

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Date: October 15, 2007

To: Derval Thomas and EPA Colleagues

From: Liz Thorndike, on behalf of CEI Board of Directors

Cc: Kevin Flynn, President; CEI Board of Directors; George Thomas, CEI Operations Manager

Subject: Final Report of Rochester CARE grant (Oct. 1, 2005-Sept. 30, 2007)

This cover memo is submitted along with the letter from Mark Gregor, City of Rochester, Director of Environmental Quality.

The attached Final Report of the Rochester CARE program under the EPA grant noted above is an exceptional success story of a community collaborative effort—its achievements and its challenges.

The effort began in the summer of 2004 when U.S. EPA and the City of Rochester approached CEI about convening stakeholders from government, business, nonprofits, academic and professional sectors to address serious air toxics emission problems, especially from mobile and many small stationary sources, that had been identified by EPA in the Rochester metropolitan area. CEI worked to identify participants and to convene an historic meeting in Rochester City Council chambers in November, 2004 that attracted representatives from some 50 organizations, agencies and businesses, ranging from grassroots activists to staff from Senator Clinton's office.

From this initial gathering, a Working Group agreed to meet regularly to define a mission, a plan of work, and a set of criteria to determine where priority efforts were needed. These elements became part of a proposal submitted to EPA in the summer of 2005. CEI was one of 11 recipients of one time grants, chosen out of a field of 132 applicants nationwide in this inaugural year of EPA's CARE program. The Final Report speaks for itself. The Appendices include a wealth of information that has added to understanding of air toxic emission problems, as well as detailed information about the process by which the CARE program elements were considered and implemented.

CEI thanks Derval Thomas and all his EPA colleagues for exceptional attentiveness, encouragement, and assistance to the Rochester CARE community and collaboration. We are also grateful for the leadership of Mark Gregor, S. Ram Shrivastava, Lorna Midgelow, Evan Lowenstein, Margit Brazda-Poirier, Sally Howard and the project managers.

CEI is proud to be associated with the CARE program and looks forward to hosting the Program and the CARE Collaborative as it seeks additional funding for initiatives built upon the solid foundation described in the Final Report and Appendices of the current EPA grant. Evan Lowenstein, volunteer CARE Acting Program Director, with colleagues, is seeking funds from the Rochester area community and from federal and state agency sources to continue the unfinished goals of the CARE Collaborative to proactively identify, analyze, assess, and respond to key toxics issues in the larger community.

**Rochester CARE (Community Action for a Renewed Environment)
...a Level II CARE Community**

Final Report

For the Period: November 2005 – September 2007

Submitted by:

Margit Brazda Poirier, Rochester CARE Program Manager
On behalf of the Rochester CARE Collaborative
Center for Environmental Information
55 St. Paul Street
Rochester, New York 14614
(585) 262-2870

October 19, 2007



Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	The Rochester CARE Collaborative	5
III.	Rochester CARE Projects	24
	A. Lead Hazard Remediation Program	24
	B. Small Business Air Pollution Prevention Program	33
	C. Neighborhood Toxics Educator Program	40
	D. Reduction of Air Toxics at the Rochester City School District	44
	E. Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Toxics	47
IV.	Summary	55
 APPENDICES (separate document)		
Appendix A:	Rochester CARE Collaborative Materials	2
	CARE Collab. Member Description	2
	Mission Statement	4
	Under-attended Toxics Issues	7
	Meeting Notes	10
	List of attendees at November 2004 initial CARE meeting	58
	Energy Conservation Web Site Action Plan	60
Appendix B:	Small Business Air Pollution Prevention Program Materials	70
	Environmental Guide for NYS Printers 2007	70
Appendix C:	Neighborhood Toxics Educator Program Materials	110
	Spring Into Health Flier	110
Appendix D:	Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Toxics	111
	CARE Small Grants Press Release	111
	Inventory and Literature Review of Mobile Source Air Toxics in the Rochester Metropolitan Statistical Area	113
Appendix E:	CARE Small Grant Recipients' Final Reports	176
	Genesee Region Clean Communities	176
	Southeast Area Coalition	181
	South West Area Neighborhood Association	187

I. Introduction

In 2005, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) awarded \$303,000 to the Center for Environmental Information in Rochester, New York as part of the Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE) grant agreement program. CARE supports communities in creating and using collaborative partnerships to reduce exposure to pollution. The Center was one of 11 recipients chosen out of a field of 132 applicants nationwide in this inaugural year of the CARE program.

The Rochester CARE process started in November of 2004, when the City of Rochester learned about the CARE opportunity and approached CEI about spearheading a process that would result in a program proposal. In November, CEI hosted a large forum to solicit the community's views of priority environmental issues that could be addressed through CARE. A sub-group of that original gathering, called the Rochester CARE Collaborative Working Group, worked over the next several months to design a multi-faceted program that would focus on key under-addressed toxics issues in the Rochester community. Mobile air toxics, small stationary air toxics sources, lead poisoning, and the 'toxics information gap' were key issues selected by the Collaborative Working Group, around which project proposals were derived for the CARE grant application. These six funded "mini-projects" that are described in this report are:

Neighborhood Toxics Educator -- Action for a Better Community, with the assistance of CEI, the City of Rochester, and the University of Rochester Environmental Health Sciences Center, created a Neighborhood Toxics Educator position to work directly in urban neighborhoods to assist residents in reducing their exposure to toxics in their homes and neighborhoods. This activity also meets the City of Rochester's Environmental Stewardship comprehensive plan goal.

Small Business Air Pollution Prevention -- The Rochester Green Business Network spearheaded research that resulted in an on-site pollution prevention program geared towards small businesses that emit air toxics in the City of Rochester, with a special emphasis on the printing industry. This program is directly in response to EPA data that shows that a third of air toxics in Rochester come from these small stationary sources.

Lead Hazard Remediation -- NeighborWorks Rochester created a Lead Remediation Funding Liaison position that serves to match urban homeowners and landlords housing children under the age of six with available resources to remediate their lead hazards. This program meets a high priority of the regional Coalition to Prevent Lead Poisoning.

Reduction of Air Toxics at the Rochester City School District -- The Rochester City School District reduced mobile air toxics on school grounds and in surrounding neighborhoods by retrofitting 15 diesel refrigerator trucks, and through associated internal and external educational messages about mobile source air toxics.

Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Air Toxics -- This campaign, led by CEI, has two parts: creation and implementation of a small grants program for community-based organizations to reduce mobile source air toxics in their neighborhoods; and a research program geared towards further improving Rochester's understanding of the most significant and under-attended mobile air toxics issues.

Rochester CARE Collaborative -- CEI also facilitated the continuation and growth of the Rochester CARE Collaborative Working Group, which will continue to proactively analyze, assess, and respond to key toxics issues in the larger community. The Collaborative initiated three new projects (apart from the 6 mini-projects) in the community that reduce toxics in our environment. This group intends to meet indefinitely to accomplish its mission and implement needed programs.

The above six programs are described in more detail in Part II of this report. The following sections of this report adhere to the reporting format provided to us by the U.S. EPA. Additional information is included in the attached appendices.

II. The Rochester CARE Collaborative

Submitted by Sally Howard, CARE Collaborative Coordinator

1. Your Partnership

a. What environmental problems does your community face that brought people together?

Our region has been identified as non-compliant for air quality and ozone levels, has had restrictions on fish consumption, and has a high asthma rate, a relatively high cancer rate, old housing stock with lead paint, and increasing sprawl producing more mobile source air pollutants.

Our region has many environmental and health organizations which have wanted to coordinate their efforts to address these issues, but have had minimal success doing that before forming the Rochester CARE Collaborative.

b. How many individuals and their organizational affiliations were involved? Please review and add to the attached list and please add a contact name for each organization.

Before the CARE grant, the Rochester Collaborative had 12 active organizational partners. By September, 2006, the Rochester CARE Collaborative was expanded to 34 partners (including EPA). Currently, we have 36 partners representing a wide range of community stakeholders. See the tables below for a list of community sectors and partners.

Rochester CARE Collaborative Partners	
Sector	# of Organizations
Academic	4
Business	3
Sm Business	3
Govt-Fed	1 (EPA)
Govt-Local	3
Govt-State	2
Individual	1
Non-profit	15
Other	4
Total	36

Rochester CARE Collaborative Partners (Member Organizations) Nov, 2005 – Sept, 2007			
	Organization Name	Sector	Contact
1	Action for a Better Community	Non-profit	Murray, Ted
2	American Lung Association - New York State	Non-profit	Trubisky, Cindy
3	Bausch & Lomb	Business	Butler, Amy
4	Breast Cancer Coalition of Rochester	Non-profit	Bluestone, Lila
5	Brighton Neighbors United	Other	Carter, Chris
6	Broccolo Tree & Lawn Care	Sm Business	Broccolo, Laurie
7	Center for Environmental Information	Non-profit	Brazda Poirier, Margit
8	Center for Sustainable Living	Non-profit	Clarke, Alison
9	City of Rochester Dept. of Environmental Services	Govt-State	Gregor, Mark
10	Coalition to Prevent Lead Poisoning	Non-profit	Hazle, Derrick
11	Coler Natural Insulation	Sm Business	Coler, Kathy
12	Eastman Kodak	Business	O'Connor, Jim
13	Electric Grand Prix Corp.	Non-profit	Heaney, Paul
14	EPA Region II	Govt-Fed	Thomas, Derval
15	Federation of Monroe County Environmentalists	Non-profit	Howard, Sally
16	Genesee Region Clean Communities	Non-profit	Keefe, David
17	Genesee-Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council	Other	Zorn, David
18	Genesee Transportation Council	Other	Perrin, Rich
19	Green Village Consulting	Sm Business	Lowenstein, Evan
20	Harbec Plastics, Inc.	Business	Atkinson, Dae
21	Individual	Individual	Thomas, George
22	Knauf Shaw LLP	Other	Reichhart, Amy
23	League of Women Voters	Non-profit	Jones, Ann
24	Monroe County - Environmental Planning	Govt-Local	Bell, Rochelle
25	Monroe County Dept. of Environmental Services	Govt-Local	Sansone, Andrew
26	Monroe County Environmental Management Council	Govt-Local	Hartshorn, Louise
27	NeighborWorks Rochester	Non-profit	VanDusen, Eric
28	New York State Dept. of Environmental Conservation, Region 8	Govt-State	Gavin, Joe
29	New York Water Environment Association	Non-profit	Harding, Nick
30	RIT's STS/Public Policy Department	Academic	Winebrake, Ph.D., Jamie
31	Rochester Area Community Foundation	Non-profit	Doherty, Ed
32	Rochester City School District	Academic	Wheatcraft, Suzanne
33	Rochesterians Against the Misuse of Pesticides & Metro Justice	Non-profit	Braiman, Judy
34	University of Rochester - Air Quality	Academic	Utell, Mark
35	University of Rochester Environmental Health Sciences Center	Academic	Kuholski, Kate
36	Water Education Collaborative at the Rochester Museum & Science Center	Non-profit	Zimberlin, Carol

c. Did this project bring any new partners into your work? How did the new partners aid the partnership and project?

23 new partner organizations were added to the Collaborative.

The new partners added technical expertise, community connections, leadership, ideas, and resources. For example: Genesee Transportation Council brought a wealth of technical expertise and industry connections regarding mobile sources of air pollutants.

d. What role did your organization play in this partnership? What skills were most important from your organization to implement the project?

Sally Howard, as the Rochester CARE Collaborative's coordinator represented both the Federation of Monroe County Environmentalists (FMCE) and the Center for Environmental Information (CEI). Sally is an unpaid member and coordinator of FMCE, is a member of CEI, and was paid a \$6032 stipend (for 232 hours) by the CARE grant budget to coordinate the Collaborative. She also gave 65.5hr (\$1702 equivalent) additional hours of volunteer service to the Collaborative over the 18-month grant period.

FMCE provided connections and knowledge from approximately 18 regional citizen environmental groups and experience in coordinating multi-group collaborative events and meetings.

CEI founded the Collaborative in 2004 and provided the unique capacity and environment for creating such an diverse collaborative because CEI has earned the communities respect and has an excellent reputation working in a fair and balanced way with government, business and citizen groups in the Rochester area for over thirty years. The mission of the Collaborative is in harmony with the mission of CEI. CEI's Board of Directors reflects much of the diversity in the community which the Collaborative strives to represent.

e. Which partners were most active? How?

The most active partners, by in-kind hours, are shown in the following tables.

In-Kind Hours by All 36 Organizations		
Meeting Hrs	In-Kind Hrs	Total Hrs
419	484.5	903.5

In-Kind Hours by Organization (Top 20)			
Organization	Meeting Hrs	In-Kind Hrs	Total Hrs
Center for Environmental Information	67.5	231.5	299
New York State Dept. of Environmental Conservation, Region 8	25.5	56	81.5
Federation of Monroe County Environmentalists	0	65.5	65.5

Genesee Region Clean Communities	12.5	26	38.5
Harbec Plastics, Inc.	15	21	36
Eastman Kodak	34	18.5	52.5
Action for a Better Community	28.5	0	28.5
Rochester City School District	8.5	19.5	28
Broccolo Tree & Lawn Care	9.5	18	27.5
University of Rochester Environmental Health Sciences Center	21.5	5	26.5
City of Rochester Dept. of Environmental Services	21.5	3	24.5
Monroe County - Environmental Planning	15.5	8	23.5
Monroe County Environmental Management Council	19.5	0	19.5
Individual	8	11	19
Genesee Transportation Council	15.5	0	15.5
EPA Region II	14.5	0	14.5
Green Village Consulting	10.5	4	14.5
Breast Cancer Coalition of Rochester	6	8	14
Knauf Shaw LLP	12	0	12
League of Women Voters	10	0.5	10.5
Total for top 20 organizations	349.5	480.5	830

Eastman Kodak In-Kind Hours (All)			
Member	Meeting Hrs	In-Kind Hrs	Total Hrs
O'Connor, Jim	16	3	19
Scott, Fred (retired 10/06)	8	15	13
Ames, Cindy (retired 3/07)	7	0.5	7.5
Ciriello, Jerry (9/07 facilitator)	3	0	3
Total for Eastman Kodak	34	18.5	52.5

In-Kind Hours by Individual (11 individuals with at least 20 hours)				
Member	Meeting Hrs	In-Kind Hrs	Total Hrs	Organization
Loomis, Lee	10	100	110	Center for Environmental Information
Thorndike, Liz	2.5	88	90.5	Center for Environmental Information
Gavin, Joe	25.5	56	81.5	New York State Dept. of Environmental Conservation, Region 8
Howard, Sally	0	65.5	65.5	Federation of Monroe County Environmentalists
Brazda Poirier, Margit	23.5	36	59.5	Center for Environmental Information
Keefe, David	12.5	26	38.5	Genesee Region Clean Communities
Atkinson, Dae	15	21	36	Harbec Plastics, Inc.
Wheatcraft, Suzanne	8.5	19.5	28	Rochester City School District
Broccolo, Laurie	9.5	18	27.5	Broccolo Tree & Lawn Care

Bell, Rochelle	15.5	8	23.5	Monroe County - Environmental Planning
Kuholski, Kate	15.5	5	20.5	University of Rochester Environmental Health Sciences Center
Total for Top 11	138	443	581	

f. What resources and strengths did each organization bring to the project?

- NYSDEC Region 8 lead the Idling Reduction at Schools initiative and participated in the Small Business Air Pollution Project and County-Wide Mobile Air Toxics Project, helped launch the CARE Collaborative, and provided technical expertise throughout the 18 months of the CARE grant.
- Genesee Transportation Council brought a wealth of technical expertise and industry connections regarding mobile sources of air pollutants, assisted with the Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Toxics research.
- Monroe County provided technical expertise, historical perspective, and knowledge of programs going on currently and in the near future; the Department of Public Health was instrumental in developing the Neighborhood Toxics Educator Curriculum.
- Center for Environmental Information initiated the group, supported the effort throughout, provided the 501(c)3 status, provided a unique and necessary forum where industry, citizen activist groups, community non-profits, and government agencies could all feel welcome, be heard, and work together. CEI also provided meeting space, facilities reservations, a website presence (www.ceinfo.org/care.php), photocopies, beverages, conference phone, and, when needed, projector rental.
- University of Rochester provided technical and medical knowledge on air toxics and lead, implementation of a small grants program, as well as creating educational materials and slide shows that were used by our initiatives.
- Action for a Better Community provided extensive environmental health knowledge, understanding of and connection to our region's most vulnerable populations as well as many in-kind hours of work.
- Harbec Plastics provided small business perspective, great ideas, and leadership.
- Broccoli Tree & Lawn Care provided small business perspective, the connections and launching of the Idling Reduction at Schools initiative, industry knowledge, and many in-kind hours and donations.
- Eastman Kodak provided many in-kind hours, insight, industry connections, and professional facilitation strategies and services.
- Breast Cancer Coalition of Rochester provided meeting space for our largest meeting, equipment, environmental health knowledge, and connection to groups that we would have not otherwise reached.
- Rochesterians Against the Misuse of Pesticides & Metro Justice provided in-depth information and innovative ideas on pesticide alternates and policy from the United States and Canada.
- Genesee Region Clean Communities provided extensive ideas and knowledge of alternative fuels, many in-kind hours, and facilitation of our strategic planning.

g. What efforts did you make to ensure that the most vulnerable community members were included in the partnership?

- We understood vulnerable community members to be those in areas of concentrated poverty, children, elderly, and populations where English was not the primary language.
- We invited to the Collaborative neighborhood groups in the City of Rochester, including those neighborhoods identified as Environmental Justice (EJ) areas.
- The following community organizations enabled us to be connected to vulnerable populations: University of Rochester's Healthy Home, Action for a Better Community, NeighborWorks Rochester, and the Rochester City School District.
- Two City of Rochester neighborhood associations were recipients of the CARE Small Grants Program to Reduce Air Toxics from Mobile Sources (see Part II.E.).
- We defined our criteria for evaluating toxic issues and action plans to give high priority to issues that affected and action plans that would benefit vulnerable populations.

Evaluation Criteria for Prioritizing the "Impact" of Each of the 57 Toxics Issues	
A	Attended to.
H	High Impact = Large risk to large groups of the community, including Health, Environmental, and Environmental Justice areas, and/or Vulnerable Populations AND - Not currently addressed adequately by other programs.
M	Medium Impact = Medium risk to large groups of the community or Large risks to small groups of the community AND - Not currently addressed adequately by other programs..
L	Low Impact = Low risk to large groups of the community or medium risk to small groups of the community OR - Currently addressed adequately by other programs.

A	Attended to.
H	High Impact = Large risk to large groups of the community, including Health, Environmental, and Environmental Justice areas, and/or Vulnerable Populations AND - Not currently addressed adequately by other programs.
M	Medium Impact = Medium risk to large groups of the community or Large risks to small groups of the community AND - Not currently addressed adequately by other programs..
L	Low Impact = Low risk to large groups of the community or medium risk to small groups of the community OR - Currently addressed adequately by other programs.

Evaluation Criteria for Prioritizing Top Five Toxics Issues	
1.	It is <u>not</u> yet adequately "taken care of" by another group or legislation.
2.	It is do-able (cost, time, technology, resources).
3.	Funds can be leveraged.
4.	It will reduce risk in our highest impact priority toxic issues.
5.	Results (reducing risk and increasing awareness) can be measured.

1.	It is <u>not</u> yet adequately "taken care of" by another group or legislation.
2.	It is do-able (cost, time, technology, resources).
3.	Funds can be leveraged.
4.	It will reduce risk in our highest impact priority toxic issues.
5.	Results (reducing risk and increasing awareness) can be measured.

Evaluation Criteria for Choosing Two Action Plans	
1.	Launched by June 2007.
2.	Do-able with financial/time/technological resources we can leverage, including new, obtainable grants.
3.	Creates an important risk reduction.
4.	Addresses under-attended toxic issue(s).
5.	We learn from implementing the action plan and use it as a seed or model for other projects.

1.	Launched by June 2007.
2.	Do-able with financial/time/technological resources we can leverage, including new, obtainable grants.
3.	Creates an important risk reduction.
4.	Addresses under-attended toxic issue(s).
5.	We learn from implementing the action plan and use it as a seed or model for other projects.

6.	The action plan will attract more grants and Collaborative members and participation.
7.	The action plan will not “wear us out” thus threatening the long-term continuation of the Collaborative.

h. What role did your EPA Project Officer, Derval Thomas, play in the partnership?

Derval Thomas provided encouragement, guidance on EPA’s expectations, clarity on grant requirements, and resources available at EPA. Specific EPA resources identified by Mr. Thomas included: EPA environmental databases, conferences, and conference calls with other CARE communities, Webinars on pertinent topics, publicity in the EPA’s Quarterly CARE Highlights Newsletter, QuickPlace, the pro bono legal advice, Clean School Buses program, and technical support at EPA. Mr. Thomas attended 7 of 12 meetings either in person or by phone, and was available by email and phone to answer our questions.

i. What barriers did your partnership experience and how did you overcome them (distrust, unequal power, control over money, differing priorities, process for reaching consensus, etc.)?

Our biggest barriers were time and money. Another potential barrier was very different priorities among our members.

Time:

We had limited participation by neighborhood organizations because the volunteer leaders were very busy. Our members had little time to do fundraising and media outreach, so although we started these efforts, we have not yet achieved what we wanted.

Money:

The energy conservation website initiative that we launched in January, 2006 is about 6 months behind schedule because securing the \$5k-\$10k in funds for the programming has taken much longer than we anticipated.

Different Priorities:

Because the Collaborative represented a broad range of our community and the members had very different priorities, we had potential for conflict, disagreement, and stalemate. We knew this ahead of time and were able to successfully manage it by setting expectations right from the beginning and documenting this in our member responsibilities memorandum (attached). We managed and capitalized on the different priorities with the following techniques:

- collaboration
- decision-making by consensus
- defining criteria before we made decisions
- focusing on our grant work plan
- listening to all members
- clear communication about reasons for decisions

- arranging for a neutral facilitator for the most complex and emotionally-charged prioritization sessions.

j. How has this partnership improved relationships among those involved? Please describe the working relationship that has improved the most and those that may still need work.

The Collaborative experience has improved some relationships because it has created an environment of cooperation and provided an opportunity to listen to each other and each other's priorities. Some organizations who had never worked together or who had previously contentious relationships, now have the positive experience of working together and improving mutual respect. For example, some of the businesses and some of the environmental activist groups have gained much mutual respect. If we can encourage their continued participation in the Collaborative, the benefits of working together will further increase.

k. Has your organization engaged in a similar process to CARE in which you had a similar role? Please describe briefly.

Yes. Both I (Sally Howard) and my organizations (FMCE and CEI) have hosted forums and programs which bring together many groups to learn about an issue and listen to each other and through consensus prioritize what actions to take.

FMCE has hosted diverse, collaborative efforts since the 1970's. Two examples of FMCE efforts are the development of the Preservation of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (PESA) report and the March 2006 Water Forum. With FMCE's primary focus being sustainable land use, the CARE process likely has a greater diversity of groups and scope of issues than most FMCE projects.

CEI's mission has been to engage government, business and citizen groups in collaborative efforts since the 1970's. They have much experience in collaborative programs, including programs which have addressed acid rain, global climate change, risk communication, road salting, as well as the current Lake Ontario Coastal Initiative, Rochester Green Business Network and Energy Smart Communities programs.

l. Is there anything else about your partnership that you would like to share?

When members attend their first Rochester CARE Collaborative meeting, often they share enthusiastic comments like "Wow! This is great!" "We should have done this long ago. It's great to share information and connections to solve environmental problems." "It's so important to have this venue to focus on under-attended problems."

I. Your Project

Please describe your CARE project and provide copies of important materials that you developed. Please make sure that your description includes the following:

a. What toxic risks did your project address?

A broad range of 57 Toxic Issues (attached) were identified by the Collaborative.

The top five priority toxic issues for greater Rochester are listed in the following table.

Top Five Priority Toxic Issues for Greater Rochester	
(The top 5 are not ranked relative to each other.)	
1.	Pollutants from fossil fuel combustion (mobile and stationary, 2 and 4-cycle engines, land and marine)
2.	Pesticide use (indoor and outdoor, public and private)
3.	Mercury (in consumer products, in fish/wildlife, from power plants)
4.	Indoor air quality problems
5.	Outdoor burning (garbage/leaf open burning in rural areas, outdoor boilers in all areas, and wood smoke in high density residential areas)

The Collaborative launched three new initiatives in 2007. All three address hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), particulate pollutants (especially PM 2.5), and greenhouses gases (GHG).

New Initiatives Launched by the Rochester CARE Collaborative in 2007				
Initiative	Toxic Issues Addressed	Status	Chair	# Members
Vehicle Idling Reduction at Schools	HAPs PM2.5 GHG	R-H has implemented chgs and is measuring reductions. Other schools are interested. Other schools to be surveyed soon.	Joe Gavin, DEC Region 8	5
Energy Conservation Website	HAPs PM2.5 GHG	Technical & Publicity Plan written. Funds are pending to program the website.	TBD	6
Reducing Air Pollution from Construction Vehicles & Equipment	HAPs PM2.5 GHG	Starting initial conversations with construction industry association.	Rich Perrin, GTC	TBD

b. What toxic reduction strategies did you pursue?

For the Idling Reduction at Schools initiative, we employed education of staff and visitors, increased awareness, self-enforcement of existing regulations, and posting of signage. We have relied heavily on collaboration with the Rush-Henrietta School District and the Rochester Area Transportation Supervisors Association to do most of the education and all of the school bus modifications.

For the Energy Conservation Website initiative, once it is up and running, we will employ community education and increased awareness to change behavior in individuals and organizations to save energy. We'll provide incentive through competition among organizations and the ability to see their direct contribution to local results.

c. How did you reach agreement on implementation decisions?

To select the Top Five Toxic Issues, we brainstormed in a large meeting, defined criteria, voted to rank all issues by priority, and then finalized the top five priorities in the next meeting through discussion and consensus. (Voting to rank all issues by priority was done via email to allow all members to give input even if not at the meeting.)

To select our two Action Plans, we gave each Collaborative member who had action plan proposals a slot on the agenda to describe their plan and later solicited additional action plans from members via email. Thirty-two (32) action plans were proposed. We agreed upon selection criteria for action plans. We created an Action Plan Evaluation Matrix (attached) in November, 2006 so that we could compare very diverse plans with the same criteria. Votes were taken via email to allow all members to participate. The votes were used to identify the top seven action plans. Through discussion and consensus, we selected our top three choices from those seven in November, 2006. (Alternative Fuels at Schools, Reduce Idling at Schools, and Energy Conservation Website). In January, 2007, we utilized an Action Plan Decision Matrix (attached) to choose our final action plans, further define them, set up subcommittees, and launch the action plans.

d. Did you reshape your partnership in any way to address strategy implementation? Please explain.

Yes. We created two subcommittees to address two of our new initiative action plans, making it easier to meet and take action—see Appendix A for descriptions of the action plans.

e. What outside resources (e.g., people, programs, approaches, etc.) were most important to your project?

- Center for Environmental Information – provided administrative support, meeting facilities and equipment, a presence on the Internet, the initial momentum to start the Collaborative, and a tremendous amount of insight and encouragement.
- EPA – provided general information, toxics definitions, directions, conference calls, Webinars and other resources.
- DEC Region 8 – provided many in-kind hours, leadership, insight, technical expertise, information on current and upcoming regulations, outdoor “No Idling”

signs, and an in-depth white paper on the top environmental problems in New York State.

- Monroe County and the City of Rochester – provided many in-kind hours, insight, technical expertise, information on current and upcoming regulations, and GIS maps.
- Eastman Kodak – provided many in-kind hours, insight, industry connections, and professional facilitation strategies and services.
- Other CARE Communities – New Haven, CT, was a model for how to approach a Level II CARE Project, other CARE communities at conferences and via phone calls shared strategies with us, and St. Louis Clean School buses provided us with materials for our Idling Reduction initiative.
- Broccolo Tree and Lawn Care – provided us with leadership and connections in the Rush-Henrietta School District, and donated trees for one of our mobile air toxics small grant recipients.
- Harbec Industries – provided many in-kind hours and great ideas for the new initiatives and the long-term sustainability of the Collaborative.

f. Was there any environmental issue that EPA seemed to lack the tools or means (e.g., Partnership Programs, data tools, other expertise) to address? If so, please describe the situation or need you had.

Partly. We found a wealth of information on the EPA web site and in their databases. However, non-existent, old, or incomplete toxics inventories for some issues made us rely on annotative, on-the-ground experience of Collaborative members instead of hard data to make decisions about toxics priorities.

g. How did you build momentum over the course of your project? Did you secure any “early wins” to help build momentum? Did you look for additional funding early on? What was acquired?

We kept our focus on the grant work plan to keep our momentum. Hearing the progress of the other five projects and the three small grants recipients gave us encouragement while the Collaborative was still defining its new initiatives. We did not acquire additional funding early on because we had not yet defined our initiatives.

h. What were the significant *outputs* of your project (meetings held, materials developed, people trained, etc.)?

- The Collaborative increased from 12 to 36 partner organizations (including EPA).
- The Collaborative met 12 times from December, 2005 to September, 2007 to discuss, prioritize, and address on multiple toxics issues facing greater Rochester.

Rochester CARE Collaborative Meetings			
#	Meeting Date	Topic	# in Attendance (incl. via phone)
(Note: Project Leaders reported progress and shared needs at every Collaborative Meeting.)			
1.	Dec 5, 2005	Initial Meeting. Overview of CARE work	17

		plan.	
2.	May 3, 2006	Project Reports. Introduce Collab structure, process and meeting dates.	14
3.	June 20, 2006	Project Reports. Decide Collab structure & process.	12
4.	Sept 19, 2006	Brainstorm 57 toxics issues and identify priority.	25
5.	Oct 17, 2006	Identify top five broad toxics issues. Define process to propose, process to vote, and criteria to select Action Plans.	17
6.	Nov 21, 2006	Select top 3 Action Plans. Formed definition subcommittees.	17
7.	Jan 23, 2007	Select two Action Plans & form implementation subcommittees.	16
8	March 20, 2007	Presentation on Mobile Source (1 hr) & Project Reports.	16
9.	April 17, 2007	Neighborhood Toxics Presentation (1 hr) & Project Reports.	19
10	May 15, 2007	General Meeting with Progress Reports	14
11.	June 19, 2007	Strategic Planning & General Meeting	14
12.	Sept 18, 2007	Final meeting during grant period. Final Reports & Future Plans.	23

- The Collaborative followed the progress of the other five Rochester CARE programs and three small grants programs.
- The Collaborative identified and prioritized 57 under-attended environmental issues.
- The Collaborative designed and launched two new initiatives to address two selected toxics issues: HAPs and P2.5 from the combustion of fossil fuels. The two initiatives are Idling Reduction at Schools and Energy Conservation Website. We also launched a third initiative, recommended by the Mobile Sources of Air Toxics group, Reducing Air Pollution from Construction Vehicles, which will reduce HAPs and P2.5.
- The Collaborative has posted updates of its progress on our web site (www.ceinfo.org/care.php).
- The Collaborative designed a strategy to sustain the group and its work.
- The Idling Reduction at Schools subcommittee has met and shared materials with the transportation supervisors of approximately 20 school districts in the area through the group Rochester Area Transportation Supervisors (RATSA). Survey will be sent soon to other school districts in Monroe County which will identify and encourage other schools to participate. The Rush-Henrietta School District has estimated it has reduced school bus engine idling by approximately 5000 hours in 2007.
- The Energy Conservation Website subcommittee has designed but not yet launched a web site and a publicity plan that will reach many school and community groups in Rochester.

i. What were your project's most significant *outcomes* (changes in policy, behavior, and practice, e.g., auto shops' shift to less toxic materials, ban adopted on school bus idling, change in local agencies' policy or procedures, school district commitment to IPM for pest control, etc.)?

- New working relationships were established among the members of the Collaborative. Many organizations in greater Rochester are now sharing information and regularly collaborating to solve toxics issues. Environmental announcements are regularly shared via email among the 55 people affiliated with the Collaborative.
- Through the information on our web site, the Collaborative has begun to increase the wider community knowledge of an action on toxics.
- The Collaborative has been instrumental in increasing attendance at member events that were publicized throughout the member organizations, such as Alternative Fuels Workshop on June 14, 2007 and the Action for a Better Community's Health Fair on May 5, 2007.
- Most members of the Collaborative are eager to continue participating.
- Project Outcomes for the five Rochester CARE Projects are described in Part II, Sections A-E of this report.

j. What specific reductions in environmental risks did your project achieve?

- The Rush-Henrietta School District has already implemented changes in its equipment and procedures to reduce idling by 5000 hours per year. This amounts to a reduction of NO_x of 670,000 grams or 1,475 pounds per year. Particulate matter can expect to be reduced by 18,000 grams or 40.5 pounds per year.

k. Were there differences between your original plan and what actually occurred in your project? Did you achieve your objectives? Please explain. What objectives were not met and why?

We achieved all of our original objectives. We had hoped to be further into the implementation of the Energy Conservation Website initiative and had more coverage in regional media by September, 2007. However, we have the commitment of a subcommittee, a solid plan, and a pending grant application for the web site implementation. We also are collaborating with the marketing firm for one television station and soon to be six radio stations to promote environmental changes by businesses and individuals in a year-long marketing campaign, which is wildly beyond our original media-coverage ideas.

l. What other resources (not already covered in your discussion of your partnership or outside resources above) did your project mobilize, both financial and in kind?

- The Collaborative leveraged an additional 700 hours of in-kind work, as well as in-kind meeting space, equipment loaning, donated photocopies, and donated trees for a neighborhood center.
- Media relations – Rochester CARE received press coverages in local newspapers and in two ½ hour radio talk shows.

I. Reflection

a. How likely is it that the progress achieved could have been made without your CARE partnership?

Very unlikely. Organizations in Rochester have long complained of working in isolation and have tried to set up area-wide collaborative groups but have had limited success until the Rochester CARE Collaborative.

b. What do you consider your project's greatest achievement?

The Rochester CARE Collaborative's greatest achievement is the collaboration, the information exchange, the increased respect, and the newfound hope to solve problems together.

c. What was your greatest challenge and how did you deal with it?

The Rochester CARE Collaborative's greatest challenge narrowing and defining our focus from the original 57 toxics issues and 31 proposed action plans. We dealt with this by voting, defining prioritization criteria, and then working towards consensus.

d. What would you do differently next time in terms of organizing and structuring your partnership to achieve your project objectives?

We ran low on time and energy to fundraise for the future and implement our new initiatives. This occurred because our most energetic members were also leading other projects of the CARE program, and other working members were retiring or making job changes.

Next time we would:

- Ask each working member to identify an alternate person to participate.
- Try to define our new initiatives sooner.
- Set up the expectation from the beginning that there will be implementation subcommittees and get member thinking about volunteering for that.
- Early in the program, designate some members whose focus will be to research grant opportunities as soon as new initiatives are defined.
- Early in the program, designate one member who will send out press releases and invite media to events.
- Ensure that there are several working members who are not also heavily involved in other projects of the CARE program.

e. How might you have been more strategic in designing or implementing your project?

We had a well-defined work plan and focused on it. A major shift in strategy that may have helped would be to take a break when we realized so many of the active members were diverted to other parts of the CARE program and to recruit some additional community members to help implement the new initiatives and initiate fundraising.

f. If you chose to create one, did you find using a logic model or other goal-driven model helpful? Please explain. Did the model change over time? If so, how?

Yes. We found that following the objectives defined in the grant work plan helped very much. The model did not change over time, but we did further define the objectives and criteria.

g. To what extent did your CARE community communicate or engage with other CARE communities and how was that interaction helpful?

We participated in each of two national CARE conferences, conference calls, most of the Webinars, and read the items posted on the CARE Communities' QuickPlace. We also used materials from the St. Louis Clean School Buses program. These interactions were very helpful because they saved us time and brought clarity when we were unsure about how to handle some situations.

h. Did media coverage play a role in your project? If so, please explain.

Yes. Representatives from Rochester CARE were guests on two occasions on a major radio talk show. CARE programs were also featured in several local newspaper and newsletter articles and well as various web sites. In 2008, the Collaborative will be working with a radio and television group for a very exciting, year-long community education initiative on how businesses and individuals can be more "green".

i. In what ways did you rely on EPA for assistance (conflict resolution, partnership support, voluntary programs, such as Tools for Schools or Pollution Prevention)?

EPA connected us to:

- Other CARE Communities through conferences, conference calls, Webinars, and QuickPlace.
- Databases on EPA.gov.
- Pro bono legal advice.
- St. Louis Clean School Buses program materials.

j. What role did your Project Officer and other EPA staff play in your work? What would you have liked more of or less of?

See above.

k. To what extent do you think that this project increased the capacity of your organization? Your partnership? Your community? Please provide examples.

The Rochester CARE Collaborative project increased the capacity of my organization and some other member organizations by being better connected to and sharing more information with other environmental organizations. Because of this we have had a few additional attendees at our events. The bigger benefit is to the greater Rochester community who will be able to move forward more quickly and effectively on new

initiatives. The Collaborative has provided the infrastructure and established the working relationships.

l. Did your project produce any new “community leaders?” Please describe.

Yes. Many members were already community leaders. Several members, especially the Project Leaders, of the Collaborative were leaders in smaller environmental circles and are now known in wider circles because of the connections of the Collaborative.

m. What advice would you offer to other communities undertaking similar work?

- Invite community leaders in a broad range of sectors.
- Recruit those invitees persistently, following up personally to encourage participation.
- Promote the benefits of participation in your Collaborative, including the capacity to share your organization’s events and promote its priorities, and the connections you’ll make.
- Create space to listen to all members.
- Spell out member responsibilities.
- Solicit agenda input from all.
- Send meeting minutes promptly.
- Don’t allow factions.
- Teach about building consensus.
- Teach fair brainstorming techniques.
- Get a professional, neutral facilitator for potentially difficult topics.
- Designate a few members to focus on fundraising opportunities early in the program.
- Study the list of EPA resources and ask your EPA Project Officer to give some examples of some ways that EPA can provide assistance.
- Get the phone number of some other CARE Community leaders and ask them to share their advice.
- Have many members test QuickPlace to be sure it’s a tool that all members can use before you spend a lot of time setting it up. If it’s not the right tool for your group, set up another electronic group where you can share files, vote, and post emails.

I. What Next?

a. Will members of your partnership continue to work on this issue or on other toxic reduction strategies to address other risks?

Yes, the Rochester CARE Collaborative will continue to work on the issue of pollutants from fossil fuel combustion as well as identifying and addressing other risks.

b. How will this work be sustained?

The mission of the Collaborative and the three initiatives will be sustained through the support of CEI and the enthusiasm and dedication of the Collaborative members.

The detail of how the Collaborative will be sustained is as follows:

1 - The Collaborative will continue to benefit the community by continuing its mission:

The Rochester CARE Collaborative is a community stakeholder group that acts in collaboration to continually identify the most important and under-attended environmental issues in greater Rochester 6-county metro area, and to leverage our broad collaborative base to develop and launch plans to address those issues.

2 - The Collaborative will be called the Rochester CARE Collaborative and will continue to represent Rochester as a CARE Community.

3 - CEI will provide the structure and administrative support for the Collaborative, as financial resources permit, including but not limited to 501(c)3 status for grant applications, oversight and coordination from the Operations Manager (currently George Thomas) or Executive Director, and meeting space.

4 - Meetings have been scheduled for Nov 20, 2007 and Jan 15, 2008.

5 - Most of the Collaborative members are enthusiastically continuing their participation beyond the CARE grant period.

6 - CEI Steering Committee and Board will support the Collaborative by regularly considering new initiatives recommended by the Collaborative and approving those which fit the mission and focus of CEI and can be sufficiently funded.

7 - The Collaborative Member Organizations will provide additional support in the form of in-kind hours, technical expertise, and supplemental meeting space or supplies if needed.

The Idling Reduction at Schools initiative will be sustained by:

1 – The volunteer subcommittee members from the DEC Region 8, Monroe County, Broccoli Tree and Lawn Care, and the Genesee Region Clean Communities.

2 – The willing and interested schools in the community, including Rush-Henrietta School District and several districts who are members of the Rochester Area Transportation Supervisors Association (RATSA).

3 – Use of the St. Louis Clean School Buses materials from the EPA web site.

4 – “No Idling” signs provided by the DEC Region 8.

The Energy Conservation Web Site initiative will be sustained by:

1 – The volunteer subcommittee members from Federation of Monroe County Environmentalists, Harbec Plastics, Monroe County, Knauf Shaw, and Action for a Better Community.

2 – Grant funds (approximately \$5k to \$10k) have been applied for and as soon as they are received, we have both a technical plan defined and local professional programming resources available to create the web site.

3 – We have a plan to involve community groups including incentives. Plan attached.

The Reducing Air Pollution from Construction Vehicles initiative is just beginning and will be sustained by:

1 – Collaborative member Rich Perrin of Genesee Transportation Council will meet with the local construction industry association to begin the conversation.

2 – The Collaborative will review this issue regularly and work with Genesee Transportation Council and the local construction industry to define a strategy to reduce pollutants.

See Appendix A for a detailed description of the above project action plans.

c.If neither your organization nor the members of the partnership plan to continue the work, please describe why.

We are continuing.

d. Please describe a continuing or next source of funding you have for your work or other groups in your community that have continued the work and have found funding.

Our continuing sources of funding and support are:

- CEI will provide administrative support.
- Members will provide in-kind services.
- Rochester Green Business Network (RGBN – a program of CEI) will be working with the Collaborative on initiatives in the business sector.
- CEI has applied for a grant that includes funding for the Collaborative's Energy Conservation Web Site
- CEI is applying for a grant to continue the work of the Collaborative and the small grants program with Evan Lowenstein volunteering as Acting Program Director.

I. Feedback and Follow up

a.Please share any thoughts you have about what EPA could do to improve the CARE program.

- It would be very helpful to have a personal EPA “orientation” given by an EPA staff member at the beginning of the CARE project. The orientation would review a list of EPA tools, materials, databases, and services, describing how each might be helpful in a CARE project. I found that I did not understand the relevance of the EPA tools and programs on the written list until near the end of the project.
 - I recommend connecting each new CARE Community with one or two leaders of experienced CARE Communities to get their advice over the phone early in the project—a mentoring project.
 - Provide the pro bono lawyer application near the beginning of the project.
 - Try to arrange for a pro bono lawyer “hot line” that we can call to address small questions with a quick phone call.
- b. We want to keep in touch and learn about the work that you do after your grant with CARE. Would it be okay for someone from the headquarters CARE team to contact you in the future to talk about how your work is progressing? Are there others we should contact instead of or in addition to you? If so, please provide their contact information.**

Yes, you can contact me at: Sally Howard, showard@solaraconcepts.com, 585-507-2112. You can also contact Margit Brazda Poirier, Rochester CARE Program Manager, at 585-314-7869 or the new Rochester CARE Collaborative Coordinator George Thomas, gctcem@rit.edu, 585-233-6086.

c. Would you be willing to be interviewed for a more in depth case study?

Yes. Contact me at Sally Howard, showard@solaraconcepts.com, 585-507-2112.

III. Rochester CARE Projects

A. Lead Hazard Remediation Program

Submitted by Eric VanDusen, NeighborWorks Rochester

I. Your Partnership

a. What environmental problems does your community face that brought people together?

The majority (55%) of houses in the city of Rochester were built before 1940 when there were high concentrations of lead in household paint. In contrast, only 13.3% of all housing units in the country were built before 1940. Because of this high concentration of older homes, many city families are at risk of lead poisoning. This is of particular concern for families with children under 6 years of age. It is also an issue of increasing concern given that much of our oldest housing stock is not being replaced with new homes, requiring costly on-going maintenance.

At the same time household income in the city is decreasing, making it difficult for property owners to keep up with the expense of these repairs out of pocket, including lead remediation work. In fact, 50% of all households in Rochester are paying more than 30% of their income for housing. Of these, 50% are paying over 50% of their monthly income for housing. In addition, 60% of all residential units are rental, which experience higher wear and tear and whose owners (landlords) are more inclined to defer maintenance in the current stagnate market climate which combines a growing number of poorer tenants with flat monthly rents.

b. How many individuals and their organizational affiliations were involved? Please review and add to the attached list and please add a contact name for each organization.

NeighborWorks® worked closely with the Coalition To Prevent Lead Poisoning (CTPLP). The CTPLP assisted with the job posting and hiring of the program's staff person. NeighborWorks® also work with the CTPLP to outreach the program's services and to identify resources to refer program participants to.

In addition, NeighborWorks® worked with other programs that provided relevant services to property owners seeking to address lead hazards. These organizations are listed below:

Coalition To Prevent Lead Poisoning:	Derrick Hazle
City of Rochester	Conrad Floss
ABC/Weatherization	Rodney Washington
ABC/GLOW	Karyn Herman
Environmental Services	Andy McLellan
The Housing Council	Alex Castro
United Way:	Ellen Lewis

c. Did this project bring any new partners into your work?

This project helped NeighborWorks® to develop a closer working relationship with the organizations listed above, particularly The Housing Council, Environmental Services and the City of Rochester. In fact, the City of Rochester allowed Lead Hazard Remediation Program staff to assist City staff with grant application in-take. We were the only program they worked with in this way.

How did the new partners aid the partnership and project?

By working in collaboration, program partners were better able to coordinate services and limited resources to the advantage of the property owners who participated.

d. What role did your organization play in this partnership?

NeighborWorks® Rochester provided case management services to owner-occupants and investors who owned property within the city of Rochester. The program referred participants to other resources that were administered by other organizations. In this capacity NeighborWorks® Rochester was able to connect with programs that mostly operated separate for one another.

e. What skills were most important from your organization to implement the project?

Project staff needed to be very knowledgeable of all the available resources, application processes, guidelines and qualifying criteria. We also needed to be knowledgeable of household lead hazards and lead safe remediation methods. In addition, staff needed to be able to work effectively with homeowners, landlords, tenants, program administrators and community leaders.

f. Which partners were most active? How?

The most active members were those who had services/resources that the program referred property owners to, including The Housing Council, the City of Rochester and Environmental Services, as well as the Coalition To Prevent Lead Poisoning

g. What resources and strengths did each organization bring to the project?

Resources: lead education and housing rehab resources.

Strengths: knowledgeable of the neighborhoods and communities that they served, as well as issues surrounding household lead hazards.

h. What efforts did you make to ensure that the most vulnerable community members were included in the partnership?

Our project sought out partners that included those that worked directly with some of Rochester's most at-risk households, including ABC and The Housing Council.

i. What role did your EPA Project Officer, Derval Thomas, play in the partnership?

Derval provided feedback and direction as the project unfolded, particularly when the project encountered programmatic challenges.

j. What barriers did your partnership experience and how did you overcome them (distrust, unequal power, control over money, differing priorities, process for reaching consensus, etc.)?

There were challenges to working with partner organizations that administered services/resources, particularly with regards to differing application processes. Delays in processing resource applications and overly complicated program requirements did, at times, strain our partnership with various organizations and compromised project outcomes. Not all of these issues were overcome, but some were by staff going the extra mile and offering to assist other organizations in collecting documents, getting applicants to appointments, etc. in order to move a property owner's grant application forward.

k. How has this partnership improved relationships among those involved? Please describe the working relationship that has improved the most and those that may still need work.

The project was able to identify gaps in resources and program requirements that presented barriers to having more property owners applying to available lead hazard remediation programs. Unfortunately, most of the more substantial barriers remained through out the program period, in spite of staff efforts to help make improvements. The program that had the most substantial barriers was the City's lead grant programs.

l. Has your organization engaged in a similar process to CARE in which you had a similar role? Please describe briefly.

NeighborWorks® Rochester continues to refer property owners to other resources that are available in the community that address lead hazards. We also continue to collaborate with partner organizations to address issues like lead hazards, affordable housing and predatory lending practices.

m. Is there anything else about your partnership that you would like to share?

II. Your Project

a. What toxic risks did your project address?

The Lead Hazard Remediation Program was designed to address household lead hazards

b. What toxic reduction strategies did you pursue?

The program was designed to provide case management services to owner-occupants and investor-owners. These services included taking an application to collect baseline data and property information. A site visit was then conducted to identify potential lead hazards and to educate property owners about the issue and strategies to remediate exposure to lead poisoning. An action plan was then created. This plan outlined property specific lead issues and identified various resources within the community that could assist with their remediation. Assistance with applying for these programs was made available as needed.

c. How did you reach agreement on implementation decisions?

Program staff worked with property owners on both understanding what potential lead hazards existed within their property and with identifying programs they could qualify to assist in addressing them. As the action plan was being created, staff and property owners discussed the short and long term priority items based on the level of the hazard, the resources available that they could qualify for and interventions that they could take on themselves. Through this process agreement was reached on what the property owners was going to undertake and what staff was willing to assist with in order to meet the plan's objectives.

d. Did you reshape your partnership in any way to address strategy implementation? Please explain.

Because there are limited rehab resources in the community to address lead hazards, and because the few that did exist have lengthy and restrictive qualifying requirements, staff needed to focus more on what property owners could do on their own and on educational resources than had been originally envisioned. This proved challenging to the program, as most property owners who sought assistance had repair issues that were greater than the owner's ability and personal resources to overcome.

e. What outside resources (e.g., people, programs, approaches, etc.) were most important to your project?

The City of Rochester's Owner-Occupied and Investor-Owner Lead Grant Program

Action For A Better Community's (ABC) Weatherization Program

The Residential Assistance Program (RAP)

ABC's Get the Lead Out (GLO) program

Lead Safe Work Practices Workshops (The Housing Council, Environmental Services and Cornell Cooperative Extension)

f. Was there any environmental issue that EPA seemed to lack the tools or means (e.g., Partnership Programs, data tools, other expertise) to address? If so, please describe the situation or need you had.

There were no issues that surfaced during the course of this program.

g. How did you build momentum over the course of your project? Did you secure any “early wins” to help build momentum? Did you look for additional funding early on? What was acquired?

Awareness of the program was developed over the course of the program year. In addition to case management services, staff conducted on-going outreach meeting with neighborhood associations, school groups, attending community health fairs and flyer-ing targeted neighborhoods. In addition, the City of Rochester included information about the program on its Lead Hot line. This hot line was set up for city residents to call to learn about lead hazard remediation resources and services.

NeighborWorks® Rochester did explore other sources of funds to continue the Lead Remediation Program. A funding application was submitted to the City of Rochester, but this request was not awarded.

h. What were the significant *outputs* of your project (meetings held, materials developed, people trained, etc.)?

The program assisted 135 units. Of these 66 (49%) were owner-occupants and 69 (51%) were investor-owners.

i. What were your project’s most significant *outcomes* (changes in policy, behavior, and practice, e.g., auto shops’ shift to less toxic materials, ban adopted on school bus idling, change in local agencies’ policy or procedures, school district commitment to IPM for pest control, etc.)?

Of the 135 units assisted, 51 (38%) successfully reduced identified lead hazards.

In addition to reducing the number of lead hazards in the community, the Lead Remediation Program was able to identify gaps in services and resources, as well as overly-restrictive program requirements (see attached Report On Program Challenges And Opportunities)

j. What specific reductions in environmental risks did your project achieve?

See above

k. Were there differences between your original plan and what actually occurred in your project? Did you achieve your objectives? Please explain. What objectives were not met and why?

Although the program did not meet its numerical goal of assisting 250 housing units, it did assist 135 units and identified gaps in resources, changes with existing program guidelines and qualification requirements.

The challenges to the program are described in detail in the attached Report On Program Challenges and Opportunities. The following summarizes the issues that were encountered:

Timing – Many programs originally identified as available to the project were spent down by the time the program was funded.

Restrictive Programs – The largest and more important lead remediation program in Rochester is administered by the City of Rochester. This HUD funded lead grant program was placed on “red” list during the project’s program year by HUD due to lack of program performance. In addition, the City’s grant programs are only available to households that have children under 6 years of age (making all others ineligible to apply) and took one year for qualified property owners to successfully complete from application to rehab completion.

Outside influences – During the projects program year other programs like ABC’s Weatherization Program went to waiting lists because resources could not keep up with demand. ABC’s waiting list was 6 months. This discouraged program participants from continuing with our case management services.

Logistics – Program availability did not conform to property owner availability. For example, all of the free lead safe work practices workshop were available only during the day, when most applicants worked. There are no free workshops on weekends.

Internal challenges – NeighborWorks® Rochester had to find a replacement for the original staff person who was hired to administer the program midway through the program year.

Applicant’s Expectations/Needs -The majority of property owners who contacted the program were interested in resources to make non-lead related repairs, many of which current programs would classify as ineligible.

I. What other resources (not already covered in your discussion of your partnership or outside resources above) did your project mobilize, both financial and in kind?

All resources that were leveraged have been outlined.

III. Reflection

a. How likely is it that the progress achieved could have been made without your CARE partnership?

The progress the Lead Hazard Remediation Program achieved would not have been possible without our partnership with the CARE Collaborative. The Collaborative was instrumental in securing the funding and with providing needed support. ABC, a CARE Collaborative member, and NeighborWorks were able to coordinate their services (GLO and Household Toxins Education) with ours (Lead Hazard Remediation Program and Homeowner Education classes) to more effectively reach a wider population.

b. What do you consider your project's greatest achievement?

Assisting 135 units that would not have otherwise received assistance.

c. What was your greatest challenge and how did you deal with it?

See attached document Report On Program Challenges And Opportunities

d. What would you do differently next time in terms of organizing and structuring your partnership to achieve your project objectives?

We would have designed program supports that the Lead Hazards Remediation Program would directly administered, rather than rely solely on referrals to other programs. It was difficult to get interested property owners to apply and take advantage of having a site visit and case management services if they felt they would not qualify for other resources. Because of the difficulties with the available programs that have already been outlined, would-be participants were reluctant to invest the time to apply only to be placed on a waiting list, face lengthy processes or end up not meeting other program's requirements. Without the promise of a direct physical benefit to their property, many property owners saw little benefit in participating in the program.

e. How might you have been more strategic in designing or implementing your project?

See above.

f. If you chose to create one, did you find using a logic model or other goal-driven model helpful? Please explain. Did the model change over time? If so, how?

We did not create a logic model.

g. To what extend did your CARE community communicate or engage with other CARE communities and how was that interaction helpful?

See section a above.

h. Did media coverage play a role in your project? If so, please explain.

No.

i. In what ways did you rely on EPA for assistance (conflict resolution, partnership support, voluntary programs, such as Tools for Schools or Pollution Prevention)?

See section I, part i above.

j. What role did your Project Officer and other EPA staff play in your work? What would you have liked more of or less of?

See section I, part i above

k. To what extent do you think that this project increased the capacity of your organization? Your partnership? Your community? Please provide examples.

This project made NeighborWorks® Rochester very aware of all the available lead remediation programs in Rochester. It also better connected NeighborWorks® to the advocacy community working to change public policy related to lead hazards. As a result, NeighborWorks® Rochester attended Coalition To Prevent Lead Poisoning meetings, City of Rochester Lead Ordinance public forums and trainings and Greater Rochester Association of Realtors trainings on lead hazard education. In addition, staff received certification in Lead Safe Work Practices and gave neighborhood presentations as a result of this project. All these activities added to the technical capacity to our organization, as well as better connecting us to the neighborhoods we serve.

l. Did your project produce any new “community leaders?” Please describe.

No.

m. What advice would you offer to other communities undertaking similar work?

Establish a partnership with a related health organization that can serve as the resource for blood-testing renters with children under six years old. This will address challenges related to renters’ lack of health insurance, as well as landlords not having the capacity to see this requirement through.

Design the program with direct access to funds for grants, low-interest loans or matching grants to be used to address lead hazards. Provide the program with its own pass-through funds to help incentivize participation.

Identify non-governmental sources of rehab funds that can address rental rehab in ways that better parallel the private market - and that aren’t “all or nothing” approaches to the issue.

Provide resources that are focused on addressing lead hazards (the program’s concern) but in ways that can include other repair needs (often the property owners concern).

IV. What Next?

a. Will members of your partnership continue to work on this issue or on other toxic reduction strategies to address other risks?

NeighborWorks will continue to work with community partners on addressing household lead hazards. We are working with the County of Monroe and the City of Rochester to create a capital pool to provide landlord loans that will address lead issues in rental units.

b. How will this work be sustained?

The Greater Rochester Health Foundation is providing funding to create a one-stop-shop resource program that will provide lead hazard case management to property owners. The model for this is very similar to the Lead Hazard Remediation Program in scope, with the exception that addition rehab resources are also being created in support of this initiative. This project will continue where the Lead Hazard Remediation Program left off.

c. If neither your organization nor the members of the partnership plan to continue the work, please describe why.

The work will continue as described above.

d. Please describe a continuing or next source of funding you have for your work or other groups in your community that have continued the work and have found funding.

See above.

V. Feedback and Follow up

a. Please share any thoughts you have about what EPA could do to improve the CARE program.

See Section 3, part m above and the attached Report on Program Challenges and Opportunities.

b. We want to keep in touch and learn about the work that you do after your grant with CARE. Would it be okay for someone from the headquarters CARE team to contact you in the future to talk about how your work is progressing? Are there others we should contact instead of or in addition to you? If so, please provide their contact information.

We would welcome staying in touch. Our contact information is:

Eric Van Dusen
Program Director
NeighborWorks Rochester®
570 South Avenue
Rochester, NY 14620
585/325-4170 x316
evandusen@nwrochester.org

c. Would you be willing to be interviewed for a more in depth case study?

Yes.

B. Small Business Air Pollution Prevention Project

Submitted by George Thomas, Center for Environmental Information

I. Your Partnership

a. What environmental problems does your community face that brought people together? Concerns for emissions of toxic chemicals to the atmosphere.

b. How many individuals and their organizational affiliations were involved? There were about 7 individuals who were involved with this project representing 5 organizations: Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT), High Tech Rochester (HTR), NYSDEC, City of Rochester and the Center for Environmental Information (CEI) – see attached list.

c. Did this project bring any new partners into your work? No How did the new partners aid the partnership and project? NA

d. What role did your organization play in this partnership? We provided the forum to meet and administer the project. What skills were most important from your organization to implement the project? Our ability to bring diverse groups together to identify and prioritize issues, then assist with the implementation of action items.

e. Which partners were most active? DEC, RIT and HTR were the most active. **How?** DEC representatives regularly attended meetings and provided valuable input and guidance. RIT also attended meetings and provided technical assistance along with support for setting up and hosting the Workshop. HTR provided the expertise necessary to conduct the on-site P2 assistance.

f. What resources and strengths did each organization bring to the project? See “e” above.

g. What efforts did you make to ensure that the most vulnerable community members were included in the partnership? NA

h. What role did your EPA Project Officer, Derval Thomas, play in the partnership? NA

i. What barriers did your partnership experience and how did you overcome them (distrust, unequal power, control over money, differing priorities, process for reaching consensus, etc.)? Our only barrier was associated with getting companies in our targeted industry to sign-up for the free on-site P2 assistance. The Workshop we held as part of this project overcame that barrier.

j. How has this partnership improved relationships among those involved? Any time groups can work together on the successful implementation of beneficial projects; their relationship on future endeavors has to improve. Please describe the working relationship that has improved the most and those that may still need work. Our relationship with HTR, DEC and the RIT College of Business has improved the most. We have already worked with the COB and DEC to set up an EPA sponsored Auto Body Workshop in October. We have

also partnered with HTR on a grant application to EPA to develop market-based approaches to improving energy efficiency in the commercial business sector.

k. Has your organization engaged in a similar process to CARE in which you had a similar role? Yes Please describe briefly. Lake Ontario Coastal Initiative (LOCI) is a similar multi-stakeholder/partner collaboration geared to reducing the environmental impact on the Lake Ontario coastal waters of New York state.

l. Is there anything else about your partnership that you would like to share? No

II. Your Project

a. What toxic risks did your project address?

The CARE Collaborative identified that 30% of the emissions of toxic chemicals to the atmosphere in the Rochester region were from small stationary sources such as small industries and businesses in urban neighborhoods. As a result, the Small Business Air Pollution Prevention Project (SBAP3) team was formed to:

Identify and prioritize these stationary sources; and

Provide technical assistance to those selected sectors in order to measurably reduce their emissions of toxic air pollutants.

The four major work steps identified to accomplish this task are described below, along with the methods of measurement.

Work Step	Target/Measure
1. <u>Emission Inventory and Risk Assessment</u> Characterize the small and medium sized business sector Use a risk assessment approach to prioritize a sector or sectors to be targeted for P2 assistance Contact businesses from the targeted sector to evaluate their participation in P2 assistance	Improve the community's knowledge of sources and effects of air toxics by convening a working group to complete and document the results of the risk assessment
2. <u>On-Site P2 Technical Assistance</u> Develop and implement an on-site P2 technical assistance program Identify P2 opportunities and review with each business Provide businesses with information about access to other funds available for implementing those P2 projects Quantify the environmental and other benefits from the implementation of those projects	Provide on-site technical assistance to up to two targeted businesses Identify and implement P2 improvement projects at those businesses Quantify the benefits
3. <u>Publicity and Educational Outreach</u> Design and implement a program to provide targeted businesses with information about reducing their emissions of toxic air pollutants Offer direct education opportunities via one workshop and up to two field trips to businesses receiving technical assistance	Provide education/outreach materials to targeted sector Conduct a workshop to share information on air toxics in targeted sector Conduct two field trips to businesses receiving assistance
4. <u>Sustaining Funding</u> Contact potential partners and funding organizations to continue or evolve this project into a long term offering	Prepare plan to pursue future funding or projects

b. What toxic reduction strategies did you pursue? Using Green Supplier Network (EPA Program) *Lean & Clean Review* techniques we identified opportunities to reduce waste and air emissions at the point of generation (source reduction) along with energy efficiency improvement opportunities.

c. How did you reach agreement on implementation decisions? Consensus

d. Did you reshape your partnership in any way to address strategy implementation?
Did not change partnership. Please explain.

e. What outside resources (e.g., people, programs, approaches, etc.) were most important to your project? As mentioned above, *Lean & Clean Reviews* were most important.

f. Was there any environmental issue that EPA seemed to lack the tools or means (e.g., Partnership Programs, data tools, other expertise) to address? NO If so, please describe the situation or need you had.

g. How did you build momentum over the course of your project? When we finally got some printers to sign up for our free on-site P2 technical assistance as a result of the Printers Workshop we got the momentum we needed. Did you secure any “early wins” to help build momentum? No Did you look for additional funding early on? No What was acquired? No

h. What were the significant *outputs* of your project (meetings held, materials developed, people trained, etc.)? Our most significant outputs and outcomes are described below.

Emission Inventory and Risk Assessment

Used a semi-quantitative risk assessment to identify printing as the sector to target for on-site P2 technical assistance

Documented the results of that assessment

On-Site P2 Technical Assistance

Individually contacted over 15 printers via email and phone but could only get one small printer to agree to have us come to their facility to do a walkthrough

Prepared and distributed a flyer to various printing associations to advertise our free P2 assistance to printers with no takers

Placed the same flyer and invitation on RGBN's website to no avail

Face-to-face contact with printers at the Green Printers Workshop in April 2007 resulted in three printers signing up for full assessments

On-site P2 technical assistance was provided by High Tech Rochester (HTR) using EPA Green Supplier Network *Lean & Clean Reviews*

To date one printer has initiated the improvement projects while the other two are expected to begin work before the end of this year

We were able to leverage our \$4,500 investment in the *Lean & Clean Review* for the first printer to gain access to \$80,000 of NYS funds to identify and implement P2 and productivity improvement projects. We expect to be able to do the same for the other two.

Publicity and Educational Outreach

Prepared and distributed a flyer to various printing associations to advertise our free P2 assistance to printers
 Placed the same flyer and invitation on RGBN's website
 Conducted Green Printers Workshop in April 2007 with over 40 attendees
 Conducted a survey of workshop participants
 Conducted field trip at Printer #2 in September 2007
 Conducted a field trip at the end of the workshop to RIT's Printers Lab
 Completed an update of the Printing Industry Association of NYS's environmental compliance manual.

Sustaining Funding

The model* developed to complete the On-Site Technical Assistance was particularly successful and was used to develop a recent grant request to EPA for \$660,000 to do more of the same over a three year period. Set up an Auto Body Repair Shop training sessions to be provided by EPA contractor for four BOCES Auto Body Repair classes and the Rochester Auto Body Guild for October 16 & 17, 2007

*** - Model:** Arrange face-to-face contact with interested parties to convince them to have HTR conduct free Lean & Clean Reviews to identify improvement opportunities along with where New York State funding is available to implement those improvements.

i. What were your project's most significant *outcomes* (changes in policy, behavior, and practice, e.g., auto shops' shift to less toxic materials, ban adopted on school bus idling, change in local agencies' policy or procedures, school district commitment to IPM for pest control, etc.)? There were two significant outcomes: recognition that we need face-to-face contact with individuals to get them to participate in on-site P2 technical assistance and leveraging the initial "seed" money we provided for on-site P2 assistance to gain access to larger amounts of NYS money to implement improvements.

j. What specific reductions in environmental risks did your project achieve? The table below summarizes the magnitude of the potential reductions in environmental risks that were identified as a result of the on-site P2 assistance. We are in the process on implementing the improvements at Printer #1 and will continue to work with the other two printers to implement their improvements.

	Printer #1	Printer #2	Printer #3
Sales (\$M):	7.5	12	20
Employees:	43	80	150
Machines:	10 narrow web litho	3 sheet fed litho	5 sheet fed litho 2 digital
VOC Emissions (#/mo.):	180	1,000	1,000
HAP Emissions (#/mo.):	< 10	200	200
Solid Waste (#/mo.):	45,000	70,000 – recycled	80,000
Hazardous Waste (#/mo.):	< 1,000	1,000	2,000
Electricity (KWH/mo.):	120,000	170,000	180,000
Gas (Therms/mo.):	NA	9,300	3,500
HAP Emission Reduction Opps:	None	20 – 50%	
Waste Reduction Opps:	\$30k (\$10k)	\$30k (\$10k)	Yes
Energy Efficiency Opps:	10% (\$10k)	20% (\$10k)	Yes
Productivity Improve Opps:	Significant (\$60k)	Significant (\$60k)	Yes

k. Were there differences between your original plan and what actually occurred in your project? Yes. We originally set out to identify HAP/VOC emission reduction opportunities and implement projects to reduce those emissions. In actuality we were only able to identify the opportunities. Did you achieve your objectives? Due to the difficulty we had in getting printers to sign-up for our free on-site P2 assistance until we had face-to-face contact with printers at the workshop in April 2007, we were not able to complete the Lean & Clean Reviews and implement the identified improvements. Please explain. What objectives were not met and why? We did not implement any VOC/HAP emission reduction projects but identified reduction opportunities that we are pursuing with one printer now and expect to do the same with the other two printers.

What other resources (not already covered in your discussion of your partnership or outside resources above) did your project mobilize, both financial and in kind? None

III. Reflection

a. How likely is it that the progress achieved could have been made without your CARE partnership? We could have updated the Printers Environmental Manual and completed the risk assessment without this partnership but could not have made progress on the on-site P2 assistance without the Workshop this partnership conducted.

b. What do you consider your project's greatest achievement? Helping three small businesses identify significant business and environmental improvement opportunities and assist them in gaining access to NYS funds to implement those improvements. Without this leveraging the projects identified would probably not be implemented.

c. What was your greatest challenge and how did you deal with it? Our greatest challenge was to get printers to sign-up to have us do the free on-site P2 technical assistance. The Green Printers Workshop was the key.

d. What would you do differently next time in terms of organizing and structuring your partnership to achieve your project objectives? No

e. How might you have been more strategic in designing or implementing your project? NA

f. If you chose to create one, did you find using a logic model or other goal-driven model helpful? Please explain. Did the model change over time? If so, how? NA

g. To what extent did your CARE community communicate or engage with other CARE communities and how was that interaction helpful? NA

h. Did media coverage play a role in your project? No If so, please explain.

i. In what ways did you rely on EPA for assistance (conflict resolution, partnership support, voluntary programs, such as Tools for Schools or Pollution Prevention)? NA

j. What role did your Project Officer and other EPA staff play in your work? The attendance of the Assistant Administrator to our Workshop was helpful. What would you have liked more of or less of? NA

k. To what extent do you think that this project increased the capacity of your organization? None Your partnership? It increased our capacity and willingness to provide on-site P2 assistance Your community? NA Please provide examples.

l. Did your project produce any new “community leaders?” No Please describe.

m. What advice would you offer to other communities undertaking similar work? If you are trying to convince stakeholders or others to participate on improvement projects create the opportunity to do it face-to-face rather than on the phone, mail or internet.

IV. What Next?

a. Will members of your partnership continue to work on this issue or on other toxic reduction strategies to address other risks? Yes

b. How will this work be sustained?

Sustaining Funding

The model* developed to complete the On-Site Technical Assistance was particularly successful and was used to develop a recent grant request to EPA for \$660,000 to do more of the same over a three year period.

Set up an Auto Body Repair Shop training sessions to be provided by EPA contractor for four BOCES Auto Body Repair classes and the Rochester Auto Body Guild for October 16 & 17, 2007

*** - Model:** Arrange face-to-face contact with interested parties to convince them to have HTR conduct free Lean & Clean Reviews to identify improvement opportunities along with where New York State funding is available to implement those improvements.

c. If neither your organization nor the members of the partnership plan to continue the work, please describe why. NA

d. Please describe a continuing or next source of funding you have for your work or other groups in your community that have continued the work and have found funding. See “b” above.

V. Feedback and Follow up

a. Please share any thoughts you have about what EPA could do to improve the CARE program. None come to mind.

b. We want to keep in touch and learn about the work that you do after your grant with CARE. Would it be okay for someone from the headquarters CARE team to contact you in the future to talk about how your work is progressing? Yes Are there others we

should contact instead of or in addition to you? No If so, please provide their contact information.

c. Would you be willing to be interviewed for a more in depth case study? Yes

C. Neighborhood Toxics Educator Project

Submitted by Ted Murray, Action for a Better Community

I. Your Partnership

a. What environmental problems does your community face that brought people together?
Mobile source toxins, Indoor air quality issues: tobacco smoke, carbon monoxide, mold, etc.

b. How many individuals and their organizational affiliations were involved? Please review and add to the attached list and please add a contact name for each organization.
Action for a Better Community, Inc. Ted Murray 585-325-5116 x4515.

c. Did this project bring any new partners into your work? How did the new partners aid the partnership and project?
The Monroe County Health Department became a closer partner by training and assisting the Neighborhood Toxics Educator (NTE) in Indoor Air Toxics.

d. What role did your organization play in this partnership? What skills were most important from your organization to implement the project?
Action for a Better Community, Inc. hired and supervised Ted Murray, the Neighborhood Toxics Educator. ABC is established as a constant presence in the neighborhoods most seriously affected by toxins. Our relationships with block clubs and neighborhood groups provided ready-made contacts for the NTE at the beginning of the program.

e. Which partners were most active? How?
U. of Rochester assisted with curriculum development.

f. What resources and strengths did each organization bring to the project?
ABC brought extensive block club group and neighborhood contacts to the project.

g. What efforts did you make to ensure that the most vulnerable community members were included in the partnership?
By using our Community Building experience and contacts.

h. What role did your EPA Project Officer, Derval Thomas, play in the partnership?
Consultation and advice.

i. What barriers did your partnership experience and how did you overcome them (distrust, unequal power, control over money, differing priorities, process for reaching consensus, etc.)?
Scheduling groups for presentations was the biggest barrier. We used persistence and flexibility to resolve that problem.

j. How has this partnership improved relationships among those involved? Please describe the working relationship that has improved the most and those that may still need work.
Our relationships with neighborhood organizations remain strong.

k. Has your organization engaged in a similar process to CARE in which you had a similar role? Please describe briefly.

No.

l. Is there anything else about your partnership that you would like to share?

No.

I. Your Project

Please describe your CARE project and provide copies of important materials that you developed. Please make sure that your description includes the following:

a. What toxic risks did your project address?

Indoor air quality, mold, tobacco smoke, lead, home chemicals, pests, carbon monoxide, and radon were the primary toxins covered in our program.

b. What toxic reduction strategies did you pursue?

Outreach community education, small and large group presentations, health fairs, individual home visits, and resident education. Additionally, we used tabloid and press media.

c. How did you reach agreement on implementation decisions?

The process was firmly outlined by the CARE Collaborative.

d. Did you reshape your partnership in any way to address strategy implementation? Please explain.

No.

e. What outside resources (e.g., people, programs, approaches, etc.) were most important to your project?

University of Rochester's Healthy Home, Monroe County Health Indoor Air Dept, Lawrence Poison Center

f. Was there any environmental issue that EPA seemed to lack the tools or means (e.g., Partnership Programs, data tools, other expertise) to address? If so, please describe the situation or need you had.

Definitely not.

g. How did you build momentum over the course of your project? Did you secure any "early wins" to help build momentum? Did you look for additional funding early on? What was acquired?

We spread word through our network of contacts and attended all relevant networking possibilities.

h. What were the significant *outputs* of your project (meetings held, materials developed, people trained, etc.)?

39 groups/2061 individuals reached

- i. What were your project's most significant *outcomes* (changes in policy, behavior, and practice, e.g., auto shops' shift to less toxic materials, ban adopted on school bus idling, change in local agencies' policy or procedures, school district commitment to IPM for pest control, etc.)?

Our outcomes are primarily process outcomes, however over 50% of surveyed participants reported making a change in their home as a result of the presentation.

- j. What specific reductions in environmental risks did your project achieve?

None measured.

- k. Were there differences between your original plan and what actually occurred in your project? Did you achieve your objectives? Please explain. What objectives were not met and why?

NTE objectives were met and exceeded.

- l. What other resources (not already covered in your discussion of your partnership or outside resources above) did your project mobilize, both financial and in kind?

None.

I. Reflection

- a. How likely is it that the progress achieved could have been made without your CARE partnership?

Uncertain.

- b. What do you consider your project's greatest achievement?

Reaching over 2000 individuals; making new associations.

- c. What was your greatest challenge and how did you deal with it?

Group scheduling.

- d. What would you do differently next time in terms of organizing and structuring your partnership to achieve your project objectives?

Nothing.

- e. How might you have been more strategic in designing or implementing your project?

Design was fine.

- f. If you chose to create one, did you find using a logic model or other goal-driven model helpful? Please explain. Did the model change over time? If so, how?

N/A

- g. To what extent did your CARE community communicate or engage with other CARE communities and how was that interaction helpful?

None.

- h. Did media coverage play a role in your project? If so, please explain.

None.

- i. In what ways did you rely on EPA for assistance (conflict resolution, partnership support, voluntary programs, such as Tools for Schools or Pollution Prevention)?

Data and education materials.

- j. What role did your Project Officer and other EPA staff play in your work? What would you have liked more of or less of?

Encouragement.

- k. To what extent do you think that this project increased the capacity of your organization? Your partnership? Your community? Please provide examples.

Capacity was improved through making new relationships such as Monroe County Health Department.

- l. Did your project produce any new “community leaders?” Please describe.

No.

- m. What advice would you offer to other communities undertaking similar work?

Order educational materials early and in large quantity. Find out where every outreach event will be held.

I. What Next?

- a. Will members of your partnership continue to work on this issue or on other toxic reduction strategies to address other risks?

Yes.

- b. How will this work be sustained?

Continued presentations.

- c. If neither your organization nor the members of the partnership plan to continue the work, please describe why.

- d. Please describe a continuing or next source of funding you have for your work or other groups in your community that have continued the work and have found funding.

NTE will work with ABC funding as part of overall health responsibility.

I. Feedback and Follow up

- a. Please share any thoughts you have about what EPA could do to improve the CARE program.

- b. We want to keep in touch and learn about the work that you do after your grant with CARE. Would it be okay for someone from the headquarters CARE team to contact you in the future to talk about how your work is progressing? Are there others we should contact instead of or in addition to you? If so, please provide their contact information.

Absolutely

- c. Would you be willing to be interviewed for a more in depth case study?

Yes

D. Reduction of Air Toxics at the Rochester City School District

Submitted by Suzanne Wheatcraft, Rochester City School District

I. Your Project

- a. What toxic risks did your project address? **Air pollution from diesel particulates from truck exhaust was the toxic risk addressed.**
- b. What toxic reduction strategies did you pursue? **We planned to install Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) in 7 trucks and in fact instead will be installing diesel oxidation catalysts (DOC) in 15 trucks.**
- c. How did you reach agreement on implementation decisions? **Discussions with CEI and EPA primarily enabled us to reach agreements. The other CARE partners also provided input to a letter level.**
- d. Did you reshape your partnership in any way to address strategy implementation? Please explain. **We worked less with ABC than we'd originally thought we would on educational efforts. Due to timing and strategies it was beyond my abilities to implement any more in this area.**
- e. What outside resources (e.g., people, programs, approaches, etc.) were most important to your project? **I could not have done this without the knowledge of District property and policies supplied to me by our Fleet Manager, Tim Herbstsommer.**
- f. Was there any environmental issue that EPA seemed to lack the tools or means (e.g., Partnership Programs, data tools, other expertise) to address? If so, please describe the situation or need you had. **I did not understand clearly going into this that the Diesel Particulate Filter technology requires an expensive "filter cleaning" device as well.**
- g. How did you build momentum over the course of your project? Did you secure any "early wins" to help build momentum? Did you look for additional funding early on? What was acquired? **We actually lost momentum at times having to deal with the introduction of ultra low sulfur diesel fuel and the inability to successfully use the DPF technology.**
- h. What were the significant *outputs* of your project (meetings held, materials developed, people trained, etc.)? **15 Trucks with diesel oxidation catalysts installed and 15 trucks with an educational message and student artwork displayed on both sides of the truck body.**
- i. What were your project's most significant *outcomes* (changes in policy, behavior, and practice, e.g., auto shops' shift to less toxic materials, ban adopted on school bus idling, change in local agencies' policy or procedures, school district commitment to IPM for pest control, etc.)? **Raised awareness both within and outside of the district as to our commitment to environmental issues.**

- j. What specific reductions in environmental risks did your project achieve? **Reduction in diesel fuel pollution to the air.**
- k. Were there differences between your original plan and what actually occurred in your project? Did you achieve your objectives? Please explain. What objectives were not met and why? **We did not install the technology we set out to. In theory, a DPF can reduce particulate emissions up to 75%, while a DOC may only reduce it by 20-30%. However, due to lower costs, we were able to install these in our entire truck fleet – 15 trucks instead of the 7 originally planned. Furthermore, the DPF filter cleaning device was not planned for so the DOCs may actually represent a better option, financially and technically (no equipment to store and operate).**
- l. What other resources (not already covered in your discussion of your partnership or outside resources above) did your project mobilize, both financial and in kind? **na**

II. Reflection

- a. How likely is it that the progress achieved could have been made without your CARE partnership? **This would not have occurred at all.**
- b. What do you consider your project's greatest achievement? **Installation of the DOCs.**
- c. What was your greatest challenge and how did you deal with it? **Due to timing issues we were rushed to finish on time. Things out of my control like the ultra low sulfur fuel, and the DPFs not performing were frustrating and it was hard for me to squeeze out the additional time needed to deal with these issues in addition to my current workload. There is no capacity here for me to get assistance with my position so when I take on additional tasks like participating in CARE it is up to me to make it work. This was a tremendous challenge that I would hesitate to undertake again.**
- d. What would you do differently next time in terms of organizing and structuring your partnership to achieve your project objectives? **I was greatly relieved when we were able to transfer the vendor payment responsibilities to CEI. I would structure it that way from the start in the future. Our system internally is extremely cumbersome to someone who so seldom navigates it and as I have no support in doing so it was a learn-as-I-go prospect.**
- e. How might you have been more strategic in designing or implementing your project? **Gotten more outside assistance from other partners.**
- f. If you chose to create one, did you find using a logic model or other goal-driven model helpful? Please explain. Did the model change over time? If so, how? **Na**
- g. To what extent did your CARE community communicate or engage with other CARE communities and how was that interaction helpful? **Na**

h. Did media coverage play a role in your project? If so, please explain. **No but we anticipate that it will. Our communications department will be promoting the trucks once the environmental message and student artwork are in place.**

i. In what ways did you rely on EPA for assistance (conflict resolution, partnership support, voluntary programs, such as Tools for Schools or Pollution Prevention)? **Faye Blondin gave us technical advice, we used the web site to educate the art students who created images to be considered for the trucks, and Derval was creative in helping us to adjust to the stumbling blocks that came up during the process.**

j. What role did your Project Officer and other EPA staff play in your work? What would you have liked more of or less of? **See above response.**

k. To what extent do you think that this project increased the capacity of your organization? Your partnership? Your community? Please provide examples. **Raised internal awareness about air pollution and we are planning to educate our community with the trucks and their artwork/messages.**

l. Did your project produce any new “community leaders?” Please describe. **na**

m. What advice would you offer to other communities undertaking similar work? **Think long and hard about your personal ability to follow through and about what your internal support and/or pressures will be.**

III. What Next?

a. Will members of your partnership continue to work on this issue or on other toxic reduction strategies to address other risks? **RCSD will – idling for example.**

b. How will this work be sustained? **District policies and local/state/federal regulations.**

c. If neither your organization nor the members of the partnership plan to continue the work, please describe why. **na**

d. Please describe a continuing or next source of funding you have for your work or other groups in your community that have continued the work and have found funding. **na**

IV. Feedback and Follow up

a. Please share any thoughts you have about what EPA could do to improve the CARE program.

b. We want to keep in touch and learn about the work that you do after your grant with CARE. Would it be okay for someone from the headquarters CARE team to contact you in the future to talk about how your work is progressing? **yes** Are there others we should contact instead of or in addition to you? If so, please provide their contact information.

c. Would you be willing to be interviewed for a more in depth case study? **yes**

E. Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Toxics

Submitted by Margit Brazda Poirier, Center for Environmental Information

I. Your Partnership

a. What environmental problems does your community face that brought people together?

Data presented to us by the U.S.EPA indicates that approximately 60% of the Rochester region's air toxics can be attributed to mobile sources. The Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Toxics was intended to address major air toxics from mobile sources – both onroad and nonroad sources.

b. How many individuals and their organizational affiliations were involved? Please review and add to the attached list and please add a contact name for each organization.

Organization Name	Type of Organization (Please select one of the following: non-profit, business, small business, trade association, academic institution, local government, state government, federal government, consultant, individual, other)
Genesee Region Clean Communities	Non-profit
South West Area Neighborhood Association	Non-profit
South East Area Coalition	Non-profit
Center for Environmental Information	Non-profit
U.S. EPA	Government
Monroe County Dept of Public Health	Government
NYSDEC	Government
Eastman Kodak Company	Industry
City of Rochester	Government
Genesee Transportation Council	Non-profit
Rochester Institute of Technology	Academia
Rochester Area Community Foundation	Foundation
Genesee/Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council	Association
University of Rochester	Academia

c. Did this project bring any new partners into your work? How did the new partners aid the partnership and project?

All of the above are new partners since none had been involved in an effort of this type and magnitude prior to CARE. All partners were active in several project components including developing and implementing a Small Grants Program and assisting with the development of an Air Toxics Research Inventory.

d. What role did your organization play in this partnership? What skills were most important from your organization to implement the project?

The Center for Environmental Information (CEI) spearheaded the effort and was responsible for implementing the Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Toxics work plan.

e. Which partners were most active? How?

All organizations were fairly equally active in implementing the components of the Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Toxics, with CEI taking on a leadership role in planning and implementation.

f. What resources and strengths did each organization bring to the project?

The participating organizations were extremely helpful in the technical expertise they were able to provide regarding hazardous air pollutants. Some, such as the Rochester Area Community Foundation, were very helpful in the development of a Small Grants Program to Reduce Air Toxics.

g. What efforts did you make to ensure that the most vulnerable community members were included in the partnership?

The Small Grants Program to Reduce Air Toxics was intended to serve under-addressed and over-exposed areas, including environmental justice areas. Two of the three Small Grants that were awarded were given to grass-roots neighborhood associations in vulnerable areas of the City of Rochester: Southeast Area Coalition and the South West Area Neighborhood Association.

h. What role did your EPA Project Officer, Derval Thomas, play in the partnership?

Derval Thomas provided us with constant guidance, encouragement, ties to other CARE communities, and staff resources.

i. What barriers did your partnership experience and how did you overcome them (distrust, unequal power, control over money, differing priorities, process for reaching consensus, etc.)?

Data gathering for the Inventory and Literature Review of Air Toxics was challenging and somewhat limited by the NATA and NEI data on EPA's database. More recent data would have improved the outcomes.

j. How has this partnership improved relationships among those involved? Please describe the working relationship that has improved the most and those that may still need work.

Many who had not previously worked together, did so in a very useful and constructive way. New networks were formed and technical expertise shared. In some cases funding was leveraged as a result of CARE efforts. For example Genesee Region Clean Communities, a non-profit, received a \$500,000 grant from the Genesee Transportation Council to fund a diesel vehicle retrofitting program and efforts to increase alternative fuels in the region.

k. Has your organization engaged in a similar process to CARE in which you had a similar role? Please describe briefly.

Yes, CEI has worked in a collaborative capacity as part of the Lake Ontario Coastal Initiative and therefore was highly qualified in leading this effort as well.

I. Is there anything else about your partnership that you would like to share?

II. Your Project

a. What toxic risks did your project address?

The Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Toxics addressed 9 major mobile source pollutants:

- Acetaldehyde
- Acrolein
- Benzene
- 1,3-butadiene
- Formaldehyde
- Xylene
- Toluene
- PM 2.5 (particulate matter smaller than 2.5 micrometers)
- PM 10 (particulate matter smaller than 10 micrometers)

b. What toxic reduction strategies did you pursue?

A detailed report, “Inventory and Literature Review of Mobile Source Air Toxics in the Rochester Metropolitan Statistical Area” was published in March 2007 as part of the CARE effort. This report led to a recommendation that particulate matter and some air toxics can be effectively reduced by targeting pollution reduction strategies in the construction sector.

The Small Grants Program resulted in almost \$30,000 granted to three grass-roots organizations that conducted toxics reduction efforts in their communities.

c. How did you reach agreement on implementation decisions?

Agreement was easily reached by consensus during the development of the “Inventory and Literature Review of Mobile Source Air Toxics in the Rochester Metropolitan Statistical Area”.

Agreement on selection of successful applicants for the Small Grants Program was based upon the following criteria, agreed upon by the committee:

Pre-screening Criteria	Check if “yes”
Is the applicant a not-for-profit? (Example: neighborhood organization, school, government, etc...)	
Is the applicant located in the Greater Rochester region (Genesee, Livingston, Monroe, Ontario, Orleans, Wayne counties)?	
Does the project have the ability to reduce mobile source air toxics?	
Does the project have an educational component to build public awareness of mobile source air toxics?	

Evaluation Criteria	Priority Ranking 1-3 3=highest score
Ability of project to reduce mobile source air toxics (1 = low; 2 = medium; 3 = high impact on mobile source toxics reduction)	
Education/outreach component of project (1 = low; 2 = medium; 3 = high educational impact)	
Geographic area of project (1 = rural area; 2 = suburban; 3 = urban area affected)	
Number of people that benefit from project (1 = under 500; 2 = 500-5,000; 3 = over 5,000 people)	
Short –term outcomes (1 = not valuable; 2 = somewhat valuable; 3 = very valuable)	
Long-term outcomes (1 = not feasible; 2 = somewhat feasible; 3 = very feasible)	
Timeline (1 = not feasible; 2 = somewhat feasible; 3 = very feasible)	
Measurement of project objectives (1 = poor; 2 = good; 3 = excellent plan to measure progress)	
Organizational capacity (1 = low; 2 = medium; 3 = high organizational capacity)	
Partnerships (1 = no partners; 2 = 1-3 partners; 3 = 3 or more partners)	
Project Budget (1 = not feasible; 2 = somewhat feasible; 3 = very feasible)	
TOTAL SCORE	

**d. Did you reshape your partnership in any way to address strategy implementation?
Please explain.**

No – the structure was effective.

e. What outside resources (e.g., people, programs, approaches, etc.) were most important to your project?

Communication with other level II CARE communities was very helpful in the development of the Inventory of Air Toxics. Media relations and attending neighborhood association meetings was important in the publicity strategy for the Small Grants Program.

f. Was there any environmental issue that EPA seemed to lack the tools or means (e.g., Partnership Programs, data tools, other expertise) to address? If so, please describe the situation or need you had.

Data gathering for the Inventory and Literature Review of Air Toxics was challenging and somewhat limited by the NATA and NEI data on EPA's database. More recent data would have improved the outcomes.

g. How did you build momentum over the course of your project? Did you secure any “early wins” to help build momentum? Did you look for additional funding early on? What was acquired?

Momentum and enthusiasm were high and remained high throughout the duration of the project. Adhering to agreed-upon timelines was very effective in producing results and continued commitment.

h. What were the significant *outputs* of your project (meetings held, materials developed, people trained, etc.)?

Significant outputs include:

- The detailed report, “Inventory and Literature Review of Mobile Source Air Toxics in the Rochester Metropolitan Statistical Area”, published in March 2007 and an accompanying presentation
- Grant awards in the amount of almost \$30,000 to three grass-roots non profit organizations

i. What were your project’s most significant *outcomes* (changes in policy, behavior, and practice, e.g., auto shops’ shift to less toxic materials, ban adopted on school bus idling, change in local agencies’ policy or procedures, school district commitment to IPM for pest control, etc.)?

The effort to work with area school districts on vehicle idling reduction was a direct result of preliminary data gathered as part of the Inventory on Air Toxics. This has already led to a reduction in school bus idling and the resulting decrease in air toxics. Other school districts are in the process of committing to this effort as well.

j. What specific reductions in environmental risks did your project achieve?

There has not been a concerted effort to measure the specific reductions in air toxics to the environment, but qualitative efforts show that through the Small Grants Program, several communities have managed a reduction in air toxics.

k. Were there differences between your original plan and what actually occurred in your project? Did you achieve your objectives? Please explain. What objectives were not met and why?

All the objectives outlined in the work plan were met with the exception of the following: there has not yet been funding committed to sustain a year two of the Small Grants Program though discussions are ongoing.

l. What other resources (not already covered in your discussion of your partnership or outside resources above) did your project mobilize, both financial and in kind?

Mentioned previously.

III. Reflection

a. How likely is it that the progress achieved could have been made without your CARE partnership?

Highly unlikely. CARE provided the vehicle to achieve far greater work than could have been achieved by each organization working in isolation.

b. What do you consider your project's greatest achievement?

The greatest achievement of the Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Toxics is the comprehensive "Inventory and Literature Review of Mobile Source Air Toxics" and the mobilization of neighborhood groups around the issue of air quality and health.

c. What was your greatest challenge and how did you deal with it?

The greatest challenge was educating enough neighborhood groups and grass roots organizations about air toxics and what they could do to reduce them. Maintaining funding for year two of the Small Grants Program is also proving to be a challenge.

d. What would you do differently next time in terms of organizing and structuring your partnership to achieve your project objectives?

Nothing.

e. How might you have been more strategic in designing or implementing your project?

We might have held more community/public meetings on CARE and air toxics before beginning implementation of the work plan, but staff time and resources did not allow for this.

f. If you chose to create one, did you find using a logic model or other goal-driven model helpful? Please explain. Did the model change over time? If so, how?

Implementation of the Countywide Campaign to Reduce Mobile Source Toxics relied on developing and adhering to set time lines and working with dedicated committees.

g. To what extent did your CARE community communicate or engage with other CARE communities and how was that interaction helpful?

I attended the National CARE meeting in Seattle in 2006 and found interactions with other CARE communities extremely helpful. For instance, Connecticut had done some similar work in air toxics from mobile sources and it was useful to get their feedback.

h. Did media coverage play a role in your project? If so, please explain.

Yes, the Executive Director of CEI and I were guests on two separate ½ hour radio talk shows; newspaper and newsletter articles were also helpful. CEI maintained a CARE page on their web site to which we could draw visitors.

i. In what ways did you rely on EPA for assistance (conflict resolution, partnership support, voluntary programs, such as Tools for Schools or Pollution Prevention)?

We relied on EPA databases, voluntary programs catalog, web site, and staff for information.

j. What role did your Project Officer and other EPA staff play in your work? What would you have liked more of or less of?

Answered previously.

k. To what extent do you think that this project increased the capacity of your organization? Your partnership? Your community? Please provide examples.

CARE provided the vehicle to achieve far greater work than could have been achieved by each organization working in isolation. For example Genesee Region Clean Communities, a non-profit, received a \$500,000 grant from the Genesee Transportation Council to fund a diesel vehicle retrofitting program and efforts to increase alternative fuels in the region.

l. Did your project produce any new “community leaders?” Please describe.

Yes, representatives of several organizations took a lead on programs and will continue to do so. For example NYSDEC and Brocollo Tree and Lawn are leading the effort to reduce vehicle idling at schools.

m. What advice would you offer to other communities undertaking similar work?

There needs to be more staff time allocated in the budget for various items. Also, include travel costs to attend the CARE national conference and associated meetings.

IV. What Next?

a. Will members of your partnership continue to work on this issue or on other toxic reduction strategies to address other risks?

Yes. We will continue to implement the recommendation made in the Inventory of Air Toxics, especially with regard to vehicle retrofitting.

b. How will this work be sustained?

There are lead persons agreeing to sustain the work but at some point grant funds or other resources will need to be obtained. At this point GRCC is will be working to retrofit vehicles for air toxics reduction through a CMAQ grant.

c. If neither your organization nor the members of the partnership plan to continue the work, please describe why.

I will remain active on a volunteer basis as best I can.

d. Please describe a continuing or next source of funding you have for your work or other groups in your community that have continued the work and have found funding.

See IV. B.

V. Feedback and Follow up

a. Please share any thoughts you have about what EPA could do to improve the CARE program.

EPA can continue to improve its communication network between the CARE communities – perhaps establish a database that groups together the main issues that different communities are addressing and contact information for each community.

b. We want to keep in touch and learn about the work that you do after your grant with CARE. Would it be okay for someone from the headquarters CARE team to contact you in the future to talk about how your work is progressing? Are there others we should contact instead of or in addition to you? If so, please provide their contact information.

Yes. You can also contact Kevin Flynn, President of CEI or the Executive Director at (585) 262-2780.

c. Would you be willing to be interviewed for a more in depth case study?

Yes -- I can be contacted at mbrazdapoirier@yahoo.com or (585) 314-7869.

IV. Summary

The opening statement of the Rochester CARE Work Plan states:

“The Rochester CARE Collaborative is comprised of a new multi-stakeholder organization and six inaugural program parts that together substantially and strategically address specific, pressing toxics issues in the Rochester community. The Rochester CARE Program, in addition to complementing and supplementing this wider community's work to reduce exposure to and incidence of multiple toxics, directly addresses the community-based toxics reduction goals of EPA's new EPA Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE) program.”

The U. S. EPA's Community Action for a Renewed Environment Program made all the programs described in this report possible. We commend EPA for initiating this program and encourage its continuation.

A special thanks must be given to the CARE Collaborative members and especially those that led, and are leading the ongoing efforts to reduce toxics in the Rochester community.