To: Feldman, Michael[Feldman.Michael@epa.gov]; Snyder, Erik[snyder.erik@epa.gov]; Kordzi, Joe[Kordzi.Joe@epa.gov]
Cc: Schwartz, Colin[Schwartz.Colin@epa.gov]; Donaldson, Guy[Donaldson.Guy@epa.gov]
From: Huser, Jennifer
Sent: Fri 1/22/2016 9:20:17 PM
Subject: CAMx vs CALPUFF modeling
Cleco Updated BART Applicability Screening Analysis.pdf

LDEQ would like to meet with us on 2/2 to discuss the EGU 114 BART responses. One of the specific items they would like to discuss is EPA's view on CAMx vs CALPUFF. Entergy had submitted CAMx results for the visibility modeling. As a coincidence of timing, Cleco has submitted a revised screening report using CAMx (attached). The revised screening shows Teche and Brame have very low impact and are therefore not subject to BART (Teche screened out using CALPUFF, but Brame was subject using CALPUFF; Brame is a coal-fired unit). I am trying to review the TCEQ CAMx modeling protocol (having a bit of a hard time finding the best place to find the parameters we approved) to compare to the CAMx modeling done by Cleco and Entergy. I know Michael has expressed concerns with using the CAMx model without carefully following the TCEQ protocol. If we can have a discussion or you guys could pull together some items for me to check in the CAMx protocols then that would greatly facilitate my review of both Cleco and Entergy.

Thanks!

Jennifer

Jennifer Huser

Environmental Scientist

Air Planning Section (6MM-AA)
USEPA Region 6
1445 Ross Ave. Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75202-2733
214-665-7347