

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

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

Process Re-engineering Meeting with Stakeholders
April 7, 1998
Washington, D.C.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feature/Characteristic	Stakeholder Involvement	Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	More Info. Loops	Decision Making	EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
I- What are the desired outcomes of the process?						
2- Who drives the process?						
II. Step-by-step review of the process						
1- Differentiate between preproposal and proposal phase						
2- Last stages of preproposal may duplicate 1st proposal [HQ] stage						
3- Preproposal stage discourages creativity of a sponsors proposal.						
4- There appears to be duplication in “getting information from project proponent” and “getting feedback from EPA” in both preproposal and proposal phases.						

Feature/Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Stakeholder Involvement	Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	More Info. Loops	Decision Making	EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
5- Preproposal lays the groundwork for streamlined analyses and decision-making.						
6- Common work practices should be standardized as tools.						
7- Best practices (successful projects). Does EPA should provide information about successful projects.						
8- What tools are being provide by EPA to sponsors to complete successful project? (e.g. success models to implement)						
9- 80% of industry time (transaction costs) is spent in to-do loops (white space) in both preproposal and proposal phase.						
10- Diffuse authority, uniqueness of proposal, EPA discipline						
11- Is there a way to standardize of key players in a process in order to provide certainty and predictability?						
12- Identification of authority. Who are the key decision-makers?						

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- States need to be consulted earlier in the process. Who are the appropriate state folks that should be contacted?						
14- Enforcement Screen- Does EPA and the state eliminate good ideas and sponsors that could potentially improve their compliance?						
15- The role of the Reinvention Action Council (RAC), formerly known as Ombuddies, needs clarification as well as the timing of their involvement in the process (mechanics).						
16- RAC authority. What is its decision-making authority of the RAC?						
17- Is enforcement screen used only to identify good/bad actors?						
18- Is the RAC role to diffuse bottlenecks primarily, or are they brought in early in the process?						
19- Is there or should there be involvement/review by other federal agencies? (e.g. external time and effort						

Feature/Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Stakeholder Involvement	Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	More Info. Loops	Decision Making	EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
could be a labor sink)						
20- In developing FPA, great amount of attention focused upon superior environmental performance, regulatory flexibility, and the stakeholder process.						
21 - Is there consistency, continuity, and uniformity in the EPA Review Team.						
22 - Is there a concurrent, shadow state process? Does this overlap and/or conflict with the federal review process?						
23 - Industry perspective tends to be on “Return on investment”.						
24 - Can stakeholder be brought in process early in order to address major concerns before final stages?						
25 - A significant amount of time is spent on technical aspects w/ regulators:						
26 - How to measure SEP? This is not clear and it takes a great amount of time.						
27 - Proportionality (balancing) & flex for SEP						

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
28 - Determining stakeholders and their proper role & technical assistance						
29 - Is there a process for keeping staff in agreement w/ upper mgmt?						
30 - Is there some clear guidance/threshold for identifying stakeholders. What are the rules of engagement?						
31 - Technical assistance to sponsors for project development and stakeholder involvement.						
32 - Different types of delays can/should be addressed at different stages of the process.						
33 - There is general sensitivity that HQ make decisions on or impacts local issues from Washington offices.						
34 - There needs to be internal EPA balancing of national policy & local issues.						
35 - Stakeholder/sponsor preparation- stakeholders and sponsors need to be prepared to meet & know what they want in a proposal.(e.g. specific outcomes, regulatory flexibility)						
36- Is there individual accountability of time						

Feature/Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Stakeholder Involvement	Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	More Info. Loops	Decision Making	EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
spent on XL FPA Development?						
37 - What is the amount of time dedicated to negotiating XL Projects?						
III. Bike Rack for Additional Ideas						
1- Technical assistance. What technical assistance resources are available?						
2- RACI Chart (roles, accountability, consultation, information)						
3- Day-to-day staff interaction						
4- Joint initiation of projects (i.e. government agencies, stakeholders, sponsors) results in streamlining stakeholder interaction.						
5 - In preproposal phase of flowchart “more info ” steps need to identify more specifically what sorts of information are needed.						
6- What is the authority & role of EPA as decision-makers? Can EPA representatives on team						
make decisions?						
7- Role of stakeholders local & national;						

Feature/Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Stakeholder Involvement	Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination	More Info. Loops	Decision Making	EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives	Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking
who has primacy?						
8 - Who has access to preproposal information.						
9- Sponsors fear of citizen suits is a significant concern.						
10 - Are there schedules, tracking & measuring systems which quantify the amount of time it takes to get through each phase of the process?						
11 - Stakeholder involvement & buy-in. How do you secure this? When is enough?						
12 - \$ for technical assistance to stakeholders and \$ for sponsors to get technical assistance. Where and when in the process are these available and /or encouraged.						
13- “XL not my day job” notion limits the amount of time that people can spend in developing a proposal or FPA.						
14- Staging/ up front work. Is there a way to encourage up-front preparation to resolve issues which slow the process down the road.						
15 - Is there a need for full time regional XL coordinators?						

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
------------------------	---------------------------------	---	--------------------------	-------------------------	---	--