

**Minutes from Region 6 Pollution Prevention Roundtable
Spring 2007 Roundtable Meeting
Thursday March 8, 2007**

Highlighted Consensus Items and Action Items

(1) The group agreed on a consistent “date stamp” for entering data into the NPPR data collection system. The group agreed that where the NPPR system asks for “YEAR SERVICE STARTED/ENDED”, we input the DATES OF DATA COLLECTION.

(2) The group voted on whether they would like to have their results individually posted. Three members voted to allow posting of individual data, the rest of the group was neutral with no votes opposing.

(3) The National system currently has no way of collecting savings as reported directly by the facility with the reduction. The group voted unanimously to give the option of inputting savings data as collected by the program and displaying it in reports.

(4) David Bond agreed to email out several items including The QAPP Lite; The PART summary of the P2 program; and his presentation (done)

Grants Administration

EPA gave several presentation regarding grants, MBE/WBE requirements, QMPs, QAPPs, and the Region 6 P2 Programs:

Jerri Englerth (Texas Grant Specialist): Every applicant needs a DUNS number. This year applicants can use Grants.Gov or mail in the application. Email applications will not be accepted. Getting registered with Grants.Gov may take longer than the advertised 2-3 days. Applications are often incomplete - submit anything your unsure about. There is a new Form of 424 (4 pages) – it asks for the same information as the previous form but in a new format. When submitting applications also need to submit to state clearinghouse. Every new application needs to go through state. Budget detail is very important – must be itemized within each category. Michelle Vattano asked whether the budget needed to be in 3 places – 424A, object class categories, and narrative. Jerri didn’t think so but suggested Michelle check with her New Mexico grant specialist.

Debroah Bradford (MBE/WBE program): Requirements apply to all grants. Any money spent outside the organization (e.g., supplies, services, equipment, contracts, construction) is subject to MBE/WBE requirements. Purpose is to allow minority owned business to participate in procurement process. Provided handout with useful resources and revised version of MBE/WBE form. These are goals, not quotas - good faith effort. Every state has its fair share goals. Noncompliance if no good faith effort or not submitting reports; www.epa.gov/osdbu - find new forms. New rule coming out – no longer will be able to use self-certified MBE/WBEs towards accomplishment; must be outside certified. How much did you spend and how much was awarded to MBE/WBE.

Can't close out a grant without MBE/WBE report. No such thing as final report if been submitting all along. Susan asked is there a dollar cut off point for applying MBE/WBE rules, like for example small purchases while on travel/emergencies. Answer - Just follow your procurement process; no dollar threshold – but can have emergency purchase procedure that would account for purchases during travel. Michelle asked whether most states provide in procurement process. Answer - they should. Susan asked about more detail on “Desk reviews”. EPA explained that there are several types of reviews including off-site reviews that are selected based on statistical surveys (grantee sends in materials in hard copy), on-site reviews done by a contracted work group for specifically chose grants (percentages are high for being selected), and more. Some reviews may cut across grants depending on the size of the organization (small organizations may have several grants reviewed, large organizations would probably be grant specific). EPA also mentioned that when your grant is closed out there is a close-out letter stating how long records should be kept (usually 3 years) after which files can be shipped off-site.

Don Johnson (QA): EPA is doing a lot of metrics / data control; congress passed several laws – information quality guidelines – any data EPA provides from grantee is subject to challenge by anyone at any time (he provided example of data challenge related to DOW Chemical). The goals with the QAPPS is to create consistency of data collection; our projects will go through QA; region given latitude on QA assessments. Discussed Quality Assurance Plan “Lite”. David will provide us copy from Region 1 on this. EPA offers QA training (5-6 per year; 4 day training). Thomas could post the schedule of these classes to p2wazoo. There may be one in May or June in Northern NM

David Bond (Region 6 P2 Coordinator) – David Bond provided a presentation (attached Power Point). He also handed out EPA 300 Day Plan. Discussed national priorities and regional (see Power Point for details). Group discussed how P2 act has historically focused on industry, while Region 6 is also doing consumer P2 and ahead of the curve. May want to bring this up through NPPR or HQ. Discussed the importance of measurement; output (brochures, etc.) versus outcome (measurable reductions) – EPA's focus is on outcomes. Discussed how numbers are rolled up by region and sent up to EPA. Susan suggested that after Thomas rolls up data and sends to EPA, that it might be good for EPA to feed this back to region (Thomas) for a back-check for quality purposes. Discussion of where we are as a region relative to other regions. Discussed possibility of having Cathy Davies speak on regional call to further this conversation.

Measurement Focus Session

Each state/organization gave an overview of their measurement protocol (see attached summaries for several of the organizations). Questions and discussions that came up during this session included:

- NMED: Michelle Vattano provided an overview of measurement for the Green Zia program. Results capture both those reported in the application and those reported after participants join the program. Reporting is on the honor system. Currently there is minimal follow-up on site assistance visits. Discussion arose regarding time-frame of

reporting results to Thomas (e.g., NPPR system) – see group discussion notes below regarding groups consensus on this topic. See NMED handout for more details.

- **Nurtured World:** Susan Roothaan provided an overview of Nurtured World’s measurement protocol. David James asked about what was meant by “standardization is difficult”. Susan responded that this referred to the process of collecting the information - since each customer thinks about their consumption pattern differently, it is hard to come up with a standard set of questions to get results. For example, gasoline use reductions might be arrived at by asking consumers about how often they fill up their tank, or how many miles they drive annually, or even figured out by looking at specific projects that result in mileage reduction (e.g., combining errands). See Nurtured World handout for more details.
- **ODEQ:** Dianne Wilkins said that they measure results from site assistance visits, hazardous waste tax credit (purchase of equipment that reduces hazardous waste), and Oklahoma Star program. Regarding assistance visits, she captures results from small companies that she provides assistance to, but is not capturing results from larger companies that she provides phone/technical assistance to, but possibly could do that in future. Reporting is on the honor system. Oklahoma Star program capture both those reported in the application and those reported after participants join the program.
- **ADEQ:** Audree Miller provided an overview of ADEQ programs. As background, ADEQ did not have a full-time pollution prevention coordinator until 2005 so measurement initiatives (which always lag P2 services by 6 months to several years) is still in the early stages of implementation. Data sources for measurement include the AR Environmental Stewardship Awards (ENVY); the AR material exchange program (ARMAX); business assistance/client assistance; BAP small business loans for P2, pollution control, and waste reduction, and the AR H2E program. See ADEQ handout for more details.
- **TCEQ:** David Greer gave an overview of TCEQ approaches for site visits and Clean Texas. Measurement mirrors the NEPT program. David discussed that they train facilities on how to measure their programs. David mentioned that the national standard (from measurement committee teleconferences) is that results can be counted for up to 5 years (e.g., a project is implemented in a particular year and that activity/result can be assumed to continue for 5 years). However, TCEQ only counts it in each year so that aggregating the data does not become too complicated. TCEQ also waits 6 months after a service is provided to survey customers. TCEQ also verifies (QA/QC) the top reducers to assure that the aggregate numbers are valid. See TCEQ handout for more details.
- **Time spent on measurement:** Craig Weeks noted that the NEPT program spends a great deal of resources (perhaps half of the resources/time) on measurement and verification of data reported by members. Susan Roothaan added that from a time perspective Nurtured World probably spends as much time following up with a workshop as conducting it.

- **Zero Waste Center:** Thomas Vinson gave an overview of Zero Waste Center approaches, which leverage the TCEQ measurements. Results from customers using the Zero Waste P2 Planner are measured and “counted” by Zero Waste Center. Thomas emphasized the need to also tell a story (in addition to hard numbers). He also raised the suggestion of how to measure regulatory integration since this is one of our regional priorities – perhaps looking at projects/results due to regulatory integration.
- **National Protocols:** Thomas Vinson gave an overview of the NPPR National Data System. Discussed the value of converting hard numbers into something customer/public would understand (e.g., pounds of CO2 corresponding to number of cars taken off the road).
- **Standard Year for Reporting:** The group discussed the need for having a standard way of reporting data into the NPPR system. David Greer explained the following protocol for Texas:
 - The fiscal year (closing in August of 2006 for example for FY06) captures results from the previous calendar year (e.g., CY05)

The question arose as to how to enter this into the NPPR system. The NPPR system asks the following questions

- A. “Year Service Started”
- B. “Year Service Ended”

Thomas suggested that for measurement purposes the region enter the year the data was collected (start date/end date for data collection). The reason for this is due to the lag in data collection and the fact that data collection doesn’t really occur until about a year after service (and implementation of projects is also lagging). Therefore, the better “date stamp” for the activity is the time the data was collected. This would mean that:

- Where the NPPR system asks for “YEAR SERVICE STARTED/ENDED”, we input the DATES OF DATA COLLECTION.

Thomas said the most important thing was to not double count (whatever date stamping you use, be consistent). The group, however, agreed that a consistent date stamp for entering data would be best (see brainstorming results below).

- **Posting aggregate as well as individual program results.** Group discussed whether they would like to have their results individually posted. Three members voted to allow posting of individual data, the rest of the group was neutral with no votes opposing. The concern that was discussed was how small programs would appear. One suggestion was to have the results posted along with the number of FTEs dedicated to the program.
 - The National system currently has no way of collecting savings as reported directly by the facility with the reduction. The group voted unanimously to give

the option of inputting savings data as collected by the program and displaying it in reports. Estimates should be labeled as estimates.

- At the end of the session on measurement, the group did a silent brainstorming on ways to improve their own or the region's measurement effectiveness. These were posted on sticky notes and summarized below.

- Consolidated Region 6 P2 Call Center
 - Paid center manager (shared)
 - Non-paid (for credit) Interns or work-study students (\$1-2/hr)
- Have to tie P2 results to compliance improvement and /or addressing state/regional program priorities (air, water, waste)
- Jan. 1 and July 1 reporting to Thomas/SW Zero Waste Center
- Consistent time frames for reporting
- Cross-walk to NEPT
- Not much measurement on behavior changes/Outputs/We should focus on effort less on these in favor lbs, gallons, \$ outcomes
- Develop a measurement questionnaire and approach system for interviewing. Make it available to the entire region.
- Coordination of fiscal years for reporting data
- Count once/ roll for five years
- Expert system for reporting – “Virgil”
- Change the Data Dictionary for dollars saved
- Volunteer review panel like Green Zia would work 4 PPAC in Texas
- Consistent reporting methods
- More quality control (reality checking) on numbers
- Normalize program results by FTEs dedicated
- Audree is an example and promoted on a national level (minimal funding/new program/small staff/inexperienced)
- Base report year on data received

RFP

EPA gave an overview of the upcoming PPG RFP and also discussed the source reduction grant (no RFP out yet). Same amount of funding - \$150,000 for source reduction. Award given at 100% for top scoring proposal and the rest is split 4 ways. Discussion of time frames for QPMs (every 5 years), QA (any changes need to be updated), and QAPP (submit new one each time).

Sign-In Sheet

Name	Organization	Phone	Email
Susan Roothaan	Nurtured World	512.663.1496	Susan.roothaan@nurturedworld.org
Justin Murrill	Nurtured World	512.784.5590	Justin@nurturedworld.org
David Greer	TCEQ	512.239.5344	dgreer@tceq.state.tx.us
Audree Miller	ADEQ	501.682.0015	miller@adeq.state.ar.us
Michelle Vattano	NMED	505.827.0677	Michelle.vattano@state.nm.us
Diane Wilkins	ODEQ	405.702.9128	Dianne.wilkins@deq.state.ok.us
David James	TCEQ	512.239.3184	djames@tceq.state.tx.us
Chris Campbell	WERC/NMSU	505.843.4251	chrisc@werc.net
Tom Fott	Zero Waste Network		tfott@preventpollution.org
Thomas Vinson-Peng	Zero Waste Network	512.239.7149	tvinson@mail.utexas.edu
Lisa London	UT Arlington	817.272.0913	llondon@uta.edu
Annette Evans Smith	EPA/Office of Planning&Coord	214.665.2127	Smith.Annette.@epa.gov
Don Johnson	EPA-QA	214.665.8343	Johnson.Donald@epa.gov
Cathy Gilmore	EPA/Office of Planning&Coord	214.665.6766	Gilmore.cathy@epa.gov
David Bond	EPA/Office of Planning&Coord	214.665.6431	Bond.david@epa.gov
Marilyn May	Kaufman Co. Environmental Co-op	972.524.0007	mmay@cebridge.net
Joe Carnie			
Deborah Bradford			
Jerri Englerth			