



ecology and environment, inc.

BUFFALO CORPORATE CENTER

368 PLEASANTVIEW DRIVE, LANCASTER, NEW YORK 14086, TEL. 716/684-8060

International Specialists in the Environment

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Subcommittee Members

MAR 16 1993

FROM: Susan Bloss *SLB*

DATE: 3/10/93

SUBJECT: November 20, 1992 and February 8, 1993 Draft Stewardship Indicator Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Enclosed are the draft minutes from the November 20, 1992 and the February 8, 1993 Stewardship Subcommittee meeting. Please note that the next subcommittee meeting is Wednesday, March 31, 1993. The meeting will be a conference call. Joel O'Connor will follow up with additional information.

Please have your comments ready for the next meeting.

DRAFT

MEETING SUMMARY

EOWG Stewardship Indicators Technical Subcommittee

Radisson Hotel
Buffalo, New York
November 20, 1992

Participants: Charles Zafonte, Joel O'Connor, Paul Bertram, Trefor Reynoldson, Sally Lerner, Lester Milbrath, Samuel Sage, Sue Mihalyi, George Werezak, Barbara Knuth, Lois New, Marna Gadoua, and Reporter: Mary Ann Storr, Ecology & Environment, Inc.

Review of Meeting Agenda:

Topics covered at the meeting included a review and refinement of the indicators by EPA, Region II and Subcommittee reconsideration of individual indicators.

Discussion of Workshop Delay:

Paul Bertram and Trefor Reynoldson, Co-chairs of EOWG, and Charles Zafonte, Chief, Niagara Frontier Program Office of EPA, Region II, attended the meeting to clarify EOWG and individual agency roles in the development of indicators. Charles Zafonte explained that EPA, Region II had difficulty in understanding the usefulness of some of the stewardship indicators that were to be discussed at a November 1992 Stewardship Workshop. EPA, Region II, in consultation with Subcommittee members, attempted to clarify the indicators and explicitly describe their effect on decision making. The resulting indicator summary was distributed at the meeting (Lake Ontario Stewardship Indicators Under Development -- Nov. 1992).

Trefor Reynoldson questioned the wisdom of one agency interrupting the work of the subcommittee. Other subcommittees of the EOWG have held workshops to define indicators and had not encountered interference from any of the four parties. Trefor expressed concern that such circumstances could set a poor precedent.

Paul Bertram observed that stewardship is very difficult to define and that, while the managers have the utmost respect for the Stewardship Subcommittee, there is concern that time and effort might be spent on soliciting public input for measurements that may not be useable.

Charles Zafonte explained that before signing off on a grant, it is valid for managers to ensure that indicators measure something that managers can affect.

An open discussion ensued during which some Subcommittee members expressed concern that the public have input to Subcommittee work soon.

Paul Bertram attempted to clarify the situation by explaining that it is the responsibility of EOWG to review products of the Stewardship Subcommittee. In the past, each of the scientific subcommittees have held workshops, but they have sought expert input, not public input. In this case it may have seemed that public approval was being sought instead of gathering additional information. Paul Bertram suggested that an Advisory, not "Public," Workshop might help clarify that the Workshop is for advice and information, not approval.

The target date for the Advisory Workshop was set for sometime in April.

Review of Indicators:

Joel suggested reviewing indicator development for purposes of clarifying schedules and assessing needed resources. He also announced that Louise Knox' job has been redefined and expanded. Consequently, she will be needing someone in Environment Canada to help her with the first indicator, below.

1) Effectiveness of Interactions Among the Public, Industry, and Governments

A survey used for this indicator could be modified for use with other proposed indicators. The design and illustrative summary of the survey can be completed by December 1993 (S. Sage).

2) Toxics Inventory

Samuel Sage will work on this indicator. Samuel will concentrate on toxics inventory information. Information on reductions in toxics released will be derived from the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI). Samuel is hopeful that a draft report can be ready by March of 1993.

3) Corporate Volunteerism

George Werezak is working on this indicator of the numbers of corporate facilities which are/are not reducing emissions voluntarily. He feels confident that industry will be very cooperative in providing the information needed for the indicator.

George and Samuel work consult each other on the progress of indicators 2) and 3) to share possibly overlapping information.

4) Toxicant Loss from Manufactured Products

Joel indicated that this indicator is potentially valuable because, for most toxicants used in manufacturing, most of their mass seems to be lost in the environment through degradation of the manufactured product, not at the point of manufacture. The indicator would estimate this loss through product degradation. However, it is not clear how fully, or how reliably, these losses can be estimated. Joel is corresponding with investigators who claim the ability to estimate such toxicant losses. Joel is not

yet able to specify a schedule for the completion of this indicator, but suggests a two-stage development process: (1) fund a demonstration effort, for about \$10 K, providing (or not) convincing evidence that the indicator is feasible, and (2) seek EOWG support of the complete indicator. The feasibility analysis could be completed by March or April 1993 if support is promptly available.

5) Environmental Volunteerism by Public

The structure for this indicator would include the number of personnel hours donated, changes in personnel hours donated, and reasons for the increases or decreases in these hours. Consideration of proactive stewardship and reactive stewardship will be included in this indicator.

Population limiting is not to be an indicator, but regional summaries will be prepared to help interpret some indicators.

It was decided that development of Indicators #1, #2, and #4 would be pursued and that #3 would be investigated further.

Paul Bertram noted that stewardship is largely a volunteer effort. Any participants requiring support for development of indicators should submit requests to Trefor Reynoldson and Paul Bertram, who will in turn meet with Griff Sherbin and Charles Zafonte to discuss funding.

Review of Measurement of Stewardship Indicators:

Barbara Knuth gave a brief overview of the proposal, "Measurement of Stewardship Indicators in the Lake Ontario Ecosystem." She explained the four major components of the survey: 1) motivators, 2) intentions, 3) actions and behavior, and 4) barriers to stewardship. Examples of specific indicators that could be measured by either a percentile or mean score are also provided. Total cost of implementation of the survey is \$170,000.

The general consensus of the Subcommittee was that while this is an excellent proposal, its contributions to specific indicators must be explicit. Barbara was asked to break down the proposal and provide costs for development, definitions of indices, and outline a pilot test. In addition, Joel will send out copies of the proposal to the Subcommittee members not present at today's meeting and he will request that any comments or responses be submitted directly to Barbara by December 20, 1992.

Other Issues:

The next Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for January 7, 1993. [Note: the next meeting has been postponed to Monday, February 8, 10:00 - 3:00 at the Radisson Hotel, Buffalo]

DRAFT

MEETING SUMMARY

EOWG Stewardship Indicators Technical Subcommittee

Radisson Hotel
Buffalo, New York
February 8, 1993

Participants: Joel O'Connor, Ron Allan, Kevin Brady, Marna Gadoua, Barbara Knuth, Sue Mihayli, Lois New, Samuel Sage, George Werezak, Tim Yagley

Welcome:

Joel O'Connor welcomed the new members to the subcommittee and had everyone introduce themselves.

The minutes of the last (November 20, 1992) meeting were distributed. A comment was raised regarding the paragraph on the Toxics Inventory indicator. George Werezak did not agree that Corporate Volunteerism should be a subset of the Toxics Inventory indicator. Each of the two indicators should stand alone as they indicate entirely different things in different units. Also, the Corporate Volunteerism indicator will document the numbers of corporate facilities which are/are not reducing emissions voluntarily. The indicator will not quantify reductions in mass emissions, as implied in the November 20, 1992 Subcommittee Minutes and stated in the November 1992 summary of "Lake Ontario Stewardship Indicators Under Development." The November 20 Minutes and the summary will be changed to reflect George's clarifications.

It was also mentioned that increases in corporate volunteerism would not necessarily produce voluntary TRI-type data reporting in Canada. Corporate volunteerism is voluntary reduction of emissions of all types. (Note-expanded scope of this indicator, recorded later in the meeting, below.)

Several subcommittee members reported that they had not received the minutes of the last meeting. The minutes will not be formally approved until all have had an opportunity to review them. George Werezak's comments will be incorporated into the minutes and the minutes will be redistributed.

Meeting Location Discussion:

Several subcommittee members have expressed their desire to hold some subcommittee meetings in a location other than Buffalo. Toronto was suggested as an alternative location. Ron Allan and George Werezak offered their respective corporate facilities as meeting locations free of charge. Both have facilities near the Toronto airport. The question as to whether NYSDEC subcommittee members can travel out of New York state will have to be answered before meeting arrangements are made final.

Agenda Review:

The goals of the day's meeting were to review and refine the four indicators, plan the Stewardship Advisory Workshop, and develop a strategy for defining indicators based on Barbara Knuth's proposal. George, Ron, and Tim will meet separately during the day to further define aspects of the corporate volunteerism indicator.

Joel O'Connor expressed his concern that the subcommittee has been working a long time on developing indicators. We need to reach closure on the effort so that informative presentations can be prepared for the workshop and comments solicited. This will allow the Subcommittee to forward to EOWG our proposed indicators along with Barbara Knuth's proposal for conducting a survey. Each indicator developer(s) must be sure to include information on continuing responsibility for the indicator, a realistic schedule, and the resources necessary to accomplish the outlined work.

Review of Indicators:

Effectiveness Among Interactions Between the Public, Industry, and Government

This indicator, measuring the effectiveness of the public to get information from the government, the effectiveness of the government to get information from industry, etc., and barriers to those information transfers, is very closely linked to Barbara Knuth's proposal. Little has been done on this indicator since Louise Knox, one of its originators, transferred to another program.

At the last meeting, the subcommittee shifted the focus of the indicator to measuring people's perception of interactions. Various government programs have provisions for interaction, but it is unclear how accurately records of those interactions are maintained. An ongoing problem remains in attempting to clarify the cause of changes in the number of interactions. Are the changes because of frustration or satisfaction? Another influence on the number of interactions will be the timing of SPDES permit renewals.

By the end of the 1992, Samuel and Barbara will have concepts, qualifiers, and possible survey questions prepared for this indicator.

Several conditions or concerns were raised regarding the development of this indicator including:

1. Careful evaluation is needed to determine reliable sources of the interaction spot check information necessary to interpret survey results. Freedom of Information Requests (FOIAs) were suggested as a well documented source of interaction data in the U.S.
2. It seems appropriate to limit scope of interaction data to those programs related to the Great Lakes.
3. Care must be taken to not confuse number of inquiries with effectiveness of inquiries.

4. When evaluating FOIA data, reviewers should consider that as the public has become more environmentally aware, information requests have become more difficult to respond to because the public asks more difficult questions. If a decrease over time in effectiveness of FOIA requests is found, it might be due to a decreased number of staff available to fill requests.
5. The NYSDEC gauges interaction effectiveness not by the number of requests or individuals at hearings, but by the number of NYSDEC employees who are convinced as to the usefulness of interaction programs. Other information like the number of advisory groups or meetings is also not an accurate gauge of effectiveness since one well placed phone call might more effectively accomplish an exchange of information.
6. The Lakewide Management Plan (LAMP) is using a slightly different approach for gauging effectiveness of interaction. The public is divided into three categories. The involved public, the potentially involved public, and the uninvolved public. Effective interaction is assessed differently for each group. Effectiveness in the involved group is gauged by number of interactions and satisfaction with the interaction. This group is also tracked to estimate their overall activity. The potentially involved group effectiveness is gauged by an increase in transfer from the uninvolved group to this group. Effectiveness of interaction in the uninvolved group is gauged by the amount of information being made available to this group. This approach might be adapted for the indicator.
7. Old interaction data analysis may be time consuming and open to interpretation, but in order to make trend analysis, this information is necessary. All the indicators will have some caveats, the subcommittee will simply have to identify them up front. Even without hard numbers, we might be able to say that communication is better than it was before and perhaps that the rate of change is improving.
8. The indicator should address interactions in all programs, not just water quality programs. The ecosystem objectives were designed to address issues that were not covered with the chemical-by-chemical approach. If we limit the indicators, they will be a less effective tool. Even though it is a broad topic, the goal of the ecosystem objectives is an ecosystem that works, therefore, we must look at all parts of that ecosystem. This is especially important since the Lake Michigan effort is very closely mimicking the Lake Ontario effort. We must set a good standard.
9. The indicator should address interaction at different levels of government. From the last meeting, one might get the impression that the four parties are only interested in things on which they can have a direct influence, but if local programs are unsuccessful, there might be a way for the four parties to help change them. An indicator with good numbers might go a long way towards convincing the four parties where changes are needed.
10. An approach for determining what information will be used in the indicator might be to perform a pilot spot check effort using what information is available. Results of the

pilot effort could be brought back to the subcommittee for a review of information quality.

Samuel indicated that he would appreciate an letter of introduction from Joel regarding the subcommittee's tasks to assist him in obtaining information from various programs. Samuel also asked anyone with ideas on which data sets should be examined to get the information to him soon. A volunteer to help with locating comparable Canadian information will also be needed. Lois New suggested that Monroe Co. might be a good place to start looking for information since they have been very active with RAP work.

Toxics Inventory Indicator

This indicator poses fewer complications than some of the other suggested indicators. Ideally, the subcommittee would be able to work directly with an EPA computer specialist to access the TRI data. The real issues, aside from labor costs, are how to present the final results geographically (by lake?, by county?), and what assumptions to make about toxic equivalency. One pound of acetone released is not equal to one pound of benzene released and if data is totalled, then an equivalency statement would be necessary.

Five years of TRI data exist, however initial year data is not considered as good because threshold limits were different and reporting has improved. Since companies have made improvements in the past five years the data is still of some value and adding a measure of compliance with reporting requirements would make the first year data more useful.

Discussion of this indicator included:

1. Information on material transfer across state lines is available through TRI. Data on transfers could show what is leaving or coming into the watershed.
2. The indicator unit would be the pounds of all chemicals released per year (by county or by watershed depending on what the subcommittee decides). Information on out-of-state transfers may be reported in pounds over time and not by chemical. This will have to be clarified.
3. NPRI data from Canada should be similar to TRI data. Canada does, however, have a different threshold limit for reporting of 10,000 kg/year.
4. EPA published a report that said that reporting compliance for TRI was not very good. Atlantic States Legal Foundation, in its own research, has not found information to support this. Perhaps this caveat can be added to the indicator description. Since compliance has been better for larger companies from the beginning, it might be more useful to look at the information for the 100 largest companies over time.
5. It might be helpful to combine the TRI data with discharge permit information. Information for the Lake counties may be of greatest interest.

Samuel hopes to have the details of this indicator finalized by the end of March.

Corporate Volunteerism

A brief definition for this indicator might be the number of corporations/organizations that have a voluntary, publicly-announced emissions reduction program.

Issues discussed regarding this indicator included:

1. The issue of enactment of stricter regulations (thus making the reductions no longer voluntary) was mentioned:
 - * The indicator could track any reductions that go beyond the regulations. Even when the regulations have been significantly tightened, there will still be room for improvements.
 - * Even when more stringent regulations are passed, there is always a lag time before enforcement.
 - * Changes in regulations may make it difficult to evaluate trends over time.
 - * Are the regulations already strict enough in the U.S. that we should look at this only as an indicator for Canada?
2. The indicator should probably also include other initiatives like adopt-a-school programs, but guidelines would be needed to clearly define such projects. Many companies are also supporting projects such as habitat management and establishing preserves.
3. George does not have a mandate within his company to expend a lot of effort on this indicator. His goal is only to develop the parameters of the indicator. It will be up to EOWG to pick up the effort. The better the development however, the more compelling to EOWG. George would like the other industrial representatives to the subcommittee to assist him in further development of the indicator.
4. Trade associates might be a good source of information for this indicator, however, information is generally gathered corporation wide, not by facility. The 33/50 program could also yield information, but again, it is corporation wide.
5. Questions regarding corporate volunteerism could be added to the Stats Canada survey of manufacturers. The census bureau in the U.S. gathers similar information.

There was general agreement that definition of the indicator would be expanded to include voluntary corporate stewardship such as community outreach programs.

Discussion of Workshop:

Samuel Sage reported that little effort has been expended on the workshop since it was postponed. The purpose of the workshop is to solicit peer review from 25-40 people from either in or out of the basin to see if they feel the subcommittee is on the right track. The workshop will also allow an opportunity to hear about the efforts of the other subcommittees. The workshop, to be held in Buffalo, was originally designed with a one day pre-meeting for various agency and subcommittee members. Samuel feels that it would be better to have that meeting after the workshop so the subcommittee can assimilate the information received.

Invitees will include professionals working on indicator issues, government and non-government personnel, industry representatives, and anyone suggested who has an interest in environmental issues. The subcommittee's definition of stewardship and an introduction to all of the Great Lakes program will be presented to the invitees. Anyone with suggested invitees should provide that information to Samuel as soon as possible.

The workshop will be funded by EOWG with EPA money and some travel expenses will be covered by Environment Canada.

The workshop will be held May 13 and 14, 1993 at a location to be determined.

Next Meeting:

[Subsequent to this meeting, it has been necessary to replace the next planned meeting (March 31st in Toronto) with a conference call. Joel will be distributing an agenda for the March 31st conference call.]

Survey Discussion:

Barbara Knuth suggested that a conference call that includes the EOWG chairs should be organized to discuss the survey. During the call, the subcommittee must ascertain if there is financial support for a survey and explain to the EOWG chairs the linkages between the survey and several of the indicators including effectiveness of interaction, corporate and individual volunteerism. The call will also allow EOWG to tell the subcommittee if it thinks the survey proposal is on the right track.

Discussion regarding the survey included:

1. The list of indicators could be expanded to eight in order to include the four in Barbara's proposal and explain to EOWG that the survey serves all of the indicators. The perception and barrier indicators are especially interesting and should not be lost.
2. With EOWG approval, the subcommittee could also suggest performing a pilot scale survey before conducting a full-scale survey.
3. Because the Effectiveness of Interaction Indicator and Barbara's behavior indicator are