



ISO 14001 Environmental Management System Management Review Meeting

Date: February 5, 2014 Time: 1:30 – 2:45

Location: Federal Foam Technologies, Inc., 600 Wisconsin Drive, New Richmond, WI 54017

Next ESC Meeting Date: **7/23/2014 – Mid-Year QSC/ESC Meeting**

Type of meeting: ISO 14001: Environmental Management System Status Review with Top Management

Facilitator: EMS Management Representative

Note taker: Document Control

Attendees:	P	Mr. Wyman Smith	P	Mr. Patrick Falkner <i>(EMS Rep)</i>	P	Mr. Steve Vincelli
	P	Mr. Dan Sikorski	P	Ms. Judy Kolstad	P	Mr. Joe Galbraith
	P	Mr. Jon Seeger	A	Ms. Melanie Rowe	A	Ms. Andrea DeRosier
	P	Mr. Butch Nick	P	Mr. Kirk Lubow	A	Mr. Chuck Crowell

P = Present, A = Absent

Please read: Management Review Meeting Agenda

Additional Attendees:

Agenda topics

- Introduction
- Continuous Improvement Team Summary
- Cost of Environment Metrics Report
- Review of Corrective Action
- Review of Preventive Action
- Internal Audit Status Report
- Status of Objective and Targets
- Review of Aspect Significance Due to Changing Circumstances, Including Legal & Regulatory
- Review of Suggestions and Opportunities for Improvement
- Review of Compliance
- Review of External Communications
- ISO 14001 Status Report
- Review of Environmental Policy
- Review of Resources
- Open Question and Answer Session
- Conclusion
- Set Date of Next Management Review

Presented By

- Mr. Patrick Falkner
- Ms. Judy Kolstad
- Team Leaders
- Mr. Patrick Falkner
- Committee
- Mr. Patrick Falkner
- Mr. Patrick Falkner
- Ms. Judy Kolstad

NOTE: Attachments listed in the minutes can be found with the original meeting minutes document.

Agenda Topics

Introduction

Discussion:	Patrick Falkner welcomed everyone to the 2013 EMS Management Review.		
Comments:			
Action items:		Person responsible:	Deadline:

Continuous Improvement Team Summary

Discussion:	Continuous Improvement Team summaries were not provided today.		
Comments:			
Action items:		Person responsible:	Deadline:

Cost of Environment Metrics Report

Discussion:	<p>Patrick presented the 2013 4th Quarter Cost of Environment Status report. <i>(Attachment A with Original Minutes Document).</i></p> <p>The total Cost of Environment for 4th Quarter 2013 was \$57,124.51.</p> <p>Prevention Cost - \$ 17,298.43 (30.3 %) (\$5,766.14/mo) (Objective is 36% - Min)</p> <p>Appraisal Cost - \$ 1,246.18 2.2 % (\$415.39/mo) (Objective is 4.0 % - Max)</p> <p>Internal Cost of nonconformance - \$38,579.90 (67.5 %) (\$ 12,859.97/mo) (Objective is 60% - Max)</p> <p>0 % External Cost of nonconformance (0 %) (Objective is 0% - Max)</p> <p>The total Cost of Environment as a Percent of Sales dollars was .80 %. Appraisal - .02 %, Prevention - .24 %, Internal – .54% and External - 0 %.</p> <p>ITEMS TRACKED AND REPORTED FOR THE COST OF ENVIRONMENT.</p> <p>Electricity by Kilowatt hours – 649,600, YTD average is 216,533. Down 35,100 Kilowatts from 3rd quarter.</p> <p>Water by gallons – 582,000 - YTD average is 194,000. Down 122,000 gallons from 3rd quarter.</p> <p>Natural Gas by Therms – 40,741, YTD average is 13,580. Up 23,213 Therms from 3rd quarter.</p> <p>Disposal by tons 152.63, Disposal Cost in dollars was \$13,993.76, Up 11.53 Tons from 3rd quarter.</p> <p>Recycled Pallets by Dollars – \$ 10.00</p> <p>Recycled Material by Dollars by – \$5,814.41, by Tons – 41.5 Down 5.6 Tons from 3rd quarter.</p> <p>9 Work Comp Claims during the 4th quarter.</p>		
Comments:	Patrick plans to review some of the C of E data used in the report; safety information in the prevention figures and variation in “Disposal by tons and dollars between the 2 nd to 4 th quarters which showed some inconsistency.		
Action items:		Person responsible:	Deadline:

Review of Corrective Action			
Discussion:	None to Review or Report at this time.		
Comments:			
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:	
Review of Preventive Action			
Discussion:	None to Review or Report at this time.		
Comments:			
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:	
Internal Audit Status Report			
Discussion:	<p>There were 10 audits conducted in 2013. 5 were Process Audits, 3 were Product Audits and 2 were the annual combined System Audits; for EMS & QMS. 3 ANRs were written during the QMS systems audit. All 3 ANRs were completed.</p> <p>As always, the process and product audits are combined audits as well which include both QMS & EMS considerations. . (Attachment B with Original Minutes Document).</p>		
Comments:	2014 audits are scheduled and will be conducted by Techlogic Inc. The schedule includes 4 Process Audits, 4 Product Audits and 1 full day planned once again for the Annual EMS & QMS Systems Audit.		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:	
Status of Objective and Targets			
Discussion:	Patrick and Joe presented the status of their Measurable Objectives		
Objective #	Objectives / Targets descriptions & Progress [# 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 & 9 are completed & closed & 4 & 7 are active]		
4	Reduce Energy Consumption – Team leader – Joe Galbraith See Below Continue program & evaluation to reduce energy usage - Extended through 2014		<i>Ongoing 2009-2014</i>
Target # 4	<p>The committee decided to continue the reduction of energy consumption in 2009. <i>Determine new targets for 2009-2014.</i></p> <p>1. Implement research and evaluation to meet the targets. Ongoing - Re-Evaluate the energy usage by December 31, 2014</p> <p>Joe presented data and information regarding a proposal he’s received in October 2013 from Bob Laska, ECS, Inc. (Environmental Control Solutions of St. Paul, MN</p> <p>Attached is the proposal for a new thermal oxidizer air pollution control system to control the emissions from your SONUS line oven and hood. The system is designed for ground mount outdoor installation and is fabricated with an external shell of 304 stainless steel so no more worry about painting.</p> <p>The system includes a 75% eff. primary heat exchanger to reduce the systems heat energy requirement. This design will provide a significant reduction in oxidizer operating energy requirements from your existing system. In addition, with the optional secondary heat recovery section, we can provide an additional 1.2 Million Btu's/hr (MMBtu) in the form of warm air for Building Make-Up.</p> <p>The current cost of energy is approx. \$6.00 per MMBtu and with approx. 3,000 hrs/yr of possible system use the payback for the optional energy recovery section will be less than 2 years.</p> <p>I am attaching the estimated annual operating cost for your existing system vs the proposed new unit. SIGMA 4000-75 GAS FIRED, THERMAL OXIDIZER AIR POLLUTION CONTROL SYSTEM FOR THE CONTROL OF THE SONUS LAMENATOR EMISSIONS.</p> <p>Proposal #12786. **See Joe’s data sheet attachments at the end of these EMS meeting minutes.</p>		

Target # 7

Reduce the quantity of waste going to the landfill by 10% by December 31, 2014.

Patrick presented the following information: the New Richmond facility was switched over to a new waste hauler in the first quarter of 2013 (Advanced Disposal/Veolia). Throughout the year service performance dominated the project and it was difficult to move onto the focus of this EMO-reducing waste quantity sent to the landfill by investigating additional avenues in material recycling or waste-to-energy providers.

In the later part of 2013, David S. from Waste Remedies reopened investigation for finding a waste-to-energy facility close to the New Richmond plant that would take the baled trim waste. The La Crosse, WI facility looked promising until they expressed that that facility was restricted to accepting waste from the city of La Crosse. Patrick F. proposed that David contact the other waste-to-energy facilities to see if they would accept our baled waste. No progress as of the date for this entry.

As for material recycling, Materials Engineering has been working with customers to change the material composition of their formed components from an upholstery/foam/Azdel configuration to a PET material. The PET can be ground a recycled. Materials Engineering is working with Federal Foam's present supplier to determine the feasibility of recycling our scrap PET material. A sample bale was sent for evaluation. Yet to be determined are: total monthly quantity of PET waste generated, total quantity supplier will accept, costs, price per pound, quality of PET scrap needed. We will review the progress of this stage toward the end of February 2014. *(Reference data in Attachment C with Original Minutes Document).*

See Patrick's data sheet attachments and documentation at the end of the EMS meeting minutes.

Comments:

Action items:

Person responsible:

Deadline:

Review of Aspect Significance Due to Changing Circumstances, Including Legal & Regulatory

Discussion:

No new materials have been added.

Presently reviewing the effects of the hazardous waste reduction of our scores to aspects in the areas relating to landfill, air emissions, and hazardous waste. No conclusions drawn as of the reports date.

Comments:

Action items:

Person responsible:

Deadline:

Review of Suggestions and Opportunities for Improvement

Discussion:

A suggestion was made to purchase an apparatus to wrap up banding to make it easier to handle. It is being evaluated at this time.

Comments:

Action items:

Person responsible:

Deadline:

Review of Compliance

Discussion:

Patrick presented compliance information:

1. Air Emissions

In June of 2013, Patrick Falkner, on the behalf of the new Richmond facility for Federal Foam Technologies, Inc., submitted a renewal Application for Existing Source Air Permit. Presently we are operating under the present Air Emissions Permit 656070140-F2, because the Department has determined that FFT New Richmond may be eligible for a Registration Permit which is less restrict in administrative and other regulation requirements. See external Communication section for more details.

2. Hazardous Waste Generation:

On June 4, 2013, Patrick Falkner on behalf of the New Richmond facility for Federal Foam Technologies, Inc., submitted a request to the WIDNR/US EPA to have its waste generator status changed from a SQG status to a CESQG or VSQG status. This is due to the fact that Federal Foam’s generation of hazardous waste has met the requirements of the new status for the past several years on a consistent monthly output. New status was granted on June 13, 2013.

Comments:

Action items:

Person responsible:

Deadline:

Review of External Communications

Discussion:

Patrick reported 2 external communications received in 2013.

1. On 6/19/2013 @ 11:00 AM: Received a telephone call from Ruth E Hilfiker of 1048 Tamarack Place, New Richmond

She called to complain about the smell of “organic vapors” she experienced while walking her dog on the Rail Bridge Trail at 10 AM (just west of the plant) that morning. Patrick Falkner spoke with her in detail regarding the complaint. She was combative over the telephone and was certain that it was Federal Foam polluting the air. Patrick did research and noticed the wind direction was from the south to south west during that time period. This is the direction in which the asphalt plant just south of the Federal Foam plant in located. On 6/24/2013 @ 10:15, Patrick contacted John Stoffel from the Baldwin branch of the WIDNR to discuss this situation.

John had stated that he did receive a telephone call from Ms. Hilfiker and explained to her that she needed to make a formal complaint in writing (complaint form on the WIDNR web site). He also advised her that the odor she smelled would most likely come from the asphalt plant to the south of New Richmond. He advised Patrick in his inquiry, that it was most likely that Ms. Hilfiker would not make a complaint because she stated she had no interest in “making out unnecessary paperwork” and that she could not provide specifics for the complaint. WE both decided to wait and see if she would file a formal complaint. On August 14, 2013, Patrick followed up with John and no complaint had been filed. John also stated that he would contact Patrick if a complaint were to be filed. As of the date of this report, no additional action required because no complaint has been filed by Ms. Hilfiker to the WIDNR and no action form John Stoffel has been requested. This issue is considered closed.

2. On 10/14/2013: Contacted by Ted Cauwels - Registration Permit Program Coordinator, Wisconsin DNR, Sturtevant Service Center

He contacted me because, on your 2012 air emissions inventory report to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), we reported that your facility (or one of your facilities) emits less than 25 tons per year of each criteria air pollutant, less than 2.5 tons per year of any federally regulated hazardous air pollutant, and less than 6.25 tons per year of all federally regulated hazardous air pollutants combined. This means we meet one of the main eligibility criteria for coverage under a Registration Permit. A Registration Permit allows small emitters to quickly register for a permit, has simplified and less frequent recordkeeping, does not expire, and under many circumstances, allows facilities to construct or modify without first having to obtain a construction permit.

Comments:

Action items:

Person responsible:

Deadline:

ISO 14001 Status Report

Discussion:

Patrick reports no changes to the standard at this time.
It is worth mentioning that the ISO 9001 standard is changing to include a RISK MANAGEMENT requirement and that PAP process would be eliminated. It is of the opinion that this may also become a part of the ISO 14001 standard sometime in the near future.

Comments:

Action items:

Person responsible:

Deadline:

Review of Environmental Policy

Discussion:

The committee agreed the policy statement is good as written and requires no change at this time.

FFT ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM POLICY

We the employees of Federal Foam Technologies New Richmond facilities are committed to working together to continually improve our environment and prevent pollution while complying with applicable legal and other requirements that relate to our Environmental Aspects. Our EMS will provide the framework for establishing and reviewing Environmental Objectives and Targets as well as providing for the documentation, implementation and maintenance of this policy. It is our belief that we at FFT can make a difference with our EMS programs by training our employees, achieving our objectives and targets, preventing pollution, recycling, energy management, waste minimization and disposing of hazardous waste in compliance with legal and other requirements. We are also committed to communicating this policy and belief to all persons working for or on behalf of our organization i.e. suppliers, customers, contractors as well as making it available to the public.

Comments:

Action items:

Person responsible:

Deadline:

Review of Resources

Discussion:

None to discuss at this time or Report.

Comments:

Action items:

Person responsible:

Deadline:

Open Question and Answer Session

Discussion:

There were no questions or comments discussed at this time.

Comments:

Action items:

Person responsible:

Deadline:

Conclusion

Discussion:

Our EMS remains strong.

Comments:

Action items:

Person responsible:

Deadline:

Set Date of Next Management Review

Next Environmental Management Review Meeting – January 29, 2015 @ 1:30 p.m.
in the large conference room

***7/23/2014 – Mid-Year QSC/ESC Meeting @ 10:00 a.m.**

Patrick's Documentation, graphs & spreadsheet information



2014 EMS
Management Review r



Microsoft Excel
Worksheet



Microsoft Excel 2003
Worksheet



Your facility may be eligible for streamlined air pollution control permit options.msg

Measurable Objective #4 Joe Galbraith

Joe's documentation, E-mail & system comparison from Bob Laska:

Attached is the proposal for a new thermal oxidizer air pollution control system to control the emissions from your SONUS line oven and hood. The system is designed for ground mount outdoor installation and is fabricated with an external shell of 304 stainless steel so no more worry about painting.

The system includes a 75% eff. primary heat exchanger to reduce the systems heat energy requirement. This design will provide a significant reduction in oxidizer operating energy requirements from your existing system. In addition, with the optional secondary heat recovery section, we can provide an additional 1.2 Million Btu's/hr (MMBtu) in the form of warm air for Building Make-Up.

The current cost of energy is approx. \$6.00 per MMBtu and with approx. 3,000 hrs/yr of possible system use the payback for the optional energy recovery section will be less than 2 years.

I am attaching the estimated annual operating cost for your existing system vs the proposed new unit.

Current Oxidizer Operating Cost vs Proposed System:

	Existing	Proposed
Oxidizer Capacity (SCFM):	8,000	4,000
Oxidizer Primary Heat Exchanger Eff. (%):	50	75
Oxidizer Operating Temp. (deg. F):	1325	1325
Oven/Hood Exhaust Rate (SCFM):	3,611	3,611
Average Solvent to Oxidizer (lb/hr):	10	10
Available Heat @ from SONUS Solvent (MMBtu/hr):	0.059	0.059
Average Run Hours per Year:	4000	4000
Average Idle Hours per Year:	2000	2000
Natural Gas Energy Cost (\$/MMBtu):	6.00	6.00
Oxidizer Firing Rate @ Run Conditions (MMBtu/hr):	1.799	0.852
Oxidizer Firing Rate @ Idle (MMBtu/hr):	0.964	0.241
Oxidizer Operating Cost @ Run Conditions (\$/hr):	10.79	5.11
Oxidizer Operating Cost @ Idle (\$/hr):	5.79	1.45
Annual Total Oxidizer Operating Cost (Run and Idle):	54,739.67	23,341.82
ANNUAL SAVINGS Proposed vs. Current:	31,397.85	



New Thermal
Oxidizer.msg



P12786-4000-75
FFT.pdf



FFT Natural Gas
Operating Cost New