

MEETING SUMMARY

of the

WASTE AND FACILITY SITING SUBCOMMITTEE

of the

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COUNCIL

**April 15, 2004
New Orleans, Louisiana**

Meeting Summary Accepted By:

**Dr. Andrew Sawyers
Chair**

**Kent Benjamin
Designated Federal Official**

**Michael Lythcott
Vice Chair**

CHAPTER EIGHT MEETING OF THE WASTE AND FACILITY SITING SUBCOMMITTEE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) conducted a one-day meeting on Thursday, April 15, 2004, during a four-day meeting of the NEJAC in New Orleans, Louisiana. Dr. Andrew Sawyers, Environmental Justice Coordinator, Maryland Department of the Environment, was elected as the new chair of the subcommittee. Mr. Kent Benjamin, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER), continues to serve as the Designated Federal Official (DFO) for the subcommittee. Exhibit 8-1 lists the members who attended the meeting and identifies the member who was unable to attend.

This chapter, which summarizes the deliberations of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee, is organized in five sections, including this *Introduction*. Section 2.0, *Remarks*, summarizes the opening remarks of the chair and the DFO. Section 3.0, *Activities of the Subcommittee*, summarizes the activities of the subcommittee, which included updates on the status of three work groups of the subcommittee and an update on the subcommittee's *Strategic Work Plan*. Section 4.0, *Presentations and Reports*, provides an overview of OSWER updates delivered on four presentations. Section 5.0, *Action Items*, summarizes the action items adopted by the subcommittee.

2.0 REMARKS

Dr. Sawyers, chair of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee, opened the meeting by welcoming the subcommittee members present and Mr. Benjamin, the DFO. Dr. Sawyers commended the work of the subcommittee and affirmed that the members have provided good leadership for the NEJAC. He went on to say that one of the goals of the meeting would be to identify projects that fall within the purview of the subcommittee and that could make a substantial improvement in people's lives over the next few years. He emphasized the importance of gauging progress in terms of tangible, "on-the-ground" improvements and of developing metrics for measuring the success of the projects implemented.

Mr. Benjamin stated that the agenda of the meeting would include reviewing the status of the activities of the subcommittee's three work groups that focus on the following issues:

- Five Priorities
- Unintended Impacts
- Federal Facilities

He stated that these reviews would be followed by an update on the *Strategic Work Plan* of the subcommittee and presentations from representatives of OSWER.

Exhibit 8-1

WASTE AND FACILITY SITING SUBCOMMITTEE

Members Who Attended the Meeting on April 15, 2004

Dr. Andrew Sawyers, *Chair*
Mr. Michael Lythcott, *Vice Chair*
Mr. Kent Benjamin, *DFO*

Ms. Michelle Alvarez
Mr. Robert Collin
Mr. Randall Gee
Mr. Robert Harris
Mr. Mosi Kitwana
Ms. Mary Nelson
Mr. John Ridgway
Ms. Connie Tucker
Mr. Vincent Wardlaw

Members Who Were Unable To Attend

Ms. Judith Espinosa

3.0 ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

Exhibit 8-2

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER)
The Five Priorities**

1. **Emergency Response and Homeland Security:** Every year, OSWER's Emergency Response Program conducts or oversees hundreds of emergency responses to clean up oil spills and hazardous substance releases. OSWER ensures that the cleanup is appropriate, timely, and minimizes human and environmental risks. OSWER's Emergency Response Program provides the people and skills necessary to respond to national security threats faced by this country. The possibility of future terrorists attacks or other large-scale disasters necessitate a national response that is immediate, protective, and preventive.
2. **One Cleanup Program:** The One Cleanup Program (OCP) is OSWER's vision for how different cleanup programs at all levels of government can work together to improve the coordination, speed, and effectiveness of cleanups at the nations' contaminated sites. OCP encourages improved collaboration among EPA cleanup programs with state, tribal, local, and other federal agency programs and stakeholders. For information on the One Cleanup Program, go to <http://www.epa.gov/oswer/onecleanupprogram>.
3. **Land Revitalization:** The Land Revitalization Agenda (LRA) promotes the reuse of once-contaminated sites in order to revitalize America's communities. Because cleanup and reuse are mutually supportive goals, property, reuse should be an integral part of the way OSWER does business. To learn more about OSWER's Land Revitalization Initiative, go to <http://www.epa.gov/oswer/landrevitalization>.
4. **Energy Recovery, Recycling & Waste Minimization:** The Resource Conservation Challenge (RCC) is a major cross-Agency initiative that identifies innovation, flexible, and more productive ways to conserve natural resources through (1) materials pollution prevention, recycling and reuse; (2) reducing chemicals in all their uses; and (3) conserving energy and materials. The RCC also includes a retail component that educates consumers about resource conservation opportunities. For more information about the Resource Conservation Challenge, go to <http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/osw/conserve/>.
5. **Workforce Development:** OSWER is committed to developing the full potential of its workforce by encouraging creativity and innovation, providing career development opportunities, and assuring that a diverse pool of qualified candidates is available for all OSWER job opportunities.

This section discusses the activities of the subcommittee, which included providing progress reports of the three work groups of the subcommittee. This section also provides an update on the subcommittee's *Strategic Work Plan*.

3.1 Five Priorities Work Group

Ms. Marjorie Buckholtz, Director, EPA Innovation, Partnership, and Communications Office OSWER, provided an update on the status of the Five Priorities Work Group of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee. A description of the five priorities is presented in Exhibit 8-2.

Ms. Buckholtz stated that one of the goals of the Work Group is to encourage open discussion among members of the subcommittee about how they can help implement the five priorities and develop relevant projects that produce net environmental improvements and tangible results. She emphasized that the underlying theme for the priorities falls under the rubric of innovation and that the priorities provide the opportunity and funding for testing new ideas. Ms. Buckholtz asked the subcommittee members to submit proposals for projects they are interested in pursuing. Mr. Michael J. Lythcott, the Lythcott Company and Vice-Chair of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee of the NEJAC, asked a question regarding the Emergency Response and Homeland Security priority; he asked if EPA was directing its efforts toward better coordination among first responders to emergency situations. Ms.

Buckholtz responded by saying that there is work going on in that area, although it is insufficient. She stated that a project in this area could potentially be pursued as an innovation pilot test under the priority, and she encouraged Mr. Lythcott to submit a proposal that particularly addresses cultural barriers and tailoring response actions to the needs of diverse communities.

Ms. Buckholtz provided another example of an initiative that the subcommittee could undertake that would fall under the Land Revitalization priority. The initiative would involve assessing existing watershed pilot studies of various sites to determine ways that they could be integrated with redevelopment activities. She mentioned that Ms. Dale Matey, EPA Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (OSRTI) would be the point of contact for this project.

Ms. Linda Garczynski, Director EPA Office of Brownfields Cleanup and Redevelopment, provided a status update on the institutional controls tracking effort under the Land Revitalization priority. She stated that geographic information system (GIS) software is being used as a tool to overlay data pertaining to institutional controls with locational information in order to assist in implementing, monitoring, and enforcing the controls. She pointed out that the data in the system currently is basic in nature and that local governments usually are responsible for adding information to the system for the sites in their jurisdiction.

Dr. Sawyers followed with a general question about whether there were focused efforts to clean up smaller brownfields communities. Ms. Garczynski responded that approximately 52 percent of the brownfields grants awarded by EPA are issued to communities with a population of less than 100,000. In addition, EPA is conducting many outreach activities to provide direct support to communities without grants. She stated that EPA is providing some type of funding to all 50 states and 40 tribes to assess resources in order to provide support to communities.

Mr. Lythcott noted that there is growing concern about the negative impact of brownfields developers on low-income communities, even with what has been defined as “acceptable levels of displacement” in brownfields policies. He also stated that under the brownfields program, developers are provided with preassembled parcels of land to reduce their risk and ensure a definite return on their investments. He asked whether anyone is looking into this matter and whether there is a way that EPA can leverage its influence on investors to convince them to invest correctly. Dr. Sawyers responded that the subcommittee should develop a more structured effort to look into this matter. He suggested meeting with Mr. Lythcott to further discuss the issue. Mr. Mosi Kitwana, International City/County Management Association (ICMA) and member of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee, added that the issue of displacement is largely a local one. He added, however, that the subcommittee does have the potential to have a significant impact on the matter and that it is worthy of debate. He went on to suggest that he could organize a meeting to further discuss this issue and possibly include it as a separate session at the upcoming brownfields conference.

Mr. Lythcott raised another question about cleanup standards for revitalized sites as well as “fence-line communities” that continuously are underfunded. He asked whether there is room for such communities to have a stronger say in establishing the level of cleanup and whether there are ways to funnel more resources to them. Dr. Sawyers asked Mr. Lythcott to speak with Ms. Buckholtz about how the subcommittee can address this issue. Mr. Benjamin and Ms. Buckholtz added that including the issue in the *Strategic Work Plan* of the Subcommittee could help make a strong case for discussion and possible implementation.

In the context of helping to implement OSWER’s five priorities, Mr. Kitwana emphasized that there are many plans being initiated at the local level that Federal agencies are not aware of and vice versa. Therefore, he recommended that the members of the subcommittee investigate ways to interact with external associations, such as those working with state and local governments, for the purposes of enhancing subcommittee planning and product development. He stated that this interaction would help the subcommittee to assess the work of other associations and to focus its own efforts.

Dr. Sawyers stated that currently there is no point of contact for the Energy Recovery, Recycling, and Waste Minimization priority. He volunteered to be the temporary point of contact until a permanent one is assigned. Mr. Randall Gee, the Cherokee Nation and member of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee, volunteered to be the point of contact for the Workforce Development priority.

In response to Ms. Buckholtz's update on OSWER's five priorities, members of the subcommittee discussed how they can align their initiatives with those of OSWER. They discussed the possibility

of identifying pilot projects under each of the priorities. Specifically, under the Land Revitalization priority, they agreed to develop recommendations for improving emergency response plans and the reporting of stored hazardous chemicals for chemical plants located in environmental justice communities. Ms. Buckholtz offered to set up a meeting between the subcommittee members and Ms. Debbie Dietrich, Director, EPA Office of Emergency Prevention, Preparedness, and Response, if they were interested in developing a project in the area of homeland security. Mr. John Ridgway, Washington State Department of Ecology and member of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee, volunteered to be the point of contact for this effort and to initiate further discussions. He mentioned that he has 14 years of experience with the Community Right-To-Know Initiative.

Dr. Sawyers concluded the session by stating that there are good opportunities for the subcommittee to partner with OSWER and that the recommendations discussed should be formalized during the afternoon session of the meeting.

3.2 Unintended Impacts Work Group

Mr. Butch Wardlaw, WPI and member of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee, provided a status update on the activities of the Unintended Impacts Work Group. Mr. Wardlaw continued by stating that although EPA considered the redevelopment aspects of the projects to be successful, the projects may have had negative unintended impacts such as displacement of residents or unfair compensation for land taken from communities. The focus of the study was on lessons learned, impacts on key stakeholders, identifiable trends, and realistic recommendations for EPA. Based on the study, members of the Work Group developed a draft report titled *Unintended Consequences of Environmental Redevelopment in Five Environmental Justice Communities: A Critical Exploration* (the unintended impacts report). The report contains an analysis of five place study locations around the United States and provides recommendations based on an assessment of the quantitative and qualitative impacts of

Exhibit 8-3

PLACE STUDY LOCATIONS AND PRIMARY RESEARCHERS FOR UNINTENDED IMPACTS WORK GROUP STUDY

- East Palo Alto, California, EPA Region 9 - John Ridgway
- Albina Community, Portland, Oregon, EPA Region 10 - Robert Collin
- Pensacola, Florida, EPA Region 4 - Michael Lythcott
- Washington, DC, Navy Yard, EPA Region 3 - Butch Wardlaw
- Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma, EPA Region 6 - Randall Gee

redevelopment projects at these locations. The five place study locations and the primary researcher for each are listed in Exhibit 8-3. Mr. Robert Collin, Department of Environmental Studies, University of Oregon and member of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee, clarified that place studies differ from case studies in that place studies are specific to a site and its unique characteristics, which cannot be generalized. The five sites were analyzed in this manner to protect their social, cultural, and economic integrity. The recommendations in the report focus on minimizing negative unintended impacts and on capitalizing on positive unintended impacts.

Dr. Sawyers stressed the importance of articulating the success of the East Palo Alto place study analysis to the Executive Council of the NEJAC. He added that it is important for the authors to maintain objectivity throughout the report, even though they may have some degree of personal knowledge about the sites analyzed. Ms. Mary Nelson, Bethel New Life, Inc. and member of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee, added that the recommendations in the report need to be more specific; in addition, if overarching themes are present, they should be identified as well. Ms. Garczynski added that if any of the authors would like to speak with her regarding brownfields issues in the context of the report, she could make herself available.

Mr. Wardlaw asked the members of the subcommittee to review the report in order to assess its readability and the strength of its conclusions, provide input on how the recommendations in the

report can be refined in a way that is useful for EPA, and provide recommendations on how to distribute the final report.

The members of the subcommittee agreed to review the draft report and provide comments. Mr. Lythcott stated that the final report can be used as a basis for making recommendations to the Executive Council and EPA with regards to actions that can minimize negative unintended impacts of redevelopment projects.

3.3 Federal Facilities Working Group

Dr. Mildred McClain, Harambee House, Inc., provided an update on the status of the Federal Facilities Working Group of the subcommittee. The Working Group was established to pursue the first goal identified in the subcommittee's *Strategic Work Plan*, which described in Exhibit 8-4.

Dr. McClain stated that the Working Group was able to accomplish the first two objectives. For the first objective, Dr. McClain was assigned to act as a liaison between the Working Group and the subcommittee. Ms. Trina Martynowicz, EPA OSWER Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office (FFRRO), was assigned as the DFO for the Working Group. For the second objective, the subcommittee was in regular, direct contact with the Working Group to provide feedback and advice as necessary on the selection of case studies. Once the case studies were selected, the Working Group prepared a draft report, *Environmental Justice and Federal Facilities: Recommendations for Improving Stakeholder Relations Between Federal Facilities and Environmental Justice Communities*. The subcommittee reviewed the report and provided comments. The Executive Council of the NEJAC then received the report and also provided comments. Dr. McClain stated that work on the third and fourth objectives currently is in progress.

Exhibit 8-4

FIRST GOAL IN THE WASTE AND FACILITY SITING SUBCOMMITTEE STRATEGIC WORK PLAN

The Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee has identified three main goals and their respective objectives to be pursued for fiscal years 2003 and 2004. The first goal states:

Strengthen the role of community residents in the cleanup and disposition of Federal properties through the work of the NEJAC Federal Facilities Working Group (FFWG)

The objectives to achieve the goal include:

- 1.1. Establish collaborative and close coordination between the work of the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee and that of the FFWG
- 1.2. Assist the FFWG in identifying case studies whose key issues of concern will be evaluated to develop general principles based on examples from actual sites
- 1.3. Compile a list of resources available to communities to assist them in participating more effectively in the cleanup of Federal properties
- 1.4. Provide a forum for dialogue between Federal agencies and communities impacted by Federal facilities

Dr. McClain provided a brief overview of the process used to produce the draft report, which presents best practices to encourage closer collaboration and coordination between Federal facilities and impacted communities. The report identifies and evaluates key issues of concern to environmental justice communities with regard to activities and operations at and around Federal facilities and presents a set of national policy recommendations to address these issues. The information in the report was based on Working Group visits to five Federal facilities. These visits were conducted to identify and examine common variables associated with stakeholder participation within environmental justice communities. The sites visited are identified in Exhibit 8-5.

Dr. McClain stated that the report provides five recommendations and three considerations to strengthen the role of community residents in the cleanup and disposition of Federal properties. Mr. Jim Woolford, Director, EPA FFRRO, added that the recommendations currently are very general in nature and can apply both to Superfund and brownfields sites. Dr. McClain mentioned the need to refine the language in the recommendations; make the format of the recommendations consistent; identify an appropriate location in the report for each recommendation; and elaborate on ways that the recommendations can be implemented, especially with regard to the issue of Alaskan

Exhibit 8-5**SITES VISITED BY THE FEDERAL FACILITIES WORKING GROUP TO PREPARE THE DRAFT REPORT**

- Fort Wingate Army Depot Activity, Gallup, New Mexico
- Hanford 100-Area (USDOE), Hanford, Washington
- Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas
- Defense Depot Memphis, Memphis, Tennessee
- Savannah River Site (USDOE), Savannah, South Carolina

communities and Federal facilities. She requested that the members of the subcommittee respond to recommendations made by the members to the Executive Council of the NEJAC regarding the draft report.

Dr. McClain pointed out that there are glaring omissions in the report involving references and specific recommendations to the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD). She recognized the difficulty of bringing

DoD to the table and stated that dialogue is needed in this area. Ms. Nelson added that it is necessary to meet with appropriate DoD officials in order to get their input on this subject. She stated that DoD does not have an environmental justice coordinator at this point and that the NEJAC should begin by convincing DoD of the importance of appointing a coordinator.

In response to Dr. McClain's presentation on the Federal Facilities Working Group's draft report, members of the subcommittee discussed the importance of inviting Federal facility representatives to participate in meetings with the Working Group. The members expressed concern about the number of DoD sites that have environmental justice issues.

Dr. McClain mentioned the importance of looking into ways to continue the activities initiated by the Working Group, as it will be disbanded in the near future. Dr. Sawyers responded that in order to ensure that the draft report is made final in a timely manner and minimal additional resources are used, the time period for comment solicitation will be extended by a maximum of one month, and the guidelines for providing comments will be stringent.

3.4 Update on *Strategic Work Plan* of the Subcommittee

Dr. Sawyers and Mr. Lythcott jointly moderated a discussion of the subcommittee's *Strategic Work Plan*. They opened the discussion by asking members of the subcommittee as well as others present at the meeting to review the *Strategic Work Plan* and provide comments or recommendations for updates. Dr. Sawyers mentioned that the document identifies three main goals. For goal 1, which is under the purview of the Federal Facilities Working Group, he suggested including a "best practices" section in the draft report that the Working Group prepared and identifying ways to collaborate with Federal facilities in order to address environmental justice issues. For goal 3, objective 3-1, "*Establishing ongoing contacts with OSWER staff responsible for the five primary priorities identified by OSWER Assistant Administrator Marianne Lamont Horinko*," Dr. Sawyers suggested adding two more objectives to include (1) working closely with OSWER to implement its priorities and (2) using OSWER programs and concerns to guide the efforts of the subcommittee. He also encouraged the subcommittee members to begin identifying potential new projects for the subcommittee to consider implementing. He reiterated the example of assessing existing watershed pilot studies of various sites under the Land Revitalization priority to determine ways that they could be integrated with redevelopment activities.

Members of the subcommittee agreed to develop recommendations under the Land Revitalization priority for improving emergency response plans and the reporting of stored hazardous chemicals for chemical plants located in environmental justice communities.

They also agreed to review the subcommittee's *Strategic Work Plan* and use the progress update handouts to acknowledge goals that have been completed. The members also agreed to add new tasks to existing goals in the document. Mr. Benjamin asked the subcommittee members to consider the issues discussed at the meeting and to identify any issues that may be important enough to "rise" to the level requiring a working group to be established. He also suggested updating the *Strategic Work Plan* to cover up to the next 2½ years so that new subcommittee members will have a plan in place when they begin their terms. Mr. Kitwana suggested adding objective 2.3 to goal 2 in order to build more effective partnerships in overall planning. He suggested that the members of the subcommittee investigate ways to interact with external associations, such as those working with state and local governments, for the purposes of enhancing subcommittee planning and product development. He also brought up the issue that the work of the subcommittee does not appear to have been distributed equally among all the members. He stated that there is a need to reassess how work is divided. He asked the subcommittee to consider strategies for more effectively getting the work done and for obtaining further resources.

Some members of the subcommittee questioned the importance of the subcommittee's efforts and whether they have been helpful to communities. Other members mentioned that OSWER approves of and supports the subcommittee's work and that many of the products generated by the subcommittee are used by OSWER. Mr. Kitwana made the point that if the work of the subcommittee is valuable, more resources need to be provided for the subcommittee to continue making progress in its activities.

Mr. Lythcott brought up the point that many of the members of the subcommittee are nearing the end of their terms and that institutional knowledge can be lost if it is not passed on. Mr. Ridgway added that the process of appointing new subcommittee members currently is taking a long time. He stated that if the process can be expedited, new members will have more time to interact with existing members and gain institutional knowledge before the existing members finish their terms.

4.0 PRESENTATIONS AND REPORTS

This section summarizes the presentations made and reports submitted to the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee.

The members of the subcommittee heard presentations from representatives of EPA OSWER, including Ms. Pat Carey, Ms. Tammie Owen, Ms. Glynis Hill, Mr. Vernon Myers, and Mr. Benjamin. The presenters provided updates on various OSWER initiatives and policies.

Ms. Carey provided an update on the Superfund Interim Policy on Permanent Relocation. Development of the policy was initiated in 1995 based on a request made by the Waste and Facility Siting Subcommittee. The Escambia Superfund site in Pensacola, Florida was chosen as a pilot project, and seven forums were held to gather stakeholder input. In 1999, the Interim Policy was issued. Ms. Carey stated that a lot of progress has been made under this policy since it was issued. For example, in March 2002, five facilitated focus groups convened in Pensacola, Florida, to assess the relocation process at the Escambia site. The focus groups helped to raise many issues, such as relocation support services, appraisal and identification of comparable housing, relocation payments, inspections, and problem resolution processes. Ms. Carey stated that 19 relocations have occurred under the policy and that three more are ongoing. Mr. Lythcott added that the efforts carried out by Ms. Carey's office should be described in the unintended impacts report.

Ms. Owen discussed the Hazardous Waste Targeting Project, which aims to provide incentives to companies for reducing the use of chemicals. The project is part of the National Waste Minimization Partnership program, a voluntary initiative with the aim of providing companies with incentives to go beyond compliance. She stated that future goals of the project will include using GIS programs to locate facilities with high volumes of chemical releases and providing the information to regional coordinators who can encourage facilities to participate in the Partnership program.

Ms. Hill and Mr. Myers presented an update on the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) Demographics Study findings, elaborating on the progress under the Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) at facilities permitted under RCRA. The purpose of the study was to develop a GPRA environmental justice database and summary report to serve as screening tools. The tools were used to compare GPRA progress made near RCRA-permitted facilities and corrective action facilities in potential environmental justice communities to progress made near such facilities in potential non-environmental justice communities. Each facility was then determined to be in a potential environmental justice or non-environmental justice community.

The database developed as a result of the study can be queried, and the data can be summarized and graphically presented to show differences in progress between facilities in potential environmental justice and non-environmental justice communities. The database also can be used with a GIS application to generate maps that provide a visual comparison of facilities that are not under control to GPRA RCRA-permitted facilities. Mr. Myers added that many sites were not included in the study because good locational data was not available for the GIS. Dr. Sawyers stated that he would like to look into this study in more detail, and identify any trends.

Mr. Benjamin summarized some accomplishments of OSWER in 2003. He stated that OSWER sent the Office of Environmental Justice a "success stories" report for fiscal year 1999 through 2001 that includes progress made in the environmental justice arena. He said that the first OSWER Environmental Justice Awards were issued in the categories of "Individual EPA Staff," "EPA Teams," and "Community-based Organization." Other accomplishments included the Office of Underground Storage Tanks organizing its first roundtable discussion of environmental justice issues and OSWER kicking off its first environmental justice training program by providing training to all its senior managers.

5.0 ACTION ITEMS

This section summarizes the action items adopted by the subcommittee.

- T Identify potential projects that can be conducted as pilot tests under the five priorities of OSWER and prepare proposals for the projects
- T Consider developing recommendations related to improving emergency response plans for chemical plants located in environmental justice communities
- T Assess existing watershed pilot studies of various sites under the Land Revitalization priority to determine ways that they can be integrated with redevelopment activities
- T Set up a meeting between Dr. Sawyers and Mr. Lythcott to develop a more structured effort addressing the issue of negative impacts of brownfields developers on low-income communities, even with what has been defined as "acceptable levels of displacement" in brownfields policies
- T Set up a meeting between Mr. Lythcott and Ms. Buckholtz to discuss how the subcommittee can address the issue of communities needing a stronger say in establishing levels of cleanup at revitalization sites

- T Review and provide comments on the draft unintended impacts report
- T Add information on the Superfund Interim Policy on Permanent Relocation and the work done by Ms. Carey's office to the draft unintended impacts report.
- T Respond to recommendations made by the NEJAC Executive Council regarding the draft report prepared by the Federal Facilities Working Group
- T Look into the database produced as a result of the RCRA Demographics Study to identify any trends
- T Look through the *Strategic Work Plan*, and make recommendations for plan updates to cover up to the next 2½ years
- T Consider topics discussed at the meeting and identify issues that may be important enough to warrant the establishment of a working group
- T Investigate ways for the subcommittee to interact with external associations, such as those working with state and local governments, for the purposes of enhancing subcommittee planning and product development