



## Challenge

Fort Campbell's procurement of products and services significantly contributes to costs, waste, and exposures to health and environmental hazards. How can Fort Campbell purchase products and services that will reduce life cycle costs, impacts from waste disposal, and exposures to hazards, while promoting sustainable manufacturing and stimulating local/national markets for environmentally preferable products?

## Fort Campbell 25-Year Goals for Procurement

Given this challenge, attendees of the Fort Campbell Installation Sustainability Workshop, which convened on 9-11 September 03, developed the following long-range goals:

**Final Goal #1:** Eliminate waste disposal by 2028.

**Final Goal #2:** Procure 100 percent sustainable goods and services by 2028.

The primary issues and goals discussed in the Procurement working group are described below. This information will be helpful in developing the short-term objectives and five-year plans needed to reach the long-range goals.

## Breakout Group Membership

**Facilitator:** Kim Gotwals

**Recorder:** T.L. Griffin

| Name             | Organization                                   |
|------------------|--|
| Dianne Burkhart  | Fort Campbell, PWBC, Supply Technician         |
| Helen Calhoun    | Fort Campbell, RBC, Budget                     |
| Trudy Carr       | Fort Campbell, PWBC, P2                        |
| Mindy Cunningham | Fort Campbell, PWBC, Affirmative Procurement   |
| Kevin Day        | Fort Campbell, DOC, Contract Specialist        |
| Rosa Elmore      | Fort Campbell, DOC, Contract Administrator     |
| Ed Engbert       | AEC  |
| Russ Godsave     | Fort Campbell, PWBC, Environmental             |
| Bob Hartwig      | AMC, Fort Campbell Logistics Assistance Office |
| Carl Heckmann    | Fort Campbell, DOC, Manager                    |
| Bob Hensley      | Fort Campbell, NAF, Manager                    |
| Robert Ott       | COE, Project Manager                           |



|                   |                                   |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Cecilia St. Denis | DRMO FT Campbell, Chief           |
| Bob Works         | Fort Polk, Supply Manager for DPW |

## List of Issues and Potential Responses to Issues

### *Staffing*

- ?? Product delivery teams lack a broad view/perspective of potential environmental issues (teams' focus limited to contract specifications).
- ?? Procurement is not resourced (i.e. staffing, database, design guidelines) to gather data and direct an affirmative procurement action.

### *Funding Processes*

- ?? There are budget/FY end constraints; it is an issue of short-term needs versus long-term.
- ?? FAR regulations are restrictive: use a 2-year budget vs. 1-year and allow carry over past 30 September if right thing to do.
- ?? Funding processes do not facilitate life cycle costing.
- ?? Life cycle of products is not always considered. The lowest initial price is the first criteria.
- ?? Different funding sources (pots of money) do not allow for life cycle cost analysis.
- ?? Fort Campbell does not practice life cycle acquisition.
- ?? Procurement is driven by fiscal constraints.
- ?? The cost of managing the program outweighs the benefit of the program. For example, Fort Campbell stopped buying retread tires because the budget for retread tires went to zero. However money was budgeted to purchase new, more expensive tires.
- ?? Multi-year leases are not common practice; one-year funding is the standard so funding for years after the initial year is not guaranteed.

### *Leadership*

- ?? There is a lack of environmental ownership in business functions.
- ?? Sustainability must be supported at the highest level.

### *Education/Awareness*

- ?? People need to be motivated to do the right thing.
- ?? There needs to be a cultural shift: more focus on the environment and people, more volunteerism, and less regulation.
- ?? Customers are not educated in green products.
- ?? Education of customers needs to expand.
- ?? When purchasing items, customers do not know if there are any environmental guidelines that should be followed.
- ?? Additional education is needed for using DRMS web site and other procurement guidelines.
- ?? The reutilization program needs to improve; it currently does not encourage the preservation of the condition of property to increase the potential for reuse.



### *Purchasing Procedures*

- ?? Fort Campbell does not have a procurement “roadmap”. Procurement procedures do not have adequate guidelines; procurement procedures are not definitive.
- ?? Chain of command must support a procurement education program.
- ?? Current Army procurement directives/initiatives do not support purchases from local manufacturers or businesses.
- ?? Current procurement approach does not focus on sustainability.
- ?? There are too many “disposable”, one-use products that are considered desirable (i.e. styrofoam containers).
- ?? With the advent of the government credit card program (\$2500 or less), controls have been “lost” to review the purchase for hazardous materials; protection has been traded for convenience.
- ?? Consumer products are not included in procurement procedures (e.g. AAFES, DECA).

### *Contracts*

- ?? Contracting for products and services does not reflect environmental requirements (APP guidelines).
- ?? Designs do not take account the resultant waste management at the end of a product’s useful life. There is no procurement loop, where secondary materials are considered as feedstocks for another product or the original product.
- ?? Fort Campbell needs more environmental oversight of contracts.
- ?? Fort Campbell needs more environmental planning prior to contract award.

### *Waste Management/Recycling*

- ?? Tipping fees are too low and do not provide an incentive for recycling.
- ?? The current economic situation does not accommodate recycling.
- ?? Usable materials are still being discarded.
- ?? Personal procurement/disposal habits are not linked with Fort Campbell’s procurement/disposal.

## **Initial Goals and Proponents Developed**

### *Initial Strategic Goal 1*

- ?? **Goal:** By 2028, eliminate waste disposal.
- **Issue:** Regional and installation waste management detracts from mission; potential contamination of land, water, and air; usable materials are still being discarded
- **Desired End State:** Zero waste
- **Metrics:** Landfill and any other disposal statistics
- **Timeframe:** 2028
- **Proponent Organization:** Command, Public Works



### *Initial Strategic Goal 2*

- **Goal:** Procure 100 percent sustainable goods and services by 2028.
- **Issue:** Current procurement approach (mission, installation, residents) does not focus on sustainability; currently do not design with the end in mind
- **Desired End State:** All purchases are sustainable
- **Metrics:** Procurement actions monitored
- **Timeframe:** 2028
- **Proponent Organization:** Command, Public Works, Contracting, PPTO

### *Initial Strategic Goal 3*

- **Goal:** 100 percent sustainability awareness for Fort Campbell and region by 2008.
- **Issue:** Limited awareness of sustainability concepts
- **Desired End State:** Educated community that supports sustainability initiatives
- **Metrics:** Education program developed by 2005; on-going training; centralize web site by 2005
- **Timeframe:** 2008
- ?? **Proponent Organization:** Command, Environmental

### *Initial Strategic Goal 4*

- **Goal:** Change funding processes to support sustainable purchasing by 2028.
- **Issue:** Initial funding source not responsible for life cycle costs; FY funding limits procurement alternatives
- **Desired End State:** Funding processes support sustainable purchasing
- **Metrics:** Percent of impediments removed
- **Timeframe:** 2028
- ?? **Proponent Organization:** Command, IRMO

### *Initial Strategic Goal 5*

- **Goal:** Ensure adequate staffing for success of sustainability initiatives starting in 2005.
- **Issue:** Current staffing is inadequate for implementation of sustainability practices
- **Desired End State:** Fort Campbell has adequate resources, installation staff, and organizational structure to meet sustainability objectives
- **Metrics:** Staff members to ensure implementation of all sustainability initiatives
- **Timeframe:** 2005, supplemented as additional initiatives come on-line
- **Proponent Organization:** Command, IRMO



## Final Goals and Team Members

### Final Procurement Goal #1

#### Eliminate waste disposal by 2028.

- **Issue:** Regional and installation waste management detracts from mission; potential contamination of land, air, and water; solid waste generation; usable materials are still being discarded; limited landfill space; society of convenience; throwaway society.
- **Desired End State:** Zero waste; all materials diverted from disposal methods into recycle/reuse options; and a community that capitalizes on emerging technologies, educational programs, and cost-effective processes to close the loop.
- **Metrics:** Generation to diversion ratio; revenues generated and cost avoidance; landfills and other disposal statistics to include:
  - ?? Construction and demolition (C&D)
  - ?? Compostables
  - ?? Municipal Solid Waste (MSW)
  - ?? Hazardous waste
- **Timeframe:** 2028
- **Proponent Organization:** Public Works Business Center (PWBC)
- **Team Members:**
  - ?? Each Directorate and Tenant Activity
  - ?? Bi-County Landfill
  - ?? Trigg, Stewart, Montgomery, and Christian Counties
  - ?? School Districts
  - ?? Chambers of Commerce
  - ?? Joint Land Use Study Group
  - ?? Colleges/Universities
  - ?? State Regulators
  - ?? Local Media



## Final Procurement Goal #2

### Procure 100 percent sustainable goods and services by 2028.

- **Issue:** Current procurement processes (mission, installation, residents) do not focus on sustainability; currently do not design with the end in mind; initial funding source not responsible for life cycle costs; FY and Type of funding (“color of money”) limits procurement alternatives.
- **Desired End State:** All purchases are sustainable, cradle-to-cradle (economics, environment, and community considered while supporting the mission) – life cycle costs are included. Funding streams support sustainable purchasing. Contract requirements support sustainable purchasing.
- **Metrics:**
  - ?? Percentage of purchases that are sustainable
  - ?? Percentage of funding impediments removed
  - ?? Sustainable purchasing becomes one of a contract’s performance measures
- **Timeframe:** 2028 (100 percent sustainable procurement phased over 25 years)
- **Proponent Organization:** Directorate of Contracting and Environmental
- **Team Members:**
  - ?? Public Works
  - ?? PPTO
  - ?? AAFES
  - ?? DeCA
  - ?? Blanchfield Army Community Hospital (BACH)
  - ?? CABC
  - ?? COE
  - ?? Vendors
  - ?? DLA and AMC
  - ?? 160<sup>th</sup> SOAR and 5<sup>th</sup> SFG
  - ?? DOD Schools
  - ?? Contractors