

NPPR P2 Intern Workgroup

Call Notes
April 12, 2011

Mission statement:

The P2 intern work group's mission is to serve as an information and resource sharing group that supports and assists state programs with the development and growth of their P2 intern programs. The work group may also provide an expanded network for P2 interns to share information and technology assessments.

Welcome and Introductions

Nancy Larson, Kansas, Co-Chair
Steve Brachman, Wisconsin, Co-chair
Cathy Colglazier, Kansas, NPPR Board Liaison
Krysta Larson, Minnesota
Marcus Rivas, EPA Region 7
Danielle Dilks, Iowa
Ida Potter, New York
Rick Yoder, Nebraska

The topic of the call was *Measures*.

- 1) What do we track now?
- 2) Is a 12-week internship enough time to get data?
- 3) How do we document these measures?
- 4) How do we follow-up?
- 5) How can we assist facilities with on-going tracking (multi-year) without scaring them off?
- 6) Equipment used and calibration issues/costs?

Each participating program provided information related to the above questions.

Iowa (Danielle Dilks)

- Iowa uses Excel spreadsheets to track and document the projects and measures. Implemented projects are on a separate sheet from the recommended projects. If you would like an electronic copy of Iowa's spreadsheets, feel free to e-mail Danielle Dilks at Danielle.Dilks@dnr.iowa.gov.
- Three months is plenty long to collect data for calculations and make recommendations, but it's not long enough to initiate or complete implementation of a project. This is why follow-up is imperative.
- Follow-up is included in the company agreements (MOU). The company agrees that they will facilitate follow-up with the intern program technical advisors every 6 months for up to 3 years. By this time, the advisor has usually developed a good relationship with the company and can continue to follow-up past the 3 years. During the follow-up, in addition to checking implementation status of projects, the advisor can identify additional opportunities such as an assessment or another intern project and remind the company of resources available to them.

Minnesota (Krysta Larson)

- The program uses a database tracking system. Student recommendations are entered as suggestions and then marked whether they were implemented or not.
- Staff follow up in December and then again in May. As part of the final report, the interns develop a table for the project(s) that indicate impact and payback. The staff uses that table on the follow-up visits. Staff continue to follow-up for at least 2 years – sometimes a little longer. They also use the follow-up to offer additional services or help. They typically try not to place back-to-back interns in a company unless the company has a totally different project to work on. If a company needs assistance implementing an intern recommendation, the technical staff tries to assist.
- 12 weeks is enough time to get data. They really push their interns to get data and the technical staff works with the interns to make sure they have the numbers needed.
- Results are documented through the database and in the final annual report. Results are also posted on their website and reported to NPPR.
- They have good input and interaction with the companies – very few just drop off or pull out. If they do pull out of the follow-up, it's more because they haven't done anything and don't want to tell us.
- The program owns some of the equipment used to obtain measures. Sometimes they ask the facility to purchase equipment needed for a project so they'll have it onsite (i.e. infrared camera).

Wisconsin (Steve Brachman)

- The program tracks the initial set of data elements developed out of NPPR and included as part of the P2 reporting process, including hazardous waste, resources conserved, dollars saved, and GHG calculations.
- 12 week timeframe – the students are good at projecting savings but in his experience only a hand full get projects implemented in that time frame. The program has not done a lot of follow-up. They plan on hiring a student during the intern period to do some backtracking from the first four years of the program to see what additional results have occurred. This is the strategy they plan to use in the future as well.
- The program doesn't own equipment – it relies on the facilities to do this. Generally, it is the facility employees using the equipment, not the interns.
- One of their program's biggest challenges is making sure the students are clear at week one what they need to provide at the end of week twelve. They are modifying the training somewhat to focus in on “here's what we need at the end of the project to document impacts.”

Kansas (Nancy Larson)

- The program tracks energy, water, solid/hazardous waste, chemical replacement, fuel replacement, cost savings, number of project vs. number of projects implemented, implementation rate, MTCO_{2e}.
- Is 12 weeks enough? It is enough time for estimated data but is rarely enough time for implemented data. Although we do get some implementation data by the end of the internship, most projects are implemented well after the internship has ended.
- How do we document measures? Final reports, case studies, Excel spreadsheet. The data is aggregated so that we can then use it to help EPA meet their strategic targets/goals. This formal data aggregation tool is a work in progress, subject to CIP.

- For follow-up, every 2 – 3 years we request to support intern project follow-up data collection as part of our P2 grant proposal. PPI staff contact each of the host companies to determine implementation status. We have only done this one time and then developed a comprehensive case study book posted at www.sbeap.org/publications/intern_case/P2_Cumulative.pdf. At that time we documented a 66% project implementation rate, and if planned projects were implemented the rate rose to 75%.
- Follow-up does require persistence, but we do not have the experience that it scares companies off.
- QAPP, equipment calibration concerns? Our agency files a QAPP each year with our state partner and EPA. We have several pieces of equipment and if we recalibrate each year according to manufacturer's instruction the costs are at least \$1,100. We need to start budgeting for this maintenance. Nancy would like to talk with other programs that have equipment to find out if there are BMPs related to field calibration and how often equipment that isn't used very often really needs calibrated. Marcus indicated he had discussed this with the Missouri intern program and they have developed some adequate alternate schedules for maintenance. He also suggested doing an equipment inventory of the P2 intern programs so people will know who uses what equipment so you would know who you could talk to for information and experience on certain equipment.

Update on New York Program – Ida Potter reported that their intern program funding was suspended for a year. However, they did get a grant to cover 50 percent of the cost for next summer. They will focus on the pharmaceutical and marina sectors next summer.

P2 intern session at National Environmental Sustainability Summit – Steve indicated the workgroup has a session on June 9 from 8:30 – 10:00. He would like to have four programs present their information. Wisconsin and Kansas will present. Krysta will not be in attendance, but she indicated Sara could present for Minnesota if necessary. Iowa is willing to present but travel restrictions may prohibit Danielle from attending. If any other intern program is willing to present, please contact Steve Brachman.

The next call is planned for June 28th and will be an opportunity for our P2 interns to be on the call and share common concerns and questions. Steve will send out a guided agenda and the call information as the date gets closer.

Future topics:

- ❑ What do states require for written reports?
- ❑ Administrative questions for developing programs
- ❑ Pay rate and process – lump sum, hourly
- ❑ Equipment use and care
- ❑ What is the story behind the measures/intern program?