

C: Chip Hughes; WETB; Director
C: Sharon Beard; WETB; Industrial Hygienist
C: Ted Outwater; WETB; Public Health Administrator/Program Administrator
C: James Remington; WETB; Staff Member
C: Deborah Weinstock; National Clearinghouse;
C: Don Elisburg; National Clearinghouse;
C: Bryan Englehardt; College of Holy Cross; Economist, Department of Economics

+++ presentation

Chip Hughes: And a lot of the work that's been done in trying to think about economic benefits from that program. So that's kind of an overview of kind of what we're doing.

Back to Sharon, do we talk about questions? I can't remember because I guess the one other piece just that I wanted to say at the beginning is, which maybe you could say, which is we have the text box for questions.

Sharon Beard: Yes, if you have a question during the webinar just please type it under the questions tab. It should be on the right-hand side of your computer, and we will be able to see them and then we'll hopefully be able to answer them on air if we can, if not we'll see what we can do as far as getting the answer to you at a later date. But any questions that you have you can just type them in at any time and we'll try to get to them. If we can't get to them during the presentation then we'll definitely do it at the end when we have questions and feedback.

Chip Hughes: Right. Yes, we've tried to figure out how to do this in some orderly fashion in terms of having a discussion, which is probably too difficult to do at this point, so we'll use that as a process for feedback and would appreciate any either questions or suggestions that you have.

What we wanted to have at this event originally was that we wanted to have a way to kind of assess where our training program has gone over the past five years and where we'd want to go for the next five years. And I think what we've seen in the past five years, if you think back to whenever, however many years ago that was, the world, itself, has changed around us in terms of what training is, what it means, how it happens, who it's done to, and how it fits into the bigger picture of worker protection.

And those were the kind of themes that we wanted to look at today, particularly with what Donald would cover, as we think about how we balance kind of our core mission of providing safety and health training on a daily basis for people for their jobs and then being able to have a way to respond and answer the calls and our resources are needed nationally.

And I think, you know, thinking back over the last five years, which I guess does that take us back before the BP oil spill?

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Chip Hughes: Yes, that would be before the BP oil spill, through Hurricane Sandy, you know, we've just -- and, also, I guess the other thing I was thinking about that would also encompass the Recovery Act, as well. When we think about, for example, the supplements that we've had to do and the way that our programs have changed by events that have happened and the way that I feel like we've tried to shape the program to events as they've happened. And in each of those situations with new partners that we've taken on, with new safety and health challenges we've taken on, with new actually technological approaches that we've done, all of those things have kind of been a core part of the evolution of our program.

So that's sort of what we would like to explore with you today and, also, I would just encourage each of you to think about how your programs have changed, how your organizations have changed, how your target populations have changed because those are things that we're trying to think about for the future as we look ahead to the next five years.

So that was basically just what I wanted to say at the beginning, and I think I'll probably next turn it over to Sharon for the next program report.

Sharon Beard: Thanks, Chip.

What I wanted to do now, was just cover a little bit of information about the Minority Worker Training Program, give you an update on numbers, and share a little bit about the project that we've been working on over the summer on best practices and lessons learned from the Minority Worker Training Report.

As you can see on the screen, we've got our final numbers in for the 2013 year, and we had a great year for job placement and training for the Minority Worker Training Program. We trained 367 individuals and out of that 297 were placed at a 76% job placement rate, so that keeps us in par with last year at 75%, and our total for the program over the years is 70% for the Minority Worker Training Program. So we're very happy that we had some great results for this year.

We had some wonderful success stories that we shared in the progress report. We had one from [Merritt Community Services] out of CPWR Consortium that focused on one of the individuals getting their own company and getting work to work in Minnesota doing construction and worked there, so that was certainly something that we highlighted the success of the program. And so we encourage you to continue giving us that information about the anecdotes for success and what's going on in each one of your programs.

This current slide gives you detail of the courses that were offered, students trained, and the total contact hours for the consortium. If you look at these numbers and something is not right with it, please let me know because we want to make sure we have the most up-to-date information on all of our training numbers here.

As you can see, we offered for the program as a whole 295 courses for the 367 students at 155,000 contact hours, which is pretty good for this program. We've been averaging anywhere from around 150,000 to 160,000 contact hours each year, so we're happy that we were able to

continue on and offer all these different courses for the consortiums under the Minority Worker Training Program.

Finally, I wanted to share with you a little bit about the project. Each of you should have been contacted, especially the Minority Worker Training grantees and anybody who has a program that focuses on bringing in underserved populations. What we were trying to do, [Dusty Russell] at MDB and [Tim Fields] worked on pulling together a document that shows the success and best practices of the Minority Worker Training Program.

They were looking at some of the -- what are the best components of the program, how have we been utilizing the training to support communities develop partnerships, with the holistic approach to training. And so he went through each one of these areas from a life skills, technical training, and what we've been able to do as far as sustainability of this program, and even kind of got into some of the evaluation components and tried to determine what are some of the best practices and lessons learned from the program. He also had some findings that we were able to pull out from the aggregate data that was presented with this report, and also recommendations on how to move forward in the future. And this is very important for us as we're looking at re-competing this program, so we'll certainly be utilizing this information.

We're in the process of getting it cleared here at NIEHS for publication. What we might do is to send it out to a couple of our grantees to get your feedback, so please when you receive it just keep an eye out for it so that we can maybe get a one or two-week turnaround time so you can give us your feedback on the report. But I want to say thanks to Dusty and Tim for their outstanding work in moving forward.

And I'm going to turn it over now I think to Ted Outwater.

Ted Outwater: Literally turning it over. I just have a couple of slides, full of numbers, once again, just to share with you guys. The first one is from the Department of Energy, and it's a four-year summary showing where we started back in 2009, 2010, and the chart is fairly self-explanatory. It shows total courses, total workers, and total contact hours.

And, as you can see, 2010, 2011 our numbers are down quite a bit from there, particularly in terms of contact hours. Part of that was the big jump due to [ARO] training for the DOE complex, and so it self-corrected. If we went back and looked a few years before that we'd been running around 30,000 workers trained, now we're down to about 27,000. I don't think it's significant unless that's a long-term trend, but it will be something we'll be looking at during this next coming year and future years.

And the second slide is for the main program, the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program. It does not include the Hazmat Disaster Training Program, and right there you can see, once again, we went -- we're down from that high in 2010 of 172,000 workers, but that was very much ARO related. But we're back up from 137,000 workers last year to 141,000, 142,000 workers this year, but that's really, once again, a pretty successful year and one we're proud of and we really, once again, want to thank you as the providers for achieving these numbers. It really

makes it a program that I wouldn't say it's easy to defend, but it's defensible, and we're really able to show these types of results and what that means in terms of human lives.

And, once again, when Sharon mentions anecdotes and success stories, we do use those and we do share them with Congress and with other agencies and that. And so, as I say, keep those cards and letters coming in.

One of the things I'd like to point out about these numbers because I've been asked about it a number of times is how does it relate to cost per contact hour? And we calculate cost per contact hour for an awardee based on what your total award was, divided by the total contact hours of training. And as an overall program for the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program we're at about \$16 per contact hour. It varies by year, but we don't use individual cost per contact hour to compare an awardee to an awardee. We do use it to look at your own award over the period of time and to use it as a guide to whether or not your costs are within certain parameters.

But, for instance, we do not compare the laborer's contact hour with the firefighter's cost of contact hour versus the community college's cost of contact hour because you all have different models, you have different audiences, you have different levels of training and degrees of training, so that would be too much apples and oranges. But we do look at within your own consortium over time, and that is one of the issues that if you do have a really high cost per contact hour it's one of those things you want to make sure that your reports emphasize the reasons your expenses are at that.

And that's pretty much all I have to say. I think we're going on to Jim. Yes, there's Jim.

James Remington: All right, good afternoon, everyone.

First, I just want to thank all of those who were able to attend the Sandy Supplement meeting that we had in New York yesterday. I think it was -- from the feedback I was getting it was pretty productive. For those of you who were able to attend and meet with some of the other Sandy Supplement's grantees from NIOSH and OSHA, there was a lot of great exchange of information, and I think everybody benefitted from that. I think we'll probably do it again in the spring, but we'll probably allocate a little bit more time for it.

So the Hurricane Sandy activity is still going on, and it's kind of morphing a little bit, more into a resiliency preparedness, but there is -- have no doubt, there's still a lot of mucking and gutting going out there and there's still areas, like [Gracie Point], that are basically empty, that it's going to require major work to get that back and going.

But, anyways, for the Hazmat Disaster Preparedness Training Program, on that table, down in the lower left, basically I just went back the past five years just to show you where we are, where we've been with training. And last year everything was pretty comparable, actually last year was a little better as far as courses. There was 825 courses that were delivered to over 12,000 workers, with over 112,000 contact hours. So we're still going the right direction with that, and I appreciate you all putting the effort into keeping that going.

There was a few other things that I would like to recommend to you all, and this is all in the idea of future disasters, is to continue making those partnerships with your locals and the local areas that they live, that they work, make it known the resources that you have available because when a disaster happens we're going to ask you are you being impacted, and I think there's no better contribution to your community than to be able to help folks recover from those kind of events.

And it also helps us that when we come in if we secure additional funding, that we can just add to what you're doing and hopefully speed things up. I say speed things up, but that's been an issue we've had with every disaster, and we're going to continue to work on that.

The other thing I want to just mention is the Worker Resiliency Project on the Gulf Coast. We have secured the [SAMSA] funds for that, and we're still going forward with that. For those of you who may be interested, let me know. I know there's a few folks that have been involved with it, but if folks who haven't been involved with it and you have an interest in it let us know. It's geared primarily for the workers, supervisors, and providers in the Gulf Coast, but our vision for this product is to be integrated into other trainings, as well, and we're going to be piloting in different areas, not only the Gulf Coast, but possibly up in New York, New Jersey, and maybe in LA in the spring, we'll give that a shot.

So I think I'm going to go ahead and stop there. We want to move it on to -- nope?

Sharon Beard: We want to announce [inaudible] check the screen and see if we have any questions before we move forward? So remember if you have a question to ask please just type it in the questions bar and we'll try to get to it.

Someone was saying audio was cutting out, so we'll try to make sure that we do better the next time.

Next question, it says at the end of this web class will we receive anything documenting our attendance? I'd like to have it as a professional certification credit. What we can do is we can certainly send out maybe at the conclusion of the webinar or later on that you attended, and we'll look at the results and make sure that we do that.

Where can we get a copy of the best practices report? We have it now, and I'll see who we have available. What we wanted to do was to get feedback from all the people who provided information to us first, and once we have that and get it finalized here at NIEHS, we'll make sure we put it available on the website for everybody to get a chance to look at it, but if you have something in particular you want to add or you want to see and provide feedback to us, we'll as a courtesy we'll probably be able to send it out to a couple of people, as long as you do not share the information because it is in draft form and it has not been cleared for publication.

Let's see, will the slides be made available after the presentation? Yes, there will be a summary available and any of the slides that we have here will be put up on the website and the Clearinghouse.

Still have some more questions here, okay. Can you say more about how the post Sandy training is changing to be more about resiliency?

James Remington: Okay, so this was mentioned yesterday at the meeting, we're aware that the mucking and the gutting and the mold, there's a -- maybe, there's a finite population that's doing the work, and as that population accomplishes what they want, the folks that are coming in, they may require some other training.

But as far as resilience preparedness, basically, it's -- much of the components that are in the training that's already being provided, what I would ask if you are recipients of the supplemental grant and you feel like you need to modify your plan, please submit that to us and the reasoning, and more than likely we'll go along with it because we realize that what happened five, 10 months ago isn't no longer the same demand that the customers have. So we're kind of flexible with that, and we just want to make sure we're meeting the needs of those who are trying to recover. Chip?

Chip Hughes: Yes, I mean one of the things that we originally put in the funding announcement was about climate preparedness and resilience. And this is a really good example of something that I feel like is a challenge to our program, also our nation, in terms of how we're going to respond to global climate change. Obviously, for us, starting -- well, back with Katrina, how our organization responded to workers and responders and community members and vulnerable populations from a major weather event are something that I think is a really important, ongoing, even emerging and increasingly important issue for us to respond to.

And that's kind of an example of where the challenges of our emergency response capacity, whether that's in utility workers that are called on to be part of a storm or hospitals and healthcare and nursing home people, you know, the transportation sector, we can sort of go on and on with ways that we potentially could work to improve the response capacity of specific worker populations that we now know are going to be part of major weather events as they happen.

I guess I would also say that it's going to get a lot easier to say who our vulnerable populations, vulnerable communities, vulnerable chemical facilities, super fund sites, et cetera, that we know now are even further threatened by the climate change process. So in some ways that really can inform training targeting.

And from the meeting yesterday in New York, I mean I think we heard some really good examples of that. One that comes to mind is the [SEIU's] effort, but there are many others. So, anyway, hopefully, that can respond to that question. I guess we look at, you know, because that's where we're trying to go, is we're looking at what are new things that we can fit within our program structure and whether that's the Hazardous Waste Program or the Minority Worker Training Program or the Hazmat Disaster Prep, those are the kind of themes that we're thinking about right now that may impact our future of the program.

James Remington: And, by all means, think about your own organizations' preparedness and resiliency, even as much as making sure that your trainers are prepared, and for our selfish

benefits the more resources you have that we can deploy, the happier we are, too. So think about that.

Chip Hughes: Yes, maybe I might just touch on one more thing, since it came up, about our SAMSA Project, the Responder Resilience Project, I think to me this is another thing that we haven't really followed up from 9-11 adequately on, and that's dealing with responder mental health issues, and this project is an effort to try to do that, specifically around stress, critical instant stress among responders, psychological first-aid.

But I guess it seems like this is another area to me, at least, that's not been adequately addressed by worker safety and health training, and that was the reason why we're trying to do this project around mental health issues for responders, which again we very much experienced in the Gulf and, again, we very much have experienced during Sandy. So, again, I see that as another emerging issue that potentially we could respond to, so.

Sharon Beard: Jim, there was a question for you, and it says what was the product that you just talked about? I'm not sure what it was, but?

James Remington: Was it the peanut butter cookies I made?

Sharon Beard: Roberto, if you could give us a little bit more information about what product you thought Jim was talking about, we'll be able to answer it, just type additional questions and we'll pull it up and answer that.

Any other questions before we move on? The technology that was going on, was going to be tested in LA?

Unidentified Participant: Oh, boy.

James Remington: Okay, so that may be --

Unidentified Participant: We should talk about that.

James Remington: Yes, we're going to have the spring meeting in LA. It's for save the date for you all, and the date is -- but don't say the date.

Unidentified Participant: April 7, 8, and 9.

James Remington: Yes, yes, so that'll be in LA. There's a couple objectives from the disaster perspective that we're looking at. One of them is to do a little scenario, for those of you who attended the Cincinnati meeting, similar to that for our grantees, we're going to do it in conjunction with the core centers, DHS core centers, and they're actually going to look at some of the research products that are being developed for the disaster rapid response or that initiative.

So we're looking more to come on that, but there is going to be a component that's going to have a disaster response portion. We haven't really come to agreement yet on the overall theme for

that meeting, but I think preparedness, resilience, survival and declining cuts in funding, all those things could kind of play into that, so more to come on that.

Sharon Beard: He just asked again, is -- are there opportunities for mobile technologies to be used?

James Remington: No, mobile technology is out. I'm just kidding. There's always opportunities for mobile technology, everything from doing site assessment surveys, to sensors, to getting training out, you know, use your imagination. Try to do something that's innovative and it's going to help the workers be able to receive training and education or anything to assess the environment that helps them stay safe within the parameters of our program, but, no, mobile technology is very much the in thing. The problem is getting the supporting technologies to make the mobile technologies work.

Sharon Beard: Jim, Roberto has thanked you for your response.

James Remington: Whatever.

Sharon Beard: Ted, we have a question from [Gary Gustafson] for you -- is the reduction in the DOE training a general trend that we are seeing throughout the DOE complex?

Ted Outwater: I don't know. I mean we'll look into that and I'll ask about that, but, no, I think it's just an up and down within our own program, so I can't relate to the overall DOE complex because the amount of training and the diversity of training there is just outside of our knowledge base.

One of the things I will say, though, is that the DOE complex, as a whole, depends upon the awardees for their [Haz Walker] training, and you guys provide -- I don't know if it's the majority, it might be the majority of all Haz Walker training within the complex, so it could be a result, some of the drop-off could be a result in the need for Haz Walker training, but I don't have enough information right now to really answer your question.

Chip Hughes: Yes, just to pick-up on that, I mean one problem that we have that everybody should be aware of is that this year we took a significant hit because of sequestration, which could continue this year as of January 15th. One of the problems with DOE's resources is that they are covered by the Pentagon amount of I think it was 8.2% because we're in the Defense nuclear weapons appropriations, so that may continue to have a big impact on the program if there's not some type of a budget deal reached by January 15th. And we shut down and we have sequestration and all those kind of things happen.

And then our base program, I believe our top line level was -- I think it was 4.2% was our overall, so we also took a hit, I mean NIEHS staff and grantees took a hit. So we're trying to keep our eye on that in terms of available resources, but spring meeting we'll have a lot more to say on that.

Sharon Beard: Okay, any other questions before we turn it over to Deborah for a Clearinghouse update? I don't see any on the screen here, so we'll move forward and turn it over to Deborah Weinstock from the Clearinghouse.

Deborah Weinstock: Hi, everyone. I just had a couple of slides I wanted to share, and it's on recently completed products that we have put out. So I wanted to make folks aware that the workshop report from our June workshop in DC is now available. The report is called Examining Safety Culture and Climate, and you can find this report on the Clearinghouse website under the -- on the main page, under the National Clearinghouse highlights section.

And then the second product that we've posted is a report on the Hurricane Sandy response activities, and it basically covers the NIEHS activities between January and September of this year. It's in the same location on the website, if you want to find it, under National Clearinghouse highlights. And it summarizes the work to date, and it includes just general WETP capabilities, it has a timeline of activities, it covers the grantee efforts and their training, the Clearinghouse efforts, including products and outreach efforts that have been made, as well as issues and challenges that we've identified during this specific response.

So those are the two documents I wanted to make sure folks knew were available now. And that is it for me. Oh, we -- okay, we also have Sandy related materials, which you can also find in the previous documents that I just discussed, but we have mold cleanup and treatment booklets available now. They're currently available just in English. We're working on getting them translated into Spanish. And they can be ordered off of the Clearinghouse website. And then the other document that you see on the right hand of the screen is a more detailed mold remediation guidance that we've put together, and that is also available on the Clearinghouse website under the disaster preparedness section. And that's it.

Sharon Beard: Are there any questions for Deborah?

Chip Hughes: Yes, I just wanted to make a comment. Deborah said -- again, you know, mold is another area, just an example of a specific occupational and environmental health hazard that surfaced after the disaster from the cleanup of homes and other facilities, but that was a situation where we had to decide that we would jump in the middle of it, gather up all the relevant states, local and federal guidance that had been created, try to make a recommendation about levels to protect or practices, et cetera.

And it seems like that was another emerging area that in the past we had actually worked on, because you've been part of that in New York City, but that was another area where the program we thought that was really -- and we jumped into it as another target population, as another hazard and as another training opportunity.

I also just want to address one other thing, you know, we did the exploratory conference last year on safety culture and, again, that was part of our effort to look at for us the context within which training happens and whether training can impact on that, whether it be a department, a workplace, a company, a location.

And then, also, I think for us out of our effort at creating a logic model we saw that rather as something that we think we need to impact on, and I don't know that what that might mean for individual grantees. I know some grantees are looking at actual safety culture modules that I know CPWR and NIOSH are exploring, but we see that as another area that is important as part of figuring out whether training makes a difference. So I would just encourage people to read the report that we've done and to really think deeply about that, on how it may impact your program.

Sharon Beard: Okay, this is Sharon. We also have a question about the report, does the [inaudible] report on training only conducted using the [inaudible] award?

Chip Hughes: That report was done to supplement [inaudible].

Unidentified Participant: And Deborah had kind of done a report on as far as how we got involved and what was done, so it's a pretty good historical accounting of how we dealt with Sandy.

Chip Hughes: But it was basically before the supplemental reports were made?

Unidentified Participant: Right, it was from the beginning, in the beginning.

Chip Hughes: Right. Yes, I think after yesterday it's clear to me that we probably need another Sandy type meeting because we have so many partners that are doing so much work under so little coordination, but don't quote me on that, anyway.

Sharon Beard: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: You guys are coordinated, some of our other partners are not.

Unidentified Participant: Like us.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Sharon Beard: Okay, I think we have one other question, I'm not sure -- it says what is mobile technology? I'm not sure that was at 1:31 we got that question, so I don't know how we want to respond. I don't know if it was mentioned for us or -- but it was a question about the mobile technologies.

All right, one other question here, what kind of courses make up the training numbers under the HDPTP?

James Remington: It's any of the courses that you put in the DMS under HDPTP. It could be everything from Hazmat, the Disaster Site Worker course, to there was some first day trainings. So it's whatever you all applied and put under your proposals for HDPTP. I didn't put up a slide that actually broke down each of the courses, but I'll make sure I do that in the future so you can see the breadth of the different courses that are provided.

Sharon Beard: Okay, I believe that's it for the questions, so let's get back to the agenda. Now we're going to have Setting the Stage by Don Elisburg.

Don Elisburg: Okay, Sharon, am I supposed to start talking?

Sharon Beard: Yes.

Don Elisburg: Okay, I did ask the question about what is mobile technology? Because I haven't a clue as to what you were talking about, and that led me to how I wanted to introduce my little piece of the discussion.

I noticed that there are 72 people on this webinar, of whom six are staff, that means we've got 66 people sitting out there, most of whom haven't a clue of what we've been talking about because we've just spent the last 45 minutes talking in Washington speak and jargon and inside the Beltway. And I wanted to try to bring some clarity to where we -- where you all might be going in the next five years.

And I think we should start out with two things that you should keep in mind. One that this is not an entitlement program, as I've said for the last quarter of a century, this is not guaranteed. The second premise is that what is this RFA or what is the next five years going to be about? It's going to be about how somebody is going to be asked to spend \$150 million or so over a five-year period, that's what the numbers are, more or less.

And I wanted to just make some points that kind of go to the issue of complacency. The program has been functioning since 1987, that's 26 years, and the question is as we listened to the last spread out of, I don't know, 15 or 20 or 25 different things we think we're doing with this program, that I had a couple of points I just wanted to suggest everybody pay attention to when you think about what the next project period might be.

The first one is this is not your 1987 Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program. This is not how in 1987 in terms of how courses were delivered and in terms of course content, in terms of technology, in terms of all the issues just in teaching and educating, we've come into the next century.

And the question is is everyone focused on the next century or are they still living on what they thought they did 26 years ago that was great? But I think that's one of the questions or one of the things that people, that in terms of somebody trying to get money ought to be able to explain where have they come in this last 26 years.

The second major point I wanted to make is that when we started Hazmat trained workers was sort of a limited specialty. It's now become a many faceted career skill over a wide, wide range of things that people need to know. Am I still on the line?

Chip Hughes: Great.

Don Elisburg: Can you hear me?

Chip Hughes: Oh, yes.

Don Elisburg: Something just beeped, but, okay, don't worry about it. So we have entirely different, as I'll get to in a minute, we have an entirely different, not only different workforce that we're training, we have an entirely different set of skills that we are actually having to train people for. Many, many faceted and many different ways, and are we institutionally and within the framework of these projects, these documents or these grants, paying attention to that and articulating what it is we're doing?

The third point I wanted to make is that we now know and we see it in terms of what everybody was talking about, Jim and everybody, that the typical site cleanup is no longer an old dump or a toxic lake, I mean they're still around and there's serious cleanup needs, but they range from the wide range of Sandy to Katrina to BP, I mean this stuff has become so complicated and so different, the question is what are we even preparing people to work in or for? Do we really understand what the universe is out there?

The next point I wanted to make is that the technology at cleanup has moved well into the 21st century, with both methods and career skills. We're a little bit beyond going -- we still do it, but we're a little bit beyond going around and sampling drums, you know? And we have to make sure that what we're dealing with and how this thing is structured is responsive to that change in technology.

The other, the next point I wanted to mention is that the target population, underscored, the target population of workers has now embraced all ranges of economic and educational backgrounds. We have anywhere from training raw immigrants to highly skilled people, who have to get into the disaster business. It's become a very, very diverse, to say the least, target population, and how are we even approaching that, given the fact that you just say, well, we have the Minority Worker Training Program is to beg the question, it doesn't respond to what this is all about.

And then the next point I wanted to mention within this is that the special needs for the disaster response, okay, of the disaster response has created the equivalent of a subset of training needs that we're in substantially, in the business of training people and working under conditions that are not normal and that are not the nine to five job and so forth and so on, and that has required anything from our booklets to videos and whatever else we've been trying to do in multiple languages to respond to these disaster requirements, which just overwhelm everybody.

And then I wanted to point out that the knowledge level and expectations of those being trained has undergone a C change. Information technology based training, technology based training is the norm. We're not sitting there focusing on how do you write something for someone in the eighth grade, we're trying to figure out how do you deal with people who may or may not have other kinds of education, but they're all walking around with a Smartphone and know how to use it better than we do, and that changes the way in which we teach, changes the way we approach everything.

And I'm not sure, myself, that we have exactly fully responded to that challenge. Many of the grantees have, many of them have gone into various things, such that at one of our other conferences the idea of talking about information technology in 1999 almost got me killed in Colorado, and now you can't have any conversation without dealing with it with anybody.

And then sort of the final one, but a very big picture, is who are the contractors and how has that changed? Do we even know who the universe of contractors are? We started out with the Hazmat with kind of a set of contractors who did this stuff, and we had to go around introducing ourselves and our course, but at least we knew who they were. Now we have such a wide range of people who are all over the lot with this, who have been dealing with either hazardous materials or dealing with disaster response. I mean there's a cottage industry of these disaster response contractors. And I think that behooves us to try to understand how is our outreach and for whom are we training and how is that going to work?

Now, all in all, I think that those are some of the core issues that are worth understanding, and I think that those are the issues that the next round, okay, the next, however they frame it, are going to have to deal with it. And as people who may be applying for this stuff or who have views on how this ought to be treated, now is the time to get that out on the table because I just do not see what I would have called business as usual, that if you've done well before you can assume that you will get your money by photocopying most of the grant and sending it in. I think that presents a real hazard between the moving forward issues and the money issues.

So, with that, Sharon, that is my views at the moment about where we might be headed, okay?

Sharon Beard: Okay, Don, that's great. Are there any questions for Don or anyone here? I forgot to actually say who is actually in the room here at NIEHS. Of course, you've heard from Chip Hughes, the Director, Ted Outwater, Jim Remington and myself, Sharon Beard, [Kathy Omark] is here. We also have two of our members here from the Grants Management Staff, Pam Clark, [Yvonne Ellis], and they're available, also, to answer any questions you might have.

Okay, Don, let me see if there's any questions for you. Can we get Don's comments for further consideration? Don?

Don Elisburg: Yes.

Sharon Beard: Okay, great.

Chip Hughes: Well, I was going to archive it.

Don Elisburg: I can't hear you, Chip?

Sharon Beard: Yes, we're going to archive and have it available, so.

There's another question here for Donald. It says great comments, Donald. What is your vision in terms of new ways to train workers?

Don Elisburg: What is my what?

Sharon Beard: Vision in terms of --

Don Elisburg: Oh, okay. Yes, I think we're trying to meld our theology, which is quite correct, of hands-on training with the fact that everyone who walks into any classroom today expecting anything from text to whatever to be in what I would call the new formats.

Nobody, just like you can't get anybody to read a regulation or the New York Times, you know, they're reading USA Today if they read anything, and we have to be able -- but they are -- but people walking in in terms of the knowledge and what we're trying to teach them, we may be still teaching them basic blocking and tackling, but they've got to be able to present it in a way that they're used to dealing with in school, whether it's PowerPoints, videos, or whatever. It's just we've got to understand where their mindset is.

And I think it's, you know, I guess the examples I was going to use is when we started out in 1987 and scrambled to put these courses together, if you remember, we had [Glen Paulson's] set of slides, that's around 500 slides or something that he had, we were using overhead projectors, we were using the teaching techniques and technologies of what we'd all learned literally in the last century.

Well, that stuff isn't there anymore, and we can sit there in a smart classroom or online in a webinar and pull out live pictures from the Philippines to see how they're doing disaster response, as we're teaching, you know? We've become such a massive information that's so instantly available we kind of have to sort out what's the core values we're trying to teach, but how do we get people, kids and I mean younger workers to absorb that in the way that they're used to absorbing something?

Sharon Beard: Thanks, Don. And here's a comment.

Chip Hughes: Oh, Don, I just wanted to come behind you on that. I mean I think one of the things that we've seen with [mocs], massive online courses, and other new methodologies for teaching and training, you know, and I think this past -- during the Sandy response thinking about three corner, which may be more intense to what was called construction toolbox talks, that the whole gamut of approaches that people have used for doing what we hope is training and education has just changed so much.

When you were talking, I was kind of thinking about the technical workshops that we'll be having in 2016 and 2018. We really never -- I know I had hoped that we would revise the period documents to [inaudible] at the technological revolution, and we didn't really get to do that. I think we also face a challenge that we have right now about trainer certification and thinking about how we train our trainers and what those expectations might be, that I don't think we were able to do in the last five years and that I hope we can do in the next five years.

So those are sort of topics that I don't think we have a lot of guidance about what is the best way to do it, but our effort at having a blended approach I believe is still really sound. The small

group activity method I think is really still sound, pedagogically, and that those will still be core parts of what we do, but how we integrate technology into that process I think that's kind of what the challenge of the next five years will be.

And then I would just say that in terms of evaluation we have to justify our existence and our program and the fact that we're having an impact every day to people who fund us. Whether we have methodologies to demonstrate impact and to quantify that, that's what we worked out a year ago. For now in the efforts of doing [inaudible] around evaluation for every program, so we still think that's really an important thing, even with the shift in technology and approach and target population and curricula, so, thank you.

Sharon Beard: We've got a couple of questions here. The first one, Don, this was for you -- several years ago you said that when the program was designed you never thought it would last so long. Well, from your perspective now how long do you think it will last? Don Elisburg?

Don Elisburg: That's a great question, and our colleague, [Dave Moleno], who is sitting up in Montana these days, and I still try to get together about every six months and laugh about how this three-year program is still going on.

I think we have institutionally, for whatever reason, been blessed by a record of success and being in an agency that nobody quite understands what it's about anyway. So we don't become a target. I think that the need is clearly out there. The response is clearly out there. The question is whether this thing can be -- this program can become or, how should I say it -- we keep being concerned that as all these things happen we wind up doing the Lord's work as a marginal participant.

And the question is are we going to be able to get the institutions to recognize that what we offer should be the mainstream of how it's done. And I think that nobody knows where the money is going to be, and at some point somebody might just decide they've had a run and we'll find somebody else to give the money to. I don't have any sense, however, that that's -- that that is on the horizon, okay?

I think we have every ability to somehow keep rocking along. The difficulty is we keep rocking along at the levels of 1987, and that means that we continue to be a shrinking piece of what is clearly a major pie.

Now I think your economists are going to talk about whether the demand for the basic Hazmat, for example, that we built our program on 26 years ago is still there or whether we have to recognize that the demand is in a slightly different area or a different situation and position ourselves to be responsive to that, rather than continuing to churn out trained workers for an industry that's sort of declining, okay?

Sharon Beard: Thanks, Don. We've got a couple other questions, and I think just for us to respond to.

Don Elisburg: Shoot?

Sharon Beard: The next one is from [Carol Rice]. It states, flexibility is the key to the ever-changing -- oops, excuse me, the screen moved, here it is -- flexibility is the key to the ever-changing landscape. How can this be blended into the create, review, send for approval process?

Don Elisburg: I think that that's a -- that's, I think, one of the major challenges is how can you, you know, within the framework of what everybody expects in order to give you money lay out what the different responses are that you're training people for? And that's an issue for Chip and the people who set the parameters of the program, but I think the concept of flexibility is exactly what we've been talking about since the beginning of this webinar is that every time you pick up the newspaper or turn on the television there's another chore for you.

Chip Hughes: Are we done?

Sharon Beard: Not yet.

Chip Hughes: Yes, hey, Don, I was thinking back to the -- when I believe it was Glen Paulson, who had the term of ever green curricula. I think it was in the new era, post-9-11.

Don Elisburg: Yes, yes.

Chip Hughes: And to get to what I think Carol is asking is what is curricula now and how do we have a process by which it can be almost updated in real-time and get somehow blessed by the Federal Government as a partner and used. And I think every disaster that we've had [inaudible] we've experienced the fact that I don't know in BP we had, I don't know, 10 versions of the course that changed like every week, and even with the Sandy thing, the same, but the core part of what we're trying to impart to people changing in real-time.

And I think partly that has to do with whether we're talking about an instructional manual, a student manual, or more an online virtual context that might live in the LMS, in the learning management system, that might be something that changes more in real-time. And I don't think we've even gotten close to figuring that out in terms of what Carol is talking about, about changing in real-time, except that we have done that during the disasters I think pretty well, even though we've driven Denver crazy.

Don Elisburg: Chip, I think that that's -- I think, Chip, that's exactly one of the issues that has to be dealt with is if I were teaching one of my environmental courses again, like I used to, I wouldn't consider having a textbook anymore because I wouldn't know, you know, by the time they got through paying \$200 for it it would be obsolete. So I think we're dealing with a very fluid thing of how we actually package stuff, but I think we also have an obligation to be looking at the newer technology, the newer issues, okay, and perhaps providing an ongoing guidance as to what's being expected from year to year or period to period.

And I think some of the responses to the disasters is turning out the mold book or turning out the hurricane book practically instantly was one way of trying to recognize here's a move in

curriculum, here's a move in curriculum, but and that's the best I can suggest at the moment, but it's -- the question is absolutely right.

Now at the fall meeting we didn't have, okay, we had a panel sort of on this courses and accreditation and all that. I think we're going to have John [inaudible] Bruce and I forget who else kind of talk about how they've taken their entire curriculum, as it were, and refocused it over a period of several years to be responsive to what they see their needs are.

Chip Hughes: No, I mean we're dealing with problems and questions that all educational institutions are dealing with, and I totally agree with kind of the fact that we haven't figured it out yet, so.

Don Elisburg: But I think it's -- I think it would be a very worthwhile project for the program in some fashion to use the people who were involved in it to try to figure that out.

Chip Hughes: Yes, yes.

Don Elisburg: Because that's where the -- that's really where the expertise is.

Chip Hughes: Well, I mean in some ways I think when we strip down to [inaudible] nice to know, need to know, whatever the other one was, that when -- if we just look at learning objectives as a core part of what we think curricula is, now it's a multimedia way to build content around learning objectives.

So it may be that what's most important is what you think you're going to impart to somebody and whether that is a knowledge piece, it might be demonstration of a capability, who knows what, but that that may be what the definition of what the curricula is, and that the pieces of it if they're PowerPoints or they're videos or they might be a book or they might be a manual, that that's sort of what we would be looking at for what we would call a course. So, anyway, I think we'll have a technical workshop on that in like 2019, hopefully before.

Unidentified Participant: We'll put in our travel orders now.

Chip Hughes: Yes, yes.

Sharon Beard: We have a couple of comments about technology, so I'll go ahead and go with those that were in that vein. Will there be [inaudible] development technologies and training?

Ted Outwater: I mean it's possible, I mean, you know, to put things in your proposals, and we've always emphasized training and numbers of workers, and to quote [Jane Frederick Butson], you know, and we've discouraged things like video projects and other high cost technological solutions and that, but we have been open to them and we have funded them at times. So it's a case-by-case type of answer. I know that's vague, but that's about the best as I can say right now.

The [SBIR] program, which we will be continuing will -- that is an appropriate place for that, and the Omnibus that NIEHS has we're now going to be issuing a number of things on sensors,

and there would be some room in there for a bit of training and community outreach, too, within the larger SBIR program. This was Ted, by the way, Ted's opinion.

Sharon Beard: Don, another question for you -- you commented about do we know who the contractors are anymore, what do you recommend we do as the NIEHS community to get to know who the new contractors are and to reintroduce ourselves as a source for their training needs?

Don Elisburg: That's kind of a softball question, but I think within the context of what everybody gets their money for they have to and I think that's part of what I think needs to be in the program is kind of build in an outreach program, build in, you know, we know that within the given areas are within a given state, we actually if we want to deal with disasters we can -- we know who every or can find out who every contractor is who is set-up for disaster response for every agency, state and local.

And the question is do you have to take the time to be able to go to them and to what you have, whether it's the local county emergency response committee or whatever they call themselves. I mean every local county, every state has -- and we sort of looked at it after 9-11, they all have these groups and we tend to -- I mean as an institution, okay, the grantees tend to be kind of a day late in identifying who they are.

If you go looking for them after the tornado comes through it's too late, they've already positioned who they are. We certainly learned in the BP situation whether we'd been able to follow through on it or not, that there was a whole network of response contractors and people just sitting there waiting to be called, and we knew nothing about most of them.

So, to me, it's a simple marketing issue, but that data, what I'm saying is there's nothing secret about it, it's all out there, everybody knows who they are, we just have to sort of spend the time to find the people who know who they are.

Chip Hughes: I mean I'll just say, Don, from behind you that in some ways it's even more consolidated, I mean the [Bechtel's], [Lot], [Martin Shaw's] are even more consolidated in this industry. At different points in time we've gone and met with them, but probably that is something that we could all do in a more purposeful way for the future.

And I think the other thing is like with the BP situation leveraging through other Federal agencies that have an impact on the private contractors is also key, whether that be FEMA, BHS, our relationships now with DHS, EPA, Corps of Engineers, et cetera. That's why we do what we do in terms of I'd say digging work and the bureaucracy because that also is another way to leverage access.

Don Elisburg: Now one of the things, Chip, that you can think about in terms of how you allocate your dollars, both within the grantees and elsewhere, is to what extent do you want to create a sense of -- how do you want this information to be accumulated? I mean is it something that you charge the Clearinghouse to develop state by state? Is it something that each awardee

should be prepared to come in with who they see as their outreach program and have some funding to be able to follow through on it?

We've said all along if you want to deal with the -- just going to back to Hazmat days, go find the people in your community who are planning to do it, and that has been the message that Sharon and everybody else has been delivering at every brown fields meeting since they started, you know? That hasn't changed. That hasn't changed, you know? That was the whole point of going to the brown fields meeting was to find out just where the money was, yes?

Sharon Beard: Jim, there was a question that Joyce had put out about what's happening with the contractors, could you answer that or at least sum up what some of the issues are? I don't have the screen in front of me, but I think I let you read that?

James Remington: Yes, I think Joyce was referring to New Jersey allowing the use of 14-year-old volunteers to do some of the cleanup work. From our perspective, whether they're 14 or whether they're 70 and they're workers, they deserve health and safety training just like anybody else.

Chip Hughes: The whole Chris Christie's children, you probably have to protect them.

James Remington: I mean whether it's ethically or morally correct to use child labor in certain tasks, that's kind of outside of our scope. We'll provide them training if we have to do that training, but, yes, we really haven't gotten to that problem. We've heard it being talked about. I haven't seen it in the field. I don't know if any of our Sandy folks, if you've actually seen that, other than, all right, volunteers go out and a lot of times they'll bring their children like on the weekends and they'll do cleanup work and the children will be doing some tasks. Yes, they need to be aware that there are hazards. Yes, they need to be protected if they're going to be in contact with any of these hazards. Is it a way to spend a family weekend? I don't know, you know, that's an individual thing.

Chip Hughes: You think?

James Remington: Yes, I actually make them walk the plank of nails, okay? So is it being done? Yes. What can we do about it? And the population of workers we could provide them health and safety training just like anybody else, and actually they may pick it up better than some populations, I don't know. So, Joyce, that's something that has to be looked at more at the political end, but we'll just leave it at that.

Sharon Beard: All right, we also had a couple of questions more on technology, and I'm going to let Ted respond because there was about three or four of those talking about the cost of technology, you know, how will it be put into the RFA that we can use the technology and those types of things. So any other comments, Ted?

Ted Outwater: I can only answer it generally, which would be, yes, the RFA will most likely address those technology issues and their cost and that. We've always allowed in your applications a certain amount of the budget for computers and other equipment and other types

of things, and so some advance technology type costs and that would be very appropriate. The balance -- yes?

Don Elisburg: Sharon, are you still there?

Sharon Beard: Yes, I'm still here.

Don Elisburg: Yes, I've got to get off in a minute, but the comments that Jim was making --

James Remington: Yes, that was me.

Don Elisburg: -- it is totally wrong, totally illegal and totally beyond the scope of your authority to teach anybody who is underage and violating a Federal child labor any other safety law. I don't know what you're thinking about? The fact of the matter is if we see kids doing that kind of work we have an obligation to pull them out of the job and get the Labor Department in to deal with it. You're not the cops, but you have absolutely no -- you shouldn't go anywhere near training underage kids to do anything like that. You're buying yourself, aside from buying yourself a handful of liability, it's absolutely illegal, and you are not authorized to do illegal acts.

James Remington: All right, noted, Don. Absolutely.

Don Elisburg: Yes, okay, I mean I just think that, you know, there's still whatever the 70 some people are that are still around, don't think that you have any authority to violate the laws of this country, and the fact that we have to see that all the time does not make us -- we have to be non-willing participants. We have to be the whistleblowers. We have to tell them you can't send those kids out to do this.

James Remington: Okay.

Don Elisburg: And I don't know why we would even think that we have some obligation to train people who are going to go out and work in that capacity, let's kill a bunch of kids.

James Remington: All right, Don, noted. Thank you.

Sharon Beard: All right, we have a request from some of the participants to please state your name and then make your comment, presenters, so that they know who is speaking. So if we could do that that would be great. Sharon Beard speaking here.

I have a question that we want to make sure Don is here to hear -- this was one that says would it be a good strategy to focus on certification of trainers and trainees be a common and shared infrastructure? For example, a common database? So any of the Panelists here want to respond to that? Want me to repeat it again, the question will be would it be a good strategy to focus on certification and training on a common and shared infrastructure, for example, a common database?

Don Elisburg: Okay, Sharon, or Chip you can maybe respond to it.

Chip Hughes: Okay.

Don Elisburg: But isn't there a section of [SARA] that's supposed to deal with that, that never got implemented?

Chip Hughes: Right, accreditation, yes, yes. Well, the whole issue of trainer accreditation has come up with the OSHA Ed Center training program, and what they use are credentials of certified safety professionals -- I can't remember what all the other -- MPH --

Unidentified Participant: Initials, initials.

Chip Hughes: Yes, and one of the things that we've never done is come up with what we think is a certification process for trainers. I don't know, again, as Don just said, I don't know if that's something that we really -- is within our scope of what we want to do, but it's an issue that's out there, and that could be something that we could talk about in the technical workshop.

Don Elisburg: Yes, I would refer -- I would suggest that you get Gary Gustafson to get into this with you because I think they've been doing a lot of issues about this accreditation and certification.

Chip Hughes: Well, yes, I feel bad because that was the presentation that we were going to have in October and maybe we'll figure out how to do that in the spring, some of the stuff that we didn't do in the fall.

Sharon Beard: All right, Don, we have people scheduled, our Economist here, Bryan Englehardt, so I have a couple other questions. We'll come back to those in a few minutes. Deborah Weinstock, are you going to introduce Bryan? Deborah, are you there?

Deborah Weinstock: Hi, yes, I am here. And we have been working with Bryan Englehardt and his colleagues, his colleague at Holy Cross, Robert Baumann and Anthony Oliver from Illinois, who have been working with us for the past couple of months, looking at some of the data on the Minority Worker Training Program. And so he's going to go ahead and summarize where they are with that work, and then we can have some questions afterwards.

Bryan Englehardt: Thanks. So I think my presentation is probably a nice carry through from some of Don's comments. And that is what are the benefits that these programs are doing, not only for the trainees or the participants in the training, but also of course you as grantees and the wider community.

And so that's really what we've looked to do, and just to kind of, you know, reiterate, my name is Bryan Englehardt. I come from the College of the Holy Cross. I'm a labor economist by training, and so once again I'll try not to give you any Washington speak, but I'll try not to give you any [inaudible] either.

But, in particular, as I think about kind of the purposes of the benefits, which I think is key, kind of bringing us all onboard with what we're going to get out of this study, it's to really quantify and document all the benefits from the Worker Education Training Program. And you don't want to leave anything left unaccounted for because if you did you might make a poor decision on whether to get funding in the future. So that's really what we're going to be doing is to make sure every stone is turned over.

And then kind of in addition to just talking about all the different benefits, to really quantify, really beyond the approach to really kind of say this is exactly what it is worth or as close as we can to saying this is exactly what it's worth. Now, of course, you know, that can sometimes [inaudible] a valid figure for everything -- no, possibly not, but of course that would be the goal, and not to [inaudible] with that rigorous and kind of quantify the benefits, but then from there also qualify all the other benefits.

01:21:17 through 01:30:53 -- [Discontinued transcription on Bryan Englehardt due to poor audio.]

Sharon Beard: This is Sharon. Thanks, again, for the presentation. I think we have a couple of questions that have come in, so I'll try to go through these right quick, and then if we have any others we'll go from there.

The first question comes from [Alex Prentiss] -- will the initial results of this pilot be available at the April meeting? This is Sharon. Alex, I'm not sure, depending on where we are in the process, whether we're going to be able to review the material before then. What we might be able to do is to give a brief presentation on what we've come up with, what are some of the -- some key results as was just shared with us briefly, but I don't know if we're going to have all that information available by April, but as soon as we are able to release it and get it cleared we will definitely get it out there for people. Especially if, now, if you want to be a reviewer of the document then you might get a chance to see it earlier, but we want to get your comments on those types of things to be able to do that.

So let's see what the next question is here. Let's see, give me just a second. We have some general questions here, I don't know if they're related to the actual presentation on the economic analysis, but I'll go ahead and put some of those out there.

One says what is the larger NIEHS community doing, excuse me, organization doing with regards to the public's education around environmental hazards, not only during normal times, but also during the natural disaster? What about something like a WebMD for environmental education? That's a question that came up. Anybody want to answer here in this group? Well, we've got -- go ahead.

Unidentified Participant: EPA.

Sharon Beard: Well, through -- this is Sharon Beard -- through the NIEHS Partnerships for Environmental Public Health we've been working to make sure that any material that is

developed for educational purposes are made available out there. We actually have a database with all different types of tools and resources on environmental education that's available.

We not only have that just through the Partnerships for Environmental Public Health that focus on all of the NIEHS programs, but just the Super Fund Basic Research Program, our program, the Center's program, our breast cancer awareness, even our deepwater horizon, we have all that material that's been developed out of all of our programs and any of the outreach, especially from our community outreach and education centers, that material is made available.

Also, on the general NIEHS page, anytime that we've developed any tools or resources that's made available to the public, we make it, we put it out there, and usually there's a [inaudible] that talks about any new materials that we develop there. We also have an environmental education page that talks about all the resources that we have here at NIEHS. So there's a lot of material out there, and we can certainly list some of that and put it in our notes as a result of this particular meeting.

So, let's see, we have a couple of other questions.

Chip Hughes: Well, Sharon, we also might want to note that our strategic plan, the NIEHS strategic plan we've been working on environmental health communications, that is also coordinating -- just to respond to the specific question, I mean I think we saw in Sandy and even yesterday that the public health communication goes far beyond worker only in terms of community, family, et cetera, so.

Sharon Beard: Okay, this is Sharon Beard again. I have a question for Bryan. It says do you have a set of questions you would like the grantees to start collecting information for?

Bryan Englehardt: Yes, I think one of the main things is to get a good grasp, especially for the Minority Worker Training Program, is when you do that annual follow-up is to ask them have you had any injuries in the last year and, if so, what they are? And, of course, these jobs are obviously dangerous, so we'll be comparing those numbers relative to other people in the field that are doing the same job. And, of course, their likelihood of being injured is less than that's the benefit we'll be trying to capture with that number. So just summarize what is the health outcomes a year later after the training?

Sharon Beard: Okay, let's see, any other questions here?

Deborah Weinstock: Sharon?

Sharon Beard: Yes?

Deborah Weinstock: This is Deborah, and I just wanted to make sure, particularly the folks in the Minority Worker Training Program know that we plan to have a call with Bryan, the other economist, and just the Minority Worker Training grantees, so we can dig in with them a little bit deeper and make sure that the economists have a good sense of or are able to get any additional

information that they haven't really been able to see in the GMS and the data that they're looking at and give them opportunity to provide feedback and stuff.

Sharon Beard: Yes, so we'll be contacting everybody -- this is Sharon Beard -- about this and setting up a time when we can all talk, but I think it's a good opportunity. We planned on doing it here in October through the Minority Worker Training Breakout Session, but we'll move forward and do that at a later date. Thanks for making the statement, Deborah.

Chip Hughes: Sharon, maybe that is something that we'll figure out how to fit into the spring meeting when we know how far along the project is. Chip in response to that one.

Sharon Beard: Yes. All right, the next question here says outreach to interface groups, since there are many at times, response is emotionally, spiritually, as well, as we go to the potential communities. This is dealing with hurricane disaster response. Will we be able to use resources for building in response in addition to partnering with other funding opportunities? This is another question by Joyce.

James Remington: Were we talking about existing funds or --

Sharon Beard: She did say in addition to partnering for funding, what else?

James Remington: Well, when I was talking about HDPTP I was talking about the developmental partnerships in collaboration within communities. I don't know where to go with that question other than -- oh, Chip is raising his hand and so -- oh, and this is Jim -- but Chip is raising his hand so I'll let him continue.

Chip Hughes: Well, no, I just think that -- no, it's a good question because we face this in terms of our core program, our core funding, what we do with it, what we do with HDPTP, but then what we do with our disaster activation, when we get activated, specifically around either response or recovery, as you know, that's a different situation in terms of what we do, what we have you do, who we serve, who our target populations are and what the scope of the training is.

So we've thought about that, whether we should have some national response capacity. Right now, what we do as a fallback position in collaboration with branch management, that we do entertain re-budgeting requests to respond to disaster response in terms of funding, but that's another whole area that I feel like where it's not clear of how we would have sustainable funds to sustain a response, like what we're doing now with Sandy, which of course was a supplemental appropriation, so a difficult answer, question to answer.

Sharon Beard: Okay, this is Sharon Beard, again. There were some other questions that I'm going back to before we get into the open Q&A, so I wanted to try to answer some of those.

This one says more of a statement than question, but as a younger generation leader I believe I could help with changing the minimum criteria document to move towards a more technologically savvy way and in turn making it more prone to the learners of the 21st century, just a thought. Any comments there?

James Remington: This is Jim. So, basically, I was actually looking at this idea of creating a whitepaper on going, using more technology to train workers. This was actually brought to my attention by someone on the Inter-Agency Board, who happens to be a firefighter. His question was my manager, city manager is making me take all of my training to renew my paramedics online, and he says if I was the public after being approved and renewed online, I wouldn't want them to approach me with a needle and an IV. So how can you go to your manager and say this is not the appropriate place for technology, more hands on, or how do you blend the two?

So I'm trying to come up with some sort of, I don't want to say ammunition but documentation to support those skills that would require more hands on versus technology, but a way also to include technology to reduce costs and to improve the efficiency of getting the training accomplished. So I don't know if that answered that question, but that is something that I'm going to be working on and I've drafted Ted to help me on that. If there's anybody out there who also wants to contribute to that feel free.

Chip Hughes: Yes, whoever the young leader is I'd be happy to hang out anytime. This is Chip, you can talk to me.

James Remington: And the average age in this room is like 56 or more. It's a good question, it's a very good comment.

Sharon Beard: Okay, let's see, other questions here. I might need some help, also, from William to kind of clarify this. It says, Sharon, responding to the question about generalized training, we all do a PDT training on environmental health hazards. Is there something else you want us to understand about that because I'm not quite sure what you want us to respond to there? If you could write that for us, I think was [William Tuscano], can you give us a little bit more information?

Chip Hughes: Is that like performance based training?

Sharon Beard: Might be, I'm not quite sure. Oh, and, Chip, your young leader is [Jason Cohen] from Nova.

Chip Hughes: Oh, great, let's hang out later.

Sharon Beard: Yes. Okay, had another question for Bryan about making sure that we write up these questions he's going to ask for grantees so that they will make sure they'll be able to provide additional information? And what we'll do is we'll make sure that the slides are available, and if there are any questions, especially I think what's important is the list of benefits and how that we could get access to that data, is what he's really looking at. And so we'll make sure that we share that with everybody and make it available.

Chip Hughes: Yes, I think what he was wondering about is whether there's longer term tracking that's done of trainees and what kind of data that is and how periodic that's done. I'm sure you guys can cover that [inaudible].

Sharon Beard: Okay, a little bit, more comments from William -- my comment pertains to the question about whether we offer generalized training to communities?

Unidentified Participant: There's always been a certain amount of leeway to cross the fence line between the workplace and the community place, and community, and a number of awardees have provided community training and actual community interventions. The steelworkers, notably, and also Dillard and deep south center, you know, so there's always some leeway there. It's one of those things, once again, it's sort of case by case, it's in your annual plan, but it's not inappropriate. It depends on how it's related to the overall mission and needs within that community.

Chip Hughes: Yes, but I mean we're back to expose people hazards, response, just like with, you know, I guess the other issue that's -- well, it was the core part of why we reopened the minimum criteria the last time that we did, which was I guess five years ago, was that we were addressing HAZ Walker and other training. So, to me, the risk framework for what it is that is a reason why somebody needs help and safety training, we started out in the 1910 120 world, well, obviously, that world has changed when we designated the idea of collateral duty responders around the emergency response, that was the giant one.

Unidentified Participant: The master [inaudible] responder.

Chip Hughes: Yes, well, as the New York Times tells us, the secondary responders, that's another big area, but and [EJ] communities and [inaudible] communities. I feel like that's still a big area for us to determine where that fits in the hierarchy of training priorities.

Sharon Beard: Okay, we've got a comment for Jim and Ted -- technology can be used very effectively for knowledge and realistic simulation, but certain tasks can only be trained effectively in a hands-on environment. Technology should be used where effective, but it can't do everything.

James Remington: This is Jim. I agree, we just need to kind of define that and put it into words and have research behind it to prove that, so that some of these frontline workers have something they could give to their managers to justify the requests to do hands-on training or maintain proficiency through hands-on training, so I agree.

Sharon Beard: That was a question from [Terry Fulbright].

James Remington: Yes, I agree with Terry.

Sharon Beard: All right, here's another request -- share Bryan's questions with the Hazardous Worker Training grantees, also. Many of us use the same trainees each year doing our Hazardous Waste refresher. We can start collecting the data now. So this is from Gary Gustafson.

So we'll definitely talk about this because we were using the Minority Worker Training Program as a pilot, so if there are some key questions that we think everybody in all of the programs should answer then that's something that we'll be discussing with Ron and we'll figure out how best to move forward and so that we can start collecting some of that data right now. So thank you, Gary, once again. I think Barbara McCabe also said the same thing in reference to collecting the data and having those questions, so we'll certainly do that.

While we're going through some of these questions, we had also put some discussion questions at the end of our webinar, and you should have had those when we sent out the agenda. Those two questions are on the screen right now. So one that I wanted to bring to everybody's attention right now is are there things we're doing that are no longer applicable and no longer add value, so if we could have any responses to that or comments, as you've had a little time to think about that while I check and see if there are any more questions.

Chip Hughes: And then, Sharon, the second one was the economics one, maybe just read it?

Sharon Beard: Sure, if you want to read it?

Chip Hughes: Yes, reflecting on the economic presentation, do we have any economic questions or thoughts regarding new initiatives for program areas to share? So, again, take your keyboard and if you want to ping us with anything on those two items?

And then I guess everybody got the overall webinar questions? No? Or we're going to cover those questions.

Sharon Beard: We're going to go through them, yes.

Chip Hughes: Okay, okay.

Sharon Beard: While we're waiting for people to give their comments or suggestions, just wanted to make sure that -- we were talking about earlier about cost for contact hours, and so I was looking at the Minority Worker Training Program because I haven't done that calculation in awhile, but it looks like it's around \$23 for cost per contact hour for Minority Worker training, which is great, when you look at that.

I remember when we first started it out it was much, much higher. Now we've gotten it down I think because we've been able to address our approach to training by offering key specific training for the workers who are involved in that program, and so that really is a great accomplishment of the program to get that cost down so low for the Minority Worker Training Program, since we're offering so many courses to the same individuals, so that's great.

All right, let's see, any questions? Well, any comments from any of the Panelists while we have everybody here?

Well, I just have one comment, we still get a lot of requests for to add asbestos and lead training to our curriculum, and one of the things we've always had for the program was that we needed to get a prior approval request before you actually offer asbestos or lead training for this program.

And so I know that we've had requests recently for the lead, RP lead renovation and repair training, and that's been added on as a training program that we've done, primarily for all of our program, not so much as DOE, but I know that that's something that we anticipate there could be some other things that we might be doing. So any comments about the lead courses or asbestos work that we might want to bring to the discussion here today?

Unidentified Participant: I thought they were all approved.

Sharon Beard: All right, here's another question -- can [technical difficulty] changed over time? The question is can Ted or others share your calculation of our program's cost per contact hour figures and how they have changed over time?

Ted Outwater: Well, I don't have them with me, but it's basically what is the total amount of your award and divided by the total contact hours you have for training for the year. And so if you look at your total awards over each year, period, as far back as you want to go, and divide it by the amount of contact hours you had for that year, that is your cost per contact hour.

Sharon Beard: Right. And then, Ted -- this is Sharon -- and Ted has said we do it as an aggregate for the programs as a whole, so we haven't looked individually at grantees cost per contact hour, but just what each particular program, we've looked at it that way. So it might be something to think about.

Ted Outwater: Well, we also look at it when we approve you annually. I do -- we do a cost, each program officer does their own and does a general cost of contact hour to see that there hasn't been some real unusual jump within your program or a reduction that would cause somebody, somewhere to ask a question.

Sharon Beard: All right, I've got another question here -- it says I anticipate the focus for the next five-year effort will continue to be Hazmat oriented, however, do you anticipate expanding the scope of the program or does the unmanned aerial system development is an emerging area for some civilian workforce development and application and first responder community?

Ted Outwater: No.

Sharon Beard: Ted is going to respond.

Ted Outwater: Well, I mean I think in that the Omnibus for NIEHS there is a number of sensor technologies and that where there might be drone or other type of applications that would be responsive under their program. We're going to be wedded to SARA and to Haz Walker as long as we're a program, and we stretch it according to the mission and the needs. And disaster training has really stretched us quite a ways. The [inaudible] funding which requires weatherization and a number of weather interventions, you know, stretched the program,

expanded the program, but I don't think we're going to go into all of those areas -- Sharon, Chip, Jim, Kathy might have other comments, but I sort of see us staying where we are and hopefully enhancing the quality of what we do.

James Remington: This is Jim. So with new technology, let's say, energy, you have new products out there, nano, wind turbines, fracking, all those kind of things, and they bring on hazards. Now when you talk about robots and things like that, I think that's a good thing. If you have a highly hazardous environment and you can use a robot versus a person --

Ted Outwater: That'd be a good exception.

James Remington: -- great, but as far as how does that impact our program, you'd have to take a look at it. Not necessarily the robot doing the work which would reduce injuries, but the person who has to work with that robot, what kind of hazards, if any, does that create?

Ted Outwater: It's like for wind turbines, we fund training under -- for workers on wind turbines, basically, because of confined space and hazardous materials that are in the turbine. So there might be, yes, there might be work around and audiences that need to be served that would be quite appropriate for our training.

James Remington: Right.

Chip Hughes: Yes, just one more comment, I mean since Y2K we have not revisited the issue of cyber safety in hazardous facilities, and I feel like it's a giant issue. I wanted us to do that the last five years around our series of scenarios, of the national disaster scenarios in terms of the grid with energy and also with potential cyber takedowns of large facilities, I think it's a really important issue that we need to -- we haven't dealt with it. Probably we could put it in there somewhere, but again it would be within the context of our training approach.

James Remington: Yes, this is Jim. Many of the backup safety features are computer based, so if you lose that safety backup where does that put the workers and things like that? So, yes, definitely cyber.

Sharon Beard: All right, next question, is more of a comment, but it says perhaps we should contact [Dr. Sueann Sarke] regarding economic benefits for the Minority Worker Training Program. She conducts focus groups, discussions with former Minority Worker Training grantees who are working and ask very specific questions regarding value of training, their earnings potential, and will they not add work injuries into the survey? Also, health and safety surveys are sent to all graduates at a six-month interval after they've obtained work, and that would be good, useful information.

Yes, [Gazeta], we will be asking to get that information. A lot of that is already included in some of your evaluation reports, so I know you've moved forward and asked other questions. And so this is why it's important, that we need to get our economists to sit down with our Minority Worker Training grantees and get access to the data that's already out there because I think this is such a rich amount of information to share, and if we can get to some of those hard

questions about work related injuries, if that data is out there, that will be fantastic, but it's hard to come by but this is something we'll certainly look forward to having a discussion on.

Bryan, did you have any comments about that?

Bryan Englehardt: That's exactly right, that's exactly what we're looking for because that's such an important number, so if there are questions there right now, that's great, we just need to flush those out and bring that data to the forefront. And, if not, we can kind of hone what exact questions we need.

Sharon Beard: All right, now I don't see any other comments. We still have the floor if you have anything you want to share, this is your time to do so. Okay, we are -- we had the other questions about anything that we're doing that's no longer applicable -- anybody have any questions or comments on that, or doesn't add value that we need to assess?

If not, we can start asking some of the other questions that we have, but I'll also preface that at the conclusion of this webinar there will be a poll or survey for you to fill out that will ask you a series of seven questions. And please take the time to answer them. If you don't want to answer them right then and there you can always copy them and answer them and send it back to us at a later date, but we want to get access because these are questions we are going to ask our technical workshop and we still want to get your feedback on these questions.

So I'll open it up and actually ask are there any other comments about these questions? What are new initiatives for this program that we might want to consider, as far as training?

Chip Hughes: But I really think we need to have [inaudible] preparedness plan.

Sharon Beard: Okay, we have a question here from [Craig Slayton]. He says will there be opportunities to expand training to address exposures to the waste products of emerging technologies used in manufacturing?

Craig, this is Sharon, it falls within the scope of what we do. If there are waste products, and so it's up to the grantee to come out with a good application that sums up what those potential risks are and can develop training that's appropriate for their target population. So I think that's definitely on par for what we're looking for as far as new initiatives.

James Remington: Craig, I guess the question that probably you're asking is that would be new materials that are created? I mean I think about the issue of nano waste. I also think about the issue of e-waste and what a total lifecycle analysis of products is in terms of where products end up and what happens to them in terms of either disposal or recycling or destruction. So I think there's probably a lot of situations that have changed over the years that we're probably not even aware of areas where workers might be engaged with waste that might have risks.

The fact that our system to identify what hazardous waste is is so antiquated is that there are many waste materials that aren't called hazardous now that aren't regulated by EPA under [Ricra Subtitle C] that would not be called hazardous waste that I think we should be concerned with.

Chip Hughes: You have to tell me what this question is.

Sharon Beard: No, we're not allowed to respond to Ron's question. Really, Ron?

Unidentified Participant: No, you don't want to --

Chip Hughes: [Ron Sniper]?

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Sharon Beard: All right, any other comments or questions? I'm going to go back and make sure I didn't miss anything. All right, I can go to the next question that we have here -- what are good approaches for describing and developing new initiatives?

Chip Hughes: I'd be happy to say something about that. I mean what we've tried to do in the past 15 years ago, 10 years ago, and five years ago was basically create a grab bag of new initiatives for folks who apply to attempt to integrate into their program. And so that could be applicable to any program component. That could be a way we would do it. I think at this point we're not sure, and we're open, and that's why we're asking the question.

Because I think one of the things that I've really felt over the past five years is that the integration of the program components, be it hazardous waste with Minority Worker Training or disaster preparedness with hazardous waste or DOE with whatever, you know, is that there's really a lot of interconnection and synergy that's happened between program components, which I think we want to encourage.

The other thing that I'll say about this is that the efforts that have been made to create multiple grantee consortium project and working groups I think is another important area where I think we've had some good experimentation, and we could potentially encourage that, so we would have groups of grantees working together in an area or on an initiative. I think that's the nature of why we're asking this question, to be able to say is that something that people want to see more of or want to see us encourage or is it too much hassle and not worth it? So just a comment, I think that was kind of what we were looking for in answer to that question.

Sharon Beard: I just wanted to make one other comment. We did have a second webinar date set for December the 17th if we needed it, so please just jot that down, and save the date. We're going to look at the responses to the questions and any other material that comes out of this to see if we really need to have a separate webinar, but please hold the date of December the 17th for right now. I think it's the same time, from one to four that we have allotted for it. So just wanted to make sure I made that comment.

Chip Hughes: Yes, I would just say one more thing, the way we have set this up we're having our annual program retreat with MDB in two weeks or something, so we were going to kind of assess how things went on this call and then decide whether we needed another one. So we'll let you know.

Sharon Beard: Well, hearing no further questions or comments, I want to thank everybody for tuning in today and sharing with us when we look at what the future holds for the Worker Training Program. We're certainly going to use the materials, the questions, and all the things that we have available to help us to move forward with this program.

I think we have one more question, hold on. The question says we are an SBIR awardee, we have developed a mobile platform for delivering training materials. We would like to partner with other awardees to provide content. This is [Robert Migloti]. So if you have -- if you want to partner with him please do, you can contact him directly, he is -- his contact information is under our program for who we fund, and so you can certainly get in contact with him for that.

Unidentified Participant: Or send it to me or to Deborah, and we'll forward it on.

Sharon Beard: Right. So thanks, again, for our presenters -- Don Elisburg for really helping us to look at what the future might look like and kind of give us some things to think about. Bryan for sharing the economic analysis and really helping us to see things in a different light about the impact of our programs, and especially Minority Worker Training Program, because I think that's going to be important to share with people about the need for training and what these individuals have achieved as a result of this training program. So I really appreciate everyone. And [Ron Schneider] says have a safe and wonderful Thanksgiving and happy holidays to everybody. So thank you very much. Please remember that at the conclusion of the webinar you will be asked some questions, so please take the time to answer those. Thank you very much.