



ACQUISITION,
TECHNOLOGY
AND LOGISTICS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3000

MAY 25 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY & OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH)
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
(ENVIRONMENT)
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
(ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY & OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH)
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY, DLA (DSS-E)

SUBJECT: Data Call for Environment, Safety and Occupational Health (ESOH)
Management Review for the First Half of FY 2004

This Memorandum requests ESOH Management Review data for the first half of FY 2004. An index of the data call elements is at Attachment 1. Questions on key issues and Executive Agent/Lead Agent duties are at Attachment 2. Specific formats for submitting data for Compliance, Pollution Prevention, and Restoration are at Attachments 3, 4, and 5, respectively.

I will use issues and progress highlighted in your responses to brief the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment), and other senior OSD officials. I request formal presentations on Base Realignment and Closure environmental program updates only, and will send a separate memo to schedule the briefings.

Submit responses by June 21, 2004. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic copy. Please refer overall comments or questions to Lt Col Mercer, ann.mercer@osd.mil, (703) 604-1831. This data call along with supplementary information will be posted on DENIX at www.denix.osd.mil/denix/DOD/Library/ESOH-MR

Alex A. Beehler

Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
(Environment, Safety and Occupational Health)

Attachments:
As stated

cc:
DUSD(I&E) Assistants and Directors
OGC (E&I) (Col George Ledbetter)
OUSD(C) (Mr. Sean Coyle)
OMB (Ms Edna Curtin)



ATTACHMENT 1
INDEX OF DATA CALL ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 2: Specific Questions for Pollution Prevention, Conservation, and Executive Agent Duties

Attachment 3: Compliance Measures of Merit and Back-Up Data

- 3.A. Clean Water
- 3.B. Safe Drinking Water
- 3.C. Compliance Enforcement Actions – Open, New, Closed, Inspections
- 3.D. Compliance Enforcement Actions by Statute
- 3. E. Compliance Enforcement Actions by Category
- 3. F. Fines and Penalties Assessed in Oct 03-Mar 04
- 3. G. Fines and Penalties Paid Oct 03-Mar 04
- 3. H. Significant Non-Compliance List for Mid-Year FY2004

Attachment 4. Pollution Prevention Measures of Merit and Backup Data

- 4.A. Environmental Management Systems (EMS) Implementation
- 4.B. Hazardous Waste Disposal Reductions

Attachment 5. Restoration Review for FY04 Mid-Year

- 5.A.-E. Questions for Specific Components
- Tables 1.a and 1.b: Planned vs Actual Restoration Activities (Active/FUDS) and (BRAC)
- Tables 2.a and 2.b: Environmental Restoration Account Actual Execution – Active/FUDS and BRAC
- Tables 3.a and 3.b: Environmental Restoration Account Planned vs. Actual Execution by Phase – Active/FUDS and BRAC

Attachment 2
Questions for DoD Components
Mid FY04 ESOH Data Call

1. Environmental Management Systems (ALL COMPONENTS) - Recent press articles report that implementing an EMS provides no guarantee of performance enhancement. What actions are you taking to ensure your appropriate facilities are implementing EMS's that effectively drive continual improvement?

2. Environmental Restoration – see Attachment 5

3. Executive Agent (EA) Duties – listed below are some of the ESOH EA duties assigned to each Component. Not all EA subjects are listed at this time. Please provide updates on the EA duties listed below for your Component, covering:

- 1) Concise description of the EA requirements/intent/organization
- 2) What was accomplished through mid-year FY04?
- 3) What are your goals and objectives for FY04 and beyond?
- 4) How do you measure progress/success?

a. Army

- 1) Munitions (DODI 4715.6)
- 2) Low Level Radioactive Waste Disposal (DODI 4715.6)
- 3) DoD Forestry Reserve Account Program (DODI 4715.3)
- 4) Conservation Training (ITRO Regulation)
- 5) Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry (ATSDR) (DODI 4715.7)
- 6) National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence

b. Navy

- 1) Chesapeake Bay Program (DODI 4715.3)
- 2) Gulf of Mexico Program (DODI 4715.3)
- 3) Partners in Flight Initiative (DODI 4715.3)
- 4) Coastal America Initiative (DODI 4715.3)
- 5) Compliance Training (ITRO Regulation)
- 6) Data Quality Working Group
- 7) Development/Update of DoDI 6055.5-M "Occupational Health Surveillance Manual" (DODI 6055.5)
- 8) Environmental Noise (PADUSD (ES) Memorandum dated February 14, 1995)

c. Air Force

- 1) Biodiversity Initiative (DODI 4715.3)
- 2) Cold War Initiative (DODI 4715.3)

TABLE 3.A. --CLEAN WATER PERMITS

Army

Measure of Merit	CY03/1	CY03/2
1. Water Pollution Control Permits (U.S. and Territories)		
a. Total Number of Water Pollution Control Permits	835	
b. Number of Water Pollution Control Permits in Compliance	807	
c. Percent of Permits in Compliance	96.65%	#DIV/0!
2. Overseas On-Base Facilities Discharging Regulated Wastewater or		
a. Total Number of On-Base Facilities		
b. Number of On-Base Facilities in Compliance		
c. Percent of On-Base Facilities in Compliance		

Navy

Measure of Merit	CY03/1	CY03/2
1. Water Pollution Control Permits (U.S. and Territories)		
a. Total Number of Water Pollution Control Permits	452	
b. Number of Water Pollution Control Permits in Compliance	422	
c. Percent of Permits in Compliance	93.36%	#DIV/0!
2. Overseas On-Base Facilities Discharging Regulated Wastewater or		
a. Total Number of On-Base Facilities	18	
b. Number of On-Base Facilities in Compliance	14	
c. Percent of On-Base Facilities in Compliance	77.78%	#DIV/0!

Marine Corps

Measure of Merit	CY03/1	CY03/2
1. Water Pollution Control Permits (U.S. and Territories)		
a. Total Number of Water Pollution Control Permits	124	
b. Number of Water Pollution Control Permits in Compliance	113	
c. Percent of Permits in Compliance	91.13%	#DIV/0!
2. Overseas On-Base Facilities Discharging Regulated Wastewater or		
a. Total Number of On-Base Facilities	31	
b. Number of On-Base Facilities in Compliance	31	
c. Percent of On-Base Facilities in Compliance	100.00%	#DIV/0!

Air Force

Measure of Merit	CY03/1	CY03/2
1. Water Pollution Control Permits (U.S. and Territories)		
a. Total Number of Water Pollution Control Permits	413	
b. Number of Water Pollution Control Permits in Compliance	380	
c. Percent of Permits in Compliance	92.01%	#DIV/0!
2. Overseas On-Base Facilities Discharging Regulated Wastewater or		
a. Total Number of On-Base Facilities	61	
b. Number of On-Base Facilities in Compliance	59	
c. Percent of On-Base Facilities in Compliance	96.72%	#DIV/0!

DLA

Measure of Merit	CY03/1	CY03/2
1. Water Pollution Control Permits (U.S. and Territories)		
a. Total Number of Water Pollution Control Permits	34	
b. Number of Water Pollution Control Permits in Compliance	33	
c. Percent of Permits in Compliance	97.06%	#DIV/0!
2. Overseas On-Base Facilities Discharging Regulated Wastewater or		
a. Total Number of On-Base Facilities	-	-
b. Number of On-Base Facilities in Compliance	-	-
c. Percent of On-Base Facilities in Compliance	0.00%	0.00%

DoD Totals

Measure of Merit	CY03/1	CY03/2
1. Water Pollution Control Permits (U.S. and Territories)		
a. Total Number of Water Pollution Control Permits	1,858	-
b. Number of Water Pollution Control Permits in Compliance	1,755	-
c. Percent of Permits in Compliance	94.46%	#DIV/0!
2. Overseas On-Base Facilities Discharging Regulated Wastewater or		
a. Total Number of On-Base Facilities	110	-
b. Number of On-Base Facilities in Compliance	104	-
c. Percent of On-Base Facilities in Compliance	94.55%	#DIV/0!

Note: Report for second half of CY03.

TABLE 3B.a.--SAFE DRINKING WATER POPULATION DATA

Measure of Merit	Army		Navy		USMC		Air Force		DLA		Total	
	CY03/1	CY03/2	CY03/1	CY03/2	CY03/1	CY03/2	CY03/1	CY03/2	CY03/1	CY03/2	CY03/1	CY03/2
1. DoD people served by regulated DoD public water systems (U.S. and territories):												
a. Total population			528,502		224,208		592,808		2,400		1,347,918	0
b. Total population that required a Tier 1 or Tier 2 public notification			85,800		-		5,100		-		90,900	0
c. Total population that received water meeting all SDWA standards subject to Tier 1 & 2 public notification requirements (1.b. is subtracted from 1.a.)			442,702		224,208		587,708		2,400		1,257,018	0
d. Percent population that received water meeting all SDWA Standards subject to Tier 1 & 2 public notification requirements during Reporting Period			83.8%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	99.14%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	93.26%	#DIV/0!
2. DoD people served by unregulated DoD public water systems (U.S. and territories):												
a. Total population			184,909		25,435		257,173				467,517	0
b. Total population that received Tier 1 or Tier 2 public notification from their water supplier			400		-		-				400	0
c. Total population that received water meeting all SDWA standards subject to Tier 1 & 2 public notification requirements (2.b. is subtracted from 2.a.)			184,509		25,435		257,173				467,117	0
d. Percent population that received water meeting all SDWA Standards subject to Tier 1 & 2 public notification requirements during Reporting Period			99.8%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.00%	#DIV/0!			99.91%	#DIV/0!
3. DoD people served by regulated Overseas DoD public water systems subject to applicable FGS/OEBGD/international treaty drinking water requirements												
a. Total population			26,425		14,497		86,604				127,526	0
b. Total population that required a "Tier 1 or Tier 2" similar notification			-		-		7,350				7,350	0
c. Total population that received water meeting all drinking water requirements (3.b. is subtracted from 3.a.)			26,425		14,497		79,254				120,176	0
d. Percent population that received water meeting all drinking water requirements during Reporting Period			100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	91.51%	#DIV/0!			94.24%	#DIV/0!
4. DoD people served by unregulated Overseas DoD public water systems not subject to any FGS/OEBGD/ international treaty drinking water requirements												
a. Total population			47,590		27,164		50,599				125,353	0
b. Total population that received a "Tier 1 or Tier 2" similar notification from their water supplier			3,000		-		-				3,000	0
c. Total population that received water meeting all drinking water requirements (4.b. is subtracted from 4.a.)			44,590		27,164		50,599				122,353	0
d. Percent population provided water meeting all drinking water requirements during Reporting Period			93.7%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.00%	#DIV/0!			97.61%	#DIV/0!
5. Summary												
a. Total DoD Population			787,426	-	291,304	-	987,184	-	2,400	-	2,068,314	0
c. Percent DoD Population Served by DoD Public Water Systems Meeting Established Drinking Water Requirements			88.7%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	98.7%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	95.1%	#DIV/0!

Notes: Report for second half of CY03.
 Regulated PWS - a Public Water System (PWS) subject to the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (US & territories) or FGS/OEBGD/international treaty (overseas)
 Unregulated PWS - a PWS that receives its drinking water from another supplier and is not subject to the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations or FGS/OEBGD/international treaty (overseas)

TABLE 3C-COMPLIANCE ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

Army

Measure of Merit											
Compliance Enforcement Act	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04/1
1. OPEN	377	282	148	149	152	65	51	48	45	48	
1a. UNRESOLVED	221	182	105	93	99	45	38	26	29	30	
2. NEW	287	225	156	184	140	136	123	107	106	96	
3. CLOSED	245	320	290	183	137	224	137	110	109	92	
4. INSPECTIONS	767	730	654	507	629	630	711	743	604	653	
New/Inspections	37.4%	30.8%	23.9%	36.3%	22.3%	21.6%	17.3%	14.4%	17.5%	14.7%	#DIV/0!

Navy

Measure of Merit											
Compliance Enforcement Act	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04/1
1. OPEN	184	152	166	139	132	60	88	109	138	111	
1a. UNRESOLVED	148	122	130	119	101	33	50	45	41	49	
2. NEW	188	161	146	125	129	105	96	95	80	45	
3. CLOSED	301	193	132	140	129	129	65	74	51	72	
4. INSPECTIONS	246	230	150	88	646	556	678	654	783	686	
New/Inspections	76.4%	70.0%	97.3%	142.0%	20.0%	18.9%	14.2%	14.5%	10.2%	6.6%	#DIV/0!

Marine Corps

Measure of Merit											
Compliance Enforcement Act	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04/1
1. OPEN	441	40	35	46	32	54	94	65	51	17	
1a. UNRESOLVED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
2. NEW	39	24	18	39	44	55	72	34	30	33	
3. CLOSED	129	425	23	30	57	33	32	63	44	65	
4. INSPECTIONS	165	125	228	260	183	238	222	279	194	534	
New/Inspections	23.6%	19.2%	7.9%	15.0%	24.0%	23.1%	32.4%	12.2%	15.5%	6.2%	#DIV/0!

Air Force

Measure of Merit											
Compliance Enforcement Act	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04/1
1. OPEN	126	70	46	14	10	10	10	20	22	17	
1a. UNRESOLVED	101	51	27	10	8	4	7	13	15	14	
2. NEW	158	146	81	47	41	40	33	47	49	54	
3. CLOSED	239	203	105	79	45	40	33	37	47	59	
4. INSPECTIONS	607	678	585	596	628	483	571	504	523	574	
New/Inspections	26.0%	21.5%	13.8%	7.9%	6.5%	8.3%	5.8%	9.3%	9.4%	9.4%	#DIV/0!

Defense Logistics Agency

Measure of Merit											
Compliance Enforcement Act	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04/1
1. OPEN	9	5	1	1	2	2	4	6	9	4	
1a. UNRESOLVED	7	2	1	1	2	1	4	6	8	3	
2. NEW	8	5	2	1	4	3	6	8	5	5	
3. CLOSED	6	9	6	1	3	3	4	6	4	10	
4. INSPECTIONS	42	47	44	29	31	21	17	20	21	21	
New/Inspections	19.0%	10.6%	4.5%	3.4%	12.9%	14.3%	35.3%	40.0%	23.8%	23.8%	#DIV/0!

DoD Totals

Measure of Merit											
Compliance Enforcement Act	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04/1
1. OPEN	1137	549	396	349	328	191	247	248	265	197	
1a. UNRESOLVED	477	357	263	223	210	83	99	90	93	105	
2. NEW	680	561	403	396	358	339	330	291	270	233	
3. CLOSED	920	1150	556	433	371	429	271	290	255	298	
4. INSPECTIONS	1827	1810	1661	1480	2117	1928	2199	2200	2125	2468	
New/Inspections	37.2%	31.0%	24.3%	26.8%	16.9%	17.6%	15.0%	13.2%	12.7%	9.4%	#DIV/0!

Notes: 1) Report Open, Unresolved, New and Closed Enforcement Actions and Regulatory Inspections for each FY, and first half of FY.
 2) Data should be consistent, eg: (Open FY03 + New FY04/1 - Closed FY04/1 = Open FY04/1)

TABLE 3D-NEW COMPLIANCE ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS BY STATUTE

Army								
Compliance Enforcement Actions by Statute	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. CAA	50	28	20	28	19	13	19	
2. CWA	46	37	31	30	38	33	37	
3. RCRA/C	46	39	38	36	28	30	18	
4. RCRA/I	12	14	16	5	6	6	3	
5. RCRA/D	8	7	5	1	4	2	2	
6. SDWA	13	7	17	20	11	21	16	
7. Other	9	8	9	2	1	1	1	

Navy								
Compliance Enforcement Actions by Statute	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01*	FY02**	FY03	FY04
1. CAA	37	30	29	21	23	34	8	
2. CWA	48	70	54	51	48	29	29	
3. RCRA/C	22	15	11	13	5	5	5	
4. RCRA/I	0	3	1	3	8	8	0	
5. RCRA/D	0	1	2	0	5	1	0	
6. SDWA	5	8	7	6	3	2	3	
7. Other	1	2	2	2	3	1	0	

* 3 NOV's listed in #7 "Other" for FY01 are 1 CERCLA, 1 TSCA and 1 OTHER

** 1 NOV listed on line 7 "Other" for FY02 is TSCA

Marine Corps								
Compliance Enforcement Actions by Statute	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. CAA	9	17	27	14	2	6	3	
2. CWA	14	11	11	40	20	13	23	
3. RCRA/C	7	8	6	2	2	6	1	
4. RCRA/I	5	1	0	2	5	3	1	
5. RCRA/D	3	5	4	2	2	1	1	
6. SDWA	3	0	5	4	2	0	4	
7. Other	0	2	2	8	1	1	0	

Air Force								
Compliance Enforcement Actions by Statute	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. CAA	16	12	8	8	10	8	11	
2. CWA	14	10	12	11	18	22	15	
3. RCRA/C	15	14	13	10	10	11	16	
4. RCRA/I	0	4	2	2	4	1	4	
5. RCRA/D	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
6. SDWA	2	1	3	2	3	6	7	
7. Other	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	

Defense Logistics Agency								
Compliance Enforcement Actions by Statute	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. CAA	0	1	2	0	3	2	0	
2. CWA	1	2	1	3	1	0	0	
3. RCRA/C	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	
4. RCRA/I	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	
5. RCRA/D	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
6. SDWA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
7. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

DoD Totals								
Compliance Enforcement Actions by Statute	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. CAA	112	88	86	71	57	63	41	0
2. CWA	123	130	109	135	125	97	104	0
3. RCRA/C	90	76	68	62	47	54	44	0
4. RCRA/I	17	23	19	12	24	18	9	0
5. RCRA/D	11	13	11	3	13	5	4	0
6. SDWA	23	16	32	33	19	30	30	0
7. Other	10	12	14	12	6	3	1	0

Note: 1) Report EAs received by statute in each FY, and first half of FY2004. FIFRA is included in Other.

2) Discuss trends

TABLE 3E-OPEN COMPLIANCE ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS BY CATEGORY

Army

Measure of Merit												
Open Compliance Enforcement Actions by C	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. ADMINISTRATIVE OR OPERATIONAL	219	249	174	90	104	89	50	37	41	42	44	
2..PROJECT RELATED	116	128	108	58	45	63	15	14	7	3	4	

Navy

Measure of Merit												
Open Compliance Enforcement Actions by C	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. ADMINISTRATIVE OR OPERATIONAL	242	148	126	137	122	123	63	85	101	93	83	
2..PROJECT RELATED	55	28	26	29	17	9	2	3	8	45	28	

Marine Corps

Measure of Merit												
Open Compliance Enforcement Actions by C	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. ADMINISTRATIVE OR OPERATIONAL	96	79	8	13	13	15	33	70	46	36	8	
2..PROJECT RELATED	435	362	32	22	32	17	21	24	19	15	9	

Air Force

Measure of Merit												
Open Compliance Enforcement Actions by C	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. ADMINISTRATIVE OR OPERATIONAL	121	62	36	27	12	9	9	5	14	12	15	
2..PROJECT RELATED	86	64	34	19	2	1	1	5	6	10	2	

Defense Logistics Agency

Measure of Merit												
Open Compliance Enforcement Actions by C	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. ADMINISTRATIVE OR OPERATIONAL	2	4	4	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	1	
2..PROJECT RELATED	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	3	

DoD Totals

Measure of Merit												
Open Compliance Enforcement Actions by C	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
1. ADMINISTRATIVE OR OPERATIONAL	680	542	348	267	251	237	156	198	205	189	151	
2..PROJECT RELATED	696	586	201	129	97	91	40	48	43	76	46	

Note: 1) Report EAs received as either administrative (e.g. paperwork) or operational (technique), or project related in each FY and for the first half of FY2004.

2) Discuss trends

TABLE 3.H--SIGNIFICANT NON-COMPLIANCE LIST (SNC) for Mid-FY2004

Name and location of Installation on EPA Significant Non-Compliance List (SNC List)	Date Added to SNC	Date Removed From SNC	Explain Reason for being on SNC List	Plan Of Action to Correct Underlying Problem	Media
A. ABC Military Storage Yard, Sioux City, Iowa	25-Dec-03	30-Mar-04	massive amounts of burnt out holiday lights and tinsel.	All lights and tinsel properly packaged and disposed of off-site.	RCRA

Notes: 1) Provide a list of all installations (US and its territories only) that are on the US Environmental Protection Agency's significant non-compliance list, and the media category of violation.

2) List any installations that were on the EPA list at any time during first half of FY2004, but were removed before 31 Mar 2004.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS IMPLEMENTATION

Number of Appropriate Facilities that have Completed Each Criterion, as of 30 Sep 2003											
	Army	Percent Complete	Navy	Percent Complete	Marine Corps	Percent Complete	Air Force	Percent Complete	DLA	Percent Complete	DOD
Total Number of Appropriate Facilities	176		89		23		199		137		624
Policy	156	88.64%	41	46.07%	7	30.43%	98	49.25%	11	8.03%	50.16%
Assessment	*	*	43	48.31%	11	47.83%	199	100.00%	12	8.76%	42.47%
Plan	*	*	24	26.97%	3	13.04%	17	8.54%	12	8.76%	8.97%
Aspects	*	*	24	26.97%	3	13.04%	15	7.54%	12	8.76%	8.65%
Training	*	*	29	32.58%	5	21.74%	28	14.07%	12	8.76%	11.86%
Review	*	*	17	19.10%	1	4.35%	13	6.53%	11	8.03%	6.73%
EMS Complete/In-Place	0	0.00%	11	12.36%	0	0.00%	7	3.52%	11	8.03%	4.65%

Number of Appropriate Facilities that have Completed Each Criterion, as of 31 March 2004											
	Army	Percent Complete	Navy	Percent Complete	Marine Corps	Percent Complete	Air Force	Percent Complete	DLA	Percent Complete	DOD
Total Number of Appropriate Facilities											
Policy		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Assessment		*		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Plan		*		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Aspects		*		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Training		*		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Review		*		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
EMS Complete/In-Place		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Note: See EMS metric definitions on DENIX: https://www.denix.csd.mil/denix/Public/Library/EMS/Documents/dod_ems_implementation_metrics.doc

Hazardous Waste Disposal

Table 4B - Hazardous Waste Disposal Reductions

	CY 92	CY 93	CY 94	CY 95	CY 96	CY 97	CY 98	CY 99	CY 00	CY 01	CY02	CY03	CY 92 - 02
													PERCENT
Army	60,055	82,999	66,984	41,156	43,831	35,204	31,700	40,198	55,192	35,613	36,068		-39.94%
(Logistics Command)	45,526	65,415	53,556	25,884	25,910	20,809	17,867	28,162	43,426	25,687	22,778		-49.97%
Navy	206,668	222,562	220,062	180,931	139,118	90,007	79,413	80,450	65,618	63,926	59,296		-71.31%
(Logistics Command-A)	79,534	91,673	65,799	50,394	0						0		0.00%
MC	78,900	114,500	75,500	78,700	75,106	64,781	75,098	38,385	14,616	25,791	14,245		-81.95%
(Logistics Command)	64,000	98,200	64,400	64,700	61,492	52,594	60,260	29,143	5,312	18,018	7,138		-88.85%
AF	49,228	37,638	33,392	30,966	24,960	21,542	20,874	19,361	16,643	20,774	18,559		-62.30%
(Logistics Command)	23,002	17,942	14,080	14,598	13,122	11,216	8,661	9,286	6,948	12,218	9,545		-58.50%
DLA	13,812	12,698	22,580	13,664	3,612	8,116	1,252	315	775	423	152		-98.90%
Total	408,663	470,397	418,518	345,417	286,627	219,650	208,337	178,709	152,844	146,527	128,320		-68.60%
Total Logistics	212,062	273,230	197,835	155,576	100,524	84,619	86,788	66,591	55,686	55,923	39,461		-81.39%

Hazardous Waste Disposal. Please provide all data in 1,000 of pounds.

Provide data to demonstrate progress toward meeting the DoD-wide goal to reduce hazardous waste disposal 50% from a 1992 baseline. Include all manifested hazardous waste, as currently defined by EPA under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, including, but not limited to, wastes associated with spills, tank cleaning, bilge water, BRAC activities, deployments, and off site disposal, treatment, recycling, and incineration activities.

Exceptions: Do not include hazardous wastes associated with CERCLA or RCRA cleanup activities. Show two sets of figures, the total hazardous waste, and the portion of those wastes generated by depots, i.e. AMC, AFMC, NAVSEA, etc. DLA should report for their facilities only.

* Formulas will be updated when new data is received.

ATTACHMENT 5
FY04 Mid-Year Restoration Review

The FY04 Mid-Year Restoration Review is focused on BRAC and each Component is asked to answer the questions under BRAC Environmental Restoration, as well as some Component-specific questions and fill in the associated charts.

Active and FUDS environmental restoration questions include Land Use Controls questions to be answered by each Component as well as questions addressing Component-specific issues. Components are requested to fill the associated charts for active installations and FUDS also.

BRAC ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION – All Components

1. Provide the data for table 1a and 2a.
2. Please describe your progress towards meeting the RIP/RC goal of 2005 at sites within your program. In your response, please provide the installations and sites that will not meet this goal, and describe the management initiatives are you undertaking to attempt to bring these sites back into conformance with the FY2005 goal? If it will not be possible for these sites to meet the FY2005 RIP/RC goal, please describe the outreach program you are planning to implement when it becomes public knowledge that you will not make this goal.

Of the sites scheduled to make the FY2005 goal, 175 are still in the investigation phase of the IRP program. ODUSD(I&E)/EM is concerned that it is not possible for this number of sites to reach the RIP/RC milestone, based on the historical trends in the Component phase and milestone data. The following is a Component-specific list of the total number of sites that are currently in the investigation phase scheduled to reach the RIP/RC milestone on or before September 30, 2005. Further, the number of sites where the study phase completion date (e.g., RI/FS) is equal to the estimated RIP/RC milestone date is shown parenthetically next to the total sites.

Army: 31 sites (27 sites)

Navy: 9 sites (9 sites)

Air Force: 118 sites (103 sites)

DLA: 17 sites (17 sites)

3. Please explain what management techniques you are employing to ensure that these sites will complete the investigation phase, have a ROD signed, and have any remedial response actions completed within this time frame, despite the average duration for these activities to date.

4. Of the sites where the end of the investigation phase is the same as the anticipated RIP/RC milestone date, what percentage of these sites will rely on the selection of a No Action alternative in the ROD? Alternatively, what percentage of these sites will rely on a natural attenuation/long-term monitoring remedy? Please explain what management techniques you are employing to ensure that these sites are adequately being characterized to support these remedy selections and your contingency plans should an alternative, more costly and time consuming remedy be required. Also, how are you coordinating your efforts with the regulatory community to ensure that a ROD can be signed with these anticipated remedies?

Property transfer is the primary mission of the BRAC process and should serve as the major driver for all program priorities associated with BRAC environmental restoration activities. Therefore, it is critical that each service's BRAC real property division coordinate closely with the personnel managing and executing environmental restoration activities at both the headquarters and installation levels.

5. Please describe your efforts to ensure that real property transfer and environmental restoration activities are well coordinated and that property transfer strategy is being accounted for as a driver in making cleanup decisions.

a. Are environmental restoration data available to your real property teams? How are these data used during the transfer process? When transferring property to the private sector, have you established a procedure for ensuring remedy maintenance, including LUC management, by the new owner? What management tools are you using to ensure these issues are addressed?

b. What management initiatives are underway to ensure that property transferred from DoD ownership does not develop new environmental restoration requirements for which DoD will be responsible? Outline what report(s) are developed prior to transfer to prevent claims of DoD responsibility for property contamination post-transfer? If not, what mechanisms do you use that protect DoD from future liability?

c. How do you account for real property transfer strategy when programming your restoration activities? If you prioritize cleanup efforts based on transfer needs, please describe the methodology employed. If you do not prioritize cleanup activities based on transfer strategy, please describe the documented methodology or protocol for prioritizing cleanup activities at your BRAC property.

On January 16, 2004, the ADUSD(ESOH), Mr. Alex Beehler, distributed a memorandum outlining the interim two-prong approach agreed upon by DoD and EPA for RODs and post-ROD implementation and documentation for NPL sites. This memorandum also outlined several metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of each approach.

6. What steps have you taken to begin tracking the data necessary to report on the DoD metrics designed to measure the results of the two Post-ROD approaches? Please discuss any difficulties you have encountered in tracking the required information.

7. Have you provided guidance on LUC issues to ensure that LUCs at BRAC installations are inspected and coordinated with ongoing operations and that other requirements, as appropriate, are being carried out? If so, please provide copies of your guidance.

The Components have indicated that the DERP MOM #5 that tracks the environmental condition of BRAC property is not adequate because it only tracks progress at an installation level and, therefore, does not allow for tracking of site-level progress. This limitation exists because the environmental condition of BRAC property is maintained in RMIS at an installation level. Tracking site-level progress may be a more beneficial tool to determine which sites are not environmentally ready to be transferred and focus efforts on those sites.

8. Do you have or are you planning to develop the capability to track the environmental condition of BRAC property (acreage Categories 1-7) at a site level within your data management system(s)? If not, what could ODUSD(I&E)/EM do to facilitate your ability to develop this capability.

9. Do you have the capability to identify which environmental restoration and/or munitions response sites are on distinct land parcels within your existing data management system(s)? If not, what could ODUSD(I&E)/EM do to facilitate your ability to develop this capability.

The BRAC Cleanup Plan (BCP) should serve as a business plan for property transfer activities associated with BRAC acreage at each installation. As such, it should document the real property transfer strategy associated with BRAC acreage as well as the DERP-governed restoration activities designed to facilitate property transfer. It is critical that this strategy be coordinated with the members of the BCT.

10. How do you ensure that the BCP reflects the property transfer strategy as well as each site's status as agreed to by all members of the BCT?

11. How do you ensure that the BCP and the state management plan support the BRAC goals associated with reaching RIP/RC by FY2005 at BRAC sites?

The Department of Defense (DoD) currently maintains a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to fund EPA's assistance and support in accelerating environmental restoration and cleanup decisions in support of reuse at selected Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) installations. The scope of this MOU states that DoD requires EPA assistance beyond what EPA funds to reach the remedy-in-place (RIP) or response complete (RC) milestones by the end of fiscal year (FY) 2005 at BRAC installations. Beyond the review of restoration-related documents, EPA personnel should be expediting site progress through their involvement with the BCT.

12. Do you see EPA FTE positively impacting operation of the BCT at your installations and property transfer? If so, please provide examples of how these funds are improving BCT performance and property transfer. If not, please provide your suggestions for tying these funding initiatives to BCT performance and how you envision a benefit to the property transfer process.

13. Given your investment in funding EPA full-time equivalency (FTE) requirements at your selected BRAC installations, has EPA assistance in accelerating cleanup and reuse at these installations been commensurate with your Service's expectations? If yes, what EPA contributions have substantiated this position? If no, where have EPA contributions not been of full value?

14. In the absence of an established metric for determining EPA's value added in accelerating cleanup and reuse, what measures do you believe are necessary to track accelerated progress and assess the cost/benefit of this MOU?

15. Upon expiration of this MOU in September 2005, will your Service support continuation of an MOU to achieve RIP at existing BRAC installations? If yes, what changes to the MOU would you require for this to occur?

BRAC ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION – Component Specific

Question for Army

Given the findings of the DODIG's recent audit of the Army's FY2002 Financial Statement, is Army confident that it will have sufficient time to make any necessary improvements to the BRAC portion of its statement to obtain a clean statement and unqualified opinion for its 2007 Financial Statement? What is the latest Army plan (with milestones) to address deficiencies in the Army BRAC program identified by the DODIG to obtain an unqualified audit opinion?

Question for Navy

Given the inherently uncertain nature of depending on land sale revenues to augment the BRAC program, what difficulties has Navy experienced with respect to programming and planning the additional funds as they become available? How is Navy addressing these difficulties?

Question for Air Force

At the FY03 end-of-year ESOH Management Review, the Air Force expected to complete its MMRP site inventory by the end of February 2004. Did the Air Force complete its MMRP site inventory as planned? When does the Air Force plan to have its MMRP sites reflected in the Air Force Financial Statement?

ACTIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION – All Components

1. Provide the data for table 1b. and 2b.

2. Land Use Controls

a. Have you provided guidance on LUC issues to ensure that LUCs at active installations are inspected and coordinated with ongoing operations and that other requirements, as appropriate, are being carried out? If so, please provide copies of your guidance.

b. Have you defined the term “LUC violation” and set up a process for tracking and reporting these violations? If so, what are you tracking and how are you reporting to headquarters? How are you differentiating between LUC violations and LUC failures?

c. Have you incorporated LUC considerations into the environmental restoration sections of your internal audits? What LUC information are you requesting?

d. Have you established mechanisms to monitor LUC costs?

ACTIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION - Component Specific

Questions for Army

1. Given that the Department is expecting clean financial statements for an unqualified audit opinion by the end of FY07 and given the findings of the DoDIG’s recent audit of the Army’s FY2002 Financial Statement, is Army confident that it will have sufficient time to make any necessary improvements to obtain a clean statement and unqualified opinion for its 2007 Financial Statement? What is the latest Army plan (with milestones) to address deficiencies identified by the DoDIG to obtain an unqualified audit opinion?

2. At the FY03 end-of-year ESOH Management Review, the Army stated it will complete its inventory of MMRP sites in FY04 and have all sites incorporated into its CTC and financial statement at the end of FY04. Is the Army still on track to meet this goal? Have any issues arisen that will cause the Army to miss this goal?

Questions for Navy

1. At the FY03 end-of-year ESOH Management Review, the Navy declared itself ready for financial audit. Given that the Department is expecting clean financial statements for an unqualified audit opinion by the end of FY07, what steps has the Navy taken so far in FY04 towards an unqualified audit opinion? What is the Navy plan to achieve that unqualified audit opinion?

2. At mid-year 2004, does Navy have an estimate as to when the MMRP site growth is expected to level off? Can Navy characterize the extent of its remaining MMRP inventory development process, including both timeframe and cost aspects?

Question for Air Force

At the FY03 end-of-year ESOH Management Review, the Air Force declared it would achieve an unqualified audit opinion on its financial statement in 2006 for active installations. At mid-year 2004, is Air Force still on track with its plan of action and milestones to achieve an unqualified audit opinion? What steps has the Air Force taken so far in FY04 towards an unqualified audit opinion?

Question for Defense Logistics Agency

In the last ESOH Management Review, DLA reported that it had taken steps toward obtaining an unqualified audit opinion for financial liability reporting. At mid-year 2004, is DLA on track with its plan of action and milestones to achieve an unqualified audit opinion? When is DLA expected to be ready to receive an unqualified audit opinion?

Questions for Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS)

1. Given that the Department is expecting clean financial statements for an unqualified audit opinion by the end of FY07 and given the findings of the DoDIG's recent audit of the Army's FY2002 Financial Statement, is Army confident that it will have sufficient time to make any necessary improvements to obtain a clean statement and unqualified opinion for its 2007 Financial Statement? What is the latest Army plan (with milestones) to address deficiencies identified by the DoDIG to obtain an unqualified audit opinion?
2. The Army cites the FUDS Program Management Plan as the primary document for identifying and monitoring site progress; however, it is not specified how corrective measures will be documented, implemented, and managed? Also, what strategies and approaches will be used in expediting site progress in order to meet the 2020 goal?
3. What percentage of the FUDS CTC is based on the use of standard cost estimating assumptions applied in the RACER estimate regarding the percentage of acres to be cleared and the depth to which clearance will take place versus relying on actual field data specifying the actual amount of acreage to be cleared and actual depth of contamination at each site? Historically, when actual field data have replaced standard assumptions in RACER, what is the typical impact on CTC? If it is an increase, what is the average increase? To what degree are changes in assumptions vetted with HQUSACE and Army Staff? Provide a listing of sites where the CTC's varied by +/- 25% in a single year over the past 3 years. Provide a short summary explaining each of the changes. If CTCs for a site increase or decrease by 25%, what steps are taken within the organization to determine whether the increase is appropriate, and if not what is done and by whom to address the issue.

ATTACHMENT 5 – TABLES
Table 1a: Planned vs. Actual Restoration Activities (BRAC)

Phase	Army			Navy			Air Force			DLA		
	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)
Investigation												
Response Complete												
Installations Achieving RIP/RC	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)
Number of Installations												

Table 1b: Planned vs. Actual Restoration Activities (Active and FUDS)

Relative Risk Site Evaluation Category	Army			Navy			Air Force			DLA			FUDS		
	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)
High															
Medium															
Low															
Not Evaluated															
Not Required															
Phase Progress	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)
Investigation															
Response Complete															
Installations Achieving RIP/RC	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Actual (based on FY04 MY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY03 EOY data)	FY04 Projected (based on FY04 MY data)
Number of Installations															

