



March 21, 2012 Meeting

UGRB Air Quality Citizens
Advisory Task Force

Task Force Process & Time Line

1. Procedural ground work: purpose and approach
2. Decide together the information you will use
3. Together, specify the issues to be resolved
4. Specify interests
5. Generate options

Task Force Process & Time Line

6. Together, evaluate options / tradeoffs / uncertainties
7. Reach agreement on recommendations
8. Evaluate progress, re-engage

Task Force Process & Time Line

- Meeting 1: Procedural ground work
- Meeting 2: Finish procedural work; begin discussion on technical issues
- Meeting 3: Solidify technical reference; frame issues; specify interests
- Meeting 4: Generate options
- Subsequent meetings: evaluate options; reach agreement on recommendations; evaluate progress

Steering Committee

- John Corra
- Jennifer Frazier
- Darla Potter
- Melissa Hovey
- Angela Zivkovich
- Carmel Kail
- Joel Bousman
- David Stewart (Mike Shaffron)
- Jerimiah Rieman
- Steve Dietrich

[

]

CHARTER DISCUSSION

Changes from Feb Meeting

- Background and Project Description
 - Made geographic references consistent:
 - Upper Green River Basin
 - Sublette, Sweetwater, and Lincoln counties
 - Reducing emissions of ozone precursors
 - Citizen participation is now an “opportunity,” not a gap

Changes from Feb Meeting

- Purpose

- Still some question about whether to reduce ozone, or ozone precursors
- *Recommend that we engage in technical discussion before making this decision*

Changes from Feb Meeting

■ Scope of the Task Force

- Changed “Authority” to “Scope”
- Changed “pursue issues” to “identify solutions”... that fall outside the scope of WDEQ’s authority

■ Products and Outcomes

- Periodic public reports

Sections Not Changed

- Geographic Area: *No change*
- Task Force Membership and Representation: *No change*
- Responsibilities of the Task Force: *No change*
- Responsibilities of the Facilitators: *No change*

[Recommended Change]

- Decision Process

If all efforts have been made to arrive at full consensus, but it appears that the Task Force will not be able to achieve it, the group may choose to proceed with less than consensus in order to achieve progress. In the event of this lack of consensus, the Task Force will; a) Allow time for the dissenting parties to express their concerns and reasons for dissent, b) Note the range of views presented on the decision at hand and record those views in the meeting summaries, and, c) Make clear in any verbal or written communications that the decision was made in order to proceed, but that consensus was not achieved.

[Recommended Change]

- Decision Process
 - Participation and Group Decisions:
 - Primary or alternate member weigh in on group decisions, not both

[

]

JOINT FACT FINDING

[Joint Fact Finding]

- Purpose: handle complex scientific and technical questions
- Helps participants agree on the information they will use (or need to collect) and how gaps or disagreements among technical sources will be handled
- Allows stakeholders to build a shared understanding of technical and scientific issues and their implications for policy

[Joint Fact Finding]

- Stakeholders work jointly to:
 - Define the scientific/technical questions that are important;
 - Identify and select qualified resources to assist the group;
 - Refine the questions/issues;
 - Set the terms of reference for discussion and recommendations;
 - Review and evaluate actions taken.

[Technical Subcommittee]

- Recommend formation of a technical subcommittee
- 6 to 8 members
- Address comments/recommendations on JFF document from Task Force members
- Provide guidance to Ruckelshaus staff in development of JFF document
- Report back to Task Force

[Conceptual Diagram]

