



Meeting Highlights

May 17, 2001

Dr. Patricia Beattie, Director of Chemical Risk Management at General Motors Corporation welcomed the MAP Stakeholder Group members to GM Headquarters and to the third MAP stakeholder group meeting. Dr. Beattie briefly overviewed GM's environmental services organization and then touched upon various environmental initiatives GM is undertaking. These initiatives are: CEAP (Community Environmental Awareness Program), Supplier Environmental Advisory Team, Gmability.com, Global Metrics.

Paul Zugger gave an overview of the EAD and the role of voluntary sector-based P2 partnerships and their importance to the state of Michigan goals. Paul also mentioned that the DEQ would like to see increased efforts to the support and promotion of P2 in the supplier community.

Stakeholder Feedback on Virtual Progress Report

A printed copy of the virtual report was provided to meeting participants, and a visual display of the internet site where the report can be viewed was shown.

The following questions/comments/suggestions were made regarding the report:

- How many people have downloaded the report?
Approximately 100 individuals have downloaded the report, and another 2,000 individuals have accessed the Auto Project website.
- Can other's link to our website?
Yes, other people can link to our website, as well as the Auto Project links to a number of auto related websites, i.e. USCAR, SAE, etc.
- Have a press event on the auto project
Workgroup will discuss this idea further.
- How do we publicize the report?
Via articles in various newsletters (auto related), using the auto project display at events, etc.
The workgroup will discuss more ideas at the next workgroup meeting.
- Greater explanation concerning the amount of TRI emissions reduced by GM's removal of the Delphi data is needed.
- Should include more emphasis on facility-based information.
- Should we move to a separate report on the first tier auto suppliers (Delphi, Visteon, etc.) to obtain a better understanding of their TRI reductions?

It was mentioned that as a virtual report, the MAP progress report will be updated as necessary, and all previous reports will be archived.

Discussion then focused on the auto project case studies – how they are distributed within the auto companies themselves; sharing them with the suppliers, the selection of what case study will be developed, and then the need for an easier to read format. The workgroup will analyze the case studies and determine case study need by sector and topic, and create a case study template.

Discuss Draft Quad Fold (executive summary of report)

A draft of the quad fold was presented to meeting participants. It was decided that the quad fold should be used as a promotional MAP piece vs. a highlight of the progress report, and therefore less technical. The workgroup will remove the technical data from the brochure and replace the data with case study summaries. The brochure will be modeled after the Canadian Auto Project brochure.

Anita Welch will make changes to the brochure and fax to MAP stakeholder members for review and comment.

Auto Companies' Supplier Initiatives

A list of supplier initiatives was developed by the auto companies and distributed to meeting participants (see attached list). Each auto company briefly described their respective initiatives and then answered questions from stakeholder group members.

The principal question asked was how the Auto Project can fold P2 issues into what's going on in the automotive supplier community. The auto company workgroup members will review the supplier activities to determine pollution prevention opportunities and discuss possible ways to direct specific Auto Project activities toward their suppliers

A couple of suggestions were made to further encompass suppliers into the auto project: 1). Build the auto project goals into the auto company supplier evaluation metrics, and 2). Have a supplier recognition component to the project that specifically meets the auto project goals.

Another question raised was how do the auto companies use the program structure to share non-competitive issues? Sue Rokosz stated that the auto companies currently use the USCAR structure to share pre-competitive issues. The case studies are another method.

Wrap-up

During the wrap up discussion the present value of the Michigan Auto Project to the auto companies was questioned. The question was whether the project brought a benefit to the auto companies and was worth the staff resource time committed. The following issues were raised at the meeting:

- What are the benefits of the MAP to the auto companies and stakeholders (suppliers and NGOs)? The suppliers and NGOs voiced that they want to see the auto project continue with a clarified focus, a stronger emphasis on supplier P2 outreach and recognition, and with greater public accountability.
- Is the MAP simply a public recognition tool, and if so, what degree of public recognition is being generated? How are the case studies distributed and shared within the auto companies and with the suppliers? Is the MAP primarily allocating its time and resources to putting together an annual report on the auto company TRI data?
- Will the auto companies meet the challenge of driving P2 in the supplier sector?

(A workgroup meeting was scheduled on Friday, June 8, to address the issues raised above. [The June 8, 2001 meeting highlights are available upon request.] Another meeting has been scheduled for June 26, 2001 as a follow up to the June 8th meeting.)