# R&D PROJECT SCOPE
# *GHG STATE TO PROGRAM MAPPING*

**January 30, 2017**

## OVERVIEW

### 1. Participants

Kong Chiu – EPA, GHGRP – chiu.kong@epa.gov

Julia Gamas – EPA, EIAG (NEI) – gamas.julia@epa.gov – Team lead

Azra Kovacevic – MN, PCA - azra.kovacevic@state.mn.us

Elizabeth Elbel – OR, DEQ - elbel.elizabeth@deq.state.or.us

Stephanie Summers – OR, DEQ- stephanie.summers@state.or.us

Jordan Garfinkle – MA, DEP- jordan.garfinkle@state.ma.us

Melissa Bender – EPA, GHGRP - bender.melissa@epa.gov

Brian Cook - EPA, GHGRP - Cook.BrianB@epa.gov

Mark Wert – MA, DEP- mark.wert@state.ma.us

Sydnie Lieb – EPA, GHGRP - lieb.Sydnie@epa.gov

Kelly Poole – ECOS - kpoole@ecos.org

### 2. Project Description

This will be a pilot study to map emission data in the national GHGRP to state GHGRP programs. The goal of the study is to understand which data elements state mandatory reporting programs have in common with GHGRP required data elements. This will help us understand what would be required to move to a common emissions reporting form. The use of a common emissions reporting form is part of the broader CAER goal of decreasing reporting burden to facilities by allowing them the ability to reduce the number of times they must report the same data element to individual programs.

At the end of this project, we would like to be able to answer: Where is the overlap between the states and GHGRP requirements? Are they exactly the same or different? If different, how important are these differences? What should our next steps be, in light of our findings and the broader CAER goal of decreasing reporting burden to facilities by using a common reporting form?

The study will:

1. Investigate the details of existing GHG reporting data requirements in a limited number of pilot states (MN, MA, OR) and the national Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (EPA e-GGRT). (i.e., state Title V or other GHG data collection vs. EPA Part 98 GHG data collection).

2. Map national GHGRP emissions to the state program for one or two sectors such as Stationary Combustion and Oil/Gas, for which there are overlaps between federal and state GHG data collection.

- Outline the mapping procedures
- Identify and compare the individual facilities reporting GHG emissions between the state and federal programs. Use quantitative and qualitative procedures to analyze the commonalities and differences between the two data sets.

- Compare methods and emissions calculations for GHGs that are reported under both state and federal programs
- Compare emissions values reported for common GHG and emitting points
- Comparisons should be made down to the emissions unit level at a minimum, and process level where available.
- Identify key similarities and differences in
  - ☐Facility and sub-facility definitions
  - ☐Reporting level
  - ☐Activity/throughput data collected; CBI or non-CBI
- Start the mapping of national GHGRP with one facility
- Identify issues and resolutions
- Modify the mapping procedures and test the mapping for the facility and sub-facility (where applicable)
- Complete mapping and testing for all facilities in the sector

3. Map national GHGRP emissions to the state program for all sectors specified in the scope.
    - Use the same procedures identified in 2 above, one sector by one sector, facility by facility

4. Prepare the mapping document for all sectors that could be used by other states

## 3. Project Steps

1. States learn GHGRP federal resources to develop an understanding of what is being required by GHGRP. A comparison is drawn with state programs.
2. The group picks two sectors to work on. States will provide summaries of their programs and the group will agree on sectors that have broad applicability across states.
3. Each state develops a list of data elements required for each sector.
4. EPA develops a list of data elements required by the GHGRP for each sector.
5. Compilation of the comparison table begins with progress being followed by group discussions and lessons being learned towards the mapping document.
6. Identify and analyze data for example facility(ies), as appropriate: An example facility in a sector is chosen, that reports both to Part 98 and a state, as a concrete example for mapping.
7. Completion of the comparison.
8. Mapping document is prepared with the comparison table included.

Steps 3 to 5 could be iterative.

## 4. Prior Work

- OR protocols documents
- Federal program:
  - Data dictionary
  - Sector summaries of reporting requirements
  - Spreadsheet with requirements (pdf)

## 5. Deliverables

☐A complete mapping of emissions from facilities that are subject to both national and the state GHGRP programs under the specified sectors for the pilot states. This mapping could be in the form of a table where each state is represented by a column, as would be the GHGRP. Rows of the table would be an item-by-item list of data elements and within each cell of the table a check would identify if the data element is required by a state and GHGRP or not.

☐A document that specifies procedures for mapping the national GHGRP to state GHGRP programs at a sector level. This document will include an analytical summary of our findings, recommendations, and any best practices or business rules that might emerge from the comparison.

## 6. Resource Needs

Resource needs will depend on whether we can count on contractor help. Each state will begin to draw up their requirements list after the sectors have been selected. The group could benefit from the help of a contractor who might draw up the comparison (select data elements that are similar and make sure they are identified as such, highlight data elements that are unique, find any data elements that may seem to be conflicting in any way, and keep the team informed of progress. We estimate two weeks (80 hours) of full time help from a contractor for the comparison.

## 7. Expected Workload

Biweekly team meetings, one hour each, to check in on progress. Individual state and EPA work time gathering information. Estimated time per team member is 2 to 3 hours/week including 1 hour biweekly meetings.

# DELIVERABLES & EXPECTED COMPLETION DATES

| Deliverable | Expected Completion Date |
|---|---|
| State program summaries and Sectors to work on | February 2, 2017 |
| Determine and justify sectors to work on | February 16, 2017 |
| States lists of data elements | February 24, 2017 |
| Comparison 30% | March 24, 2017 |
| Final list of state elements | April 24, 2017 |
| Comparison 100% | May 26, 2017 |
| Final document and comparison table | June 26, 2017 |