I. The Training

This report documents the planning and implementation of the 2012 Annual 507 Program Training (Training). The report provides details about the Training and a summary of the participant evaluations. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Asbestos and Small Business Ombudsman (ASBO) within the Office of Small Business Programs (OSBP) sponsored the Training. PRIZIM Inc. (PRIZIM) provided logistics support for the Training under a contract with EPA.

The Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended in 1990, directed each state to create programs to assist small businesses in understanding and complying with their CAA obligations. These programs, known as the 507 Programs, consist of three components: Small Business Ombudsman (SBO), Small Business Environmental Assistance Program (SBEAP), and a Compliance Advisory Panel (CAP). For the past 15 years, members of the 507 community have come together at an annual national meeting to build and maintain a national network of assistance providers and to improve the technical capability of SBO/SBEAPs. To reach these goals, the annual meeting includes training on the structure and requirements of the 507 Programs, new regulations, and compliance issues. It also provides a venue for assistance providers, EPA staff, and small businesses to learn from each other about assistance initiatives and approaches. In addition, EPA regulatory staff and rule writers have an opportunity to hear about challenges and issues related to the implementation of regulations in the small business community.

In 1995, the 507 Programs created the SBO/SBEAP National Steering Committee (NSC) to represent the interests of the 507 Programs and to facilitate communications between the state programs, the EPA ASBO, and the EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS). One 507 Program SBO/SBEAP representative and one alternate SBO/SBEAP from each of the ten EPA regions serves on the NSC. The NSC also functions through the following subcommittees: awards, measurement-promotional, climate change, technical-air, technical-waste, and technical-water. The annual Training is an opportunity for the NSC to report to the SBO/SBEAP community, hold their annual face-to-face meeting, and gather new ideas and recruit members from the SBO/SBEAP community. The NSC subcommittees also report to the Training attendees and hold meetings during the Training.

The state CAPs, which consist of small business owners and operators, are important components of the 507 Programs. Similar to the NSC, the state CAPS are represented by a National CAP (NCAP), which also meets during the annual Training. The participation of CAP small business owners at the Training provides them an opportunity to learn more about the regulatory process, and for EPA and assistance providers to learn more about the needs and concerns of small businesses.

The 2012 Training was streamlined to focus primarily on technical training and to take advantage of having EPA rule writers, located nearby in the District of Columbia, as speakers. In addition to the broad purpose of the Training to foster, a national network of assistance providers and improve the technical expertise of the programs, this year an additional purpose was to promote understanding between the 507 Programs and EPA rule writers. Below are specific training objectives and how each was achieved:
Foster a national network of environmental assistance providers

- NSC meeting
- NSC subcommittee meetings
- NCAP meeting
- Regional meetings
- Networking at the Training

Build capacity of state assistance providers

- Six technical training and best practices sessions
- Presentations by EPA rule writers
- Networking with EPA staff and rule writers

Improve and support 507 Programs

- NSC meeting
- NSC Subcommittee meetings
- NCAP meeting
- Six technical training and best practices sessions
- Networking with state and EPA staff

Increase EPA awareness of small business concerns and strengthen relationship between EPA and 507 Programs

- Technical trainings and subcommittee meetings with EPA rule writers
- Presentations by EPA staff
- Networking with EPA staff

II. Training Details

This Training was a joint effort of the EPA ASBO and the 507 Programs. Details about the Training planning and logistics are presented below.

Training Planning and Management

The EPA ASBO, PRIZIM, and the NSC Planning Subcommittee worked jointly to plan and carry out the Training. The EPA ASBO provided financial support, helped with Training logistics including site selection, provided personnel, and helped coordinate the Planning Subcommittee. PRIZIM, under an EPA Contract, provided planning and logistics support. The primary individuals from EPA and PRIZIM involved in the Training planning and logistics include:

- Joan Rogers, EPA ASBO
- Angela Suber, EPA ASBO Team
- Robert France, PRIZIM
- Tiffin Shewmake, PRIZIM
- Francie Boker, PRIZIM

The NSC Planning Subcommittee provided invaluable support. The Subcommittee held monthly conference calls on the Training, identified and contacted potential speakers, and helped develop the Training agenda. The Planning Subcommittee was fundamental in ensuring that the Training content met the needs of the 507 Program community and included the most relevant topics. A list of the Planning Subcommittee members is in Attachment 1.
Planning for the Training started about eight months out from the meeting date. The group used evaluations from the 2010 Training to help identify Training themes and design the sessions. The first Planning Subcommittee Training call was conducted on September 29, 2011; calls were held monthly thereafter until the Training in May 2012.

**Location**
In order to secure the participation of the most EPA staff and speakers, the NSC decided to hold the 2012 Training in the Washington, D.C. area. The planning committee evaluated hotels in the area and selected the Sheraton Crystal City Hotel in Crystal City, Virginia for its convenient access to public transportation, easy transportation from Washington D.C. and close proximity to many sites in the heart of the DC metropolitan area. The hotel selection process was based on availability, location, and facilities.

**Logistics**
Conducting a successful Training involves numerous tasks. As noted above, the Planning Subcommittee helped in the content development and identification of session speakers. Other tasks conducted prior to the Training included:

- Negotiate hotel contract for the guest room government per diem rates, audiovisual equipment, meeting rooms, and other amenities.
- Coordinate planning committee meetings (plan, develop agenda, schedule and lead meetings, take notes and post on web).
- Conduct a pre-Training site visit to review the hotel arrangements and obtain an appreciation for the area around the hotel, and meet with hotel staff regarding logistics.
- Coordinate Training agenda development (number and length of days, number of tracks, number and length of general and breakout sessions, assign meeting rooms, and schedule breaks).
- Identify and coordinate speakers for the general sessions.
- Send confirmation letters to the session speakers and moderators with instructions.
- Collect Training presentations from presenters to load on computers in the session rooms at the Training and to post on the website.
- Produce electronic and printed Training agendas.
- Create evaluation forms for the training, general sessions, and individual technical sessions.
- Implement a Greening initiative for participants and the hotel.
- Print nametags and fill badge holders prior to the Training.
- Assign sessions to meeting rooms.
- Set up virtual sessions (identify software and send out instructions)
- Coordinate with Audrey Zelanko, AGZ & Associates, on the Training web site at www.sbeapTraining.com (registration, agenda, hotel, travel, planning committee information, etc.).

At the Training, staff from PRIZIM helped with Training logistics, staffed the registration table, answered participant questions, checked session rooms to make sure that the audio/visual equipment was working, took notes at selected sessions, provided support for the virtual sessions, and in general, ensured that the Training went smoothly.

The meeting rooms consisted of one medium size ballroom and a small boardroom for working lunch sessions. In addition, computers were set up by the registration area for participants to use the internet.

**Participants**
There were 75 registered Training participants, including speakers, EPA staff, and contractors. Participants from 26 states attended the Training. The list of the Training participants is in Attachment 2. Participants were from
state and federal programs, small business owners, and related non-profit organizations. The chart below has the breakdown by organization type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA (Headquarters, Regional, and RTP Staff)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental Organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Programs (SBOs and SBEAPs)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown of participants by EPA region for Trainings in 2010, 2011 and 2012 is in the table below. This table is not complete because not every participant filled out the appropriate section in the registration form. However, it provides a good idea of the geographic representation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA Region</th>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 1 (ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2 (NY, NJ, PR, VI)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3 (PA, DE, DC, MD, VA, WV)*</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4 (KY, TN, NC, SC, MS, AL, GA, FL)**</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5 (MN, WI, IL, MI, IN, OH)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6 (NM, TX, OK, AR, LA)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7 (NE, KS, IA, MO)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8 (MT, ND, WY, SD, UT, CO)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 9 (AZ, CA, NV, HI)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 10 (WA, OR, ID, AK)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes EPA HQ ** includes EPA RTP

Training Agenda and Sessions
The Training consisted of the following sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday May 8</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newcomer Breakfast (507 Program Training)</td>
<td>Subcommittee Working Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Session</td>
<td>Best Practices Session: Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Training (Waste): RCRA Inspector Training—Process-based Inspections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSC Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday May 9</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Meetings</td>
<td>NCAP meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcommittee Working Sessions</td>
<td>Subcommittee Working Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Training (Air): Boiler and RICE Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Thursday May 10 | AM | • Best Practices Session: Applicability Determination Index (ASI) Update  
• 507 Program Collaboration Discussion |
|-----------------|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                 | PM | • Technical Training (Water): Pesticide General Permit and Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures 101  
• Training: Low Impact Development and Green Infrastructure |
|                 | PM | • Training: EPA Rule Making Action Development Process  
• Closing Remarks |

The full Training agenda is in Attachment 3. Section III of this report includes a discussion of the participant feedback for the individual sessions. Descriptions of the Training sessions are presented below.

**Newcomer 507 Program Training**

New this year, the Newcomer 507 Program Training was provided as part of a less formal breakfast on the first day of the Training. The goal was to encourage newcomers to meet long time members on their first day of the conference. Renee Bashel, the outgoing NSC Chair, gave a brief presentation that provided a refresher on the history and purpose of the 507 Programs, and described the NSC and its subcommittees. The training also introduced useful resources for the programs and discussed how each state program can become more involved.

**Meetings**

Regional meetings were held during breakfast on Wednesday. These informal meetings give regional SBO/SBEAPs, EPA staff, and small businesses an opportunity to network and discuss common issues and initiatives.

The Training is the only time during the year that subcommittee members have a face-to-face meeting. It is also an opportunity to recruit new members and for subcommittee members to hear from the SBO/SBEAP community. On Wednesday, The NSC held their annual meeting, which was open to all participants. The other subcommittees also hold annual-face-to-face meetings that typically include a combination of presentations, training, and discussion. For example, this year the Measurement-Promotional Subcommittee discussed next steps for gaining input from states on measurement and promotional efforts. At the Technical-Waste Subcommittee meeting, the group focused on updates of EPA’s waste determination program evaluation. The Technical-Air Subcommittee focused on tools to help with providing technical assistance, and a demonstration from EPA of regulations.gov and social media tools.

**Opening Remarks**

Jeanette Brown, Director of the EPA OSBP, welcomed participants at the opening plenary. Lisa Lund, Director, Office of Compliance, shared six themes for the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA): Prioritizing, Participating in Rule Workgroups, Working Closely with Partners, Building Assistance in Site Visits, Improving Transparency and Taking Advantage of Web-Based Technology. In addition, NSC Chair Renee Bashel provided 2012 highlights from the NSC and subcommittees.

**Trainings**

Some of the training sessions focused on technical information and rule updates to increase the capacity of state programs to provide the most up to date and effective assistance to small businesses. Other sessions provided best practice information on related topics that the providers are frequently asked about such as energy savings, sustainability and green infrastructure. For the first time, several of the sessions were available as virtual sessions for call-in participants. This new approach is discussed in more detail in section IV below.
Specifically, the trainings included the following speakers and topics.

**Technical Training (Waste): RCRA Inspector Training - Process-based Inspections**
Jackie Vega, EPA National Enforcement Investigations Center (NEIC)

This training described the advantages of conducting process-based inspections and provided guidance for incorporating process-based inspection techniques. Case studies and examples presented in the training focused on the RCRA regulations, but the concepts apply in any type of inspection.

**Technical Training (Air): Boiler and RICE Area Source Rules**
Boiler Rule -- Renee Lesjak Bashel, Wisconsin SBEAP
RICE Rule -- Melanie King, EPA Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards
Overview -- Jan King, EPA Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards

This training session focused on the evolving Boiler and Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines RICE area source rules. Melanie King, rule writer of the RICE rule, presented on the content and recent changes of the RICE rule. Renee Bashel spoke about the Boiler Rule. A panel of SBEAPs discussed issues in providing compliance assistance to small businesses on these rules and audience members were encouraged to participate in the exchange about their own experiences. Jan King, EPA, provided an overview of upcoming proposed changes and potential impacts to small businesses.

**Best Practices: Applicability Determination Index (ADI) Update**
Maria Malave, EPA Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance

This session provided instruction on using the ADI, a web-based database that contains memoranda issued by EPA on applicability and compliance issues associated with NSPS, NESHAP, CFC, and Asbestos rules.

**Best Practices: Low Impact Development (LID)**
Chris Kloss, EPA Office of Water, Water Permits Division

This session looked at the opportunity to incorporate LID into urban areas to improve water management. Examples of the benefits and how LID practices can support broader sustainability and community livability goals were also included.

**Best Practices: Green Infrastructure**
Alan Sparkman, CAP, NCAP, Executive Director of Tennessee Concrete Association

This session covered rain and stormwater capture and reuse, as well as storm water quantity reduction and quality improvement using the Tennessee Concrete Association’s office campus as an example.
Action Development Process
Laura Free, EPA Office of Policy, Regulatory Management Division

This overview focused on how regulations are developed at EPA with an emphasis on how small businesses and other interested parties can be involved in the process.

Networking
An official networking session was held on the first day of the Training to facilitate networking and encourage relationships between assistance providers from across the country, and between state and EPA staff. In addition, space was provided at the breakfasts for informal networking meetings.

Awards Ceremony
The Annual Small Business Recognition Awards Ceremony was held Tuesday evening. The awardees were:

- Small Business Environment Assistance Program Award – Pennsylvania SBEAP
- Small Business Environmental Stewardship Award – Minuteman Press, Lawrence, KS and Martinizing Dry Cleaning, Wichita, KS
- Karen V. Brown Award– Cathy Colgazer, KS and Judy Mirro, VT

Greening the Training
PRIZIM worked with the Planning Subcommittee to reduce the environmental impact of the Training. Environmental efforts implemented this year included further reducing the amount of paper used, educating participants on their impacts, and working with the hotel to reduce their footprint. Information on this greening was included on the Training webpage.

Initiatives to reduce the Training footprint included the following.

- Continuing with paper minimization efforts from previous meetings that included only handing out a one page double-sided agenda instead of a multi-page program, and posting other meeting material such as the attendee list on the website.
- Discouraging presenters from handing out copies of their presentations and posting presentations and other material on the Environmental Home Page (http://www.smallbiz enviroweb.org/SharingInformation/Conferences.aspx#CrystalCityVA).
- Reusing material from previous meeting including badge holders and un-used evaluation forms (dates are not printed on material so that they can be reused)
- Providing attendees with information how to reduce their environmental impacts during travel and while at the conference.

Each year, the planning committee looks for an environmentally preferable venue to host the training. The Sheraton Crystal City Hotel was partially selected for its location, which is walking distance to the Metro (Reagan National Airport is also on the Metro) and restaurants. Staff also asked the hotel to fill out a questionnaire about their sustainability initiatives. The questionnaire communicates the importance the planning subcommittee places on sustainability to the hotel, recognizes current hotel initiatives and also provides the hotel with information on additional actions that they could take. Current hotel initiatives include:

- A recycling program that includes paper, plastic, glass, metal, and food grade cooking oils; and in-room recycling containers.
- A comprehensive energy management system to regulate lighting and temperature in meeting spaces.
- The tracking of electricity, gas, and water utilities in the Energy Looking Glass program.
- Environmental purchasing practices such as buying reusable and/or less toxic products and products that are available in bulk.
Participants were asked about greening in the overall training evaluation. Only 13 participants filled out this evaluation, the results are shown in the pie chart below. Seventy-five percent of respondents rated greening efforts as good or excellent.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses to how would you rate the greening initiatives at the training?](chart)

Participants were also asked about activities they undertook to reduce their environmental impacts at the meeting. The most popular options were to use public transportation, turn off lights and appliances, reuse towels and linens, turn faucet off while brushing teeth, use reusable mugs and dishes, decline daily newspaper, and eat less meat. Fewer respondents carpooled, took a direct flight, used a laptop or scrap paper for notes, ate local or organic foods, or selected food with minimal processing and packaging. This information can be used when planning for the next meeting to structure the meeting to encourage participants to further reduce their impacts.

III. Training Evaluations

Training staff asked participants to fill out evaluations for individual sessions and for the Training as a whole. Below is a summary of the evaluation results. The raw data is in Attachment 4.

Overall Training Evaluations
Only 12 attendees returned completed evaluations for the overall Training. This low response reflects that a number of attendees left the conference early. In the future, it may make sense to make the last day a half day to avoid attendees leaving in order to travel. The responses (selections were “excellent, good, fair, and poor”) were very positive. The table below shows the distribution of “excellent,” “good,” “fair,” and “poor” ratings for the Training overall by percentage for each category. No aspect was rated poor. Figure 1 shows the same data graphically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Conference Evaluations</th>
<th>Overall Content</th>
<th>Overall Format</th>
<th>General Sessions</th>
<th>Conference Materials</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>After-hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation included several open-ended questions. Responses to these questions are in Attachment 5. When asked to comment on the most useful portions of the Training overall, several respondents mentioned networking, and technical and regulatory topics as the most useful part. Two respondents liked the world café format with one suggesting selecting questions relating to compliance assistance and outreach.

When asked to comment on the least useful portions of the Training, several respondents suggested ending the meeting earlier. Suggestions for improving the Training included having a motivational speaker and including more breaks in the agenda.

Participants had the opportunity to comment on what topics they would like to see at the next Training. Suggested topics from the comments are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>UST Regulations</th>
<th>Measurement training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue with timely updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include other agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Training Sessions
The Training included six technical training and best practices sessions; participants turned in evaluations for all of the sessions. The number of completed evaluations per session ranged from 5 (for the LID and Green Infrastructure session) to 22 for the Boiler/RICE area source rules. The majority of the Overall category ratings were “excellent” and “good.” There were very few ratings of “fair” and “poor.” Figure 2 shows the percentage of overall ratings awarded to sessions. The numbers appearing above the columns represent the number of evaluations turned in for each session.
The raw data with comments is in Attachment 4. The comments were overall quite positive.

IV. Virtual Training Access

For the first time, virtual access was offered at the training for selected sessions, including:

- Technical Training (Air): Boiler and RICE Area Source Rules.
- Best Practices: Applicability Determination Index (ADI) Update.

Virtual access was provided by GoToMeeting webinar service. Participants could hear the presenters (through their computers or by calling into a conference line), see the presentations, and type in questions or comments. A moderator at the session managed GoToMeeting and provided questions from the virtual participants to the speakers. Participants indicated that GoToMeeting was easy to use and that they were pleased to get the technical training without traveling. One participant said that it would be great to offer all sessions of the training as a webinar.

Survey results from individuals participating virtually were generally positive results including:

- 100% indicated that being able to participate in the technical training via webinar was a valuable option.
- 100% could hear the speaker clearly and viewed the presentation in sync with the speaker.
- Two thirds who asked a question via the webinar platform had their question answered during the training. Most participants (88 percent) did not ask a question.
- 12% experienced some technical difficulties during a virtual session.

Several participants indicated that they would have liked to have seen an occasional photo or video stream of the presenter and/or audience on site to feel more involved. In addition, several participants had trouble hearing questions from the audience because a microphone was not used by all who spoke. Participants also noted that it would have been helpful for the sessions to run on time.
V. Lessons Learned and Recommendations

There were several valuable lessons learned from this Training, which are listed below.

Virtual Training Sessions
The virtual training sessions worked well and had a lot of support from participants. One lesson from this first effort is the importance of keeping strictly to the agenda time schedule when offering virtual sessions. Expand time between sessions when providing virtual access to ensure that sessions will start on time. Several participants also noted that it would be nice to have pictures of the presenters or streaming video of the presentation. The advantage of using just the presentation and GotoMeeting is that it is very cost effective and is an option that should be evaluated for the next meeting.

Alternate Between Annual In-Person and Virtual Training Meetings
The success of the virtual training sessions shows that electronic training is a feasible alternative to in-person training. Given the increasingly tight budgets at the federal and state levels, it may make sense to alternate between annual in-person and virtual training meetings. This approach is a way to provide cost effective training and capacity building to the state programs while preserving the valuable networking aspect of in-person meetings. There is the added benefit of reducing the environmental impact of the annual training meeting. Another advantage is that in the virtual training years, there could be a greater focus on the regional meetings, and EPA and the EPA regional liaisons could be more involved with the meetings. EPA staff could participate in regional meetings, either through travel or on the phone. People from other areas could make presentations virtually at regional meetings to share success stories or alternate approaches to issues.

Implementation of Past Conference Recommendations
Several recommendations from past meetings were implemented at this training. These included not holding concurrent sessions, shortening the length of the meeting, and locating the meeting to encourage the participation of agency staff. These changes all improved the quality of the training. It is particularly useful to hold the meeting in the Washington, D.C. metro area or near Research Triangle Park in North Carolina so that more EPA staff can participate. In addition, many states plan additional meetings with federal agencies when traveling to Washington, D.C.

This report was prepared by PRIZIM, Inc.
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