

***DOD Region 4 P2 Partnership Steering Committee
Agenda for Conference Call
August 30, 2001
10:00 a.m.***

Introductions

Review of Executive Committee Meeting (August 13-14, 2001)

*Regional Priorities
Criteria for Proposals
Application Process
Time line
Flowchart*

Distribution of Materials/ "Getting the word out"

*How to distribute to Universities
Talking with individual state partnerships*

Update from San Antonio Conference

Newsletter

*Need state partnership inputs for September newsletter
Need a state P2 person to do "Regional Perspective" for Septembers Newsletter*

Web page

*Need state pages hyperlinked to the DOD Partnership webpage
Need updates on the state partnerships*

Next Steering Committee Meeting November 15, 2001 in Charleston, SC

*Review of Tentative Agenda
Hotel Information*

Participants

Laila Capers, Navy
Rusty Harris Bishop, NC
Khairy Abu-Salah, MS
Dr. Tom Whitney, MS
Joe Yates, Ft. Knox, KY
David Glass, AF Regional Office
Gary Garrison, 81st Army
Bob Burgess, SC DHEC
Kathy Stiles, Parris Island, SC
Ron Graham, TN
Michael Olsen, FL
Bob Donaghue, Georgia P2AD
Suzanne Burnes, Georgia P2AD
Gary Ellis, AL
Mary Joyce Friburn, KPPC
Dan Ahern, EPA
Carol and Don Hill, MISSTAP
Haney Zaghoul, DOA
Christine Steagall, USC, SC

Regional Priorities

The conference call began with a discussion about how the Executive Committee decided the Top 7 Regional Priorities, based on the results of the Needs Survey. Christine stated that these priorities are based on the state partnership problems and issues the Region feels the need to address. The next step will be to release the request for project proposals, along with the rest of the documentation in the email message, which will be used as supplemental information to go with the call for proposals.

Mary Joyce Friburn (KPPC) asked about the matrix and other categories. Christine confirmed the funding will be used for the top 7 identified priorities.

Ed Engbert stated that the priorities were still broad and energy or water projects could be framed as compliance through P2. Environmental Compliance through P2 could capture almost anything. Christine agreed but said the only critical step is to assign/identify which regional priorities the proposal will be working on or the proposal cannot be funded.

Mary Joyce Friburn said Cam Metcalfe was very interested in energy and she proposed that energy be included as one of the top priorities for the regional priorities. Energy is a big issue in Kentucky and Tennessee and he would like it as a separate priority. This was noted.

Rusty Harris Bishop said NC had energy and water conservation on a separate tier. They felt these issues were lumped in with EMSs because of its non-regulatory environmental

aspects. Christine asked how the other executive committee members felt about this. She was concerned that the states of TN and KY also identified energy as a separate priority. Everyone felt like the committee had already gone through the process of identifying priorities.

Kathy Stiles agreed that energy could be rolled into environmental compliance since it is so broad. Any energy projects would have to be justified as pollution prevention.

Dan Ahern agreed proposals could be submitted as P2 measured energy projects to meet the executive order and still be within the framework of the priorities as they are.

Rusty-Harris Bishop thought the executive committee did a good job deciding how to figure out the region's top priorities and proposed the partnership keep the 7 priorities that came out of the initial survey. Bob Burgess seconds and the list was approved.

Michael Olsen asked for clarification in the recycling category and outreach and costing tools. Do they serve as examples or specific categories within recycling? Bulleting decreases the wiggle room when specifics are put in, or is that the executive committee's intention? Bob Burgess said he thought the bullets were not specific, but examples and Christine agreed.

Christine announced the plan was for funding to be put in place between USC and DOD by the end of September, federal fiscal year end. A timeline was put together for the projects' funding process. The flowchart is self explanatory for applying for the funding and completing the process.

Ranking Criteria

Criteria were developed by the Executive Committee as a way to rank the proposals as they come in. There are 4 main areas of criteria: 1) Regional; 2) Results Oriented; 3) Technology Transfer; and 4) Military Value, with subcategories that are identified under each.

Rusty-Harris Bishop asked if the proposal does not address criterion 1) Regional and it was ranked 0 in that category would it still be funded? Christine said that the committee discussed that and Bob Donaghue said the committee agreed it had the discretion to override that in special cases such as in a unique project that looks like it could be of value.

Michael Ohlsen was concerned about bullets #2 "In partnership with a DOD Installation" and #3 "Partnerships with several installations, services, universities and states" under 1) Regional Criteria. He thinks that whole section could be renamed from Regional to

something like team partners and score it based on who all is involved. Does it address regional priority as a yes or no whether to proceed with this grant overall?

Bob Burgess said if there was going to be "no go gatekeeper" that it ought to be separate. Christine asked if it was made a gatekeeper and it had to be regional would this limit us on the potential for funding a proposal that does not address something regional but something in a specific state that could be transferred regionally? Rusty-Harris Bishop stated he thought the task needed to be addressed in the proposal, that whoever submits a proposal should make sure they go outside of their state to address other people's needs. He asked how installations fit in at this point since they don't have the contacts that universities have and it's difficult for them to craft the proposals with installation participation. Effort is on the proposal writers to include that regionality.

Christine asked for a motion that addressing regional priorities would not be a ranking criteria but a requirement. It was proposed that addressing regional priorities be a "go, no go" criteria. Ed Engbert suggested the use of the new regional website to set up a discussion board based on these 7 priorities so universities and installations putting proposals together could use it as a means to get feedback across the region. Short timeframe would be a problem.

Motion was made to require addressing regional priorities as the "bottom line." If a proposal doesn't address regional priority it doesn't get funded. Vote was taken and approved.

Rusty asked if the proposal works how do we then facilitate that regionality? Are there ways that we can help? It's going to be tough because the universities don't work with the bases within his state. It was suggested advertisements be sent out on the listserv and use the steering committee as a liaison. A suggestion was made to list names of the steering committee members on proposals so they could be on alert to help. Another idea was to work with John Calcagni to use the website as a communication tool. Rusty thinks they have the software to do it and he will talk with John. **Action item: NC set up discussion board on the Partnership web page.**

Point was made that two partnerships may want to work on EMS and whether they could submit a joint project, rather than the committee having to decide which project to fund. If two partnerships want to go down the EMS route and there is only money to fund one of them, that puts them into a win, lose situation. Christine said as bullet #3 states the more installations, universities, states, and services you work with the stronger the proposal.

On the application flowchart there is no real requirement. A university can submit straight to USC without having the official sponsorship on the application of the respective state partnership. Christine said that was correct but if you see in the flowchart the work plan timeline has to be submitted to the State Partnership and the state P2

person. They may not be involved with the development but they are involved with the work. Should there be a requirement they would be involved.

Hany Zaghloul, Army Corp of Engineers, said since this is the first year and we are not sure what is the nature or the characteristic of the region's problems, it is difficult with all the requirements. Requirements should be clear and easy the first year and we can learn from our experiences as we go.

Using EMS as an example, Ed Engbert said the Army was struggling with what its policy is going to be on EMS and it would be dangerous for someone at a university to propose training unless they knew the concerns from each of the services. They could possibly learn that by talking to their state partnerships.

Ed anticipated a lot of proposals coming in without the amount of coordination that the committee would like to see, and suggested the committee could send them back for further coordination. The hope is that the individual bases DOD P2 partnerships would link up with their universities and work together to make proposals that will satisfy the needs of that partnership. It was suggested some people might want to post their proposals on the website for comments and feedback.

Bob Burgess said there should be a certain amount of confidentiality to the proposals.

Haney asked if in the proposal process if there was a plan or step built in so a proposal could receive some comment and be reworked? Christine said no, but there is time in the schedule after its been approved by the steering committee. It would lengthen the process for that one project but we would get better results. **Action item: The Executive Committee would review proposals and ask for additional comments after the November 15, 2001 meeting.**

Christine suggested making a change to the flowchart by adding Partnership to DOD State P2 block. It was approved.

Dave Glass said this is not the only time that people will have a chance to put in a project application. This is the first round. The intent is to get the best proposals from the colleges and universities that meet the criteria and regional priorities and then several months down the road there may be other priorities that come out.

Project Application

Christine described the application. It was developed to be simple, but detailed so that the steering committee would have a good idea about the project's product. Small projects are anything less than \$50,000 done within a 6-9 month period of time. Large projects are \$50,000 - \$200,000 with 1 1/2 years to complete. Deadline is October 15 for postmarked, or emailed or faxed to USC office. USC will distribute them to the

Executive Committee for their recommendations and review. The steering committee will make the final decision at the November 15 meeting. Small projects completed by

September 30, 2002, and large projects completed by June 1, 2003 to give us time to meet the funding requirements of DOD. *These dates are based on USC being funded by the end of September 2001. Should the money not come in these dates could change.

After an award, a detailed budget and work plan are required to be submitted to USC. Deliverables due will be the progress report and at project completion a Power Point presentation to the lead state partnership. A fact sheet of the project, CD, hardcopy of all materials and final report are also required.

Christine said that it was important for the state partnership and state P2 person to be kept involved in the project. A recommendation was made that the project needed to be coordinated and signed off by the state P2 person. She described the contents of the application and said it should be forwarded to her and she will send them to the steering committee. A motion was made to approve the application and approved.

Flowchart

The flowchart was developed for an easier way to understand the submittal process. Christine read through and explained it. She suggested another line be added that USC forward it to the regional steering committee. She suggested USC submit a list to the regional steering committee of the funded projects and do routine updates. She also described the small and large projects flowchart.

Haney gave an update on the funding, it has been issued from the Office of Secretary of the Defense to the Department of the Army and has to be committed to the financial system that exchanges money between different parts of the Army. The Army has the statement of work and the money will be committed to South Carolina with USC as prime contractor.

The office handling the money transfer is requiring a technology vs. soft type study. We want to focus on technology transfer type programs. The Partnership needs to create a balance between less feasible studies and more "let's try it and see what works."

Suggestions for the flowchart were made to explain what ITRC, DENIX were and put a website on it for universities to use. It was asked why WRRC wasn't listed, Christine said she took that as where the regional partnership distributes information. It was decided that WRRC would be put under Regional Partnership so it was understood. Motion was made to approve and was approved.

Timeline

Christine read the dates and activities for the first round of funding. At the November 15 meeting, partners will know if the money is in place, how much can be awarded, and a decision can be made at that time if there will be another call for proposals and a new timeline can be set up then. Refinement of any projects will be done after this meeting. Motion was made and timeline was approved.

Distribution of Information

Christine said she was planning on sending this information to the listserv and putting all these documents on the website. The steering committee needs to talk with their state partnerships and university contacts to spread the word. She offered to help with this so approvals could be made at the November 15 meeting. Christine distributed this draft information at the San Antonio conference.

Newsletter

A problem with the newsletter is people who don't have the most current Adobe software program to open the document. Barrie will attach the address for downloading the most current version of Acrobat Reader for people to download. This will be quarterly and the next issue will go out in the September-October timeframe. Christine stressed the importance of the state update in the newsletter. Hans VanderKnyff will be coordinating with the state partnerships getting updates of what is going on in them. In the next newsletter, we are looking for a regional perspective author. Bob Donaghue volunteered and Christine said she would get Hans to get in touch with him. **Action item: Send out deadline for state updates.**

John Calcagni (WRRC) has done a great job of getting information on the webpage. They are going to improve it and make the states links live so updates for webpage will be necessary too. Christine will get in touch with state people to hyperlink the regional people to the specific state pages. She will get deadlines out for this information. **Action item: Hyperlink state pages to the Regional Partnership page.**

Last item on agenda is the next steering committee meeting in Charleston, SC. Christine is trying to find a meeting room and meet from 8-5 p.m. NPPR conference is at the Mills House, Multi-State Working Group Meeting is at the DoubleTree Suites. Christine will send out information on hotels in the area. Dan Ahern's Regional P2 Roundtable meeting will be on the November 14th. The agenda will include a review on the projects, looking at state's role in development of the projects, and more website information. Another topic will be the Virginia P2 Partnership. The steering committee feels we should do more within our partnership with the major commands and senior leadership. It was suggested that technology transfer and sharing of information be made between Region 3 as well as Region 4. Virginia is the only state within Region 3 with a P2 partnership. They will be invited to present what they are doing within the region and share

information. They will not be involved in the funding aspect of the projects. Ed Engbert will try to get a representative from ITRC to talk about what they are doing and try to get information about how we will work with them. Christine will send out information about the meeting place as soon as possible.

Major Garrison asked for information to be mailed to him on the previous meetings. The executive committee, made up of the regional environmental coordinators, EPA and GA and SC will meet at the end of October to do the first review of the proposals and then send out "final candidates" to the Steering Committee for review at the November 15 meeting.

Ed will have information on the Southeastern conference. Christine encouraged those who attend to spread the word. MS and AL will have meetings in conjunction with the conference and will be able to talk about the program.

Thanks to all and apologies for technical problems. The next meeting is October 29 and 30 in Atlanta for the Executive Committee. The review of the projects will take place and recommendations will be made. All final documentation approved during this conference call will be on the website by September 4, 2001.