



MATERIALS

Fort Carson 25-Year Goals for Materials

Attendees of the Fort Carson Installation Sustainability Workshop, which convened on 4-6 September 02, developed the following long-range goals:

Zero waste disposal.

100% of Fort Carson and DoD procurement actions support sustainability.

All stakeholders are trained, compliant, and motivated towards sustainability principles.

The primary issues and initial goals discussed in the Materials 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: Ms. Kim Gotwals

Recorder: Mr. Adam Lynch

Rank	Name	Organization
Mr.	Steve Blanchard	Clean Air Campaign
Mr.	Ed Engbert	AEC
Ms.	Libby Ervin	DOC
Mr.	Harry Flanagan	ITT/DOL (Team Leader)
Mr.	Jerry Funderburg	DECAM
Mr.	Bob Gravelle	DOL HWCC
Mr.	Wylie Harper	USAHPDM-West
Mr.	Eric Haukdal	ACSIM-ODEP
Mr.	Larry Holland	DOL
Ms.	Laura Kemp	USACE-NWD
Ms.	Burla Martin	DECAM
Mr.	Kirk Mills	CDPHE
Mr.	Harold Noonan	DECAM
Mr.	Nick Pallotto	DECAM
Mr.	John Plomer	ACSIM-ODEP
Ms.	Linda Reynolds	DOC
Mr.	Larry Rhodes	DRMO
Mr.	Marty Savoie	ERWC/CERL
Mr.	Duane W. Schaap	DOL



MATERIALS

Mr.	Ed Tebo	DECAM (Environmental POC)
Mr.	Bob Tomlinson	21CES/CEVQ
Mr.	Paul Wolfe	Colorado Springs Utilities

List of Issues and Potential Responses to Issues

Technology and Innovation

- Reduced disposal options for solid and hazardous waste (and increased costs)
- We use too much solvent-based paint
- Unknown technology requirements and capabilities
- Environment of concern is not defined
- Using too many hazardous materials
- Hazardous chemical/substance guidance is always changing

Waste Management/Disposal

- No incentive to reuse or recycle products
- No composting program
- We have too many disposable containers
- Need better coordination between local organizations to encourage recycling and reuse
- Unused materials become hazardous waste
- Poor reuse of C+D waste
- No local control over reuse/recycle decisions
- We generate too much waste
- Limited recycling options in region (no cooperation)
- Wastewater sludge is sent off-site (not processed and reused)
- Need to improve recycling and reuse

Fiscal

- Immediate resource constraints limit long-term investments
- Annual fiscal year cycle does not promote sustainable purchasing practices
- Life-cycle material tracking is inadequate
- Life-cycle analysis does not take into account total environmental/social costs
- Product life-cycle costs and risks are not shared from user to producer
- Inadequate facilities and resources

Product Validation

- Inflexible maintenance specs; alternative processes slow to be approved
- We do not exert enough influence on what suppliers provide
- Some mission-critical substances have short shelf-lives
- Perception that alternative products perform poorly
- Government agencies not coordinating on sustainability issues



MATERIALS

- Difficult to maintain adequate training levels with high personnel turnover
- Unwillingness to accept risk stifles innovation
- Unit commanders have no incentives to promote sustainability/environmental issues (OER criteria)

Procurement

- Increase in “off-the-shelf” purchases
- No control or education about APPs/EPPs
- Purchasing does not take into account if a product is recyclable
- Procurement process not consistent with regards to suppliers standards (environmental, quality)
- Procurement is not based on life-cycle analysis
- Government procurement process is often dependent on politics
- Local purchase controls
- Government Purchase Cards (GPCs)
- Poor procurement policy (too slow to change; inefficient)
- Decentralization of purchasing (no oversight)
- Unable to purchase most current IT hardware and software (not enough info)
- Lack of procurement flexibility (must buy what’s available or affordable, not what we need)
- No enforcement of credit card rules
- Poor enforcement of procurement policies and rules
- Not enough direction with regards to alternative procurement or EPPs
- “End-of-year-money” leads to poor purchasing decisions
- Transportation impacts are not taken into account in purchasing

Initial Goals and Proponents Developed

Initial Strategic Goal 1

- **Issue:** We expend too many resources on compliance, often to the detriment of training and readiness; we need to improve our environment, health and safety, and quality of life.
- **Desired End State:** Fort Carson does not use materials subject to environmental, health, or safety regulations.
- **Metric:** Number of items that are regulated
- **Timeframe:** 2027
- **Proponent Organization:** DPW – Environmental; Procurement Office

Initial Strategic Goal 2

- **Issue:** All materials are not effectively used, reused, or recycled in accordance with sustainability principles; a procurement process that does not promote efficient use, reuse, and recycling of all process residuals and debris; lack of partnerships with customers and communities



MATERIALS

- **Desired End State:** Zero waste disposal
- **Metric:** Total weight/volume of waste; volume of treated effluent released
- **Timeframe:** Land filled waste reduced 50% by 2010; 100% by 2027. Wastewater effluent reduced 50% by 2010, 100% by 2027.
- **Proponent Organization:** DECAM, DPW

Initial Strategic Goal 3

- **Issue:** Current Fort Carson purchases, buy-backs, or leases do not support sustainability.
- **Desired End State:** Use a comprehensive life-cycles resource management system to ensure 100% of Fort Carson procurement actions support sustainability.
- **Metric and Timeframe:** 5 years- 100% of purchases include recycled content, resource management system in place; 10 years- Procurement policies support sustainability concepts; 15 years- 100% of purchased equipment uses renewable energy; 20 years- 100% of purchases will not degrade the environment after purchase; 25 years- zero waste from procurement activities.
- **Proponent Organization:** Army Contracting Agency- DOC

Initial Strategic Goal 4

- **Issue:** We release air pollutants that degrade our environment and affect our health and safety.
- **Desired End State:** Zero air emissions of EPA Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs)
- **Metric:** Pounds of HAPs released
- **Timeframe:** Reduce HAPs by 50% by 2010; reduce HAPs by 100% by 2027
- **Proponent Organization:** DECAM, DoD

Initial Strategic Goal 5

- **Issue:** The products we currently use do not meet sustainability objectives and mission requirements; stakeholders are not committed, educated, and “incentivized.”
- **Desired End State:** All stakeholders are trained, compliant, and motivated towards sustainability principles.
- **Metric and Timeframe:** 50% education by 2007, 100% education by 2012, 100% incentives developed by 2007, 100% incentives implemented by 2017.
- **Proponent Organization:** Command Teams

Initial Strategic Goal 6

- **Issue:** DoD purchases are not consistent with standardized sustainability principles.
- **Desired End State:** All DoD purchases meet sustainability objectives
- **Metric and Timeframe:** 50% of DoD purchases meet standardized sustainability criteria by 2017, 100% by 2027, shelf life and product-tracking decision support system is 100% implemented by 2017.
- **Proponent Organization:** Weapons/ Support System Activities.



Final Goals and Team Members

Final Education and Awareness Goal

All stakeholders are trained, compliant, and motivated towards sustainability principles.

- **Issue:** Lack of awareness of sustainability principles and implications; lack of institutional, community, and individual responsibility and accountability; stakeholders are not committed or educated
- **Desired End State:** All stakeholders are trained, compliant, and motivated towards sustainability principles.
- **Metrics and Timeframe:**
 - 100% participation in education program for on-post personnel by 2005, off-post outreach/education by 2007
 - Establish a Sustainability Index by 2005 (a numerical measure of behavior change linked to other sustainability goals)
 - Incorporate Sustainability Principles into job descriptions by 2005
 - Establish incentives program to reward compliance with sustainability principles by 2005 (e.g. money saved is returned to units, time off)
- **Proponent Organization:** SPPO
- **Team Members:**
 - G3/DPTM
 - DOC
 - ACS
 - DECAM
 - DOL
 - AAFES
 - DCA
 - DOIM
 - PAO
 - Pike's Peak Area Council of Governments
 - CPAC



Final Life-Cycle Procurement Goal

100% of Fort Carson and DoD procurement actions support sustainability.

- **Issue:** DoD and Fort Carson purchases do not support sustainability; we expend too many resources on compliance, often to the detriment of the mission.
- **Desired End State:** 100% of DoD and Fort Carson procurement actions support sustainability.
- **Metric and Timeframe:**
 - Develop and use a comprehensive life-cycle resource management tool by 2005 (develop Sustainability Preferable Purchasing (SPP) criteria);
 - 100% of local purchases are SPPs by 2007;
 - 50% of DoD purchases are SPPs by 2017, 100% by 2027.
- **Proponent Organization:** DOC
- **Team Members:**
 - DOL
 - G4
 - DPTM
 - DPW
 - DECAM
 - DOIM
 - DoD Suppliers
 - ACA
 - DRMO



Final Waste Goal

Zero waste disposal.

- **Issue:** We generate too much waste; all materials are not effectively used, re-used, or recycled.
- **Desired End State:** Zero Waste Disposal
- **Metric and Timeframe:**
 - Total weight of solid and hazardous waste reduced 50% by 2010; 100% by 2027;
 - Total weight of HAP emissions reduced 50% by 2010, 100% by 2027
 - Total volume of wastewater and storm water treated reduced by 50% by 2010, 75% by 2020
- **Proponent Organization:** DPW
- **Team Members:**
 - DECAM
 - Colorado Springs Utilities
 - Regulatory Agencies
 - DOC
 - AAFES
 - MEDDAC
 - Garrison Command