

**Tribal Infrastructure Task Force Meeting Summary  
May 16, 2012 2:00-3:30 PM**

**Introductions**

Dana Baer	Indian Health Service (IHS) Sanitation Facilities Construction (SFC) Program
Scott Barringer	U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development (USDA), Rural Utilities Service
Deborah Broermann	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Southwest Office of Native American Programs
Jennifer Bullough	HUD Office of Native American Programs
Marta Burg	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 9 Tribal Caucus
Dave Clark	Rural Communities Assistance Partnership (RCAP)
Lorrie Davis	USDA, Rural Development
Sheila Frace	EPA Office of Water (OW), Office of Wastewater Management (OWM)
Greg Gwaltney	EPA, OW, OWM
David Harvey	EPA OW, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (OGWDW)
Hal Nielson	USDA, Rural Development, Rural Utilities Program
Carolyn O'Neill	HUD, Southwest Office of Native American Programs
Ken Norton	National Tribal Water Council
Jon Melhus	USDA, Rural Development
Stephen Poloncsik	EPA Region 5
Nate Rawding	Horsley Witten Group, Inc.
Charles Reddoor	EPA, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER)
Linda Reeves	EPA Region 9
Matt Richardson	EPA, OW, OWM
Ben Shuman	USDA Rural Development, Water Program
Kelly Titensor	U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
John Wheaton	Nez Perce Tribe (NPT), Idaho
Michaelle Wilson	EPA Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery (ORCC)
Felicia Wright	EPA Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER)

**A. Welcome, Introductions, and Review of ITF Road Map (Matt Richardson, EPA)**

Matt provided a review of the Road Map document. In previous meetings the ITF heard from six different Tribes on utility operations. During the last ITF meeting, some concerns were raised about the representativeness of the information collected from Tribes. However although this is a small sample size relative to the full list of tribal utility entities, the document identifies very similar challenges that we at EPA hear from rural State utilities. Matt is also looking forward to working with the work groups and developing an ITF Action Plan.

## **B. Next Quarterly ITF Call is Cancelled and Limited to an E-mail Report out (Sheila Frace)**

Sheila Frace thanked everyone for their participation on this call, as well as on past calls. In place of a conference call for the July ITF meeting, an update on the progress of workgroups will be provided to each member via email. This will provide flexibility to those working on construction projects. The following ITF meeting in September will be a regular conference call.

Will the email exchange be among a limited group or all of the members of the ITF group?

The email report out will be to all ITF members with an update on progress by workgroup. All ITF members are encouraged to comment on any information shared by email.

Matt Richardson introduced a group called MATIC (the Multi-Agency Tribal Infrastructure Tribal Collaborative), which had been discussed during the last ITF meeting as sharing similarities to the efforts of the ITF. During today's call, Carolyn O'Neill and Deborah Broermann from HUD will present the MATIC to the ITF.

## **C. The Multi-Agency-Tribal-Infrastructure-Collaborative (MATIC) (Carolyn O'Neill / Deborah Broermann, HUD)**

Deborah Broermann gave an overview of the MATIC – Multi-Agency Tribal Infrastructure Collaborative that is based in Arizona. A PowerPoint file was distributed to the ITF group prior to the call as the basis for this presentation.

MATIC is a group of 16 different federal, state, and non-profit organizations that provide resources and assistance to Tribes in Arizona and the southwest. It is a voluntary group that meets monthly.

MATIC began in May 2010, by calling Tribal partners to create a group to expand the resources provided to Tribes. MATIC has monthly meetings to share information on the resources available to assist Tribes with various infrastructure projects. Information is shared on program updates, funding sources, information, and training opportunities for infrastructure projects on Tribal lands. MATIC partner agencies are identified in the presentation on slide #6. MATIC also includes three major educational institutions in Arizona: Northern Arizona University, Arizona State University, and University of Arizona.

MATIC has hosted two annual statewide forums. These are open to anyone who wants to attend and provides information on the resources available to Tribes. The first resource forum was attended by 170 participants, and the second forum by 180 participants. Each forum featured presentations by federal agencies on resources, information on successful Tribal projects, and an opportunity for Tribes to meet individually with federal agencies regarding funding, training, and specific projects. Training people on developing and managing a project, as well as on operating the project afterwards, are important elements for any project's ongoing sustainability. The individual time at the end of the forum has been very successful.

In addition, MATIC mobilizes teams to visit and assist Tribal projects with identified obstacles or barriers.

EPA Region 9 staff took the lead on a Tribal Building Code Survey, and also a Green Building Code Summit for Tribes. The building code is critical to infrastructure projects. Linda Reeves can provide additional information about the Green Building Code Summit to anyone who is interested.

MATIC compiled a comprehensive list of resources for Tribes, and is in the process of making it available online. The dynamic list contains different resources and web links available to Tribes.

MATIC facilitates meetings with funders through its monthly meetings. A Tribe with a project in mind can submit it to the group to identify available resources.

The annual Tribal Resource Forum is well attended. In addition, MATIC offers technical assistance, trainings opportunities, and financial resources to Tribes. To share information about their project, Tribes present their projects to MATIC.

Examples of projects MATIC collaborated on include the following:

#### Tohono O'odham - Modular Bathroom

Partners involved include EPA, IHS, USDA, HUD, and the Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI). This project included 380 homes without basic sanitation facilities. Most of the homes had pit-prives and yard hydrants which created a series of public health issues. The federal regulations conflicted: IHS funds could only be used for sanitation infrastructure, but not the actual construction of the bathrooms. The Tohono O'odham Tribal Utility Authority did not have the upfront funds to construct the bathrooms. USDA had funding, but the funds could not be provided to an organization, it could only be given to individual people. The role of MATIC was to overcome the conflicting rules. Of the 380 homes identified as needing upgraded sanitation facilities, about 200 bathrooms have been installed so far.

#### Hopi - Arsenic Mitigation Project

Partners involved included EPA, IHS, RCAC, and the Intertribal Council. EPA reduced the maximum contaminant level (MCL) for arsenic in drinking water from 50 parts per billion (ppb) to 10 ppb, which required mitigation for the Hopi Tribe because their water system was no longer in compliance. The Hopi Tribe had received some drinking water funding from EPA for a feasibility study, and the Tribe entered a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with IHS to upgrade the system into compliance. This was a \$25 million project, which is very expensive, but also very necessary because of the remote location of the system.

#### White Mountain Apache - Water Well

This project was to construct a new water well and water delivery system to ensure that water is delivered to all housing units. The water system includes a concrete dam, plumbing for the system, water treatment plant, and water distribution pipeline. The project also created about 120 jobs, and covered, 2,627 square miles.

In addition to funding, MATIC focuses on three key areas with collaboration as a component to each area:

- 1) The up-front planning and design;
- 2) The actual construction and implementation of the project; and
- 3) Operation and maintenance, and sustainability.

MATIC identified lack of operation and maintenance knowledge as a major issue, for which technical assistance providers and trainers are needed. In Arizona, the Tribal Assistance Providers Group is headed by IHS. MATIC can identify the strengths and weaknesses of the technical providers and suggest an appropriate technical provider for a certain project. For example, if a Tribe needs hands-on training, the Tribal Assistance Providers Group (TAPG) can identify a resource provider skilled in training. IHS has been instrumental in getting the TAPG up and running in Arizona and Nevada, and Linda Reeves at EPA has established the Regional Tribal Operations Committee (RTOC) group in California. In addition to funding, federal agencies have staff to assist Tribes. One obstacle is getting the word out to Tribes about what MATIC is and how it can assist. Contact information for MATIC members is listed at the end of the PowerPoint presentation.

### **Questions**

Before the White Mountain Apache water system was put in place, how was the water being delivered?

The water well serving the Tribe was not completely shut down, but was in disrepair and only running at about 15% of its initial capacity. The existing water well still operated while the new system was being constructed. The Tribe was not without water, but would have run out of water without the new system.

As a part of the White Mountain Apache project, were any solid waste management needs identified?

This would need to be answered by the project specialist.

Linda Reeves commented that MATIC is an excellent example of how the national inter-agency infrastructure taskforce work is successfully carrying out the inter-agency coordination at the local level. There are a lot of parallels between MATIC and the work of the ITF.

Jennifer Bullough commented that groups similar to MATIC could be replicated throughout the country. This would work best on a project/state level to gather resources, and to coordinate the actions of the various partners. Call participants outside Arizona and the southwest area that are interested in setting up an organization similar to MATIC should contact Jennifer Bullough, Deborah Broermann, or Carolyn O'Neill.

Deborah Broermann noted that MATIC has worked very well on a state level in Arizona. When MATIC receives a request from a different state, it has to identify different partners to address

Tribal issues. Groups that become too large may not have the same effectiveness as a smaller group.

Felicia Wright mentioned that she recently received a call regarding the Hopi arsenic mitigation project, and the Tribe is requesting a meeting with EPA. The information that was presented on the Hopi arsenic mitigation project provides helpful background knowledge.

Deborah Broermann suggested that Felicia contact Nova Balzej from EPA, who is working very closely with the Hopi Tribe.

#### How was MATIC started?

The idea for MATIC came from Carolyn O'Neill who wanted to determine if there was interest among Tribal partners in working together on Tribal infrastructure projects. Tribal partners who were contacted were eager to participate and needed someone to take the lead.

Carolyn O'Neill explained that Deborah Broermann deserves the credit for keeping MATIC going. Deborah is very well known and well respected throughout the Tribal community in Arizona. It is necessary to have someone to take ownership of the group and have the dedication to make it successful.

#### Are you able to send a copy of the MATIC Tribal Resources Guide?

The MATIC monthly meetings include a sharing list as well as the funding resource guide. The sharing list provides information on projects that are in a preliminary stage, projects that are underway and need resources, as well as completed projects. In addition, a resources guide (PDF form) contains categories for MATIC partners that include information on funding, training, and technical assistance. This document is updated as programs are added or removed.

#### Why was the funding guide created?

One of the partners from an educational institution was interested in developing a resource matrix to share with the group. He and his staff volunteered their time to do the research, identify weblinks, compile the contact information, and keep it updated. He is an engineer by trade and is dedicated to Tribal projects.

Carolyn O'Neill pointed out that the work to create the resource matrix was provided for free. This was possible as a result of Deborah Broermann's many contacts throughout the Tribal community. She is on the executive board for the Construction in Indian County Conference and is able to pull in resources in many different ways. MATIC does not have a budget for its activities. The most recent funding forum was extremely successful as a result of the collaboration of the members in MATIC. The forum had almost 200 attendees including those calling in remotely. Deborah Broermann will send Matt Richardson a copy of the resource matrix and the MATIC sharing list.

#### How many participants in the MATIC forum received travel funds from one of the agencies involved?

All travel is funded by the Tribes. No travel funding was provided by the federal agencies. The

agencies provided representatives to speak at the forum, and to meet with the Tribes, but no travel funds.

Carolyn O'Neill noted this year may be a challenge for travel, but the forum has been so successful that the audience exceeds the target number of attendees. As a result, MATIC may set up a second forum in Tucson, Arizona to keep the audience smaller.

#### **D. Solid Waste Management in Indian Country (Michaelle Wilson, EPA)**

Charles Reddoor is the Tribal coordinator for the solid waste management program along with a team of people working on grant and policy projects. A website (<http://www.epa.gov/wastes/wyl/tribal/index.htm>) for the program contains a number of items that may be of interest. Michaelle Wilson will provide information on the solid waste program to Matt Richardson for distribution to the ITF group.

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), is the statute for EPA's waste management program. It contains two Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance measures: 1) the cleanup and closure of open dumps, and 2) the increase in the number of Tribes with an integrated waste resource management plan.

Existing partnership efforts with IHS are important to achieving solid waste management program goals. IHS was able to accommodate EPA information on solid waste when they changed their database.

In Indian Country, Subtitle C of RCRA is the permitting authority and Subtitle Z is the non-hazardous waste facility section that addresses facilities in Indian Country and covers recycling, reduction, and elimination of waste.

EPA's authority to regulate in Indian Country was affected by a 1996 court decision (*Back Country Against Dumps v. EPA*), which determined that the Tribal section in the RCRA is not a section, and as a result Tribes are not treated as states as in other EPA programs. The solid waste program is unable to delegate to or authorize Tribal governments, so the program can only provide voluntary assistance. EPA does have hazardous waste enforcement authority over open dumps or solid wastes through the eminent and substantial danger clause of the statute.

The solid waste program partners with regional offices and other federal agencies to provide technical assistance and grant funding. Technical assistance includes education materials and training.

In the past there were two grant programs, but only one is remaining. A regional program also assists Tribes: each Region has a "Senior Environmental Employee" (SEE), a retired individual, who provides direct support to Tribes on integrated waste management plans, cleanups, closure of open dumps, and other solid waste topics. The SEE program helps to build important relationships and partnership with Tribes.

***a. The ITF's Renewed Focus to Include Solid Waste***

As part of the ITF, the solid waste program wants to focus on sustainability. The MATIC projects are a good example of the things that the solid waste program is working towards. The goal is to create sustainable transfer stations that have an integrated waste management plan in place.

The solid waste program wants to learn from the experiences of the water program. The ability of MATIC to work with several different agencies is impressive. The solid waste program can benefit from learning new ways of leveraging resources and is also looking for financing options to consider in waste management issues.

Waste management is an issue for projects with construction. Often, after the construction for a project is completed, a lot of construction debris is left behind. Having a plan for construction debris at the beginning of the project would help address this problem.

The main focus of the solid waste program within the ITF group is sustainability and life cycle of waste materials to reduce wastes on the front end. The solid waste program is doing some planning within EPA on "sustainable waste management." This looks at the manufacturing process and when materials are first being used, to reduce the waste that is created. This is one of the solid waste program's priorities, and it would like to work with the ITF on this issue.

***b. Unique Issues, Solution Strategies & Take Away Items for Tribal communities***

According to the GPRA goals, by 2015 the program wants to increase the number of Tribes covered by an integrated waste management plan by 78 and to cleanup, close, or upgrade 281 open dumps. The program has already exceeded these targets. As March of 2012, it has created 136 integrated waste management plans and cleaned up, closed, or upgraded 654 open dumps.

The primary inter-agency interaction is with IHS. The IHS Sanitation Tracking and Reporting System (STARS) provided EPA the ability to track the sanitation infrastructure deficiencies, and to receive clean up resources from IHS when an open dump is listed on the STARS database. The program is working to impart to the Tribes the importance of participating in the recording and reporting of open dumps.

IHS has an operation and maintenance (O&M) data management system which is a portion of STARS. This database includes information on open dumps that have been reported. SEE employees, IHS staff, and EPA Region employees, collect information on open dumps using portable GPS devices.

There were two solid waste grant programs for Tribes, however, funding for the Tribal Solid Waste Management Assistance Project, an interagency partnership with BIA, IHS, HUD, USDA, and DOD, was eliminated this year. Funding for this program is included in the president's 2013 budget proposal.



The second program is the Hazardous Waste Management Grant Program; it is open to all Tribes proposing education programs or hazardous waste cleanups. There have been several very successful projects in the last couple of years. One of the projects was a “hazardous waste round up” which had a collection and pick up of hazardous waste. There are several very well run Tribal transfer stations that collect many types of waste, including electronics, household hazardous wastes, and used oil to reduce the solid wastes in Indian Country. Partnerships are an important way of providing non-financial resources.

Charles Reddoor added that peer matching started at a meeting in October 2011, attended by all the regional RCRA Tribal coordinators. Issues raised included declining funding, and how to continue to train and provide knowledge to Tribes without money to travel. This brought people together in a similar way that MATIC did. The solid waste program is going to start the peer matching program at the Tribal land use forum in August this year in Coos Bay, Oregon. Peer matching works best at the regional level. Within each of the EPA regions an SEE employee acts as a circuit rider. The individual has the funds to travel among the Tribes within each region. Two regional circuit riders can travel to see what projects are underway, what is completed, and what is planned. This helps the SEE employee understand the information that individual Tribal members may require.

Because of frequent turnover, many Tribal members do not know what they should be doing. The peer matching program sometimes results in Tribal members calling federal partners with questions.

The solid waste program has developed a strong relationship with the American Indian Environmental Office, which has agreed to cover travel expenses submitted in advance.

Michaelle Wilson noted that a Tribal Lands Forum is held every year. This year is its third year and it will be held in Oregon. The Forum features sessions on interagency projects and also on problems common in rural areas but not specific to Tribes. The “Solid Waste Journal” is a resource which contains information on issues such as “meth lab” clean ups. A session is also held on general solid waste issues.

Matt Richardson noted the parallels between solid waste and water issues. Many of ITF members are the same people that address solid waste and water issues. Having a means for communication is important.

Are the modular bathrooms for the Tohono O’odham project a single-unit or separate parts assembled together?

The modular bathrooms were built onsite by a contractor, and then placed at each individual home.

Are they composting toilets?

No, they are not composting toilets, but the toilets are low-flow and take advantage of energy efficient lighting.



## **E. Current ITF Activities & Updates**

### ***a. Grant Paperwork Streamlining and NEPA (Matthew Richardson, EPA)***

This group developed a report last year, and is wrapping up the work. There are basically two directives:

- 1) Asking our regions to meet every six months with their counterparts at different federal agencies, similar to the MATIC organization; and
- 2) A NEPA summary document that outlines the NEPA requirements for different federal agencies. The group is in the process of finalizing this document, and will announce the tools when they are available.

### ***b. Update on a Common Project Engineering Report among the Agencies (Ben Shuman, USDA)***

The project was initially part of the ITF, but also had a separate component – Small Communities Water Infrastructure Exchange composed of non-tribal agencies looking at state government and federal agencies. Rather than having two different committees, the thought is to combine the two and work together as a single group. The next teleconference will be held on May 24<sup>th</sup>, from 3-4pm. Currently, Dana Baer and David Harvey are part of the group. Thirteen state governments are also involved along with HUD, IHS, EPA, and USDA. A collaboration website has been set up to coordinate work using Lotus software. Currently, the group is reviewing documents and developing a first draft for a common Project Engineering Report outline.

### ***c. Collection of Tribal O&M Utility Data (Ben Shuman, USDA)***

A kick off conference call was held about two weeks ago. The workgroup is using EPA's contractor and David Harvey is the primary contractor coordinator. David Harvey noted the workgroup has developed a scope of work to identify an approach on how to collect Tribal O&M cost information and compare the costs to optimal O&M costs. The workgroup will pilot the information inquiry with less than nine Tribal entities, and then revise this approach based on the results of the pilot. The number of entities that can be contacted is limited by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA). The scope of work is being reviewed internally at EPA to ensure all quality control papers are complete and hopefully this will be available this week.

### **When will the NEPA requirements document be completed?**

The document should be completed within the month. Matt met with the NEPA staff at EPA and received feedback last week. The document needs to be approved by management at EPA before it can be circulated. Linda Reeves mentioned she is looking to add program guidance at the beginning of the document and then send it out to all of the Tribal housing organizations that HUD works with.

## **F. Discussion and Identification of Future ITF Activities (All)**

Sheila Frace noted that the last call contained good discussion on the project engineering report, as well as the O&M data collection effort. Much of the discussion evolved around the longer term training needs of Tribes, at both the operator and the Tribal leadership level. EPA and USDA have also been hosting a workshop targeted at small communities and hope to include Tribal representatives. Sheila does not have an update on the May workshop and whether there were any Tribal representatives in attendance. One of the goals was to determine whether the materials for O&M on water and wastewater were appropriate for the audience (small and Tribal systems). The intent was to go back after the three pilots and use the feedback to adjust the training materials. There may be an opportunity to have a workshop specifically for Tribes. Sheila would like to discuss it during a future call, or via email to get suggestions for a place to host the workshop. Federal agencies are limited in the travel and workshops as a result of limited funds. This may be an opportunity for a more active region, or to build on an existing event. The workshop is on utility operation maintenance and management and is a 2-day format.

Dave Clark stated that he likes the Commonalities document and would like to share this information with subsequent successful projects to collect more information. Dave asked if it would be possible to take the Commonalities document and turn it into something similar to a survey to have Tribes identify the challenges from their projects.

Sheila Frace noted federal agencies are limited by the PRA, so an inquiry would be limited to 10 or fewer people.

Dana Baer added that when working with a Tribal partner, it is possible to ask questions to collect information in a manner that does not conflict with the PRA. Also, a group such as RCAP could collect the data since they are not a federal agency and not subject to the PRA.

Dana Baer also noted that since he is visiting with Tribes and collecting information on the SDS lists, he could collect information as part of the same conversation and it may not be subject to the PRA.

Dave Clark asked if collecting more information from Tribes using the information in the Commonalities documents would be useful or whether everything is already covered.

Dana Baer commented that the listening sessions were useful to get an example of a variety of Tribal utilities, both large and complex utilities such as Tohono O'odham, and smaller, less sophisticated utilities. Some ITF members feel that the perspectives shared in the listening sessions are not representative of all Tribes, but they do provide a sense of the general issues.

Marta Burg expressed her concern with using the Commonalities document to identify a representative list of barriers to Tribal utilities. While the Commonalities document is useful for identifying factors that have helped make a utility successful, it is unclear that Region 9 Tribes would agree that all the barriers to sustainability have been identified. Based on the findings of the O&M working group pilot project, additional limitations of the Commonalities document may also be identified.

When the ITF is determining its next steps, other information beyond the cost of operating a water system in Indian County should be considered, such as barriers to sustainability for both public and non-public water systems, and various ways to collect information from Tribes.

Jennifer Bullough added that project pitfalls are another issue for Tribes. Since the Commonalities document states the best ways for Tribal utilities to operate, it can also be used to infer the incorrect ways of doing things. Jennifer noted that HUD recently conducted two or three PRA requests. The PRA prohibits the federal government from imposing a paperwork burden on citizens without obtaining approval from Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for projects that collect information from 10 or more respondents. If the ITF wishes to collect information from 10 or more respondents it must submit a PRA request to OMB. The request is then published in the federal register as a proposal, and public comments can be submitted. The public comments are addressed in a subsequent proposal. A typical PRA approval takes six to nine months to get approved, but it is not difficult. Jennifer has someone on her staff that has been successful with the PRA requests. If the ITF is interested, it could combine a process for collecting information on both the Commonalities and the O&M piece. Jennifer would be willing to guide the request through the PRA process. The federal agency would need to have the funding to do the work.

Marta Burg commented that in the near term, one step for the ITF is to identify the universe of information that is needed in addition to the information that the federal agencies already have access to. Marta is unclear if something will be done after the report from the initial pilot study and what the scope of the recommendations from the pilot study might be.

Marta Burg would like to know more about the O&M data system used by IHS.

Dana Baer will provide information on the O&M data system to Marta by webinar and will coordinate a time that works for her offline.

Dana Baer asked for reactions to the idea of a non-federal partner conducting the information inquiry.

Marta Burg indicated she has no problem with a non-federal partner conducting the inquiry.

Dave Clark suggested that RCAP could write a case study for successful projects and identify the challenges and the successes as part of each case study.

Marta Burg added that it is important to determine the questions to ask because each ITF member may have a different idea of what information is needed.

Sheila Frace commented that how the questions are formulated and the format used to deliver the questions can make a big difference in terms of the response. Most people's first reaction will be related to resources. The approaches Tribes use to work with limited resources are the basis for the Commonalities document. For example, the ability to turn off service is a tool to get people to pay the bills. Sheila noted there needs to be a way to identify the solutions to the barriers, not

only the barriers. There should also be a way to understand what models are being used by Tribes.

Marta Burg stated that there may be ways of collecting information without conflicting with the PRA. First, the ITF should think about the various types of information to collect so as to inform an overall approach to collecting information. Marta stressed the importance of obtaining good results from the effort, and of determining if the ITF has enough information to identify the best next steps. More thought may be needed on what information is required in order to make those determinations.

Dana Baer added that the IHS Operation & Maintenance Data System (OMDS) recently added an O&M score that shows how effectively a Tribal utility operates based on Sanitation Deficiency System (SDS) projects. The O&M score uses a point range from 0 to 16 and is assigned based on a variety of operational parameters. Dana will send information to Matt Richardson on the O&M scoring system to share with the ITF by email. Also, IHS has an annual O&M survey for Tribes that is focused on the performance of its programs. IHS has approval for this survey from OMB and will send information on it to Matt to distribute to the group. This information may be helpful to develop the next tool.

#### **G. Future Meeting Schedule, Action Item List Review and Next Steps (Matt Richardson, EPA)**

Action items from this meeting are listed below.

- The July 18<sup>th</sup> conference call is canceled and will be replaced by an email report out on July 18<sup>th</sup> to each ITF member with an update on the workgroups.
- The next call will be on September 19<sup>th</sup>.
- Call participants outside Arizona/southwest area who are interested in setting up an organization similar to MATIC should contact Jennifer Bullough, Deborah Broermann, or Carolyn O'Neill.
- Deborah Broermann will send Matt Richardson a copy of the resource matrix and the MATIC sharing list.
- Michaelle Wilson will provide information on the Solid Waste Management Program's Tribal resources to Matt Richardson.
- Dana Baer will provide information on the O&M data system to Marta by webinar and will coordinate a time that works for her offline.
- Dana Baer will send Matt Richardson information on the IHS O&M scoring system and the Tribal survey used by IHS for O&M.