

**National Training Workshop on Local Urban Air Toxics
Assessment and Reduction Strategies
November 2001**

Participant Evaluations

Section A. By what type of organization are you employed?

- EPA/OAQPS 5 ATSDR 1 Local Agency 14 Academic 2
- EPA Region 11 State Agency 10 Community 9 Other 6
- EPA Other 5

A. Is your role in your organization, at least with respect to air toxics activities, more managerial, or technical?

| | <u>Managerial</u> | <u>Technical</u> |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Federal | 3 | 19 |
| State/Local Agency | 16 | 18 |
| Community/Other | <u>9</u> | <u>4</u> |
| | 28 | 31 |

Section B. Overall workshop success

B1. Did you find the amount/diversity of information overwhelming

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| Federal | 5 | 17 |
| State/Local Agency | 1 | 25 |
| Community/Other | <u>4</u> | <u>10</u> |
| | 10 | 52 |

B1. and, would you rather see future workshops more narrowly focused?

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| Federal | 12 | 11 |
| State/Local Agency | 6 | 19 |
| Community/Other | <u>3</u> | <u>11</u> |
| | 21 | 41 |

B2. For your needs, did you find the level of detail:

| | <u>Appropriate</u> | <u>Too Superficial</u> | <u>Too Deep</u> |
|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Federal | 14 | 8 | 1 |
| State/Local Agency | 20 | 5 | |
| Community/Other | <u>10</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>4</u> |
| | 44 | 15 | 5 |

B3. Were you looking for specific technical training

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| Federal | 8 | 10 |
| State/Local Agency | 13 | 12 |
| Community/Other | <u>3</u> | <u>10</u> |
| | 24 | 32 |

B3. and/or, general overview?

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| Federal | 11 | 4 |
| State/Local Agency | 20 | 3 |
| Community/Other | <u>12</u> | <u>2</u> |
| | 43 | 9 |

B4. This was a national workshop. Do you think future workshops should also be national, or would you recommend regional workshops instead?

| | <u>National</u> | <u>Regional</u> | <u>Both/Either</u> |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Federal | 3 | 4 | 14 |
| State/Local Agency | 7 | 2 | 15 |
| Community/Other | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>11</u> |
| | 12 | 9 | 40 |

B5. The duration of this workshop was 3 days. For future workshops, what duration would you recommend?

| | <u>Shorter</u> | <u>Longer</u> | <u>3 days was agreeable</u> |
|--------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Federal | 4 | 1 | 17 |
| State/Local Agency | 4 | | 20 |
| Community/Other | <u>5</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>9</u> |
| | 14 | 2 | 46 |

B6. Would you prefer a weekend date for future workshops?

| | <u>Weekend for future workshops (Yes)</u> | <u>Weekend for future workshops (No)</u> |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Federal | 3 | 19 |
| State/Local Agency | 1 | 23 |
| Community/Other | <u>2</u> | <u>14</u> |
| | 6 | 56 |

C. Specific Presentations/Activities - Now's your opportunity to comment on specific presentations/activities. They are listed below to jog your memory, followed by space for your comments.

C1. Leadership Panel Comments:

- Air Toxics in Urban/Local Areas
- Summarizing Workshop and Discussing Next Steps

Federal

- Excellent - informative, forthright, openness to discuss items of differences of opinion. Opening panel was better than closing panel.
- The moderator did an excellent job in posing some questions for the panel members to lead the discussion.
- Very good. Good to hear the different perspectives
- Good mix was very helpful in getting a lot of different views
- Very honest speakers
- Panel was very experienced and well versed in their fields
- Need more State/Local, less Federal
- The EPA panel did little to illuminate community leadership attributes/relevance. The panel should have more community partners - fewer folks who don't/haven't done strong community work - - i.e., less Federal more folks from the community on the panels.
- Wasn't there for first panel - too early for me to get there when beginning travel on
- First day kind of useless/shallow, second day good but not enough time to really get into it. Inventory section too shallow (made them sound too easy and simple to the community people there)
- Closing too much general platitudes and not enough substance — too much like what everyone should have said in this evaluation form.

State/Local Agency

- The speaker from ICMA did an excellent job on the opening and closing panels, she kept things at an interesting pace
- Excellent - good group from very diverse points of view
- An excellent resource level of information. Provided a great opening to what information and thought was to come

- Helpful, especially bracketing the conference
- This was an excellent discussion and well lead but not a good format to start a 3-day meeting; it would have been better later in day or if it included presentations.
- Great touch. Very informative. Great Overview, Good Idea
- Good presentations, well presented
- Good. No comments
- Interesting - helpful to hear about case studies/current projects, helpful to hear perspectives from various stakeholders
- Pretty good - some were a bit vague - preferred more focused presentations
- Need to be more specific
- Need to fit these local assessments into context of CAAA/regulatory context
- It was okay
- One more community representative
- Least useful of workshop

Community/Other

- The initial panel was okay - a good overview
- The best panel was on understanding measured and modeled data (outstanding information)
- Good overview and capacity building discussion on the first day to provide context to more specific information
- Pretty good - people who care
- More State participation (more states) and community groups (less Federal), summarization excellent
- Next steps need more time and discussion - without a plan, what's the point of it all?

C2. Special Session Community Action Against Asthma (including field trip):

Federal

- Excellent - very informative, real world, helped reinforce community participation value/thanks (i.e., applauding local moms is important to showing value of their participation)
- Excellent - it gave a more realistic appreciation of the details of the project
- This was really fantastic. It made everything seem so "real."
- Absolutely fantastic description of integrating science, community involvement, community ownership and outcome accomplishment. Congratulations!
- Very good! Very informative! Loved it!
- Provided very good insight into community involvement and how to get community involvement
- This was very valuable. We need the women who visit and the recipients do TV spots for this effort. I appreciate their effort and the children who will be healthier.
- This was the highlight of the workshop
- Interesting, but not quite what I need for air toxics risk assessment
- Not directly related to toxics. Make better link from asthma to air toxics

State/Local Agency

- Excellent and very informative. The bus tour guides were great!
- Excellent: the tour of the community was an important part. The research was presented in the context of real people's lives.
- Very good session - many seemed to find it eye-opening
- Good getting in the field and interacting with others
- Good - but with the field trip we could have used better outline of air pollution issues (we seemed to be haphazardously driving around)
- Good - helpful to see community group in action on site
- Good practical experience
- This was an impressive trip, I learned more than I thought I would, plus it was fun to see the "nut and bolts" of the end-point of our work.
- Loved the field trip excellent planning, thanks!
- Very informative and disturbing. Sometimes we forget about how bad it can be
- Very much appreciated - first hand experience is best! (especially when its is a successful project)
- Great hands-on representation and nice to hear from all types of participants
- Best part of the workshop! Nice to get out of the "laboratory" and see what happens in the real world
- Illuminating. Provides perspective on what is and what are not true problems
- An eye(and nose) opening experience in E(in) justice, the trip gave me a close-up perspective of communities juxtaposed against heavy, polluting industry. How people can stand to live next to the incinerator is beyond me. The presentation was very good also the community activists and those they reached provided a very down-to-earth view of exposure monitoring.
- Presented facts, figures and what was required to make the Asthma program work
- I thought the tour was a little long - but very good

Community/Other

- Excellent - field trip was very helpful hearing from the workers (CES) and parents gave me hope that all this may be worthwhile
- Excellent trip (eye-opener) - should be a little slower to give more time for viewing
- Great field trip! Depressing (eye-opening) and uplifting at the same time
- Great - people need to be shocked into the reality of what's going on
- Best part of the program - enjoyed tour
- It was great to get out and see Detroit's challenges and successes. The CAAA program was a wonderful example of community capacity building
- Most informative: Information was well presented, having all players provide information regarding activities, participation and data collected proved to be an enlightening presentation.
- Discussion was very good.
- Please continue to provide in the future

C3. Presentation on Cleveland Pilot:

Federal

- Excellent - informative, emphasized EPA desire to be inclusive and involve stakeholders, community, etc.
- This was great!
- Description of composition of workgroup was interesting.
- Process for resolution of issues was interesting
- Good overview
- Could have been ½ day instead of field trip
- Could've used more time to explain the community involvement aspect
- Not ripe for presentation
- Don't know what's newsworthy about the project per se.
- A little more details would have been nice, but apparently the project isn't that far along
- Too early to get idea of projects that are in process
- Not enough details to guide other potential project followers

State/Local Agency

- Good presentation of information, interesting approach
- Would've liked more detail and a longer presentation
- Not enough data, should have been expanded with additional information/references on group composition and procedures for affecting actions by group
- It is still not clear to me exactly what the output/product of the Cleveland study will be
- Too short. This project is what the workshop is about. How to set up this type of project locally and seek air toxic reductions. I was very disappointed
- Needed more information about surveys, preliminary plans, etc.
- Vague, I can't say I can tell anyone what they are doing
- Would have been nice to hear about the problems encountered in reacting the objective and how the group is attacking voluntary reductions for the business point of view

Community/Other

- Good information - and a great neighboring State for future resources and information for our use
- Helpful information, comprehensive enough
- I would have like to hear more about the community engagement process and some of the potential project proposals

C4. Information Exchange/Poster Session:

Federal

- Outstanding
- Very useful - nice to have an organized way to network, but still informal
- This was fun
- I hope that next time OTAQ will participate
- Needed more participation, perhaps more up front planning and advertisement

State/Local Agency

- Excellent and information great!
- I liked the poster session, very informative - fun good interaction
- The opportunity for networking with the experts or experienced was great, thanks
- The large display maps at the last booth were very impressive. If I had spent more time looking at them, I could have gotten a lot of information. Overall I found this to be a useful and enjoyable part of the event - more so than I expected
- A good place to chat
- They were kind of crowded, though
- Space was small
- Probably should have been on second night not last
- Not as informative as I thought

Community/Other

- Great opportunity to learn about other projects going on and to share information about ours
- Information exchange was relevant to understanding the structure of various states in their efforts to combat air toxics, however, with various differences in state and local agencies information can be bland
- A great opportunity for locating resources and to have one-on-one exchange with other leaders and community-based representatives
- Data miner poster far out shined other material presented. Would be powerful tool in hands of community in negotiating emission reductions
- States and communities should be encouraged to display - more time needed
- Poor display abilities - need to have vertical panels to walk by - not tables w/cloths
- Missed it, too late. Should have been earlier
- Fair. Needed more participants

C5. Panel discussions:

Federal

- All very good, very informative, valuable, good spirit of openness to ideas/cooperation, some with excellent passion to remind us that we have real problems/real people to consider
- Good mix with EPA, Regions, S/L/T and community groups
- Some panel members were good in responding to questions about ultra fine PM - they complemented each other in a technical risk-related subject in which I was interested and wasn't well-versed regarding issues.
- Good ideas on how to get help from locals
- Good cross section of views
- Good
- In general, panel discussions were good.
- Speakers did not seem to have interacted before hand. Some presentations had way to much detail and number of slides were exhausting. Each group should write out their own critiques.

- Some subjects provided “what” but did not offer “how” to guidance. There were a lot of emphasis in building community capacity and not enough on building institutional capacity (or the presentation on the subject was too superficial). Funding is always an issue. If I don’t have \$100,000 or \$500,000 to spend. How can I launch an asthma or Cleveland project? Some alternative or more simplified project might be more feasible.
- I think in the future I would try to cover less topics all at once
- Spend more time describing projects
- Some way to technical and inaccessible to locals/community attendees, to academic
- Target to the majority of the audience
- Some of it was pretty technical

State/Local Agency

- Excellent!
- Generally all panel discussions were very, very good. I think the panel format was excellent.
- Some good
- Good case studies. Valuable overview by Federal and State programs
- It would be nice to get handouts for every speaker
- The two strongest sessions in my mind were the “measuring and estimating” and the “interpreting and understanding” discussions. I hope the citizen’s group liked them also.
- Need more specific information re: case studies -successes/failures, -costs, -future use of database, with less overall general information, more information on solutions - on how to help communities understand air toxics and the limitations of government agencies - more information on building successful relationships - less repetition of same information by panel members.
- Some not too helpful. Always make sure to define acronyms and technical jargon - for instance - in mobile sources - what are bought fuels? In LA Toxics program - what is TED/?

Community/Other

- Great! Good range of speakers, lots of good information presented
- A great tie in for all participants and a chance to see the connection we all share in this arena.
- Provided a diverse level of expertise in various levels of knowledge
- A lot of good data presented
- Local assessment results were good
- Very little relationship to health outcomes. Scientists know what harms the community (obvious because they can set standards) but material not given to community. Next conference - “What are these emissions affecting in our daily lives?”
- Still not enough emphasis on community involvement, (most Federal and State people still not clear on community involvement - their understanding needs a bit more educating)
- Some presentations too deep, even for people in the know. People want specifics and want them simply stated.

- Need a panel on how to improve communications with communities
- Weak presentations, hardly any new material on these panels

C6. Small group discussions:

Federal

- Excellent overall
- This was new stuff to me. I enjoy new ideas and things
- Breakout were good
- Good idea
- Really bought out diversity in those interested in air toxics, enjoyed interchange of divergent viewpoints
- Should reduce number - too many, some worked, some didn't. Maybe some general discussions once per day
- They were not reported back on and integrated in a larger discussion
- Needed more active facilitators. Should have stayed more consistent with logistics/agenda
- Could have been longer in most sessions
- The breakout discussions on building capacity and modeling/monitoring were not useful and were my least favorite part
- Not enough structure, should have specific tasks or questions to answer
- The Q/A for mobile source hot spots should not have conflicted with the small group discussion. It compromised the integrity of the small group session

State/Local Agency

- Excellent idea, first time I've seen it. I think all of us would have gladly set in these sessions longer.
- All small group discussions were good. Our facilitator/group leader did a great job of keeping things on track and interesting.
- It was very informative to hear different perspectives. Everyone was very respectful of each other. Good job facilitating!
- Appreciated smaller groups for networking and chance to dialog
- They were good - too bad I couldn't take part in all of them
- Case studies useful
- Good for generating ideas
- Very important to get honest feedback and strongly suggest keeping these discussion groups and incorporating them into other EPA workshops
- Additional training-type questions would add effectiveness to workshop.
- Hope action will be taken on discussion topics
- Feedback from that is unclear
- Not very good - too many different people with different agendas - just ended up in arguing. Maybe group project or ideas on a case study would be helpful

Community/Other

- It was interesting learning how different cities and states environmental issues are being addressed. It was, however disappointing to discover that some states and cities are more diverse while others are not as creative.
- I got a lot out of these discussions, “Breakout” sessions were extremely valuable on followup points
- Building community institutional capacities was a plus
- Small groups were very conducive to talking about different issues.
- EPA Region 6 provided very valuable info and they seem to be leaders in this field
- Discussions were good. Clarifying, identifying community and scientists concerns
- Federal and State people should listen more and answer questions rather than preach their philosophy

C7. Value of take-home materials (notebook materials presented, notebook materials that weren't presented, and other materials handed out):

Federal

- Good materials; get speakers to submit earlier; good reference for later
- The notebook is good, the issue papers and other info are a great resource
- Copies of the overheads are not always that useful
- Need something more simplistic up front. Need overview of how all the pieces (e.g. urban, residual risk, community assessments) fit together
- Missing materials were very disappointing ... still would be helpful to receive materials although late. Would be nice to have breakout session notes Tip: Presentations should be prepared two ways; (1) normal pretty slides with color for sessions and (2) slides prepared in simpler black/white format so that graphics are still legible in black/white copies e.g., some map/chart colors not distinguished when printed in black/white. Also some color graphics covered text when printed in black/white.

State/Local Agency

- Excellent!
- Very good - wish everyone had given their presentations for notebook. Will Poster session info be available on the website?
- Look forward to summaries of other breakout sessions
- Material was ok, but presentations were most valuable
- Wish all were included so we could follow along
- Instead of book full of paper - - how about a CD-ROM?

Community/Other

- Excellent for reference guide and building a network of resource persons
- Great! Good work pulling this together and keeping it updated. Fact sheets are good addition to presentation
- A lot of information, but overall good stuff
- Copies of slides were very useful, contact information useful
- Fair, would like course on Data Miner tool

C8. Value of interaction with other workshop participants, including Information Exchange/Poster Session

Federal

- Excellent
- This was the best part
- Being generous with the breaks really helped us have useful interaction, as well as the poster session
- Schedule was so tight there was little time for interaction. Would have liked to have had a group lunch at least once and/or some type of social hour to do some networking!
- More would be better, but the interest in doing so may increase if this is held again
- The mix of participants could be arranged to be more evenly represented by various participating organization. Avoid putting participants from the same organization in the same group

State/Local Agency

- Excellent, very good diversity
- Interaction with other workgroup participants was extremely valuable (poster session was good too)
- Learned a lot through interaction, networking & contacts with people already working on projects we might take on was best part
- Great interchange. This size of workshop was just the right size
- Needed more from outside Midwest

Community/Other

- Excellent, great opportunities
- Motivation! Resources defined!
- Interaction was very important. Helped clarify even further what the issues were. Felt that a lot of data was presented
- Since we weren't able to present during the formal workshop sessions, the poster session was a great opportunity to share info about our work
- State and Feds tend to cluster together probably they know each other. They should make the effort to interact with community and Tribal folks.

Section D. Logistics

D1. Crowne Plaza Pontchartrain Hotel arrangements

| | <u>Excellent</u> | <u>Very Good</u> | <u>Good</u> | <u>Fair</u> | <u>Poor</u> | <u>N/A</u> |
|---|------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| | 4 | 13 | 19 | 15 | 3 | 6 |
| D2. Room Rate | 2 | 13 | 9 | 15 | 4 | 13 |
| D3. Transportation Available | 3 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 6 | 1 |
| D4. COBO Center facilities | 2 | 19 | 22 | 11 | 5 | 1 |
| D5. Site visit, (buses, lunch, facility) | 25 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 8 | |

D6. How satisfied were you with facilitators during the workshop?

| | <u>Very Satisfied</u> | <u>Satisfied</u> | <u>Dissatisfied</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Federal | 7 | 9 | 2 |
| State/Local Agency | 11 | 11 | |
| Community/Other | <u>7</u> | <u>9</u> | |
| | 25 | 29 | |

Additional comments for (D6):

- They provided added value to the workshop in general
- All were very knowledgeable and professional: “Bang-up job.”
- Our group was fairly vocal and focused so facilitator’s job was relatively easy. Did a good job.
- Facilitator made a large difference in workshop sessions
- They were great at keeping speakers on time
- Experts in their fields and recognized the need to tone down technical aspects for all to better understand our focus.
- Pretty good
- Panels seemed to stay on schedule, but at the cost of some very assertive/aggressive enforcement of that schedule.
- Most breakouts were valuable because of participants rather than the paid facilitators.
- Breakout groups were not especially well done, facilitator did not control group well.
- Need to sometimes summarize for lay audience
- Did not ensure everyone participated, not much energy, seemed confused about substance, more interested in finishing time than interaction.
- We needed especially in breakouts someone who could guide discussion. Our group had no such guide. The designated individual was pinch-hitting and seemed very uncomfortable with the role.

D7. How satisfied were you with pre-workshop contacts (ease of registration, ability to answer questions in advance of workshop date. etc.)?

| | <u>Very Satisfied</u> | <u>Satisfied</u> | <u>Dissatisfied</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Federal | 10 | 12 | |
| State/Local Agency | 15 | 7 | |
| Community/Other | <u>6</u> | <u>8</u> | |
| | 31 | 27 | |

Additional comments (D7):

- The consultant staff were responsible and routinely shared information
- Problem was that called for registration by Oct. 1, and then added a Friday meeting to the agenda - that was too late for me to try to accommodate. Late agenda also meant that it was by leap of faith to know what I was getting in to.

- Suggestion: give information about restaurants, Detroit, etc., in advance so we can plan! Could just do a link on the website.
- Prefer to have seen agenda be finalized earlier. Question of would/should attend seemed to be an issue up to the start of conference.

D8. Did you use the workshop’s website as a main source of information on the upcoming workshop?

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Federal | 14 | 8 |
| State/Local Agency | 9 | 13 |
| Community/Other | <u>6</u> | <u>10</u> |
| | 29 | 31 |

Additional comment: Emails provided most of the updates

D9. Do you expect you’ll use the workshop’s website afterward, such as to download specific materials?

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Federal | 18 | 3 |
| State/Local Agency | 22 | 1 |
| Community/Other | <u>13</u> | <u>3</u> |
| | 53 | 7 |

D10. If available, would you like a CD-ROM compilation of notebook materials and other presented materials, even though all materials will be available for a period of time through the workshop’s website. (If one becomes available, we will post information on how to obtain a copy on the website.)

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Federal | 10 | 11 |
| State/Local Agency | 11 | 12 |
| Community/Other | <u>9</u> | <u>6</u> |
| | 30 | 29 |

Section E.1: The Bottom Line(All things considered, are you glad you participated in the Detroit Workshop)?

| | <u>Very</u> | <u>Mostly</u> | <u>Somewhat</u> | <u>Not Really</u> |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Federal | 11 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| State/Local Agency | 16 | 8 | | |
| Community/Other | <u>6</u> | <u>10</u> | | |
| | 33 | 23 | | |

E.2: Additional Comments: Is there anything else we should know?

Federal

- Excellent workshop. Give consideration to bring future workshops to other regions (i.e., Western region). Involve participants from industries and more academic institutions, transportation agencies, etc.
- Good opportunity to meet and work with newly discovered colleagues!
- Good job overall!
- We need to do a much better job of showing how to present data, information and conclusions/options. Difficult to follow, impossible to read (poor presentation). Increase the diversity of panels - less EPA. Hold the conference in a city with an active community-led air project. This conference should really emphasize the integration of community into public policy at all levels - most of these seemed to bring in community at the end of the process. Overall the panels gave the impression that panelists were the sole providers of knowledge. There was minimal exchange. There was no adequate treatment of (risk) communication - it was all measurement and assessment. I strongly suggest getting away from 4-5 panelists speaking to 20 rank rows - using font so small it can only be read without strain in the first four rows. Do not allow presenters to use material - slides, etc., that cannot be viewed and discerned by all audience members. Learning is a two-way street - spend more time listening to the audience and learn from them. More networking forums and idea exchange. I strongly disliked the format to open and close the conference. I don't want to hear from people who are disassociated from their active community/governance.
- I'm a technical person, but I don't think the monitor/model/risk talks should have been geared toward me, but more to a layman audience, i.e., the local/community attendees. Many of the scientific talks were too technical to be useful as training - - they were over people's heads. The better ones used plain English, pictures and examples.
- I suggest rotating the breaks, so that everyone gets to meet everyone else. (i.e., don't have the same people meet together for all breakouts)
- Maybe this type of thing should be more directly aimed toward community groups
- I'm starting to learn a lot! Some things are still overwhelmingly confusing for me. Too much information - - too little time!
- I'd like to see a meeting aimed at educating community members. I would like to see more on the "building capacity" in the future. I'd like to learn more about what community groups are involved with and actively doing
- Needed presentations from those agencies off the beaten path of air toxics - smart growth, etc.
- Ending at 4:00 p.m. on the last day is no longer adequate for travelers, given the long lead time required at the airport for security
- Maybe community groups with less expertise need separate sessions to get them up to speed (ahead of time). Scholarships were great idea!! Do more of this next time. Final session was excellent. Good way to raise understanding level of all.
- Great job by OAQPS leads and participants in moving this important effort forward! Need more involvement of OPPT and others with innovative ideas. Need more community involvement. More health department interaction . . . more discussion of

successes/failures in developing community trust tips/examples ... survey of what communities need to understand, the risks and what their choices are .. (i.e. survey real communities) ... have panel discussions ... EJ petitions/studies

- Better audio visual set up would be more pleasant (thought it was adequate)
- It's EPA policy that travel is supposed to be during normal work hours when possible - suggest starting Monday afternoon and ending Thursday or Friday morning. (2) The convention center did not have recycling bins! EPA should only book events at places that have recycling - minimum is can recycling for drinks served on break. I think there may be information on EPA website on this (3) Really bad that hotel didn't serve affordable breakfast (4) Contract for better break food - hard candy, hot tea, snacks to keep folks going! (5) If you want more interaction among folks, have lunch as part of the conference. People will sit together and talk. Give enough time to eat. (6) We were lucky on the weather - think about weather when picking location. Also think of where folks can go for meals - within walking distance that is safe!
- EC/R has done a good! Ending the workshop at lunch or very early afternoon may prevent losing so many people.
- EC/R did a good job of pulling it all together. Need to think about how to develop future actions around levels of information needed.
- We need to be very clear on what is not known regarding urban toxics - people think EPA has the answers and they are really just getting started

State/Local Agency

- Excellent workshop. Perhaps it would help to have each Region to identify industry in their area that are proactive in reductions. This would serve as a database from which to invite industry at next conference
- Overall, great!
- This is the best conference that I have attended in my professional experience! Great job!
- Very good workshop - Thanks!
- Very good, I would come again next year
- Good workshop! I was looking for info on how to develop a needs assessment and implementation but all this will help me in my role as a task force member
- Well organized and presented
- We need more of these, good mix of participants
- Still would like some perspective from EPA on where these local assessments fit into the Integrated Air Toxics Strategy goals and program. The workshop was confusing because it isn't where local assessments come into the federal regulatory program or even a State's program - state authority issues were neglected, - more specific "how to" on funding needed, - who was the target for this workshop? It seemed to be for very proactive states - not those that NEED a strong federal mandate to perform these activities
- Can you provide more data or info on using the data of the cumulative exposure project, status on how close we are to developing standards for compounds listed in the CEP
- Need discussion/presentation on what is in the future from USEPA for national controls on mobile sources, i.e., diesel PM and benzene; need to invite industry representatives,

- interaction with community activists and regulators could be invaluable
- Would like to see industry representatives at workshop to share success stories as well as needs and awareness
- As one of the few local participants, I was disappointed that there were no local presenters, especially since there is an Urban Air Toxics Study in progress here in the Detroit area. There is also a model community/industry/regulatory group known as the Good Neighbors United Initiative, working together to address environmental concerns such as odors, fugitive dust, toxic air emissions, and illegal dumping in (7) down river communities. On the whole, I took a lot of good information from the workshop. Thanks for your efforts

Community/Other

- Good job!
- Your generosity in information and travel scholarships made it possible for more participants to be present and involved in this very valued workshop. Thank you!
- Good workshop!
- The information was good even though a lot was very technical. Need to include a day or at least a half day session to include community folks presented in understandable form we really need to make more of an effort to make sure all the data and information is more available to concerned citizens who pay for it all via taxes. This section should be longer.
- I appreciate organizers' efforts to stay on schedule. But many speakers seemed rushed. Plan fewer speakers per panel - this means difficult choices, but if a speaker is just going to read a set of slides, they may as well just hand out copies.
- Allow community more participation in workshop planning. Not enough community representation
- The list of participants is an excellent tool for establishing and maintaining a good network with various State and local agencies.
- I would like to suggest that the planners of the next conference include global concerns. Although, Alaska is a state it is a considerable distance away from the rest of the states. The main concern I have is that the contamination from industries, emissions, incinerators, etc. all eventually end up in the arctic regions such as Alaska. I would also have been interested in hearing more about the contamination of the air in New York and how we may be affected by it. Again, thank you for the opportunity to meet with people from around the Nations to discuss and learn more about air quality.
- There appears to be a lot of knowledge in EPA Regional offices that was shared in my small workgroup (particularly Region 6). It made this workshop worthwhile for me
- It would be really good to have community groups represented who want to do this work - not just who are already doing the work
- Future workshops: would be useful to include some health-related presentations
- Please advise Federal and State persons that the other participants need to know them and not stick to themselves
- Need to have more time for Q&A at the end of each session

- It would have been nice - at an EPA conference to see re-usable mugs/cups for coffee and water during the conference.
- Need more minority community participation - experts need to know who they are working for