



**MEETING SUMMARY OF THE  
WESTERN REGIONAL AIR PARTNERSHIP MEETING**

September 13-14, 2006  
Grouse Mountain Lodge, Whitefish, Montana

**Wednesday, September 13**

8:00 am      **Call to Order**      *Steve Owens*

- Welcome to Montana      Bob Habeck, State of Montana
- Welcome Hawaii to WRAP
- Introduction of Lewis McLeod, WRAP Co-Director, NTEC
- Agenda Review

8:15      Jack Potter, Chief, Science and Natural Resources, Glacier National Park

Welcomed the group to Glacier National Park and provided a general introduction to air quality issues in Glacier.

8:30      Chris Shaver, Chief, Air Resources Division, National Park Service

“Air quality issues in Glacier and other relevant regions of the West”

Presentation:

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/2a\\_Chris\\_Shaver.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/2a_Chris_Shaver.pdf)

8:55      Dan Fagre, Research Ecologist  
USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center, Glacier Field Station

“Climate change impacts to Glacier and other mountainous regions”

Presentation:

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/2b\\_Dan\\_Fagre.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/2b_Dan_Fagre.pdf)

9:40      Leigh Welling, Director  
Crown of the Continent Research Learning Center, Glacier National Park

“Incorporating climate change mitigation and adaptation into Glacier's environmental management plan”

Presentation:

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/2c\\_Leigh\\_Welling.ppt](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/2c_Leigh_Welling.ppt)

10:00 Break / Prepare for Field Trip

10:30 Depart Grouse Mountain Lodge for Field Trip to Glacier National Park

### **Thursday, September 14**

8:00 Call to Order

- Approve Minutes from April 4-5 Meeting in Salt Lake City

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/3\\_April\\_2006\\_Minutes.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/3_April_2006_Minutes.pdf)

Rick Sprott moved the minutes be approved. There were no objections and the minutes were unanimously adopted.

- Discussion of Funding and Work Plans

Funding History and Current Status:

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/3a\\_Funding\\_Summary.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/3a_Funding_Summary.pdf)

2007 Work Plan:

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/10\\_WRAP\\_2007\\_Work\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/10_WRAP_2007_Work_Plan.pdf)

Work Plan Overview Presentation:

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/10a\\_Workplan\\_Summary.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/10a_Workplan_Summary.pdf)

Patrick Cummins provided an overview of the WRAP's funding history and current status. 80 percent of WRAP funding is spent on project work and most of that has been technical work. Prior to the WRAP there was not a West-wide inventory or modeling capability or evaluation of monitoring data. All of these things are now available not only to states and tribes but to anyone interested in Western air quality issues – that is where the bulk of the funds have gone. Now we need to maintain this technical capability and infrastructure. These are also the tools we need to follow through on the implementation of the regional haze plans.

He noted that there is pressure on EPA to cut spending. Part of that could have been because of the WRAP surplus, but the surplus will be gone by the end of 2007. Question is what is needed to sustain efforts. Steve Owens noted that ECOS has seen this as well in funding going to states, generally.

Tom Chapple asked what we know in terms of the EPA program personnel's perspective. Pat said the recommendation from the program offices was to maintain funding at \$5

million in 2007, but the proposed budget was \$2.5. Five RPOs will meet with EPA in Kansas City next week so we can find out what this really means, what their vision is and then work with budget people and through the political process to make sure the message is coming through on what program people believe is required.

John Corra asked what the spending goes toward on the policy side. Patrick said stationary sources, fire, and dust are the biggest categories under this funding.

Patrick talked about prospects for future funding, but said the focus needs to be on '08, as we expect it to be very difficult to get Congress' attention for '07. We will need to make the case to EPA that WRAP deserves the lion's share of the \$2.5 million planned for all the RPO, given the number of Class1 areas, and other factors.

Regarding FY 08 funding, Patrick noted it will be a two-year process for SIP approval once they are submitted. WRAP needs to be in a position to address questions during that process, maintain technical systems and track progress.

A power point presentation was given on the work plan by both Patrick and Lewis McLeod. Need to note that this work plan is just for regional haze and not for any other initiatives that WRAP chooses to work on, such as climate change, which is funded from other sources.

Lewis McLeod discussed Tribal funding. He noted that WRAP has assisted Western tribes because it is a unique collaboration with the states to meet environmental objectives. This is a big accomplishment. The tribes' workplan supports tribes in the WRAP process. Lewis listed accomplishments and tasks of NTEC staff in supporting tribes. One of the committees tribes are extremely involved in is the emissions forum. Tribal data development work group gets majority of funding. With this contract, we should be able to assist tribes in knowing what tools are available and assisting them in using them. This funding can support tribes, but if it goes lower next year it will affect ability of tribes to travel and participate.

Motion to approve work plan was from Jim Norton and Tom Chapple seconded the motion. Passed unanimously.

Patrick said WRAP will look to diversify its funding and pursue other sources at the federal level and grants. Would help if stakeholders also contacted Congress and the Administration about the value of the WRAP. Rick Sprott said diversification is important, but don't want to live hand to mouth and need a reliable source of funding. Need to consider how we get the RPOs out of the regional haze "bin" to work on other issues with tribes. Patrick – working with tribes is a key element. John Corra asked about whether contractors and vendors should be asked to share in the burden and look at what they are charging. Tom Chapple said at some point we need to convene a work group about our long-term needs, especially as we go beyond regional haze.

9:00 Tribal Caucus Report

*Tribal Members and NTEC Staff*

Report:

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/6a\\_Tribal\\_Caucus\\_Report.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/6a_Tribal_Caucus_Report.pdf)

Presentation:

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/LIFE\\_AFTER\\_2007.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/LIFE_AFTER_2007.pdf)

Members of the Tribal Caucus reported on their discussions regarding possible issues for WRAP to address in the future. Lewis McLeod, Stanley Paytiamo, and Melissa Estes gave the presentation. Steve Owens said he thought the Tribal Caucus report dovetails well with the work of the WRAP. Richard Long said the work proposed would take the group into new areas and is an excellent document with themes that resonate well with EPA. Chris Shaver agreed. Melissa said other sources of funding are being sought for this work.

9:30 Greening WRAP Travel

*WRAP Communications Committee*

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/7\\_Greening\\_WRAP\\_Travel.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/7_Greening_WRAP_Travel.pdf)

Members of the Communications Committee provided a short presentation on programs where individuals can purchase “green tags” to offset emissions associated with travel to meetings. This information is being provided for individual WRAP participants, not as a proposal for WRAP funding.

9:45 Break

10:00 Update on GHG Inventory Project *Center for Climate Strategies*

Presentation:

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/CCS\\_Update\\_on\\_GHG\\_Inventories.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/CCS_Update_on_GHG_Inventories.pdf)

10:20 GHG Registry

*Board Members and WGA Staff*

#### Report from WRAP’s July Workshop

A copy of the interactive agenda is available on the Web site. Ten states and 60 people attended. Lewis represented the tribes. The industry comments revolved around there being support for reporting GHG emissions, but the most important thing is that there be one registry. What California has in place is considered a good one. Building on that, the group discussed the idea of a multi-state registry that would meet the needs of all the states.

#### Report from Sept. 6 Meeting on Multi-state Registry and Next Steps

Steve Owens, Jim Norton, and Eileen Tutt participated on behalf of WRAP in a meeting on Sept. 6 that included states from other regions. The registry is policy neutral. It is a a

tool that states and tribes can use on a voluntary basis. California needs a tool like this to implement its new climate change law. The reporting mechanisms and protocols will be common to all.

Eileen said there are a lot of similarities between haze and climate change. Going alone gets us nowhere. The registry is an accounting device that needs to be consistent. Jim Norton said anything we do on climate will not interfere with what we do on haze and funding must be separate from WRAP monies. There is nothing a state would be required to do. The registry issue came up a year ago at our separate climate change meeting. There's a diversity of ideas on how this might be used. The beauty of the way this is evolving is that it is a tool that can be used for reporting by a state as it chooses – voluntary, mandatory or not at all. Pat said companies have indicated that meets their needs as well, since many of them operate in different states.

Larry Lau discussed other data exchange systems and is interested in how this one may develop and whether any of those would be useful. Pat said a technical committee will look at a lot of these issues. The California registry system is up and running with large and small companies participating. This effort expands on all of the development work already done by California.

The registry group is creating a steering committee with reps from each region – two states and one tribe, plus staff. Steve and Jim volunteered at the last meeting to serve in that capacity and Lewis said the tribes will choose someone at next tribal caucus to participate. Eileen Tutt will participate for CA and the CA Registry staff will also be involved. Expenses will be covered by Rockefeller Brothers Fund and Energy Foundation grants to WRAP.

The steering committee is looking at a couple of meetings and conference calls and bringing results back to this group in March. There will be a technical group, which Ira Domsy of Arizona will participate on as well as an individual from Oregon. We will have an outreach process to our members. What is envisioned is to have an MOU ready by June 2007 and the registry in place by January 2008. It would be a non profit organization funded by fees from the reporters and possibly some grant funding. The burden on states and tribes as far as staff resources is to be kept to a minimum. Eileen said the industry participants would much rather see a multi-state registry rather than pay fees to California. Steve said if there are no objections to that happening, Jim and he would continue to participate in the calls and meetings to develop the MOU. There were no objections.

Chris asked if there was any reason why national parks couldn't participate and register their emissions. Eileen said the California registry has many entities participating using a general protocol. There is a separate forestry protocol.

Steve said this process should be as open and transparent as possible and wants to make sure information on the meetings is available to interested parties from all states and tribes. Pat said as far as stakeholder outreach, what was discussed is that each region will be responsible for its stakeholder outreach. Eileen said California will have a public

process as it meets its January 2008 deadline. WRAP's participation in that process would be beneficial.

11:00            Status of Technical Analysis            *Technical Oversight Committee*

Presentation:

[http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/Board\\_Tech\\_Talk\\_9\\_14\\_06\\_final.pdf](http://www.wrapair.org/WRAP/meetings/060913m/Board_Tech_Talk_9_14_06_final.pdf)

12:00            Meeting Adjourned