

**Summary of Full Partnership Meeting
DOD Region 4 P2 Partnership
Westin Peachtree Plaza Hotel, Tower Meeting Room–1202
Atlanta, GA
June 28, 2001
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

Welcome and Introductions:

Christine Steagall of the Center for Environmental Policy at the University of South Carolina's Institute of Public Affairs and program coordinator for the DOD Region 4 P2 Partnership, opened the meeting at 9:00 AM. After introducing herself, she began by covering several administrative matters. She handed out copies of the partnership's brochure prepared by the Institute of Public Affairs, and asked the attendees to verify the completeness of the list of more than 90 partners. The attendees then briefly introduced themselves.

Steagall announced that the first issue of the partnership's newsletter was ready to go but that a computer problem prevented her from bringing copies to the meeting. She emphasized that the newsletter, while prepared and published by USC, is not a South Carolina–Georgia publication but rather a *partnership* publication. It will be distributed electronically to all members and posted on the Web site handled by the Waste Reduction Resource Center (WRRC).

Steagall passed around a list of e-mail addresses so that the attendees could verify the accuracy of their information (the list comprises more than 300 names). She will distribute it as a PDF file and will announce its availability via the DOD listserv (dodp3@lists.p2pays.org).

Because the regional partnership had been stagnant for several months, the purpose of the meeting was to reenergize the group. Steagall read the mission of the DOD Region 4 P2 Partnership. Its mission is not to carbon-copy what the individual state partnerships are doing, but rather to take the states' successes to the regional level and share them with others through technology transfer. The partnership has been working on establishing regional priorities through the needs and expertise survey.

Because of the large number of members (more than 90), the partnership decided that each of the states would have two representatives on the steering committee: one would be the state P2 representative and the other a DOD representative. It was up to each state alliance to select its representatives. Steagall mentioned their names and those of the DOD regional environmental coordinators. The first steering committee meeting was held on May 10 and 11 in Chattanooga, Tenn. The meeting dealt, in part, with identifying where the regional partnership's focus should lie. The steering committee meets twice a year. Steagall encouraged the state partnerships and alliance members to let the regional partnership know their specific P2 concerns and problems.

Steagall mentioned some of the upcoming partnership activities: (1) Various Web sites (DENIX, P²AD, and WRRC—see the URL information below) will carry meeting notes, the partnership brochure, membership data, and other information. (2) The executive committee working meeting is scheduled for August 13 and 14, 2001. The executive committee was formed to develop the selection criteria and application process for congressionally funded projects. (3) The 6th Annual Joint Services Pollution Prevention & Hazardous Waste Management Conference and Exhibition will be held in San Antonio, August 20–23. The P2 partnership will *not* hold a formal meeting at this year's conference, but it will sponsor a social evening on August 21 or 22 (the date and time will be announced later). (4) The next steering committee meeting will be held in conjunction with the National Pollution Prevention Roundtable meeting tentatively scheduled for November 15, 2001, in Charleston, S.C.

Overview of Congressional Funding:

Mike Witkoski of USC's Institute of Public Affairs gave a presentation on "Funding: Past, Present, Future." The EPA-DOD-South Carolina Charter was signed in July 1998, and in October 1999 Congress funded a two-year grant to support the EPA Region 4 partnership. In January 2000, USC put together a proposal to take to Washington, D.C., to fund a regional partnership to work with the P2 organizations in the states and with the DOD facilities. The original \$3 million funding became \$2 million during the congressional budget process. The funds, however, ended up in the wrong category. Another problem was that the intended use for the money was not put in writing; Witkoski

wasn't sure if the proper wording was eventually added. The eventual agreed-upon solution among the DOD, congressional staffs, and USC was to re-program the funds to allow the partnership access to them. There is now a request in to transfer the funds to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; the Corps would enter into an agreement with USC to get those funds flowing to the regional level. The USC liaison in Washington, who is working closely on the issue, said it looked as if the re-programming would take place in a "short" time frame. USC is working hard to get this matter resolved before the end of the fiscal year. The paperwork is ready at various levels; a few more items may need to be finalized once the university gets some last-minute information from Washington on the wording. Otherwise, everything is ready to go.

Witkoski explained how the money would be allocated, once it came in. A small amount would be spent on administration and coordination; the bulk of the money would be earmarked for small grants for applied problem-solving research, similar to South Carolina's small-grants program. One of the reasons for the priority and expertise survey is to find out what the needs are at the various installations. If a P2 problem is successfully addressed at one installation, its solution can be replicated through technology transfer or other mechanisms to address similar problems at other facilities. Witkoski said the partnership is already seeing some definite trends developing as to what the various bases and P2 organizations want it to focus on. The next step is to have a process for reviewing and selecting the grant proposals that come from the various installations and states. Also, the funding levels, the funding mechanism, and so forth need to be worked out. This effort will start ASAP. Witkoski emphasized that, once the funding comes in, the partnership can't afford to sit on it; the partnership needs to fund projects and start generating results, preferably within the first year. Even though the funding may be extended to three to five years, the partnership shouldn't wait that long to allocate the money because there's an excellent chance for future funding along this line. This funding represents a direction that DOD and EPA would like to take because it offers an opportunity for fairly significant results with a relatively modest allocation of resources. But it depends on the partnership coming up with success stories rapidly. The partnership needs to look at projects with a rapid turnaround but with significant results: success stories that lead to technology transfer.

Results of Regional Priorities Surveys:

Dave Glass, regional environmental officer with the Air Force Regional Environmental Office—Eastern Region, talked about Alabama's experiences with the regional priorities surveys. Representatives from the state and from six Alabama installations (Anniston Army Depot, Fort Rucker, Redstone Arsenal, Birmingham ANGB, Maxwell AFB/Gunter Annex, and Montgomery ANGB) met in Montgomery on May 23 and 24. The six installations had completed the surveys in advance.

Glass explained that, if four or more installations had applied "high priority" ratings to any of the "sub-activities" on the survey form, the group developed a list of priority needs categories—that is, the items they might want to explore in more detail: asbestos, disposal/ recycling materials, environmental compliance, P3 assessments and waste audits, hazardous waste inventory control, recycling, safety and health issues, and EMSs. The Montgomery group eventually decided on five priority needs areas to develop more specific proposal information for consideration by the full Region 4 partnership. These five areas are as follows:

- Develop technology transfer mechanisms, to include video or brochures, on successful practices with DOD recycling programs—a market study of why some programs succeed and others don't.
- Develop a tool to calculate and articulate the benefits to be gained through recycling programs, both economically and environmentally.
- Develop a regional effort to champion DOD service policies/guidance/implications of affirmative procurement of products and services. There's often a disconnect, said Glass, between the environmental side of the house and the contracting-procurement side. Training in this area is important.
- Develop and provide P2 opportunity training on installations, particularly shop-level training.
- Develop and provide affirmative procurement training by video or on-site means by senior military executives to installation command staff. Command staff typically rotate out every three or four years, so there's a continual need for training.

Glass discussed these five need statements in more detail, giving a background summary for each.

Glass recognized four persons, in particular, who helped him with the survey: Al Townsend (Fort Rucker), Tracy Williams (Anniston Army Depot), Ed Engbert (Army SREO), and LtCol T. J. Norvell (Montgomery ANGB); LtCol Norvell was not present at the partnership meeting.

Glass asked for everyone's feedback by the first of August so that he can bring it to the upcoming steering committee meeting that month. He can be reached at 404-562-4201, 1-888-610-7419, or david.glass@atlaafcee.brooks.af.mil.

Kathy Stiles, DOD representative from the Marine Recruit Depot Parris Island, presented the South Carolina update on the regional priorities surveys. She said the quarterly S.C.–DOD P2 Alliance meeting was held on June 13 and 14, at which time she got back some of the survey forms she had sent out. Unfortunately, they weren't completed properly, and the surveys were sent out again. She said she was pleased with the response but had hoped for more input.

South Carolina has identified five priorities:

- Green procurement (affirmative procurement) is likely a problem for many installations.
- Environmental management systems. Perhaps a step-by-step instruction booklet may work well to encourage their use, according to Stiles.
- C&D waste. Parris Island has a major problem with C&D waste. The installation is located in a rural area, and there are no large companies "knocking at the door" looking for such waste.
- P2 training. Between Parris Island's environmental office and its safety office, the installation conducts several training sessions annually, but, according to Stiles, the term "P2" is never mentioned. Outside of the environmental office, moreover, few people even know what P2 means. Instruction booklets or videos, sent to the people doing the training, could begin to address this problem.
- Training on, and awareness of, hazardous material tracking systems. Stiles said that each service is adopting or will soon adopt its own tracking system, but people involved with these systems probably do not understand the reasoning behind them. A training and awareness program needs to be set up.

She mentioned that Charleston AFB asked for help in finding a less-hazardous alternative for brushed-cadmium plating for C-17 landing gear. She said the suggestion was more specific than what she was looking for in the survey, but it was definitely a priority for the air base itself. Nevertheless, this problem may serve as a good example, said Stiles. Perhaps another branch of the military has a similar problem; it may be generating the same type of hazardous waste. A solution to this problem could become one of the success stories for the regional partnership.

DENIX Web Site:

Ed Engbert, REC with the U.S. Army SREO, introduced the DENIX Web site. Support was granted at the state level about two years ago to aid communication among all state P2 partnerships on a national level. The Web site requires a password for access, but the procedure for obtaining one is simple. At the DENIX site (www.denix.osd.mil), state partnerships can post information about their organizations—membership lists, meeting schedules, meeting minutes, lessons learned, and other information. It can also be used to ask and answer questions.

Engbert said the Web site is underused right now and that a commitment is required from each state partnership to upload information and keep it current. Without useful, up-to-date information on the site, no one will want to access it. Each state partnership will need to assign one person to maintain its Web site information. At the regional level, the DENIX site becomes even more important, said Engbert, especially when the partnership begins communicating on projects, proposals, funding, and meetings.

John Calcagni of the WRRRC said he's been working with Christine Steagall to develop a regional P2 partnership site that will carry materials from each of the states. Steagall will be the content provider and the WRRRC will provide the Web site and Web services.

Steagall displayed a list of Region 4 Web sites and a listserv:

- DENIX: www.denix.osd.mil
- Listserv: Subscribe at lists.p2pays.org/mailman/listinfo/dodp3 (post messages at dodp3@lists.p2pays.org)

- WRRRC: wrrc.p2pays.org
- P²AD: www.p2ad.org

The coordination of these four resources and their content will be worked out.

P2Rx Internet Information:

Suzanne Burnes, P2 specialist from the Georgia P²AD, spoke about the P2Rx Topic Hub (www.p2rx.org/topichub.htm) that's being developed. Part of the whole EPA P2Rx program, the topic hub provides a Web-based guide to specific subjects. Region 4 has the lead for the DOD sector, with support from Region 8. Under the EPA grant, said Burnes, the scope of work states that P²AD is responsible for the topic hub's content development, and she has been working with the WRRRC to give them that content. The WRRRC has developed a format and has dealt with the HTML conversion process. The topic hub will provide a consistent format for P2 information, not just for the DOD but across the realm of P2. For the regional partnership, the first topic hub page is on the "household hazardous waste" chapter completed by P²AD. It takes a lot of the information presented in that chapter, which is available on the P²AD Web site, and puts it into a more uniform format that can be accessed nationally.

John Calcagni pointed out that the WRRRC is the P2Rx center for EPA Regions 3 and 4. Most of the other centers won't be offering information that is directly DOD-related, but Region 4 will be conducting outreach with other regions to attempt to get a greater buy-in on DOD partnerships.

Best Management Practices Guide:

Suzanne Burnes continued with an update on the *Best Management Practices Guide*, part of the grant with EPA task 3. P²AD is continuing development of the guide. In the previous grant cycle they started the work and completed the chapter on household hazardous waste. The next chapters will cover hazmat pharmacies, painting and coating operations, and C&D waste management. Their intent was not to duplicate existing material, but rather to pull information from existing resources and make it specific to this region. This effort, said Burnes, would give the partnership case studies and a primer or quick reference for someone new to P2. The guide is not meant as a comprehensive resource, she said, but it gives readers the basics and tells them where to go for more information. The first chapter was completed last November and is posted online at the P²AD Web site: www.p2ad.org. There is a link to this site from the DENIX and WRRRC Web sites.

Burnes said the chapter being completed now covers hazmat pharmacies, and it is scheduled to be completed by the end of July, 2001. It's an introduction to the concept of a hazmat pharmacy—how to select a system, what the different services are endorsing, the different software that's available, what types of resources are needed, and so forth. Key components of the guide are case studies.

The next chapter, "Painting and Coating" is also in progress. Burnes said P²AD has done the literature searches and is now talking to people within Region 4 and looking at what painting and coating technologies are being used, how cost-effective they are, what physical requirements they impose, who's doing what, and how successful they have been.

She said the following chapter—"C&D waste management"—will be based on research being conducted by the Georgia P2 partnership.

EPA Update:

Dave Holroyd, federal facilities coordinator with EPA Region 4, gave an update on what's new with the EPA. He mentioned the new EPA administrator, Christine Todd Whitman. She has made it perfectly clear, said Holroyd, that the EPA wants to get people into compliance and wants a better environment, and the agency is going to achieve those objectives through the compliance system.

He told the attendees that they're going to need to work more with their states rather than with the EPA. The states are out there more often than the EPA is, he said. The agency will go out and do overviews of the states, but it is not going to be doing compliance inspections. Nevertheless, the EPA is still going to be conducting its multi-media inspections. It will also provide information about EMSs for both federal and nonfederal facilities.

Holroyd said the EPA has seen a slippage in P2 efforts at federal facilities, possibly due to the contracting out of work. Federal facilities need to give contractors P2 incentives, otherwise they won't do P2. "Do P2 and you won't have all those regulatory requirements over your heads," he said.

The EPA is pushing federal facilities on RCRA's Section 6002, dealing with affirmative procurement. The agency is focusing on antifreeze, tires, and motor oil, but may add a few more commodities later. There's no real requirement to purchase recycled content, however. But if you're out of compliance, said Holroyd, buying recycled-content materials could result in a penalty offset.

The EPA is still doing enforcement work, but most of its enforcement actions deal with hazmat pharmacies. A well-run pharmacy cuts down on RCRA problems. The agency's focus has changed from pure enforcement to assistance, followed by enforcement if necessary.

The types of problems the EPA is seeing today are different from before: the problems are no longer of the "burying 55-gallon drums out back" variety; they're more of the "we can't read the label" or "this one hasn't been tested yet under RCRA" kinds of problems. Most of the violations the agency is seeing are still RCRA-related, but it is seeing a few violations in drinking water and in wastewater.

The EPA is pushing EMSs and the Performance Track program.

Closing:

Christine Steagall thanked everyone for attending the meeting and noted the meeting summary will be posted on the WRRRC web site soon.

Note: If you would like a copy of any of the presentations contact Christine Steagall at steagall@iopa.sc.edu.