

January 2005 P2 Conference Call
19 January 2005

1. Steve Woodbury encouraged people to share their experiences with integrating P2 into site EMS/ISMSs by participating in the EMS training program scheduled in March at Columbus. People should feel free to submit abstracts and call Steve if they have any questions.

Later in the conference call, Beverly Whitehead asked for site feedback on integrating P2 into the EMS/ISMS. Bruce Campbell, LLNL, indicated that the lab is working on presenting the business case for P2 and Lisa Burns, YMP, reported that a team is being formed to address the water and energy P2 implications for the site.

2. Jane Powers provided an update of EPA's program to reduce use of five priority chemicals: cadmium, lead, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury, and naphthalene. EPA suggests that Federal agencies achieve a 50% use reduction of these chemicals in certain processes (e.g., reducing lead in soldering).

In keeping with the spirit and role of EMSs, sites should identify the priority chemicals they will target for use reduction, rather than automatically use the EPA's priority chemicals. Jane sought information on

- Whether sites have identified priority chemicals for use reduction,
- How sites track their efforts to reduce use of their priority chemicals, and
- How sites report their use-reduction progress.

John Harley mentioned that about four years ago SRS did a mini-PPOA of the TRI chemical releases the site reported. The assessment included how the chemicals were used and possible alternatives to their use.

Suggestions were made that (1) sites should record their chemical use reduction activities in the Accomplishments portion of the P2 data call and (2) the instructions for the data call include a reminder to that effect.

3. Headquarters submitted a proposal to the EPA P2 grant program to conduct a PPOA at a site. A solicitation for a volunteer site will be issued if the proposal is accepted. Several sites indicated that they did not submit proposals because the cost and time associated with applying for a grant and the recordkeeping and reporting associated with receiving one outweighed the monetary value of the grant.

4. Don Lentzen reported that 50 P2 award nominations were submitted. The respective PSOs selected 31 of them as Best-In-Class for forwarding to the White House Closing-the-Circle Awards. The PSOs also selected 6 Star award winners. Award selections are tentative pending acceptance by EH-1.

5. Beverly Whitehead stated that EH-43 developed fact sheets assessing the applicability of 6 P2 activities undertaken at other Federal facilities to DOE operations. The fact

sheets describe, among other things, the EPP database developed by EPA and mercury recycling. The fact sheets will be posted on the P2 web site shortly.

6. Greg McBrien reported that the P2 IG final report was issued on 14 January and sent to EH-1, EM-1, and NNSA-66. Action items were included for those organizations and were basically the same as those listed in the draft report with the exception that a recommendation was made to consider creative funding mechanisms such as generator set-aside funds.

February 2005 P2 Conference Call
17 February 2005

1. DOE P2 Goals for 2006 and Beyond

Jane stated that a DOE Notice will be developed to announce the new P2 goals for 2006 and beyond because a Notice carries more clout than a memo from the Secretary. The Notice will be drafted to incorporate the goals developed by the Work Group and those suggested by EH management; they are very similar. After the EH Deputy Secretary approves the Notice it will be posted on the Directives webpage for comment. Clarification of what wastes (e.g., routine, non-routine, everything but legacy, or something else) to be covered by the new goals would be included either in the Notice or in the EO 13148 annual report data entry guidance.

Arnie Edelman requested that the Notice include the concepts of accountability and annual review to engage senior management. For the same reason, Karin King requested that the Notice incorporate the LEEDs challenge that EE had been promoting.

2. Transitioning to Green Construction Projects – Lessons Learned

Keith Dempsey and Rick Griffin described their experience and successes in greening new building construction at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. When the decision was made in 2000 to “green” all new buildings, the team opted to follow the LEED approach because it was a recognized standard, it incorporated many of the green elements the team wanted to pursue, and it included a standardized and recognized certification process.

The success of their program is attributable to

- A master plan,
- Senior management and DOE site management support,
- Team understanding and acceptance of green goals and green specifications,
- Combating the pre-conceived notion that green buildings cost more by integrating green thinking right from the start and developing a wide array of options to choose from,
- Willingness to look to innovative engineering process designs and solutions and weigh their relative merits, and
- Careful selection of experienced and qualified people to do the commissioning and certification and any advising.

3. IG Audit

Jane reported that EH commented once again that PSOs should be responsible for ensuring P2 site activities but the draft audit report continues only to include recommendations for EH, NNSA, and EM. The final report is due in several months.

4. EO 13148, EO 13101 Status

Don Lentzen reported that the Department’s waste reduction goals were achieved for all routine wastes with the exception of low-level radioactive waste. The Department purchased \$40 million of environmentally preferable products. Don also announced that the BuyBio program is now in effect; the Department of Agriculture will issue its BuyBio product list in the fall of the year.

March 2005 P2 Conference Call
17 March 2005

1. Savannah River Site (SRS) 2004 P2 Awards

John Harley presented information on the three SRS nominations that were selected as 2004 P2 award winners.

- Jim Morgan, Manager, Chemical Commodity Management Center: Mr. Morgan is recognized for his leadership in developing and managing the Center which provides centralized control of chemicals and chemical products and uses a lifecycle chemical management approach. In FY03 and 04 the Center dispositioned over 100 metric tons of hazardous and non-hazardous chemicals and avoided waste disposal costs of \$10.2 million. Mr. Morgan was also heavily involved in developing the DOE three-volume Chemical Management Handbook – A Guide for Best Practices.
- SRS ALARA Center: provides state-of-the-art information and opportunities for demonstration of new equipment, technologies, and techniques that could support cost-effective radiological work. Vendors supply equipment for demonstration purposes. The SRS P2 program provides 80% of the funding for one of the two people who staff the center.
- SRS Uses Unserviceable Cargo Containers to Package Low-level Radioactive Waste: use of retrofitted, formerly unserviceable cargo containers for waste disposal saves about \$12 million over a three-year period – primarily due to greater efficiency in waste handling. In addition, the company that supplies the containers has expanded thereby creating new jobs, cargo containers that otherwise would be discarded are recycled, and other Federal agencies have access to dramatically reduced waste disposal options. One 40-foot Sealand cargo container replaces the need for over 20 standard B25 waste boxes. (Brian Bowers related that Paducah received 398 containers from the Army and only had to pay for the refurbishing.)

John also described two SRS nominations that did not receive P2 awards: using a “waste” reactor cask as the container for waste for which there was no other waste disposition path and conducting a pollution prevention opportunity assessment on sample analysis requirements that led to different processes saving \$6 million over the life of the project.

2. John Neave, EM-41, reported on the status of the Metals EIS and the moratorium on the unrestricted release for recycling of scrap metals from radiation areas within DOE. Briefings are being held for the new DOE management involved in the decision and efforts are being coordinated with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on its rulemaking that would govern the control of solid materials with small or no radiological material. That rulemaking could take between 6 to 12 months; DOE would not be bound by it.

3. Shab Fardanesh, EE, presented the following information from the alternative fuels annual report:

The Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPAAct) requires each agency to acquire 75 percent of its covered light-duty acquisitions as alternative fuel vehicles (AFV). Executive Order

13149 (signed April 2000) requires that each agency reduce its covered petroleum fuel consumption by 20 percent by the end of FY 2005 compared with FY 1999 consumption. To ensure success with this goal, agencies must also:

- comply with AFV acquisition requirements of EPAct;
- use alternative fuels in its AFVs a majority of the time (at least 51 percent) by the end of FY 2005 (compared to FY 1999); and
- increase the fuel economy of its new light-duty non-AFV acquisitions by 3 miles per gallon (mpg) by the end of FY 2005 (compared to the baseline year 1999).

DOE's performance in FY 2004 was as follows:

EPAct

- 75 percent of the 1,065 covered light duty vehicles (LDV) acquired in FY 2004 must be AFVs (i.e., 799). DOE acquired 880 AFVs and earned 177 additional credits through biodiesel fuel use and acquisition of dedicated AFVs, for a total of 1,057 credits or 99 percent of covered acquisitions.

E.O. 13149

- achieved 21 percent alternative fuel use in AFVs (goal is 51 percent minimum by end of FY 2005 and the P2E2 internal goal is for a 75 percent level by the end of FY 2005)
- increased fuel economy of new LDVs to 19.1 mpg, an increase of 2.1 mpg over the 1999 baseline
- consumed 6,857,174 gasoline gallon equivalents (GGE), a decrease of 1.8 percent from the baseline

EIA's projections show an increase in fuel consumption in DOE by 4.6 percent since 1999. Alternative fuel use is 6.5 percent of overall fuel used in FY 2004 which has resulted in a modest petroleum fuel use reduction of only 1.8 percent since 1999. This was largely achieved because of the alternative fuel usage that replaced petroleum.

DOE has funded 22 alternative fuel infrastructure sites at its various locations since 2003.

- 15 E85
- 4 CNG
- 3 B20.

(15 of these projects have been completed so far with 7 E85 stations expected this year)

Shab indicated she would send to Beverly a copy of the 8 March 2004 Kyle McSlarrow memo on alternative fuel and site's alternative fuel score cards. She stated that alternative fuel grant money is available through the Clean Cities program but Federal entities are eligible only if they partner with a non-federal entity.

4. IG audit update – the final report has not yet been issued but is expected soon. It may require quarterly reporting and an action plan to address the recommendations it will make. The recommendations may include the need for performance measures and innovative funding programs for P2.

May 2005 P2 Conference Call
19 May 2005

1. Update on Metals EIS and Suspension on the Release of Scrap Metal – Andy Wallo, EH-41

- The draft metals EIS is completed; action by senior management will determine if the EIS will be released or continue to be withheld.
- Senior management needs input about the impact of the scrap metal release suspension on site operations. An early suspension memorandum advised sites to re-evaluate the control and release of their materials; sites commenting on the suspension's impact on operations should ensure that the re-evaluation has been done. Memoranda associated with the suspension are available at http://quickplace.lnc.doe.gov/quickplace/eh-41/main.nsf/h_Toc/CAE269A8DC53229A852569EA004EC1B2/?OpenDocument
- EH-41 will be sending notifications to people on their distribution lists of the websites of a Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) SECY on the disposition of licensed personal property. Although the NRC is not looking for comments on the SECY at this time, EH-41 is interested in receiving any feedback on the SECY as it may be the basis for a subsequent rulemaking on disposition of solid materials. DOE will comment on the proposed solid materials rule when it is published.
- The SECY does not demonstrate much of a cost savings between reuse/recycle and disposal but that may arise from how transportation costs were factored in.

2. Federal Electronics Challenge (FEC) Update – Jeff Eagan, EH-43

- Jeff clarified that DOE would not incur any liability in FEC donations of electronics as long as General Services Administration (GSA) property disposition guidelines are followed. The liability question arose at the P2 Workshop.
- The liability issue and other FEC topics will be discussed at the 2 June FEC national conference call on establishing donation programs. A 16 June call is planned for new partners. Information on the calls is available at http://quickplace.lnc.doe.gov/quickplace/eh-41/main.nsf/h_Toc/CAE269A8DC53229A852569EA004EC1B2/?OpenDocument
- The Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool (EPEAT) is a tool for evaluating the environmental performance of electronic products throughout their life cycle. Procurement personnel might find the information helpful. The EPEAT website is <http://www.EPEAT.net>.

3. DOE Fleet Score Cards with Performance for EPAct and EO 13149 – Shab Fardanesh, (EE) and Vicki Putsche, (NREL)

- For 2004, DOE received a passing grade for its performance under the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPAct) that requires each agency to acquire 75 percent of its covered light-duty acquisitions as alternative fuel vehicles (AFV).
- In its performance under EO 13149 for that same year, DOE received an average grade for reduction in petroleum use; a pass grade in miles per gallon increased; and a failing grade in alternative fuel use in alternative fuel vehicles.

- Sixteen sites that had been monitored for several years (because they had accounted for about 90% of DOE's petroleum use) achieved substantial covered petroleum use reductions but complex-wide the covered petroleum use showed minimal reduction because other fleets increased use by 20%.
- Helene Mattiello, 202 287 1593, is a source of budget request information related to OMB form A-11.

4. New P2 Goals – Jane Powers, EH-43

- Senior EH management will be briefed on the new P2 goals on Friday, 20 May. Upon EH concurrence, the goals will be placed in the directives system for comment.
- A discussion of whether the goals should be quantitative or qualitative, revolved around the topic of the best source of quantitative goals. HQ-driven quantitative goals were perceived to have more clout as they would be more likely to be incorporated into contractor contracts. The other perspective was that site-driven quantitative goals, arising from the site EMS, were more meaningful because they more accurately indicate site specific P2 needs.

5. EO13148 Report – Don Lentzen, EH-43

- The 2004 report was released in April and is available at <http://www.eh.doe.gov/oepa/whatsnew.html>.
- Don requested comments from sites on how the data collection database can be improved. Sites are requested to make a copy of their last report, mark it up as to areas needing improvement and any other suggestions, and send it to Don. He also is welcoming any ideas on what sites see as important for inclusion in the database and how those ideas can be incorporated. Don is also interested in having site EMS goals, targets, and objectives – or links to sites' EMSs – included in the database.

6. P2 Website Update – Josh Silverman, EH-43

- Presentations and photos from the NNSA/DOE P2 Workshop and the PPOA training materials have been loaded on the website. Responses to the questionnaire on the collection and use of P2 and waste generation data have been collated and summary information is on the website.

7. Review of the NNSA/DOE P2 Workshop – Mike Sweitzer, NNSA

- Mike thanked everyone involved in planning and implementing the Workshop for putting together a successful activity.
- One way to demonstrate the value of such workshops in the future is to let Mike know of the ideas/products/services implemented at sites as a result of the information obtained at the 2005 Workshop.
- Lisa Burns has indicated her willingness to present the PPOA training prepared for the Workshop at interested sites. Since the material has already been developed, the training cost to the site should be reasonable.

June 2005 P2 Conference Call
16 June 2005

1. Update on Metals EIS and Suspension on the Release of Scrap Metal – Arnie Edelman, SC
 - The Nuclear Regulatory Commission proposed rule on the release of metals from power plants is no longer under consideration. The Commissioners determined that the existing case-by-case release process was working effectively and that the NRC had other more pressing issues to pursue.
 - DOE was interested in the proposed rule as a possible basis for resolving the suspension on the release of scrap metal. The NRC proposed rule might not have been too helpful to DOE because it established a 1mrem/year standard for equivalent use of materials or landfilling. However, in ceasing action on the proposed rule, the Commissioners stated that they believed the 1 mrem was a reasonable standard for free release.
 - The status of the DOE draft metals EIS remains unclear. A decision should be made in July.
 - DOE is in the early stages of developing a free release protocol for uncontaminated materials. Because of the negative reaction to a DOE 2001 proposed release protocol, the protocol under development might include a pilot project. Andy Wallo, EH-41, is the lead for the protocol being developed.

2. Waste Reduction Revitalization II Report – Beverly Whitehead
 - Version II of the report is a compilation of best practices derived from the P2 accomplishments submitted in the 2004 data call, the activities submitted to the White House Closing the Circle Award, and Fed Facts (an EPA publication).
 - The report, along with Version I of the report, will be posted on the P2 website as a searchable database.

3. P2 Agency Goals – Jane Powers
 - The draft new P2 goals will go into the RevCom system as changes to DOE 450.1; the goals appear in Attachment 3 to the Order. There will be a 30-day comment period.
 - Attachment 3 lists strategies for the goals; they are to be treated as mandatory where applicable.

4. P2 Performance Measures – Jane Powers
 - The draft P2 performance measures were sent out 16 June for review. The measures respond to the P2 agency goals, are based on feedback from conference calls, the P2 Workshop, and the P2 goals work group, and reflect the sense that sites will have an EMS and that P2 is integrated at the site through the EMS.
 - Comments on the draft performance measures are due to Jane by Wednesday, 13 July. The July P2 conference call will include a discussion of whether a manual, guidance document, or policy is the best vehicle for issuing the performance measures.
 - Sites would start reporting on their performance on the new P2 goals in October 2006; reporting would be done on-line.
 - The following points were raised in the discussion of the draft performance measures:

- Consider dropping the word “measures” because that word has a contractual connotation. “Indicators” might be a better word since what are being asked for are indicators of P2 progress.
- A single site might have multiple EMSs. Would the site report on each of its EMSs or develop an aggregate report?
- If Order 450.1 is in a contract and the new goals are an Order change, then a change notification to the contractor should be adequate to implement the new goals.
- The draft performance measures focus on the targets and objectives in the site’s EMS. However, it could happen that a site’s targets and objectives don’t match the P2 agency goals.
- The reporting associated with the measures seems to be quite burdensome.
- Performance measures should assess performance not guide/force site performance. The way they are written now, the performance measures could force sites to put PPOAs into their EMSs.
- The draft performance measures don’t measure progress – they measure what you have done rather than the results you have achieved. [Note: Jane pointed out that the measures do ask sites to report on the results of their actions in terms of avoided releases or waste generation, costs avoided, and other benefits).

5. EH Inclusion in Contracting – Beverly Whitehead

- EH is interested in knowing what contracts are coming due so that it can comment on their environmental provisions. The following sites were mentioned: SRS, ANL, Thomas Jefferson, Hanford, West Valley, NTS, and Ashtabula.
- Please notify Beverly with information on any site contracts that might be coming due.

6. LEEDs Training – Arnie Edelman

- The recent 8-hour LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) training was very helpful and informative.
- A repeat of the course is possible but would have to be completed by the end of this fiscal year.

July 2005 P2 Conference Call
21 July 2005

1. EMS Update, Steve Woodbury

- Completed compiling information for the June quarterly EMS update
- Focus after December 31st, 2005 is to maintain and sustain the EMS – “This is the race to the starting line.”
- A new guidance for Report Letters is available (450.1-A)

2. Development of Environmental Summit/ P2 Workshop – Josh Silverman

- The Office of the Federal Environmental Executive (OFEE) intends to sponsor an Environmental Summit (workshop) May 2-6, 2006, at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, MD.
- OFEE offered a list of possible topics (below) for comment, which were sent out via e-mail prior to the conference call.
- EH is considering planning next year's P2 workshop to run in parallel, or as a subset of the OFEE conference. We welcome your input both on the OFEE event and the value of merging the P2 workshop into it.

The following points were raised in the discussion of the P2 workshop:

- The National Pollution Prevention Roundtable (NPPR) annual meeting is scheduled to be in New Orleans in May of 2006.
- The NPPR conference topics typically are more outreach related and not necessarily specific to pollution prevention.

3. Update of the P2 Website – Josh Silverman

- The EH P2 website is currently in the process of being updated. This is the first major update in over 3 years.
- Environmentally Preferable Purchasing and Buy Bio information will be added to the site.
- Please provide comments/concerns regarding the re-design of the site.

4. Development of Waste Reduction Revitalization Report – Beverly Whitehead

- The Version II of the report is a compilation of best practices derived from the P2 accomplishments submitted in the 2004 data call, the activities submitted to the White House Closing the Circle Award, and Fed Facts (an EPA publication).
- The report, along with Version I of the report, will be posted on the P2 website as a searchable database.
- A green bullet information brief will be distributed in the next month.

5. P2 Performance Measures – Jane Powers

- The draft P2 performance measures were sent out June 16th for review. The measures respond to the P2 agency goals, are based on feedback from conference calls, the P2 Workshop, and the P2 goals work group. They reflect the sense that sites will have EMS with P2 integrated.

- The performance measures are based on specific P2 requirements, the OG audit, and the requirements for the EO annual reports.
- The performance measures are tracked through accomplishments reported and a series of “yes” and “no” questions.
- Sites would start reporting on their performance on the new P2 goals in October 2006; reporting would be done on-line.
- Another draft of the performance measures will be available the week of July 25th.
- The following points were raised in the discussion of the draft performance measures:
 - The reporting associated with the measures seems to be quite burdensome.
 - EPP and Waste Generation reporting will still be performed per the request of the PSOs.
 - The performance measures are based on DOE Order 450.1
 - Some sites do not have compliance with DOE Order 450.1 as part of their contract but rather have compliance with ISO 14001.
 - Many sites do not see the relationship between “strategies” and DOE Order 450.1 and want to ensure that those “strategies” are not mandatory. By requiring the specific “strategies,” flexibility is lost.
 - Consider dropping the word “measures” because that word has a contractual connotation. “Indicators” might be a better word since what are being asked for are indicators of P2 progress.
 - EPP is only tracked by dollars spent and not what was purchased; this may not be a good indicator of performance.
 - Performance measures should assess performance not guide/force site performance. The way they are written now, the performance measures could force sites to put PPOAs into their EMSs.

The next P2 conference call is August 18.

August 2005 P2 Conference Call
18 August 2005

1. Update on Metals EIS – John Neave (via message)
 - The status of the EIS continues to be under management review

2. Environmental Summit/P2 Workshop – Josh Silverman
 - The Office of the Federal Environmental Executive (OFEE) has not yet responded to the EH suggestion to merge the OFEE Environmental Summit, scheduled for May 2-5, 2006, and the P2 workshop planned for that same month. DOE suggested that the P2 Workshop could run in parallel with or be a sub-set of the Summit.
 - The next OFEE meeting on the Summit will be held in September.
 - Contact Josh with any comments you'd like to have considered for either gathering.

3. P2 Website – Josh Silverman
 - The re-design of the EH P2 website is continuing. Information contained on the site prior to the re-design will remain unless it is no longer valuable.
 - The P2 data call will still be hosted on the website.
 - New features of the P2 website will include
 - BuyBio information,
 - Environmentally Preferable Purchasing information,
 - a “best practices” searchable database, and
 - periodic highlighting of a P2 website of interest.
 - Contact Josh with ideas for or comments on the website.

4. FEC (Federal Electronics Challenge) – Jeff Eagan
 - Eight DOE sites or facilities have signed on as FEC Partners. Only one other Federal agency (GSA) has more Partners than DOE and it has a total of 9 Partners.
 - The next FEC conference call is scheduled for Thursday, 1 September at 1 PM Eastern time. The topic for that call is integrating electronic stewardship into the EMS. The call number is 1-866-299-3188, the conference code is 899999.
 - The FEC website at <http://www.federalelectronicchallenge.net/partcall.htm> has information on additional future calls.
 - EPEAT (Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool) standards for procurement are being developed and will probably be rolled out in Spring 2006.

5. P2 Data Call – Don Lentzen
 - The form and content of the 2005 data call will be very similar to what they were last year.
 - The on-line system will be up and running on 1 October.
 - Passwords will again be required for data entry and review. Passwords used last year will still be valid; new passwords can be obtained from IT.
 - Deadlines for data reporting are as follows:
 - **EO 13148 data:** **7 December 2005**
 - **Best-in-Class award nominations:** **7 December 2005**

▪ **EPP data:**

7 December 2005

- Contact Don with any questions or comments.
6. Best Practices Document/Green Bullet Information Brief – Beverly Whitehead
- The Best Practices document (the sequel to last year’s Waste Reduction Revitalization Report) is under final review and will be released shortly.
 - The activities highlighted in the Best Practices document were selected from DOE nominations to the Closing the Circle competition, site accomplishments submitted in the last data call, and the EPA publication, FedFacts.
 - The information brief, “Green Bullet Usage at DOE Sites,” is under final review and should be released in early September.
7. New P2 Goals Update – Jane Powers
- The preponderance of the major comments submitted through the RevCom review of the proposed P2 goals opposed treating the P2 goal strategies as requirements.
 - EH management proposed that the strategies be required in order to establish strong expectations for P2 integration by sites and to provide sites with a rationale for obtaining site management support for P2 activities.
 - Sites will select the strategies that are applicable to their site situations and will report on them and the results achieved. This reporting will be used for the DOE corporate reports.
 - October 11 is the date by which the goals must be finalized. Within the next few weeks, EH will contact all the authors of major comments to reach agreement on the resolution of their comments.
8. Site Participant Comments on the P2 Goals
- There was concern that sites may be required to do PPOAs in areas that were not identified as being significant in the site EMS if the strategies are required.
 - Order 450.1 and the CRD already prescribe operational assessments such as PPOAs. Requiring them to be related to specific P2 goals is redundant and may not be appropriate for every site.
9. Site Participant Comments on the P2 Performance Measures
- The question was also raised as to whether PSOs or NNSA could establish P2 reporting requirements other than those listed as the draft performance measures. No resolution of the issue was reached but one suggestion was that the DOE P2 performance measures be considered the basic reporting requirements and that PSOs or NNSA could develop additional P2 reporting requirements specific to their sites.
 - The P2 reporting is of concern because some sites are asked to report on different timelines (i.e., fiscal year for some reports but calendar years for others) from different sources (e.g., state requirements, contractual obligations, Executive Orders).
 - The flowdown of requirements process was raised as something that should be investigated related to reporting on the new goals. Apparently, under this process a request for change of responsibilities is submitted by DOE to sites and determinations are made there as to (1) whether the existing contract needs to be

modified to respond to them or (2) which of the new responsibilities will be added to the contract if it must be amended.

- A preference was expressed to use the term “reporting requirements” rather than “performance measures.”

September 2005 P2 Conference Call
15 September 2005

1. Initiative on Unneeded Materials and Chemicals – Arnie Edelman

- The 1995 Materials in Inventory identified 900,000 tons of materials held by DOE that no longer had a defined or immediate use. A December 1999 IG study recommended the need for DOE to strengthen its management of excess materials and chemicals and accelerate their disposition.
- In June 2005 the CFO issued a memo requesting NNSA and ESE to develop budgets and strategies for disposing of unneeded materials. The strategy to address unneeded materials and chemicals (UMCs) is due by October 10, 2005.
- Materials and chemicals are unneeded if they remain idle for a period of two years after project completion or close out without a written mission-related justification by the cognizant DOE Site Manager.
- A draft strategy will be sent to SC, NE, EM, RW, and FE shortly for review. An element of the draft strategy is site development of specific plans for the management and disposition of UMCs. The site plans are to address:
 - Development and maintenance of an inventory of UMCs; inventories of existing UMCs will be in place no later than September 30, 2006.
 - Development of a site specific schedule for the disposition of the current inventory of UMC based on the complexity and size of the inventory. This schedule shall reflect intermediary goals as well as the overall goal of the Department of dispositioning all UMCs currently in inventory by the end FY 2011.
 - Annual assessment and evaluation of the need for materials and chemicals in inventory against program budget and activities for the upcoming budget year to identify any additional UMCs.
 - Development of contract performance measure(s) to prevent accumulation of UMCs and incorporation of a contract clause requiring timely disposition (within two years) of the newly identified UMCs.
 - Utilization of existing management systems, to the extent practicable, to identify opportunities for reutilization, recycle, sales, and disposal of UMCs within DOE and other federal agencies. These systems include those operated by Office of Procurement and Assistance Management [Energy Asset Disposal System \(EADS\)](#), the General Services Administration [Federal Disposal System \(FEDS\)](#), and the Department of Energy, Office of Science, [Materials Exchange](#).
- The DOE Materials in Exchange website at <http://wastenot.er.doe.gov/doematex/login.asp> lists unneeded materials suitable for use or reuse but does not have any time restrictions on how long materials are listed. The Property Management System, by comparison, gives DOE sites a 90-day window to seek materials after which GSA lists the materials for another 90 days. The DOE Materials in Exchange website is password protected; contact Arnie for a password.
- NNSA is presumed to be working on its own version of an unneeded materials strategy.

- PSOs are to annually report on their progress in meeting UMC disposition with the first report due November 15, 2006.
2. EPA's Plans Related to the Gulf Coast – Greg McBrien
 - Information on EPA's approach to recycling and disposing of debris left in the wake of Hurricane Katrina is provided at the end of these notes.
 - Minutes on the Environmental Impacts and Cleanup Workgroup (EICW) Subcommittee on New Orleans Conference Call on September 14, 2005 are provided at the end of these notes.
 - DOE will assess the feasibility of using green power in the rebuilding of the Gulf Coast utility systems.
 3. Results of IG Audit Report – Discussion
 - A concern was raised that the absence of HQ funding for P2 programs or oversight of them would diminish the role and effectiveness of P2 at sites since site management attention is gotten through such HQ involvement.
 - Several participants responded that the EMS review should be sufficient to garner management support for P2 since it is to be integrated into the EMS.
 - OA (Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance) has included EMS review in some of its audits and will do so consistently in the future.
 - EM submitted a report to the IG on the PPOAs done by EM sites but has not yet received a response from the IG.
 - A DOE order and manual on oversight are being prepared pursuant to DOE's acceptance of DNFSB (Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board) Recommendation 2004-1. The order and manual may include EMS assessments, and, by extension, P2 performance assessments.
 - EH will continue to gather information on site progress in integrating P2 in site activities. The performance measures associated with the new P2 goals are an effort to hold site managers accountable for tracking and reporting on the status of P2 at their sites.
 4. Environmental Summit/P2 Workshop for May 2006 – Josh Silverman
 - The OFEE Environmental Summit is now named the Environmental Training Conference. It will be hosted by the Department of Health and Human Services and held at the NIH (National Institutes of Health) in Bethesda, Maryland on May 2-4, 2006.
 - The Conference theme is "Sustainability" and the topical areas are: Smart Procurement, Stewardship, and Environmental Management.
 - Workgroups have begun to flesh-out the topical areas in preparation for the next planning meeting in November. Contact Josh if you'd like to become involved in a workgroup or have ideas to suggest.
 - The OFEE is still amenable to having the DOE P2 2006 Workshop run with the Environmental Training Conference but final details have not been worked out.
 5. "Best Practices" and "Green Bullet" Documents – Beverly Whitehead
 - The "Best Practices" document is still under EH management review.

- Based on the significant comments made during the TRI Focus Group review of the “Green Bullets” draft, it is being re-written to encompass a broader range of issues than it had originally.

6. P2 Goals – Jane Powers

- Most of the major comments on the new P2 goals have been resolved via conversations with the commenters.
- The P2 strategies listed in Attachment 3 of the draft Order will not be required but instead will be described as tools or methods sites should consider for applicability and appropriateness.
- A new redline version of the Order showing the responses to comments will be posted shortly on RevCom for a 10-day concurrence period. The goal is to have the new Order complete by the end of October.
- The performance measures will also be modified to be consistent with the new goals.

CORRECTION:

The August P2 Call notes incorrectly indicated that the data call deadline for EO 13101 EPP data is 7 December 2005. The correct date is **30 December 2005 for EPP data.**

EO 13146 data and best in class nominations are due 7 December 2005.

Debris Recycling and Disposal from Hurricane Katrina

As of September 13, 2005, there is little information available from EPA on efforts underway to recycle or dispose of debris along the gulf coast. At present, EPA efforts are focused on recovery of water and wastewater facilities, oil spills and leaks of hazardous materials, water and air monitoring, and household hazardous waste collection and disposal. The disaster recovery efforts are discussed on a special EPA Headquarters web page for Katrina at: <http://www.epa.gov/katrina/index.html>

The disaster recovery activities by EPA are being run out of the Region VI (Dallas) office for Louisiana and by the Region IV (Atlanta) office for the rest of the affected States. Both Region IV and Region VI have web pages devoted to the Katrina recovery effort at: <http://epa.gov/region4/Katrina/index.htm> and <http://epa.gov/region6/katrina/index.htm> The Region VI page contains the following information in their News Release for September 13, 2005: *“It is estimated that there are 160,000 residences, 360,000 cars, and tens of thousands of boats to be considered for removal and disposition.”* This is the first estimate I have seen of the potential amount of debris generated by the storm.

One of the web pages directs readers to information on debris disposal on the FEMA Region III (Philadelphia) web site at: <http://www.fema.gov/regions/iii/env/debris.shtm> This web page generally discusses disposal of debris and says open burning exceptions may be granted by the State in emergency situations. There is a brief discussion of the items that cannot be burned, but little information on alternative options like recycling.

An EPA Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER) web page does discuss recycling disaster debris at: <http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/non-hw/muncpl/debris.htm> This webpage also contains a Sample Debris Management Plan from the Louisiana Office of Emergency Preparedness: <http://www.loep.state.la.us/disrecovery/debrismgtsampleplan.htm>. The plan contains this debris estimate: *“(it is) estimated that under the worst scenario, e. g., is a Category 5 hurricane, heavy vegetation cover, heavy commercial density, and heavy precipitation, the amount of acres needed for a temporary landfill is 3,352 acres. To help visualize what 33,800,068 cy of debris looks like, picture a building occupying 1 acre ...that building would be 2,046 feet high or approximately 200 stories high”!* While the sample plan does discuss recycling, it is limited to soils, wood, and non-ferrous metals. Once again, burning is discussed as a disposal method for debris.

Finally, the EPA OSWER web page contains some information on debris recycling and some case studies on disaster debris. The OSWER guide says: *“FEMA may fund recycling of disaster debris if the local government has in place prior to the natural disaster a policy emphasizing recycling, or if the local government can demonstrate that recycling is a cost-effective debris management option.”* A case study about Hurricane Andrew in 1992 gives an estimate of 43 million cubic yards (6 million tons) of debris generated by the storm in Metro-Dade County. The Florida Department of Environmental Regulation did allow debris to be burned under a 30-day emergency order.

**Minutes on the Environmental Impacts and Cleanup Workgroup (EICW)
Subcommittee on New Orleans Conference Call September 14, 2005**

The charge for the group is to:

- Develop a high-level policy overview,
 - Identify issues that need to be raised or dealt with,
 - Identify items that need to be taken back to the larger environmental task force, and
 - Develop a reporting structure.
- Agencies on the call were invited to share what they were doing. EPA, HUD, DoD, NIH, USGS, USDA, and DOT reviewed their activities.
 - Basically, these agencies are:
 - Assessing/monitoring contamination in soils, sediments, ground water, surface water, drinking water systems, and air,
 - Establishing cleanup levels,
 - Conducting removal activities (including dead animals),
 - Working on relocating/providing housing for evacuees (and particularly those living in public housing),
 - Assisting in pest control,
 - Providing search and rescue,
 - Conducting health assessments,
 - Providing health and safety officials,
 - Identifying long-term topics and cultural sensitivities, and
 - Identifying highway/road construction needs.
 - Blaine Rowley (EM-21) told the group that DOE (EM) was not yet heavily involved, but we were there to provide expertise and assistance in environmental restoration.
 - **DOE was asked if we were going to provide assistance in developing alternative energy sources for buildings as the city rebuilds in place of the older/destroyed less efficient energy sources.**
 - **Blaine told them he would bring this request up to management-he assumes it would be an EE led effort and as such, EE should also become involved.**

**October 2005 P2 Conference Call
20 October 2005**

1. Upcoming Federal Electronics Challenge (FEC) Activities – Jeff Eagan (202-586-4598)

- FEC Awards and Recognition program is open to all FEC Partners – there are 8 or 9 DOE FEC Partners at this time. The presentation, "[Applying For Recognition From FEC](#)" [PDF](#) | [PPT](#) , describes the process of applying for recognition from FEC. It includes step-by-step instructions on filling out the annual report, award application, and award level checklists. The presentation will be made at telephone conference calls at 1:00 PM Eastern Time on 17 November and 1 December. The call in number and conference code are the same for both days: call in number is 1-866-299-3188 and the conference code is 899999.
- Electronics Reuse and Recycling Challenge – is open to all Federal agencies. The five-month challenge begins on 15 November 2005, America Recycles Day, and ends on 22 April 2006, Earth Day. Winners from different categories will be selected based on the number of pounds of electronics they have recycled during the five-months. The Challenge will be initiated at kick-off events in DC, Chicago, Seattle, San Francisco, Denver, Kansas City, and Atlanta. Agencies and sites are also encouraged to develop their own kick-off events.
- Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool (EPEAT) – is the subject of the next FEC conference call to be held on 3 November 2005 at 1:00 PM Eastern Time. The call in number is 1-866-299-3188 and the conference code 899999.

2. Environmental Summit / P2 Workshop – Josh Silverman (202-586-6535)

- Contents of the May 2006 Environmental Summit sponsored by the Office of the Federal Environmental Executive are under development.
- EH is still open to ideas for the P2 Workshop content. Preliminary ideas are:
 - Update on the IG Report,
 - Changes to the P2 Reporting System
 - Update on the New P2SES (Pollution Prevention and Sustainable Environmental Stewardship) Goals and Performance Measures
 - P2 Awards Presentation
- Ideas on possible training opportunities associated with the P2 Workshop are particularly welcome. Ideas put forward were training in assessing the integration of EMSs into ISMSs, EMS auditing, and the FEC.

3. P2 Data Call and Data Entry – Josh Silverman (202-586-6535) for Don Lentzen (202-586-7428)

- The P2 Data Call has been issued and the P2 data entry web site is up and running.
- Discussion arose regarding what constitutes a “site” for P2 reporting purposes. The general consensus was that P2 reports should be aggregated and reported by PSO when there are multiple PSOs represented at a site.

4. New P2 Goals – Jane Powers (202-586-7301)

- The draft final of the new P2SES goals is included in Change 2 to DOE Order 450.1 which is in RevCom for a 10-day review and comment period. Comments are due Monday, 31 October and must relate to the responses made to the major comments submitted during the earlier 30-day RevCom review. A comment-response table based on the 30-day review is available.
- DOE Order 450.1 Change 2 will become final two weeks after any comments arising from the 10-day are resolved.
- EH will suggest modifications to DOE O 231.1A, *Environment, Safety, and Health Reporting*, and DOE M 231.1-1A, *Environment, Safety, and Health Reporting Manual* to be in accord with Change 2 to DOE O 450.1.
- EH will also develop a guidance document for the new P2SES performance measures. The guidance will clarify that the P2SES strategies are to be integrated into site EMSs as applicable and appropriate.

November 2005 P2 Conference Call
17 November 2005

1. Chemical Management Services (CMS) at Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) – Butch Byers (bbyers@slac.stanford.edu)

- The CMS system became operational facility-wide on 1 August 2005.
- Motivations for implementing a chemical management system were the need for SLAC to be permitted under Title V of the Clean Air Act (and provide for facility-wide tracking of chemical use) and its participation in the Silicon Valley Chemical Management Services Pilot Project on chemical use.
- The motivations for opting for CMS were that internal development of a management system was estimated at \$1 million and that CMS provided all hardware and software. Another motivation was that the cost of managing chemicals was six to seven times the cost of their purchase when life cycle costs were factored in.
- The CMS Phase I services include
 - transactions are completely on-line,
 - the catalogue is on-line and includes field descriptions of chemicals used on site in the last two years,
 - vendor who manages inventory is off-site and delivery is at point-of-use which ensures greater safety in delivery and holds the vendor liable for any problems,
 - vendor management of MSDS, and
 - vendor provides 80 pre-programmed report platforms and options for personalizing report forms.
- In the process of preparing for the CMS, personnel identified 14 major chemical cleanup projects and many opportunities to surplus and excess tanks, cylinders, and materials.
- Vendor contract includes performance metrics.
- Preliminary results of entering into the CMS contract are
 - order cycle time has been reduced from multiple days to same day;
 - delivery time commitments are exceeding targets,
 - hazard communication burdens are reduced, and
 - simplified ESH reporting and querying due to one-stop information platform (moved from 13 spreadsheets for reporting purposes to 1).

2. Upcoming Federal Electronics Challenge (FEC) Activities – Jeff Eagan (202-586-4598)

- The Kansas City Plant has been actively providing local schools with excess computer equipment. Twenty-six schools have benefited through the re-use of this equipment. The site anticipated gifting 800 computers in the summer of 2005.
- The Memorandum from John Shaw, Assistant Secretary for Environment, Safety and Health (EH-1), and Rosita Parkes, Chief Information Officer (IM-1), to Operations and Field Office Managers on the Department's commitment to the FEC is available at http://www.eh.doe.gov/P2/fec/EH1_IM1_FEC_Memo20Jun05.pdf.
- FEC Awards and Recognition program is open to all FEC Partners – there are 8 DOE FEC Partners at this time. The presentation, "[Applying For Recognition From FEC](#)"

[PDF](#) | [PPT](#) , describes the process of applying for recognition from FEC. It includes step-by-step instructions on filling out the annual report, award application, and award level checklists. The presentation will be made at a telephone conference call at 1:00 PM Eastern Time on 1 December. The call in number and conference code are: 1-866-299-3188 and 899999, respectively. The application deadline is 31 January 2006.

- Electronics Reuse and Recycling Challenge – is open to all Federal agencies and all sites (i.e., FEC Partnership status is not required). The five-month challenge began on 15 November 2005, America Recycles Day, and ends on 22 April 2006, Earth Day. Winners from different categories will be selected based on the number of pounds of electronics they have recycled during the five-months. Awards will be presented at the White House on Earth Day.
- Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool (EPEAT) – will be operational for DOE in Spring of 2006.

3. Environmental Summit / P2 Workshop – Josh Silverman (202-586-6535)

- The May 2006 Environmental Summit sponsored by the Office of the Federal Environmental Executive continues to be under development.
- EH is still open to ideas for the P2 Workshop content. A work group to help plan the workshop will convene the week of 12 December.
- FedCenter – is a joint EPA/Army Corps of Engineers website that provides information and communication forums. The following are just some of the program areas on the website: environmental compliance, buying green, EMS, green buildings, P2, chemical management, and sustainability. The website is located at <http://www.fedcenter.gov>.
- Josh is the DOE representative to the FedCenter Board (Arnie Edelman is the alternate). The Board is being asked to identify roles, functions, services that FedCenter should provide; contact Josh with any ideas you may have.

4. P2 Data Call and Data Entry – Don Lentzen

- The reporting system is closed until further notice due to unauthorized access by unknown individuals.
- The reporting forms are the same as last year so sites can continue to gather data as in the past year. This will expedite reporting the information when the reporting system becomes operational again.

5. P2 Goals – Jane Powers

- The Secretary or Deputy Secretary will be approving the new P2 goals shortly.
- The performance measures for the new goals are being modified to ensure conformance with the new goals; they will be issued as guidance.
- The DOE HQ-EMS will be completed by the end of December and will be posted on the website.
- ANL has developed on-line training on DOE O 450.1; inform Jane of any other training programs sites have for the Order.