

12/16/03 conference call  
Multimedia Subcommittee of National Steering Committee

Present on call: Terry Polen, Maria Rivera, Gregory Copely, and Phyllis Strong

Minutes:

#1

Phyllis shared the information that the National Compliance Advisory Panel (NCAP) was working on the pursuit of multimedia authority for 507 programs and was discussing this issue during their 12/16 conference call which was being held at exactly the same time as ours. Phyllis had spoken recently with Elsa Bishop, member of the NCAP, to ensure that this group was aware of our work, knew how to find our survey and pull results from it, and knew where to find our meeting minutes. Elsa was confident that the group had the information they needed from us. Elsa did say that someone from the NCAP might contact Phyllis if they felt further clarification on an issue was needed.

Terry gave a short recap of the discussion that occurred during the 12/9 National Steering Committee (NSC) conference call in which one of our subcommittee members, Richard Rasmussen, expressed concerns to a member of the NCAP about their work in pursuit of multimedia authority for 507 programs.

#2

Members on the call completed discussion of Terry's interview with Dan Nickey of the Iowa Waste Reduction Center (IWRC). Members judged the interview to be well done and were pleased with the findings. IWRC appears to have a high quality multimedia program and strengths to build on and share with other programs. Greg shared his positive experience with sending staff to the IWRC for training.

#3

There was no further discussion of the NE Compliance Assistance Protocol. David Byro had previously e-mailed this protocol to all subcommittee members. This protocol can be kept as a reference tool and can be discussed further at the request of any subcommittee member. David's interview with Tom Franklin stood as well done. NE's multimedia program has strengths to offer, as had been discussed at our 10/28/03 conference call.

#4

Maria had spoken with Richard about her spreadsheet of findings from our survey results. She had forwarded Richard's suggestions to the group. The completion of the analysis seems to have complex issues because of differences that can surface between comments entered and the activities designated. Phyllis will talk to Audrey Zelanko about the easiest way to approach this problem and pull out the data we need. Phyllis will share Audrey's suggestions with the group and then Maria can determine if she needs to take any further steps to get a picture of how multimedia activity is distributed on a regional basis. (Note, Phyllis plans to speak with Audrey about this topic during the week of 1/5/04 – 1/9/04.)

#5

As a follow up to Maria's survey analysis, members on the call answered these questions; David had given his answers prior to the call. Once these questions have been answered in the affirmative or negative, we will know whether we need to complete their associated tasks.

A. Only Region 1 has multimedia programs in every state. Does it make sense to look to Region 1 to ask for them for models for good multimedia programs?

B. How does it affect our approach if a region doesn't have any multi-media programs? For example, no Region 2 SBAPs have multimedia programs. Of the Region 8 states that answered our on-line survey, none have multimedia programs

C. Do we want to promote a peer match program that matches mentor multi-media programs with programs that want to become multimedia?

If so:

1. Should we develop a list of criteria that we look for in a model multimedia program? Likewise, should we develop a list of criteria that we look for in program that would like to become multimedia and would like to have a mentor?
2. Should we develop a list of expectations of activities/services provided through a peer match program for both the mentor program and the program that wants to become multimedia?
3. Should we send e-mails to programs that have multimedia programs for suggestions for names of model programs for a peer match program? Would we target Region 1 first and include any criteria we might develop in such e-mails?
4. Should we develop a request to send to model program candidates to see if they want to participate in a multimedia peer match program? Likewise, should we develop a request to send to programs that are not multimedia to see if they would like to become so and would like to have a mentor program work with them?

Phyllis will forward a summary of these questions and answers to the group. Tom, Roslyn, Duane, and Richard can enter their responses. Once these members have completed their answers/comments the final information can be shared with the group. Further actions based on these answers can be discussed at our next conference call.

#5

The Environmental Results Program (ERP) material forwarded by Teresa Kinder can be used as reference materials. Phyllis attended an ERP workshop in Lansing, MI that was hosted by Teresa and her colleagues.

Phyllis shared the following:

- ERP workbooks and checklists and workshop presentation materials offer wonderful educational materials and are available for sharing. They are often designed for particular industry sectors, such as dry cleaners or auto mechanical repair shops. They are sometimes designed for a particular media such as underground storage tanks. They clearly address multimedia issues, are concise, and are written in plain language.
- Portions of the ERP work fits well into 507 program work. Our programs can develop checklists and workbooks and conduct workshops and this type of work can fit well with outreach to small businesses.
- A caution for 507 programs is the part of the self certification process where a non-responder can eventually be contacted by regulatory staff for follow up.

Phyllis will forward a Road Map for ERP which explains the process. Members can look it over and discuss any concerns about the self certification piece at our next conference call.

#6 The next conference call will be planned for late February.