

## SPD Environmental Summit II

*" Understanding or Environmental Responsibilities"*

*11 – 14 March 2003  
El Segundo, California*

### **Summit Opening**

*The following were expectations identified by the attendants at the beginning of the summit:*

- a. Continue to develop systems to share info across boundaries and disciplines.*
- b. Learn the Divisions implementation plans for the 7 EOPs.*
- c. Understand the changes in environmental programs.*
- d. Understand what each other are doing.*
- e. Understand cross-functional programs.*
- f. Share program Information.*
- g. Inspiration.*
- h. Share ideas with others.*
- i. Understanding the rest of the organization.*
- j. Develop Synergy.*
- k. Improving identity of environmental organizations.*
- l. Learn the future of the Corps.*
- m. Learn what we do and how we do it.*
- n. Foster and facilitate relationships.*

*Several observations were presented by the participants and reinforced by BG Davis. These were the absence of participants from Civil Works Regulatory Branch and other Federal Agencies. It was the belief of several participants that regulatory plays an integral part of the Corps and their presence should have been emphasized. It is the General's belief that in fine-tuning our environmental operations, we need to include our partners and regulators as outside eyes. In that manner they could bring new dimensions to the way we execute our programs.*

*A challenge from BG Davis:*

*In the era of cutbacks and short funds, " How do you make this meeting an investment instead of an expense?" What will you take away and how will you follow-up on what you have learned during the Summit? The Corps as a learning organization anticipates that application of the concepts and information obtained during the Summit will be used as the metric in determining the answer to the question.*

# SPD Environmental Summit II

"Understanding of Environmental Responsibilities"

11 – 14 March 2003  
El Segundo, California

## **Daily Hot-washes**

### **Day 1**

#### *Things that went well:*

- a. *Discussion on Sustainability*
- b. *Same folks that participated in ENVS I were present.*
- c. *There was Command Interest. BG Davis's participation.*
- d. *Captivating interest, looking forward to next day.*

#### *Things that didn't go well*

- a. *No participation by regulatory*
- b. *Need to stick to schedule*
- c. *Not enough people*
- d. *Audibility*

### **Day 2**

#### *Things that went well:*

- a. *Presence of Commander*
- b. *District Environmental Overviews*
- c. *Better control of time*
- d. *More breaks*
- e. *Tanis's Endangered Species ID Cards*
- f. *Inter-district initiatives*
- g. *Less Power-point Presentations*

#### *Things that didn't go well*

- a. *Not all EOP Sustainability reps present*
- b. *No CESPAN PM rep present*
- c. *No presence by Regulatory folks*

## **Summit Closing Comments by participants (exact statements from exit questionnaire):**

1.
  - a. *Good opportunity to hear how others operate in the areas outside normal work activities.*
  - b. *New Vision on Corps Activities.*
  - c. *Hearing other District's concerns about regional work. What is and is not working.*
  - d. *Need less speakers and more interaction between all districts.*

2.
  - a. *We needed the Natural Preservation and operations folks attending.*
  - b. *This was a good follow-on to the 1<sup>st</sup> Summit.*
  - c. *There was much better involvement by CW this Summit.*
  - d. *The Planners indicated that the Summit requires a theme.*
  - e. *There was much better emphasis on projects and process rather than, " commercials".*
  - f. *Need to ensure this event is placed on the SPD Master Calendar next time.*
  
3.
  - a. *Good Idea to capture presentations on CD.*
  - b. *Very Good mix and balance of presentations.*
  - c. *Do need to engage others in the Corps and other resource agencies with environmental responsibilities and program authorities.*
  - d. *Schedule of presentations would benefit from a one-sentence description of the theme.*
  - e. *Provide a list of defined acronyms and authorities to attendees on day one.*
  - f. *Include Tech-13s.*
  - g. *Excellent networking opportunities.*
  - h. *Make better use of your cables, Have Power-point operator off to one side as far as possible.*
  
4.
  - a. *I thought this years meeting was better. I enjoyed hearing from the civil side.*
  - b. *Good balance of topics discussed and just about the right length.*
  - c. *More case examples in the future.*
  - d. *Thanks for getting us all together.*
  
5.
  - a. *Presentations provided a good cross-functional overview of Division Environmental Programs- Civil Works/Military.*
  - b. *Location of Meeting was great.*
  - c. *The panel discussions were a nice change of pace from single person presentations.*
  
6.
  - a. *Good participation among all Districts and Division.*
  - b. *Good presentations from outside Division and Corps.*
  - c. *Good participation/support from BG Davis.*
  - d. *Need more Regulatory Participation.*
  
7.
  - a. *The Environmental Operating Principles cross all internal boundaries, similar to PMBP. The discussions are no more applicable to this group than many others such as PM Civil and PAO. Print soft stuff to hold interest.*
  - b. *Conference needs a better-defined focus if it is to attract participation.*
  - c. *Need to get plans from other Divisions/Districts; steal from the best.*
  - d. *Concurrent sessions for specific groups may provide more interest.*
  - e. *Get agenda out earlier.*

8.
  - a. *Good cross-functional (need regulatory)*
  - b. *Good exposure to other programs (Civil, HTRW, Military)*
  - c. *Excellent facilities*
  - d. *Good job by SPD to set-up and facilitate discussions.*
  - e. *Assure presentations are in alignment (perchlorate discussion was not totally applicable)*
  - f. *Reduce to 2 days, make presentations tighter.*
  
9.
  - a. *Walker presentation was excellent and put the 7 EOPS into prospective.*
  
10.
  - a. *The district overviews were good*
  - b. *The USACE 2012 overview was good.*
  - c. *Nice hotel but the conference room was dismal.*
  
  - d. *Fix the cable from the laptop to LCD projector.*
  - e. *Need to define goals of conference a bit better.*
  
11.
  - a. *Unfortunate that Operations and Regulatory did not participate.*
  - b. *Good representation of Districts.*
  - c. *All participated.*
  - d. *Better relationships*
  - e. *Did not follow-up on last year's action items.*
  - f. *Sometimes hard to see the presentations.*
  - g. *Some equipment failures.*
  
12.
  - a. *Conference was a little unfocused. Original idea was to bring together all the various people and organizations doing environmental things in SPD. Then, attendance was limited and I wondered what the purpose of the meeting was. In spite of all that, I think that the meeting went well and was useful and informative.*
  - b. *Days ran too long. 8 to 5 is too long.*
  
13.
  - a. *Presentations from the Districts went well. Participation by BG Davis was great. That demonstrated his commitment to the environmental program. Sorely missed the REO presentation. Kurt Williams talk last year was very beneficial. The hotel with happy hour added a lot, as most had easy vehicles to socialize after the sessions.*
  
14.
  - a. *Excellent choice of location*
  - b. *Good Participation*
  - c. *Outside sessions with EPA and CEERL were excellent; we need more.*
  - d. *District presentations were informative.*
  - e. *Do not jam too many presentations into sessions.*
  - f. *Need to include more real work examples to explain the program elements.*

15.

- a. *Liked:*
- a. *ERDC Presentation*
  - b. *Yolo Wetlands presentation/discussion*
  - c. *Rio Salado/Tres Rios presentation*
  - d. *Perchlorate presentation*
- b. *Did Not Like:*
- a. *Civil Works Overview*
  - b. *SFO?*
  - c. *Coffee*
  - d. *Room for conference meeting*
  - e. *EMS presentation*

16.

- a. *Things that went well:*
- a. *That this happened is well.*
  - b. *Length good, 3 days*
  - c. *Green Hotel*
  - d. *Breakfast and happy hour good opportunity for mixing.*
  - e. *BG Davis attendance was good.*
  - f. *The diversity of the participants was good.*
  - g. *Exposure for CERL was good.*
  - h. *Exposure for Susanne and Brownfield program was good.*
  - i. *Yolo presentation was great.*
  - j. *Global Green Presentation was great.*
- b. *Things that didn't go so well:*
- a. *Needed longer Lunch on Thursday*
  - b. *Forgot to bring last year's "Due out".*
  - c. *Projector broken, no contingency.*
  - d. *Regulatory function missing.*
  - e. *WREO and IMA speakers cancelled.*
  - f. *SPN not informed ahead of time.*
  - g. *Not clear what theme of outside speakers was.*
  - h. *Forgot to review agenda at beginning.*
  - i. *Invite outside partners.*

17.

- a. *Positive things:*
- a. *Focused, uninterrupted time on subject.*
  - b. *Face time / relationship building time with colleagues across SPD.*
  - c. *Increased awareness of District and Division wide activities, challenges and innovations.*
  - d. *Ideas with POCs to discuss future*
  - e. *Info on emerging technology, policy, trends.*
    - *CEERL*
    - *RSC*
    - *Potential approaches to Braces*

- *Environment new policy*
  - f. *RSC update – great progress since last year*
  - g. *EOP – Senior Leaders intent on*
  - h. *Command and Senior Level participation.*
  - i. *Great Facilities.*
- b. *To improve:*
- a. *Clearer coordinated statement of intent and purpose of conference*
  - b. *Bring Regulatory, Natural Resource, and Lakes professionals to the table.*
  - c. *May want to add field trips.*