2019 Best Practices   
Nomination and Recognition Process - Summary

The Association of Air Pollution Control Agencies (AAPCA) is seeking nominations from public agencies, private entities, and individuals to identify ground breaking technology, innovative practices, and exemplary operations in the field of air pollution control. Of particular interest are activities that are directly transferrable to the operation of an air pollution control agency.

# Process

How to nominate? Anyone can identify and recommend that a certain organization, control technology, or operation be identified as a “best practice.” The application below should be used to provide the information for the best practice nomination.

# Evaluation Process

The AAPCA Best Practices Committee will evaluate each nomination for a “best practice” on a scale of 0 – 100. Nominations receiving a score of 90 or higher will be recommended as a “Best Practice.” The AAPCA Best Practices committee will provide the scoring evaluation to the AAPCA Board of Directors for final approval of the “Best Practices” designation.

# Sharing of Information

The purpose of having “best practices” recognition is to transfer information to various parties to expand the best practices to a larger group of people. The sponsor of the best practices will be invited to give a presentation at the AAPCA annual membership meeting in the fall. In addition, the best practices information will be provided on the public version of the AAPCA website.

# Questions

Any questions on the process may be directed to AAPCA’s Executive Director at [jsloan@csg.org](mailto:jsloan@csg.org) or the Chairperson of the AAPCA Best Practices Committee at [Robert.Hodanbosi@epa.ohio.gov](mailto:Robert.Hodanbosi@epa.ohio.gov).

2019 Best Practices Application - Instructions

# Application Instructions

Please read all the instructions and criteria carefully before filling out the application. Applications will be scored based on the information provided. Incomplete applications will not be considered.

The application consists of the following sections:

1. Contact Information
2. Program Areas
3. Overview
4. Description of Best Practice
5. Lessons Learned
6. Evaluation of Practices
7. Sustainability
8. Transferability
9. Uniqueness
10. How did you learn about the Best Practices Program?

***Answer each section separately***; *do not combine sections*. Please make sure to answer all questions in complete sentences. Also, please be mindful of typos and grammatical errors; poorly written applications may not be forwarded for review. If selected, Best Practices winners will be asked to give a presentation at the AAPCA Fall Business Meeting. Background information on the best practice will be placed on the AAPCA website.

All Best Practices applications **must** be submitted on the AAPCA’s form.

While filling out the Best Practices application, keep in mind that the goal of the Best Practices Program is: (1) to recognize outstanding air pollution prevention practices (2) to promote sharing of these outstanding practices among air pollution control agencies and the public.

# Eligibility

Any organization that is associated with air pollution control is eligible to submit best practices.

# Deadlines

To be eligible for the 2019 Best Practices Awards, submissions must be received by **11:59 PM Eastern Time on March 22, 2019**. We strongly encourage early submissions. The forms may be submitted to [jsloan@csg.org](mailto:jsloan@csg.org)or mailed to:

Jason Sloan, Executive Director

AAPCA

C/O: The Council of State Governments

1776 Avenue of the States

Lexington, KY 40511

# Contact Us

For general information about the Best Practices Program, please visit Best Practices page at [www.cleanairact.org](http://www.cleanairact.org).

# Additional Information to Assist in Completing the Form Description of Best Practice

* Goal(s) and objectives of practice
* What did you do to achieve the goals and objectives?
  + Steps taken to implement the program
* What was the timeframe for the development of the process or control equipment
* Were other stakeholders/companies involved? What was their role in the planning and implementation process?
* What are the costs associated with the equipment or staffing with this practice? Please provide actual data, if possible. Did the project receive federal or state funding?
* What did you find out? To what extent were your objectives achieved?

# Lessons Learned

* Lessons learned in relation to the project
* Lessons learned in relation to partner collaboration (if applicable)
* Is this practice better than what has been done before?
* Did you do a cost/benefit analysis or a cost effectiveness analysis? If so, describe.

# Evaluation of Best Practices

* Did you evaluate your practice?
  + List any primary data sources, who collected the data, and how (if applicable)
  + List any secondary data sources used (if applicable)
  + List performance measures used. Include process and outcome measures as appropriate.
  + Describe how results were analyzed
  + Were any modifications made to the practice as a result of the data findings?

# Sustainability

* Sustainability – is there sufficient commitment to sustain the practice?
  + Describe sustainability plan

# Transferability

# How adaptable is practice to other organizations?

# Uniqueness

* Is this a unique practice that has not yet been adopted by other organizations?

*Please read instructions before filling out the application below*

Submit to: Jason Sloan, Executive Director, AAPCA, [jsloan@csg.org](mailto:jsloan@csg.org)

**The deadline is March 22, 2019 for 2019 Best Practices Nominations.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contact Information: | |
| Name/Title: |  |
| Organization: |  |
| Address: |  |
|  |  |
| Phone: |  |
| Email: |  |
| Program Area: *please check one below* | |
| Air Quality Monitoring & Testing  Permitting  Inspections / Enforcement  Control Technology  Process Improvement  Administration of Air Quality Programs | |
| Overview: *no more than 300 words* | |
|  | |
| **Description of Best Practice** | |
|  | |
| **Lessons Learned** | |
|  | |
| **Evaluation Process** | |
|  | |
| **Sustainability** | |
|  | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Transferability** |
|  |
| **Uniqueness** |
|  |
| **How did you learn about the Best Practices Program?** Check all that apply. |
| AAPCA Brochure  Email from AAPCA  AAPCA website  Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**Thank you for your submission!**

**Below is a sample nomination:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contact Information: | |
| Name/Title: | /Chief, Permitting Section |
| Organization: | AAA Quality Air Pollution Control Agency |
| Address: | 123 Main Street |
|  | Center of World, Ohio 44444 |
| Phone: |  |
| Email: |  |
| Program Area: *please check one below* | |
| Air Quality Monitoring & Testing  Permitting  Inspections / Enforcement  Control Technology  Process Improvement  **Example**  Administration of Air Quality Programs | |
| Overview: *no more than 300 words* | |
| The air pollution control agency has had difficulty in providing a satisfactory approach to hold a public hearing on a controversial air pollution source and both take testimony and provide information and answer questions. The solution that was developed is a two-step process and allows flexibility to the approach. Instead of just holding a public hearing and having citizens testify into the record, the agency holds a "public information session" prior to the formal public hearing that allows the individual citizens to obtain information on the project and ask questions. There are different mechanisms and processes to hold these meetings/hearings. Flexibility is the key! | |
| **Description of Best Practice** | |
| Many times the public has expressed frustration at the public hearing process. Although testimony is taken, there is no opportunity to share information or answer questions. In order to provide more information to the public, the air pollution control agency set up a two-step process to address controversial air pollution sources. The first step is an attempt to gauge the level of concern/controversy with the source and the number of agencies that may be involved. For example, a new large project that involves different programs, such as a hazardous waste incinerator or coal-fired power plant, the agency may set up tables in a gymnasium with staff at the tables answering questions for several hours on agency requirements even including other state agencies such as Natural Resources or Health. Other times, such an extensive program is not needed. The agency will have a short presentation followed by questions and answers from the public for an hour before the actual hearing. In one case, with a complex chemical plant, the agency allowed the company to complete a short presentation on the process before the information session. For a source that is mildly controversial the agency will hold an information session a week before the public hearing and after a short presentation, complete a question and answer session for several hours to allow the public to ask questions about the facility. | |
| **Lessons Learned** | |
| The most important item is to gauge the level of interest in the community, then adjust the plan to attempt to accommodate the public. For a small group of individuals, meeting with them an hour before the hearing may be exactly what is needed. For other times, having a separate information session is needed. Sometimes just meeting with a group of 4 or 5 people in someone’s home will address the concerns. The main focus needs to be how to address the main concerns of the public.  **Example** | |
| **Evaluation Process** | |
| There was no formal evaluation process. However, the frequency of antagonistic hearings have lessened versus what has happened in the past. Having the public be able to ask questions and receive answers to most questions appears to provide a better forum for the actual hearing. | |
| **Sustainability** | |
| Overall, this effort does require the investment of more time, but provides for a more productive public hearing process. The amount of time is not significantly greater than the standard public hearing process so should be able to be continued into the future. Also, this approach reduces the time spent having to answer “Why won’t you answer my question?” | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Transferability** |
| Other organizations could easily adopt this practice without additional funds. |
| **Uniqueness** |
| We are the first air pollution control agency to try this approach, although other innovative public hearing techniques have been utilized by other organizations. |
| **How Did you learn about the Best Practices Program?** Check all that apply. |
| AAPCA Brochure  Email from AAPCA  AAPCA website  Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**Thank you for your submission!**