

**Texas Commission on Environmental Quality**  
**Pollution Prevention Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
February 27, 2006

**Location:**

12100 Park 35 Circle  
Building F – Room 5108  
Austin, TX 78753

The meeting began at approximately 9:15 a.m.

The following PPAC members participated in the meeting: Melanie Barnes (co-chair), Sharla Hotchkiss, Luke Metzger, Berna Dette Williams, Candace Broucher, Robert Gill, Jim Cumbest, Debbie Boyle, Fred Shannon, and Bee Moorhead. Matt Baker, Brian Christian, Jennifer Allis Ahrens and James Voelker participated in the meeting as TCEQ staff as well as Thomas Shook from the Texas Building and Procurement Commission.

**Introductions**

After the committee members introduced themselves, Matt Baker provided a brief update of Small Business and Environmental Assistance (SBEA) activities. Mr. Baker reported that upon taking the position as Director in September, he had requested that staff evaluate all programs that were currently being implemented by the division. He noted that he had asked that this review take place with environmental benefits in mind, with special attention to programs that might not provide maximum benefits and programs that might not be the best use of limited staff time and limited resources. He also reported that priority projects will be those that match the three main priorities identified by management: air quality, water quality, and water conservation.

Mr. Baker pointed to two programs that the division would be focusing on enhancing: EMS certification for larger facilities and the site assistance visit (SAV) program. He also reported that efforts will be made to expand on recognition and incentives provided to Clean Texas, Cleaner World members. He suggested that a main focus in all of these efforts will be to show results. As an example of the type of project staff may be looking to implement, he pointed to the effort to document results of a zero-emissions livestock feeding operation. He noted that reducing emissions from agricultural operations is a priority in the watershed.

Sharla Hotchkiss asked for additional clarification on the three priorities Mr. Baker had identified. Mr. Baker responded that air quality efforts will focus especially on non-attainment areas. He suggested that water quality would be another priority. Finally, he noted that water conservation would be an agency priority, especially in West Texas. He suggested that efforts were under way to attempt to coordinate with the Governor's office to base any financial or regulatory incentives more on commitments to strong environmental practices. He also noted that there will be a greater focus on personal responsibility and what personal measures will be need to achieve environmental goals. He pointed to Drive Clean Across Texas and Keep Texas Beautiful as two programs that could be expanded on to created a better identity more in line with a program such as Don't Mess With Texas.

Melanie Barnes asked if the agency could play more of a role in work with the Texas Congressional delegation to deal with water quantity issues. Brian Christian responded that the

agency is required to typically stay away from anything that might appear to be lobbying. Mr. Baker suggested that efforts will be made to pull together what information is already available to make it readily available to everyone. Ms. Barnes suggested that some federal subsidies might encourage practices that use more water as opposed to encouraging water conservation. Ms. Hotchkiss noted that many communities are already providing information on practices such as xeriscaping. Mr. Baker suggested that information on that type of personal choice or personal responsibility is the type of information these efforts will work to provide. He noted that it will be necessary to show people the benefits of these practices. Mr. Christian suggested that the Water Conservation Task Force had addressed some of these issues. He noted that in their findings, they had suggested that any mandates would be best to come from local authorities, but the TCEQ could provide information to build on their efforts and promote personal measures that individuals could implement.

### **SBEA—New Directions and Initiatives**

Brian Christian provided additional information on potential changes to SBEA and Pollution Prevention and Industry Assistance (PPIA) programs, as well as information on agency goals and priorities that had been planned for later in the meeting. He noted that with the Environmental Management System (EMS) statute passed by the legislature, EMS had become a priority for PPIA, often at the expense of other programs. In assuming the role of manager of PPIA, Mr. Christian noted that he had focused specifically on analyzing how the EMS statute had been implemented, as well as what the legislature had intended through the EMS legislation. He also noted that an added focus was how Clean Texas, Cleaner World (CTCW) could be made more accessible by returning to the basics of EMS. He reported that management is still being briefed on proposed changes, but he can say that there will still be a CTCW program, EMS will continue to be a part of CTCW, and staff will still conduct site assistance visits. He suggested that an overriding goal in making any changes is to bring PPIA more in line with core agency priorities.

Mr. Christian reported that PPIA staff will no longer be implementing two programs, Hospitals for a Healthy Environment (H2E) and mercury reduction efforts aside from those mandated by HB 2793. He noted that H2E is not a high priority for the agency, and that no significant risks were found in the visits that were conducted. In terms of mercury reduction programs, he said PPIA would defer to Toxicology or the Chief Engineer's Office on mercury issues.

Mr. Christian suggested that any initiatives initiated by PPIA would need to provide the most "bang-for-the-buck." He suggested that the effort to reanimate the SAV program is a good example. He described the SAV program as the pollution prevention assistance program for the agency in that it allows staff to help identify problems at facilities and suggest solutions for fixing those problems. He noted that previously, requests for SAVs were made from the outside, with awareness of the program passing largely through word-of-mouth. He suggested that there was not much follow-up with the facilities and there was not much tracking of results.

With the changes being made, Mr. Christian hopes that the SAV program might be a third leg in the agencies efforts to promote compliance, along with permitting and enforcement. He suggested that the goal will be to reduce impacts and to be a part of efforts to address problems encountered by regulated entities. In implementing these efforts, he noted that PPIA will be using the same tools as other segments of the agency to target SAVs based on risk—identifying facilities and communities with significant risk and helping the agency to address that problem. SAVs would then work to provide solutions to specific issues identified prior to the visit, but also other issues identified while on site.

In terms of priorities for PPAC, Mr. Christian reported that after attending the national Pollution Prevention Innovations conference in Denver, it was clear that Texas is a leader in pollution prevention. He suggested that a primary goal for both PPIA and the PPAC will be to ensure that the Texas program remains the premiere program in the U.S.

He suggested that as pollution prevention programs are approaching ten years, three main problems were identified. First, it is often difficult for states to track the results of pollution prevention programs. Next, in many cases, core programs in various states don't appreciate pollution prevention efforts. He noted that many programs are struggling for survival and relevancy due to these issues.

Mr. Christian suggested that the PPAC and PPIA could both ensure relevancy by focusing on agency priorities. He suggested that it will be important for the committee to further this goal while pulling from everyone's respective backgrounds while also viewing initiatives through the lens of agency priorities. Matt Baker noted that in addition to state and agency priorities, it is important that the PPAC pursue issues and initiatives identified by committee members as well. He added that the PPAC could help drive a renewed focus on results. He cited, as one example, a previous lack of focus on poor performers. He suggested that a focus on getting poor performers in compliance should be a priority for everyone.

A.W. Armstrong asked what the agency's perspective on the Strategically Directed Regulatory Structure (SDRS) is. Mr. Christian noted that the agency has adopted the rule, and the agency hasn't identified any need for additional efforts. Mr. Armstrong suggested that pursuing other issues and initiatives could be a more effective use of time and resources for both the committee and the agency. Melanie Barnes asked if the agency has in fact implemented all of SDRS. Mr. Armstrong noted that the committee has devoted a significant amount of time to SDRS over the last several years. He suggested that efforts should be more focused on results than on "big picture" issues. Ms. Barnes suggested that she had understood that the pieces of SDRS had been implemented, but shifting the "culture" of enforcement towards SDRS had not yet occurred.

Mr. Baker suggested that the PPAC is in a unique position to take recommendations forward to promote a renewed focus on results.

Sharla Hotchkiss noted that concepts had been provided, but the issue will be in implementing them. She suggested that a list of overlying priorities and a vision of PPAC's role would be helpful. She noted that she needs that sort of strategic planning, and that she would prefer a separate detailed list of priorities. Mr. Christian responded that such a list had been produced for staff, including goals from the agency and state priorities.

Mr. Armstrong suggested that perhaps the committee should re-evaluate the initiative selection process that had been developed in the summer retreat.

Luke Metzger suggested that information on weaknesses of existing programs would be helpful.

Ms. Barnes suggested that she believes the initiative selection process has worked so far. She believes it has helped to identify real opportunities to pursue initiatives with the support of the committee. Ms. Barnes also asked if the priorities of legislative leaders are known. Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that renewed involvement from representatives of the legislators would be helpful.

Mr. Baker responded that a detailed list of priorities could be provided, but such a list would be an evolving document as new priorities are identified. He suggested that the PPAC should work to ensure that issues are statewide efforts that affect communities throughout Texas. He suggested that such issues go back to the larger issues of reducing pollution and improving compliance—not just through visits to industry, but also through education and awareness.

Mr. Christian suggested that results are increasingly important. He noted that there is increasing pressure in federal grant requirements to identify specific outcomes—that initiatives must begin with an end in mind. He suggested that perhaps the PPAC could employ a logic model similar to that used for EPA projects. Ms. Barnes responded that the initiative selection process is meant to function that way, adding that the mercury convenience switch subcommittee was a good example.

Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that in providing education to committee members, each member might want different levels of information. She added that resources available on the internet could be helpful.

### **Approval of Agenda**

Melanie Barnes asked if the committee would like to approve the agenda. Luke Metzger suggested that there is not any clear direction in the agenda. Mr. Metzger asked what direction staff would like the committee to go in. A.W. Armstrong suggested that this meeting could be used to get re-oriented and that action items could be identified for the next meeting. Ms. Barnes suggested that the agenda be expanded to include further discussion of goals and objectives.

### **Selection of new committee Co-Chair**

Melanie Barnes asked if anyone had any nominations for PPAC co-chair. She noted that the second co-chair position should typically come from the regulated community. A.W. Armstrong suggested that he would be willing to serve as co-chair. Sharla Hotchkiss motioned to nominate Mr. Armstrong. Luke Metzger seconded the nomination. The nomination was approved by the Full Members present unanimously.

### **Existing PPAC Initiatives**

#### **Green Purchasing**

Thomas Shook from the Texas Building and Procurement Commission provided the members with printed updates to answers to member questions from the September meeting. He also provided members with a printed copy of the Work Plan developed for the Recycling Market Development Program. James Voelker noted that the Work Plan was provided in an effort to keep members updated on the efforts of the RMDP to this point.

Sharla Hotchkiss suggested that instead of telling agencies what to do, perhaps they could be provided incentives to encourage them to purchase environmental. She suggested that such incentives had worked with the people that could be affected most—perhaps work with the contractors state agencies will be working with.

Luke Metzger suggested that for the Green Building Council, it would need to be changed. He asked when the five year update would need to be next updated. Debbie Boyle noted that it was adopted in 2005, so 2010 would probably be the date for the next update. Melanie Barnes suggested that now is the time to start working on getting it into the plan for the update.

Ms. Boyle suggested that demonstrating the cost effectiveness over the life of the facility would be helpful. Ms. Barnes suggested that the new Texas Instruments facility could be a good example. She suggested that they have implemented a lot of the green building measures. She also noted that there is building going on at state agencies and state schools. She suggested that it would be beneficial to get these things integrated now as these facilities are being constructed. She noted that Texas Tech students have designed their proposal for the Bush Library with green building principles

Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that a recent H-E-B constructed in Austin is a good example of a green building.

Mr. Shook noted that he is excited to be a part of the process, especially the opportunity to expand into new areas of recycling. He suggested that the committee should consider him a resource, adding that he will be working with TCEQ closely. He told committee members that they should feel free to contact him with any additional questions.

Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that the challenge is going to be what hook can be used to get people and agencies to do this. She referenced Ms. Boyle's earlier statement of the need to be able to cite savings.

Ms. Boyle agreed that it is important to lay out what the environmental benefits are and what the cost benefits are. She added that it will be important to provide information on when a facility can see cost recovery and when they can see payback. With that information, the question would be why not implement the measures, or why would a facility wait five years to implement these measures.

Ms. Barnes asked if the RMDP requirements would include state schools.

Mr. Shook suggested that all past legislation has included universities, adding that state schools are governed by the university system—a state entity.

Ms. Boyle asked for clarification on what RMDP is.

Brian Christian responded that RMDB was a board originally created to set recycling goals for the state of Texas. He suggested that the organization had originally limped along. He added that TxDOT was added. He noted that GLO was the original lead, then TCEQ became lead. Eventually GLO left the board and this legislation was introduced to continue the function but eliminate the board. A legislator added the requirement to coordinate with PPAC in the last session. He noted that there was not any legislative discussion as to intent as to what they wanted PPAC to do, meaning the committee has a lot of latitude then to decide how far they want to go.

Ms. Barnes asked what the RMDB had been doing. A.W. Armstrong asked how staff saw the RMDP fitting into the realigned PPIA. Mr. Christian responded that he does not see this as a high priority for the PPAC. He suggested that this is not because it's not important, but because there are bigger issues for the committee and the section. He noted that TBPC has been doing a good job implementing the program so it's not something that needs to be fixed. He asked if Mr. Shook had any additional thoughts.

Mr. Shook suggested that he was present largely to introduce himself so he should probably get with Mike Lindner to see if they could develop some suggestions to come back to the committee with.

Ms. Barnes suggested that what the committee had originally seen was the opportunity to begin incorporating some of the things that are more widely accepted in the business world into state government. She also suggested that this is an opportunity to identify what can be done already under existing authority, and what might need to be done legislatively.

Mr. Christian suggested that at this point, staff's homework is to get a better understanding of recommendations and priorities for PPAC in coordination with TBPC along the lines of larger questions of priorities and objectives.

Ms. Barnes suggested that this could be a good opportunity to identify weaknesses in Texas, such as state facilities and institutions in west Texas where recycling isn't necessarily taking place.

Mr. Shook suggested that he has the opportunity to expand his job to where it needs to go, including the opportunity to try to encompass other roles. Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that she is pleased that this isn't legislatively mandated at this point but more targeted at market development.

Debbie Boyle asked if the goal is for agencies to help develop markets for identified waste products, or is it more aimed at helping state agencies to identify and purchase recycled products. Mr. Christian suggested that the original focus was to develop the markets for identified waste streams, but having been out of the discussion for several years, he added that the focus of the discussion may have shifted to more of a focus on identifying recycled products.

Ms. Barnes suggested that that answer would get to the question of whether Green Building would fall into these efforts. Mr. Christian suggested that he does not recall Green Building being a focus of these efforts originally. He suggested that the question today would be a policy question for the agency of whether it should be promoting Green Building and if this is the opportunity to promote Green Building. He suggested that it may be fair to say that Green Building is inherently good, but the question is should staff be dedicated to promoting Green Building

Ms. Barnes asked if there is anything additional to add.

Sharla Hotchkiss mentioned that the Environmental Excellence Awards are a good opportunity for companies to get a blueprint for implementing environmental projects recognized.

Ms. Barnes noted that the types of things state agencies are doing in terms of green purchasing don't always make it to the general public. Ms. Hotchkiss agreed noting that Ms. Barnes had mentioned that she didn't know what Texas Tech was doing. Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that green purchasing might be a topic with a good opportunity for some grass roots groups to help get the word out.

Ms. Barnes suggested that this might be something that could be included with RENEW. Mr. Christian responded that the TCEQ is interested in seeing RENEW expanded to all of Region 6

Ms. Hotchkiss asked for an explanation of what RENEW is. Ms. Barnes responded that it identifies potential purchasers for items that would otherwise be waste products to allow them to be reused.

A.W. Armstrong added that a good example is Dow where they identified excess hydrogen that they then worked to partner in the development with fuel cells

Debbie Boyle asked how much the RENEW program being used, adding that TXU has tried a number of times, but the logistics were difficult.

Mr. Christian suggested that RENEW may be something that can be a source of renewed focus for PPIA. He added that Matt Baker has identified it as a priority, so perhaps the program can be reviewed now that the reviews of EMS and site assistance visits are wrapping up. He suggested that if nothing else, efforts could be made to help resolve issues for potential users

Berna Dette Williams added that she had worked with RENEW to do something with materials from high school science labs, adding that universities can have the same problem with having excess materials. She suggested that that might be a place for some kind of smaller quantity exchange through RENEW.

Mr. Christian suggested that members were raising valid points. He asked if a study of RENEW to identify new opportunities for improvement might be something PPAC would be willing to undertake as a new initiative. He added that such a review would fit in rather cleanly with what SBEA is trying to accomplish.

Ms. Williams noted that she had submitted a project for TEEA in the past and it did not receive an award, but she appreciated the information she continued to get encouraging her to continue to do projects. She suggested that given the quantity of mail coming in, that and other messages might need to be delivered in person to better sell them.

Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that the Air Force is both a major user and a producer. Robert Gill responded that they are not involved in the production so they wouldn't have much of a role in the materials used for productions, but they are responsible for the equipment once it arrives on the base. He asked if with RENEW, liability remains. He asked if the program provides any opportunity for identifying potential byproducts in a material from user to user.

Ms. Barnes suggested that the product is actually purchased. She acknowledged that exchanges of certain products and materials can pose problems.

Luke Metzger noted that he had served on the TEEA committee in the past, and they had looked at one company that did this and in that instance, the company purchasing the waste was simply burning it as fuel as opposed to actually removing it from the waste stream...looking at the other issues like Green Building

Ms. Barnes asked if the committee was ready to move on to electronics recycling.

### **Electronics Recycling**

Brian Christian reported that SBEA gets involved in electronics recycling events throughout the state. He added that the Division had traditionally required those groups to register those events. He added that, in effect, it had been policy to treat those collected materials as household hazardous waste collection events. He suggested that the Keep Midland Beautiful event highlighted a larger issue of how the agency wants to handle those types of waste. He suggested that as an agency, TCEQ needs to get its arms around the issue to make sure that it is handling inquiries agency-wide on the same page, but also so it can answer state and federal legislative

questions with a uniform policy response. He reported that PPIA will be heading up the agency-wide coordination of this issue. He pointed to topics like MTBE as examples of topics in the past where the agency developed an agency white paper as to whether it was a problem. He added that with e-cycling, the agency will first try to answer the questions of if it's a problem, and if it is a problem, how will the agency address the problem.

Melanie Barnes asked if the agency would like stakeholder involvement from groups such as Keep Texas Beautiful. Mr. Christian responded that the agency envisions some stakeholder involvement, but they are discussing this internally at this point.

Sharla Hotchkiss reported that after the retreat, she had written a White Paper and then as a follow-up she had submitted an application for a TEEA award. She added that at that point, they were told that they were not in compliance with guidelines and procedures for such events. She reported that those comments lead to further discussions with TCEQ staff regarding the requirements. She noted that she didn't know these forms and requirements existed. She suggested that it wasn't a bad thing for her because she knew how to handle this and she knew who to work with. However, she suggested that others who encounter similar problems might be discouraged. She suggested that if the law does require this, then the requirements need to be simplified to make them understandable to those in communities that might want to put on an event such as the event in Midland. She reported that the agreement at the end of the discussion was to work together to make the process less onerous.

Mr. Christian added that the existing forms and requirements were based on other requirements. He noted that PPIA is working with ECE to coordinate this discussion. He suggested that there are larger issues that need to be addressed within the agency to make sure all of the concerns are addressed regarding these events. He suggested that this is an example of the type of discussion that can be better facilitated now between both Matt and Brian within the agency.

Ms. Hotchkiss noted that she has asked KTB to get TCEQ to do a training or a session at their KTB conference, adding that additional outreach can be done. She then asked what groups can do in the meantime regarding events that are already scheduled over the next year. Mr. Christian responded that he does not envision this process taking too long.

Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that to her understanding, these rules were originally created for facilities that do this collection as a business, not for non-profits that simply do one collection event a year.

Fred Shannon suggested that in the agency's efforts to pull people together, Alan Watts and the work he's been doing on electronics recovery should be included. Mr. Christian responded that they will be including both Mr. Watts and Mike Lindner from PPIA as well as staff from other areas of the agency.

Ms. Barnes asked for a quick wrap-up on mercury switches.

### **Mercury Switches (HB 2793 Implementation)**

James Voelker reported that the agency had been coordinating its efforts with the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers and End of Life Vehicle Solutions (ELVS), the group formed by the Alliance to deal with these issues. He noted that approximately 700 collection buckets had been mailed to auto salvage facilities throughout Texas, adding that approximately 600 buckets had been accepted by facilities. He reported that the automobile manufacturers had been very

cooperative in implementing HB 2793. He added that the TCEQ is now working on developing a mechanism to allow for reporting while also trying to identify independent figures to make its own calculations for recovery rates.

Luke Metzger asked if the EPA was satisfied with the program implemented in the state of Texas. Mr. Voelker responded that the EPA has not inquired about the program and that he is not aware that the EPA is moving towards a standard for judging collection programs in various states.

Mr. Metzger asked if the EPA had moved on their area source rule. Brian Christian responded that staff had not heard anything further about the proposed area source rule from EPA.

Mr. Christian added that the existing programs in the Small Business and Local Government Assistance Section would be the platform for outreach.

Mr. Metzger asked what recovery rate would be considered a success. Mr. Christian responded that the results from the first year of the program would likely provide the information required to set that benchmark. Mr. Voelker responded that the TCEQ has not discussed a target recovery rate because it is still working to determine the “universe” of auto salvage facilities in the Texas while also gaining a better idea of the number of “qualifying” vehicles that are processed in Texas each year.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 11:55 a.m. It reconvened at 12:35 p.m.

A.W. Armstrong asked if the committee could revisit the agenda. He noted that a number of topics had been discussed. He proposed moving up the agenda with a goal of ending the meeting by 2:30 p.m. or 3:00 p.m., with the understanding that the committee should be sure to discuss any items members would like to discuss.

### **PPAC Initiative Selection Process**

Melanie Barnes pointed out that the committee has an existing process to review potential initiatives, but that the committee also has a “new direction” that PPIA and SBEA will be taking. She suggested that perhaps the committee should reevaluate this process in light of changing agency priorities. She noted that the committee had created the process to try to filter out projects that don’t necessarily have much support on the committee and also to better gauge outcomes and objectives. She asked if the committee should look at the review process diagram to see if there are any questions that need to be added.

Sharla Hotchkiss suggested that extra effort should be made to ensure that it fits with the objectives of SBEA.

A.W. Armstrong noted that Matt Baker and Brian Christian had provided three focus areas: water quality, water conservation, and air quality. Ms. Hotchkiss added that personal responsibility had been a priority as well.

Mr. Armstrong responded that that is an over arching objective. He suggested that the committee should review the process in terms of what the committee is likely to get back from TCEQ.

Ms. Hotchkiss pointed out that the existing diagram already asks if the initiative falls within the TCEQ Strategic Plan.

Mr. Armstrong asked in response how those priorities are defined.

James Voelker noted that the initial question was added in an effort to provide a more concrete list of strategies and objectives for the agency that committee members could reference in discussing proposed initiatives

Luke Metzger noted that three main priorities were provided, asking if that should be added to the question.

Mr. Armstrong suggested that that question might exclude some topics that the PPAC would like to take on. He added that the committee does not need to address it at this meeting.

Melanie Barnes suggested that an action item for everyone would be to look at the processes before the next meeting in conjunction with the new priorities for SBEA from Brian Christian and Matt Baker to see if any questions need to be added.

Ms. Barnes suggested that the next item would be to discuss committee priorities and what each member cares about.

### **Individual Member Goals and Objectives**

Debbie Boyle noted that she was especially struck by the discussions about education. She suggested that she is a strong proponent of education, adding that she believes providing education to achieve long term change is important. She suggested that if the PPAC can provide feedback to the SBEA in providing this education it could be effective. She suggested that the committee should “small bites of the apple” so that it can begin to see progress, adding that she believes the committee and TCEQ can really begin to change people’s minds and how they do things personally.

Luke Metzger said that the three goals that Matt and Brian laid out are at the top of his list. He added that an issue he would like to see addressed would be global warming. He would like for the committee to identify projects that can accomplish greenhouse gas reduction, especially if they improve air quality. He believes it is a big issue, especially since Texas does not have any regulations on reducing greenhouse gases. Mr. Metzger said he would also like to see the committee get involved in the enforcement review that TCEQ is doing. He noted that they are currently reviewing penalty policy. He suggested that the discussion could be contentious, and the PPAC could serve a valuable role as a stakeholder.

Robert Gill said that the Air Force started out well in promoting Pollution Prevention about 10-15 years ago, but they found that it was one of the first things to get crowded out of budgets when money got tight. He said that for a pollution prevention project to get funded in the Air Force now, it has to have a quick payoff, typically within one or two years. He noted that for the wing commander making the decision, he needs to make a payoff in 1-2 years while he is in that post. Mr. Gill said that one of his main goals is to hear a little bit about what types of projects can be implemented with that type of payoff. He suggested that beyond that, Texas has the most bases of states in his region, and he feels it’s important to maintain a close relationship and dialogue with TCEQ.

Sharla Hotchkiss asked how he felt after the first part of the meeting. Mr. Gill responded that he is encouraged. He added that the topics of the PPAC are important because pollution is wasting resources and businesses and agencies alike are stretched for resources, but it is also important because any pollution is also something that needs to be cleaned up meaning more costs.

Fred Shannon noted that Hewlett-Packard is already involved with staff like Alan Watts have been focused on developing efforts to find ways to recycle e-scrap and wants to stay involved in those efforts. He added that he is also education, and agrees with Ms. Boyle of the importance of enhancing environmental education. Mr. Shannon also added that he has an interest in promoting environmentally preferable purchasing.

Berna Dette Williams reiterated the need promote environmental education. She said that she has an added concern of who is helping provide information to those teaching environmental issues to young people. She suggested that efforts should be made to make sure that our young people are environmentally minded, adding that there is a responsibility for teaching environmentalists. She added that she is happy to hear that water quality will be a priority, especially given that drinking water but also projects like the bays around Galveston are very important to League City. Ms. Williams would also like to see efforts made to assist the non-attainment areas, adding that she is encouraged that there has already been some discussion of those areas.

Sharla Hotchkiss noted that KTB is an environmental education organization, with a primary mission of promoting personal responsibility for an individual's environment. She added that as an individual, she thinks it's important that the committee discuss water conservation and water quality.

A.W. Armstrong suggested that it is fair to say everyone on the committee wants to improve the environment—both globally, and locally here in the state of Texas. He said that he would like to talk about sustainability, and the ability to addresses three issues: economic, environmental, and social. He suggested that to get to sustainability, the state would need to make progress in several areas. He added that this could be accomplished in part by promoting personal change. Mr. Armstrong said that he would like to conceptually define what the agency might want to do and determine how the committee can affect that change. He suggested that this would be accomplished not only through education, but also through enforcement. He said that he believes these are all things the committee can do. He suggested that the committee decide what it can do and try to implement little projects.

Melanie Barnes agreed that education is one thing that the PPAC and agencies are lax in. She noted that both Matt Baker and Brian Christian alluded to it, adding that the information is often out there, it's just a matter of pulling it together. She suggested that PPAC could be a catalyst to pull that information together. She suggested that when it comes to education, the state really need to involve its institutions of higher learning. Ms. Barnes suggested that many of the issues could be facilitated locally because there are issues that various local communities won't be interested in implementing. Ms. Barnes also asked if there is anything the committee can do to affect change in federal and state policy that might run counter to efforts to improve the environment. Ms. Barnes added that in terms of global warming, the committee might want to look into how it might affect issues such as water and water supply and what its effects might be economically in the state of Texas. She also said that her main priority is getting the institutes of higher learning on board.

Ms. Boyle noted that one thing TXU is already involved in is teacher education efforts through seminars and workshops on a variety of topics each summer. She added that TXU also conducts efforts through TMRA, and approximately 100 teachers who go through that program every summer.

Mr. Armstrong asked if TXU pays for those programs. Ms. Boyle responded that yes they do. She added that the thought is to train the teachers who are teaching the youngest people to have a

better understanding of environmental impacts. Ms. Boyle also added that she believes it is important to work to promote science and science education, especially to girls to encourage them to remain interested in science. She said she does not know if there is something the state can do to encourage those efforts, adding that all of the committee members likely have insight into one or two things that can be done to make these efforts successful.

Mr. Armstrong suggested that this again goes back to making the business case for many of these strategies and practices.

Ms. Williams suggested that 2-3 years ago, an environmental curriculum was created, mostly for science teachers, adding that it might require an update. Ms. Hotchkiss said that she believed Keep Texas Beautiful helped in creating that curriculum, adding that it also provides for teacher training and that's been integrated into TEKS.

Ms. Barnes added that Texas Tech had been involved with something like that in the past in another program tailored especially for girls.

Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that this is another example that it's all out there and the committee does not need to reinvent the wheel.

Mr. Metzger suggested that there are programs available for campuses such as Campus Climate Challenge that include education as well as measures that can be implemented by the campus to reduce emissions. Ms. Williams added that University of Houston-Clearlake has existing environmental programs as well. Ms. Hotchkiss added that UT-El Paso has also undertaken efforts to implement environmental programs on both sides of the border.

Ms. Barnes asked if the PPAC could come out with a statement that it supports teaching to promote a better understanding of science because it will promote a better understanding of the environment. She suggested that such an effort could fit in with existing requirements within the TEKS. Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that from what Brian Christian had said, the committee would not be able to do that.

Ms. Williams noted that the Texas Municipal League had released very specific guidelines for lobbying that limit what can be done.

Bee Moorhead agreed with the discussion of sustainability. She suggested that the religious community would be strongly behind that. Ms. Moorhead suggested that a goal would be to focus in on projects that have some "doable" component—some action that people can be challenged to implement to engage them. She added that another topic that she had not heard is to try to strengthen TCEQ. She said that she is frustrated with the small percentage of resources that are devoted to the environment, suggesting that for the kind of change towards sustainability discussed in the meeting, the agency needs to be strong enough and credible enough to speak to the people of Texas. She suggested that it could be something the committee can figure out is strategically, how the agency can be seen as a major voice in determining what our state's priorities might be.

Ms. Barnes asked if there were any other comments or questions.

Ms. Boyle said she does not disagree with increasing the role of the agency, but asked how the committee could go about doing that. She noted that funding had been mentioned and asked how that specifically would be an answer. Ms. Moorhead suggested that she does not think going and

looking for more money is the answer to that problem. She suggested that the committee could help identify projects and issues where, strategically, it could help the agency build credibility even without additional resources. She noted that through Breath of Life, they tell congregations that the TCEQ is the source of information on air quality issues. She noted that many of them don't even know that there is a TCEQ.

Ms. Barnes pointed out a similar example from Texas Tech in the 1980s-90s when they had to develop safe methods conducting research. She noted that those early efforts met with resistance, but today, everyone looks to them as the experts in determining how to best deal with things safely. She said they are viewed more as a resource than as the people waiting to get you.

Ms. Hotchkiss suggested that that was what worried her about green purchasing, adding that she believes it should involve a lot of education instead of requirements.

Mr. Armstrong suggested that if nobody else had any comments or questions, they could move on to scheduling upcoming meetings.

### **2006 PPAC Meetings**

Melanie Barnes noted that it had been suggested that the next face-to-face meeting in May should be around the time of the Environmental Trade Fair in Austin on either May 8 or May 11. It was determined that May 11 worked best for most people. Sharla Hotchkiss suggested that it could be a good opportunity for members to attend the Texas Environmental Excellence Awards as well on the night of May 10.

A.W. Armstrong suggested that the committee set the dates and times for conference calls in March and April as well.

It was decided that mornings work best for most people on Tuesdays and Thursdays. It was decided that the next conference call will be Thursday, March 23, at 9:00 a.m. to discuss the materials provided about the direction of SBEA and PPIA. James Voelker said that staff would try to get materials to them by March 17. The April meeting was set for Thursday, April 20, at 9:00 a.m.

Sharla Hotchkiss suggested that staff send out advance notice on timing of meetings as soon as possible.

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.