

**Coordination of Regional Pollution Prevention Information Centers**

**EPA Grant 83375501-0**

**Semiannual Report**

**May 1, 2008 – October 31, 2008**

**submitted by: Jean S. Waters, P2Rx coordinator  
University of Nebraska at Omaha**

Executive Summary .....	1
<b>1. Project Accomplishments .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.1. Identify, evaluate, and measure outcomes and outputs from information services and outreach .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1.1. Establish P2Rx/EPA measurement workgroup.....	2
1.1.2. Quantify current measures.....	2
1.1.3. Workgroup evaluate and recommend measures .....	2
1.1.4. Determine gaps in information .....	2
1.1.5. Make recommendations based on information services measurement.....	2
1.1.6. Help centers prioritize their work and share components of the overall strategy.....	3
Center directors will meet in January, 2009, to further discuss the results of the recent PPIN Evaluation, conducted by Abt. The follow-up recommendations, outlines in 1.1.5 will be discussed. Additionally, centers will discuss how they can better cooperate and share components of work with each other.....	3
<b>1.2. Measure and evaluate current networking activities .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.3. Pursue efficiencies in information delivery .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.3.1. Centralize the Topic Hub™ database.....	3
1.3.2. Centralize the library databases.....	3
1.3.3. Provide limited Web consulting to centers and external partners.....	3
<b>1.4. Facilitate communication among centers .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.4.1. Administrative calls and meetings .....	3
1.4.2. Web personnel from Centers quarterly calls .....	3
<b>1.5. Program Coordinator Evaluation .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.6. External outreach .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.6.1. National Environmental Partnership Summit .....	4
1.6.2. Federal Center Environmental Conferences.....	4
1.6.3. Met with OPPD staff and P2 Coordinators .....	4
1.6.4. Published 2009 P2Rx Calendars.....	4
1.6.5. Presented at Region 7 P2 Roundtable.....	4
1.6.6. Participated in P2Rx/NPPR Measurement workgroup.....	4
<b>2. Project Task Summary .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Attachments .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1. “Cookie Committee” call minutes .....	8
3.2. P2Rx Administrative call minutes, May, June, July, August, September, and October, 2008 .....	8
3.3. Web developers call minutes, June and September 2008 .....	8
3.4. Executive Committee call minutes, May and September 2008 .....	8
3.1. “Cookie Committee” call minutes .....	1
3.2. P2Rx Administrative call minutes, May, June, July, August, September, and October, 2008 .....	5
3.3. Web developers call minutes, June and September 2008 .....	16
3.4. Executive Committee call minutes, May and September 2008.....	18

## Executive Summary

The Program Coordinator for the Pollution Prevention Information Network (PPIN) has had a productive second half of the first project year. The PPIN network operates as the Pollution Prevention Resource Exchange (P2Rx).

Working in conjunction with the EPA contractor, Abt Associates, the **PPIN evaluation is complete**. This significant project yielded several important recommendations.

The **top priorities** (agreed upon by at least five of eight centers) were:

1. **Follow up with known customers**
  - a. Determine **type of customer** (end-user of information or intermediate user)
  - b. Ask if short-term, intermediate or long-term **outcomes** occurred
2. **Continue** to the following:
  - a. Spend adequate resources to **keep websites up-to-date**
  - b. **Centralize functions** for collecting case studies, maintaining P2 Program Directory, Performance measurement, and some of the web coding
  - c. Have **value-added communication** within the administrative group
3. **Capture Intermediate Outcomes** – behavior change or other intermediate outcomes if environmental outcomes are not available

A committee was led into formulation of a scheme for **centers to implement a “cookie”** to users on their websites, so their use of the site could be tracked. Implementation has occurred at NEWMOA and after a testing period, the computer code will be shared with other centers.

A committee was formed to design “common questions” that all centers can ask of their users, in order that the results can be aggregated.

The **Topic Hub database** has been **centralized**. This eliminates some code maintenance for individual centers and assures the latest data and links are shared among all centers. The library was not centralized but a Google search box has been employed that searches all P2Rx Center websites.

**External outreach** included presentations by the P2Rx coordinator at the

- National Environmental Partnership Summit
- Federal Center Environmental Conferences (West and East)
- Region 7 P2 Roundtable

Meetings were held with OPPD staff and the P2 coordinators (via conference call) and there was significant participation in the P2Rx/NPPR Measurement Workgroup.

Monthly administrative calls, quarterly web developer calls, and two executive committee calls were held and documented.

# 1. Project Accomplishments

## *1.1. Identify, evaluate, and measure outcomes and outputs from information services and outreach*

### *1.1.1. Establish P2Rx/EPA measurement workgroup*

An evaluation team was formed by EPA to evaluate the Pollution Prevention Information Network (PPIN). The team of Beth Anderson, Yvonne Watson, Andrea Hramits, Charles Bevington, Hugh Gibson, and Pam Swingle (EPA), Andy Bray, Elizabeth Bird, and Jean Waters (P2Rx) and Abt Associates (contractor), has continued to meet via conference call on May 6, May 8, and June 4.

### *1.1.2. Quantify current measures*

Abt compiled the data that centers collected in the PPIN evaluation report. This information is included in the final report, posted at [http://p2rx.org/AdminInfo/2008\\_survey\\_results/FINAL%20PPIN%20Evaluation%20Report\\_August8.pdf](http://p2rx.org/AdminInfo/2008_survey_results/FINAL%20PPIN%20Evaluation%20Report_August8.pdf) The evaluation concluded that many measurements are made by individual centers apart from the survey, but since the questions are inconsistent among centers, it is difficult to make statistically-valid statements about them.

### *1.1.3. Workgroup evaluate and recommend measures*

A committee was formed within P2Rx to determine how to give website users a “cookie” so their usage of the website would be known, and what information we could track. The committee had calls on June 27 and August 7. It is comprised of Andy Bray and Nate Bisbee (NEWMOA), Curt McCracken and David Webb (WRRC), Tyler Rubach (GLRPPR), Thomas Vinson (Zerowaste), Elizabeth Bird and Wes Fleming (Peaks). The committee was formed to make a proposal to the entire P2Rx group regarding the use of cookies or some other technology to determine demographics of users and intermediate and long-term outcomes from Website usage. Minutes from these “cookie committee” calls are posted at <http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/committees/cookie/> and are included in the appendix.

The “cookie committee” gave their report to the administrators on the call October 13, 2008. Their recommendation was to deploy a “pop up” on the website that would ask the user whether they were an end-user of the information (business) or intermediate user of the information (TAP).

The “common questions” committee was formed on the October 13, 2008 Administrator’s call. It consists of Lynn Turner (Zerowaste), Deb Taevs (PPRC), Ed Gonzalez (WSPPN), and Andy Bray (NEWMOA). This committee will propose questions all centers can use to determine the type of clients that use the websites and any intermediate outcomes from their use, in accordance with the logic model.

### *1.1.4. Determine gaps in information*

It has been determined that the centers need a way to track the kinds of users who come to the website. These users can broadly be classified as end-users (those who are getting information for themselves or their own organization) and intermediate users (technical assistance programs (TAPs) or those who are getting information to pass on to a client). The cookie committee (see 1.1.3) is assigned to determine the technical aspects employing a pop-up or some other way of identifying these two types of users on the website.

### *1.1.5. Make recommendations based on information services measurement*

Recommendations provided as a result of the PPIN evaluation were reviewed by all the centers in September. Center directors voted individually on the recommendations via an on-line survey created by the Coordinator’s office. The results of the survey were tabulated and distributed to the Centers. On an administrators call, September 10, 2008, the recommendations were reviewed by the group and confirmation of priority was made. The results are posted at

[http://p2rx.org/AdminInfo/2008\\_survey\\_results/SummaryoftopABTEvaluationRecommendations.pdf](http://p2rx.org/AdminInfo/2008_survey_results/SummaryoftopABTEvaluationRecommendations.pdf)

The top priorities (agreed upon by at least five of eight centers) were:

4. Follow up on Rapid Response and possibly other Technical Assistance Contacts
  - a. Determine type of customer and type of request
  - b. Evaluate need for need for information based upon requests received via rapid response

- c. Perform follow-up to see if changes occurred with clients
- 5. Continue to the following:
  - a. Spend adequate resources to keep websites up-to-date
  - b. Centralize functions for collecting case studies, maintaining P2 Program Directory, Performance measurement, and some of the web coding
  - c. Have value-added communication within the administrative group
- 6. Capture Intermediate Outcomes – behavior change or other intermediate outcomes if environmental outcomes are not available

*1.1.6. Help centers prioritize their work and share components of the overall strategy*

Center directors will meet in January, 2009, to further discuss the results of the recent PPIN Evaluation, conducted by Abt. The follow-up recommendations, outlines in 1.1.5 will be discussed. Additionally, centers will discuss how they can better cooperate and share components of work with each other.

**1.2. Measure and evaluate current networking activities**

Current networking activities conducted by centers were compiled by Abt. The evaluation results are posted as noted in 1.1.2. Abt recommends Centers follow up with advisory boards or clients to which Centers provided technical assistance (as noted in 1.1.5). The common questions committee will propose questions all centers can use for this follow-up so results can be aggregated from all centers and statistically analyzed.

**1.3. Pursue efficiencies in information delivery**

*1.3.1. Centralize the Topic Hub™ database*

The Topic Hub database has been centralized. All the data is now fed from one server to every center.

*1.3.2. Centralize the library databases*

The P2Rx.org website now has a “Google” search box which indexes all the Centers websites, including the library. This solution accomplishes the goal of combining library data plus sector resources and other information on the websites without physically (electronically) combining the databases.

*1.3.3. Provide limited Web consulting to centers and external partners*

NEWMOA is the subcontractor providing web consulting to centers and doing the web work for P2Rx. They have provided assistance to four centers during this period.

**1.4. Facilitate communication among centers**

*1.4.1. Administrative calls and meetings*

Monthly administrative conference calls were arranged and facilitated in May, June, July, August, September, and October. An agenda is distributed one week prior to each call and input is solicited. Minutes are posted to the administrative section of the P2Rx.org Website, <http://p2rx.org/WebCall/getAdminGroup.cfm> following the calls. They are also included in the appendix.

Center directors provided an update of their activities in June. The coordinator provided centers their center-specific survey results (culled from the Abt report) in July. These results are posted on the administrative page of P2Rx.org.

*1.4.2. Web personnel from Centers quarterly calls*

A quarterly call of Web personnel from all the Centers was held on June 26 and September 25. Minutes are included in the appendix and posted at <http://p2rx.org/WebCall/getCall.cfm>

**1.5. Program Coordinator Evaluation**

The executive committee had a call on May 5, 2008, in preparation for the National Environmental Summit. Minutes are included in the appendix. The committee changed personnel by a vote of the Center Directors on the July 9, 2008 administrators call. Chris Wiley of the Pacific Northwest Pollution Prevention Resource Center (PPRC) resigned from that center, so Julie Woolsey of the Waste Reduction Resource Center (WRRC) was elected to take his place on the executive committee. Also on the committee are Andy Bray of the Northeast Waste Management Officials’ Association (NEWMOA), and Ed Gonzalez of the Western Regional Pollution

Prevention Network (WRPPN). The committee had a call on September 22, 2008 to discuss the possibility of centers focusing on a topic nationally, rather than limiting collaboration to regional partners. The minutes from the call are included in the appendix. The committee is responsible for evaluation of the P2Rx coordinator, among other things. Evaluation of the coordinator is expected to be done in the next reporting period.

### **1.6. External outreach**

#### **1.6.1. National Environmental Partnership Summit**

Presented information at the National Environmental Partnership Summit in Baltimore, May 19-22, 2008. Presentations included the P2 Results database and leading the P2Rx Fun Walk, which is an alternative networking event held annually at the summit. The event raises awareness of P2Rx and provides support for a local environmental philanthropic project. The presentation is posted at <http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/Summit%2008.ppt>.

#### **1.6.2. Federal Center Environmental Conferences**

Presented P2Rx overviews at two Federal Center Environmental Conferences, June 3 in Bethesda, MD, and June 19 in Big Sky, Montana. The presentation is posted at <http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/P2Rx%20Fed%20Cntrs%20West.ppt>.

#### **1.6.3. Met with OPPD staff and P2 Coordinators**

Met with Tom Tillman, Beth Anderson, and others at EPA Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics in Washington, D.C., in conjunction with the trip to the Fed Center Conference. The meeting allowed for an update and review of P2Rx progress.

Met with EPA Regional P2 coordinators via conference call on November 13.

#### **1.6.4. Published 2009 P2Rx Calendars**

These hard-copy 12-month calendars can be viewed at <http://www.p2rx.org/Calendar/2009calendar.pdf>. This year, we requested people on the P2 Tech listserv to provide us their photographs for consideration for the calendar. We had 14 people enter photographs. The graphic artist at the University of Nebraska at Omaha made the selections, based upon quality of the photograph, variety of subject matter, and she tried to use as many of the individuals who entered as possible. Additionally, the Pollution Prevention Interns from the University of Nebraska at Lincoln entered Haiku poems, and some were included. Every person whose work was published received a few complimentary calendars.

#### **1.6.5. Presented at Region 7 P2 Roundtable**

Attended Region 7 P2 Roundtable in Kansas City October 27-28; provided a short update on P2Rx.

#### **1.6.6. Participated in P2Rx/NPPR Measurement workgroup**

Participated on two conference calls (August 26 and September 25) and a face-to-face meeting (October 7-8, in Denver) of the P2Rx/NPPR Measurement workgroup. PPRC has completed its work on the P2 Results database and all centers host a database portal. The data is now also available to be transferred via the EPA node system. NEWMOA will be working with Michigan next year on the next iteration of improvements to the system. Centers support of the P2 Results database and their outreach to P2 programs in their region resulted in significant participation in recording outcomes from P2 activities. The NPPR (National Pollution Prevention Roundtable) has published an on-line version of the aggregated results for 2004-2006. The centers all participated in this effort and the Coordinator's IT contractor (NEWMOA) assisted the centers in this effort.

In addition to the calls and meeting, I participated in a session the Measurement workgroup held at the National Environmental Partnership Summit. The purpose of the session was to explain the work being done by the workgroup and to recruit new members and participants who would contribute metrics to the database.

## 2. Project Task Summary

The project task summary follows the detail of the project strategy.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Accomplishments</b>
Evaluate and measure outcomes and outputs from <b>information services and outreach</b> (Project Strategy 1.1)	<i>Quarter 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Solicit workgroup</li> <li>▪ Compile measures</li> <li>▪ Coordinate with EPA consultant on measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Workgroup continues to meet</li> <li>▪ Abt (contractor) compiled existing measurement data</li> </ul>	Current measures compiled by EPA contractor, Abt
	<i>Quarter 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conduct face-to-face workgroup meeting</li> <li>▪ Identify gaps in measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Publish meeting minutes</li> <li>▪ Publish recommended measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Face-to-face meeting complete</li> <li>▪ Committee met and proposed a “pop-up” cookie to track users Oct. 13, 2008</li> </ul>
	<i>Quarter 3-4</i> Compile auxiliary measures obtained from centers	Publish expanded measurement results	Formed “common questions” committee to propose questions all centers could ask of their users.
	<i>Quarter 5-6</i> Analyze measurement results with workgroup and executive committee	Publish recommended changes to information services	Review was conducted by all centers on September 10, 2008 and are posted on P2Rx.org.
	<i>Quarter 7-8</i> Help Centers prioritize work and share components of overall strategy	Establish network-wide priorities with center responsibilities	Next steps are expected to be decided upon at the Administrator’s meeting in early 2009.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Accomplishments</b>
Measure and evaluate current <b>networking</b> activities (Project Strategy 1.2)	<i>Quarter 1</i> Compile networking measures	List current measures	Contractor has completed compiling measures
	<i>Quarter 2</i> Recommend measures; review	Publish recommended measures	Review of recommendations on September 10 are posted on P2Rx.org.
	<i>Quarter 3-4</i> Assist centers with internet implementation to gather audience statistics	P2Rx Centers implement audience measures	Next steps are expected to be decided upon at the Administrator's meeting in early 2009.
	<i>Quarter 5-6</i> Compile information gathered by centers	Publish summary of audience statistics and networking measures	Not begun
	<i>Quarter 7</i> Make recommendations for changes/improvements	Publish recommendation document	Not begun
	<i>Quarter 8</i> Help Centers prioritize work and share components of overall strategy	Establish network-wide priorities with center responsibilities	Not begun

<b>Task</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Accomplishments</b>
Pursue efficiencies in information delivery (Project Strategy 1.3)	<i>Quarter 1-4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Get agreement from centers on hosting site and mechanism of display for Topic Hubs</li> <li>▪ Help centers migrate data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P2Rx standard for centralized Topic Hubs</li> <li>▪ Produce centralized Topic Hub database</li> </ul>	Topic Hub Database is centralized.
	<i>Quarter 5-8</i> Contact external partners to share Topic Hubs	Topic Hubs displayed with three or more external partners	One external partner has contacted PPRC to display Topic Hubs
	<i>Quarter 1-4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Get agreement from centers on hosting site and mechanism of display for virtual, centralized library</li> <li>▪ Help centers migrate data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P2Rx standard for centralized library</li> <li>▪ Produce centralized library</li> </ul>	A Google search box has been installed on the P2Rx.org site to index and search all eight center's sites, including their libraries.
	<i>Quarter 5-8</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Help centers display library on their sites</li> <li>▪ Find external partners to display library</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Library displayed on individual center sites</li> <li>▪ Library displayed with three or more external partners</li> </ul>	Implementation has not begun
	<i>Ongoing</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assist Centers with web or database issues</li> <li>▪ Provide minimum training on P2Rx products to new web personnel</li> <li>▪ Assist external partners with display of P2Rx products</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of documented "bugs" in Bugzilla</li> <li>▪ Number of updates of software in CVS</li> <li>▪ Number of trainings</li> <li>▪ Number of external partners assisted</li> </ul>	NEWMOA (the subcontractor) provided assistance to four centers. No bugs have been reported to Bugzilla.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Accomplishments</b>
Facilitate communication among centers (Project Strategy 1.4)	<i>Ongoing</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monthly conference calls among Center directors</li> <li>▪ Quarterly regional updates</li> <li>▪ Monthly conference calls among web personnel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Center directors conference call minutes</li> <li>▪ Regional updates e-mail “newsletters”</li> <li>▪ Web developers’ conference call minutes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Six calls were held and minutes posted</li> <li>▪ Regional updates were provided by centers in June and are included in the minutes</li> <li>▪ Web calls were held in June and September; minutes are posted</li> </ul>
Program coordinator evaluation (Project Strategy 1.5)	<i>Quarter 2, 4, 6</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Executive committee evaluate coordinator with input of all center directors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evaluations posted</li> <li>▪ Response posted</li> </ul>	Executive committee changed personnel; no evaluation of the coordinator yet

### **3. Attachments**

*3.1. “Cookie Committee” call minutes*

*3.2. P2Rx Administrative call minutes, May, June, July, August, September, and October, 2008*

*3.3. Web developers call minutes, June and September 2008*

*3.4. Executive Committee call minutes, May and September 2008*

### 3.1. “Cookie Committee” call minutes

#### *Cookie Committee Call June 27, 2008*

The P2Rx “cookie” committee met on a call Friday, June 27, 2008. David Webb and Curt McCracken (WRRRC), Tyler Rubach (GLRPPR), Andy Bray and Nate Bisbee (NEWMOA), Wes Fleming (Peaks), Beth Anderson (EPA), Thomas Vinson (Zero Waste), and Jean Waters (P2Rx) were on the call.

There are two things we are trying to learn about our web usage.

1. Demographics – Is the user a TAP or a business?
2. Follow-up – Have we increased awareness, changed behavior, prevented pollution, etc.?

We discussed what could be accomplished with a “cookie”.

Only the site that issues the cookie has access to it. The simplest thing would be to track people on P2Rx.org or each individual site. If we only tracked users on P2rx.org, it wouldn’t show the use of non-p2rx products which are located on individual center sites. Webtrends includes a way to track cookies; it’s just a feature you “turn on.”

One problem with a persistent cookie (one that exists beyond a specific, individual session) is that about 35% of people wipe out their cookies. Therefore, we would need to have a reason for people to register so they would stay signed in.

We would pursue a cf cookie since all sites use cold fusion.

#### Registration issues

Tyler suggested we do a p2rx log-in. Microsoft live ID allows a user to log in once and be registered for multiple sites. This would mean we’d set up web services to track where users are on every center’s site.

What would be the motivation for people to register? We need to have some kind of value-added page or service that would motivate people to register.

1. We have to offer users something for their registration that is value-added and keeps them signed in
2. We’re not sure how to track a user across all sites. (If a user logs onto P2RIC and then goes to GLRPPR, does GLRPPR know it’s the same user?) Might be possible in Webtrends Analytics 8.1. If not, what would it cost to program? (Would we need a Web service where anything set on the p2rx cookie would be sent to p2rx, read by p2rx, and sent back to the center’s site?)
3. Could one center run Webtrends for everyone? Would that help anything?
4. What would we even be allowed to track, given EPA and University policies? Note: We do not have a federal contract. Beth says there are no restrictions on grantees for cookies. Paul Chalmers uses registrations, is he using cookies?
5. Could we offer an Amazon look and feel? We could play off users previous experience and tailor the interface. If we had cookie users that were doing searches, the next time they came back we’d display anything new on the topic they searched on previously. We’d need a network-wide ontology, though.

#### Other ways to skin the cat

We could send a short survey to people we know (programs directory, regional listservs, users of the rapid response) but how do we know the demographic of our Web users?

How about offering a TAP site and a business site? Then depending which one they visit we’d know something about them. This is social engineering – rather than ask them, you let them configure their interface and then you know.

Google-mini offers different indexes; it is a Google custom query. You can type in all the urls you want to search and it returns the result. In theory we could have custom search engine for p2rx. It's not clear what additional functions do you get by using the Google mini.

Next call is Monday, July 28 at noon PT, 1:00 MT, 2:00 CT, 3:00 ET.

### ***Cookie Committee Call August 7, 2008***

Curt McCracken, David Webb, Andy Bray, Nate Bisbee, Tyler Rubach, Thomas Vinson, Beth Anderson, and Jean Waters were on the call.

Andy presented results of their investigation into implementing a cookie on the P2Rx websites.

The different technical options we've talked about for how to implement a cookie for additional info on our users:

1. first party cookie only
2. third party cookie only
3. first party cookie and a separate third party cookie
4. first party cookie and third party cookie that talk to each other

1. First Party Cookie only (using <cfCookie...> and WebTrends)

#### Pluses

- easy to set the cookie (in a site-wide application.cfm, theoretically)
- generally more accepted than third party cookies (browser security settings tend to reject out third party cookies before first party cookies)
- can work with existing WebTrends configuration
- flexible to enable centers that are inclined to use the cookie for more than just demographic tracking to do so

#### Minuses

- must have WebTrends 7.5 or higher (purchased after May 2005)
- each Center would need to analyze the cookie use on their site and report to Jean with semiannual web measures
- can't track users across all of the sites

#### Unknowns

- don't know how other analytics software, such as Saw Mill handle or analyze for cookies [Thomas says Saw Mill and Urchin should be able to do it. Curt is running 30-day trial on Urchin. It costs about \$2000. Andy spent about \$1500 for Webtrends but their site is very small. Google bought Urchin out a few years ago.] We don't know if Google analytics will allow cookies or not.
- what about those PDFs? A cf cookie can't be served directly from a pdf. If a non cold fusion file is served, the cf server doesn't even get involved. Tyler doesn't know of any way to set a cookie for someone who requests just a pdf page. WRRRC tried to serve the pdf in a framed environment a number of years ago because they were trying to brand their information. If we did something like that, we could serve the cookie. Curt thinks it was usability with the wrapper so that's why they did away with it, but not sure. The other question is whether there is any Google impact.

## 2. Third Party Cookie only (using SmartSource with WebTrends)

### Pluses

- analysis would be centralized and only done by P2Rx.org
- would be able to track a single user across all of the sites

### Minuses

- need to set-up a new server for collecting the tracking data
- might have real implementation problems on some centers; i.e., would need to put a snippet of code within the <BODY> tag of each page

### Unknown

- whether or not there are other ways of implementing a third party cookie other than SmartSource
- what about those PDFs?
- Could we write a user-defined function that would insert the Java script (cookie) into the body?

## 3. First Party Cookie and a Separate Third Party Cookie

### Pluses

- all those mentioned above
- flexible enough that if individual centers could chose to nothing with first party (if centers want to get more info they could)

### Minuses

- all those mentioned above
- would mean more work than just choosing one or the other

## 4. First party cookie and third party cookie that talk to each other

### Pluses

- all those mentioned above

### Minuses

- all those mentioned above
- much more complicated to implement

### Unknowns

- how would the first and third party cookie talk to each other
- what would added benefit of knowing how first party user traveled throughout the network

Thomas provided his reaction. First, Andy did great research. He wondered how important any benefit would be to having the first and third party match up. His initial reaction is to implement first-party cookie. He thinks he can do this using Sawmill to analyze web data.

Thomas points out that cookies are not the only thing we can do to help identify and track users. There are various places on our sites where people register (programs directory, rapid response, listservs, measurement tool, webinars or other training, etc.) We can capture the demographics from these folks, and can follow up with them to determine outcomes.

Thomas said that Sawmill only cost a few hundred dollars. Tyler didn't really like Sawmill when he tried it because it operated like its own little web server. Running the reports was pretty demanding of the computer and took a long time to run. Curt says WebTrends still takes all night to run at WRRC. Andy says theirs takes about a half hour to run a quarter's worth of data.

Tyler is interested in the third party cookie because it's less work for him. It might be more work for sites that don't have a global header, though. The first-party cookie sounds good, too, as a way to get started. GLRPPR doesn't run WebTrends 7.5. Tyler wonders if we could have one center run WebTrends for everyone?

Jean said that WRRC will probably have to keep running their own, but perhaps others could be done by a single center.

Curt is concerned about trying to use the third-party cookie because he'd have to get the cookie into the body of all the documents on his site. There are too many documents in the library to accomplish this without some way to do it automatically.

David doesn't like cookies. He thinks it's best to try the third-party cookie because it will give you a more standard solution across sites.

Andy isn't leaning one way or another. The quickest way to deliver across the board is probably the third party. However, if we want to pilot it, first-party cookie on a couple of sites is the easiest thing to do. The biggest problem with a third-party cookie is that you have to have a dedicated server and you have to have a couple more ports on your firewall open. Tyler thinks they could get the server on-line pretty easily. Andy also said that your internet service provider (ISP) would have to enable cookie tracking in the web logs.

***Conclusion:***

Knowing what we know now, it seems like the first party option would be the lowest hurdle. Andy will check about the cost of having one center run Webtrends for all centers.

With a first-party cookie, we can ask users to identify whether they primarily use the website to find environmental information to apply to their own organization or facility (business) or to provide assistance to others outside their organization (TAP). Centers will be able to report that the numbers of registered TAPs and businesses, and user sessions and page views for each.

We would not be able to track users across different center websites. (but we don't do that now)

### ***3.2. P2Rx Administrative call minutes, May, June, July, August, September, and October, 2008***

#### **P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call**

Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2008

***Attendees:*** Beth Anderson and Yvonne Watson (EPA), Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray (NEWMOA), Gary Hunt, Curt McCracken, and Tom Edgerton (WRRC), Bob Iverson (GLRPPR), Thomas Vinson-Peng and Lynn Turner (Zero Waste), Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Elizabeth Bird (Peaks to Prairies), Ed Gonzales and Kevin Dick (WRPPN), Chris Wiley (PPRC)

#### ***Action Items:***

**June 4, 2008**, at 2pm ET, 1pm CT, 12pm MT, and 11am PT call with center directors to discuss the Abt report

**Jean-** send the link with Centralized Topic Hubs to all

**Ed-** send the list with upcoming webinars to all

#### ***Abt Report Update:***

All the center directors should have received final Abt report. Yvonne has not reviewed it yet, so would like to schedule another meeting to get feedback from center directors after their review. However, Abt is no longer obligated to work on the document because their contract has ended; if there is a major revision needed, however, EPA would try to work with Abt to get appropriate changes made.

Beth asked whether this document will be public. Yvonne responded that they will post it on the intranet and on the internet; however they are not in a hurry. The main focus now is for each center director to understand and to agree with the report. Yvonne said center directors are the stakeholders, so they have to decide, look at the data and make recommendations. After having all the recommendations from the report, center directors have to see which ones will be implemented.

Everybody agreed that to review this report, it has to be a separate call, because it will generate a lot of discussion, and since it is a public document, they have to really take the time to respond to it. The call is scheduled for June 4, 2008, at 2pm ET, 1pm CT, 12pm MT, and 11am PT.

#### ***Baltimore Summit:***

People to attend summit: Ken, Ed, Thomas, Andy, Gary, Jean, Lynn, Thomas.

#### ***Fed Center Presentations:***

Jean sent an e-mail to everybody containing the power point for NPPR meeting which will be held as part of the Environmental Summit. If anyone has any additions, they should send them to her. She is doing two presentations for Federal Facility Environmental Managers. She will explain what P2Rx is and if any Center wants to highlight any products or services they offer that would be of interest to Federal Facilities, they should send that into to Jean ASAP.

*Updates on:*

### **Centralizing Topic Hubs**

Andy and Nate are working to centralize the Topic Hubs by June 26. Jean asked everybody to take a look at the display. The navigation is slightly different. She will send the link to everybody. Andy said sharing the Topic Hubs functions like the news box, and it is designed for those who run cold fusion. Later on they will move to other platforms too.

### **WRPPN/PPRC Webinar**

Ed and Chris said that the webinar went well, and there were more than 90 people who attended. The software functioned well, even if the attendees don't have the opportunity to talk, they can submit questions at any time. They also launched a survey, and had 24 respondents. They also did pre-survey and post-survey. Ed said that they could upgrade to the corporate account if anybody else wants to join to share the cost. He also said that he will try to find out whether the corporate account allows streaming video, which would be nice.

Chris said that they got good demographic information about webinar attendees. Jean asked if they could determine whether future webinars reach out to small businesses.

Beth suggested to simply ask attendees whether they are using the info for their business or they are passing it on. This information would help document our impact.

### **WRRC Library Cookies**

Elizabeth and Gary are planning to implement cookies on their website as a part of their grant. Jean proposed to form a subcommittee of administrators to determine what we need cookies to do for us. Gary said that first they need to know what the capabilities of cookies are and what information can it store.

A "cookie" committee was appointed. It consists of Elizabeth Bird and Wes Fleming (Peaks), Andy Bray and Nate Bisbee (NEWMOA), Thomas Vinson (Zero Waste), Curt McCracken and David Bond (WRRC), and Tyler Rubach (GLRPPR). Andy said that Ron Still (WRRC) would also be welcome on the committee if he's available.

### **Web and Activity measures report**

Yvonne said that it is important to know what measures to use and to prioritize the measurements. She said they have a statistician who will help in figuring that out. Beth suggested that it would be good to know this information within next 6 months to know what to push for. She also said that proposals don't really have a lot of measures.

Yvonne said identifying who is the primary and secondary audience is crucial, and that showing P2Rx has this "reach" must be documented.

Beth added that there are ways to move forward and that there are a lot in place to do the measurements. She also said that within next 6 months you should have a sense of what to do.

### *Updates on PPIN proposal/award process*

Beth said that they are making it up as it goes along. The request is \$226,000 more the available money, so that will lead to cuts in the budgets. She also said that some people are going by reviews and suggestions. At this point no allocations have been made.

She said they still did not decide how to cut budgets, a percentage for all the proposals, or eliminating tasks from individual proposals.

### **P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call Wednesday, June 11th, 2008**

**Attendees:** Beth Anderson (EPA), Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray (NEWMOA), Gary Hunt, Tom Edgerton, and Julie Woosley (WRRC), Bob Iverson (GLRPPR), Thomas Vinson-Peng and Lynn Turner (Zero Waste), Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Elizabeth Bird and Mike Vogel (Peaks to Prairies), and Ed Gonzalez (WRPPN)

#### ***Action Items:***

All: Send Jean P2 resources for auto body and paint shops

#### ***Outcome of Abt Evaluation Report:***

Jean proposed we implement cookies on our sites

To identify visitors demographics-who the people are

What they looked at (output)

Where they live - region and try to capture whether a person from one region looks at another region's info, (show national usefulness)

Whether and how they are using the info (outcome).

For starters, there will be about 2 questions to get our known users to register and get a cookie. Further, a pop-up can be used after the user looks at "X" number of documents in order to ask whether they are using the information, whether the info was useful, and if they pass this info on.

All of the centers could use the same 3-4 questions on a survey. These questions could be in addition to an existing survey that they use. The idea is to have some consistent questions for comparison across the network. (Beth can follow up with OPEI on its approved customer satisfaction survey to see what questions we can use, and whether open-ended questions can be used). Centers can also follow up with the people we know through help desk, (fill out help-desk form for centralized follow-up or the center can follow up themselves). At workshops and trainings, centers can ask the questions right then.

We also need to keep “case studies” or “testimonials” in an attempt to connect the dots and show the link between our outputs to long-term outcomes.

### *Moving Forward to Change Measures:*

Both the web measures and the activity measures should be reported. Abt pointed out in their report that we currently just report a number without clarifying who is calling, or how they used the information provided. Andy said cookies are an attempt to link who is using the web, where they are from, and who they are.

Abt reported that centers don't follow up individually with people who have used our technical assistance. It may be possible for all centers to use a web form for their technical assistance and have follow-up standardized and centralized.

For web activity, we should still continue to follow the big picture and report total activity, which is not difficult. Our goal is to continue to track useful web activity information, but it shouldn't be too burdensome.

The cookie committee (Dave Webb, Curt McCracken, Wes Fleming, Elizabeth Bird, Andy Bray, Nate Bisbee, Thomas Vinson, and Tyler Rubach) will need to see what it will take to implement cookies, whether the current web measures will stay in effect, and if there is value in reporting the current numbers. Thomas pointed out that currently the difficulty with web measures is to ensure the accuracy of the web numbers.

### *Center Activities:*

NEWMOA is working with their region to determine the impact of materials consumption on greenhouse gas emissions. Once a strategy is crafted, they will look for foundation money. They are trying to develop a regional strategy on materials and wastes and climate impact. Use of materials has gotten lost because of too much focus on energy and transport with respect to their impact on greenhouse gas emissions. About 36% of greenhouse gas is attributed to materials consumption. The focus of the project is to reduce the materials that produce most of the greenhouse gas.

Zero Waste strategy is also thinking along NEWMOA's line. Thomas said that terms like “beyond garbage” begin to emerge. Also, byproducts from industrial operations are important. There is a need to get organics out of landfill, and compost them.

PPRC and Zero waste put in climate change proposal for source reduction grants. Zero waste proposed to devise a strategy to work with the mayor's climate change strategy working groups, industrial commercial working group, and cross cutting issues workgroup. They have identified lowering peak loads as one possibility. Each city has its own workgroups.

WRRRC recycling people are working with some cities and they are using recycling to help them reduce greenhouse gases. They are following EPA's WARM model.

When CO2 is redefined as pollution, recycling is an important strategy; however, Beth said recycling has never been considered prevention. Andy said that we're better served to go back upstream and push prevention. Thomas mentioned that they are also considering reuse.

Elizabeth announced that she'll be leaving in August or September because she'll be going full time at her other job.

## P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call Wednesday, July 9th, 2008

**Attendees:** Beth Anderson (EPA), Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray (NEWMOA), Gary Hunt and Julie Woosley (WRRC), Bob Iverson (GLRPPR), Thomas Vinson-Peng and Lynn Turner (Zero Waste), Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Elizabeth Bird and Mike Vogel (Peaks to Prairies), Deb Taevs (PPRC)

**Action Items:** All: by August 13 give Jean ideas (2-3 per center) for topics for 2009 calendar

### *Center by center survey results:*

Jean announced that center results are posted on the P2Rx website. Jean mentioned that people who take the survey tend to quit the survey after question 1 and 6. Most of the people are finding out about P2Rx or the specific center by hearing about us from colleagues, WRRC was the exception; most people learned about WRRC from a search engine. Topic Hubs are most popular and most used products. Many people don't know about most of the products on our websites. Lynn commented that she wanted to look more closely at the results of users who have familiarity with the center. Others want to look at first-time users in an attempt to see how to market their website better.

All center directors agreed that they will take a closer look at the center by center results and will familiarize themselves more with the finding for their specific center by next admin call, where they will discuss it one more time with more detail.

Lynn said that in their hard-copy surveys, given at pre-treatment workshops, about 60% of businesses reported water pollution reduction. Deb mentioned that the P2Rx products are not well known by businesses or TAPs, and that these survey results should be marketed more. She also suggested that the results can be rephrased and used in publicity, grant proposals, or just presenting these results to EPA. Andy said that he likes the idea of trying to summarize the key findings and to highlight the achievements. Elizabeth suggested using a 2 page template for each center results. She also suggested to have both, a national and center specific report. She also said that P2Rx needs to do more outreach, and if this data gives this opportunity, they should do it.

Deb said that they can send these services and usage of services results to businesses, journals, press release, and press advisory. Rick expressed his dilemma of choosing the strategic approach:

Strengthen the strong points or try to advertise what people don't know about. Does it make sense to invest in search engine optimization? If users access news, should we focus more on the news or should we draw people to other products?

Andy also mentioned that the results of the surveys are limited by the number of the respondents, which for some centers is pretty low.

Jean suggested center directors think about what they want to do with products that are not used that much. Thomas mentioned that it is not about how many people use these services but what is the final environmental outcome. Deb emphasized that even if the numbers are low, they can represent an entity, especially businesses.

### ***PPIN Evaluation Report by Abt Associates***

Regarding making the Abt report public, everybody voted pro (nobody opposed).

### ***Report on web committee and cookie committee:***

As it was discussed in June, the primary problem remains to determine demographics of the website users. Are they TAPs or businesses? The second question is to get information about what products they use. Andy mentioned that tracking people across the websites raises some ethical and privacy issues. Deb asked if P2Rx ethical issues are at the same level as a private company and Andy replied that they would definitely have higher standards, and letting people know what is a cookie and how we're intending to use this information.

The possibility to replace the pop-up question with a required registration while using the website was discussed. Jean pointed out that if we're going to ask people to register, there should be a motive for that, what would they receive for their registration?

Thomas said that Zero Waste does require registration for the P2 planner and other tools, and people do register. He also suggested the program directory, measurement tools, rapid response, and listservs for people to register in order to use them. Elizabeth also said Peaks to Prairies offers the Parks Tool Kit that requires people to register if they want to use it.

Beth asked if anyone already has a user database. PPRC thinks they do, WRRC has a database for "Ask Rudy." Peaks uses a spreadsheet to track rapid response questioners.

Andy reported on the web committee call; the minutes are posted. The consolidated Topic Hub database is in place, and they are making some changes on the display. He also brought into attention the fact that the topic hubs will no longer be updated from the centers' website. Center personnel will log in on the P2Rx administrative website to update their topic hubs. Andy mentioned that link-checking should be done monthly, and that there will be additional options to "change", "delete" or "do not display".

### ***Executive committee election:***

Julie Woosley was elected as the new executive committee. No one opposed during the voting procedure.

Jean also talked about the calendars for the 2009. She mentioned that they better get started working on new topics. She also said that she needs the ideas for new topics by August 13, about 2-3 ideas per center. She also suggested for centers to ask regional photographers to submit their pictures, and they will receive credit on the calendar for their pictures.

She also said that she needs centers to commit for the calendar, and to contribute \$500 per center. This will give them about 50 calendars.

Thomas and Bob had reservations about committing, but they did not rule it out completely.

## P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call Wednesday, August 13th, 2008

The P2Rx Admin call on August 13, 2008 was attended by Andy Bray (NEWMOA), Curt McCracken and Julie Woosley (WRRC), Tyler Rubach (GLRPPR), Lynn Turner (Zerowaste), Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Mike Vogel and Elizabeth Bird (Peaks to Prairies), Ed Gonzalez (WSPPN), Deb Taevs (PPRC), Beth Anderson (EPA), and Jean Waters (P2Rx).

Elizabeth announced that Myla Kelly will be the new center director at Peaks. She starts next week. Elizabeth will overlap with her for a few weeks.

Each center discussed lessons learned from analysis of survey results that Veronica Doga (P2Rx) prepared and posted for each center, with end-user and TAP responses separated.

Ed - WRPPN and P2Rx are making a difference to TAPs. The conference, rapid response, and Topic Hubs are biggest services. Several TAPs correlated increased savings with internet and conference info. Correlation between how much WRPPN and P2Rx helped is unknown - they think there is some correlation but the number is unknown. News scored very low.

Curt - WRRC felt their Rapid Response, library, and Topic Hubs were most useful. There were so few responses it is hard to tell the difference between businesses vs. TAPs. Businesses are more likely to come in by Google, TAPs have site bookmarked. News and listservs scored very low for businesses, for TAPs, vendor database was lowest. Curt mentioned that he's been getting a lot of requests lately from vendors wanting to get on the vendor database.

Lynn - Zerowaste had lots of hard copy survey results because they used them in conjunction with workshops. When reviewing the survey results, they focused on users that had used Zerowaste more than once. Non-hazardous waste was the biggest reduction, followed by hazardous waste reduction. TAPs reported hazardous waste reduction and water pollution reduction. Zerowaste tried to think about how best to serve constituents through the workshop. Lynn called 132 people who attended the workshop, asking how Zerowaste could serve them and what else they needed. They are now trying to think about utilizing the workshop info on the website to reach broader audience.

Deb remarked that TAPs use Topic Hubs and news equally at PPRC. Individual users use news a little more. Topic Hubs seem like the entrée into the site. It might be interesting to try and direct people to other services, having come in from the Topic Hubs. The second highest way to have heard about the site is "other" but not sure what that means. The response that people got to PPRC from a link on another website is really low. Deb wonders if she should spend some time to get more links on other sites. TAPs know less about environmental outcomes by businesses they serve, but they do know PPRC saves them money/time. Rapid response has low awareness.

Rick noticed a distinct difference between businesses and TAPs. Most everyone heard about P2RIC through e-mails, listservs or colleagues. Businesses don't have a very broad understanding of what P2RIC offers, mostly news and listservs. TAPs were the only ones to say they had changed anything or their work was easier. TAPs

didn't have outcome measures, though. Businesses didn't respond to that question. Rick is going to take the approach of going with what is strong and make it stronger. Listserv-like products, news, a calendar that is news-like. There's an engagement, networking, getting value from learning and interactions and we're helping foster that. We won't get rid of other things but will de-emphasize some of it. References like library, topic hubs, and case studies will still be posted but not as prominent.

Andy observed first-time user responses aren't helpful or informative. Word of mouth is number one way people hear about NEWMOA. This points out the need to get the word out more. NEWMOA got a decent response to the vendor database but they don't link to it. This is somewhat surprising. Case studies got a relatively lower ranking than they expected, not sure what it means. Given the sample size, not sure what to take away from any of this. A couple of regional products: mercury reductions database and regional activities database, had more "somewhat useful" or "don't use" responses. Andy wants to find out more about why these products didn't score better. There is not enough information to make decisions about divesting. They got mixed feedback on the Topic Hubs. They saw lots of changes in awareness from both audiences

Elizabeth noticed Peaks got more positive responses from end-users than from TAPs. Most prominent response for both groups is they're unaware of or they don't use the products. Peaks could do a lot more to make people aware of the resources they have available. Least useful is library; it is not easy to link to WRRC library. Some said vendor database is useful. TAPs got more value out of news, topic hubs, and case studies. Businesses got more out of program directory and case studies. People that use the website more than once find resources useful and impact is quite strong.

Tyler reported that he looked the survey over before the call with Bob.

Report of cookie committee, by Andy:

We want to have a "cookie" on the Web site to gain information about who the users are (end users or TAPs) on the websites. Committee has met a couple of times and done research. The committee recommends a first-party cookie to find out whether users are a tap or business. We'd then have an additional measure that allows us to say something more about the users. The number of users that are TAPs or businesses plus the resources they're using. The idea is that we'll start to try and pilot this. Andy is already working on it for NEWMOA and P2Rx. The next steps are to get the pop-up and privacy policy in place. There are different ways you can ask the question, it would be the same question.

For centers that just want the code and will drop it in, Andy will provide it because everyone is using cold fusion. Elizabeth commented that we all want to use the same words to ask the questions.

All centers voted to implement a first-party cookie, except Curt, who said WRRC is up in the air because they will be leasing all IT from the state.

Andy mentioned that centers will need version 7.5 of Webtrends to track the cookies. Does it make sense to consolidate the WebTrend report generation? There would be some licensing costs but centers wouldn't have the on-going need to generate the reports. Andy will get back to the group once he's implemented the cookies on NEWMOA and P2Rx Websites

Andy reported that the Topic Hubs were hacked four days in a row. Nate and Andy worked on the software code to eliminate the hacker's entry points. The Topic Hubs have not been hacked for several days now. All centers have made the software changes recommended.

Jean asked the centers to comment on whether or not they thought the testimonials reported in the semi-annual report were useful. Rick thinks most of the testimonials are in response to rapid response. Jean needs to remind centers to send these. Elizabeth said they would be most likely to deliver these if it were a requirement instead of voluntary. Beth thinks it is more useful to go back in six months and get outcomes. Make it clear that it's short term outcome in awareness and knowledge. Mike thinks they're very valuable. It's important to have quotes and real stories from clients. Lynn calls workshop participants later to see if they need more assistance, they have a written commitment from workshop participants. The comments they receive are really wonderful. She asks if things were a result of the workshop or something they were already planning. People say good things about the center.

### **P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call Wednesday, September 10th, 2008**

**Attendees:** Beth Anderson (EPA), Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray and Rachel Collela (NEWMOA), Gary Hunt (WRRC), Bob Iverson (GLRPPR), Lynn Turner (Zero Waste), Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Myla Kelly (Peaks to Prairies), Deb Taevs (PPRC)

**Action Items:** Jean - calendar, revisit recommendations.

#### ***2009 P2Rx Calendar Update:***

Jean gave an update about the 2009 P2Rx Calendar. She stated that Ellen is still working on it, and that next week the calendar should be ready.

#### ***P2Rx Recommendations Survey Results:***

Jean started going through the survey results and analyzing each question. The results are posted on the P2Rx website <http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/toc.cfm>

Rick said he'll share his study (about how can an institution show the impact of the information provided on the outcome) with Lynn, and if they can come up with something, they can share it with everybody.

Jean will take a closer look at recommendations and responses and will revisit this issue next call.

#### ***Measurement Task Force Update:***

Meeting face-to-face first week of October in Denver

EPA has gone before advisory board putting questions

Beth mentioned that EPA is looking into different ways to track information,

Clean Product counting will be done until there is no market share for it

Andy said that similar measures can be applied to centers

***Topic Hub Review Update:***

Deb mentioned that she will do their update at the end of the month

Jean asked everybody to review people who contributed to your tool

Andy said that NEWMOA is still waiting for their contract

Jean mentioned that PPRC and NEWMOA are working on updating the hubs.

Deb also said that PPRC is still waiting for the reviewers to get back to them

Jean asked who got the reviews

NEWMOA-yes?

Peaks and Prairies- no

GLRPPR-no

Zero Waste-no

P2RIC- yes?

WRRC-no

PPRC-yes

Andy said that Rachel is taking care of the review and she used the same format as PPRC, and if there are things that somebody does not like about the format, or has a comment, they can change the format.

**P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call**

**Wednesday, October 13th, 2008**

The P2Rx administrators met on conference call Monday, October 13, 2008. Andy Bray (NEWMOA), Julie Woosley (WRRC), Bob Iverson (GLRPPR), Lynn Turner (Zero waste), Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Myla Kelly and Mike Vogel (Peaks), Ed Gonzalez, (WSPPN), Deb Taevs (PPRC), Jean Waters (P2Rx) and Beth Anderson (EPA) were on the call.

The evaluation report from Abt includes the recommendation that centers follow up with the clients we know. This could include people who attend meetings or trainings, or those who use the rapid response service. Centers should identify if clients are primary users or secondary users and if they used the information we provided. We need to identify short-term outcomes (did they learn anything?). Beth said that in response to the evaluation, centers need to document that they are reaching the TAPs, that they're learning something from our information. We can also try to show behavior change or environmental outcomes, but short-term outcomes are essential. Centers can continue to work with businesses, but need to identify their clients as primary users of the information (businesses) or secondary users (TAPs).

Lynn reported that Zero waste follows up as technical assistance rather than with a survey and thus avoids the need for an ICR. When Zero waste follows up, they ask if the information the client received was useful, how it was useful, and if they need further information. PPRC is collecting rapid response data like this, also. P2RIC, Peaks, and WSPPN report they are not currently following up with their clients. WRRC is doing some follow-up but they do not use standard questions.

All the centers agree to use a standard set of questions if we collectively decide on them. Beth is trying to work with someone in OPEI to help craft the questions. A committee of Lynn, Deb, Ed, and Andy agree to work on the standard questions.

Beth wants to know if centers report this information. Beth is trying to connect the dots of the logic model. Short term outcomes - people have learned something - is where we are. To show environmental outcomes usually takes a longer relationship. From the evaluation, Beth feels that we're best to show short-term outcomes. We need to better document that we're reaching the TAPs. We're not to stop working with the businesses but need to know which is which. Beth is trying to work with someone in OPEI to help craft the questions.

The web group report was given by Andy. NEWMOA is piloting using a cookie via a pop-up on their website. The pop-up asks one question, to identify the visitor as a primary or secondary user of information. Users will also have the option to respond that they don't want to answer the question. Once the pop-up appears, the cookie is set. Users will be identified as a (1) primary user of information, (2) secondary user of information, (3) elected not to answer, or (4) closed the pop-up without answering any question. The cookie will last on the user's computer for 5 years (unless they clear their cookies).

NEWMOA set up privacy compact policy so web browsers will recognize it. This will allow security systems to recognize the pop-up as legitimate. Andy and Nate showed the pop-up to the web group on September 25th. The pop-up will be piloted on NEWMOA and P2Rx websites. Andy and Nate will report on implementation and measurement of the cookie to the web group at their next call. Centers will be able to analyze the user's path through the site using their web analytic tool (such as Webtrends). Centers should be able to collect all the same web usage data by type of cookie user, as they do now for all users.

Deb said that PPRC may want to join the pilot. Andy said they will be glad to help, just call him later.

The P2Rx/NPPR measurement task force reported that there is a request for programs to enter their 2007 data into the P2 Results database. EPA is not requiring that every program share their data explicitly. Transparency is important but we don't necessarily have to show specific numbers tied to specific programs. Deb said centers could get testimonials from how programs are using the results. It's important to ask programs in the region how they're using this information and see how we can better serve them.

The location for the next P2Rx Administrative meeting was discussed. The vote for Savannah, Georgia won. We will meet there during the last week of January.

Deb asked if any center has a good system to manage projects - Andy uses Microsoft Project. He bought it through Tech Soup for a low cost.

### *3.3. Web developers call minutes, June and September 2008*

#### P2Rx Web Group Conference Call

Thursday, June 26th, 2008

The P2Rx Web group had a call on June 26 2008. Present on the call were Andy Bray and Nate Bisbee (NEWMOA), David Webb and Curt McCracken (WRRC), Tyler Rubach (GLRPPR), Thomas Vinson and Tom Fort (Zerowaste), Zach Fowler (P2RIC),

Wes Fleming (Peaks), Ryo Yamaki and John Handzo (WRPPN), Prabin Kanel (PPRC), Jean Waters (P2Rx) and Beth Anderson (EPA).

#### Action items:

- All centers finish implementation of centralized Topic Hubs
- Centers disable current admin pages for programs directory and Topic Hubs
- Centers with Topic Hubs under development work with Andy and Nate to be sure all data is transferred to P2Rx.org (Sustainability Hub is being developed by Peaks)
- Jean send out usernames and passwords to all the centers
- Jean send web filters to all centers
- Prabin set Zach up with Google Analytics account for P2RIC

Andy reviewed the reasons we've changed to a consolidated Topic Hub database

- Eliminates the need for centers to update Hub database monthly
- Most current version of the Hub will be displayed on every center's site
- Eliminates the need for centers to have the database on their ISP (this could be a cost-savings for centers that have remotely-hosted websites, such as WRPPN, Zerowaste, and Peaks)
- Hubs can be easily shared with external partners

Some other things to keep in mind with the centralized Topic Hub database

- The display shown is the only version. (It has the Topic Hubs authored by the center listed first, followed by an alphabetic list of the other hubs.)
- Search engine spiders will still only index the topic hubs at the authoring center's site. (for example, the Lean Manufacturing Topic Hub would be seen as coming from the Southwest Center for Zero Waste; we use the "no index/no follow" for the other hubs)
- Administrative functions for both Topic Hubs and Programs Directory will now be done from the p2rx.org website. The display and functionality will be the same as the current Topic Hub admin; the user ID, and passwords will be exactly the same as centers currently use for the programs directory. Jean will send out usernames and passwords to all the centers.
- Local admin function for topic hubs and programs directory should be disabled so we don't have the problem of someone at the center using the old admin function. The old admin function will NOT put data into the centralized Topic Hub database.
- The title of the page that contains the Topic Hubs is still up to the individual center

- The first few times the new Topic Hub page is loaded, it will take a couple of seconds, then cold fusion will build the cache and it will be faster
- Any Topic Hubs currently under development will be captured by Andy & Nate and the data will be moved to the p2rx.org site. Andy & Nate will get with individual centers that have Hubs under development to assure this is done. Once on the p2rx.org site, the Hubs can be further manipulated, just like before.

David Webb and Curt noted that they'd be interested in just displaying an alphabetic list of Topic Hubs, rather than displaying the ones authored by their center at the top. We will bring this up to the P2Rx administrative group to find out what they want to do. Also, they are concerned about the way links are displayed. They think they are hard to copy and paste.

Nate reviewed installation of the new code. Folks need to make a few simple changes to the index.cfm file and replace your current Topic Hub index.cfm file with the one attached (after backing up the old one!!). This file is also posted on the CVS. The changes are listed in the readme.txt file, also posted on CVS.

The next Webtrends report is due July 15. David reported that their Webtrends stopped working on May 18, just for the WRRC site. To others on the call, it sounds like a problem they have had, where the analysis fails because may have reached page limit. The Webtrends WRRC is using isn't supposed to have a page limit, but it is old and there is no support for it.

Zerowaste uses Sawmill (commercially available) to analyze web traffic. Wes uses Google Analytics. It is a free program, which Prabin also uses. Prabin will set Zach up so he can use it on P2RIC. It's easy to set up an account and they give you a java script to put it in the main include file so it's on every page on your site. You can get nice graphs on usage, etc. but you can't get user IP addresses. You can apply filters. Tyler points out that it does not record the number of downloads, which is a problem for him since GLRPPR has lots of pdf files.

There is a question about filters. The P2Rx standard for filters can be found at <http://www.p2rx.org/adminInfo/WRRCfilters.cfm>. This list groups blocked browsers into 13 different groups. This is just for convenience when using Webtrends.

Our next call will be Thursday, September 25, 2008 at 9:00 PT, 10:00 MT, 11:00 CT, 12:00 ET. The conference line number will be 402-472-6296.

***3.4. Executive Committee call minutes, May and September 2008***  
***P2Rx Executive Committee Call – May 5, 2008***

Andy Bray, Jean Waters, Ed Gonzalez, and Chris Wiley met on a call May 5, 2008 to discuss plans for the National Environmental Summit. The Fun Walk is scheduled, although the Summit Registration doesn't include the option for people to pay for the walk as part of their registration. Jean is providing a poster with the history of the Fun Walk and the current funds recipient, Chesapeake Bay Foundation. She also has post-card size maps for all participants at the Summit. We will have the P2Rx display but no one needs to be at the table at all times. Center directors are needed if available to help lead groups on the walk. Andy will definitely participate. The Fun Walk is Wednesday morning at 8:00 a.m. The P2 Measurement Workgroup is also Wednesday morning, at 9:00 a.m. Jean has been invited to make a presentation on P2Rx to the NPPR workgroup session.

***P2Rx Executive Committee Call – September 22, 2008***

Andy Bray, Jean Waters, and Beth Anderson met on a call September 22, 2008. Ed Gonzalez was unable to join because his plane was late, Julie Woosley had trouble with their phone system and couldn't make the long-distance call.

We discussed the ideas Rob Guillemain proposed for coordinating the EPA P2 grant programs and using P2Rx more deliberately to provide information and coordination among grantees. For example, if EPA picked two or three focus areas, P2Rx could provide a specific set of information and services. TAPs would agree to work with P2Rx and other TAPs nationally to coordinate resources, share successes, etc. P2Rx could provide training, such as webinars, news about the focus area, and a user-list serve on the topic. P2Rx could split the work among centers.

One hurdle in writing the RFP is to know how to write evaluation criteria that gives points to those that coordinate their proposals with others.

Can a top 'priority project' (i.e., one that focuses on the nationally identified priority issue) be 'guaranteed' funding through evaluation criteria, or funding priorities that are called out in the solicitations, e.g., 10% of the funding will go toward funding "priority projects"?

Perhaps the evaluation criteria to demonstrate partnering could be something like - 10% for standard stuff, e.g., letters of support, +10% for demonstration of a higher level of coordination of work plans and participation in a topical workgroups? There is demonstration that P2Rx can support NPPR workgroups – as in the P2 Results workgroup and the Tribal workgroup. The focus area workgroups would not necessarily need to be part of NPPR but that could also work.

The idea is that coordination of effort can be put in the RFP as a task, e.g., grantees will work together through the center.