

*Environmental Management System (EMS) Aspect
& Impact Workshop #2 at Fort Eustis
After Action Report*

Background Workshop Information

On 26 February 2004 at 0900-1400, the Fort Eustis Directorate of Public Works Environmental and Natural Resources Division (DPW-ENRD) hosted the second in a series of EMS workshops at the Fort Eustis Club.

The objectives of this workshop were to:

- complete the analysis of Fort Eustis activities, aspects and impacts (begun during the previous workshop),
- obtain scored results for each impact/activity,
- rank the scores to obtain the five (5) greatest scoring impacts/activities within each functional area, and
- develop challenge statements relative to those results.

Content

The workshop was opened by COL David Bender who spoke to the 41 participants on the importance of incorporating sustainability into long term planning.

Following the opening, Ms. Linda Rice provided an overview of the day and starting the showing of an Environmental Management Training video from Eglin AFB (21 minutes in length). After the video, Ms. Rice resumed training on typical Fort Eustis activities and their related environmental aspects (causes) and impacts (effects).

After the morning break, Mr. David Eady of the Army Environmental Policy Institute (AEPI) taught how to determine significance of environmental impacts. Following that began the group exercise in which the attendees broke out into functional area teams to work toward scoring environmental impacts at Fort Eustis. Each group worked through scoring their activities and environmental causes and effects over a working lunch. The scoring led to a ranking exercise during which the top five impacts and associated activity were identified and then reported to the participants at large. In cases where scores for an impact were equal, both impacts were reported which resulted in more than the top five being listed.

Group members also authored “challenge” statements which reflect how to minimize the environmental impacts of the activities associated with the major functional areas.

The results of the scoring and challenge statements are as follows:

Functional Area: Training Areas/Range Activities

<i>Activity: Aspect: Impact</i>
Ranges (live fire) operations: Waste generation, hazardous & universal: Land use
Port/marine operations: Emergency situations, spills: Water quality
Land & sea maneuver training operations: Land disturbance: Erosion
Airfield operations: Nuisance: Human health
Ranges (live fire) operations: Land disturbance: Erosion
Land & sea maneuver training operations: Cultural Resource Affected: Destruction or degradation

Challenge statement:

How does Fort Eustis maintain high quality training, ensuring safety and human health, while protecting natural and cultural resources and minimizing adverse impacts to the environment?

Functional Area: Medical

<i>Activity: Aspect: Impact</i>
Clinic operations: Waste generation, medical: Air quality
Radiology operations: Waste generation, hazardous & universal: Water quality
Radiology operations: Waste generation/disposal, medical: Air quality
Radiology operations: Waste generation/disposal, medical: Human health
Radiology operations: Waste generation, hazardous & universal: Air quality
Radiology operations: Waste generation, hazardous & universal: Human health

Challenge statement:

How does Fort Eustis continue to provide quality health and ensure environmental stewardship of air and water, human health and the control of waste management?

Functional Area: Natural, Cultural & Land Management

<i>Activity: Aspect: Impact</i>
Pest management: Air emissions, fugitive: Human health
Pest management: Emergency situations, spills: Human health
Pest management: Emergency situations, spills: Soil quality
Timber harvest & forest mgmt.: Natural resource affected: Habitat alteration
Timber harvest & forest management: Land disturbance: Erosion
Timber harvest & forest management: Land disturbance: Habitat alteration

Challenge statement:

How does Fort Eustis preserve and improve its natural and cultural resources while sustaining and expanding its operational capabilities given its limited land mass?

Functional Area: Community and Recreation Services (Troop Support)

<i>Activity: Aspect: Impact</i>
Autocraft shop: Air emissions, Vehicle emissions: Human health
Autocraft shop: Waste generation/disposal, hazardous & universal: Land use
Autocraft shop: Waste generation/disposal, hazardous & universal, Soil quality
Golf course services: Waste generation/disposal, hazardous & universal: Land use
Golf course services: Waste generation/disposal, hazardous & universal: Soil quality
Golf course services: Waste generation/disposal, hazardous & universal: Water quality

Challenge statement:

How does Fort Eustis continue to provide a high level of community and recreational services with minimal impact on environmental resources, and limited disturbance to mission objectives?

Functional Area: Mission, Industrial, & Maintenance Operations

<i>Activity: Aspect: Impact</i>
Dock & pier operations: Natural resource affected, habitat: Water quality
Open anchorage: Emergency situations, spills: Water quality
Dock & pier operations: Natural resource affected, habitat: Habitat alteration
Open anchorage: Emergency situations, spills: Habitat alteration
Dock & pier operations: Waste generation/disposal, hazardous & universal: Water quality
Aircraft maintenance activities: Waste generation/disposal, hazardous and universal: Land use

Challenge statement:

How do Mission, Industrial, & Maintenance Operations at Fort Eustis accomplish its mission while improving air quality, protecting habitat and health, and sustain natural resources?

Functional Area: Public Works

<i>Activity: Aspect: Impact</i>
Solid waste management: Waste generation/disposal, municipal (trash): Land Use
Solid waste management: Land disturbance: Land Use
Solid waste management (note: this is a positive impact): Recycled Materials: Land Use
Building construction & renovation: Land Disturbance: Erosion
Solid waste management: Waste generation/disposal: Hazardous & universal: Land Use
Solid waste management: Waste generation/disposal: Hazardous & universal: Human Health

Challenge statement:

How can Public Works continue to effectively construct and maintain post facilities/services while reducing/eliminating impacts to the quality of the air, land, water, and human health? As well as, reducing land materials and fossil fuels usage?

Team input will be available via the DPW-ENRD web site for review by the EQCC and participants. Participants will use this information in subsequent workshops as they work toward setting long and short term goals for environmental management. **This effort will eventually complement the efforts of other types of strategic planning on the installation.**

Participants at the EMS to Sustainability Workshop #2

With a total of 41 participants, a marked decrease (34.9%) in participation was noted between this and the previous workshop (63 participants). This occurred because several organizations and/or divisions were not represented. Also, some organizations did not send multiple representatives as they had to the previous workshop. We really need representation from all organizations in the future. Organizations need to provide an alternate if the original POC cannot attend.

Participant Evaluation Form Responses

Each participant was requested to fill out a workshop evaluation form which consisted of ten (10) questions and a comment section. The respondents were requested to use a ranking system of 1 to 5 where 5 equaled the best possible or excellent score. The comment section was provided to allow for additional comments or suggestions.

Twenty-eight (28) responses were received from 41 participants. The responses evaluate the workshop in the following manner:

- Eighty-two (82 %) the participants rated the workshop overall as “above average to excellent”.
- Eighty-nine percent (89 %) responded that the quality of the instructors was above average to excellent however, only seventy-one percent (71%) felt the material was presented clearly with examples that were easy to understand. Additionally, 64% felt the instructions for the team working sessions were clear and easy to follow. On the other hand, when further clarification was required during the team working session, eighty-five percent (85%) responded that it was provided in a clear manner.
- Seventy-eight percent (78 %) rated the team working session’s productivity as above average to excellent and seventy-one percent (71%) “Agreed” to “strongly agreed” the charts and tables used during the team working session were easy to use.

One interpretation of these results might be that while the majority of respondents felt the quality of the instructors was above average to excellent they found the material initially difficult to understand and instructions difficult to implement. However further clarification was provided in an above average to excellent manner which resulted in the majority responding that the team working sessions were productive.

- Seventy-five percent (75%) felt that the Eglin AFB Environmental Management Training video effectively improved their understanding of EMS in an above average to excellent capacity.
- Seventy-one (71%) “Agreed” to “strongly agreed” that sufficient breaks were provided during the workshop.
- Only fifty percent (50%) of responding participants felt the physical classroom was above average to excellent. Twenty-nine percent (29%) of responding participants rated the classroom environment as average. Fourteen percent (14%) rated the physical classroom environment as below average. Seven percent (7%) rated the physical classroom environment as poor.

Comments made by the participants largely revolved around comfort conditions and were as follows:

- Too hot/too cold.
- Couldn't get temperature correct!
- It'd be great if the temperature was constant in the building.
- Please have the heating/air regulated.
- Good people/bad classroom.
- Please add coffee to the morning break.
- Have coffee in the morning.
- We need to have coffee.
- The 0900 – 1400 timeframe was about as long as this type session should last. Good job!
- Provide each person with a notebook/handouts etc. Group had difficulty rating impacts. There was some confusion on whether we were to base the ratings on potential impacts in general or on current practices/operations that are in place (which if applied would reduce impacts).
- Workshop was productive.