



**National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT)
Teleconference Meeting Summary
January 31, 2012
3:00 p.m. ET**

Welcome and Opening Remarks

The call began at 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time, Tuesday, January 31, 2012. *Mark Joyce* welcomed the Council members and the public. He thanked the members for their hard work in producing the two letters that were to be discussed during the call, the *Vulnerable Populations Advice Letter* and the *Fourth NACEPT Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning*. He explained the purpose of the call was to raise factual errors that need to be corrected before sending the letters to the Administrator; these changes must be approved via a quorum. He then explained that five members of the public had expressed interest in joining the call and they would have an opportunity to raise concerns during the two public comment breaks. He explained the ground rules of the call and the procedure that any changes made by the group will be changed after the call, as will the formatting of the Vulnerable Populations letter.

Mark Joyce then gave NACEPT Chair, *Jim Johnson* the opportunity to say a few welcoming words to the Council. He congratulated the group on their two-year membership terms and their accomplishment of everything they had on their original agenda. He reminded them of the stated purpose of this call, and explained the end process where he will give three possible motions for the Council to decide on – to approve the report as written, to approve the report with editorial changes to be done by the NACEPT Chair and workgroup chairs, or to require major revisions and send it back to the workgroup. He then proposed that when the letters are to be sent to the Administrator they should include the signatures of the workgroup chairs as well as his own.

Overview of NACEPT Vulnerable Populations Advice Letter

The overview of the Vulnerable Populations Advice letter began with *Mark Mitchell* discussing the process used to complete the letter. The charge of the letter was to provide advice from the committee on the identification and use of technologies that are innovative and safe to protect public health in vulnerable populations. Specifically, the committee was asked to focus on:

- Methods to empower vulnerable populations with innovative and safe technologies.
- Opportunities to expedite the identification and use of existing technologies and scientific developments to better protect vulnerable populations.
- Identification of game changing technologies that could be useful in vulnerable populations.

- Best techniques for engagement of vulnerable populations in environmental research activities.

The process began by looking at vulnerable populations mainly through the use of different community case studies and determining major issues within these case studies that could be addressed through technology. The group looked at over a dozen communities and focused on those they considered to be game changing.

The group developed a case study and from that study they developed the game changing technology that would aid the community. The group members also contacted environmental justice experts involved with technologies and vulnerable population communities to ask about their approach to the issues. The case studies were then put into a package for easy reference, and *Fred Hauchman* from EPA was contacted to make sure there were no major errors within the report as far as EPA was concerned.

DeWitt John quickly walked through the letter explaining the content. The letter goes into detail with recommendations for three types of technologies - detection, monitoring and assessment technologies, communication technologies, and solution technologies. The first section talks about distinctive threats to vulnerable populations and environmental justice communities, these include multiple and cumulative exposures and additional stressors which make the consequences of vulnerable populations more severe. The letter then goes on to address the three types of technologies using case studies as examples. DeWitt continued by explaining which technologies were associated with the appropriate case studies and why.

The final section outlines the five recommendations given to the EPA:

- Establish a process through which EPA would make it a practice to reach out to communities to identify all 3 kinds of technologies.
- Reach out to those in private business and the public sector who are knowledgeable about the various kinds of technologies.
- EPA should reach out and work with other federal agencies.
- Provide a biannual update to environmental justice communities.
- Strengthen EPA's IT capacity responsibilities – develop data to understand what's happening in the communities.

Mark Mitchell then led the group in a discussion over proposed changes that were sent out to the group prior to the teleconference. Following a short discussion of these edits *Jim Johnson* opened up the floor to general comments on the report by the NACEPT members. Many members commented that Mark and DeWitt had done an excellent job drafting the letter. Jim then went over each section asking if there were any concerns raised.

- *Sara Kendall* raised a concern about how people will be trained and/or educated to use the proposed technology.
- *Olufemi Osidele* suggested additional footnotes to page 6.
- *Vivian Loftness* thought that the word communication was not fully fleshed out. It was decided she would send a few sentences to be added to the report for clarity.
- *Ella Filippone* also raised concerns about communication and if it will be bilingual and appropriate for the audience in general.

Public Comments on NACEPT’s Vulnerable Populations Advice Letter

There were no public comments.

Discussion and Approval of NACEPT’s Vulnerable Populations Advice Letter

Jim Johnson then asked the Council if they believed the text supports the recommendations listed in the letter, which they agreed it did. He reminded the Council that there would be formatting and some editing done to the letter after the call. *Jennifer Nash* moved to approve the letter, this was seconded by multiple members of the Council and the NACEPT Vulnerable Populations Advice Letter was approved with editorial changes.

Overview of Fourth NACEPT Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning: *Leadership Development and Organizational Transformation*

Leah Ann Lamb started by thanking the members of the leadership sub-group. She explained their process of looking at EPA documents, meeting with personnel and discussing leadership within EPA at all levels. The leadership recommendations were organized into 4 areas:

- Organizational Transformation
- Leadership Competencies
- Succession Planning
- External Sourcing/Recruitment

Jim Johnson opened the conversation up to general comments about the letter – does this letter address the charge – *Bob Olson* said yes and that it’s impressive. Jim then went through each area to ask for recommendations.

- It was decided that on page three in the Leadership Competencies section, a change would be made to include “with diverse stakeholders” after “building relationships”. There would also be an editorial change in that paragraph, changing “that is” to “for example”.
- In the Succession Planning section *Billy Turner* raised a concern over the possibility of being counterintuitive to the One EPA goal.
- An External Sourcing/Recruitment title will be added to the last paragraph in the section.
- It was also decided that a thanks to Linda Fisher would be added as a footnote.

**Public Comments on Fourth NACEPT Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning:
*Leadership Development and Organizational Transformation***

There were no public comments.

**Discussion and Approval of Fourth NACEPT Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning:
*Leadership Development and Organizational Transformation***

Jim Johnson asked if there was a motion for the letter. *Howard Learner* moved to approve the letter, *Vivian Loftness* seconded his motion. The Fourth NACEPT Advice Letter on EPA Workforce Planning: *Leadership Development and Organizational Transformation* was approved with editorial changes.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. ET.

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 January 31, 2012 are complete and accurately reflect the discussions and decisions of said meeting.

/Signed/

04/13/12

Dr. James H. Johnson, Jr.
NACEPT Chair

Date

Teleconference Participants

NACEPT Members

Karl Benedict
Ben Dysart
Kurt Erichsen
Ella Filippone
Effenus Henderson, *Workgroup Member*
DeWitt John
Jim Johnson, *NACEPT Chair*
Sara Kendall
Leah Ann Lamb
Howard Learner
Vivian Loftness
Mark Mitchell
Jennifer Nash
Edith Parker
Bob Olson
Olufemi Osidele
Billy Turner

Members of the Public

Julia Farber

EPA Representatives

Mark Joyce, OFACMO, *Designated Federal Officer*
Megan Moreau, OFACMO
Eugene Green, OFACMO
Fred Hauchman, ORD
Gelena Constantine, ORD