

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

## Appendix B

### Summary of Quarterly Report Updates

(This page intentionally left blank.)

## Summary of Quarterly Report Updates

Wisconsin was awarded the State Innovation Grant in Spring 2009. By Fall 2009 the Region 5 project team had begun work to develop the Environmental Results Program for Autobody Shops. The first quarterly report to USEPA Region 5 was submitted January 29, 2010. Within 30 days of the end of each quarter, a report was submitted summarizing activities undertaken by the project team to complete each of the key project milestones shown here.

### ERP Project Milestones

Quarter	Projected Milestones	Accomplished
1. Fall 2009 (Oct-Dec)	1. Develop and submit Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) 2. Identify universe of facilities 3. Select contractor for IL baseline visits 4. Complete MOU between WI Department of Commerce and other state SBEAPs and NEWMOA 5. Develop site visit checklist, protocol and training, data management process 6. Conduct site visit training 7. Begin baseline site visits	December 2009  Spring 2009 Spring 2010 October 2009  Summer 2009 - Winter 2010 Fall 2009 Spring 2010
2. Winter 2010 (Jan-Mar)	8. Quarterly Report 9. Finish baseline site visits 10. Data management and analysis for baseline 11. In partnership with associations, develop outreach materials to publicize the project	On time Fall 2010 Fall 2010 Fall 2009 - Spring 2010
3. Spring 2010 (Apr-Jun)	12. Quarterly Report 13. Mail self-certification and workbook to urban universe 14. Respond to requests for assistance on phone or site	On time December 2010  Spring 2011
4. Summer 2010 (Jul-Sep)	15. Quarterly Report 16. Conduct workshops and other education	On time Started Fall 2010 Continued through 2011
Federal fiscal year 2011		
5. Fall 2010 (Oct-Dec)	17. Quarterly Report 18. Help USEPA develop post-certification inspection and data management protocol	On time Spring 2011
6. Winter 2011 (Jan-Mar)	19. Quarterly Report 20. Finish development of post-certification inspection protocol and data routines; Begin processing cert data	On time Started Spring 2011, Complete Spring 2012
7. Spring 2011 (Apr-Jun)	21. Quarterly Report 22. Final cert data processing; Begin post-cert inspections; design transition to Region 5 (Sept 2011 - May 2012)	On time Spring 2012 Sept 2011-Jan 2012 No transition plan
8. Summer 2011 (Jul-Sept)	23. Quarterly Report 24. Finish post-cert inspections	On time Spring 2012 (Data entry complete)
Federal Fiscal Year 2012		

### ERP Project Milestones

Quarter	Projected Milestones	Accomplished
9. Fall 2011- Winter 2012 (Oct-Mar)	25. Quarterly Report 26. Finalize post-cert data and analysis 27. Create vehicle for annual (or other periodic) submittals and data management between state/fed	On time Winter-Summer 2012 Not complete
10. Spring - Summer 2012 (Apr - Sept)	28. Finalize project report.	Summer 2013

The milestones summarized are numbered below. The numbering is not sequential as the quarterly reports are not addressed in the summary. Some of the items were combined in summaries below.

1. Develop and submit QAPP - The QAPP was drafted, reviewed by all partner organizations and submitted to USEPA for their review in December 2009. It was approved by USEPA on January 22, 2010.

2. Identify universe of facilities - States agreed upon the use of county population density and selected shops from within the counties within the highest 10% of population density across the whole region (6 states). Lists of each state's universe of shops were sent to WI SBEAP in December for selecting the randomized samples.

3. Select contractor for IL baseline visits - University of Illinois, Illinois Sustainable Technology Center was selected as the contractor to conduct baseline visits on behalf of the IL SBEAP.

4. Complete MOU between WI Dept of Commerce and other state SBEAPs and NEWMOA - The MOU was completed and signed in October 2009.

5. Develop site visit checklist, protocol and training, data management process - The SBEAPs spent a lot of time working on the checklist, refining the questions to ensure common understanding among all states. The site visit checklist was completed in February, 2010. The effort was extended to ensure that the questions could be entered correctly in an online data entry survey that was designed. During the discussions on the checklist, our EBPI's were refined to the following:

#### List of Environmental Business Practice Indicators (EBPIs) and Other Indicators

EBPIs	Question(s) in Checklist
<b>Practices Associated with subpart 6H</b>	
• % using HVLP or equivalent high transfer efficiency technology	I6
• % with high transfer efficiency painter training in place	B2a
• % with different components of training	B2b
• % using hands-on or classroom-only training	B2b
• % with documentation of training	B2c
• % at which all spray-applied coatings were used in enclosed booth or prep station	C3, I1, I3
• % of booths/stations fitted with particle filters	C4b, I2, I4
• % of booths/stations fitted with filter/system achieving 98% capture	C4c&d

**List of Environmental Business Practice Indicators (EBPIs) and Other Indicators**

EBPIs	Question(s) in Checklist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% where spray gun cleaning is done with enclosed or non-atomizing washers</li> </ul>	C5, 17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% maintaining MSDS or formulation records for all solvents/coatings used</li> </ul>	C9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% maintaining records of the amount/content of coatings containing Cr, Pb, Cd, Ni, Mn</li> </ul>	C10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% <b>NOT</b> using paint strippers containing Methylene Chloride</li> </ul>	C6, 18
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% keeping records to document annual MeCl usage</li> </ul>	C7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average and range of MeCL used</li> </ul>	C7b
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of MeCL users with written MeCl minimization plan</li> </ul>	C8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% maintaining records of the amount of coatings containing VOC and HAP</li> </ul>	A6
<b>Other Practices</b>	
<b>AIR PRACTICES</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paint hours per year</li> </ul>	A7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average quantity and range of coatings used</li> </ul>	A6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% using dustless vacuum or overhead capture equipment</li> </ul>	F
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% meeting applicable state requirements</li> </ul>	Varied
<b>AIR RECORD KEEPING:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average use of high VOC and low VOC coatings and solvents per year</li> </ul>	A6
<b>HAZARDOUS WASTE</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average and range of maximum amount of RCRA waste generated in a month</li> </ul>	D3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Numbers of facilities in generator classes (CESQG or VSQG, SQG, LQG or not)</li> </ul>	D3
<b>INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER INDICATORS</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of facilities <b>not</b> discharging IWW to surface water</li> </ul>	E2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of facilities <b>not</b> discharging IWW to a storm, sanitary or combined sewer system</li> </ul>	E2
<b>POLLUTION PREVENTION-ENERGY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of facilities taking one or more actions to conserve energy over the past three years (distribution across menu of possible actions)</li> </ul>	G1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of facilities taking one or more actions to reduce pollution (VOC, PM and toxics) during the past three years (distribution across menu of possible actions)</li> </ul>	F1

6. *Conduct site visit training* - Site visit training was conducted on November 18 and 19, 2009.

7. Finish baseline site visits – Site visits began in February 2010, and were conducted steadily through the end of summer 2010. The field staff encountered a number of rejections from shops or shop contacts that could not be reached as well as drops due to inaccurate listings. MN experienced a short term travel restriction during May 2010, during which no business travel could be conducted. They were able to resume site visits in June.

States encountered a range of dropped shops (e.g., closed shops or those that did not fit the definition of autobody refinishing shop) and shops that could not be reached or that declined having a site visit. Among the drops were shops that we could not reach and that, after some more research, were found on lists like Department of Revenue’s delinquent tax payers, or in other state records that made it clear the shop was closed.

The states with higher drop-out rates did not have state-mandated registrations or licenses for refinishing shops. Ohio had a state registration for refinishing shops, but a miscommunication about categories in the list resulted in a large number that were not affected by the rule being on the list. Indiana, Minnesota and Wisconsin used business databases that were developed by companies for marketing or yellow pages listings and often included many inaccurate uses of the industry codes (SIC and NAICS) used to sort out refinishing shops.

Those shop owners who declined visits gave a variety of reasons for the lack of interest. Some expressed concern about the amount of time taken out of their day when they were very busy. Others felt they already met all the requirements and didn’t need the help. [We were offering the visit as a free assessment of their compliance with the new USEPA rule.] The shops that didn’t return calls, assuming they were in operation, were likely the ones that didn’t want anyone from government in their shop. Occasionally staff would drive by locations that were not returning calls, if another visit was nearby. Many were shut down, but a few were still operating and looked rather busy. We did not do a full check on all those that declined visits, so we don’t know fully which ones might have been drops. Another complication in some areas was the language barrier. If no one was available that could speak English, we often marked that shop as declined or unavailable.

10. Data management and analysis for baseline - An online survey form was developed, matching the baseline checklist questions, for the purpose of having field staff enter the responses for each visit. The online data entry and data management process was completed and explained to all participants in April 2010. Data entry began immediately for those states with some portion of their baseline visits complete. By the end of summer 2010, data for around 140 visits had been entered. Each state agreed to complete 2-3 extra visits in order to ensure a complete data set for the sample goal of 146 for the region, in case some had to be dropped for statistical reasons. Data entry was completed by September 2010, with data from 156 visits for the final analysis.

A contract was issued to Tetra Tech to upgrade to the ERP Performance Analyzer Tool so it would allow analysis of the regional data. The project statistical analysis was to be completed with the Analyzer once all the data had been entered.

11. In partnership with associations, develop outreach materials to publicize the project - A smaller group of SBEAPs and NEWMOA met to develop the self-certification checklist to be provided to shops. The checklist was completed and development of a training video was started, to walk shops through how to use the checklist. Materials were created to mail to

shops, notifying them of the availability of the checklist and training materials. An online checklist was prepared to allow shops to respond electronically, only mailing in the official Notification of Compliance Status for the Area Source NESHAP.

All materials were developed and posted online. Each state program worked with trade associations, suppliers or other contacts to provide training and materials to shops. States sent emails or letters to contacts to notify them prior to or around the time the self-certification materials were mailed in November 2010.

*13. Mail self-certification and workbook to urban universe* - In early November 2010, all self-certification checklists were mailed to shops - in fact they were sent to all shops in all states, not just urban areas. The "workbook" refers to compliance assistance materials, which in many ERPs are provided through a detailed document. To save costs and simplify the materials, the project materials were all provided online through a common web page originally maintained by WI Department of Commerce (Commerce) and later maintained by WDNR when the WI SBEAP moved to that agency.

*14. Respond to requests for assistance on phone or site* - All states were getting calls soon after the self-certification forms were mailed to facilities by the states. Since the final deadline for the compliance notification was not until March 2011, calls were expected to continue for months.

Calls tapered off about one week after the March 2011 deadline. A few additional checklists and forms were trickling in during the following months, and a few continued to come in through 2012.

*16. Conduct workshops and other education* - Each state managed workshops in different ways, as best served their shops' needs. An online webinar was provided via the website to help shops complete their forms. This made training available 24/7 to shops that may be busy during the day. We expected training needs to taper off by early January, but planned to respond to any requests in the future as well. Training requests continued into 2011, well beyond the deadline, but it appeared many shops still had not heard about the rule.

Of the two webinars created for training shops, the counts are:

Training Video	Posting through 3/17/2011	3/18/2011 through 2/20/2013
6H Overview	244	137
6H Self-certification Checklist	247	81

While the bulk of the use of these tutorials happened up through the compliance deadline of March 11, 2011, there have been a good number of views since the deadline.

*18. Help USEPA develop post-certification inspection* - This began in November 2010. We held training on November to go through an inspection checklist for USEPA's use. Discussion of the type and number of what the USEPA staff could not take place at the time. We expected issues with USEPA's Information Collection Request (ICR) process when asking the full slate of questions, and going beyond air questions when they are air staff doing the inspections.

The state innovation grant ICR was out for public comment for its renewal in October 2010, and comments were provided to clarify the process of USEPA follow-up inspections to complete the project.

In January 2011, USEPA inspectors were provided with their randomized inspection lists so that they could prepare for travel in late spring and early summer. A discussion between project co-lead Bashel and the USEPA inspectors occurred in February to establish the final inspection checklist questions. USEPA Region 5 determined they would be unable to ask questions beyond the Area Source NESHAP, so the post-certification inspections would not address multimedia topics.

20. Processing self-certification data - This step was delayed until temporary staff could be hired to complete the work. The delay continued through 2011 because the WI SBEAP moved from Commerce to WDNR. Finally, in January 2012 staff was hired. The data entry was completed in May 2012, quickly assessed for accuracy, and then data analysis began.

22. Conduct post-certification inspections - This step was delayed until the ICR renewal was finalized. USEPA inspectors began conducting inspections in September 2011 and presented a progress report with some lessons learned to that point at the Region 5 SBEAP annual meeting on October 18, 2011. Inspections were completed in January 2012.

26. Finalize post-cert data and analysis - Once inspections were complete, USEPA staff began scanning and emailing the checklists to Bashel for data entry. The temporary staff hired for self-certification data entry also entered the USEPA checklists into a separate survey tool for that purpose. This was completed in June 2012 and data analysis began.

During 2011, testing of a final version of the Performance Analyzer was completed. Data analysis appeared to work for the baseline data entered. However, subsequent application updates to Microsoft Access a bug caused an error to result whenever using the Performance Analyzer to complete the statistical analysis. When contacting the programmer to fix the bug, we learned she had moved to a new job. In late 2012 she was brought on in a small subcontract in an attempt to fix the bug. The fixes to address current versions of Microsoft have been completed.

27. Create vehicle for future submittals and data management between state/fed - After all data was compiled, the state SBEAPs and USEPA inspectors involved in the project held a conference call. As of November 2012, the final decision from USEPA Region 5 management on how to proceed on enforcement of the violations found was still under review.