



# **Western Regional Air Partnership 2007 Work Plan**

**September 5, 2006**

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction .....	2
II.	Background .....	6
III.	Project Summaries .....	9
	Stationary Sources Joint Forum .....	9
	Fire Emissions Joint Forum .....	10
	Dust Emissions Joint Forum .....	11
	Mobile Source Forum .....	12
	Air Quality Modeling Forum .....	13
	Emissions Forum .....	14
	Ambient Monitoring and Reporting Forum .....	14
	Attribution of Haze Work Group .....	15
	Air Managers Committee .....	16
	Communications Committee .....	17

## I. INTRODUCTION

This work plan was developed by the WRAP Planning Team (Oversight Committees and Forum Co-Chairs) and summarizes ongoing activities and expenditures of the Western Regional Air Partnership (WRAP), including current projects and those planned for 2007 and 2008. This work is funded through existing EPA grants (FY04-05) and through the WRAP's FY06 regional haze grant from EPA.

The total amount of EPA's FY06 funding for the WRAP's regional haze work is \$1,302,555. Of this amount, \$787,095 will be awarded to WGA and \$515,460 will be awarded to NTEC. This document will be submitted to EPA in support of WGA's grant application. The NTEC work plan is a separate document that will be submitted to EPA by NTEC.

As shown in Table 1, as of June 30, 2006, \$3,130,920 remains in WGA's existing WRAP grant (FY04-05). Table 2 lists projects currently underway and funded through the existing grant. Table 3 lists pending projects, including current and future tribal data projects covered under NTEC's grant. Table 3 also identifies those projects to be funded with FY06 grant funds.

For this work plan, NTEC and WGA staff worked together to present budgets for each organization that provide funding for staff, travel support, and project management through September 2007. The budgets reflect the fact that effective July 1, 2006 NTEC assumed administrative responsibility for contracts related to the work of the Tribal Data Work Group and for reimbursement of tribal travel and meeting expenses.

In developing this work plan, the WRAP Planning Team recognized that the FY06 grant funds covered by this work plan will be the last funds NTEC and WGA receive prior to the SIP deadline of December 2007. Also, the WRAP's FY07 grant (funds available in late 2007) may be reduced from historical funding levels. Therefore, all critical projects and contract work needed for the SIPs must be funded through this work plan.

In developing this work plan, WRAP forums and committees were asked to consider projects that are essential to the needs of state and tribal implementation plans for regional haze, including the key technical support elements that must be maintained through 2008 (after the SIPs are submitted).

It is important to note that the WRAP's planning process must accommodate a unique landscape of environmental, social, economic, and political issues. The WRAP region includes 116 (or 75 percent) of the nation's 156 mandatory federal Class I areas, half the land mass of the United States (not including Alaska), a very large portion of publicly-owned lands, and numerous tribal jurisdictions (many with large land areas). It also emits a minority of total U.S. emissions, borders both Canada and Mexico, and receives pollution from Asia. Air quality in Western Class I area is also greatly influenced by "natural" emissions, such as those from wildfires and wind-blown dust.

The WRAP region is also experiencing rapid population growth and other challenges to preventing deterioration of air quality, such as drought. This presents a unique and challenging

environment for long-term planning which is best addressed through a single, well-funded and well-organized institution at the appropriate political level. The WRAP, with appropriate financial support from EPA, provides such an institution, especially given its management structure shared between the Western Governors' Association and the National Tribal Environmental Council.

Finally, the WRAP's long-term planning process must deal with relevant events beyond its control, such as federal initiatives and the ramifications of legal challenges to the RHR. One way the WRAP contends with these events is to have sufficient staffing to track the issues and to foster a constructive dialogue among its members.

**Table 1 - June 30, 2006  
Financial Status Report**

<b>WGA</b>	<b>FY04-05 Funds Remaining</b>	<b>2006 Grant Funds - WGA</b>	<b>Total Budget – WGA</b>
Travel Reimbursements	34,832	225,532	260,363
Conference Calls	26,129	4,059	30,187
Meeting Expenses	9,268	76,951	86,218
Direct Salaries and Benefits	201,479	166,075	367,554
Overhead & Other Expenses	151,288	49,479	200,767
Travel and Project Management through 9/07	422,995	522,095	945,090
Contractor Assistance <b>(\$1,077,000 obligated)</b>	2,707,925	265,000	2,972,925
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,130,920</b>	<b>787,095</b>	<b>3,918,015</b>

**Table 2: Projects Underway**

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Current Contract</b>	<b>Expenditures to Date</b>
<b>SSJF</b>		
Review 2018 Projections for Non-Utility Sources in 309 SO2 Program (Pechan)	23,300	5,963
Oil and Gas EI Improvements & Control Strategy Evaluation	100,000	0
<b>FIRE</b>		
<i>2002 National Wildfire EI (inter-RPO project - Air Sciences)</i>	133,779	120,252
Phase III & IV Inventories plus Additional Tasks (Air Sciences)	188,936	151,128
Evaluation of FTS (AS/ECR)	24,130	21,712
<b>MOBILE SOURCES</b>		
Non-Road Retrofit Demonstration Projects - (Emissions Advantage)	244,540	223,384
<b>MODELING</b>		
Regional Modeling Center (UCR)	3,567,421	3,311,100
<b>EMISSIONS</b>		
EDMS (Pechan)	933,788	877,971
<b>TRIBAL DATA</b>		
Tribal Inventory Gathering and Analysis (ITEP/NAU) - Phase III	442,000	352,439
<b>DUST</b>		
Common Definition of Dust and Dust Emission Types (Environ)	86,953	69,316
Fine Fraction of Dust EFs (MRI)	130,436	124,278
Update Handbook (Countess)	30,000	18,931
Pilot Project -NM (106)	60,000	15,000
<b>AMBIENT MONITORING AND REPORTING</b>		
Causes of Haze (\$70 K for Dust Impacts, \$85 K for Tribal Areas) (DRI)	1,020,000	916,600
<i>Natural Haze Levels Analysis (from OAQPS, national project) (Tombach)</i>	85,000	76,210
<b>ATTRIBUTION OF HAZE</b>		
TSS Phase I & II (ARS)	250,948	181,652
TSS (CIRA)	71,000	0
<b>AIR MANAGERS COMMITTEE</b>		
308 Implementation Work Group - State Support (WESTAR)	36,000	31,775
308 Implementation Work Group - Tribal Support (NM) (109)	60,000	40,000
State Caucus Staff Support (WESTAR)	587,434	501,190
309 2004 Milestone Report (Perrin Quarles)	30,762	13,924
<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>		
Web Site Maintenance (B. Bissey)	151,500	128,086
<b>Subtotal for Projects Underway</b>	<b>8,257,927</b>	<b>7,180,911</b>

<b>Table 3: Pending Projects</b>	<b>FY05 Grant</b>	<b>FY06 Grant</b>	
	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>STATIONARY SOURCES</b>			
BART - Technical Assistance to States and Tribes	89,000		
309 SO2 Program Revisions	90,000		
<b>FIRE</b>			
Fire Tracking System	204,000		50,000
Smoke Mgmt Technical and Policy Workshop	21,000		
Section 308 Strategies for Fire	60,000		
<b>MODELING</b>			
Modeling Support for 308 and 309 SIPs	150,000	100,000	
<b>EMISSIONS</b>			
2006-2007 EDMS Hosting / Operation	320,000		40,000
<b>DUST</b>			
Enhanced Data Analysis (Pilot Project or Other)	53,000		
<b>AMBIENT MONITORING AND REPORTING</b>			
Causes of Haze	50,000		50,000
<b>ATTRIBUTION OF HAZE</b>			
TSS -2007	375,000		
<b>AIR MANAGERS COMMITTEE</b>			
Contractor Assistance	50,909		
308 Implementation Work Group - State Support	18,000		
Technical and Economic Analysis of Reasonable Progress	50,000		
State Caucus Staff Support (to Sept. 07)	55,000		
<b>COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE</b>			
Public Outreach and Communication on WRAP Issues	20,000		
Web Site Maintenance	25,000		25,000
<b>Subtotal for Pending Projects – WGA</b>	<b>1,630,909</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>165,000</b>

	<b>FY05 Grant</b>	<b>FY06 Grant</b>	
	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>TRIBAL DATA - NTEC Grant</b>			
Analysis of SIPs for Tribal Issues	100,000		
Tribal Data in Technical Support Document	50,000		
TEISS	50,000	72,500	50,000
Analysis of Improve Network		30,000	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>102,500</b>	<b>50,000</b>

## **II. Background**

The 1990 Amendments to the Clean Air Act established the GCVTC, which in June of 1996 completed its original mission to recommend strategies for improving visibility in the Grand Canyon and other Class I areas on the Colorado Plateau. Recognizing the need for a process to monitor and coordinate the implementation of its final recommendations, the GCVTC members created the WRAP. The WRAP includes participants from industry, environmental groups, and other affected parties and operates in conjunction with regional organizations such as WESTAR, the Western Governors' Association, and the National Tribal Environmental Council. The work products of the WRAP are used by states and tribes in the preparation of their individual implementation plans to meet the requirements of the federal regional haze rule promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1999.

While the initial focus of the WRAP was to implement the recommendations of the GCVTC in conjunction with federal visibility rules, the requirements of these rules also highlighted the need to implement other regional planning processes to improve visibility in all western Class I areas. In March 1999, the WRAP expanded its charter to address all regional air quality issues.

### **A. Tribal Options for Implementation Plan Development**

Under the regulatory framework provided by the Tribal Authority Rule (TAR) (40 CFR 49.1–49.11) and the regional haze rule, tribal implementation of visibility programs through Tribal Implementation Plans (TIPs) is optional. The TAR authorizes but does not require tribes to receive delegation of authority to implement any program, or “reasonably severable elements” of a program, under the Clean Air Act. The preamble to the regional haze rule explains that “a tribal visibility program is not dependent on strategies selected by the State or States in which the tribe is located.” (64 Fed. Reg. 35714, 35756, July 1, 1999) The net result is that any tribe in the GCVTC transport region may implement §308 or §309 in whole or in part.

The policy and technical work of the WRAP to assist states is designed to simultaneously assist tribes in the same way. Tribal concerns are being addressed at every level within the WRAP. Tribal and state implementation plan needs may be different. As these differences are identified, project tasks and work plans are updated to reflect the improved understanding of tribal needs.

To ensure that tribal needs are addressed, the active participation of tribal representatives on all forums has been and will continue to be sought and encouraged. The National Tribal Environmental Council (NTEC) is responsible for coordinating tribal participation in the WRAP and receives funds from EPA for this purpose. Since some tribes do not have the resources or expertise to participate in the WRAP, NTEC provides tribes with analyses and synopses of issues emanating from the WRAP forums and work groups and from sources outside the WRAP. NTEC also facilitates consensus building within the WRAP tribal caucus. The Institute for Tribal Environmental Professionals (ITEP) at Northern Arizona University also provides assistance and staff through the Tribal Data Development Working Group to address a key tribal need – the acquisition of data necessary to make informed policy decisions.

Finally, it should be noted that the WRAP organizational structure provides several checkpoints for tribal input. First and foremost, the WRAP has established equal representation for tribes and states within its management structure, including a tribal Co-Chair of the WRAP. Key positions are also reserved for tribal representatives on all standing committees, forums, and work groups. Public workshops for WRAP work products and travel support from the WRAP ensure that the broader tribal community has an opportunity to participate in the WRAP process.

## **B. WRAP Organization and Structure**

In September 1997 the WRAP was formed with a membership including states and tribes both within and outside the GCVTC region. The WRAP established oversight committees and forums charged with developing work plans to implement the GCVTC recommendations and to facilitate development of implementation plans under the RHR.

### **1. Membership**

The WRAP membership currently includes the Governor or his/her designee from 14 states and 12 tribes, two U.S. Cabinet Secretaries and the Administrator of the EPA or their designees:

#### States

Alaska  
Arizona  
California  
Colorado  
Hawaii  
Idaho  
Montana  
New Mexico  
North Dakota  
Oregon  
South Dakota  
Utah  
Washington  
Wyoming

#### Tribes

Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians  
Cortina Indian Rancheria  
Hopi Tribe  
Hualapai Nation of the Grand Canyon  
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall  
Native Village of Shungnak  
Nez Perce Tribe  
Northern Cheyenne Tribe  
Pueblo of Acoma  
Pueblo of San Felipe  
Confederated Tribes of Salish and Kootena  
Pueblo of Zuni

#### Federal Agencies

Department of the Interior  
Department of Agriculture  
EPA

### **2. Charter and Bylaws**

The WRAP Charter and Bylaws set forth the organizations goals, principles, and operating procedures and are posted on the WRAP website at <http://www.wrapair.org/about/index.html>.

### **3. WRAP Organization**

The WRAP is composed of several forums, committees, and work groups. All these groups include participation from the WRAP membership (states, tribes, and federal agencies) and interested stakeholders (industry, environmental groups, local governments, academia, etc.).

Committee and forum members are expected to represent and communicate with their agencies and constituents. Forum and committee members are responsible for establishing mechanisms that will ensure this communication occurs. These mechanisms may involve working through trade groups, state and tribal organizations such as the Western States Air Resource Council (WESTAR Council), the National Tribal Environmental Council (NTEC), and intra- and inter-agency forums.

#### **C. Project Management**

Members of committees and forums perform much of the work of the WRAP. The oversight committees monitor forum and work group activities to ensure that work products are developed in a timely manner and that stakeholder participation remains representative, balanced, and fair. Contractors hired with EPA grant funds are relied upon to expand the resources of the WRAP. Committees and forums direct the work of contractors.

Support services to the WRAP come from the National Tribal Environmental Council (NTEC) and the Western Governors' Association (WGA). The Communications Committee has developed a Communications Manual for the WRAP's internal and external communications and assists committees and forums with outreach strategies for specific products and activities.

WGA and NTEC staff provide overall project management for the WRAP, including preparing and managing grant applications, funds, requests for proposals (RFPs), contracts, travel reimbursements, meetings, conference calls, public and media inquiries, press releases, Web sites, requests to participate in the WRAP, and report publications. Staff assistance includes providing a "sounding board" for stakeholders having concerns with the WRAP processes and relating concerns to forum co-chairs, oversight committees, committee co-chairs, facilitators, and the WRAP co-chairs.

WGA and NTEC staff routinely attend the meetings of the various committees and forums. WGA and NTEC jointly or separately perform tasks related to WRAP and serve as primary contact points by responding to media and public inquiries.

Under a separate EPA grant, NTEC assists tribal participation in the WRAP by arranging and facilitating Tribal Caucus meetings; providing coordination among tribal representatives of various committees and forums; performing legal, policy and technical analyses on various WRAP issues; and securing contractor assistance for additional policy and technical analysis. This includes providing staff support to the Tribal Caucus within the WRAP.

Staff positions include the WRAP Co-Directors (WGA and NTEC) who oversee other staff, share general management responsibilities, work with stakeholders to ensure the WRAP's processes are fair and equitable, and serve as the primary points of contact for EPA, the media,

and the general public. There are state and tribal caucus coordinators hired with WRAP funds through WESTAR and NTEC, respectively.

WGA also employs a technical coordinator and policy analyst to support the oversight committees, forums, and work groups. NTEC employs a tribal communications specialist who works closely with the WRAP's Communications Committee and who is available to other committees and forums to ensure that communications with and for the tribes are properly being carried out. NTEC also employs a tribal policy analyst to address the unique circumstances of tribes with respect to the Clean Air Act and other related issues.

#### **D. Contract Management**

WRAP staff at NTEC and WGA work with the forums to manage WRAP contracts. WGA and NTEC, as the recipients of EPA grants, are responsible for executing and administering contracts and ensuring that work products are completed. These responsibilities are met with input from forums and work groups. Forums and work groups may create balanced subgroups for purposes of contract management.

It is the responsibility of the forums and work groups and their respective oversight committees to develop the scope of work for each contract. All contracts are to be developed in accordance with the work plans approved by the WRAP and submitted to EPA. Once the scope of work has been properly developed, it is transmitted to WGA or NTEC who are responsible for developing an RFP or sole source justification. All RFPs are sent to known contractors, posted on the WRAP Web site, and published in the Federal Business Opportunities publication as appropriate. Bidders are provided 30 days to respond.

## **II. PROJECT SUMMARIES**

### **Stationary Sources Joint Forum**

The focus of the SSJF is on developing a stationary source control program to help meet the reasonable progress and BART requirements of the Clean Air Act and Regional Haze Rule. This work plan assumes that Section 309 SIPs for SO<sub>2</sub> will be resubmitted by five states (OR, UT, NM, AZ, & WY) and that all other stationary sources/pollutants will be addressed through source-by-source BART approaches. The SSJF will also evaluate potential emission reduction strategies for non-BART sources.

The SSJF will conduct the analyses necessary to support the Section 309 market-based alternative, including identifying BART-eligible sources and demonstrating that any alternatives demonstrate greater reasonable progress than BART. The SSJF will also help coordinate any plant-by-plant BART analyses the states or tribes may choose to pursue.

Other SSJF activities include tracking EPA's BART rules and proposed guidelines. The SSJF will also work with the 309 Coordinating Committee to conduct any additional analyses that may be necessary to allow states and tribes to resubmit the SO<sub>2</sub> milestone and backstop emissions trading program following the court's decision in CEED v. EPA.

Finally, NO<sub>x</sub> and PM emissions must be addressed in such a way as to satisfy the SIP revision requirements under Section 309 of the Regional Haze Rule, as well as the Section 308 BART and reasonable progress requirements for all states.

Work will include emissions inventory analysis, improvements, and future year projections; examination of control technology capabilities; maintenance of the list of BART-eligible sources in the WRAP region; and technical demonstrations that alternatives developed for BART provide for greater reasonable progress than BART.

There are several uncertainties that must be factored into this work. As a result, there is a need to maintain flexibility in program design and to assess new information as it becomes available, including information from ongoing WRAP technical studies which will provide more information on the contribution of various sources to regional haze in the West.

To the extent practical, and as requested by WRAP members, the forum will coordinate the implementation of BART and address trading program design issues, such as 2018 and interim milestones; geographic, new source, and tribal considerations; monitoring and reporting requirements; enforcement provisions; economic impact assessments; and a general method for allowance allocation.

### **Fire Emissions Joint Forum**

The FEJF projects identified fall into two main categories:

- 1) The first grouping includes Planning projects to directly support the development of policy and technical tools for SIP/TIP development under §308.
- 2) The second grouping includes Implementation projects to directly support the existing fire policies and programs applicable to the implementation needs for §309 and §308.

#### **PLANNING**

Smoke Management Technical and Policy Workshop - Work on the Smoke Management Technical and Policy Workshop will be started in 2006. A three-day workshop will be held in late 2006/early 2007 to assess technical work to date, §309 policy and SIP implementation, and refinement of policy options under §308. This effort will build on the two FEJF workshops held in 2004 to ensure that the needed technical and policy tools are in place for SIP/TIP development under §308.

Section 308 Strategies for Fire – This project will be started in 2006. As states and tribes further develop their strategies for addressing fire impacts and contribution to regional haze for their §308 plans, new policies and strategies may need to be developed, their effects on the emission inventories determined and their visibility effects assessed. This task will ensure that the needed technical and policy tools are in place for SIP/TIP development under §308.

## IMPLEMENTATION

Fire Emissions Tracking System – The project to Evaluate Existing Fire Tracking Systems was started in 2005 and will be completed in Fall 2006. Evaluation of existing fire emissions inventory systems was a prudent step to develop a Fire Emissions Tracking System (FETS) as identified in the WRAP FTS Policy to calculate emissions from fire activity data. Based on the results of the evaluation project, the FEJF will proceed with the development of a WRAP FETS in 2006. Implementation of the WRAP FETS will continue into the future. The WRAP FETS will incorporate a specific format, parameters, defaults, structure and methods of emission calculation for required and optional FTS elements per the WRAP FTS Policy such as the tracking of ERTs and the calculation of emissions averted. The WRAP FETS will also incorporate certain SMP elements critical to the interjurisdictional exchange of information describing characteristics of planned burns per the Guidance for Coordinating Smoke Management Programs under development through in-kind support by the FEJF. These tasks directly support the implementation of the FTS, AEG, and ESMP requirements in §309 as well as similar implementation issues for §308. The FEJF plans to fund the FETS primarily from its 2006 budget with FY05\$, but also requests \$50,000 for 2008 FETS operations from the FY06 WRAP grant. Those monies would cover operations of the FETS only for the first half of 2008, an additional \$50,000 (currently unfunded) is needed to cover FETS operations for the second half of 2008.

Project Title	Funding		
	2006 (FY05 \$)	2007 (FY05 \$)	2008 (FY06 \$)
<b>Planning</b>			
Smoke Management Technical and Policy Workshop	21,000		
Section 308 Strategies for Fire	30,000	30,000	
<b>Implementation</b>			
Fire Tracking System – Evaluation of Existing FTS	24,130		
Fire Emissions Tracking System – Development & Implementation	204,000		50,000 (50,000 for 2 <sup>nd</sup> ½ of 2008 unfunded)

### Dust Emissions Joint Forum

The Dust Emissions Joint Forum (DEJF) has made significant progress on several fronts, including: completion and evaluation of a regional windblown dust inventory, analysis of ambient dust data at Class I areas and its attribution to various sources, quality assurance of dust emissions data provided by jurisdictions across the WRAP region, experimentally-based improvements to PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission factors for fugitive dust, completion and revisions to the WRAP Fugitive Dust Handbook, development and demonstration of a definition of natural and anthropogenic dust, and development of a template for the dust portion of a regional haze SIP using Salt Creek, NM as a test case.

Although much progress has been made in advancing the technical and policy tools available to address dust in Class I areas, there is still significant uncertainty regarding the sources of dust at many Class I areas on the 20% worst visibility days. The DEJF has identified a few areas where its remaining funds can be used to address this uncertainty. The work would build upon and enhance the current body of work described above. Some examples are provided below. The precise application of DEJF funds will depend on the final outcome of its current projects and on the interest expressed by DEJF members, particularly on the project described below regarding enhancement of local windblown dust emission factors.

The remaining funds will be used to conduct additional analysis of the ambient dust data at Class I areas and/or to develop empirically-based windblown dust emission factors for a subset of Class I areas. The original analysis of ambient dust data was limited to 3 of the 5 years comprising the regional haze visibility baseline. Additional data are now available for the 5th year and could be added to the analysis. Alternatively, an enhanced analysis method using wind back trajectories, landuse data, and wind erodability indices has been demonstrated by the Desert Research Institute using data from the Salt Creek Class I area in New Mexico. This method could be applied to other high-dust areas to further identify the causes of dust. Finally, empirically-based windblown dust emission factors could be developed for one or two Class I areas using sand traps designed and built by the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District in eastern CA. The District has offered in-kind technical support and sand traps to other areas which may benefit from having more accurate emission factors. To the extent these areas are representative of other Class I areas, this approach may improve local windblown dust emissions for several Class I areas. The current factors are based on a limited set of wind tunnel studies and 4 km-resolution data regarding land use and soil types. Although they provide meaningful regional and qualitative emissions data, they do not significantly improve the performance of gridded air quality simulation models with respect to dust.

### **Mobile Sources Forum**

Diesel retrofits are a growing national priority and increases are expected in federal funds to support specific retrofit proposals. Regional organizations can enhance the success of this broad initiative by providing cost-effective options for government and stakeholder outreach, training, sharing information and lessons learned, inter-project coordination, administrative and technical support, and effective communications between federal grantors and local project implementers. The value of regional organizations in a national retrofit initiative is recognized in the Clean Air Act Advisory Committee's April 10, 2006 recommendations to EPA, and is also evident in the number of regional diesel collaboratives recently formed. However, it is not clear that sufficient resources will be provided to capitalize on the advantages of these regional organizations.

For the past two years the WRAP has used some of its funds to promote diesel retrofits through the oversight and leadership of the Mobile Sources Forum (MSF). MSF products have included written guidance on diesel retrofits, technology updates, summaries and updates of available funding sources, ad hoc support to WRAP members for individual projects and grant proposals, and a series of comprehensive diesel retrofit boot camps intended to spur the development and enhancement of diesel retrofit projects and programs.

Due to increasing budget constraints on the WRAP, no new projects or funding are being proposed for the MSF. The MSF will continue its focus on diesel retrofits and convene on a regular basis to share information on diesel retrofit projects, trends, and opportunities. It will also advocate for sufficient regional funding and be prepared to make the best use of such funding in the event the WRAP acquires additional funds through restoration of its regional haze grant or through other means.

### **Air Quality Modeling Forum**

The Modeling Forum will complete the work defined in the 2006 Regional Modeling Center (RMC) contract ([http://pah.cert.ucr.edu/aqm/308/docs/2006/memo\\_RMC\\_2006\\_contract\\_mods.doc](http://pah.cert.ucr.edu/aqm/308/docs/2006/memo_RMC_2006_contract_mods.doc)), and complete the associated documentation. While completing this work, the Modeling Forum proposes to then address the following strategic goals with their Regional Modeling Center project during 2007-08:

- 1) Provide states and tribes continuing and expanded support for and access to RMC information for data mining and technology transfer;
- 2) Provide stable storage media and support services for long-term archiving, data transfer, and ongoing website support as needed by the WRAP;
- 3) Define and implement a revised, scaled-back form of the RMC to be implemented by the end of 2006; and
- 4) Move to a “work assignment” format for 2007-08 regional modeling simulations in support of the haze SIPs:
  - a. Plan for 3 or 4 control strategy and/or sensitivity regional modeling simulations to support haze SIP preparation during 2007; and
  - b. An approximately equal number of regional simulations in 2008 to answer or clarify questions about the haze SIPs submitted in December 2007.

The preferred approach will be to modify and scale back the existing RMC structure. Computer upgrades/purchases will need to be made because existing RMC equipment is getting old and unreliable.

The Forum also proposes that a policy support approach to defining the scope, scale, and questions to be answered by each simulation be implemented; these decisions should be coordinated by an oversight group of key technical and planning/policy representatives across the WRAP region. This new or existing group might include and/or consolidate members from the TOC, the AoH Workgroup, the IWG, and draw upon the expertise of each individual Forum or Workgroup as needed. The AoH Workgroup is currently closest in composition to the group proposed by the Modeling Forum. The Modeling Forum specifically proposes that they not decide “what to model”, instead focusing on addressing the strategic goals listed above. Discussions with the TOC, AMC, IWG, and AoH Workgroup are planned over the next several months.

**Modeling Forum Budget Summary for 2006-08:**

	<b>FY05 Grant</b>	<b>FY06 Grant Request</b>	<b>Currently Unfunded</b>
	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007 to mid-2008</b>	<b>July-December 2008</b>
<b>Modeling Support for 308 &amp; 309 SIPs</b>	150,000	100,000	50,000

**Emissions Forum**

The Emissions Forum intends to focus on maintenance and operation of the Emissions Database Management System (EDMS) for the foreseeable future, at this point, through 2008. The EDMS is operational, although some functions are currently being improved in response to deficiencies identified by third party testing. The system must be maintained to provide states and tribes the means to prepare regional haze plans, assess control strategies, conduct additional modeling analyses, house updates to existing inventories, address new inventory needs for pollutants of regional concern, and assess emission reduction efforts.

The operation and maintenance budget includes the annual cost for a contracted database administrator to operate the EDMS, provide data analysis products, user assistance, quality assure new data, update database versions, resolve data overlaps between state and tribal data, and prepare standard reports. In addition, a host site is employed to provide the necessary hardware, including servers, and to ensure data security and archiving.

Budget Summary for 2006-08:

2006 (remainder) EDMS maintenance and operation, including host site	\$ 90,000
2007 EDMS maintenance and operation, including host site	\$160,000
2008 EDMS maintenance and operation, including host site	<u>\$150,000</u>
Total	\$400,000

Existing FY05 Emissions Forum EDMS funding	\$320,000
New FY06 Funds requested to cover through mid-2008	\$ 40,000
Additional funding needed to cover through 12/08, but currently unfunded	<u>\$ 40,000</u>
Total	\$400,000

**Ambient Monitoring and Reporting Forum**

The Causes of Haze Study is a complex, 4-year data analysis project totaling approximately \$1,000,000. The study draws on the IMPROVE regional haze monitoring network data. This project will be complete at the end of 2006. The results are posted to the Causes of Haze Assessment web site at: <http://coha.dri.edu/index.html>.

The data and results from this project need to be maintained and updated to a limited degree. As such, the AMRF proposes to use \$50,000 of FY05 funds for CoHA website support and data update needs for 2007. The AMRF requests \$50,000 from FY06 funds to cover limited support and maintenance for 2008. If the WRAP region states and tribes need to restore CoHA to a

higher level of effort than maintenance and limited updates, the existing data and results will be available, but additional funding will be required.

**AMRF Budget Summary for 2007-08:**

	<b>2007 (from FY05 funds)</b>	<b>2008 (from FY06 funds)</b>
<b>Maintenance of the CoHA Website</b>	50,000	50,000

**Attribution of Haze Workgroup (AoH)**

The AoH Workgroup has worked during 2005-06 to complete the delivery of the WRAP Technical Support System (TSS); the TSS will be released in October 2006 for use in regional haze planning by states and tribes in the WRAP region. The design, development, and implementation of the TSS has been directed by AoH Workgroup in close consultation with other Forums, Workgroups, the Technical Oversight Committee, and in particular, the Implementation Workgroup. AoH plans to operate the TSS using the same contractor team on an ongoing basis, to fully support the development and implementation of the December 2007 haze plans. AoH uses a pair of parallel contracts to fund the contractor team as shown in the two tasks below. The full work plan for the late 2006 through 2007 time period can be found at: [http://wrapair.org/forums/aoh/meetings/060726den/Workplan\\_2007\\_072706.doc](http://wrapair.org/forums/aoh/meetings/060726den/Workplan_2007_072706.doc).

Major strategic goals of the work plan include:

- Ongoing TSS web site hardware and software maintenance;
- Database and analysis tool archiving for future reference and access by WRAP participants, stakeholders, and the EPA;
- Formal training and general web site support for WRAP participants;
- Analytical tool enhancements for access to monitoring, modeling, and emissions data as required by WRAP participants; and
- Performance of additional regional or local analyses required for SIP preparation, as requested by WRAP participants.

All work performed for this effort will be coordinated and prioritized by the AoH Workgroup. The training and analytical tasks will be performed in close consultation with the Implementation Work Group (IWG) and other Forums and Workgroups as appropriate.

<b>AoH Budget Summary for 2007-08:</b>	<b>2007 through mid-08 (from FY05 funds)</b>	<b>July to December 2008 (not currently funded)</b>
<b>Operations, Maintenance, &amp; TSS Development</b>	225,000	75,000
<b>User Support for Regional Haze Planning &amp; Ongoing TSS Development</b>	150,000	50,000

Existing FY05 AoH Workgroup TSS funding for 2007 through mid-2008	\$375,000
Additional funding needed to cover remainder of 2008, but currently unfunded	<u>\$125,000</u>
Total	\$500,000

## **Air Managers Committee**

The Air Managers' Committee provides project review and tracking from the perspective of state and tribal air managers with primary responsibility for the development and tracking of regional haze plans. The state and tribal caucus coordinators at WESTAR and NTEC will continue to assist the committee in 2007. In addition to the staff support discussed below, there are two additional line items in the AMC budget. They are:

Contractor Assistance (\$50,000): These funds are earmarked for project needs not anticipated in the current work plan. When a forum identifies a new project or supplemental funding for an existing project, they can apply to the AMC for use of these contractor assistance funds.

Technical and Economic Analysis of Reasonable Progress (\$50,000): As the deadline for regional haze plans approaches, the Air Managers anticipate additional analyses will be needed to evaluate the technical and economic factors that go into determining whether the plans demonstrate reasonable progress for each Class I area. This work is expected to begin in mid-2007, once the majority of emission reduction strategies have been identified and modeled. It is also likely that some of this work will occur in 2008 in order to answer questions that arise from EPA and others once the SIPs have been submitted.

The AMC's Implementation Work Group (IWG) is comprised of state and tribal staff (SIP/TIP writers). This group began its work in earnest in 2004. The IWG will continue through 2007 to:

- Help guide and assess project output from the other WRAP forums and workgroups;
- Develop a roadmap or template/framework that states and tribes may use to construct their individual SIPs and TIPs;
- Compile information on supplemental benefits of regional haze control strategies, and;
- Facilitate the essential understandings between states and tribes to develop and implement their SIPs and TIPs.

### Staff Support for the State and Tribal Caucuses

The State and Tribal Caucus Coordinators assist the tribal and state air directors with continual tracking and reporting of WRAP activities, issue identification and communication among the WRAP partners, recruitment of WRAP participants from states and tribes, and facilitation of issue resolution. The State Caucus Coordinator position is filled through a contract between WGA and WESTAR. The Tribal Caucus Coordinator is funded through the NTEC budget.

### Implementation Work Group (IWG)

The IWG got up and running in 2004, and will continue its work in two principle areas through 2006. First, IWG is on track to develop one or more "templates," or "roadmaps," to assist states and tribes in writing their 308 and 309(g) plans. In addition the IWG will maintain ongoing communication with the other forums and oversight committees as needed, prompting timely information from states and tribes, and in turn providing feedback to the forums to ensure they are focused on the critical planning questions. WESTAR provides direct staff assistance under a services contract with WGA. The State of New Mexico provides additional part-time contract staff to address the specific planning needs of tribes.

## Communications Committee

### Web Site Maintenance

The WRAP's website is one of its primary communications tools. The budgeted funds will be used to continue the contract with the WRAP's webmaster through 2008.

### Public Outreach and Communication on WRAP Issues

These funds will be used to produce written materials, visual presentations, and other outreach material that describe the work of the WRAP to external audiences. This effort will begin in mid-2007 and continue into 2008 as the SIPs are finalized and need to be communicated to governmental entities and the public at large.