STATES ERP CONSORTIUM NATIONAL MEETING
Reno, Nevada
Agenda for Work Group Session 1 – Reporting Results

- Benefits of Using Core Descriptors and Measures

- Overview of Core Descriptors and Measures

- Presentation of "ERP Performance Analyzer"
    - *Context*: Use of <u>Common Measures Project</u> data as an example
    - Presentation of tools with connections to reporting results core measures

- Discussion of Suggested Changes To Date

- Preparing for Tuesday Morning Work Group Session 3:
    - The ERP Results Reporting Compact

STATES ERP CONSORTIUM NATIONAL MEETING
Reno, Nevada
Agenda for Work Group Session 3 – Reporting Results

- Further Discussion of Suggested Changes (as necessary)

- Informal Polling of States to Determine Readiness to Sign-On to the **ERP Results Reporting Compact**

  - Identifying Barriers to Signing-On

- Setting Schedule for Finalizing Core Descriptors & Measures

- Other Issues:

  - ✓ Possible National Environmental Information Exchange and/or State Innovation Grant Applications;

  - ✓ Completing the Reporting Results Guide;

  - ✓ Next States ERP Results Report

Benefits of Using Core Descriptors and Measures

- Provide Credible & Defensible Data

- Better Able to Compare Results within and across Sectors & States

- Increase Acceptance of the ERP Approach (including ERP measurement)

- Identify Effective and Efficient Environmental Protection Strategies

- More Easily Communicate ERP Results

Overview of Core Descriptors

- **Universe:** Definition; Location; Size; Confidence in; and Key environmental concerns

- **Policy approach:** ERP tools/components used; Cert type (vol/mand); Cert motivators; ERP permanence; External influences

- **Measurement approach:** EBPI list; EBPI selection approach; Random sample size and approach; Data collector skills/training

- **Other:** Data entry approach; Timeframe of key activities

Overview of Core Measures (1 of 2)

- **Certification-related:** Cert rate; "High-concern" discrepancy rate on EBPIs; Rate of self-disclosed non-compliance; RTC rate; and *RTCs as % of self-disclosed non-compliance*.

- **Inspection-related:** Achievement rate for each EBPI; Summary of EBPI performance changes; aggregate achievement rate for all EBPIs; achievement rate across all compliance-related measures (i.e., compliance rate); *Average and distribution of facility scores for all EBPIs, for just compliance-related EBPIs, and for all compliance-related measures.*

Note: Italics denotes the 7 optional measures

Overview of Core Measures

- **Environmental/Health Outcomes*:** Rate of managing/controlling certain environmental aspects; Level of group emissions/etc.; and Ecological/occupational/public health impacts

- **Costs/Resources*:** Agency level of effort (first ERP cycle and subsequent cycles)

- **Other:** Other benefits of ERP; other key measures

Note: * Denotes the 5 "aspirational" measures

ERP Measurement Tools

Tools	Houses Data?	Analyzes Data?	Presents Data?	Very Auto-mated?
ERP Performance-Analyzer	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Yes
EPA Results Analyzer	--	Yes	Partial**	--

* Statistical analyses require JMP statistical software.
** Using custom Vermont version of Results Analyzer, for single samples.

For Sample Planning: MA DEP, EPA and other states have tools available to identify sample sizes and pick facilities for random samples.

Contacts: For the ERP Performance-Analyzer, Contact Suzi Peck (MA DEP). For the EPA/VT Tools, contact Scott Bowles (USEPA) or Mike Crow (consultant). States such as RI, FL, and MI have other measurement tools that may be valuable to states.

Suggested Changes to Date

- **ADDITIONS:**
  - ❑ ERP fit with regulatory structure (e.g., replaces permits, etc.)
  - ❑ Scope of ERP (multimedia, OSHA, etc.)
  - ❑ Description of stakeholder involvement
  - ❑ Similarity with federal requirements
  - ❑ Media-focused compliance rate, rather than overall compliance rate

Suggested Changes to Date

- **Deletions:** data entry approach, confidence in universe size

- **Miscellaneous:** promote the "optional" measures to full core status; provide more guidance on capturing quantitative values

- **Minor changes:** wording, grouping, numbering, presentation changes

Approach to Addressing Suggestions

- RRWG PROPOSES:

  - **For Minor Changes:** Proceeding with minor modifications that improve the documentation without substantively changing the measures/descriptors

  - **For Major Changes:** What level of review and sign-off is appropriate?

STATES ERP CONSORTIUM NATIONAL MEETING
Reno, Nevada
Agenda for Work Group Session 3 – Reporting Results

- Further Discussion of Suggested Changes (as necessary)
- Informal Polling of States to Determine Readiness to Sign-On to the **ERP Results Reporting Compact**
  - Identifying Barriers to Signing-On
- Setting Schedule for Finalizing Core Descriptors & Measures
- Other Issues:
  - ✓ Possible National Environmental Information Exchange and/or State Innovation Grant Applications;
  - ✓ Completing the Reporting Results Guide;
  - ✓ Next States ERP Results Report

ERP RESULTS REPORTING COMPACT

PURPOSE OF THE COMPACT:

- The States ERP Consortium asks all Consortium members and other ERP implementers to sign on and notify the Consortium chairperson of their commitment to the ERP Results Reporting Compact. **The ERP Results Reporting Compact is intended to ensure that agencies implementing ERP are reporting credible and defensible data. This will support the credibility of ERP as a whole, which will benefit all users.**

ERP RESULTS REPORTING COMPACT

THE COMPACT:

- Agencies implementing ERP agree to certain principles when reporting results from ERP initiatives. **The overarching principle is transparency: it should be clear to all interested parties what an ERP state is measuring, how it is measuring it, and what is not captured in that measurement.**

ERP RESULTS REPORTING COMPACT

SPECIFIC PRINCIPLES INCLUDE:

- 1. **Making all results readily available** to the public and to ERP stakeholders (including both positive and negative results).

- 2. **Presenting results that are representative** of the group covered by ERP, based upon the application of statistically sound sampling approaches.

- 3. **Reporting on the limited set of "core" measures and descriptors** identified in *A Guide to Reporting ERP Results,* and following the guidelines for those measures.

ERP RESULTS REPORTING COMPACT

- 4. **When choosing to report results for non-core measures** from *A Guide to Reporting ERP Results*, striving to **follow the guidelines for those measures whenever feasible.**

- 5. **Adhering to the statistical principles and sampling approaches recommended** in *A Guide to Reporting ERP Results*, or using alternatives which strive for the same goals of transparency and defensibility and reflect good statistical practices.

ERP RESULTS REPORTING COMPACT

- 6. **Reporting how each result is calculated** and providing statistical information for each result (e.g., definition of the measure, especially if inconsistent with *A Guide to Reporting ERP Results;* basis for any comparisons made; and statistical significance, sample size, confidence level, and confidence interval).

- 7. **Presenting description, assumptions and limitations of the methodology** used in developing results (e.g., sampling approach, possible sources of bias).

- 8. **Using, improving upon and sharing common tools** for storing, analyzing and presenting results, whenever possible.

Illustration of Calculations (1 of 2)

	EBPI 1	EBPI 2	EBPI 3 (Vol.)	Non-EBPI 1
Facility A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Facility B	Y	Y	--	N
Facility C	Y	Y	N	Y
Facility D	Y	N	N	Y
Achievement Rate, Each EBPI	100.0%	75.0%	33.3%	

- **Aggregate Achievement Rate for All EBPIs** = **73%** (i.e., 8Y/11 relevant)
- **Achievement Rate across All Compliance-Related Measures** = **50%** (i.e., 2 facilities at 100%, 2 at 0%)
- **Average Facility Score for All EBPIs** = **75%** (i.e., 2 at 100%, 1 at 67%, 1 at 33%; divided by 4)

Illustration of Calculations (2 of 2)

	EBPI 1	EBPI 2	EBPI 3 (Vol.)	Non-EBPI 1
Facility A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Facility B	Y	Y	--	N
Facility C	Y	Y	N	Y
Facility D	Y	N	N	Y
Achievement Rate, Each EBPI	**100.0%**	**75.0%**	**33.3%**	

- **Average Facility Score for All EBPIs = 75%** (i.e., 2 at 100%, 1 at 67%, 1 at 33%; divided by 4)
- **Average Facility Score for Compliance-Related EBPIs = 87.5%** (i.e., 3 at 100%, 1 at 50%; divided by 4)
- **Average Facility Score for All Compliance-Related Measures = 83.4%** (i.e., 2 at 100%, 2 at 67%; divided by 4)