

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT



Feature/Characteristic	1 Stakeholder Involvement	2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	3 More Info. Loops	4 Decision Making	5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
9- There is a perception on part of industry that statutes (litigation, decrees etc.) are obstacles. How will industry actions affect legal statutes/decisions in progress?						
10- Massachusetts is streamlining and eliminating regulatory process?? Questioning assumptions which is very effective.						
11- Successful technique was to separate the staff from the issues						
12- How do we define success? (E.g. community involvement) Who defines success?						
13- Must be a system in place to monitor and evaluate success?						
14- Some offices promote staff that have demonstrated success.						
15- "XL means an exception to the rule" attitude serves as a barrier.						
16- Lack of accountability also a barrier.						
17- Ensuring that a good product means success						
18- Goal is to keep flexibility in XL but to put some structure into it.						
19- Program offices may not get info up front. This causes questions later.						
20- Sponsors may still be creative as long as the rules are clear.						
21- What is a product? EPA should expand the definition of						

Feature/Characteristic	1 Stakeholder Involvement	2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	3 More Info. Loops	4 Decision Making	5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
“product”.						
22- Cost benefit analysis should be considered in determining success.						
23- the exercise of going thru the process may be one of the benefits.						
24- EPA is confronted with diametrically opposed notion that process must remain flexible versus completely structured. Process should be structured in a way which expedites decision-making, solutions, and FPA Development .						
<b><u>Federal/state Coordination</u></b>						
1- Process could benefit from full time XL champions who set meetings, comp. On time, move						
2- Staff turnover hinders coordination. Continuity is enhanced by responsible passing of baton.						
3- In drafting FPA, One person should be responsible for handling comments, coordination etc.						
4- For the Kick-off Meeting there should be a mainual stating groundrules and structure.						
5- There should be a champion at political level to serve the cross program decision-making role.						
6- Internal review process for EPA should be limited and expedited. “Get it out the door”						
7- EPA culture seeks 100% consensus- Projects should not be						

Feature/Characteristic	1 Stakeholder Involvement	2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	3 More Info. Loops	4 Decision Making	5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
hindered because of lack of 100% consensus.						
8- High level support- There should be someone at political level charged with resolving conflicts and making decisions.						
9- Agency appropriate needed resources						
10- XL is not included as part of EPA position Descriptions which means lack of mechanism for accountability						
11- There should be a schedule which tracks the process between EPA and the state but not at the expense of stakeholder involvement.						
12- There should be an agreement on a schedule for both state and EPA. We should define a model for schedules/tracking systems but avoid a guidance document.						
13- Model for state/federal coordination should include all participants ???						
14- What is the stakeholder process? Does it need to be an obstacle?						
15- Should review the State of Oregon Healthcare model and other models for federal/state coordination.						
16- Establishment of timetables should not be done at the expense of quality.						
17- Ownership-Who is responsible for managing stakeholder						

Feature/Characteristic	1 Stakeholder Involvement	2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	3 More Info. Loops	4 Decision Making	5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
process. We should build into the process resources, knowledge of stakeholders to help steer process.						
18- There should be joint management for process across all interested & affected stakeholder groups.						
19- Is consensus an internal EPA or within the stakeholder process?						
20- Some regions have had minimal coordination problems with states. Regions are concerned that HQ and managers are not making decisions and moving the process along.						
21- OR or the program offices should have authority to make decisions.						
22- Regional staff participated more freely when they realized that accountability was no issue.						
23- Florida's DEP mirrors EPA- EPA and states should coordinate/communicate reviews to avoid different outcomes and save time and resources. In "should be" process we should identify a central coordinating point.						
24- Regions should work with HQ to iron out issues such as statutory barriers early in the process. EPA HQ						
25- The goal should be to "Do it once, do it together, and use a common work process". There should be an agreed upon map for a work process.						

Feature/Characteristic	1 Stakeholder Involvement	2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	3 More Info. Loops	4 Decision Making	5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
26- XL torubles are largely internal.						
27- Many managers are not willing to stick to timeframes. If a program office misses a deadline then the process should continue without them.						
28- Some managers are willing to make decisions but issues may not reaxh these managers in a timely fashion.						
29- Team members should understand that as a tema member one is expected to deliver in a timely fashion.						
<b><u>Stakeholder Involvement</u></b>						
1- Is stakeholder involvement industry driven versus agency driven? What are the implications of this?						
2- There is concern that direct vs broad participation dcreates "elit" stakeholder groups.						
3- Need to clarify how stakeholders are chosen.						
4- Industries confront a counterbalance by bringing in stakeholders early for concepts that do not develop into proposals.						
5- We need to identify incentives that would provide a baseline to measure success.						

Feature/Characteristic	1 Stakeholder Involvement	2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	3 More Info. Loops	4 Decision Making	5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
6- Environmental Justice (EJ) concerns should be met without entire stakeholder group attempting to understand the legal and procedural issues related to (EJ).						
7- Must be a balanced and accountable technique for advancing all concerns. Good decision-making identifies measures for determining success.						
8- Cannot extract EJ concerns out of a stakeholder process.						
9- We should examine the stakes of the stakeholders involved in the process.						
10- The risk of early stakeholder involvement may be perceived vs. real.						
11- EJ should be an educational piece of this process. It will help determine if we are doing a good enough in involving all concerns.						
12- Companies must be willing to be diverse in techniques and approaches (e.g. coffee shop discussions etc).						

Feature/Characteristic	1 Stakeholder Involvement	2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	3 More Info. Loops	4 Decision Making	5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
13- Companies need information to suggest techniques and new idea for stakeholder involvement (E.g. case studies, BMP's examples).						
14- What incentives beyond Superior environmental Performance. Is this a catalyst for strong stakeholder sponsor relation?						
15- Many publics must be served and conversations with stakeholders must begin early.						
16- Issues should be deferred to local stakeholder groups. National groups do not always understand the local issues.						
17- Regional agencies should apply concepts of environmental equity in the region and not expect local groups to carry out requirements.						
18- Non-traditional groups should be included in process may demonstrate different techniques which complement XL.						
<b>Decision-making</b>						
1) Process should encourage a champion decision-maker for Regions and HQ						
2) Stakeholders need one contact; this contact should have access						

Feature/Characteristic	1 Stakeholder Involvement	2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	3 More Info. Loops	4 Decision Making	5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
to decision-maker.						
3) Groundrules should be established (e.g. what is consensus;minority opinion)						
4) Decison loop needs to include Congress.						
5) Need incentives and rewards for staff working on XL.						
6) Must empower the EPA negotiator or be clear what authority they do have)						
7) Rummler-brach & RACI						
8) Decision process should be transparent and clearly spelled out						
9) Staff are often hesitant about raising issues.						
10) Enforcement trumpability.						
11) Stakeholders can ne employed to shine light on agency decision-making.						
12) Should be deference to stakeholders consensus on what to do.						
13) National environmental should be resources to local-avoid undercutting locals						
14) There should be a practical way to incorporate the input of all stakeholder groups						

Feature/Characteristic	1 Stakeholder Involvement	2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	3 More Info. Loops	4 Decision Making	5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
------------------------	---------------------------------	---	--------------------------	-------------------------	---	--

15) Better coordination among stakeholder groups (local, national, EJ)						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--