



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

**May 19-20, 2011
Hilton Garden Inn
815 14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005**

MEETING SUMMARY

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 2011

Welcome and Introductions

Mark Joyce, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Associate Director of the Office of Federal Advisory Committee Management and Outreach (OFACMO) and Acting Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT); James H. Johnson, Jr., NACEPT Chair; and Cynthia Jones-Jackson, EPA, Acting Director, OFACMO

Mr. Mark Joyce (EPA, OFACMO), Acting DFO, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m., welcomed the Council members and thanked them for their participation. He announced that Mr. Bob Perciasepe, EPA Deputy Administrator, and a number of other senior officials from the Agency would be speaking to the Council at this meeting. He then turned the meeting over to Dr. Johnson.

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr., (Howard University), NACEPT Chair, noted that it was the group's third meeting and the Council now has reached the point where it will have some more advice to submit to the EPA Administrator and senior staff for their evaluation. He expressed his gratitude to the members of NACEPT for their hard work between meetings, and thanked the guests for coming to share their knowledge with the Council so that a better product would result.

Cynthia Jones-Jackson, EPA, Acting Director, OFACMO welcomed the members of NACEPT and thanked them for the work they had done up to that point. She also thanked the workgroup leaders for their leadership role in the Council's endeavors. She extended a welcome to Mr. Perciasepe, and recognized other senior leaders who would be speaking to the Council, including Dr. Paul Anastas (Science Advisor and Assistant Administrator, EPA Office of Research and Development [ORD]), Ms. Nanci E. Gelb, (Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, EPA Office of Administration and Resources Management [OARM]), Mr. Raul Soto, Jr. (Associate Assistant Administrator, Outreach, Diversity and Collaboration, EPA OARM), Mr. James W. Newsom (Assistant Regional Administrator for Policy and Management, EPA Region 3), and Mr. Rafael DeLeon (Director, EPA Office of Civil Rights). She then reviewed the day's agenda, and introduced Mr. Perciasepe.

Opening Remarks

Bob Perciasepe, EPA Deputy Administrator

Mr. Perciasepe thanked NACEPT for inviting him to speak and for the work conducted by the Council. Copies of the EPA 2011- 2015 Strategic Plan were distributed to the members, and he noted that NACEPT had offered advice on earlier materials that went into the plan. EPA is trying something new

with this Strategic Plan; one of the new ideas in the plan is called cross-cutting strategies. EPA has statutory and Constitutional responsibility to be responsive to the laws of the U.S. Congress that the Agency must implement, such as the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. The laws that give EPA the authority to act to protect human health and the environment have led to the concept of “stovepiping.” For example, there is a long “to do” list from Congress that must be done to clean up the Nation’s air. A similar “to do” list exists for cleaning up our Nation’s water. Commonalities exist across these different areas of expertise, however, so instead of a strategic plan that addresses only clean air and water, for example, this plan also identifies important cross-cutting strategies. This is the first time EPA has attempted this; NACEPT noted in its comments that the concept was not quite fleshed out, but EPA will continue to develop these concepts and make them more vibrant. Mr. Perciasepe noted that some concepts in the cross-cutting strategies are Agency priorities and align with NACEPT’s charges. One such concept is environmental justice (EJ). EPA’s work is not confined to headquarters, and nowhere is that more important than in EJ. EPA has the capacity to be in communities and bring the public into the work conducted by the Agency. EPA is required by law to conduct a public process, but the Agency is not limited in how to accomplish this. EPA could, for example, hold public meetings in the evening at a local elementary school, versus conducting the meetings during regular business hours. EPA must determine how to reach out effectively to these communities, and technology and how EPA uses technology plays an important role. The “digital gap” is narrowing and the EPA Administrator is now using blogs and Twitter to communicate with the public.

There are 13 EJ screening tools that are used to determine which communities are overburdened. They have many similar characteristics, so EPA is working to determine which are best and have these serve as the baseline. Even at the permit level, the Agency must have some consistency when deciding what will be done in a geographic area.

NACEPT’s first advice letter on strengthening the Agency’s workforce outlined some of the challenges EPA is facing in this area. The issues of science and technical competencies must be addressed, as must embracing the workforce and building mechanisms that allow it to evolve and strengthen. Administrator Lisa Jackson could not be at this meeting because she is with President Obama this morning presenting awards for excellence in math and science. Pursuit of the fields of math and science is important to EPA, and the Agency is trying to do more to build enthusiasm for EPA’s mission so that hiring managers are presented with a diverse pool of qualified, talented candidates. EPA is looking forward to NACEPT’s input on this issue.

Other workforce issues are more difficult to address. For example, how can the quality of life at EPA be improved? The 17,000 employees at EPA work hard, and the environment in which they work should be one that promotes enthusiasm for accomplishing the Agency’s mission, is supportive of their professional goals, and offers rewarding experiences. Despite the fact that EPA is facing some difficult times in terms of budget constraints the Agency has done some remarkable work. During a recent town hall meeting, the Administrator announced an additional thrust for the quality of life at EPA under the broad rubric of continuing to make EPA one of the best places to work in the Federal Government. This policy is based on three pillars. The first pillar is creating a supportive work environment, and one way to accomplish this will be through simpler business systems. More flexibility also is important. EPA needs to change its mindset to recognize that teleworking is not a benefit, but a workforce efficiency tool. The second pillar is professional development. When a new employee comes to EPA, the Agency could reach out to the employee to include him/her in brainstorming sessions or social events, rather than focusing on completing the paperwork. EPA is working on a “universal welcoming package” that will help new employees to learn their role, and where they fit in the Agency. By building on some of the self-started entities such as the Emerging Leaders Network, the Agency can ensure that employee welcomes are more interactive and career building. The final pillar is benefits and amenities. EPA wants to better share information through a directory of expertise in the Agency. The Emerging Leaders Network already has brainstorming sessions that cut across different disciplines. EPA also tries to encourage employees to use fitness programs, which leads a better balance of work and life. Most EPA facilities have some access to

physical fitness facilities, and the Agency wants to make sure its employees are aware of these and other amenities.

The “One EPA” concept is building a new culture of thinking within the Agency. EPA’s senior career leaders have put forward a set of principles that are distributed to everyone in the Agency. These principles are:

1. Being outcome-oriented so day-to-day actions are connected with extraordinary outcomes.
2. Aligning efforts so EPA develops a shared understanding of its challenges and the solutions that can help to confront them.
3. Maintaining strong and collaborative relationships inside and outside the Agency based on effective communication and mutual respect.
4. Seeking diverse views and tools that build in creative integrated solutions to support an inclusive environment.
5. Delivering on the promise to the public and each other and EPA’s mission by feeling ownership of the Agency as a whole.

This last principle is the most powerful. Feeling ownership of the Agency creates a different way of thinking about daily work, and it is empowering to think that, as an employee, one has a “piece of the action” of the Agency as a whole. Mr. Perciasepe thanked NACEPT for its work; the Council’s first letters have helped to mold the strategic plan and the kind of workforce that EPA needs.

Discussion

Ms. Ella Filippone (Passaic River Coalition), NACEPT member, asked for a copy of the “One EPA” principles. Mr. Perciasepe responded that they were posted on the EPA intranet, but could be shared with the group.

Ms. Arleen O’Donnell (Eastern Research Group, Inc.), NACEPT member, asked Mr. Perciasepe to discuss the major impacts of the budget reductions on EPA. He responded that EPA’s budget was \$8.6 billion of the \$3 trillion federal budget. He stressed that EPA understands that it has to be part of dealing with the reality of the deficit. Belt-tightening at EPA is in order. Under President Obama’s first term, EPA’s budget saw its highest level ever in pure dollars; a big part of that increase was the infrastructure programs and ensuring that grant programs to the states were robust. The increase did not amount to a large growth in the Agency’s operating budget. Additional money was put into the State Revolving Fund (SRF). These are funds provided to state banks for low interest loans and for loan forgiveness. The argument could be made that EPA could reduce its spending, but it should be noted that the Agency is trying to maintain an increase in state grant funds. States have been hit very hard, and they must operate without a deficit. In the operating plan for the 2011 budget, EPA switched some funds around so that it could increase funding for state and tribal grants.

With respect to its operating budget, EPA is on the brink. The Agency has 1,500 fewer full-time equivalents (FTE) than it did 10 years ago. With state reductions and EPA’s lack of growth, it will be difficult for the Agency to maintain the same kinds and level of oversight. EPA will constrain how turnover is conducted in the workforce, and will be examining travel, contracting, and different programs to maximize cost savings. EPA also will take a hard look to identify and eliminate duplication of effort throughout the Agency. EPA will be forced to increase efficiency. Simplifying the lives of its workers and reducing the complexity in the work place can have a financial benefit by increasing worker productivity. Mr. Perciasepe closed by stating that our Nation’s environmental protection system relies on careful orchestration among state authorities, state resources, federal authorities, and federal resources.

Overview of NACEPT's Second Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning: *Strategies to Obtain and Retain Scientific and Technical Expertise and Leadership Capabilities and Culture for "One EPA"*

Howard Learner and Sara Kendall, NACEPT Workforce Workgroup Co-Chairs

Paul T. Anastas, Science Advisor and Assistant Administrator, EPA ORD

Nanci E. Gelb, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, EPA OARM

Raul Soto, Jr., Associate Assistant Administrator, Outreach, Diversity and Collaboration, EPA OARM

James W. Newsom, Assistant Regional Administrator for Policy and Management, EPA Region 3

Dr. Johnson introduced the panel and invited Mr. Howard Learner (Environmental Law and Policy Center), NACEPT Vice-Chair, and Ms. Sara Kendall (Weyerhaeuser Company), NACEPT member, to present first. Ms. Kendall noted that Mr. Learner had compiled all of the input to the letter. When the workforce workgroup convened in January to look at its charge, the workgroup's efforts were consolidated into four topical areas: (1) identifying EPA's options for recruiting scientific and technical talent; (2) developing recommendations for developing diverse scientific and technical talent; (3) trying to achieve the "One EPA" culture; and (4) identifying recommendations for developing both the mission critical skills and mission critical talent and diversity building into EPA leadership.

The workgroup held a series of conference calls with helpful EPA staff to discuss what has been done in each of these four areas. Much material was available to the workgroup to research and synthesize, and it became clear that it was too much to handle in a thoughtful and intelligent way. The workgroup made the decision to start with the first charge on how to recruit, hire, and retain the needed scientific and technical talent, and how to achieve the "One EPA" culture. The second advice letter reflects that division of duties based on the two topics. The workgroup also recruited some additional help, Mr. Effenus Henderson, the Chief Diversity Officer at Weyerhaeuser Company. The workgroup will focus a third letter on diversity and leadership. The third letter may include an integrating piece to tie the four areas together, or that will be addressed as a separate letter, to round out the whole year's work. Mr. Learner will discuss the two topics in the letter and the workgroup's recommendations.

Mr. Learner said that the workgroup's goal was to do a good job addressing two pieces of the charge. The framework and charge by topic are laid out on the first page of the letter. Strategies for the Agency to conduct recruitment and hiring and retention are addressed first, followed by a set of overall recommendations. This is followed by the One EPA issue and another set of recommendations. He acknowledged that because none of the workgroup members actually worked at EPA, the letter probably missed some of the complexities of working at the Agency on a daily basis. He explained that the workgroup is "parachuting in" and hopes that the members have done their homework so that the advice makes sense to EPA. Advisory councils are designed to provide advice, and EPA can choose to take that advice when it makes sense and reject it if it does not. Mr. Learner also pointed out that the workgroup was not composed of management and human resource (HR) consultants, but of people who have experience dealing with similar problems and situations in their own businesses, nonprofit organizations, or academic institutions on a day-to-day basis.

Pages 2-5 of the letter include some comments and charts, and some discussion of the hiring process. Universities are churning out a lot of scientific and technical talent, and this talent is readily available because of the downturn in the economy. Pages 5-7 deal with recruitment, including comments about ways in which it works well and ways in which it could be accelerated. Even if one looks at the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) standards, hiring at EPA is slower than it could be. As a result, the Agency risks losing some of the people it would like to hire. Pages 7-10 of the letter address employee retention. The Agency's attrition rate is not that high when compared to other complex agencies. EPA is known as a good place to work according to the results of the 2010 employee viewpoint survey and several outside surveys, and employee reactions are favorable. The single best way for the Agency to retain the individuals it wants to retain is for the employees to be aligned with the EPA mission. That

finding leads to the set of recommendations on pages 10-11 of the letter. Some recommendations are very specific; the workgroup's goal was offer specific ideas and identify specific opportunities rather than provide sweeping broad recommendations. Page 12 transitions into the section on "One EPA." The first several pages contain commentary on the value of "One EPA," and the challenges of its implementation. Cross-media approaches are discussed, but the statutes under which the Agency operates are media specific (for air, water, or other single media). Pages 14-15 of the letter contain fairly specific recommendations related to achieving the "One EPA" culture. He noted that other NACEPT members may have some suggestions.

Dr. Johnson explained that the NACEPT members would have an opportunity to discuss and provide input on the letter later in the day. The panel would speak next, and offer input to the workgroup and Council. NACEPT members then can seek clarification from the panel or pose specific questions.

Mr. James Newsom thought the letter had hit the mark, and stated that his remarks would focus on the work and challenges of the EPA regions. The primary hiring mechanism for the 10 regions (approximately half of EPA) over the last 4 to 5 years has been the Federal Careers Intern Program (FCIP). That recruiting mechanism allowed EPA to address all of its entry grade needs regardless of the disciplines or skills needed. The diversity pool was enormous. More focused recruiting could be conducted as required; about 30 people per year were brought into the Agency through this program. They were organized as classes to help them develop relationships with each other and to develop an identity in the organization. That authority, however, is no longer available to the Federal Government because the FCIP has been cancelled. Now, the Agency uses delegated examining authority, and the regions have had to redesign the way it recruits for specific positions. Every job at EPA, aside from some student positions, is filled through the USAJOBS website. For most of these jobs, only the first 50 applicants are accepted for consideration. To ensure that qualified candidates apply, region staff attend job fairs to provide job seekers advice on how to apply for EPA jobs through the website.

In terms of the advice letter, he suggested that the workgroup might want to look at how the hiring process has changed with the elimination of the FCIP. He also proposed that the workgroup consider how to address some of the problems associated with the current electronic employment opportunity system through the USAJOBS website. Ms. Kendall responded that the workgroup had learned about the impact of losing the FCIP; particularly, how its elimination has resulted in a loss of diversity. Therefore, it will be covered in the third advice letter.

Dr. Paul Anastas commented that the Agency has benefitted from taking NACEPT's advice in the past. When EPA looks across the current state of its scientific and technical workforce, it is important to recognize that the second letter is inextricably linked to the first. Because EPA is doing excellent work does not mean that it is working on the right things. EPA has a tremendous amount to be proud of, and tremendous advances have been made. A point in the first letter, however, is that different skills and perspectives are needed. The charts in the letter indicate that there are plenty of scientists and engineers graduating from our universities, but environmental challenges are changing and science is evolving. Therefore, we may not be asking the right question. Right now, EPA has a workforce that has been in place for decades, but almost all are single discipline scientists trained in reductionism. The integrated systems thinking that is needed today, will require some hard thinking about the future workforce. This challenge will not be met simply by determining how many scientists and engineers are out there. EPA needs to be more effective and efficient. By including these integrated transdisciplinary systems thinkers on the workforce, the Agency can have greater impact and achieve greater cross-cutting goals and be more effective in each of the goals, rather than continue doing what it has done for the past 40 years more efficiently. What type of individuals and tools are needed to advance excellence, efficiency, and effectiveness? What are the constraints?

Looking specifically at ORD, the workforce is not diverse. This is an ongoing challenge, and it is not due to lack of focus. In addition to the systems issues, the Agency also needs to focus on how it can continue

to do a better job to bring in employees that increase EPA's diversity for the long term. Regarding "One EPA," the single biggest advantage that EPA has in recruiting and retaining excellence is its mission. The more employees understand their impact on achieving our mission, the greater their commitment. It is a disservice to the Agency and to its employees when they cannot see how their work plays a role in achieving the EPA mission. Dr. Anastas stated that he chairs the Agency's Science and Technology Policy Council (STPC), which cuts across EPA. One of the STPC's goals is to show people how all of these pieces come together to address the broader goals of EPA. The Agency will have a pressing need to bring in people at the higher levels as well. That is something that this group may wish to discuss further in its advice letters. There are other mechanisms beyond permanent hires, such as the Title 42 authority to bring in expert contractors. Did the workgroup identify any commonalities or best practices in its research? In closing his comments, Dr. Anastas noted that *The Scientist* magazine, based in the United Kingdom, listed best places for postdoctoral candidates to work. Of the 100 institutions that were ranked, EPA came in 12th. He thanked NACEPT for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Learner asked how to best recruit the sort of multidisciplinary science and technical candidates coming out of graduate schools. Dr. Anastas responded that only a few university programs produce such candidates, and EPA looks to those institutions for recruiting.

Dr. Daniel Kammen (University of California, Berkeley), NACEPT member, indicated that he currently serves as the Chief Technical Specialist for Renewable Energy at the World Bank, which is similar in size to EPA. He thought Dr. Anastas' comments about the systems approach and the need to hire individuals with varied skills touched on two key aspects. He thought the need areas identified and the comments and recommendations in the letter did not match up. There needs to be a process for identifying the future directions of EPA and for nurturing new scientists with the required knowledge areas. Dr. Kammen introduced his Ph.D. student, Ryan Shelby, who is studying mechanical engineering but also working with tribes in California. Dr. Kammen said that he was not certain of how to encourage students at the Ph.D. level to take the kinds of risks needed so that they graduate with the transdisciplinary strength and systems thinking that EPA is seeking. Knowledge of past protocol does not generate diversity or new thinking.

Ms. Vivian Loftness (Carnegie Mellon University), NACEPT member, asked to what extent does the workforce letter need to deal with the statement that transdisciplinary and systems thinking are needed, and she asked what EPA is doing to address this need. Dr. Anastas responded that it would be excellent to have the letter state that explicitly. The last time he spoke to NACEPT, he talked about the way this approach could be institutionalized. The way the scientific and technological foundations have been realigned across the Agency means that ORD works with programs and regions. Cross-disciplinary, cross-life cycle approaches are used. EPA is looking at formulating its scientific questions, approaches, and solutions in the systems perspective, so that it moves away from the old fragmented approach. Although EPA will never be finished, because that is what agility looks like, the Agency already is taking this approach.

Dr. Olufemi Osidele (Southwest Research Institute), NACEPT member, stated that Dr. Anastas had discussed system skills being acquired on the job. When recruiting, EPA advertises for a programmer, for example. How does the interviewer determine if a candidate has a systems attitude? Dr. Anastas replied that it was a great question and it is quite a challenge. Some of the best systems thinkers at the Agency now were not trained formally in systems thinking. Understanding the person's ability to think more broadly is critical. EPA must make it clear to the hiring managers that they need to ask the right questions in the interview process to glean this information.

Ms. Nanci Gelb expressed her gratitude for the draft letter. She is very passionate about bringing energy and challenge into the workforce. She echoed the earlier statements that EPA is a great place to work. Many of the people who are leaving are doing so because they have reached retirement age. EPA will do its very best to make the Agency a better place to work and to bring in new energy, but EPA also needs to

bring in senior people who have perspective on new work environments. She noted that any advice NACEPT could provide on how to bring in more seasoned people with the needed perspective would be appreciated.

Ms. Gelb then addressed the 80-day standard that OPM established for hiring. Although EPA wants to make its hiring process more efficient, this has been a challenge. EPA's hiring process appears to take much longer than some other federal agencies, but there are steps along the way where other agencies are stopping the clock and EPA is not. She looks forward to receiving NACEPT's advice on how to recruit people who are systems thinkers, have the competency to learn and grow, and have the foresight to see emerging issues. She noted that the government used to have a training and recruitment program called Presidential Fellows, which was an excellent way to cull out graduate students who had some of those skills and traits. Ms. Gelb also stated that EPA needs to figure out ways to provide opportunities and growth for newer employees through which they can interact with and be exposed to more senior decision makers.

Mr. Raul Soto thanked Dr. Johnson for the opportunity to speak to NACEPT. Since he last spoke to the Council, he has been able to work side-by-side with many committed individuals in the Agency. There are many passionate and committed individuals at EPA, but unfortunately, sometimes it is the system that constrains their ability to affect change. The questions posed in the electronic recruiting process can lead down a certain path in terms of skill sets, and that may not be the direction that you want to go. Who determined these questions and how can we be sure that these questions are valid? He sees an opportunity for EPA to enhance its skill set and competency through effective succession planning.

EPA needs to engage middle managers so that they understand that succession planning and recruiting a qualified, competent workforce is part of their responsibilities, an important aspect of the Agency's current mission, and critical for the future of EPA. The Agency has been analyzing its hiring and other data, and has developed a comprehensive database containing information on hiring, awards, and so on. He noted that the Department of Defense has reached out to private organizations for an information technology (IT) swap, and this public-private sector nexus is something EPA could explore. The Agency has data on the applicant pool, but does not maintain data on how many people actually apply for an opening. Mr. Soto noted that outreach is only effective if the Agency is reaching out to the right people at the right times. He mentioned that 43 percent of the EPA workforce is hired on the basis of technical prowess. There should be distinct recruitment campaigns for three strata: entry level, middle management, and senior leadership. Pipelines for candidates must be developed to recruit from many different organizations. In addition, to increase diversity, EPA needs to move away from focusing recruitment efforts on single minority academic institutions. The Agency needs to develop stronger relationships with consortia of minority academic institutions to leverage and optimize its resources.

Discussion

Mr. Learner thanked the members of the panel for their comments.

Dr. DeWitt John (Bowdoin College), NACEPT member, stated that the systems with which EPA must work in carrying out its mission include people, organizations, communities, and businesses. Does EPA look for people who are social scientists who understand how people work, but have adequate training in the sciences to work closely with scientists? Mr. Newsom commented that there is a difference between the skills needed for ORD headquarters and the regions. Regional employees are in the field conducting compliance inspections, and they are out working with community groups at night. The regions would not seek history majors, for example, but they do look for people who have good skills in communication and collaboration. The Agency does hire public affairs specialists, and those who know how to communicate with communities. EPA is trying to make that an element of the interview process. He noted that a divergence of need exists between policy and regulation writing as it relates to inspections, particularly in the area of community outreach. Ms. Gelb added that history majors, for example, may not necessarily be

a good fit for the field and laboratory work conducted by EPA. Across the Agency, however, EPA does look for people who can write, analyze, and communicate effectively.

Mr. Kurt Erichsen (Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments), NACEPT member, responded to Mr. Newsom's comments about depending on the USAJOBS website for recruiting. Does use of USAJOBS have any impact, positive or negative, on the diversity of the applicants? Mr. Newsom replied that it is difficult to determine if there has been any effort to increase diversity when using the electronic process. When there is focused recruiting, specific efforts are made to include diverse candidates. With electronic recruiting, he may only interview 20 out of 100 applicants, and he has no data on the others who applied. Mr. Newsom stated that more veterans now are applying for positions, and there appears to be more diversity among that pool than in the past. Mr. Soto added that hiring authority is a big issue when EPA is compared to other organizations; it can be disheartening when others can hire on sight. He believes that the dependence on USAJOBS for hiring will have an impact on diversity, although it will take some time for it to be documented. The question is what can the Agency do about it now to prevent the negative impact.

Ms. Erica Bannerman (City of Alexandria), NACEPT member, commented to Ms. Gelb that she had spoken with Dr. Noha Gaber, who is the founder of the Emerging Leader Network. Dr. Gaber indicated that she is enthusiastic about addressing workforce issues.

Mr. Clayton Matt (Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes), NACEPT member, asked what the Agency is doing to recruit candidates from small communities. He has not observed efforts to reach out to small schools in small communities. Mr. Soto responded that many of those efforts are being handled by the regions, as are many of the tribal outreach efforts. The Executive Order on community colleges that was issued late last year emboldened EPA to reach out, particularly to Hispanics, 50 percent of whom go to 2-year colleges before they receive their degree from 4-year institutions. Mr. Soto's group is working with the Office of International Tribal Affairs to develop a comprehensive outreach strategy for the tribal partners. He was at Haskell University recently as part of a consortium effort discussing potential opportunities. Mr. Newsom added that the Administrator's office has an interest in improving EPA's relationships with minority institutions. His region has a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with five of the 11 historically black colleges in his region. These MOUs range from providing grant money to assisting in starting environmental programs at the colleges. These colleges are in need of money, and EPA's inability to provide it often gets in the way of collaboration. He also is using the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, through which the Federal Government can work with academia. The human resources officer in Region 3 also is a professor at Lincoln University, and he is working on creating a human resources program. Mr. Soto added that in October 2010, EPA provided significant funding to historically black colleges through Region 4 to develop an environmental curriculum. Additionally, last fall, EPA officially launched the eco-ambassadors program, which has three pillars: the on-campus component, tribal component, and EJ component.

Dr. Johnson thanked the panelists for their participation.

Discussion of NACEPT's Third Workforce Advice Letter on Achieving Greater Diversity in EPA

Overview and Initial Thoughts on NACEPT Diversity Charge

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

Mr. Effenus Henderson, Diversity Consultant to the NACEPT Workforce Workgroup

Dr. Johnson noted that there are vacancies on the workforce diversity team, because the current team lacks diversity. He introduced Mr. Effenus Henderson (Weyerhaeuser Company), consultant to the NACEPT workforce workgroup on diversity issues. He has prepared a draft document for discussion that will form the basis of the workgroup's third letter. Recommendations will be made on the definition of

diversity, the methods of tracking diversity, and advocacy for diversity. The letter should be completed in 2011.

Mr. Henderson commented that it was an honor and privilege to be working with NACEPT. He noted that diversity of inclusion is a significant issue for the Agency because EPA engages not only employees but a diverse set of stakeholders. He heard comments earlier that, as a mission-driven organization, it is important to attract people to the Agency's mission. EPA needs to consider who currently is not at the table but should be. Mr. Henderson has found that people define diversity very differently and there is a significant degree of difference in how people define the concept of inclusion. In simple terms, diversity is the mix all employees bring to the organization, and includes the diversity of thinking styles, organizations, and backgrounds. Inclusion is how to make the broad richness of difference come together. To shape the work of this particular area, it must be considered from an overall Agency systems point of view. (Note: This presentation will be continued after Ms. Barbara Bennett's remarks.)

Overview of FY 2011-2015 Strategic Plan

Barbara J. Bennett, EPA Chief Financial Officer

Dr. Johnson stated that NACEPT had provided comments on the draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-2015 Strategic Plan. Ms. Bennett explained that, at the previous meeting, she could not go into much detail about the plan because it was a draft; she was pleased to be able to discuss it now, along with how NACEPT's comments were taken into consideration. The approach for the Strategic Plan (SP) was to try to simplify it and make it more meaningful. To focus the Agency's efforts and priorities, EPA wanted to streamline the SP and focus on the most important issues.

The SP starts with the Administrator's priorities and core values to ensure that the SP could set Agency direction and would be used as a management tool. A top-down, policy-driven approach was taken, rather than the historical bottom-up approach. The goal of streamlining an executive plan was met. The SP itself serves as the blueprint for how EPA will focus its work. The plan has five goals, which are similar to past goals, but amended based on the Administrator's priorities and comments, including those from NACEPT. The goals are: (1) taking action on climate change and improving air quality; (2) protecting America's waters; (3) cleaning up communities and advancing sustainable development; (4) ensuring the safety of chemicals and preventing pollution; and (5) enforcing environmental laws. A major change in this SP was the inclusion of cross-cutting fundamental strategies: expanding the conversation on environmentalism; working for EJ and children's health; advancing science, research and technological innovation; strengthening state, tribal and international partnerships; and strengthening EPA's workforce and capabilities. EPA was able to streamline the SP's strategic measures by approximately 40 percent. The cross-cutting fundamental strategies are about changing the way EPA works, and are supported by annual action plans.

A key component of the plan was public comment, and nearly 500 comments were received through the www.regulations.gov website. The commenters included states, tribes, local governments, businesses, public interest groups, the federal agencies, academia, and individuals.

EPA had posed specific questions to NACEPT for comments on the draft plan: Do the draft SP's goals effectively advance achieving the Administrator's priorities and EPA's statutory mission outcomes? Do the cross-cutting fundamental strategies improve the way that EPA carries out its mission?

NACEPT's response was on target and quite helpful to Ms. Bennett's office and to the program offices with which the full responses were shared. In particular, she appreciated the confirmation of the priorities and the plan's overall focus. On addressing the challenges of the state budget crises, EPA is continuing to deal with the issue. EPA addressed how the budget challenges potentially affect the ability to achieve its goals but the SP is limited in what it can say about resource constraints. In addressing NACEPT's comment on articulating means for achieving cross-cutting fundamental strategy visions and principles,

the intention is for the SP to articulate a 5-year vision with accompanying principles for achieving each of the visions. EPA tightened the introductory language to include specific wording about developing annual action plans. The five FY 2011 action plans are posted on EPA's website, and are meant to evolve each year. Expanding the scope of the goal "cleaning up our communities" based on NACEPT's comments to emphasize the broader goals of land preservation and restoration, led to the goal title "cleaning up our communities and advancing sustainable development." On integrating climate change, EPA acknowledged NACEPT's comments related to greenhouse gas activities and the perspective on the relative priorities, which stated that the first two bullets in goal 1 were not the highest priorities, but near-term goals, and the initial order was kept. A group of climate analysts at the Agency developed new cross-Agency adaptation and mitigation measures for this SP. In terms of integrating EJ and children's health in achieving EPA goals, these are Administrator priorities. There is a cross-cutting fundamental strategy specific to EJ and children's health, which stresses their importance. Lastly, on NACEPT's comment on utilizing environmental education as a tool, EPA does not specifically identify environmental education as a program in the SP, but outreach and education are discussed in the indoor air work section of the goal 1 chapter. EPA also deliberately added a principle to the environmentalism strategy that focused on educating and empowering individuals and Agency partners. Ms. Bennett thanked NACEPT for its comments, and though all were not incorporated, the key items were addressed.

EPA is attempting to refocus the performance management aspect of the Agency. EPA gives equal weight to the programmatic (what EPA does) and cross-cutting fundamental strategies (how EPA does it). Strategic planning leads to annual planning and budgeting, which lead to operations and executions, which lead to results measurement, reporting, and accountability. The latter is fed back into strategic planning. Using the programmatic example "protect and restore watersheds and aquatic ecosystems", the longer term SP involves the strategic goal "protecting America's waters", and the strategic measure to, by 2015, attain water quality standards for all pollutants and impairments in identified water bodies. The annual budget measure involves the number of total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) established or approved by EPA, and the internal operational measure captures regional and state contributions to the number of TMDLs established or approved by EPA. Progress, or examples of activities discussed at senior-level meetings could include number of TMDLs approved, backlogs and challenges, stakeholder input, and specific geographic water body issues. An example of a cross-cutting fundamental strategy, "working for EJ and children's health," also was included in the presentation. Because cross-cutting strategies are a new component to the SP, EPA needed to ensure they were elevated to the same level as programmatic issues.

Dr. Johnson posited that EPA has merged the programmatic and strategic cross-cutting principles together such that what EPA does and how EPA does it could be put into one annual review. Ms. Bennett responded that this was discussed during the conversations and check-ins. That is part of the process in the review.

Ms. Kendall mentioned that there had been much discussion about the need for systems thinking at EPA, and that also is connected to the cultural change Mr. Perciasepe is helping to lead through "One EPA." These management metrics in the SP drill down to a level of specificity that has to go back to the media/silo from which they come. How can both objectives be accomplished? Ms. Bennett replied that cross-cutting fundamental strategies are supposed to be cross-cutting, and although the goals look more media specific, EPA has tried to incorporate multi-silo elements. EPA wants elevating fundamental strategies to pervade the Agency. Individual cross-cutting strategies also will incorporate performance reviews. The strategies are supposed to evolve each year, whereas the goals have more budget framework associated with them. EPA did not want to tie the strategies to the budget dollars. Ms. Bennett, Mr. Perciasepe, and the Program Manager will meet three times each year: one meeting will be goal specific and one will be strategy specific.

Mr. Learner commented that when the advice letter was written, NACEPT was painfully aware of the state budget crises. The situation is even more challenging today in terms of states being able to complete

their historical responsibilities. Additionally, he complimented the Agency for using the prism of children's health for overall chemical management. EPA's approach seemed somewhat cross-cutting there, but not on the air or water side, and that is key. Ms. Bennett answered that only one example had been presented. The annual action plan has an example from each. Mr. Learner thanked her for her work.

Ms. O'Donnell noted that the SP looked good, and appreciated that it had been streamlined. On page 48, increasing wetlands in the United States, and in particular coastal wetlands, is mentioned. She hoped that some numbers can be spliced out, and asked where the progress toward these goals will be reflected. NACEPT has commented in the past that there should be a strong link between SPs and the Report on the Environment. How can EPA ensure that some of the important details are not lost in the report? Ms. Bennett responded that EPA took into account the Report on the Environment when developing the SP.

Dr. Karl Benedict (University of New Mexico), NACEPT member, mentioned the SP's emphasis on working with stakeholder communities and increasing interaction with external research. He did not see any strategic measures related to improving access to data being generated as they are generated by sensor systems or observation systems, or measures that would track progress toward being able to deliver data and information to those communities. Ms. Bennett replied that Cynthia Giles wants to continue electronic reporting, and it was made a highlighted item in the 2012 budget, but because there were seven measures in place, not all are mentioned. It may not be specifically identified, but will be incorporated in the future. EPA agrees with making data available and continuing to be more transparent. Mr. Newsom commented that much of the data used is generated in the states. There are 12 priority data flows that cross all of the EPA media, but there are major gaps. In the past month, Mr. Perciasepe issued a memorandum to the Assistant and Regional Administrators stating that filling data gaps is a priority.

Dr. Marian Chertow (Yale University), NACEPT member, asked about the mix of complexity and bureaucracy inherent in working at EPA. When is this issue discussed at senior-level meetings? Ms. Bennett responded that in the past year, EPA has spent significant time on program updates. There was not a consistent mechanism for discussion. EPA put together the SP at the same time it was developing the annual action plans for the strategies. To set the new framework for going forward, the Agency set key performance indicators (KPIs) (previously senior management measures were used). The KPIs indicate which measures are working. EPA determined KPIs for each goal and strategy and ensured that they were given equal weight. KPIs will be first order of business at meetings. Mr. Barry Worthington (United States Energy Association), NACEPT member, noted that with the cross-cutting fundamental strategies, EPA should consider the thread of diversity in each of them. For example, the Agency needs to build relationships to increase the diversity of those involved in the conversation on environmentalism. With respect to EJ and children's health, the majority of children in America will be of color in the future, making diversity an important aspect of this area as well. Ms. Bennett agreed, and thanked Mr. Worthington for the comments.

In closing, Ms. Bennett stated that technology is a key element of EPA's regulatory strategy. EPA is working on existing rules that may benefit from new technologies, and looking for real technology opportunities to inform options for new regulatory frameworks. EPA is working with federal partners to accelerate environmental technology clusters. For example, in January, EPA announced the Water Technology Innovation Cluster in partnership with the Small Business Administration among others. EPA also is working with the Department of Commerce to support the i6 Green Challenge, a \$12 million competition in which winning teams will receive funds to drive technology commercialization. Finally, EPA is working to broaden the conversation on environmental technology innovation, starting with a water technology workshop to be held on May 23, 2011. She thanked NACEPT for its continued engagement, noting that workforce issues will be a key component for EPA going forward.

Discussion of NACEPT's Third Workforce Advice Letter on Achieving Greater Diversity in EPA (Continued)

Overview and Initial Thoughts on NACEPT Diversity Charge

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

Mr. Effenus Henderson, NACEPT Workforce Diversity Co-Lead

Mr. Henderson noted that a diverse workforce was not enough; it must be leveraged to achieve organizational outcomes and goals. The workgroup would like to examine how diversity and inclusion align with the SP. The workgroup is finding that more inclusive leaders are needed, and the circle of influence must be expanded. The question is how to shape the behavior of leaders in such a way that employees are engaged to optimize outcomes outlined in the SP. Regarding data and reporting, as EPA examines information such as a telephone survey or attrition report, it should note the significant variations in terms of how those people are leaving and differences in satisfaction across the groups. The Agency is looking at a targeted outreach strategy to enhance and improve the interview to hire ratio of diversity in candidates.

Overview of EPA Diversity Programs and Activities and Additional Guidance for NACEPT Workgroup

Mr. Raul Soto Jr., Associate Assistant Administrator, Outreach, Diversity and Collaboration, EPA OARM

Mr. Rafael DeLeon, Director, EPA Office of Civil Rights (OCR)

Mr. James W. Newsom, Assistant Regional Administrator for Policy and Management, EPA Region 3

Mr. DeLeon noted that he, Mr. Soto, and Mr. Newsom could not do their jobs without their staffs and the technical experts who would be working with the workforce workgroup during tomorrow's session. The outline for the third letter is an excellent start, and it will provide the Agency some much needed advice. He thanked NACEPT for the work it had done so far, and said he looked forward to the Council's future comments on diversity. He mentioned that the panel members all work closely with EPA's Office of Human Resources, and they have done much in the past few months in the regions. A meeting was held with the regions as part of a broad, Agency-wide effort to bring all the necessary people together to discuss employment and civil rights, and the intersection between the two. The meeting included employees from OCR and the Office of Human Resources, as well as program management officials and others.

As EPA receives advice letters from NACEPT, it is useful to hear from outside groups about what the Agency should be doing better. Civil rights and equal employment opportunity (EEO) are not solely OCR's responsibility. To the extent that NACEPT can enforce the notion that civil rights and EEO are Agency-wide responsibilities throughout all of the Council's recommendations, it should do so. He thanked Dr. Anastas for being candid about the lack of diversity in ORD. EPA welcomes comments on the SP, and Mr. DeLeon sees OCR as taking an important role in the cross-cutting strategies of the workforce issues. EPA wants NACEPT to continue to advise the Agency beyond the report stage to help EPA with implementing specific recommendations. In addition, NACEPT also should give some thought to how EPA can be held accountable for the recommendations.

All EPA regions and program offices have MD715 action plans, in which they take ownership for their actions in terms of civil rights. Each program or region was supposed to submit its action plan last week. NACEPT may want to ask EPA to share these action plans with the workgroup. EPA also welcomes NACEPT's assistance with developing our national recruitment and outreach strategy. EPA's human resources staff now is developing such a program. This advice may have to be provided in the fourth letter.

Mr. DeLeon has supported the minority academic institutions programs, but asked NACEPT for advice on how to reach the other minority institutions that are not historically black institutions. It is estimated that 75 or 80 percent of minority students graduate from non-historically black institutions.

NACEPT should ensure that its recommendations on hiring and recruiting are balanced and not overly ambitious. Recommendations often do not take into account some of the challenges faced by the Agency. It would be beneficial if NACEPT's recommendations can be attained by EPA. Mr. DeLeon said he did not see anything in the outline about recruiting individuals with disabilities. The two most underrepresented groups in the Agency are Hispanics and people with disabilities. Finally, NACEPT should ensure that all the strategies recommended to improve diversity are consistent with law. EPA has constraints on how much hiring can be done based on race and ethnicity.

Mr. DeLeon agreed that FCIP was one of the best hiring authorities, but it can no longer be used. The FCIP, however, was used in conjunction with centralized hiring. Now, hiring is very decentralized. NACEPT may want to consider a recommendation to centralize the hiring process. Mr. Newsom has been one of the champions of EEO and diversity throughout his entire career. ORD and other organizations within EPA that are not diverse need similar champions. In the MD715 process, EPA observed that the Agency was losing minority staff through attrition. In 2010, EPA hired, for example, 29 black women, but 27 left the Agency. All the effort to recruit these minorities resulted in a net zero gain. Mr. Learner asked Mr. DeLeon to examine the comments NACEPT made on exit interviewing to see if they are helpful to the Agency. Mr. DeLeon noted that, in the public sector, the selecting official cannot see the racial composition of the applicants. EPA can conduct assessments post-hire, however, to assess the diversity of the applicant pool to determine if recruitment efforts paid off. Mr. DeLeon said he is looking forward to receiving NACEPT's recommendations.

Discussion

Ms. Kendall commented that when the workgroup began addressing this topic, it had a session on understanding some of the real constraints. Given the significant constraints, the workgroup had thought about having a workshop for the diversity team. An advantage of that workshop would be to bring in those who have greater knowledge of the legal constraints at EPA. Mr. DeLeon said he would commit EPA lawyers in the Office of the General Counsel to take part in that workshop.

Dr. Kammen noted that a strategy the World Bank found particularly effective was to recruit several individuals at once from a university.

Mr. Newsom encouraged NACEPT to note the differences between headquarters offices that develop policy and establish strategic direction and regional offices that have large field staffs, bench chemists, and community involvement staff. Different parts of EPA have different needs. Many of the regional needs are akin to those of states.

Mr. Matt asked if contract employees can be included in diversity challenges. Mr. Soto responded that the EPA Office of Small Business Programs would be responsible for ensuring that the Agency's contracts and grants include diversity. There also is a group within OARM that ensures that contracting is equitable.

Mr. Soto said that there were 38 individuals interested in a position that he was trying to fill when he started with OARM, and he decided to interview all of them to be inclusive. His office has reached out to the Executive Management Group to help them define and develop a sustainable diversity initiative. Diversity must be integrated into the daily mindset values and the accountability of the organization. OARM is working on developing EEO elements through the MD715 as well as putting into place a performance management process. In addition, they are working to leverage EPA's existing programmatic opportunities. The Agency is looking at leveraging programs such as the National Estuary

Program to develop a multi-textured approach to incorporating diversity (e.g., the limited English proficiency that can be found in the Gulf Coast, with a significant tribal component). OARM also is working on developing a strategy that incorporates nongovernmental organizations to ensure the inclusion of a trainer component. EPA is looking to NACEPT to help it define and expand the role and definition of diversity, because the Agency is at a critical nexus right now.

Dr. Chertow noted that Mr. Newsom suggested that NACEPT address regional needs. According to the “best places to work” survey, two regions were at the top of the Federal Government, Region 1 and Region 9. Do these regions have best practices? What are they doing right? Do they have best practices with respect to ensuring/enhancing diversity? Mr. Newsom encouraged NACEPT to look at the “data behind the data” in the “best places to work” survey. This survey examines only 3 questions from an employee viewpoint survey that contains approximately 40 questions. The survey is an excellent recruiting tool, but all the data should be examined. Dr. Chertow asked if NACEPT should look to Regions 1 and 9 for best practices. Mr. Newsom responded that it could, but he thought the Council should examine the whole employee viewpoint survey, which has six or seven areas of competency. Mr. DeLeon noted that by focusing on just two regions, NACEPT might miss out on what can be gleaned, in terms of best practices, from the other regions and offices. Mr. Newsom added that all regions have special emphasis employment programs under the EEO rubric. In Region 3, that is a useful resource to bring people together as well as a recruitment tool. It has been particularly helpful as it relates to the Asian Pacific community. Dr. Chertow commented that something about the survey must be useful, because it is a helpful recruiting tool.

Dr. Ben Dysart (Dysart and Associates, Inc.), NACEPT member, asked to what extent cross-cutting factors are relevant to qualify for executive performance bonuses. Mr. DeLeon responded that each member of the Senior Executive Service (SES) must write up his/her accomplishments at the end of the year, and identify goals at the beginning of the year. All of those ratings then go before a performance review board that has to review the SES member’s proposed rating. If the performance does not justify the rating, a bonus will not be approved.

Mr. Henderson encouraged NACEPT to consider some of the diversity practices of the regions. One might be doing the best job with outreach while another is doing the best job with professional development. This information would be useful to the Agency.

Mr. Newsom commented that some of this information can be gleaned from the MD715 reports. Mr. DeLeon asked Ms. Megan Moreau (EPA, OFACMO) to send the NACEPT members the MD715 template for action plans.

Public Comments

Dr. Johnson called for public comments at 12:00 noon. There were no public comments.

Council Discussion of Second Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning

Dr. Johnson noted that the discussion of the advice letter should be at high level; specific issues such as wording changes should be sent to Ms. Moreau. By the end of tomorrow’s session, the Council should reach consensus about what the letter will look like in its revised form. Mr. Learner added that the larger and substantive points in the letter should be dealt with during tomorrow’s session. If there are any fundamental disagreements, they will be resolved by the end of the meeting. Next week or the week after, the smaller working group will begin putting the revised letter in order, integrating the substantive points that have been made into a revised letter in addition to making any editorial changes that have been sent to Ms. Moreau. He hoped that the workgroup would have the final letter ready within 2 to 2.5 weeks; that letter will be approved via a teleconference to be held approximately 1 month from now. The revised letter will be sent to all members within about 2.5 weeks so that it can be approved before the end of June.

Ms. Jennifer Nash (Harvard University), NACEPT member, suggested that it would be helpful if the letter could refer back to the first letter and some of the long-range, visionary, and creative aspects that were in that letter. Perhaps the letter could show how these aspects would be carried forward.

Ms. Loftness noted that on page 14, item 4, the importance of systems thinking is referenced, but it seems that there is an equally important issue—it is not just who is hired, but how they are put to work. That needs to be stated, and public-private-university interchanges should be considered. Canada has a tradition of these that is incredibly beneficial. The individuals who are not part of government learn a great deal about it, and the government agencies get the benefit of private sector or academic thinking.

Dr. Benedict commented that, with centralized hiring, some of the screening seems to be conducted in a black box. It would be useful to have some secondary review as to the quality of that screening as a way to continuously compare the pools coming out to the pools going in. That relates to the introduction of additional ability components in terms of the transdisciplinary focus, and that will be a new review area for the evaluation process. It may require some additional coordination and oversight in that initial screening process, and that could dovetail with the diversity information capture that also was discussed to evaluate those hiring cycles. A few references were made to statistics in terms of managerial satisfaction with the screening process as consistent with other agencies. He asked what those standards were, and whether “good” was enough.

Ms. Kendall added that this was a complex point to try to address. Good “flow in” versus “flow out” data are not available because of the arbitrary USAJOBS cut offs (e.g., the first 50 applicants). The best candidates might be in the 100-175 applicant pool, but they will not get into the system. The electronic hiring process presents some real challenges; the tool omits data that are relevant to addressing the questions on diversity.

Dr. Johnson mentioned Dr. Kammen’s comment that he did not see real connectivity between the SP and the second advice letter. He was examining whether the advice letter would help EPA to achieve some of the goals in the SP. Dr. Johnson thought it might be useful to see if any of the SP issues are embraced by the workgroup’s charge.

Ms. Kendall stated that the smaller workgroup had started to discuss the planning of work and identified the need to write a fourth letter, referred to as the integrating letter, and it may be the best way to more fully address the SP. Dr. Johnson noted that the workgroup will draft a letter that pulls together the overarching pieces and provides connectivity among the other letters. Relating those letters to the SP is a good addition to that fourth letter.

Mr. Robert Olson (Institute for Alternative Futures), NACEPT member, suggested that the letter be more specific with regard to the Agency’s ability to attract talented employees, and the need for systems perspectives and systems thinking. He noted that these are not easy to track. Mr. Learner acknowledged this difficulty. If EPA is seeking people with distinct cross-disciplinary skills, it looks to certain programs in the country that are leading in that area. Although this approach makes sense from a recruiting perspective, it makes it difficult to achieve diversity, and this is an issue within ORD (which represents 43% of EPA). It is difficult to reconcile this issue.

With respect to using USAJOBS, Mr. Henderson commented that some of the more sophisticated electronic systems do allow screening of candidates based on criteria as opposed to accepting only the first 50 applicants. The first 50 may not be the most qualified individuals for the job, so there needs to be some flexibility in the system. In addition, the applicant pool can be examined to assess the diversity of the applicants in the pipeline. Although a hiring manager cannot examine demographic information, others in the Agency can look at those data to assess any trends and the diversity of the pipeline. In terms of recruiting individuals with broad systems thinking skills, EPA needs to build core ability within the

Agency to identify and engage people about those kinds of skills. If EPA is hiring such people but the leadership is not prepared to manage such skills and is still operating in a traditional mindset, that Agency will not benefit from these new skills. EPA must look at both sourcing candidates with these kinds of skills and building the capability of the leadership to manage a staff with these skills. Dr. Johnson noted that Ms. Bennett referred to the SP as a top-down plan; therefore, Agency leaders would be the plan implementers and the ones out in front in making sure that the plan's goals and actions are accomplished.

Dr. Chertow believes that the workgroup needs to strengthen the relationship between the statements in the body of the letter and the recommendations. Dr. Johnson agreed. Dr. Chertow added that the environmental leadership issue had become so prominent that perhaps it should be moved from the recommendations to the body of the letter. It would elevate this issue to mention what a large part it has played in the Agency's culture.

Mr. Learner asked for input on the optimal or maximum appropriate length for the advice letter. Mr. Joyce responded that there was no limit to length. Dr. Johnson noted that the length of the letter might determine its organization. For example, a long letter may require a summary up front.

Based on the workgroup discussions, Ms. Kendall stated that more work is needed on the two topics that will be addressed in the third letter. The fourth letter will pull the other letters together. In the second advice letter, there are specific discussions and observations about recruitment and "One EPA." Should the "One EPA" charge be addressed in its own letter? Perhaps it could be the context to the fourth letter. After a robust discussion, the workgroup decided to keep the two pieces together in the second letter. Mr. Olson suggested that two advice letters could be submitted simultaneously, one on recruiting and one on "One EPA."

Mr. Matt commented that much time was spent discussing the stovepiping at EPA, but there was little consideration of how EPA coordinates with other agencies. This might be worth mentioning.

Dr. Johnson suggested that the transition between the two topics was not as smooth as it could be, so if the workgroup decides to keep the two topics in the same letter, a transitional piece should be prepared. Mr. Learner asked Dr. Johnson if he had a preference for one or two letters. Dr. Johnson suggested keeping them together with a smooth transitional piece connecting them.

Ms. Bannerman thought that pages 4 and 5 needed more citations because she was unsure of the source of the data. Dr. Osidele said he had contributed the data, and he would add citations.

With regard to the diversity letter, Dr. Chertow thought it would be good to discuss Mr. Henderson's presentation. Dr. Johnson said that no work would be done on the diversity letter at this meeting, but Mr. Henderson will be available for questions tomorrow.

Ms. Jones-Jackson stated that Ms. Gelb had just sent her the "One EPA" principles and Ms. Moreau will send them out to the NACEPT members.

Council Discussion of Second Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning

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

Dr. Johnson reminded the workgroup of its charges, and noted that the charges provided some loose boundaries for things that should be considered in the letters. He suggested that someone be designated to serve as a final reader for the second advice letter. Dr. Benedict agreed to read the letter and determine if it is responsive to EPA's charge.

The first advice letter from the workforce workgroup has been sent to EPA; the second advice letter will be submitted between now and September 2011; the third advice letter will be discussed at the September

meeting and move toward approval at that time; and the overarching fourth letter will be submitted at the end of 2011.

The vulnerable populations group is addressing the following three questions:

1. What currently is known about major environmental and related health risks faced by vulnerable populations?
2. What technologies are most useful (i.e., accessible, affordable, understandable, easy to implement) in monitoring, communicating, and reducing these risks, in particular, specific technologies that are now emerging as “game changers”?
3. How can EPA identify and address the barriers to the development and deployment of such technologies?

This workgroup is using case studies as a forum for answering the questions. It plans to select 7 of the 14 case studies during the break out session. One means of reducing the number is to ask if the study leads to a technology development that is needed. Before the end of this meeting, the workgroup will reach agreement on the case studies to be included in the report. By September, there should be a draft for NACEPT consideration.

Ms. Loftness said she was surprised that the case studies were 6 to 8 pages in length; she was more surprised that the number of case studies would be reduced to six or seven. The diversity of case studies is critical for making a case for the diversity of technologies, and she wondered if the workgroup had made a wrong turn in deciding to eliminate so many case studies. The SP is a reminder of the arenas in which the case studies should be placed. Dr. Johnson commented that the number of case studies is not the issue; it is more important to ensure that the case studies address the diversity of technologies that need to be developed. Five case studies on the same technology are not needed. Mr. Joyce pointed out that the case studies selected for inclusion should be actionable by EPA. Dr. Fred Hauchman (EPA, ORD, Office of Science Policy) will be with the group during tomorrow’s session, and he has reviewed the 14 draft case studies to determine which ones would be most useful to ORD.

Workforce Issues and Vulnerable Populations Workgroup Concurrent Sessions

Workforce Issues Workgroup Session

The Workforce Issues Workgroup session included the following NACEPT members: Ms. Bannerman, Dr. Marian Chertow, Ms. Christine Costopoulos (Empire State Development), Dr. Jim Johnson (Co-Lead), Ms. Sara Kendall, Ms. Leah Anne Lamb (Utah Department of Environmental Quality), Mr. Howard Learner, Mr. Robert Olson, and Dr. Olufemi Osidele. Mr. Effenus Henderson served as a consultant and Co-Lead.

Outline for the NACEPT Workforce Workgroup’s Second Advice Letter (Exhibit 1, Flipchart 1)

Ms. Kendall discussed adding more differentiation in the workgroup’s second advice letter to EPA in the recommendations for entry-level positions (where supply and demand are key), mid-level positions, and other, more senior positions. She recommended moving some of the pieces that has been written to the third letter on diversity and senior leadership. She suggested that there should be some foreshadowing of these issues in the second letter. Also, based on the information presented earlier today, it might help to focus more on issues associated with using the electronic hiring process, which might be presenting some barriers to the Agency’s goals. She proposed changing some of the questions asked or screening tools so that EPA does not lose the richness of the applicant pool. Mr. Learner pointed out that there might be legal constraints about which the workgroup is unaware. Ms. Claire Milam (EPA, Executive Resources Division) added that EPA is about to change over to the new version of USAJOBS, USAJOBS version 3

(USAJOBS3). There are some differences; for instance, applicants can upload resumes and there are new procedures for entering and outputting data. There may be additional important revisions of interest to the workgroup, so she will find out more details.

Ms. Kendall said that she and Dr. Osidele participated in a conference call about USAJOBS3. Dr. Osidele pointed out that one issue will be how to deal with the 75-applicant cutoff for job advertisements. Ms. Milam responded that there are legal ramifications associated with the new system and issues that are beyond EPA's ability to control or influence because this is a government-wide change. Ms. Kendall asked Dr. Osidele to write some paragraphs about the challenges that USAJOBS3 could present to EPA's hiring process in the next week. She also asked him to suggest some steps that the Agency could take to work around those challenges, particularly, the concern that EPA might miss good candidates in the targeted areas in which they are looking to hire because of the applicant cutoff.

Another topic that was raised by the Council, which Ms. Kendall thought had been discussed in an earlier workgroup session but was deferred to the advice letter on hiring for leadership positions, was that EPA does not always have to hire candidates who are experienced interdisciplinary systems thinkers, because new hires can learn skills on the job and through rotational assignments, and public/private rotations. She suggested touching on this idea in the second letter and developing it further in the leadership letter. Ms. Jones-Jackson pointed out that the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) was another program through which EPA staff could gain some of these skills.

Dr. Chertow was concerned that these types of programs may be cut back or eliminated because of tight budgets. The respondents in her survey who were in EPA fellows programs were among the most frustrated, because they did not think they could get a permanent position at the Agency. Dr. Chertow suggested that the workgroup focus on the main issues of hiring, recruitment, and balance of supply and demand rather than "luxuries" like the fellowship programs. Her survey also provided feedback that using USAJOBS was tedious and frustrating, although perhaps USAJOBS3 will be better. Ms. Kendall asked Dr. Osidele about USAJOBS3, and he replied that it will be essentially the same as version two, although it will allow applicants to upload multiple resumes. Ms. Milam confirmed that EPA fellows do not gain any advantage in the Agency's hiring process, but there are internships, like the Student Temporary Employment Program (STEP), which can lead to jobs at EPA. Dr. Chertow speculated about the legality of knowing the demographics of applicants to STEP.

Ms. Milam stated that the FCIP had been discontinued because a lawsuit was brought against the Federal Government by veterans' rights groups. She added that President Obama was committed to the idea of rotations between the federal and other hiring sectors, which is practiced by his own management council. Ms. Jones-Jackson pointed out that the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) allows civilian federal personnel to work up to 3 years outside the public sector before returning to their government positions. Employees of qualifying institutions may serve for similar periods for federal agencies.

Ms. Bannerman suggested moving the section on developing leadership to the front of the letter, because that is part of EPA's Strategic Plan. Relating to that topic, Ms. Milam suggested revisiting the group's recommendation about merit-based raises for senior executives. Mr. Learner asked whether 360 degree feedback reviews were aligned with how evaluations were done. In response, Ms. Milam described how the evaluation process for SES personnel. There is a five-tier system designed so that an "effective" rating is the norm, but in practice, fewer than 20 percent of SESers receive a rating of effective or lower. Most receive a rating of commendable. Ms. Kendall suggested that the workgroup defer making recommendations on merit-based pay because she did not think the Workgroup had enough information on the subject, which is primarily a human resource issue. She recognized that this topic could be related to EJ issues, but NACEPT has little experience dealing with human resources issues. Ms. Milam promised that she would investigate the 360 degree review process further so that she could provide more information to the workgroup. She knew that many organizations use it, and EPA currently uses it for developmental purposes, but not for performance appraisals. Mr. Learner asked Ms. Bannerman, who

wrote the recommendation about introducing 360 degree reviews, to hone it further to reflect the issues discussed.

Mr. Olson proposed two improvements to be added to the letter. One was for EPA to bring in consultants to help develop multidisciplinary projects, and the other was for the Agency to develop a directory of multidisciplinary expertise using the web and social media. This directory would need to be continuously updated. Ms. Milam suggested linking the proposed directory to a resume database.

The workgroup turned to addressing the overall organization and timing of writing the second letter (see Exhibit 1, Flipchart 1):

- Mr. Olson will be adding recommendations on building One EPA,
- Ms. Bannerman will hone the recommendation on the 360 degree review process (incorporating what Ms. Milam provides).
- Dr. Osidele will address the electronic hiring process.

These pieces should be finished by May 27. Mr. Learner and Ms. Kendall will prepare a final draft letter by June 6 and send it out to the workgroup members for final review by June 10. The workgroup members will submit their comments by June 17, and Ms. Kendall and Mr. Learner will revise letter and submit it to the Council. NACEPT will vote to approve the letter by conference call by July 1.

In terms of general changes to the letter, Ms. Kendall suggested that text needs to be added to: link topics in the first and second letters, foreshadow topics to come, and link the two topics within the letter.

Dr. Chertow noted that the tone of the workgroup's first letter was uplifting and creative, and she thought the second letter could be made more interesting. Although she recognized that it needs to contain a lot of statistics and discussion of process, adding some points like advice on advanced technology jobs would help to make it livelier. Ms. Kendall thought that putting the part about "One EPA" up front would help make the letter more visionary and uplifting, but because the topic of hiring talent is more mechanical the letter was necessarily written in a more mechanical way. Dr. Johnson suggested that it might help to remove the tables, because that information was summarized in the graphical presentation. Dr. Osidele noted that the group had discussed items to put in an appendix. Dr. Chertow suggested making the figures smaller and the captions larger.

Mr. Learner pointed out that there was a tradeoff between expediting the completion of the letter and the amount of rewriting that could be done. Ms. Kendall stressed the importance of resolving any issues about the letter during this meeting, before participants returned to their other responsibilities.

Ms. Kendall added that she was pushing to get the outline of the second letter completed, because the workgroup needs time to work on diversity and leadership, and no one wants to be working on the letter in December. Ms. Jones-Jackson stated that EPA recognizes and is thankful for the Workgroup's commitment; she realizes that serving on the Council is very time consuming. EPA does not want to overburden the NACEPT members, but it would be beneficial if the issues on senior managers could be addressed, because that charge originated from senior EPA administration. Dr. Johnson suggested that it might be helpful if EPA could provide assistance with editing and putting together the pieces drafted by the Council members, the final product could be produced faster and it would be more coherent.

Senior Executive Service (SES) Leadership Development

Mr. Learner commented that a number of issues were raised by the workgroup that need to be addressed by EPA. They are not all easily reconciled, because they affect different parts of the Agency. He proposed that the workgroup come up with a list of issues to address that are manageable. Right now, the workgroup's advice focuses heavily on entry-level concerns, but the workgroup also needs to advise EPA

on how to address mid-level attrition. Ms. Kendall agreed that the workgroup should try to incorporate issues affecting mid-level staff.

Ms. Kendall observed that there was a tension between EPA's goals of choosing interdisciplinary thinkers, who usually come from a small subset of schools, and achieving diversity. She thought that NACEPT should point out to EPA's senior leadership the need to select a path. She hesitated to recommend developing another study or program, because these can become a distraction. She proposed instead to encourage the Agency to be thoughtful and develop a plan. Mr. Learner said he did not know how to resolve the issue that only a modest number of schools produce transdisciplinary students, but the Agency has a goal of increasing the diversity of its workforce. He suggested that the workgroup write a few sentences about the tension between these two goals and encourage the Agency to think give it careful consideration. Ms. Milam added that there also are potential hires who have a lot of experience but lack formal education. Currently, EPA cannot hire them because of the structure of the system.

Ms. Moreau suggested that it would be helpful to have a few other people provide their perspectives on how to get the workgroup's message out and who should receive it. Ms. Milam asked if the workgroup planned to produce a letter or a report. Ms. Moreau responded that they had not determined the format, and Ms. Jones-Jackson added that any format would be appropriate.

Mr. Ismael Martinez (EPA, Office of Civil Rights) volunteered that his office produces an affirmative employment report each year, which compiles responses about five elements dealing with hiring and recruitment. The report will come out at the end of October. The report is released in two parts: the first covers what actions have been done and the second discusses the results. The first part is coming out this week. Ms. Jones-Jackson asked if the report could be made available to the Council.

Mr. Martinez responded that he can provide them access to the report. He will summarize it for the workgroup and outline EPA's diversity policy and procedures and how and where the Agency recruits. Ms. Kendall thanked Mr. Martinez for the information on the report and when it will be available. The workgroup will add information about it in the integration letter. She thought a discussion of the report would fit best under the topic of diversity. Ms. Kendall suggested that the workgroup wait for Mr. Henderson, who will be present for tomorrow's session (May 20), to discuss diversity further.

Ms. Kendall said that in January the group identified the following issues for EPA to address: adding the development of technical skills and talents to the leadership development process and studying retention. Mr. Learner led a team in January in which Dr. Osidele worked on strategies and Mr. Kobi Wright (Cummins, Inc.), NACEPT member, and Ms. Kendall focused on retention. They looked at these issues across the Agency, not just in the senior management corps. Now, the workgroup needs to think about how to address these issues and divide the work. Mr. Learner said that the workgroup should look at the pieces that are completed and figure out how to pull them together.

Mr. Learner asked for Dr. Osidele's thoughts on what the Workgroup should say about leadership development and he asked if the workgroup wanted to start listing points for discussion. Ms. Kendall suggested that two topics to address are retention and attrition. Ms. Milam mentioned that Mr. Martinez has data on retention, which he confirmed. It is divided by race and national origin. Mr. Martinez stated that he also has data on recognition, awards, and promotions.

Mr. Learner asked if the workgroup can address attrition qualitatively. He believes that EPA has an enormous problem with senior level people leaving, not based on their age but on when their last child graduates from college. He listed three issues to address: a retention strategy (What can be done to keep senior personnel?), a leadership development plan for mid- or below-SES staff, and Agency actions to bring in personnel to fill gaps laterally. Ms. Kendall added that there is a fourth issue. EPA needs to decide whether to fill vacant mid-level positions. It is possible another staff member might be able to take over those duties. Mr. Learner noted that nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) do this. Not everyone

**EXHIBIT 1. FLIPCHARTS FROM EPA WORKFORCE WORKGROUP
BREAKOUT SESSION
May 19, 2011**

Outline for Second Advice Letter (flipchart page 1 of 4)

One EPA/Recruiting/Retention/Diversity Strategies (The How)

Co-Chairs: [Howard Learner](#) and [Sara Kendall](#) (will compile drafts into one letter)

I. Recommendation on 360° reviews – defer to third letter?

(Responsible Workgroup Member: [Erica Bannerman](#))

- A. 5-tier system
- B. “Effective” is expected to be the norm but 75% receive “commendable”
- C. Issue: development vs. merit

II. One EPA – move to beginning of the letter

(Responsible Workgroup Member: [Robert Olson](#))

- A. Recommend bringing in consultants to cross boundaries
- B. Create a directory of expertise using the web and social media
- C. Link directory to résumé database

III. Other changes

- A. Draft linkage paragraphs with the first letter
- B. Foreshadow next letters
- C. Link the two topics
- D. Make it more uplifting
- E. Replace tables with graphs
- F. Move section on the distinction about issues at Regions vs. Headquarters
- G. Structurally differentiate between entry/mid/senior level issues/recommendations
- H. Reflect more total systems thinking in hiring/retention recommendations ([Robert Olson](#))
- I. Diversity in recommendation

IV. To do's

- A. Redraft based on Council input ([Howard Learner](#), [Sara Kendall](#)) – by June 6
- B. Draft section on electronic hiring process challenges and recommendations ([Femi Osidele](#)) – by May 27
- C. Draft section on One EPA ([Robert Olson](#)) – by May 27
- D. Review final draft ([Workgroup](#)) – by June 10
- E. Review final draft ([Council](#)) – by June 17
- F. Approve letter by conference call ([Council](#)) – by July 1

who leaves is replaced. Ms. Milam responded that EPA does that as well. Ms. Milam commented that there is a fifth item related to leadership development: accelerated development.

Ms. Lamb observed that when staff members retire, it offers the Agency an opportunity to fill those positions with innovators who may not always be the ascension candidates. Ms. Milam agreed, noting that this point was raised earlier and that it is somewhat true for EPA. The question is whether it is better to improve or be more efficient. The “old guard” piece is part of the conversation. There are fears that

managers will not be able to hire externally and will have to groom new leadership from internal candidates. They will have to start the leadership development process very early.

Ms. Lamb asked how many SES positions are filled internally. Ms. Milam answered that, historically, 73 percent of the positions were filled by individuals already employed by the Agency, there were some intragovernmental transfers, and 18 percent came from outside the government. Mr. Martinez commented that these statistics are partially the result of the hiring process. All SES vacancies are announced internally first. If that is not successful, the announcement is made externally. He pointed out that there may be only a small group of eligible GS-14 and 15 candidates. Ms. Milam explained that EPA has chosen this hiring path to promote retention.

Ms. Kendall suggested that managers can learn interdisciplinary thinking. Ms. Lamb concurred, observing that there currently is a lot of mobility within EPA.

Ms. Kendall stressed that there are key things the workgroup needs to address at this session to carry out its charge, including identifying the right EPA resources. Mr. Martinez suggested Debbi Hart as a resource. Ms. Hart is working for John Taylor on a succession management plan that will cover topics such as how many people are needed and whether EPA needs a given position. Ms. Kendall thought it would be useful to understand EPA's approach to succession before the workgroup reads the MD715 reports. Mr. Martinez volunteered that Ms. Antoinette Powell-Dickson would be another good resource, and Ms. Milam added that Susan Smith would be a good resource as well. Ms. Kendall asked Ms. Moreau to contact these individuals and set up a conference call to make sure the workgroup understands these issues. Mr. Learner stated that he can participate in a call scheduled after June 17, 2011.

Ms. Kendall asked for volunteers for the leadership development subgroup. Ms. Lamb, Ms. Kendall, Dr. Osidele, and Mr. Learner volunteered. Ms. Lamb will lead the subgroup. Mr. Learner will participate after he finishes his current task of completing the second advice letter. The EPA headquarters resources on leadership and development are Mr. Martinez, Ms. Milam, Ms. Sharon Ridings, and Ms. Powell-Dickson. Mr. Stan Meiburg will serve as a regional resource.

Ms. Kendall asked for input from EPA on what would be most helpful on the topic of leadership development. Ms. Milam identified several issues: (1) knowledge/experience transfer/acceleration from SESers, GS-15, and GS-14 personnel who are retiring, with a focus on GS-12 and GS-13; (2) how to push supervisor levels lower or accelerate development; (3) how to handle employees who are technical but not people leaders; (4) moving from individual to collective base development; (5) focusing on the strategic base of the Agency; (5) on-the-job learning; and (6) projects that cross the silos of the Agency.

Ms. Bannerman questioned if there was any relation between age and GS level. Ms. Milam thought it was more accurate to talk about career stage rather than age. She added that cross-generational mentoring is a great suggestion because there is not enough of it at EPA. Mr. Martinez noted that there is a "Leaders and Learners" mentoring program that is growing, and it is cross-generational. Ms. Jones-Jackson mentioned that this program just started in January, so it is in its very early stages. Ms. Bannerman commented that she would like to know more about access to the program and how individuals participate in it.

To ensure that EPA achieves its leadership development goals, Ms. Kendall suggested that it would be helpful for the workgroup to identify relevant issues and possible responses. Possible responses are evaluating connections to the strategic plan and rewarding leaders who help with the development of other leaders. Leaders who do not do this weaken EPA. Ms. Milam stated that SESers cannot get promoted, but they can get bonuses, which are based on performance. Mr. Martinez mentioned that EPA uses Individual Development Plans (IDPs), but these are voluntary. Some staff members do not choose to participate. He thought this would be a good point to address in the letter.

Ms. Bannerman asked about the cap on SES salaries. Mr. James Hiscock (EPA) answered that, in 2011, the minimum salary is \$119,554 and the maximum is \$179,700. Ms. Jones-Jackson commented that at one time SES had levels. Ms. Kendall added that there once was an award for being “SESer of the Year,” and that was a meaningful incentive. Ms. Milam pointed out that there are still awards and bonuses for SES staff.

Ms. Bannerman wanted to know more about the incentives for SES staff and how they were awarded. Ms. Milam explained that there is a 5-tier rating system. Very few SESers receive a rating of effective or below, however. By the time employees reach the level of SES, they almost always receive a rating of superior. She suggested that the workgroup may want to do some research on benchmarking SES ratings.

Mr. Martinez noted that EPA currently has 289 SES staff members. The cap for the Agency is 300. It is difficult to recruit senior people if nearly all of the SES positions are filled because there would be no room for advancement. Ms. Kendall asked if there are benchmarks on how many leaders are needed. Ms. Milam replied that those numbers are changing.

Ms. Kendall pointed out that EPA has a great deal of material on these topics, but there are different documents on leadership, retention, and attrition. It might become overwhelming quickly, so it would be best to divide up the work. Ms. Moreau asked whether specific documents could be identified before the subgroups meet.

Ms. Kendall stated that Mr. Wright could not attend this meeting, but he has done the reading. She will add him to the subgroup on Retention and Attrition to work with Ms. Lamb and Ms. Costopoulos. Ms. Costopoulos will be the leader of that subgroup.

Ms. Kendall recalled that when NACEPT originally organized this workgroup, EPA asked about growing a more diverse leadership. The workgroup plans to address diversity and leadership in the next letter. Ms. Kendall noted that when the workgroup discussed the charge of leadership development, attrition, retention, and growing diversity were identified as the three key subtopics. There was a specific diversity charge. Diversity cuts across all these things. She was concerned that having one subgroup on diversity of leadership and another on diversity in general might be duplicative. Ms. Milam responded that diversity is EPA’s key issue. How can EPA bring in outside talent to increase diversity? Vision and application have to come from the higher levels. Ms. Kendall agreed and concluded that the subgroup would discuss diversity to a fuller extent.

Dr. Johnson pointed out that some people might only read the section on SES leadership development. Ms. Milam believes that EPA’s greatest challenge is to grow a diverse SES staff from within. Mr. Martinez emphasized that the workgroup’s efforts should be centered on the Executive Core Qualifications. Ms. Kendall thought that Dr. Johnson made a good point. If people tend to read only one section, perhaps diversity should be discussed under each section. There could be a specific section on diversity that would go into deeper detail. Dr. Johnson suggested that there should be references to the diversity section even in the leadership development and retention sections.

Reviewing the Workgroup session, Ms. Kendall felt that under the leadership topic, the Workgroup had developed a good plan for both subtopics. She anticipated that in July the subgroups will kick off their work in two separate conference calls, even though the subtopics are related. Dr. Johnson pointed out that Ms. Lamb is a member of both groups, so she can ensure that there is continuity but not overlap.

Dr. Chertow wondered if there is a college network for Hispanic academics. Ms. Kendall proposed that Dr. Johnson pose that question to Mr. Roger Rivera (National Hispanic Environmental Council), NACEPT Member. Ms. Milam questioned Mr. Martinez about whether he has connections with the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) and if he could tell the workgroup about it. LULAC might be a resource for the diversity subgroup. She noted that Mr. Rivera, who could not attend this

NACEPT meeting and may not be able to continue to serve on the Council due to personal reasons, is very active in Hispanic leadership. Ms. Kendall thought that Mr. Rivera understands the issues faced by Hispanic environmental professionals, which may be similar to or different from those facing African-Americans. Mr. Martinez noted that the low participation of Hispanics is one of the biggest diversity issues in EPA.

Ms. Kendall raised the issue of outreach to people with disabilities. Ms. Jones-Jackson suggested that Mr. Eugene Green (EPA OFACMO) would be a good resource for that, and he will attend the workgroup meeting tomorrow (May 20). Ms. Bannerman asked whether the workgroup will consider veterans' issues as well. Mr. Martinez pointed out that there are many veterans with disabilities.

Ms. Kendall stated that the workgroup had finished its main task for today—completing the outline of the second advice letter. She suggested that the workgroup consider the integration of diversity and leadership development issues during tomorrow's meeting.

Mr. Martinez asked about the next steps. Ms. Kendall responded that the subgroup leaders (Mr. Henderson, Ms. Lamb, and Ms. Costopoulos) will coordinate with Ms. Moreau on setting up conference calls. Ms. Moreau asked that the workgroup copy her on any e-mails concerning the conference calls. Ms. Bannerman suggested that it would be helpful if someone would take notes during the conference calls. Ms. Kendall stated that EPA had been very helpful identifying the relevant documents. The workgroup needs to think about organizing the topics. The next NACEPT meeting will be held in September so a final report must go out to the Council members by early September.

Vulnerable Populations Workgroup Session

The Vulnerable Populations Workgroup session included the following NACEPT members: Dr. Karl Benedict, Dr. Ben Dysart, Mr. Kurt Erichsen, Ms. Ella Filippone, Dr. DeWitt John (Co-Chair), Ms. Vivian Loftness, Mr. Clayton Matt, Dr. Mark Mitchell (Co-Chair), Ms. Jennifer Nash, Ms. Arleen O'Donnell, and Dr. Edith Parker.

Dr. John thought that the schedule for the workgroup's efforts might be the appropriate place to start. The timeline can be changed, and is intended to convey the idea that the report will be approved in December. The schedule is tight as it stands. He suggested that the workgroup present summaries of the case studies under consideration for the report.

Ms. Loftness expressed concern about the intention to reduce the number of case studies. It makes more sense to ensure that the cases cover all three categories of technologies under discussion, and that they discuss at least the major categories of EPA goals (climate change, water, air quality, land and soils, etc.). It would show good faith to discuss the need for technologies in each of the arenas. Dr. John responded that he thought of these points as criteria for selecting the cases, but perhaps the workgroup should run through the cases currently available, and think about how this report can be useful and sufficiently broad and inclusive. There are some difficult decisions to make on how many case studies to include and the length of each. The group will vote on this after the cases are described.

Ms. Filippone described the Passaic River case study; the issue is legacy pollutants in a tidal river. EPA continuously postpones a decision for a focused feasibility study on cleaning up the river. Better technology is needed for dredging, dewatering, and destroying the contaminants. Technologies are available, but EPA has not adopted or examined any of them. The EJ part of this is that there are 16 municipalities along this stretch of the river that include vulnerable populations (minorities and recent immigrants); the area is 45 percent white. Dr. Mark Mitchell (Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice), NACEPT member, noted that another EJ issue is subsistence fishing and resulting increased exposure. Ms. Filippone added that this case has a great deal of replicability in other polluted rivers in the

United States. Dr. Mitchell noted that need for a fish testing technology that is more readily available and provides instantaneous results.

Dr. John noted that the group had discussed including three areas of technologies: those for problem identification, those for problem assessment and communication, and those for problem solution. The workgroup's charge is to determine the need for technologies, but another aspect is the ability to deploy the technology in communities that have EJ characteristics and the potential resistance to using the technology. Ms. Filippone commented that when contaminated sediments are removed from a river, the only option is to transport them to a landfill. Such transport is expensive, and it is wrong to transport the problem to another state.

Mr. Matt presented the case study written by Ms. Kristie Orosco (San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians), NACEPT member. She had studied the problem of mold in tribal housing, but Mr. Matt broadened it to mold and other environmental hazards created by poor housing construction methods. The case involves the need for technologies for monitoring, mitigating, and remediating these problems. In addition, there is a need for policies that require those technologies, because without such policy, those in need will not receive the technology. EJ issues involve the need for more programmatic involvement at the tribal level to address remediation and mitigation and housing construction. Additionally, EJ issues include substandard co-housing and the lack of control in communities. Ms. Loftness added that if the problem is that the houses were built in inappropriate locations, there is a need for a technology that will help in selecting more appropriate locations. Ms. Filippone added that for houses with mold that are located in floodplains, community members also would have to work with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Mr. Shelby noted that the lack of ownership of design and control of homes and energy efficiency are key EJ concerns, because many of the homes were energy inefficient. Community members want to understand the issues associated with poor home design.

Dr. Mitchell described the Hartford trash incinerator case, in which one of the largest incinerators in the country often is out of compliance, but the community has not been able to demonstrate the noncompliance. In addition, there are many upsets, exposures, and fires at the incinerator. Toxins released are not captured even though they cause health effects. Continuous emissions monitoring of toxics coming out of the stack is the technology needed to keep the facility functioning well and in compliance. Instead of having one annual test where the company hires a consultant and schedules a time for a test, the stack output would be continually tested. This is needed because the toxicity of the emissions varies from minute to minute. This is an urban community, and Connecticut burns more trash than any other state in the country. The largest trash incinerators are in the biggest cities, and Hartford brings in trash from 70 surrounding towns. Dr. Edith Parker (University of Iowa), NACEPT member, asked if the technologies would be better defined. There are many assessment aspects to the issue, including air monitoring and health effects. Ms. Loftness noted that this effort was a natural partnership with the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The best case would include the use of data analysis and risk analysis technologies. Dr. Parker said the field study aspect was important as well; some of the methods were still very cumbersome. Ms. O'Donnell noted that the website www.EJnet.org lists 40 pollutants, including a long list of toxics that can be monitored continuously. This is a useful case study because the technology is available. Ms. Nash added that the workgroup's charge did address deployment technologies.

Dr. Mitchell described the Waterbury food-to-energy facility. He explained that there are many experimental technologies proven only at small scale that then are scaled up. This facility was supposed to be the largest in the country; food waste was to be brought in from all over the state to the facility where it would be composted under pressure over a 30-day period to produce gas that can be burned to create electricity. The concern is that the technology had not been proven at this scale and that these types of facilities often have accidents. Additionally, the facility had not considered what to do with the waste. Ms. Loftness commented that Dr. Kammen had wanted to examine the risk assessment analysis that had to be conducted for any of the fossil fuel alternatives under development. This facility is trucking in food

waste and is not examining the ramifications of the trucking. Dr. Kammen may merge this case with the Marcellus Shale story. The technology needed is a middle ground technology, and could be a whole new solution set technology, but in this case the risk assessment was not done before the action was cleared. Dr. Kammen said that EPA has the best and longest standing risk assessment procedures, but does not seem to be able to apply them in these settings. Dr. Mitchell added that this facility is in a predominantly Latino neighborhood.

Dr. Mitchell then described a case study on New Bedford polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Several factories in New Bedford produced capacitors, but they closed down in the 1970s when the Toxic Substances Control Act went into effect. The factories were located along the New Bedford harbor, and it was unclear whether the PCBs spilled into the harbor during loading and unloading, but after the facilities closed, the PCBs were placed in dumps at about six locations around the city, filling up the wetlands. Over the years people started building on these locations, and it now is unclear where the PCBs were deposited and whether people have built houses on or near the dumps. When children play in some of the barren areas around the city, they get rashes. When it rains, there is typically 18 inches of water standing in the yards of these homes. Is there a way to test for the presence of dioxin and PCBs in the schoolyards that were built in these areas? Remediation was attempted at some locations, but hotspots for PCBs and dioxins are still being found in certain areas. Simple testing technologies are needed for communities to use to test the soil for PCBs and dioxins. Dr. Benedict asked about plans for a database to compile and capture this information into a usable form, because the knowledge will be gone in a year. The schools are largely attended by people of color.

Dr. Mitchell summarized the Rubbertown case study as well. Rubbertown is a section of west Louisville, Kentucky, along the Ohio River that contains a stretch of 11 chemical plants across the street from an African American neighborhood and adjacent to a low-income white neighborhood. There have been a number of explosions and fires at these plants, and there are frequent releases of toxic chemicals. Air monitoring is conducted over 24-hour periods. Residents want to be able to conduct testing immediately after a release to get data on the peak concentrations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in the air after these releases rather than the 24-hour averages. Control technologies are needed, as is real-time community monitoring. Ms. Nash asked whether there were cumulative impacts from exposures other than through the air. Ms. Loftness added that human testing for cumulative impacts could be considered. Therefore, the technologies needed are biomonitoring, air monitoring, control technologies, and community monitoring. There also needs to be a communications method to notify the public of releases. The plant representatives claim that the high levels of VOCs in the air are from the automobiles, and not from their facilities.

Dr. Dysart described the Graniteville train wreck case study. Graniteville, South Carolina, is one of many mill towns with abandoned facilities and legacy pollutants. A chlorine tank car exploded during the train wreck. By the time the regulators arrived at the location, all the people affected by the release were in the hospital. Because the regulators found no injured people, they focused on the fish in the creek. Lawyers settled the case before any health information was available on the first responders. Sensors were needed to assess the exposure of the 250 to 300 people who were hospitalized after the wreck. This involves both technology and technology deployment. Exposure cannot be estimated without data. The lack of low-cost, reliable sensors serves a lot of interests. If no data are available, no one can be held accountable. Follow-up medical studies of those who were hospitalized identify continuing problems, particularly with the children of this low income minority community. Ms. Loftness suggested that it might be useful to include the number of people affected by each of these stories to get a sense of scale. In the building industry, for example, it is mandatory to install fire sensor technology in every building. This is not conducted outside of the building arena. Perhaps there should be a distributed sensor requirement for any toxicity. Dr. Mitchell noted that a sensor would be useful on the vehicle itself. The largest source of chlorine releases is trucks that are involved in accidents going to sewage treatment or water plants. Mr. Erichsen suggested that part of the solution is for these facilities to switch to ultraviolet decontamination instead of chlorine. Dr. Dysart noted that the tanks of chlorine involved in the train

wreck were en route to a mill, and because of the accident, the company went out of business. This is a non-fixed location scenario, and dispersion modeling could apply.

Dr. Dysart then described a case in the Louisiana/Texas “chemical corridor” along the Mississippi River. A large number of communities there still are being exposed to toxic chemicals. Petrochemical and chemical refineries release pollutants in the air, groundwater, land, and surface water. This case includes EJ issues, and one community could be used to illustrate many others. Low-cost, easy-to-deploy, reliable sensors are needed to provide timely credible and actionable data and to alert people to the problems in the community. Although the problems are multimedia, Dr. Dysart suggested focusing on air.

Mr. Erichsen discussed a Lake Erie Beach case, where the issue is beach contamination. This problem is endemic in the Great Lakes, and causes direct exposure of anyone swimming in the public beaches. Source identification technologies are needed. Because many of these beaches are close to combined sewers, the usual presumption is that the sewer overflows are causing the problem. Mr. Erichsen’s suspicion, however, is that the sources of contamination are from the watershed, and the combined sewer overflows may not be the problem with most beaches. The EPA literature on the subject does blame combined sewers, with septic tanks as an afterthought, and little discussion of watershed sources. DNA sampling has been tried without productive results, it is not clear that this is a practical technology. There is a real need for better methods of source identification for the many potential sources of pathogens that affect these beaches. Another technology being used in this area is coastal habitat and wetlands as a means of cleaning water before it gets to beaches. This would be a development and deployment opportunity. The third applicable technology is predictive modeling. If a sample is collected and incubated, it takes several days before the water quality is determined; predictive modeling, however, could predict the water quality at a given time. The most impacted vulnerable population is children, because the beach is a state park and the most inexpensive access to the beach. Impacts on low income groups are more tenuous. The people who live in the watershed are not as impacted as those who use the park. Pathogens are the toxins present, and the usual indicator is *E. coli*. A question exists as to whether the source is biosolids, because sampling has been inconclusive. This watershed is worse than neighboring watersheds, so there is something different about it. Ms. Loftness noted that there might be a suite of watershed indicators that would make the area safe for farm animals and recreation.

Mr. Erichsen noted that the Ottawa River case was not presented because of similarities to the Passaic River case.

Mr. Erichsen then summarized the Toledo Brownfields case, which involves an industrial neighborhood abandonment issue, community sustainability, redevelopment, and ways to live in a community impacted by old contamination. This case has a direct link with economic redevelopment, and can be characterized as a cross-cutting strategy. The case study involves three unrelated brownfields sites that are close to each other. The affected community is almost 100 percent African American and low income. A number of projects for assessment and remediation are under way in the area. A need exists for communication between the scientific and impacted communities. Uses of the land that will be productive and beneficial to the community should be found. Soil is being tested for potential use in urban agriculture, but soil may be brought in for raised beds. One of the technologies being considered is phytoremediation, but there is some controversy over its viability.

Mr. Shelby discussed Dr. Kammen’s study on energy and poverty, which is based in Nicaragua. Some rural communities are not able to connect to the national grid, and instead are using diesel generators that are rather expensive and polluting. The Nicaraguan government worked with the communities to design mini microgrids utilizing some diesel to generate power. The Nicaraguan government and citizens pursued this only after it was proven to them that sustainable development paths could actually save money. Dr. Kammen was working on developing mitigation curves with the local and national governments to show that the solutions would save money and reduce poverty, but also reduce air pollution. The technologies are foldable tank systems. Ms. Loftness suggested that the case could be

bundled with the tribal housing case. Mr. Erichsen asked if there are locations where the technology could be used in the United States. Mr. Shelby has been working with Dr. Kammen on tribal housing, and could add to the case study. The communities want to be educated on the available solutions which are real and tangible. Dr. Benedict added that there might be a Navajo Nation location where this could apply.

Ms. Loftness stated that Dr. Kammen will write a case study on shale gas drilling. This is a case that would highlight the need for risk assessment. He believes that our country is moving to develop alternative combustion fuel sources without examining all of the environmental ramifications. Without analysis and risk assessment, there could be serious hazards associated with these alternative sources. Ms. Loftness sent a study on the hazards to the workers digging for shale gas to the workgroup members. There are papers available about onsite storage of the water used in the process. Mediation technologies are needed. Dr. John added that he understood that deep gas drilling was substantially unregulated in many places. Ms. Loftness noted that this was an EJ issue because the more informed customers typically do not sign up to have the process conducted on their land.

Ms. Filippone mentioned another possible case study on groundwater contamination from legacy pollutants by industries. The pollution plumes extend under people's homes, and they contain a variety of pollutants. The VOCs that are released from the groundwater affect the indoor air quality, which causes health problems that cannot be pinpointed to anything in particular.

Ms. Loftness suggested two further case studies on: (1) fire retardants (sensor technologies and alternatives) and (2) combined storm sewer overflows. Ms. O'Donnell suggested another case study on diesel from mobile sources (issue is technology deployment to communities). Case studies already are written on this topic.

Mr. Joyce commented that there had been much discussion on a number of different issues, but ultimately the report and recommendations should be useful to and actionable by EPA and ORD. During tomorrow's meeting, Dr. Hauchman will be able to provide some direction to the workgroup on those case studies that would be most useful to EPA. Perhaps the workgroup should wait for his input before eliminating or adding case studies. Drs. John and Mitchell decided that a vote should be taken, and that Dr. Hauchman's recommendations would likely echo those of the Workgroup.

Dr. Mitchell noted that case studies should be selected based on the technological and vulnerable populations issues associated with the case.

Ms. Loftness commented that some of the case studies can be linked because they focus on similar challenges. She is hesitant to eliminate any of the cases, and would prefer to shorten them. Dr. Mitchell suggested that, after the vote, the workgroup should discuss the possibility of expanding the scope of some of the case studies.

Dr. Benedict suggested that the case studies be grouped by need area and Mr. Shelby agreed. It was stated that actionable technologies would be a more useful way of grouping the studies. Dr. Mitchell recommended that the group vote on the case studies and then group them. Dr. John thought it was important to vote on the cases because the case studies have to be drafted in a month; there may be some natural combinations among the selected case studies.

A vote was taken with the following outcome (selected case studies received four or five votes):

Cases selected (4-5 votes)

Passaic

Housing on tribal lands

Hartford

Rubbertown

Toledo
Graniteville

Cases not selected

3 votes Diesel, New Bedford
2 votes CSOs, Chemical Corridor, Lake Erie, Fire retardants, Groundwater
1 vote Shale gas
0 votes Waterbury

Ms. Loftness suggested that some of the cases selected could be bundled.

Dr. Mitchell asked if anyone was uncomfortable with removing any of the cases that were now off the list.

Ms. Loftness suggested that the Waterbury study could be combined with the Hartford study, because both are incinerators and power plants in low-income neighborhoods. She also thought the case studies should be tightened so that they are presented in a page, if possible.

Dr. Parker noted that mobile sources of diesel did not make the cut, and that was a large issue.

Ms. O'Donnell suggested that a paragraph on diesel be added to the report and the case studies referenced.

Mr. Erichsen agreed, of the case studies he had written, the Toledo case had a greater connection to EJ issues than the Lake Erie case.

Dr. Johnson commented that he had not heard any comments on how well the case studies represent the breadth of technologies that need to be developed. Each should have an EJ component, but they also should address different classes of technologies so that the field is covered sufficiently.

Mr. Matt noted that the selected cases did involve technology and EJ issues, but they do not identify technologies to help empower vulnerable communities that face EJ issues. Is EPA interested in such technologies? If so, that element seems to be missing. Perhaps some of the narrative can be expanded to include this issue. Workgroup members agreed that such technologies should be included. Ms. Filippone noted that some sensors mentioned could immediately alert communities to a problem. It was stated that another example of communication technology might be advising the local communities; for example, providing the community advice about what should and should not be grown in a garden planted in areas with contaminated soils. Dr. Johnson asked Mr. Matt to provide an example of what he thinks is not being addressed by the selected case studies. Mr. Matt responded that communities need processes as well as monitors. Communities, cities, and small governments should be thinking about these issues in the same way as tribes. They need to figure out what they can do for themselves and what resources EPA can provide to assist them. The workgroup will not be able to include examples that define all the problems and identify all the technology needs. Given that realization, what process can be included in the studies that will empower communities to bring their resources to bear on the problem? Ms. Filippone agreed with Mr. Matt in terms of process, but noted that the discussion focused on technology. Mr. Erichsen commented that a low-cost way of conducting outreach is to put information on a website, but that method does not necessarily reach the population in low-income communities. Dr. Johnson added that the case studies could mention the need for developing a process that would allow communities to use the technologies to help themselves.

Dr. Parker noted that the charge stated the workgroup should give EPA suggestions on working directly with vulnerable populations to identify environmentally related health issues as well as the need for new and improved technologies. Given that the workgroup is gravitating toward discussions of EJ, Mr. Matt

said he found three EPA reports on EJ in Indian Country and one that was as recent as 2010 from a group called the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and the Law.

Dr. John commented that some of the cases not chosen could enrich another selected case study. Ms. Loftness asked if Dr. John was assuming that the case studies would be 6 to 10 pages. Dr. John confirmed that assumption. Because shorter expositions would be preferable for some audiences, it was suggested that the full case studies be 6 to 8 pages and that there be an executive summary that boiled the text down to one-half of a page. Ms. Loftness commented that the formats of the studies were so different that they were not consistent in identifying the issues. Dr. John stated that perhaps both a 1-page box summary and a full, longer case study were needed. Ms. Loftness noted that the workgroup's charge will not have been met if the case studies make up the heart of the report; to meet its charge, the workgroup needs to discuss the types of technologies in the three tiers mentioned by EPA. Dr. Benedict suggested that the shorter case studies be in the report, and the longer versions in the appendix.

Dr. Dysart asked about the detail needed to identify the technologies. Dr. Mitchell said he thought they should be as detailed as possible.

Ms. O'Donnell agreed with Ms. Loftness and Dr. Benedict that the Workgroup's charge was to answer the question. If the report is only case studies bracketed by an introduction and conclusion it will be insufficient. The first charge question will require a literature search of some kind to answer it effectively. The case studies are just examples, and do not address what currently is known.

Ms. Loftness suggested that members discuss their own case studies relative to the technologies in those three categories during tomorrow's session. Dr. Parker asked if the workgroup needed to examine the charge and determine what could be gleaned from the case studies to answer it. Some questions deal with process and policies that need to be in place. Ms. Nash noted that a plan was needed for how the group would address some of the other aspects of the report. Dr. Benedict commented that with more specifically defined technologies, the group was in a better position to answer charge question 3.

Mr. Joyce explained that the intent of the report is to identify needs. Ms. Filippone responded that if there is no technology available to address a cleanup issue that is a need for a technology to be developed. Mr. Joyce agreed. EPA's hope has been that the workgroup would identify needs for technologies to better meet unresolved ongoing environmental issues in vulnerable populations. A specific technological solution does not need to be offered.

Dr. Mitchell commented that lower income people have more of access to cell phones than to other technologies, so perhaps this could be part of the communications solution. Mr. Matt stated that he had been under the impression that people were trying to aim for new technologies, but in vulnerable populations, the real issue may be access to existing technologies. Mr. Joyce agreed that this issue was important for addressing many of these problems, but that is not the central task for the report. ORD is asking the workgroup to identify needs for known technological solutions. If there are situations in which there is a need but no known solutions, or known solutions that have not been implemented because the political will is not there, there is no role for EPA. Congress controls the funding and passes the laws that determine what EPA can do. Dr. Mitchell suggested that a key issue is getting communities organized to put pressure on their political leaders.

Dr. John commented that the next task is to examine the charge and determine how the selected case studies can inform the charge questions. The workgroup can meet as a whole and address this, or meet in small groups, taking similar case studies. Dr. Mitchell was interested in determining who will be working on what cases, because each case should be addressed by several people.

Ms. Filippone said that the workgroup should revisit the mission statement to determine what has and has not been accomplished. The workgroup then should develop an outline for the case studies so that they all

are similar in format and are easier to read. Ms. Loftness suggested that more discussion was needed on the range of technologies needed. Ms. Filippone asked what Dr. Hauchman would be expecting from the workgroup. Mr. Joyce stated that Dr. Hauchman had reviewed the case studies, but it would be useful for the workgroup to explain to him why these cases have been identified as a priority, and then get a sense from him whether EPA already is conducting work in that area and whether there is a role for EPA. Also, as much as possible, the workgroup should identify technological needs for each case study.

Ms. Nash noted that the research conducted thus far was only a subset of what needed to be done. Ms. Loftness agreed, and thought they needed Dr. Hauchman's input on more than the case studies. The workgroup needs a sense of where EPA believes some of the frontiers to be in terms of technology. Dr. Dysart mentioned that the workgroup had been asked to give ORD advice. Mr. Erichsen added that the workgroup may want to provide recommendations on prioritizing the work related to these case studies in which the Agency already is involved. Dr. Mitchell brought up many technologies in the discussion that were not included in the case studies.

Dr. John presented the agenda for the next day's discussion with Dr. Hauchman based on the members' comments. Mr. Joyce suggested that the charge is malleable, and the workgroup should not fixate on the one specific document. The ultimate charge is to identify ongoing severe environmental problems in communities of vulnerable populations that have unaddressed needs that can be met by technology.

Mr. Joyce explained the report process to the workgroup. Once a draft of the major sections is completed, then it goes to the contractor to be edited, and that becomes the working draft so that everyone is using the same draft. At that point, members will identify what might be missing or what should be revised.

Dr. Dysart composed a brief definition sheet that he distributed to the members. Mr. Shelby will help write the tribal case study.

The meeting was recessed for the day following the concurrent sessions.

FRIDAY, MAY 20, 2011

Council Approval of Second Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning

Mr. Joyce welcomed the NACEPT members back to the meeting and thanked them for a productive first day.

Dr. Johnson suggested the dates of September 19-20 or 22-23, 2011, for the next NACEPT meeting. Another possibility is September 26-27, 2011. By show of hands, the members indicated their availability for the proposed meeting dates. The next meeting will be held on September 19-20 or 26-27, 2011. Dr. Johnson suggested that EPA staff search for meeting space to see what is available on those two dates. Also, EPA should contact the members who are not present at this meeting to determine their availability, so that the meeting can be held on the date when most members can attend. Dr. Johnson asked the Council members to hold both sets of dates open until the final date is determined. If a member is needed to participate in a workgroup discussion and is unable to attend in person, perhaps a teleconference can be arranged, but the line must be open to the public.

Dr. Johnson then reviewed the preliminary workplan that has been developed by Mr. Henderson for achieving greater diversity and inclusion within EPA. He sought feedback on the workplan, and noted that it should be benchmarked against the charge to ensure that the charge issues are being addressed. The workplan offers definitions of the topical areas that will be addressed and a preliminary recommendation. The workgroup has been expanded with the addition of Dr. Chertow. In June, the Workforce Workgroup's diversity subgroup will participate in a session with EPA to discuss diversity issues.

Mr. Henderson noted that he had met with OPM the previous day, because there had been some questions about hiring practices, and the subgroup could discuss this. The MD-715 reports are going to be very important to informing the discussion and the outcomes in the June meeting, and will be very helpful to have.

Dr. Johnson asked the Council if there was a need to revisit the second advice letter. The letter will be revised based on input both from the panel and the Council's comments and that draft will be circulated to the workgroup members before it is submitted to NACEPT for a final review. Ms. Kendall confirmed that EPA would work with the NACEPT members to schedule a conference call in June or early July to review and approve the second advice letter.

Returning to Mr. Henderson's summary of the diversity component of the third letter, Dr. Johnson asked if the members had any feedback. Dr. Chertow said that she had examined previous meeting minutes about ensuring diversity at EPA, and she thought that the goals posted the previous day were generic rather than aimed at EPA. She suggested that the Council's goals be clarified. A diverse and technically astute SES pool is needed. More specificity with respect to the goals is needed. Mr. Henderson agreed that his initial framework was generic because the Council had not yet convened to delve into the goals. If anyone has any suggestions, he would welcome them. Dr. Chertow added that the group did not discuss the definition of diversity. Ms. Kendall responded that the EPA charge provided a definition of diversity. Dr. Johnson stated that the EPA definition should be used.

Ms. Loftness commented that there might be some overlap between the definition of diversity and the definition of vulnerable populations. Dr. Dysart has a two-page summary of the key issues with vulnerable populations. Representation of vulnerable populations within EPA would help the Agency to address challenges in this area. Ms. Kendall noted that the first advice letter addressed how EPA's mission is changing because of more complexity; the discussion about diversity should bring that in as well. This issue is not just whether EPA can recruit more scientists and engineers from diverse backgrounds; rather, the mission of EPA is going to be different in the future to address EJ concerns. Dr. Chertow commented that she believed Mr. DeLeon was seeking more African American and Hispanic experts and technical staff for the Agency. Achieving diversity in thinking should not stop with the existing work on diversity that EPA has been conducting. Mr. Henderson concurred that this was an important point, and stated that as the framework for the diversity strategy is shaped around workforce representation and the pipeline for talent at EPA, those MD-715 reports will be very important, and will show the various areas where there is the most significant underutilization. For example, in a particular specialty area, African American women may be the most significantly underutilized group, so short-term strategies can be developed to target recruitment of African American women for that area. The recruiting and retention report mentioned that African Americans were concentrated at lower-level jobs. That is the information that the subgroup needs to develop its advice and recommendations.

Dr. Johnson asked if the Council had any broad guidance for the workgroup. Mr. Erichsen asked how the diversity goals can be implemented when the hiring managers cannot consider race or ethnicity in recruiting or hiring. Dr. Johnson commented that the pool of candidates being considered has to be rich in diversity. Mr. Henderson stated that OPM informed him that hiring managers cannot target a specific racial or ethnic category on the final list of candidates, but they can look for ways to broaden the applicant pool through targeted recruiting and targeted venues to assure larger representation of underrepresented minorities in the candidate pool.

An EPA staff member advised that the Council may be confusing EEO categories with diversity. EPA is looking for a broader definition of diversity, including diversity of thinking.

Workforce Issues and Vulnerable Populations Workgroup Concurrent Sessions (continued)

Workforce Issues Workgroup Session

Dr. Johnson introduced and welcomed Mr. Eugene Green (EPA, OFACMO). He will be working with the NACEPT Workforce Workgroup and gradually be taking over the support responsibilities of Ms. Megan Moreau (OFACMO). He stated that the workgroup will be talking about its charge of advising EPA on achieving workforce diversity. He introduced the members of the workgroup and noted that a subgroup of the workgroup will meet in June to address diversity issues.

Mr. Henderson reported that he had spoken with OPM Deputy Director Christine Griffin about current governmental hiring processes. He learned that it was common practice to use a cutoff of 50 for the size of the applicant pool, but it was not a policy. USAJOBS is the primary way people apply for government positions, but agencies have different staffing systems. Taleo is one of the methods used to track staffing. Mr. Henderson said he focused his questions to Ms. Griffin on outreach to find out whether EPA can do targeted outreach (e.g., at an event or a particular university). She informed him that EPA does that all the time; the Agency cannot allow a hiring officer to favor particular applicants within a hiring pool, but outreach to create the pool is acceptable. Mr. Henderson suggested that the workgroup may be getting confused about the Office of Human Resources' discretion with regard to the hiring pool. If the workgroup schedules a June meeting, Ms. Griffin is willing to attend and speak about hiring categories at EPA. Mr. Henderson supported her participation at the June meeting to provide the members a better sense of the parameters for diversity and inclusion.

Dr. Johnson asked whether applicants to EPA's fellowship programs provide demographic data. Ms. Powell-Dickson responded that unless they provide information voluntarily, EPA cannot ask for that data. Mr. Martinez explained that EPA tries to increase the opportunity for minorities to apply rather than focus on the numbers. This is how EPA uses targeting to attain greater diversity. Mr. Henderson pointed out that in the private sector, businesses are required to keep applicant logs and this now is being enforced more strictly.

Ms. Jones-Jackson asked Mr. Martinez about the data that are available on applicants. He replied that his office will have collected an entire year of information in 2011. He noted that his office just started to track applicant demographics. Mr. Martinez explained that to comply with the EEO Management Directive 715 (MD-715) of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) for establishing affirmative programs of equal employment opportunity, EPA examines five areas: outreach, recruitment (i.e., Is the Agency getting the diverse applicant pool it wants?), hiring (i.e., Is the Agency hiring them?), development (i.e., Are those hired happy and are they moving up?), and retention (i.e., What tools should the Agency use to keep them?).

Dr. Johnson pointed out that the workgroup needs to ask the proper questions to answer its charge, and these questions will guide the June meeting. For example: How can EPA ensure access to the best and most technologically advanced applicant pool? What can EPA do to ensure diverse applicants are selected, retained, and promoted in the SES? What can EPA do to ensure that the SES is held in high esteem? What can EPA do to define and track diversity in the SES in the broadest sense? The scope is broader than EPA's charge because it includes thinking styles, educational backgrounds, family experiences, etc. Each of the Workforce Workgroup's letters mentions diversity and points to the third letter, which will focus on it. He suggested that the approach to achieving diversity among the SES staff could be very different from achieving it among the technical staff.

Ms. Milam stated that the charge was not well written to distinguish between the EEOC's definition and a broader diversity definition. Does EPA have representation of the civilian workforce in the SES? Is EPA bringing the diverse thinking styles into the SES? Ms. Powell-Dickson confirmed that EPA needs the

workgroup to address diversity in the SES but also to examine EPA's culture of diversity. MD-715 is fine as a definition for the EEO, but diversity outreach needs to go beyond that definition at EPA and change the Agency's culture. Managers are hiring people like themselves, but EPA needs diverse thinking so that it can meet the needs of the diverse citizens.

Dr. Johnson clarified that there are two approaches to addressing diversity at EPA: understanding and following the EEOC definition versus using a more broadly defined diversity approach. He maintained that the workgroup needs to address the first approach. Ms. Powell-Dickson noted that Ms. Gelb and Mr. Soto at OARM wrote the original charge to NACEPT and she acknowledged that the EEO definition is the basis for the Office of Human Resources' work on diversity. Although EEO forms the legal basis, Ms. Powell-Dickson hoped that the workgroup could address some of the issues raised by Mr. DeLeon. Ms. Bannerman pointed out that if the workgroup is going to use a broader definition for diversity, different references are needed than those that are listed. Ms. Kendall thought the workgroup should start identifying questions for the June meeting, and then they can select different references.

Dr. Johnson suggested that EPA needs both to recruit people to enhance diversity and to study what makes EPA a good place to work. The Agency should strive to have a diverse applicant pool and be a place where people flourish. Mr. Henderson asked how leaders set the tone within EPA. He maintained that this is important to building a diverse pool.

Dr. Johnson reminded the workgroup that it should be outlining the agenda for the June meeting and examining the available resources. The workgroup needs to make adequate progress to prepare for the June meeting. In terms of a timeline, Ms. Kendall proposed that it would be helpful to have a draft of the advice letter by August. The Council needs a draft final letter by September 10. The writing will have to be done in June and July. Therefore, it would be productive to develop an outline and identify the questions to address at the June meeting. The workgroup may need more data for the June meeting and EPA will need time to gather than information. Ms. Bannerman asked Mr. Martinez when the MD-715 report will be available. Ms. Moreau asked if the workgroup could get access to the full report, and Mr. Martinez replied that he would check and get back to her.

Basis for the Agenda for the June Meeting

As a basis to forming an agenda for the June meeting, Ms. Kendall began by asking EPA for suggestions about the best references on diversity and whether the workgroup can get a summary or overview of EPA's MD-715 plans. Mr. Martinez said that it might be difficult to identify the best references. He noted that the diversity office is new at EPA, but he could provide the workgroup with information from other agencies. Ms. Kendall stated that even a verbal summary of the MD-715 would be helpful to the workgroup. Mr. Martinez explained that EPA submits an MD-715 report to the EEOC each year. From that, EPA creates an action plan to help senior management. Ms. Moreau posited that the workgroup might like a summary of both documents. Ms. Milam was of the opinion that the workgroup would benefit most from the full report. Ms. Powell-Dickson cautioned, however, that EPA has a very conservative legal office that may not want to release the entire report.

Ms. Kendall identified two items to consider for the agenda: (1) whether leaders are held accountable for promoting diversity and (2) the legal constraints to promoting diversity. Ms. Bannerman suggested adding a discussion of best practices at EPA, including the regions, as well as at other agencies. Dr. Chertow continued that it might be useful to meet with representatives from other agencies. Mr. Martinez recommended Ms. Griffin (OPM), which Mr. Henderson seconded. Ms. Powell-Dickson remarked that EPA views the Veterans Administration (VA) as a model for its diversity program, and VA has a booklet of best practices. The workgroup could ask Ms. Georgia Coffey (or a member of her staff), who runs the diversity office at the VA, to come to the June meeting and offer her insights. There is a lot of information on how a diversity program could work in the Federal Government on the VA website. Ms. Powell-Dickson added that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is another agency that has a very good diversity program. Ms. Susan Wong, the Special Assistant for Diversity at the Goddard

Space Flight Center, is on detail to Ms. Veronica Villalobos to help establish the Office for Diversity and Inclusion at OPM. Ms. Kendall suggested that EPA's attrition data, broken down by national origin, race, and gender, would be helpful. Ms. Powell-Dickson will check with legal to determine what information can be shared with the workgroup. Ms. Bannerman added that if information on net loss is available, it would be useful. Mr. Martinez promised to check whether he can provide statistics from 2007-2010.

Mr. Henderson indicated that he would like more information on the FCIP. Ms. Powell-Dickson responded that a lawsuit about the program was brought against EPA by veterans groups, so the program was discontinued. She stated that EPA can provide information on the replacement program, which has not been implemented yet. Ms. Bannerman asked how EPA addresses disabilities and how the workgroup should include this issue in the diversity discussion. Mr. Henderson suggested that the hiring of veterans might be pertinent. Ms. Milam suggested that the workgroup discuss the capabilities of USAJOBS3, because it could change human resources at EPA.

Mr. Henderson proposed that the workgroup assign a lead person for each of these questions, which will form the basis for the agenda for the June meeting. The workgroup did so (see Exhibit 2, Flipchart 1, questions A-L). The workgroup also identified EPA personnel who could serve as resources for each question, and these also are indicated in Exhibit 2. Ms. Kendall pointed out that the order of the questions as listed might not be the best flow for the agenda. Ms. Bannerman thought she might need time to process these issues, in response to which Ms. Kendall proposed that a series of conference calls in advance of the June meeting to talk through these questions might be worthwhile.

**EXHIBIT 2. FLIPCHARTS FROM EPA WORKFORCE DIVERSITY
WORKGROUP BREAKOUT SESSION
May 20, 2011**

One EPA/Recruiting/Retention/Diversity Strategies (The How)

Co-Leads: [Effenus Henderson](#) and [Jim Johnson](#)

Diversity workgroup session questions (flipchart page 1 of 3)

I. Basis for agenda for June meeting

- A. What are the best references?
(EPA Resources: **Ismael Martinez, Antoinette Powell-Dickson**)
- B. Can the workgroup get a summary or overview of MD 715 plans?
(EPA Resources: **Ismael Martinez, Michael Butkovich, Antoinette Powell-Dickson**)
- C. Are leaders held accountable for promoting diversity? What emphasis on diversity is expected of the leadership (critical job elements, communication for managers, and diversity action plan for SES vacancies)?
(EPA Resources: **Claire Milam, Antoinette Powell-Dickson**)
- D. What legal constraints are there in promoting diversity?
(EPA Resources: **Antoinette Powell-Dickson, Julia Rhodes**)
- E. Are there best practices in EPA or in other agencies?
(U.S. Office of Personnel Management [OPM], Office of Diversity and Inclusion: **Veronica Villalobos, Director**; U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Office of Diversity and Inclusion: **Georgia Coffey, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Christine [Christy] Compton, Equal Opportunity Specialist**; NASA)
- F. What does attrition data look like by national origin, race, and gender?
(EPA Resources: **Antoinette Powell-Dickson will check data availability with EPA's legal staff and the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission [EEOC] advisory council**)
- G. What are the net loss statistics from 2007-2010?
(EPA Resource: **Debbi Hart**)
- H. Can OPM talk about the Federal Career Intern Program (FCIP) replacement, the Pathways Programs framework?
(Responsible Workgroup Members: **Effenus Henderson, Christine Griffin**)
(OPM Resource: **Veronica Villalobos**)
- I. How does EPA frame the accommodation of disabilities in its diversity charge? (EPA Resources: **Eugene Green, Tex Gomez**)
- J. What does EPA do to accommodate disabilities and veterans in its current programs?
(EPA Resources: **Debbi Hart, Bill Haig**)
- K. What will USAJOBS version three offer? How will it change human resources at EPA?
(Responsible Workgroup Members: **Effenus Henderson, Christine Griffin**)
- L. How will USAJOBS version three change EPA's role?

Structure of the advice letter (Exhibit 2, Flipchart 2)

- A. Outreach
- B. Recruitment
- C. Hiring
- D. Onboarding
(EPA Resources: Emerging Leaders Network [ELN]–GS, Claire Milam–SES)
- E. Employee development (EEOC, external hiring for SES, silo mentoring program)
- F. Retention/engagement (ELN, affinity/employee resources, Special Emphasis Program Managers [SEPMs])

Structure of the Advice Letter on Leadership

Ms. Milam noted that every SES member is evaluated by the same performance measures. Mr. Martinez clarified that the five-tier system used to be applied just to SES personnel, but now it has been expanded to all management and supervisors. Ms. Powell-Dickson concurred, stating that Administrator Jackson recently required it for all leaders within the Agency. Mr. Henderson stated that he would be interested in any communications from the Administrator on this topic.

Ms. Milam told the workgroup that most discussion of diversity at EPA is related to the EEOC definition, not to the broader one; Ms. Powell-Dickson disagreed, however. Mr. Martinez pointed out that senior management provided the specific language for the workgroup's use. EPA must develop a diversity action plan whenever there is an SES opening specifying how the Agency will do outreach to attract a diverse applicant pool. Ms. Powell-Dickson noted that EPA also is seeking to implement a diversity action plan before announcing vacancies for all management positions.

Ms. Kendall suggested that the workgroup structure the advice letter on achieving diverse leadership at EPA around several broad issues (see Exhibit 2, Flipchart 2). In June, the workgroup members could add what they have heard and their thoughts on these issues. Mr. Martinez commented that EPA's Shared Service Centers view outreach, recruiting, and hiring as one process. EPA Headquarters breaks it down, however. Mr. Henderson mentioned that he would like to know more about onboarding versus orientation at EPA. He emphasized that onboarding helps facilitate engagement and inclusion when taking on new people. He asked if there is a similar process at EPA. Mr. Green replied that a workgroup was recently formed to focus on that topic. He suggested Brian Tillman as a resource for further information about it. Ms. Milam said that OPM and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) are piloting onboarding for SES, but Mr. Green was referring to something specific to the Office of the Administrator. The Emerging Leaders Network (ELN) is an informal organization that was formed to meet the onboarding needs of young staff members and they are doing a very good job. Someone from the ELN would be a great resource for the workgroup about onboarding at the GS level. Ms. Milam said that EPA had developed diverse applicant pools for SES positions in the past, but that process did not seem to be effective for hiring from other agencies. She gave an example of a hiring process she ran several years ago in which 30 percent of the 30 applicants for SES positions were from other agencies, but none of them were hired.

Ms. Powell-Dickson noted that EPA does not have a formal mentoring program. EPA has informal mentoring and rotational development, but no general mentoring. Ms. Jones-Jackson disagreed, pointing out that EPA recently started such a program called "Leaders and Learners." Ms. Powell-Dickson clarified that some offices are using mentoring, but it is not Agency-wide. The Office of Water (OW), for

example, has been doing it for a long time. Ms. Jones-Jackson countered that “Leaders and Learners” is a pilot program and, at the end of next year, it will be applied across the Agency.

Mr. Martinez suggested that the workgroup’s report address the perception of a glass ceiling at EPA. The Agency does not know why it exists. Perhaps the NACEPT Workforce Workgroup could help by studying barriers and how they have formed. Mr. Martinez noted that Special Emphasis Program Managers (SEPMs) are used as a resource to recruit African-Americans for management positions.

Cross-Cutting Issues

Ms. Kendall suggested that to structure a discussion of diversity issues, the workgroup should focus on recruiting and hiring. Within those issues are cross-cutting issues: silo programs, glass ceilings, the historical mission of EPA, systemic barriers, and the One EPA initiative.

Ms. Powell-Dickson stated that poor planning for succession is an Agency-wide problem. Sixty-eight percent of EPA’s SES population is eligible to retire, but the SESers are slow to leave the Agency. That is part of why there is a glass ceiling: there are no open positions. If EPA had succession planning, it might encourage mid-level employees who are seeking advancement.

Ms. Milam commented that there is a connection between diversity and the other workgroup’s topic of protecting vulnerable populations. Mr. Henderson echoed her observation. Ms. Milam thought the workgroup should state why diversity is so important beyond compliance. Ms. Powell-Dickson noted that this is in one of the Administrator’s goals. Ms. Kendall suggested that diversity is a tool to achieve the goals stated in EPA’s strategic plan. Ms. Powell-Dickson thought that environmental justice and diversity should be woven into the strategic plan.

Mr. Henderson stated that employee engagement and satisfaction need to be considered through the diversity lens. He wanted to know what programs EPA currently has in place. Ms. Powell-Dickson answered that EPA has plans to start doing employee surveys and town hall meetings. The Agency did not have time this year, but these are planned for 2011-2012. Mr. Martinez observed that for the “One EPA” concept, the Agency needs to move towards communication between offices. There are many silos and much repetition at the Agency. EPA’s Office of Human Resources has a large number of programs, but other departments do not know about them. Ms. Jones-Jackson stated that this is one of the reasons that “One EPA” was considered.

Meeting Logistics

The workgroup discussed the meeting date and location. Ms. Kendall thought a 1-day meeting would be best. The workgroup decided that an all-day meeting on June 14 would be sufficient. The attendees of that meeting will be Dr. Johnson, Dr. Chertow, Ms. Bannerman, Mr. Rivera, and Mr. Henderson. The following EPA staff also will participate: Mr. DeLeon, Mr. Soto, and Ms. Gelb, as recommended by Ms. Jones-Jackson. Mr. Henderson asked that Mr. DeLeon and Mr. Soto be invited for the entire day. Ms. Moreau responded that she already sent them an invitation. Ms. Jones-Jackson proposed that the workgroup might want to invite Stan Meiburg as well. Ms. Powell-Dickson suggested the Julia Rhodes might also be able to participate. Ms. Milam asked that Karen Higginbotham be added to the list.

Mr. Henderson asked who will do the logistics to organize the June meeting and set up a schedule for briefings on the topics of the meetings. Ms. Moreau volunteered to take the lead. Ms. Jones-Jackson proposed that everyone start feeding information to Ms. Moreau and Mr. Green, and EPA will create an agenda. Mr. Henderson thought some topics should come before others, but Ms. Powell-Dickson responded that the agenda likely will depend on the schedules of EPA attendees.

Mr. Henderson proposed a working lunch during the June meeting given the scope of the agenda. Ms. Jones-Jackson said that she had a conference room available that would accommodate 25 people. Mr. Henderson did not think the group would be larger than 25 so he thought the room would work.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Kendall noted that the workgroup will need to do a report out when the main session reconvenes after the break. Mr. Henderson asked whether there was anything that had been left out. He summarized the objectives and desired outcomes for the June meeting. The objectives are to use the agenda developed in today's meeting to review current practices and strategies that affect diversity at EPA. The outcome will be to review that data and make a series of preliminary recommendations based on them for a letter to be reviewed by the workgroup and later the Council in September.

Ms. Milam encouraged the workgroup to think of diversity as an imperative. In the past, the workgroup has focused on the stability of the workforce. Mr. Henderson suggested that this might be an action item to add to the June meeting. He would like an EPA person to take the lead. Ms. Milam thought it would be good to get the strategic planning staff at EPA involved in the discussion. Ms. Powell-Dickson agreed that after this meeting, it would be worthwhile to meet with EPA staff about the strategic plan.

Ms. Milam observed that this would be a first for the Agency. It is not part of EPA's culture to hold such brainstorming sessions. That is why it would be best to frame out the issues before meeting with EPA. Ms. Powell-Dickson told the workgroup that they would have to present to EPA the direction the group is going before the discussion begins. Ms. Milam agreed because the meeting will be open to the public, and *Inside EPA* and other trade journals attend NACEPT meetings. Mr. Henderson proposed that the workgroup have a conversation about this after the June meeting. He thought it was important to frame the issue to the Agency that diversity goes beyond workplace representation to EPA's charter. Ms. Jones-Jackson indicated that Ms. Milam may want to talk to her managers first about participating in a public conversation. Ms. Milam agreed that this is an important discussion for EPA's senior leaders, however, it is one that they have not discussed yet. She thought this would be a great opportunity for it, and Ms. Jones-Jackson agreed.

Mr. Henderson reminded the workgroup of the need to stay focused for the June meeting because there would be a very full agenda. He thought the workgroup had accomplished what it needed to do so he adjourned the workgroup session at 11:00 a.m.

Vulnerable Populations Workgroup Session

Dr. Hauchman joined the workgroup to discuss the case studies. Dr. John pointed to the list of case studies selected by the workgroup and explained the selection process to Dr. Hauchman. He suggested that the members briefly inform Dr. Hauchman of the case study topics and Dr. Parker further recommended that the technologies be the focus of the descriptions.

Dr. Hauchman confirmed that the workgroup wanted to know if the recommendations in the case studies would be useful to EPA. Ideally, EPA would like to take the recommendations and act on them, and ORD is the office that is most immediately within the relevant sphere of influence. He will be listening for the type of technology needed and whether it is innovative. He brought a sheet on technologies from his colleague Chris Saint that outlines three basic types of technologies: data collection, data management, and risk management. When listening to the group, he will try to place the technologies into one of these three groups as a useful way of thinking about them.

Ms. O'Donnell commented that the case studies will not address the questions in the charge. She thought it would be useful to hear from Dr. Hauchman, after the case studies are described, regarding how to supplement them. Dr. Hauchman mentioned that the Office of Environmental Justice has made

presentations on disproportionate impacts, and there had been a conference to examine the science behind EJ. It was a groundbreaking conference that brought a lot of people together in March 2010. EPA committed to responding to the recommendations with a 100-day report, and there are draft report responses to the conference available on the EPA website, and one of them is on science. Dr. Hauchman agreed to send the link to members.

Ms. Filippone described the Passaic River case study. Dr. Hauchman agreed that existing technologies for dredging are inadequate. Because of the areas where contaminated sediments exist, would the group recommend an assessment or evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of available technologies?

Ms. O'Donnell added that there are technologies that have been identified outside the United States.

Ms. Filippone noted that EPA needs to "bless" these technologies before they will be used in this country, and that has not happened yet. Dr. Hauchman noted that there can be legal obstacles to doing that, and he would recommend an evaluation of new technologies.

Dr. John stated that Ms. Orosco had e-mailed a summary of what she thought to be the priorities.

Ms. Loftness added that this was useful because she had not presented the full case study, but the actions that are needed to address the case and the recommendations of the workgroup. That is a totally different approach than the one the workgroup has been taking. A decision must be made as to how to proceed.

Mr. Joyce commented that Dr. Hauchman had agreed to make subject matter experts available to the committee members as they are drafting these cases. They may be able to answer questions such as why these technologies have not been used.

Mr. Matt described the case study on tribal housing. Mr. Shelby added that this would include tools used to collect the data. Dr. Hauchman stated that this was an excellent example of a case in which a call can be scheduled with the Office of Indoor Air and those at ORD who are familiar with these technologies. If this issue will have a particular emphasis on tribal issues, ORD coordinates with the Tribal Science Council (TSC). A process has just been completed in which the TSC leaders identified their priorities, and they may be interested in hearing input from NACEPT.

Dr. Mitchell summarized the Hartford case study. Dr. Hauchman confirmed that only average measurements were being taken, and the peaks were not measured. Dr. Mitchell then discussed the Rubbertown case study. Dr. John commented that Rubbertown was a place with multiple stressors. There are technological issues and issues regarding how to deploy the technology. Dr. Hauchman stated that tools are being developed (such as C-FERST) that will allow communities to plug into the model and identify the highest priority needs within a complicated exposure scenario. Cumulative risk assessment and impact analysis are part of the charge as well. Mr. Joyce noted that the C-FERST presentation and all of the other presentations from the past meetings should be available on the NACEPT website.

Mr. Erichsen described the Toledo Brownfield case study. Dr. Hauchman said he was listening for a recommendation about the deployment of technologies. Dr. Mitchell commented that a qualitative testing technology was needed for the community. Ms. Loftness emphasized that the question is how much measurement is needed before the need to remediate is evident. One of the challenges to the workgroup is determining whether more monitoring/sampling is needed or whether a solution technology already is needed. Dr. Mitchell countered that sampling is needed to determine the location of the contamination. Mr. Matt said that much of the discussion focused on informational rather than technical issues. For example, how does EPA communicate the problem to the community in a way that empowers the effected community to act? Ms. Filippone added that the VOCs from the groundwater get into people's homes, and the causes of the resulting illnesses are not identified. The importance of using indoor emissions monitoring and treatment systems must be communicated to future property owners.

Dr. Dysart summarized the Graniteville case study. Dr. Mitchell added that in addition to community-based monitors, a sensor could be placed on the train. Dr. Hauchman noted that each of the case studies had a definite community empowerment component. The workgroup could explore what might be

helpful, such as applications for cell phones, and easy access to a web-based source of information. ORD has a lot to offer in terms of information technologies, but the workgroup could assist EPA by being as descriptive as possible about what would be most helpful. The breadth of the case studies is quite large. The workgroup should take advantage of the opportunity to talk to people at the Agency who can better speak to these issues. This will enhance the quality of the workgroup's recommendations as well. Mr. Joyce suggested that an initial draft of the case study might be useful to Dr. Hauchman for determining the best people at EPA to speak to each issue. Dr. Hauchman added that it would be useful to have a concise write-up of each case study to give to the subject matter experts. Dr. John commented that his one-page summary focused on technology issues. Dr. Hauchman pointed out that EPA staff would understand that this was only part of the overall workgroup effort. Mr. Erichsen stated that he would like to have a conference call with subject matter experts in Toledo before submitting a one-page summary on the case.

Ms. Loftness said the cases also could be considered as generic in terms of the scope of problems with which they deal. There are mobile toxins, tribal housing, brownfields, and legacy toxins. When the list of needed technologies is generated, the workgroup should consider the generic, not just the specific case, challenge.

Dr. Benedict noted that some key challenges have been identified, and in some cases there may be existing technologies to deal with them. Through the more specific definition of those challenges and what the workgroup sees as the potential technical solutions to the challenges, the workgroup then would need to engage with the experts at EPA. The first charge question can be addressed in this way. The third charge question, barriers to the use of existing technologies, also can be addressed.

Dr. John stated that more information might be needed by EPA staff than what was contained in his one-page summaries. Mr. Joyce noted that these could be sent to staff at EPA. Dr. John will send the case profiles to Dr. Hauchman including contact names for each of them. Dr. Hauchman then will begin to call the relevant EPA staff members. Dr. Mitchell asked how long it would take for Dr. Hauchman to identify the appropriate experts at EPA. Dr. Hauchman answered that, depending on people's availability, he could set up telephone calls in a few weeks. The calls will be informal, and can be done relatively quickly.

Ms. Loftness stated that in the technology arena it would be best to state that "the following technologies are critically needed," as a recommendation. She has been trying to write a generic statement about each of the three clusters of technology. The first class is sensing technology. The second class is data and risk assessment. The last is the solution set technologies. Ms. Nash asked if the information technologies would fall into the sensing solution set. Ms. Loftness responded that GPS and GIS are analysis tools. Ms. Nash sees information technology going both ways so that the community has an opportunity to communicate concerns to the decision makers. Ms. Loftness thought such information technologies would fall into the second category. Dr. Hauchman added that he liked what had been said about generic examples. The workgroup may want to consider the top line of the case studies as "indoor air" as opposed to the name of the location of the case. That would have more appeal to EPA.

Dr. John commented that at least two people should work on each case study. Ms. O'Donnell added that the case studies should have a consistent format. She suggested that because there are primary authors, perhaps a reviewer could be added to each case instead of a secondary author.

Dr. Benedict mentioned that it might be worthwhile to identify the IT component within each of the case studies and discuss it as a cross-cutting issue. He will take the lead on this aspect of the report. The assignments are identified in Exhibit 3.

**Exhibit 3. Case Studies from the May 19th NACEPT Vulnerable Populations/
Environmental Justice Work Group Meeting**

<u>Six Selected Case Studies</u>	<u>Technology Needs Identified</u>
Lower Passaic River Sediment Contamination (Ms. Filippone and Mr. Erichsen)	Dredging, dewatering, remediation, fish testing
Housing IAQ on Tribal Lands Energy Efficiency (Ms. Orosco, Mr. Matt and Mr. Shelby)	Monitoring, mitigation, remediation, communication, siting
Hartford’s Trash Incinerator (Dr. Mitchell and Ms. O’Donnell)	Continuous emissions monitoring, health effects monitoring, air testing, data analysis, stack pollution control retrofit.
Rubbertown Plants, Louisville, KY (Dr. Mitchell, Dr. Parker and Dr. Dysart)	Real time air monitoring, pollution control technology, biomonitoring, handheld VOC community monitoring, communications, emissions reductions.
Graniteville, SC Train Wreck (Dr. Dysart and Ms. Nash)	Low-cost, easy-to-deploy air toxics sensors, GPS of tank cars, mobile sensors, data management systems, warning systems, dispersion modeling.
Toledo Housing Brownfields (Mr. Erichsen and Dr. John)	Assessment and remediation, soil testing, indoor air monitoring, phytoremediation, communication of health risks.

Ms. O’Donnell said that she will ask her intern to do a web search on current knowledge about major environmental and related health risks to vulnerable populations. Mr. Shelby will do a literature review on the first charge question.

Mr. Joyce informed the workgroup that it is more compelling if there is a list of sources being cited. He asked the members to keep the source materials organized so that the references can be included as endnotes in the final report.

Ms. Nash suggested that other cross-cutting issues besides IT should be addressed. Ms. Loftness noted that this is where EPA could be of great help to the workgroup. Maybe there is enough information at EPA on these topics and on systems thinking approaches to deal with the environmental challenges of vulnerable populations that could be cited.

Dr. John suggested that someone could begin drafting broad recommendations before the case studies were finished; the case studies will inform the recommendations.

Mr. Erichsen asked who would develop the format for the case studies. He also asked if any graphics would be needed for the report. Mr. Joyce said that the contractor would be able to help the workgroup with graphic needs for the report; members should think about which graphics and images would be useful to reinforce the information in the case studies. Dr. Mitchell said it would be helpful to have a model case study so that everyone could follow the format used in that one.

Dr. John suggested that the EPA Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE) program could be contacted and informed of the scope of what the workgroup is doing; CARE staff might be able to contact the 100 communities and ask them about issues that are important to them. He further suggested that workgroup members start an e-mail conversation about other cross-cutting issues.

Ms. Filippone asked if it was possible, when addressing the first charge, for a member to submit a commentary to Ms. O'Donnell about what is known or not known about vulnerable populations based on a project that they are working on. This could be used as part of the discussion on what is known about health effects.

Dr. Parker asked about the timeline for the workgroup's efforts so a timeline was developed (see Exhibit 4).

Exhibit 4. Timeline for Vulnerable Populations Workgroup Report

May 20	Select cases; give profiles to Fred Hauchman
May 27	Case study technology 1-pagers to DeWitt John, etc. from 1st/2nd authors
June 1	Descriptions plus case study 1-pagers to Fred Hauchman To chairs: 5 pages single spaced with references, etc., report outline
June 3	Phone calls to ORD
June 20	Submit 2nd draft case studies and cross-cutting papers
July 1	Workgroup phone call Send draft to ORD for initial help
July 20	3rd draft of case studies and an initial draft of the rest of the report (grid, intro, recommendations) 3rd workgroup phone call?
July-August	Help from ORD and editors
August 15	Draft report to full workgroup
September 1	Comments from workgroup members; phone call?
September 15	Initial report to NACEPT
December 1	Review draft to NACEPT: final edits and approval.

Mr. Joyce noted that when case studies and other parts of the report are submitted, they should be sent to Dr. John, Dr. Mitchell, and Ms. Orosco because they are the workgroup chairs. They should, in turn, send the items to Mr. Joyce. Ms. Loftness has crafted a draft report that attempts to put some of the framework around the case studies, and she will send that to the workgroup members.

The workgroup discussed the fact that the timeline may be overly ambitious, but Dr. John noted that it was a target, and would give the members some sense of the urgency of preparing the report. Mr. Joyce advised that the more specificity in the case studies, the better. Generic comments are not as helpful as detailed, specific comments. Dr. John said an outline of how the case studies should be organized would be available by the end of next week. Dr. Hauchman shared the document "Environmentally Just Technology", which examines the social dimensions of EJ, with the workgroup.

Dr. John agreed to send members the list of case studies and assignments.

Workgroup Report Outs

Dr. Johnson advised members that they would soon receive an e-mail about scheduling a conference call sometime in July for approval of the Workforce Workgroup's second advice letter. The date needs to be set as soon as possible, because a 15-day notice must be published in the *Federal Register*.

Dr. Johnson reminded members to save both sets of dates discussed for the September meeting.

Workforce Issues Workgroup Report

Mr. Henderson reported that the workgroup started with a discussion of the recommendations and drafting of the letter to be delivered in time for the September meeting. The workgroup discussed the questions that required more data and determined who might be able to help to acquire this data. The group decided to schedule a full-day meeting on June 14, 2011, and a number of questions will be answered at that meeting. An EPA staff member will help to set the agenda for this meeting, and representatives from OPM will be invited to talk about the constraints and parameters for the diversity work that is being conducted. Ms. Kendall helped to describe the structure of the information that will be developed in the letter to EPA. Accountability was assigned to a staff member who will be assembling that information. The subgroup will reflect on information gained from the June meeting, and using a structured set of questions, will begin developing the recommendations to EPA.

Ms. Loftness confirmed that the subgroup was holding a meeting in Washington, DC, to gather further information from EPA. She noted that this was a different methodology than the one the Vulnerable Populations Workgroup had discussed, and it might be a useful idea for that workgroup as well.

Dr. Johnson noted that the workgroup outlined the second part of the third letter as well. Ms. Kendall stated that the other topic in the third letter would be a discussion regarding concerns on attrition in the SES staff. That portion of the letter will be focused on attrition/retention issues that are specific to the SESers. The workgroup will be covering all the issues around retention and trying to attract new staff from outside the Agency. Then the workgroup will discuss leadership development. These topics contain diversity issues that the workgroup will touch on, but this will be informed by the work that the diversity subgroup is conducting. The workgroup will be using some documents that EPA already has provided. Ms. Lamb will be leading the section on leadership development, and Ms. Costopoulos will be leading the section on attrition and retention.

Dr. Johnson noted that both of these projects seemed to be on target in terms of the timeline that has been proposed. Mr. Henderson indicated that a discussion was held about attempting to tease out the organizational imperative toward diversity as it relates to the strategic plan and any other broader issues that the Agency has been bringing forth, but because of the amount of work in front of the group, that will be revisited at a future date. Ms. Kendall noted that it might be a useful topic to address in the fourth letter.

Vulnerable Populations Workgroup Report

Dr. Mitchell noted that the workgroup had accomplished a lot at this meeting. The workgroup has decided to focus on the case studies in the report. The workgroup selected six case studies that are illustrative of the types of technologies that are needed in EJ and other vulnerable communities. The studies illustrate problems in air, water, and contaminated soils and cut across the different types of technologies from sensor technologies to information and other types of technologies. The workgroup's timeline is very ambitious, and much work still remains to be completed to complete the report. The workgroup is dividing up the work on the case studies, and EPA staff will be identified who can provide expertise for each case study. These EPA experts will assist the workgroup with the technical issues associated with the case studies. The workgroup hopes to have the first draft of the report ready to share with the full Council by the September meeting.

Dr. Johnson noted that Ms. Bennett had informed the Council on which pieces of its advice were used, which was demonstrative of the fact that NACEPT has given thoughtful and useful advice to the Agency.

He emphasized that NACEPT is an independent group; it should be helpful to the Agency and produce advice in a timely manner.

Public Comments

Dr. Johnson asked if there were any public comments, and there were none.

Chair's Summary and Next Steps

Ms. Jones-Jackson thanked the NACEPT members for all of the work they had conducted during the past 2 days. She introduced Mr. Green to the Council. He will be performing much of the work that now is being done by Ms. Moreau. Mr. Green is cognizant of some of the processes involved and very responsive, so members should feel free to carbon copy him when sending information to Ms. Moreau.

Mr. Joyce added his thanks to the members, and reminded them that EPA is paying attention to NACEPT; this was demonstrated by the staff members who made themselves available to the Council during the meeting. He further thanked EPA staff who had attended the meeting and who will continue to work with the Council and the workgroups. He stressed that their assistance is essential in terms of NACEPT providing the best counsel possible to the Agency.

Dr. Johnson thanked the Council members for the work they did at the meeting as well as the work they did and will do outside the meeting.

Mr. Joyce thanked everyone again for their participation and energy. OFACMO staff will contact members soon with information about the dates in September. He adjourned the meeting at 12:06 p.m.

Action Items

- ✧ Ms. Moreau will e-mail all members the MD-715 template for action plans once received from Mr. DeLeon.
- ✧ Dr. Osidele will add citations to pages 4 and 5 of the Workforce Workgroup's second advice letter.
- ✧ Ms. Moreau will e-mail the "One EPA" principles to all members.
- ✧ The following action items were identified for the Vulnerable Populations Workgroup:
 - Mr. Shelby will help write the tribal case study.
 - Dr. Hauchman will send the link for the draft of the EPA 100-day report on the science behind EJ to members.
 - Dr. John will send the case profiles (with additional information from authors) to Dr. Hauchman including contact names for each of them. Dr. Hauchman then will begin to call the relevant EPA staff members.
 - Members will complete assigned case studies by June 20, 2011.
 - Ms. O'Donnell will ask her intern to do a web search on current knowledge of environmental health risks to vulnerable populations.
 - Mr. Shelby will do a literature review on the first charge question by June 3, 2011.
 - Case studies should be sent to Dr. John, Dr. Mitchell, and Ms. Orosco, and they will send them to Mr. Joyce.
 - Ms. Loftness has crafted a draft report that attempts to put some of the framework around the case studies, and she will send that to the workgroup members.
 - Dr. John will send the members the list of case studies and assignments.
- ✧ The following action items were identified for the Workforce Issues Workgroup:
 - Dr. Osidele will draft a section on electronic hiring process challenges and recommendations by May 27.
 - Mr. Olson will draft a section on "One EPA" by May 27.
 - Mr. Learner and Ms. Kendall will redraft the second advice letter based on the Council's input by June 6.
 - The workgroup members will review the final draft of the second advice letter by June 10.
 - The Council will review the final draft of the second advice letter by June 17.
 - NACEPT will approve the second advice letter via conference call by July 1.
 - The leadership development and retention and attrition subgroups will meet by conference call in July.
 - Subgroup on recruiting/retention/diversity strategies will meet June 14 at EPA.

- Mr. Martinez will provide the workgroup with EPA's full MD-715 report or a summary.
- Mr. Martinez and Antoinette Powell-Dickson will provide the workgroup with references on promoting recruiting/retention/diversity strategies.
- Mr. Martinez will provide the workgroup with data on the ascension pool for SES (GS-13, 14, and 15).
- Ms. Powell-Dickson and Julia Rhodes will provide the workgroup information on legal constraints to promoting diversity.
- Ms. Powell-Dickson will check data availability on attrition at EPA by national origin, race, and gender.
- Debbi Hart will provide the workgroup with statistics on net loss (2007-2010).

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

NACEPT 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
Center for Industrial Ecology
School of Forestry and Environmental Studies
Yale University
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 (NACEPT Vice Chair)

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

Ms. Vivian Loftness

Professor of Architecture
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA

Mr. Clayton Matt

Director of Tribal Services
Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes
Pablo, MT

Dr. Mark A. Mitchell

President
Connecticut Coalition of Environmental Justice
Hartford, CT

Ms. Jennifer Nash

Executive Director
Regulatory Policy Program
Harvard Kennedy School
Harvard University
Cambridge, 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

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
School of Public Health
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI

Mr. Barry Worthington

Executive Director
United States Energy Association
Washington, DC

NACEPT Acting Designated Federal Officer

Mr. Mark Joyce

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Federal Advisory Committee
Management and Outreach (OFACMO)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (1601M)
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-2130
E-mail: joyce.mark@epa.gov

EPA Participants

Paul Anastas

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-6620
E-mail: anastas.paul@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

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

Nanci Gelb

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-1146
E-mail: gelb.nanci@epa.gov

Andrew Geller

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
109 TW Alexander Drive
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Phone: (919) 541-4208
E-mail: geller.andrew@epa.gov

Eugene Green

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-2432
E-mail: green.eugene@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

Debbi Hart

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

Cynthia Jones-Jackson

Acting Director, OFACMO
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

Debbie Lake-Hinkle

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-2622
E-mail: lake.debbie@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

Ismael Martinez

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-1866
E-mail: martinez.ismael@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: mccoys.stephanie@epa.gov

Claire Milam

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-5320
E-mail: milam.claire@epa.gov

Megan Moreau

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-7582
E-mail: moreau.megan@epa.gov

Jim Newsom

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 3
1650 Arch Street
Mail Code: 3PM00
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029
Phone: (215) 814-5152
E-mail: newsom.jim@epa.gov

Michael Nieves

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 566-1478
E-mail: nieves.michael@epa.gov

Dennis O'Connor

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 343-9213
E-mail: oconnor.dennis@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

Antoinette Powell-Dickson

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 566-0738
E-mail: powell-dickson.antoINETTE@epa.gov

Raul Soto

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

Shawna Green Whitehurst

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
109 T.W. Alexander Drive
Mail Code: N229-01
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Phone: (919) 541-3499
E-mail: whitehurst.shawna@epa.gov

Other Participants**Matthew Field**

Inside EPA
E-mail: mfield@iwppnews.com

Effenus Henderson

Chief Diversity Officer
Director, Workforce Representation &
Diversity
Weyerhaeuser Company
Federal Way, WA
E-mail: effenus.henderson@weyerhaeuser.com

Jenny Hopkinson

Inside EPA
E-mail: jhopkinson@iwppnews.com

Patty Kalla

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Aaron Lovell

Inside EPA
Phone: (703) 416-8536

Ryan Shelby

University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA
Phone: (510) 761-6192
E-mail: b-westlake@acs.org

Brittany Westlake

American Chemical Society
Phone: (202) 872-6274
E-mail: ryan.shelby@berkeley.edu

Alexandra Woodruff

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Contractor Support**Jennifer Lee**

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

Mary Spock

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



**National Advisory Council for
Environmental Policy & Technology**

**Final Agenda
May 19-20, 2011
Hilton Garden Inn
815 14th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 1-202-783-7800**

Thursday, May 19, 2011

8:00 am Registration

8:30 am Welcome and Introductions

Mark Joyce
NACEPT Acting Designated Federal Officer
EPA Office of Federal Advisory Committee Management and Outreach

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr.
NACEPT Chair

Cynthia Jones-Jackson
Acting Director
EPA Office of Federal Advisory Committee Management and Outreach

8:40 am Opening Remarks

Bob Perciasepe
EPA Deputy Administrator

**9:00 am Overview of NACEPT's Second Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning:
*Strategies to Obtain and Retain Scientific and Technical Expertise and Leadership
Capabilities and Culture for "One EPA"***

Howard Learner and Sara Kendall
NACEPT Workforce Workgroup Co-Chairs

Paul T. Anastas
Science Advisor and Assistant Administrator
EPA Office of Research and Development

Nanci E. Gelb
Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator
EPA Office of Administration and Resources Management

Raul Soto Jr.
Associate Assistant Administrator
Outreach, Diversity and Collaboration
EPA Office of Administration and Resources Management

James W. Newsom
Assistant Regional Administrator for Policy and Management
EPA Region 3

10:00 am Break

10:15 am Discussion of NACEPT's Third Workforce Advice Letter on Achieving Greater Diversity in EPA

Overview and Initial Thoughts on NACEPT Diversity Charge

- Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr.
NACEPT Chair
- Roger Rivera and Effenus Henderson
NACEPT Workforce Workgroup Diversity Co-Leads

Overview of EPA Diversity Programs and Activities and Additional Guidance for NACEPT Workgroup

- Raul Soto Jr.
Associate Assistant Administrator
Outreach, Diversity and Collaboration
EPA Office of Administration and Resources Management
- Rafael DeLeon
Director
EPA Office of Civil Rights
- James W. Newsom
Assistant Regional Administrator for Policy and Management
EPA Region 3

11:15 am Overview of FY 2011-2015 EPA Strategic Plan

Barbara J. Bennett
EPA Chief Financial Officer

12:00 pm Public Comments

12:15 pm Lunch (on your own)

- 1:15 pm** **Council Discussion of Second Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning**
- 2:45 pm** **Break**
- 3:00 pm** **Review Workgroup Charges and Deliverables**
 Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr.
 NACEPT Chair
- 3:15 pm** **Workforce Issues and Vulnerable Populations Workgroups meet in separate, concurrent sessions.**
- 6:00 pm** **ADJOURN**

Friday, May 20, 2011

- 8:30 am** **Council Approval of Second Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning**
- 9:30 am** **Workforce Issues and Vulnerable Populations Workgroups meet in separate, concurrent sessions.**
- 11:15 am** **Break**
- 11:30 am** **Workgroup Report-Outs**
- 12:30 pm** **Public Comments**
- 1:00 pm** **Chair's Summary, Action Items, and Future Meeting Dates**
- 2:00 pm** **ADJOURN**

Chair Certification

I, Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr., Chairman of the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) certify the meeting minutes for May 19-20, 2011 are complete and accurately reflect the discussions and decisions of said meeting.

/Signed/

August 10, 2011

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr.
NACEPT Chair

Date