



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

**November 14-15, 2011
EPA Potomac Yard Conference Center
2777 S. Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202**

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 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, welcomed the NACEPT members and thanked them for attending the meeting. He noted that Deputy Administrator Bob Perciasepe would be arriving shortly and then turned the meeting over to Dr. Johnson.

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr., (Howard University), NACEPT Chair, welcomed the members and commented that the morning's presentations would primarily address NACEPT's work on sustainability. NACEPT has been asked to develop advice on how the Agency can implement recommendations from the National Academy of Sciences' *Report on Sustainability and the U.S. EPA* (referred to as the Green Book). In the afternoon, a panel discussion on the NACEPT draft workforce recommendations on diversity and leadership will be held. The two workgroups then will meet in separate, concurrent sessions to continue work on vulnerable populations and workforce issues, and will continue their work the following morning. He thanked all of the speakers for their participation, and recognized in particular Jerome Paulson from the Children's Health Protection Advisory Committee (CHPAC) and Philip Johnson from the Environmental Financial Advisory Board. He explained that they are attending so that the Council has an understanding of current projects that their respective committees have under way that might be complementary to the work on sustainability that NACEPT is beginning. He also thanked members for their work before, during and after the meeting, and paraphrased a quote on teamwork from Vince Lombardi, stating that individual contributions to a group effort will make NACEPT work.

Ms. Cynthia Jones-Jackson, EPA, Acting Director, OFACMO, welcomed all participants. She echoed Dr. Johnson's comments in appreciation of the work NACEPT members had conducted thus far on workforce planning and vulnerable population issues and the impending work on sustainability. She stated that Dr. Johnson's leadership was priceless. She thanked Dr. Bernard Goldstein, Ms. Linda Fisher, and Mr. Terry Yosie, the keynote speakers on sustainability. She also thanked Assistant Administrator for the Office of Research and Development (ORD) and Senior Science Advisor to the Administrator Dr. Paul Anastas; Mr. Ira Leighton, Deputy Regional Administrator for Region 1; and Mr. Craig Hooks, Assistant Administrator for the Office of Administration Resources Management (OARM). She mentioned that Mr. Lek Kadeli, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Management at ORD will be joining

the meeting in the afternoon. She thanked Ms. Ramona Trovato, Associate Assistant Administrator for Management in ORD; Mr. Alan Hecht, Director of Sustainability in ORD; Mr. Stan Meiburg, Deputy Regional Administrator for Region 4; Mr. Raul Soto; and Mr. Rafael DeLeon.

Dr. Johnson asked the members and other attendees to introduce themselves, and introductions were made.

Ms. Vivian Loftness (Carnegie Mellon University), NACEPT member, asked about the draft letters to the Administrator that were circulating among Council members. Dr. Johnson responded that there was a workforce letter in its final stages that deals with diversity; another workforce letter that addresses leadership, which will require some work; and a vulnerable populations letter that may require some additional work following this meeting. She queried whether certain key words were emphasized in the letters: water, air, soil, energy, and so on. Currently, the environmental technologies for vulnerable populations letter does not mention the water issue, but it should. She asked if the Council could make a decision as a group on the key words that should be included. Dr. Johnson commented that the linkages to the six strategic goals of the Agency should be mentioned, but he did not think it was necessary to include every key word.

Ms. Jones-Jackson introduced the first speaker, Mr. Bob Perciasepe, EPA Deputy Administrator.

Opening Remarks

Bob Perciasepe, EPA Deputy Administrator

Mr. Perciasepe thanked the NACEPT members for all of their efforts on behalf of EPA, and noted that one of the topics he would be discussing—the EPA workforce—was related to the work of the Council. At the May meeting, the concept of One EPA was discussed, as was One Great Place To Work, and EPA is continuing to build on these concepts as well as addressing some of the advice provided by NACEPT. In March, the Administrator described the efforts as “three legs to the stool”: a supportive work environment, strengthening career development, and building awareness of the benefits that exist for employees. The Agency has begun to make information more available to employees through a reworking of its intranet. EPA also is trying to create a single sign-in to access the Agency’s various systems (i.e., e-mail, shared drives, intranet) that the staff members use daily. EPA has had software to allow videoconferencing for quite some time, but the Agency is trying to enhance that capability, and to install software that will allow people to conference individually because of the increase in the number of employees that telecommute. In December, an Executive Management Council meeting, which includes all the Deputy Regional and Deputy Assistant Administrators, will be held “virtually” from the 10 regions and several locations in Washington, DC, using Adobe Connect and companion software. Technical support staff will be available on a conference line. It is not free to conduct a virtual meeting via Adobe Connect, but it is much less expensive than flying staff into Washington. Although this will not replace all face-to-face meetings, it is being considered to save money and enhance the interaction of staff when face-to-face contact is not possible. EPA is trying to build these changes into the Agency’s strategic plan so that it can be held accountable in enhancing these systems and building a supportive work environment.

Mr. Perciasepe stated that NACEPT’s comments on diversity within EPA already had been helpful. During the past summer, the President issued an Executive Order directing agencies to submit a framework for diversity in hiring, training and advancement inside the federal workforce. The Executive Management Council now has a subcommittee addressing a strategic diversity plan with Mr. Hook’s team. EPA is looking to improve the coordination between the Office of Civil Rights, which has played a role with respect to special emphasis groups, and OARM. EPA is moving in the direction that has been supported by NACEPT. In regard to improving the experiences of the senior leadership at EPA, the President’s Management Council, which consists of deputies at all of the federal agencies and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and meets monthly, has taken on additional

mentoring and training opportunities for Senior Executive Service (SES) across the agencies and the cross-agency sharing of SES talent. For example, some SES-level EPA staff members now are working in the Department of the Interior (DOI) to help get the new Bureau of Oceans and Environmental Management up and running. He commented that developing partnerships at the federal level has always been a struggle. Mr. Perciasepe said he recently worked with some White House offices on the development of a diagram on how research on hydraulic fracturing at the Department of Energy (DOE), U.S. Geological Survey, DOI and EPA is coordinated. Technology, for example, could be an area of overlap among the agencies but each one's focus would be different. EPA's technology focus is oriented toward technology that currently is available and could be used in a regulatory environment, and DOE is focusing on where the technology is going in the future. Steps are being taken to ensure that these federal research programs are coordinated. EPA also has partnerships with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation (DOT) regarding sustainable communities. In addition, EPA is working to improve coordination with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Dr. Howard Koh, Assistant Secretary of Health at HHS, and Mr. Perciasepe have attended several conferences together. The President's Management Council and the Interagency Council on Environmental Justice (EJ) have directed agencies to draft their own EJ plan.

Since the last time NACEPT met, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), at the request of the Administrator and Dr. Anastas, has produced a report (which is called the Green Book) that examines the points EPA should consider on sustainability. Mr. Perciasepe explained that he thinks of sustainability as a continuum. The study and practice of how to move down that continuum are important concepts for EPA. He believes that the Agency has a real opportunity to bind together many of its disparate parts through the more holistic view of sustainability. For example, renewable biofuels would allow independence from foreign sources of oil, but their production requires a lot of land and may compete with food crops. He also used the examples of catalytic converters and photovoltaic solar cells: both have pros and cons. These are examples that could benefit from enhanced tools and techniques that consider sustainability. Sustainability is simple to embrace, but difficult to implement. The challenge now is to translate the NAS' report into day-to-day practices at the Agency. It will be the topic of a robust discussion for NACEPT. The Administrator, in responding to NAS and thanking them for the work, has suggested that EPA needs to socialize the ideas in the broader community that interacts with EPA. NACEPT has a role to play, and Mr. Perciasepe is pleased that the NAS report is on the Council's agenda. Although there may be obstacles, nothing prohibits EPA from developing more analytic tools for the work it conducts, particularly regulatory impact analysis, rulemakings and broader decisions about the research agenda. He offered the example of secondary smoke exposure to support the fact that EPA's research agenda can have a profound impact on society even when no regulatory authority is exercised, noting that it was EPA's risk assessment in the 1990s that popularized the knowledge of the health impacts of exposure to secondary smoke from cigarettes. The issue of sustainability and how it is incorporated into EPA's decision making on research and other work is important on numerous fronts.

Discussion

Dr. Johnson stated that some of NACEPT's work addresses inclusion as well as diversity; making people a part of the team working to improve the environment. Regarding sustainability, Dr. Johnson would like NACEPT to assist in creating draft charge questions for the Administrator and the SES at EPA on implementing the recommendations in the Green Book, translating it into EPA's day-to-day activities, and socializing the content.

Ms. Loftness asked to what extent risk analysis is a pervasive technique within EPA, and how are the key agendas of water and chemistry being placed against the touchstone of risk analysis. Mr. Perciasepe replied that risk analysis and risk assessment are well-established at EPA, and can inform a bigger picture of sustainability. He explained that his examples went beyond a risk assessment, but that it is a vital tool that has created a common language at EPA across the different media. Things that change are exposure pathways, risk management choices and legal frameworks. The common language of risk assessment is

needed to think across the programs, but sustainability is part of a bigger picture. He added that life-cycle assessment is a useful tool but it involves a very complex set of analyses without a commonality that could be applied across different scenarios. Life-cycle analysis for a biofuel, however, may have attributes that are similar to life-cycle analysis for a chemical.

Ms. Sara Kendall (Weyerhaeuser Company), NACEPT member, mentioned Mr. Perciasepe's comments on socializing sustainability. Regarding the Council's work for the past 18 months on workforce development and the One EPA culture, she asked whether the charges are connected. Mr. Perciasepe responded that getting the EPA workforce to believe that the things they do connect to the work done by other members of the workforce is an important aspect of the One EPA concept. Socializing sustainability inside the workforce helps the One EPA culture as well. Because all government agencies are facing budget cuts, they have to get better at conducting their business with the resources that are available. In socializing sustainability outside of the Agency, Mr. Perciasepe worries that some will perceive it as a new EPA program when instead it is an improved way to be more efficient in performing current work.

Dr. Johnson noted that the Council would be hearing more about sustainability at EPA as well as some examples from private industry. He thanked Mr. Perciasepe for his presentation and then introduced Dr. Bernard Goldstein.

Overview of the National Research Council Report on “Sustainability and the U.S. EPA”
Dr. Bernard D. Goldstein, Chair, Committee on Incorporating Sustainability in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Dr. Goldstein stated that NAS was asked by EPA to give advice on how sustainability can be put into an operational framework at the Agency. The NAS' mission is to advance science and technology and to advise the government and nation on science policy and applications. The report was written by the a committee under the Science and Technology for Sustainability Program, Policy and Global Affairs Division, National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academies. The study builds on existing sustainability efforts in EPA by strengthening the analytic and scientific basis for sustainability as it applies to human health and environmental protection within the Agency's decision-making process.

The study was launched in November of 2010 and the report was published on September 15, 2011. It addressed the following questions: What should be the operational framework for sustainability for EPA? What scientific and analytical tools are needed to support the framework? How can the EPA decision-making process rooted in the risk assessment/risk management (RA/RM) paradigm be integrated into this new sustainability framework? What expertise is needed to support the framework?

The study was undertaken now for a number of reasons: (1) because current and emerging problems are more complex and challenging, (2) tools are becoming available to address these problems, (3) sustainability is becoming a common approach to address broader issues, and (4) it has value to the development and the competitiveness of the United States. The charge for the report was to develop a framework for EPA to solve complex environmental challenges through a more integrated, systems approach similar to the 1983 NRC report *Risk Assessment in the Federal Government*. The recommended framework will be scaled up under the broader NRC study, *Sustainability Linkages in the Federal Government*, which began in September 2011.

The committee did not define sustainability, but used the definition from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA): “to create and maintain conditions, under which humans and nature can exist in productive harmony, that permit fulfilling the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations.” Sustainability is both a process and a goal; the committee approached the task by thinking of it as a process. There will be a staged and programmatic implementation at EPA that will lead to accelerated programs and to a growing body of Agency successes and experiences with sustainability. NRC is not telling EPA to do anything that is contrary to its governing laws. Several committee members

believed that some of the actions EPA is taking now are based on how it interpreted those laws at the time. In their opinion, the laws may not be as restrictive as EPA thinks. The framework has two levels, and both can be organized as circles, as they are two iterative processes. The upper level begins with the overall principles that guide sustainability and says that the EPA Administrator must state EPA's sustainability vision. Sustainability will not work for any agency without a firm commitment to developing metrics and reporting on how well the metrics have been achieved. Framework level two involves stakeholder engagement and collaboration. In the second level, a decision must be taken through evaluation of the outcomes. The tools must go through synergy and tradeoff analysis among the various legs of the sustainability paradigm. One of the topics discussed was the human health issue because the sustainability three-legged stool contains social, environmental and economic concerns. Health has been subsumed under social concerns, but really is a larger part of what EPA does, and it must be incorporated within the sustainability thinking. The framework was developed with the intent that EPA could apply it to any decision to which a need arose.

The committee recommends that EPA develop a "sustainability toolbox" that includes a suite of tools for use in the Sustainability Assessment and Management approach. Collectively, the suite of tools should have the ability to analyze present and future consequences of alternative decision options on the full range of social, environmental and economic indicators. Application of these tools, ranging from simple to complex, should have the capability for showing distributional impacts of alternative options with particular reference to vulnerable or disadvantaged groups and ecosystems. Examples of these tools include risk assessment and life-cycle assessment. Tradeoff and synergy analysis are needed to develop tools, and NRC hopes that as EPA tries to develop even more sustainability approaches, the tools will develop further. The committee recommends EPA include risk assessment as a tool, when appropriate, as a key input in its sustainability decision making.

Sustainability goes beyond risk management as it is primarily concerned with maximizing benefit while addressing risks of concern, rather than being an exercise focused mainly on achieving risk-based standards. NRC and others have been trying to extend the risk assessment/risk management framework to encompass sustainability. Risk assessment and risk management should be subsumed into sustainability.

Expertise required to support the framework would include multidisciplinary professionals who are proficient in many disciplines, who have experience in the development and implementation in the sustainability assessment tools described, and who have a working knowledge in all three pillars and their application to environmental issues. The Agency should hire leaders and scientists from within and outside sectors to aid in shifting to a more cross-cutting mindset. Although EPA has existing staff in all the main areas of sustainability-related fields, the Agency should further facilitate collaboration among existing professional expertise. The committee recommends EPA institute a focused program of change management to achieve the goal of incorporating sustainability into all of the Agency's thinking; to foster Agency-wide innovation; to optimize the social, environmental, and economic benefits of its decisions; and create a new culture among all EPA employees.

Discussion

Dr. DeWitt John (Bowdoin College), NACEPT member, asked if the committee found places or organizations that had implemented sustainability assessment and management in a successful manner. Dr. Goldstein responded that examples were provided in the report, but his favorite is the New York City school system's \$1.2 billion bill for replacing polychlorinated biphenyls-containing light fixtures. The energy savings realized from the low-energy fixtures prevented the layoff of teachers. EPA's willingness to work with the local agencies, environmental groups and citizens to deal with the risk issue is shown in a number of examples. The percentage for which the United States as a nation is responsible for superb work in advancing sustainability is much smaller than it was during the risk area in 1983. EPA needs to pay attention to the many international examples.

Ms. Loftness noted that the precautionary principle is an issue that the Europeans are beginning to adopt in which a lack of complete knowledge does not lead to the inability to act. She asked Dr. Goldstein for his thoughts on this principle, and he replied that he believed it to be a superb principle that had been subverted by the European propensity to use it as a trade barrier; it is basically risk-guided use of public health. NRC believes that the precaution is built into sustainability and into many U.S. laws.

Ms. Jennifer Nash (Harvard University), NACEPT member, stated that talk of culture change makes her apprehensive because the discussion is at a high and broad level at a time of significant resource constraints. NACEPT is being asked to advise EPA on how to take the report forward, but she does not want NACEPT to delay further progress. She asked for concrete, small steps that NACEPT could recommend that would help progress sustainability. Dr. Goldstein responded that NACEPT could build on a number of actions that EPA already is taking; the question to ask is how to empower the staff within EPA that already wants to move toward sustainability.

Dr. Jerry Paulson (CHPAC) commented that the NAS report mentions conducting activities across silos in the Agency. Through the CHPAC, he works with a part of EPA that is supposed to be transdisciplinary, and he is seeking suggestions on how sustainability can work in the context of an Agency that is designed to think in silos. Dr. Goldstein replied that the issue cannot be solved quickly, but can be managed with effort. The NRC hopes that the report provides a framework that enables people to manage it.

Ms. Erica Bannerman (City of Alexandria), NACEPT member, noted that the report defines “long-term” as more than 5 years, which seemed counter-intuitive. Dr. Goldstein replied that he did not recall the consideration of this timeframe.

Dr. Ben Dysart (Dysart and Associates, Inc.), NACEPT member, stated that Dr. Goldstein had mentioned benefit/cost analysis, and asked for guidance on what costs and what benefits get counted, and which ones do not get counted. Dr. Goldstein responded that the committee did not address details at that level.

Sustainability From the Perspective of Other Organizations

Ms. Linda J. Fisher, Chief Sustainability Officer, DuPont

Ms. Fisher noted that she uses the same presentation inside DuPont to socialize sustainability. DuPont has 13 different businesses, and they range from the handling of toxic substances to producing seeds for food. Getting staff to think about sustainability across that continuum is difficult, and getting them to think of it as one DuPont is a challenge.

Sustainability is a highly evolving concept; when she compares the Green Book (NRC’s report on sustainability) to the Red Book (NRC’s report on risk assessment from 1983), the one caution she has is that although components of risk assessment have changed over time, it is perhaps more frozen in approach. Sustainability is moving so rapidly that she worries that the framework may be out of date quickly. As EPA socializes sustainability, it should consider how quickly some of the concepts are moving.

The discussion around sustainability and the environment has shifted from what government is going to tell industry to do to a whole lot of forces on industry that are making businesses rethink their business model. Businesses and their products are under attack. Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) use the marketplace to both attack and work with companies to bring about change, and companies are very responsive to that. In terms of sustainability, in many cases government is driving industry, and in many cases, the government is lagging behind industry because society is setting expectations to which industry is responding that are ahead of the government regulatory process.

The global regulatory landscape is changing. The United States used to be ahead of many other countries, but this is no longer the case. A very complex web of product regulations exists globally, so DuPont must

navigate regulatory regimes around the world. It is expensive and complicated, and is driving industry to think differently about product development and whether products can be designed out of the regulatory programs.

DuPont is a science- and market-driven company. Its vision is to be the world's most dynamic science company, creating sustainable solutions. Sustainable growth, as defined for DuPont, is the creation of shareholder and societal value while reducing the environmental footprint along the value chains in which it operates. DuPont considers the products that it can bring to the market that might make its customers more sustainable. Considerable confusion exists about how this is different from DuPont's commitment to environmental stewardship. DuPont has four core values: safety, environmental stewardship, highest ethical values, and respect for people. Environmental stewardship is seen as managing businesses to ensure that DuPont is in compliance with all legal requirements, and that the use of raw material, water and energy is minimized. Environmental stewardship does not relate to what is brought to market as sustainable growth does.

DuPont's sustainable growth journey began with compliance and moved through footprint reduction goals, energy goals and market-facing goals. DuPont targeted energy for sustainability and made commitments to keep the energy use to 1990 levels. Currently, the company runs 8 to 9 percent below the 1990 level of energy use although the company has grown 40 to 50 percent. This has saved shareholders about \$4 to \$5 billion. DuPont discovered that if it focused research dollars on products that would make society more sustainable, it would be more effective than decreasing its footprint to zero. This was a major shift for the company that began around 2006. DuPont committed to double its research investment for products and services that make its value chain more sustainable by 2015. Research products are measured against 11 environmental criteria; to qualify, the product must be 40 percent better in one and at least equal in the other 10 criteria. Other goals beyond increasing research and development investments are increasing revenue from products that improve energy efficiency or reduce greenhouse gases, doubling revenues from non-depletable resources, and introducing 1,000 products to make people safer.

There is competitive advantage in having products in compliance, but there is a more competitive advantage if industry can work with the customers to go beyond compliance to environmental stewardship, and it increases even further when the focus is on product sustainability and societal needs. DuPont's sustainable growth goals are based on major trends, such as increasing food production, decreasing dependence on fossil fuels, and protecting lives and the environment. The company now conducts sustainable growth reviews, which are included in the planning cycle, during the strategy reviews. These in turn feed into the technology and corporate budget reviews, and the process begins again.

Dr. Terry F. Yosie, President and Chief Executive Officer, World Environment Center

Dr. Yosie explained that the World Environment Center (WEC) was created by the United Nations (UN) in the early 1970s at the same time that EPA was created. People at the UN as well as in the private sector thought there was a need to create a neutral institution where business and government could discuss the emerging global environmental agenda. It became an independent NGO in the early 1980s.

The WEC works with about 46 large global companies. Its mission is to work with them in partnership with governments, other NGOs, universities and other stakeholders to help them implement sustainable development in their business strategies and day-to-day operations. Across the world, individual nations, companies and others are attempting to adapt to major environmental drivers and tailor them to their purpose. Currently, there are major shifts in power and policy around the world, and there is a transition away from the United States and Europe.

Sustainability has become important because of globalization of market-driven economic activity; emergence of global-scale problems, limitations of current institutions, and evolution of global, middle-

class consumer values. Sustainability continues to evolve, and today consists of wealth creation using fewer natural resources; transitioning to lower carbon economies; innovation opportunities and value creation linked at market scale; redefined roles and responsibilities for business, government, NGOs and consumers; and adaptability for the longer term.

Siemens is examining urbanization because it provides power and water to cities. IBM has a number of technology platforms with which it can examine transportation, health care, or energy efficiency and allow these different systems to talk to each other. Unilever believes it has a strong case for business sustainability, and plans to de-couple its future economic growth from environmental impacts. Unilever has specific quantitative measures of the number of people who will be living healthier lifestyles because of the reformulation of their products.

Regarding sustainability and government policy, China recently published its 12th 5-year plan that makes major commitments on sustainable development. The Chinese believe that sustainability is part of the platform for their own economic development, and take a broad, long-term view. China has set a number of quantitative policy targets, including those for farmland reserves and water consumption and quality, and plans to apply an integrated array of policy tools, such as technology standards, emission limits and taxes.

To integrate sustainability into a policy framework successfully, it is necessary to take a systems approach. Other criteria for policy success are broadening the risk assessment framework into a life-cycle approach, thinking about closed-loop systems such as net-zero buildings, expanding transparency to create competitive markets, and new competencies. Conversely, criteria for policy failure include lack of investment in research and development, ignoring economics, assuming that one institution can solve large-scale problems, remaining only a regulatory agency, and not accepting that sustainability requires radical change in leadership and behavior.

Discussion

Mr. Robert Olson (Institute for Alternative Futures), NACEPT member, noted that Ms. Fisher had stressed how the sustainable growth review early in the planning cycle was important for driving sustainability in the company; he asked if an analogy could be made to EPA's planning processes. Ms. Fisher responded that this might be seen in the Agency strategy document, which could continue to emphasize the natural resource or environmental issues at stake that tools need to address.

Ms. Ella Filippone (Passaic River Coalition), NACEPT member, commented that there had been much discussion about developing new products. She comes from the state with the largest number of brownfields in the United States, and to be sustainable, many places must be cleaned up. She asked how DuPont applied its sustainability initiatives to contaminated areas. Ms. Fisher replied that DuPont's remediation group has been active with EPA in considering positive uses of contaminated sites. In terms of the approach to specific sites, DuPont tends to hold onto the property, but is considering other ways to address what might be best for communities, such as leasing the properties for development of solar fields or wind farms.

Mr. Kurt Erichsen (Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments), NACEPT member, mentioned that urban density was key in the development of U.S. cities, and asked how U.S. cities compared with global urbanization and about the differences between economic drivers in these cases. Dr. Yosie replied that major American cities had shown a great deal of leadership in this area. There are two things that differentiate the experience in U.S. cities from other parts of the world. First, in some countries, there are 20 million people living in a city—the scale is overwhelming in terms of managing city services. This makes these cities more receptive to sustainability than cities in the west. Second, in other countries, government has taken a more active role in enabling sustainability discussions and investing in infrastructure.

Ms. Bannerman asked how diversity and inclusion efforts should fit within a sustainability framework for an organization such as EPA. Dr. Yosie responded that WEC conducted a lot of work with global companies and their suppliers in different countries. In Latin America, 30 to 35 percent of suppliers to Walmart and other large companies are managed by women. Issues related to women's empowerment are directly related to the success of a company in growing products that will be sold in the U.S. market. These are not issues unfamiliar to EPA or other agencies.

Dr. Paulson commented that an issue he saw for the sustainability process is how to create unified balance sheets. Many benefits from environmental regulation will be health benefits. Dr. Yosie agreed that this would apply to accounting models as well. Ms. Fisher mentioned that her one concern about the framework is that it could become a rigid approach to a fluid process.

Ms. Nash said she was surprised by the framework approach to sustainability, and asked if DuPont addressed sustainability through a management system approach. Ms. Fisher responded that DuPont was using the management system of its planning process, but it has fewer audiences to satisfy than EPA. Dr. Yosie added that many companies build their sustainability commitments using management systems as a foundation.

Dr. Dysart asked how and to what extent leading companies are factoring social costs into business decisions. Ms. Fisher responded that DuPont was attempting to understand any adverse health consequences through its product stewardship program and compliance program. Dr. Yosie added that the issue Dr. Dysart raised is part of a burgeoning conversation around the world. The economic and environmental parts of the sustainability discussion have received more emphasis to date than the social aspect. Ms. Fisher added that the product regulatory regimes also were exploding around the world.

Incorporating Sustainability in the U.S. EPA

Dr. Paul Anastas, Senior Science Advisor and Assistant Administrator for the Office of Research and Development, EPA

Dr. Anastas stated that the Administrator characterized the topic of sustainability as building on the 40-year foundation of what EPA has done, but went on to state that the difference between risk assessment and sustainability is like the difference between treating a disease and pursuing wellness. Pursuing wellness means EPA must pursue its mission of protecting human health and the environment in a compatible manner with societal and economic benefit. Sustainability means pursuing the mission more effectively. EPA is focusing on how to operationalize sustainability. There has been considerable focus on the "what" of sustainability, but EPA and NACEPT must focus on the "how." Operationalizing sustainability will be a complex challenge, but EPA is open to this. The Agency values the ongoing conversation with NACEPT because it makes EPA more efficient and effective.

Dr. Anastas said he would like to have a conversation about the framework that Dr. Goldstein discussed and whether or not it is frozen in time, because he views it more as an approach to adaptive management that allows for flexibility. Level 1 of the framework is Agency-wide process, and Level 2 is sustainability assessment and management process. EPA has formed a Science and Technology Sustainability Team that is focusing on some of the recommendations in the Green Book. The team has been tasked with developing a science-based guide for practitioners. It will incorporate relevant examples from EPA programs and be subject to external peer review.

This approach to considering sustainability analytics examines how EPA understands the challenges and recommendations of NAS. There is a need for a scientific approach to sustainability, and the heart of this is the assessment tool kits mentioned in the Green Book. Risk assessment is described as a fundamental pillar of sustainability, but risk assessment itself is not static. When life-cycle assessment is examined, it really is dealing with life-cycle perspectives. Assessment tools also include environmental footprint

analysis, ecosystem service valuation, and inherency analysis. These assessment tools will change, but hopefully toward a broader understanding. The Science and Technology Policy Council (STPC) has been engaged and there has been cross-Agency engagement as well. Within ORD, the research program has been aligned to focus research endeavors on sustainability. Additionally, EPA will do the same for its extramural research portfolio and the guidance on sustainability analytics is being produced. He suggested that NACEPT be explicit about whether or not sustainability is important for EPA to pursue. Implementing policies can be simple, but institutionalizing and operationalizing them can be difficult; therefore, EPA is seeking advice and recommendations from NACEPT.

Ms. Nancy K. Stoner, Acting Assistant Administrator, EPA Office of Water

Ms. Stoner noted that she would discuss water sustainability as an example in trying to determine how to operationalize sustainability in one area while being cognizant of the bigger picture. EPA needs to move to a framework that looks at water resources differently because of the aging of the existing infrastructure, population growth, development, urbanization trends, and climate change. This change will present a number of opportunities for development of additional fields. The environmental technology field has great potential for the United States, for example.

A sustainability policy exists at EPA for water infrastructure, which is an effort to lay out principles on three fronts: the sustainability of the water infrastructure, the broader sustainability of water and sector systems, and the role these play in the overall sustainability of the communities. It stresses fixing the existing infrastructure and the need to coordinate water infrastructure investments with plans for growth and investment in all aspects of community infrastructure.

Green infrastructure means both existing natural infrastructure and engineered infrastructure designed to mimic the natural infrastructure and provide the same functions. It is an important element in having sustainable communities. EPA is focusing on green infrastructure in terms of the sustainability of water and wastewater infrastructure and how that fits into the broader paradigm of sustainable communities. EPA's green infrastructure agenda is about community partnerships and determining how to develop tools that help people in decision making, and reducing barriers to dissemination of sustainable ideas. EPA has 10 initial partners in this endeavor and hopes to have many more.

A memorandum from Cynthia Giles and Ms. Stoner about wet weather integration was distributed recently. The objective is to examine the various investments EPA is making in wastewater, storm water, combined sewer overflow, sanitary sewer overflow, and nutrient removal and to prioritize them. Another effort—urban waters and sustainable communities—is focused on water as a centerpiece of healthy communities. Both of these efforts attempt to ensure that investments are aligned with sustainability. Ms. Stoner noted that DOT, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and EPA, in terms of sustainable communities, must consider how money is spent so that issues are not considered individually.

Mr. Ira Leighton, Deputy Regional Administrator, EPA Region 1 (New England)

Mr. Leighton hoped NACEPT could develop a charge to help put sustainability on the ground at the regional level because his organization is faced with addressing some of the recommendations in the Green Book. Region 1 is trying to find a way in which the workforce can identify areas where there is an intersection of social, environmental and economic factors. As part of Earth Month, the Region hosted a Sustainability Day in which EPA staff members heard their colleagues describe their experiences of landing on those nodes where key principles meet national programs and cross-cutting initiatives. A second Sustainability Day will be held in February 2012.

Region 1 also created a Sustainability Steering Committee, which is a cross-section of the workforce from all of the Region's offices. Its goals are to encourage a Region 1 culture change toward greater

sustainability; to promote and implement education and communication, measurement of progress, and tool development to support regional sustainability outcomes; and to support national EPA sustainability initiatives. All work at Region 1 on sustainability is supported by sustainability workgroups designed to support education and outreach, identify and utilize sustainability tools, and highlight new and existing sustainability measures.

Region 1's proposed Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 actions involve investing in activities that are replicable; linked to existing program priorities, core environmental goals, or cross-cutting initiatives; feasible in terms of known resources; and measurable in terms of progress. There were 16 projects active in the Region that illustrate real progress on sustainability principles, but many were instituted as pilots. They were driven primarily by EPA and less so by a connection with outside stakeholders, and in many cases the benefits have been tracked only anecdotally. At the end of FY 2012, the goal is for sustainability to be supported by all program actions, measured, and driven by both EPA and stakeholders.

As one of the initiatives, Region 1 decided to focus on the relationship between energy efficiency and the need for enhanced performance of water and wastewater treatment plants. This led to an auditing tool for energy that the Office of Water gave to Region 1. The Region aims for zero-net energy, and believes it is feasible to operate a large percentage of its infrastructure without importing electricity from the grid. Another project involves the application of a cutting-edge tool in the Narragansett Bay Nutrient Project. Dr. Anastas provided this tool to allow Region 1 to develop a strategy to answer the question: What are the linkages between the value of the resources, who pays, fisheries, costs, nonpoint solutions, and point source approaches? Modeling systems are being integrated among economic, environmental and social aspects.

If Region 1 is successful in its endeavors, sustainable, incremental and measurable outcomes will be achieved; there will be a culture change within the Region, and sustainable efforts will be considered the most effective approaches.

Discussion

Dr. Johnson asked if EPA was examining readily available tools for sustainability. Mr. Leighton replied that it was EPA's approach to make incremental progress using the tools at hand.

Ms. Loftness noted that her workgroup has been charged with examining what kinds of critical technologies and sciences are needed: measurement technologies, assessment technologies and solution technologies are being considered. She asked if there was a sense at EPA which category needed the most focus. Dr. Anastas stated that the Agency has established a history of deeply understanding complex environmental issues; this is important to inform solutions. Transforming knowledge into a solution is essential, and much work is being conducted to accomplish this. Ms. Stoner added that dissemination of solutions is another area on which EPA needs to work.

Mr. Erichsen asked what issues and roadblocks inhibit the widespread implementation of green infrastructure as a solution to combined sewer and wet weather issues for wastewater treatment plants. Ms. Stoner noted that the Clean Water America Alliance just issued a report on that topic, but there are challenges in terms of scaling up solutions; the complex nature of the various agencies that need to be involved in green infrastructure at the federal and local levels; complex federal, state, and local requirements that can conflict with each other; tailoring solutions for particular communities; and creating funding packages. Mr. Leighton added that solutions were needed for dealing with the institutional aspects of these problems.

Ms. Kendall stated that there was an inherent tension between EPA's historic skill set and getting the strategic direction correct. This may be a long-term transformation of EPA. She asked what the Agency would like to get from NACEPT. Dr. Anastas said there was a recognition that there would be near-term,

medium-term and long-term victories and investments. Identifying these victories will be very helpful. EPA produces considerable information; is it provided to the public in a reductionist manner? Regarding culture change, this may be aligning the existing threads in Agency culture with the change EPA wants to enact. Mr. Leighton offered that NACEPT could make recommendations that allow EPA to shift the conversation from the anecdotal to the science.

Public Comment

James H. Johnson, Jr., NACEPT Chair

Dr. Johnson stated that it was time to call for public comment. No public comments were offered.

Discussion (Continued)

Mr. Clayton Matt (Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes), NACEPT member, commented that tribes have been thinking about sustainability for years. Industry is recognizing how to deal with scale by taking a market approach, and EPA regions are dealing with it by taking incremental, measurable approaches. If achieving sustainability is a process, at what point should setting sustainability goals at the macro-scale be discussed? Dr. Anastas replied that these goals need to be set with the recognition that current metrics are not necessarily geared toward sustainability goals. Having NACEPT's opinion on the topic would be useful. Mr. Leighton commented that the approach to larger scale problems in Region 1 was to choose the most important problems and fix them. As long as EPA is able to show that the trendline is moving in the right direction, that is what matters at a macro level.

Dr. Anastas thanked NACEPT for a rich conversation. There have been discussions of sustainability throughout much of EPA's history, but the Agency needs NACEPT's opinion to ensure that it is systematic, institutionalized and operationalized. Ms. Stoner thanked the Council, and asked that NACEPT consider goals both internal and external to the Agency. Mr. Leighton commented that the more NACEPT's efforts are connected to an understanding of what motivates EPA's workforce, the more the recommendations will be valued by the Agency.

Ms. Bicky Corman, (EPA, Office of Policy) noted that the Agency was hopeful that NACEPT would make recommendations where the Agency's expertise could best be applied, including some short-term projects.

Dr. Johnson thanked the panel members for their time and input.

Overview of NACEPT's Draft Advice Letters of EPA Workforce Planning: *Ensuring Diversity and Attracting and Retaining Superior Executive Leadership Talent* and Discussion on NACEPT's Final Overarching Workforce Planning Letter

Presenters: *Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr., NACEPT Chair; Mr. Effenus Henderson, NACEPT Workforce Diversity Sub-Team; Ms. Sara Kendall, NACEPT Workforce Leadership Sub-Team*

Discussants: *Mr. Craig E. Hooks, Assistant Administrator, EPA Office of Administration and Resources Management; Ms. Ramona Trovato, Deputy Associate Administrator for Management, EPA ORD; Mr. A. Stanley Meiburg, Deputy Regional Administrator, EPA Region 4 (Southeast); Mr. Raul Soto, Jr., Associate Assistant Administrator for Outreach, Diversity and Collaboration (ODAC), EPA Office of Administration and Resources Management; and Mr. Rafael DeLeon, Director, EPA Office of Civil Rights*

Dr. Johnson noted, in the past year, NACEPT has produced two advice letters in response to the Agency's charge on workforce planning issues. The first letter addressed scientific and technical competencies needed; the second recommended strategies to obtain and retain scientific and technical expertise and leadership for the culture of One EPA. The Council now is completing work on the final two charge questions. Mr. Effenus Henderson will provide an overview of the recommendations in the draft advice

letter on ensuring diversity at EPA. Agency panel members will determine if the charge question has been answered, and NACEPT will determine if the letter is ready for approval. Ms. Kendall will review the points in the draft letter on attracting and retaining leadership talent. The draft letters, once approved, will be combined into one document and will address related issues that have been raised since the letters were drafted.

Mr. Henderson noted that the diversity sub-team believes that diversity and inclusion is a significant and growing priority for the Agency. Stakeholder groups are numerous and increasingly diverse and go beyond the workforce to the communities and private industry.

The sub-team was charged with addressing three questions: (1) How can EPA best ensure access to a diverse and technically astute SES applicant pool? (2) What can EPA do to ensure that diverse applicants selected into the SES are retained, developed and promoted? (3) Given the broader concept of diversity that EPA is espousing to, how can EPA define and then track/measure diversity in this broadest sense? The steps that the sub-team took during the process involved understanding the current states of diversity at EPA; assessing commitment from Agency leaders; understanding alignment with Office of Personnel Management (OPM) processes and practices; and discussing and drafting the proposed recommendations included in the letter.

The sub-team developed the following recommendations: (1) enhance the linkage of diversity and inclusion strategies to the overall mission of EPA and the One EPA theme; (2) consider the impact of demographic change on cross-cutting strategies; (3) institute an Agency-wide diversity and inclusion framework for EPA actions; and (4) strengthen the talent pipeline for SES-level positions.

To enhance the linkage to the Agency mission, there must be a conversation with EPA leadership about whether diversity and inclusion is an important part of the strategy because leadership must drive these objectives. Additionally, the inclusion strategies should be expanded to include all critical stakeholder groups, and align the concepts with One EPA. Demographic effects should be analyzed in terms of EPA's abilities to: expand the conversation on environmentalism; work for environmental justice and children's health; advance science, research and technological innovation; strengthen state, tribal and international relationships; and strengthen EPA's workforce and capabilities. A framework at EPA for diversity and inclusion should include leadership expectations and accountability, and integration with the strategic plan. The final recommendation should strengthen the talent pipeline, particularly among minorities, for SES-level positions by taking actions that focus on areas where there are significant utilization gaps of women and minorities, and creating or enhancing relevant programs at minority-serving institutions.

Diversity will be a cornerstone to EPA's ability to create a sustainable organization and carry out its mandates. The sub-team's suggestion is that EPA needs to build a much more strategic diversity framework that sets some clear expectations for leaders.

Ms. Filippone asked if multilingual or bilingual elements are included in the program. Mr. Henderson responded that they are, because Latino/Hispanic communities are significantly underrepresented and a specific strategy targeted at building those relationships is an important dimension.

Ms. Kendall explained that she was standing in for Ms. Leah Ann Lamb who had been leading the sub-team on leadership. The sub-team's letter currently is a work in progress. The charge was to examine EPA's strategies to attract and retain superior executive leadership talent. Many of EPA's interests and concerns in this area relate to the fact that it has an extremely loyal employee base and although many staff members do not retire when they become eligible, there are many employees who probably will retire soon, and a qualified SES pipeline is needed. The sub-team asked: How can EPA best position its SES members to lead and support a highly technical and evolving workforce? What might a typical developmental path look like in an organization that focuses on the leadership capabilities and culture required to achieve One EPA? What measures could EPA adopt that would best exemplify progress in

achieving One EPA and measure the associated leadership capabilities and culture? The sub-team also is trying to link these recommendations to NACEPT's recommendations on One EPA.

Ms. Kendall pointed out that the sub-team has received a great deal of help from EPA's Chris Zarba and Dave O'Connor who presented a session on Agency leadership development programs in place. The sub-team also had a follow-up conversation with Linda Fisher about her tenure at EPA.

In terms of organizing topics, the sub-team tried to analyze how to optimize existing training and development, consider additional options for leadership development, and address organizational transformation and transition. Beyond people, organizational structure and talent must be developed. The sub-team's findings to date are that EPA is conducting significant well-directed work on this topic, although there are recommendations to improve it. Potential areas for improvement include: full engagement of existing SES in succession planning; funding of the formal Candidate Development Program; assessment and leveraging of regional leadership best practices; institutionalization of a career path that includes exposure to multiple parts of the organization; focusing on core competency training on strategic thinking; aligning One EPA leadership principles with core competencies; and planning more intentional organizational transformation. The sub-team has specific recommendations for the latter topic: conduct more intentional organization analysis at the managerial level; enhance career management planning to encourage mobility; ensure effective succession planning for departments; and strengthen basic and inclusive leadership skills in leadership candidates.

Dr. Johnson introduced the panel of discussants.

Mr. Hooks recognized Ms. Kim Lewis, the Director of the Office of Human Resources, who was present at the meeting. He then thanked NACEPT for previous recommendations, which the Agency already has begun to integrate. He noted that he is the Chief Sustainability Officer for EPA, and was pleased to hear the morning's discussion. Much of the work EPA is conducting on sustainability is driven by Executive Order. EPA does take diversity and inclusion seriously, but there is always room for improvement. Fifty percent of EPA's existing SES are eligible to retire now, and 68 percent will be eligible by 2013. When it comes to diversity in the SES ranks, NACEPT's recommendations are good in three out of four cases. If you examine the diversity profile of EPA's SES core compared to the diversity of the Agency overall, it is not the same. NACEPT's recommendations represent a long-term solution; it will be 20 years before someone moves from college to the SES level in the Agency. He asked what the Agency should do to facilitate bringing people from outside EPA into the SES ranks and upper management positions of the Agency.

Mr. Soto thanked the NACEPT membership for its attention to the charge. The work NACEPT has done in clarifying the definition of diversity and inclusion and developing the metrics that will measure progress on this topic in the strategic plan goes to the heart of EPA's collaborative efforts. He suggested that rather than just strengthening its SES workforce, EPA should rethink the talent pipeline development for SES. The recommendations are thoughtful and reasonable. Diversity is the mindset, and inclusion is the action and initiative. He is encouraged by the recommendations as they are in line with efforts that EPA already has initiated. In terms of linking diversity inclusion to the strategic plan, it must go beyond compliance and be useful enough to provide specific recommendations on what methodologies and actions EPA should use to guarantee diversity for the next 40 years of EPA. The recommendation on strengthening the pipeline needs a sense of urgency, and EPA should be elevating some approaches that can be taken immediately. Perhaps there are two complementary pathways to reinforce the workforce. Additionally, communication styles for the respective constituencies must be addressed; better ways for EPA to communicate with both its internal and external communities should be included in the advice letter. Finally, when he examines the diversity and inclusion plan, he struggles between trying to develop individual pillars that focus on the various areas of opportunity and creating some overarching philosophy.

Mr. Meiburg thanked Dr. Johnson and NACEPT members for their work. He noted that leadership development is an important issue. The future SES at EPA will have to be able to: work extremely hard, possess excellent situational awareness, and understand the whole Agency, not just one piece of it. They also will have to function well outside of their comfort zone, be able to fit their style to the circumstances they face, be articulate and thoughtful with a wide variety of audiences; and collaborate well with others. EPA is not going to be able to accomplish its mission by relying solely on regulatory tools. The Agency does face some challenges. Borrowing from Dr. Yosie's presentation, if future SES staff wanted to fail, they would focus on only one dimension of leadership, would not invest in continued executive development, would not value interpersonal leadership networking, would promote people who were not ready, and would neglect the human factor. The Agency collectively needs to invest more thoughtfully and systematically in leadership development; he believes NACEPT's recommendations are correct, especially the support of the SES Candidate Development Program.

Ms. Trovato noted that she had retired from EPA but returned to the Agency to work on two initiatives: sustainability and the organizational transformation of ORD. She and Mr. Meiburg both are graduates of the SES Candidate Development Program, which is excellent for networking and forming relationships with other SESers. She strongly supports the recommendation for its funding. She also supports mobility within the Agency because staff will gain experiences and lessons learned to share with EPA staff. She also supports the recommendations for organizational transformation with regard to leadership. She initially came to EPA because she believed in supporting its mission; she stayed for that same reason but she also stayed to serve the public. There is great value in public service. In terms of diversity, from an ORD perspective, the office does not have the right skill mix for sustainability. Economists and social scientists are needed, as are people who are skilled at collaboration. The diversity recommendations should be broadened from their focus on racial diversity to consider needed skill mixes.

Mr. DeLeon thanked NACEPT for its efforts on charge questions 1, 2, and 4, and its continuing efforts on charge questions 3 and 5. On recommendation 1, to move the Agency forward, there is need for greater clarity and connection to the mission critical strategies and goals of the Agency. Additionally, to effectively manage environmental programs, EPA will have to find people who can effectively engage with diverse leaders, Agency staff, citizens, environmental organizations, and community groups. With regard to recommendation 2, the most underrepresented group at the Agency is Hispanics. In terms of multilingual obligations of the Agency, he referred to the order EPA has just released on Limited English Proficiency (LEP). He will send the document to Ms. Megan Moreau (EPA, OFACMO) and Mr. Eugene Green (EPA, OFACMO) so that they can distribute it to the NACEPT members. An order released a month ago tasks each region and program to look at its guidance, policies and procedures and ensure that the most underserved communities have a voice in their development. Part of the order also requires that each program and region create an LEP plan by the end of December 2011. The creation of a framework appears consistent with EPA's diversity efforts. He asked that NACEPT revise a sentence at the end of the third recommendation, which states that the President's Executive Order provides the legal basis for diversity and inclusion in the federal workplace, and the Executive Order provides more guidance and direction for the executive branch. Pertaining to recommendation 4, as Mr. Hooks said, just using education for the pipeline means that it will take many years to increase minority numbers. EPA must be inclusive of other strategies, and NACEPT should think short-term as well. The last sentence in the recommendation needs some attention; it may unintentionally be encouraging non-minority institutions to give preferential treatment to minority students. Finally, one observation on the draft sub-team gap analysis: the fourth bullet states that the internal and external pipelines are adequate. He thanked Cynthia Jones-Jackson and the OFACMO team for organizing and supporting the meeting.

Discussion

Ms. Filippone asked Mr. DeLeon to repeat the name of the multilingual order just released and to describe it. Mr. DeLeon responded that it was the Limited English Proficiency Order, and it is an Executive Order that directs federal agencies to provide meaningful access to their programs and activities to those who

have limited English proficiency. Each agency has an obligation to make its programs and activities accessible.

Ms. Bannerman thanked the discussants for their comments, and noted that comments on the short-term versus long-term solutions for the pipeline were relevant. She then asked discussants to define what they meant by short term. Mr. Hooks responded that the Administrator wanted to see change in 4-year increments. EPA has had a long history of filling SES positions from within the same office, but now multiple experiences around the Agency are more valued. The challenge that EPA will face, however, is bringing someone in at the GS-15 level that comes from outside the Agency. Ms. Bannerman asked if it would be beneficial in the letter to classify recommendations in the addendum section as short-term and long-term. Mr. Hooks agreed that it would be helpful. Ms. Trovato mentioned that ORD currently is recruiting Title 42 positions to lead its national research programs. It is likely these positions will be filled by individuals from outside EPA, therefore, they will not know how EPA works. The management at ORD is planning to help them succeed by hiring coaches and identifying mentors for them within senior leadership. Dr. Johnson added that the Title 42 positions do not have to be filled from outside the Agency.

Mr. Billy Turner (BTurner Consulting, Inc.), NACEPT member, commented that leadership opportunities within the organizational structure are the main focus, but he believes that there are opportunities to achieve leadership skills outside the employing organization. For example, there are leadership opportunities in educational institutions as well as community and faith-based organizations, which offer ample opportunity for leadership development. He encouraged adding this to the letter. Mr. Meiburg agreed, and noted that considerable activity of this sort was being conducted at the regional level.

Mr. Henderson stated that his sub-team struggled with how to provide recommendations on what is taken for granted. Mentoring and coaching will help people join EPA, but the sub-team was not sure that it should address this issue. In industry there is an example of scorecards — leaders have a scorecard that includes diversity metrics that are reviewed and leaders are rewarded or not rewarded for their results in that as well as other areas. Is that the kind of recommendation EPA is seeking in terms of a short-term recommendation? Mr. DeLeon confirmed the scorecard was a good example of a short-term recommendation. EPA has started using interview panels for hiring, but it would be useful to have this reinforced through recommendation as a best practice. Mr. Soto added that in the area of analytics, his office is working on something called the dashboard that functions in the same manner as a scorecard to help the practitioners as well as the leadership. Mr. DeLeon stated that for the current MD 715 exercise, each agency must conduct an analysis of its work force, and EPA had been able to begin collecting applicant flow data on how many people are applying for jobs, how many are found to be qualified, and how many are being selected. The analysis has shown that EPA has some useful outreach and recruitment efforts with respect to American Indians and Hispanics. They are applying and qualifying for the jobs, but they are not being selected. It would be helpful if NACEPT suggested best practices and approaches that other organizations use in dealing with attitudinal barriers or other indicators of discrimination in the selection process. During the next year, EPA will examine what is driving the selection decisions.

Dr. Johnson stated that NACEPT would look at the recommendations made in relationship to the original charge, and noted that the workforce group would morph into a discussion about sustainability.

Ms. Loftness commented that she extracted sections from the Green Book that are critical for the workforce and vulnerable populations groups to consider.

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. Jim Johnson (Co-Lead), Ms. Sara Kendall, Ms. Leah Ann Lamb (via telephone), Mr. Robert Olson,

and Dr. Olufemi Osidele (via telephone). Mr. Effenus Henderson serves as a consultant and Co-Lead for the workgroup.

Ms. Kendall thought the workgroup should discuss a process for finalizing the workforce letters, because it makes sense to have both letters brought forward to the Council at the same time. Additionally, the areas of overlap should be discussed. Ms. Bannerman stated that the diversity sub-team was planning a conference call with some EPA staff members to further discuss the suggestions made by the panel; this call likely will be held during the second week of December. Ms. Kendall did not know if the idea of approving the letters via conference call was still appropriate if both letters need the level of work that will take them to the next NACEPT meeting. Ms. Moreau stated that it was Dr. Johnson's preference to approve the diversity letter as soon as possible because it might need less work than the leadership letter. Ms. Jones-Jackson commented that OFACMO had met with Dr. Johnson recently and his preference was to move the diversity letter forward, and perhaps the leadership letter will be ready for approval at the next meeting. Ms. Bannerman explained that the diversity sub-team was planning to assemble their ideas on the comments made at this meeting, hold a conference call with EPA to discuss them, and then prepare the final draft.

Ms. Kendall asked the diversity sub-team about the pipeline for diversity in SES leadership. This could be handled in either letter, but should not be handled in both. Mr. Henderson believed it would fit better into the leadership letter. Ms. Kendall noted that the leadership sub-team had not examined the SES statistics. Ms. Leah Ann Lamb (Utah Department of Environmental Quality), NACEPT member, stated that the group had the data, but had not analyzed it. Ms. Bannerman noted that she saw two issues with regard to the SES: lack of diversity and 50 percent are eligible for retirement. She asked the workgroup members how they wanted to address these issues.

A participant noted that, as people retire, it provides an opportunity for EPA to reconfigure the SES core to make it more diverse. The feeder pipeline, however, is not as diverse as EPA would like. Ms. Lamb noted that the data indicate that the current SES population is 81 percent white, 5 percent Hispanic, 10 percent African American and almost 3 percent Asian. Ms. Jones-Jackson suggested that NACEPT recommend how EPA can redevelop the SES pipeline. Dr. Olufemi Osidele (Southwest Research Institute), NACEPT member, stated that in the second letter the workgroup recommended diversifying the hiring pool, and asked about the diversity of the external pool. Ms. Kendall commented that Mr. Meiburg had said it was difficult to fill a GS-15 position from outside the Agency. NACEPT could recommend that EPA look externally to improve the pipeline if the barriers to hiring external candidates are high. Mr. Bill Ocampo (EPA, ORD) mentioned that he was a Title 42 program manager, and both high-level scientific experts and science leaders are hired under Title 42. Last year, NAS recommended that the Title 42 program incorporate diversity into recruitment mainly in the candidate pool. Mr. Ocampo has taken an aggressive approach, using high-level search committees, including those who are cognizant of issues of diversity in both skills and race/ethnicity. It seems there was some impact in terms of the candidate pool itself, but it is hard to determine if there was an impact in terms of selection. Ms. Kendall noted that this sounds like a good model to be built into the recommendations. A participant noted that only ORD had hiring authority under Title 42, so it is not a good model EPA-wide. Mr. Henderson understood that EPA could not hire someone who was not a U.S. citizen. Mr. Ocampo confirmed that was the case with the exception of Title 42. An EPA staff member explained that EPA needed to move away from being an Agency of "tree-huggers" to a science-based agency that deals with issues that impact people's day-to-day lives.

Mr. Henderson asked if it was decided where diversity in leadership should reside. He heard some broader components that the diversity sub-team should build this into that letter. Ms. Kendall thought it would be important for the other letter (the one that does not specifically address diversity in leadership) to contain a reference to it (referring to the other letter). Mr. Henderson noted that Ms. Lamb would take the lead on the diversity and leadership issue for the leadership sub-team.

Mr. Henderson asked about the outreach strategies that Mr. Ocampo had used. Mr. Ocampo explained that they were built into the program, but had been enhanced recently. The resulting candidate pool seems to be more robust. Ms. Kendall asked if Ms. Lamb would like to follow-up with Mr. Ocampo on this topic. Ms. Lamb responded that she would like to have a call with Mr. Ocampo and Mr. Henderson, noting that everything that is ongoing would need to be leveraged. Ms. Kendall asked Ms. Moreau and Mr. Green to help set up a call with Mr. Ocampo to discuss the Title 42 outreach strategies. Mr. Ocampo noted that outreach was being conducted elsewhere at EPA, and it might be useful to get a baseline of what happens across the Agency. Mr. Ismael Martinez (EPA, Office of Civil Rights), Terry Jones (EPA), and any other interested members of either sub-team, also will participate in the call. Mr. Henderson added that these outreach efforts need to be funded adequately.

Ms. Kendall understood that the diversity letter would be approved before the next meeting, but the leadership letter probably would be approved at the next meeting. Dr. Johnson stated that his goal was to have the diversity letter approved during a teleconference before the end of 2011. Also by the end of the year, there should be good drafts of the vulnerable population piece and the leadership piece such that they can be approved at a meeting in February 2012. He also would like to send a letter on sustainability to the Administrator as soon as possible. It is not yet clear whether that needs to be vetted by the entire Council. The goal is to plan around some initial charges on sustainability at the February 2012 meeting. Ms. Kendall noted that at one point, there was consideration of a final workforce letter that pooled common topics. Dr. Johnson said that would be done after February. One thing Dr. Johnson wants to examine is the evolution of advice that came about following the Red Book.

Ms. Moreau agreed to set up a conference call for the leadership sub-team.

Mr. Henderson asked about EPA's targeted outreach to a specific community. An EPA participant noted that if it was on the Office of Human Resources' recruitment calendar, they will take that lead and ask ODAC if there is a shortfall of money. ODAC is tasked with calling different offices that might have an interest in that event and asking them to contribute.

Dr. Johnson noted that the sustainability group will begin work tomorrow, but asked for some advice on how to proceed. He noted that EPA's Derry Allen and Alan Hecht would be present the following day to aid in the discussion of what NACEPT should focus on first to help the Agency. Ms. Kendall said that there was tension between detail-driven work and strategy. She heard different things from the EPA leaders themselves: one leader said sustainability is about being more efficient and doing more with fewer resources and another said sustainability is about rethinking the way EPA conducts business and trying to connect across its silos. Ms. Bannerman asked if NACEPT should provide a vision of sustainability for EPA or if it would be more effective for the Council to help implement it after a vision is developed. Ms. Jones-Jackson replied that EPA has been dealing with sustainability for some time, but following publication of the Green Book, it is her understanding that EPA would like NACEPT to advise EPA on how to implement some of the recommendations and incorporate sustainability into its operations. Dr. Osidele did not think the workgroup should define sustainability because it can be time consuming and impede progress. Dr. Johnson stated that NAS adopted an operational definition based on NEPA. Ms. Kendall thought EPA already must understand what it means to embrace the three pillars of sustainability in operations. Is EPA thinking through all three elements? The leadership should have a common understanding of the scope, but she did not hear this in the earlier presentations and discussions. EPA has not been active in sustainability outside of its focus on reducing the environmental footprint. The Agency must examine sustainability carefully. Dr. Johnson said that the argument for moving forward with its adoption must not be politically sensitive. It has not been shown yet that sustainability as a way of business will be both economically beneficial and satisfy EPA's mandates.

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), Dr. Daniel

Kammen (via telephone), Ms. Vivian Loftness, Mr. Clayton Matt, Dr. Mark Mitchell (via telephone – Co-Chair), Ms. Jennifer Nash, and Dr. Edith Parker.

Dr. John noted that the workgroup had received comments on the draft letter during and after the conference call. Dr. Johnson stated that if this workgroup could complete its work before the end of the calendar year, it would facilitate NACEPT's review. Ms. Loftness said she did not have a chance to edit the letter, and believes there needs to be more content added to the assessment technology and solution technology paragraphs to make them comparable to the measurement technology section. Dr. John noted that assessment technology and communication and monitoring will be discussed. Additionally, several people have commented that a fuller description of vulnerable populations that are not environmental justice (EJ) communities is needed. The third place that requires some work is the discussion of solution technology. One reason it needs to be revised is that there now is a new case study for the letter. Finally, the workgroup needs to address the edits that have been received; however, it is more important that the workgroup focus on revising the draft to ensure that it is convincing, and conveys its message clearly and forcefully. It would be useful for the workgroup members to look at the draft with this in mind. The recommendations should be sharp and at the front of the report. Dr. John suggested going around the table to get input, and then breaking into small groups to look at the documents and incorporate the comments/suggestions. Ms. Nash said she would like the workgroup to discuss the case studies before the end of the meeting.

Mr. Erichsen submitted some written comments on the draft, restricting himself to the case study that he prepared and some points on communications technologies. Dr. Dysart commented that he had made edits to the November 8 draft. His most extensive additions had to do with existing high-tech monitoring systems.

Dr. Karl Benedict (University of New Mexico), NACEPT member, had been working on the topic of information technology. He wrote an introduction/summary of the appendix that could be added into the body of the letter. This has not been circulated to the workgroup yet.

Ms. Filippone noted that the number one finding was important, but she stressed that monitoring had to lead to solutions to the problems. The EJ communities do not have the technology and understanding needed to handle these issues, and they depend on EPA. She would like to see a statement under number one that says monitoring and detection of contaminants leads to a solution. Solutions should be from cradle to grave, and solutions that pass a problem to another party should not be accepted.

Dr. Edith Parker (University of Iowa), NACEPT member, noted that her main comment was that more on vulnerable populations is needed.

Ms. Loftness stated that the structure of the measurement section needs work, and the assessment technology and solutions technologies sections need to be advanced.

Mr. Matt said that he would get Ms. Kristie Orosco's case study in a week or so and send it to the workgroup members. Dr. John asked if it would be possible to examine the initial draft. Mr. Matt noted that when he agreed to help with the case study, he expanded the discussion of mold to indoor air quality. He mentioned that there had been a mold problem at the tribal college near his home, and some students became ill. They agreed to let Mr. Matt include the case study, but he needs to check with them before proceeding. He also needs to complete some of the text as well.

Dr. John asked if Dr. Benedict's summary needed to be reviewed by others, and Dr. Benedict replied that he did not think it was necessary because it was merely a synopsis of the appendix. He agreed to send a copy to the members via e-mail that evening. Dr. John said that the monitoring piece seemed like it needed the most work, and Ms. Loftness agreed, adding that the solutions section also needed enhancements. Ms. Loftness created a draft in response to this that she will circulate to the workgroup.

She suggested that “EPA” should be used instead of “ORD.” Additionally, the word “communication” is relatively narrow. The words “assessment and communication” are broad in terms of the technologies needed. The idea is to discuss technologies for assessment, such as those EPA discussed earlier in the day. Dr. Parker noted that monitoring and detection are mentioned, and asked about the relation of assessment to detection or monitoring. Ms. Loftness stated that there was an extensive list of sensor choices on the table in the long version of the document. The measurement hardware and the data repository are one whole set of technologies. There is a lot of interest at EPA in using these technologies. The next step is the linkages. Geographic information systems (GIS) in combination with health measures from hospitals and statistical analysis give a different set of outcomes. Dr. Parker added that there is an opportunity to work with National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS)-funded researchers who conduct much of the linking to the monitoring exposure and the health outcomes.

Dr. Mark Mitchell (Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice), NACEPT member, noted that when these data are present, they often are discounted by government and industry. If people say that chemical X is above the regulatory level, then chemical X can be reduced from that facility. Biomonitoring data have not been seen as robust enough to show chemical sources. Ms. Loftness stated that the biomeasurements are a small aside in the measurement section; the bigger question is expanding the category of communication to include data assessment. Dr. Mitchell commented that the question is who has the ability to perform the data assessment and how is it going to make a difference.

Ms. Filippone noted that with certain GIS maps, trends and the location of contaminants can be identified. There should be a reference to the kinds of tools Ms. Loftness described because they provide visual understanding that is important for EJ communities. Dr. Mitchell agreed, but thought perhaps that the workgroup should be setting the goals for assessment technologies. Ms. Filippone commented that if the communities were presented with data, they could assess them for themselves. Dr. John noted that there are a variety of technologies and techniques for analyzing data in new and interesting ways to gain a more exact understanding of the relationships between the causes of environmental injustice. To get needed tools into the community, they must be developed by experts and then distributed to the community. The recommendations focus on community partnerships as distinguished from analytical development or technology development. Should the recommendations focus equally or instead on the development of these technologies? Dr. Benedict suggested that enabling technologies could be developed; not a delivery of a product to EJ communities, but creating capabilities within EPA to present data and information that can be accessed, understood, and analyzed by EJ communities and their partners. Ms. Loftness noted that when a community has successfully solved a problem, the solution should be captured in a repository so that others can learn from the success. It might be critical for the information technology (IT) section to have an obligation in each of the categories.

Dr. Dysart stated that monitoring involves sensing, detection and warning, but also quantification of occurrences. Both are important—much of the sensing would be more community based, and the quantification would require technicians who were qualified as well as input from community members. He asked whether it might be useful to divide the monitoring into those two areas. Ms. Loftness thought it would be better to keep them together. The first section, however, needs to be structured more clearly; perhaps it should be a series of bullets. Dr. Parker commented that brevity was needed. Dr. Benedict said monitoring should be thought of as a continuum, and therefore could be presented succinctly.

Dr. Filippone suggested that the message to communities be kept simple, and Mr. Erichsen noted that his community had ceded the monitoring and assessment to the local experts. EPA has a term “lay experts,” that describes community experts. Ms. Loftness suggested that “citizen science” would be a good term to use in the text.

Dr. John asked for volunteers to rewrite the monitoring section. Ms. Nash asked for a summary of the discussion thus far. Ms. Loftness stated that the first topic was monitoring and detection, the second assessment and communication, and the third portable and sustainable solution set technologies. She drafted the second section (assessment and communication), and agreed to work on the third section

(portable and sustainable solution set section). She thought the monitoring section needed to raise some more issues.

Dr. Kammen commented that EPA has been active with supporting technologies. He asked for the sense of the workgroup about the technical status versus the empowerment and support role, noting that EPA has generated considerable knowledge in the technical aspects area. Dr. John said that the current recommendations are that EPA should get involved in the deployment and citizen engagement process. Ms. Filippone expressed concern that EPA may not be able to be an advocate for EJ communities. She stressed that the recommendations in this letter be actionable by EPA. Dr. Kammen said it might be worth contacting EPA Region 9 because they have developed a series of recommendations and protocols based on input from the EJ community in Palo Alto, California.

Dr. John stated that the workgroup was close to a solution on the first topic (monitoring and detection). Ms. Nash offered her summary of the discussion. The workgroup agrees that monitoring and detection should be addressed as a continuum and the richness of measures offered by citizen experts also must be captured. For section two, communication and assessment, Ms. Loftness has developed a draft with an emphasis on the role of GIS. This is a subtle shift to what is in the current findings. Dr. John noted that the concept behind singling out number one was that equipping communities with better data would give them substantial political clout; that is why the words “most important need” were included. Ms. Loftness stated that the critical first step is measurement.

Mr. Erichsen asked if there was a need for capacity building to foster and build the local expertise, and if that fit into number one or number two. Ms. Loftness responded that it should be included in number one. Mr. Erichsen mentioned three levels of expertise: national experts; local experts at the universities, NGOs and agencies; and residents. He assumed “citizen monitoring” referred to the residents. Dr. Dysart mentioned that in his additions, he referred to the global community. Ms. Filippone agreed that NGOs should be mentioned in the letter.

Ms. Nash suggested discussing the recommendations because they are the most important part of the letter. She also mentioned that volunteers are still needed to incorporate the input provided at the meeting. Ms. Loftness agreed that the workgroup should move on to the recommendations rather than the solution set section, but she noted that solution science and technologies cluster around prevention as well as remediation. She asked why the front section was separated from the needs section. Dr. John suggested finishing the discussion on the substance before addressing format. Ms. Loftness asked if there were 10 imperatives in the recommendations. She thought the section that follows should be called “Steps to Achieving Recommendations.” Dr. John said the three recommendations should be put in boldface type and placed on the first page.

Ms. Filippone disagreed with the first paragraph on page 7. It should be more straightforward, or start with the second paragraph. Dr. John thought that the paragraph could be removed.

Ms. Loftness questioned the implication that all the technological development should be done hand-in-hand with the EJ community; some of it should be done with the EJ community, but not all. Dr. John replied that while developing the technologies, developers should check if the community has interest in them and would be able to use them. Ms. Loftness suggested the wording “invest in the development of meshed expertise and data acquisition that incorporates low-cost yet robust technologies with expert citizen science users and expert users, spot versus continuous, simple versus compound metrics, and point versus nonpoint.” Dr. Benedict stated that “sensor networks” is shorthand for different types of sensors.

Dr. Parker expressed doubt that the workgroup had identified every game-changing technology, or addressed vulnerable populations other than EJ populations. Ms. Loftness suggested writing a section for each of the three categories, “identify game-changing sensors and sensor network, identify game-changing assessment and communication, and identify game-changing solution sets.”

Dr. John noted that he was struck by the statement on the bottom of page 2, “presently ORD lacks any mechanism for public input into its research agenda.” The thrust of the plan to change this was to perform business in the field and ensure the community thinks the research is relevant.

Dr. John asked if the bullets on page 8 were acceptable. Ms. Filippone commented that the third bullet, a reference to air intrusion systems, should be added. On section two, the first bullet should be changed from “Indian” to “Native American.” Number three should be solutions technologies. Effective communications would be number two. Ms. Nash suggested that the workgroup be specific about who is supposed to carry out the recommendations. ORD is more specific than EPA, but she asked if specific parts of ORD should be referenced. She would like readers to know when a recommendation is directed to them, and currently the recommendations are too general. Ms. Loftness added that the letter is asking EPA to include EJ communities as their partners from the beginning. Ms. Nash thought the letter should point out the importance of regions in this matter. Dr. John added that there are references to sediments and hazardous waste, but there may be other big widespread EJ problems. Ms. Filippone stated that if the process can be moved forward to find solutions for brownfields, it would be beneficial. Dr. John suggested making a generic recommendation and using brownfields as an example. Ms. Filippone responded that there are processes available for cleanup, but EPA must examine them and choose the appropriate ones for remediation. An effort should be made to seek solutions. Perhaps the letter could include a recommendation that funding should be made available for solution research for brownfields, sediments and hazardous wastes. Dr. Parker asked for a discussion of the proposed revisions Ms. Loftness suggested on strengthening the solution technology.

Dr. John asked if any other topics should be discussed. Ms. Nash mentioned the case studies. Ms. Loftness volunteered to update the sections discussed, but sections one and three were not ready. She agreed to send her changes via e-mail to Ms. Stephanie McCoy (EPA, OFACMO), who would print copies for the workgroup. She also will send copies via e-mail to the workgroup members. Dr. John said that the following day the workgroup would divide up the document and attempt to finish writing it.

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

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2011

Workforce/Sustainability Issues and Vulnerable Populations Workgroup Concurrent Sessions

Workforce/Sustainability Issues Workgroup Session

Dr. Johnson introduced Mr. Derry Allen (EPA, Office of Policy [OP]), who has been a key contact in trying to develop the charge questions. He also mentioned that Mr. Alan Hecht (EPA, ORD), who was the liaison at EPA for the development of the Green Book, will be joining the workgroup shortly. Ownership of the task will be with OP and ORD. Dr. Johnson explained that the workgroup’s task would be to develop some charge questions. There now are questions dealing with framework, vision, workforce, culture, tools, best practices and prioritization of the report recommendations.

Mr. Allen expressed his appreciation for having the opportunity to work with the group on developing a charge. He has worked with NACEPT previously, and he believes the Council can help EPA in a variety of ways. In the case of the Green Book, Administrator Jackson has asked for input on where to start in implementing the report’s recommendations; specifically, actions that would have support and be likely to meet with some early success because this will be important over the long term. EPA has begun a listening process that will continue for the next 4 to 5 months. EPA is speaking with some of the other advisory committees as well as states, businesses, NGOs and other interested groups. The Agency is asking a series of questions of these groups; he will share a draft discussion guide with the workgroup. The three main questions are: What experience do you have that would be informative to EPA as it sets

out on the journey to implement the recommendations? What tools and metrics do you recommend? What recommendations do you have for EPA? The last question is more general, and could address EPA's starting point and what environmental issues should be addressed first. Additionally, EPA is asking how it can integrate principles of sustainability into its general set of regulatory, enforcement, technical assistance and other core activities. NACEPT may not want to address all of these questions, but in some areas, there will be a good match between certain aspects of the questions and NACEPT's skills. EPA will work closely with NACEPT to determine the intersection.

Mr. Hecht stressed that NACEPT first needs to agree that EPA should be moving forward on sustainability. He would recommend that NACEPT return to its report on stewardship from several years ago. Mr. Allen commented that the definition of stewardship in that report contained sustainability. Mr. Hecht stated that NACEPT could point out EPA's strengths in moving toward sustainability. He also asked that the Council consider EPA's various roles, and the large targets that can leverage those roles. Currently, federal agencies are meeting to determine how to work together to implement sustainability. The NAS started a new study called "The Linkages" in September 2011, which is supported by seven agencies and three foundations. He added that EPA is working on the Analytical Framework document that Dr. Anastas mentioned in his presentation yesterday, and hopes to have it circulated to the STPC the week of November 21st. NACEPT will be given this report, and it may help the discussion.

Mr. Allen suggested that NACEPT conduct the sustainability work in a series of phases with each building on the other and perhaps develop a letter during each phase. The Agency hopes to prepare the first draft of an Agency-wide strategy for sustainability in March 2012, but he believes EPA's work on the topic with NACEPT will extend beyond that. There may be additional questions that NACEPT is able to address following release of the Agency-wide strategy.

Ms. Kendall noted that NACEPT could identify EPA's strengths before the strategy is released. Dr. Johnson agreed that sustainability's implementation in the Federal Government could not be carried out by EPA alone. He asked what other agencies, local governments, corporations and NGOs were doing with regard to sustainability; NACEPT should examine best practices at these organizations. Ms. Kendall thought it would be valuable to use NACEPT members' experience to help provide the stakeholder input. She noted that cataloguing the activities of other organizations would entail more work than EPA itself would be doing.

Mr. Hecht asked if the existing regulatory system prevents industry from moving toward sustainability. Ms. Kendall commented that she had participated in one of the industry sessions held by NAS; the input from those around the table was that EPA should not limit itself to things it cannot change, such as laws. Ms. Bannerman commented that the City of Alexandria, Virginia, has embarked on a 3-year sustainability plan, and the first step in the process was a visioning session. She thinks EPA is at the implementation stage prior to the visioning stage. Mr. Allen agreed that visioning had to be a starting point, and if NACEPT had ideas on how that might best be articulated, members should share them with EPA. Dr. Johnson asked if NACEPT could provide advice on visioning in a timely manner. It would be difficult for the Council to inform a draft to be released in March. Dr. Johnson stated that workgroup members could provide comments to EPA as individuals, although this would not represent a NACEPT response.

Dr. Osidele suggested a series of short advice letters to EPA that could be provided in a timely manner as the issues arise. Mr. Joyce commented that although it may take less time to develop a letter, the process to release it takes some time because a public teleconference must be held to discuss it, allow for public comment, and then approve it. He suggested that the workgroup take stock of the materials the Council has been given thus far and create an initial work plan as well as a timeline for how it could be executed so that they are ready to present to NACEPT at the February meeting. Dr. Johnson mentioned the process of implementation of the Red Book; perhaps that process could be examined to inform NACEPT's comments. Ms. Kendall said that this could be considered a phase 2 or a phase 3. There is foundational work that EPA needs to conduct.

Mr. Allen stated that although EPA needs to achieve a common vision for sustainability, there is enthusiasm within the Agency to implement the concepts in the Green Book. Mr. Allen indicated that he was involved with the Red Book and could talk about aspects of the process that were useful. Dr. Johnson explained that he was discussing the whole spectrum of the Red Book process, including the implementation and how it was embraced. Ms. Kendall suggested three questions that NACEPT could begin working on now: What are the critical steps EPA needs to complete to effectively implement sustainability into its programs and practices? What are the strengths that EPA can leverage to be successful in deploying sustainability across the Agency and with key stakeholders? What are the barriers and weaknesses that EPA needs to address to ensure success? If NACEPT could respond to these questions in a letter by February, that would be helpful input as EPA completes the first draft of the strategy in March. Mr. Turner noted that sustainability is a three-legged stool; EPA is a strong environmental agency, but it is weak on the social and economic areas. He asked how EPA planned to balance the stool. He stressed that sustainability needs to mean something and be able to withstand scrutiny. Mr. Hecht responded that when EPA tried previously to promote a shift toward sustainability in the Agency, the Science Advisory Board said that EPA needed to define it more clearly. He mentioned another activity at EPA that illustrates the concept of moving toward sustainability: work on green products. The realization from that work was that a green product was media-centric. There is no sustainable product. With EPA, the General Services Administration and others, there is an ongoing conversation about ways to promote an integrated view of how much water, energy and carbon goes into a product. Mr. Henderson stated that the challenge for NACEPT is to direct some specific areas of focus that can be operationalized by EPA. This is collaborative work, so working with the community must be considered when developing a sustainability strategy. A significant part of the challenge will be raising the level of awareness of what behavior and systems need to change to promote sustainability over time.

Dr. Osidele stated that the timeline ends November 2012, but the results may not be seen for several generations, so the long view should be kept in mind. Ms. Kendall noted that EPA's statement on wanting early successes presents a red flag because it may mean skipping a lot of the foundational work.

Dr. Johnson stated that NACEPT should contribute to the long-term success of sustainability, build on its strengths, provide advice in a timely manner, and be helpful. Not all the good ideas presented at this meeting will be a fit for NACEPT. Ms. Bannerman commented that there is a hierarchy in this process: visioning, planning and implementation. Dr. Johnson asked how NACEPT could complete step one in a timely manner given that the charge is in development. Unsolicited advice could be offered along with examining other ideas for the charge. Ms. Jones-Jackson noted that individual ideas could be sent to Mr. Joyce and they could be incorporated into EPA's draft strategy to be completed by March. Ms. Kendall responded that the individual initiatives would be put on a back burner because there was so much else to do. She liked the idea of convening a series of conversations. Ms. Bannerman asked if EPA would take on the initiative of developing a comprehensive sustainability framework, or is EPA looking at the process through a lens of environmental sustainability. Mr. Allen responded that EPA's focus is the environment and the laws it enforces are oriented toward the environment, but he agreed that other factors must be considered as well. Mr. Hecht said that one of the valuable messages from the Green Book is that the environment and the economy are driven together, and that sustainability can enhance the economy, promote social well-being and protect the environment.

Dr. Johnson stated that, for the strategic plan, EPA is discussing the case in which sustainability is an ingredient in everything that is done at the Agency. It is not a case where a problem is formulated, then checked to see if it is a sustainability issue. Ms. Bannerman agreed that if sustainability is integrated into the fabric of every organization, sustainability experts will not be needed. A participant noted that EPA is trying to create a framework for sustainability in a very contentious political environment. Focusing on the vision is extremely important because there must be a shared mindset in the leadership of EPA so that everyone understands and has clarity of purpose.

Mr. Allen mentioned that the Agency workforce believes that EPA is an environmental agency because that is the focus of most of the Agency's measures, incentives and rewards. When the risk paradigm was first implemented, EPA had checklists; over time, the staff no longer needed them. Mr. Turner stated that the definition of sustainability in the Green Book is taken from NEPA; sustainability should not take on the stigma of NEPA and Environmental Impact Assessments. Dr. Osidele noted that EPA should build trust with the communities so that when regulations are promulgated, they are not resented. This is one way to address the social aspect.

Ms. Bannerman commented that sustainability is not a hierarchy, but a continuum, among the three pillars. Green buildings create a net improvement in the quality of life, sell at a higher price, and meet or exceed a regulatory threshold. Mr. Hecht noted that it should not be framed as if EPA were adding sustainability as a new program and there will be new sustainability projects. It should be viewed as changing how the Agency does its work.

Dr. Johnson identified three phases of implementation: (1) NACEPT follows a charge and provides unsolicited advice; (2) NACEPT and EPA discuss whether the framework is articulated in sufficient detail for it to be useful to the Agency, examine breakthrough objectives, and describe sustainability as a benefit; and (3) sustainability evolves from a framework to a culture. (See Exhibit 1 on page 26 for the phases and charge questions.) In Phase 1, input would be provided as unsolicited advice to be timely; the draft framework would be in hand when addressing Phase 2. Number one under Phase 1 addresses the critical steps that EPA must complete to effectively implement sustainability in its programs and practices, including a sustainability vision. The second question in Phase 1 involves EPA's strengths to be leveraged, and the third involves EPA's weaknesses. Ms. Kendall stated that it would be easier for EPA than for NACEPT to look for the "low-hanging fruit" to approach first. Mr. Joyce commented that in addition to providing the initial unsolicited advice, it would be helpful not to defer the overall charge questions. Those should be developed for the February meeting so that it is clear to EPA and the Council what NACEPT is proposing to do and in what timeframe. Dr. Johnson responded that Phase 1 would include developing the charge questions, with seven questions in all spread over three phases. Mr. Joyce noted that there would be numerous drafts and iterations. Mr. Allen agreed with the three phases and their content, but in terms of timing on the first phase, he asked if it might be possible to write something on that fairly quickly so that NACEPT arrives at the February meeting with something that is well-developed. He also hopes that NACEPT will not wait until February to have some more conversations on the content of the rest of the charge questions, and might produce something before the end of the calendar year. Dr. Johnson thought that NACEPT might have charge questions in draft form before leaving the meeting, with the understanding that the workgroup would answer number one before February. The workgroup then will provide the other questions for circulation to EPA by the end of December.

Ms. Bannerman noted that the charge is usually given to NACEPT, and asked why NACEPT was developing the charge for submission to the Administrator. Mr. Joyce responded that the charge often is developed in conjunction with the program offices and parts of the Agency that will be working with NACEPT. Mr. Allen commented that EPA is asking NACEPT to inform the Agency where the Council could be most helpful. Dr. Johnson stated that by considering and developing the charge, the Council will create a better product. Ms. Kendall noted that the first question actually should be whether EPA should pursue sustainability.

Ms. Kendall asked what it meant for the answer to question one to be unsolicited advice. Dr. Johnson replied that the benefit is timeliness. Ms. Bannerman asked if the advice would have the same impact as formal advice. Dr. Johnson answered that it would have greater impact because of the timeliness of the advice received.

The workgroup drafted questions and a timeline for its work on sustainability, which is presented in Exhibit 1 (page 26). Dr. Johnson explained that there would be an unsolicited advice letter, and NACEPT

would have to determine how it would approach the rest of the work: in a single product or in several letters.

Mr. Joyce asked if everything listed under Phase 1 would be completed by mid-January. Dr. Johnson replied that only the first question under that phase would be completed by the middle of January. The rest of Phase 1 will come back in a charge question to NACEPT. The draft charge questions should be done earlier, so that they will be presented to the Council at February's meeting. At the same meeting, the workgroup will present for discussion by NACEPT an unsolicited letter addressing questions 1a and 1b.

Ms. Kendall asked when the workgroup would answer questions 2 and 3 under Phase 1. She also would like to discuss the first question under Phase 2. Dr. Johnson replied that Phase 2 could not begin until the workgroup received a charge, but that questions 2 and 3 of Phase 1 could be answered after the February meeting. Ms. Kendall expressed concern that question 1 under Phase 2 would lead to a critique of the NAS report. Dr. Johnson replied that if NACEPT provided advice to EPA in January 2013 about the sufficiency of the articulation of the framework, it would not be helpful.

Mr. Turner asked about the Red Book. Mr. Allen said it was titled *Risk Assessment in the Federal Government*, and was published in 1983 by the NAS. It laid out the framework for risk assessment and risk management in the Federal Government in the same way the Green Book addresses sustainability at EPA.

Ms. Kendall noted that the language she wrote for question 3 was not about avoiding the regulatory mindset, but avoiding the prescriptive mindset. Mr. Allen said that he had read into that question that EPA could not reach sustainability only through regulations.

Dr. Johnson asked for volunteers for the various tasks. Dr. Johnson and Mr. Olson will draft questions 1a and 1b in Phase 1. Mr. Olson and Ms. Bannerman will serve as leads on development of the unsolicited advice letter on Phase 1, questions 1a and 1b. Ms. Kendall will refine questions 2 and 3 in Phase 1.

Exhibit 1. NACEPT Draft Sustainability Charge Questions

November 15, 2011

Phase	Timeframe	Charge Questions <i>*To be finalized and approved by the Administrator in time for the February NACEPT Meeting.</i>	Lead for Refining Charge Question	Lead for Developing Advice Letter
Phase 1	December 2011 – February 2012 <i>EPA conducts outreach</i>	(Unsolicited advice letter) 1a. Should EPA move forward on the NAS recommendations? 1b. What are the critical steps EPA needs to complete to effectively implement sustainability into its programs and practices? - What should be included in the Sustainability vision?	Jim and Bob	Bob and Erica
	February – November 2012 <i>EPA releases Sustainability Plan in March/April 2012</i>	2. What strengths can EPA leverage to successfully deploy sustainability across the Agency and with key stakeholders?	Sara	

Ms. Filippone suggested that the communication and monitoring group also do the recommendations for that section because they will be familiar with the findings; the same can be done with the solutions group.

Dr. John said the groups should meet for 1 hour and then get back together to determine what more needs to be done. He will work with Mr. Matt and Ms. Filippone on the solution technologies section. Dr. Parker will draft the text on vulnerable populations. Dr. Benedict, Dr. Dysart and Ms. Nash will work on the monitoring and communication section. Mr. Erichsen will start with the monitoring and communication group and then join the solutions technology group to provide input to both.

The small groups met separately until the conclusion of the concurrent breakout session.

Workgroup Report Outs

Dr. Johnson thanked the NACEPT members for their efforts in completing their products, and then called for the workgroup report outs.

Workforce Issues Workgroup Report

Dr. Johnson noted that he would like NACEPT to approve the diversity letter to the Administrator. The comments received were editorial in nature and can be incorporated easily. They included a request that the obvious be stated in several cases, the comment from Mr. DeLeon that an Executive Order is not a legal basis for action, and a request that the wording for the fourth recommendation address the implication of preference to an ethnic group. He called for a motion to approve the diversity letter with the editorial changes proposed. Ms. Filippone moved that the letter be approved, and Dr. John seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by NACEPT.

Dr. Johnson stated that the leadership letter is evolving. The workgroup will incorporate the comments that Ms. Kendall received after her presentation. A conference call will be scheduled to discuss the letter soon.

Sustainability Issues Workgroup Report

Dr. Johnson stated that the Sustainability Workgroup met for the first time that day. The group has an opportunity to do something atypical: get involved in the development of the charge questions for the Administrator to consider. That process usually is conducted with EPA staff. Dr. Johnson drafted the principles for NACEPT participation; basically anything that the workgroup does should: be conducted in a timely manner, build on NACEPT's strengths, be helpful, and lead to the long-term success of sustainability. Dr. Johnson then reviewed the three phases of the project: Phase 1 will address three questions, the first of which will be addressed through an unsolicited letter to the Administrator; Phase 2 will address two questions; and Phase 3 will address a single question. The workgroup will develop charge questions and answer questions 1a and 1b simultaneously, and this work will be completed before the February meeting. When the draft questions are finished, they will be passed on to EPA staff members in OP and ORD who have ownership of sustainability at EPA.

Vulnerable Populations Workgroup Report

Dr. John stated that the workgroup held useful discussions during the previous day, and conducted an extensive rewrite of the letter on the previous evening. That morning, the workgroup broke into three teams and addressed various parts of the report. The different sections are being merged and there will be a final draft at the end of the meeting. He will edit and proofread the draft the following weekend, and a public teleconference will be held for its review and approval by the Council.

Mr. Joyce asked that the workgroup inform OFACMO as soon as a date is chosen for the teleconference. Dr. John responded that the date would be chosen within the next week, and he suggested that the call occur in the second week of January.

Public Comments

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

Chair's Summary, Action Items and 2012 Meeting Dates

Dr. Johnson asked the members to hold the following dates open for the next meeting: February 13-14, 2012, and February 21-22, 2012. He explained that those dates are being considered because the current meeting facility, which is less expensive and quite adequate, is available on those dates. Additionally, some members' terms expire at the end of February so the next meeting should occur before then.

Ms. Jones-Jackson thanked participants for their efforts and dedication. They are greatly appreciated by OFACMO and also by the senior leadership at EPA. She thanked the OFACMO staff for their hard work in planning and supporting the meeting.

Mr. Joyce then thanked the members for their work, and stated that NACEPT input is valued highly by the Agency.

Adjournment

Mr. Joyce adjourned the meeting at 12:45 p.m.

Action Items

- ✧ Mr. DeLeon will send the recently released Limited English Proficiency Order to Ms. Moreau and Mr. Green. Ms. Moreau will disseminate it to the NACEPT members.
- ✧ Mr. DeLeon will send Ms. Moreau his comments regarding the appendix of the diversity letter.
- ✧ The following action item was identified for the Vulnerable Populations Workgroup:
 - Mr. John will notify OFACMO about the time for the Vulnerable Populations Workgroup conference call in January and OFACMO will set up the call.
- ✧ The following action items were identified for the Workforce Issues Workgroup:
 - Ms. Moreau and Mr. Green will set up a call with Mr. Ocampo, Ms. Lamb and Mr. Henderson to discuss Title 42 outreach strategies.
 - Ms. Moreau will set up a conference call for the leadership sub-group.
- ✧ The following action items were identified for the Sustainability Issues Workgroup:
 - Dr. Johnson and Mr. Olson will draft questions 1a and 1b in Phase 1 of the sustainability project.
 - Mr. Olson and Ms. Bannerman will serve as leads on development of the unsolicited advice letter on Phase 1, questions 1a and 1b of the sustainability project.
 - Ms. Kendall will refine Phase 1 questions 2 and 3 of the sustainability project.
 - Ms. Nash and Ms. Bannerman will refine the questions in Phase 2 of the sustainability project.
 - Dr. Osidele and Mr. Turner will refine the charge question for Phase 3.

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. 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 (via telephone)

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 (via telephone)

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

**Mr. Howard Learner (NACEPT Vice Chair –
via telephone)**

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 (via telephone)

Founder and Senior Policy Advisor
Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice
Hartford, CT

Ms. Jennifer Nash

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

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

Dr. Olufemi Osidele (via telephone)
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. Billy Turner
President
BTurner Consulting, Inc.
Columbus, GA

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

Derry Allen
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: allen.derry@epa.gov

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

Marian Cooper
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-0620
E-mail: cooper.marian@epa.gov

Bicky Corman
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-4332
E-mail: corman.bicky@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

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

Sheila Hall
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: hall.sheila@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

Alan Hecht
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-4772
E-mail: hecht.alan@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

Ron Hoffer

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: hoffer.ron@epa.gov

Craig Hooks

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

Ira Leighton

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 1
5 Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109-3912
Phone: (617) 918-1011
E-mail: leighton.ira@epa.gov

Kimberly Lewis

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

Timothy McProuty

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-4996
E-mail: mcprouty.timothy@epa.gov

Stan Meiburg

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 4
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30303-8960
Phone: (404) 562-8357
E-mail: meiburg.stan@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

William Ocampo

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-0987
E-mail: ocampo.william@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

Nancy Stoner

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-5700
E-mail: stoner.nancy@epa.gov

Ramona Trovato

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

Larke Williams

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 564-0664
E-mail: williams.larke@epa.gov

George Wyeth

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 566-2203
E-mail: wyeth.george@epa.gov

Other Participants**Linda Fisher**

DuPont

Bernard Goldstein

University of Pittsburgh
E-mail: bdgold@pitt.edu

Doug Guarino

Inside EPA
E-mail: dguarino@iwnews.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@iwnews.com

Coy McKinney

Public

Jerry Paulson

Children's Health Protection Advisory
Committee (CHPAC)

Dylan Richmond

The National Academies
E-mail: drichmond@nas.edu

Terry Yosie

World Environment Center

Contractor Support

Beverly Campbell

The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.

656 Quince Orchard Road, Suite 210

Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Phone: (301) 670-4990

Fax: (301) 670-3815

E-mail: bcampbell@scgcorp.com



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

**Draft Agenda
November 14-15, 2011**

**EPA Potomac Yard Conference Center
One Potomac Yard
2777 S. Crystal Dr.
Arlington, VA 22202
Tel: 703-347-8930**

Monday, November 14, 2011

EPA Potomac Yard South Building, Ground Floor Conference Room

8:00 am Registration

8:30 am Welcome and Introductions

Mark Joyce
Associate Director and 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

9:00 am Opening Remarks

Bob Perciasepe
EPA Deputy Administrator

**9:30 am Overview of National Research Council Report on
“Sustainability and the U.S. EPA”**

Dr. Bernard D. Goldstein
Chair
Committee on Incorporating Sustainability in the
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

10:00 am Sustainability from the Perspective of Other Organizations

Linda J. Fisher
Chief Sustainability Officer
DuPont

Dr. Terry F. Yosie
President and CEO
World Environment Center

10:45 am Break

11:00 am Incorporating Sustainability in the U.S. EPA

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

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator
EPA Office of Water

Ira Leighton
Deputy Regional Administrator
EPA Region 1 (New England)

12:30 pm Public Comments

1:00 pm Lunch

**2:00 pm Overview of NACEPT's Draft Advice Letters on EPA Workforce Planning:
*Ensuring Diversity and Attracting and Retaining Superior Executive Leadership
Talent* and Discussion on NACEPT's Final Overarching Workforce Planning
Letter**

Presenters

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr.
NACEPT Chair

Effenus Henderson
NACEPT Diversity Sub-team

Sara Kendall
NACEPT Leadership Sub-team

Discussants

Craig E. Hooks
Assistant Administrator
EPA Office of Administration
and Resources Management

Lek Kadeli
Deputy Assistant Administrator
for Management
EPA Office of Research and
Development

A. Stanley Meiburg
Deputy Regional Administrator
EPA Region 4 (Southeast)

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

Rafael DeLeon
Director
EPA Office of Civil Rights

- 3:30 pm** **Break**
- 3:45 pm** **Workforce Issues and Vulnerable Populations Workgroups meet in separate, concurrent sessions.**
- 5:30 pm** **ADJOURN**

Tuesday, November 15, 2011

EPA Potomac Yard South Building, Ground Floor Conference Room

- 8:30 am** **Sustainability 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 2012 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 November 14-15, 2011 are complete and accurately reflect the discussions and decisions of said meeting.

/Signed/

February 10, 2012

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr.
NACEPT Chair

Date