

**NORTHERN AIR MANAGERS MEETING**  
**Portland, Oregon**  
**September 27, 2001**

Attendees:

Annette Liebe - ORDEQ	Jenifer Williams - NezPerce Tribe
Julie Simpson - NezPerce Tribe	Ira Domsky - AZDEQ
Dan Olson - WYDEQ	Chris Shaver - NPS
John Cox - CVTIR	Tom Chapple - AKDEC
Bob Raisch - MTDEQ	Bill Grantham - NTEC
Lisa Riener - Quinault Nation	Ondrea Barber - ITCA
Rick Sprott - UTDAQ	Stu Clark - WA Dept. of Ecology
Bob Saunders - WA Dept. of Ecology	Sandra Ely - NM Env. Dept.
Roxanne Ellingson - Walker River Paiute Tribe	

By phone:

Dana Mount - ND	Rose Lee - Yakama Nation
Dan Johnson - WESTAR	

This meeting of the Northern Air Managers was convened at 9:00 am on September 27, 2001, at the Hotel Vintage Plaza in Portland, Oregon. Following a moment of silence in memory of the events of September 11, 2001, and introductions of those in attendance and those participating by conference phone, Dan Olson, NAM co-chair, presented a background on the Northern Air Managers and a statement of the primary purpose of this meeting.

**Background**

Dan Olson began by outlining the history of the eventual formation of the Northern Air Managers Committee as an official standing committee of the WRAP. In late 1998 and early 1999 there were a number of meetings of primarily northern states that were concerned that since the WRAP was considered to be functioning solely as the "Son of the GCVTC" and was responding to the proposed Regional Haze Rule primarily in regard to the issues on the Colorado Plateau, the needs of non GCVTC states would not be addressed by that regional group. The original question was whether a separate regional group be formed or whether an attempt be made to refocus the WRAP to the needs of all Western States. The latter was the eventual choice which resulted in a proposal to the WRAP in March 1999 for a committee to be formed initially called the Northwest Air Managers Committee whose charge was to provide that focus. The WRAP concurred with that proposal and following the

development of a work plan and membership including states, tribes and federal partners, the Northern Air Managers Committee was officially recognized as a formal committee at the September 1999 Wrap meeting.

At the May 3, 2001, NAM meeting in Tempe, the members concluded that over the previous two years, while 309 issues remained a priority, the focus of the WRAP forums and work groups under the leadership of the IOC and TOC was to the needs of the entire region and that current concerns and issues facing the WRAP members were not specific to the northern region. Issues such as the transition of the regional work products of the WRAP to specific implementation plans; approvability issues facing state and tribal governments in 15 western states, 4 EPA regional offices, and EPA-HQ; lack of a mechanism for issues arising out of state and tribal caucuses to be discussed and resolved prior to or instead of involving the WRAP board; a way to more effectively involve and inform air managers, regardless of their degree of involvement in the WRAP process, of the priorities, process, and products of the WRAP effort.

At the May 24, 2001, WRAP meeting at the Acoma Pueblo these concerns were identified and the recommendation was made to the board that the NAM be reformed to include all state and tribal air managers (or senior programmatic staff) in the entire WRAP region. The WRAP concurred with the proposal and directed the NAM to determine the level of interest, develop a statement of purpose and method of operation (work plan), a structure, and define how the Air Managers Committee would interface with the IOC , TOC and the WRAP stakeholder process (FLMs/EPA).

And so, here we are!

## **Discussion**

Dan Olson began the discussion by stating in view of the logistics problems and concerns following September 11, the level of attendance today seemed to indicate that the interest was there. He then presented a strawman for discussion with the following points:

- \* Forums and work groups in all cases are dealing with a regional approach to complex issues that eventually must become specific plans.
- \* Stakeholder discussions lead to tradeoffs and negotiations on nearly all issues to reach a consensus position.
- \* Without consensus the issue is elevated to a higher level stakeholder process at the IOC/TOC or to the WRAP board.
- \* This process works - if those involved at the various levels are informed as to what is going on as the process evolves and how consensus is reached.

He then postulated a structure which he called a converging-parallel path (which raised eyebrows and

stimulated some discussion about terminology). The concept was that a fully informed, independently functioning, state caucus and tribal caucus internally could discuss issues affecting those entities that could be self-generated or that may result from an evaluation of the ongoing work of the forums. Issues that were sufficiently important could then be brought before the Air Managers Committee (AMC) for discussion and resolution. That resolution can take many forms but, in the final analysis, must be presented to the IOC and/or TOC for consideration and subsequent action. The basic problem is one of communication and involvement:

- \* Regardless of current or future involvement, none of the air managers can be involved in all aspects of the work of the forums.
- \* We need to be able to determine if a perceived issue (state or tribal) is a real issue that needs discussion and resolution.
- \* We need feedback of those issues to the stakeholder process through our representatives on the oversight committees, planning team, or whatever is appropriate so that those representatives may be better able to voice the positions of the states and tribes collectively as well as their individual state and tribe.

One solution discussed rather freely at the Planning Team meeting in Seattle a couple of weeks ago was that a dedicated staff person be hired for each caucus whose sole function (day job) was to provide that communication like between the caucuses and the forums and committees of the WRAP. Following a freewheeling discussion on the strawman proposal, general consensus was that the structure would work and that the concept of dedicated staff support was critical to its success.

Bill Grantham indicated that the tribes would welcome a forum where the tribes could discuss and perhaps resolve specific issues one-on-one with states without the necessity of involving the WRAP board on all issues. He indicated some of those issues may go beyond specific regional haze issues.

Bob Raisch suggested that there also may need to be a link from the AMC to the Communications Committee (CC) as well as the IOC/TOC. Others supported this idea.

Annette Liebe stressed we really need the communications link between the caucuses and the WRAP.

Chris Shaver stressed that the FLMs are not concerned that the caucuses discuss issues internally, agreed that staff support to the caucuses is a good idea, but that when the AMC convenes to discuss issues as a formal WRAP committee that stakeholder involvement must be maintained in the process.

Ira Domskey stressed that we need to be careful not to mess with the consensus process of the forums, but that if the AMC has consensus on an issue it needs to be presented to the WRAP.

Rose Lee suggested, regarding the question as to when or how often the AMC should meet,

that regular meetings are appropriate.

Bob Saunders suggested this concept would work to help resolve some current concerns from his perspective.

## **Summary**

At the end of the day, discussion solidified around the following:

### Structure

- \* Individual state and tribal caucuses with dedicated staff support to each
- \* Air Managers Committee Membership
  - All states and tribes in the WRAP region
  - Ex-Officio membership for all other WRAP stakeholders (FLM, etc)
  - State and Tribal Co-chair selected

### Communication

- \* Dedicated staff would provide communication and information flow between the caucuses, forums and the AMC.
- \* The AMC would communicate to the WRAP through the IOC, TOC, and CC.

### Funding

The participants at the Sept 27 meeting identified the following funding requirements:

1. State caucus staff/travel - One individual whose responsibility would be to attend forum, work group, and committee meetings and conference calls to keep the caucus members fully informed. The mechanism for acquiring this individual is left to the caucus, but the funding level needed for salary, benefits, overhead, etc plus related travel expenses is about \$110 K.

2. Tribal caucus staff/travel - Same assumptions. It was recognized that the Tribes are engaged in an effort to secure separate EPA funding which would provide this necessary level of support, however, that funding is by no means certain. The Air Managers Committee feels it is critical that the Tribal caucus receive adequate support at the same level as the State caucus to be fully informed of the WRAP efforts and suggest that the WRAP formally and vigorously support their efforts for separate EPA funding while planning to provide it from the WRAP budget if that effort fails.

3. The Committee is also concerned that, as has been the case during the last two years under the NAM, there will be needs identified as we proceed with the multitude of tasks in which we are engaged, that tasks will be identified that are not funded or inadequately funded that need to be accomplished. In a budget as large as the WRAP budget there needs to be a contingency. We are proposing a modest contingency of \$50K - to be supplemented by item #2 above if our Tribal partners are successful in their efforts.

## **Next Steps**

Dan Olson was volunteered (thanks folks) to:

- \* Summarize this meeting and have the minutes posted on the NAM page. I have attempted to be accurate.
- \* To alert the Planning Team during the next scheduled conference call of the funding needs beyond the \$120K already identified in the draft work plan.
- \* To research the WRAP bylaws to determine if changes are needed to sanction the AMC.
- \* To prepare for a presentation to the WRAP board at the SLC meeting recommending the expansion of the NAM to the AMC.