

To: WRAP Members

From: WRAP Communications Committee Co-Chairs and Co-Project Managers:
Barry M. Aarons, Al Zemsky, Jan Miller, Bill Grantham, Patrick Cummins

Topic: Public Advisory Board Structure

Date: October 31, 2001

We have been discussing the status and future role of the WRAP's Public Advisory Board (PAB). It may be that the PAB has not played a significant role in the WRAP process to date because it does not fit as well into the WRAP structure as it did in the Grand Canyon Commission structure.

It is possible that the role previously handled by the PAB in the Grand Canyon process now is actually undertaken through stake holder involvement in forums and committees and a broader outreach and communication program. For example, all WRAP forums and committees strive to have involvement from the same interest groups represented on the PAB and we have a newsletter and speakers' bureau whose goal is to dispense information on the purpose of the WRAP. Our current structure and outreach programs may actually better facilitate of the communication and involvement that the PAB is designed to obtain.

The Grand Canyon Commission was one very large report undertaken by a broad coalition of participants, and the PAB members built support within each state for adoption of the recommendations as a package. The WRAP is a series of smaller efforts yielding reports and recommendations on very specific topics. With such a focus on specific issues, and broad based stake holder involvement throughout the process, there is less of a need for the intensive review role envisioned for the PAB. The WRAP products will be available for use by states and tribes in their SIPs and TIPs, but in most cases there is not a need for all members to adopt exactly the same approaches.

Given the number of WRAP forums, committees and working groups, we might engage a single PAB on an almost permanent basis if they were to fully carry out the role they did in the GCVTC. On the other hand, the structure of each of the WRAP groups contains elements of the many different segments of interest and stake holders as might be needed, and might be replicating, on a smaller basis, the work envisioned for the PAB.

That is not to say that the PAB function of general community outreach and extended stake holder management is not necessary. It seems, however, that the paradigm of public

outreach and stake holder involvement in our current structure has changed and may not fit the PAB structure as it was with the Grand Canyon process.

From a practical standpoint, we currently have problems populating the forums, working groups and committees with people who can undertake a significant work load on behalf of the WRAP. Our own Communications Committee has struggled with this issue for quite a while. As such, populating an intensive and ongoing PAB effort may not be practicable at this time.

With these issues in mind, we would ask that the WRAP consider the future of the PAB in relation to the current outreach program and stake holder involvement inherent to the WRAP process. We can then discuss whether we should make any specific organizational changes with regard to the PAB structure. We will discuss this at the November 14 WRAP meeting and look forward to your thoughts on these ideas and discussions.