

**Minutes from the  
DOD Region 4 P2 Partnership  
Steering Committee Meeting  
November 15, 2001  
Charleston, SC**

Christine Steagall called the session to order and mentioned the notebook updates and other materials available. She reviewed the agenda that had presentations in the morning followed by discussion and decision on project proposals in the afternoon.

Christine gave a quick update on the DOD P2 Partnership, discussed the newsletter Resources and its usability and asked for feedback on the newsletter. Dan Ahern commented that the newsletter was "very well liked" and that he e-mailed it to EPA staff and others around the region. Bob Donoghue asked about the purpose of the newsletter -- if the purpose was technology transfer, then the current mailing list was probably adequate. However, if the purpose was also PR for the Partnership, then it needs to go to more persons, including officials in DC, P2 people at the various headquarters and elsewhere. Other attendees thought this was a good idea. Christine asked for people to send her e-mail addresses of persons at headquarters --the Regional Recs will take care of this. She also asked for e-mails of state P2 persons, such as Bob King at SC DHEC and others.

Christine gave an update on the status of the funding -- still in process and it looks as if it is still "a couple of weeks away."

Christine said that since the purpose of the Partnership was to enhance DOD P2 activities in Region 4, then in addition to Congressional funding we need to look at other ways to be of service. The regional survey has identified the top seven needs of installations in the area and the Partnership needs to focus on these in other ways beyond the Congressional funding. For example, doing something in Affirmative Procurement that would cost nothing -- perhaps bringing information to the Partnership. Or there could be "work groups" similar to those of the National P2 Roundtable -- what would be the possibility of having Partnership work groups based on the seven priorities? Christine asked for a sense of the feeling of the committee members.

Joe Yates from Ft. Knox said that DOD has its goals and objectives and that state P2 organizations have their goals and objectives and that each side doesn't necessarily know what the other is doing. He suggested that we need to mesh better and share more information.

Ed Engbert said he could imagine each of the funded proposals having a work team assigned to it to help share information among the Partnership. Concerning the P2 Roundtable and what it does, he said it would be helpful to interact with DOD, which has two conferences a year, one general and one with work groups.

Bob Donoghue noted that the Partnership was conceived before the possibility of DOD funding and that we need to spend time in putting together a strategic plan for the Partnership as a whole. EPA Region 5 has regular meetings with DOD P2/environmental folks to foster such interaction, and Mississippi does something similar. He noted that there would be a call for papers to be delivered at the Portland meeting this coming April.

Joe Yates noted that since 70 to 80 percent of military facilities sit in Region 4 we should be able to influence DOD on environmental matters. Bob Donoghue said that one issue that keeps coming up is travel and the Partnership keeps trying to work on this to ease the situation for members. Example, the DOD/P2 meeting in Atlanta last year and this current meeting, linked to the state P2 Roundtable -- these

efforts help share the burden of travel. The strategy of linking the two groups when possible seems to work out pretty good so far.

Concerning the P2 Roundtable papers, work groups, etc., Christine asked for more information. Ed Engbert replied that he would be going to a meeting in about three weeks on the topic and would e-mail comments, etc. on how to rejuvenate DOD P2 efforts. Bob Burgess asked if it would be a good idea to attend P2 Roundtable meetings for a year to get a flavor of them before becoming actively involved. Kathy Stiles asked if perhaps we were spreading ourselves too thin -- would it be a better idea to refocus on the state partnerships? Bob Donoghue stressed the need to get back to Region 4 and develop an overall strategic plan. Dave Glass suggested that a small group could begin work on a draft strategic plan. Christine asked for a sense of the members on this topic. Bob Donoghue responded with a quick review of the purpose of the Partnership and pointed out that its major purpose is not necessarily funding but on strengthening state programs and improving coordination with the military. Some further general discussion followed about a strategic plan but no formal action was taken.

Sharon Baxter, Director of Pollution Prevention VADEQ, gave a presentation on the Virginia/DOD Partnership. Virginia is the only state in Region 3 to have a DOD Partnership and was inspired by a 1998 EPA meeting to form the Partnership. The group has been in place for about a year with some 23 installations having signed on, including the Pentagon. Ms. Baxter distributed copies of the Partnership Charter. The reasons for the Partnership included the DOD presence in Virginia, the opportunities to share information with DOD facilities, to promote participation in DEQ programs and the opportunities for other facilities to learn from DOD success stories. Ms. Baxter reviewed the Partnership's goals and noted that they did build in an annual evaluation process to look at priorities, projects, commitments, etc. The Partnership tries to meet on a quarterly basis as a full group with work groups meeting to communicate and share information on an on-going basis. Ms. Baxter was asked if the Partnership planned to bring in some universities. She answered that they hadn't really thought about that. She was asked if the Region 4 Partnership could receive copies of any reports, etc. She said the Virginia Partnership was working on a web site and might use WRRRC as its host. She was asked about DENIX and replied that it hasn't really worked out as they'd hoped. She was asked about interaction with business, such as with Busch Gardens. She said this had not happened yet but was being considered.

Ed Engbert made a presentation on ITRC, a sub-committee of ECOS for the exchange of information on clean-up technologies. TARP is the P2 equivalent of ITRC. TARP has been working on storm water management, alternative septic system designs and non-hazardous control systems as areas of study at this point. If the protocol for a system or process is approved in one of the seven member states then its acceptance is facilitated in the other states. There is a need for state regulatory agencies to buy into ECOS for it to be effective. The Region 4 Partnership needs to integrate efforts and share information with ITRC so as not to duplicate efforts, minimize waste and duplication, etc. Perhaps all of this could become part of the strategic plan.

John Calcagni made a presentation on the WRRRC website, [wrrc.p2pays.org](http://wrrc.p2pays.org). It has information from the DOD Region 4 P2 Partnership, including a map of the Partnership, copies of the newsletter Resources, proposals and supporting documents, a list of contacts both DOD and state regulatory agencies and is linked for contacts. The site is intended to post products from proposals and has a 2 page checklist prepared by Florida, "Things to Look for on a Base." Calcagni said the site is interested in putting up new tools. It is open access, with nothing secure, no pass words and kept on one level as much as possible. The site wants to work with the individual state partnerships, including posting of notes and minutes from partnership meetings. He is looking to link with DENIX to reduce duplication. WRRRC page would be the main page for the various state partnerships. It now serves as the primary library for several states with 12,500 documents on line, and many of them military documents. There is a 1-800 hotline (1-800-476-

8686) "Ask Rudy" for information. The site also maintains a listserv for the states. The best protocol is to work with Christine Steagall to get state information up on the site.

Christine asked the members about the preference between WRRC and DENIX. Discussion followed, including a discussion on security and confidentiality of information and the need in these times to watch what is placed on the web.

The Committee next discussed defining the states' roles in developing projects, especially the work on the installations and how the states will be involved with that. Christine asked if we needed to go back to find out what are the priorities and focuses of the state P2 agencies in Region 4. Joe Yates said that he didn't know if there was enough information shared between the two sides and that they need to get together more and need to do this at both regional and state levels. We should involve the state regulatory and P2 folks with DOD folks at information-sharing meetings. Bob Donoghue cited the Georgia Military Leadership Conference as an example of an effort that has raised visibility of the state partnership, increased awareness, etc. He also noted that base commanders typically change every two years. Ed Engbert spoke about a recent conference where an executive session was held with DOD and state environmental agencies to discuss the pros and cons of current activities. Instead of Regional Partnerships doing this, let DOD conferences continue to do it. Christine asked if the states were comfortable with their participation -- was EPA comfortable with its level? Bob Burgess said that it seemed as if the states were comfortable and that South Carolina certainly was. He suggested that he would like to see grantees in South Carolina summarize their projects for regulators at the beginning of the process. Christine noted that another role for the State P2 organizations is to be involved in the projects -- they now have the opportunity to review and comment on the projects.

Ed Engbert asked what was the story on the conference calls. Christine replied they would continue as needed but could go to a regular schedule if desired or needed. She said that the plan was to have two steering committee meetings (spring and fall) and one full Partnership meeting probably with the DOD/P2 Conference to minimize travel for each group. In the discussion which followed Bob Donoghue noted that we also have state meetings, state partnerships, etc. and suggested that we have fewer rather than more meetings and pack the agenda with items, then break into smaller groups to focus on priority areas.

Christine suggested the committee discuss focus areas for the Partnership and begin to prepare for the June meeting at the Atlanta DOD conference. The P2 people would be there at the Regional Roundtable. Dan Ahern suggested we set up groups for areas to help oversee funded projects and make reports about them at the June meeting. Bob Donoghue asked if we could have volunteers to pull together a strategic plan. Task forces and focus areas would be an element in this strategic plan. Donoghue made a motion to put together a strategic plan task force to develop a plan over the next month or so. Dan Ahern asked if the committee could give a sense as to what should be included in the strategic plan. Joe Yates said the state partnerships could tell what they want in the plan. Input could come by meetings and e-mail. Bob Donoghue, Joe Yates and all DOD recs agreed to get together for a dinner meeting that evening to discuss the strategic plan and the process of developing it.

The committee gave the following input into items to be considered for the strategic plan:

- foster P2 information sharing
- use input from various charters
- identify opportunities, develop success and promote success (Virginia charter)
- help state partnerships
- consider regional issues
- minimization of duplication efforts
- develop mission, goals and objectives from first set-up of Region 4 DOD P2 Partnership

The committee then recessed for lunch.

Christine Steagall called the committee back to order following the lunch break.

Dan Ahern announced that there was a P2 opportunity in Atlanta on March 26-28, where two P2 motivators/trainers would give a three-day course on organizational P2. For more information members should contact Dan Ahern.

Christine began the discussion of the proposals. The Executive Committee met in Atlanta on October 29 and using the regional priorities as a guide and with reference to other DOD activities, came up with 14 projects/proposals to consider based on the ranking criteria developed by the Partnership. She noted that the proposals needed improvement, especially in terms of coordination with other groups and activities. Ed Engbert suggested that we could establish work teams to adjust the proposals to improve them, help meet criteria, answer questions, etc.

**PROJECTS UNDER PRIORITY 1- ACHIEVING ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE THROUGH POLLUTION PREVENTION:**

**DOD 108L - "Green ammo."** Discussion: is this a good idea? Is it feasible? Does the Army support this? Is the data there from earlier studies? Does this have a champion at DOD? Wendy Duffy says she wants it. More information is needed. Work team established to find out more data, ask questions, come up with go/no go recommendation.

**TEAM:** Ed Engbert (team leader), Tony Best, Khairy Abu-Salah, Dave Glass, Kathy Stiles, Michael Ohlsen.

Process question raised: after the review committee (work team) looks over the proposal and answers questions, does the proposal come back to the full steering committee for a final vote? Decision: yes. Subcommittees must report their findings and recommendations by December 15 to the full steering committee. The vote can be taken by e-mail or conference call as to be determined later.

Army Environmental Center comments: This project should not be considered. There have already been studies by CHPPM which state that this is not a problem. It is the USAEC position that this program is not valid and is a waste of government money if funded. When reviewing the POC list, there is no involvement with the green bullet developers or program managers. Please contact Mr. Rick O'Donnell to discuss AEC's comments.

**DOD 132L - "Storm water study."** Discussion: Produces "outputs" not "outcomes." Does not transfer well to other facilities. Already being done in places such as Parris Island, for example.

(This proposal was eliminated and there is no review team associated with it. However, the subject is something that the regional partnership should probably keep informed about and look for opportunities to enhance lessons learned/information sharing across the region)

AEC COMMENTS: Some VERY important issues that need to be addressed here.

1. Management of storm water systems in the Army must first look at elimination or consolidation of activities using LOW COST practical P2 methods to address discharge of contaminants to storm water systems or waters of the US. That means change the way you do business, use less toxic materials, consolidate treatment systems that discharge to storm water systems etc. Using end of pipe treatment for stormwater rather than managing or eliminating discharges needs to be avoided. The Army has already shown in the past that it can not keep up with maintenance of treatment systems like oil water separators and ends up spending millions of dollars to replace separators that were not properly maintained.

2. Second, when structural BMPs must be constructed to address runoff into a storm water system, selection of a structural BMP should be based on low cost and low maintenance. Also since EPA and states are now trying to evaluate pollutant reduction levels the structural BMP should show or quantify reduction levels of pollutants.

3. Third, EPA will be putting out a proposed new rule in Jan/Feb 02 that addresses effluent standards for construction. Minimum measures and EPA approved measures will be required for construction when the rule finally becomes final. That means that anyone developing BMPs for stormwater from construction needs to ensure it meets EPAs standards.

4. Fourth, we need to ensure that we don't construct something to address non-point source runoff that converts "non-point runoff" to "point source runoff" and now a permit is required. Several issues that have surfaced recently have shown that the use of berms to stop non-point runoff from entering a stream is now channeling water. EPA is trying to argue that this is now a "conveyance of water" which makes it a storm water system and it is now required to get a permit. If we are to address non-point runoff we need to ensure we look at the use of vegetation to slow flow or reduce pollutant runoff.

5. Fifth, future planning and construction at installations need to incorporate Low Impact Development for storm water into their plans in order to decrease runoff and improve water quality.

Please contact Ms. Georgette Meyers to discuss AEC's Comments, [gdmymers@aec.apgea.army.mil](mailto:gdmymers@aec.apgea.army.mil)

**DOD 118L - "Treatment of bilge water."** Discussion: Is there a need for this? Bill Raspet has checked into this -- same issue was looked into about 2 years ago, NAVC said they didn't want this. Could this be adapted for other facilities? Commit to work team.

AEC COMMENTS: How is this interacting with the NAVSEA efforts to treat bilge tanks?

**TEAM:** Bill Raspet (team leader), Laila Capers, Tony Best, and Gary Ellis.

#### **PROJECTS UNDER PRIORITY 2- CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION (C& D) DEBRIS:**

##### **DOD 122S - "Sustainability guidelines."**

Can Dr. Pierce provide consultation services, how about coordinating with Mobile Dist Corps of Engineers and other COE organizations? (**can DOD 122 be combined with DOD 123?**)

**TEAM:** Linda Larson, Joe Yates, Michael Ohlsen, and Ed Engbert

##### **DOD 123S - "Costs of sustainable designs."**

Discussion: Already in place by Corps of Engineers? Linda Larson said her engineers say they don't have the specs for sustainability. Robins AFB has specifically asked for these specs. Joe Yates: Let's get with the COE to make sure it's not a duplication. Concerning DOD 123S, is a report a results oriented deliverable? Could help overcome hurdles within DOD. Michael Ohlsen suggested adding a component for technology transfer/mentoring. The primary investigator needs to get with the COE. Commit to team. (can DOD 122 be combined with DOD 123? How can this proposal be leveraged off the preceding 2 C&D proposals?)

AEC Comments: Double check to make sure that this has not already been done by COE. Has this been coordinated with their green building program?

**TEAM:** Linda Larson (team leader), Joe Yates, Ed Engbert, and Michael Ohlsen.

**DOD 129S - "Sustainability charrettes."** Discussion: Template for charrettes in general? Add to projects 122 and 123 to include actual implementation. Is there going to be a useful product/result from this? An Organizational Guide to Pollution Prevention is a book already in place. Commit to team.

**TEAM:** Linda Larson (team leader), Michael Ohlsen, Stephanie Bush (Georgia), Joe Yates, Ed Engbert, Dave Glass, and Kathy Stiles.

**PROJECTS UNDER PRIORITY 3 – IMPLEMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (EMS):**

**DOD 111S - "Ft. Bragg Family Housing."** Discussion: Modify to be applicable to other military facilities? Make more transferable. Most installations have specific regulations as to what you can and cannot do. This proposal was eliminated. Not enough justification and not transferable. Housing residents don't normally do their own landscaping.

**DOD 103L - "EMS training and implementation in Region 4."** Discussion: DOD comfort level with EMS? Go to states, get guidelines to help do EMS on installations. Not a panacea for NOVs (Bob Burgess). How do we utilize the tools we already have? Training is how we get there. Commit to team.

**TEAM:** Dave Glass (team leader), Cam Metcalf, George Carellas, Laila Capers, Tony Best, and Christine Steagall.

**DOD 106L - "EMS evaluation pilot project."** Discussion: Analysis of EMS pilot programs or assistance in actually implementing EMS? Is there anyone out there already working with DOD on this? Double check on this. Commit to team.

**TEAM:** Same as DOD 103L.

**PROJECTS UNDER PRIORITY 4 – RECYCLING:**

**DOD 128L - "Waste analysis and inventory."** Discussion: Has this been done previously? Is this different from other activities now going on? Have USAF bases gone through this? Is this an exchange? A data base? Need for the Reserves -- one of their big problems is transportation -- TVA partnership didn't work out. Need to coordinate with DRMO. This is inter-services. Commit to team.

**TEAM:** Maj. Garrison (team leader), Kathy Stiles, and Sandy Sullivan.

**DOD 105S and DOD 112S - "Green deconstruction guide."** Discussion: Combined by executive committee as two good proposals that provide a "how to" guide for military bases. Work on this is being done in Florida -- but not on the military side. Habitat for Humanity is a potential partner. What about lead-based paint? Not addressed in DOD 112S. How to merge/partner these together? Two separate grants -- one effort. Add a look at Fort Bragg as part of the effort (concrete buildings); Parris Island (metal buildings). Commit to team.

Note: Executive Steering committee recommended that these two be funded but needed to be combined together.

AEC Comments: Double check to make sure that this is coordinated with the Army Contaminated Building Deconstruction Program at CERL.

**TEAM:** Michael Ohlsen (team leader), Joe Yates, Al Townsend, Linda Larson, Stephanie Bush, and Rusty Harris-Bishop.

**PROJECTS UNDER PRIORITY 5 – POLLUTION PREVENTION TRAINING:**

**DOD 120S - "P2 Training at shop level."** Discussion: Modules on specific topics at the shop level to meet specific needs. One specific topic per shop. Team to make sure deliverable is well-defined. In power point to be adaptable for specific installations? Find out what sort of resources are already out there. Look at specific shops that we need training for. Link needs/available resources. Is \$49,000 enough? Commit to team.

**TEAM:** Linda Larson (team leader), Al Townsend, Bill Raspet, Maj. Garrison, and Cam Metcalf.

**DOD 127L - "Integrating P2 into EMS."** Discussion: How is this different from the other EMS projects? Add to 101L (not on Steering Committee list) and include Robins AFB? Focus on this is how to bring EMS to shop level -- an entirely different level? Same thing as earlier proposal? Commit to team.

Note: It was recommend that this proposal be considered for integration with DOD 101, which was not initially chosen by the Executive Committee. However, DOD 127 was chosen and has a lot of similarity to DOD 101. Some economy of scale might be realized by pulling DOD 127 into DOD 101 (4 states vs. 3) for not much more money)

**TEAM:** Bob Donoghue (team leader), Joe Yates, Cam Metcalf, Bob Burgess, Ed Engbert, Becky McCoy (Robins AFB), and Dan Ahern.

Kathy Stiles commented that "I think we're really going overboard on this EMS" without knowing what the services want. Bob Donoghue suggested we could do the first round of EMS with Cam Metcalf and then decide what to do. Question: should this be revised to include DOD 101 and DOD 103? Dan Ahern said those are two different things.

Christine Steagall gave a quick recap of the committee's decisions. The work teams will get together via conference calls, e-mail, etc. and Christine will facilitate as needed. Summaries of the team reports and recommendations are due to Christine by December 15. A one page summary which follows the same format at the original proposal. Teams can go back to the University POCs in making changes, adjustments, etc. However, when POCs are contacted they should be told specifically that this does NOT mean they are being funded. The teams will probably stay with the projects until the end of the activities.

The question was raised about forming an affirmative procurement focus team. Should that be done now or later? What is the status of the White House Task Force on Affirmative Procurement? The decision was made to wait until after the holidays to address this issue -- there is enough to focus on at the moment. In addition, if we wait, we will know more about the funding as well.

Christine Steagall said that she would prepare and send letters of notification to the proposal POCs, informing them of their status, telling them about the work teams, etc.

The meeting then adjourned.

