

**Conference Call Notes**  
**Executive Committee Conference Call**  
**DOD Region 4 P2 Partnership**  
**Thursday, June 7, 2001**

Executive Committee

George Carellas

Ed Engbert

Bob Donaghue

Brain Marshburn

Laila Capers

Dan Ahern, was not present on call

The call began with a round of introductions, followed by a brief discussion of the minutes from the Chattanooga meeting, to which there were no corrections or additions. Christine Steagall said she hoped to have the minutes loaded on the WRRC and DENIX websites soon.

The first topic of discussion was reviewing the questions the Executive Committee was tasked to focus on and answer. The questions were: 1) How will we set regional priorities from the results of the survey? And 2) What criteria will be used to select projects and allocate funds? Answering these questions will be the first task the Executive Committee will accomplish. This needs to be done prior to the November meeting so the application process can be set up to fund the regional identified projects. There was a lot of discussion on how the Executive Committee should set the criteria and should the criteria be set based on what the states surveys identify.

Alabama has completed its survey and identified priorities, which included need for support in P2 procurement; solid waste and recycling and packaging and transfer of information. South Carolina will undertake the survey at its upcoming meeting on June 13-14.

Possible criteria mentioned were 1) issues that were regional in scope; 2) projects that could be easily accomplished for "quick success stories"; and 3) projects which offered opportunities for technology transfer.

Ed Engbert suggested that we consider the criteria developed by the US Army and offered to distribute these to the members of the executive committee. His offer was accepted.

Bob Donaghue asked what items needed to be prepared prior to the November partnership meeting, such as a "straw man" document for discussion

on applications and evaluations of proposed projects. Other deliverables to be completed in draft form before November were: 1) definition of regional priorities as based on the survey (in other words, what is a regional priority and how is it determined?); 2) criteria used to select grants; 3) application process; and 4) identification of the deliverables expected from grantees at the end of their various projects.

Discussion focused on the topic of regional priorities. These will come from the states. At some point, the regional priorities and the selection criteria become very close, if not identical. Priorities/criteria could include:

- multiplicity (the topic or issue affects many states and facilities)
- "economy of scale"
- severity of issue
- issues which lend themselves to a regional approach
- projects which have opportunity for technology transfer
- issues which are not being worked on elsewhere -- as George Carellas said, they "should enhance rather than duplicate previous or on-going programs."
- projects which have the potential for minimizing compliance issues in the future ("regulatory driven," as Ed Engbert phrased it)
- projects which are in compliance with other DOD/EPA/State P2 priorities
- cost
- projects which have or could have partnerships with them

A brief discussion followed about partnerships between grantees and universities. Should USC be the single source for linkage or would grantees in the various states arrange their own relationships? It was decided that grantees should, where possible, identify in-state colleges or universities as appropriate based on specific projects, but that USC will be available as a resource to link grantees with academic and other expertise.

Given the time factor, it was decided that a working meeting was needed prior to November. After some discussion, Atlanta was chosen with the P2AD conference room as the site on August 13-14. The meeting will begin around 1:00 pm on August 13.

The state partnerships will make every effort to complete their surveys prior to the August meeting and to forward the results to USC's Center for Environmental Policy. Christine will see that the minutes to the executive

committee meeting are distributed to partnership members early in the week of June 11-15 and that completion of the surveys is a priority action item.

Discussion turned to the presentations at the June 26-28 meeting in Atlanta, specifically the presentations on the P2 partnerships on Wednesday. Each state will make a brief presentation on the big issues within that state. The military rep and the state rep will work out the details of the presentation between themselves. It was pointed out that the session will be at the end of the day and that many participants will have to attend the Army and Air Force town hall meetings, which followed. There was a discussion of the format for slides used in the presentation and a standard format was suggested and approved.

The Executive Committee decided there will not be a formal meeting during the Joint Service P2 Hazardous Waste Conference in San Antonio, Aug 20-23, 2001. Christine was asked to plan an informal dinner get together at a local establishment as a way to mingle with members of the partnership. She will be planning something for Tuesday or Wednesday evenings. After arrangements are final she will forward to everyone to mark their calendars.

Christine brought up the suggestion of adding the 81<sup>st</sup> Army National Guard to the Executive Committee. All the other services regional environmental coordinators are on the Executive Committee and it seems appropriate to include them. The Executive Committee agreed and Christine will invite them to participate in the future meetings.

No other issues were discussed and call completed.