels in the future year to a fuel not used in the base year, the profile was selected according to the new type of fuel. If the unit was a CEMS unit in the base year, it was treated as non-CEMS in the future year.
- When a CEMS unit operated in only one season in the base year, but IPM predicted that there were emissions in both seasons, an average profile was used for the future year unit during both seasons.
- New units coming on line used the appropriate region and fuel-specific profiles
- Units that are not new but had no emissions in 2011 were treated like new units.

For more information on the development of IPM emission estimates and the temporalization of those, see <http://www.epa.gov/powersectormodeling/BaseCasev513.html>, in particular the Air Quality Modeling Flat File Documentation and accompanying inputs.

3.3.3 Residential Wood Combustion Temporalization (rwc)

There are many factors that impact the timing of when emissions occur, and for some sectors this includes meteorology. The benefits of utilizing meteorology as method for temporalization are: (1) a meteorological dataset consistent with that used by the AQ model is available (e.g. outputs from WRF); (2) the meteorological model data is highly resolved in terms of spatial resolution; and (3) the meteorological variables vary at hourly resolution and can therefore be translated into hour-specific temporalization.

The SMOKE program GenTPRO provides a method for developing meteorology-based temporalization. Currently, the program can utilize three types of temporal algorithms: annual-to-day temporalization for residential wood combustion (RWC), month-to-hour temporalization for agricultural livestock ammonia, and a generic meteorology-based algorithm for other situations. For the 2011 platform, meteorological-based temporalization was used for portions of the rwc sector and for livestock within the ag sector.


GenTPRO reads in gridded meteorological data (output from MCIP) along with spatial surrogates, and uses the specified algorithm to produce a new temporal profile that can be input into SMOKE. The meteorological variables and the resolution of the generated temporal profile (hourly, daily, etc.) depend on the selected algorithm and the run parameters. For more details on the development of these algorithms and running GenTPRO, see the GenTPRO documentation and the SMOKE documentation at http://www.cmascenter.org/smoke/documentation/3.1/GenTPRO_TechnicalSummary_Aug2012_Final.pdf

and <http://www.cmascenter.org/smoke/documentation/3.5.1/html/ch05s03s07.html>, respectively.


For the RWC algorithm, GenTPRO uses the daily minimum temperature to determine the temporal allocation of emissions to days. GenTPRO was used to create an annual-to-day temporal profile for the RWC sources. These generated profiles distribute annual RWC emissions to the coldest days of the year. On days where the minimum temperature does not drop below a user-defined threshold, RWC emissions for most sources in the sector are zero. Conversely, the program temporally allocates the largest percentage of emissions to the coldest days. Similar to other temporal allocation profiles, the total annual emissions do not change, only the distribution of the emissions within the year is affected. The temperature threshold for rwc emissions was 50 °F for most of the country, and 60 °F for the following states: Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas.

Figure 3-4 illustrates the impact of changing the temperature threshold for a warm climate county. The plot shows the temporal fraction by day for Duval County, Florida for the first four months of 2007. The default 50 °F threshold creates large spikes on a few days, while the 60 °F threshold dampens these spikes and distributes a small amount of emissions to the days that have a minimum temperature between 50 and 60 °F.

Figure 3-4. Example of RWC temporalization in 2007 using a 50 versus 60 °F threshold



The diurnal profile for used for most RWC sources (see Figure 3-5) places more of the RWC emissions in the morning and the evening when people are typically using these sources. This profile is based on a 2004 MANE-VU survey based temporal profiles (see http://www.marama.org/publications_folder/ResWoodCombustion/Final_report.pdf). This profile was created by averaging three indoor and three RWC outdoor temporal profiles from counties in Delaware and aggregating them into a single RWC diurnal profile. This new profile was compared to a concentration based analysis of aethalometer measurements in Rochester, NY (Wang *et al.* 2011) for various seasons and day of the week and found that the new RWC profile generally tracked the concentration based temporal patterns.

Figure 3-5. RWC diurnal temporal profile

The temporalization for “Outdoor Hydronic Heaters” (i.e., “OHH”, SCC=2104008610) and “Outdoor wood burning device, NEC (fire-pits, chimneas, etc)” (i.e., “recreational RWC”, SCC=21040087000) were updated because the meteorological-based temporalization used for the rest of the rwc sector did not agree with observations for how these appliances are used.

For OHH, the annual-to-month, day-of-week and diurnal profiles were modified based on information in the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) “Environmental, Energy Market, and Health Characterization of Wood-Fired Hydronic Heater Technologies, Final Report” (NYSERDA, 2012) as well as a Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM) report “Assessment of Outdoor Wood-fired Boilers” (NESCAUM, 2006). A Minnesota 2008 Residential Fuelwood Assessment Survey of individual household responses (MDNR, 2008) provided additional annual-to-month, day-of-week and diurnal activity information for OHH as well as recreational RWC usage.

The diurnal profile for OHH, shown in Figure 3-6 is based on a conventional single-stage heat load unit burning red oak in Syracuse, New York. As shown in Figure 3-7, the NESCAUM report describes how for individual units, OHH are highly variable day-to-day but that in the aggregate, these emissions have no day-of-week variation. In contrast, the day-of-week profile for recreational RWC follows a typical “recreational” profile with emissions peaked on weekends.

Annual-to-month temporalization for OHH as well as recreational RWC were computed from the MN DNR survey (MDNR, 2008) and are illustrated in Figure 3-8. OHH emissions still exhibit strong seasonal variability, but do not drop to zero because many units operate year round for water and pool heating. In contrast to all other RWC appliances, recreational RWC emissions are used far more frequently during the warm season.

Figure 3-6. Diurnal profile for OHH, based on heat load (BTU/hr)




Figure 3-7. Day-of-week temporal profiles for OHH and Recreational RWC





Figure 3-8. Annual-to-month temporal profiles for OHH and recreational RWC

3.3.4 Agricultural Ammonia Temporal Profiles (ag)

For the agricultural livestock NH_3 algorithm, the GenTPRO algorithm is based on an equation derived by Jesse Bash of EPA ORD based on the Zhu, Henze, et al. (2013) empirical equation. This equation is based on observations from the TES satellite instrument with the GEOS-Chem model and its adjoint to estimate diurnal NH_3 emission variations from livestock as a function of ambient temperature, aerodynamic resistance, and wind speed. The equations are:

$$E_{i,h} = [161500/T_{i,h} \times e^{(-1380/T_{i,h})}] \times AR_{i,h}$$

$$PE_{i,h} = E_{i,h} / \text{Sum}(E_{i,h})$$

where


- $PE_{i,h}$ = Percentage of emissions in county i on hour h
- $E_{i,h}$ = Emission rate in county i on hour h
- $T_{i,h}$ = Ambient temperature (Kelvin) in county i on hour h
- $V_{i,h}$ = Wind speed (meter/sec) in county i (minimum wind speed is 0.1 meter/sec)
- $AR_{i,h}$ = Aerodynamic resistance in county i

GenTPRO was run using the “BASH_NH3” profile method to create month-to-hour temporal profiles for these sources. Because these profiles distribute to the hour based on monthly emissions, the monthly emissions are obtained from a monthly inventory, or from an annual inventory that has been temporalized to the month¹⁷.

¹⁷ SMOKE v3.5.1 will correctly read in a monthly inventory and apply GenTPRO ag NH_3 month-to-hour temporalization. However, SMOKE v3.5 beta incorrectly applied an annual-to-month temporal profile on top of a monthly inventory when

Figure 3-9 compares the daily emissions for Minnesota from the “old” approach (uniform monthly profile) with the “new” approach (GenTPRO generated month-to-hour profiles). Although the GenTPRO profiles show daily (and hourly variability), the monthly total emissions are the same between the two approaches.

Figure 3-9. Example of new animal NH₃ emissions temporalization approach, summed to daily emissions



3.3.5 Onroad mobile temporalization (onroad, onroad_rfl)

For the onroad and onroad_rfl sectors, the temporal distribution of emissions is a combination of more traditional temporal profiles and the influence of meteorology. This section will discuss both the meteorological influences and the updates to the diurnal temporal profiles for the 2011 platform.


Meteorology is not used in the development of the temporal profiles, but rather it impacts the calculation of the hourly emissions through the program Movesmrg. The result is that the emissions vary at the hourly level by grid cell. More specifically, the on-network (RPD) and the off-network (RPV and RPP) processes use the gridded meteorology (MCIP) directly. Movesmrg determines the temperature for each hour and grid cell and uses that information to select the appropriate emission factor (EF) for the specified SCC/pollutant/mode combination. In the previous platform, RPP used county level minimum and maximum temperature ranges for the day to determine the appropriate EF. This potentially overestimated the temperature range for any particular grid cell, which would result in increased emissions for vapor-venting. In the 2011 platform (and the 2011NEIv1), RPP was updated to use the gridded minimum and maximum temperature for the day. This more spatially resolved temperature range produces more accurate emissions for each grid cell. The combination of these three processes (RPD, RPV, and RPP) is the total onroad sector emissions, while the combination of the two processes (RPD, RPV) for the refueling mode only is the total onroad_rfl sector emissions. Both sectors show a strong meteorological influence on their temporal patterns (see the 2011NEIv1 TSD for more details).

Figure 3-10 illustrates the difference between temporalization of the onroad sector used in the 2005 and earlier platforms and the meteorological influence via SMOKE-MOVES. In the plot, the “MOVES” inventory is a monthly inventory that is temporalized by SCC to day-of-week and hour. Similar temporalization is done for the VMT in SMOKE-MOVES, but the meteorologically varying EFs add an additional variation on top of the temporalization. Note, the SMOKE-MOVES run is based on the 2005 platform and previous temporalization of VMT to facilitate the comparison of the results. In the figure, the MOVES emissions have a repeating pattern within the month, while the SMOKE-MOVES shows

temporalizing with GenTPRO ag NH₃ profiles. As an interim solution, a flat monthly profile was applied to the states with a monthly ag NH₃ inventory.

day-to-day (and hour-to-hour) variability. In addition, the MOVES emissions have an artificial jump between months which is due to the inventory providing new emissions for each month which are then temporalized within the month but not between months. The SMOKE-MOVES emissions have a smoother transition between the months.

Figure 3-10. Example of SMOKE-MOVES temporal variability of NO_x emissions




For the onroad and onroad_rfl sectors, the “inventories” referred to in Table 3-12 actually consist of activity data. For RPP and RPV processes, the VPOP inventory is annual and does not need temporalization. For RPD, the VMT inventory is monthly and was temporalized to days of the week and then to hourly VMT through temporal profiles. The RPD processes require a speed profile (SPDPRO) that consists of vehicle speed by hour for a typical weekday and weekend day. Unlike other sectors, the temporal profiles and SPDPRO will impact not only the distribution of emissions through time but also the total emissions. Because SMOKE-MOVES’ process RPD calculates emissions from VMT, speed and meteorology, if one shifted the VMT or speed to different hours, it would align with different temperatures and hence different EF. In other words, two SMOKE-MOVES runs with identical annual VMT, meteorology, and MOVES EF, will have different total emissions if the temporalization of VMT changes.

In previous platforms, the diurnal profile for VMT¹⁸ varied by road type but not by vehicle type (see Figure 3-11). These profiles were used throughout the nation.


¹⁸ These same profiles were used for onroad emissions in the 2005 platform.

Figure 3-11. Previous onroad diurnal weekday profiles for urban roads



EPA wanted to create new diurnal profiles that could differentiate by vehicle type as well as by road type and would potentially vary over geography. The 2011NEIv1 process provided an opportunity to update the diurnal profile with information submitted by states. States submitted MOVES county databases (CDBs) that included information on the distribution of VMT by hour of day and by day of week¹⁹ (see the 2011NEIv1 TSD for details on the submittal process for onroad). EPA decided not to update the day of week profile because MOVES only differentiated weekday versus weekend while the default SMOKE profiles differentiated each of the 7 days. EPA mined the state submitted MOVES CDBs for non-default diurnal profiles²⁰. The list of potential diurnal profiles was then analyzed to see whether the profiles varied by vehicle type, road type, weekday vs. weekend, and by county within a state (see Figure 3-12).

Figure 3-12. Variation in MOVES diurnal profiles




¹⁹ The MOVES tables are the hourvmtfraction and the dayvmtfraction.

²⁰ Further QA was done to remove duplicates and profiles that were missing two or more hours. If they were missing a single hour, the missing hour could be calculated by subtracting all other hours fractions from 1.

EPA attempted to maximize the use of state and/or county specific diurnal profiles. If a specific state or county's profiles varied by vehicle type or/and road type, then the submitted profile was used. If the profile had less variability than the old SMOKE defaults (i.e. neither varied by vehicle type nor road type), then a new default profile would be used (see below for description of new profiles). This analysis was done separately for weekdays and for weekends, therefore some areas had submitted profiles for weekdays but defaults for weekends. The result was a set of profiles that varied geographically depending on whether or not the profile was submitted and the characteristics of the profiles (see Figure 3-13).

Figure 3-13. Use of submitted versus new national default profiles



A new set of diurnal profiles was developed from the submitted profiles that varied by both vehicle type and road type. Before developing the national profiles, there needs to be a mapping between MOVES road types and SMOKE road types (i.e., the last three digits of the SCC) and between MOVES source types and SMOKE vehicle types. The mapping between road types is relatively straight forward (see Table 3-13). Basically the road types are consolidated into 4 types in MOVES, therefore the new profiles will not differentiate at the level of the SMOKE road type. For example, the SMOKE “urban interstate” (SCCLAST3=230) will have the same profile as the SMOKE “urban other freeways and expressways” (SCCLAST3=250). The mapping between MOVES source type and SMOKE vehicle type is more complicated; it is a many-to-many mapping (see the 2011NEIv1 TSD for more details).


Table 3-13. Mapping of MOVES to SMOKE road types

MOVES roadtype ID	Description	SMOKE SCCLAST3	Description
2	Rural Restricted Access	110	Rural Interstate: Total
3	Rural Unrestricted Access	130	Rural Other Principal Arterial: Total
		150	Rural Minor Arterial: Total
		170	Rural Major Collector: Total
		190	Rural Minor Collector: Total
		210	Rural Local: Total
4	Urban Restricted Access	230	Urban Interstate: Total
		250	Urban Other Freeways and Expressways: Total
5	Urban Unrestricted Access	270	Urban Other Principal Arterial: Total
		290	Urban Minor Arterial: Total
		310	Urban Collector: Total
		330	Urban Local: Total

For the purposes of constructing the SMOKE diurnal profiles, all MOVES profiles for the road type and for any overlapping source types are averaged together to create a single diurnal profile for a specific county, SMOKE road type, SMOKE vehicle type, and weekday or weekend. This process is also used for creating SMOKE versions of the submitted profile in the non-default regions (described above). The states that submitted profiles that varied by vehicle and road types for weekdays were: Idaho, Maine, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. The states that submitted profiles that varied by vehicle and road types for weekends were: Idaho, Maine, and Michigan. EPA created individual profiles for each state (averaging over the counties within) to create a single profile by state, vehicle type, road type, and weekday or weekend. The states individual profiles were averaged together to create a new default profile²¹. Figure 3-14 shows two new default profiles for light duty gas vehicles (LDGV, SCC7 2201001) and heavy, heavy duty diesel vehicles (HHDDV, SCC7 2230074) on restricted urban roadways (interstates and freeways, SCCLAST3=230 and 250) for weekdays. The grey lines are the individual state profiles, the black line is the new default profile, and the 2 colored lines are the previous SMOKE default profiles. Note that there are two previous SMOKE profiles for this road type, but that they don't vary by vehicle. In contrast, the new default profile does vary by vehicle and places more LDGV VMT (left plot) in the rush hours while placing HHDDV VMT (right plot) predominately in the middle of the day with a longer tail into the evening hours and early morning. For a full list of the default profiles, see ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/temporal_profiles/onroad_default_hourly_profile_plots_2011ed.zip.

²¹ Note that the states were weighted equally in the average independent of the size of the state or the variation in submitted county data.

Figure 3-14. Updated national default profiles for LDGV vs. HHDDV, urban restricted weekday



For California, CARB supplied diurnal profiles that varied by vehicle type, day of the week²², and air basin. These CARB specific profiles were used in developing EPA estimates for California. For Texas, the profiles used were a combination of state supplied (via MOVES CDBs) and new national defaults. Although EPA adjusted the total emissions to match California’s and Texas’ submittals to the

²² California’s diurnal profiles varied within the week. Monday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday had unique profiles and Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday had the same profile.

DRAFT

2011NEIv1, the temporalization of these emissions took into account both the state specific VMT profiles and the SMOKE-MOVES process of incorporating meteorology. For more details on the adjustments to California's and Texas' onroad emissions, see the 2011NEIv1 TSD.


3.3.6 Additional sector specific details (afdust, beis, c1c2rail, c3marine, nonpt, ptfire)

For the afdust sector, meteorology is not used in the development of the temporal profiles, but it is used to reduce the total emissions based on meteorological conditions. These adjustments are applied through sector-specific scripts, beginning with the application of land use-based gridded transport fractions and then subsequent zero-outs for hours during which precipitation occurs or there is snow cover on the ground. The land use data used to reduce the NEI emissions explains the amount of emissions that are subject to transport. This methodology is discussed in (Pouliot, et. al., 2010, http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/conference/ei19/session9/pouliot_pres.pdf), and in Fugitive Dust Modeling for the 2008 Emissions Modeling Platform (Adelman, 2012). The precipitation adjustment is applied to remove all emissions for days where measureable rain occurs. Therefore, the afdust emissions vary day-to-day based on the precipitation and/or snow cover for that grid cell and day. Both the transport fraction and meteorological adjustments are based on the gridded resolution of the platform; therefore, somewhat different emissions will result from different grid resolutions. Application of the transport fraction and meteorological adjustments prevents the overestimation of fugitive dust impacts in the grid modeling as compared to ambient samples.

Biogenic emissions in the beis sector vary by every day of the year because they are developed using meteorological data including temperature, surface pressure, and radiation/cloud data. The emissions are computed using appropriate emission factors according to the vegetation in each model grid cell, while taking the meteorological data into account.

For the c1c2rail and c3marine sectors, emissions are allocated with flat monthly and day of week profiles, and most emissions are also allocated with flat hourly profiles.

For the nonpt sector, most the inventories are annual except for the agricultural burning (SCC 2801500000) inventory which was allocated to months by adding up the available values for each day of the month. For all agricultural burning, the diurnal temporal profile used reflected the fact that burning occurs during the daylight hours - see Figure 3-15 (McCarty et al., 2009). This puts most of the emissions during the work day and suppresses the emissions during the middle of the night. All states used a uniform profile for each day of the week for all agricultural burning emissions, except for the following states that for which EPA used state-specific day of week profiles: Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Figure 3-15. Agricultural burning diurnal temporal profile

For the ptfire sector, the inventories are in the daily point fire format ORL PTDAY. The ptfire sector is used in the model evaluation case (2011ed) and in the future base case (2018ed). The 2007 and earlier platforms had additional regulatory cases that used averaged fires and temporally averaged EGU emissions, but the 2011 platform uses base year-specific (i.e., 2011) data for both cases.

For the nonroad sector, while the NEI only stores the annual totals, the modeling platform uses monthly inventories from output from NMIM. For California, a monthly inventory was created from CARB's annual inventory using EPA-estimated NMIM monthly results to compute monthly ratios by pollutant and SCC7 and these ratios were applied to the CARB inventory to create a monthly inventory. .

3.4 Spatial Allocation

The methods used to perform spatial allocation are summarized in this section. For the modeling platform, spatial factors are typically applied by county and SCC. As described in Section 3.1, spatial allocation was performed for a national 12-km domain. To accomplish this, SMOKE used national 12-km spatial surrogates and a SMOKE area-to-point data file. For the U.S., EPA updated surrogates to use circa 2010-2011 data wherever possible. For Mexico, updated spatial surrogates were used as described below. For Canada surrogates provided by Environment Canada were used and are unchanged from the 2007 platform. The U.S., Mexican, and Canadian 12-km surrogates cover the entire CONUS domain 12US1 shown in Figure 3-1. The remainder of this subsection provides further detail on the origin of the data used for the spatial surrogates and the area-to-point data.

Additional documentation on the 2011 spatial surrogates is available at ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/spatial_surrogates/ in the files US_SpatialSurrogate_Documentation_v091113.pdf and US_SpatialSurrogate_Workbook_v093013.xlsx. The spatial cross reference file is in gsref_2011.xlsx. Plots of the spatial surrogates are available in all_surrogate_maps_2011platform_12US1_v2.pdf. Note that these are plots of the surrogate fractions summed by grid cell, so grid cells that overlap multiple counties can show values greater than one. These

maps are only to give an idea of the spatial distribution of the surrogates. Allocations of CAP emissions to each of the surrogate codes is given in 2011ed_spatial_surrogate_CAPs_feb112014.xlsx.

3.4.1 Spatial Surrogates for U.S. emissions

There are more than 70 spatial surrogates available for spatially allocating U.S. county-level emissions to the 12-km grid cells used by the air quality model. As described in Section 3.4.2, an area-to-point approach overrides the use of surrogates for some sources. Table 3-14 lists the codes and descriptions of the surrogates. The surrogates in bold have been updated with 2010-based data, including 2010 census data at the block group level, 2010 American Community Survey Data for heating fuels, 2010 TIGER/Line data for railroads and roads, the 2006 National Land Cover Database, 2011 gas station and dry cleaner data, and the 2012 National Transportation Atlas Data for rail-lines, ports and navigable waterways. Surrogates for ports (801) and shipping lanes (802) were developed based on the 2011 NEIv1 shapefiles: Ports_032310_wrf and ShippingLanes_111309FINAL_wrf, but also included shipping lane data in the Great Lakes and support vessel activity data in the Gulf of Mexico.

The creation of surrogates and shapefiles for the U.S. was generated via the Surrogate Tool. The tool and documentation for it is available at <http://www.ie.unc.edu/cempd/projects/mims/spatial/> and http://www.cmascenter.org/help/documentation.cfm?MODEL=spatial_allocator&VERSION=3.6&temp_id=99999.

Table 3-14. U.S. Surrogates available for the 2011 modeling platform.

Code	Surrogate Description	Code	Surrogate Description
N/A	Area-to-point approach (see 3.3.1.2)	520	Commercial plus Industrial plus Institutional
100	Population	525	Golf Courses + Institutional +Industrial + Commercial
110	Housing	527	Single Family Residential
120	Urban Population	530	Residential - High Density
130	Rural Population	535	Residential + Commercial + Industrial + Institutional + Government
137	Housing Change	540	Retail Trade
140	Housing Change and Population	545	Personal Repair
150	Residential Heating - Natural Gas	550	Retail Trade plus Personal Repair
160	Residential Heating – Wood	555	Professional/Technical plus General Government
165	0.5 Residential Heating - Wood plus 0.5 Low Intensity Residential	560	Hospital
170	Residential Heating - Distillate Oil	565	Medical Office/Clinic
180	Residential Heating – Coal	570	Heavy and High Tech Industrial
190	Residential Heating - LP Gas	575	Light and High Tech Industrial
200	Urban Primary Road Miles	580	Food, Drug, Chemical Industrial
210	Rural Primary Road Miles	585	Metals and Minerals Industrial
220	Urban Secondary Road Miles	590	Heavy Industrial
230	Rural Secondary Road Miles	595	Light Industrial
240	Total Road Miles	596	Industrial plus Institutional plus Hospitals
250	Urban Primary plus Rural Primary	600	Gas Stations
255	0.75 Total Roadway Miles plus 0.25 Population	650	Refineries and Tank Farms
260	Total Railroad Miles	675	Refineries and Tank Farms and Gas Stations
270	Class 1 Railroad Miles	680	Oil & Gas Wells, IHS Energy, Inc. and

DRAFT

Code	Surrogate Description	Code	Surrogate Description
			USGS
261	NTAD Total Railroad Density	700	Airport Areas
271	NTAD Class 1, 2, 3 Railroad Density	710	Airport Points
280	Class 2 and 3 Railroad Miles	720	Military Airports
300	Low Intensity Residential	800	Marine Ports
310	Total Agriculture	801	NEI Ports
312	Orchards/Vineyards	802	NEI Shipping Lanes
320	Forest Land	807	Navigable Waterway Miles
330	Strip Mines/Quarries	808	Gulf Tug Zone Area
340	Land	810	Navigable Waterway Activity
350	Water	812	Midwest Shipping Lanes
400	Rural Land Area	850	Golf Courses
500	Commercial Land	860	Mines
505	Industrial Land	870	Wastewater Treatment Facilities
510	Commercial plus Industrial	880	Drycleaners
515	Commercial plus Institutional Land	890	Commercial Timber

For the onroad sector, the on-network (RPD) emissions were spatially allocated to roadways, and the off-network (RPP and RPV) emissions were allocated to population. For the onroad_rfl sector, the emissions were spatially allocated to gas station locations. For the oil and gas sources in the nonpt sector, the WRAP Phase III sources have detailed 2008-based basin-specific spatial surrogates shown in Table 3-15. These surrogates were also updated in the northeast Marcellus Shale region using 2011 data. Any remaining oil and gas sources still use the 2005-based surrogate “Oil & Gas Wells, IHS Energy, Inc. and USGS” (680) developed for oil and gas SCCs. The surrogates in Table 3-15 were applied for the counties listed in Table 3-7.

Table 3-15. Spatial Surrogates for WRAP and Marcellus Shale Oil and Gas Data

Country	Code	Surrogate Description
USA	689	Gas production at all wells
USA	690	Oil production at all wells
USA	691	Well count - CBM wells
USA	692	Spud count
USA	693	Well count - all wells
USA	694	Oil production at Oil wells
USA	695	Well count - oil wells
USA	696	Gas production at gas wells
USA	697	Oil production at gas wells
USA	698	Well count - gas wells
USA	699	Gas production at CBM wells

Not all of the available surrogates are used to spatially allocate sources in the modeling platform; that is, some surrogates shown in Table 3-14 were not assigned to any SCCs, although many of the “unused” surrogates are actually used to “gap fill” other surrogates that are assigned. When the source data for a surrogate has no values for a particular county, gap filling is used to provide values for the surrogate in those counties to ensure that no emissions are dropped when the spatial surrogates are applied to the emission inventories. Table 3-16 shows the total of CAP emissions (i.e., NH₃, NO_x, PM_{2.5}, SO₂, and

DRAFT

VOC) by sector. Appendix E shows the emissions totals by surrogate code and sector for most of the CAPs. Some sectors use only one surrogate, those are listed below:

- ag: Total Agriculture (#310) with 3,524,607 tons of NH₃;
- onroad_rfl: Gas Stations (#600) with 157,629 tons of VOC; and
- rwc: 0.5 Residential Heating - Wood plus 0.5 Low Intensity Residential (#165) with 903,651 tons of CAPs.

Table 3-16. Total CAP emissions by sector for U.S. Surrogates

Code	Description	afdust	c1c2rail	nonopt	nonroad	np_oilgas	onroad
100	Population			1,221,647	47,453		2,742,952
120	Urban Population						521,778
130	Rural Population	1,102,192					282,583
140	Housing Change and Population	162,157		224,499	662,641		
150	Residential Heating - Natural Gas			278,120			
165	0.5 Residential Heating - Wood plus 0.5 Low Intensity Residential						
170	Residential Heating - Distillate Oil			142,700			
180	Residential Heating – Coal			12,791			
190	Residential Heating - LP Gas			42,196			
200	Urban Primary Road Miles						2,534,014
210	Rural Primary Road Miles						1,609,013
220	Urban Secondary Road Miles						281,011
230	Rural Secondary Road Miles						491,782
240	Total Road Miles	287,531					
240	Total Road Miles			6,825			
250	Urban Primary plus Rural Primary			102,793			
260	Total Railroad Miles			2,195			
261	NTAD Total Railroad Density		15,271		3,559		
271	NTAD Class 1 2 3 Railroad Density		802,720				
280	Class 2 and 3 Railroad Miles		45,114				
300	Low Intensity Residential			162,807	234,134		
310	Total Agriculture	896,741		709,177	586,125		
312	Orchards/Vineyards			5,720			
320	Forest Land			347			
330	Strip Mines/Quarries	59,782					
350	Water				770,993		
400	Rural Land Area	1		1,188	663,518		
500	Commercial Land			115,905			
505	Industrial Land			747,634	186,522		
510	Commercial plus Industrial			225,266	281,481		
515	Commercial plus Institutional Land			294,718			
520	Commercial plus Industrial plus Institutional			11,252	122,236		

DRAFT

Code	Description	afdust	c1c2rail	nonpt	nonroad	np_oilgas	onroad
525	Golf Courses plus Institutional plus Industrial plus Commercial			0	220,996		
527	Single Family Residential			0			
535	Residential + Commercial + Industrial + Institutional + Government			334,251			
540	Retail Trade (COM1)			1,375			
545	Personal Repair (COM3)			63,005			
555	Professional/Technical (COM4) plus General Government (GOV1)			2,872			
560	Hospital (COM6)			9			
575	Light and High Tech Industrial (IND2 + IND5)			2,554			
580	Food, Drug, Chemical Industrial (IND3)			11,626			
585	Metals and Minerals Industrial (IND4)			615			
590	Heavy Industrial (IND1)			156,032			
595	Light Industrial (IND2)			80,484			
600	Gas Stations			413,518			
650	Refineries and Tank Farms			130,222			
675	Refineries and Tank Farms and Gas Stations			1,203			
680	Oil and Gas Wells					116,568	
692	Spud count					77,009	
693	Well count - all wells					8,599	
694	Oil production at Oil wells					1,241,682	
695	Well count - oil wells					221,759	
696	Gas production at gas wells					1,130,789	
697	Oil production at gas wells					1	
698	Well count - gas wells					294,244	
700	Airport Areas			32,030			
801	Port Areas			12,578			
802	Shipping Lanes		571,927				
808	Gulf Tug Zone Area		5,503				
820	Ports NEI2011 NOx		76,008				
850	Golf Courses				9,628		
860	Mines				3,874		
870	Wastewater Treatment Facilities			6,018			
880	Drycleaners			10,026			
890	Commercial Timber				23,202		

3.4.2 Allocation method for airport-related sources in the U.S.

There are numerous airport-related emission sources in the NEI, such as aircraft, airport ground support equipment, and jet refueling. The modeling platform includes the aircraft emissions as point sources. For the modeling platform, EPA used the SMOKE “area-to-point” approach for only airport ground support equipment (nonroad sector), and jet refueling (nonpt sector). The approach is described in detail in the

2002 platform documentation: http://www.epa.gov/scram001/reports/Emissions%20TSD%20Vol1_02-28-08.pdf.

The ARTOPNT file that lists the nonpoint sources to locate using point data was unchanged from the 2005-based platform.

3.4.3 Surrogates for Canada and Mexico emission inventories

The surrogates for Canada to spatially allocate the 2006 Canadian emissions are unchanged from the 2007 platform. The spatial surrogate data came from Environment Canada, along with cross references. The surrogates they provided were outputs from the Surrogate Tool (previously referenced). Per Environment Canada, the surrogates are based on 2001 Canadian census data. The Canadian surrogates used for this platform are listed in Table 3-17. The leading “9” was added to the surrogate codes to avoid duplicate surrogate numbers with U.S. surrogates. Some new surrogates for Mexico became available in the 2011 platform. The surrogates are circa 1999 and 2000 and were based on data obtained from the Sistema Municipal de Bases de Datos (SIMBAD) de INEGI and the Bases de datos del Censo Economico 1999. Most of the CAPs allocated to the Mexico and Canada surrogates are shown in Table 3-18. The entries in this table are for the other sector except for the MEX Total Road Miles and The CAN traffic rows, which are for the othon sector.

Table 3-17. Canadian Spatial Surrogates

Code	Description	Code	Description
9100	Population	9493	Warehousing and storage
9101	Total dwelling	9494	Total Transport and warehouse
9102	Urban dwelling	9511	Publishing and information services
9103	Rural dwelling	9512	Motion picture and sound recording industries
9104	Total Employment	9513	Broadcasting and telecommunications
9106	ALL_INDUST	9514	Data processing services
9111	Farms	9516	Total Info and culture
9113	Forestry and logging	9521	Monetary authorities - central bank
9114	Fishing hunting and trapping	9522	Credit intermediation activities
9115	Agriculture and forestry activities	9523	Securities commodity contracts and other financial investment activities
9116	Total Resources	9524	Insurance carriers and related activities
9211	Oil and Gas Extraction	9526	Funds and other financial vehicles
9212	Mining except oil and gas	9528	Total Banks
9213	Mining and Oil and Gas Extract activities	9531	Real estate
9219	Mining-unspecified	9532	Rental and leasing services
9221	Total Mining	9533	Lessors of non-financial intangible assets (except copyrighted works)
9222	Utilities	9534	Total Real estate
9231	Construction except land subdivision and land development	9541	Professional scientific and technical services
9232	Land subdivision and land development	9551	Management of companies and enterprises
9233	Total Land Development	9561	Administrative and support services

DRAFT

Code	Description	Code	Description
9308	Food manufacturing	9562	Waste management and remediation services
9309	Beverage and tobacco product manufacturing	9611	Education Services
9313	Textile mills	9621	Ambulatory health care services
9314	Textile product mills	9622	Hospitals
9315	Clothing manufacturing	9623	Nursing and residential care facilities
9316	Leather and allied product manufacturing	9624	Social assistance
9321	Wood product manufacturing	9625	Total Service
9322	Paper manufacturing	9711	Performing arts spectator sports and related industries
9323	Printing and related support activities	9712	Heritage institutions
9324	Petroleum and coal products manufacturing	9713	Amusement gambling and recreation industries
9325	Chemical manufacturing	9721	Accommodation services
9326	Plastics and rubber products manufacturing	9722	Food services and drinking places
9327	Non-metallic mineral product manufacturing	9723	Total Tourism
9331	Primary Metal Manufacturing	9811	Repair and maintenance
9332	Fabricated metal product manufacturing	9812	Personal and laundry services
9333	Machinery manufacturing	9813	Religious grant-making civic and professional and similar organizations
9334	Computer and Electronic manufacturing	9814	Private households
9335	Electrical equipment appliance and component manufacturing	9815	Total other services
9336	Transportation equipment manufacturing	9911	Federal government public administration
9337	Furniture and related product manufacturing	9912	Provincial and territorial public administration (9121 to 9129)
9338	Miscellaneous manufacturing	9913	Local municipal and regional public administration (9131 to 9139)
9339	Total Manufacturing	9914	Aboriginal public administration
9411	Farm product wholesaler-distributors	9919	International and other extra-territorial public administration
9412	Petroleum product wholesaler-distributors	9920	Total Government
9413	Food beverage and tobacco wholesaler-distributors	9921	Commercial Fuel Combustion
9414	Personal and household goods wholesaler-distributors	9922	TOTAL DISTRIBUTION AND RETAIL
9415	Motor vehicle and parts wholesaler-distributors	9923	TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL AND GOVERNMENT
9416	Building material and supplies wholesaler-distributors	9924	Primary Industry
9417	Machinery equipment and supplies wholesaler-distributors	9925	Manufacturing and Assembly
9418	Miscellaneous wholesaler-distributors	9926	Distribution and Retail (no petroleum)

DRAFT

Code	Description	Code	Description
9419	Wholesale agents and brokers	9927	Commercial Services
9420	Total Wholesale	9928	Commercial Meat cooking
9441	Motor vehicle and parts dealers	9929	HIGHJET
9442	Furniture and home furnishings stores	9930	LOWMEDJET
9443	Electronics and appliance stores	9931	OTHERJET
9444	Building material and garden equipment and supplies dealers	9932	CANRAIL
9445	Food and beverage stores	9933	Forest fires
9446	Health and personal care stores	9941	PAVED ROADS
9447	Gasoline stations	9942	UNPAVED ROADS
9448	clothing and clothing accessories stores	9943	HIGHWAY
9451	Sporting goods hobby book and music stores	9944	ROAD
9452	General Merchandise stores	9945	Commercial Marine Vessels
9453	Miscellaneous store retailers	9946	Construction and mining
9454	Non-store retailers	9947	Agriculture Construction and mining
9455	Total Retail	9950	Intersection of Forest and Housing
9481	Air transportation	9960	TOTBEEF
9482	Rail transportation	9970	TOTPOUL
9483	Water Transportation	9980	TOTSWIN
9484	Truck transportation	9990	TOTFERT
9485	Transit and ground passenger transportation	9993	Trail
9486	Pipeline transportation	9994	ALLROADS
9487	Scenic and sightseeing transportation	9995	30UNPAVED_70trail
9488	Support activities for transportation	9996	Urban area
9491	Postal service	9997	CHBOISQC
9492	Couriers and messengers	9991	Traffic

Table 3-18.CAPs Allocated to Mexican and Canadian Spatial Surrogates

Srg code	Description	NH ₃	NO _x	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂	VOC
22	MEX Total Road Miles	15,965	370,867	34,396	13,713	375,276
10	MEX Population	0	0	0	0	431,231
12	MEX Housing	0	161,013	17,483	2,123	452,685
14	MEX Residential Heating - Wood	0	20,093	211,525	2,859	380,572
16	MEX Residential Heating - Distillate Oil	0	38	0	11	2
20	MEX Residential Heating - LP Gas	0	25,303	787	63	614
22	MEX Total Road Miles	0	0	0	0	3,513
24	MEX Total Railroads Miles	0	74,969	1,669	663	2,824
26	MEX Total Agriculture	679,212	164,144	72,372	2,127	43,958
28	MEX Forest Land	0	16,224	67,683	660	79,018
32	MEX Commercial Land	0	125,211	7,726	0	286,982
34	MEX Industrial Land	0	45,831	5,684	59,201	133,440
36	MEX Commercial plus Industrial Land	0	0	0	0	332,495

DRAFT

Srg code	Description	NH ₃	NO _x	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂	VOC
38	MEX Commercial plus Institutional Land	0	6,400	216	84	28,293
40	Residential (RES1-4)+Commercial+Industrial+Institutional+Government	0	8	20	0	241,710
42	MEX Personal Repair (COM3)	0	0	0	0	33,616
44	MEX Airports Area	0	14,639	0	1,149	6,857
46	MEX Marine Ports	0	124,951	2,991	1,482	1,099
48	Brick Kilns - Mexico	0	776	6,691	0	10,244
50	Mobile sources - Border Crossing - Mexico	0	454	0	0	2,668
9100	CAN Population	603	0	276	0	304
9101	CAN total dwelling	643	46,256	12,783	14,698	32,944
9106	CAN ALL_INDUST	133	21,526	381	3,921	2
9113	CAN Forestry and logging	1,582	8,561	28,622	1,809	36,114
9115	CAN Agriculture and forestry activities	160	239,553	25,318	9,092	26,526
9116	CAN Total Resources	0	17	0	0	5
9212	CAN Mining except oil and gas	0	0	5,391	0	0
9221	CAN Total Mining	42	2,292	45,374	728	26
9222	CAN Utilities	189	14,882	369	1,124	255
9233	CAN Total Land Development	17	20,789	1,928	981	2,551
9308	CAN Food manufacturing	0	0	0	0	4,535
9323	CAN Printing and related support activities	0	0	0	0	25,203
9324	CAN Petroleum and coal products manufacturing	0	0	2,402	0	0
9327	CAN Non-metallic mineral product manufacturing	0	238	7,708	2,941	1,218
9331	CAN Primary Metal Manufacturing	0	98	5,062	12	6
9412	CAN Petroleum product wholesaler-distributors	0	0	0	0	70,125
9416	CAN Building material and supplies wholesaler-distributors	2	0	1,461	3,259	560
9448	CAN clothing and clothing accessories stores	0	0	0	0	328
9562	CAN Waste management and remediation services	165	893	1,596	1,998	16,551
9921	CAN Commercial Fuel Combustion	494	33,816	2,750	35,471	850
9924	CAN Primary Industry	0	0	0	0	219,282
9925	CAN Manufacturing and Assembly	0	0	0	0	139,227
9931	CAN OTHERJET	9	14,388	548	1,139	7,629
9932	CAN CANRAIL	109	122,694	4,093	5,737	3,304
9942	CAN UNPAVED ROADS	40	3,462	3,499	48	152,674
9945	CAN Commercial Marine Vessels	28	45,454	6,404	14,325	61,139
9946	CAN Construction and mining	247	156,770	10,070	5,667	17,180

DRAFT

Srg code	Description	NH₃	NO_x	PM_{2.5}	SO₂	VOC
9947	CAN Agriculture Construction and mining	19	37,452	536	26	32,683
9950	CAN Intersection of Forest and Housing	1,053	11,700	120,045	1,671	173,130
9960	CAN TOTBEEF	176,156	0	7,420	0	317,394
9970	CAN TOTPOUL	74,204	0	2	0	264
9980	CAN TOTSWIN	122,094	0	996	0	3,186
9990	CAN TOTFERT	178,791	0	9,279	0	0
9991	CAN traffic	22,294	550,896	10,888	5,548	285,104
9994	CAN ALLROADS	0	0	55,468	0	0
9995	CAN 30UNPAVED_70trail	0	0	106,707	0	0
9996	CAN urban_area	0	0	284	0	0

4 Development of 2018 Base-Case Emissions

This section describes the methods used for developing the 2018 future-year base-case emissions. The future base-case projection methodologies vary by sector. With the exceptions discussed in Section 4.2, the 2018 base case represents predicted emissions in the absence of any further controls beyond those Federal and State measures already promulgated or under reconsideration before emissions processing began in November, 2013. The future base-case scenario reflects projected economic changes and fuel usage for EGU and mobile sectors. The 2018 EGU projected inventory represents demand growth, fuel resource availability, generating technology cost and performance, and other economic factors affecting power sector behavior. It also reflects the expected 2018 emissions effects due to environmental rules and regulations, consent decrees and settlements, plant closures, control devices updated since 2011, and forecast unit construction through the calendar year 2018. In this analysis, the projected EGU emissions include the Final Mercury and Air Toxics (MATS) rule announced on December 21, 2011 and the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) issued March 10, 2005. More information on the EGU base case can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/powersectormodeling/BaseCasev513.html>.

For mobile sources (onroad, onroad_rfl, nonroad, c1c2rail and c3marine sectors), all national measures for which data were available at the time of modeling have been included. The Tier 3 standards proposed in March, 2013 are represented (see <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/tier3.htm>). Efforts made to include some regional haze and state-reported local controls as part of a larger effort to include more local control information on stationary non-EGU sources are described further in Section 4.2. The following bullets summarize the projection methods used for sources in the various sectors, while additional details and data sources are given in the following subsections and Table 4-1.

- EGU sector (ptegu and ptegu_pk): Unit-specific estimates from IPM version 5.13, including CAIR and Final MATS.
- Non-IPM sector (ptnonipm): Projection factors and percent reductions reflect comments received during the development of the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) along with emission reductions due to national and local rules, control programs, plant closures, consent decrees and settlements. Projection approaches for corn ethanol and biodiesel plants, refineries and upstream impacts represent the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA). Airport-specific terminal area forecast (TAF) data were used for aircraft to account for projected changes in landing/takeoff activity.
- Point and nonpoint oil and gas sectors (pt_oilgas and np_oilgas): Regional projection factors by product type using Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2013 projections to year 2018. Cobenefits of stationary engines CAP-cobenefit reductions (RICE NESHAP) and New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) VOC controls reflected for select source categories.
- Fires sector (ptfire): No growth or control – 2011 estimates used directly.
- Agricultural sector (ag): Projection factors for livestock estimates based on expected changes in animal population from 2005 Department of Agriculture data, updated according to EPA experts in July 2012; fertilizer application NH₃ emissions projections include upstream impacts EISA.
- Area fugitive dust sector (afdust): Projection factors for dust categories related to livestock estimates based on expected changes in animal population and upstream impacts from EISA.
- Residential Wood Combustion (rwc): Projection factors that reflect assumed growth of wood burning appliances based on sales data, equipment replacement rates and change outs. These changes include a growth in lower-emitting stoves and a reduction in higher emitting stoves.

DRAFT

- Remaining Nonpoint sector (nonpt): Projection factors implement comments received during Cross State Air Pollution Rule development and emission reductions due to control programs. PFC projection factors reflecting impact of the final Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT2) rule. Upstream impacts from EISA, including post-2007 cellulosic ethanol plants are reflected.
- Nonroad mobile sector (nonroad): Other than for California and Texas, this sector uses data from a run of NMIM that utilized NONROAD2008a with database “NCD20130731_nei2018dv1”, using future-year equipment population estimates and control programs to the year 2018 and inputs that were either state-supplied as part of the 2011NEIv1 process or using national level inputs. Final controls from the final locomotive-marine and small spark ignition OTAQ rules are included. California and Texas-specific data were provided by CARB and TCEQ, respectively.
- Locomotive, and non-Class 3 commercial marine sector (c1c2rail): For all states except California, projection factors for Class 1 and Class 2 commercial marine and locomotives reflect final locomotive-marine controls and RFS2 adjustments. California projected year-2017 inventory data were provided by CARB.
- Class 3 commercial marine vessel (c3marine): Base-year 2011 emissions grown and controlled to 2018, incorporating controls based on Emissions Control Area (ECA) and International Marine Organization (IMO) global NO_x and SO₂ controls.
- Onroad mobile, not including refueling (onroad): MOVES2010b (extended idle mode) and MOVES2010b-Tier3NPRM-based emissions factors for year 2018 were developed using the same representative counties, state-supplied data, meteorology, and procedures that were used to produce the 2011 emission factors described in Section 2.3.1. California and TCEQ-specific data were provided by CARB and TCEQ, respectively. This sector includes all non-refueling onroad mobile emissions (exhaust, extended idle, evaporative, evaporative permeation, brake wear and tire wear modes).
- Onroad refueling mode (onroad_rfl): the same projection approach is used as for the onroad sector and processing is described in Section 2.3.2, in that emission factors are from MOVES2010b and that California and Texas did not include state supplied emissions.
- Other onroad (othar): No growth or control for Canada because data are not available. Mexico inventory data were grown from year 1999 to 2018.
- Other nonroad/nonpoint (othon): No growth or control for Canada. Mexico inventory data were grown from year 1999 to 2018.
- Other point (othpt): No growth or control for Canada and offshore oil. Mexico inventory data were grown from 1999 to year 2018. Non-U.S. C3 CMV data projected using the same methodology as the c3marine sector.
- Biogenic: 2011 emissions used for all future-year scenarios.

Table 4-1 summarizes the control strategies and growth assumptions by source type that were used to create the U.S. 2018 base-case emissions from the 2011v6 base-case inventories. Lists of the control, closures, projection packets (datasets) used to create 2018 future year base-case scenario inventories from the 2011 base case are provided in ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/2018emissions/CoST_packets/ in the file 2018ed_Projections_with_CoST_23dec13.xlsx. These packets were processed through EPA Control Strategy Tool (CoST) to create future year inventories. CoST is described here: <http://www.epa.gov/ttnecas1/cost.htm>. The CoST packets are formatted in the same way as those needed for SMOKE and are available on the 2011v6 web site within the CoST_packets directory mentioned above in the file 2018ed_CoST_packets.zip. Summaries of the emissions changes resulting from all CoST packets (control programs, projections and closures) can be found in the reports directory of the 2011/2018 emissions

DRAFT

modeling platform release: ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/2018_emissions/ in the files 2018ed_CoST_ptnonipm_facility_summary.xlsx and 2018ed_CoST_sector_summaries.xlsx.

Table 4-1. Control strategies and growth assumptions for creating the 2018 base-case emissions inventories from the 2011 base case

Control Strategies and/or growth assumptions (grouped by standard and approach used to apply to the inventory)	CAPs affected	Section
Non-EGU Point (ptnonipm and pt_oilgas sectors) Controls and Growth Assumptions		
Ethanol plants that account for increased ethanol production due to EISA mandate	All	4.2.1.1
Biodiesel plants producing 1.6 billion gallons of production due to EISA mandate	All	4.2.1.2
Ethanol distribution vapor losses adjustments due to EISA mandate	VOC	4.2.1.6
Refinery upstream adjustments from EISA mandate	All	4.2.1.7
Livestock emissions growth from year 2011 to 2018, also including upstream RFS2 impacts on agricultural-related activities such as pesticide and fertilizer production	All	4.2.2
Oil and gas production AEO-based regional growth factors and VOC NSPS controls	All	4.2.4
Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines (RICE) NESHAP with reconsiderations	NO _x , CO, PM, SO ₂	4.2.3
State fuel sulfur content rules for fuel oil – as of July, 2012, effective only in Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York and Vermont	SO ₂	4.2.6
Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters MACT with Reconsideration Amendments	CO, PM, SO ₂ , VOC	4.2.7
NESHAP: Portland Cement census-division level based on Industrial Sector Integrated Solutions (ISIS) policy emissions to year 2018. The ISIS results are from the ISIS-Cement model runs for the NESHAP and NSPS analysis of August 2013 and include closures.	All	4.2.8
Future baseline inventory improvements received from states and a 2005 platform NODA and comments from the CSAPR proposal, including local controls, fuel switching, unit closures and consent decrees	All	4.2.9
Facility and unit closures obtained from various sources such as states, industry and web posting, EPA staff and post-2011 inventory submittals	All	4.2.10
Aircraft growth via Itinerant (ITN) operations at airports to 2018	All	4.2.10
Boat Manufacturing MACT rule, VOC: national applied by SCC	VOC	4.2.11.1
Lafarge and Saint Gobain consent decrees	NO _x , PM, SO ₂	4.2.9.3
Consent decrees on companies (based on information from the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance – OECA) apportioned to plants owned/operated by the companies	CO, NO _x , PM, SO ₂ , VOC	4.2.9.3
Refinery Consent Decrees: plant/unit controls	NO _x , SO ₂	4.2.9.3
Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration (CISWI) revised NSPS	PM, SO ₂	4.2.11.2
Nonpoint (afdust, ag, nonpt np_oilgas, and rwc sectors) Controls and Growth Assumptions		
MSAT2 and RFS2 impacts on portable fuel container growth and control from 2011 to 2018	VOC	4.2.1.3
Cellulosic ethanol and diesel emissions from EISA mandate	All	4.2.1.4
Ethanol transport working losses inventory from EISA mandate	VOC	4.2.1.5
Ethanol distribution vapor losses adjustments due to EISA mandate	VOC	4.2.1.6
Livestock emissions growth from year 2011 to 2018, also including upstream RFS2 impacts on agricultural-related activities such as pesticide and fertilizer production	All	4.2.2
Oil and gas production AEO-based regional growth factors and VOC NSPS controls	All	4.2.4
Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines (RICE) NESHAP with reconsiderations	NO _x , CO, PM,	4.2.3

DRAFT

Control Strategies and/or growth assumptions (grouped by standard and approach used to apply to the inventory)	CAPs affected	Section
	SO ₂	
State fuel sulfur content rules for fuel oil – as of July, 2012, effective only in Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York and Vermont	SO ₂	4.2.6
Residential wood combustion growth and change-outs from year 2011 to 2018	All	4.2.3
Future baseline inventory improvements received from states	NO _x , VOC	4.2.9
Onroad Mobile Controls (All national in-force regulations are modeled. The list includes key recent mobile control strategies but is not exhaustive.)		
National Onroad Rules: All onroad control programs finalized as of the date of the model run, including most recently: Proposed Tier-3 Standards: March, 2013 Light-Duty Greenhouse Rule: March, 2013 Heavy (and Medium)-Duty Greenhouse Gas Rule: August, 2011 Renewable Fuel Standard: February, 2010 Light Duty Greenhouse Gas Rule: April, 2010 Corporate-Average Fuel Economy standards for 2008-2011, April, 2010 2007 Onroad Heavy-Duty Rule: February, 2009 Final Mobile Source Air Toxics Rule (MSAT2): February, 2007 Tier 2 Rule: Signature date February, 2000 National Low Emission Vehicle Program (NLEV): March, 1998	All	4.3
Local Onroad Programs: California LEV _{III} Program Ozone Transport Commission (OTC) LEV Program: January, 1995 Inspection and Maintenance programs Fuel programs (also affect gasoline nonroad equipment) Stage II refueling control programs	VOC	4.3
Nonroad Mobile Controls (All national in-force regulations are modeled. The list includes recent key mobile control strategies but is not exhaustive.)		
National Nonroad Controls: All nonroad control programs finalized as of the date of the model run, including most recently: Emissions Standards for New Nonroad Spark-Ignition Engines, Equipment, and Vessels: October, 2008 Control of Emissions of Air Pollution from Locomotives and Marine Compression-Ignition Engines Less than 30 Liters per Cylinder: March, 2008 Clean Air Nonroad Diesel Final Rule – Tier 4: May, 2004	All	4.4
Locomotives: Control of Emissions of Air Pollution from Locomotives and Marine Compression-Ignition Engines Less than 30 Liters per Cylinder: March, 2008 Clean Air Nonroad Diesel Final Rule – Tier 4: May, 2004	All	4.4.1
Commercial Marine: Category 3 marine diesel engines Clean Air Act and International Maritime Organization standards: April, 2010 Control of Emissions of Air Pollution from Locomotives and Marine Compression-Ignition Engines Less than 30 Liters per Cylinder: March, 2008 Clean Air Nonroad Diesel Final Rule – Tier 4: May, 2004	All	4.4.2

[A quick background on the Control Strategy Tool \(CoST\)](#)

CoST is used to apply most non-EGU projection/growth factors, controls and facility/unit/stack-level closures to the 2011 emissions modeling inventories to create year 2018 inventories for the following sectors: afdust, ag, c1c2rail, nonpt, np_oilgas, ptnonipm, pt_oilgas and rwc. The CoST training manual is

DRAFT

available at: http://www.cmascenter.org/help/model_docs/cost/2.5/CoST_UsersGuide_2012-08-01_Final.pdf. The CoST development document, which is a more thorough but dated document of how to build and format CoST input files (packets) is available at: http://www.epa.gov/ttnecas1/models/CoST_Development%20Document_2010-06-09.pdf. The CoST packets used for 2018ed are available here: The CoST packets themselves can be found in ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/2018emissions/CoST_packets/.

CoST allows the user to apply projection factors, controls and closures at various geographic and inventory key field resolutions. CoST provides the user with the ability to perform numerous quality assurance routines as well as create SMOKE-ready future year inventories. There are also available linkages to existing and user-defined control measures databases and it is up to the user to determine how control strategies are developed and applied. EPA typically creates individual CoST datasets or “packets” that represent specific intended purposes. For example, aircraft projections for airports are in a separate PROJECTION packet from residential wood combustion sales/appliance turnover-based projections. CoST uses three packet types as described below:

1. **CLOSURE:** Applied first in CoST. This packet can be used to zero-out (close) point source emissions at resolutions as broad as a facility to as specific as a stack. EPA used these types of packets for known post-2011 controls as well as information on closures provided by states on specific facilities, units or stacks. This packet type is only used in the ptnonipm sector in the 2011 platform.
2. **PROJECTION:** This packet allows the user to increase or decrease emissions for virtually any geographic and/or inventory source level. Projection factors are applied as simple scalars to the 2011 emissions inventories prior to the application of any possible subsequent CONTROLS. A PROJECTION packet is necessary whenever emissions increase from 2011 and is also desirable when information is based more on activity assumptions rather than known controls. EPA used PROJECTION packet(s) in every non-EGU modeling sector in the 2011 platform.
3. **CONTROL:** These packets are applied after any/all CLOSURE and PROJECTION packet entries. The user has similar level of control as PROJECTION packets regarding specificity of geographic and/or inventory source level application. Control factors are expressed as a percent reduction (0 to 100) and can be applied in addition to any pre-existing inventory control, or as a replacement control where inventory controls are first backed out prior to the application of a more-stringent replacement control.

As mentioned above, CoST first applies any/all CLOSURE information for point sources, then applies PROJECTION packet information, followed by CONTROL packets. A hierarchy is used by CoST to separately apply PROJECTION and CONTROL packets. In short, in a separate process for PROJECTION and CONTROL packets, more specific information is applied in lieu of less-specific information in ANY other packets. For example, a facility-level PROJECTION factor will be replaced by a unit-level, or facility and pollutant-level PROJECTION factor. It is important to note that this hierarchy does not apply intra-packet types; for example, CONTROL packet entries are applied irrespective of PROJECTION packet hierarchies. A more specific example: a state/SCC-level PROJECTION factor will be applied before a stack/pollutant-level CONTROL factor that impacts the same inventory record. However, an inventory source that is subject to a CLOSURE packet record is removed from consideration of subsequent PROJECTION and CONTROL packets.

The implication for this hierarchy and intra-packet independence is important to understand and quality assure when creating future year strategies. For example, with consent decrees, settlements and state

DRAFT

comments, the goal is typically to achieve a targeted reduction (from the 2011NEIv1) or a targeted 2018 emissions value. Therefore, as encountered with this 2018 base case, consent decrees and state comments for specific cement kilns (expressed as CONTROL packet entries), needed to be applied instead of (not in addition to) the more general approach of the PROJECTION packet entries for cement manufacturing. By processing CoST control strategies with PROJECTION and CONTROL packets separated by type of measure/program and also by consent decree and state comments, it is possible to show actual changes from the 2011 inventory to the 2018 inventory for each packet.

Ultimately, CoST concatenates all PROJECTION packets into one PROJECTION dataset and uses a hierarchal matching approach, a sample subset of which is shown in Table 4-2, to assign PROJECTION factors to the inventory. For example, a packet entry with Ranking=1 will supersede all other potential inventory matches from other packets. CoST then computes the projected emissions from all PROJECTION packet matches and then performs a similar routine for all CONTROL packets. Therefore, when summarizing “emissions reduced” from CONTROL packets, it is important to note that these reductions are not relative to the 2011 inventory, but rather, to the intermediate inventory *after* application of any/all PROJECTION packet matches. It is also important not all 70+ hierarchy options are shown. The fields listed in Table 4-2 are not necessarily named the same in CoST, but rather are similar to those in the SMOKE FF10 inventories; for example, “REGION_CD” is the county-state-county FIPS code (e.g., Harris county Texas is 48201) and “STATE” would be the 2-digit state FIPS code with three trailing zeros (e.g., Texas is 48000).

Table 4-2. Subset of CoST Packet Matching Hierarchy

Rank	Matching Hierarchy	Inventory Type
1	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, UNIT_ID, REL_POINT_ID, PROCESS_ID, SCC, POLL	point
2	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, UNIT_ID, REL_POINT_ID, PROCESS_ID, POLL	point
3	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, UNIT_ID, REL_POINT_ID, SCC, POLL	point
4	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, UNIT_ID, REL_POINT_ID, POLL	point
5	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, UNIT_ID, SCC, POLL	point
6	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, UNIT_ID, POLL	point
7	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, SCC, POLL	point
8	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, POLL	point
9	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, UNIT_ID, REL_POINT_ID, PROCESS_ID	point
10	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, UNIT_ID, REL_POINT_ID	point
11	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID, UNIT_ID	point
12	REGION_CD, FACILITY_ID	point
13	REGION_CD, NAICS, SCC, POLL	point, nonpoint
14	REGION_CD, NAICS, POLL	point, nonpoint
15	STATE, NAICS, POLL	point, nonpoint
16	REGION_CD, NAICS	point, nonpoint
17	NAICS	point, nonpoint
18	REGION_CD, SCC, POLL	point, nonpoint
19	STATE, SCC, POLL	point, nonpoint
20	SCC, POLL	point, nonpoint
21	REGION_CD, SCC	point, nonpoint
22	STATE, SCC	point, nonpoint
23	SCC	point, nonpoint
24	REGION_CD, POLL	point, nonpoint
25	REGION_CD	point, nonpoint
26	STATE, POLL	point, nonpoint
27	STATE	point, nonpoint
28	POLL	point, nonpoint

The remainder of this section is organized either by source sector or by specific emissions category within a source sector for which a distinct set of data were used or developed for the purpose of projections for the 2018 base case. This organization allows consolidation of the discussion of the emissions categories that are contained in multiple sectors, because the data and approaches used across the sectors are consistent and do not need to be repeated. Sector names associated with the emissions categories are provided in parentheses.

A list of inventory datasets used for this and all cases is provided in Table G-1 in Appendix G. The ancillary input data in the future-year scenarios are very similar to those used in the 2011 base case except for the speciation profiles used for gasoline-related sources, which change in the future to account for increased ethanol usage in gasoline. Table G-1 of Appendix G also shows the differences between ancillary input data sets between the 2011 base case and the future-year scenario. The specific speciation profile changes are discussed in Section 3.2.1. Table G-2 in Appendix G also provides the values for the main parameters used in the emissions modeling cases.

4.1 Stationary source projections: EGU sectors (*ptegu, ptegu_pk*)

The future-year data for the *ptipm* sector used in the air quality modeling were created by the Integrated Planning Model (IPM) version 5.13 (v5.13) Final MATS (Mercury and Air Toxics Standards) of (<http://www.epa.gov/airmarkt/progsregs/epa-ipm/index.html>). The IPM is a multiregional, dynamic, deterministic linear programming model of the U.S. electric power sector. Version 5.13 reflects state rules, consent decrees and announced shutdowns through August, 2013. IPM 5.13 was significantly updated from the previous version 4.10 and represents electricity demand projections for the Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2013. The scenario used for this modeling represents the implementation of the Clean Air Interstate Rule, the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, and the final actions EPA has taken to implement the Regional Haze Rule. More details on the 2018 base case can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/powersectormodeling/BaseCasev513.html>.

Directly emitted PM emissions (i.e., $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}) from the EGU sector are computed via a post processing routine that applies emission factors to the IPM-estimated fuel throughput based on fuel, configuration and controls to compute the filterable and condensable components of PM. This methodology is documented in the air quality modeling flat file documentation available here: http://www.epa.gov/powersectormodeling/docs/v513/FlatFile_Methodology.pdf. As part of the development of the flat file, a cross reference between the 2011 NEIv1 and IPM is used to help populate stack parameters and other related information. This cross reference is available from http://www.epa.gov/powersectormodeling/docs/v513/FlatFile_Inputs.xls. The emissions in the flat file created from the IPM outputs are temporalized into the hourly emissions needed by the air quality model as described in Section 3.3.2.

4.2 Stationary source projections: non-EGU sectors (*afdust, ag, nonpt, np_oilgas, ptnonipm, pt_oilgas, rwc*)

To project U.S. stationary sources other than the *ptipm* sector, growth factors and/or controls were applied to certain categories within the *afdust*, *ag*, *nonpt*, *np_oilgas*, *ptnonipm*, *pt_oilgas* and *rwc* platform sectors. This subsection provides details on the data and projection methods used for these sectors. In estimating future-year emissions, EPA assumed that emissions growth does not track with economic growth for many stationary non-IPM sources. This “no-growth” assumption is based on an examination of historical emissions and economic data. While EPA is working toward improving the projection approach in future emissions platforms, the Agency is still using the no-growth assumption for the 2011 platform unless states

DRAFT

provided specific growth factors for 2018. More details on the rationale for this approach can be found in Appendix D of the Regulatory Impact Assessment for the PM NAAQS rule (EPA, 2006b).

For many sources, EPA applied emissions reduction factors (CONTROL packets) to the 2011 base case emissions for particular sources in the ptnonipm, nonpt and two oil and gas sectors (np_oilgas and pt_oilgas) to reflect the impact of stationary-source national and local-scale control programs including consent decrees. Information on plant, unit and stack closures (CLOSURE packets) is restricted to the ptnonipm sector. Some of the controls described in this section were obtained from comments on the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) proposal.

The contents of the controls, local adjustments and closures for the 2018 base case are described in the following subsections. Detailed summaries of the impacts of all control programs, local adjustments and closures are provided in ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/reports/2018_emissions/. Year-specific projection factors (PROJECTION packets) for year 2018 were used for creating the 2018 base case unless noted otherwise. The contents of these projection packets (and control reductions) are provided in the following sections where feasible. However, some sectors used growth or control factors that varied geographically and their contents could not be provided in the following sections (e.g., facilities and units subject to the Boiler MACT reconsideration has thousands of records). Regardless of whether the growth or control factors for a sector are provided in a table in this document, they are available as “projection”, “control”, or “closures” packets for input to SMOKE on the 2011v6 platform website in ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/2018emissions/CoST_packets/. This section is divided into several subsections that are summarized in Table 4-3. Note that future year inventories were used rather than projection or control packets for some sources.

Table 4-3. Summary of non-EGU stationary projections subsections

Subsection	Title	Sector(s)	Brief Description
4.2.1	RFS2 upstream future year inventories and adjustments	nonpt ptnonipm	1) Point and non-point inventories received from OTAQ that account for the upstream impact of the RFS2 and the EISA mandate. 2) Point and non-point adjustment factors that EPA applied to the 2011 inventory to reflect RFS2 in 2018.
4.2.2	Upstream agricultural and livestock adjustments	afdust, ag, nonpt, ptnonipm	Adjustment factors to all ag-related sources that also reflect upstream RFS2 impacts on ag-related processes impacted by increased ethanol use.
4.2.3	Residential wood combustion projections	rwc	Adjustment factors that reflect the change in RWC emissions by appliance type, including wood stove change-outs and accounting for estimated future sales and replacement rates.
4.2.4	Oil and Gas projections	np_oilgas, pt_oilgas	Projection packet reflecting regional AEO-based growth for oil and gas production as well as VOC NSPS controls for select sources.
4.2.3	RICE NESHAP controls	nonpt, np_oilgas, ptnonipm, pt_oilgas	Control packet reflecting RICE NESHAP with reconsideration amendments.
4.2.6	Fuel sulfur rule controls	nonpt ptnonipm	Control packet reflecting state and local fuel sulfur rules, including ULSD.
4.2.7	Industrial Boiler MACT	ptnonipm	Control packet reflecting ICI Boiler MACT

DRAFT

Subsection	Title	Sector(s)	Brief Description
	reconsideration controls		reconsideration reductions.
4.2.8	Portland cement NESHAP projections	ptnonipm	Year-2018 ISIS policy case reflecting the Portland Cement NESHAP, including closures, controls at existing kilns and an inventory containing new kilns constructed after 2011 that account for shifting capacity from some closed units to open units.
4.2.3	State comments and consent decrees/settlements	nonpt, ptnonipm	Projection and control packets reflecting numerous sources of consent decree/settlement information as well as state comments and data regarding 2018.
4.2.9	Aircraft projections	ptnonipm	Airport-specific projections to year 2018 based on FAA itinerary activity estimates.
4.2.10	Remaining non-EGU controls and closures	ptnonipm	All other controls and plant/unit/stack closures information not covered in previous subsections

4.2.1 RFS2 upstream future year inventories and adjustments (nonpt, ptnonipm)

EPA incorporated adjustments for some stationary source categories to account for impacts of the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) renewable fuel standards mandate in the Renewable Fuel Standards Program (RFS2; EPA, 2010a). These mandates not only impact emissions associated with highway vehicles and nonroad engines, but also emissions associated with point and nonpoint sources. The "upstream" emission impacts of the renewable fuels mandate are associated with all stages of biofuel production and distribution, including biomass production (agriculture, forestry), fertilizer and pesticide production and transport, biomass transport, biomass refining (corn or cellulosic ethanol production facilities), biofuel transport to blending/distribution terminals, and distribution of finished fuels to retail outlets. These impacts are accounted for in the 2018 inventories. There are also impacts on domestic crude emissions upstream of petroleum refineries, due to displacement of gasoline and diesel fuel with biofuels, but these are not accounted for in these projections as these data were not available. Greenhouse gas standards also affect production and distribution of gasoline and diesel fuels, but the impacts of these rules will be very small in 2018 and were not accounted for.

Based on the Annual Energy Outlook 2013 (early release) energy use of 15.47 quad (10^{15} BTU) (Department of Energy, 2012), EPA estimated the 2011 ethanol volume as 11.1 billion gallons (Bgal). EPA assumes that an unadjusted 2018 inventory, which does not account for the impacts of the EISA renewable fuel mandate, would have comparable ethanol volumes to 2011. However, analyses done to support the RFS2 rule (EPA, 2010a) suggest a significant increase in renewable fuel volumes in 2018 (see Table 4-4). Adjustments applied to the inventories (described in the following subsections) reflect the impacts on emissions due to the difference between the 2011 ethanol volumes and the renewable fuel volumes shown in Table 4-4. In 2018, EPA assumed 1 Bgal of ethanol would be used as E85, 10 Bgal as E10, and about 4 Bgal as E15.

Table 4-4. Renewable Fuel Volumes Assumed for Stationary Source Adjustments.

Renewable Fuel	Volume (Bgal)
Corn Ethanol	14.7
Cellulosic Ethanol	0.235
Imported Ethanol	1.061
Biodiesel	1.887
Renewable Diesel	0.236
Cellulosic Diesel	0.290

4.2.1.1 Corn Ethanol plants inventory (ptnonipm)

Future year inventories: “ethanol_plants_2018ed_NEI” and “ethanol_plants_2018ed_OTAQ”

As discussed in Section 2.1.4, EPA supplemented the 2011 NEI with corn ethanol plants that EPA OTAQ identified. The 2011 emissions were projected to account for the increased domestic corn ethanol production assumed in this modeling, specifically an increase from 13.9 Bgal in 2011 to 14.7 Bgal by 2018. The projection was applied to all pollutants and all facilities equally. Table 4-5 provides the summaries of estimated emissions for the corn ethanol plants in year 2011 and 2018²³.

Table 4-5. 2011 and 2018 corn ethanol plant emissions [tons]

Pollutant	2011	2018
CO	15,934	16,858
NH ₃	726	768
NO _x	18,048	19,095
PM ₁₀	10,602	11,217
PM _{2.5}	5,995	6,343
SO ₂	34,608	36,294
VOC	19,654	21,115

4.2.1.2 Biodiesel plants inventory (ptnonipm)

New Future year inventory: “Biodiesel_Plants_2018_ff10”

EPA OTAQ developed an inventory of biodiesel plants for 2018 in support of producing biodiesel fuels for the EISA mandate. Plant location and production volume data came from the Tier 3 proposed rule.^{24,25} The total volume of biodiesel came from the AEO 2013 early release, 1.3 BG for 2018. To reach the total volume of biodiesel, plants that had current production volumes were assumed to be at 100% production and the remaining volume was split among plants with planned production. Once facility-level production capacities were scaled, emission factors were applied based on soybean oil feedstock. These emission factors in Table 4-6 are in tons per million gallons (Mgal) and were obtained from EPA’s spreadsheet model for upstream EISA impacts developed for the RFS2 rule (EPA, 2010a). Inventories were modeled as point sources with Google Earth and web searching validating facility coordinates and correcting state-county FIPS. Table 4-7 provides the 2018 biodiesel plant emissions estimates. Emissions in 2011 are assumed to be near zero, and HAP emissions in 2018 are nearly zero.

Table 4-6. Emission Factors for Biodiesel Plants (Tons/Mgal)

Pollutant	Emission Factor
VOC	4.3981E-02
CO	5.0069E-01
NO _x	8.0790E-01
PM ₁₀	6.8240E-02
PM _{2.5}	6.8240E-02
SO ₂	5.9445E-03

²³ The 2011 emissions are the sum of the NEI and OTAQ facilities. The same is true for 2018.

²⁴ US EPA 2013. Draft Regulatory Impact Analysis for Tier 3 Vehicle Emission and Fuel Standards Program. EPA-420-D-13-002.

²⁵ Cook, R. 2012. Development of Air Quality Reference Case Upstream and Portable Fuel Container Inventories for Tier 3 Proposal. Memorandum to Docket EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0162.

DRAFT

Pollutant	Emission Factor
NH ₃	0
Acetaldehyde	2.4783E-07
Acrolein	2.1290E-07
Benzene	3.2458E-08
1,3-Butadiene	0
Formaldehyde	1.5354E-06
Ethanol	0

Table 4-7. 2018 biodiesel plant emissions [tons]

Pollutant	2018
CO	649
NO _x	1048
PM ₁₀	89
PM _{2.5}	89
SO ₂	8
VOC	57

4.2.1.3 Portable fuel container inventory (nonpt)

Future year inventory: “2018_PFC_inventory_FF10_revision2”

EPA used future-year VOC emissions from Portable Fuel Containers (PFCs) from inventories developed and modeled for EPA’s MSAT2 rule (EPA, 2007a). The 10 PFC SCCs are summarized below (note that the full SCC descriptions for these SCCs include “Storage and Transport; Petroleum and Petroleum Product Storage” as the beginning of the description).

- 2501011011 Residential Portable Fuel Containers: Permeation
- 2501011012 Residential Portable Fuel Containers: Evaporation
- 2501011013 Residential Portable Fuel Containers: Spillage During Transport
- 2501011014 Residential Portable Fuel Containers: Refilling at the Pump: Vapor Displacement
- 2501011015 Residential Portable Fuel Containers: Refilling at the Pump: Spillage
- 2501012011 Commercial Portable Fuel Containers: Permeation
- 2501012012 Commercial Portable Fuel Containers: Evaporation
- 2501012013 Commercial Portable Fuel Containers: Spillage During Transport
- 2501012014 Commercial Portable Fuel Containers: Refilling at the Pump: Vapor Displacement
- 2501012015 Commercial Portable Fuel Containers: Refilling at the Pump: Spillage

The future-year emissions reflect projected increases in fuel consumption, state programs to reduce PFC emissions, standards promulgated in the MSAT2 rule, and impacts of the EISA on gasoline volatility. OTAQ provided year 2018 PFC emissions that include estimated Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP) and oxygenate impacts on VOC emissions, and more importantly, large increases in ethanol emissions from RFS2. These emission estimates also include refueling from the NONROAD model for gas can vapor displacement, changes in tank permeation and diurnal emissions from evaporation. Because the future year PFC inventories contain ethanol in addition to benzene, EPA developed a VOC E-profile that integrated ethanol and benzene; see Section 3.2.1.1 for more details. Emissions for 2011 and 2018 are provided in Section 5.

Table 4-8. PFC emissions for 2011 and 2018 [tons]

Pollutant	2011	2018
VOC	198,395	29,119
Benzene	786	645
Ethanol	0	3,719

4.2.1.4 Cellulosic fuel production inventory (nonpt)

New Future year inventory: “2018_cellulosic_inventory”

Depending on available feedstock, cellulosic plants are likely to produce fuel through either a biochemical process or a thermochemical process. OTAQ developed county-level inventories for biochemical and thermochemical cellulosic fuel production for 2018 to reflect AEO2013er renewable fuel volumes. Emissions factors for each cellulosic biofuel refinery reflect the fuel production technology used rather than the fuel produced. Emission rates in Table 4-9 and Table 4-10 were used to develop cellulosic plant inventories. Criteria pollutant emission rates are in tons per RIN gallon. Emission factors from the cellulosic diesel work in the Tier 3 NPRM were used as the emission factors for the thermochemical plants. Cellulosic ethanol VOC and related HAP emission factors from the Tier 3 NPRM were used as the biochemical VOC and related HAP emission factors.²⁶ Because the future year cellulosic inventory contains ethanol, a VOC E-profile that integrated ethanol was used, see Sections 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.1.3 for more details.

Plants were treated as area sources spread across the entire area of whatever county they were considered to be located in. Cellulosic biofuel refinery siting was based on utilizing the lowest cost feedstock, accounting for the cost of the feedstock itself as well as feedstock storage and the transportation of the feedstock to the cellulosic biofuel refinery. The total number of cellulosic biofuel refineries was projected using volumes from AEO2013 (early release). The methodology used to determine most likely plant locations is described in Section 1.8.1.3 of the RFS2 RIA (EPA, 2010a). Table 4-11 provides the year 2018 cellulosic plant emissions estimates.

Table 4-9. Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors for Cellulosic Plants (Tons/RIN gallon)

Cellulosic Plant Type	VOC	CO	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	SO _x	NH ₃
Thermochemical	5.92E-07	8.7E-06	1.31E-05	1.56E-06	7.81E-07	1.17E-06	1.44E-10
Biochemical	1.82E-06	1.29E-05	1.85E-05	3.08E-06	1.23E-06	6.89E-07	0

Table 4-10. Toxic Emission Factors for Cellulosic Plants (Tons/RIN gallon)

Plant Type	Acetaldehyde	Acrolein	Benzene	1,3-Butadiene	Formaldehyde	Ethanol
Thermochemical	2.95E-08	1.27E-09	9.61E-10	0	5.07E-09	2.09E-07
Biochemical	3.98E-07	1.11E-08	1.39E-08	0	2.28E-08	6.41E-07

²⁶ It should be noted that in the Tier 3 NPRM we meant to use different cellulosic ethanol non-VOC CAP emission factors depending on which feedstock the plant was using but instead used the same emission factors (based on a forest waste feedstock) for all the plants. This was corrected by using emission factors for the non-VOC CAPS that were based on a stover feedstock for the biochemical plants.

Table 4-11. 2018 cellulosic plant emissions [tons]

Pollutant	Emissions
Acrolein	1
Formaldehyde	4
Benzene	1
Acetaldehyde	21
CO	6,088
Ethanol	146
NH ₃	0.1
NO _x	9,199
PM ₁₀	1,088
PM _{2.5}	547
SO ₂	819
VOC	414

4.2.1.5 Ethanol working loss inventory (nonpt)

New Future year inventory: “Ethanol_transport_vapor_2018rg_ref_v1”

This inventory was provided by OTAQ to represent upstream impacts of loading and unloading at ethanol terminals. Emissions are entirely evaporative and were computed by county for truck, rail and waterway loading and unloading and intermodal transfers (e.g., highway to rail). Inventory totals are summarized in Table 4-12. The leading descriptions are “Industrial Processes; Food and Agriculture; Ethanol Production” for each SCC.

Table 4-12. 2018 VOC working losses (Emissions) due to ethanol transport [tons]

SCC	Description	Emissions
30205031	Denatured Ethanol Storage Working Loss	23,420
30205052	Ethanol Loadout to Truck	14,425
30205053	Ethanol Loadout to Railcar	10,484

4.2.1.6 Vapor losses from Ethanol transport and distribution (nonpt, ptnonipm)

Packet: “PROJECTION_2011_2018_distribution_upstream_OTAQ_Tier3FRM”

OTAQ developed county-level inventories for ethanol transport and distribution for 2018 to account for losses for the processes such as truck, rail and waterways loading/unloading and intermodal transfers such as highway-to-rail, highways-to-waterways, and all other possible combinations of transfers. These emissions are entirely evaporative and therefore limited to VOC.

A 2018 inventory which included EISA impacts was developed by adjusting the 2007 platform inventory. These adjustments were made using an updated version of EPA’s spreadsheet model for upstream emission impacts, developed for the RFS2 rule²⁷. Below EPA describes how the Agency developed emission factors and fuel volumes to make these adjustments with the RFS2 impacts spreadsheet.

²⁷ U.S. EPA. 2013. Spreadsheet “upstream_emissions_rev T3.xls.”

DRAFT

Vapor loss VOC emission factors (EFs) for gasoline were first developed, based on inventory estimates from the 2005 NEI (EPA, 2009a). Total volume of gasoline was based on gasoline sales as reported by the Energy Information Administration (2006). Emissions were partitioned into refinery to bulk terminal (RBT), bulk plant storage (BPS), and bulk terminal to gasoline dispensing pump (BTP) components. Emissions for the BTP component are greater than the RBT and BPS components.

Total nationwide emissions for these components were divided by the energy content of the total volume of gasoline distributed in 2005 to obtain emission factors in grams per million metric British Thermal Units (g/mmBTU). Total volume of gasoline was based on gasoline sales as reported by the Energy Information Administration.²⁸ -In addition to gasoline VOC emission factors for the RBT/BPS components, emission factors were developed for the BTP component, for 10% ethanol and 15% ethanol, and 85% ethanol. Emission factors were calculated by applying adjustment factors to the gasoline EFs. The BTP adjustment factors were based on an algorithm from the 1994 On-Board Refueling Vapor Recovery Rule (EPA, 1994):

$$EF \text{ (g/gal)} = \exp[-1.2798 - 0.0049(\Delta T) + 0.0203(Td) + 0.1315(RVP)]$$

Here delta T is the difference in temperature between the fuel in the tank and the fuel being dispensed, and Td is the temperature of the gasoline being dispensed. EPA assumed delta T is zero, and the temperature of the fuel being dispensed averages 60 °F over the year.

Average summer RVPs at the Petroleum Administration for Defense Districts (PADD) level was used to calculate adjustments. The U.S. is broken into five PADDs for petroleum products data collection purposes via the U.S. Energy Information Administration; see: <http://www.eia.gov/oog/info/twip/padddef.html>. These PADD regions are shown in Figure 4-1.

All counties within a PADD received the same adjustment for BTP emissions. Volumes for each fuel type and summer RVPs for 2018 with EISA impacts are provided in Table 4-13 while volumes without EISA are in Table 4-14. These volumes and RVPs were obtained from analyses done for the Tier 3 rule. These two sets of volumes were used to estimate emissions using the RFS2 impacts spreadsheet (see below for details).

²⁸ Source: Energy Information Administration. 2006. Annual Energy Outlook 2006. Report #:DOE/EIA-0383(2006) Available at <http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/archive/aeo06/aeoref_tab.html>

Figure 4-1. Map of Petroleum Administration for Defense Districts (PADD)




Table 4-13. RVPs Assumed for 2018 ethanol and gasoline volumes with EISA

PADD	Total Fuel Volume	Gasoline Volume	Ethanol Volume	E10 Only Volume	E15 Only Volume	E85(74) Only Volume	Weighted RVP	Weighted E10 RVP	Weighted E15 RVP	Weighted E85 RVP
1	4.50E+10	3.99E+10	5.18E+09	3.71E+10	7.43E+09	4.73E+08	8.536	8.651	8.056	7
2	3.46E+10	3.03E+10	4.25E+09	2.31E+10	1.11E+10	3.63E+08	9.051	9.35	8.493	7
3	2.14E+10	1.89E+10	2.48E+09	1.72E+10	3.95E+09	2.25E+08	8.399	8.515	7.973	7
4	5.07E+09	4.48E+09	5.89E+08	4.06E+09	9.53E+08	5.33E+07	9.322	9.536	8.536	7
5	2.35E+10	2.08E+10	2.71E+09	1.91E+10	4.13E+09	2.47E+08	7.906	7.974	7.645	7
Total	1.30E+11	1.14E+11	1.52E+10	1.01E+11	2.75E+10	1.36E+09	8.567	8.696	8.175	7

Table 4-14. RVPs Assumed for 2018 ethanol and gasoline volumes without EISA

PADD	Total Fuel Volume	Ethanol Volume	Gasoline Volume	E0 Only Volume	E10 Only Volume	Weighted RVP	Weighted E0 RVP	Weighted E10 RVP
1	4.42E+10	2.47E+09	4.17E+10	1.95E+10	2.47E+10	8.63	8.301	8.883
2	3.38E+10	1.92E+09	3.19E+10	1.47E+10	1.92E+10	9.48	8.925	9.907
3	2.09E+10	1.02E+09	1.99E+10	1.07E+10	1.02E+10	8.77	8.391	9.166
4	4.96E+09	2.54E+08	4.71E+09	2.43E+09	2.54E+09	9.18	8.674	9.674
5	2.30E+10	1.27E+09	2.17E+10	1.03E+10	1.27E+10	7.77	7.602	7.911
Total	1.27E+11	6.93E+09	1.20E+11	5.76E+10	6.93E+10	8.75	8.372	9.059

DRAFT

A benzene g/mmgal emission factor for 2018 was based on benzene inventory projections used in the 2011 Cross-State Air Pollution Rule and projected gasoline volumes obtained from the Annual Energy Outlook 2011 Early Release Overview. This emission factor was used to estimate g/mmBTU emission factors based on the energy content of E0, E10, and E15 gasoline. Aside from energy content, EPA did not account for the effect of other fuel parameters on emission rates for E0, E10, and E15 blends. Thus, the E10 emission rate is slightly higher than the E0 rate due to the lower energy content of E10, and the E15 emission rate is higher still. The E85 emission rate was estimated for the RFS2 rule. Emission factors are summarized in Table 4-17.

Table 4-15. Storage and Transport Vapor Loss Emission Factors (g/mmBtu)

Process	Fuel	Benzene
BTP	E0	0.250
	E10	0.259
	E15	0.264
	E85	0.023
RBT/BPS	E0	0.059

These emission factors for VOC and benzene were used in conjunction with an updated version of EPA’s spreadsheet model for upstream emission impacts, developed for the RFS2 rule, to estimate PADD level inventory changes of the changes in gasoline volume in 2018 with 2007 ethanol volumes versus projected volumes with EISA. VOC inventory changes were used to develop nationwide adjustment factors that were applied to modeling platform inventory SCCs associated with storage and transport processes (see Table 4-16). Benzene emission estimates were obtained either by application of the adjustments in Table 4-16 or through speciation of VOC in SMOKE.

Table 4-16. Adjustment factors applied to storage and transport emissions

Year	Process	PADD	Pollutant	Adjustment Factor
2018	BTP	1	VOC	0.9515
			benzene	0.9905
		2	VOC	0.9619
			benzene	0.9882
		3	VOC	0.9778
			benzene	0.9879
		4	VOC	0.8983
			benzene	0.9885
		5	VOC	0.9430
			benzene	0.9901
	RBT/BPS	All	VOC	0.9553
			benzene	0.9893

Ethanol emissions were estimated in SMOKE by applying the ethanol to VOC ratios from headspace profiles to VOC emissions for E10 and E15, and an evaporative emissions profile for E85. These ratios are 0.065 for E10, 0.272 for E15, and 0.61 for E85. The E10 and E15 profiles were obtained from an ORD analysis of

DRAFT

fuel samples from EPA's exhaust test program²⁹ and have been submitted for incorporation into the EPA's SPECIATE database. The E85 profile was obtained from data collected as part of the CRC E-80 test program (Environ, 2008) and has also been submitted for incorporation into EPA's SPECIATE database. For more details on the change in speciation profiles between 2011 and 2018, see Section 3.2.1.4.

After developing emissions from the 2018 with EISA volumes versus the 2018 without EISA volumes, EPA created ratios of these two cases to apply against the 2007 platform emissions. This created a 2018 reference case. For the 2011 platform, EPA scaled the same sources so that their total emissions matched the 2018 reference case.

It should be noted that these adjustment factors are based on summer RVP, but applied to emissions for the whole calendar year. However, higher RVPs in winter corresponding to lower temperatures result in roughly the same vapor pressure of the fuel and roughly the same propensity to evaporate. Significant evaporative emissions are not expected from storage and transport of biodiesel, renewable or cellulosic diesel fuel due to their low volatility. The cumulative impacts are VOC reductions of approximately 26,075 tons across the nonpt sector and 2,681 tons in the ptnonipm sector in 2018 for these processes. See Appendix B for the complete cross-walk between SCC, and state-SCC for BTP components, and each type of petroleum transport and storage.

4.2.1.7 Pipeline and Refinery EISA adjustments (ptnonipm)

Packet: "PROJECTION_pipelines_refineries_2018ed"

Pipeline usage and refinery emissions were adjusted for changes in fuels due to the EISA. These adjustments were developed by EPA OTAQ and impact processes such as process heaters, catalytic cracking units, blowdown systems, wastewater treatment, condensers, cooling towers, flares and fugitive emissions. A portion of these impacts are discussed in this section, with additional impacts due to transport discussed in the onroad and c1c2rail sectors (see Sections 4.3.1 and 4.4.1, respectively).

Calculation of the emission inventory impacts of decreased gasoline and diesel production, due to EISA, on nationwide refinery emissions was done in EPA's spreadsheet model for upstream emission impacts (EPA, 2009b). Emission inventory changes reflecting EISA implementation were used to develop adjustment factors that were applied to inventories for each petroleum refinery in the U.S. (Table 4-17). These impacts of decreased production were assumed to be spread evenly across all U. S. refineries. Toxic emissions were estimated in SMOKE by applying speciation to VOC emissions. It should be noted that the adjustment factors in Table 4-17 are estimated relative to that portion of refinery emissions associated with gasoline and diesel fuel production. Production of jet fuel, still gas and other products also produce emissions. If these emissions were included, the adjustment factors would not be as large. The impact of the EISA-based reductions is shown in Table 4-18.

²⁹ U.S. EPA. 2011. Hydrocarbon Composition of Gasoline Vapor Emissions from Enclosed Fuel Tanks. Office of Research and Development and Office of Transportation and Air Quality. Report No. EPA-420-R-11-018. EPA Docket EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0135.

Table 4-17. 2018 adjustment factors applied to petroleum pipelines and refinery emissions associated with gasoline and diesel fuel production.

Pollutant	Pipelines	Refineries	Both
CO	0.9964	0.9776	0.9741
NO _x	0.9819	0.9867	0.9688
PM ₁₀	0.9967	0.9839	0.9806
PM _{2.5}	0.9975	0.9789	0.9765
SO ₂	0.9981	0.9781	0.9763
NH ₃	n/a	0.9517	n/a
VOC	0.999	0.9719	0.9710

Table 4-18. Impact of refinery adjustments on 2011 emissions [tons]

Pollutant	Reductions 2018
CO	1,233
NH ₃	135
NO _x	2,256
PM ₁₀	466
PM _{2.5}	495
SO ₂	1,986
VOC	1,515

4.2.2 Upstream agricultural and Livestock adjustments (afdust, ag, nonpt, ptnonipm)

Packet: "PROJECTION_2011_2018_ag_including_upstream_OTAQ_25nov2013_v1"

Inventory adjustments were previously developed for 2030 as part of final RFS2 rule modeling³⁰. For the Tier 3 proposal, adjustments for 2017 were scaled by the ratio of 2017 renewable fuel volumes versus 2030 volumes. Although 2018 was modeled for this rule rather than 2017, EPA continued to use the 2017 adjustments. Impacts on farm equipment emissions were not accounted for, however. Emission rates from the GREET model (fertilizer and pesticide production)³¹ or based on the 2002 National Emissions Inventory (fertilizer and pesticide application, agricultural dust, livestock waste) were combined with estimates of agricultural impacts from FASOM (Forest and Agricultural Section Optimization Model). Since FASOM modeling used a reference case of 13.2 billion gallons of ethanol, impacts used in the modeling for this rule are underestimates.

Adjustment factors are provided in Table 4-19. These adjustments were applied equally to all counties having any of the affected sources. This is an area of uncertainty in the inventories, since there would likely be variation from one county to another depending on how much of the predicted agricultural changes occurred in which counties. By using percent change adjustments rather than attempting to calculate absolute ton changes in each county, EPA has attempted to minimize the inventory distortions that could occur if the calculated change for a given county was out of proportion to the reference case emissions for

³⁰ U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2010. Renewable Fuel Standard Program (RFS2) Regulatory Impact Analysis. Assessment and Standards Division, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Ann Arbor, MI. Report No. EPA-420-R-10-006, February, 2010. Available at <<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/renewablefuels/regulations.htm>>.

³¹ GREET, version 1.8c. Available at <<http://greet.es.anl.gov/>>.

DRAFT

that county. For instance, a different approach could estimate reductions that were larger than the reference case emissions, since there was no linkage between the 2011NEIv1 inventories and the FASOM modeling. The specific sources (SCCs) and affected pollutants that these adjustments were applied to are listed in a docket reference³².

Table 4-19. Adjustments to modeling platform agricultural emissions for the Tier 3 reference case

Source Description	Adjustment
Nitrogen fertilizer application	1.0242
Fertilizer production, mixing/blending	1.0603
Pesticide production	0.9544
Agricultural tilling/loading dust	1.0079
Agricultural burning	1.000
Livestock dust	0.9868
Livestock waste	0.9901

For the animal waste sources, EPA also estimated animal population growth in ammonia (NH₃) and dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) emissions from livestock in the ag and afdust and ptnonipm sectors. Therefore, a composite set of projection factors is needed for animal operations that also reflect the minor 0.99% decrease resulting from the EISA mandate. These composite projection factors by animal category are provided in Table 4-20. As discussed below, dairy cows and turkeys are assumed to have no growth in animal population, and therefore the projection factor for these animals is the same as the upstream agriculture-related projection factor. The PROJECTION packet used for these sources, including the cross-reference to the animal categories listed in Table 4-20 and the source categories in Table 4-19 is provided on the 2011v6 platform website in ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2011v6/v1platform/2018emissions/CoST_packets/.

Table 4-20. Composite NH₃ projection factors to year 2018 for animal operations

Animal Category	Projection Factor
Dairy Cow	0.9901
Beef	0.9851
Pork	1.0582
Broilers	1.0904
Turkeys	0.9290
Layers	1.0629
Poultry Average	1.0557
Overall Average	1.0310

Except for dairy cows and turkey production, the animal projection factors are derived from national-level animal population projections from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Food and Agriculture Policy and Research Institute (FAPRI). This methodology was initiated in 2005 for the 2005 NEI, but was updated on July 24, 2012 in support of the 2007v5 platform (EPA, 2012) and 2011 to 2018 animal population projections were computed for these 2011v6 projections to year 2018. For dairy cows, EPA assumed that there would be no growth in emissions based on little change in U.S. dairy cow populations from year 2011 through 2018 according to linear regression analyses of the FAPRI projections. This assumption was based on an analysis of historical trends in the number of such animals compared to production rates. Although productions rates have increased, the number of animals has declined. Based on this analysis, EPA concluded that production forecasts do not provide representative estimates of the future

³² U. S. EPA. 2011. Spreadsheet “agricultural sector adjustments.xls.” Docket EPA–HQ–OAR–2011–0135.

DRAFT

number of cows and turkeys; therefore, these forecasts were not used for estimating future-year emissions from these animals. In particular, the dairy cow population is projected to decrease in the future as it has for the past few decades; however, milk production will be increasing over the same period. Note that the ammonia emissions from dairies are not directly related to animal population but also nitrogen excretion. With the cow numbers going down and the production going up the excretion value will change, but no change was assumed because a quantitative estimate was not available. Appendix G provides the animal population data and regression curves used to derive the growth factors.

4.2.3 Residential wood combustion growth (nonpt)

Packet: "PROJECTION_2011v6_2018bau_RWC_25nov2013.txt"

EPA used a "business as usual" (BAU) approach to Residential Wood Combustion (RWC) projections that does not account for national New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for wood stoves, since they are currently in the comment-seeking process from proposal (EPA, 2013a and available at: <http://www2.epa.gov/residential-wood-heaters/proposed-new-source-performance-standards-residential-wood-heaters>). EPA projected residential wood combustion (RWC) emissions to the year 2018 based on expected increases and decreases in various residential wood burning appliances. As newer, cleaner woodstoves replace *some* older, higher-polluting wood stoves, there will be an overall reduction of the emissions from older "dirty" stoves but an overall increase in total RWC due to population and sales trends in all other types of wood burning devices such as indoor furnaces and outdoor hydronic heaters (OHH). It is important to note that our RWC projection methodology does not explicitly account for state or local residential wood control programs. There are a number state and local rules in place, specifically in California, Oregon and Washington. However, at this time, EPA does not have enough detailed information to calculate state specific or local area growth rates. Therefore, with the exception of California, Oregon and Washington, EPA is using national level growth rates for each RWC SCC category. After discussions with California air districts, regional office contacts and EPA experts, EPA decided to simply hold RWC emissions flat (unchanged) for all SCCs in California, Oregon and Washington.

The development of projected growth in RWC emissions to year 2018 starts with the projected growth in RWC appliances derived from year 2012 appliance shipments reported in the Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) for Proposed Residential Wood Heaters NSPS Revision Final Report (EPA, 2013b), also available at: <http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2013-12/documents/ria-20140103.pdf>. The 2012 shipments are based on 2008 shipment data and revenue forecasts from a Frost & Sullivan Market Report (Frost & Sullivan, 2010). Next, to be consistent with the RIA (EPA, 2013b), growth rates for new appliances for certified wood stoves, pellet stoves, indoor furnaces and OHH were based on forecasted revenue (real GDP) growth rate of 2.0% per year from 2013 through 2018 as predicted by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA, 2012). While this approach is not perfectly correlated, in the absence of specific shipment projections, the RIA assumes the overall trend in the projection is reasonable. The growth rates for appliances not listed in the RIA (fireplaces, outdoor wood burning devices (not elsewhere classified) and residential fire logs) are estimated based on the average growth in the number of houses between 2002 and 2012, about 1% (U.S. Census, 2012).

In addition to new appliance sales and forecasts extrapolating beyond 2012, assumptions on the replacement of older, existing appliances are needed. Based on long lifetimes, no replacement of fireplaces, outdoor wood burning devices (not elsewhere classified) or residential fire logs is assumed. It is assumed that 95% of new woodstoves will replace older non-EPA certified freestanding stoves (pre-1988 NSPS) and 5% will replace existing EPA-certified catalytic and non-catalytic stoves that currently meet the 1988 NSPS (Houck, 2011).

DRAFT

EPA RWC NSPS experts assume that 10% of new pellet stoves and OHH replace older units and that because of their short lifespan, that 10% of indoor furnaces are replaced each year. These are the same assumptions used in the 2007 emissions modeling platform (EPA, 2012d). The resulting growth factors for these appliance types varies by appliance type and also by pollutant because the emission rates, from EPA RWC tool (EPA, 2013rwc), vary by appliance type and pollutant. For our non-NSPS projection approach, the projection factors are the same for all pollutants except for EPA certified woodstoves of all types. For EPA certified units, the projection factors for PM are lower than those for all other pollutants. The projection factors also vary because the total number of existing units in 2011 varies greatly between appliance types.

California did not report detailed SCCs in the 2011NEIv1, simply reporting emissions from general fireplaces (SCC=2104008100) and general woodstoves (SCC=2104008300). California, Oregon and Washington also have state-level RWC control programs, including local burn bans in place. Without appliance counts in California at specific appliance types (e.g., certified versus non-certified), and an inability to incorporate significant local RWC control programs/burn bans for a future year inventory, EPA decided to leave all RWC emissions unchanged in the future for all three states. The RWC projections factors for 2018 for states other than California, Oregon and Washington are provided in Table 4-23. EPA-certified woodstoves (inserts and freestanding) utilize different projection factors for direct PM than all other pollutants.

Table 4-21. Non-West Coast RWC projection factors to year 2018

Pollutant	SCC	Description	Projection Factor
All	2104008100	Fireplace: general	1.072
All	2104008210	Woodstove: fireplace inserts; non-EPA certified	0.897
PM	2104008220	Woodstove: fireplace inserts; EPA certified; non-catalytic	1.076
All other	2104008220	Woodstove: fireplace inserts; EPA certified; non-catalytic	1.181
PM	2104008230	Woodstove: fireplace inserts; EPA certified; catalytic	1.081
All other	2104008230	Woodstove: fireplace inserts; EPA certified; catalytic	1.181
All	2104008300	Woodstove: freestanding, general	1.171
All	2104008310	Woodstove: freestanding, non-EPA certified	0.98
PM	2104008320	Woodstove: freestanding, EPA certified, non-catalytic	1.076
All other	2104008320	Woodstove: freestanding, EPA certified, non-catalytic	1.181
PM	2104008330	Woodstove: freestanding, EPA certified, catalytic	1.081
All other	2104008330	Woodstove: freestanding, EPA certified, catalytic	1.181
All	2104008400	Woodstove: pellet-fired, general (freestanding or FP insert)	1.645
All	2104008510	IF: Indoor Furnaces: cordwood-fired, non-EPA certified	1.103
All	2104008610	OHH: Outdoor Hydronic heaters	1.237
All	2104008700	Outdoor wood burning device, NEC (e.g., fire-pits, chimneas)	1.072
All	2104009000	Residential firelog total; all combustor types	1.072

The national impact of RWC projections for PM_{2.5} and NO_x by SCC are provided in Table 4-24. Regionally, these impacts vary considerably depending on the distribution of these appliance types. For example, RWC emissions increase more in areas with a higher proportion on OHH (Great Lakes and Northeast).

DRAFT

Table 4-22. National RWC impacts for PM_{2.5} and NO_x from 2011 to 2018

SCC	Description	PM _{2.5}			NO _x		
		2011	2018	Difference	2011	2018	Difference
2104008100	Fireplace: general	66,699	70,422	3,723	7,263	7,673	410
2104008210	Woodstove: fireplace inserts; non-EPA certified	49,336	44,788	-4,548	4,514	4,098	-416
2104008220	Woodstove: fireplace inserts; EPA certified; non-catalytic	11,420	12,130	710	1,328	1,525	197
2104008230	Woodstove: fireplace inserts; EPA certified; catalytic	4,205	4,482	277	412	473	61
2104008300	Woodstove: freestanding, general	9,525	9,525	0	1,079	1,079	0
2104008310	Woodstove: freestanding, non-EPA certified	83,842	82,321	-1,521	7,672	7,533	-139
2104008320	Woodstove: freestanding, EPA certified, non-catalytic	17,998	19,129	1,131	2,094	2,407	313
2104008330	Woodstove: freestanding, EPA certified, catalytic	10,838	11,520	682	1,063	1,212	149
2104008400	Woodstove: pellet-fired, general (freestanding or FP insert)	1,747	2,719	972	2,169	3,377	1,208
2104008510	IF: Indoor Furnaces: cordwood-fired, non-EPA certified	26,432	29,052	2,620	1,759	1,933	174
2104008610	OHH: Outdoor Hydronic heaters	79,163	97,910	18,747	2,290	2,832	542
2104008700	Outdoor wood burning device, NEC (e.g., fire-pits, chimneas)	20,573	21,916	1,343	2,266	2,414	148
2104009000	Residential firelog total; all combustor types	6,511	6,939	428	1,762	1,877	115
Total	Total RWC	388,289	412,853	24,564	35,671	38,433	2,762

4.2.4 Oil and Gas projections (np_oilgas, pt_oilgas)

Packet: PROJECTION_2011v6_2018_oilgas_27nov2013.txt


The oil and gas point (pt_oilgas) and nonpoint (np_oilgas) sectors are modeled separately from the remaining point (ptnonipm) and nonpoint (nonpt) sector emissions primarily to better track/isolate and summarize the oil and gas projections from 2011 to future years. EPA is aware that these emissions inventories are subject to much scrutiny in the base year (2011) as well as growth and control assumptions in the coming years. Our initial approach at projecting these emissions is a simple regional-level Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2013-based methodology with some associated VOC reduction factors for sources that would be subject to New Source Performance Standards (NSPS). The methodology EPA describes here was a result of a coordinated effort between EPA OAQPS and EPA Office of Atmospheric Programs (OAP) Climate Change Division (CCD).

The AEO-2013 regional growth factors are based on 2011 to 2018 oil production, gas production and combined oil and gas production trends, available in Supplemental tables for regional detail, Table 131 and Table 132 at: http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/tables_ref.cfm. These National Energy Modeling System

DRAFT

(NEMS) regions are shown in Figure 4-2 and demonstrate one of the many limitations of this projection strategy: projections are not based on oil/gas basin but rather, much larger geographic regions. A county-NEMS region cross-walk was developed to assign counties in New Mexico and Texas to specific NEMS regions.

Figure 4-2. Oil and Gas NEMS Regions



Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration, Office of Energy Analysis.

The AEO-2013 provides regional growth factors for oil production and gas production; however, numerous sources (SCCs) in the 2011 platform are ambiguous regarding the type of product being extracted/produced. These sources were assigned to a combined oil and gas category set of factors where oil and natural gas production levels were summed using a barrel-of-oil equivalent of 0.178 barrels of crude oil to 1000 cubic feet of natural gas. The AEO-based projection factors for each products type and NEMS region, provided in Table 4-25, are applied to for all pollutants and SCCs in the point and nonpoint oil and gas sector inventories, with the exception of VOC for select SCCs. The two character region codes (e.g., “NE” for Northeast region) are relevant in the following discussion on VOC projection factors.

DRAFT

Table 4-23. AEO-based 2018 Projection Factors

Region	Oil	Gas	Oil/Gas
Northeast (NE)	1.238	1.596	1.572
Gulf Coast (GC)	1.853	1.246	1.368
Midcontinent (MC)	1.165	0.910	0.955
Southwest (SW)	1.391	1.043	1.173
Rocky Mountains (RM)	1.642	1.098	1.243
West Coast (WC)	0.865	0.993	0.888

For select VOC processes, SCCs were identified that were likely to be affected by NSPS and verified with EPA OAP and OAQPS oil and gas sector experts. NSPS reductions for VOC-only were applied in composite with AEO-based regional growth factors to create a set of “net” growth factors. These NSPS VOC reductions are consistent with EPA OAP-led Climate Action Report, available at: <http://www.state.gov/e/oes/rls/rpts/car6/index.htm>. The VOC NSPS reductions specifically, are discussed in Section 2 of the “Methodologies for U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Projections” document available at: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/219472.pdf>. These composite projection factors for VOC NSPS sources are provided in Table 4-24.

There were several assumptions in the application of NSPS VOC reductions. NSPS VOC reductions were only applied to increase (if any) of emissions from 2011 to 2018 as provided by the AEO projection factor. If AEO-based gas or oil production was projected to decrease in 2018 versus 2011, then NSPS reductions had no impact. One exception, highlighted in Table 4-24, is for natural gas well completions; these “one-shot” activities are generally short-term year to year processes and therefore NSPS reductions are applied to the entire 2018 projected estimates. Other important assumptions are:

- Emissions change linearly with production-level changes (AEO projections)
- In the absence of local/state rules, existing equipment will continue to be used and there is no replacement of capital that would be affected by the NSPS; the NSPS only affects growth for processes other than natural gas well completions.
- Engine-related regulatory impacts are accounted for separately (see RICE NESHAP in the following section)
- EPA did not attempt to account for or quantify the potential reductions due to the oil and natural gas NESHAP
- Secondary emissions related to NSPS reductions were not accounted for (e.g, NO_x emissions arising from the combustion of VOC emissions)

EPA acknowledges that these assumptions are not ideal, particularly the linear scaling of production changes to emissions for all processes. EPA hopes that future refinement of this methodology, particularly for large processes with highly-reactive pollutants such as glycol dehydrators, improve this aspect of oil and gas projections.

DRAFT

Table 4-24. Oil and Gas sector VOC 2018 Projection Factors for NSPS sources

SCCs	SCC Level 4	NSPS Source	NSPS Reduction	Resource	Region	AEO Factor	VOC NSPS (Final) Factor	
2310030210; 2310030300; 2310021010	Gas Well Tanks - Flashing & Standing/Working/Breathing, Uncontrolled; Gas Well Water Tank Losses; Storage Tanks: Condensate	Storage Tanks	70.3%	Gas	NE	1.596	1.177	
					GC	1.246	1.073	
					MC	0.910	0.910	
					SW	1.043	1.013	
					RM	1.098	1.029	
					WC	0.993	0.993	
2310010200; 2310011020	Oil Well Tanks - Flashing & Standing/Working/Breathing; Storage Tanks: Crude Oil			Oil	NE	1.238	1.071	
					GC	1.853	1.253	
					MC	1.165	1.049	
					SW	1.391	1.116	
					RM	1.642	1.191	
					WC	0.865	0.865	
31000222; 2310121700; 2310021601; 2310021602	Drilling and Well Completion; Gas Well Completion: All Processes; Gas Well Venting - Initial Completions; Gas Well Venting – Recompletions	Gas Well Completions	95.0%	Gas	NE	1.596	0.080	
					GC	1.246	0.062	
					MC	0.910	0.045	
					SW	1.043	0.052	
					RM	1.098	0.055	
					WC	0.993	0.050	
2310021300	Gas Well Pneumatic Devices	Pneumatic controllers	77.0%	Gas	NE	1.596	1.137	
					GC	1.246	1.056	
					MC	0.910	0.910	
					SW	1.043	1.010	
					RM	1.098	1.023	
					WC	0.993	0.993	
31000325; 31000324	Pneumatic Controllers High Bleed >6 scfm; Pneumatic Controllers Low Bleed			Gas	100.0%	NE	1.596	1.000
						GC	1.246	1.000
						MC	0.910	0.910
						SW	1.043	1.000
						RM	1.098	1.000
						WC	0.993	0.993
2310010300	Oil Well Pneumatic Devices	Oil	77.0%	NE	1.238	1.055		
				GC	1.853	1.196		
				MC	1.165	1.038		
				SW	1.391	1.090		
				RM	1.642	1.148		
				WC	0.865	0.865		
31000309	Compressor Seals	Compressor Seals	79.9%	Gas	NE	1.596	1.120	
					GC	1.246	1.049	
					MC	0.910	0.910	
					SW	1.043	1.009	
					RM	1.098	1.020	
					WC	0.993	0.993	

DRAFT

The national impact of the AEO-based projections for oil and gas sector point and nonpoint inventories is shown in Table 4-27. As previously-discussed, these projections vary by product type, NEMS region and for some processes for VOC NSPS controls. The smaller percent increase in VOC due to NSPS controls is evident. The larger percent growth in NH₃ is an artifact of Virginia containing 77 of the 112 tons; Virginia being in the Northeast NEMS region, has gas production increasing 59.6% according to AEO projections in Table 4-23.

Table 4-25. Projected national Oil and Gas sector 2011 and 2018 emissions, summed point and nonpoint

Pollutant	2011	2018	Increase	Percent Difference
CO	662,762	807,868	145,107	22%
NH ₃	112	159	47	42%
NO _x	670,245	817,136	146,891	22%
PM ₁₀	23,587	29,248	5,661	24%
PM _{2.5}	19,008	23,537	4,529	24%
SO ₂	72,337	91,054	18,716	26%
VOC	2,360,726	2,664,887	304,161	13%

National, and even NEMS-region projections are not representative of the trends in each state for many of the reasons already discussed. Emissions projections also vary by state depending on the proportion of gas, oil and gas/oil (undefined) emissions in the inventory for that state. For this reason, EPA provided VOC and NO_x state-level projections for the oil and gas sector in Table 4-28.

Table 4-26. Projected by-state NO_x and VOC 2011 and 2018 Oil and Gas sector emissions

State	VOC 2011	VOC 2018	VOC Difference	NO _x 2011	NO _x 2018	NO _x Difference
Alabama	22,445	26,400	3,954	11,309	14,178	2,869
Arizona	78	90	12	15	18	3
Arkansas	9,019	8,140	-879	11,573	10,790	-783
California	15,829	14,203	-1,626	3,179	2,976	-203
Colorado	238,717	209,628	-29,090	29,860	37,636	7,776
Connecticut	1	1	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	3,179	3,846	667	180	237	58
Georgia	3	4	1	16	25	9
Idaho	7	9	2	0	0	0
Illinois	27,313	31,029	3,715	9,293	14,121	4,828
Indiana	9,694	11,574	1,880	6,189	9,648	3,459
Iowa	36	33	-3	2	2	0
Kansas	94,601	96,185	1,584	56,613	53,677	-2,936
Kentucky	24,958	32,322	7,364	24,448	38,803	14,355
Louisiana	117,324	143,754	26,429	49,701	65,351	15,649
Maine	16	26	9	0	0	0
Maryland	8	11	3	12	19	7
Massachusetts	22	35	13	0	0	0
Michigan	28,377	35,758	7,382	17,682	28,002	10,320
Minnesota	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	26,248	33,407	7,159	3,492	4,558	1,066
Missouri	79	81	2	17	17	0

DRAFT

State	VOC 2011	VOC 2018	VOC Difference	NO _x 2011	NO _x 2018	NO _x Difference
Nebraska	2,374	2,495	121	901	864	-37
Nevada	440	553	113	20	26	6
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	13	21	7	1	2	0
New Mexico	139,402	148,382	8,980	42,277	46,874	4,597
New York	8,222	11,379	3,157	606	944	338
North Dakota	96,873	117,943	21,070	6,375	8,225	1,851
Ohio	10,321	11,996	1,675	322	507	184
Oklahoma	231,536	220,820	-10,717	83,337	77,766	-5,571
Oregon	45	45	-1	41	41	0
Pennsylvania	18,947	25,959	7,012	40,604	64,481	23,877
South Carolina	9	14	5	0	0	0
South Dakota	1,444	1,718	274	256	304	47
Tennessee	2,700	3,182	482	1,548	2,432	884
Texas	969,231	1,150,990	181,759	193,512	226,694	33,182
Utah	131,497	157,230	25,733	21,128	26,013	4,885
Virginia	6,628	9,509	2,880	9,577	15,285	5,708
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	43,422	60,296	16,873	30,346	48,391	18,045
Wisconsin	0	0	0	1	1	0
Wyoming	42,977	53,237	10,260	2,785	3,330	544
Total	2,360,726	2,664,887	304,161	670,245	817,136	146,891

Note, the national and state-level summaries provided in Table 4-25 and Table 4-26 do not include reductions from the RICE NESHAP. EPA is also aware that early release AEO 2014 projections (available at: [http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/er/pdf/0383er\(2014\).pdf](http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/er/pdf/0383er(2014).pdf)) became available in December 2013. Overall, it appears that oil production increases significantly in the draft AEO 2014 compared to the AEO 2013 projections, about 22% higher by 2019 in the draft AEO 2014 projection versus the AEO 2013 projection. There appears to be less significant increase, about 11%, in projections for natural gas in the draft 2014 AEO versus AEO 2013.

4.2.5 RICE NESHAP (nonpt, ptnonipm, np_oilgas, pt_oilgas)

Packet: CONTROL_RICE_incl_SO2_2007v5_27nov2013.txt

There are three rulemakings for National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines (RICE). These rules reduce HAPs from existing and new RICE sources. In order to meet the standards, existing sources with certain types of engines will need to install controls. In addition to reducing HAPs, these controls have co-benefits that also reduce CAPs, specifically, CO, NO_x, VOC, PM, and SO₂. In 2014 and beyond, compliance dates have passed for all three rules; thus all three rules are included in the emissions projection. These RICE reductions also reflect the recent (proposed January, 2012) Reconsideration Amendments, which results in significantly less stringent NO_x controls (fewer reductions) than the 2010 final rules.

The rules can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/icengines/> and are listed below:

DRAFT

- National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines; Final Rule (69 FR 33473) published 06/15/04
- National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines; Final Rule (FR 9648) published 03/03/10
- National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines; Final Rule (75 FR 51570) published 08/20/2010

The difference among these three rules is that they focus on different types of engines, different facility types (major for HAPs, versus area for HAPs) and different engine sizes based on horsepower. In addition, they have different compliance dates, though all are after 2011 and fully implemented prior to 2018. EPA projects CAPs from the 2011NEIv1 RICE sources, based on the requirements of the rule for existing sources only because the inventory includes only existing sources and the current projection approach does not estimate emissions from new sources.

The Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) for the Reconsideration of the Existing Stationary Compression Ignition (CI) Engines NESHAP: Final Report (EPA, 2013ci) is available at: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/RICE_NESHAPreconsideration_Compression_Ignition_Engines_RIA_final2013_EPA.pdf. The Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) for Reconsideration of the Existing Stationary Spark Ignition (SI) RICE NESHAP: Final Report (EPA, 2013si) is available at: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/NESHAP_RICE_Spark_Ignition_RIA_finalreconsideration2013_EPA.pdf. Together, EPA calls these the RICE NESHAP amendment RIA's for SI and CI engines. From these RICE NESHAP RIA documents, EPA obtained cumulative RICE reductions for all SCCs represented by CI and SI engines. These aggregate reductions and percent reductions from baseline emissions (not the 2011NEIv1) are provided in Table 4-27.

Table 4-27. Summary RICE NESHAP SI and CI percent reductions prior to 2011NEIv1 analysis

	CO	NO _x	PM	SO ₂	VOC
RIA Baseline: SI engines	637,756	932,377			127,170
RIA Reductions: SI engines	22,211	9,648			9,147
RIA Baseline: CI engines	81,145		19,369	11,053	79,965
RIA Reductions: CI engines	14,238		2,818	5,100	27,142
RIA Cumulative Reductions	36,449	9,638	2,818	5,100	36,289
SI % reduction	3.5%	1.0%	n/a	n/a	7.2%
CI % reduction	17.5%	n/a	14.5%	46.1%	33.9%

These RIA percent reductions were used as an upper-bound for reducing emissions from RICE SCCs in the 2011NEIv1 point and nonpoint modeling sectors (ptnonipm, nonpt, pt_oilgas and np_oilgas). To begin with, the RIA inventories are based on the 2005 NEI, so EPA wanted to ensure that our 2011 reductions did not exceed those in the RICE RIA documents. For the 2011 platform EPA worked with EPA RICE NESHAP experts and developed a fairly simple approach to estimate RICE NESHAP reductions. Most SCCs in the inventory are not broken down by horsepower size range, mode of operation (e.g., emergency mode), nor major versus area source type. Therefore, EPA summed NEI emissions nationally by-SCC for RICE sources and also for sources that were at least partially IC engines (e.g., “Boiler and IC engines”). Then, EPA applied the RIA percent reductions to the 2011NEIv1 for SCCs where national totals exceeded 100 tons; EPA chose 100 tons as a threshold arbitrarily, assuming there would be little to no application of RICE NESHAP controls on smaller sources. Next, EPA aggregated these national reductions by engine type (CI

DRAFT

vs. SI) and pollutant and compared these to the RIA reductions. As expected, for most pollutants and engine types, our cumulative reductions were significantly less than those in the RIA. The only exception was for SO₂ CI engines, where EPA opted to scale the RIA percent reduction from 46.1% to 10.2% for four broad nonpoint SCCs that were not restricted to only RICE engines. These four SCCs were the “Boilers and IC Engines” or “All processes” that would presumably contain some fraction of non-RICE component. Reducing the SO₂ percent reduction for these four SCCs resulted in slightly less than 5,100 tons of SO₂ reductions overall from only RICE NESHAP controls. However, more specific CoST projection packets would later override these RICE NESHAP reductions. Recall the CoST hierarchy discussed earlier; these RICE NESHAP reductions are national by pollutant and SCC and thus easily overridden by more-specific information such as state-level fuel sulfur rules (discussed in the next section). Impacts of the RICE NESHAP controls on nonpt, ptnonipm, pt_oilgas and np_oilgas sector emissions are provided in Table 4-28.

Table 4-28. National by-sector reductions from RICE Reconsideration Controls

Pollutant	Nonpoint Oil & Gas (np_oilgas)	Point Oil & Gas (pt_oilgas)	Nonpoint (nonpt)	Point (ptnonipm)	Total
CO	1,865	95	8,838	7,167	17,964
NO _x	1,101	94	1,976	2,033	5,205
PM ₁₀	0	0	1,201	300	1,501
PM _{2.5}	0	0	1,120	282	1,402
SO ₂	1,699	0	1,571	1,049	4,319
VOC	6,249	52	1,304	4,074	11,679

4.2.6 Fuel sulfur rules (nonpt, ptnonipm)

Packet: CONTROL_SULF_2011v6_2018_27nov2013.txt

Fuel sulfur rules that were signed by November, 2013 are limited to Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and Vermont. The fuel limits for these states are incremental starting after year 2012, but are fully implemented before June 30, 2018 in all of these states. Other states in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic had pending sulfur rules but were not finalized prior to November, 2013 -the completion date of the 2011 platform year-2018 projection. Background on most of these enforceable and pending fuel sulfur rules can be found here:

http://www.ilta.org/LegislativeandRegulatory/MVNRLM/NEUSASulfur%20Rules_09.2010.pdf. A more recent update to the status of fuel sulfur rules is provided here:

<http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=5890#>.

Connecticut

A public hearing on proposed regulations on fuel sulfur limits for heating oil via Connecticut State Agencies section 221-174-19b was held on October 9, 2013 (see <http://www.ct.gov/deep/cwp/view.asp?A=2586&Q=530284>). Effective July 1, 2018 maximum fuel sulfur content limits for distillate, residual and kerosene fuels go into effect. For distillate fuel oil or distillate fuel oil blended with biodiesel, these new limits must not exceed 15 ppm, a 99.5% reduction from 3000 ppm in the baseline and down from 500 ppm effective July 1, 2014. Residual oil or residual fuel oil blended with biodiesel fuel must not exceed 3000 ppm, a 70% reduction from today’s 1% fuel content assumption for smaller stationary sources. For kerosene, a 15 ppm limit replaces the existing 500 ppm limit, a 97% reduction.

DRAFT

Maine

The Maine Law Legislative Document (LD) 1662 sets a fuel sulfur rule effective January 1, 2014 that reduces sulfur to 15 ppm for distillate fuel, resulting in a 99.5% reduction from 3,000 ppm assumed in year 2008. Maine Law LD 1662 also states that #5 and #6 fuel oils must not exceed 0.5% by weight (500 ppm), which is a 75% reduction from an assumed 2% baseline sulfur content in 2008. These Maine sulfur content reductions are discussed here:

http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/bills_124th/billpdfs/SP062701.pdf.

Massachusetts

The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection issued a commitment in their State Implementation Plan (SIP) to adopt Phase 2 ultra low sulfur diesel (ULSD) limits by year 2016. Similar to Maine, this will reduce the sulfur content in distillate fuel to 15 ppm, a 99.5% reduction from the 3,000 ppm baseline. Additional details on the phase-in of ULSD can be found here:

<http://www.mass.gov/dep/service/online/boilwbk.pdf>

New Jersey

The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection adopted sulfur fuel content rules for kerosene and home heating distillate oil. For distillate oil, the ULSD limit of 15 ppm yields a 99.5% reduction from the 3,000 ppm baseline. For kerosene, the same 15 ppm limit is adopted, resulting in a 97% reduction from an assumed 2,000 ppm baseline. More details on these fuel sulfur limits in New Jersey can be found here:

<http://njtoday.net/2010/09/01/nj-adopts-rule-limiting-sulfur-content-in-fuel-oil/>

New York

New York also signed a law requiring ULSD to replace distillate heating oil #2, which results in a fuel sulfur content limit of 15 ppm, a 99.5% reduction from the 3,000 ppm baseline. The ULSD law (A.8642-A/S.1145-C) can be found here:

http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/rkassel/governor_paterson_signs_new_la.html and here:

<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/07/20/new-york-mandates-cleaner-heating-oil/>. New York City also includes limits by year 2015 on #4 and #6 residual oils, where fuel sulfur content must not exceed 0.5% by weight (500 ppm), a 75% reduction from an assumed 2% baseline sulfur content in 2008. By 2030, these sources must burn ULSD (15 ppm). The NYC updated Air Code, updated from the NY DEP is discussed here: http://www.nyc.gov/html/dep/html/news/dep_stories_p3-109.shtml.

Pennsylvania

Legislation has been proposed in Pennsylvania that would reduce allowable sulfur levels to 15 ppm for distillate oil, a 99.5% reduction from the 3,000 ppm baseline. While EPA typically do not include proposed rulemakings in our base projection scenarios without direction from state agencies, the existence of similar, finalized standards in neighboring Northeast census region states such as New Jersey and New York suggest this will become finalized prior to 2018. EPA can revise this, and potential application to other fuels, based on state comment or regulatory changes.

Vermont

Vermont ULSD fuel and date requirements for home heating oil are similar to those adopted in Massachusetts: a 99.5% reduction to 15 ppm from the 3,000 ppm baseline.

A summary of the sulfur rules by state, with emissions reductions is provided in Table 4-31.

Table 4-29. Summary of fuel sulfur rules by state

State/ Metro	Fuel	% reduction	2011 Emissions	2018 Emissions	2018 Reductions
CT	Distillate	99.5	12,535	347	12,188
CT	Kerosene	97			
CT	Residual	70			
ME	Distillate	99.5	7,041	706	6,335
ME	Residual	75			
MA	Distillate	99.5	19,540	98	19,443
NJ	Distillate	99.5	6,146	31	6,115
NJ	Kerosene	96.25			
NY	Distillate	99.5	32,984	1,027	31,957
NYC	Residual	75			
PA	Distillate	99.5	14,634	73	14,561
VT	Distillate	99.5	997	5	992

4.2.7 Industrial Boiler MACT reconsideration (ptnonipm)

Packet: CONTROL_BlrMACT_ptnonipm_20XX_2011v6

The Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters MACT Rule, hereafter simply referred to as the “Boiler MACT” was promulgated on January 31, 2013 based on reconsideration. Background information on the Boiler MACT can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/boiler/boilerpg.html>. The Boiler MACT promulgates national emission standards for the control of HAPs (NESHAP) for new and existing industrial, commercial, and institutional (ICI) boilers and process heaters at major sources of HAPs. The expected cobenefit for CAPs at these facilities is significant and greatest for SO₂ with lesser impacts for direct PM, CO and VOC.

Boiler MACT reductions were computed from a non-NEI database of ICI boilers. As seen in the Boiler MACT Reconsideration RIA (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/boiler/boilersriaproposalrecon111201.pdf>), this Boiler MACT Information Collection Request (ICR) dataset computed over 558,000 tons of SO₂ reductions by year 2015. However, the Boiler MACT ICR database and reductions are based on the assumption that if a unit *could* burn oil, it *did* burn oil, and often to capacity. With high oil prices and many of these units also able to burn cheaper natural gas, the 2011NEIv1 inventory has a lot more gas combustion and a lot less oil combustion than the boiler MACT database. For this reason, EPA decided to target units that potentially could be subject to the Boiler MACT and compute preliminary reductions for several CAPs prior to building a control packet.

Step 1: Extract facilities/sources potentially subject to Boiler MACT

EPA did not attempt to map each ICR unit to the NEI units, instead choosing to use a more general approach to extract NEI sources that would be potentially subject to, and hence have emissions reduced by the Boiler MACT. The NEI includes a field that indicates whether a facility is a major source of HAPs and/or CAPs. This field in our FF10 point inventory modeling file is called “FACIL_CATEGORY_CODE” and the possible values for that field are shown in Table 4-30. Because the Boiler MACT rule applies to only major sources of HAPs, EPA restricted the universe of facilities potentially subject to the Boiler MACT to those classified as HAP major or unknown (UNK). The third column indicates whether the facility was a candidate for extraction as being potentially subject to the Boiler MACT.

DRAFT

Table 4-30. Facility types potentially subject to Boiler MACT reductions

Code	Facility Category	Subject to Boiler MACT?	Description
CAP	CAP Major	N	Facility is Major based upon 40 CFR 70 Major Source definition paragraph 2 (100 tpy any CAP. Also meets paragraph 3 definition, but NOT paragraph 1 definition).
HAP	HAP Major	Y	Facility is Major based upon only 40 CFR 70 Major Source definition paragraph 1 (10/25 tpy HAPs).
HAPCAP	HAP and CAP Major	Y	Facility meets both paragraph 1 and 2 of 40 CFR 70 Major Source definitions (10/25 tpy HAPs and 100 tpy any CAP).
HAPOZN	HAP and O3 n/a Major	Y	Facility meets both paragraph 1 and 3 of 40 CFR 70 Major Source definitions (10/25 tpy HAPs and Ozone n/a area lesser tons for NO _x or VOC).
NON	Non-Major	N	Facility's Potential To Emit is below all 40 CFR 70 Major Source threshold definitions without a FESOP.
OZN	O3 n/a Major	N	Facility is Major based upon only 40 CFR 70 Major Source definition paragraph 3 (Ozone n/a area lesser tons for NO _x or VOC).
SYN	Synthetic non-Major	N	Facility has a FESOP which limits its Potential To Emit below all three 40 CFR 70 Major Source definitions.
UNK	Unknown	N	Facility category per 40 CFR 70 Major Source definitions is unknown.

From these facilities EPA extracted records (process level / release point level emissions) from our modeling file with industrial, commercial, institutional boiler or process heater SCCs. A complete list of these SCCs is provided in Appendix H. The resultant data are the NEI sources potentially subject to the Boiler MACT.

Step 2: Match fuel types and control reductions to the NEI SCCs

After obtaining the subset of 2011NEIv1 sources potentially subject to the Boiler MACT, EPA assigned each inventory SCC to a fuel type. The reductions are based on the ICR fuel types and associated controls from an April 2010 “Baseline Memo.pdf” memorandum available on the Regulations.gov website (<http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0058-0802>) under docket # EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0058-0802. These ICR fuel types and associated default controls were mapped to SCCs in our inventory using the cross-walk provided in Table 4-31. The previously-mentioned Appendix H also maps the complete list of inventory SCCs to these ICR fuel categories.

Table 4-31. Default Boiler MACT fuel percent % reductions by ICR fuel type

ICR Fuel Category	SCC Fuel Category(s)	CO	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂	VOC
Coal	coal, petroleum coke, waste coal	98.9	95.8	95	98.9
gas 1 (other)	gasified coal, hydrogen, liquified petroleum gas (LPG), propane/butane, refinery gas	1	1	1	1
gas 2	digester gas, gas, landfill gas, process gas	99.97	0	95	99.97
Bagasse	Bagasse	95.3	90	95	95.3
dry biomass	Wood	95.8	99.1	95	95.8
gas 1 (natural gas)	natural gas, unknown	1	1	1	1
heavy liquid	coal-based Synfuel, crude oil, liquid waste, methanol, residual oil, waste oil	99.9	98.3	95	99.9
light liquid	distillate oil, gasoline, kerosene, oil, other oil	99.9	93	95	99.9
wet biomass	solid waste, wood/bark waste	85.5	99.2	95	85.5

The impacts of these Boiler MACT reductions on the controllable facilities and units are provided in Table 4-32. Controls were applied as “replacement” controls to prevent over-control of units that had existing

controls. However, this assumes that the inventory correctly reflects units with controls, so it is likely that some units that are not recorded as controlled in the 2011NEIv1 but are actually controlled were reduced more than they should have. Overall, the CO and PM_{2.5} reductions are reasonably close to the year-2015 expected reductions in the Boiler MACT Reconsideration RIA:

<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/boiler/boilersriaproposalrecon111201.pdf>. It is worth noting that the SO₂ reductions in the preamble (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/boiler/fr21mr11m.pdf>) were estimated at 442,000 tons; the additional SO₂ reductions in the reconsideration are from an additional cobenefit from more stringent HCl controls. The 2011NEIv1 SO₂ emissions are actually less than the estimated Boiler MACT reductions, likely a result of numerous units undergoing fuel switching from coal or oil to natural gas via changing energy prices between the Boiler MACT RIA analyses and the 2011NEIv1. It is also worth noting that EPA did not attempt to quantify the reductions of nonpoint ICI boiler emissions from Boiler MACT controls.

Table 4-32. Summary of Boiler MACT reductions (tons) compared to Reconsideration RIA reductions

Pollutant	2011 Emissions	2018 Emissions	Reductions	RIA Reductions
CO	267,685	66,682	201,003	187,000
PM _{2.5}	34,586	10,819	24,654	25,601
SO ₂	301,748	35,553	276,195	558,430
VOC	19,295	6,984	12,311	n/a

4.2.8 Portland Cement NESHAP projections (ptnonipm)

As indicated in Table 4-1, the Industrial Sectors Integrated Solutions (ISIS) model (EPA, 2010b) was used to project the cement industry component of the ptnonipm emissions modeling sector to 2018. This approach provided reductions of criteria and select hazardous air pollutants. The ISIS cement emissions were developed in support for the Portland Cement NESHAPs and the NSPS for the Portland cement manufacturing industry.

The ISIS model produced a Portland Cement NESHAP policy case of multi-pollutant emissions for individual cement kilns (emission inventory units) that were relevant for years 2015 through 2030. These ISIS-based emissions are reflected using a CoST packet for all existing kilns that are not impacted by more local information from states (or consent decrees) –see next section- and two cement inventories for new kilns:


- 1) Inventory: “cement_newkilns_year2018_from_ISIS2013_NEI2011v1”
Contains information on new cement kilns constructed after year 2011,
- 2) Inventory: “cement_newkilns_year_2018_from_ISIS2013_NEI2011v1_NONPOINT_v0”
Contains information ISIS-generated, but not-permitted, new cement kilns constructed after year 2011,
- 3) Packet: “PROJECTION_2011_2018_ISIS_cement_by_CENSUS_DIVISION_04dec2013.txt”
Contains U.S. census division level based projection factors for each NEI unit (kiln) based on ISIS updated policy case emissions at existing cement kilns. The units that closed before 2018 are included in the 2018 base case but are included in other CoST packets that reflect state comments and consent decrees (discussed in the next section).

The ISIS model, version August 2013 was used for these projections. Recent data updates include updated matching of kilns to better capture recent retirements, capacity additions and projections of capacity additions from Portland Cement Association (PCA) Plant Information Summary of December 31, 2010 and feedback from Portland Cement NESHAP reconsideration comments. Updated cement consumption projections are based on a post-recession (July 2012) PCA long-term cement consumption outlook. Updated

DRAFT

emissions controls in 2015 from the NESHAP are also reflected. Overall, as seen in Figure 4-3, domestic production of cement grows significantly between 2011 and 2015, then more slowly through 2018. Meanwhile, emissions from NESHAP-regulated pollutants such as PM and SO₂ drop significantly based on regulated emissions rates. Emissions for NO_x increase, though not as much as production because the ISIS model continues the recent trend in the cement sector of the replacement of lower capacity, inefficient wet and long dry kilns with bigger and more efficient preheater and precalciner kilns.

Figure 4-3. Cement sector trends in domestic production versus normalized emissions



Multiple regulatory requirements such as the NESHAP and NSPS currently apply to the cement industry to reduce CAP and HAP emissions. Additionally, state and local regulatory requirements might apply to individual cement facilities depending on their locations relative to ozone and PM_{2.5} nonattainment areas. The ISIS model provides the emission reduction strategy that balances: 1) optimal (least cost) industry operation, 2) cost-effective controls to meet the demand for cement, and 3) emission reduction requirements over the time period of interest.

The first step in using ISIS 2018 projected emissions the cement industry is matching the kilns in year 2018 to those in the 2011NEIv1. For kilns that were new in 2018, EPA used two different approaches for modeling. For kilns already permitted, known locations (coordinates) allowed us to process these as point sources. However, the ISIS model also created “generic” kilns in specific geographically strategic locations (counties) to cover the need for increased production/capacity in future years. Because these generic kilns are not permitted and the location in these counties is uncertain, EPA decided to model these as county-level to avoid placing large emissions sources from a model (ISIS) artifact in one grid cell. These nonpoint source kilns were then spatially allocated based on industrial land activity in the county. A list of all new point and nonpoint inventory cement kilns in 2018 are provided in Table 4-33. There are additional new kilns generated by ISIS beyond year 2018 that are not shown in this table.

Table 4-33. Locations of new ISIS-generated cement kilns

ISIS ID	Permitted?	Facility Name	FIPS	State	County
FLNEW2	Y	Vulcan	12001	FL	Aluchua
GANEW1	Y	Houston American Cement	13153	GA	Houston
NCNEW1	Y	Titan America LLC	37129	NC	New Hanover
NewGA2	N	n/a	13153	GA	Houston

DRAFT

NewPA8	N	n/a	42011	PA	Berks
NewSC1	N	n/a	45035	SC	Dorchester
NewTX1	N	n/a	48029	TX	Bexar
NewTX10	N	n/a	48091	TX	Comal
NewWA1	N	n/a	53033	WA	King

While ISIS provides by-kiln emissions for each future year, EPA cement kilns experts preferred that the Agency project existing cement kilns based on a more-smooth geographic approach to reduce the “on”/“off” switching that ISIS assigns to each kiln based on production and capacity demands. It would be inefficient and unrealistic to project existing cement kilns to operate as essentially 0% or 100% capacity based strictly on ISIS output. Therefore, EPA developed a U.S. Census Division approach where ISIS emissions in 2011 and 2018, that matched the 2011NEIv1 (e.g., not new ISIS kilns), were aggregated by pollutant for each year within each of the 9 census divisions in the contiguous U.S.

(<http://www.eia.gov/consumption/commercial/images/cendivco.gif>). These aggregate emissions were used to create a 2018/2011 emissions ratio for each pollutant and geographic area. The projection ratios, provided in Table 4-34, were then applied to all 2011NEIv1 cement kilns –except for kilns where specific local information (e.g., consent decrees/settlements/local information).

Table 4-34. U.S. Census Division ISIS-based projection factors for existing kilns

Region	Division	NO _x	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂	VOC
Midwest	East North Central	2.024	0.106	1.800	0.527
Midwest	West North Central	0.930	0.614	0.695	0.317
Northeast	Middle Atlantic	1.853	0.058	0.904	0.561
Northeast	New England	2.560	0.004	3.563	0.713
South	East South Central	0.999	0.109	0.402	0.323
South	South Atlantic	1.042	0.284	0.911	0.413
South	West South Central	1.220	0.079	0.484	0.225
West	Mountain	1.453	2.542	1.917	0.310
West	Pacific	1.465	0.001	0.300	0.321

For all ISIS future year emissions, PM₁₀ is assigned as 0.85 of total PM provided by ISIS, and PM_{2.5} is assigned as 0.45 of total PM. All new ISIS-generated kilns, point and nonpoint format, are assigned as Precalciner kilns (SCC=30500623). While ISIS provides emissions for mercury, EPA did not retain these in our modeling.

Table 4-35 shows the magnitude of the ISIS-based cement industry emissions changes between the 2011NEIv1 and 2018 projection scenario. Kilns that matched the 2011NEIv1 were simply projected to year 2018 based on U.S. census division aggregate changes in ISIS predictions. There are some local exceptions where EPA did not use ISIS-based projections for cement kilns where local information from consent decrees/settlements and state comments were used instead. Cement kilns projected using these non-ISIS information are not reflected here in Table 4-35. EPA also split out ISIS-based new kilns in 2018 with permitted (as of August 2013) kilns modeled as point sources and “generic” ISIS-generated kilns as nonpoint sources.

Table 4-35. ISIS-based cement industry change (tons/yr)

Pollutant	2011	2018	New kilns in 2018	Total	Difference 2018 -2011
-----------	------	------	-------------------	-------	-----------------------

DRAFT

	NEIv1	projected	Permitted (point)	ISIS-generated (nonpoint)	2018	
NO _x	53,874	71,205	3,751	6,836	81,792	27,919
PM _{2.5}	1,772	722	8	15	745	-1,027
SO ₂	17,065	18,629	1,775	3,263	23,667	6,602
VOC	2,690	903	91	167	1,161	-1,529

4.2.9 State comments and consent decrees/settlements (nonpt, ptnonipm)

This subsection describes the numerous (12 in all) CoST PROJECTION and CONTROL packets developed to reflect a wide range of information on future year non-EGU point and nonpoint source projections. In general, this information is derived from:

- comments received from the Cross-State Air Pollution proposal
- local and state comments over the past several years,
- consent decrees and settlements, and
- EPA staff data mining and analyses

4.2.9.1 Comments from Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (2010)

EPA released a Notice of Data Availability (NODA) after the CSAPR proposal to seek comments and improvements from states and outside agencies. The goal was to improve the future baseline emissions modeling platform prior to processing the Final CSAPR. EPA received several control programs and other responses that were used for future year projections. However, this effort was performed on a version of the 2005 modeling platform, which used the 2005NEIv2 as a base year starting point for future year projections. Now with the 2011 platform using the 2011NEIv1 for most non-EGU point and nonpoint sources, many of these controls and data improvements were removed from this 2018 base case projection. But for those controls, closures and consent decree information that are implemented after 2011, EPA used these controls/data after EPA mapped them to the correct SCCs and/or facilities in the 2011 NEI. This subsection breaks down the controls used for the nonpt and ptnonipm sectors separately, and also describes the consent decrees separately. EPA used July 1, 2011 as the cut-off date for assuming whether controls were included in the 2011 NEI. For example, if a control had a compliance date of December 2011 EPA would assume that the 2011 NEI emissions did not reflect this control and EPA would need to reflect this control in our 2018 base case. It is important to note that these controls are not comprehensive for all state/counties and source categories. These only represent post-year 2011 controls for those areas and categories where EPA received usable feedback from the CSAPR comments and related 2005 platform NODA.

Packet: "CONTROLS_CSAPR_consent_2011v6.csv"

These controls reflect consent decree and settlements that were identified in our preparation of the Final CSAPR emissions modeling platform. These controls generally consist of one or more facilities and target future year reductions. After EPA removed all consent decrees with compliance dates prior to late-2011, EPA matched the remaining controls to the 2011 NEI using a combination of EIS facility codes, "agy_facility_id", "agy_point_id" and searching the EIS. Then, EPA recomputed the percent reductions such that the future year emissions would match those for facilities originally projected from the 2005 NEI-based platform –these consent decrees were released from 2007 through 2010, when the 2005 NEI was the general baseline. EPA did not retain consent decree controls if the emissions in the 2011NEI were less than the controlled future year emissions based on the 2005 platform. EPA were left with consent decree controls in twelve states (AL, CA, IN, KS, KY, LA, MI, MS, OH, TN, TX, WY) that accounted for 2,515 tons of NO_x and 11,014 tons of SO₂ cumulative reductions.

DRAFT

Packet: “CONTROL_CSAPR_ptnonipm_2011v6_22nov2013.txt”

EPA created a CONTROL packet for the ptnonipm sector that contains reductions needed to achieve post year-2011 emissions values from the CSAPR response to comments. These reductions reflect fuel switching, cleaner fuels, and permit targets via specific information on control equipment and unit and facility zero-outs in the following states: Georgia, New Hampshire, New York and Virginia. Cumulatively, these controls reduce NO_x by 655 tons and SO₂ by 7,221 tons.

Packet: “PROJECTION_CSAPR_WVunit_ptnonipm_2012_2011v6_21nov2013.txt”

This packet contains the only post-2011 unit-level growth projection resulting from CSAPR comments. The Sunoco Chemicals Neal Plant in Wayne County West Virginia replaced a 155MM Btu/hour coal-fired boiler with a 96.72 MM Btu/hour natural gas-fired unit in 2010. This closure is already reflected in the 2011 NEI; however, in 2012, a new natural gas unit was slated to operate and therefore EPA scaled emissions at an existing natural gas boiler to match these 2012 emission targets provided to us by West Virginia via CSAPR comments. This packet simply results in an extra 22.5 tons of NO_x and minimal increased emissions for PM and SO₂.

4.2.9.2 State comments since spring of 2013

The following packets were derived from information received from several states since the spring of 2013 regarding point and nonpoint projections to year 2018.

Packets:

“PROJECTION_VA_ME_TCEQ_AL_comments_2011v6_2018_03dec2013.txt”

“CONTROL_VA_ME_TCEQ_comments_2011v6_2018_03dec2013.txt”

These packets represent primarily local closures and expected changes in future year emissions, in some cases, specified as year 2018, but otherwise simply to be used rather than the 2011 NEI values for general future year modeling. These comments from Alabama, Maine, Texas and Virginia were received in the spring through early fall of 2013. The CONTROL packet was used for specific stack/unit closures and emissions reductions. Deciding which packet type to use (PROJECTION or CONTROL) for applying state comments in CoST is fairly subjective. EPA is forced to use PROJECTION packets when emissions increase, and if EPA can get away with using only 1 type of packet (PROJECTION or CONTROL) for a single source of comments, AND, the choice does not result in different final projected values, then the packet type that best fits was used. For example, if a set of state comments results in emissions increasing and decreasing at various stacks and other CoST packets do not apply, then the packet type choice does not matter. If, however, EPA chose to represent emission decreases as a PROJECTION packet entry, and another CoST CONTROL packet applies to that source, then EPA are applying two different sources of reductions –not ideal. Our goal is for state comments to pass through to the final future year inventory as-is. For this reason, EPA does not quantify emission changes for these packets separately. The cumulative impact of these emissions is shown in Table 4-36. Note that the widespread Texas NAICS-level economic-based growth factors and impacts are discussed separately.

Table 4-36. Impacts of most non-EGU point source state comments received in 2013

State	Pollutant	2011NEIv1	2018 Projection	Change
Alabama	NO _x	2,941	3,062	120
Alabama	SO ₂	1,156	1,168	12
Maine	NO _x	178	45	-134
Maine	SO ₂	2,069	666	-1,463

DRAFT

Texas	NO _x	3,337	712	-2,625
Texas	SO ₂	8,461	229	-8,233
Texas	VOC	469	65	-404
Virginia	NO _x	8,065	4,531	-3,534
Virginia	SO ₂	1,646	2	-1,644

Packet: “PROJECTION_TCEQ_ptnonipm_NAICS_comments_2011v6_2018_04dec2013.txt”

This packet represents county-specific economic-based NAICS-level projections provided by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) for minor source emissions. Growth factors are based on projections of gross product for various types of industry, population and various economy.com data. EPA did not apply these projections to oil and gas sources, opting to use the consistent regional/fuel-based approach discussed in Section 4.2.4. A summary of these minor source ptnonipm sector projection impacts for Texas are provided in Table 4-37.

Table 4-37. Minor source ptnonipm sector NAICS-level projections for Texas

Pollutant	2011NEIv1	2018 Projection	Change
CO	114,817	136,696	21,879
NH ₃	2,099	2,619	520
NO _x	138,389	157,997	19,609
PM ₁₀	21,146	26,044	4,898
PM _{2.5}	17,301	21,384	4,084
SO ₂	21,432	28,033	6,601
VOC	62,386	79,671	17,285

Packet: “PROJECTION_TCEQ_AREA_comments_2011v6_2018_04dec2013.txt”

This packet represents nonpt sector 2011-based projections for year 2018 for Texas as provided by TCEQ. These county-level and SCC-specific projections are based on a combination of economy.com and Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) data. EPA did not apply these projections to oil and gas sources, opting to use the consistent regional/fuel-based approach discussed in Section 4.2.4. EPA also did not apply these projections to the Residential Wood Combustion sector which were the same for every RWC SCC and county, opting instead to use our national-based but SCC-specific approach discussed in Section 4.2.3. A summary of these nonpt sector changes in Texas is provided in Table 4-38.

Table 4-38. Minor source nonpt sector projections for Texas

Pollutant	2011NEIv1	2018 Projection	Change
CO	68,967	83,299	14,333
NH ₃	2,659	2,720	60
NO _x	32,581	34,329	1,748
PM ₁₀	19,999	24,416	4,416
PM _{2.5}	15,520	19,268	3,747
SO ₂	9,099	8,805	-293
VOC	239,657	256,046	16,389

4.2.9.3 Consent decrees and settlements

These packets were derived in prior emissions modeling platforms, dating back to the 2005 NEI and 2008 NEI. EPA updated this information based on information in the 2011NEIv1 and analysis for compliance dates. Many of these consent decrees were already in place in 2011 and therefore removed from

DRAFT

consideration for projections. New information (e.g., Cabot Corporation) has also been obtained since the spring of 2013 and has been included in our projections. Consent decrees or settlements released after November are not included. EPA also does not reflect consent decrees that do not have obvious quantifiable reductions for important emissions modeling pollutants (CAPs).

Packet: “CONTROL_ConsentDecree_Cabot_BlackPowderPlants_03dec2013_v0.txt”

This Cabot Corporation Clean Air Act settlement (release date of November 19, 2013) targets NO_x and SO₂ reductions of 1,975 and 12,380 tons, respectively, from three carbon black manufacturing plants in Louisiana and Texas. More information on this settlement can be found at:

<http://www2.epa.gov/enforcement/cabot-corporation-clean-air-act-settlement#reductions>.

Because EPA did not have specific stack-level information on this settlement, the Agency apportioned the total reductions proportionally to each of the three facilities such that each process in all the facilities was assigned the same percent reduction and that the cumulative NO_x and SO₂ reductions would be achieved.

Packet: “CONTROLS_Refineries_additional_consent_2011NEI_v1_25nov2013_v1.txt”

This packet consists of two settlements. The BP Whiting settlement (released May 23, 2012) is available at: <http://www2.epa.gov/enforcement/bp-whiting-settlement>. The Marathon Petroleum Company, Detroit Refinery environmental mitigation project (released April 5, 2012) is available at:

<http://www2.epa.gov/enforcement/marathon-petroleum-company-lp-and-catlettsburg-refining-llc-settlement>.

The initial application of these settlements was to the 2008 NEI. Therefore, to be consistent with previous future year estimates for these facilities, EPA modified existing computed reductions from the 2008 such that future year estimates from the 2011NEIv1 matched those done with the 2008 NEI. These settlements reduce NO_x by 78 tons at the Detroit Refinery and NO_x and SO₂ by 780 and 150 tons, respectively, at the Indiana BP Whiting facility.

Packet: “CONTROL_OECA_2011v6_25nov2013.txt”

The Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) provided emission reduction information for several consent decrees while EPA was preparing emissions for the 2005 NEI-based modeling platform (http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/emch/toxics/proposed_toxics_rule_main.pdf). The press releases for these consent decrees are available on EPA’s enforcement website (<http://www.epa.gov/enforcement/>) and some were available with quantitative emission reductions that EPA was able to convert into a control packet. These petroleum refinery settlements are available at:

<http://www2.epa.gov/enforcement/petroleum-refinery-national-case-results>. These settlements were released in the 2003-2010 time period and include information for a few corporations but with aggregate reductions over numerous facilities under these companies and subsidiaries. Therefore, EPA developed an initial table of 2008 NEI emissions summed over all affected facilities for each company. Then EPA merged the multi-facility expected reductions from each of these consent decrees to develop an overall future year (post-compliance date) emissions estimate for each company after all controls/reductions are implemented. Using this methodology, the emissions reductions were apportioned to each plant owned/operated by each company using the same percent reduction from the 2005 NEI emissions.

Now that EPA is using the 2011 NEI, the Agency2011NEIv1, expected that some of these consent decree controls/reductions would have already been applied by 2011. EPA did not want to over-control any particular plant. Therefore, EPA computed facility-specific reductions based on the controlled emissions

DRAFT

from the 2008 NEI. For example, as seen in Table 4-37, SO₂ emissions at all Cargill facilities were reduced about 24% in the 2008 NEI: from 6,921 tons to 5,280 tons. In the 2011NEIv1, SO₂ emissions at these same Cargill facilities totaled 6,263 tons, so only approximately 1,000 tons, a 16% cumulative reduction over all Cargill facilities, were needed to achieve the 5,280 consent decree target.

The column “2008 NEI Controlled” in Table 4-39 was our target for year 2018 emissions. However, many of these facilities are ethanol plants and are therefore projected separately using EPA OTAQ’s national projections for ethanol plants (see Section 4.2.1). This is a biggest issue for the Cargill facilities, a majority of which are defined as ethanol plants. Note in Table 4-39, the “applicable” (non-ethanol plants) 2011NEIv1 emissions available for OECA consent decree controls is significantly less than the sum of all Cargill facility emissions. The discrepancies between actual and applicable 2011 NEI emissions for the other OECA facilities are primarily a result of CoST hierarchy assignments. In short, more-specific (more resolved than facility/pollutant of the OECA packet) control information from other CoST packets are used for some of these stacks/units/facilities.

Table 4-39. Target company-wide reductions from OECA consent decree information

Corporation	Pollutant	2008 NEI (tons)	2008 NEI Controlled (tons)	Reductions from 2008 (tons)	2011NEIv1 Emissions (tons)	2011NEIv1 applicable (tons)	Actual 2018 Reductions
Cargill	CO	10,889	262	10,627	6,045	401	394
	NO _x	2,265	1,478	787	1,714	806	111
	SO ₂	6,921	5,280	1,642	6,263	849	172
Conoco Phillips	NO _x	14,331	7,334	6,997	9,391	9,070	2,932
Sunoco	NO _x	4,506	1,975	2,531	3,235	3,154	1,231
	PM _{2.5}	1,030	585	445	1,072	714	379
Valero	NO _x	8,212	6,109	2,103	6,676	4,913	966
	PM _{2.5}	2,554	1,955	599	2,338	1,883	718
	SO ₂	11,479	2,903	8,575	6,040	4,807	3,367
Total	CO	10,889	262	10,627	6,045	401	394
	NO _x	29,314	16,896	12,418	21,016	17,943	5,240
	PM _{2.5}	3,584	2,540	1,044	3,410	2,597	1,097
	SO ₂	18,400	8,183	10,217	12,303	5,656	3,539

Packet: “CONTROL_LaFarge_StGobain_ptnonipm_2011v6_22nov2013.txt”

This control packet includes settlements for all 15 U.S. plants owned by Saint-Gobain Containers, Inc., the nation’s second largest container glass manufacturer, and all 13 U.S. plants owned by the Lafarge Company and two subsidiaries, the nation’s second largest manufacturer of Portland cement. These settlements, released January 21, 2010, are the first system-wide settlements for these sectors under the Clean Air Act and require pollution control upgrades, acceptance of enforceable emission limits, and payment of civil penalties. The settlements require various NO_x and SO₂ controls, some of which (SO₂ scrubbers) also reduce PM emissions. A couple of Lafarge kilns were also scheduled to be shut down. One of these units was shutdown prior to 2011 and as expected, is not in the 2011NEIv1. However, a Lafarge kiln in Joppa, Illinois was unexpectedly found in the 2011NEIv1 and communication with the Illinois DEP indicated that this unit was not closed as of the summer of 2012. More information on the Lafarge settlement can be found here: <http://www2.epa.gov/enforcement/lafarge-north-america-inc-clean-air-act-settlement>. More information on the Saint-Gobain settlement is available here: <http://www2.epa.gov/enforcement/saint-gobain-containers-inc-clean-air-act-settlement>. Many of the controls for the units at these facilities were implemented prior to 2011 and were therefore removed from the

DRAFT

CONTROL packet; however, cumulatively, there is still significant reductions post-2011: 9,210 tons of NO_x, 214 tons of PM_{2.5} and 11,777 tons of SO₂.

4.2.9.4 EPA staff data mining

Packet: “CONTROLS_Regional_Haze_2011v6.csv”

This packet includes a set of NO_x and SO₂ reductions provided by EPA’s OAQPS Air Quality Policy Division (AQPD) visibility experts. These reductions reflect expected emissions reductions and future year caps for facilities of various industries (e.g., cement kilns, taconite, steel, pulp and paper and mining industries) in the following states: Georgia, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New York, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia and Wisconsin. Cumulatively, 28,589 tons of NO_x and 20,698 tons of SO₂ are reduced by these controls.

4.2.10 Aircraft projections (ptnonipm)

Aircraft emissions are contained in the ptnonipm inventory. These 2011 point-source emissions are projected to future years by applying activity growth using data on itinerant (ITN) operations at airports. The ITN operations are defined as aircraft take-offs whereby the aircraft leaves the airport vicinity and lands at another airport, or aircraft landings whereby the aircraft has arrived from outside the airport vicinity. EPA used projected ITN information available from the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) System: <http://www.apo.data.faa.gov/main/taf.asp> (publication date March, 2013). This information is available for approximately 3,300 individual airports, for all years up to 2030. The methods that the FAA used for developing the ITN data in the TAF are documented in: http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/apl/aviation_forecasts/taf_reports/media/TAF_summary_report_FY20112040.pdf.

None of our aircraft emission projections account for any control programs. EPA considered the NO_x standard adopted by the International Civil Aviation Organization’s (ICAO) Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP) in February 2004, which is expected to reduce NO_x by approximately 3% by 2020. However, this rule has not yet been adopted as an EPA (or U.S.) rule; therefore, its effects were not included in the future-year emissions projections.

EPA developed two sets of projection factors for aircraft. The first set was a simple national (U.S.) aggregation, used primarily for airports with very little activity, by ITN operation type (commercial, general aviation, military and air taxi) to be used as a default method for projecting from 2011 to 2018. The second set of projection factors was by airport, where EPA projected project emissions for each individual airport with significant ITN activity.

Packet: “PROJECTION_2011_2018_aircraft_21nov2013.txt”

In this case, EPA simply summed the ITN operations to national totals by year and aircraft operation and computed projection factors as future-year 2018 ITN by 2011-year ITN. EPA assigned factors to inventory SCCs based on the operation type shown in Table 4-40.

Table 4-40. Default national-level factors used to project 2011 base-case aircraft emissions to 2018

SCC	Description	Projection Factor
2265008005	Commercial Aircraft: 4-stroke Airport Ground Support Equipment	1.1741
2267008005	Commercial Aircraft: LPG Airport Ground Support Equipment	1.1741
2268008005	Commercial Aircraft: CNG Airport Ground Support Equipment	1.1741
2270008005	Commercial Aircraft: Diesel Airport Ground Support Equipment	1.1741

DRAFT

SCC	Description	Projection Factor
2275000000	All Aircraft Types and Operations	1.1741
2275001000	Military Aircraft, Total	0.9972
2275020000	Commercial Aviation, Total	1.1741
2275050000	General Aviation, Total	1.0199
2275050011	General Aviation, Piston	1.0199
2275050012	General Aviation, Turbine	1.0199
2275060000	Air Taxi, Total	0.9417
2275060011	Air Taxi, Total: Air Taxi, Piston	0.9417
2275060012	Air Taxi, Total: Air Taxi, Turbine	0.9417
2275070000	Commercial Aircraft: Aircraft Auxiliary Power Units, Total	1.1741
27501015	Internal Combustion Engines; Fixed Wing Aircraft L & TO Exhaust; Military; Jet Engine: JP-5	0.9972
27502011	Internal Combustion Engines; Fixed Wing Aircraft L & TO Exhaust; Commercial; Jet Engine: Jet A	1.1741
27505001	Internal Combustion Engines; Fixed Wing Aircraft L & TO Exhaust; Civil; Piston Engine: Aviation Gas	1.0199
27505011	Internal Combustion Engines; Fixed Wing Aircraft L & TO Exhaust; Civil; Jet Engine: Jet A	1.0199

Packet: “PROJECTION_2011_2018_aircraft_by_airport_21nov2013.txt”

The second set of projection factors was by airport, where EPA projected emissions for each individual airport based on the following criteria:

- ITN activity in year 2011 are greater than 1000 for any of the four available modes: commercial, general aviation, military and air taxi;
- ITN airport matched to 2011NEIv1
- ITN activity is not the same for 2011, 2018 and 2025 AND 2035. The rationale here is that these ITN data add no value if 2011 ITN data are used for all future years. These airports were projected based on the national default method.
- A hierarchical assignment was applied when the airport emissions in the NEI did not match the type of ITN information. For example, if an airport in the 2011NEIv1 contained only general aviation emissions (based on NEI SCC), and the ITN data for that airport did not contain general aviation, then commercial aviation activity was used to project these emissions. There were 11 of 15 possible hierarchical assignments used in our projection methodology where EPA assigned a “fall-back” ITN projection method to an NEI airport SCC, and most of these assignments were linked to very small NEI emissions.

A summary of the national impact of airport-specific and default national projection approaches for airports is provided in Table 4-41. Most of the significant airports, and hence increased emissions, are projected via the airport-specific projection packet. Overall, aircraft NO_x emissions increase approximately 17% between 2011 and 2018.

Table 4-41. Increases in aircraft emissions by year 2018 from airport-specific and national-level methods

	CO	NO _x	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂	VOC
2011NEIv1 total	456,212	111,575	7,362	12,563	29,687
Airport-specific increases	34,334	18,897	420	2,024	2,950
National approach increases	2,254	137	31	12	64

Total Increase in 2018	36,558	19,034	451	2,036	3,014
-------------------------------	--------	--------	-----	-------	-------

4.2.11 Remaining non-EGU controls and closures (ptnonipm)

This section describes all remaining non-EGU stationary source reductions and closures not already discussed. These CONTROL packets and CLOSURE packets generally have lesser national-level impact on future year projections than many of the items above. However, these impacts can be significant locally – particularly plant closures.

4.2.11.1 Boat Manufacturing MACT (ptnonipm)

Packet: CONTROL_MACT_BoatManuf_2007v5_03aug2012.txt

EPA included MACT rules where compliance dates were 2011 or later. EPA OAQPS Sector Policies and Programs Division (SPPD) provided all controls information related to the MACT rules, and this information is as consistent as possible with the preamble emissions reduction percentages for these rules.

A 32% reduction to VOC and VOC BAFM HAPs was applied to the Boat Manufacturing SCCs in the ptnonipm inventory. Compliance with the MACT reduction is expected to occur by use of low HAP resins and gel coats and use of non-atomized resin spray application systems. Documentation on this control is provided in the Guidance for Estimating VOC and NO_x Emission Changes from MACT Rules document (EPA, 2007b). The national impact of these reductions is 411 tons of VOC.

4.2.11.2 CISWI/HWI controls (ptnonipm)

Packet: CONTROL_CISWI_2011v6_22nov2013.txt

On March 21, 2011, EPA promulgated the revised NSPS and emission guidelines for Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration (CISWI) units. This was a response to the voluntary remand that was granted in 2001 and the vacatur and remand of the CISWI definition rule in 2007. In addition, the standards re-development included the 5-year technology review of the new source performance standards and emission guidelines required under Section 129 of the Clean Air Act (CAA). The history of the CISWI implementation is documented here: <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/129/ciwi/ciwipg.html>. Baseline and CISWI rule impacts associated with the CISWI rule are documented here: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/129/ciwi/baseline_emission_reductions_memo.pdf. EPA mapped the units from the CISWI baseline and controlled dataset to the 2011NEIv1 inventory and because the baseline CISWI emissions and the 2011NEIv1 emissions were not the same, EPA computed percent reductions such that our future year emissions matched the CISWI controlled dataset values. CISWI reductions limited to SO₂ reductions of 1,427 and 1,413 tons in Arkansas and Louisiana, respectively.

4.2.11.3 Remaining facility closures

Packets:

“CLOSURES_EIS_2011NEIv1_sep2013_25nov2013_v1.txt” &
 “CLOSURES_2008_Merged_12nov2013_v0.txt”

This section describes two CLOSURE packets. The first “EIS” packet is from a September 11, 2013 Emissions Inventory System (<http://www.epa.gov/ttnchie1/eis/gateway/>) report of post-2011 permanent facility shutdowns, based on facility status code “PS”. The second “Merged” packet is from a concatenation of previous facility and unit-level closure information used in the 2008 NEI-based emissions modeling platform (http://epa.gov/ttn/chief/emch/2007v5/2007v5_2020base_EmisMod_TSD_13dec2012.pdf). The

DRAFT

“EIS” closures impact facilities in 12 states while the “Merged” packet closures are spread out over 34 states. The cumulative reductions in emissions from this packet are shown in Table 4-42.

Table 4-42. Reductions from all EIS-based and remaining information facility/unit-level closures

Pollutant	Reductions
CO	1,420
NH ₃	441
NO _x	3,117
PM ₁₀	1,858
PM _{2.5}	1,613
SO ₂	26,073
VOC	2,207

4.3 Mobile source projections

Mobile source monthly inventories of onroad and nonroad mobile emissions were created for 2018 using a combination of the NMIM and the SMOKE-MOVES models. The 2018 onroad emissions account for changes in activity data and the impact of on-the-books rules including: the Light-Duty Vehicle Tier 2 Rule (EPA, 2000), the 2007 Heavy Duty Diesel Rule (<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/highway-diesel/>), the Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT2) Rule (EPA, 2007a), the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS2) (EPA, 2010a), the LD GHG/CAFE standards for 2012-2016 (EPA, 2010c), the Heavy-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Rule (EPA, 2011a), and the Tier 3 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) (<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/tier3.htm>). Local inspection and maintenance (I/M) and other onroad mobile programs are included such as California LEVIII, the National Low Emissions Vehicle (LEV) and Ozone Transport Commission (OTC) LEV regulations(<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/lev-nlev.htm>).

Nonroad mobile emissions reductions for these years include reductions to locomotives, various nonroad engines including diesel engines and various marine engine types, fuel sulfur content, and evaporative emissions standards.

Onroad mobile sources are comprised of several components and are discussed in the next subsection (4.3.1). Monthly nonroad mobile emission projections are discussed in subsection 4.4. Locomotives and Class 1 and Class 2 commercial marine vessel (C1/C2 CMV) projections are discussed in subsection 4.5, and Class 3 (C3) CMV projected emissions are discussed in subsection 4.4.2.

4.3.1 Onroad mobile (onroad and onroad_rfl)

The onroad emissions for 2018 use the same SMOKE-MOVES system as for the base year (see Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2). Meteorology, speed, spatial and temporal surrogates, representative counties, and fuel months were the same as for 2011, discussed above.

4.3.1.1 VMT and vehicle population

Estimates of total national Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) in 2018 came from DOE's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2013 (<http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/>) transportation projections (http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/sector_transportation.cfm), specifically the reference case (release dates April 15th-May 2nd 2013). Trends were developed by calculating ratios between 2011 AEO and 2018 AEO estimates and renormalizing the trends so that a projection of the 2011NEIv1 VMT would match the AEO's 2018 total VMT (across all vehicle types). These ratios were developed for light versus heavy duty and for gasoline versus diesel vehicle types. The projection factors, the national 2011NEIv1 VMT (“VMT_2011”) by vehicle type (SCC7), and the default future VMT (“VMT_2018) by vehicle type are show in Table 4-43.

Table 4-43. Projection factors for 2018 VMT (in millions of miles)

Classification	SCC7	Description	VMT 2011	ratio	VMT 2018
light_gas	2201001	Light Duty Gasoline Vehicles (LDGV)	1,595,751	1.0226	1,631,840
light_gas	2201020	Light Duty Gasoline Trucks 1 & 2 (M6) = LDGT1 (M5)	682,930	1.0226	698,375
light_gas	2201040	Light Duty Gasoline Trucks 3 & 4 (M6) = LDGT2 (M5)	351,812	1.0226	359,768
heavy_gas	2201070	Heavy Duty Gasoline Vehicles 2B thru 8B & Buses (HDGV)	98,334	1.1056	108,714
light_gas	2201080	Motorcycles (MC)	19,744	1.0226	20,190
light_diesel	2230001	Light Duty Diesel Vehicles (LDDV)	4,764	3.8885	18,526
light_diesel	2230060	Light Duty Diesel Trucks 1 thru 4 (M6) (LDDT)	13,389	3.8885	52,063
heavy_diesel	2230071	Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicles (HDDV) Class 2B	6,080	1.2753	7,753
heavy_diesel	2230072	Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicles (HDDV) Class 3, 4, & 5	30,625	1.2753	39,055
heavy_diesel	2230073	Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicles (HDDV) Class 6 & 7	48,998	1.2753	62,486
heavy_diesel	2230074	Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicles (HDDV) Class 8A & 8B	131,503	1.2753	167,704
heavy_diesel	2230075	Heavy Duty Diesel Buses (School & Transit)	8,938	1.2753	11,399

These national SCC7 ratios were applied to the 2011NEIv1 VMT to create an EPA estimate of 2018 VMT at the county, SCC level. The following states/regional organizations provided projected VMT that supplanted EPA's projected VMT: Connecticut, Georgia, Maine, Maryland³³, Michigan, and SEMCOG. Michigan and SEMCOG provided county total VMT. For these estimates, EPA's 2018 SCC fraction by county (which takes into account the AEO growth by vehicle and fuel type) were used to distribute the organization's total VMT to SCC. For the rest of the states, the VMT was either in MOVES county database (CDB) format or was already distributed to SMOKE SCC (Georgia only³⁴). For these counties, EPA used the state supplied distribution of VMT to vehicle type and road type (these distributions tended to match their 2011 submittals).

Vehicle population (VPOP) was developed by creating VMT/VPOP ratios from the 2011NEIv1 VMT and 2011NEIv1 VPOP at the county, vehicle type (SCC7) level. These ratios were applied to the 2018 VMT (including state updates) to create a 2018 VPOP. The one exception was Georgia that supplied VPOP for the 20 counties in the Atlanta area.

4.3.1.2 Set up and Run MOVES to create EF

Emission factor tables were created by running SMOKE-MOVES using the same procedures and models as described for 2011 (see the 2011NEIv1 TSD and Section 2.3). The same meteorology and the same representative counties were used. Changes between 2011 and 2018 are predominantly VMT, fuels, national and local rules, and the model-year distribution of the fleet, which is built into MOVES. Fleet turnover resulted in a greater fraction of newer vehicles meeting stricter emission standards.

Similar to the 2011 onroad run, two MOVES runs were needed to model 2018: MOVES2010b was used for refueling and extended idle modes and Tier3NPRM (version of the MOVES model for the Tier 3 proposal) was used for all other modes. The similarities and differences between the two runs are described in Table 4-44.

³³ Maryland's CDBs were missing VMT projections for Howard County (FIPS 24027). This was discovered at a late date; therefore EPA estimates of VMT and VPOP were used for this one Maryland county.

³⁴ Georgia supplied VMT for the 20 counties in the Atlanta area. For the rest of Georgia, EPA estimates were used.

DRAFT

Table 4-44. Comparison of MOVES runs for 2018

Element	T3NPRM	MOVES2010b
Code	MOVES20110414a	MOVES20120410
Default database	movestier3db20110512	movesdb20121030
VMT and VPOP	CDBs and state DBs for 26 states	Same as t3nprm
Hydrocarbon speciation	T3FRM2018_natinv_HCspec_SS_M	Same as t3nprm
Fuels	tier3frm_2018_09192013_NOE85forOAQPS	Same as t3nprm
CA LEVIII	ca_standards_SS_20130617 (16 states)	Same as t3nprm
Tier 3 controls	tier3ctldbs_060313	Default

The following states were modeled as having adopted the California LEV III program (see Table 4-45)

Table 4-45. CA LEVIII program states

FIPS	State Name
06	California
09	Connecticut
10	Delaware
23	Maine
24	Maryland
33	New Hampshire
34	New Jersey
36	New York
41	Oregon
42	Pennsylvania
44	Rhode Island
50	Vermont
53	Washington

Fuels were projected into the future using estimates from the AEO2013 (<http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/>), release dates April 15th-May 2nd 2013. The AEO2013 projection includes partial implementation of RFS2 in 2018 and assumes that all fuels have an ethanol content of E10 or greater. The regional fuels in 2011 were projected to 2018 so that some of the regional variation is preserved but the totals match AEO2013. E85 fuels were removed from the database and the other fuels were appropriately adjusted because the T3NPRM version of MOVES is unable to model E85 directly (see Section 3.2.1.2 for a description of how emissions were adjusted to account for E85). For details on the 2018 speciation of onroad, which is strongly dependent on the fuels, see Section 3.2.1.4.

4.3.1.3 National, California, and Texas adjustments

A set of adjustments were done in SMOKE-MOVES to create 2018 emissions: HDGHG and E85, extended idle, California emissions, and Texas emissions.

Because the version of MOVES used in the Tier 3 NPRM analysis does not have the capability to model Heavy-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Rule (HDGHG) and E85, an interim version of MOVES incorporating updates for HDGHG and E85 was used to derive the adjustment factors. The medium and heavy duty

DRAFT

greenhouse gas program set in place by the rule begins with 2014 model year and increases in stringency through 2018. These changes primarily affect long haul diesel, but other heavy-duty source types are also affected slightly. For additional details, see the documentation for HDGHG rulemaking.³⁵ The HDGHG rule was implemented in the interim version of MOVES through three key elements. They are: (a) revised running emission rates for total energy, (b) new aerodynamic coefficients and vehicle masses for use in MOVES operating mode generation, (c) auxiliary power units (APUs) that largely replace extended idle in long haul trucks and are added to MOVES as a new process for combination long haul trucks. The affected MOVES tables are “*EmissionRate*” and “*SourceUseTypePhysics*”.

EPA conducted a statistical analysis examining the effect of E85 on emissions in comparison to E10. The dataset included 21 flex-fuel vehicles that were tested on both E10 and E85 over LA92 drive cycle. The study found that there were no statistically significant difference in THC, NMOG, VOC, NO_x, CO and PM between E10 and E85 ($\alpha=0.05$). For toxics, E85 showed a statistically significant decrease in emissions of benzene and 1,3-butadiene, and a statistically significant increase in emissions of acetaldehyde, formaldehyde, and ethanol. The results from the study were incorporated into the version of MOVES used to develop the adjustment factors by updating the “*GeneralFuelRatioExpression*” and “*HCSpeciation*” tables in MOVES default database. The modeling of E85 also used updated “*AVFT*”, “*FuelFormulation*”, “*FuelSupply*”, and “*FuelUsageFraction*” tables, reflecting the renewable fuel volumes and market fractions projected by the Annual Energy Outlook 2013 (AEO2013) Report.³⁶

The two scenarios modeled to develop the adjustment factors were ‘pre-HDGHG/without E85’ and ‘post-HDGHG/with E85’. All input databases other than the ones related to HDGHG and E85, described above, were kept the same between the two runs. The emissions inventories for both scenarios were based on an inventory run at the national scale. MOVES was run separately for January and July in calendar year 2018³⁷. These adjustment factors were national by vehicle type (SCC7), process, month, pollutant, and mode. These adjustments were only for the rate-per-distance (RPD) and rate-per-vehicle (RPV) processes³⁸.

The second set of adjustment factors was for extended idle. This uses the same approach as was used in 2011 (see the 2011NEIv1 TSD for details) except for the VPOP was updated to be consistent with 2018. These adjustments were by county, vehicle type (long-haul truck SCCs only), and mode (extended idle only) and impacted the RPV process only.

The third set of adjustment factors was meant to incorporate 2018 emissions provided by California. The same approach as was used in 2011 was used to match the emissions totals provided by CARB (see Section 2.3.1). The only differences between the 2011 approach and that applied for 2018 are that the latter uses the 2018 emissions from CARB and the 2018 SMOKE-MOVES output (EPA estimates), where the 2018 “CARB emissions” were created by interpolating between the 2017 and 2020 CARB emissions. The provided CARB emissions were produced from working draft versions of EMFAC2011-LD and EMFAC2011-HD and include the following heavy duty regulations: chip reflash, extended idling, public fleet, trash trucks, drayage trucks, and trucks and buses. It does not include the GHG/smartway regulations

³⁵ Final Regulatory Impact Analysis, Chapter 5 (RIA) (PDF) (553 pp, EPA-420-R-11-901, August 2011)

³⁶ U.S. Energy Information Administration, Annual Energy Outlook 2013 (April 15, 2013)

³⁷ The January adjustment factors were used for all the winter fuel months and the July adjustment factors were used for all the summer fuel months.

³⁸ During QA of the adjustment factors, an error was discovered in extended idle for July and evaporative in RPD, RPV, and RPP. For extended idle, the adjustment factors were replaced with January’s adjustment factors. For evaporative, the adjustment factors were set to 1 for both months. These modifications to the adjustment factors are expected to have minimum impact on the 2018 emissions.

DRAFT

for trucks, or the low carbon fuel standard. These adjustment factors are by county, SCC3, pollutant and impact all processes (RPD, RPV, RPP).

The fourth set of adjustment factors was meant to incorporate emissions provided by Texas. Conceptually, EPA used the trend of 2011 to 2018 based on EPA's estimates to project Texas' submitted emissions for 2011. Mathematically, this is equivalent to taking the Texas adjustment factors derived for 2011 (see Section 2.3.1 for details) and applying them directly to EPA's 2018 run. These adjustment factors are by county, SCC7, pollutant and impact all processes.

Because these adjustment factors are multiplicative, a single set of adjustment factors may be created by multiplying the 4 adjustment factors together taking care to match process (RPD, RPV, or RPP), mode, pollutant, SCC, and county. Movesmrg uses the composite adjustment factor file (CFPRO) to estimate 2018 emissions that incorporates each of these adjustments (or a subset of them depending on county, mode, and process).

4.4 Nonroad mobile source projections (c1c2rail, c3marine, nonroad)

The projection of locomotives and Class 1 and 2 commercial marine vessels to 2018 is described in Section 4.4.1. These sources are treated in shapes in the NEI but are considered at the county-level in the modeling platform. The projection of the larger Class 3 commercial marine vessels, treated as point sources in the modeling platform, is described in Section 4.4.2. Most of the remaining sources in the nonroad sector are projected by running the NMIM model with fuels and vehicle populations appropriate to 2018, as described in Section 4.4.3.

4.4.1 Locomotives and Class 1 & 2 commercial marine vessels (c1c2rail)

There are three distinct components used to craft year 2018 inventories from the 2011 base case. The first component of the 2018 c1c2rail inventory is the non-California data projected from the 2011 base case. The second component is the CARB-supplied year 2017 data for California. The third component is a set of EPA OTAQ-provided county-specific emissions adjustments that account for different fuel transport characteristics resulting from the EISA (RFS2) mandate. Specifically, these adjustments reduce finished petroleum-based fuel transport by rail and barge (CMV) and add ethanol-based finished fuel transport by rail and barge.

Step 1: Project non-California CMV and rail emissions

Packet: "PROJECTION_2011_2018_c1c2rail_BASE_noRFS2_05dec2013.txt"

This packet creates an intermediate set of year 2018 emissions for all states except California. This packet does not reflect emission impacts from ethanol volume impacts from the EISA (RFS2) mandate; the EISA impacts are applied for all states in Step 3. This packet consists of national projection factors by SCC and pollutant between 2011 and 2018 that reflect the May 2004 "Tier 4 emissions standards and fuel requirements" (<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/documents/nonroad-diesel/420r04007.pdf>) as well as the March 2008 "Final locomotive-marine rule" controls (<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/420f08004.pdf>). These projection ratios are provided in Table 4-46.

DRAFT

Table 4-46. Non-California year 2018 intermediate projection factors for locomotives and Class 1 and Class 2 Commercial Marine Vessel Emissions

SCC	Description	Pollutant	Projection Factor
2280002XXX	Marine Vessels, Commercial;Diesel;Underway & port emissions	CO	0.9525
2280002XXX	Marine Vessels, Commercial;Diesel;Underway & port emissions	NO _x	0.7623
2280002XXX	Marine Vessels, Commercial;Diesel;Underway & port emissions	PM	0.6755
2280002XXX	Marine Vessels, Commercial;Diesel;Underway & port emissions	SO ₂	0.1275
2280002XXX	Marine Vessels, Commercial;Diesel;Underway & port emissions	VOC	0.7715
2285002006	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Class I Operations	CO	1.175
2285002006	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Class I Operations	NO _x	0.8123
2285002006	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Class I Operations	PM	0.6764
2285002006	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Class I Operations	SO ₂	0.0319
2285002006	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Class I Operations	VOC	0.6116
2285002007	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Class II / III Operations	CO	1.175
2285002007	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Class II / III Operations	NO _x	1.0576
2285002007	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Class II / III Operations	PM	1.0241
2285002007	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Class II / III Operations	SO ₂	0.0319
2285002007	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Class II / III Operations	VOC	1.1175
2285002008	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Passenger Trains (Amtrak)	CO	1.0574
2285002008	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Passenger Trains (Amtrak)	NO _x	0.6635
2285002008	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Passenger Trains (Amtrak)	PM	0.6052
2285002008	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Passenger Trains (Amtrak)	SO ₂	0.0303
2285002008	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Passenger Trains (Amtrak)	VOC	0.5316
2285002009	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Commuter Lines	CO	1.0574
2285002009	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Commuter Lines	NO _x	0.6635
2285002009	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Commuter Lines	PM	0.6052
2285002009	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Commuter Lines	SO ₂	0.0303
2285002009	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Line Haul Locomotives: Commuter Lines	VOC	0.5316
2285002010	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Yard Locomotives	CO	1.175
2285002010	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Yard Locomotives	NO _x	0.9767
2285002010	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Yard Locomotives	PM	0.9436
2285002010	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Yard Locomotives	SO ₂	0.0320
2285002010	Railroad Equipment;Diesel;Yard Locomotives	VOC	0.9388

The future-year locomotive emissions account for increased fuel consumption based on Energy Information Administration (EIA) fuel consumption projections for freight rail, and emissions reductions resulting from emissions standards from the Final Locomotive-Marine rule (EPA, 2009d). This rule lowered diesel sulfur content and tightened emission standards for existing and new locomotives and marine diesel emissions to lower future-year PM, SO₂, and NO_x, and is documented at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/marine.htm#2008final>.

EPA applied HAP factors for VOC HAPs by using the VOC projection factors to obtain 1,3-butadiene, acetaldehyde, acrolein, benzene, and formaldehyde. C1/C2 diesel emissions (SCC = 2280002100 and 2280002200) were projected based on the Final Locomotive Marine rule national-level factors. Similar to locomotives, VOC HAPs were projected based on the VOC factor.

Step 2: Intermediate California year 2018 inventory

Obtained from CARB, the locomotive, and class 1 and 2 commercial marine emissions used for California reflect year 2017 and include nonroad rules reflected in the December 2010 Rulemaking Inventory

DRAFT

(<http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2010/offroadlsi10/offroadisor.pdf>), those in the March 2011 Rule Inventory, the Off-Road Construction Rule Inventory for “In-Use Diesel”, cargo handling equipment rules in place as of 2011 (see <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ports/cargo/cargo.htm>), and the 2007 and 2010 regulations to reduce emissions diesel engines on commercial harbor craft operated within California waters and 24 nautical miles of the California baseline.

The C1/C2 CMV emissions were obtained from the CARB nonroad mobile dataset “ARMJ_RF#2002_ANNUAL_MOBILE.txt”. These emissions were developed using Version 1 of the CEPAM which supports various California off-road regulations. The locomotive emissions were obtained from the CARB trains dataset “ARMJ_RF#2002_ANNUAL_TRAINS.txt”. Documentation of the CARB offroad methodology, including c1c2rail sector data, is provided here: http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/categories.htm#offroad_motor_vehicles. EPA converted the CARB inventory TOG to VOC by dividing the inventory TOG by the available VOC-to-TOG speciation factor.

Step 3: Adjusting intermediate 2018 c1c2rail emissions to reflect the EISA mandate

Rail and barges are used to transport ethanol from production facilities to bulk terminals. To account for emissions associated with this transport, 2022 RFS2 rule rail impacts were adjusted to account for differences in ethanol volumes and locomotive emission rates between 2007 and 2018. There is only a small difference, not quantified, between ethanol volumes in 2007 and 2011. Emission factors used to make adjustments were obtained from an EPA locomotive emission factor fact sheet (EPA, 2009e).

In EPA’s RFS2 final rule, impacts of these modes of transport of ethanol on combustion emissions from the C1 and C2 CMV and rail inventories were estimated for 2018, based AEO 2013 projections on the difference between ethanol volumes mandated by EISA versus RFS1 rule volumes (EPA, 2010a). RFS2 rule impacts were adjusted to account for (a) differences in rail and barges emission rates in 2018 versus 2022, and (b) the difference in ethanol volume impacts for 2018 under EISA versus the 8.7 billion gallons assumed for the intermediate 2018 inventory. Emission factors used to make these adjustments were obtained from analyses done to support the 2010 Category 3 Marine Diesel Rule (EPA, 2009f). The adjusted national inventory impacts were allocated to individual counties using factors developed from the Oak Ridge analysis of ethanol transport (Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2009). These impacts were then applied to the unadjusted inventory.

These emissions from updated ethanol volumes are not included in the previously-discussed non-California loco-marine rule-based projections (Step 1) and CARB 2017 inventory (Step 2). Nationally, these additional emissions are modest and are shown in Table 4-47. The overall difference between 2011 and 2018 c1c2rail sector emissions are provided in Table 4-48. These sector totals include all U.S. states as well as offshore and Puerto Rico.

Table 4-47. EISA mandate emission adjustments in 2018

Pollutant	C1/C2 CMV	Locomotives
CO	-855	1,715
NH ₃	-2	5
NO _X	-3,635	8,346
PM ₁₀	-139	198
PM _{2.5}	-155	-10
SO ₂	-296	80
VOC	-136	357

Table 4-48. Difference in c1c2rail sector emissions between 2011 and 2018

Pollutant	2011	2018	Difference
CO	242,771	255,496	-12,725
NH ₃	707	712	5
NO _x	1,392,532	1,129,284	-263,248
PM ₁₀	46,142	31,963	-14,179
PM _{2.5}	43,491	29,893	-13,598
SO ₂	23,160	3,161	-19,999
VOC	56,543	33,334	-23,209

4.4.2 Class 3 commercial marine vessels (c3marine)

As discussed in Section 2.4.2, the c3marine sector emissions data were developed for year 2002 and projected to year 2011 for the 2011 base case. The ECA-IMO project provides pollutant and geographic-specific projection factors to year 2011, and also projection factors to year 2018 that reflect assumed growth and final ECA-IMO controls. The ECA-IMO rule, published in December 2009, applies to Category 3 (C3) diesel engines (engines with per cylinder displacement at or above 30 liters) installed on U.S. vessels. The ECA-IMO rule includes an implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 NO_x limits for C3 engines beginning in 2011 and 2016, respectively. The ECA-IMO rule also imposes fuel sulfur limits of 1,000 ppm (0.1%) by 2015 in the ECA region –generally within 200 nautical miles of the U.S. and Canadian coastlines, as well as 5,000 ppm (0.5%) for “global” areas –those areas outside the ECA region. For comparison, with the exception of some local areas, year 2011 sulfur content limits are as high as 15,000 ppm (1.5%) in U.S. waters and 45,000 ppm (4.5%) in global areas. More information on the ECA-IMO rule can be found in the Category 3 marine diesel engines Regulatory Impact Assessment:

<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/oceanvessels.htm>.

Projection factors for creating the year 2018 c3marine inventory from the 2011 base case are provided in Table 4-49. Background on the region and Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) FIPS is provided in the discussion on the c3marine inventory for 2011 –Section 2.4.2. The impact of the Tier 2 and Tier 3 NO_x engine standards is less noticeable because of the inevitable delay in fleet turnover for these new engines; however, the immediate and drastic cuts in fuel sulfur content are obvious. VOC and CO are mostly unaffected by the engine and fuel standards, thus providing an idea on how much these emissions would have grown without ECA-IMO controls. VOC HAPs are assigned the same growth rates as VOC.

Table 4-49. Growth factors to project the 2011 ECA-IMO inventory to 2018

Region	EEZ FIPS	2018 Adjustments Relative to 2011					
		NO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}	VOC (HC)	CO	SO₂
East Coast (EC)	85004	1.068	0.556	0.556	1.361	1.361	0.136
Gulf Coast (GC)	85003	0.960	0.504	0.504	1.222	1.222	0.122
North Pacific (NP)	85001	1.014	0.501	0.501	1.255	1.255	0.126
South Pacific (SP)	85002	1.121	0.593	0.593	1.421	1.420	0.144
Great Lakes (GL)	n/a	1.027	0.444	0.444	1.125	1.125	0.113
Outside ECA	98001	1.217	1.356	1.356	1.356	1.356	1.356

As discussed in Section 2.4.2, emissions outside the 3 to 10 mile coastal boundary but within the approximately 200 nm EEZ boundaries were projected to year 2018 using the same regional adjustment factors as the U.S. emissions; however, the FIPS codes were assigned as “EEZ” FIPS and these, as well as Canada C3 CMV, emissions are processed in the “othpt” sector (see Section 2.5.1 and 4.4.1). Note that state

DRAFT

boundaries in the Great Lakes are an exception, extending through the middle of each lake such that all emissions in the Great Lakes are assigned to a U.S. county or Ontario. The classification of emissions to U.S. and Canadian FIPS codes is needed to avoid double-counting of C3 CMV U.S. emissions in the Great Lakes because, as discussed in Section 2.4.1, all CMV emissions in the Midwest RPO are processed in the “c1c2rail” sector.

4.4.3 Other nonroad mobile sources (nonroad)

This sector includes monthly exhaust, evaporative and refueling emissions from nonroad engines (not including commercial marine, aircraft, and locomotives) derived from NMIM for all states except California and Texas. Similar to the onroad emissions, NMIM provides nonroad emissions for VOC by three emission modes: exhaust, evaporative and refueling.

With the exception of California and Texas, U.S. emissions for the nonroad sector (defined as the equipment types covered by the NONROAD model) were created using a consistent NMIM-based approach as was used for 2011. Specifically, NMIM utilized NONROAD2008a including future-year equipment population estimates, control programs to the year 2018, and inputs either state-supplied as part of the 2011NEIv1 process or national level inputs. Fuels for 2018 were assumed to be E10 everywhere for nonroad equipment. The fuels were developed from the MOVES fuels, which in turn were developed to be consistent with AEO2013 projections for 2018. The databases used in this run were NMIM county database “NCD20130731_nei2018dv1” and fuels database “tier3frm2018ctrlfuels_03152013_e10fuelsNMIM.” The 2018 emissions account for increases in activity (based on NONROAD model default growth estimates of future-year equipment population), changes in fuels and engines that reflect implementation of national regulations and local control programs that impact each year differently due to engine turnover. For details on the 2018 speciation of nonroad, see Section 3.2.1.4.

The version of NONROAD used was the current public release, NR08a, which models all in-force nonroad controls. Recent rules include:

- “Clean Air Nonroad Diesel Final Rule - Tier 4”, published June, 2004:
<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/nonroad-diesel.htm>
- Control of Emissions from Nonroad Large Spark-Ignition Engines, and Recreational Engines (Marine and Land-Based), November 8, 2002 (“Pentathlon Rule”).
- OTAQ’s Small Engine Spark Ignition (“Bond”) Rule, October, 2008:
<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/smallsi.htm>

Not included are voluntary local programs such as encouraging either no refueling or evening refueling on Ozone Action Days.

California and Texas nonroad emissions

Similar to the 2011 base nonroad mobile, NMIM was not used to generate future-year nonroad emissions for California, other than for NH₃. EPA used NMIM for California future nonroad NH₃ emissions because CARB did not provide these data for any nonroad vehicle types. For the rest of the pollutants, the CARB-supplied 2017 nonroad annual inventory were distributed to monthly emissions values by using the 2018 NMIM monthly inventories to compute monthly ratios by county, SCC7, mode and pollutant, which was consistent with the approach in 2011 (see Section 2.4.3). Some adjustments to the CARB inventory were needed to convert the provided TOG to VOC. See Section 3.2.1.3 for details on speciation of California nonroad data see Section 3.2.1.3)³⁹. . The CARB nonroad emissions include nonroad rules reflected in the

³⁹ In addition, airport equipment was removed from CARB’s inventory because these sources were modeled elsewhere.

December 2010 Rulemaking Inventory (<http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2010/offroadlsi10/offroadisor.pdf>) and those in the March 2011 Rule Inventory, the Off-Road Construction Rule Inventory for “In-Use Diesel”.

For Texas, EPA combined Texas’ submitted estimates for 2011 with EPA projections of nonroad emissions into 2018. Specifically, projections were based on state-wide SCC7, mode, poll ratios⁴⁰ of 2018 NMIM to 2011 NMIM. These ratios were then applied to Texas’ submitted 2011 emissions inventory, which had already been distributed to a monthly inventory (see Section 2.4.3), to create a 2018 monthly nonroad inventory.

4.5 “Other Emissions”: Offshore Class 3 commercial marine vessels and drilling platforms, Canada and Mexico (othpt, othar, and othon)

Recall from Section 2.5, that emissions from Canada, Mexico, and non-U.S. offshore Class 3 Commercial Marine Vessels (C3 CMV) and drilling platforms are included as part of three emissions modeling sectors: othpt, othar, and othon. Non C3 CMV emissions for Canada and offshore sources were not projected to future years, and are therefore the same as those used in the 2011 base case. Canada did not provide future-year emissions that were consistent with the base year emissions. The Mexico emissions are based on year 1999 but projected to year 2018. A background on the development of year-2018 Mexico emissions from the 1999 inventory is available at: <http://www.wrapair.org/forums/ef/inventories/MNEI/index.html>.

4.5.1 Point sources from offshore C3 CMV and drilling platforms and Canada and Mexico (othpt)

As discussed in Section 2.5.1, the ECA-IMO-based C3 CMV emissions for non-U.S. states are processed in the othpt sector. These C3 CMV emissions include those assigned to Canada, those assigned to the Exclusive Economic Zone (defined as those emissions just beyond U.S. waters approximately 3-10 miles offshore, extending to about 200 nautical miles from the U.S. coastline), and all other offshore emissions – far offshore and non-U.S. EPA processed these emissions in the othpt sector for simplicity of creating U.S.-only emissions summaries. Otherwise, these emissions are processed in the same way as the U.S. C3 CMV emissions in the c3marine sector. The projection factors for the othpt C3 CMV emissions vary by geographic and region as shown in Table 4-c3. C3 CMV emissions in British Columbia were assigned as North Pacific, Ontario as Great Lakes, and all other eastern Canada provinces as East Coast.

Mexico point-format year-2018 inventories are used essentially as-is with only minor formatting changes. The othpt sector also includes point source offshore oil and gas drilling platforms that are beyond U.S. state-county boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico. EPA used emissions from the 2008NEIv2 point source inventory for both 2011 and 2018. EPA expects updated offshore oil and gas drilling emissions in the next version of the 2011 NEI (Version 2).

4.5.2 Area, nonroad mobile and onroad mobile sources from Canada and Mexico (other, othon)

Both year-2006 Canada and year-2018 Mexico inventories were converted from their original SMOKE One-Record per Line (ORL) and Inventory Data Analyzer (IDA) formats, respectively, to SMOKE Flat File 10 (FF10) inventory format: <http://www.cmascenter.org/smoke/documentation/3.5/html/ch08s02s07.html>. Otherwise, these inventories were used as-is.

⁴⁰ These ratios were initially attempted by county/SCC7/mode/pollutant, but due to significantly different distributions of certain source types between EPA and TCEQ’s emissions, this created unreasonable growth in certain areas. The above approach was used except in the following, relatively limited conditions. If a state/SCC7/mode/pollutant was in EPA 2018 emissions but not in EPA’s 2011 emissions, 2018 EPA emissions were used in the final inventory. If a state/SCC7/mode/pollutant was in TCEQ’s 2011 emissions but was not in EPA’s 2018 emissions, then state/SCC3/mode/pollutant ratios were used to project to 2018.

5 Emission Summaries

The following tables summarize emissions differences between the 2011 evaluation case and the 2018 base case. These summaries are provided at the national level by sector for the contiguous U.S. and for the portions of Canada and Mexico inside the smaller 12km domain (12US2) discussed in Section 3.1. The afdust sector emissions represent the summaries *after* application of both the land use (transport fraction) and meteorological adjustments (see Section 2.2.1); therefore, this sector is called “afdust_adj” in these summaries. The onroad and onroad refueling (onroad_rfl) sector totals are post-SMOKE-MOVES totals, representing air quality model-ready emission totals, and the onroad portion include CARB emissions for California. The “c3marine-US” sector represents c3marine sector emissions with U.S. FIPS only; these extend to roughly 3-5 miles offshore and all U.S. waters in the Great Lakes and also include all U.S. ports. The “c3marine, EEZ component” represents all non-U.S. c3marine emissions that are within the (up to) 200 nautical mile Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) boundary but outside of U.S. state waters. Finally, the “c3marine, non-US non-EEZ component” represents all non-U.S. emissions outside of the (up to) 200nm offshore boundary, including all Canadian and Mexican c3marine emissions. The c3marine sector is discussed in Section 2.4.2. The “Off-shore othpt” sector is the non-Canada, no-Mexico component of the othpt sector –the offshore oil platform emissions from the 2008 NEI.

National emission totals by air quality model-ready sector are provided for all CAP emissions for the 2011 evaluation case in Table 5-1. The total of all sectors in the 2011 evaluation case are listed as “Con U.S. Total w/ ptfire”. Table 5-2 provides national emissions totals by sector for all CAPs in the 2018 base case.

Table 5-3 provides national-by sector emission summaries for CO for all the cases: 2011 evaluation case and 2018 base case. Table 5-4, Table 5-5, Table 5-6, Table 5-7, Table 5-8 and Table 5-9 provide the same summaries for NH₃, NO_x, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, SO₂ and VOC, respectively. These national tables also include differences and percent differences for each modeling sector between the 2011 evaluation case and the 2018 base case. Note that the same ptfire emissions are used in both cases.

DRAFT

Table 5-1. National by-sector CAP emissions summaries for 2011 evaluation case

Sector	CO	NH3	NOX	PM10	PM2_5	SO2	VOC
afdust_adj				18,502,317	2,487,403		
ag		3,517,371					
c1c2rail	173,347	484	1,051,169	34,865	32,557	18,975	48,818
c3marine	13,403		131,301	4,384	3,992	40,692	5,110
nonpt	3,046,375	142,323	832,166	715,709	533,248	392,638	3,792,612
np_oilgas	642,182	0	653,219	21,756	17,200	17,195	2,273,214
nonroad	13,952,389	2,627	1,630,409	162,420	154,660	4,031	2,024,633
onroad	25,473,866	118,124	5,666,702	285,112	205,145	27,915	2,287,603
onroad_rfl							157,629
ptfire	22,580,113	362,910	347,103	2,362,132	2,005,142	177,107	5,174,593
ptegu	724,444	21,944	1,990,884	266,633	193,877	4,614,299	32,376
ptegu_pk	8,662	425	21,941	2,159	1,886	28,476	783
ptnonipm	2,568,080	74,847	1,771,835	494,639	339,240	1,071,982	873,159
pt_oilgas	22,218	112	22,091	1,887	1,857	55,273	89,755
rcw	2,578,229	20,343	35,672	389,019	388,288	8,986	446,972
Con U.S. Total	71,783,308	4,261,510	14,154,492	23,243,031	6,364,495	6,457,569	17,207,256
Off-shore to EEZ*	130,419	0	610,664	16,961	15,525	133,606	81,286
Non-US SECA C3	17,169	0	202,516	17,199	15,823	127,563	7,297
Canada othar	2,810,350	386,147	462,996	810,747	248,907	61,179	932,322
Canada othon	3,303,239	17,572	392,209	11,075	7,712	4,046	199,939
Canada othpt**	560,661	15,543	369,993	65,782	39,828	825,675	157,170
Mexico othar	439,901	109,861	189,592	69,523	23,600	26,559	499,145
Mexico othon	423,978	3,247	76,880	7,593	6,970	1,413	73,888
Mexico othpt	116,609	0	414,399	137,512	101,884	828,418	83,838
Non-US Total	7,802,326	532,370	2,719,249	1,136,392	460,249	2,008,459	2,034,885

* "Offshore to EEZ" includes both the offshore point emissions, and the "Offshore to EEZ" c3marine emissions

** Canadian c3 emissions are included in "Canada othpt"

DRAFT

Table 5-2. National by-sector CAP emissions summaries for 2018 base case

Sector	CO	NH3	NOX	PM10	PM2_5	SO2	VOC
afdust_adj				6,741,452	923,168		
ag		3,596,908					
c1c2rail	189,355	489	869,089	24,346	22,508	2,628	33,334
c3marine	17,518		136,147	2,338	2,129	5,354	6,678
nonpt	3,058,148	142,384	847,975	720,106	536,477	304,514	3,634,506
np_oilgas	782,408	0	795,491	27,248	21,565	25,488	2,555,021
nonroad	12,377,375	2,900	1,071,612	107,005	100,949	1,868	1,360,554
onroad	15,469,627	86,826	2,647,482	208,598	125,173	12,418	1,133,928
onroad_rfl							74,386
ptfire	22,580,113	362,910	347,103	2,362,132	2,005,142	177,107	5,174,593
ptegu	752,467	39,629	1,486,128	256,679	199,186	1,443,777	39,227
ptegu_pk	11,249	439	9,954	247	215	3,432	313
ptnonipm	2,419,986	75,822	1,768,859	466,566	316,328	720,681	870,202
pt_oilgas	25,493	159	25,970	2,062	2,026	64,076	106,345
rcw	2,736,854	21,485	38,434	413,597	412,852	10,018	466,259
Con U.S. Total	60,420,596	4,329,951	10,044,245	11,332,376	4,667,720	2,771,361	15,455,347
Off-shore to EEZ*	146,323		635,570	9,630	8,841	18,746	88,045
Non-US SECA C3	23,318		246,579	23,327	21,462	173,124	9,896
Canada othar	2,810,350	386,147	462,996	810,747	248,907	61,179	932,322
Canada othon	3,303,239	17,572	392,209	11,075	7,712	4,046	199,939
Canada othpt	561,438	15,543	370,944	65,276	39,370	818,374	157,501
Mexico othar	527,917	109,840	226,341	70,916	47,191	19,286	577,078
Mexico othon	397,197	4,465	46,794	9,420	8,591	659	62,948
Mexico othpt	148,758		544,690	170,910	127,734	1,066,482	94,351
Non-US Total	7,918,540	533,567	2,926,123	1,171,301	509,808	2,161,896	2,122,080

DRAFT

Table 5-3. National by-sector CO emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences

Sector	2011 CO	2018 CO	2018-2011	% Change
afdust_adj				
ag				
c1c2rail	173,347	189,355	16,008	9%
c3marine-US	13,403	17,518	4,115	31%
nonpt	3,046,375	3,058,148	11,773	0%
np_oilgas	642,182	782,408	140,226	22%
nonroad	13,952,389	12,377,375	-1,575,014	-11%
onroad	25,473,866	15,469,627	-10,004,239	-39%
onroad_rfl				
ptfire	22,580,113	22,580,113	0	0%
ptegu	724,444	752,467	28,023	4%
ptegu_pk	8,662	11,249	2,587	30%
ptnonipm	2,568,080	2,419,986	-148,094	-6%
pt_oilgas	22,218	25,493	3,275	15%
rwc	2,578,229	2,736,854	158,625	6%
Con U.S. Total	71,783,308	60,420,593	-11,362,715	-16%
Off-shore to EEZ*	130,419	146,323	15,904	12%
Non-US SECA C3	17,169	23,318	6,149	36%
Canada othar	2,810,350	2,810,350	0	0%
Canada othon	3,303,239	3,303,239	0	0%
Canada othpt**	560,661	561,438	777	0%
Mexico othar	439,901	527,917	88,016	20%
Mexico othon	423,978	397,197	-26,781	-6%
Mexico othpt	116,609	148,758	32,149	28%
Non-US Total	7,802,326	7,918,540	116,214	1%

DRAFT

Table 5-4. National by-sector NH₃ emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences

Sector	2011 NH ₃	2018 NH ₃	2018-2011	% Change
afdust_adj				
ag	3,517,371	3,596,908	79,537	2%
c1c2rail	484	489	5	1%
c3marine-US				
nonpt	142,323	142,384	61	0%
np_oilgas				
nonroad	2,627	2,900	273	10%
onroad	118,124	86,826	-31,298	-26%
onroad_rfl				
ptfire	362,910	362,910	0	0%
ptegu	21,944	39,629	17,685	81%
ptegu_pk	425	439	14	3%
ptnonipm	74,847	75,822	975	1%
pt_oilgas	112	159	47	42%
rwc	20,343	21,485	1,142	6%
Con U.S. Total	4,261,510	4,329,951	68,441	2%
Off-shore to EEZ*				
Non-US SECA C3				
Canada othar	386,147	386,147	0	0%
Canada othon	17,572	17,572	0	0%
Canada othpt**	15,543	15,543	0	0%
Mexico othar	109,861	109,840	-21	0%
Mexico othon	3,247	4,465	1,218	38%
Mexico othpt				
Non-US Total	532,370	533,567	1,197	0%

DRAFT

Table 5-5. National by-sector NO_x emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences

Sector	2011 NO _x	2018 NO _x	2018-2011	% Change
afdust_adj				
ag				
c1c2rail	1,051,169	869,089	-182,080	-17%
c3marine-US	131,301	136,147	4,846	4%
nonpt	832,166	847,975	15,809	2%
np_oilgas	653,219	795,491	142,272	22%
nonroad	1,630,409	1,071,612	-558,797	-34%
onroad	5,666,702	2,647,482	-3,019,220	-53%
onroad_rfl				
ptfire	347,103	347,103	0	0%
ptegu	1,990,884	1,486,128	-504,756	-25%
ptegu_pk	21,941	9,954	-11,987	-55%
ptnonipm	1,771,835	1,768,859	-2,976	0%
pt_oilgas	22,091	25,970	3,879	18%
rwc	35,672	38,434	2,762	8%
Con U.S. Total	14,154,492	10,044,244	-4,110,248	-29%
Off-shore to EEZ*	610,664	635,570	24,906	4%
Non-US SECA C3	202,516	246,579	44,063	22%
Canada othar	462,996	462,996	0	0%
Canada othon	392,209	392,209	0	0%
Canada othpt**	369,993	370,944	951	0%
Mexico othar	189,592	226,341	36,749	19%
Mexico othon	76,880	46,794	-30,086	-39%
Mexico othpt	414,399	544,690	130,291	31%
Non-US Total	2,719,249	2,926,123	206,874	8%

DRAFT

Table 5-6. National by-sector PM_{2.5} emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences

Sector	2011 PM _{2.5}	2018 PM _{2.5}	2018-2011	% Change
afdust_adj	913,525	923,168	9,643	1%
ag				
c1c2rail	32,557	22,508	-10,049	-31%
c3marine-US	3,992	2,129	-1,863	-47%
nonpt	533,248	536,477	3,229	1%
np_oilgas	17,200	21,565	4,365	25%
nonroad	154,660	100,949	-53,711	-35%
onroad	205,145	125,173	-79,972	-39%
onroad_rfl				
ptfire	2,005,142	2,005,142	0	0%
ptegu	188,811	199,186	10,375	5%
ptegu_pk	1,886	215	-1,671	-89%
ptnonipm	339,240	316,328	-22,912	-7%
pt_oilgas	1,857	2,026	169	9%
rwc	388,288	412,852	24,564	6%
Con U.S. Total	4,785,551	4,667,718	-117,833	-2%
Off-shore to EEZ*	15,525	8,841	-6,684	-43%
Non-US SECA C3	15,823	21,462	5,639	36%
Canada othar	248,907	248,907	0	0%
Canada othon	7,712	7,712	0	0%
Canada othpt**	39,828	39,370	-458	-1%
Mexico othar	23,600	47,191	23,591	100%
Mexico othon	6,970	8,591	1,621	23%
Mexico othpt	101,884	127,734	25,850	25%
Non-US Total	460,249	509,808	49,559	11%

DRAFT

Table 5-7. National by-sector PM₁₀ emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences

Sector	2011 PM ₁₀	2018 PM ₁₀	2018-2011	% Change
afdust_adj	6,663,357	6,741,452	78,095	1%
ag				
c1c2rail	34,865	24,346	-10,519	-30%
c3marine-US	4,384	2,338	-2,046	-47%
nonpt	715,709	720,106	4,397	1%
np_oilgas	21,756	27,248	5,492	25%
nonroad	162,420	107,005	-55,415	-34%
onroad	285,112	208,598	-76,514	-27%
onroad_rfl				
ptfire	2,362,132	2,362,132	0	0%
ptegu	266,633	256,679	-9,954	-4%
ptegu_pk	2,159	247	-1,912	-89%
ptnonipm	494,639	466,566	-28,073	-6%
pt_oilgas	1,887	2,062	175	9%
rwc	389,019	413,597	24,578	6%
Con U.S. Total	11,404,072	11,332,376	-71,696	-1%
Off-shore to EEZ*	16,961	9,630	-7,331	-43%
Non-US SECA C3	17,199	23,327	6,128	36%
Canada othar	810,747	810,747	0	0%
Canada othon	11,075	11,075	0	0%
Canada othpt**	65,782	65,276	-506	-1%
Mexico othar	69,523	70,916	1,393	2%
Mexico othon	7,593	9,420	1,827	24%
Mexico othpt	137,512	170,910	33,398	24%

DRAFT

Table 5-8. National by-sector SO₂ emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences

Sector	2011 SO₂	2018 SO₂	2018-2011	% Change
afdust_adj				
ag				
c1c2rail	18,975	2,628	-16,347	-86%
c3marine-US	40,692	5,354	-35,338	-87%
nonpt	392,638	304,514	-88,124	-22%
np_oilgas	17,195	25,488	8,293	48%
nonroad	4,031	1,868	-2,163	-54%
onroad	27,915	12,418	-15,497	-56%
onroad_rfl				
ptfire	177,107	177,107	0	0%
ptegu	4,614,299	1,443,777	-3,170,522	-69%
ptegu_pk	28,476	3,432	-25,044	-88%
ptnonipm	1,071,982	720,681	-351,301	-33%
pt_oilgas	55,273	64,076	8,803	16%
rwc	8,986	10,018	1,032	11%
Con U.S. Total	6,457,569	2,771,361	-3,686,208	-57%
Off-shore to EEZ*	133,606	18,746	-114,860	-86%
Non-US SECA C3	127,563	173,124	45,561	36%
Canada othar	61,179	61,179	0	0%
Canada othon	4,046	4,046	0	0%
Canada othpt**	825,675	818,374	-7,301	-1%
Mexico othar	26,559	19,286	-7,273	-27%
Mexico othon	1,413	659	-754	-53%
Mexico othpt	828,418	1,066,482	238,064	29%
Non-US Total	2,008,459	2,161,896	153,437	8%

DRAFT

Table 5-9. National by-sector VOC emissions (tons/yr) summaries with differences

Sector	2011 VOC	2018 VOC	2018-2011	% Change
afdust_adj				
ag				
c1c2rail	48,818	33,334	-15,484	-32%
c3marine-US	5,110	6,678	1,568	31%
nonpt	3,792,612	3,634,506	-158,106	-4%
np_oilgas	2,273,214	2,555,021	281,807	12%
nonroad	2,024,633	1,360,554	-664,079	-33%
onroad	2,287,603	1,133,928	-1,153,675	-50%
onroad_rfl	157,629	74,386		
ptfire	5,174,593	5,174,593	0	0%
ptegu	32,376	39,227	6,851	21%
ptegu_pk	783	313	-470	-60%
ptnonipm	873,159	870,202	-2,957	0%
pt_oilgas	89,755	106,345	16,590	18%
rwc	446,972	466,259	19,287	4%
Con U.S. Total	17,207,257	15,455,346	-1,751,911	-10%
Off-shore to EEZ*	81,286	88,045	6,759	8%
Non-US SECA C3	7,297	9,896	2,599	36%
Canada othar	932,322	932,322	0	0%
Canada othon	199,939	199,939	0	0%
Canada othpt**	157,170	157,501	331	0%
Mexico othar	499,145	577,078	77,933	16%
Mexico othon	73,888	62,948	-10,940	-15%
Mexico othpt	83,838	94,351	10,513	13%
Non-US Total	2,034,885	2,122,080	87,195	4%

6 References

- Adelman, Z. 2012. *Memorandum: Fugitive Dust Modeling for the 2008 Emissions Modeling Platform*. UNC Institute for the Environment, Chapel Hill, NC. September, 28, 2012.
- Anderson, G.K.; Sandberg, D.V; Norheim, R.A., 2004. Fire Emission Production Simulator (FEPS) User's Guide. Available at http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/fera/feps/FEPS_users_guide.pdf
- ARB, 2000. "Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles". California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board, Mobile Source Control Division, Sacramento, CA. October, 2000. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/documents/rrpFinal.pdf>.
- ARB, 2007. "Proposed Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicles". California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board, Mobile Source Control Division, Sacramento, CA. April, 2007. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2007/ordies107/isor.pdf>
- ARB, 2010a. "Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets and the Off-Road Large Spark-Ignition Fleet Requirements". California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board, Mobile Source Control Division, Sacramento, CA. October, 2010. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2010/offroadlsi10/offroadisor.pdf>.
- ARB, 2010b. "Estimate of Premature Deaths Associated with Fine Particle Pollution (PM_{2.5}) in California Using a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Methodology". California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board, Mobile Source Control Division, Sacramento, CA. August, 2010. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-report_2010.pdf.
- BEA, 2012. "2013 Global Outlook projections prepared by the Conference Board in November 2012". U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. Available from: <http://www.conference-board.org/data/globaloutlook.cfm>.
- Bullock Jr., R, and K. A. Brehme (2002) "Atmospheric mercury simulation using the CMAQ model: formulation description and analysis of wet deposition results." *Atmospheric Environment* 36, pp 2135–2146.
- Department of Energy, 2012 Annual Energy Outlook 2012, Early Release. Report No. DOE/EIA-0383(2012), June 2012. Available at: <http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/>
- ERG, 2006. *Mexico National Emissions Inventory, 1999: Final*, prepared by Eastern Research Group for Secretariat of the Environment and Natural Resources and the National Institute of Ecology, Mexico, October 11, 2006. Available at: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/net/mexico/1999_mexico_nei_final_report.pdf
- ERG, 2009. *Development of Mexico National Emissions Inventory Projections for 2008, 2012, and 2023*. Available at: <http://www.azdeq.gov/environ/air/plan/download/dmneip.pdf>.
- Energy Information Administration. 2006. Annual Energy Outlook 2006. Report #:DOE/EIA-0383(2006) Available at: http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/archive/aeo06/aeoref_tab.html.

DRAFT

- Energy Information Administration. 2010. Annual Energy Outlook 2011 Early Release Overview. U.S. Department of Energy, December 2010. Report # DOE/EIA-0383ER (2011). Available at: http://www.eia.doe.gov/forecasts/aeo/tables_ref.cfm
- Environ Corp. 2008. Emission Profiles for EPA SPECIATE Database, Part 2: EPAct Fuels (Evaporative Emissions). Prepared for U. S. EPA, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, September 30, 2008.
- EPA, 1994. Onboard Refueling Vapor Recovery for Motor Vehicles, Fact Sheet. April, 1994. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/regs/ld-hwy/onboard/orvrfact.txt>
- EPA, 2000. Light-Duty Vehicle, Light-Duty Truck, and Medium-Duty Passenger Vehicle Tier 2 Exhaust Emission Standards. Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Assessment and Standards Division. Ann Arbor, MI 48105. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/standards/light-duty/tier2stds.htm>
- EPA, 2005. *EPA's National Inventory Model (NMIM), A Consolidated Emissions Modeling System for MOBILE6 and NONROAD*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Assessment and Standards Division. Ann Arbor, MI 48105, EPA420-R-05-024, December 2005. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/models/nmim/420r05024.pdf>.
- EPA 2006a. *SPECIATE 4.0, Speciation Database Development Document, Final Report*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, EPA600-R-06-161, February 2006. Available at http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/software/speciate/speciate4/documentation/speciatedoc_1206.pdf.
- EPA, 2006b. Regulatory Impact Analyses, 2006 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particle Pollution. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, October, 2006. Docket # EPA-HQ-OAR-2001-0017, # EPAHQ-OAR-2006-0834. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/ria.html>.
- EPA. 2007a. National Scale Modeling for the Final Mobile Source Air Toxics Rule, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Emissions Analysis and Monitoring Division, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, EPA 454/R-07-002, February 2007. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/toxics/454r07002.pdf>
- EPA, 2007b. Guidance for Estimating VOC and NO_x Emission Changes from MACT Rules, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Air Quality Policy Division, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, EPA-457/B-07-001, May 2007. Available at http://www.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/ozone/o3imp8hr/documents/guidance/200705_epa457_b-07-001_emission_changes_mact_rules.pdf.
- EPA, 2008. Regulatory Impact Analysis: Control of Emissions from Marine SI and Small SI Engines, Vessels, and Equipment. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Assessment and Standards Division, Ann Arbor, MI 48105, EPA420-R-08-014, September, 2008. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/marinesi-equipld/420r08014.pdf>
- EPA, 2009a. 2005 National Emissions Inventory, Version 2. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/net/2005inventory.html>.
- EPA. 2009b. "Impact Calculations RFS-Docket.xls." Available on the RFS2 Docket EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0133 at: <http://www.regulations.gov/#!home;tab=search>.
- EPA, 2009c. Exhaust Emission Profiles for EPA SPECIATE Database: Energy Policy Act (EPAct) Low-Level Ethanol Fuel Blends and Tier 2 Light-Duty Vehicles. Assessment and Standards Division, Office of Transportation and Air Quality. Report No. EPA-420-R-09-002.

DRAFT

- EPA, 2009d. Regulatory Impact Analysis: Control of Emissions of Air Pollution from Locomotive Engines and Marine Compression Ignition Engines Less than 30 Liters Per Cylinder. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Assessment and Standards Division, Ann Arbor, MI 48105, EPA420-R-08-001a, May 2009. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/420r08001a.pdf>
- EPA, 2009e. Emission Factors for Locomotives. Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Assessment and Standards Division, Ann Arbor, MI EPA-420-F-09-25. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/locomotv/420f09025.pdf>.
- EPA, 2009f. Regulatory Impact Analysis: Control of Emissions of Air Pollution from Category 3 Marine Diesel Engines. Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Assessment and Standards Division, Ann Arbor, MI. Report No. EPA-420-R-09-019. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/marine/ci/420r09019.pdf>.
- EPA. 2010a. Renewable Fuel Standard Program (RFS2) Regulatory Impact Analysis. Assessment and Standards Division, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Ann Arbor, MI. Report No. EPA-420-R-10-006, February, 2010. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/renewablefuels/regulations.htm>.
- EPA, 2010b. Technical Support Document: The Industrial Sectors Integrated Solutions (ISIS) Model and the Analysis for the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants and New Source Performance Standards for the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Sectors Policies and Program Division and Air Pollution Prevention and Control Division, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, August 2010.
- EPA, 2010c. Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards, Final Rule. April, 2010. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/ld-hwy/greenhouse/ld-ghg.htm>
- EPA, 2011a. Heavy-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas (HDGHG) Emissions Inventory for Air Quality Modeling Technical Support Document, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Air Quality Assessment Division, Research Triangle Park, NC. Report No. EPA-420-R-11-008, August 2011. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/documents/420r11008.pdf>
- EPA. 2011b. Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Final CAP-BAFM 2005-Based Platform, Version 4.2. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/emch/index.html#final>
- EPA, 2012a. 2008 National Emissions Inventory, version 2 Technical Support Document. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Air Quality Assessment Division, Research Triangle Park, NC. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/net/2008inventory.html#inventorydoc>
- EPA, 2012b. Regulatory Impact Analysis: Final Rulemaking for 2017-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Assessment and Standards Division, Ann Arbor, MI. Report No. EPA-420-R-12-016, August, 2012. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/documents/420r12016.pdf>
- EPA. 2012c. “upstream emissions_2020 AEO.xls”, “upstream emissions_2020 PM NAAQS rev.xls,” Available on the PM NAAQS Docket [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0955] at: <http://www.regulations.gov/#!home;tab=search>.
- EPA, 2012d. Preparation of Emission Inventories for the Version 5.0, 2007 Emissions Modeling Platform Technical Support Document. Available from: http://epa.gov/ttn/chief/emch/2007v5/2007v5_2020base_EmisMod_TSD_13dec2012.pdf.

DRAFT

- EPA, 2013ci. Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) for the Reconsideration of the Existing Stationary Compression Ignition (CI) Engines NESHAP: Final Report. Available from: available at: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/RICE_NESHAPreconsideration_Compression_Ignition_Engines_RIA_final2013_EPA.pdf.
- EPA, 2013rwc. “2011 Residential Wood Combustion Tool version 1.1, September 2013”, available from US EPA, OAQPS, EIAG.
- EPA, 2013si. Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) for Reconsideration of the Existing Stationary Spark Ignition (SI) RICE NESHAP: Final Report. Available from http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/regdata/RIAs/NESHAP_RICE_Spark_Ignition_RIA_finalreconsideration2013_EPA.pdf.
- Frost & Sullivan, 2010. “Project: Market Research and Report on North American Residential Wood Heaters, Fireplaces, and Hearth Heating Products Market (P.O. # PO1-IMP403-F&S). Final Report April 26, 2010”, pp. 31-32. Prepared by Frost & Sullivan, Mountain View, CA 94041.
- Houck, 2011; “Dirty- vs. Clean-Burning? What percent of freestanding wood heaters in use in the U.S. today are still old, uncertified units?” Hearth and Home, December 2011.
- Joint Fire Science Program, 2009. Consume 3.0--a software tool for computing fuel consumption. Fire Science Brief. 66, June 2009. Consume 3.0 is available at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/fera/research/smoke/consume/index.shtml>
- Kochera, A., 1997. “Residential Use of Fireplaces,” Housing Economics, March 1997, 10-11. Also see: <http://www.epa.gov/ttnchie1/conference/ei10/area/houck.pdf>.
- LADCO, 2012. “Regional Air Quality Analyses for Ozone, PM2.5, and Regional Haze: Base C Emissions Inventory (September 12, 2011)”. Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium, Rosemont, IL 60018. Available at: http://www.ladco.org/tech/emis/basecv8/Base_C_Emissions_Documentation_Sept_12.pdf
- McCarty, J.L., Korontzi, S., Jutice, C.O., and T. Loboda. 2009. The spatial and temporal distribution of crop residue burning in the contiguous United States. *Science of the Total Environment*, 407 (21): 5701-5712.
- McKenzie, D.; Raymond, C.L.; Kellogg, L.-K.B.; Norheim, R.A.; Andreu, A.G.; Bayard, A.C.; Kopper, K.E.; Elman, E. 2007. Mapping fuels at multiple scales: landscape application of the Fuel Characteristic Classification System. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 37:2421-2437. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2009. Analysis of Fuel Ethanol Transportation Activity and Potential Distribution Constraints. U.S. Department of Energy, March 2009. Docket No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0133.
- MDNR, 2008; “A Minnesota 2008 Residential Fuelwood Assessment Survey of individual household responses”. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Available from http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/forestry/um/residentialfuelwoodassessment07_08.pdf.
- NESCAUM, 2006; “Assessment of Outdoor Wood-fired Boilers” (NESCAUM, 2006). Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM) report. Available from http://www.nescaum.org/documents/assessment-of-outdoor-wood-fired-boilers/2006-1031-owb-report_revised-june2006-appendix.pdf.
- NYSERDA, 2012; “Environmental, Energy Market, and Health Characterization of Wood-Fired Hydronic Heater Technologies, Final Report”. New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA). Available from: <http://www.nyserderda.ny.gov/Publications/Case-Studies/-/media/Files/Publications/Research/Environmental/Wood-Fired-Hydronic-Heater-Tech.ashx>.

DRAFT

- Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2009. Analysis of Fuel Ethanol Transportation Activity and Potential Distribution Constraints. U.S. Department of Energy, March 2009. Docket No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0133.
- Ottmar, R.D.; Sandberg, D.V.; Bluhm, A. 2003. Biomass consumption and carbon pools. Poster. In: Galley, K.E.M., Klinger, R.C.; Sugihara, N.G. (eds.) Proceedings of Fire Ecology, Prevention, and Management. Misc. Pub. 13, Tallahassee, FL: Tall Timbers Research Station.
- Ottmar, R.D.; Prichard, S.J.; Vihnanek, R.E.; Sandberg, D.V. 2006. Modification and validation of fuel consumption models for shrub and forested lands in the Southwest, Pacific Northwest, Rockies, Midwest, Southeast, and Alaska. Final report, JFSP Project 98-1-9-06.
- Ottmar, R.D.; Sandberg, D.V.; Riccardi, C.L.; Prichard, S.J. 2007. An Overview of the Fuel Characteristic Classification System – Quantifying, Classifying, and Creating Fuelbeds for Resource Planning. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 37(12): 2383-2393. FCCS is available at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/fera/fccs/index.shtml>
- Pouliot, G., H. Simon, P. Bhave, D. Tong, D. Mobley, T. Pace, and T. Pierce . (2010) “Assessing the Anthropogenic Fugitive Dust Emission Inventory and Temporal Allocation Using an Updated Speciation of Particulate Matter.” International Emission Inventory Conference, San Antonio, TX. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/conference/ei19/session9/pouliot.pdf>
- Raffuse, S., D. Sullivan, L. Chinkin, S. Larkin, R. Solomon, A. Soja, 2007. Integration of Satellite-Detected and Incident Command Reported Wildfire Information into BlueSky, June 27, 2007. Available at: <http://getbluesky.org/smartfire/docs.cfm>
- Russell, A.G. and G.R. Cass, 1986. *Verification of a Mathematical Model for Aerosol Nitrate and Nitric Acid Formation and Its Use for Control Measure Evaluation*, Atmospheric Environment, 20: 2011-2025.
- SESARM, 2012a. “Development of the 2007 Base Year and Typical Year Fire Emission Inventory for the Southeastern States”, Air Resources Managers, Inc., Fire Methodology, AMEC Environment and Infrastructure, Inc. AMEC Project No.: 6066090326, April, 2012
- SESARM, 2012b. “Area and Nonroad 2007 Base Year Inventories. Revised Final Report”, Contract No. S-2009-06-01, Prepared by Transystems Corporation, January 2012. Available at: http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&ved=0CDAQFjAC&url=ftp%3A%2F%2Fwsip-70-164-45-196.dc.dc.cox.net%2Fpublic%2FSESARM%2FRevised%2520Final%2FSESARM%2520Base%2520Year%2520Revised%2520Final%2520Report_Jan2012.docx&ei=xU-AUPu1F4WA0AHC5YHYCg&usg=AFQjCNFhjgx3Ej-hbfYmMUP4zGI_HBiqZA&sig2=hWWN0m3WYPSO28QSn5BIA.
- Skamarock, W., J. Klemp, J. Dudhia, D. Gill, D. Barker, M. Duda, X. Huang, W. Wang, J. Powers, 2008. A Description of the Advanced Research WRF Version 3. NCAR Technical Note. National Center for Atmospheric Research, Mesoscale and Microscale Meteorology Division, Boulder, CO. June 2008. Available at: http://www.mmm.ucar.edu/wrf/users/docs/arw_v3.pdf
- Sullivan D.C., Raffuse S.M., Pryden D.A., Craig K.J., Reid S.B., Wheeler N.J.M., Chinkin L.R., Larkin N.K., Solomon R., and Strand T. (2008) Development and applications of systems for modeling emissions and smoke from fires: the BlueSky smoke modeling framework and SMARTFIRE: 17th

DRAFT

International Emissions Inventory Conference, Portland, OR, June 2-5. Available at:
<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/conferences.html>

- U.S. Census, 2012; “2012 Statistical Abstract, Construction and Housing: Housing Units and Characteristics”. U.S. Census Bureau. Available from:
http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/construction_housing/housing_units_and_characteristics.html
- Wang, Y., P. Hopke, O. V. Rattigan, X. Xia, D. C. Chalupa, M. J. Utell. (2011) “Characterization of Residential Wood Combustion Particles Using the Two-Wavelength Aethalometer”, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 45 (17), pp 7387–7393
- Wolf, et al, 2009. *Developing Mexico National Emissions Inventory Projections for the Future Years of 2008, 2012, and 2030*. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/ttnchie1/conference/ei18/session2/wolf.pdf>.
- Yarwood, G., S. Rao, M. Yocke, and G. Whitten, 2005: Updates to the Carbon Bond Chemical Mechanism: CB05. Final Report to the US EPA, RT-0400675. Available at
http://www.camx.com/publ/pdfs/CB05_Final_Report_120805.pdf.
- Zue, Henze, et al, 2013. “Constraining U.S. Ammonia Emissions using TES Remote Sensing Observations and the GEOS-Chem adjoint model”, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118: 1-14.