2018 Western States Planning Readiness Survey for Regional Haze State Implementation Plans for the Second Implementation Period

**SURVEY QUESTIONS**

1. Has your staff evaluated IMPROVE monitoring data for Class I areas in your state using the ”most impaired days” tracking metric? (**YES/NO**) If YES,
	1. What techniques/methods are you using? [ANSWER]
	2. What problems/issues/solutions, if any, have you identified? [ANSWER]
2. Would your state use work by a regional contractor to evaluate the monitoring trends and implications of the ”most impaired days” and related tracking metrics on the glidepath for Class I areas in your states? (**YES/NO**) If NO,
	1. How would you communicate your state-specific analyses to neighboring states? [ANSWER]
3. When does your state expect to evaluate sources for reasonable progress? [ANSWER]
	1. What methodology/plan do you have to begin this? [ANSWER]
	2. How will you align your plan with approaches by other states? [ANSWER]
	3. Can your state begin RH planning (i.e., using emissions-based screening methods) before the tracking metric is finalized? (**YES/NO**)
4. The WRAP Monitoring and Glidepath Subcommittee intends to recommend to the WRAP Regional Haze Planning Workgroup (RHPWG) that the EPA method to define ”most impaired days” be used as a commonly derived tracking metric that applies to all WRAP Class I areas. The Subcommittee will further recommend that individual states may wish to review and apply alternative assumptions as well for specific Class I areas in the state. Does your state have concerns with this recommendation? (**YES/NO**)
	1. Please provide your perspective on the pros/cons of a commonly derived metric for your state. [ANSWER]
5. Will your state’s approach to selecting sources for reasonable progress analyses for the second round of regional haze planning be different if IMPROVE monitoring data indicates that visibility at a Class I is meeting Uniform Rate of Progress versus not meeting Uniform Rate of Progress? (**YES/NO**) If YES,
	1. How will your state’s approach differ? [ANSWER]
6. Has your state started projecting future-year emissions? (**YES/NO**) If YES,
	1. Describe your state’s progress and methods, including the sectors and years for which you are estimating emissions. [ANSWER]
	2. Do you plan to use recommendations from the RHPWG Emission Inventory & Modeling Protocol Subcommittee for any of your projections? (**YES/NO**)
7. Does your state plan to incorporate visibility as a factor in the control measures analysis? (**YES/NO**)
8. What regulatory mechanisms does your state have to require controls on:
	1. Regulated point sources? [ANSWER]
	2. Area sources? [ANSWER]
	3. Mobile sources? [ANSWER]
9. List any regulations and/or control programs that could affect regional haze that your state has enacted in the last 5 years or since the last progress report. Please provide citations or links, if any. [ANSWER]
10. Does your state intend for WRAP to include state-specific emissions control measures in the 2028 WRAP regional air quality modeling that will inform reasonable progress goals for 2028? (**YES/NO**) If YES,
	1. Does your state understand the WRAP 2019 timeline for 2028 modeling? (**YES/NO**)
11. Has your state begun planning:
	1. For public outreach? (**YES/NO**)
	2. For consultation with:
		1. Other western states? (**YES/NO**)
		2. Local air regulatory agencies? (**YES/NO**)
		3. Federal Land Managers (FLMs)? (**YES/NO**)
		4. Tribes? (**YES/NO**)
		5. EPA? (**YES/NO**)
12. Related to consultation with Tribes, FLMs, and EPA:
	1. Briefly describe previous RH consultation efforts, including dates and relevant entities. [ANSWER]
	2. Do you envision this to be done through WRAP, state resources, or a combination of the two? [ANSWER]
13. Will your state contribute in-kind work (e.g., IMPROVE monitoring data analysis, emissions inventories/forecasting, or regional modeling) toward this Round 2 Regional Haze planning effort? (**YES/NO**)
	1. List in-kind work provided on previous and current RH efforts, if any. [ANSWER]
	2. List subcommittee participation and technical skills that the state is considering for potential in-kind efforts. [ANSWER]
14. Provide the links to state webpage(s), if any, where you are publically posting documents related to regional haze rulemaking/planning. [ANSWER]
15. Please list any special regional haze planning issues/concerns for your specific state. As an example, if you are a §51.309 state, list any additional challenges in transitioning to the §51.308 approach. [ANSWER]
16. What comments does your state have on the Sept. 11, 2018 Regional Haze Reform Roadmap[[1]](#footnote-1) released by EPA? [ANSWER]
	1. Would release of guidance and/or data from EPA according to the schedule outlined in the Roadmap affect your state’s participation in the WESTAR-WRAP regional analysis process? (**YES/NO**)
	2. What information would your state want or need from EPA in terms of the Roadmap deliverables, to augment your SIP preparation? [ANSWER]
1. Available at: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-09/documents/regional_haze_reform_roadmap_memo_09-11-2018.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)