

Army Sustainability Committee (ASC) Meeting Minutes

25 Oct 07

Welcome and Opening Remarks

COL Mike Bennett (DAIM-ISE) welcomed members to the meeting and reviewed the agenda (Enclosure 1). He thanked everyone for attending and noted this would be the last bi-monthly meeting; future meetings will be held quarterly beginning in Jan 2008. He asked everyone to introduce themselves for the benefit of those who were participating via conference call. Chris Werle (LMI) completed the attendance sheet (Enclosure 2) and will make corrections to the listed contact information if needed.

Review 28 Aug 07 Meeting Minutes

COL Bennett asked the attendees if any changes were needed to the minutes from the 28 Aug 07 meeting. No changes were requested at this time, so he asked that any changes be forwarded to either Wanda Johnsen (DAIM-ISE) or Chris Werle within the next week. After that time the minutes will be finalized and posted to the Army Sustainability website.

Old Business

Strategic Plan Update

COL Bennett updated the ASC on developments related to the draft *Army Strategic Plan for Sustainability* (hereinafter 'Strategic Plan') that have occurred since the last meeting. He noted that he talked to Carl Scott (ODASA [ESOH]) about this last week. Carl indicated there were still a few more tweaks needed before sending it to Mr. Davis, and that Mr. Davis has additional revisions that he wants to make as well. Carl plans to staff the final draft without a formal cover memo. COL Bennett said he would touch base with Carl to get another status update and send an email to ASC members to let them know where things stand.

Sustainability Workshops Update

Wanda provided an update on the status of installation sustainability workshops by reviewing the current schedule (Enclosure 3) and providing an updated handout (Enclosure 4) showing the installations where sustainability plans are either being implemented or are in the planning process. She noted that since the last ASC meeting efforts included completion of Workshop C for the PANG, Workshops A/B at Letterkenny AD, Workshop D at USAG Wiesbaden, and the Pre-planning meeting at Fort Detrick. Between now and the end of Jan 08 they expect to complete Workshop D for the PANG, Workshops C/D at Anniston AD, and Workshop C at Letterkenny AD. She also noted that the IMCOM planning approach currently in use may not work well with the MEDCOM and AMC strategic planning processes. It may work best if they integrate sustainability planning with strategic planning, completing them jointly rather than separately. Bob Shakeshaft (AEC) pointed out that the only IMCOM installation currently planned for this year is USAG Alaska.

Tad McCall (AEPI) emphasized that Phil Jessup (IMCOM Plans and Ops) has been a great partner in this effort. He feels it is good to think about how best to deploy, noting that we may want to use a different approach based on experience to date. For example, how might we apply the process to an entire combatant command, like AFRICOM? The ultimate answer may end up being a regional solution, with the individual ISPs being developed within the context of broader regional plans. Karen Baker (HQ, USACE) also noted that the community outreach/participation component of the installation guide to sustainability planning may need to be revised to better reflect the special needs of industrial installations. John Fittipaldi (AEPI) stressed that putting ISP development within the plans and operations functional area helps ensure it will not become another environmental stovepipe process. COL Bennett agreed; if the workshops are linked to environment many of the other functional participants tend to bow out early. We need to focus on impacts across all functional areas.

Wanda indicated she would be revamping the materials, timing, and structure for future workshops to make needed process improvements. COL Bennett noted that having HQDA sponsor the workshops increased everyone's interest and appreciation for the overall effort. We will work closely with the State of California and the CA Air NG to set up workshops there. Tad McCall pointed out that AEPI has not had much luck getting the Air Force at large to embrace sustainability. However, the Air NG has been on the leading edge of many initiatives in the past, so this may end up being the mechanism we need to increase Air Force involvement. Wanda also noted that the PANG workshops included the Air NG and their senior leadership.

New Business

Draft ASC Charter Revisions

Wanda reminded everyone that the current ASC Charter expires next month, and that we will request an extension to keep the committee operating until a new Charter is approved. She handed out a copy of the latest draft, which includes revisions she received from ASC members (Enclosure 5). A key consideration related to the new Charter is EO 13423 and the large number of new data collection and reporting requirements it prescribes. To facilitate meeting these new requirements, we could revise the Charter to permit use of the ASC to help address these forthcoming data calls; especially those that involve multiple functional offices. Wanda discussed this approach with Carl Scott last week and he was supportive.

The current draft Charter includes only a few minor comments received since the last meeting. In paragraph 10 under Composition, we still want to have each member designate a primary and alternate point of contact. This will be done for continuity purposes and doesn't necessarily mean that more people cannot attend meetings. Contractors will not be allowed to attend future meetings unless they are working in-house in support of DAIM-ISE, or have otherwise been specifically invited. Karen Baker is concerned that we have listed the Office of the Chief of Engineers (OCE) as a member, but not USACE. She stressed that OCE represents the military arm of the Corps, and that excluding USACE overlooks the civil works side of the organization. Wanda emphasized that OCE is free to designate any POCs they wish, including someone from USACE, so that should not be a problem. Wanda asked attendees to send any additional comments or recommended changes to her over the next week. She will coordinate with Carl Scott to determine how to best address the EO 13423 oversight role. COL Bennett pointed out that there are 100+ committees already in existence that touch environment in some way. Many functional offices are already collecting data to facilitate EO 13423 reporting, but we are not sharing that data effectively. The ASC would be an excellent vehicle for both collecting and reporting data.

AEPI Update

John Fittipaldi updated the group on recent happenings at AEPI. Late in FY07 AEPI funded development of an Army Sustainability Retrospective Report covering the 1998-2000 timeframe. It will focus on the discovery and evolution of sustainability within the Army, and will entail conducting many interviews of key players who have been instrumental to the success of the effort. It will be more of a lessons learned study designed to highlight what we have learned along the way. AEPI is also working to develop a 2008 Army Sustainability Update Report that is to be completed and available on the web by Jan 2008 (per Mr. Davis). AEPI prepared a preliminary draft of such a report for FY2006, but that version didn't get much traction from Mr. Davis. Accordingly, he provided new direction to develop a report that presents a more balanced depiction of Army progress with respect to sustainability and compliance.

The current draft of the report follows the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) format, which Mr. Davis prefers because he knows of several organizations that are using it and feels it will be a more credible source of information to demonstrate progress over time. John noted that some of the standard data fields for the GRI format are blank because the Army does not currently track the data; but that helps define what other information we will need to start tracking. John has already distributed an initial draft of the report to ASC members and other selected parties, which he admits was not very well polished. Nevertheless, he felt was important to get out for review and comment. The idea was to communicate Mr. Davis' intent and then to continue work to refine the report.

Karen Baker asked how many fields we did not have data for; it was about 20-30%, but not all of them apply. Emil Dzuray (LMI) noted that GRI is a consensus based standard for developing a sustainability report, and that organizations are not required to use all data fields. Kurt Wexel (DAIM-FDF-UE) stated that an energy category for transportation needs to be added because it currently only includes facilities energy.

The data reflected in the draft Army report primarily comes from Reports to Congress. John would like to include FY07 data in the report, but it is not likely to be available in time to meet the Jan 2008 publication suspense; accordingly the report will focus primarily on FY06 data. Anne Johnson (ODASA [ESOH]) stressed that we need to make sure the report is well balanced and tells our good news story. She also felt we should have a 10-12 page glossy section up front that presents a clear and concise summary, with the harder to digest details following in appendices. Wanda pointed out that we should also remove all references to rescinded EOs. COL Bennett said we should consider distributing the next draft to a much wider audience to ensure we don't end up using incorrect information. Antonia Giardina (OASA [I&E]) asked about the general sense of the comments received on the initial draft. John indicated that Emil has compiled them into a spreadsheet and will send them electronically to everyone who reviewed the draft.

John also discussed a recently completed RAND report prepared by Beth Lochman. While it was supposed to be a handbook on ISP planning, it has evolved into an ISP policy study. The briefing report presents several good recommendations that we can capitalize on now, and will be presented soon to Mr. Davis and Dr. College. Wanda stated that she and COL Bennett have reached similar conclusions to those reflected in the report, and are already working on some of the same issues. For example, installation planning, transportation, and DPW staff really don't need to spend much workshop time in training; it would be more effective for them to spend the time developing projects. Also, we probably don't need to conduct 4 workshops. In fact, it may be simpler to just integrate sustainability principles into the overall installation strategic planning

process. DAIM-ISE has requested FY08 funding to conduct an Army Sustainability Summit, possibly at Fort Bragg if IMCOM agrees. Wanda also noted that NDCEE has an FY08 tasker to do something similar, so we need to ensure we don't duplicate efforts and waste resources. She will set up a planning committee to provide oversight. While details have not been set, she expects that each installation having an ISP will have the opportunity to brief their plan, progress to date, impediments, etc. They will also have breakout sessions to focus on impediments and workarounds in more detail. Attendees will include policy developers so they can learn more about the key sustainability issues installations face, and help find the resources needed to implement the ISPs.

Army Sustainability Award Update

Wanda distributed the latest draft of the sustainability award concept strawman (Enclosure 6) and indicated that we are very close to having a final draft. As mentioned at the last meeting, we will not include this with the environmental awards; rather it will become a separate and distinct award outside the environmental stovepipe. She plans to issue a formal call letter by mid-Nov. This latest draft includes fleshed out criteria definitions and a scoring matrix for use in evaluating nominations and selecting the winners. One additional refinement to the scoring matrix will be to expand the Practicality, Cost-Effectiveness, and Quantifiable Results criteria to facilitate evaluating the degree to which the nomination addresses key elements of EO 13423.

The award will not include a monetary payment because the money is not available. In view of this, John Fittipaldi asked if it might be possible to have a medallion struck. Anne Johnson felt that the opening paragraph of the strawman should talk to more than just air, water, and land resources and should focus more on the total Army. Karen Baker said that tying the award to EO 13423 makes it more compliance based; instead, perhaps it should be tied more to the 6 goals of the Army Strategy for the Environment. She also suggested that we substitute "public involvement" for "outreach." Bill Goran (ERDC) suggested that the term "installation/activity" be changed to read "activity/installation." Curt Wexel was somewhat confused by the fact that the purpose statement focuses on installations, but the criteria focus on projects. We need to be clear as to what we mean. Tim Julius (DAIM-ISE) pointed out that the annual environmental awards are due 1 Nov 07 and that installations may be too tied up with preparing those nominations to properly focus on this new one. Wanda recognized that it is not perfect, but we will refine the award criteria and process as we go. Wanda will circulate the draft to ASC members again for final review and comment; comments need to be returned to her by 2 Nov 07.

DoD EO 13423 Working Group Matrix

Wanda indicated that the DoD Working Group has developed a matrix of data that will be asked for to respond to EO reporting requirements (Enclosure 7). Mr. Davis is Mr. Eastin's representative on the WG, and he comes to COL Bennett for help when needed. The matrix highlights the data required, existing DoD reporting metrics, gaps, what we are already collecting, etc. She will send the matrix to everyone electronically and asked that everyone review it to see what we all need to be doing now. If anyone has any ideas for how to fill in the gaps, please let her know. John Fittipaldi asked if there is a data dictionary that tells us where the data resides, who owns or maintains it, etc. Curt Wexel indicated it would be helpful to know who the point of contact is for each primary data source, and what other working group, if any, may already exist that is working to address the issue. The bottom line is that as data calls begin to come in, we will need to get the ASC more involved to help address them.

Wrap-up & Next Meeting

John Fittipaldi suggested that to improve future participation on the ASC, we may want to consider rotating meeting hosts (not Co-chairs) and physical locations. COL Bennett said we might also have each member present a brief roundtable report on what they have accomplished since the last meeting.

In closing, Wanda thanked everyone for their attendance and participation. She also encouraged ASC members to suggest agenda items for future meetings and to volunteer to be presenters as well. MAJ Eddington (G-4) will speak on the Army Energy Program at the next meeting. ASC members who want to disseminate information before the next meeting should forward it to Wanda or COL Bennett and they will see that it gets out to everyone. Anne Johnson noted that she is working on a sustainability blog to solicit and collect comments about Army sustainability from interested stakeholders.

The next meeting will be held on 31 Jan 08 at a TBD location. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1500.

Enclosures:

- 1 – Agenda
- 2 – Attendees
- 3 – Sustainability Workshop Calendar
- 4 – Installation Sustainability Plans Map
- 5 – Draft Revised ASC Charter
- 6 – Army Sustainability Award Strawman
- 7 – DoD EO 13423 Working Group Matrix

Army Sustainability Committee (ASC) Meeting Agenda
ODEP Conference Room PT 9300 (9th Floor)
Presidential Towers, Crystal City, VA

Thursday, 25 Oct 07
1300-1500 hrs

Call in # 410-436-1000 (Conference Code 0981)

1300 – 1305	Welcome/Opening Remarks	COL Bennett (ODEP)
1305 – 1310	Review Jun 07 Meeting Minutes	COL Bennett / All
1310 – 1450	Draft <i>Strategic Plan for Army Sustainability</i> update	TBD
	Sustainability Workshops update	W Johnsen (ODEP) & B Shakeshaft (AEC)
	Finalize ASC Charter revisions	COL Bennett / All
	Sustainability award update	W Johnsen
	AEPI update (Sustainability Report, conference, etc.)	J Fittipaldi & T McCall (AEPI)
	DoD EO 13423 Workgroup	COL Bennett
	Proposed ASC support to Army EO 13423 Implementation	COL Bennett & W Johnsen
	Other	COL Bennett / All
1450 – 1500	Wrap-up, assign action items, & confirm next meeting	COL Bennett

Next ASC Meeting Thurs. 31 Jan 08

(switching to a quarterly meeting)

Tentative topics:
Army Energy Program Update – MAJ Edington, G4

ASC Meeting Attendees (25 Oct 07)

	Name	Organization	Phone	Email address
	Abdoo, VJ	IMCOM-Plans	703-602-1866	Vern.abdoo@hqda.army.mil
X	Baker, Karen	HQ, USACE		
	Bandy, Philip B. MAJ	OTJAG-ELD	703-696-1569	Philip.Bandy@hqda.army.mil
X	Bennett, Michael COL	DAIM-ISE	703-601-1933	Michael.Bennett@hqda.army.mil
	Breitenfeldt, Rick	NGB	703-607-2575	Rick.Breitenfeldt@ngb.army.mil
X	Brewer, Greg	ACSIM-MD	703-601-2541	gregory.brewer@hqda.army.mil
	Columbus, Philip R.	ACSIM-FDF-F	703-604-2470	Philip.r.columbus@us.army.mil
	Cushman, George	DAIM-ISE	703-601-1961	Georgec@hqda.army.mil
	Delaney, Thomas	CTC/NDCEE	703-310-5676	delaneyt@ctc.com
X	Dzuray, Emil	LMI	703-917-7013	edzuray@lmi.org
	Eady, David	CTC/NDCEE	678-570-9030	eadyd@ctc.com
	Dilks, Kelly	DAIM-FDF	703-601-0511	Kelly.dilks@hqda.army.mil
	Edington, MAJ Royce	G-4 (DALO-SUT-SE)	703-614-0799	Royce.edington@hqda.army.mil
	Ellor, Jim	ASA(ALT) SAAL-PE	703-806-9237	James.a.ellor@us.army.mil
	Evans, George	SAAL-PE	703-604-7029	George.evans@saalt.army.mil
	Evenstad, Kristin	G-3 (DAMO-TRS)	703-692-6427	Kristin.evenstad@hqda.army.mil
X	Fittipaldi, John	AEPI	703-604-2307	John.Fittipaldi@hqda.army.mil
	Foltz, Stuart	ERDC-CERL		
	Funderburg, Terry	HQ, AMC	703-806-8723	Terry.l.funderburg@us.army.mil
	Gaines, Sally	JMC	309-782-0032	gainess@osc.army.mil
X	Giardina, Antonia	ASA(I&E)	703-692-9897	Antonia.giardina@us.army.mil
	Giffin, Dave	USAEC	410-436-2527	Dave.giffin@us.army.mil
X	Goran, Bill	ERDC-CERL		
	Grote, John H., Jr.	AEPI-USAWC Fellow	703-602-2343	John.grote@hqda.army.mil
	Hadlock, MAJ Gregg	NGB-ARNG	703-607-4504	Gregg.hadlock@us.army.mil
	Hall, Chaela	USAEC	410-436-7071	Chaela.Hall@us.army.mil
	Hallmark, COL Mary	AEPI	703-602-0183	Mary.hallmark@hqda.army.mil

Enclosure 2

	Name	Organization	Phone	Email address
	Hanson, Michelle	ERDC-CERL		Michelle.j.hanson@erdc.usace.army.mil
	Hassell, Leonard	OASA(I&E)	703-697-8162	Leonard.Hassell@hqda.army.mil
	Higgins, Tammy	HQ, AMC	703-806-8722	higginst@hqamc.army.mil
	Hill, COL Tim	AEPI Fellow	703-604-2343	Timothy.hill@hqda.army.mil
	Jennings, Sara	ARNG	703-607-7961	Sara.jennings@ng.army.mil
	Jessup, Philip	HQ, IMCOM	703-602-3337	Philip.jessup@hqda.army.mil
X	Johnsen, Wanda	DAIM-ISE	703-601-1512	Wanda.Johnsen@hqda.army.mil
X	Johnson, Anne	ODASA(ESOH)/LMI		
	Juhasz, Don	ACSIM-FDF-U	703-601-0374	Don.juhasz@hqda.army.mil
X	Julius, Tim	DAIM-ISE		
	Keenan, COL John	DAIM-ISE	703-601-1990	John.Keenan@hqda.army.mil
	Kuntz, Gordon D.	AEPI-USAWC Fellow	703-602-0183	Gordon.kuntz@hqda.army.mil
	Leonard, Jennifer	DAIM-ISE	703-601-1587	Jennifer.leonard@hqda.army.mil
	Lichtenstein, Mark	G-3/BAH	443-465-0764	Lichtenstein_mark@bah.com
X	Lyon, David	G-4	703-614-3762	David.Lyon@hqda.army.mil
	Luther, Robert	ODASA(ESOH)	703-697-4032	Robert.luther@hqda.army.mil
X	McCall, Tad	AEPI	703-604-2321	Tad.McCall@hqda.army.mil
X	Moffett, Peg	PAO, NGB-ARNG		
	Murphy, Richard	SAIE(ESOH)	703-697-5433	Richard.o.Murphy@hqda.army.mil
	Patton-Williams, Toni	SAIE(ESOH)	703-697-3937	willitp@hqda.army.mil
	Polchek, COL Allison	USALSA	703-696-1231	Allison.Polchek@hqda.army.mil
	Porter, Nancy M.	USACE	703-761-5092	Nancy.m.porter@usace.army.mil
	Purcell, David	ACSIM	703-601-0371	David.purcell@hqda.army.mil
	Rewerts, Chris	ERDC-CERL		
	Rice, Linda	IMCOM-Plans	703-602-3337	linda.rice@hqda.army.mil
	Robertson, Beverley	IMCOM-Plans	703-602-2491	beverley.robertson@hqda.army.mil
	Scharl, John	ACSIM-FDF	703-601-0700	John.scharl@hqda.army.mil
	Scharf, Steve	SAAL-ZT	703-601-1138	Steve.Scharf@us.army.mil
	Schroeder, J. Bob	DAIM-ISE	703-601-1586	Joe.Schroeder@hqda.army.mil
	Sciascia, Richard	IMCOM - Operations	703-602-4366	Richard.sciascia@hqda.army.mil

Enclosure 3



Sustainability Planning Calendar

Updated: 28 Aug 07

July 07 10-11 Jul – PANG Workshop B	Aug 07 21-23 Aug – USAG Wiesbaden Wksp C	Sept 07 11-13 Sept – PANG Workshop C
Oct 07 2-4 Oct – Letterkenny Workshop A/B 11 Oct – Ft Detrick Pre-Planning Mtg 22-26 Oct USAG Wiesbaden Wksp D 29 Oct - 2 Nov – PANG Wksp D	Nov 07 12-16 Nov – PANG Workshop D (con't)	Dec 07 2-4 Dec – Aniston Workshop C
Jan 08 Tentative – Aniston Workshop D 22-24 Jan – Letterkenny Workshop C	Feb 08	Mar 08
April 08 7-9 Apr – Letterkenny Workshop D	May 08	June 08
July 08	Aug 08	Sept 08
Oct 08	Nov 08	Dec 08

Workshop A/B = Awareness & Baseline
 Workshop C = Goal Setting
 Workshop D = Develop Targets & Objectives

W. Johnsen, DAIM-EDS / wanda.johnsen@hqda.army.mil/703-601-1512

200800RAUG07

CHARTER FOR THE ARMY SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

1. **Name of Committee.** The Army Sustainability Committee.

2. **Date Established.** 31 January 2005.

3. **Date to be Terminated.** The Committee is re-chartered through 13 November 2009, and the Charter is revised and reissued herewith. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health) [DASA(ESOH)] and the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM) will review the Charter at that time to determine if the Charter will be continued, canceled, or revised and reissued, as appropriate.

Deleted: 31 January

Deleted: 7

4. **Category and Type of Committee.** Intra-Army

5. **Purpose.** The Army Sustainability Committee (hereinafter Committee) is a senior-level advisory body of limited duration, chartered to provide strategic advice in integrating and implementing sustainable practices (including sustainable design and development into) all appropriate Army policies, procedures, and publications, thereby instilling the sustainability ethic across all Army functional areas. The Committee will accomplish the stated purpose by providing policy advice to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations & Environment) [OASA(I&E)] and implementation advice to the ACSIM and other appropriate organizations across the Army.

Deleted: the concept of

Deleted: ility and/or

Deleted: it

The Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA) will use recommendations and products of the Committee to monitor progress, provide guidance, conduct analyses, and brief sustainability principles to HQDA staff and senior leaders, ACOMs, ARNG, IMCOM, JMCOM Regions, Field Operating Agencies, Garrisons, and other appropriate Army or DoD officials or organizations. The Committee will also advise on the potential value of and options for integrating sustainability principles within all Army organizations and the effective use of resources to achieve that end.

Deleted: M

Deleted: A

Deleted: IMA

Deleted: installations

6. **Direction and Control.** The Committee reports to the ASA(I&E) and the ACSIM.

Deleted:

7. **Authority.** Established at the ACSIM's direction on 31 January 2005, under authority of DA General Order No. 3, Assignment of Functions and Responsibilities within Headquarters, Department of the Army, 9 July 2002, and AR 15-1, Committee Management. DA General Order No. 3 charges the ACSIM with directing execution of Army programs and management concepts to ensure installation readiness to train, project, sustain, recover, reconstitute, and protect forces and to provide high standards of environmental quality, public outreach, and quality of life for soldiers and their families. AR 15-1 provides Army policy on the establishment and management of intra-Army committees. Under these authorities, the ASA(I&E) and the ACSIM charters the Committee to address sustainability issues of special interest to the Army.

Deleted: of the ACSIM

8. **Scope.** As the formal advisory body to the Army on sustainability and related issues, objectives of the Committee include but are not limited to:

- a. Seeking and developing partnerships across all Army functional areas to attain Army sustainability

- b. Obtaining understanding and support from all Army functional areas regarding Army sustainability.
- c. Developing an Army Sustainability Policy memorandum signed by the SECARMY and/or CSA.
- d. Developing various outreach programs to educate the Army community, stakeholders, and the public about Army sustainability.
- e. Integrating installation master planning and sustainable installation concepts into Army Regulations, and EMS guidance documents, and incorporating procedures into Army core business practices.
- f. Integrating the Army Strategic Plan for Sustainability initiatives that support overall Army sustainability and monitoring the metrics defined in the Plan.
- g. Identifying internal Army measures to achieve the goals set forth in Executive Order 13423, Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management, 24 Jan 2007.
- h. Developing Army initiatives that will support Army sustainability.
- i. Identifying all stakeholders and ensuring a collaborative approach to Army sustainability efforts.
- j. Developing performance measures and indicators for Army sustainability.

Deleted: ,

Deleted: installation

Deleted: installation

9. Administrative Support and Staff Arrangements. The DASA(ESOH) within the OASA(I&E) is assigned to provide policy oversight. The ACSIM will serve as the Army Staff proponent for the Committee. On behalf of the ACSIM, the Chief of the Installation Services Directorate – Environment Division will be the Executive Secretary, and as such is responsible for:

Deleted: Director of

Deleted: al Programs

- a. Ensuring meetings are properly conducted, members are informed as to changes in the membership, and the membership is informed of all actions undertaken by the Committee.
- b. Briefing the Co-Chairs prior to each meeting regarding the agenda and topics.
- c. Providing all clerical and administrative support for the Committee.
- d. Ensuring agendas and topic documentation are prepared and distributed well in advance of scheduled meetings.
- e. Ensuring appropriate reports, Committee meeting minutes, and other documents and records of Committee activities, are prepared and distributed to all members and the ACSIM, as soon as practicable.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: are prepared, as well as

Deleted: .
 ¶ Ensuring minutes of meetings

Deleted: Division

Deleted: Office of the Director of Environmental Programs, OACSIM

Deleted: Committee

Deleted: able

Deleted: s

10. Composition. The Assistant for Sustainability in the ODASA(ESOH) and the Chief, Sustainability Branch, ACSIM Installation Services Directorate – Environment Division will serve as the Committee Co-Chairs. Each member organization will designate a primary representative and alternate representative. These member organization representatives must be at an appropriate rank to speak for the organization, they represent, with the recognition that all significant policy

recommendations and program decisions will be fully staffed via standard HQDA staffing procedures. Permanent member organizations will be:

- Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations & Environment)
- Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics, & Technology)
- OACSIM Installation Services Directorate – Environment Division
- OACSIM Installation Services Directorate – Housing Division
- OACSIM Operations Directorate
- Office of the Chief of Engineers
- Office of the Director, ARNG
- Office of the Director, USAR
- Installation Management Command
- U.S. Army Materiel Command
- U.S. Army Medical Command
- Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G1
- Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G3/5/7
- Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G4
- Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G6
- Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G8
- Office of the Chief of Public Affairs
- Office of the Judge Advocate General, Environmental Law Division
- U.S. Army Environmental Command
- U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine
- U.S. Army Environmental Policy Institute
- Directorate of Environmental Integration, Army Engineer School

Deleted: s

Deleted:

Deleted: Office of the Director of Environmental Programs,

Deleted: Office of the Director of Facilities and Housing,

Deleted: Office of the Director of Plans and Operations,

Deleted: Agency

Deleted: Center

Deleted: <#>U.S. Army Materiel Command¶

Upon recommendation of the Committee and approval of the chartering official, members may be added or removed as necessary. At the invitation of the Co-Chairs, subject matter experts or representatives from other Army Staff agencies, Army Commands, Army Installations, Department of Defense Components, and other government agencies may participate in Committee activities involving matters in which that organization has a significant interest, or if their presence is required because of the specific issues being addressed.

Deleted: Major

11. Committee Level and Other Data.

- a. The Committee Co-Chairs shall direct and supervise the operations of the Committee and shall schedule and preside at Committee meetings and at other meetings held subject to special call.
- b. The Committee will meet quarterly, with additional meetings convened by the Co-Chairs as appropriate. Meetings will normally be held on the last Thursday of the first month of each quarter (October, January, April, and July).
- c. The Committee Co-Chairs, with support from the Executive Secretary, will provide an agenda and appropriate materials in advance of each meeting. The agenda for each meeting will generally include the following topics as appropriate:
 - (1) Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Meeting Agenda
 - (2) Review and Discussion/Correction of Previous Meeting Minutes
 - (3) Subcommittee/Working Group Reports

Deleted: six times per year

Deleted: even numbered months

- (4) ~~Sustainability Updates and Presentations~~
- (5) ~~Wrap-up, Assign Tasks/Schedule, Set Next Meeting Date~~

Deleted: <#>Old Business Updates¶
 <#>New Business Presentations¶
 Functional Proponent

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- d. The Committee Co-Chairs will also provide official documentation of actions taken by the Committee through the use of meeting minutes, coordination processes, distribution of signed documents, and electronic media.
- e. After ensuring that all matters have been comprehensively addressed, the Committee Co-Chairs shall forward recommendations as appropriate to the ACSIM for decision.
- f. All members will support a consensus-based approach to achieving the objectives of the Committee. If consensus cannot be achieved, the majority position will be forwarded to the ACSIM with the minority positions identified.
- g. The Committee Co-Chairs may establish subcommittees and working groups to carry out Committee-assigned projects and actions as appropriate to effectively discharge the Committee's mission. Each subcommittee or working group will have a "sunset clause" in its charter, which will be reviewed periodically by the Committee Co-Chairs. When such subcommittees or working groups are necessary, the Chief of the Installation Services Directorate – Environment Division will prepare requests to form the groups with support from the Army Staff.
- h. The Committee has no special powers to impact the Army's way of conducting routine business. The Committee shall operate in accordance with the provisions of all applicable Army and Department of Defense Directives.

Deleted: panels

Deleted: panel

Deleted: panels

Deleted: Director of

Deleted:

Deleted: al Programs

12. Correspondence. Correspondence may be directed to the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, Installation Services Directorate – Environment Division, 600 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-0600, telephone (703) 601-2421.

Deleted: Director of

Deleted: al Programs

APPROVED: Keith Eastin
 Assistant Secretary of the Army
 Installations & Environment

Deleted: Geoffrey G. Prosch

Deleted: Acting

APPROVED: Robert Wilson
 Lieutenant General, GS
 Assistant Chief of Staff
 for Installation Management

Deleted: Geoffrey D. Miller

Deleted: Major

Deleted: ¶
 ¶

ARMY SUSTAINABILITY AWARD

“Sustain the Mission – Secure the Future”

1. REFERENCES.

a. Executive Order 13423; Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management; Sec 1; January 26, 2007.

b. Army Strategy for the Environment, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment, October 1, 2004.

2. BACKGROUND. The Army is working aggressively to ensure our Soldiers have the resources they need to accomplish their mission. These resources include land, water, and airspace to train and test systems, a healthy environment, and continued community support. The Army’s effort to institutionalize these sustainability concepts is enabling the Army to meet its current and future needs while improving our ability to organize, equip, train, and deploy Soldiers. This long-range vision will enable us to meet the Army mission today and into the future.

3. PURPOSE. This Army Sustainability Award recognizes Army installations/activities and individuals who have developed tangible, cost-effective practices leading to a sustainable Army. As recognized in the Army Strategy for the Environment, “a sustainable Army simultaneously meets current as well as future mission requirements world-wide, safeguards human health, improves quality of life, and enhances the natural environment.”

4. AWARD GUIDANCE.

a. Award Categories. The Sustainability Award will be presented in two categories: installation/activity and individual.

b. Eligibility. All Army installations/activities and individuals are eligible to compete, including Army civil works facilities.

c. Call for Nominations. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment [ASA(I&E)] will send out a call for nominations no later than 31 November each year for the previous fiscal year. The call for nominations will be sent through the chain of command to all activities and installations.

d. Submission. The nomination process includes completion of a nomination packet and third-party onsite verification of the initiatives/successes submitted in the nomination packet. Instructions for submitting nominations are included in Appendix A.

e. Judging. Evaluation criteria include: Leadership; Partnership; Innovation; Practicality, Cost-Effectiveness, and Quantifiable Results; and Army-wide Applicability. Descriptions of these criteria are provided in paragraph 7. A panel of government experts in their field will evaluate nomination packet submissions against these criteria.

Point values will be assigned to each criterion and will be used to score each nomination packet. Each judge will score each nomination packet, and then the entire judging panel will convene to discuss the nominations and select the winners.

f. Award Notification and Presentation. Official notification of winners will be made by the ASA(I&E). Winners will be presented with a plaque and certificate during a ceremony hosted by the ASA(I&E).

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

This award is intended to recognize practical, but significant and timely, implementation of the principles of sustainability. Sustaining the Army's mission is a much more global concept than just good maintenance or continuation of current activities. Nominees must address each of the following criteria in their nominations packet, but nominees are encouraged to provide additional justification for their project as appropriate.

a. Leadership. The Leadership category describes how your organization's senior leaders have embodied and institutionalized the Army's sustainability values as articulated in the *Army Strategy for the Environment* and led the implementation of the nominated project/initiative. Describe the organization's commitment to sustainability and its embodiment through policy, assigned organizational responsibility, management reviews of progress, and public involvement and communication efforts. Expand on the purpose of the project/initiative; how the organizational leadership was involved with implementation of project/initiative; unique aspects of management and execution support as they relate to the project/initiative; and explain techniques/methods used by leaders to overcome any organizational/process/structural/regulatory obstacles.

b. Partnership. The Partnership category describes how the project/initiative leveraged partnerships to achieve desired outcome(s). Describe partnerships with government agencies, private sector, academia, and international organizations and their influence on the successes; identify how the partnerships improved community relations, created advocates for initiative, lowered costs, removed regulatory/legal barriers, or provided volunteers, and other positive values and/or contributions of partnerships to the project/initiative.

c. Innovation. The Innovation category describes how the project/initiative implemented innovative and new concepts and tools to achieve the desired outcome(s). Describe how the project/initiative involved new methods, concepts, or tools. Explain what was new or innovative, how it diverged from past practice, and what (if anything) makes it different from other initiatives.

d. Practicality, Cost-Effectiveness, and Quantifiable Results. This category describes how the project/initiative resulted in practical, cost-effective, and quantifiable results in achieving sustainable Army operations. Provide a narrative describing the impact/significance of the project/initiative to the activity/installation and how it supports the long-term viability of the mission while reducing the Army's total ownership costs. Success of the project/initiative should be presented in terms of the Triple Bottom Line

(i.e., mission, community, and environment) as well as how it addresses the Executive Order 13423 goals (e.g., energy conservation, alternative fuels, alternative vehicles, green procurement, LEED-standard buildings). Nomination packets should also include documentation demonstrating the project/initiative's quantifiable results and return on investment (ROI), for example: labor-hours, energy usage (incl. type), cost avoidance (i.e., military labor and/or use of an installation landfill), equipment costs (incl. purchase/rental), and other associated costs/factors.

e. Army-Wide Applicability. This category describes the potential Army-wide applicability of the sustainability project/initiative. Describe how this project/initiative could this be deployed to other Army activities or installations.

APPENDIX A

NOMINATION INSTRUCTIONS

The Sustainability Award will be presented to the activity/installation and individual that has done the most to improve the posture of their activity/installation and the Army with regard to becoming “sustainable.”

1. Eligibility Standards. [See paragraph 6a]
2. Selection Criteria. The Sustainability Award will be presented to the activity/installation and individual that most successfully meets the spirit of the “Selection Criteria” identified in paragraph 7.
3. Format for Nomination Packet. All entries must be submitted electronically to:

Installation Services Directorate – Environment Division (ATTN: Sustainability Award)
Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management
NC1/Presidential Tower, Room 9400
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202

- a. The nomination packet must contain no more than seven typewritten pages, ten photos, and a one-page site plan. Seven typed pages must be written using single-spaced Arial font (minimum font size: Arial 11).
- b. Up to ten photographs may be submitted as part of the nomination packet. Photographs should be used to put accomplishments in perspective with the overall scope of work. Each photograph should be 8” x 10” in size. Electronic files for photographs should be at least 300 dpi resolution.
- c. A single-page site plan on 8-1/2 x 11 inch paper may be submitted to describe the scope of work performed.

APPENDIX B. Evaluation Criteria Scoring Matrix

Award Criteria and Definition	Score Guidelines					
	0 Pts	1 Pt	2 Pts	3 Pts	4 Pts	5 Pts
<p>Leadership: The Leadership category examines how your organization's senior leaders have embodied and institutionalized the Army's sustainability values as articulated in the <i>Army Strategy For The Environment</i> and led the implementation of the nominated project/initiative. Describe the organization's commitment to sustainability and its embodiment through policy, assigned organizational responsibility, management reviews of progress, and outreach and communication efforts. Expand on the purpose of the project/initiative; how the organizational leadership was involved with implementation of project/initiative; unique aspects of management and execution support as they relate to the project/initiative; and explain techniques/methods used by leaders to overcome any organizational/process/structural/regulatory obstacles.</p>	No evidence of leadership involvement articulated in nomination package.	Limited evidence of leadership involvement is articulated in the nomination package.	Evidence of leadership involvement; and evidence of commitment to values demonstrated but not yet institutionalized policy, assigned organizational responsibility, conducted performance reviews, or outreach and communication effort.	Evidence of leaders' commitment to sustainability values with initial institutionalization through established, policy, assigned organizational responsibility, conducted performance reviews, or an outreach and communication effort.	Evidence of leaders' commitment to sustainability values with many aspects institutionalized through established, policy, assigned organizational responsibility, conducted performance reviews, or outreach and communication effort.	Evidence of leaders' commitment to sustainability values and institutionalization through established, policy, assigned organizational responsibility, conducted performance reviews, and outreach and communication effort.
<p>Partnership: The Partnership category examines how the project/initiative leveraged partnerships to achieve desired outcomes. Describe partnerships with government agencies, private sector, academia and international organizations and their influence on the successes; identify how the partnerships improved community relations, created advocates for initiative, lowered costs, removed regulatory/legal barriers, or provided volunteers, and other positive values of partnerships to the project/initiative.</p>	No evidence of partnerships articulated in nomination package.	Limited evidence of how partnerships were used to achieve desired outcomes.	Evidence of informal partnerships, but not clear linkage to enabling desired outcomes.	Evidence of informal partnerships with clear linkage to enabling desired outcomes or beginning formal partnerships with no clear linkage to desired outcomes.	Evidence of formal partnerships with early stages of involvement enabling desired outcomes.	Evidence of formal partnerships with demonstrated involvement enabling of desired outcomes.
<p>Innovation: The Innovation category examines how the project/initiative implemented innovative and new concepts and tools to achieve desired outcomes. Describe in what ways the sustainability initiative involved new methods, concepts or tools. Explain what was new or innovative, how it diverged from past practice and what if anything makes it different from initiatives elsewhere.</p>	No mention of innovation or uniqueness articulated in nomination package.	Limited evidence presented as to the innovative, unique or original aspects of the sustainability project/initiative.	Evidence presented as to the innovative, unique, or original aspects of the sustainability project/initiative. Judges rate project in bottom 50% of innovative nominations.	Evidence presented as to the innovative, unique, or original aspects of the sustainability project/initiative. Judges rate project in top 50% of innovative nominations.	Evidence presented as to the innovative, unique, or original aspects of the sustainability project/initiative. Judges rate project in top 25% of innovative nominations.	Evidence presented as to the innovative, unique, or original aspects of the sustainability project/initiative. Judges rate project most innovative of all nominations.
<p>Practicality, Cost-Effectiveness, and Quantifiable Results: This category examines how the project/initiative resulted in practical, cost-effective and quantifiable results in achieving sustainable Army operations. Provide a narrative describing the impact/significance of the project/initiative to the activity/installation and how it supports the long-term viability of the mission while reducing the Army's total ownership costs. Success of the project/initiative should be presented in terms of the Triple Bottom Line (i.e., mission, community, and environment) as well as how it addresses the Executive Order 13423 goals (e.g., energy conservation, alternative fuels, alternative vehicles, green procurement, LEED-standard buildings). Nomination packets should also include documentation demonstrating the project/initiative's quantifiable results and return on investment (ROI), for example: labor-hours, energy usage (incl. type), cost avoidance (i.e. military labor and/or use of an installation landfill), equipment costs (incl. purchase/ rental) and other associated costs/factors.</p>	No results or outcomes (quantifiable or otherwise) articulated in the nomination package.	Limited evidence as practical, cost-effective, and quantifiable results of the sustainability project/initiative. Results not linked to EO13423 goals or Army objectives. Comparative or trend information not reported.	Evidence provided that shows practical, cost-effective, and quantifiable results of the sustainability project/initiative across few of the EO13423 goals or other Army objectives. Little or no comparative or trend information is reported.	Evidence provided that shows practical, cost-effective, and quantifiable results of the sustainability project/initiative in many EO13423 goals or Army objectives. Some comparative or trend information presented against targets.	Evidence provided that shows practical, cost-effective, and quantifiable results of the sustainability project/initiative in many EO13423 goals or Army objectives. Some comparative or trend information presented against targets. Data shows progress toward goals.	Evidence provided that shows practical, cost-effective, and quantifiable results of the sustainability project/initiative in many EO13423 goals or Army objectives. Some comparative or trend information presented against targets. Data shows goal achievement or benchmark leadership.
<p>Army-Wide Applicability: This category examines the Army-wide applicability of the sustainability project/initiative. Describe how this project/initiative could this be deployed to other Army activities or installations.</p>	No mention of Army-wide applicability mentioned in nomination package.	Limited evidence of applicability to few other Army sites mentioned in nomination package.	Evidence of applicability to limited number of other (less than 50%) Army sites clearly articulated in nomination package.	Evidence of applicability to many (> 50%) Army sites clearly articulated in nomination package.	Evidence of applicability to most (>90%) Army sites clearly articulated in nomination package.	Evidence of applicability to most (>90%) Army sites and other DoD, Government Agencies, or Corporations, clearly articulated in nomination package.

DRAFT

B-2
DRAFT