

EPA Air Toxics Pilot Working Group  
Meeting Minutes  
August 25, 2003

Members attending: Rev. Marvin Smith, Emily Lee, George Baker, Bob Leidich, Bill Skowronski, Bill Davis, Tim Nieberding, Eleanor Bykoski, Richard Connelly, Herbert Mausser, Richard King, Elissa Feldman, Mike Suver, Frances Henderson, Elvin Vauss

Absent: Marty Gelfand, Stu Greenberg, Richard King, Joe Calabrese, Hollie Dellisanti, Laura Hobson, Anjali Mathur, Tom McLeary, Ed Resnick

Guest: Tom Kelly

Facilitators: Sanda Kaufman, Linda Kimble

The Ohio Air Toxics Group convened for the sixteenth time at the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District.

June MEETING MINUTES – approved.

Introduction of Working Group members from Tremont and Lee-Miles Seville

Elvin Vauss (Vice President) and Frances Henderson (council member) of the Lee-Miles-Seville Council introduced themselves to the Working Group.

Discussion and approval of Cleveland Clean Air Century Campaign Mission Statement

Linda presented the proposal to have a mission statement for the campaign. The planning committee drafted three possible choices:

- I. To improve health in northeast Ohio by reducing air toxics.
- II. To improve health in northeast Ohio by reducing air toxics through community efforts.
- III. To create sustainable community efforts for improving health in northeast Ohio by reducing air toxics.

Discussion about mission statement. The working Group approved:

Cleveland Clean Air Century Campaign

*Our mission is to improve health in northeast Ohio by reducing air toxics through sustainable community efforts.*

Bob Leidich and the group thought it would be a good idea if the campaign had a catchy slogan (i.e. American Lung Association's slogan-When you can't breathe, nothing else matters). The WG decided the planning committee would draft a few suggestions for WG approval.

Implementation Team Updates (see team summaries, distributed at the meeting)

Discussion about projects

ETS

Heavy Duty Fleets

Bob Leidich is scheduled to give a presentation at the next WG meeting on emission reductions of each retrofit project.

Tools for Schools

Rev. Smith had a concern about the TFS project being mandatory for CMSD building maintenance if the CCACC is voluntary.

Emily explained that the district made the project mandatory for the building maintenance not CCACC.

Autobody

Anjali can no longer take the lead on this project and the team consists of two people. More people needed for implementation. Linda will call WG members to volunteer.

Electroplaters

Herb is encouraged by the interest of the electroplaters trade organization. He thinks by working with them we will get more bang for our buck. The electroplater's strategic goals match the goals of the team.

Emissions Inventory

Barbara Driscoll stated that a draft report of emissions #'s will be submitted by mid- September. Barbara will e-mail notebook of stationary sources and draft fact sheets on pollution prevention to Linda, which will be distributed to WG members.

ETS/Smoke Free Home Pledge

On August 8, 2003, the Greater Cleveland Smoke Free Homes Campaign (GCSFHC) met to discuss their next, short and long-term goals, and mission.

Jennifer Scofield, Health Promotion Director for the City of Cleveland's Department of Public Health, agreed to serve as the GCSFHC workgroup's coordinator for a period of six months to one year.

Working Group thought it was great that other organizations were taking a lead on a project.

Cleveland Clean Air Century Campaign Prize-winning Competition (see competition description, distributed at the meeting)

## October-Collaborative Training

Purpose: To build local capacity and transfer skills and knowledge.

Juliana and Pat Field are looking at October dates for this training. Date pinpointed the WG members will be notified and asked to invite organization members

## Mini-reconvening of Working Group members

Sanda will call all Working Group members for a mini-reconvening call/meeting. The information she gathers will provide a base for the development of the campaign's strategic plan by the planning committee.

get input on:

- How to improve process, project, to enhance participation
- How to structure the evaluation of this year's effort and of the sustainable portion

The meetings/calls will be of a 15 minute to half hour duration—either conducted by phone or face-to-face meeting at Levin College.

What does "success" mean for the implementation phase? Discussion.

Q: Looking at the end of the grant (June 2004), how would you know you had success in implementing the projects?

- Dissemination of a report recording the results; quantified if possible
- Record learning experience about community efforts-how
- Sustainability –reflected in the report
- The trust in regulators and business people
- Replicability in other cities-requires documentation ("cookie-cutter")
- Record of lessons learned about working together
- Record of why the projects and campaign worked then tell it to others
- Expandability to other groups—people wanting to join
- Marketable cookbook
- Plan for continuation in report
- Public awareness
- Tangible results
- Document written so others could see why they should join
- Political recognition
- Institutionalization
- Community demand /recognition
- Voluntary efforts become mandated practice
- General public brings issues to this group
- Being perceived by public as a body that can solve problems
- Group seen as a source of information for public

## Meeting Frequency

Proposal: meetings quarterly or every other month for the Working Group.

Concerns, suggestions:

- Quarterly too rare
- Monthly for sustainability and bi-monthly by default
- Make meetings flexible
- Should not have a monthly meeting just for the sake of having a meeting—agenda should be worthy of a meeting

Consensus—The meetings will remain monthly and bi-monthly by default if the planning committee determines more time is needed to beef up the agenda

Electronic Approval Process (see e-approval description, distributed at the meeting)

Concerns, suggestions:

- What if you have a strong objection? If anybody has a strong objection to a proposed decision the matter will be discussed at the next WG meeting before a decision is made.
- One week given for the approval process
- Develop a subject line that identifies that a decision is needed on a subject i.e. new WG member
- Subject line—Working Group Decision

Consensus—The WG members agrees that some decisions can be made electronically, at least a week would be given for a final approval and a recognizable subject line will be utilized.

Project Funding (see guidelines, distributed at the meeting)

## SEP Funds Update

Bill Skoworonski states there is a possibility of SEP Funds being utilized for Campaign projects. The SEP funds are still in the works.

SEP funds could possibly provide monies for additional CMSD retrofits

Funding Committee Report (see funding committee power point presentation, checklist, and query, distributed at the meeting)

Q: Will projects that involve \$0 monies need to be approved by the Working Group.

A: Yes, because that project would be considered a campaign project and the WG members would have to decide if that project meets the goals and mission of the campaign

Q: Is it possible for the funding committee to attend a proposal-writing seminar?

A: Yes, this decision would have to be approved by the WG –funds would have to be researched  
The Foundation Center offers a full-day workshop for \$195–non-credit courses offered at Tri-C and CSU.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:10pm