



121 Champion Way  
Canonsburg, PA 15317

jshimshock@reliant.com  
Writer's Direct Dial Number  
724-597-8405

May 2, 2008

**Email and Overnight Delivery**

Ms. Angela King  
Environmental Planner  
Mid-Atlantic Regional Air Management Association, Inc.  
8600 LaSalle Road, Suite 636  
Towson, Maryland 21286

**Re: Comments on draft MANE-VU report entitled "2018 Visibility Projections"**

Dear Ms. King:

Reliant Energy, Inc. and our contractor ENSR Corporation appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft MANE-VU report entitled "2018 Visibility Projections" as prepared by Northeast States Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM). Reliant Energy owns and/or operates many power plants in the United States including 18 in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and four in the State of New Jersey, and we are dedicated to operating all of our plants in compliance with all applicable environmental regulations and permits. We take seriously our responsibility for environment stewardship and exercise care for the communities that we are members of and serve. Details of Reliant Energy's comments to the aforementioned report are provided in the attached document – our comments can be summarized as follows:

1. The modeling results are of limited value because the 2018 emissions inventory does not fully reflect the expected reductions in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from electrical generating units (EGUs) located with the MANE-VU, VISTAS and MWRPO regions. As noted in Section 2.1 of the draft report, "MANE-VU Class I states made the decision to maintain the CAIR level of emissions in this 2018 modeling," and as such, "516,350 tons of emissions were added back" to the 2018 SO<sub>2</sub> emissions inventory. The report not only fails to provide any justification for this decision, but this decision appears to be in conflict with the protection of visibility regulations promulgated in 40 CFR 51.306(e). Reliant Energy urges NESCAUM and MANE-VU to perform another modeling exercise using a revised the 2018 emissions inventory that fully reflects the expected reductions in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from EGUs located with the MANE-VU, VISTAS and MWRPO regions.

2. The EGU emissions inventory prepared by Alpine Geophysics was not available for review in conjunction with the review of the NESCAUM modeling report. During the recent MANE-VU Stakeholder Briefing conducted on April 4, 2008, Reliant Energy proposed the establishment of a working group charged with reviewing the 2002 and future year's emissions inventories because of the apparent discrepancies and peculiarities as observed by Reliant Energy. The proposal to establish an emissions inventory working group was previously offered by Reliant Energy on January 9, 2008 as part of our comments document to the NESCAUM report entitled "MANE-VU Modeling for Reasonable Progress Goals."
3. Section 4.0 of the report includes a series of figures and tables that present the expected  $PM_{2.5}$  mass concentrations during natural background conditions. We believe that these concentrations are unrealistically low, and are based upon a 1990 NAPAP study that is now 18 years old. Other issues such as international transport, the new IMPROVE equation components of visibility impairment and updated information about natural sources of haze-causing particulate emissions should be considered in updating the background concentrations particulates that are subject to realistic controls. This topic was discussed during the Air & Waste Management specialty conference in Moab, Utah during the week of April 28-May 2, and we would like to offer additional comments on this issue when the program preprints become available.

Reliant Energy appreciates your attention to these comments as an important stakeholder in the regulatory process, and we are looking forward to your reply. If you have any questions or comments regarding this submittal, please contact me via telephone or email as listed above.

Very truly yours,



John P. Shimshock

Sr. Air Environmental Specialist

Attachments

Cc: Mr. Robert Paine, ENSR Corporation

# Comments on “2018 Visibility Projections”

Submitted by Reliant Energy, Inc. and ENSR Corporation

May 2, 2008

Reliant Energy and our contractor ENSR Corporation appreciate this opportunity to comment on a draft MANE-VU report entitled “2018 Visibility Projections” that is dated March 31, 2008 and available at <http://www.nescaum.org/topics/regional-haze/regional-haze-documents>. The Northeast States Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM) has prepared the aforementioned draft report for the Mid-Atlantic / Northeast Visibility Union (MANE-VU) Regional Planning Organization (RPO) to assist states in developing strategies to address regional visibility and fine particle (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) issues. Air quality simulations for calendar year 2018, a Regional Haze Rule [RHR] milestone year, were performed using the Community Multi-Scale Air Quality (CMAQ) modeling system. Reliant Energy’s comments can be summarized as follows:

1. The modeling results are of limited value because the 2018 emissions inventory does not fully reflect the expected reductions in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from electrical generating units (EGUs) located with the MANE-VU, VISTAS and MWRPO regions. As noted in Section 2.1 of the draft report, “MANE-VU Class I states made the decision to maintain the CAIR level of emissions in this 2018 modeling,” and as such, “516,350 tons of emissions were added back” to the 2018 SO<sub>2</sub> emissions inventory. The report not only fails to provide any justification for this decision, but this decision appears to be in conflict with the protection of visibility regulations promulgated in 40 CFR 51.306(e) as summarized below (*italics added for emphasis by Reliant Energy*):

The State *must consider*, at a minimum, the following factors during the development of its long-term strategy:

- (1) *Emission reductions due to ongoing air pollution control programs,*
- (2) Additional emission limitations and schedules for compliance,
- (3) Measures to mitigate the impacts of construction activities,
- (4) Source retirement and replacement schedules,
- (5) Smoke management techniques for agricultural and forestry management purposes including such plans as currently exist within the State for these purposes, and
- (6) Enforceability of emission limitations and control measures.

Reliant Energy urges NESCAUM and MANE-VU to perform another modeling exercise using a revised the 2018 emissions inventory that fully reflects the expected reductions in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from EGUs located with the MANE-VU, VISTAS and MWRPO regions.

2. The EGU emissions inventory prepared by Alpine Geophysics was not available for review in conjunction with the review of the NESCAUM modeling report. During the recent MANE-VU Stakeholder Briefing conducted on April 4, 2008, Reliant Energy proposed the establishment of a working group charged with reviewing the 2002 and future year's emissions inventories because of the apparent discrepancies and peculiarities as observed by Reliant Energy. For example, we have noted some inexplicable increases in direct PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions in the future, which is contradictory to what we would expect from substantial SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emission controls (please reference the emission inventories as presented on MARAMA's web site). The proposal to establish an emissions inventory working group was previously offered by Reliant Energy on January 9, 2008 as part of our comments document to the NESCAUM report entitled "MANE-VU Modeling for Reasonable Progress Goals."
3. Section 4.0 of the report includes a series of figures and tables that present the expected PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentrations during natural background conditions. We believe that these concentrations are unrealistically low, and are based upon a 1990 NAPAP study that is now 18 years old. Other issues such as international transport, the new IMPROVE equation components of visibility impairment and updated information about natural sources of haze-causing particulate emissions should be considered in updating the background concentrations particulates that are subject to realistic controls. This topic was discussed during the Air & Waste Management specialty conference in Moab, Utah during the week of April 28-May 2, and we would like to offer additional comments on this issue when the program preprints become available.

Details of Reliant Energy's comments are organized by section and presented below.

#### **Comments on Section 2: 2018 Emissions Inventory**

- An Alpine Geophysics report that describes the EGU emissions inventory preparation has been provided for review as of April 29, 2008, and review of that report will be completed by May 30, 2008. Any conclusions from the "2018 Visibility Projections" report that rely upon EGU emissions are subject to further review after the EGU emissions inventory report and additional information on modeled emissions (such as direct PM) from EGUs has been reviewed.
- The discussion about SO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions associated with the 167 top EGU stacks has several confusing aspects. There are several issues that need to be clarified in the final report as noted below.
  - The report mentions an SO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction "exactly matching the shortfall of 75,809 tons" that was recorded at a "hypothetical stack" in the MANE-VU region. Is this reduction a real emissions decrease at an actual facility (that NESCAUM does not want to disclose), or is it a hoped-for reduction that is not committed to? If

it is a real reduction, it would be helpful for the reader to know at least which state it is in, if not the identity of the actual facility itself.

- ▶ Information provided in the discussion between Tables 2-1 and 2-2 appears to indicate the following:
  - The MANE-VU “shortfall” from Table 2-1 of 75,809 TPY of SO<sub>2</sub> is accomplished by a recorded emission reduction from a “hypothetical stack.”
  - The MRPO “shortfall” of 265,683 TPY of SO<sub>2</sub> is more than made up for from IPM3.0 estimates, providing 290,551 TPY additional reductions.
  - The VISTAS “shortfall” of 129,275 TPY of SO<sub>2</sub> is more than made up for by the VISTAS G2 inventory plus Virginia adjustments, providing some 180,155 TPY additional reductions.

Why doesn't the report state at this point that expected SO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions in MANE-VU and the adjacent RPOs will meet the MANE-VU goal of SO<sub>2</sub> reductions equivalent to the Top 167 EGU SO<sub>2</sub> Control Scenario? This should be a point at which there is a significant finding of success in meeting this desired goal! Why not state it and put it in bold print? We conclude that no additional EGU SO<sub>2</sub> reductions should be necessary now that MANE-VU has documented that the accounted-for SO<sub>2</sub> reductions exceed their own reduction goals.

- ▶ The relationship between the values tabulated in Tables 2-2 versus those in Table 2-1 is puzzling. However, maybe no connection was intended, except that the goal of the 167 Top EGU stack strategy should somehow be tied into the CAIR level of emission reductions.
- ▶ The “add back” of 516,350 tons of EGU SO<sub>2</sub> emissions to the modeled inventory means that the MANE-VU modeling results presented in the rest of the report are out of touch with the real emission reductions and have no relevance. MANE-VU should remodel with the updated EGU emissions and present more realistic “2018 Visibility Projections.” What we are saying is that, essentially, ignoring the additional 516,350 TPY of SO<sub>2</sub> reductions invalidates the results presented later in the report.
- The SO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction strategies described in Section 2.2 for MANE-VU involve only fuel oil-related SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, consistent with what is expected for sulfur content reductions in fuel oil nationwide. However, the SO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions described in Section 2.5 go beyond fuel oil for some source categories. Unless the other RPOs have agreed to the SO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions from non-EGU coal-fired boilers and boilers without fuel specifications, NESCAUM should not count on these emission reductions.

### **Comments on Section 3: 2018 Modeling Projections**

- As stated above, we believe that these projections are inaccurate because the updated EGU SO<sub>2</sub> inventory has not been accounted for in the modeling. The report discusses this to some extent for the Dolly Sods results. It is not clear why MANE-VU is bothering to present these irrelevant results.
- It is somewhat disappointing (and counter-intuitive) to read that the modeled sulfate is reduced only by about one-third on the worst 20% days, while the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions due to CAIR alone are reduced by 73% at full implementation, and Section 2 of the draft document notes additional reductions beyond this. Therefore, please explain why the modeling is not indicating a larger reduction of sulfates. In essence, we strongly recommend that the massive CAIR-related emission reductions need to be first accomplished and the results monitored, and then the regional models need to be tested to see if they can replicate the visibility improvements accomplished before any further reductions are mandated. It may be that the worst 20% of days has several days for which uncontrollable PM emissions (such as from forest fires or international transport) are a big component of the problem. If that information is available somewhere, please provide a reference. If this is the case, then some effort should be made to reconsider what is the 2064 natural background goal, accounting properly for what cannot be changed.

### **Comments on Section 4: 2018 Visibility Results**

- The report implies that significantly more emission reductions will be needed to reach natural background conditions. We wonder what the modeling would show if all rational emission reductions to all US-based source groups were obtained. That should be the 2064 goal, rather than some hypothetical goal that does not properly account for uncontrollable or unpredictable sources of particulate emissions, whether they are natural or non-USA sources. As noted above, we may offer additional comments on a more realistic natural conditions goal after reviewing the papers presented at the Moab, Utah conference.



HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
1900 K STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1109

TEL 202 • 955 • 1500  
FAX 202 • 778 • 2201

ANDREA BEAR FIELD  
DIRECT DIAL: 202-955-1558  
EMAIL: [afield@hunton.com](mailto:afield@hunton.com)

FILE NO: 31531.010001

April 25, 2008

**VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL AND  
EMAIL**

Ms. Angela King  
Environmental Planner  
MARAMA  
8600 LaSalle Road  
Suite 636  
Towson, MD 21286

**Comments on MANE-VU's 2018 Visibility Projections Draft Report**

Dear Ms. King:

These comments are submitted on behalf of the Utility Air Regulatory Group ("UARG")<sup>1</sup> in response to the April 4, 2008 email invitation from the Mid-Atlantic/Northeast Visibility Union ("MANE-VU"), asking stakeholders to comment on its "2018 Visibility Projections" Draft Report (hereinafter "2018 Visibility Projections Draft Report"). As explained in that email invitation, the 2018 Visibility Projections Draft Report provides information on MANE-VU's efforts to quantify the "visibility impacts of those measures that are being actively considered by MANE-VU states as a result of the regional haze consultation process . . . [and] will be useful to the MANE-VU states as they establish reasonable progress goals and develop their long-term emissions management strategies for Class I areas under the federal Regional Haze Rule."

---

<sup>1</sup> UARG is an unincorporated association of individual electric utility companies and trade associations. UARG participates in federal and precedential state proceedings arising under the federal Clean Air Act and having an impact on UARG members. UARG has participated in the planning processes of Regional Planning Organizations ("RPOs") as they guide states in the preparation of regional haze plans to be submitted to EPA.

Ms. Angela King  
April 25, 2008  
Page 2

MANE-VU's 2018 Visibility Projections Draft Report attempts to describe the complicated process that MANE-VU followed to evaluate what the impact on visibility would be in 2018 if, by that year (1) electric generating units ("EGUs") in the states in MANE-VU, VISTAS and the Midwest Regional Planning Organization ("MRPO") implement the emission reductions required by the Clean Air Interstate Rule ("CAIR") (as projected by IPM version 2.1.9 modeling); (2) those states also implement certain additional emission reductions from non-EGU sectors (including best available retrofit technology ("BART") emission controls at a limited number of non-EGU sources); and (3) certain emission reductions (described below) occur from EGUs in Ontario. Given the very summary description of the MANE-VU analysis provided in the draft report, some aspects of the analysis are unclear and should be explained in more detail in the final version of the report.<sup>2</sup>

Most important, however, is the conclusion provided in the draft report, *i.e.*, that under the emission reduction scenario used in the analysis "[a]ll MANE-VU [Class I area] sites are projected to meet or exceed the uniform rate of progress goal for 2018 on the 20 percent worst days." 2018 Visibility Projections Draft Report, Section 3. In addition, the draft report concludes that, under that scenario, there is no projected worsening of visibility on the 20 percent best days. *Id.*

Given these conclusions -- and findings by other RPOs that, in general, Class I areas in the eastern half of the country for the most part will meet or exceed their uniform rates of progress for 2018 -- we believe it is appropriate for states in the affected RPOs to continue to develop regional haze state implementation plans ("SIPs") for the first planning period that (1) reflect the emission reduction levels for EGUs that result from compliance with CAIR, and (2) do not

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, the draft report fails to explain why the analysis (1) subtracted 75,809 tons from "one hypothetical stack in the [MANE-VU] region" to satisfy the "shortfall" between projected 2018 EGU emissions at those MANE-VU EGU stacks that are among the "167 top EGU stacks" and MANE-VU's 90-percent reduction target for those stacks, but then (2) added back that same number of tons at the same hypothetical MANE-VU stack. Why was that procedure used for EGUs in the MANE-VU region while another procedure was used for EGUs in VISTAS and MRPO states (where the analysis apparently used information related to actual stacks and actual EGUs and applied a somewhat more geographically refined emission "add-back")? 2018 Visibility Projections Draft Report, Section 2.1.



Ms. Angela King  
April 25, 2008  
Page 3

include additional emission reduction requirements for EGUs. We also believe that EPA would be justified in approving any such SIPs.

In presenting its analysis, MANE-VU refers (in Section 2 of the 2018 Visibility Projections Draft Report) to “a number of additional potentially reasonable control measures,” including “additional SO<sub>2</sub> emissions reductions at electric generating units (EGUs).” Presumably, this is a reference to MANE-VU’s “top 167 stacks” scenario. For the reasons described above, it is neither necessary nor appropriate, as part of the current regional haze SIP development process, to impose -- or to ask other states to impose -- additional control measures on EGUs. The above-described MANE-VU modeling projections show that no such additional control measures are needed to meet or exceed the uniform rate of progress for 2018 at MANE-VU Class I areas.

Any effort to evaluate what visibility improvements may be needed or appropriate should take into account, in a much more systematic way than the draft report does, the impact of non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions. MANE-VU appropriately considers in its analysis the impact of SO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions that are expected to occur from six coal-burning EGUs in Ontario that are scheduled to be shut down and replaced with nine natural gas turbine units with NO<sub>x</sub> controls. *See* 2018 Visibility Projections Draft Report, Section 2.4. As MANE-VU recognizes by its consideration of this factor, emissions from Canadian sources plainly can have significant effects on visibility in the MANE-VU states. SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the six Ontario EGUs considered by MANE-VU in its analysis, however, are merely a subset of non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions of visibility-impairing pollutants that likely contribute to visibility impairment in MANE-VU Class I areas. UARG believes that if MANE-VU (and the other RPOs) address the effects of such emissions in a more systematic way in their 2018 visibility projections,<sup>3</sup> that would further demonstrate the sufficiency of current and planned emission controls to achieve reasonable progress goals.

---

<sup>3</sup> Attached is a copy of a paper by the Electric Power Research Institute (“EPRI”) concerning a method for taking the effect of these emissions into account in visibility analyses. Also attached is a white paper providing further information on the method described by EPRI. UARG urges MANE-VU to apply the approach described by EPRI, or a similar technically justified approach, to assess in a comprehensive way the impact of emissions from non-U.S. anthropogenic sources on projected 2018 visibility in MANE-VU Class I areas. UARG encourages MANE-VU to present that assessment in the final version of its report.



Ms. Angela King  
April 25, 2008  
Page 4

UARG appreciates this opportunity to comment on the draft MANE-VU report and looks forward to participating as appropriate in other proceedings by RPOs to address implementation of the Clean Air Act's visibility improvement provisions.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Andrea Bear Field".

Andrea Bear Field

cc: John E. Hornback  
Annette Sharp  
Michael Koerber

# Effect of Transboundary Pollution on Visibility A Case Study for Northern Class I Areas

## Technical Brief

### Introduction

The Regional Haze Rule (RHR) was promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1999 to address mitigation of regional haze in the United States. The RHR calls for states to establish reasonable goals and emission reduction strategies for improving visibility in mandatory Class I areas (national parks and wilderness areas), striving to achieve “natural visibility conditions” by 2064. The RHR requires that the visibility at these Class I areas on the 20% worst haze days (expressed in deciviews) should improve along a “uniform rate of progress” (URP). EPA has prescribed that the URP be calculated exclusively from the difference between the 20% worst haze conditions in the 2000–2004 baseline period and under natural conditions in 2064. The URP serves as a reference in determining a state’s progress toward achieving the 2064 goal. States are required to develop plans every 10 years to meet the reasonable progress goals (RPG) based on the URP. The plans for the first implementation period that call for meeting the RPG in 2018 are due in 2008.

EPA defines natural conditions as those that would exist “in the absence of human caused impairment.” From a practical point of view, reaching this goal of natural conditions in the United States is impossible because air pollution from other countries gets transported across the border and increases the U.S. pollutant concentrations above the natural level. According to EPA, a contribution from transboundary transport is not to be considered when setting the 2064 natural conditions goal, even though a major fraction of the actual visibility impairment at some near-border Class I areas may be due to transboundary transport of pollution. However, if a state has difficulty achieving visibility improvement progress along the URP line, it may present transboundary transport as a mitigating reason, if appropriate. A state has to first estimate the impact of transboundary pollution on the visibility impairment at a Class I area of interest.

Figure 1 illustrates a conceptual method to quantify the effect of transboundary pollution when determining whether an RPG has been met for a particular site. Point “A” represents the 2018 progress goal calculated via the URP “glide slope” and point “X” represents the estimated 2018 design value (that is, the model estimated value accounting for emissions reductions by 2018). If transboundary pollution can explain the difference between values at points, A and X, a state can still show it has made “reasonable” progress toward meeting the EPA-prescribed URP.




Figure 1. Illustration of a Way to Account for Transboundary Pollution.

### Estimating Transboundary Pollution

Global chemical transport modeling offers a means of estimating the contributions of transboundary pollution. With EPRI support, Harvard University used a global chemical transport model, GEOS-Chem, to assess the amount of transported pollutants coming from outside the United States and their impact on meeting the RHR. An important finding from that work was that the current transboundary transport of ammonium sulfate is significantly higher than the default natural concentrations. This transport is mostly from Canada and Mexico, but there is also a non-negligible contribution from Asia. Other haze-causing pollutants whose transboundary influence was significant included organic carbon, dust, and ammonium nitrate (at the northern Class I areas in the upper Midwest).

The Harvard simulations were performed for 2001, whereas most states are using 2002 as the base year for modeling for developing their implementation plans for the RHR. Using the same principles as used by Harvard, VISTAS (Visibility Improvement State and Tribal Association of the Southeast) has estimated transboundary pollution at all Class I areas in the United States for 2002 using the EPA’s CMAQ (Community Multi-scale Air Quality) model. The model was run for three configurations by VISTAS:

- Run 1: Base case with all emissions
- Run 2: Simulation with no U.S. anthropogenic emissions
- Run 3: Simulation with no global anthropogenic emissions

For each of these simulations, boundary conditions were provided by the GEOS-Chem model that was also run separately for each scenario. The transboundary anthropogenic impact was calculated by subtracting concentrations obtained using Run 3 from those obtained using Run 2.

## Effect of Transboundary Pollution at Northern Class I Areas

Four Class I areas (Voyagers National Park, MN; Seney National Wildlife Refuge, MI; Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, MN; and Isle Royale National Park, MI) were chosen to examine the effect of transboundary pollution on meeting the RPG for 2018. This was done by first calculating the URP for each site and then estimating points “A” and “X” (as shown in Figure 1). The data for calculating the base case (2000–2004) visibility conditions, 2064 natural conditions, and the 2018 design values were obtained from the Midwest Regional Planning Organization (MRPO). For each site, MRPO provided the observed conditions (species concentrations) for all the 20% worst haze days occurring from 2000 to 2004, average natural visibility conditions for the 20% worst haze days, and the 2018 relative reduction factors (RRFs) for each species for the corresponding 20% worst haze days in 2002.

The following steps were undertaken to estimate the effect of transboundary pollution at these sites:

1. The base case visibility in deciviews was calculated by averaging the deciviews for the 20% worst haze days occurring from 2000 to 2004. The new IMPROVE equation was used to convert species concentrations to light extinction.
2. The 2018 RPG (in deciviews) was calculated assuming a linear progression from the base case visibility in 2004 (calculated in Step 1) to the natural visibility in 2064.
3. The 2018 design value was calculated by first multiplying the 2018 RRFs for each species with the corresponding concentration of that species from 2000 to 2004 to estimate the future concentrations of those species. The new IMPROVE equation was then used to convert the species concentrations to light extinction. The deciviews were calculated for each day (corresponding to the 20% worst haze days from 2000 to 2004) and then averaged to calculate the 2018 design value.
4. The transboundary concentrations (obtained from VISTAS) corresponding to the 20% worst haze days in 2002 were averaged to get an average value for each species. These concentrations were subtracted from the corresponding concentrations calculated for the future year (2018) in Step 3. The resulting concentrations for each species for each of those days were converted to light extinction using the new IMPROVE equation and then converted to a revised design value for 2018.

If the design value calculated in Step 3 is below the URP, then the state has achieved the RPG for that Class I area. However, if the design value is above the URP, then the revised design value calculated in Step 4 can be examined. If the revised design value is below the URP, the argument can be made that transboundary pollution is responsible for that Class I area not meeting its URP, and the state can cite that as a mitigating reason.

## Results

Figure 2 shows the glide slope calculation and the 2018 design values for the Boundary Waters Class I area. The solid blue line denotes the URP with the solid diamond in 2018 showing the RPG. The light blue open rectangle shows the 2018 design value. In this case, the design value is above the URP line; therefore, it fails to meet the RPG for 2018. However, the red open triangle shows that the revised 2018 design value (removing the effect of transboundary pollution) is below the URP line; thus, the state is able to meet the “reasonable” progress goal.

Figures 3, 4, and 5 show similar plots for Isle Royale, Voyagers, and Seney. As the data show, in each case, removing the effect of the transboundary pollution allows each of these Class I areas to achieve the 2018 RPG (although it is still slightly above the URP at Voyagers).




Figure 2. Glide Slope Calculation for Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness




Figure 3. Glide Slope Calculation for Isle Royale National Park




Figure 4. Glide Slope Calculation for Voyagers National Park




Figure 5. Glide Slope Calculation for Seney National Wildlife Refuge

### Export Control Restrictions

Access to and use of EPRI Intellectual Property is granted with the specific understanding and requirement that responsibility for ensuring full compliance with all applicable U.S. and foreign export laws and regulations is being undertaken by you and your company. This includes an obligation to ensure that any individual receiving access hereunder who is not a U.S. citizen or permanent U.S. resident is permitted access under applicable U.S. and foreign export laws and regulations. In the event you are uncertain whether you or your company may lawfully obtain access to this EPRI Intellectual Property, you acknowledge that it is your obligation to consult with your company's legal counsel to determine whether this access is lawful. Although EPRI may make available on a case-by-case basis an informal assessment of the applicable U.S. export classification for specific EPRI Intellectual Property, you and your company acknowledge that this assessment is solely for informational purposes and not for reliance purposes. You and your company acknowledge that it is still the obligation of you and your company to make your own assessment of the applicable U.S. export classification and ensure compliance accordingly. You and your company understand and acknowledge your obligations to make a prompt report to EPRI and the appropriate authorities regarding any access to or use of EPRI Intellectual Property hereunder that may be in violation of applicable U.S. or foreign export laws or regulations.

**The Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)**, with major locations in Palo Alto, California; Charlotte, North Carolina; and Knoxville, Tennessee, was established in 1973 as an independent, nonprofit center for public interest energy and environmental research. EPRI brings together members, participants, the Institute's scientists and engineers, and other leading experts to work collaboratively on solutions to the challenges of electric power. These solutions span nearly every area of electricity generation, delivery, and use, including health, safety, and environment. EPRI's members represent over 90% of the electricity generated in the United States. International participation represents nearly 15% of EPRI's total research, development, and demonstration program.

Together...Shaping the Future of Electricity

### Electric Power Research Institute

3420 Hillview Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94304-1338 • PO Box 10412, Palo Alto, California 94303-0813 USA  
800.313.3774 • 650.855.2121 • [askepri@epri.com](mailto:askepri@epri.com) • [www.epri.com](http://www.epri.com)

© 2007 Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Inc. All rights reserved. Electric Power Research Institute, EPRI, and TOGETHER...SHAPING THE FUTURE OF ELECTRICITY are registered service marks of the Electric Power Research Institute, Inc.

♻️ Printed on recycled paper in the United States of America

October 2007

## **ASSESSING VISIBILITY EFFECTS OF INTERNATIONAL EMISSIONS UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT REGIONAL HAZE PROGRAM**

A recurring issue in implementation of the Clean Air Act regional haze program concerns how to account for effects of international emissions, particularly man-made emissions, on visibility in the United States. This issue has generated discussion recently among federal and state officials and others addressing regional haze implementation. This paper summarizes an approach that many states (including states in the VISTAS and CENRAP regional planning organizations (RPOs)) are using to account appropriately for effects of non-U.S. emissions. As discussed below, that approach is consistent with EPA's regional haze rules and, contrary to some recent suggestions, does not "redraw" the uniform rate-of-progress "glidepath" for visibility improvement.

### **Accounting for Foreign-Source Manmade Emissions**

The regional haze program's overarching "national goal" is "the prevention of any future, and the remedying of any existing, impairment of visibility in mandatory class I Federal areas which impairment results from manmade air pollution." (Clean Air Act § 169A(a)(1).) States must develop, and submit by December 17, 2007, state implementation plans (SIPs) to make "reasonable progress" toward that goal. These SIPs must state, and explain, reasonable progress goals (RPGs) for 2018 for relevant Class I areas.


EPA has long recognized the obvious fact that states have no power to control emissions from sources located outside the United States, and states cannot be expected to offset the visibility effects of foreign-source manmade, or anthropogenic, emissions through additional emission reductions at domestic sources. In developing their SIPs, however, states need some reasonable way to account for those effects. A method to do so is described in a May 2007 report by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI).<sup>1</sup> This method relies on available data and models, such as the GEOS-Chem model, to assess visibility-impairing emissions from non-U.S. sources and the effects of those emissions on the ability to meet RPGs for Class I areas. As the report discusses, this method also has been used in VISTAS, the southeastern states' RPO, which used EPA's Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) model in its analysis.

---

<sup>1</sup> The report is available at [http://my.epri.com/portal/server.pt?Abstract\\_id=000000000001015251](http://my.epri.com/portal/server.pt?Abstract_id=000000000001015251).

This method allows a comparison between: (1) projected visibility conditions (in deciviews) at a given Class I area in 2018 reflecting the modeled effects of all emissions regardless of type or location of source (*i.e.*, U.S. anthropogenic emissions, non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions, and emissions from natural sources both inside and outside the U.S); and (2) the visibility conditions that would be projected to exist at that area in 2018 if non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions were removed from the emission inventory. The modeled visibility values for 2018 can be plotted on a graph that also displays the “uniform rate of progress” (URP) glidepath for the area in question. (The URP, which states must consider under the regional haze rules, is a steady rate of visibility improvement at the Class I area from the 2000-2004 baseline period to the 2064 “natural conditions” target date described in the rules.)

Shown below is an example, from the EPRI report, of a graphic presentation of the results of this kind of assessment. This example shows projected values for Isle Royale National Park in Michigan.<sup>2</sup> The straight blue line shows the URP for that Class I area. The blue square shows the projected 2018 deciview level reflecting the effects of all emissions, including non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions. The red triangle shows the projected 2018 deciview level if non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions are removed. In this example, the projected deciview level with all emissions included (the blue square) is above the URP, meaning that projected visibility is worse than the visibility represented by the URP. But the projected deciview level with non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions excluded (the red triangle) is lower than the URP, meaning that projected visibility would be better than the URP if non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions were removed.



<sup>2</sup> The report describes results of analyses showing significant transboundary impact in four Class I areas in the Northern Midwest (Seney National Wildlife Refuge, Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and Voyageurs National Park, in addition to Isle Royale). Though not discussed in the report, EPRI and VISTAS modeling results also show that transboundary emissions can have significant effects on visibility impairment in Class I areas near the Mexican border.

## **Consistency with EPA's Rules and Guidance**

As can be seen from the illustration on the preceding page, this approach does *not* modify the URP glidepath. Instead, it shows projected deciview levels -- both levels with and levels without the visibility effects of non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions -- in 2018. That is important because the regional haze rules indicate, and EPA has reiterated in guidance, that the URP is to be set using only baseline conditions and projected natural conditions in 2064. Thus, it seems clear that states may not *change* the URP by, for instance, increasing the 2064 "natural conditions" deciview level to account for the effects of non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions (which would in turn increase the 2018 point on the "adjusted" URP).

The approach discussed in the EPRI report is consistent with EPA's statements about how states may account for international emissions' effects on Class I area visibility. For example, in the preamble to its final regional haze rules, EPA responded to commenters' "concerns that EPA should take into account that States are not able to control international sources in reviewing a State's proposal for a reasonable progress target":

EPA agrees that the projected emissions from international sources will in some cases affect the ability of States to meet reasonable progress goals. The EPA *does not expect States to restrict emissions from domestic sources to offset the impacts of international transport of pollution*. We believe that States *should evaluate the impacts of current and projected emissions from international sources* in their regional haze programs, particularly in cases where it has already been well documented that such sources are important. At the same time, EPA will work with the governments of Canada and Mexico to seek cooperative solutions on transboundary pollution problems.

64 Fed. Reg. 35714, 35736 col. 3 (July 1, 1999) (emphasis added). In informal guidance issued in 2006, EPA elaborated on states' authority to evaluate and take into account the effects of foreign emissions. For example, EPA stated:

Both in explaining RPGs and in assessing whether current implementation plan strategies are achieving them, States can take into account the nature of international emissions. For instance, after having applied the four statutory factors [that states must consider in determining reasonable progress] and calculated their RPGs, states can at their discretion, quantify the effects of international emissions



on their ability to reach RPGs. However, States should not directly consider the effects of international emissions when calculating their uniform rates of progress by either adding the effects of international emissions to their estimates of natural conditions, or by subtracting international emissions from current conditions. Either of these approaches conflicts with the basic definition of “current conditions” (baseline conditions for the first SIP) and “natural conditions,” as described in the 1999 [regional haze rules].

EPA, “Additional Regional Haze Questions” (Sept. 27, 2006 Revision) at 19.

The approach that is described in the EPRI report and that is being used by a number of states to account for non-U.S. anthropogenic emissions does not change the definition or calculation of current or natural visibility conditions. Thus, it does not change the deciview values used in determining the URP and does not change the URP itself. Rather, that approach is simply a tool to use in “explaining [the] RPGs” that states select and in “quantify[ing] the effects of international emissions on their ability to reach RPGs,” consistent with EPA guidance.<sup>3</sup>

Recently, certain statements have been made by staff members in EPA regional offices and at Federal land manager (FLM) agencies, among others, regarding the approach described in the EPRI report that appear to reflect a misunderstanding of that approach. For example, responding to a VISTAS state’s presentation in a September 2007 inter-RPO conference call about that state’s evaluation of international-emission effects (conducted along the lines of the approach described in EPRI’s report), one EPA-region staff member initially said that that approach appeared to involve redrawing the URP. A similar comment was made later by another EPA-region staff member, who suggested the approach seems to involve setting a new glidepath. And an FLM analyst indicated he

---

<sup>3</sup> It is important to note that EPA’s rules do not require a state to determine that the URP is the RPG for a given area; states may, for example, properly determine that the RPG should be less ambitious than the URP. 40 C.F.R. § 51.308(d)(1)(ii); 64 Fed. Reg. at 35732 cols. 2-3; EPA, Guidance for Setting Reasonable Progress Goals Under the Regional Haze Program, at p. 1-3 (June 1, 2007) (“The glidepath is not a presumptive target, and States may establish a RPG that provides for greater, lesser, or equivalent visibility improvement as that described by the glidepath.”). Because EPA does not require or expect states to restrict domestic sources’ emissions to offset the impacts of international transport, it would seem that states have discretion to consider effects of non-U.S. manmade emissions as a “relevant factor[ ]” in “determin[ing] what additional control measures would be reasonable,” which is one of the steps in the state’s selection of the rate of progress that is reasonable. *Id.* at p. 2-3. Doing so would not change the URP but may result in establishing an RPG that is less ambitious than the URP.

thought this approach reflected an inappropriate technique for accounting for non-U.S. emissions.

For the reasons discussed above, it seems clear that these criticisms reflect a fundamental misunderstanding of this approach, which does not call for any redrawing or other adjustment of the glidepath. The following points should be kept in mind -- and articulated -- in any discussion of this issue:

- **The approach described by EPRI does not recalculate the Uniform Rate of Progress (URP) glidepath. Calculation of the glidepath is based only on the 2000-2004 observed conditions (the “current,” or baseline, conditions) and the 2064 natural conditions. The 2018 URP is calculated from the glidepath.**
- **This approach does not add transboundary impact (*i.e.*, visibility impact from non-U.S. anthropogenic sources) to either the baseline or the 2064 “natural conditions” end point.**
- **This approach is consistent with and, in fact, uses transboundary contribution estimates from VISTAS.**
- **The 2018 Reasonable Progress Goal (RPG) for a given Class I area is calculated as the visibility conditions (in deciviews) that an area is projected to achieve in 2018 from implementation of a reasonable set of emission controls selected by the state, based on the state’s consideration of the statutory “reasonable progress” factors.**
- **Assessing transboundary impact may be particularly important if the 2018 RPG selected by the state is at a higher deciview level than the 2018 URP level. In such cases, this approach can be useful for the state in understanding and explaining: (1) the extent to which the deciview difference between the 2018 RPG and the 2018 URP may be accounted for by transboundary impact on the Class I area at issue; (2) why, for that area, meeting the URP would require unreasonably rapid progress; and (3) why the progress goal selected by the state is reasonable.**
- **For the Northern Midwest Class I areas, an EPRI analysis using this approach showed that the transboundary impact is significant. EPRI and VISTAS modeling results also show that the transboundary impact can be significant for Class I areas near Mexico.**



**VISIBILITY IMPROVEMENT –  
STATE AND TRIBAL ASSOCIATION OF THE SOUTHEAST**  
526 FOREST PKWY STE F  
FOREST PARK GA 30297-6140

(voice) 404-361-4000 (fax) 404-361-2411  
[www.vistas-sesarm.org](http://www.vistas-sesarm.org)

April 25, 2008

Anna Garcia  
Executive Director  
Mid Atlantic/Northeast Visibility Union  
Hall of the States, 444 North Capitol St.  
Suite 638  
Washington, DC 20001

RE: VISTAS Comments  
MANE-VU Best and Final Modeling

Dear Anna,

The states involved in the VISTAS regional haze planning organization appreciate the opportunity to provide the following comments to the MANE-VU states regarding the recent MANE-VU Best and Final modeling effort which evaluated visibility benefits in 2018 of possible future emissions control strategies. The MANE-VU Best and Final strategy appears to include controls in the VISTAS region, and perhaps elsewhere, for which no enforceable requirements are in place to implement the projected controls. The modeling effort utilized information that is inconsistent with what was provided to MANE-VU during interstate consultation with the VISTAS states. MANE-VU used emission control strategies and levels for the VISTAS states that are different from those used in the VISTAS assessment and included in the State Implementation Plans (SIPs) by the VISTAS states.

For Electric Generating Units, VISTAS states began with the 2018 emissions controls projected by the Integrated Planning Model (IPM) version 2.1.9 and adjusted these projections to reflect known controls on specific units. VISTAS states consulted with their utilities to adjust IPM projections for 2018. This included additional controls on EGUs in Georgia and North Carolina for which state regulations are in place that require specific controls to be installed by 2018. It also included controls on EGUs in Alabama, Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia consistent with requirements of federal consent decrees. Florida, South Carolina, and Virginia added back into the inventory emissions from oil-fired boilers that IPM assumed would be shut down by 2018 but utilities indicated would not be shut down. In contrast, MANE-VU added SO<sub>2</sub> emissions back into the 2018 eastern RPO inventory because as modeled for VISTAS, total SO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the areas of the MRPO, MANE-VU and VISTAS were below the CAIR caps and MANE-VU states do not believe that that is realistic. VISTAS states are confident of controls that will be installed in the Southeast by 2009 and are relying on state regulations as well as utility and IPM projections for 2018.

These MANE-VU assumptions provide an alternative worst case estimate of 2018 emissions that does not use the specific evaluation completed by the VISTAS states and used in the VISTAS states' SIPs. VISTAS states have documented the basis for the assumptions

used in their SIPs and will re-evaluate progress in 2012 to determine if adjustments to these assumptions are needed.

MANE-VU states determined that reducing sulfur in fuel oil for residential, commercial, and industrial users and implementing BART controls could reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from non-EGU sources in MANE-VU states by more than 28%. MANE-VU therefore asked VISTAS and MRPO to reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from non-EGU by 28% and subsequently reduced the VISTAS and MRPO non-EGU 2018 SO<sub>2</sub> inventory by that percentage in the MANE-VU Best and Final modeling. Fuel oil contributes 15-37% to SO<sub>2</sub> in areas of influence for MANE-VU Class I areas, but in the VISTAS states, fuel oil contributions are less than 10% of the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the areas of influence for the VISTAS Class I areas. The VISTAS SO<sub>2</sub> contribution assessment for the VISTAS Class I areas demonstrated that the major sources of SO<sub>2</sub> in the VISTAS areas of influence are EGUs and coal-fired industrial boilers. To achieve a 28% reduction in non-EGU emissions in the VISTAS states, MANE-VU assumed that a 50-60% SO<sub>2</sub> reduction would be achieved for emissions from industrial boilers in the VISTAS states. These assumptions do not appear to take into account cost analyses conducted by VISTAS states as part of the evaluation of the four statutory factors for contributing sources in the areas of influence for VISTAS Class I areas. While most VISTAS states determined that there were no cost-effective controls for sources contributing to Class I areas in the VISTAS states, some VISTAS states are still completing their determinations. The ultimate collective conclusions of the VISTAS states will also apply for more distant Class I areas such as those in the MANE-VU region.

In summary, the MANE-VU Best and Final modeling has evaluated benefits of potential control strategies that do not reflect the emissions inventories provided to MANE-VU for the VISTAS states. Therefore the VISTAS states recommend that the MANE-VU states use the VISTAS inventories rather than the MANE-VU Best and Final inventory in their SIPs. States are given the authority to define reasonable measures for sources within their respective boundaries. Through the SIP approval process, EPA will determine if control assumptions included in VISTAS states' SIPs are appropriate to demonstrate reasonable progress toward visibility improvement. The VISTAS states believe that the MANE-VU state SIPs will be most readily approvable by EPA if the VISTAS inventories are used.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have questions, please direct them to John Hornback, executive director of SESARM, at 404-361-4000 or [hornback@metro4-sesarm.org](mailto:hornback@metro4-sesarm.org).

Sincerely,



Barry Stephens, Chair  
VISTAS State and Tribal Air Directors

CC: John Hornback

Susan Wierman  
Executive Director  
Mid-Atlantic Regional Air Management Association, Inc.  
8600 LaSalle Road, Suite 636  
Towson, MD 21286



---

west virginia department of environmental protection

---

Division of Air Quality  
601 57<sup>th</sup> Street SE  
Charleston, WV 25304  
Phone: 304.926.0475 ♦ Fax: 304.926.0479

Joe Manchin III, Governor  
Stephanie R. Timmermeyer, Cabinet Secretary  
[www.wvdep.org](http://www.wvdep.org)

April 25, 2008

Ms. Angela King  
MANE-VU c/o  
MARAMA  
via e-mail

RE: West Virginia Comments on the  
MANE-VU 2018 Visibility Projections  
Draft Report

Dear Ms. King:

The West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Air Quality (DAQ) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Mid-Atlantic/Northeast Visibility Union (MANE-VU) 2018 Visibility Projections Draft Report. These comments are being submitted via e-mail to the Mid-Atlantic Regional Air Management Association (MARAMA), which is assisting MANE-VU.

West Virginia is a member of the Visibility Improvement - State and Tribal Association of the Southeast (VISTAS) regional planning organization and concurs with the comments submitted by Barry Stephens, Chair of the VISTAS State and Tribal Air Directors, on behalf of the VISTAS members. VISTAS has expended a tremendous amount of resources to assist member states in developing their Regional Haze State Implementation Plans (SIPs) and has consistently delivered high-quality technical analyses. We strongly believe that the sophisticated professional work completed by VISTAS provides a more than adequate technical basis on which members can build their SIPs. Indeed, EPA and the Federal Land Managers have universally praised the VISTAS work products and initial SIPs for their technical accuracy and comprehensiveness. In addition to the VISTAS comments, DAQ would like to provide supplemental comments.

We would like to emphasize that we expressly notified several MANE-VU states at the start of the public comment period for our proposed Regional Haze SIP in October 2007. Further, though not required, the DAQ at that time provided electronic copies of the full SIP documentation, including the emission inventories developed by VISTAS, to the following MANE-VU states: Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Vermont, and Pennsylvania.



Although DAQ did receive several substantive comments from New Jersey on other matters, no comments received from New Jersey, or any other MANE-VU state, raised any issue regarding the emissions inventories used in the SIP modeling. Given subsequent developments, the DAQ believes that some of the potential commenters knew, or should have known, that significantly different emissions inventories were in process for MANE-VU's visibility evaluations. The emissions are clearly the fundamental basis for any such evaluations and should be one of the first elements examined upon review because the projected emission changes establish the expected rate of progress. Yet no one, including potential MANE-VU commenters, raised this issue during the formal comment period for our proposed Regional Haze SIP, despite proactive outreach efforts. Given the impact on evaluations for Class I areas such as Brigantine (NJ), Shenandoah (VA) and Dolly Sods (WV), the DAQ believes that it is inappropriate to arbitrarily revise the projected emissions inventory for a regulatory analysis. We believe that the approach taken by VISTAS is more suitable and supportable.

For electric generating units (EGUs), VISTAS states began with the 2018 emission controls projected by the Integrated Planning Model (IPM) version 2.1.9 and adjusted the projections to reflect known controls on specific units. West Virginia recommended that the IPM projections be used for our EGUs in 2018, since we did not have any more reliable information available to justify changes. West Virginia did, however, make adjustments to the 2009 IPM projections to remove controls that we knew were not scheduled for installation by that date. Ignoring the careful application of local knowledge, MANE-VU has inappropriately increased the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions of W.Va.'s EGU sources by 20%, without regard for existing/scheduled controls, and without consulting the DAQ.

MANE-VU also determined that their member states could achieve a 28% reduction in non-EGU SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by reducing sulfur in fuel oil. Therefore, MANE-VU asked VISTAS and the Mid-West Regional Planning Organization (MRPO) to reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from their non-EGUs by 28%. DAQ evaluated potential controls for non-EGUs in our state and determined that there were no equivalent reasonably available controls. However, the W.Va. EGUs achieve excess emission reductions which more than offset the MANE-VU fuel oil "ask." DAQ documented this result in our proposed Regional Haze SIP as provided to the MANE-VU states identified above. MANE-VU, however, then assumed a 50-60% decrease in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from industrial boilers in the VISTAS states, including W.Va. This reduction is neither realistic nor enforceable and was modeled without consulting DAQ.

The Regional Haze Rule gives states the authority to define reasonable measures for sources within their respective borders and the VISTAS states, including W.Va., provided MANE-VU with the projected 2018 VISTAS emission inventory during the interstate consultation process. MANE-VU chose not to accept the VISTAS inventory and instead evaluated the benefits of potential control strategies that do not reflect the information provided by the VISTAS states.

Letter to Ms. Angela King  
April 25, 2008  
page 3

DAQ believes that MANE-VU has significantly changed emission control assumptions subsequent to the formal RPO consultation meeting, without a sound basis. West Virginia strongly recommends that the MANE-VU states use the VISTAS inventories supplied to them for our states, rather than the inventory that MANE-VU has adopted. DAQ notes that EPA will ultimately determine what control assumptions are appropriate for use in SIPs to demonstrate reasonable progress toward visibility improvement. DAQ believes that the MANE-VU state SIPs are more likely to be federally approvable if the VISTAS inventories are used.

Sincerely,



William Frederick Durham  
Deputy Director  
Assistant Director, Planning  
Division of Air Quality