

Meeting Summary  
Stakeholder Meeting  
October 17, 2000

Susan M. Cischke, Senior Vice-President of Regulatory Affairs and Passenger Car Operations at DaimlerChrysler Corporation welcomed the MAP Stakeholder Group members to DC Headquarters and to the second MAP stakeholder group meeting.

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.

**Discussion regarding "Response to Stakeholder Issues"**

Anita Welch reviewed the Response to Stakeholders document with meeting participants. The document focuses on how the MAP addresses each of thirteen issues previously raised by Stakeholder Group members. Discussion was then opened to specific questions regarding the document.

*Highlights of the Stakeholder Group discussion and recommendations follow.*

Stakeholder support of the student intern program was expressed, however, a dedicated internship program may not be feasible because it requires a common project among the three auto companies. This has proven difficult in past years. The auto company case study projects are too diverse and commonality is hard to find (other than the case studies that have already been done). Ford and GM currently run internal student internship programs. Funding for a MAP-based student internship program continues to be an issue. The DEQ (vs. AAMA in the US Auto Project) may be able to assume the lead in coordinating an internship program from the MAP.

Recommendation: As expressed in the project's goals and objectives, project participants should seek mutually beneficial opportunities for student internship assignments as they are determined to be feasible.

Stakeholders expressed the continued need for supplier P2 outreach. Life Cycle Analysis may be the key, especially for getting the data and information from suppliers to support LCA and life-cycle engineering.

Recommendations: The MAP needs to look at ways to integrate supplier stewardship (including means to support LCA efforts w/ suppliers); OEM supplier mentoring; find ways to measure how the MAP is progressing; how does P2 fit into the supplier initiatives being promoted currently, especially with supplier progress. The MAP workgroup needs to answer what the project can do to spearhead this? How do we measure our success in this? Are advances shown in what we're doing now?

More partnership/training is needed. The information chain from a supplier to the supplier's supplier is too broad. Data is hard to get; the environmental burden of an auto is too dispersed (20,000 parts in one auto). Proprietary issues of sharing true impact, such as energy costs, recycling may exist. Lear is partnering with OEM to do a pilot study.

Recommendation: Auto Project could sponsor a presentation at a Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) conference on supply chain integration.

Meeting Summary  
Stakeholder Meeting  
October 17, 2000

**Draft of the MAP 2000 Progress Report**

Paul Zugger provided an overview of the previous progress reporting history and the significant input that was provided by the past Auto Project Advisory Group in improving the content and format of the reports.

Anita described the Foreward and Executive Summary portions of the report including the format and a description of the tables and figures. It was also pointed out that the auto companies exceeded their commitment to develop 12 case studies/year with an actual 29 submitted. (Case studies are available on the MDEQ's MAP internet site)

Each Auto Company Representative (Doug Orf, DaimlerChrysler; Sue Rokosz, Ford; Sandy Brewer, GM) provided an overview of their respective sections.

*The Stakeholder Group made the following comments and recommendations regarding the report's format and content:*

The report's focus on TRI emissions is too simplistic, and may not cover all the issues. Are the reductions actually caused by outsourcing? If so, then real progress is not reported because supplier emissions are not included.

Recommendations: It was suggested that in the next report we include more explanation of the data; and in a broader context, what does the data mean? We need to challenge the mission of the group – identify new challenges and find ways to quantify results. Could the auto companies give a thumbnail sketch of main projects or highlights of big efforts that have reduced the GLPT's? Develop a publication for the public to convey the progress of the MAP (not as technical as the report). The report needs a greater breakdown of the trend analysis over the years (for example: compound class breakdowns; breakdowns by facility type; company by company chemical breakdowns). The report also needs to address specific activities that address substances of concern (i.e. mercury).

How is TRI data reported? All companies should define "releases" the same.

Recommendation: The report needs consistent definitions (releases) - companies need to agree on what data reporting can be done to be consistent and common among company reporting (consistency in reporting on off-site transfers). Check footnotes.

The report should clarify activities of the MAP versus other projects implemented by the auto companies or their suppliers. Mercury phase-out needs to be addressed and communicated, especially regarding existing vehicles and what's being done about them.

Recommendation: The report could be divided into three parts: GLPT reductions (including specific projects), Other initiatives that affect suppliers, and Other activities related to MAP goals.

Summary: Significant P2 progress has been made within the auto industry. Where do we go now? Now maybe we should increase our focus on quality/efficiency/technology. Where do we test these new technologies?

Meeting Summary  
Stakeholder Meeting  
October 17, 2000

[Presentations were provided by Ross Good, DaimlerChrysler, on End of Vehicle Life Legislation in Europe and by Reg Modlin and Fred Maloney, DaimlerChrysler, on Fuel Cell/New Generation Vehicles.]

**Wrap-up**

The stakeholder group agreed to continue meeting twice a year, and revisit this issue next year. The next meeting will be held in April/May with the following meeting held in November to review the draft annual report.

Stakeholders are asked to respond to the 2<sup>nd</sup> report draft within a week of its distribution.

**Next Agenda**

Suggestions for the next meeting's agenda included:

- ✓ How to more effectively track and influence the activities of suppliers.
  - Sector-based approaches (metal finishers strategic goals)
  - Trading costs when dispersed among suppliers
- ✓ Incorporating LCA into the project, or at least reporting on activities.
- ✓ Auto companies as transportation companies (thought: have dept./staff from companies attend).
- ✓ Unresolved substances (mercury) reductions as a topic.
- ✓ Planning for the content of the next progress report (refresh on internet).