

EPA

Moderator: Victoria Robinson  
August 23, 2007  
1:00 pm CT

Man: Hello?

Man: Yeah.

Man: Hello.

Richard Moore: This is Richard.

Charles Lee: Hi Richard.

Okay, should we get started...

Victoria Robinson: Yes.

Charles Lee: Victoria? Okay, great.

Hi, good afternoon. My name is Charles Lee. I'm the acting director for the Office of Environmental Justice at EPA. And I'm the designated federal officer for the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council.

And I want to welcome all of you (unintelligible) the NEJAC and members of the public to this actually very first public teleconference of the NEJAC. And it's my duty under the Federal Advisory Committee Act to call the meeting to order.

The purpose of this meeting is to provide a briefing of the agenda and major topics to be discussed at the NEJAC public meetings scheduled for September 18 through September 20, 2007 in Baltimore.

The issues are first, the air pollution impacts of goods movement on communities and two, key issues related to the integration of the environmental justice considerations in EPA's programs, policies, and activities.

At this time, I want to introduce a person who all of you know well -- Victoria Robinson, who is the NEJAC national program manager. Before I turn it over to you, Richard, to - as chair of the NEJAC, I want to just remind you that Victoria will go through the members to establish a quorum, to provide you information on the teleconference procedures, and also do an agenda review.

So with that, Richard, I'll turn it over to you.

Richard Moore: Yes, good morning. My name is Richard More. I'm the director of the Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice and I'm chair of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Committee.

I would like to also welcome everyone to this first teleconference call. And this is a process that we've discussed for public input and public participation. We'll be having probably several of these teleconference calls in the period...

((Crosstalk))

Richard Moore: Also as all of you are aware that we do have the NEJAC Council also on the line and we also will be having as Charles said a face-to-face meeting in Baltimore, Maryland next month. So again, welcome to everyone. And Victoria, I will turn it over to you.

Charles, I do want to mention that I was unable to get on a landline. I'm on the cell phone. And so if we could just be prepared -- we may have - not have no problems, but I'm in a rural community in Northern New Mexico. And I just would like to prepare that Charles, if I lose you somewhere along the line, I would please ask that someone else pick up the chairship.

Charles Lee: Thank you, Richard.

Victoria?

Victoria Robinson: (Unintelligible).

Hi. I'm Victoria Robinson. I'm the national program manager for the NEJAC. And I'm going to first establish the quorum of members. When I call your name, just go ahead and say here so I know that you're here.

Richard, we know you're here.

Richard Moore: Yes.

Victoria Robinson: Katie Brown?

(Patricia Salkin) or (Patty Salkin) will not be able to make the call. She's - had an emergency family situation.

Paul Mohai?

Paul Mohai: Here.

Victoria Robinson: Okay.

Donele Wilkins?

Omega Wilson?

Elizabeth Yeampierre?

Elizabeth Yeampierre: Here.

Victoria Robinson: Thank you.

Chuck Barlow?

Chuck Barlow: Here.

Victoria Robinson: Sue Briggum?

(Bill Harper)?

Greg Melanson?

If you're here and you might have your phone on mute, you might need to unmute it during this period of time.

Chuck Barlow: Victoria, this is Chuck. Can you hear me?

Victoria Robinson: Yes, I can.

Chuck Barlow: Let me just say one thing. There was a little confusion when I dialed in as to whether people were be being placed on an open line so that they could speak or not.

The secretary asked me if I was presenting. And at first I said no, I'm not. And finally we figured out, though, that I needed to be able to speak. So some of these folks may be on the line where you can't hear them.

Victoria Robinson: Okay.

I'm going to have to - Operator, (Mark), are you there?...

Okay. We will...

Operator: Yes ma'am.

Victoria Robinson: Yes.

I had sent a list of - two lists. One was the people who were supposed to be calling in as speakers and they had direct dial-in, and the other ones were operator-assisted calls.

The ones that did a direct dial-in, they're supposed to be - their lines are supposed to be unmuted.

Do I need to give those names?

Operator: Yes ma'am. Okay, the people we have now are John Rosenthall.

Victoria Robinson: Yes, he should be unmuted.

Operator: Okay.

We have Paul Mohai.

Victoria Robinson: Mohai, yes.

Operator: Joyce King.

Victoria Robinson: Yes, unmute her, yes.

Operator: Okay, Shankar Prasad.

Victoria Robinson: Yes.

Operator: Yourself.

Victoria Robinson: Yes.

Operator: (Joli Patrank).

Victoria Robinson: Yes, (Joli).

Operator: Richard Moore.

Victoria Robinson: Yes.

Operator: Chuck Barlow.

Victoria Robinson: Yes.

Operator: And Elizabeth Yeampierre.

Victoria Robinson: And how many does that come up to be then.

Woman: That's everyone that dialed in for the...

Victoria Robinson: Okay, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. That's - is that eight names plus one?

Operator: Yes ma'am.

Victoria Robinson: That makes nine? Okay. All right. Richard, we need two more for the quorum, but we can still wait till some other individuals join in. We will call some people on this - on our end to see if they are - if they're having difficulty joining in on the call. Okay? So

Jolene Catron: Victoria, this is Jolene. I didn't hear you call my name.

Victoria Robinson: Okay, I'm sorry, yeah, he gave us your name. I have on the call Richard Moore, Paul Mohai, Chuck Barlow, Elizabeth Yeampierre, Shankar Prasad, Jolene - I mean, John Rosenthall, Jolene Catron, and Joyce King.

Is it - did I miss anybody else?

Okay.

(Joe): Why we do this. Why don't we proceed with the informational part of the meeting and...

Victoria Robinson: Who just joined us?

Nobody.

(Joe): ...and then basically there are two - Richard, there are two actions to be taken. If we don't have quorum, we don't have to take those actions today. We can poll the members at some point so that the actions can be recorded. How's that?

Richard Moore: That's fine, (Joe).

(Joe): Okay. So we'll go through it like that.

Victoria Robinson: All right. Okay. So the next thing, teleconference procedures. As we've said earlier, this is the first public teleconference meeting that the NEJAC has held. And in order to be able to accommodate a public meeting on the phone, we've had to do some different - slightly different procedures for this call.

The only people whose lines are unmuted, those lines who are open, will be the members of the NEJAC. (As with) any other kind of meeting of a federal advisory committee, the only ones who are allowed to speak or to participate verbally are the members of the council and the DFO.

Everybody else is observing. The public, whether they're EPA or other federal agencies or the general public or state agencies, their (unintelligible) the general public and they're observing and your lines are on mute.

There is a public comment period scheduled today at 3:30 in which four people have signed up in advance in accordance with the Federal Register notice.

And their lines will opened at the appropriate time by the Operator. We will call your name in the order that you signed up. And you will have your five minutes to give public comment.

And then when the comment is concluded, the Operator will mute your line. And then we'll proceed to the next person.

For your information, there will be a written transcript and a meeting summary, a written meeting summary that will be completed for this call as we do with all NEJAC meetings.

And that - those documents will be posted to the web when they are completed and approved by the chair in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Woman: Okay.

Victoria Robinson: And during this - as we go through the agenda, I will be making note that there are two items that are up for approval, that are actions that are needed by the NEJAC members and which will need a quorum.

The first item is after we go through all of the logistics and everything, at 2:30 we're going to be reviewing the proposed agenda. Charles Lee will lead that discussion.

And the action from that is - from the members that you must approve the proposed agenda. If you have any questions or concerns, there will be a time for that discussion with Charles. And it is hoped that we get an approval of the agenda as-is or revised.

Then following that discussion at 2:45 will be a - an update about the Goods Movement Work Group led by Shankar Prasad. And the action from that discussion will be to approve the charge from the NEJAC to the Goods Movement Work Group to address the requests from the agency.

For those of you who are unaware, EPA has a charge or puts out a task request to a federal advisory committee, in this case the NEJAC to examine goods movement impacts on air quality in communities. And the NEJAC itself has decided in turn that they need a work group to conduct the research and develop a white paper for the response.

And the NEJAC has to put a charge to that work group. And that's what this document today will be to approve that charge.

And at 3 o'clock will be a discussion led by Charles Lee about - it's a preliminary briefing if you will about EJ integration, environmental justice integration efforts at EPA.

At 3:30, we are scheduled for the public comment. Those four public commenters are Steve Sumida from Alaska Intertribal Council; Rupal Patel from the Communities for Clean Ports; Penny Newman for the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice; and LeVonne Stone from the Fort Ord environmental Justice Network.

When we call your name, the Operator will go ahead and unmute your line and you'll be able to make your comment.

And at 4 o'clock, we anticipate that we will adjourn the meeting.

We hope you all enjoy this call. It's our first time doing this and we're looking forward to this.

So Richard?

Charles Lee: Richard?

Richard Moore: Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Victoria, Charles.

I think Victoria just did the piece in terms of reviewing the agenda. I'm not sure at this moment whether we're - we've got enough NEJAC Council members to approve this agenda. What is your recommendation to move forward?

Man: Well, like I said, I think that we can proceed to provide the informational of this teleconference and have discussion around that information.

If we do not have quorum at the point that the actions need to be taken, we will provide a call via email to all of the members too. So that would be suggestion on how to move forward.

Richard Moore: So with that said, Charles, are we prepared then to move forward with Shankar...

((Crosstalk))

Shankar Prasad: ...one clarification, Richard. This is Shankar.

On this agenda, at 4 o'clock, what you see is goods movement group action plan.

(Unintelligible) I thought it was basically the discussion part of the NEJAC (on what's) being presented at 11:30 and how to go to the next step and get the...

Charles Lee: Hey Shankar, this is Charles.

Richard, the next part, I was going - before we go to Shankar and the specific items around the Goods Movement Work Group, I was going to present the proposed agenda.

Richard Moore: Okay, please proceed.

Charles Lee: And then Shankar, your question perhaps can be either addressed by that time or we need to clarify it. At that time we should do so.

Shankar Prasad: Okay, that's fine.

Charles Lee: Okay.

So I think those of you on the call have received a number of items for the - for today's call. And one of those is a proposed agenda for the NEJAC public meeting.

And I will just kind of walk through that, provide some background, and some of that too in terms of the specific items on the agenda will have - will be more discussed in the later parts of today's agenda.

By way of introduction, I want to say that the overall kind of approach and perspective that EPA has towards this coming - this upcoming meeting is that we consider the EPA's relationship to the NEJAC as a continuing relationship.

And as - and all along for many years, more than a decade I think with NEJAC's help, EPA has been and is making a significant and meaningful difference in many people's lives. And we see the NEJAC as a very valuable partner as I said in this process.

Part of the evidence of that is the fact that recently as you know, EPA made a decision and has acted upon a commitment to provide formal written responses to your recommendations.

Actually you should know that Grant Nakayama, who is the assistant administrator for Enforcement and Compliance Assurance at EPA and the senior official in charge of environmental justice at EPA has been very proud of the fact that we are beginning to do that.

And the third thing just in terms of background as part of the continuing relationship is that we seek to enlist the NEJAC's assistance in identifying and addressing important EJ challenges going into the future.

And in that context, I would say that we believe that we are entering a new phase in our relationship with the NEJAC. And as I've said since I became the acting director, and this is something that has been echoed in - by many of the leadership at EPA, is that we want to have a much more meaningful relationship, meaningful input, and meaningful utilization of the NEJAC. And I think the agenda as it - for this meeting kind of reflects that approach.

So as you know, the NEJAC public meeting in Baltimore is a three - is a 2-1/2 day meeting beginning at 9:00 am on Tuesday, September 18.

And quickly speaking, there will be an opening session. We have confirmed as persons providing welcome Shari Wilson, who is the Secretary for the Environment from the - for the Maryland - state of Maryland. And also Bill Wisniewski, who is the deputy regional administrator for Region 3. Region 3 is, of course, the host region.

After that, there would be an overview around the - of the Office of Environmental Justice and EPA's Environmental Justice Program. And we kind of wanted to talk about new directions.

It is actually the - this is the first NEJAC meeting that after I had been named by Grant to be the acting director for the Office of Environmental Justice. So we wanted to communicate not only - first of all to reiterate EPA continuing commitment to environmental justice and particularly Grant's continuing leadership and as I've always inspiration for the program.

Wanted to communicate and provide you with information on significant developments and new priorities since I've been named the acting director, and then also to summarize the lessons we learned over the last 15 years and future directions - for what we see as important future directions in the larger sense for environmental justice at EPA.

So that's this overview which we think will be very important to provide a context for the meeting.

The rest of that day is going to be devoted to goods movement. And you're going to hear about that from Shankar, who is one of the co-chairs of the - from Shankar Prasad, who is one of the co-chairs of the NEJAC's Goods Movement Work Group.



So - and there are at this point a number of panels - an update and a number of panels related to the issue. The panels, one will be more local in nature being that it'll focus on issues and perspectives of different parties around the Port of Baltimore. And the other two give a - to give an overview of different types of goods movement activities on the part of the EPA headquarter and regional offices.

And then lastly at - what is in the agenda, that's the item I think you mentioned, Shankar, is a - was billed as a goods movement work group action plan or that's the discussion in terms of actions to be taken going into the future. And if we need to clarify that, it would be good to do so on this conference call.

On the September 19, which is Wednesday, is an entire day devoted to EPA integration of environmental justice efforts. And this is a day that Grant, who you know has really welcomed the opportunity to come and spend time and dialogue with the NEJAC is going to be here. Because of the - and he's - he has chosen to come on this day because it is so - his discussions will be so integral to the topic at hand.

And so we're going to start with a dialogue with Grant. And then I'm going to give a synopsis in terms of some of the specific EJ integration efforts, echoing some of things I said on the day before.

Then there will be in the morning a presentation around the Environmental Justice Strategic Enforcement Assessment tool and a discussion of that. I'll go into details later about that later when I talk about EJC.

In the afternoon, we wanted to do the same type of presentation and discussion around the environmental justice program reviews, including (some) background on how - EPA's perspective on how to do program reviews and a larger discussion about EJ integration and the role of program reviews in enhancing those integration efforts.

So that is the second day. And then on the last day, half a day, we want to provide time for - after you have some time - an evening to kind of reflect around the prior day's discussion to take actions - to deliberate and take actions upon the information that you've heard and the discussion you've had.

One thing that we would suggest and we've begun to put in place is the establishment of another work group for the NEJAC, which will focus around environmental justice integration.

And obviously any other items that you may think is appropriate in terms of actions to take will be welcome at that time.

Then around 10:30, we want to spend some time to report back and discuss with you some of the key items, key things that EPA has done in response in implementing the NEJAC recommendations

Lastly, the last item on the agenda is we want to provide a time for more of an open discussion, providing you an opportunity make comments regarding issues that has been discussed during the meeting and to highlight any additional concerns for EPA to consider.

So that then leads us to approximately 1 o'clock on Thursday, September 20, which is the time we expect the meeting to adjourn.

I did forget to say that on the evening of September 18 at 6:30, there will be a public comment period. As you know, public comment periods are required under the Federal Advisory Act. And we expect that to go as long as necessary, but we have it in the agenda to last to about 9:30.

So with that, Richard, is the kind of agenda overview.

Richard Moore: Well, excellent, Charles. We appreciate that I should say as we begin to open this up for some discussion to the council members that Charles and I have been in consultation and in conversations around this agenda. And so at this time, I would like to open it up for questions, comments from the council members in regards particularly to the agenda.

Chuck Barlow: Richard, this is Chuck.

I just wondered if we had - if we have named or set a moderator for the public comment period?

Man: That usually is a role of the chair, who happens to be Richard.

Chuck Barlow: Right.

Man: I can't think of a better moderator.

Chuck Barlow: Okay.

Richard Moore: And thank you for that, Chuck.

Any other questions or comments from (unintelligible).

Paul Mohai: Yes, sir. Yes, Richard, this is Paul Mohai.

The question I have is what sorts of materials will be distributed? And when would they become available in terms of providing information for people to be prepared for the meeting?

Man: Well, the first thing is that we did provide you some background materials. And we will have a briefing book ready about, when, two weeks, a week or so? Victoria would know the answer to that.

Victoria Robinson: The meeting binder you'll get onsite. We have found over time that it's best to have one actually there.

We will probably send you some other information that you might need to review prior to the meeting, but for the most part, you receive - most of that you would receive (unintelligible) you'd receive (unintelligible) the two different charges. You'd receive the three one-pagers that are the basis for the discussions that are going to be had.

But if there's any other documents that come up that we find that are pertinent, we will most definitely send those to you in advance. But onsite the members and everybody else who registers to attend the meeting will receive a meeting binder that has all of these documents in it.

Shankar Prasad: Richard, this is Shankar.

Richard Moore: Yes sir.

Shankar Prasad: I'm just concerned that basically if the primary reason on the day one is focused on goods movement, I see that the committee discussion, the web group (wants us to) seek input from each of the members on how they are planning and what the future would be and how they are drafting the document and so on.

So the committee will have - we would need significant input from the committee members before we go on and trying to draft the reports.

So I think we may need more time for the committee discussion. So I was - I - my suggestion is that a way to extend that committee discussion period from - in sort of between 4:00 and 5:00, can we do it from 3:30 to 5:00? Or if necessary, can we continue that discussion on Thursday?

Man: The answer to that is - well, there are several questions. Continuing on Thursday would be something we should make room for. And I think that would be a very good idea.

That probably means that we should change the expected adjournment time to somewhat later so we can have space for that discussion.

What that means, of course, is then we have - we need to make sure you know to - in terms of making travel plans. But having more time on Thursday actually seems like a good idea.

The constraints in terms of the Tuesday agenda is that having these panels are important and they are very important because there's some valuable information and also a strong desire on the part of different groups including EPA offices to kind of present around their activities.

The other constraint would be that we are locked into 6:30 as the public comment period.

Shankar Prasad: (Unintelligible) that's fine. That's why I suggested we should probably seriously consider adding some time on Thursday.

Victoria Robinson: Yeah, that would be great. Right.

Man: So we should probably add at least an hour more to committee business and action.

Shankar Prasad: Yeah.

Victoria Robinson: In the morning.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Victoria Robinson: Okay.

Man: In the morning, yeah.

Victoria Robinson: We can do that.

Shankar Prasad: And second question I had here was on Wednesday, the current agenda shows 4 o'clock dinner. I assume it is printing error and it should be 5:00 pm, right?

Victoria Robinson: No.

Man: Well, let me just answer that. It - this is probably going to go a lot later than 4 o'clock.

Shankar Prasad: That's why I said...

Man: This is...

Shankar Prasad: ...so I - I just think that it will end at 4:00, but people to plan is...

Man: Right.

Of course, you can always have dinner at 4:00. That's up to you.

But no, the - as - what you see now is the tentative agenda, but we expect this to be filled in a lot more. I did not indicate to you not only is Grant expecting to stay longer than just a - the - his time of dialogue with you to - assuming that he has time, but he has a desire to spend more time with you, and also other senior officials at EPA have expressed desire to participate in this discussion with you.

So we do expect this then to be longer and it'll probably last at least till 5 o'clock.

Shankar Prasad: Okay.

Richard Moore: Shankar, did you have any other comments?

Shankar Prasad: No. Thanks.

Richard Moore: Thank you.

Council members, just to alert you of this discussion, that on your return travel, please try to adjust that because we will still be needing to have a quorum.

Okay, comments/questions, council members?

Langdon Marsh: Richard, this is Lang Marsh.

There was a group of about four or five us that were put on hold for a whole and didn't join the call till about quarter past. So if there was anything you needed to tell us or you want to do another roll call just to make sure who's on the call that now would be a good time to do it.

Man: Yeah, we - Victoria has indicated to me that after this discussion, before we have the action item, we should probably do a roll call to make sure we have established quorum.

Richard Moore: And thank you for those comments, Lang, and welcome. Was reviewing the proposed agenda for the NEJAC Council meeting on September 18 to September 20.

Okay, any other questions, comments, council members? Thank you, Lang, for joining us.

Katie Brown: Richard, this is Katie Brown.

What are the deliverables at the end of these three days?

Charles Lee: Let me...

Richard Moore: (Yes, Charles, please).

Charles Lee: ...just say a couple of things.

There are - there - when the - when Shankar presents around the Goods Movement Work Group update he is presenting to you as a status of a set of recommendations that is being developed.

Of course, that is - that - those recommendations are not expected to be submitted to EPA until June 2008. So the deliverable for that work group would be discussion and feedback around the work that they are doing, which is - so that's on the one had.

In terms of the discussion around the EJ integration, we are - we want to first of all - and we want to take this very seriously. We know that a lot of the issues related to the EJ integration are pretty complex and daunting challenges. And so we want to spend enough time to make sure you're fully briefed and the members of the public are fully briefed about these issues.

We expect there to be ample discussion, and when I go through the - these different topics, I would share with you some of the discussion questions that Richard and others have come up with.

And so that's the first kind of outcome that we want to have. We want to establish and get your concurrence upon establishing another work group related to EJ integration.

Sue Briggum and - who is a member of the NEJAC and (Veronica Eddy), who is presently not a member, have agreed to co-chair that work group.

And then we have not decided how - what kind of charge that we want to provide to that work group because, you know, that is something that needs to be thought through very carefully.

And it's something that we want to do in conjunction with and under the leadership of the Environmental Justice Executive Steering Committee, which is composed of the deputy assistant administrators and the deputy regional administrators. And that's a senior leadership body around environmental justice at EPA. So with all of those things in mind, that's what we want to see happen.

Now the other thing that could happen if the because of these discussions around the EJ integration issues you wish to communicate something in response that, you know, that is your decision.

But it is something we welcome. If you want to say something in terms of what you think what are some of the issues that you think the EPA should be cognizant (unintelligible) or to be more aware of in terms of for its consideration, that is something that we think would be really great and it would be very valuable to our efforts as we move forward in terms of integration efforts.

So...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Charles Lee: ...then lastly I think basically as far as discussion and feedback around the purpose is report back and discussion around some of your key - some of the key EPA efforts to implement your recommendations we think would be - are going to be helpful in terms of bringing back to EPA to have better implementation.

And what form that may take, I don't think it needs to be any more than just that kind of discussion and our noting it as something that we would consider.

So those are some of - I think are the deliverables or the outputs that we see coming out of this meeting.

Omega Wilson: This is Omega.

My question had to do with as far as the integration discussion. Is there going to be some kind of template or some kind of a document or a briefing that we'll have a change to look at prior to coming to Baltimore?

Charles Lee: Well, you have two things there that we gave you that we've tried to synopsise some very big items two - in terms of two pieces of paper. There will probably be other ones.

I think - I mean, we're going to provide - we're going to try to provide another piece of synopsis, which is just an overview on this.

If it's helpful to you, what we could do is to take from the EPA Office of Environmental Justice web site a lot of the items that's relevant to ongoing EJ integration efforts, send you those links. And you could - that would be - definitely be good background material.

Omega Wilson: Okay, that - I think that would be useful.

Charles Lee: Right.

I mean, keep in mind that we do not expect - we want to do this very thoughtfully. So we don't think it's helpful for you to ask you to - or try to push you to take actions around something that is inherently very complex and without being fully aware of this.

And that's why we're not asking - we're not putting forward a charge to you around those - around EJ integration issues at this time. We want it to come out of a dialogue that we have with you that begins on the September 18 meeting and allows time to really sit back and think it through as far as what would be the most judicious use of your time and talents and experiences.

Omega Wilson: Okay, all right. Thanks.

Richard Moore: Thank you, Charles. Comments/questions? How are we doing, Victoria, in terms of time?

Victoria Robinson: Okay, we are at target. And are - if there aren't any other comments, I want to do a quick roll call and then to actually turn it over to you to run the vote for the approval of the agenda, okay?

Richard Moore: Okay.

Victoria Robinson: So are there any other comments about the agenda? Suggestions?

Okay, I'm going to take a real quick roll call again. Richard, I know you're on the call. Katie Brown, I know you're on the call. Paul Mohai, I know you're on the call.

Donele Wilkins?

Donele Wilkins: I'm here.

Victoria Robinson: All right, wonderful. Welcome, Donele.

Donele Wilkins: Thank you.

Victoria Robinson: Omega Wilson, yes.

Omega Wilson: Here.

Victoria Robinson: Right. Elizabeth, I know you're on the call.

Elizabeth Yeampierre: Yes.

Victoria Robinson: Jolene Catron, I know you're on the call. Joyce King, you're on the call. Chuck Barlow, you're on the call. Sue Briggum?

Sue Briggum: Yes.

Victoria Robinson: Wonderful. (Bill Harper)? Okay.

Greg Melanson?

Gregory Melanson: Yes, I'm here.

Victoria Robinson: Wonderful, Greg.

Chris Holmes?

Chris Holmes: I'm here.

Victoria Robinson: Wonderful. Lang Marsh, we know you're on the call, John Rosenthal, we know you're on the call.

Jody Henneke?

Jody Henneke: I'm here.

Victoria Robinson: Wonderful. Shankar, we know you're on the call.

John Ridgway?

John Ridgway: Hi, I'm here.

Victoria Robinson: Okay, wonderful. So we show everybody here. We have a full quorum and we have two absent at this time. And I do want to apologize to all you. We will - this is our first time.

We're getting - we're shaking out all of the details and procedures. We're hoping on the future calls we will be able to address this and so that you won't have the problem of being muted like that. Okay?

Jolene Catron: This is Jolene. Can you hear me?

Victoria Robinson: Yes.

Jolene Catron: Hi. I'm sorry, I was on - I had my phone on mute and I wanted to - I have a comment about the agenda. Actually it's a question.

Victoria Robinson: Okay.

Jolene Catron: I was asking my question and I guess I was on mute.

My question is regarding the public comment period on Tuesday. Where is this advertised to the public that they can attend this meeting and provide comments?

Victoria Robinson: We - it is - it's in three locations. One, it was in the Federal Register notice, which went out this week. It was published in the EJ listserv announcements that go out. We will send it out again in early September as a reminder that this meeting is going to be happening. And it's also posted on our web site...



Jolene Catron: Okay.

Victoria Robinson: ...the NEJAC web site.

Man: The EJ listserv goes out to approximately 4000 people at this point?

Victoria Robinson: Yes.

Man: And actually this is also a plug for anyone who want to be on the listserv or anyone who knows somebody that wants to be on the listserv to let us know.

Victoria Robinson: Right.

This is a caution right now. Please wait about one week to try to register for the EJ listserv. There is a system error on EPA's server related to all of the listservs. And they are working on it as we speak.

So if you wait till next week, we're hoping that the listserv registration will be up to date and working. But also you can go to our web site and that information is posted there.

Jolene Catron: And this is Jolene again.

The comments, are they just oral comments provided in person? Or do you also take written...

Victoria Robinson: Yes we take...

((Crosstalk))

Jolene Catron: We take all verbal comments. And sometimes we get a comment (unintelligible). Any written comments is automatically added to the public record and included as part of the transcript. We actually have them transcribe those written comments.

The - and those that we have in advance are provided to the members for their review as well if we have them in advance.

According to the Federal Register notice we put out, all written comments that you want to have provided for our binders will have to be received by September 10 in order to actually get into the binders. Anything we receive after that will be distributed at the meeting to the members.

We do accept both. And we do make both a part of the public record.

Jolene Catron: Okay, thank you.

Richard Moore: Thank you, Jolene.

Any other as we move for approval of the agenda? Any other comments?

Okay, then I'd like to move in the action item for approval for the NEJAC agenda.

Jody Henneke: This is Jody. So moved.

Donele Wilkins: Wilkins, second.

Richard Moore: Okay, thank you.

Is the (unintelligible) and those comments a consensus that the agenda is approved?

All: Yes.

Man: No objection.

Richard Moore: Okay, thank you very much.

I think we're ready then. The agenda's been approved. We're ready, Shankar, if you are. We're ready for the Goods Movement Work Group update.

Victoria Robinson: Oh, one quick thing, Richard, I wanted to remind all you members to please send in your travel request forms so we can get your invitational travel completed, the earlier the better.

And this is a note -- we already have made your hotel reservations. So please do not make reservations at the hotel. I'm talking about the members directly.

If you have any changes to the dates that we've put down, please give us a call right now. You're all schedules - unless you've already told me otherwise, you're all scheduled to arrive the 17th, depart the 20th.

So please contact me about your hotel changes if you need to, but please submit your travel request forms in either fax or email to (Shelly Dawson). You have that information on the form.

Jody Henneke: Victoria, this is Jody. I know you know I've changed agencies and have support staff that haven't done this with you yet.

Victoria Robinson: Okay.

Jody Henneke: Is there - can I have that electronic form sent to me by email or something?

Victoria Robinson: Well, I did send it, but I will resent it to all of the members who have not responded already. I'll do that...

Jody Henneke: Well, I'm sure I'm on that list.

Victoria Robinson: There are several of you on that list. I will go ahead and have that sent out to you guys again tomorrow.

Jody Henneke: Thank you, ma'am.

Jolene Catron: Victoria, this is Jolene.

I haven't - I've been trying to fax this in to the number provided on the form and there's been no answer.

Victoria Robinson: Okay.

We - I have to apologize. Our building here is undergoing telecommunications rewiring. And that I think has been causing some problems with some faxes. Jolene, I will email you a new number to fax it to.

Jolene Catron: Okay, thank you.

Victoria Robinson: And I'll do the same thing for everybody else.

Jolene Catron: Great.

Richard Moore: Okay, are we ready then to proceed with those clarifications? Okay, Mr. Shankar, Goods Movement Work Group update.

Shankar Prasad: Thanks Richard and welcome to you all and so to the members of the public.

I have the pleasure and privilege of chairing the Goods Movement Work Group along with Terry Goff, who has been very extremely supporting and helpful in shaping our group formation, as well as in the formation of the agenda and how to move to the next step.

So far, we have formed a group, which consists of 12 members. And it includes five of the NEJAC members.

Overall if you look at the split, there are two from the community, one tribal representative, four from the industry, two from the state, two academia, and one local planning group.

We have had two - one face-to-face meeting and four conference call meetings. And based on the charge that you all have, those questions, we came up with a list of almost seven areas that will have specific recommendations and with a principal on that.

That is what you will be seeing from us as the Goods Movement Work Group will be presenting it to the NEJAC as to what we have considered, a detailed framework of the document. Essentially the contents aren't exactly (unintelligible) but the framework of the document and how we intend to proceed.

And each of those seven areas will be led by one of the members. And they will be presenting to you in brief what their thinking is and why they are focusing on those specific areas.

And we will be seeking your input and also we'll be posing some specific questions to you such that the discussion would be much more fruitful.

That's one of the reasons you probably will not have too many background materials sent yet because we are still working on the detailed framework and want to seek your input.

And we are formalizing how to proceed and what sort of recommendations would be needed. And we are also working with the EPA staff to get some more information that needs to be fit in as well.

So our current plan is to start off being able to prepare a draft after seeking your input and take on and be able to prepare that draft along with a consultant that is being hired to do some specific analysis and probably prepare a draft - preliminary draft probably by early next year.

And subsequently after your input, we plan to go back, revise the document. And we are looking as we said to be able to release the draft in the middle of the next year.

And hopefully we'll have another opportunity -- I am not clear how that will work out in terms of the resources, you know, whether there will be another opportunity for the work group and the NEJAC to interact.

And that's in brief. And if you want to go anything more because seven areas probably just want to let you know are the community involvement and participation, local planning, collaborative governance and problem solving, regulatory mechanisms, technology innovations, environmental management systems related to mitigation efforts, and resources and innovative financing.

These are the seven primary areas we think we are looking at the way of forming specific recommendations and providing a (unintelligible) of why these are being chosen.

Richard Moore: (Unintelligible) go ahead, Shankar.

Shankar Prasad: Any questions, clarifications, I'll be glad to answer.

((Crosstalk))

Richard Moore: ...Shankar. I just wanted to - you may have mentioned this. There's two chairs of that working group. You're one of them. Could you identify the other chair, please?

Shankar Prasad: Mr. Terry Goff from Caterpillar. (I did), yes. (Unintelligible).

Richard Moore: All right, thank you. Thank you.

Questions, comments council members?

John Ridgway: This is John Ridgway.

I'm curious if there were any other areas that (unintelligible) chosen not to be included for targeted recommendations?

Shankar Prasad: No.

We are not - that's one of the reasons we want to come to you and have an open discussion. And that's why I was suggesting earlier that we - if we needed more time to discuss are there more areas to be added, we are open for the suggestions.

So...

John Ridgway: Thank you.

Shankar Prasad: ...(unintelligible) to do that (unintelligible). And also we have not had too many meetings or too many (unintelligible) because some of the members have been - have agreed to participate only recently, so all - what group members have not met at all of the meetings, so only now we have the full membership and from now on we will be having the biweekly conference calls.

Richard Moore: Great. Thank you, Shankar. Questions, comments, council members?

Katie Brown: Shankar, this is Katie Brown. Are there minutes of your meetings of your calls?

Victoria Robinson: Those are actually being developed and will be distributed to the work group members. Is that something that we needed to distribute to the NEJAC members at large, Charles?

Charles Lee: Well, you know, that's a - this is one of those issues because this is a process in which the work group needs to be able to talk candidly.

Victoria Robinson: Mm-hm.

Charles Lee: I think, you know, we need to - and (unintelligible) this question, Katie, has never come up before. So why don't we think about it. I don't think it's a straightforward answer of a yes or a no. I mean, it is a good question.

Victoria Robinson: Mm-hm.

Katie Brown: But Charles, I really don't want them. But I feel just going into the meeting next month terribly unprepared. And if I'm inundated with materials to read and sort of, you know, distill at the same time there's active discussion going on by people who've been thinking about this for the last six months, I just don't - I mean, I'm just at a real disadvantage and I'm not giving my best to the process.

Charles Lee: Yeah, and...

Katie Brown: So that's really the issue for me is how can I be better prepared to participate in the meeting.

Charles Lee: Katie, maybe we should try to see is the - some of the discussion and you will probably need to get the framework that we are planning to do. Probably that could be shared very much earlier.

Woman: Yes.

Charles Lee: And I do not know now much of the other details you would need.

Richard Moore: Katie?

Katie Brown: Yeah. That's a start.

Victoria Robinson: I - Katie, this is Victoria.

Katie Brown: Mm-hm.

Victoria Robinson: I think the one piece of - the one documentation that you - that would probably be of use to you as members would probably be the minutes summary from our face-to-face meeting, which will be - we will have here like on Monday.

That's - our contractor will get that to us then. And I think that is something that would give you the framework for the sense and the tone of where the work group is headed.

Katie Brown: Okay.

So when might we get that?

Victoria Robinson: Once I receive that and have Shankar and Terry, the two co-chairs, view it, it's - I'll get it out to you right away. So it could be as early as the end of next week.

Katie Brown: Okay, okay. Thank you.

Victoria Robinson: So but that...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria Robinson: ...document that would be able to give you a good background.

Man: Will this be sent to all of the NEJAC members?

Victoria Robinson: Yes, it will be sent to all of the NEJAC members.

Katie Brown: Well, thank you.

Shankar Prasad: And also, Victoria, you may want to think of adding the - some of the presentations made at the face-to-face meeting.

Victoria Robinson: Yes, okay, we can take a look. That might - that - we're going to have to figure out how to distribute that because it is literally too big for emails, so that's going to be an issue of how do we get that out to them.

Shankar Prasad: Okay.

Victoria Robinson: We'll talk.

Shankar Prasad: Yeah.

Richard Moore: Then I know, Victoria, there's - and we don't want to overwhelm people with a lot of paper, but just to proceed with that, we might want to redo the charge (unintelligible).

Victoria Robinson: (Unintelligible).

Richard Moore: The charge for the council under the goods movement, and then obviously that's the charge for the working group.

Questions, comments?

John Ridgway: John Ridgway here.

If any of the NEJAC members that are not on the work group would be interested in listening in on a conference call, would that be a possibility, of the work group that is?

Richard Moore: Victoria, Charles?

Victoria Robinson: Yeah, that would be. One of the things that we have to make sure that when we do is that we do not end up with a quorum of NEJAC members. And that throws it into a whole different kind of ballgame when it comes to compliance with all of the Federal Advisory Community Act rules for open and public meetings and all of the other stuff.

So right now, we have...

Shankar Prasad: Five members.

Victoria Robinson: I'm sorry.

Shankar Prasad: They have five NEJAC members on the work group.

Victoria Robinson: Right.

And if we were to get any - if we were to get a total of ten, that automatically would put a quorum in place. And then that makes - that kind of restricts how the work group can actually operate.

John Ridgway: Thank you. I understand.

Victoria Robinson: I'm sorry?

John Ridgway: I said thanks, I understand.

Victoria Robinson: Right.

And one of those things would be Federal Register notice of the meetings in advance (unintelligible).

Charles Lee: But in generally, you know, we can - to the - within the requirements of FACA rules, you know, we can try to accommodate all of this. If one of - a couple of you or a few of you want to listen in, I think we can make that possible.

Richard Moore: Okay, questions, comments?

Okay, Victoria, how are we doing with time, please?

Victoria Robinson: Okay, we are actually five minutes early. I mean, it's 2:55 and it's time now to address the NEJAC charge for the Goods Movement Work Group in terms of approving the charge as written or making any revisions. Everybody should've received a copy of that a month ago and then recently.

Richard Moore: Okay, council members, we're at the action item on that agenda for the Goods Movement Work Group, the approval for the NEJAC charge to the Goods Movement Work Group.

Are we prepared to move forward?

Woman: Richard, I have sort of three documents here that are titled similarly. Could you - am I looking at a half page, the full page, or the three-page document?

Victoria Robinson: It's the half page that says, "Charge to Goods Movement Work Group." Do you see that one?

Woman: Yeah, yeah.

Victoria Robinson: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Richard Moore: Okay, charge to the Goods Movement Work Group draft, questions, comments? Are we prepared to move forward on this action item?

I move that we approve the charge for the Goods Movement Work Group.

Shankar Prasad: Shankar (unintelligible) recommended.

Richard Moore: Okay.

Council members, we - are we in agreement?

All: Yes.

Man: Yes, we are.

Women: Yes.

Richard Moore: Okay, Shankar, thank you very much. We have approved the charge. Good presentation, good summary. Just wanted to as we move forward to the next agenda item congratulate those that have been on the Goods Movement Work Group. I know the chairs have been



working hard and the other members have also. So a good piece of work. Thank you all for doing that.

Okay, Charles, are we ready?

Charles Lee: Yes, we are, actually right on time.

So I'm going to go through this really quickly. There's a lot of things here. And do not worry if you don't pick up everything. The meeting is designed so that we spend a lot of time to share this information with you, have the appropriate people who worked on the - these particular projects at EPA to talk with you and have both they and EPA senior leadership to have dialogue with you.

So - and I guess the overall context of this is our efforts to integrate environmental justice considerations in all EPA's programs, policies, and activities.

And that's been a historic, ongoing, and long-term task, challenge for EPA and for other agencies, both federal and state.

And actually to take it in a broader context, many of the lessons that we've learned over the past 15 years directly relate to environmental justice integration efforts, like, for example, the need to have clear legal authorities under existing EPA statutory - EPA statutes; to have a consistent approach to identifying areas of environmental justice concern; to better define what disproportionate impacts are; to integrate environmental justice into the EPA's core planning and budget processes; to have ongoing regular program reviews around environmental justice -- these are just some of the things that relate to EJ integration efforts.

And you will hear a little bit of - in terms of what we've done when I give my overview at the NEJAC meeting. But I think on all of these things, EPA has actually done something pretty significant in terms of making headway.

So at this point, in terms of present efforts around environmental justice integration, there's two key things, two key projects are - one is moving to fruition and the other is beginning.

And the one that's moving to fruition is the one that has to do with having a consistent approach to identifying areas of potential environmental justice concern.

And that's the Environmental Justice Strategic Enforcement Assessment tool, which - whose acronym is EJC. And the effort that is just beginning to get underway actually started towards the end of last year, our Environmental Justice Program Reviews.

So these are two specific you are going to get briefings on and (unintelligible) and - at the NEJAC meeting.

So in terms of EJC, what is basically - this is a project that's been ongoing since about 1995. In fact, for many - those of you who may remember, EPA, the enforcement office had come to talk to the Enforcement Subcommittee about EJC at one point and got a lot of very valuable feedback.

This is a tool for - and it is a tool at this point for the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, which happens to be the office that the Office of Environmental Justice has (tasked) to consistently identify areas where potentially disproportionately high and adverse environmental public health burdens, or another way of putting it is potential areas of environmental justice concern.

And this has been a project that's been ongoing for many years. Today I'm just going to go over some of the background and goals of EJC, some of the EJC indicators, and then just some of the ways in which we seek to operationalize it.

The - what gave birth to this was the fact that for a long time, this idea of what is a consistent definition of an area of environmental justice concern did not exist. And in fact many EPA offices, particularly the regional offices, had different approaches towards identifying areas of potential EJ concern.

And it became from a national perspective impossible then to have consistent ways of measuring our actions in areas of environmental justice concern or to be able to identify - or to report and to analyze the results of EPA actions.

In the long run, the ability to do such - something like that is just really critical to achieving and being able to show tangible environmental public health results.

So Phyllis Harris when we the deputy assistant administrator at - for EOCA, the enforcement office, charged us to develop a tool that can achieve those goals in terms of providing national consistency for the implementation of a EJ program and (unintelligible) measure and report on our progress in terms of environmental - tangible environmental results.

The way that the EJC tool is constructed is that it is a - based upon 18 indicators. These indicators have to be federally recognized or managed data sources.

There is a - the hope or the goal is to use data sets at the census tract level. And there is the - to use data sets available for the whole country. And that - and these are divided into four categories, which are environmental, human health, compliance, and social demographics.

And you have in your little fact sheet the - what the specific indicators are. Short - for short, the National Air Toxics Assessment, which is NATA cancer data, NATA non-cancer, neurological, and respiratory hazard index, NATA non-cancer diesel particulate matter, toxic chemical emissions, which basically - and transfers for industrial facilities based upon the Risk-Screening Environmental Indicators tool, population-weighted ozone monitoring data, and population-weighted PM 2.5 monitoring data.

The human health indicators are percent infant minority and percent low birth weight - low weight births. And this is an area that we think needs to be strengthened. There are a lot of challenges getting good human health data, which I would not talk about today.

But one reason why even though there was not as robust data as we may like, we felt it was important to set a marker as to the importance of human health indicators, one reason being that the NEJAC Enforcement Subcommittee really emphasized the - their concern about human health.

The compliance data are inspection of major facilities violations and major facilities formal actions and major facilities and facility density.

And the social demographic indicators are a percent of the population living in poverty, percentage of the population that's minority, percent of the population under 25 - 25 or older - years old without a high school diploma. That measure basically shows educational level, population over 65 and under 5-years of age and percent of population of limited English proficiency.

And there is an algorithm that would then be calculated and be able to rank these across the country.

And then we have - we're able to then track this in terms of the EPA's Online Tracking Information System. And then over several years of that kind of information, we began to really kind of generate information about where EPA has taken actions relative to environmental justice, what kind of results have resulted from those actions that EPA has taken, and overall environmental and public health quality in areas disproportionately burdened by environmental risks and harms.

So that's the EJC tool. You will hear a lot more about that. Richard, (Veronica Eddy), and (Sue Bergen) have worked with us to identify some discussion questions, which we will send you in preparation for the meeting that will help focus your - a discussion around these.

And some of these are with respect to EJC, is it important for EPA to use a consistent approach to identify areas of potential EJ concern; how can EPA foster better understanding of the EJC tool; how can EPA ensure meaningful public participation in future refinements of the EJC tool; and what are our potential concerns from EJ stakeholders surrounding the agency's use of the EJC tool.

So I don't know. Richard, do you want me to go through the EJ program reviews presentation? Or do you want me to stop here and take some questions?

Richard Moore: I think you might - that was a lot of information. Appreciate that, Charles. We may want to stop, open it up for comments and questions, and then move to the next one.

Paul Mohai: Charles, this is Paul.

A question I have is it should like - from what you said, the agency's been working on this for some time. Is there information pertaining to more details about this tool on the web for people who want to find out more about, you k now, what the algorithm looks like or even something that provides some examples of how this algorithm is applied and so on?

Charles Lee: Not yet. But that would be there I think shortly. We're - there's still a lot of work being done in terms of finalizing this in terms of identifying many questions of - such as the ones you've asked.

So not yet, but I think the hope is is that when it is ready that the agency is fully transparent as much as possible with regard to this tool.

- Sue Briggum: Charles, this is Sue.
- I thought that was an extremely concise and helpful introduction. One small thing that occurs to me might be helpful for the meeting is there are some terms in here -- this goes somewhat to Paul's questions as well -- that you might have a glossary to assist on if people had a sense of, you know, what the (unintelligible) tool was. I'm not talking about providing the whole thing, but just, you know, a brief paragraph or something. That might help our discussion September.
- Charles Lee: That would be great.
- And, you know, along the lines of that, you know, that question in terms of how we - how can we foster better understanding of the EJC tool among the public...
- Sue Briggum: Mm-hm.
- Charles Lee: ...and across - without that understanding, there can't be meaningful public participation. So these kind of things, like a glossary associated with this would be great. Any other ideas like that would be really welcome.
- Sue Briggum: Thanks.
- Richard Moore: Kind of - I just wanted to second that, Sue. That's was very good. Comments and questions, council members?
- Chuck Barlow: Yes, I - this may be a more substantive - this is Chuck Barlow.
- It may be a more substantive question than we want to get into right now. And if that's the case, Charles or Richard, just let me know.
- But in the third bullet where we talk about compliance indicators, the first one is inspections of major facilities. And I could see that cutting both ways because it's a good thing that you have inspections.
- It's a good thing that you have a lot of inspections. But on the other hand, you are showing by having a lot of inspections that you have a density of facilities.
- So I'm just wondering actually as the logarithm works - algorithm works whether that's sort of a positive toward an area being considered an EJ area or a negative because there would seem to be adequate enforcement in place.
- Charles Lee: The answer to that is that's a very good question. These are never simple - these are not simple, straightforward indicators or issues.
- I just have to say nobody on this call is equipped to really fully answer you. We'll bring that question back, as well I think it would be great if you raised that at the NEJAC meeting.
- Chuck Barlow: Okay, thank you.

Charles Lee: Yeah.

And, I mean, there are going to be people there far more conversant around EJC and the, you know, just the whole enforcement operation that will be - would be - I think will welcome the opportunity to dialogue with you about the issue you just raised.

Man: (Unintelligible).

John Ridgway: John Ridgway here, a couple things.

I agree with what Sue Briggum said about some kind of a little cheat sheet or list of some of these items to explain what they are. For example, maybe a couple sentences on each of the 18 indicators, what they come from, most people probably don't understand that (RECI) comes from the Toxic Release Inventory data, for example.

Specifically to the third bullet also major facilities, the term major has some regulatory meaning. For others it doesn't. You know, what's not included in other words? And lots of communities may have a lot of facilities that pollute and have impacts, but they would not be considered major.

So does that mean they're not considered or what? That could be something maybe we'll learning about more in September.

And then my last point is in the bottom paragraph, it says that the top 10% and 20% scoring census tracts in a state are considered potential areas of concern. And this gets to my role on the NEJAC.

What does that mean to the states, not to mention the communities or areas that are listed of concern? I'm hoping that there'll be an opportunity to address that dynamic.

How do the states get this information? What if states have EJ concerns in areas that aren't recognized by this tool? Does that create any problems? Or how does that interaction work with states?

And I'd be glad to help address that at the appropriate time.

Charles Lee: Yeah, there's a lot of questions you raise, all of which are really great ones.

The last one is especially one that we've been thinking about trying to pursue more. That last question I put forward about potential concerns from EJ stakeholders, we recognize that the use of the EJC tool particularly with respect to identification of what is or is not a potential EJ community may have ramifications, and not just for EPA or that community, but also other stakeholders, like business or industry or state government.

So, you know, thinking about a process by which we can kind of really work through those kind of issues are going to be really important.

Ultimately, you know, the hope is that everybody, all of the major stakeholders are on the same page as far as the approach. And, you know, the questions having to do with how does -

how to use something in terms of a particular decision or action or program is not a simple, straightforward one.

I mean, the - when you get to the heart of it or just from - just in terms of how - one of the reasons why this tool was developed was to have some kind of consistency in terms of being able to report and be able to show results as far as our actions are concerned, particularly with respect to disproportionate higher-end impacted communities.

So it's not a simple question and it's not a simple answer to that, but I think it's a great question.

John Ridgway: Well, thanks. I look forward to talking about it more in Baltimore. You're right, they're very complicated and dynamic (unintelligible).

Richard Moore: And thank you for that, (Tom). And thank you for saying that you'd be willing to also to work on that.

Okay, questions, comments? Victoria, how are we doing time wise?

Victoria Robinson: We have 15 minutes before public comments.

Richard Moore: Okay, questions, comments, council members?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Langdon Marsh: This is Lang Marsh.

Sort of a follow-up to John's question, I'm what the - what other kinds of categorizing tools that are used by the federal or more specifically but possibly also by state governments to identify areas for other reasons and what - how these indicators and this tool might intersect with them?

I'm thinking for example of economic zones, which are designated for various purposes for loans or tax credits or other things, whether - and whether this tool will be used - or the results of this tool will be used for either positive or hopefully not negative purposes by various institutions, both private and public.

So just to think about and maybe bring to the meeting, you know, the - how this overlaps with or is designed differently from tools for example to identify economic development zones for example.

Charles Lee: That's great.

Hey Richard?

Richard Moore: Yes sir.

Charles Lee: Can I just say that all of these are great. And one of the things to get back to Katie Brown's original question in terms of outputs, as a result of the - one of the outputs that you might think

about for - from the meeting may be like I said some kind of communication that kind of identifies issues that you think EPA should be thinking about as it - as we're moving forward with respect to EJC and EJ reviews or other matters of EJ integration.

It does not have to be - you don't have to have a recommendation as to what to do about these, but it is very important to flag key issues. And it helps I think our collective thinking process as to be strategic about how to move forward and also to, you know, in terms of devoting resources, the kind of questions that we can come back to you with as far as a charge is concerned so that we're very focused and strategic about influencing the future development of what I think is a truly important tool for environmental justice.

Richard Moore: And I think that's also a very good suggestion.

Council members, if there's other comments and questions, I think Charles is going to give another brief report back.

Charles Lee: Okay.

And this one here, you have a fact sheet on. And this is a process that began end of the latter part of last year. And we will send you the report from which this process emanated from, which is the EPA Inspectors General reported dated September 18, 2006 that said - which is entitled, "EPA needs to conduct environmental justice reviews of its programs, policies, and activities."

There were four recommendations from that, all of which go - comes down to the fact that they believe that EPA needs to do regular environmental justice program reviews.

The EPA has agreed with this, these recommendations, and it has responded to the IG with a plan that the IG - a corrective action plan to the IG that the IG accepted on May 18 of this year.

And actually parenthetically if you note the testimony of the Inspector General to the SEPW, Senate Environmental - Environment Public Works Committee hearing, they actually commended EPA's response to their recommendations report.

So what has happened is that the EPA has convened a work group of 61 members from all EPA regions and major program offices. And these are - this group has been working to develop protocols around several - four major programmatic functions around which - to be used for EJ reviews.

These are standard-setting and rule-making, permitting, enforcement and compliance, and cleanup and remediation.

The primary objectives of conducting reviews as presently stated is to identify ways in which the agency is effectively identifying and addressing EJ concerns and then opportunities where it can enhance its effectiveness for identifying and addressing EJ concerns.

This all has - the discussion around this all has - is leading to at this point a testing of these EJ protocols, which are - the first iteration of which has been completed and then beginning some pilots to - in terms of an overall more - in terms of what a real live EJ review may look like.

Because as you know that when it comes to addressing environmental justice kind of issues or looking at environmental justice-related initiatives, they're going to include many of these programmatic functions, as well as other programmatic functions and done so and coming together in very specific ways and tailored ways.

So this is a pretty complex thing. I think it is fair to say that we really support this because we believe that evaluation can be used as a very positive tool for program development, because as all - anyone who has done any kind of reading or study of program evaluation knows that if you have a good methodology and you - for program evaluation that you start to apply up front, that becomes a real driver or an engine for - to influence positive - in positive ways program development.

And so if we were to think about this in the long term, these - the - we want to make these program reviews another tool that kind of influences both EJ integration with the idea that what EPA efforts much produce are tangible environmental public health benefits for disproportionately affected communities.

So with that, let me just give, Richard, just some questions that Richard, (Veronica), and (Sue) came up with around EJ program reviews. And this is one is how should EPA determine which programs, policies, or activities need EJ reviews; how will EPA develop criteria to judge the effectiveness of these programs, policies, and activities; how can communities benefit from the agency doing EJ reviews; how can EPA ensure meaningful public participation while conducting EJ reviews; how can EPA foster better understanding of the results of these EJ reviews; how can the results of EJ reviews be meaningfully utilized by communities and other EJ stakeholders; and what are potential concerns from EJ stakeholders surrounding the agency's approach to conducting EJ reviews.

And like I said, Richard, we'll make sure everybody gets a copy of these in preparation for the meeting.

Richard Moore: Great, Charles. Thank you.

Comments/questions?

Chris Holmes: Yeah, Richard and Charles, this is Chris.

Woman: Hello?

Charles Lee: Hello?

Richard Moore: Are you still there, Chris?

Woman: Hello?

Richard Moore: Okay, we lost him somewhere in that...

Charles Lee: He'll call back.



Richard Moore: (Unintelligible) he'll call back. Any other comments or questions.

Joyce King: Mr. Chair, this is Joyce King.

I really want to make sure that there's meaningful dialogue with (unintelligible) because sometimes - and it goes back to the issue right before this one about the EJC.

Sometimes they don't participate in the census, you know, as far as my territory's concerned, they do not. So I think we need to make sure that there is government-to-government dialogue when we talk about reviews and we talk about program evaluations.

So that's my comment. Thank you.

Charles Lee: Yeah, you know, the - there's two things - two ways I will respond to that. Those - that is a really great question. There are particular implications of your questions for both EJC and the reviews and integration efforts overall.

So this would be one of those questions that I think you should make sure gets on the list of items that the council things that the EPA should be considering.

Joyce King: (Thank you).

Richard Moore: Yeah, and I just wanted to affirm those comments. I won't repeat any of that. I think the - it was laid out.

So any additional questions or comments?

John Ridgway: John Ridgway here.

My only question is there's no reference to timing in this document at all. Is this something that the EPA has set a directive to have at least one review done by a certain time or a template for these reviews to be built by a certain time? Any information on that?

Charles Lee: Yeah, this is a short document. We are - our commitment is that environmental justice reviews would begin on March of 2008.

So actually that's very ambitious. And - but that's the commitment. So we would be having - we would be doing these pilots. Let's see, we're doing now some of the protocol testing. We're going to start doing pilots. All of that has to happen before - by or around March of 2008.

Now that is a target. And so - but that is a target that has been submitted. However, part of the issue here is going to be making sure that we're going about this in a very judicious way.

Richard Moore: Okay, any other (unintelligible).

Katie Brown: This is Katie. And I guess I just want to say I think this is a very important issue, a fascinating issue, and I'm glad it's come to the NEJAC.

Charles Lee: Thank you, Katie.

John Ridgway: John Ridgway again here. I hope I'm not monopolizing questions, but the reference to the 61-member EPA group, will there be summaries of what they've come up with that would be shared with the NEJAC? Or is that more internal and we should not expect their insights (unintelligible) comment.

Charles Lee: I'm not - I don't know. I'm not in a position to answer that question yet because - but we will get back to you on that.

John Ridgway: Thank you.

Chris Holmes: Hey Charles, it's Chris. Are you there?

Charles Lee: Hey Chris.

Chris Holmes: Hey. I just - you know, when we start having an examination of EJ applying to EPA programs, I - my favorite, which I really hope we look at, is the risk management program.

And, you know, I've always been very concerned that the analyses that companies are expected to do for offsite exposure, you know, now because of 9/11, they're all taken offline. It's very hard to get a hold of them.

Charles Lee: Mm-hm.

Chris Holmes: And I think it'd be important to take a few of these and really drill down and really examine them to make sure that they really are (adequately) doing what they were supposed to do, which is to educate the community on worst possible case exposures and the steps that they're supposed to take to prevent catastrophes from occurring. And my bet is they've never been audited. That's just my bet.

Charles Lee: Again, like I said, this is going to be my constant refrain, which is those are great issues. It would be great if the NEJAC communicates a list of these of these kind of issues so that we can share them with the agency.

Chris Holmes: Okay. I...

Charles Lee: The NEJAC having put its imprimatur upon, you know, a list like that gives it so much more weight.

Chris Holmes: Got it. Okay.

Richard Moore: Okay, Victoria, how are we doing time-wise?

Victoria Robinson: It's 3:30 now.

Richard Moore: Okay.

Comments - last comments and questions before we open up for public comment?

Okay, excellent presentation, Charles. We appreciate that.

Okay, council members, we're about ready to go into public comment. We welcome the public and others that were observing this conference call.

I think the general ground rules for public comment that we use also at the NEJAC face-to-face meetings is that the comments - commentees -- sorry about that -- are asked to make their comments within five minutes.

I've asked Victoria to keep us on time a little bit, about right up on that four-minute piece, just to remind us where we are, and would encourage the council members if there's any questions or comments after each one speaks to be concise. And I know you all will be because you have always been.

So Victoria, I think we're ready. If I didn't fail to mention anything else, I think we're ready for public comments.

Victoria Robinson: Great.

And before we actually open up the mic for the first individual, I do want to say to everybody that again, this is our first opportunity for doing this kind of public comment via public teleconference call and there were limitations in terms of how far in advance you could sign up for public comment.

And we're going to try to keep on refining this comments for future calls. So please don't judge us quickly by this one operation.

The first person will be Steve Sumida. And Operator, (Mark), if you could open his line, but I wanted to let everybody know that for the speakers, I'll give you a countdown at two minutes and then one minute, a minute. And then we'll let you know when time is up. Okay?

Richard Moore: Great. Open up the line, please.

Steve Sumida: Hello? Am I online?

Richard Moore: Yes, you are.

Steve Sumida: Thank you very much. I'd like to thank NEJAC for this opportunity to address them in this FACA format.

I'd like to introduce the organization that I represent. I'm the acting executive director of the Alaska Inter-Tribal Council. Our membership is drawn from 229 federally recognized tribes Alaska statewide.

We are not the Alaska Federation of Natives. That organization represents Alaska Native Claim Settlement Act eight chartered corporations. Those corporations have populated most of the FACA groups that EPA and other federal agencies have compiled.

So I - in that context, I'm doubly grateful to be here because the tribal councils are not well represented by the corporations, which are engaged in natural resource extraction throughout Alaska.

The native corporations through Alaska Federation of Natives have managed to populate the FACA group by populating the tribes in Alaska, so it's very difficult for outside entities to ascertain exactly who they're hearing from.

With that background, I'd like to just address some transportation-related and air-impacted structures in Alaska. The first one I wanted to mention is Donlin Creek mine.

This is a huge mine that is well along in its development process. It's anticipated to move 60,000 tons of throughput daily. The mine will be an open pit two-mile by one-mile with a 2000 acre (tailings impoundment) with a 900-foot high earthen impoundment.

This will be in rural Alaska on the Upper Kuskokwim - or on tributaries of the Upper Kuskokwim River. There are no roads in this region.

We're expecting that the ore will be moved by barge traffic on a river that has approximately 15 downriver subsistence communities who've lost permafrost with climate change. They're suffering extreme erosion. There have been no studies on the bow wakes impacts on these subsistence communities that are already eroding.

Another issue we have are - and by the way, that Donlin Creek mine is being - is on land, so it's being developed by one of the regional native corporations, (Chalista) Corporation.

Another issue we have is Alpine and Prudhoe Bay, where the - which have been excepted from Clean Air Act standards and regulations for a number of emissions.

We have a native population immediately adjacent to that in (Newixit), where the health aide (Rosemary Atunangarak) has witnessed an increase in asthma and upper respiratory diseases encompassing 80% of the adult population.

That Prudhoe area releases 12,000 tons of carbon monoxide a year. Nitrogen oxides are two times greater than in Washington DC just for that little subsistence community.

So that's a transportation mechanism of pipelines. And I don't know if this group considers that, but Alaska has virtually no roads to the subsistence areas. And we're impacted by transportation modalities such as pipelines and barges that result in different regulatory...

Victoria Robinson: (Two minutes).

Steve Sumida: ...impacts and health impacts.

One more I'd like to point out is Red Dog mine. This has about a 24-mile - it's in the Northwest Arctic region of Alaska. NANA Corporation is developing it. It's another native corporation.

It has lead and zinc pollution that the National Park Service has said is 2-1/2 times greater than the maximum reported downwind - or reported sampling of severely polluted regions in

Central European countries. Lead is 36,000 parts per million. Zinc is 180,000 parts per million with cleanup standards of (8000 and 100) parts per million.

I'm going to leave it there, but these are issues that we can't get out. And the subsistence communities for all of these -- for the Alpine, Red Dog, Donlin Creek -- these are Alaska Native Claim Settlement Act corporations, the one that - the ones that control Alaska native representation to NCAI and to the Alaska Federation of Natives.

Our environmental issues are not being heard. We have difficulty reaching...

Victoria Robinson: Time.

Steve Sumida: ...these groups.

And so again, thank you for the invitation.

Richard Moore: And we thank you very much for joining us.

Questions, comments, council members?

Jolene Catron: Am I off mute? Hello?

Richard Moore: Yes, go ahead.

Jolene Catron: Can you hear me?

Richard Moore: Yes, I can.

Jolene Catron: Okay. This is Jolene.

Thank you for your comments, Steve. I have a quick question. Can you please spell the creek mine, the first one that you mentioned? What - how do you spell that?

Steve Sumida: It's the Kuskokwim River. It's K-U-S-K-O-K-W-I-M. It's akin...

Jolene Catron: Okay.

Steve Sumida: ...it's somewhat parallel to the Yukon River, but its barging - its viable barging length is actually longer than the Yukon.

Jolene Catron: And what is the mine's name? I heard it as Diamond Creek.

Steve Sumida: No, it's Donlin Creek mine. It's being developed by (Chalista) Corporation and Barrick.

Jolene Catron: Please spell that?

Steve Sumida: Donlin?

Jolene Catron: Mm-hm.

Steve Sumida: D-O-N-L-I-N.

Jolene Catron: Okay, thank you.

Richard Moore: Thank you, Jolene. Did you have any other questions or comments, Jolene?

Jolene Catron: None that I can think of right offhand, thank you.

Richard Moore: Great, thank you. Council members?

Woman: Just that I think it's very helpful to have this. And Shankar is chairing the work group on goods movement and I'm sure will be taking your comments into consideration in his report.

Richard Moore: Great, thank you.

Comments/questions, council members?

Okay, well, we'd really like to thank you for joining us on today's call. And please, any additional written materials or otherwise that would be helpful to us to understand the issues would be great.

Thank you for keeping within the time frame and please give our greetings to our colleagues in Alaska. Thank you, Steve.

Jolene Catron: Richard, this is Jolene. I'm sorry. In our internal agenda, we have Steve's organization listed as the Inner-Tribal Council. It's Inter, I-N-T-E-R?

Victoria Robinson: Yes, I caught that, thank you.

Jolene Catron: Okay.

Richard Moore: Thank you, Jolene.

Okay, Victoria, I think we're ready...

Victoria Robinson: (Okay).

Richard Moore: ...to go to the next presenter.

Victoria Robinson: Operator, can you go ahead and close off Steve's line and open up the line for Rupal Patel? Have they called in yet?

Operator: They have not called in yet.

Victoria Robinson: All right, then we'll go to the next person on the list. Penny Newman from the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice.

Operator: Ms. Newman, your line is open.

Penny Newman: Thank you. Can everybody hear me?

Richard Moore: Yes, we can, Penny. Welcome to the NEJAC.

Penny Newman: Thanks Richard.

I first have to say that I'm really pleased to see that EPA has (unintelligible) by having the NEJAC continue and that's very nice to hear.

CCA EJ, the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice, was represented on the very first NEJAC committee, so we go back a long ways. And I have to tell you, Richard, we're - I'm in awe of your stamina and persistence in staying with it over all of these years.

Also like to take a moment to say hi to Sue. It's been a long time.

Sue Briggum: Hi Penny.

Penny Newman: Hi.

Sue Briggum: It's good to hear your voice.

Penny Newman: Yeah.

It's a goods movement issue. And I - we are very, very pleased to see that EPA and NEJAC are taking a specific focus on this because for the communities that I live with and work with, this is the issue. This is a real survival issue for us.

We have been working on goods movement since 1997 when the area that we're in -- Riverside, San Bernardino County area of Southern California (unintelligible) to the south and east of Los Angeles -- covers more than 30,000 square miles, most of it very open land, which is seen by Los Angeles and the ports of Los Angeles as the perfect place to put million-plus square foot warehouses, truck distribution centers, intermodal facilities, et cetera.

So we've seen over a very short period of time, a matter of five years, rural communities being converted into industrial urban areas. It's been a real shock for all of us.

In our particular area, we have - live in the South Coast air district, which is an extreme non-attainment area. And the Mira Loma/Glen Avon area, where we're located, has the highest levels of particulate pollution in the nation. We are fourth in the world, only after Jakarta, Indonesia, Calcutta, India, and Bangkok, Thailand.

USC children's health study that has been a longitudinal study going for over ten years now has identified the children in our communities as having the slowest lung growth and the weakest lung capacity of all children in Southern California due to particulate pollution.

Recently both the South Coast air district and the Southern California Association of Governments have called on our governor and on the president to issue a state of emergency for our area due to some of the statistics that come out such as 5400 premature deaths just in

the South Coast area each year due to 2.5 PM. And the urge and direction that we seem to be taking to increase the traffic, the trucks, the rail, the shipping...

Victoria Robinson: Two minutes.

Penny Newman: ...by a magnitude of three to five times.

So this is (unintelligible) issue for our communities. And I want to thank the work group for allowing me to sit in on their meeting recently and participate and it was very nice to meet Omega and Joyce and share our stories, and of course always with Shankar.

We are very eager to help out in any way to add to our understanding of the goods movement and its impact on community health and air. And anything that we can do to provide information and input, we would very much like to participate in that effort.

I'd also like to bring to the attention of people and invite all of you and to urge you to share the information with others that there will be a community conference on goods movement to take place in the city of Carson on November 30 and December 1 of this year that will look at the impact and try to come up from a community perspective what the solutions need to be to really make our communities healthy.

If people would like more information, you can contact me. Our web site is...

Victoria Robinson: One minute.

Penny Newman: ....ccaej.org or call 323-442-2745. And we welcome this. We're looking at this as an international conference. We're in the process of trying to find scholarship money to bring our sisters and brothers from around the country to get your impact.

Certainly the face of goods movement is very diverse, very - it's on a lot of different areas. And to try and get that full picture, we need the participation of everyone.

Thank you.

Richard Moore: Great. Thank you, Penny. I would also like to just to thank you and - for the many, many years of work in behalf of and with communities, not only in California, but throughout the country.

Penny Newman: Oh, thank you, Richard. Coming from you that's very nice.

Richard Moore: And please, get that information to us, Penny, on that conference in November please?

Penny Newman: I will, thank you.

Richard Moore: Okay, council members, please, comments/questions?

Woman: Is Penny a member of the work group?

Richard Moore: Shankar?



Hello?

Woman: This is (unintelligible). No, Penny is not a member of the work group, although she did attend our face-to-face meeting and she provided a lot of valuable input.

And we look forward to her - we'll be - I'll be talking with her after this call, probably tomorrow, to discuss some involvement by our organization.

Woman: That sounds great.

Richard Moore: Okay, comments/questions, council members?

Joyce King: Mr. Chair, this is Joyce.

Are we going to distribute the information that Penny gave us?

Victoria Robinson: Which information is that?

Richard Moore: (Unintelligible).

Victoria Robinson: Are you talking about the information from this call?

Joyce King: No, on Mira Loma.

Victoria Robinson: That's going to be included I think in the meeting summary from the face-to-face meeting.

Joyce King: Yes, okay.

Victoria Robinson: Yeah.

Joyce King: Just wanted to make sure.

((Crosstalk))

Victoria Robinson: ...to the members.

Richard Moore: All right. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

Comments/questions, council members?

Okay, well, you know, again, Penny, we thank you, you know, for your comments and we look forward to you continuing to work with the working group and with the NEJAC Council as we move forward on our final (unintelligible). So thank you.

Again, Victoria, I think we're ready to go to the next presenter.

Victoria Robinson: Operator, we'll go ahead now and open the mic for LeVonne Stone from the Fort Ord Environmental Justice Network.

Operator: Ms. Stone, your line is now open.

LeVonne Stone: Hello?

Richard Moore: Yes, welcome to the NEJAC Council.

LeVonne Stone: Okay.

Yes, I wanted to make some comments to the fact that the - I'm concerned about environmental justice and who is it really represents because as a black American, we're running into all kinds of problems with getting mentorship, funds, resources, and any kind of help with writing grants.

We also have a very serious complaints. We have two very serious complaints starting in 2003 with the EPA concerning our federal facilities because nobody in the environmental justice - the NEJAC or CEJAC is willing to really take on this problem of addressing the concerns of communities and the health concerns and the economic concerns with federal facilities and any health effects at all I have never seen addressed.

The cancers and all of the other illnesses are rampant. We have a landfill (unintelligible) moved to another site, a street that's 150 acres. And then on the other side where they moved the landfill from, they're building all these nice fancy houses.

The other old houses are being torn down around the residents. The debris - construction debris is in the air. Wind is blowing. And everybody's saying no, that's not our area, go here, go there.

And the problem even with - within the NEJAC and all of the other JACs is that there is no really - real communication across the board. There is nobody seems to know what anybody else is doing and it's very convenient to put the responsibility or blame on some other department within these agencies.

That needs to stop in our country. This is 2007. That needs to stop. It needs to be broken down. It needs to be on the agenda.

Okay, I know I have to talk fast here or I'm going to be cut off.

And we always have to wait. We're the public that needs to be served and we always have to wait until the end of everything. Hours can go by and we'll still be waiting and listening and hoping we're going to get a chance to let somebody know what's going on.

We now - and out here, we now have to deal with the problem of being sprayed with a new pesticide called CheckMate OLR-F, which has never been used in the United States of America. It was used once in Australia. Australia has all of this open land and nobody knows the context of how this stuff was being used.

We're the people that have to go out, call up. The US EPA signed off on this chemical. And we never had any knowledge of it months ago. Now here we are.

I got a notice on Thursday that they were going to have this meeting set up on a Monday and it was like a cattle drive where they're sitting behind the table wanting to talk to people one on one. Then they're supposed to start spraying on September 5.

These things are gel pellets which will come down on you like rain. They have the ability - they have an exemption to spray it on our gardens, on our houses, residential areas, everywhere. Seaside and Marina does not even grow fruit or vegetables, but we are some of the main people to be sprayed with this stuff.

And people are asking well, why isn't Pacific Grove and Santa Cruz and all of these people that don't have large minority populations, why aren't they getting sprayed? And nobody has answered us.

This is very serious. We are writing the governor's office. We're calling Washington. We're trying to do everything that we can. I know I am in this very short time frame.

You know, we are tired of this, all of this fighting that we have to do and we don't even make a paycheck.

The city - how you become a member of NEJAC is another thing. You know, who - why is there certain people picked to be members or to be a internal part of the process because that seems to be the only way to get something done is you have to be right there fighting for your particular part of whatever it is that's going on and hoping that somebody's going to hear you and somebody is going to lend an ear and say yeah, we need to look at this part of the earth or this part of the universe over here (unintelligible).

Victoria Robinson: Time.

LeVonne Stone: There's 8000 acres of contaminated munitions, which some of it right now is due to be turned over to the Reuse Group, who has shown no respect for the residents or the community groups who live and work here.

We need some help. We really need to know where environmental justice is and where it's going and what is all of these conversations about.

Richard Moore: Great. Thank you, ma'am. I can assure you that the sentiment that you're expressing is a sentiment that many of us that have been in the environmental justice movement for many, many years have had.

Charles or Victoria, there was a question about how do you get on the NEJAC Council. Could one of you please respond to that?

Victoria Robinson: Yes.

Can you hear me?

Richard Moore: Yes, ma'am.

Victoria Robinson: Okay.

The process is where it's a self-nomination process or - in which you indicate your interest of serving on the NEJAC. And we do go through the membership one or two - one or twice - two times every two years depending on cycle that we have for our members.

And what I was going to is - and I'll explain it now, but I'm going to be sending out an email on the listserv, which explains that what you need to do is you need to in order to get into our pot if you will, our poll of potential members is to send a resume, an up-to-date resume, as well as a letter of recommendation from another party about your willingness and interest and applicability of serving on the NEJAC.

And then we put that into our files. And when we go through the process of appointing new members, we will be looking through that - those - that pool of resumes.

Richard Moore: Great. Thank you, Victoria.

Council members, comments/questions?

Donele Wilkins: Richard, it's Donele. I just have a question. Where did the caller say she was calling from?

Richard Moore: Yes, could you please repeat that, please? Repeat your name again please and where you're calling from and your...

LeVonne Stone: This is - okay, this is LeVonne Stone. I'm the director of the Ford Ord Environmental...

Richard Moore: Okay, Victoria?

Victoria Robinson: Yes, we do not have any other individuals for public comment unless Rupal Patel has joined us? Operator, have they joined us yet?

Operator: They have still not joined.

Victoria Robinson: Okay, fine. Then we no - we have no more public comments. The public comment will be closed.

And it is three minutes to 4:00.

Richard Moore: Okay.

Well, the council members, I think you would agree that we've - for a first teleconference call that we've tried, I would like to thank those technical providers that have been assisting us in this process, the operators and so on. And I'm going to leave it at that. Is there any other closing comments?

Chris Holmes: Yeah, Richard, I was very impressed by the presentations and the complaints and the problems that people had (unintelligible) this is Chris Holmes - that people had in that conference call.

I mean, it really motivates me as to why I'm on this board. I think it's tremendous that they're able to air it and that we're able to learn (it). So thank you.

Richard Moore: Thank you.

Comments/questions? I mean, the comments (unintelligible) council members?

Comments/questions, Victoria, Charles?

Man: (Unintelligible) finished.

Victoria Robinson: No.

I think that it went well and we are - we will be exploring ways to improve the process for the future calls. I know that you as members have asked to consider having maybe once a quarter a public teleconference call. And I think that can be doable if this is any indication.

But we know that there are some quirks and we'll be working on that and looking for ways to expand the number of individuals who are actually trying to dial in to a call and giving a little bit more flexibility to them.

But we've got to honor the purpose of the call and that is to - and be able to support that through maintaining and reducing any audio loss from excess noise, like this ambient noise off of lines, things like that.

So - but it's been good. And I appreciate everybody's patience on this. And if there's any suggestions, please, you have my email. You can contact me.

For those of you on the call, you can contact our contractor, who you've been dealing with already, and they'll pass that information on to me.

Richard Moore: Great. Thank you, Victoria.

Victoria Robinson: Thank you.

Richard Moore: I think with that said, we will see in you in Detroit.

Victoria Robinson: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Baltimore.

Richard Moore: I mean in Detroit. Thank you. Thank you for reminding me.

Woman: Well, we'll take you in Detroit.

Richard Moore: I will be going to the wrong place, but I'll hang out with Donele for a couple days and then go to Baltimore.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Donele won't be in Detroit. She'll be in Baltimore.

Richard Moore: Exactly.

Woman: All right.

Richard Moore: Again, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you all very much for your all's participation.

Women: Thank you.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thanks Charles.

Man: Bye.

END