

**Great Lakes Regional P2 Strategy Meeting  
EPA Region 5  
February 22 – 23, 2006**

**DRAFT**

Facilitated by John Perrecone

Next Steps For GLRPPR - This is your organization and in order for change to happen it must happen from you, the members.

The objective of the meeting was:

- I. Identify what each state is doing now.
- II. How are we measuring P2 accomplishments and waste reductions due to P2.
- III. What are our common problems among the states.
- IV. How can the Great Lakes states coordinate and collaborate better.
- V. Identify how GLRPPR can fit into the collaboration efforts of the states.
- VI. Discuss funding sources available

At this meeting we decided that it would be successful if:

- We start and finish on time.
  - Accomplished
- There are no bad ideas.
  - Accomplished
- Concrete activities or assignments beyond the meeting.
  - 4 Workgroups were established that would move forward with conference calls and summaries of current related activities both regionally and nationally.
  - Sessions/presentations will be organized by workgroup members at the Fall GLRPPR Meeting.
- Define the role of the roundtable – mission is clear.
  - Reviewed our mission.
  - Decided to host a Fall GLRPPR Workgroup Meeting in Chicago at EPA Region 5.
  - Coordinate Work Groups
- Understand stakeholder needs.
  - There was a diverse group of people who attended this meeting and had the opportunity to represent and share their needs.
- Strategic direction defined.
  - The GLRPPR Organizational Plan will be updated by the Steering Committee.
  - 4 Workgroups will be established (mentioned above).
  - Measurement of activities was an overarching topic of all activities, including workgroups.
  - Communication strategy was developed.
    - One face to face meeting a year will be held in Chicago, and electronic meetings (i.e. webcast, etc.) will be explored by Workgroup members.
  - A Strategy Meeting will be held again in two – three years.

Top Environmental Issues In the Great Lakes Region

1. Water Quality – POPs/PBTs
2. Mercury
3. Renewable Energy Initiatives

4. Greenhouse Gases
5. Unregulated Haz Waste
6. E-Waste
7. Freshwater Consumption
8. Diesel Idling
9. Open Burning
10. Promote Green Behavior
11. Sustainable & Green Schools

GLRPPR will review our current sector resources to assure that we have electronic resources and links associated with these topics. We will use these topics as a reference for themes for future editions of the LINK newsletter. We will also dedicate one edition of LINK each year to sharing program measurement information from each state/organization. This will be based on the annual reports the states generate and submit to their legislature.

### GLRPPR Communication Strategy

- One Annual Meeting in Chicago Each Year
  - Blocks of time for discussion format as well as presentations.
  - Steering committee will identify structure of agenda
    - Start time, end time, all plenary or breakouts
  - Agenda will be driven by the workgroups and/or common problems and what we are working on. & include discussions that focus on State TAP's, Regulatory Agencies, and NGO's will be incorporated.
  - A summary of progress from year to year on workgroup activities will be prepared along with the discussions at the Annual Meeting.
  - Travel requirements hinder P2 experts to go to conferences. Scholarship \$ for speakers should be written into the GLRPPR grant to assist representatives from the state to attend the program.
- Phil will send out monthly regional activity updates to the GLRPPR member listserv.
- States will include a voluntary information/project sharing strategy that utilizes GLRPPR. This will P2 Grant applications.
- The regional collaborations will explore ways to better provide project information to HQ OPPTS and communicate how HQ can help you.
- Improved ways to share information with GLRPPR members about EPA National Initiatives will be explored.

### Discussion Groups

#### **Water Discussion Group – Jack Annis**

Jack Annis, Deb Jacobson, Cindy McComas, Karen Teliha, Ted Smith, Peter Wise, David Liebl

This discussion group intends to move forward with programming and outreach in the following water related areas driven by the interest level of GLRPPR members, a number of new issues as well as our own interests. This is considered as a draft issue paper for the water discussion group and we are looking for input from all GLRPPR members interested in water issues.

#### **Water Supply**

What we know now:

- Water has been cheap and readily available but that is changing

- States/communities can't handle growth with the existing supplies of water in many areas of the Great Lake states
- Great Lakes offer a tempting source for new demands on water supply

#### Gaps:

- Communities and Industry does not generally know how much water it uses or the actual cost of use
- How big is the actual impact of industry use on the overall water supply
- Does water conservation have a tie in to P2 as well as energy conservation

#### Steps:

- Perhaps an inventory of on-going water supply programs and issues
- Presentation of analysis of actual cost of use (TCL at WMRC)
- Checklist(s) for water use reduction opportunities
- Web Cast or other distance learning methods to transfer information about water use reduction techniques, processes, BMP's
- Tools for determining actual cost of water use in industry
- Conference track/session at GLRPPR Fall Meeting
- Input on Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement

### **Waste Water – Point Sources**

#### What we know now

- Treatment facilities can't handle growth, particularly in small WWTP systems
- Treatment systems not designed or capable of removing pharmaceuticals and other new emerging pollutants which are less known and understood
- NPDES permits do not address pharmaceuticals new or emerging pollutants
- There seems to be two options that can be used
  - Building more or upgrading existing treatment plants
  - Using P2 to reduce the loading on existing and future treatment plant capability

#### Gaps:

- In addition to pharmaceuticals what are the emerging pollutants we might be able to impact/reduce through P2
- No treatment or p2 technology to address pharmaceuticals and emerging pollutants in waste water
- Drug synthesis (green engineering, PBT profiler)
- Identification of adequate treatment technologies
- Regulations don't address eco-toxicity in NPDES permits
- Wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) need information on eco-toxicity, treatment and P2 options

#### Steps:

- More P2 with industrial dischargers or direct dischargers
- Public education through and with wastewater treatment plants.
- Integrate P2 concepts in to NPDES permits
- Encourage wastewater treatment plant upgrades – where they can
- Develop common P2 suggestions or BMP's by sector to act as a guide for wastewater treatment plant operators-pretreatment coordinators
- Conference track/session (outreach) at a WWTP conferences
- Technical assistance providers (TAP's) partnering with POTW's
- Permits – Agriculture Toxicity
- Integrate P2 into TMDL regulations
- GLRPPR to post a collection of conservation plans

- Are WWTP's potentially a source of new GLRPPR membership

## **Waste Water – Non-Point Sources**

What we know now:

- Non-point sources have a large impact surface water quality
- Agricultural and urban run-off are probably the two main areas we might affect

Gaps:

- Most of us have not previously worked in this area
- There has been a great deal of work completed in some states under other programs so we do not need to reinvent the wheel (Farm A-Syst, Storm Water Regulations, UW-Extension water Quality programs)

Steps:

- Perhaps an inventory of existing programs, tools in the region and nationally
  - BMP initiative for sector(s) associated with non-point source water pollution (Ag?)
- Integrate P2 into TMDL regulations

UW-Extension folks have about 140 people signed up for the following program next Monday and Tuesday concerning storm water regulations in Wisconsin. <http://runoffinfo.uwex.edu/march21.htm>

## **Energy Efficiency – David Cera**

David Cera, Gary Miller, Ann Goode, Tom Eggert, Mike Kelley, Amelia Gooding, Emma Lou George, Dr. Lynn Corson

What we know now: Minnesota and Illinois have begun conducting P2E2 assessments. Indiana has a contract to do this.

Gaps: Focus on industrial process efficiency. Possible information exchange on other energy issues (Green House Gas emissions, alternative energy)

Steps: Look at regional grants from DOE and/or state energy office.

Hold a workgroup conference call. Emma Lou George will set this up.

Regional training.

Tie to industrial assessment centers – Wisconsin, Illinois, Northern Iowa, Ohio, Michigan.

Measure P2 from E2

Tap into GHG goal funds

## **Mercury –**

Cameron Lory, Marcia Horan, Becky Lockart

What we know now:

Overwhelming amount of info.

Lack of overall communication and coordination

Lack of some alternatives

Gaps:

Steps:

Inventory of who is doing what in the Great Lakes region – Marcia Horan volunteered to do this.

Decide how we should move forward as a GLRPPR effort an/or get involved.

Monthly conference calls will be held to follow up.

GLRPPR could play an advocacy role.

Summary of Issue in the Great Lakes (provided by Steve Kratzer at MDEQ):

Last (2005) year a group of "environmentally minded" legislators in various Great Lakes states introduced a package of approximately 14 bills in several states, including Michigan, called the Mercury Initiative. Those bills expired in legislative session, however have been re-introduced in the present (2006) session. Presently there are 24 bills in the Michigan legislature dealing with various aspects of mercury elimination. Generally the mercury bills fall into one of four category areas; use bans, disposal bans, sales bans and labeling/notification. Michigan had previously enacted two bills; banning sale of mercury thermometers and getting mercury out of K-12 schools.

Virtually all state environmental agencies in the Great Lakes Region have staff specializing in various mercury aspects be it air, water, waste or pollution prevention. These staff specialists collaborate regularly on projects through [monthly conference calls] relating to their specialty interest areas.

Mercury TMDL's, LAMP's AOC's and speciation modeling are hot topics of research and debate. The interdisciplinary policy group of these mercury experts participate monthly in the EPA Region V Great Lakes Mercury Group conference call led by Alexis Cain at U.S. EPA's Great Lakes National Program Office. These participants are also closely involved with the mercury subcommittee of the Bi-National Toxics Strategy. These people frequently participate in the bi-annual meetings held in Chicago and Toronto.

Several of the Great Lake States mercury specialists, including three from Michigan DEQ participate regularly in the Environmental Council of States (ECOS) Quick Silver Caucus and serve on a variety of sub-committees such as 1)- Mercury Auto Switches, 2)- Mercury Program Compendium, and 3)- Mercury Labeling.

Our staff has also worked for more than a decade with groups relating to mercury elimination in health care facilities such as Hospitals for a Healthy Environment (H2E), American Society of Hospital Engineers (ASHE), American Society of Hospital Environmental Services (ASHES), the American Hospital Association (AHA), Physicians for Social Responsibility and Health Care Without Harm. The Michigan Chapter of H2E recently celebrated their 15th year of environmental initiative accomplishments.

Should you have comments or questions about any of these Great Lakes area initiatives please feel free to reply to contact

Steven J. Kratzer  
Mercury P2 and Policy Specialist  
Environmental Science and Services Division  
Michigan Dept. of Environmental Quality  
P.O. Box 30457  
Lansing, MI 48909  
517/373-0939 tx  
517-373-3675 fax  
e-mail: [Kratzers@michigan.gov](mailto:Kratzers@michigan.gov)

## **Lean and Green – Laura Rauwerda**

Laura Rauwerda, Brad Cumming, Beth Anderson, Phil Kaplan, Karen Wan, Candice Sellar

What we know now:

\$400k earmark to the right place (local non-profit regional economic development & MEP)

EPA HQ GSN program

Environment Canada Fledgling GSN program

Lean Green Toolkit – anyone/anywhere can use it (test drive).

US MEP/Canada OCETA & C2P2

MEP National Meeting – May 2006 in Florida = OPPORTUNITY!!!

NPPR Workgroup

Gaps:

Regional MEPs don't effectively communicate.

Regulatory agencies need to play/act a supporting role to MEPs (definition of "support" wide open).

National MEP getting to the centers.

Relationship building/sharing

Only one event – need more – at least quarterly.

Follow-up after initial meeting

"Story to tell", measurement, business case (marketing collateral).

Include a team EHS + Procurement

Steps:

Bundling regulatory support to companies (any form of support. Not limited to regulatory).

Encourage mentoring

Relationship building & sharing of relationship benefits through collaboration (buzzword ☺)

Idea sharing by the workgroups

Go to Florida to MEP National Meeting!!! (We're not asking ☺)

Create Region 5 P2 grant to fund an outside entity to facilitate and support a Lean and Green network of P2 technical assistance providers, economic entities, industry and MEP centers in the U.S. and Canada.

Laura R., Phil K, and Karen W will call EPA National GSN Program (Tara O'Hare) as a follow-up to discuss adding sectors: Metalworking and Food Manufacturers.