



National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) Meeting

**May 25 – 26, 2010
Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
1800 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202**

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 2010

Welcome and Introductions

Sonia Altieri, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Cooperative Environmental Management (OCEM), National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT), Designated Federal Officer (DFO);

*Rafael DeLeon, EPA, Director, OCEM; and
James H. Johnson, Jr., NACEPT Chair*

Ms. Sonia Altieri (NACEPT Designated Federal Officer [DFO]) called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m., welcomed the Council members, and reviewed some logistical information. Mr. Rafael DeLeon (EPA, OCEM) thanked members for a successful orientation session the previous day and noted that as Director of OCEM, his office is responsible for providing guidance, oversight, and direction to the Agency's 24 federal advisory committees and 24 subcommittees. He thanked Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr., for serving as Chair.

Dr. Johnson (Howard University), NACEPT Chair, asked members to introduce themselves, and noted the "big picture" issues that he would like the Council to accomplish:

- ✧ Provide information and advice for the EPA Administrator and preserve and increase the image of NACEPT as a source of independent advice.
- ✧ Raise the profile of NACEPT within EPA with policy and management advice that benefits from the input of science, budget, and impacts of environmental actions. Better coordination with other Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) committees could result in solicitation of advice from NACEPT by senior officials within EPA and increase respect for NACEPT's advice overall.
- ✧ Work together, have fun, and continue to learn.

He identified three specific goals for the meeting. The first was to hear the report of the NACEPT Subcommittee on Promoting Environmental Stewardship (SPES) and act on it. The second goal of the meeting was to form two subgroups to examine the two draft charges before the Council and make them actionable. Action could be conducted by a Council workgroup or subcommittee, and the output could be a full report or a letter report. Dr. Johnson asked Ms. Arleen O'Donnell and Mr. Robert Olson to lead the two workgroups on workforce issues and vulnerable populations. Members should consider how they would like to participate. The third goal was to examine another likely charge on issues, such as climate change, energy, water quality, and ecosystem services, that involve multiple agencies, and how the issues

could be coordinated. Another workgroup would be needed to address that charge. Dr. Johnson expressed his hope that one of the three goals would capture the interest of every member.

Dr. Johnson then asked members of the public to introduce themselves. A list of the Council members and other participants is attached.

Ms. Kristie Orosco (San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians), NACEPT member, asked Dr. Johnson to elaborate on the third goal. Dr. Johnson noted that some topics, such as climate change, energy, water quantity and quality, and ecosystem services, are broader than EPA. NACEPT may want to consider how to develop a roadmap for advancing collaboration and minimizing stove-piping within EPA. The goal is to optimize interagency collaborations. Although each agency has a defined role, have those roles been defined in a way that provides the greatest synergy? Additionally, the relationship between issues must be considered: actions taken in the area of climate change will affect water use issues. When the big picture is examined, a clearer understanding of the relationships among agencies and among environmental concerns may emerge, and it may be possible to find ways to capitalize on those synergies. NACEPT's advice should lay a foundation for long-term efforts but should be able to be implemented within a 3- to 4-year window.

Mr. Howard Learner (Environmental Law and Policy Center), NACEPT member, noted that the two charges included in the meeting materials were framed very differently; the charge on workforce issues is much more elaborate. Dr. Johnson responded that the workforce charge has been vetted more thoroughly, and the vulnerable populations charge is only in the developmental stages. The workgroup will be tasked with moving it to an actionable level.

Mr. Billy Turner (BTurner Consulting, Inc.), NACEPT member, asked how coordination among NACEPT and the other FACA committees would occur. Dr. Johnson replied that when he had served on the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) he had given a presentation to the Science Advisory Board (SAB) on the role of the BOSC. The SAB was responsible for ensuring that EPA did the right science, and the BOSC ensured that it was conducted in the right manner. Understanding the roles of each Board provided linkages and opportunities to work collaboratively. Similarly, NACEPT could give presentations to other FACA committees about its work. Dr. Johnson serves as SAB's NACEPT liaison, and the SAB currently has a Committee on Science Integration for Decision Making. The activities of and information from this committee should be beneficial to NACEPT, and there may be similar situations with other FACA committees.

Opening Remarks from EPA's General Counsel

Scott Fulton, EPA General Counsel

Mr. Fulton explained that the Administrator could not attend the meeting because she was in the Gulf region dealing with the environmental challenges posed by the BP oil spill. He noted that EPA views federal advisory committees as a vital part of increasing public input into the government's decision-making processes. The committees, with diverse expertise and backgrounds, offer EPA valuable advice. NACEPT has played an important role in shaping EPA's programs and policies. Mr. Fulton thanked the SPES members and co-chairs Mr. Lee Paddock and Mr. David Paylor for their efforts, and stated that he was looking forward to receiving the Council's advice letter. He noted that one of the challenges when dealing with an environmental tragedy such as the BP oil spill was to stay focused on the everyday activities of environmental protection. Although EPA is fully engaged in the Gulf and that clearly will be a long-term commitment, the Agency also must focus on the key environmental policy and programmatic challenges facing the Agency.

Mr. Fulton noted that the two key issues on which EPA is seeking the Council's advice are the EPA workforce and vulnerable populations. EPA is faced with serious workforce challenges because of the Agency's aging workforce. In approximately 8 years, nearly one-half of EPA's workforce will be eligible

to retire, and when these employees retire they take with them a significant portion of the Agency's knowledge base. Nevertheless, the anticipated wave of retirement presents opportunities to recruit and develop a more diverse and exceptionally qualified workforce. As science and technology advance, EPA staff must be on the cutting edge of these innovations. The Agency will value NACEPT's thoughts on how EPA can ensure that: (1) future employees are viewed as leaders in their fields, and (2) the Agency's presence as the Nation's environmental engine and a world leader in environmental science and policy are solidified. Success depends on the skills, motivation, capacity to work collaboratively, and flexibility of the workforce, and on the capability with which staff can deploy technology. NACEPT's input on succession planning, executive development, and diversity will be valuable.

On the issue of vulnerable populations, the Council will hear from Lisa Heinzerling, who leads EPA's Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation (OPEI), and Lisa Garcia, Senior Advisor to the Administrator for Environmental Justice. Expanding the conversation on environmentalism, working for environmental justice (EJ), and expressing the special circumstances of vulnerable populations are some of Administrator Jackson's highest priorities. Pollution can stifle economic growth and community revitalization; a weak environment means a weak consumer base. When economic prosperity is limited, crime and drug use are higher. Administrator Jackson has asked that EJ be part of every decision made at EPA, and that the special needs of vulnerable populations be at the forefront of the Agency's thinking. NACEPT can contribute by examining emerging technologies as a lever for advancing EJ and vulnerable population protection efforts. EPA is seeking help in identifying existing technologies that can aid government and community efforts to protect vulnerable populations, and in discovering "game changing" technologies that focus on the evaluation of cumulative health risks in these communities. NACEPT can help EPA to engage communities in the environmental conversation and to inform them about new understandings of environmental health and quality brought about by the new developments in research. The Council's skills, passion, and resources can help EPA confront these challenges. Mr. Fulton thanked the NACEPT members for their past and future input into EPA's work and for enabling the Agency's efforts.

Discussion

Mr. John Preston (C Change Investments, LLC), NACEPT member, asked why the use of oil dispersants was discontinued in the Gulf of Mexico. Mr. Fulton responded that the Administrator wants the least toxic materials possible to be used in the Gulf to minimize both the short- and long-term consequences. Mr. Preston pointed out that there was insufficient time for companies with less toxic dispersant technologies to have their dispersants analyzed in time for use on this spill, but such testing should be conducted so that more options are available for use in the future. Mr. Fulton agreed.

Mr. Learner asked how the two different charges to the Council would be processed at the Agency. Mr. Fulton responded that NACEPT's ideas on workforce recruitment and development will pass to the Office of Administration and Resource Management (OARM), which will be responsible for implementation and, in turn, may offer guidance to other parts of the Agency. Although the goal is to have vulnerable populations considered in every decision, the work on this issue has a few drivers at EPA, including Ms. Garcia and the EJ program in the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA). Some ORD staff members are working on the questions NACEPT may be considering related to cumulative impacts, and the Office of Children's Health Protection also may be involved. EPA's successes dealing with vulnerable populations and EJ have been relatively modest, and the Agency's understanding of the phenomenon is limited; therefore, any innovative ideas from NACEPT will be invaluable. The Administrator is more committed than any prior leader of the Agency to EJ, and there is opportunity for instituting some lasting changes.

Ms. Vivian Loftness (Carnegie Mellon University), NACEPT member, asked for clarification on the term "emerging technologies" in the charge on vulnerable populations. The implication of the charge is that there is a technological solution set to the problem. Given the ecological challenges and importance of

systems thinking, should NACEPT be looking for ecological systems with vulnerable populations or specifically at emerging technologies? Mr. Fulton noted that the focus on technologies arose from the fact that EPA has a National Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, and it was thought that NACEPT could make a complementary contribution to that Committee's efforts on the technology side. If solutions not related to technology arise in NACEPT discussions, they also should be brought forward. Mr. DeLeon mentioned that there would be discussion later in the day on whether the charge needs to be clarified.

Mr. Kobi Wright (Cummins, Inc.), NACEPT member, noted that one of NACEPT's charges is to promote environmental stewardship in the regulated community beyond the regulations in place. Cummins, Inc., manufactures diesel engines, and the diesel manufacturing community is under a consent decree. Is it possible for those under a consent decree to partner with EPA in various programs? Mr. Fulton responded that where an entity falls in terms of compliance is not a factor in whether it can engage in an active discourse with EPA on policy and regulatory matters. Some formal partnerships with EPA confer a status that can be used as a marketing device for the partner, and compliance status in this case would make a difference in the ability to participate.

Dr. Marian Chertow (Yale University), NACEPT member, asked Mr. Fulton to comment on what he wished had fallen under EPA's purview when the Agency was created. Mr. Fulton replied that if he was redesigning the EPA, he would address the brown versus green disconnect; he noted that the pollution control orientation of EPA, which is inherently brown, offers some benefits in terms of focus and expertise development for the green side.

EPA's 2010-2015 Strategic Plan Approach

Barbara J. Bennett, Chief Financial Officer, EPA

Ms. Barbara Bennett explained that EPA's strategic plan describes the Agency's 5-year environmental and human health outcome goals and strategies to accomplish them. EPA's performance management system is circular; the strategic planning process for a 5-year period occurs every 3 years (as required by the Government Performance and Results Act) and sets in motion the annual planning, which feeds into the operations and execution of the goals through the annual National Program Guidance, and finally into year-end reporting and results measurement and evaluation. EPA is attempting to streamline every aspect of this circle. The plan was delayed 1 year in this instance due to the new administration.

The goal in revising EPA's strategic plan is to create a simplified and meaningful plan that advances the Administrator's priorities, sets Agency direction, is used as a top-down management tool by senior leadership, and reflects EPA's core values (science, transparency, and adherence to the rule of law). The strategic plans at EPA have become too long and therefore less strategically focused. The plan focuses on the Administrator's seven priorities: taking action on climate change, improving air quality, assuring the safety of chemicals, cleaning up communities, protecting America's waters, expanding the conversation on environmentalism and working for EJ, and building strong state and tribal partnerships. The goals and objectives of the plan are aligned with the priorities, but the Agency is adding cross-cutting fundamental strategies that: (1) set expectations for changing the way EPA works in achieving those goals, and (2) ensure that the objectives are taken into consideration. The current plan has approximately 170 strategic measures, and the Agency has been charged with reducing that number by 50 percent or more. The current goals and the proposed goals are very similar. The five proposed goals do not cover all seven priorities; some of the priorities are covered by the proposed cross-cutting fundamental strategies. Three of these strategies are being addressed by NACEPT.

Expanding the conversation on environmentalism involves engaging and empowering communities to be self advocates, including those who have been historically under-represented and have disproportionate impacts, and supporting and advancing environmental protection and human health nationwide. This approach represents a new era of outreach for EPA, and the Agency will use new media and make its work more transparent to the public. Working for EJ and children's health involves reducing and

preventing harmful exposures and health risks to children and underserved communities and supporting community efforts to build healthy, sustainable neighborhoods. EPA is attempting to incorporate these priorities into all of its activities, and is developing a consistent approach across all the goals. Strengthening EPA's workforce and capabilities involves improving the Agency's internal management, encouraging innovation and creativity, and ensuring that EPA is an excellent workplace positioned to address the environmental challenges of the 21st century. The Agency must ensure that the retiring knowledge base is replaced with a highly innovative workforce.

The strategies in the plan will each have a vision, will indicate basic operating principles for changing how the Agency will do business, and will include an overarching statement that EPA will hold itself accountable and how. Each strategy will have a lead to ensure that the plans are relevant and there is commitment to adhere to them. There may be individual action plans for some years. The framework of the fundamental strategies will be real and actionable; program and regional offices must develop and propose firm commitments and report on progress.

The strategic plan will be published for a public review period from June 18 through July 30, formal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review will begin August 13, and the final strategic plan will be issued September 30 so it can be in place for the start of the new fiscal year on October 1.

Discussion

Ms. Sara Kendall (Weyerhaeuser Company), NACEPT member, noted that the strategies have a strong focus on communities, which translates to a role for local government, but EPA's mandates are directed at a federal or state level. How will that operational gap be bridged? Ms. Bennett noted that the community provides a way to organize. A brownfields community engagement initiative could demonstrate what communities need from EPA and provide ways to work with other agencies and other missions. EPA is attempting to be as involved in multimedia and inter-agency efforts as possible.

Ms. Loftness asked whether the language in the proposed goals could be changed, because "cleaning up our communities" has a negative connotation. It implies that the communities are dirty, and it narrows the scope from healthy communities and ecosystems to brownfields remediation. Ms. Bennett responded that under each goal there will be several objectives and measures; the Agency's goal is that EJ and environmentalism be taken into consideration through all of the objectives. Ms. Loftness noted that there are issues that would not fit under cleaning up communities because that is a retroactive rather than a proactive statement. The previous focus, healthy communities and ecosystems, involved a much broader set of goals. Ms. Bennett answered that EPA is seeking input into the plan and would welcome comments when the objectives are available for public review.

Mr. Robert Olson (Institute for Alternative Futures), NACEPT member, thanked Ms. Bennett for being responsive to NACEPT's suggestions on simplifying the strategic plan, and asked whether the Council would have a role in the public review of the plan. Ms. Bennett noted that she was looking forward to hearing the Council's feedback.

Ms. Jennifer Nash (Product Stewardship Institute), NACEPT member, thanked Ms. Bennett for reducing the number of strategic measures and making them more useful. She noted that NACEPT previously suggested linking the strategic plan to EPA's other plan documents, such as the budget; it would be useful to see the level of resources going into each measure. Ms. Bennett responded that the goals and objectives will be linked directly to the budget, which is why five versus seven goals to match the Administrator's priorities were chosen. EJ is not linked to the budget so it could not be viewed as an initiative that is "in someone else's budget," rather than as a fundamental strategy of how EPA's business is conducted.

Dr. Daniel Kammen (University of California, Berkeley), NACEPT member, asked about EPA's near-term plan to stretch stimulus money, noting that short, fast infusions of money are not necessarily useful.

Ms. Bennett replied that EPA is trying to maximize the resources at hand and plan accordingly. With regard to the longer term availability of funds or implementation, the Administrator has asked Ms. Bennett to work with the Assistant Administrator for Research and Development to address this. The point is well taken that EPA has short-term solutions and a long-term problem.

Ms. Ella Filippone (Passaic River Coalition), NACEPT member, asked how the achievements made during the 5-year period of the strategic plan will be evaluated and presented to the public. Ms. Bennett responded that the measures in the strategic plan note various milestones and how EPA wants to achieve them. The annual report will be more useful and meaningful as well. The Administration has asked every agency to put forth performance goals that will provide input on a more frequent basis. Ms. Filippone suggested that the strategic plan and reports should be printed in Spanish as well as English for greater accessibility, especially as EJ is an issue of note. One participant stated that there is an Agency initiative to produce EPA documents in Spanish.

Ms. Orosco asked Ms. Bennett to explain the Administrator's goal of forming strong state and tribal partnerships. Ms. Bennett responded that she had the honor of speaking with the tribal caucus, and wants to engage with them as frequently as possible. The issues that the tribes face are enormous, and that fact is not taken lightly in the Agency. EPA tried to increase the resources for tribes in the 2011 budget. In terms of the strategic plan, EPA is engaging with the tribes more frequently.

Overview of NACEPT Subcommittee on Promoting Environmental Stewardship (SPES) Recommendations

Lee Paddock and David Paylor, SPES Subcommittee Co-Chairs, and Jennifer Nash, NACEPT Subcommittee Liaison

Ms. Nash shared the roots of the effort on environmental stewardship, and noted that she served as Co-Chair of the NACEPT Environmental Stewardship and Collaborative Governance workgroup and NACEPT's liaison to the SPES. The workgroup produced a report, *Everyone's Business: Working Toward Sustainability Through Environmental Stewardship and Collaboration*, in May 2008. The recommendations from SPES build on and update the work summarized in that report. Common threads include the definition of stewardship. Stewardship is an overarching framework that links all of EPA's activities, including regulatory actions, partnership programs, information-sharing work, grants, and educational activities. The challenge is to use the whole toolbox in a way that achieves the greatest environmental results. There is a misconception that stewardship means EPA's voluntary or partnership programs. In fact, it is the whole toolbox, and regulation is the Agency's most powerful tool for changing behavior and getting people to take responsibility for their choices. The SPES has taken some overarching thinking down to the detailed level to make stewardship an ethic and set of practices for the Agency.

Mr. David Paylor (Virginia Department of Environmental Quality) noted that when the SPES was first envisioned, its goal was to take the next steps in the Performance Track program, but before the SPES was formed, the program was discontinued. The SPES looked at the reasons Performance Track had come under such extreme criticism so that the mistakes would not be repeated. Performance Track was perceived as allowing companies to sidestep regulatory responsibilities, and did not articulate the change in enhanced environmental performance well. The SPES met approximately three times, and a subgroup was formed to create an actionable working document. The overarching theme was regulatory versus voluntary compliance and EPA's role in both. Two key tensions emerged: the idea that EPA has more regulatory obligations than it currently meets and resources should be put toward those obligations, versus the idea that regulations are the foundation of EPA's work but insufficient to meet the Agency's more global environmental responsibilities, and that stewardship could help to bridge that gap. The plan tries to strike a balance between those ideas. The SPES believes that there is a need for EPA leadership in environmental stewardship. Additionally, corporate stewardship creates an opportunity for exceptional environmental results.

Mr. Lee Paddock (George Washington University Law School) noted that there was unanimity among SPES members that stewardship is important; the concern was how much EPA can and should invest in stewardship given the Agency's regulatory responsibilities. Stewardship must be integrated in Agency investments and functions in a strategic way with a focus on new opportunities instead of new programs. Opportunities exist in EPA's partnership programs and the Agency needs to examine these programs more strategically to determine how they fit into long-range plans. The Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) has been looking at the partnership programs to identify opportunities for the past several months.

The definition of environmental stewardship is "individuals and institutions taking responsibility to protect and enhance the environment and human health." As an ethic, it is rooted in individual values and organizational cultures. As a practice, it embodies the understanding that compliance is fundamental, voluntary efforts can supplement but not replace compliance, and individuals and organizations should systematically work to reduce or avoid adverse impacts. Stewardship, as both an ethic and a practice, requires the fair treatment of all communities, and it is not synonymous with EPA's partnership programs; partnership is an aspect of stewardship. Strong regulatory and enforcement programs play a role in motivating stewardship actions. Stewardship is necessary because environmental challenges often stretch beyond the law and are too large to be addressed with Agency resources. EPA must leverage other resources such as private funding sources and citizen and corporate actions, such as supply chain management.

The recommendations in the report include:

1. **Build a clearer stewardship capacity within the Agency.** A statement from the Administrator that indicates the importance of stewardship should be incorporated into the Agency's mission. The Executive Management Council (EMC) should be used to coordinate stewardship activities. EPA should model stewardship in implementing Executive Order 13514 related to energy efficiency and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, creating a core of staff expertise to deal with stewardship, and continuing to seek outside advice from NACEPT or other organizations.
2. **Facilitate engagement in partnership activities by increasing their effectiveness and reach, and evaluate and update existing programs, as OAR is doing.** The Agency should facilitate engagement in and access to partnership activities, serve as a supporting mechanism for the stewardship of others, and advance stewardship through judicious use of EPA "branding."
3. **Make stewardship fundamental to how regulations are designed.** Experts on stewardship should be consulted when rules are designed. EPA should encourage innovation for better performance and use regulatory design to encourage information disclosure and early compliance.
4. **Measure progress and define success.** A state of the environment report should be published. The White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) used to publish such a report, but it has been discontinued. New measures should be developed to improve monitoring and ecosystem-scale analysis, and use of the new GHG inventory should be maximized. Clear measures of progress and success should be defined for partnership programs, and common external measures for stewardship and new tools for risk communication should be developed.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Discussion and Approval of NACEPT Subcommittee on Promoting Environmental Stewardship (SPES) Recommendations

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr., NACEPT Chair

Dr. Johnson thanked SPES DFO Regina Langton for her help in developing the report, and reminded the Council members that this was their opportunity to ask questions or get clarification on items in the report.

Discussion

Ms. Loftness noted that the report presents a compelling set of issues for EPA and NACEPT. She asked whether environmental stewardship in EPA would preclude continuous evaluation of alternative compliance solutions to EPA mandates; for example, combined storm-sewer mandates and the potential for using surface stormwater management systems as an alternative to dual pipe systems. Would the proposed structure codify an appeals process as well as an evaluation process so that environmental mandates can be updated? Mr. Paylor responded that alternative compliance measures are not being considered except in building innovations into regulations going forward. He stated that alternative compliance measures were a lightning rod that drew criticism of Performance Track. Mr. Paddock added that suggesting a specific appeals process was beyond the reach of the SPES.

Mr. Learner agreed that a national state of the environment report is needed and asked why CEQ no longer prepares the report. He also noted the difficulty in combining stewardship practices with EPA branding. Mr. Paddock replied that CEQ was downsized in the 1980s, and the report may have been discontinued because of lack of funding or lack of staff or both. The branding issue is problematic. He added that ENERGY STAR has produced a significant change in energy use without regulation. When designed correctly, EPA branding can be useful, but the drawbacks must be considered. Mr. Paylor mentioned that branding is a double-edged sword but it can motivate consumer and corporate behavior; branding has considerable power that should not be overlooked. Mr. Learner suggested adding language to the transmittal letter about EPA consulting with CEQ before issuing a state of the environment report.

Dr. Chertow commented that the SPES report was thoughtful, but she thought it was difficult to crystallize around a stewardship example. She served on the Connecticut CEQ, and its largest activity was producing a state of the environment report. There has been a great deal of work on creating measures and indicators; those words are used frequently in this report. EPA should identify indicators that are simple and relevant. The report should promote 10 or 12 indicators that matter, and the Agency should use these indicators to demonstrate results after 5 years.

Dr. Dewitt John (Bowdoin College), NACEPT member, noted that he was part of a project in which CEQ worked with other agencies, including EPA, to examine the possibility of creating national environmental indicators. This is a very difficult and complex issue. He asked if the report includes any proposals that EPA has decided not to pursue, such as maintaining a technical assistance capacity to support the stewardship efforts of others and evaluating and updating existing programs. Are the stewardship and partnership programs being incorporated into other programs? Mr. Paddock responded that the SPES started by examining Performance Track and stewardship issues, and during that process, in the fall of 2009, EPA's OPEI was reorganized and the National Center for Environmental Innovation was eliminated. Partnership programs, which up to that point were the focus of OPEI, were relegated back to the media offices. The report notes that there is an important capacity issue; EPA has staff expertise in the partnership programs, but there needs to be a mechanism for holding them together. The Agency is not interested in new programs for stewardship but wants it integrated into daily activities.

Ms. Kendall complimented the SPES members on their work and the inclusion of stewardship at the citizen level. She cautioned, in terms of regulatory stewardship, that many good intentions have run into statutes and regulations that make them difficult to carry out. During the last decade, this has caused

frustration in some innovation programs, so programs should be grounded in the rule of law. She suggested that the transmittal letter reference where the recommendations of the SPES fit into the EPA strategic plan. Ms. Kendall noted that she had not seen the word “sustainability,” which is the stewardship activity that occupies many in the corporate world, local communities, and governments. Mr. Paddock responded that the SPES decided that sustainability is an outcome, and stewardship is a methodology to achieve that outcome.

Ms. Arleen O’Donnell (Eastern Research Group, Inc.), NACEPT member, asked whether the SPES discussed the state of the environment report in the context of EPA’s Report on the Environment. NACEPT has had input into shaping EPA’s Report on the Environment, and has commented that it should be more like a state of the environment report with more relevant, shorter term measurements. Mr. Paylor noted that the SPES did not discuss this in depth; discussions focused on the need for EPA to improve measurement and reporting, but not on how that could be done most effectively. Ms. O’Donnell noted that the report states that the stewardship programs should be reevaluated and that the EMC should be the body that coordinates stewardship activities. She did not see, however, the process for integrating stewardship into the regulatory program. She did not see the mechanism for integration mentioned in the recommendations. Mr. Paylor noted that the SPES sidestepped this issue. EPA did not want new programs and stewardship does need to be integrated, but the SPES believed it should not recommend organizational structures. Mr. Paddock noted that the other two significant recommendations are that the Administrator make a statement on the issue and that it be incorporated into the mission of the Agency. This is similar to the way the Agency has tried to incorporate EJ.

Mr. Preston thought there would be a problem in converting the SPES’s policies into action. What is done on the policy side will be judged by how it translates into action. It might help to develop specific examples to move forward; examples would create a relevance that would encourage more action.

Mr. Wright asked whether the SPES had examples for the recommendation that regulations should encourage information disclosure and early compliance. Mr. Paddock noted that if the statutory framework allows different approaches to managing a problem, this should be part of the regulatory design. The rule writer should consult with someone who knows the value of information disclosure. Credit for early action could be part of the regulatory program. Mr. Wright commented that there is a recognized tension between EPA as a regulator versus an entity that creates partnerships with communities or regulated entities, and asked what was meant by using branding judiciously. Mr. Paylor responded that the criteria for branding have connection to meaningful outcomes. ENERGY STAR is being criticized by some now because they think the bar is not high enough. The fundamental issue is that people recognize that branding means something in terms of an environmental result. Mr. Paddock noted a second issue with branding that came to light from the Performance Track experience: whether Performance Track represented the best of the best. If companies are in noncompliance, there could be a negative association with the EPA brand. Involvement by EPA or state agencies beyond branding could be promoted. Many collaborations are initiated outside of government for important environmental results, such as Project Green Fleet in Minnesota, which has retrofitted all of the diesel buses in the state. That effort was initiated by the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce and the state’s leading environmental group. Funding comes from the state agency and EPA, but also from foundations as well. These cases are not branding but collaborations in which the government plays a role; they could be promoted and utilized within the Agency.

Dr. Kammen stated that the community aspects of the report were excellent, but that some metrics are needed to make the recommendations operational. The report steers away from areas where metrics are important. In the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) reports in the late 1990s, the future was defined as today plus or minus a small epsilon. In climate, there are some clear numbers; for example, an 80 percent reduction in emissions is needed during a 40-year time period. The Clean Air Act has a different mechanism in which air quality is improved to the best available measurement and cost effectiveness. The report does not discuss areas in which enough is known to

establish metrics. There are insufficient metrics in some social measures. Dr. Kammen recommended making the report more quantitative and employing the suites of metrics that are useful. As an example, Section 1A in the report, on building stewardship capacity (knowledge and management), is a clear place to include metrics where they prove valuable. He suggested adding quantitative measures where they can be useful, and highlighting areas where not enough is known to include these measures.

Mr. Kurt Erichsen (Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments), NACEPT member, stated that stewardship in the Great Lakes area dealt mainly with the nonpoint source issue. How could agriculture, which normally lies outside of the regulatory process, become part of the stewardship process? Mr. Paylor noted that nonpoint sources were not incorporated into the discussion in most of the work done by the SPES. In Virginia, this issue is being faced because of the Chesapeake Bay cleanup plan that is due in one year. Regulating agriculture is within the context of the cleanup plan. The issue was not contemplated in the drafting of the SPES report, but it is an area where stewardship concepts could be brought to bear. Mr. Paddock noted that many voluntary programs worked on the Chesapeake Bay issue but did not achieve the pollution reduction needed. There will be a new push for regulatory programs for the Chesapeake Bay, some of which should be designed with stewardship concepts in mind, but efforts beyond regulation will be required. Construction and agriculture will have to be reached through both regulatory and non-regulatory methods. Mr. Paylor added that the application of stewardship activities to agriculture must include a large educational component.

Dr. Ben Dysart (Dysart and Associates, Inc.), NACEPT member, commented that he supported stewardship, with entities taking responsibility for their actions and consequences. Stewardship and EJ focus on the regulated community, and the report gives the impression that it is written by regulators, academics, and nongovernmental organizations for the business community. Non-business representatives outnumbered business representatives three to one on the SPES. Profit is maximized by externalizing as much cost as possible because revenue (R) – cost (C) = profit (P). Dr. Dysart asked how the recommendations about stewardship align with externalizing cost. Mr. Paddock answered that the business representatives on the SPES said that businesses are ahead of EPA on stewardship, and are acting for reputational value among other reasons. Reputational value constitutes roughly 40 percent of the economic value of publicly held corporations. He pointed out that this recommendation goes beyond corporations and deals with the public education of citizens. Mr. Paylor added that the business representatives expressed exasperation about EPA's perceived disengagement in the stewardship activity; they wanted more EPA engagement in the discussion.

Dr. Karl Benedict (University of New Mexico), NACEPT member, noted that there were common threads in the recommendations, including the foundation of the availability of information as a factor facilitating the increase in the engagement in stewardship. He encountered the term "leverage" on a number of occasions, but that may imply a more active role by EPA than the attempt to facilitate actions by non-regulated organizations, communities, and individuals. EPA's role is more that of a facilitator than one who leverages the activities of other actors outside its control. The state of the environment report is an excellent suggestion but is only one way to deliver information to those EPA wants to involve in the stewardship concept. Producing a document that summarizes a set of key environmental indicators and variables is only a starting point. As EPA considers EJ and local impacts, it cannot illustrate in such a report the diversity of indicators across the population. The environment report could be treated as a point of access for much more detailed local information. Providing a link to local conditions in context to the larger trends would strengthen the effort to engage the broader community in stewardship activities. Mr. Paddock responded that the distinction between leveraging versus facilitating is largely semantics; leveraging in this case means thinking about opportunities that can be created to bring in new organizations and financing. Measuring and monitoring were issues of concern but not the principal function of the subcommittee, and the SPES members did not believe they could go beyond raising the issue.

Mr. Turner commented that, in terms of the vision in the report, he strongly agrees that quality of life depends on healthy ecosystems, but he is not sure a strong economy rests on healthy ecosystems. A connection exists between a strong economy and the amount of regulation. Additionally, on page five, where clear and understandable indicators are discussed, the health of the Nation's air and water are mentioned but land is not included and should be. Mr. Paddock responded that the exclusion of land was not intentional. On the vision statement, people have different views on the connection between ecosystems and economies. The SPES supported the vision statement; NACEPT must decide if it should be passed on to the Administrator. Mr. Paylor added that in the context of corporate stewardship and sustainability, an economy cannot be sustained in the long term if it continues to degrade the ecosystem.

Ms. Orosco provided input on how to encourage voluntary stewardship in the private sector. One view from the modern indigenous perspective is that consumers actively seek to be empowered with information on how their purchases affect the environment from point A all the way to the consumers themselves. This is evidenced in the growth of fair trade certified products. As nutrition information is to food, environmental impacts can be to products. Consumers drive the industrial and commercial engine. Currently, environmental facts on products are somewhat piecemeal and difficult to authenticate. Most people look to the Internet to research the product, its origin, and the environmental impacts. The development and implementation of environmental facts can be examined when EPA branding is discussed. People want to be able to make choices so that the products they buy and the raw materials from which the products originate come from sustainable situations, and they want to be able to trace their own impact as consumers. EPA can lend expertise and influence and have an impact at the consumer level.

Dr. Olufemi Osidele (Southwest Research Institute), NACEPT member, asked for clarification on deliberations of the Subcommittee on Risk Communication as discussed on page seven. Is the SPES recommending that risk be the sole basis for measuring stewardship behavior, or just a means of informing that behavior? There are many components of risk assessment, but its analysis does provide for some qualitative considerations, including the community and stakeholder perspectives on risk. The paragraph mentions that it is important for EPA to collaborate with other groups; perhaps this could be elaborated. Additionally, were any examples of good practices and efforts to communicate risk discussed during deliberations? Mr. Paddock noted that the principal issue, coming from a justice perspective, was that some of the traditional communication on risk (for example, where exposure is explained as 1 in 1,000 risk to a community) does not communicate the facts that interest communities, such as what the risk means to individuals and children. There remains a concern about how risk is communicated and EPA, as part of its overall effort in working with communities, needs to reexamine this communication.

Ms. Erica Bannerman (Office of Environmental Quality, City of Alexandria), NACEPT member, noted the omission of sustainability from the subcommittee's report, and suggested that a paragraph be included on why sustainability is not highlighted in the advice letter.

Dr. Edith Parker (University of Michigan), NACEPT member, commented that she was pleased that collaboration with other agencies, including the National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), was noted in the risk communication discussion.

Mr. Preston said that when the economy and environment can be combined, environmental policies are strengthened. When you find something that is economically viable, the private sector embraces it. There are technologies being implemented that are far cheaper than the old practice. Last year, 2 million square feet of office space were retrofitted with lighting controls that have a 2.5-year payoff financially, but a 50 to 70 percent reduction in the lighting cost for the building. Mr. Paylor added that businesses in Virginia that have begun to develop environmental management systems and engage in corporate stewardship programs have found that they have been able to reduce their costs as a result of acts based on environmental stewardship. He understood Mr. Preston's concern with operationalizing the recommendations. Within the context of Performance Track, Mr. Paylor was hesitant to recommend

specific means to conduct activities within the Agency, but the report suggests a culture change at EPA, at least to the extent that it recommends that corporate stewardship be the responsibility of the whole organization and not just OPEI. A successful start would be achieved if the Administrator challenged the regional offices to provide technical resources to those interested in corporate sustainability and charged the EMC to find ways to make this happen. Mr. Paylor said he would agree that ideal operational changes are in place if the 40 partnership measures are translated into a larger brand a few years down the road.

Dr. Johnson thanked the speakers, and noted that he had not heard any comments objecting to the content and recommendations of the report; there were a few issues, however, that might need to be revamped. Some changes include: the addition of land in Section 4A, and clarification of the relationship between the economy and environmental health. There were a few additional editorial suggestions. Dr. Johnson explained that NACEPT's options include: (1) sending the report back to the SPES and asking the committee to make changes; (2) having the Council rework the report; or (3) highlighting the points from this discussion in the cover letter. He suggested eliminating the second option because the SPES had done a great deal of work on the report and should retain ownership of the document. He also did not think the report needed to be revised to address the Council's comments. He thought the third option was the best approach, and identified the following points for possible inclusion in the cover letter: (1) comments on the CEQ's state of the environment report and its usefulness as a way to provide information; (2) the fact that the report is qualitative, and the next generation should provide some quantitative milestones for a definition of success; (3) operationalization—the Council recognizes that the report does not bring about specific next steps; and (4) branding. A cover letter could address each of these points in a way that brings them forward in the report. Dr. Johnson would like to work with a small group of two or three members to draft the letter. He asked that NACEPT members who have comments on the draft send them to Ms. Altieri. Dr. Johnson then asked if the word "land" in Section 4A was an omission; he asked that the subcommittee be polled to see if the word could be included in the report. Mr. Paddock commented that if the change is considered a technical correction, it could be made without seeking the approval of the SPES. Dr. Johnson agreed that this was a technical correction, and asked for volunteers to assist him in drafting the cover letter.

Mr. Olson stated that Ms. Orosco's comment on the individual's role in stewardship is important enough to stand on its own.

Ms. Bannerman thought it important to address how sustainability differs from environmental stewardship in the letter. Dr. Johnson thought the reference to Executive Order 13514 was adequate to make that contrast. He stated his preference for keeping the letter focused and no more than one page.

Ms. Altieri commented that the Council could agree to submit the cover letter to the Administrator with the understanding that all points raised today would be in the letter. If additional changes are made to the report after the meeting, another Council teleconference will be required to approve it.

Dr. Johnson pointed out that the May 21 letter must be addressed to NACEPT first and then sent to the Administrator, so the current addressee must be changed. Dr. Kammen asked whether, if the Council recommends changes and the co-chairs agree with them, the letter can be edited without necessarily requiring a conference call. Dr. Kammen did not think that giving guidance to the Administrator on what sustainability means is a minor point that should be discussed in a one-page cover letter. What is the easiest, clearest way to highlight fundamental points going forward without causing undue extra work? The letter is too vague and does not discuss those metrics that lead to sustainability. That statement sounds like a big enough change that it may be violating the technical change rule. Dr. Johnson asked if whether, over the next 24 hours, the Council could draft a cover letter that addresses all the issues. Dr. Kammen asked if Dr. Johnson was asking the Council to develop a one-page cover letter commenting on the letter report, and Dr. Johnson confirmed this. Dr. Kammen said he submitted a draft subsection for Section 1A in the letter, which states: "To support this mission, the EPA should examine and develop a set of metrics that capture at least some of the dimensions of sustainable stewardship into the

communication and evaluation of external partners or activities of the Agency. Although it is clear that any set of metrics, even an evolving and organic one, cannot reflect every technical, environmental, and social aspect of stewardship, it is important to develop, define, and utilize these metrics to assist the Agency in meeting its mission.” Dr. Kammen stated that the section captured some of the essence of the discussion. Mr. Paddock pointed out that the cover letter was a comment on the report rather than an amendment to the report.

Mr. Olson asked Ms. Nash if content from the original work of the Council that was not reflected in the SPES report also might be added. Ms. Nash noted that the previous Council report addressed the relationship between stewardship and sustainability.

Mr. Mark Joyce (EPA, OCEM) stated that the transmittal letter often is substantive in its own right and raises a number of additional issues that the Council members think are important and need to be highlighted, and would complement the work that has been done on the Subcommittee’s advice letter. Although the drafting of the letter can occur outside of the meeting, the major points and emphases of issues addressed need to be agreed upon by the group or another teleconference will be required.

Dr. Johnson reviewed the issues to be included in the cover letter: sustainability, individual roles, operationalization, quantification, state of the environment report, and branding. He asked the following members to assist him in drafting the letter: Dr. Kammen, Ms. Orosco, Ms. Bannerman, and Dr. Chertow. Other NACEPT members will have a chance to comment, but a teleconference should not be necessary.

Mr. Paylor noted that if members review the previous NACEPT report, they will find that not much is new in the letter report; operationalizing is the key. Once the report is reviewed and ready to go, Mr. Paddock and Mr. Paylor would like to have a meeting with Dr. Johnson and Mr. Bob Perciasepe about how to operationalize the recommendations in the letter.

Dr. Johnson called for a motion to approve the report with the recommendation of adding “land” to Section 4A. The motion was made and seconded, and the report was approved by the Council.

Integrating Environmental Justice into Rulemaking

Lisa Heinzerling, Associate Administrator, EPA’s Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation (OPEI)

Ms. Heinzerling thanked NACEPT members for their work and noted that an initiative has been under way since the 1990s to address EJ. The regulatory process lies at the core of EPA’s work, and the Agency has begun to examine how it can be shaped by consideration of EJ. The Agency has committed not to rest with the phraseology used in the past that stated if a rule protects the environment and human health, there are therefore no EJ problems. A rule may generally protect the environment and human health but have a negative effect on communities of concern. Ms. Heinzerling noted three points about the integration effort: (1) it may well influence the shape of rules that EPA issues; (2) it will affect the institution of EPA in an important way; and (3) it will affect the transparency with which EPA conducts its work.

On the first point, a good example is the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for nitrogen dioxide issued several months ago. The NAAQS had an implementation plan that requires EPA’s Regional Administrators to consider siting 40 monitors in communities that may be overburdened with pollution. The explicit focus on particular communities in the rulemaking process likely will occur more often.

The effect on EPA as an institution will be deep and durable, but less obvious. The regulatory process at EPA involves a highly developed set of procedures for internal coordination and decision making. For major rules (tier 1 and tier 2), the process involves milestones called early guidance, option selection, and

final Agency review. The Agency now is in the process of developing guidance that will tell rule writers and Agency managers to consider EJ at each major stage of the rulemaking process. This will change the way the Agency conducts its daily business. Questions about EJ will be asked at every stage of the rule. Managers charged with organizing the milestone meetings and staff charged with conducting analysis that supports the rules all will get involved in EJ. This process spreads EJ across the Agency as an issue and priority, an important institutional development.

Transparency itself is a value emphasized by Administrator Jackson, and it will benefit from the focus on EJ. Another initiative at EPA is called the Rulemaking Gateway, which is a Web site that brings the user to major documents associated with rules. The Gateway contains rules, where they stand in the rulemaking process, and whether they have been identified as having implications for EJ. Internally, the EJ effects of the rule are considered from the beginning of an action. Externally, informing the public about rules and their implications for EJ can encourage public participation in rulemaking process.

The Agency is serious about EJ but is approaching the matter cautiously because of the need for analysis that has not been conducted before. Transparency and collaboration will be particularly important. The EPA leadership has a strong desire to attempt a number of types of analyses that are appropriate for the different contexts confronted, and there may be missteps; EPA needs the public's input.

Discussion

Ms. O'Donnell asked about the criteria for flagging rules likely to affect EJ, who decides whether there will be an effect, and how the analysis is conducted. Ms. Heinzerling responded that the program offices flag a rule with potential EJ implications and examine where it is likely to have an impact and the type of pollutants involved. EPA is in the early stages of the process, and OPEI is issuing a guidance to the Agency to consider EJ in rulemaking in advance of a more technical guidance that will discuss how to conduct the analysis.

Dr. Mark Mitchell (Connecticut Coalition of Environmental Justice), NACEPT member, asked how communities are notified that a rule may have EJ implications. Ms. Heinzerling responded that the Rulemaking Gateway is a passive instrument in that users must access it, but some of the focus in the guidance on the rulemaking process will be how to reach affected communities. Dr. Mitchell asked if listservs were being used. Ms. Garcia noted that part of the internal review would involve how EPA can incorporate more meaningful participation. A listserv may be a useful method, but identification of the rules through the Rulemaking Gateway is the first step. Perhaps EPA can discuss methods of contact with the communities once the guidance is issued. Ms. Heinzerling added that there are efforts under way to use interactive social media, and there is recognition that a Web site alone will not be sufficient.

Ms. Kendall asked whether, in the consideration of vulnerable populations, EPA used as part of its criteria populations outside of the United States; for example, if a rule puts a burden on an industry that would encourage it to send production offshore to a location where there is less environmental protection, is this considered? Ms. Heinzerling responded that it is not part of the Agency's consideration. It is an active issue in some National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) cases.

Dr. John asked for elaboration on the idea of public involvement in the process. Ms. Heinzerling stated that there was a great deal of enthusiasm outside of EPA, but some assistance will be required for people to determine how best to participate. Ms. Garcia noted that there is a process for soliciting comments that will involve community outreach and an ongoing learning process as to what methods will best encourage participation.

Dr. Johnson thanked Ms. Heinzerling, and noted that Mr. Charles Lee, Director of EPA's Office of Environmental Justice, would be available for questions after the next presentation. He also introduced Dr. Peter Grevatt, Director of the Office of Children's Health Protection and Environmental Education.

Environmental Justice and Vulnerable Populations

Lisa F. Garcia, Senior Advisor to the Administrator for Environmental Justice, EPA

Ms. Garcia stated that one of the Administrator's priorities is to have EJ included in every decision at the Agency. EPA is working toward bringing justice and equality to some of the environmental burdens that communities face. Expanding the conversation on environmentalism requires reaching out to communities that have not been part of the decision-making process in the past. EPA's Office of Environmental Justice (OEJ) supports the vision that "all people regardless of race, national origin, or income are protected from environmental hazards, and participate meaningfully in achieving a healthy environment in which to live, work, and play." EPA operates under statutes such as the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act, and for EJ purposes, Executive Order 12898 from 1994, which states that each federal agency must make an effort to include EJ as part of its mission.

Key program strategies include: engaging overburdened communities in EPA decision-making and enlisting partners (including other federal agencies) to meet community needs; applying regulatory tools to protect vulnerable communities; empowering vulnerable communities to build healthy, sustainable, and green neighborhoods; and building internal mechanisms to ensure integration and accountability.

Expanding the conversation on environmentalism involves EPA's grassroots effort. The Agency held an EJ video contest and is about to announce the winners. EPA, in collaboration with the Congressional Black Caucus, is taking EJ tours of communities and conducting listening sessions and roundtables. Additionally, the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response community engagement initiative has helped to develop processes for community engagement and enhanced public outreach.

Applying regulatory tools includes incorporating EJ in rules (guidance development is under way); strengthening the science foundation for disproportionate impact; creating opportunities to use and strengthen environmental laws; and enhancing Agency transparency through initiatives such as the Regulatory Gateway.

To build healthy, sustainable communities, EPA is conducting pilot projects with EJ showcase communities. The projects examine communities holistically; EPA considers how the regions can work with the community to examine all factors that may be burdening it. The Department of Transportation (DOT)/Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)/EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities is a mechanism for the agencies to work with communities on sustainability efforts. To build internal accountability mechanisms, EPA is conducting strategic planning and beginning to evaluate some EPA programs on their EJ developments.

EJ highlights are notable under several of the Administrator's priorities, including the GHG endangerment findings, the CEQ Climate Change Adaptation Task Force climate initiatives, and the Toxic Substances Control Act reform to assure chemical safety. The goal at EPA is that program offices take on the role of incorporating EJ into programs instead of keeping responsibility solely with the OEJ.

Discussion

Ms. Leah Ann Lamb (Utah Department of Environmental Quality), NACEPT member, asked if EPA looked for underserved communities in its assessment of impacted communities. Ms. Garcia responded that the Agency did look for low-income communities that do not have sufficient infrastructure; part of the Agency's effort is to bring along communities with basic needs.

Ms. O'Donnell asked Ms. Garcia to define vulnerable populations and disproportionate impact. Ms. Garcia responded that vulnerable populations for the purposes of EJ include low-income communities, communities of color, and tribal populations, but in broader terms also can encompass

sensitive populations of children and the elderly. For EJ, elderly populations are not included, but OEJ does work closely with Dr. Grevatt on children's health issues. Dr. Grevatt noted that the term "vulnerable life stages" is used when examining children's health. Vulnerabilities can be due to location or unique exposure. Mr. Lee added that vulnerability, from an EJ perspective, encompasses chemical, physical, and biological factors, but also social and cultural factors; all have to do with how pollution affects a community. Disproportionate impacts are difficult to define. Disproportionate means significantly different in terms of impacts, which are affected by emissions as well as the nature of the population. Dr. Grevatt commented that within communities that face disproportionate impacts, children are the most sensitive population, so there is a need for his and Ms. Garcia's offices to work together. Ms. Garcia commented that having a set formula for disproportionate impact would not be useful because it can differ by region and by whether the community is urban or rural, for example.

Mr. Wright thanked Ms. Garcia, Mr. Lee, and their colleagues for their efforts in having EJ permeate Agency activities. He asked whether there are uniform criteria as to how EJ standards are being implemented in regulatory guidance. Ms. Garcia responded that a flexible system is being developed, but will determine how there can be consistency in identifying communities of concern by developing tools and measures.

Mr. Erichsen mentioned that local communities may not see drugs and crime as environmental issues. How can these issues be related back to environmental issues while remaining relevant to local communities? Ms. Garcia noted that many communities view solutions to social, economic, and environmental problems as equal in bringing the community to a sustainable future. EPA does not tell communities what they need but is there to talk about environmental concerns; part of the Agency's job is to express the positive aspects of working on the environmental component that bring about better social, health, and educational outcomes.

Dr. Dysart noted that EJ tours had been going to the same places for many years, and asked why places with EJ concerns came into being and remain cases for so long. Ms. Garcia responded that she could not say how the communities were chosen in the past, but in this initiative, the legislators have input on communities that they want to highlight, and are seeking the best place for a roundtable meeting. The EJ tour tries to bring out as many stakeholders as possible.

Mr. Learner asked how sociological research was being used. Ms. Garcia noted that the EJ work is sensitive to cultural traditions in looking at vulnerable populations. EPA will begin to work with universities on examining some of the other sociological inputs or science inputs and how the Agency will incorporate more of that.

Dr. John asked if EPA had heard back from states and businesses about ways they can cooperate with the Agency to fulfill stewardship goals and political goals. Ms. Garcia stated that working to engage the states accounted for a large part of the Agency's success. The current priority has been working with CEQ on an interagency workgroup, and EPA is beginning the process to bring along other partners such as industry, foundations, and members of the community.

Overview of EPA's Symposium on the Science of Disproportionate Environmental Health Impacts
Onyemaechi Nweke, Physical Scientist, EPA, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA), OEJ

Dr. Nweke noted that Executive Order 12898 charges each federal agency to "make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority and low income populations." Additionally, it is one of Administrator Jackson's priorities to include EJ in all of EPA's decisions.

Regulatory development is the core work of the Agency. Regulations must be sufficiently protective of vulnerable population groups from the outset, and to achieve this goal, EPA must develop a science-based approach for consistently identifying disproportionately impacted minority and low-income populations.

To this end, EPA has conducted several activities, including the identification of factors that are associated with disparities in environmental health among minority, low-income, and tribal populations. These include proximity to pollution sources, unique exposure pathways, multiple and cumulative exposures and impacts, physical infrastructure, diminished capacity to participate in decision-making, and psychosocial stress. Vulnerability is based on physical, chemical, biological, social, and cultural factors and how they interact in complex ways. Proximity to hazards affects disparities in both exposure and ability to recover from exposure. Additionally, after controlling for socioeconomic factors, race remains a robust predictor of the location of commercial hazardous waste facilities in the United States. Unique exposure pathways are important for many populations, and involve cultural practices or community activities or behaviors that are unique and can lead to exposures to hazards (and higher levels of hazards) where other groups in the population are not exposed. Multiple exposures and additive or synergistic interactions lead to higher risks of adverse health impacts or more severe health outcomes. Physical infrastructure includes substandard housing conditions and lack of neighborhood and community resources. Diminished capacity to participate in decision-making can be due to lack of access to information, lack of representation, and linguistic or cultural barriers. Studies suggest that psychosocial stress is an effect modifier; for example, neighborhood psychosocial hazards exacerbate the adverse effect of lead on language and executive functioning after adjustment for known risk factors.

EPA has reviewed the state of the science with respect to the contribution of these factors to disparities in environmental health among minority, low-income, and tribal populations through the commissioning of papers. The charge questions were to describe the contributions of each factor to environmental health risks and impacts and to disparities in these risks/impacts, and to identify knowledge gaps and research needs to advance policy. In addition, EPA commissioned a paper on approaches for incorporating vulnerability into risk assessment.

The science and policy symposium on EJ was held to discuss these commissioned papers, get feedback from stakeholders, and get input on about identifying research gaps. The objectives of the symposium were to: describe the state of the science on factors that contribute to disproportionate environmental health impacts; explore assessment and policy analysis frameworks, tools, and methods; and identify goals for an action agenda. Numerous recommendations were made at the symposium in four broad areas of science, policy, capacity building, and healthy communities, and included: using communities to collect data; developing measures for the social environment; providing communities with tools for mapping environmental information; ensuring that analysis informs policy choices; conducting inter-agency collaboration; addressing vulnerabilities in communities due to lack of access to health care and socioeconomic factors; and providing funding for community research.

Next steps involve reviewing recommendations and developing action items. Information from the symposium will be developed into a technical guidance on how to incorporate EJ considerations analytically into regulatory development decisions, and the Agency will develop a research strategy to address policy-relevant scientific gaps.

Discussion

Mr. Learner noted the importance of the recommendation on integrating monitoring data and air quality data and finding ways to make that mapping available to communities, and asked how this would be conducted. Dr. Nweke responded that recommendations currently are being reviewed. Mr. Lee stated that this would be part of the next discussions.

Dr. Kammen asked which of the case studies around communities of color taking charge of the data generated in their communities have been evaluated by EPA. Dr. Nweke welcomed any suggestions; a formal team to examine the recommendations has been formed to create an action plan to address some of these issues. Dr. Grevatt added that there are a number of examples where communities have provided data that illuminated a problem, and the Administrator recognizes that there is a need for communities to have a seat at the table. Dr. Kammen noted that the layering of new technologies and community empowerment should be encouraged in disadvantaged and tribal communities; for example, low cost, long-lasting sensors are available. Mr. Preston commented that the cost of the sensors has decreased significantly, and suggested that EPA could get global monitoring of any airborne or water pollutant by offering \$10,000 to the first person who reports a verified major emission. Mr. Lee noted that in EJ communities, there is a need for information, science, and research, but more importantly a need for action, and this discussion centers on the piece that connects the two.

Ms. Loftness said that the costs of dealing with indoor environmental quality (IEQ) had not decreased, and asked if there was a broader discussion of healthy built infrastructures and their relationship to vulnerable populations at the symposium. Dr. Nweke responded that she had received a letter from advocates asking that resources be directed to indoor air quality, and recommendations were made at the symposium on the topic; additionally, the commissioned paper on housing addresses some of the issues. Dr. Grevatt added that the Children's Health Protection Advisory Committee is establishing a task force to examine indoor air quality, and the Sustainable Communities partnership among EPA, HUD, and DOT is very focused on the built environment.

Dr. Parker mentioned that environmental impact statements and EJ statements are needed for many projects under NEPA, but consideration is not given to health, and asked whether EPA has the ability to require a health impact assessment. Dr. Nweke noted that a colleague is working to have NEPA analysis incorporate health assessments. Mr. Lee added that there was much activity around this topic, and many EPA regions are beginning to incorporate health into their NEPA reviews.

Mr. Olson mentioned a study conducted at the Woodrow Wilson Center on progress in low-cost sensors and testing technologies and strategies for citizen use in local communities. Dr. Nweke responded that she would like to learn more about this study.

Ms. Lamb asked if publications from the symposium will be posted on a Web site, including the concept of evaluating health impacts in the NEPA process. Dr. Nweke noted that the Agency is revising its Web site; some of the information is available on the ORD's Web Site. In terms of showcasing EPA's work in EJ, it would be useful to share the information. Dr. Mitchell asked for a copy of the presentation slides. Dr. Johnson responded that Ms. Altieri could send them out, and that they would be posted on the NACEPT Web Site.

Mr. Roger Rivera (National Hispanic Environmental Council), NACEPT member, asked if NEPA law required a review of health impacts. Dr. Nweke responded that she did not know if NEPA required consideration of health, but OEJ is encouraging federal partners to include health impact assessments as part of their environmental impact statements. Dr. Grevatt said that he would get a legal opinion from the Agency. Mr. Rivera noted that being able to require agencies to consider health impacts in NEPA reviews would be extraordinarily helpful. Mr. Learner responded that NEPA legally includes health, but health assessments often are not conducted.

Dr. Osidele stated that in his environmental assessment work, he has not seen a direct requirement for health impacts, but the Nuclear Regulatory Commission does a safety review as part of the license application process. The NEPA process is done in conjunction with safety reviews, so the health information is taken from safety reviews and incorporated into the environmental impact statements.

Overview of Emerging Technologies and Vulnerable Populations Charge

Fred Hauchman, EPA, ORD, Director of Science Policy, Office of Science Policy (OSP)

Dr. Fred Hauchman stated that the draft NACEPT Proposed Charge on Emerging Technologies and Vulnerable Populations was in the formative stages. He had rearranged the four technology-related charges, and he wanted the draft and process to be collaborative. The charge relates to the identification and use of innovative technologies that are safe for the environment and public health, and that can aid government at all levels to better protect vulnerable populations. Dr. Hauchman placed the first and fourth bullets together because they both relate to community involvement.

Ms. O'Donnell commented that both bullets one and four were vague, and asked if they were meant to seek advice on how to get the community involved. Dr. Hauchman responded that the goal was to engage the users of the research at the front end and throughout the process so that it can be conducted with full knowledge of what the needs are, and how to deliver technologies in a way that is useful. Another issue is the need to educate communities with respect to what is within EPA's mandate and capabilities; the need for a dialogue is what is intended by the bullet on best techniques for community engagement.

Dr. Hauchman described the structure of the ORD, which works closely with the Office of the Science Advisor. The Senior Environmental Technology Officer (SETO) sits in the Office of the Science Advisor. The Office of Science Policy is the interface between science and policy, staffing the regulatory workgroups and managing the Board of Scientific Counselors. ORD has 13 locations, including three national laboratories, and conducts both cross-program and program-targeted research. Most of the EJ issues apply to the Human Health Research Program, but there are relevant elements in many of the programs.

ORD's work cuts across many different areas of research to assess and manage risks in special populations such as children, small communities, and tribes. Vulnerable population research activities include approaches for community-based assessments, data and methods for hazard identification and risk characterization, the Children's Health Research Program, and technologies for small communities. Research on special populations takes into account economic and social factors, non-chemical stressors, and lifestyle and cultural practices that may affect risk assessment. ORD has an in-house research program but also conducts a great deal of technology transfer and collaboration under Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs), Material Transfer Agreements, Outside User Agreements, licenses, and additional research through Environmental Technology Verification, grants, and support by other agencies and organizations.

Paul Anastas, Assistant Administrator for ORD, has listed sustainability, relevance, and solution-oriented research among his priorities, and ORD is realigning programs to meet these priorities. Sustainable technological innovations are one of four areas of emphasis that Dr. Anastas outlined in his "Path Forward" memo, and research will be conducted through internal entrepreneurial seed grant programs, external partnerships, and collaboration with the private sector.

Dr. Hauchman noted several examples of technologies for vulnerable populations. Community engagement is important in each of these examples. The Arsenic Treatment Technology Demonstration Project involved extensive studies on treatment technologies for cost-effective arsenic removal in small systems to comply with the arsenic standard; provided information to states, EPA regional offices, and small drinking water systems; and provided the basis for design manuals and performance reports. A lead test kit provides a practical method for analysis of water, paint, dust, and soil. The STREET (Screening Tool for Roadway Emissions and Exposure to Toxics) uses a geographic information system framework to identify communities at a higher risk of exposure to traffic-related pollution. One case study overlaid contaminant exposure information over population information by block to assess risk in communities, creating an informative tool. What a community does with the information once it is available is key; EPA must be able to assist communities in interpreting the data. A health study examining high traffic

patterns and health implications takes a similar approach, and helps to identify whether certain populations are experiencing higher rates of exposure.

Ms. Loftness asked what actions EPA would take using these data. Dr. Hauchman noted that EPA could propose regulations but could not impose new land use requirements; this illustrates the necessity of involving other federal partners. Dr. Parker commented that this was an interesting example of leveraging a number of resources. She is part of two NIEHS-funded projects, one on diesel, the other on air filters' ability to reduce particulate matter. Although the ideal is land use change, other mitigation is possible. Dr. Mitchell noted that a similar project was undertaken in New Haven, Connecticut; it used results to place a sound barrier on the highway and gave residents closest to the highway air purifier units.

Other studies included a near roadway study of adverse birth outcomes in Los Angeles, California, and a Community-Focused Exposure and Risk Screening Tool (C-FERST), a Web tool now under development that will enable community risk assessments including the impacts of multiple stressors.

Discussion

Mr. Wright asked where one could find a list of the types of technologies that ORD had developed and how they can be accessed. Dr. Hauchman responded that a search could be conducted on EPA's science inventory. There is no central inventory of research related to these topics. One outcome of the symposium is to develop an inventory with an EJ focus. Mr. Preston asked if the lead test kit was commercial or developed at EPA; Dr. Hauchman was unsure.

Ms. Nash asked for a definition of technology; for example, is a social networking tool a technology? Dr. Hauchman responded that it could be defined as broadly as some of the health screening tools used to examine vulnerable populations, or it could mean hardware and software. For NACEPT's discussion, it can be defined to best bring in the expertise of the members.

Dr. Mitchell asked whether the maps shown were available online. Dr. Hauchman responded that they were not, but presentations on the studies were available from the researchers. Dr. Mitchell noted that small communities were not the same as small area analysis tools, and in many communities, analysis is needed by census block or a smaller area. Dr. Hauchman replied that the examples given were for rural small communities, versus a small segment of a larger community.

Mr. Rivera noted that a compendium or inventory of EJ-related research and technologies would be extremely helpful, as would be a breakdown of costs, because a \$20,000 test kit would not be affordable for a vulnerable community. Dr. Hauchman stated that the goal was to make the technologies as affordable as possible, but he did not have specific cost information. Mr. Preston mentioned that a benefit of the hand-held lead test kits was that they could do 1,000 tests in a day, and can be rented. Mr. Rivera asked if CRADAs transfer physical technology or provide an agreement that communities can use equipment. Dr. Hauchman noted that CRADAs and material transfer agreements are two different vehicles. The CRADA involves EPA's work with a research partner to jointly solve a problem. The material transfer agreement allows the actual transfer of products to other researchers.

Mr. Erichsen asked how state and local government officials could be involved in community-led programs. Dr. Hauchman replied that EPA works through its regional offices to be one step closer to the state and local governments; depending on the type of study, EPA would want to work closely with local community leaders.

Ms. Loftness suggested that the emerging technology title in the charge might be broadened to include systemic design engineering and science solutions. She asked to what extent EPA should be moving beyond health outcomes for vulnerable populations.

Mr. Rivera asked if there is an office within EPA with the mandate to provide useful technology to vulnerable populations; for example, where would a community in Detroit get a lead test kit?

Dr. Hauchman responded that the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention would be most interested in the test kit, and listed information on the kit on its Web site, but he was unsure if they had targeted outreach. Mr. Rivera added that it was important that technology developed by EPA get into vulnerable communities.

Ms. O'Donnell asked whether ORD had an inventory of community-based case studies. Dr. Hauchman responded that there is a listing of Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE)-related programs. Ms. O'Donnell asked whether there would be collaboration with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) on this work. Dr. Hauchman responded that CDC is sponsoring a national conversation on community issues from a health perspective, and Kevin Teichman, the Deputy Assistant Administrator for ORD, is a key participant. There are interactions on a variety of topic areas, but not a systematic collaboration.

Dr. Chertow noted that point-of-use and treatment technologies had been discussed, and pointed out that some other tools may have a more future-oriented view, mentioning a study her group had conducted using lifecycle assessment tools to determine how to manage sewage sludge.

Mr. Learner stated that analytical tools might be added to technology, and that most of the examples mentioned have to do with air. How would this apply to water? Dr. Hauchman mentioned some examples of monitoring technique research for measuring contaminants in drinking water, and innovations from the Homeland Security Research Center in rapid methods to measure contamination in addition to some biological monitoring research. EPA is embarking on a program to examine regulatory approaches and research on drinking water.

Dr. Osidele asked to what extent to consider proprietary technologies in the context of these charges. Dr. Johnson responded that affordability would be a consideration whether or not the software and hardware were proprietary.

Ms. Filippone asked if EPA has set protocols for water quality testing and dioxins and polychlorinated biphenyls. Dr. Hauchman replied that that ORD works with the program offices to develop an analytical method that is then handed to the program office, but is not involved in developing standard protocols. If there is a regulation, a *Federal Register* section will deal with monitoring. Ms. Filippone asked how EPA accepts research conducted by a state. Dr. Hauchman responded that ORD did not assess research; the Environmental Technology Verification program does conduct that type of assessment.

Dr. Parker asked who the end users were for the methods to empower vulnerable communities.

Dr. Hauchman responded that the intention was not that it be strictly communities; it could be a health department or environmental program or university.

Discussion on Vulnerable Populations

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr., NACEPT Chair

Dr. Johnson suggested that the group discuss constraints, brainstorm what could fit into the boundaries, and then form a subgroup to distill the information into a charge with input from the group and senior officials. Boundary conditions involve working with tools and methodologies including quantitative tools. Clarification of the term vulnerable populations is needed, and the recommendations should be able to be conducted in a reasonable period of time, but may be able to be continued past a 4-year period.

Ms. Nash asked whether there are decision points NACEPT should be aware of while debating their charge, because advice letters are most effective when they can inform key decisions. Dr. Hauchman responded that having the product in the next 6 to 10 months would be useful.

Mr. Preston noted that the Council had not discussed emerging transformative technologies, such as a cement technology that provides an 80 percent reduction in GHGs at a lower cost. There are some transformative technologies on the cusp that would do more for vulnerable communities.

Mr. Rivera urged EPA to examine CDC's definition of vulnerable populations, which has been agency-reviewed and has received input from EJ communities, rather than redefine it.

Ms. Loftness listed the key points for discussion: in addition to the question of whether the charge involves technology or a broader system design engineering and science approach, there is the issue of identifying and addressing environmental quality issues for vulnerable populations. Health, safety, and performance have been discussed as outcomes, and the range of vulnerable populations has been discussed. Innovations need to reach vulnerable populations, so there is a technology transfer component and an affordability component.

Dr. Benedict noted that given that primary information sharing occurs over the Internet, information technology issues should be considered, such as how the systems are designed to provide access to low level data used to support research and the information products stemming from the research. Additionally, appropriate interoperability standards are needed to streamline the sharing of information with communities and other federal agencies.

Dr. Mitchell commented that in EJ communities, often new power plants are built in areas with older, less efficient plants, which decreases the pollution worldwide, but increases it in the area. EJ requires a small area analysis.

Dr. Chertow said that she preferred the words innovative technologies to emerging technologies, because "emerging" implies that the technology has not yet been tested, and vulnerable populations should receive something that is known to work.

Ms. Orosco noted that from an indigenous perspective, a science and technology of maintaining Earth as sustainable exists; for example, a tree in a community can clean air and water and provide socioeconomic benefits, and can be considered a technology in this sense.

Dr. Johnson stated that the workgroup will be a subset of the Council who will come back to NACEPT with a set of suggested refinements for the charge. The workgroup would come back with a product within the next 2 weeks. Workgroup members will be Ms. O'Donnell as the lead, Ms. Loftness, Dr. John, Mr. Preston, Dr. Mitchell, and Ms. Orosco. Ms. O'Donnell asked Council members to send her their thoughts on crystallizing the scope of the workgroup by close of business on May 25, 2010.

Dr. Dysart asked which definition of EJ communities or vulnerable populations was being used. Dr. Johnson responded that the workgroup would discuss that and give some guidance.

Dr. Johnson suggested that the group examine the possibility of review of the strategic plan; it will be released September 30, 2010, and the review would have to be conducted through a conference call. NACEPT also may want to have some input into the symposium as the recommendations and conclusions are being developed. Additionally, Mr. DeLeon and Dr. Johnson have been discussing a change to the NACEPT logo that would convey the idea that NACEPT is independent from EPA and include the Council name.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 2010

Overview of EPA's Workforce Issues

Bob Perciasepe, EPA Deputy Administrator

Mr. Perciasepe thanked members for their commitment to providing advice to EPA, and noted that the Administrator wanted to be at the meeting, but was working on the issue in the Gulf in Louisiana. When EPA was created 40 years ago, there were 6,000 employees; today there are 17,000 employees, which places EPA in the top 20 federal agencies. One of the Agency's goals is to be the best place in the Federal Government to work. The previous review by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) rated EPA number 6 of 30. Another survey is being conducted now, with the responses to be released in July. EPA wants to have the most talented and dedicated workforce in the Federal Government, and believes it has the best mission in public service: to protect public health and the environment. The Agency must be proactive to attract the best people, and the following must be considered:

- 1) A retention and succession plan must keep building the bottom of the pyramid with a robust, talented, and diverse workforce. Currently, 22 percent of the EPA workforce is eligible for retirement, and in 7 years approximately 50 percent will be eligible. The intersection between the ability to conduct EPA's mission and quality of workforce is important. The Agency needs to have a dedicated staff and a plan for the transition of the knowledge base, and it would be useful to receive input from NACEPT. The Council discussed diversity and the ability of the Agency to deal with overburdened communities; EPA needs to have a workforce that can relate to those communities and looks like the members of those communities to accomplish this.
- 2) The quality of the work life for employees must be excellent. The day-to-day work at EPA must be beneficial to the employees' quality of life. The Agency offers tuition loan programs, transit subsidies, fitness centers in most of the locations, and daycare in many centers. In addition, it now offers flexible time programs. Combined with a flexible workplace, this creates a situation in which managing the workforce is a challenge for managers, who may not have the skills to deal with a distributed workforce, and training is needed. The Federal Government is a complex workplace on both the organizational and government-wide levels. Complexity creates resilience in the system but can be difficult on individual employees. When examining the quality of life of the workforce, EPA must determine how to reduce the complexity bestowed upon first line managers. Attention to two areas can address this: technologies to streamline processes and the characteristics of the business processes themselves. EPA is seeking ways to make the processes work better for managers.
- 3) The One EPA concept celebrates EPA's complexity because there is a robust presence, for example, in the Gulf area through Region 6 and Region 4. How the world looks at EPA must be considered. A state Governor may view the word of a regional employee as the word of EPA. Those outside the Agency do not consider EPA staff's office or department; the general world thinks of all of the Agency employees as EPA. Managers at the Agency often identify themselves by their office, but One EPA attempts to break down the stovepiping created by the Agency's complexity and encourage the workforce to think about the fact that they are part of greater whole. Mr. Perciasepe and the Administrator talked to the senior executive service, approximately 300 people, about the concept so that it could be passed down to other staff.

EPA needs to fight for the future workforce and needs NACEPT's input. What should the Agency be doing to acquire the talent needed? Younger people have a different view of their relationship to technology and how it facilitates their ability to work. How the Agency deals with workforce complexity is a large part of retaining and attracting a high-quality workforce. EPA must look like America, and be prepared culturally and in skills to reach different communities. In the past, EPA conducted pollution control for the average person, but the patterns of burden are different than the average, so the Agency is changing how this is addressed. Lastly, fostering the culture for One EPA is important in addressing

stovepiping issues. Without a solid workforce that is geared to the changing world, EPA will not be able to conduct its mission.

Discussion

Ms. Loftness noted that Mr. Perciasepe's comments had clarified the goals and objectives for the workforce development charge, but two points had not been mentioned: (1) the buildings themselves and work settings and to what extent part of workforce development is being first in class in terms of resource conservation and indoor environmental quality, and (2) the disciplinary breadth in the workforce and collaborative work processes. Mr. Perciasepe responded that rehabilitating the facilities could have an effect on people's work, and that a number of facilities have been redone. The President has issued an Executive Order to consider the environmental footprint of facilities. In addition, the Agency has the intellectual discipline to carry out its mission but also has a great yearning to improve itself.

Ms. Lamb asked Mr. Perciasepe's opinion on diversity of perspective in the workplace. Mr. Perciasepe responded that it is vital that EPA employ people with diverse experience and perspectives.

Mr. Olson said that, to some extent, EPA has faced backwards to address problems that demanded attention. How much should this study focus on a workforce more familiar with emerging technologies? Mr. Perciasepe replied that EPA was attempting to look forward, and that the Administrator had announced that the Agency would now look for treatment technologies that address groups of contaminants in addressing drinking water standards instead of examining one at a time. EPA will start giving information to capital markets on where the Agency is heading, and is working with the Small Business Administration to create cluster areas for centers of excellence and thinking about innovative technologies. Paul Anastas also has a focus on thinking ahead.

Dr. Chertow asked if Mr. Perciasepe had found an unexpected trait common to success in personnel. Mr. Perciasepe noted that EPA would welcome advice on looking for talent, but does not have a linear process on hiring; because of stovepiping, it happens in different places. Mr. Learner asked how EPA prioritizes among many desirable qualities in terms of applicants. Mr. Perciasepe responded that a question might be whether the Agency has enough of each type of personnel and the correct array of talents, and would welcome guidance from NACEPT.

Ms. Orosco emphasized the importance of having vulnerable community outreach to children at a young age, and asked what type of resources are being used for community outreach with the emergence of the discussion on climate change and EJ. Mr. Perciasepe responded that EPA has a small environmental education program, but more important is the funding that the Agency provides communities to do training in the brownfields program on jobs related to environmental cleanup. Additionally, the Agency offers internship programs in all regional offices. The Agency needs to partner with other institutions, including tribes, so that younger people can be educated about the field.

Mr. Perciasepe will send his written comments to Ms. Altieri, who will distribute them to the Council.

Overview of EPA's Workforce Charge

Susan B. Hazen, EPA, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Administration & Resources Management (OARM); Raul Soto, EPA, Associate Assistant Administrator, Outreach, Diversity & Collaboration, OARM

Dr. Johnson noted that because the workforce issues charge was more developed than that on vulnerable populations, NACEPT should discuss how to implement it rather than what it states.

Ms. Hazen pointed out that EPA has benefitted throughout the years from NACEPT members' knowledge and experience. She mentioned the Administrator's seven priorities, and noted that to accomplish the

agenda, EPA needs to take advantage of the talent within and outside of the Agency. It is EPA's goal to make the Agency the number one place to work in government, and to have the tools, assets, and infrastructure to get the best employees. The work under contemplation with NACEPT will serve as a component in providing a place for a career in public service instead of a job in government. The Agency needs to get in front of new technologies instead of catching up, and to address foreseen problems, such as nanotechnology. A strong and flexible workforce is instrumental to EPA's success, and the Agency is asking for NACEPT's support in two areas: workforce planning for scientific and technical occupations, and effectively positioning EPA's executive-level talent to lead the workforce.

The scientific and technical staff at EPA represent 39 percent of the Agency workforce, approximately 7,000 people, and 20 percent are eligible to retire this year. Workforce planning efforts to date have focused on supporting offices to ensure that they have the right number of staff with the right experience. Workforce planning efforts to date have been aimed at building a workforce planning infrastructure. The Agency has identified 19 mission critical positions for the EPA. EPA has developed a strategic workforce plan identifying needs through the next decade. EPA is using the full array of federal hiring authorities to bring in senior level scientists; NACEPT may be able to help determine whether more hiring options are needed. The Agency, however, is facing significant competition in acquiring staff with the scientific and technical skills needed, and seeks the Council's help in developing strategies on how to compete successfully.

The senior executive service (SES) level staff need to be positioned to lead and support the workforce. It will be a challenge to integrate new and existing staff. The Agency is ranked 12th in effective leadership and needs to ensure those with the right skills are in leadership positions. The diversity of EPA's executive workforce must be improved. EPA is one of the most diverse agencies in government based on statistics, but it needs to have staff members who relate to people in communities being served. The Agency must be able to recruit and retain a diverse, technically advanced SES core. Of the SES core, 47 percent can retire this year and 80 percent in 2 years. Having that large a population potentially leave within a short period of time requires a plan in place so that knowledge is not lost. NACEPT may be able to help with effective succession planning and management.

EPA needs to cast a large net for qualified candidates who have all types of skills (scientific, technical, and soft skills) and expertise and who can tackle complex environmental challenges. The following are questions that NACEPT will need to address for the workforce planning charge: (1) What are the competencies necessary to support EPA's mission today and what will they be in 10 years? What technical competencies will become new priorities for the Agency and what recruitment strategies are likely to help EPA obtain those competencies? (2) What specific strategies are recommended that will most effectively maintain a world class workforce that is prepared to lead and exceed mission requirements? (3) Under this area, what are the best practices found in the private sector and academic worlds, and do these practices have relevance to the challenges that EPA is facing?

The charge of positioning EPA's executive staff to lead our workforce involves the strategy of ensuring a strong pipeline of future leaders, and succession planning is critical. The following charge questions are asked of NACEPT: (1) How can EPA best attract and maintain superior executive leadership talent that can effectively direct and challenge its workforce so that the Agency maintains its position as an environmental leader? (2) How can EPA best position its SES members to lead and support a highly technical and evolving workforce? (3) What might a model mentoring program for incoming executives look like? (4) What have other organizations done to successfully accelerate the readiness of their executive pipelines? (5) How can EPA best ensure access to a diverse and technically astute SES applicant pool? NACEPT's expertise will be useful in answering these questions.

Mr. Soto noted that the Outreach, Diversity, and Collaboration Initiative is part of Administrator Jackson's desire to have more strategic coordination on human resource-related initiatives. He is in the process of establishing a pathfinding team to address these issues. The goal of the initiative is to ensure

that there is a philosophy of engagement. There is a need to look at strategies for early, mid- and senior-level careers, which offer a glimpse of the challenge of attraction, development, and retention. EPA must ensure the maximization of resources. The pipeline may not exist in certain communities at the Agency, and infrastructure must be put in place to create it. Many initiatives exist that are not linked to the seven priorities. The initiative's role is to ensure that clear synergies are in place, and to look outwardly 5 to 15 years ahead at emerging technologies and at the ability to leverage small businesses.

Some areas of overlap exist in the initiative's customer-facing initiatives, for example, diversity touches on collaboration in regional or inter-agency settings. The goal is to get people to think beyond a single point or entity, and look at both strategic and operational objectives for both the regional offices and the Assistant Administrators' group. Mr. Soto asked NACEPT to consider what has worked in that arena, and what should be measured.

One of the mandates that the initiative has been charged with is to ensure that when an inquiry about employment comes into the Agency, the data are captured and articulated to the proper individual, be it in the regions, headquarters, or external to EPA. When OARM thinks about technology, it considers links to particular knowledge that can guide the organizations on the internal side, and on the external and outreach side, what EPA is doing with community-oriented efforts and to create a greater link to internal forces. The initiative is exploring the use of social media and how they can be utilized in an effective outreach effort. EPA has developed a number of smartphone applications during the past several years, and their use can be part of a community outreach effort.

Dr. Parker asked if Mr. Soto was referring to the work being conducted to recruit staff. Mr. Soto said yes. Organizational diversity is something to contend with, but there is a tremendous amount of opportunity with the retirement of a large part of the staff, and the tone must be set. The initiative's goal is to establish a cohesive strategic alignment.

Mr. Learner said that EPA likely is not unique in examining these issues, but that workforce issues span agencies. Is there an inter-agency working group involving other agencies that tend to attract high-powered professionals with technical skills so that there can be some shared learning? Ms. Hazen responded that each agency has a chief and deputy chief human capital officer who are part of a community that meets regularly under the auspices of OPM. OPM director John Berry has taken an aggressive approach in trying to bring agencies together to sort through these issues. NACEPT may be interested in looking at Mr. Berry's hiring reforms. Any agency can ask to pull together a group to look at any topic. EPA is coming to NACEPT because it is somewhat unique, in that it is competing for staff who can earn 2 to 3 times more in the private sector.

Mr. Soto noted EPA has office-specific initiatives, yet people do not understand what EPA is about; the uniqueness of the various sections must harmonize. EPA is trying to position itself in the prime location with a compelling reason for workers to come there in terms of work and work environment. In terms of diverse hiring, applicants must see someone that they can relate to or will not be interested. EPA intends to go into middle schools and conduct outreach. The Agency needs a strategy beyond a 5-year plan.

Discussion

Ms. Kendall asked about the growth trajectory of EPA. What does EPA do to create performance management techniques that help instill cultural goals and philosophies? Has EPA given thought to recruiting mid-level and senior staff from the business community, and has this been successful?

Ms. Hazen replied that EPA does not expect to see significant growth in number of employees over the next decade; there will a switch in how the mission is accomplished by using more technology, and the Agency will look closely at standard core programs, and at whether there are voluntary programs that have been overtaken by legislation. It is a tradition at EPA to hire young people; people are hired from business in an office-dependent manner. The regulated community has not been a prime target for

outreach in terms of hiring in the program offices; most promotions happen internally. In the administrative support offices, there is more outside hiring. In terms of performance management, EPA uses a performance evaluation system, the Performance Assessment Rating System. There would be mixed reviews as to whether it nurtures the culture that EPA would like to see.

Ms. Nash asked about the extent to which budget constrains what EPA does; is the Agency hiring now, and how many full-time equivalents (FTEs) is it trying to fill? Ms. Hazen responded that the Agency is continually hiring hundreds of people every year, replacing people who leave and creating new positions as new projects develop. There is a robust opportunity to influence hiring during the next few years.

Mr. Olson asked that Ms. Hazen elaborate on the charge's discussion of developing five scenarios of different conditions. Ms. Hazen noted that EPA is looking for better ways to conduct outreach and hiring, and better ways to reach additional resources.

Ms. O'Donnell asked whether EPA had developed a profile for the skill sets needed across the Agency. Ms. Hazen responded that EPA had conducted a great deal of research on the kinds of skill sets that will be necessary during the next several years. The Agency will need toxicologists and chemists, for example, but has not gone through the emotional skills for what type of employee it needs to seek; EPA is not looking to replace like with like, but is looking to meet the technical challenges it has with individuals best suited to EPA's environment.

Mr. Preston suggested that EPA likely has between 2,000 and 5,000 people who could be reassigned because there are "fiefdoms" within EPA, and groups are more creative if tenure is less than 5 years. Moving people around is healthy for their attitude on work and for productivity. Ms. Hazen agreed, but civil service rules and regulations limit what can be done.

Mr. Rivera noted that the National Hispanic Environmental Council is 13 years old, and has tried for that time to help people of color find work with federal environmental agencies. A variety of baseline data from EPA and OARM are needed such as diversity statistics and other workforce-related numbers. He mentioned concern that EPA was described as a diverse government agency. For the past 9 years OPM has produced a report on the state of Hispanic employment at federal agencies, and the ninth annual report states that as of June 30, 2008, there were 865 permanent Hispanic employees at the Agency, constituting 5.2 percent. Ms. Hazen stated that the Agency has data it can share; EPA is diverse compared to other federal agencies. EPA, however, has a unique role, and must be as diverse as the public it serves.

Dr. Parker asked about EPA's outreach to universities, because there has been a dramatic drop in students in schools of public health who enter the environmental health sciences. Mr. Soto responded that the outreach has been spotty; there are programs geared to minority-serving institutions, others geared specifically to the discipline, but there is no cohesive strategy in place that brings them together. Linkages have to be created to nontraditional efforts. Dr. Parker added that a dialogue with universities on the kinds of skills and personnel needed would be useful.

Dr. Dysart noted that EPA wants the SES core to be held in high esteem. How is it regarded now internally and externally? Mr. Soto replied that EPA must ask if it is providing the SES the necessary tools to be effective. In some areas, SES members are not effective, and EPA must assess what it is doing to make them successful; this must cut across every stratum, not just SES. Gap analysis must be conducted, but much work has been conducted to develop the SES ranks. EPA has reached out to other agencies to refresh the SES leadership. Ms. Susan Kantowitz, Deputy Director of Human Resources at EPA, commented that there are areas in which the SES is held in very high esteem (technical abilities), and areas where they are not (dealing with workforce issues on a day-to-day basis).

Ms. Filippone noted that she had much experience with EPA, and many people with technical and scientific experience rise to management level and do not have the management and personal skills to

deal with the public, which is harmful to the Agency; why has there been no training program for these individuals? Mr. Soto responded that EPA must examine dual career laddering, and recognize who among the staff would make efficient leaders. Ms. Filippone asked why EPA no longer participates on the local level in things like Earth Day fairs. Ms. Kantrowitz replied that in each region, Regional Administrators have their own events. There is local engagement, and Agency staff members are in the schools quite often in conjunction with Earth Day, but it is impossible to get into every community.

Dr. Osidele noted that 50 percent of the SES core is eligible to retire this year, but asked about the level of attrition at lower levels. Mr. Soto responded that he did not have those data with him, but that “presenteeism,” in which an individual is a static contributor in the organization, must be ferreted out as well. Ms. Kantrowitz added that she could get the exact statistics, but generally speaking, there is a low attrition rate. More turnover occurs where there are numerous other opportunities in the area for advancement.

Dr. Chertow stated that EPA offers for students often are vague in terms of projected start time. Ms. Kantrowitz responded that EPA has recently realigned some internship programs to position the job offer at a convenient point for the student. Some job offers are pending budgetary realities. If there is an announcement out, there is a position open with a due date by which it must be filled. Dr. Chertow added that full-time offers need to be addressed in a more professional manner.

Mr. Learner noted the mention of the pipeline; there is an unprecedented opportunity with people coming out of law school who do not have opportunities at law firms, and those who have been at senior associate levels at law firms. Mr. Soto responded that the Agency is examining this opportunity and formatting job descriptions so that they become attractive to these individuals.

Ms. Christine Costopoulos (Empire State Development), NACEPT member, asked about the opportunities for people inside the Agency to move ahead and into SES positions. Ms. Kantrowitz responded that the opportunities are significant; senior positions often require knowledge that a staff member can only get by moving up internally. Most of the SES appointments come from inside the Agency.

Mr. Rivera mentioned that the charge document talks about SES, but also talks about youth, students, and middle managers, yet it does not explicitly ask NACEPT to look at other levels of EPA employees. NACEPT’s recommendations should address the whole workforce pipeline. Mr. Soto replied that the charge for his office is to look across the whole organization. Mr. Rivera noted that the charge language would need to reflect this. Ms. Kantrowitz responded that there is some diversity, but Hispanics are an area where EPA needs to focus. EPA lacks diversity at the GS-14 and GS-15 levels and in the SES core. Mr. Rivera added that diversity must be examined on a region-by-region basis as must mobility and necessary skill sets to move ahead in particular offices.

Discussion on Workforce Issues

James H. Johnson, Jr., NACEPT Chair

Dr. Johnson asked Ms. Altieri if a quorum was needed to hear public comments at 1:30 p.m. Ms. Altieri responded that it was not necessary.

Dr. Johnson suggested that the Council address the workforce charge; some background material can be made available. The Council has sufficient diversity of disciplines and talent related to this charge to form a workgroup and supplement it as needed with consultants to provide narrow, specific information. Mr. Rivera had mentioned that the entire pipeline for EPA employees should be examined instead of just the SES, and Dr. Johnson noted that the group was in agreement that the charge should reflect this. The workgroup should develop some final suggested refinements to the charge and pass them on to Dr. Johnson and Mr. DeLeon, who will inform the Council what EPA senior officials think of the

changes. Dr. Johnson asked if other changes needed to be made to the charge. Dr. Chertow suggested that the entire hiring process be examined, including the time taken to negotiate offers with qualified employees. Dr. Johnson stated that the charge can be amended in two ways: officially through proposing changes to the charge itself, or by casting the net wider than expressed in the charge.

Mr. Rivera noted some statistics to illustrate the issue of diversity at EPA. From OPM's report on Hispanic populations in the federal workforce, at EPA as of June 30, 2008, there were 865 new permanent Hispanic hires, constituting 5.2 percent of the EPA workforce, and as of June 30, 2009, the number had grown to 940 new permanent hires, 5.6 percent of the EPA workforce. Given that Hispanic civilians constitute 12 percent of the civilian labor workforce, Hispanics are underrepresented at EPA. For the entire Federal Government, in 2008, 4,669 Student Career Experience Program (SCEP) students moved into permanent positions; of those, 238 were Hispanic, which constitutes 5 percent. In 2009, 5,613 SCEP students moved into permanent positions of whom 277 were Hispanic, which represented a decrease to 4.9 percent. The challenge is steep in terms of improving the diversity of the workforce pipeline for EPA.

Mr. Learner suggested that several sentences be added to the charge stating that the Council should identify other very specific opportunities that will help accomplish the charge. The charge could be broadened slightly with other targeted, timely, and specific ideas.

Mr. Olson said that the human resources staff wrote the charge section on scenarios to suggest examining different circumstances the Agency might encounter in the future and what that might mean for the skill sets that are necessary. Some sharpening of the strategic language would be useful.

Ms. Loftness noted that the following issues should be addressed in the charge: the physical environments of the workforce as a way of attracting, retaining, and ensuring the health of workers; and a proactive role in examining disciplinary breadth and collaboration critical to achieving broad goals.

Ms. Orosco commented that in her community, people ready to retire are revered for their knowledge, which is documented. Some of those retiring from EPA have been at the Agency since it was created. It would be useful to interview them about their history within EPA and their contributions, and create informational documents and DVDs.

Dr. Johnson summarized the following items that should be addressed in the charge: (1) examine the entire pipeline; (2) examine the entire hiring process; (3) identify specific opportunities to assist EPA; (4) consider the impact of the physical environment on the workforce; (4) suggest that EPA take a proactive role in examining disciplinary breadth and the collaborative skills of individuals; and (5) value and take advantage of the knowledge base of those who are retiring. He noted that the group had not moved far outside of what had been defined in the charge.

Mr. DeLeon stated that the group had not strayed far from the charge; the five areas mentioned fit within the broad umbrellas of recruitment/retention and development/knowledge management. One of the underlying themes of the charge is executive development, and the Council and speakers have commented on these topics.

Mr. Olson noted that Mr. Soto had suggested the Council offer tactical advice within 2 to 3 months and conduct the strategic work during a longer period. Dr. Johnson pointed out that the timeline suggests a final report in 15 months and preliminary findings in 9 months. Mr. DeLeon mentioned that the human resources staff had handed out a revised charge that incorporates comments from research and development staff. There will be opportunities to continue revising the charge.

Dr. Johnson suggested a workgroup, with consultant input if needed, to consist of Ms. Costopoulos, Dr. Osidele, Mr. Olson, Ms. Kendall, Dr. Dysart, Mr. Rivera, Ms. Lamb, Ms. Nash, Mr. Learner, Mr. Wright and Mr. Turner. He asked that Ms. Nash and Mr. Olson convene the group. Dr. Johnson will

work with Mr. DeLeon and inform the workgroup if the charge needs to be amended. Mr. DeLeon noted that if, based on the input of the group, the charge is revised, human resources should be given an opportunity to examine it to determine whether the changes are within the scope of the document.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

James H. Johnson, Jr., NACEPT Chair

Dr. Johnson summarized the Council's actions during the meeting. One goal was to act on the SPES report, and with the addition of one word throughout the document to ensure that all media (air, water, and land) are included, the document was approved. The transmittal letter will be changed to address NACEPT, and a letter will be added that will highlight issues important to the Council. This work should be completed by June 15, 2010.

Secondly, a workgroup was formed to address the charge on vulnerable populations; Dr. Johnson and Mr. DeLeon will take the suggestions back to the Agency. The next step is to determine how to carry out the charge, and to determine whether the Council has sufficient skill sets to deal with the charge itself or whether a subcommittee will be needed. Ms. Altieri commented that nothing would preclude NACEPT members from serving on the subcommittee; at minimum there would be a NACEPT liaison. Mr. DeLeon noted that he would consult the FACA attorneys on staff. Mr. Joyce commented that generally a subcommittee is formed, managed, and funded by another program office, and involves a membership process and appointment by the Administrator. Dr. Johnson said he would keep the Council informed of the process, but that members should consider whether a subcommittee or workgroup would be the best approach to address the charge. Ms. O'Donnell asked that as the workgroup addresses the charge, members should recommend whether it should be carried out by a subcommittee or workgroup. Dr. Johnson responded that this should be included as a personal note to him. Ms. Lamb said she thought the vulnerable populations charge would be addressed through multiple presentations from external partners to NACEPT as a whole versus a subcommittee, because there is great interest on the Council. Dr. Johnson agreed that the workgroup could offer some advice on this topic.

Finally, a workgroup was formed to address the workforce charge. Dr. Mitchell asked about the agenda on the workforce issues. First, Mr. DeLeon and Dr. Johnson will take the five recommended issues back to the Agency to determine if they are part of the scope of the charge and give the co-conveners guidance based on the outcome. The workgroup will choose a Chair and will report back on their work at the next meeting. The workgroup's task is to be responsive to the charge in the document and produce a full report or letter report. Those members not on the workgroup can attend workgroup meetings if interested, but it must be ensured that a quorum is not formed, so they must give notice in advance if they intend to participate. If other NACEPT members have suggestions for the workgroup, they should e-mail them to Ms. Altieri, who will send them to the workgroup.

Ms. Loftness noted that a better technology than e-mails should be used to keep track of the dialogue on the charges in one place. Dr. Johnson commented that, for the Council, all correspondence must be public, but this is not the case for the workgroups, and the forum could be a protected site. He suggested that the group strategically address the issue of how communication efforts can be enhanced using technology. Ms. Loftness asked whether e-mail announcements could be bundled and sent once per week, and Ms. Altieri agreed that they could. She mentioned that different technology options were being considered, but that FACA had to be kept in mind. Ms. Lamb suggested that the meeting materials be posted on the NACEPT Web Site and that members be sent a link. Dr. Johnson noted that an attempt would be made to do that. Ms. Lamb asked if group members should be signing up for any listservs related to the charges, and asked if there was a way that materials sent to the group could be targeted for the topic areas. Dr. Johnson suggested that all the presenters be asked to provide links to other sources of information as a standard practice. Ms. Loftness pointed out that a Web site for the Council could have a password-controlled area within a generally public site. Ms. Altieri commented that several years ago, an attempt was made to set up a QuickPlace site for the group, but it was not used. Mr. Joyce noted that

communications technology has advanced beyond what the FACA statute envisioned, but indicated that OCEM staff would examine different options that would allow the Council to work more efficiently. Mr. Wright stated that he preferred to have the communications continue to come from Ms. Altieri. Dr. Johnson noted that both options were possible.

Ms. Kendall mentioned that a few members were unable to attend the orientation, and asked if there could be a conference call to go over the information. Mr. DeLeon asked that members review the orientation book first, but that a call could be set up if there were questions.

Ms. Kendall asked about the possible third charge for the Council that Dr. Johnson had mentioned the day before. Dr. Johnson responded that there would be more information at the next meeting around the issue of the evolving mission of EPA and inter-agency issues.

Mr. Learner asked that the dates for the next meeting be sent out as soon as possible.

Mr. DeLeon noted that Ms. Bennett had invited the Council to offer comments on EPA's strategic plan and the budget. Dr. Johnson stated that possible activities for the Council included a review of the strategic plan and providing real-time feedback on the symposium as its results are being examined. The final strategic plan will be released in September of 2010, so a mechanism for providing advice must be determined. He suggested that a conference call be held in July. Mr. Joyce stated that the comment period for the strategic plan is June 18 to July 30, 2010; the Council would need to organize now and be ready to offer comments as soon as the document is available. Ms. Loftness suggested that the group members act as individuals instead of as a Council due to the condensed timeframe. Dr. Johnson commented that both options could be considered; some institutional knowledge exists on doing reviews of strategic plans, and those new to the process could learn from it in a conference call. Ms. O'Donnell suggested that individuals who are interested could send comments to the leader of the strategic planning group, who could compile them. Dr. Johnson noted that commenting as a Council would depend on when the comments were received. Mr. Joyce asked if the Council commented on previous strategic plans section by section. Ms. Altieri said that the Council had made general recommendations on the plan, but also made specific comments on line items. Dr. Johnson suggested that given the timeline, that Council comments be general in nature.

Mr. DeLeon suggested mid- to late-September dates for the next meeting, followed by another meeting during the first 2 weeks of December. In 2011, a meeting would be held in March, followed by one in June or July. A conference call can be scheduled in July and/or August; the July call could be used to come to consensus on any comments on the strategic plan. Mr. Learner asked that the last week of September be considered for the meeting, and Mr. Preston agreed with the suggestion. Dr. Johnson noted that dates will be sent to members for feedback.

The July conference call will have three agenda items: review of the draft strategic plan, updates on the charge for vulnerable populations, and an update on the workforce issues workgroup. Mr. Joyce suggested that a teleconference would be needed for the Council to organize comments on the strategic plan, and another would be needed to adopt the recommendations. Dr. Johnson agreed that this would be ideal, but he suggested that he develop a format for comment with a few members.

Ms. Filippone asked about the length of the strategic plan. Mr. Joyce noted that the previous time the Council reviewed the strategic plan, Ms. Altieri sent everyone a copy of the Council's comments, and that the plan would be a lengthy document. Dr. Johnson stated that an example of a previous plan and comments are available on the Web site.

Dr. Johnson mentioned that the workgroup would receive data requested on the workforce issues as part of their charge. Mr. DeLeon noted that the Office of Human Resources and Office of Civil Rights will ensure that the data are sent to OCEM, who will send it to the workgroup. He announced that Ms. Altieri

would be on assignment in Chicago for several months, so members should carbon copy Mr. Joyce (joyce.mark@epa.gov, 202-564-2130), Mr. DeLeon (deleon.rafael@epa.gov), and Ms. Stephanie McCoy (mccoy.stephanie@epa.gov, 202-564-7297) on everything sent to her. Mr. Joyce will be the point of contact while Ms. Altieri is in Chicago. Dr. Johnson added that he should receive all e-mail correspondence related to the mission and charge at jjohnson@howard.edu.

Public Comments

Two public comments had been submitted to Ms. Altieri. Dr. Johnson stated that the comment on solar panels in federal buildings should be acknowledged as worthy of consideration and that the commenter should be referred to the General Services Administration. He asked that a motion be entered that the Chair be charged to send out such a response; the motion was entered, seconded, and passed by the Council.

Adjournment

Dr. Johnson thanked the Council members and adjourned the meeting at 12:51 p.m.

Action Items

- ✧ Council members with comments on the draft SPES advice letter should send them to Ms. Altieri.
- ✧ The SPES Chairs will re-address the advice letter to NACEPT, and add the word “land” in Section 4A of the letter.
- ✧ Dr. Kammen, Ms. Orosco, Ms. Bannerman, and Dr. Chertow will assist Dr. Johnson in drafting the transmittal letter to be included with the SPES advice letter.
- ✧ Ms. Altieri will distribute copies of Dr. Nweke’s presentation to the Council.
- ✧ The Vulnerable Populations Workgroup will make recommendations on the charge within 2 weeks. Dr. Johnson and Mr. DeLeon will take the suggestions back to the Agency. Workgroup members will include Ms. O’Donnell as the lead, Ms. Loftness, Dr. John, Mr. Preston, Dr. Mitchell, and Ms. Orosco.
- ✧ Council members should send their thoughts on crystallizing the scope of the Vulnerable Populations Workgroup to Ms. O’Donnell by close of business on May 25, 2010.
- ✧ Mr. Perciasepe will send his written comments to Ms. Altieri, who will distribute them to the Council.
- ✧ The Workforce Issues Workgroup should develop final suggested refinements to the charge and submit them to Dr. Johnson and Mr. DeLeon, who will inform the Council of the response of EPA senior officials to the changes. The workgroup will consist of Ms. Costopoulos, Dr. Osidele, Mr. Olson, Ms. Kendall, Dr. Dysart, Mr. Rivera, Ms. Lamb, Ms. Nash, Mr. Learner, Mr. Wright, and Mr. Turner. Ms. Nash and Mr. Olson will convene the group.
- ✧ If other NACEPT members have suggestions for the Workforce Issues Workgroup, they should e-mail Ms. Altieri, who will send them to the workgroup.
- ✧ Dr. Johnson will respond to the public comment on solar panels in federal buildings.
- ✧ OCEM staff will send specific suggested dates for the next meeting and conference call to the Council members for feedback.
- ✧ Dr. Johnson will develop a format for comment on the strategic plan in cooperation with a few members.
- ✧ The Office of Human Resources and Office of Civil Rights will ensure that the requested data for the workforces charge is sent to OCEM staff, and they will send it to the workgroup.
- ✧ Members should carbon copy Mr. Joyce, Ms. McCoy, and Mr. DeLeon on any correspondence to Ms. Altieri. They also should carbon copy Dr. Johnson on any issues related to NACEPT’s mission and charge.

National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) Meeting Participants

Members

Ms. Erica Bannerman

Senior Environmental Specialist
Department of Transportation and
Environmental Services
Office of Environmental Quality
City of Alexandria
Alexandria, VA

Dr. Karl Benedict

Director
Earth Data Analysis Center
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM

Dr. Marian Chertow

Associate Professor
Yale University
Center for Industrial Ecology
School of Forestry and Environmental Studies
New Haven, CT

Ms. Christine Costopoulos

Director of Environmental Policy
NYS Department of Economic Development
Empire State Development
Albany, NY

Dr. Ben Dysart

Principal
Dysart and Associates, Inc.
Nashville, TN

Mr. Kurt Erichsen

Vice President
Environmental Planning
Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of
Governments
Toledo, OH

Ms. Ella Filippone

Executive Director
Passaic River Coalition
Morristown, NJ

Dr. DeWitt John

Thomas F Shannon Distinguished Lecturer
in Environmental Studies
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, ME

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr. (NACEPT Chair)

Professor and Dean Emeritus
Department of Civil Engineering
Howard University
Washington, DC

Dr. Daniel Kammen

Professor of Energy
Energy Resources Group
University of California
Berkeley, CA

Ms. Sara Kendall

Vice President
Environment, Health and Safety
Weyerhaeuser Company
Federal Way, WA

Ms. Leah Ann Lamb

Assistant Director
Division of Water Quality
Utah Department of Environmental Quality
Salt Lake City, UT

Mr. Howard Learner

President and Executive Director
Environmental Law and Policy Center
Chicago, IL

Ms. Vivian Loftness

Professor of Architecture
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA

Dr. Mark A. Mitchell

President
Connecticut Coalition of Environmental Justice
Hartford, CT

Ms. Jennifer Nash
Director of Policy and Programs
Product Stewardship Institute, Inc.
Boston, MA

Ms. Arleen O'Donnell
Vice President
Eastern Research Group, Inc.
Lexington, MA

Mr. Robert L. Olson
Senior Fellow
Institute for Alternative Futures
Alexandria, VA

Ms. Kristie Orosco
Director of Environmental
Protection and Compliance
San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians
Valley Center, CA

Dr. Olufemi Osidele
Senior Research Engineer
Geosciences and Engineering Division
Southwest Research Institute
San Antonio, TX

Dr. Edith A. Parker
Associate Dean and Associate Professor
Department of Health Behavior
and Health Education
University of Michigan
School of Public Health
Ann Arbor, MI

Mr. John T. Preston
Managing Partner
C Change Investments, LLC
Cambridge, MA

Mr. Roger Rivera
President
National Hispanic Environmental Council
Alexandria, VA

Mr. Billy Turner
President
BTurner Consulting, Inc.
Columbus, GA

Mr. Kobi Wright
Corporate Counsel
Cummins, Inc.
Indianapolis, IN

Designated Federal Officer

Ms. Sonia Altieri
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Cooperative Environmental
Management (OCEM)
MC 1601M
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-0243
E-mail: altieri.sonia@epa.gov

EPA Participants

Tracy Atagi
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (703) 308-8672
E-mail: atagi.tracy@epa.gov

Barbara Bennett
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-1151
E-mail: bennett.barbara@epa.gov

Michael Brody
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-7558
E-mail: brody.michael@epa.gov

Oscar Carrillo
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-0347
E-mail: carrillo.oscar@epa.gov

Kate Cooper

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
E-mail: cmc9bh@virginia.edu

Cathy Davis

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-2703
E-mail: davis.catherinem@epa.gov

Rafael DeLeon

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-4899
E-mail: deleon.rafael@epa.gov

Ikisha Edmonds

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
E-mail: ikisha-e@yahoo.com

Scott Fulton

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-8040
E-mail: fulton.scott@epa.gov

Lisa Garcia

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-1259
E-mail: garcia.lisa@epa.gov

Peter Grevatt

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-8954
E-mail: grevatt.peter@epa.gov

Patricia Lee Harrigan

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 566-1666
E-mail: harrigan.patricia@epa.gov

Debbie Hart

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-2011
E-mail: hart.debbie@epa.gov

Fred Hauchman

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-3151
E-mail: hauchman.fred@epa.gov

Susan Hazen

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-4600
E-mail: hazen.susan@epa.gov

Lisa Heinzerling

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-8443
E-mail: heinzerling.lisa@epa.gov

James Hiscock

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-7645
E-mail: hiscock.james@epa.gov

Cynthia Jones-Jackson

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-2321
E-mail: jones-jackson.cynthia@epa.gov

Mark Joyce

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-2130
E-mail: joyce.mark@epa.gov

Susan Kantrowitz

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-4606
E-mail: kantrowitz.susan@epa.gov

Regina Langton

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 566-2178
E-mail: langton.regina@epa.gov

Kelly Lausten

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
E-mail: kml9b@virginia.edu

Charles Lee

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-2597
E-mail: lee.charles@epa.gov

Hillary Marshall

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-3099
E-mail: marshall.hillary@epa.gov

Stephanie McCoy

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-7297
E-mail: mccoy.stephanie@epa.gov

Claire Milan

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-7582

Nnenna Njoku

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-6237
E-mail: njoku.nnenna@epa.gov

Onyemaechi Nweke

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 566-2314
E-mail: nweke.onyemaechi@epa.gov

Bob Perciasepe

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-4700
E-mail: perciasepe.bob@epa.gov

Victoria Robinson

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-6349
E-mail: robinson.victoria@epa.gov

Susan Smith

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-6656
E-mail: smith.susan@epa.gov

Raul Soto

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-0229
E-mail: soto.raul@epa.gov

Presenters**Lee Paddock**

Associate Dean for Environmental Law Studies
George Washington University Law School
2000 H St., NW
Washington, DC 20052
Phone: (202) 994-0417
E-mail: lpaddock@law.gwu.edu

David Paylor

Director, Virginia DEQ
George Washington University Law School
629 East Main Street
Richmond, VA 23219
Phone: (804) 698-4020
E-mail: david.paylor@deq.virginia.gov

Other Participants**Maria Hegstad**

Inside EPA
Phone: (703) 416-8541

John Heltman

Inside EPA
E-mail: jheltman@iwpnews.com

Wendy Naus

Council on Social Work Education
Phone: (202) 289-7475
E-mail: wendy@lewis-burke.com

Dawn Reeves

Inside EPA
Phone: (703)562-8766

Daniel Semick

Government Accountability Office
E-mail: semickd@gao.gov

Contractor Support**Mary Spock**

Writer/Editor
The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.
656 Quince Orchard Road, Suite 210
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone: (301) 670-4990
Fax: (301) 670-3815
E-mail: mspock@scgcorp.com