EMISSIONS MODELING IN ACTION: ESTIMATING EMISSIONS FOR USE IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MODELING STUDY

James G. Wilkinson* and Cyndi Loomis Alpine Geophysics, LLC, Eugene, OR

Dave Souten and Chris Emery ENVIRON Corporation, Novato, CA

1. INTRODUCTION

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for monitoring ambient air quality within the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties (SFBA). The BAAQMD is also developing enforcing responsible for and emissions control plans to mitigate violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) within the SFBA. In the past, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has designated the SFBA as non-attainment for the federal 1-hour ozone NAAQS. In response to the designation, the BAAQMD has developed and submitted implementation plans over the years, which serve as the cornerstone to reduce adverse ozone levels in SFBA.

As a result of implementing the plans, violations of the 1-hour ozone NAAQS have been reduced to levels such that on April 22, 2004, the EPA determined that the SFBA attained the 1-hour ozone NAAQS (Federal Register, 2004a). Shortly thereafter, the 1-hour ozone NAAQS was replaced by the new, stricter 8-hour ozone NAAQS (Federal

Register, 2004b). Based on SFBA ozone levels from 2001-2003, EPA has designated the SFBA as a marginal non-attainment area of the 8-hour NAAQS (EPA, 2004).

In an on-going study of air quality in the SFBA, in conjunction with the Central California Ozone Study (CCOS) (ARB, 2003), the BAAQMD developed inputs to an air quality modeling system for two episodes: 9-13 July, 1999; and 29 July through 02 August, 2000 (ENVIRON, 2005). The choice of these episodes was based on the analysis of 1-hour ozone exceedances in the Bay Area from 1995 through September 2002 (ENVIRON, 2005), though there is supporting evidence that indicates the July 11 and 12, 1999 period will also be suitable for use in photochemical modeling of 8-hour ozone.

A core component of the BAAQMD air quality modeling system is the emissions modeling system. The emissions modeling system in use by BAAQMD is comprised of the following components:

 Emissions Modeling System of 1995 (EMS-95) for stationary and area sources emissions estimates (Wilkinson, *et al.*, 1994);

^{*}*Corresponding author address*: James G. Wilkinson, Alpine Geophysics, LLC, 2076 Westwood Lane, Eugene, OR 97401; e-mail: jgw@alpinegeophysics.com

- Biogenic Emissions Inventory Geographic Information System (BEIGIS) for biogenic emissions estimates (ARB, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c); and
- California on-road EMissions FACtor model for 2002 (EMFAC2002) (ARB, 2004d) coupled with the California Integrated Transportation Network (ITN) (Wilkinson, 2004) and the Direct Travel Impact Model (DTIM) (Fieber and Ireson, 2001) for on-road mobile source emissions estimates.

This system of emissions modeling tools was used to prepare emissions estimates for carbon monoxide (CO), total organic gases (TOG), and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) that were suitable for input to the CAMx air quality model (ENVIRON, 2003). The emissions data were derived from a variety of sources. The California Air Resources Board (ARB) prepared stationary source and county-wide area source emissions estimates for representative episode days (ARB, 2004e). Estimates of temporally and spatially resolved biogenic organic gas emissions estimates were developed using BEIGIS (ARB, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c). Spatially and temporally resolved soil NOx emissions were estimated using the methods of Williams et al. (1992) with landuse data based on version three of the Biogenic Emissions Landcover Database (BELD3) (EPA, 2001; Pierce et al., 1998) and soil NOx emissions factors from version three of the Biogenic Emissions Inventory System (BEIS3) (Vukovich and Pierce, 2002). County-wide on-road mobile source emissions of NOx, CO, and TOG were estimated using EMFAC2002 and were spatially and temporally allocated using surrogates developed through the

application of DTIM over the ITN (Wilkinson, 2004). For the July-August 2000 episode, the base emissions estimates were supplemented day-specific emissions estimates from with wildfires (ARB, 2004e), refineries (ENVIRON, 2005), sixty-seven other large stationary sources (ARB, 2004e), agricultural burns (ARB, 2004e), and commercial marine shipping (ENVIRON, For the July 1999 episode, only day-2005). specific emissions estimates for commercial marine shipping were developed since data for the other day-specific source were unavailable in a timely manner. All emissions estimates were then chemically speciated for both Carbon Bond IV (Gery et al., 1989) and SAPRC99 (Carter, 2000) chemical mechanisms, and reformatted for use in CAMx using EMS-95 (ENVIRON, 2005).

In this paper, we summarize the overarching process to develop the CAMx-ready emissions estimates and discuss the technical shortcomings. These shortcomings resulted in the study team revising the following emissions source categories more than once during the study: stationary sources, area sources, biogenics, on-road mobile sources. wildfire emissions. and refinery emissions. Finally, we provide suggestions on how to improve the process to estimate air quality model ready emissions.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Base Stationary and Area Source Emissions

During the initial stages of the study, ARB supplied base emissions estimates for the CCOS modeling domain (Figure 1), which is the same domain used for the BAAQMD photochemical modeling. The base emissions included estimates for stationary and area sources. Though it is well known that emissions undergo constant revision, especially during the course of an air quality modeling study as air quality modeling results indicate potential errors in the estimates, the base stationary and area source emissions underwent no less than thirteen revisions during the course of



the study. These revisions to the base estimates resulted in various changes to the overall NOx and TOG emissions that ranged on the order of a few tons per day to over two hundred tons per day. Each time a revision was made to the base stationary and area source emissions, they were reprocessed through the emissions modeling system in order to prepare a new set of CAMxready emissions data sets.

In order to track the changes to the base stationary and area source emissions, a file naming scheme was adopted that identified the version of base emissions as delivered by ARB directly in the CAMx-ready emissions files (ARB, 2004f). Further, an Excel spreadsheet was prepared to maintain a specific list of revisions to the base stationary and area source emissions cross-referenced to the ARB version number (ARB, 2004f). Though this worked early in the process, the shear number of changes to the base stationary and area source emissions coupled with changes to emissions in the other emissions source categories resulted in difficulties in tracking which were the most recent CAMx-ready emissions files. As one can imagine, this occasionally resulted in the use of out-of-date CAMx-ready emissions estimates.

2.2 Refinery Emissions

Based on work performed by the BAAQMD, refinery NOx emissions, specifically from flaring operations, were increased from 0.1 tons per day (tpd), as they existed in the ARB emissions inventory, to 13 tpd (ENVIRON, 2005). However, early in the study, it became clear that these revised emissions estimates were not included in the base stationary source emissions estimates that were delivered by ARB for EMS-95 processing. Further, there was evidence to suggest that other refinery-related emissions were also underestimated (e.g. upset events, pressure relief valves), which might affect TOG emissions In an effort to better characterize as well. emissions from refinery operations, the BAAQMD undertook another effort to develop day-specific emissions estimates for refinery operations within the District's jurisdiction. These day-specific emissions estimates were used in lieu of the previous standard BAAQMD/CARB estimates for the July/August 2000 base case air quality modeling (ENVIRON, 2005). Hence, the study team revisited the issue of revised refinery emissions at least twice during the course of the study.

As noted previously, no such additional effort was performed for the July 1999 base case episode (ENVIRON, 2005). Instead, the standard ARB area source emissions estimates for refineries, revised to account for the factor of one hundred increase initially determined by BAAQMD, were used for July 1999.

2.3 Commercial Marine Shipping Emissions

NOx and VOC emissions estimates from oceangoing commercial marine vessels are substantially underestimated in existing emissions inventories (Corbett et al., 1999; Corbett and Fischbeck, 1997). In order to correct this suspected deficiency, day-specific NOx and VOC emissions for oceangoing and San Francisco Bay commercial marine traffic were estimated.

Dinh (2002) estimated monthly shipping emissions for the SFBA based on 1999 ship traffic data from the San Francisco Maritime Exchange (SFME). Two types of daily ship movement data for the period of July-August 2000 were obtained from the SFME: non-tug and tug. Data used in the subsequent non-tug calculations included vessel name, activity date, and port movements, while the tug calculations included the number of tugs used.

Results showed that the daily variation in the number of non-tug ships was from 13 to 24. Deviations from the average of almost 19 non-tug

ships per day thus ranged from +37% to -32%, for a total variation of 69% around the mean. Results also showed that the number of tugs varied from 21 to 53. Deviations from the average of almost 37 tugs per day thus ranged from +43% to -43%, for a total variation of 86% around the mean. These daily factors from the mean were applied to the monthly July-August 2000 and July 1999 CCOS shipping inventories to adjust for dayspecific marine shipping emission estimates.

2.4 Wildfire Emissions

Emissions from the July/August 2000 episode were characterized by a heavy contribution from forest fire smoke. The smoke plumes from this and other large regional fires in Oregon and Nevada were detected aloft on several days by multiple aircraft and ozonesonde samples taken throughout central California (ENVIRON, 2005). Further, air quality modeling experiments demonstrated that emissions from wildfires had significant impact on air quality modeling predictions throughout the CCOS domain, possibly even in the SFBA (ENVIRON, 2005). The University of California at Berkeley's Center for the Assessment and Monitoring of Forest and Environmental Resources (CAMFER) laboratory estimated day-specific temporally and spatially resolved emissions for two of the largest wildfires, the Manter fire in Tulare County and the Plaskett fire in Monterey County, using a modified version of the USDA Forest Service First Order Fire Effects Model (FOFEM) (Reinhardt et al., 1997), called the Emissions Estimation System (EES) (ARB, 2004e). For a number of smaller wildfires throughout the domain, emissions were calculated based on the number of acres of three vegetation types (i.e., chaparral, grass, and timber) coupled with U.S. Forest Service fuel loading and emission factors (ARB, 2004e). The number of acres, vegetation type, fire duration, and location information were taken from California Department of Forestry (CDF) fire incident reports and newspaper articles (ARB, 2004e).

The July 1999 episode was not nearly affected by forest fire smoke, as fire activity levels were more representative of a "typical" ozone day (ENVIRON, 2005). Therefore, the emission inventory for July 1999 contained standard season day fire estimates.

Two issues arose with the use of these estimates. First, the emissions estimated by the modeling systems were not verifiable. Further, no efforts were (or have been) expended to determine the magnitude of the uncertainty in the emissions estimates. Second, it was well known that these emissions estimates had to be distributed in the vertical as the smoke plumes were observed to penetrate through the atmosphere. Given the unverifiable nature of the estimates, the magnitude of the emissions was deemed fixed; and hence, were not revisited during the course of the study. However, the distribution of the wildfire emissions estimates were discussed extensively, and ultimately, three revisions to the emissions estimates were made to account for alternative vertical distributions of the wildfire emissions estimates.

2.5 On-road Mobile Sources

The modeling process for on-road mobile sources was very complex involving three models

other than EMS-95. Day-specific, county-wide onroad mobile sources emissions for both episodes were estimated using EMFAC2002 (ARB, 2004d). These estimates were then spatially and temporally disaggregated using on-road mobile source spatial surrogates that were prepared using DTIM (Fieber and Ireson, 2001) runs which were based on data in the ITN (Wilkinson, 2004). A complete description of the methods to estimate on-road mobile source emissions are described elsewhere (Wilkinson, 2004; ARB, 2004e).

Three issues arose during the modeling of onroad mobile source emissions. First, the modeling process was dependent on spatially and temporally resolved surface level temperature and relative humidity. During the early stages of the study, these fields were in a state a flux as the meteorological modeling was incomplete. The first round temperature and relative humidity fields that were used to estimate emissions were based on preliminary meteorological modeling (using the prognostic MM5 model), but a performance evaluation had not yet been undertaken. Screening evaluations later revealed that the daytime temperature fields were far too cool, while nighttime fields were too warm (a classic problem associated with MM5). Therefore, a second round of environmental fields were developed using a hybrid combination of prognostic meteorological modeling results and diagnostic techniques based on interpolation of observations (ARB, 2004e). As the study progressed and the meteorological observations were further scrutinized, it was discovered that significant errors existed in the observed temperatures especially for monitoring stations in the SFBA. Subsequently, a third and fourth round of meteorological fields were used to estimate new on-road mobile source emission inventories. The third round of meteorological fields was developed based solely on new interim meteorological modeling results, and the fourth round of meteorological fields was based on the hybrid approach with revised meteorological observations.

Second, during the course of the study, ARB released a new version of EMFAC which required that the on-road mobile source modeling undergo another change. Fortunately, the release of a new version of EMFAC coincided with the release of the second round of meteorological data.

Third, the source code that acted as a "wrapper" EMFAC2002 underwent around revisions to account for changes in data that impacted the EMFAC2002 results. These data changes impacted vehicle population counts in the SFBA. For the July-August 2000 episode, these source code and data changes were accounted for; however, as discovered very late in the study, these changes did not propagate through the July 1999 episode, which ultimately required yet another run of the modeling system to estimate on-road mobile source emissions. In all, the onroad mobile source modeling system was rerun on five different occasions.

2.6 Biogenics

Organic gas biogenic emissions were modeled using BEIGIS (ARB, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c) and supplemented with soil NOx emissions estimated using other methods and data (Williams *et al.*, 1992; EPA, 2001, 2003; Pierce *et al.*, 1998; Vukovich and Pierce, 2002). These estimates require both spatially and temporally resolved estimates of temperatures and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR). As with the second round of on-road mobile source emissions estimates, the biogenic emissions for the July-August 2000 episode were estimated based on temperatures that were derived based on the hybrid approach and PAR values taken directly from the meteorological modeling (ARB, 2004e). However, as subsequent meteorological fields became available, no effort was made to remodel the biogenic emissions estimates. Though for the July 1999 episode, only the most recent meteorological fields were used to estimate biogenic emissions.

2.7 Meteorology

As noted with the biogenic and on-road mobile emissions estimates. various source meteorological fields were used in the modeling effort. Also, as can be deduced, no single, consistent meteorological field was used to estimate the emissions for all emissions sources. To further exacerbate the issue, none of the meteorological fields that were used to estimate emissions were truly consistent with the meteorological fields that were used in the air quality modeling efforts.

2.8 Emissions Summary

Table 1 summarizes the emissions estimates for the two BAAQMD ozone episodes. Representative days for each episode are shown: J-WE is a July weekend day; J-WD is a July weekday; and A-WD is an August weekday. The emissions source categories are as follows: *EGU*

Bay			CO		SOX							
Area	July	-August 2	2000	July	1999	July-	August 20	July 1999				
	J-WE	J-WD	A-WD	J-WE	J-WD	J-WE	J-WD	A-WD	J-WE	J-WD		
EGU	11	26	38	9	9	1	1	1	1	1		
Other	29	31	244	36	38	71	69	65	62	63		
Area	22	22	22	22	22	-	-	-	-	-		
Ship	2	3	3	4	3	5	7	7	8	7		
Off-road	1,051	570	570	873	483	2	2	2	2	2		
On-road	1,781	2,054	2,047	1,472	1,689	2	3	3	2	2		
Bio	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Total	2,896	2,706	2,924	2,416	2,244	81	82	78	75	75		
Bay			NOX		TOG							
Area	July-August 2000			July	1999	July-	August 20	00	Julv	July 1999		
									• • • • •			
	J-WE	J-WD	A-WD	J-WE	J-WD	J-WE	J-WD	J-WE	J-WE	J-WD		
EGU	J-WE 20	J-WD 26	A-WD 20	J-WE 15	J-WD 16	J-WE	J-WD 18	J-WE 20	J-WE 14	J-WD 14		
EGU Other	J-WE 20 63	J-WD 26 66	A-WD 20 63	J-WE 15 77	J-WD 16 81	J-WE 17 377	J-WD 18 431	J-WE 20 437	J-WE 14 361	J-WD 14 413		
EGU Other Area	J-WE 20 63 25	J-WD 26 66 25	A-WD 20 63 25	J-WE 15 77 23	J-WD 16 81 23	J-WE 17 377 370	J-WD 18 431 376	J-WE 20 437 376	J-WE 14 361 387	J-WD 14 413 393		
EGU Other Area Ship	20 63 25 10	J-WD 26 66 25 13	A-WD 20 63 25 10	J-WE 15 77 23 17	J-WD 16 81 23 14	J-WE 17 377 370 1	J-WD 18 431 376 1	J-WE 20 437 376 1	J-WE 14 361 387 1	J-WD 14 413 393 1		
EGU Other Area Ship Off-road	20 63 25 10 147	J-WD 26 66 25 13 199	A-WD 20 63 25 10 147	J-WE 15 77 23 17 147	J-WD 16 81 23 14 200	J-WE 17 377 370 1 182	J-WD 18 431 376 1 100	J-WE 20 437 376 1 100	J-WE 14 361 387 1 158	J-WD 14 413 393 1 88		
EGU Other Area Ship Off-road On-road	20 63 25 10 147 263	J-WD 26 66 25 13 199 343	A-WD 20 63 25 10 147 263	J-WE 15 77 23 17 147 219	J-WD 16 81 23 14 200 293	J-WE 17 377 370 1 182 196	J-WD 18 431 376 1 100 228	J-WE 20 437 376 1 100 229	J-WE 14 361 387 1 158 195	J-WD 14 413 393 1 88 227		
EGU Other Area Ship Off-road On-road Bio	20 63 25 10 147 263 9	J-WD 26 66 25 13 199 343 10	A-WD 20 63 25 10 147 263 9	J-WE 15 77 23 17 147 219 11	J-WD 16 81 23 14 200 293 13	J-WE 17 377 370 1 182 196 339	J-WD 18 431 376 1 100 228 457	J-WE 20 437 376 1 100 229 396	J-WE 14 361 387 1 158 195 642	J-WD 14 413 393 1 1 88 227 731		

Table 1. SFBA emissions estimates for July-August 2000 and July 1999 ozone episodes.

is electric generating utilities; *Other* is stationary sources other than EGU; *Area* is area sources; *Ship* is commercial marine shipping; *Off-road* is non-road mobile sources; *On-road* is on-road mobile sources; and *Bio* is biogenics.

It is interesting to note the following:

- Though July 1999 was a much warmer episode than July-August 2000 (ENVIRON, 2005), EGU CO, NOx, and TOG emissions are higher for July-August 2000 due to the use of day-specific emissions estimates;
- Other CO emissions for A-WD are substantially higher due to an upset event captured at a refinery through the use of day-specific emissions;

- Though July 1999 was a warmer episode than July-August 2000, *on-road* CO and NOx emissions are about 20 % higher in July-August 2000 while TOG emissions are roughly equal; and
- Biogenic emissions in July 1999 are roughly double the July-August 2000 emissions.

It is well known that EGU emissions are dependent on ambient temperature. Given that July 1999 was much warmer than July-August 2000, one would expect the EGU emissions to be at least roughly equivalent for the episodes. Since this is not the case, it seems prudent to investigate why this discrepancy exists. Similarly, it seems prudent to investigate why the emissions for onroad mobile sources are reacting to temperatures in what appears to be a non-intuitive manner. Finally, though biogenic emissions are higher in July 1999, which is consistent with expectations (i.e. as temperatures increase, biogenic emissions increase), the factor of two increase is higher than what is expected; hence, it seems apropos to determine if this is the correct response.

2.9 Organic Gas Speciation

A component of the emissions modeling process is to convert organic gas emissions estimates into a form that is suitable for input to the air quality model. This process is known as speciation, and the resulting mix of speciated emissions defines the overall reactivity of the organic gas estimates. As part of the study, air quality model ready emissions estimates were prepared using both the Statewide Air Pollution Research Center (SAPRC) (Carter, 2000) and the Carbon Bond Four (CBIV) (Gery et al., 1989) speciation profiles (ARB, 2004e). During the course of the study, three versions of the CBIV profiles and five versions of the SAPRC profiles were used (ARB, 2004e). The use of the alternative speciation profiles resulted in at least four additional revisions to the air quality model ready emissions files through the application of the emissions modeling system.

Studies performed by Tesche *et al.* (2004), Vizuete *et al.* (2004), and Emery and Tai (2004) indicated that a possible explanation for persistent photochemical model under-predictions of ozone at key monitoring stations was due to the lack of reactivity in the organic gas emissions. It was well known that the CBIV speciation profiles used by ARB and EPA were different, and that the use of each set of speciation profiles would produce an inventory with different overall reactivity. This was tested by mapping the ARB emissions source categories to the EPA CBIV speciation profiles for just the stationary and area source emissions categories and running the EMS-95 speciation processors

Table 2 shows the results of the speciated emissions estimates based on the EPA CBIV speciation profiles. Table 3 shows the results of the speciated emissions estimates based on the ARB CBIV speciation profiles. *PAR* indicates the paraffinic portion of the emissions estimates. *REACTIVE* indicates the sum of the remaining CB-IV components of the emissions estimates (i.e., higher molecular weight aldehydes [ALD2], ethylene [ETH], formaldehyde [FORM], methanol [MEOH], ethanol [ETOH], isoprene [ISOP], olefins [OLE], toluene [TOL], and xylenes [XYL]). Though alternative speciated emissions were estimated for the entire domain, only the emissions estimates for the SFBA are shown.

Table 4 shows the difference between the two model-ready inventories (EPA minus CARB). For both episodes, PAR and REACTIVE emissions increase using the EPA speciation profiles in SFBA for *EGU, Other,* and *Area* for both weekend day and weekday. Interesting differences include the following: *Off-road* REACTIVE emissions for both episodes show a sign flip from weekend day to weekday; *Area* and *Other* PAR emissions in July 1999 are about 10% greater than those in July/August 2000; and *Area* REACTIVE emissions in July 1999 are double those of July/August 2000. Given that the underlying criteria pollutant emissions estimates are similar between the two episodes, it is unclear why this is occurring. That is, one would expect similar changes in the speciated emissions from one episode to the next. It is possible that the inclusion of day-specific emissions estimates in the July/August 2000 episode may have some impact; however, due to limited resources for this experiment, an explanation as to why this has occurred was not definitely determined.

			PAR			REACTIVE					
Bay Area	July-August 2000			July 1999		July	-August 2	000	July 1999		
	J-WE	J-WD	A-WD	J-WE	J-WD	J-WE	J-WD	A-WD	J-WE	J-WD	
EGU	6	6	7	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	
Other	73	88	90	70	88	63	77	78	61	78	
Area	104	106	106	126	128	44	46	46	53	55	
Ship	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	
Off-road	84	43	43	73	37	73	45	45	65	41	
On-road	115	136	136	123	144	57	65	65	52	60	
Bio	44	55	54	85	96	270	366	325	478	545	
Total	426	434	436	482	498	511	604	565	714	783	

Table 3.	Speciated or	ganic gas	emissions	estimates	based or	n ARB	CBIV	profiles	(tons)	per dav).
----------	--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	-------	------	----------	--------	---------	----

			PAR			REACTIVE					
Bay Area	July-August 2000			July 1999		July-August 2000			July 1999		
	J-WE	J-WD	A-WD	J-WE	J-WD	J-WE	J-WD	A-WD	J-WE	J-WD	
EGU	2	2	3	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	
Other	45	58	59	38	54	14	22	23	13	24	
Area	72	75	75	89	91	41	43	43	46	49	
Ship	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
Off-road	80	42	42	69	37	80	44	44	70	39	
On-road	115	136	136	123	144	57	65	65	52	60	
Bio	44	55	54	85	96	270	366	325	478	545	
Total	358	368	369	405	423	462	542	502	660	718	

Table 4. Difference (EPA minus ARB) in speciated organic gas emissions estimates based on EPA and ARB CBIV speciation profiles (tons per day).

			PAR		REACTIVE					
Bay Area	July	/-August 2	2000	July 1999		July-August 2000			July 1999	
	J-WE	J-WD	A-WD	J-WE	J-WD	J-WE	J-WD	A-WD	J-WE	J-WD
EGU	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
Other	28	30	31	32	34	49	55	55	48	54
Area	32	31	31	37	37	3	3	3	7	6
Ship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(1)
Off-road	4	1	1	4	-	(7)	1	1	(5)	2
On-road	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bio	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	68	66	67	77	75	49	62	63	54	65

3. RECOMMENDATIONS/CONCLUSIONS

In all, there were twenty-four reruns of various aspects of the emissions modeling system to account for changes in emissions data and estimates. The complexity of the emissions modeling system coupled with the volume of changes resulted in numerous stops-and-starts of the overall air quality modeling process. This significantly impacted not only the project schedule, but also significantly stressed project resources. One overriding problem that continued to occur was the difficulty in knowing which set of air quality model ready emissions estimates were most current. Though a file naming convention was used to distinguish among the various air quality model ready emissions files, it became clear early in the project that the shear number of files and the rapidity of their change would confuse users as to their content. Further, though it was possible to couple the contents of an Excel spreadsheet with components of the air quality model ready emissions file name to determine which emissions data and estimates were changed, again because of the shear number of files present and the rapidity of change, it was simply difficult to ascertain what was changed. Finally, though it could be discerned what emissions source categories were changed in each air quality model ready emissions data set, the magnitudes of the changes were not adequately maintained.

In order to ameliorate these problems in the future, there are at least two approaches that can be followed. First, all source code related to the emissions modeling system needs to be placed under a central version control system. Users can then download either the most recent production release, or opt to download a release candidate. Given the ubiquitous nature of the World Wide Web in the sciences, it seems particularly natural for model developers to provide a central site to deploy software. Emissions modeling systems can be deployed by developers through their own websites. Or sites such as sourceforge.net can provide capabilities to manage Open Source projects. By centralizing source code deployment, modelers will ideally not be beholden to more than one source for emissions model code. Such an effort to centralize emissions modeling source code, of course, will require some effort by the developers of EMS-95, DTIM, EMFAC, EMFACwrapper, ITN, BEIGIS, BELD3, BEIS3 and the like to setup and maintain such central repositories. Of note, EMFAC (ARB, 2004d), BEIS3 (EPA, 2003), and BELD3 (EPA, 2001) currently have central release points though only BEIS3 is provided in its FORTRAN source form. That is, only a Windows-compatible executable is provided for EMFAC, and BELD3 is a suite of ASCII data that requires other software to manipulate for use in BEIS3.

Second, it is time to begin housing all emissions related data and estimates under a true data base management system. In this study, emissions data and estimates were maintained in SAS data sets, ASCII files, Excel spreadsheets, UNIX binary files, and PC binary files. By housing the emissions data and estimates under a true data base platform, the emissions data and estimates can be "tagged" with an appropriate identifier as to their context. Such a "tag" can be carried through to the air quality model ready emissions estimates. Use of the "tag" can be used to determine not only the emissions source categories that had changed from "tag" to "tag," but it can also be used to track such things as the magnitude of the change and the date of the change.

Efforts are now well underway to deploy the CONsolidated Community Emissions Processing Tool (CONCEPT, 2005). In many ways, CONCEPT codifies these two recommendations. CONCEPT currently has emissions modeling capabilities for stationary sources, area sources, biogenics, on-road mobiles sources, and non-road mobile sources. CONCEPT is an open source emissions modeling system based on the open source PostgreSQL (2005) Structured Query Language (SQL) data management system.

It was clear from the start of the study that changes were to be expected to the emissions data and estimates as the study was to progress. It was not clear just how numerous these changes were to be. Nor was it clear just how significant these changes were to detrimentally impact project resources. It is possible that better planning may have mitigated some of the problems that occurred during the emissions modeling component of the study. Regardless, the shear number of the emissions models employed, coupled with the complexity of operating the models and the number of groups involved in operating them, contributed to the problematic aspects that were encountered. Though emissions estimates suitable for input to CAMx were developed and much modeling has

been performed by several California regulatory agencies, the emissions data and estimates are still suspect. Indeed, on-going review of both the air quality model results and of the emissions estimates have shown: (1) that the temporal distribution of emissions from heavy-duty diesel vehicles, a key contributor to NOx, is incorrect for both episodes; (2) that VOC reactivity and/or total VOC emission rates are too low in key areas of the domain; (3) that EGU emissions for July 1999 are suspect; (4) that there appears to be a significant temperature dependence of on-road mobile emissions which is currently unexplained; and (5) that there are suspected over estimates of the biogenic OVOC and monoterpene emissions in the July 1999 episode. Given the suspect nature of the emissions inventory, it is remiss to conclude that the current emissions estimates are truly suitable for use in SIP-related air quality planning efforts. Hence, they are currently being used as a place holder in on-going air quality modeling analyses.

4. REFERENCES

ARB, 2003: Central California Ozone Study. Reports available at www.arb.ca.gov/airways/CCOS/CCOS.htm.

ARB, 2004a: The Biogenic Emission Inventory Geographic Information System. California Air Resources Board. www.ladco.org/biogenics/beigis/presentation/beigis_cod ing_demo/index.htm

ARB, 2004b: Biogenic Emissions. California Air Resources Board. eos.arb.ca.gov/eos/ARB_Modeling/JulyAug2000_SIP_ Modeling Doc AppB 11-26-03.pdf ARB, 2004c: Treatment of OVOCs. California Air Resources Board, 2004. eos.arb.ca.gov/eos/ARB_Modeling/Addition_of_OVOCs. doc

ARB, 2004d: EMFAC2001 version 2.08 and EMFAC2002 version 2.20: Calculating emission inventories for vehicles in California; User's Guide. www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest_version.htm

ARB, 2004e: Preparation of Emissions. California Air Resources Board, 2004. eos.arb.ca.gov/eos/ARB_Modeling/JulyAug2000_SIP_ Modeling_Doc_Ch4_11-26-03.pdf

ARB, 2004f: Emissions Coordination Group. California Air Resources Board. eos.arb.ca.gov/eos/ARB_Modeling/JulyAug2000_SIP_ Modeling_Doc_AppA_11-26-03.pdf

Carter, W.P.L., 2000: The SAPRC-99 chemical mechanism and updated VOC reactivity scales. Prepared for the California Air Resources Board Contracts No. 92-329 and 95-308. pah.cert.ucr.edu/~carter/reactdat.htm

CONCEPT, 2005: CONsolidated Community Emissions Processing Tool (CONCEPT). conceptmodel.org

Corbett, J.J., P. S. Fischbeck, and S. N. Pandis. 1999: Global Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Inventories for Oceangoing Ships. *J. Geoph. Res.*, **104**(D3), 3457-3470.

Corbett, J. J. and P.S. Fischbeck. 1997: Emissions from Ships. *Science*, Vol. 278, 31 October.

Dinh, T., 2002: Source inventory categories #344-356. Unpublished BAAQMD report, 7 pp.

Emery, C.A. and E. Tai, 2004: CAMx model performance for speciated and total VOC for

July/August 2000. Memorandum to BAAQMD and MAC, prepared by ENVIRON International Corporation, Novato, CA, April 13, 2004.

ENVIRON, 2005: Final Report: Development Of A Photochemical Modeling System For The Bay Area Air Quality Management District To Support Ongoing Ozone Air Quality Analyses. Prepared for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109. Prepared by: ENVIRON International Corporation, 101 Rowland Way, Novato, CA 94945; Alpine Geophysics, LLC, 2076 Westwood Lane, Eugene, OR 97401; ATMET, LLC, P.O. Box 19195, Boulder, CO 80308; San Jose State University, Department of Meteorology, 1 Washington Square, San Jose, CA 95192. January.

ENVIRON, 2003: User's Guide, Comprehensive Air Quality Model with extensions (CAMx), Version 4.00. Prepared by ENVIRON International Corporation, Novato, CA. www.camx.com

EPA, 2001: The Biogenic Emissions Landcover Database Version 3.1. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Via ftp at ftp.epa.gov/amd/asmd/beld3.

EPA, 2003: BEIS3 version 0.9. United States Environmental Protection Agency. ftp://ftp.epa.gov/amd/asmd/beis3v09/.

EPA, 2004: 8-Hour Ground-Level Ozone Designations in EPA Region 9. April 15. www.epa.gov/region09/air/ozonedesignations/

Federal Register, 2004a: Interim Final Action to Stay and Defer Sanctions Based on Attainment of the 1-hour Ozone Standard for the San Francisco Bay Area, California. Federal Register, Volume 69, Number 78, Pages 21715-21717, April 22, 2004. www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-AIR/2004/April/Day-22/a9140.htm Federal Register, 2004b: Final Rule To Implement the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard – Phase 1. Federal Register / Vol. 69, No. 84, Pages 23,951-24,000.

 $www.dfwcleanair.com/actions/8hour/8hour_phase1.pdf$

Fieber, J. L. and R. G. Ireson. 2001: DTIM4 User's Guide. Manual updated by Wayne Luney. Prepared by ICF Kaiser Consulting Group, Systems Application International, 101 Lucas Valley Road, San Rafael, CA. Prepared for California Department of Transportation, Office of Travel Forecasting and Analysis, PO Box 942874 (MS-38), Sacramento, CA (wayne.luney@dot.ca.gov).

Gery, M.W., G.Z. Whitten, J.P. Killus, and M.C. Dodge, 1989: A photochemical kinetics mechanism for urban and regional computer modeling. *J. Geoph. Res.*, **94**, 12925-12956.

Pierce, T., Kinnee, E., and Geron, C., 1998: Development of a 1-km resolved vegetation cover database for regional air quality modeling. Proceedings of the American Meteorological Society's 23rd Conference on Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, Albuquerque, NM. November.

PostgreSQL, 2005: www.postgresql.org

Reinhardt, E., R.E. Keane, and J.K. Brown. 1997: First Order Fire Effects Model: FOFEM 4.0 User's Guide. USDA Forest Service. General Technical Report INT-GTR-344. 65 p.

Tesche T. W., D. E. McNally, J. G. Wilkinson, H. E. Jeffries, Y. Kimura, C. Emery, G. Yarwood, and D. R. Souten. 2004: Evaluation of the 16-20 September 2000 Ozone Episode for use in 1_hr SIP Development in the California Central Valley. Prepared for the California Air Resources Board, by Alpine Geophysics, LLC, Ft. Wright, KY, O3 Chemistry, NC, University of Texas, Austin, TX, and ENVIRON International Corporation, Novato, CA (AG-90/TS201).

Vizuete, W., D.T. Allen, C.A. Emery, G. Yarwood, H. Jefferies, 2004: Evaluation of the July 31, 2000 Ozone Episode in the San Francisco Bay Area with the Process Analysis Tool. Prepared for the BAAQMD, San Francisco, CA, by the University of Texas, Austin, TX, ENVIRON International Corporation, Novato, CA, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, NC.

Vukovich, J. M. and T. E. Pierce, 2002: The Implementation of BEIS3 within the SMOKE Modeling Framework. Presented at 11th International Emission Inventory Conference "Emission Inventories - Partnering for the Future," Atlanta, GA, April 15-18. www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/conference/ei11/modeling/vukovi ch.pdf

Wilkinson, J. G., C. F. Loomis, R. A. Emigh, D. E.
McNally, T. W. Tesche, 1994: Technical
Formulation Document: SARMAP/LMOS Emissions
Modeling System (EMS-95). Final report prepared for
the Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium (Des
Plaines, IL) and the Valley Air Pollution Study Agency
(Sacramento, CA). EMS-95 User's Guide available at
www.ladco.org/tech/emis/ems95 guide/ems95.html.

Wilkinson, J. G., 2004: Development of the California Integrated Transportation Network (ITN). Final report prepared for Vernon Hughes, Manager, Control Strategy Modeling Section, CalEPA- Air Resources Board, Planning and Technical Support Division, 1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA. Prepared by Alpine Geophysics, LLC, La Honda, CA. ARB Contract 93-2PM. AG Report AG-TS-90/155.

Williams, E.J., Guenther, A. and Fehsenfeld, F.C., 1992: An inventory of nitric oxide emissions from soils in the United States. *J. Geoph. Res.*, **97**, Number D7:7511-7519.