

Stakeholder Group Meeting Highlights

April 11, 2000



Stakeholder Group Members present: Tom Borton, Michigan Industries of the Future; Phil Kaplan, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region 5; Rebecca Spearot, Lear Corporation; Robert Marr, PPG Industries (representing Don Emch); James Murray, Wayne County Department of Environment; Charles Griffith, Ecology Center; Paul Chalmer, National Center for Manufacturing Sciences; Jonathan W. Bulkley, University of Michigan; Guy Williams, National Wildlife Federation.

Stakeholder Group Member not present: Kevin Korpi, Michigan Chamber of Commerce.

Others present: Barry Wyerman, Lear Corporation; Wendy Fitzner, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ); Pat Beattie, General Motors Corporation (GM); Wendy Lange, GM.

Workgroup Members: Sandra S. Brewer, GM; Marcia Horan, MDEQ; Sue Rokosz, Ford Motor Company; Doug Orf, DaimlerChrysler; Anita Singh Welch, MDEQ.

Facilitator: Tom Occhipinti, MDEQ.

The first Michigan Auto Project (MAP) Stakeholder Group meeting consisted of presentations on:

1. The historical overview of the Great Lakes and U.S. Auto Projects (handouts available)
2. An overview of the current Michigan Auto Project
3. The Michigan Auto Project Stakeholder Group roles and responsibilities, and
4. Product Development.

Discussion periods were held after the presentation on “Stakeholder Group Roles and Responsibilities,” and at the end of the meeting as part of the “Wrap-up.” The following list is the issues raised during the discussion periods:

1. The Auto Project should discuss an outreach plan and include the MAP’s future outreach efforts, such as, (1) the Auto Project Progress Report, (2) Auto Project Display board (need to include the Environmental Assistance Center’s phone number and the Michigan Auto Project’s internet address/uniform resource locator), (3) possible conference and trade shows where the display and Auto Project information can be shared, and (4) the auto companies could work together for outreach to 2nd and 3rd tier suppliers
2. What is the individual partner’s (MDEQ, DaimlerChrysler, Ford and GM) level of commitment to the project, as well as their allocated budget to this project. What is MDEQ’s leadership role?
3. Consider including in the scope of the project issues such as, urban sprawl (major concern in Wayne County), energy impacts and conservation.
4. Need an increased environmental stewardship role by the auto companies to their suppliers. The stakeholders would like to see the auto companies work with their purchasing departments or environmental offices (backward integration).
5. Other efforts to integrate P2 goals into the supplier network (consistent and/or consolidated environmental reporting). There should be a coordinated effort amongst the auto manufacturers on supplier environmental requirement materials certifications.

6. Need to establish a mechanism for regular communication to Stakeholder Group. Possibly e-mail all Stakeholder Group members quarterly with Workgroup meeting summaries and actions taken. The MAP will also add the workgroup meeting summaries to the project's internet site. Some group members said they would like to meet more than once a year to discuss issues and ideas more frequently. One member voiced that a once a year meeting was adequate.
7. Examine the use of metrics to measure environmental burden reduction. The Group would like to see how successful the project is in spearheading P2 and how successful the P2 projects are in achieving environmental improvements and reducing environmental burdens (land use, transportation and usual media issues). How will the stakeholders and workgroup know if the MAP is successful? What would MAP members consider success?
8. Consider expanding scope of project's report – thoughts included expand measurements, such as, impact of auto operation (mobile impact). Also, what about post-consumer fate? Need to explain why certain chemicals are used.
9. Incorporate the use of college student interns, as was done in the previous Auto Project. In the U.S. Auto Project, college student interns worked separately for the auto companies, but coordinated their collective knowledge on one case study during the summer – sharing information about each of the companies and accomplishing excellent technology transfer.
10. Expand connections of MAP to other organizations, groups, and actions, such as: Automotive Industry Action Group (AIAG), Alliance of Automotive Manufacturers (AAM), United States Consortium of Automotive Research (US CAR), Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE), Society of Manufacturing Engineers (SME), etc. Possibly send a letter from the MAP to all of the organizations affiliated with the auto industry. This letter could let the organizations know what the MAP is currently doing, what the future holds and how the MAP would like to pursue further communication on P2 issues with the organizations.
11. Consider MAP vision and its leadership role. Some members of the Stakeholder Group would like to see the Auto Project be more visionary.
12. Define pollution prevention (P2) in the Auto Project documents.
13. The Stakeholder Group had concerns that they were unable to have substantial input into the development of the Michigan Auto Project Agreement. The group is seeking opportunities to contribute to the project's development and would like to see a more interactive process.

The Auto Project Workgroup members will discuss each issue raised by the stakeholders at the next workgroup meeting on May 17, 2000. The workgroup will follow-up with a written response to the issues raised by the stakeholders within two weeks of receiving all the stakeholders' comments to the meeting highlights, or by September 1, 2000 (whichever comes first).

The next Stakeholder Group meeting is scheduled on Tuesday, October 17, 2000 at DaimlerChrysler Headquarters in Auburn Hills. The meeting will be held in conference room 1-G (first floor). Additional information regarding the meeting will be supplied in August.