

## Memorandum

To: Dialogue Participants, Alternates, and Staff

From: The Keystone Center

Subject: Follow-up from the May 3-4, 1998 Dialogue Meeting in Anniston, Alabama

Date: June 28, 2004

### Meeting Summary Structure and Deadlines

The following draft summarizes the discussions from the Anniston Dialogue on Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) meeting, which occurred on May 3-4, 1998. This summary is comprised of:

- action items agreed to by the Dialogue at the meeting;
- an overview of topics addressed in the presentations; and
- a summary of issues and concerns raised and discussed by the Dialogue.

For ease of reading, the meeting summary is organized by topic and is not necessarily chronological. Slides of presentations made at the meeting are available upon request by contacting Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

## Action Items

**Action Item: The next Dialogue meeting is scheduled for July 12-14, 1998 near Washington, DC. The meeting will start at 10:00 a.m. on July 12 and conclude no later than 5:00 p.m. on June 14.** *Responsible Entities:* Participants should have received and returned their meeting response forms by June 5, 1998. Questions regarding logistics for the meeting should be directed to Horne Engineering at 888-482-4312. *Time Line:* Keystone will distribute a draft agenda for this meeting by July 1, 1998.

**Action Item: The Dialogue requested verification as to whether data gap information identified in the procurement process could be revealed after the award of CLIN 0003.** *Responsible Entities:* Chuck Comaty will explore this request with each individual technology provider. *Time Line:* Chuck Comaty will report back to the Dialogue at the July Dialogue meeting.

**Action Item:** The Keystone Center will work with Chuck to schedule a conference call for members of the Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) work group to discuss additional proposals to the BAA. *Responsible Entities:* Keystone will distribute calendars to work group members and schedule a call at Chuck's direction. *Time Line:* The BAA Work Group meets on an on-going basis.

**Action Item:** Individuals can submit nominees to the National Research Council (NRC) for Assembled Chemical Weapons (ACW) potential Reviewers. *Responsible Entities:* Individuals should submit names to Attention: Rob Bailey, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418. *Time Line:* Requests should be submitted to Rob Bailey by September 1, 1998.

**Action Item:** A summary of public outreach activities at each of the assembled chemical weapons stockpile sites will be distributed via the Dialogue Exchange. *Responsible Entities:* The DoD Public Outreach Team will compile this information. *Time Line:* This summary will be provided by July 1, 1998.

**Action Item:** The following was agreed to regarding the CATT's role until the announcement of CLIN 0003. 1) The CATT will continue to have an on-site representative working in coordination with the DoD Technical Team. This on-site representative will stay in regular contact with the rest of the CATT via conference calls. 2) The CATT will continue to send regular updates to the Dialogue. 3) The CATT will be represented at the CLIN 0003 Decision meeting scheduled for June 29-July 1, 1998. 4) The CATT will continue to provide feedback to DoD on the demonstration location strategy. 5) The CATT will develop a proposal for their role after the July Dialogue meeting. *Responsible Entities:* The CATT. *Time Line:* The role outlined above describes the charge of the CATT through July 12, 1998.

**Action Item:** Summary of comments from the March 12, 1998 NRC Meeting in Richmond, Kentucky to be posted to the Dialogue Exchange. *Responsible Entities:* Keystone will work with Rob Bailey to incorporate any additional community comments he received via mail. *Time Line:* The comments will be posted to the Dialogue Exchange by June 15, 1998.

**Action Item:** Determine if it is possible for the CATT to be the Dialogue's representatives during demonstration site visits. *Responsible Entities:* Joe Novad, DoD Technical Team, will explore the possibility of CATT visitations to individual sites. *Time Line:* Joe Novad will report back to the Dialogue at the July meeting.

**Action Item:** Draft revisions to the Dialogue ground rules regarding public document distribution. *Responsible Entities:* The CATT will draft revisions to the Dialogue ground rules for the entire Dialogue's review. *Time Line:* The CATT and Keystone will draft these revisions and post them to the Dialogue Exchange for review by the entire Dialogue group.

**Action Item:** Individuals interested in participating on a work group in coordination with PM ACWA to draft the December 15, 1998 Report to Congress should submit names to Janesse Brewer of Keystone. The draft Report will be distributed for Dialogue review prior

**to it being finalized.** *Responsible Entities:* Dialogue participants should contact Janesse via e-mail at jbrewer@keystone.org or via telephone at (970) 468-5822. *Time Line:* Interested Dialogue participants should contact Janesse by June 30, 1998.

**Action Item: Determine any legal ramifications of including Dialogue participants in the development of the December 15, 1998 Report to Congress.** *Responsible Entities:* Lisa Simon will discuss this issue with her colleagues before the July Dialogue meeting. *Time Line:* Lisa will report back to the Dialogue at the July meeting in Washington, DC.

**Action Item: Determine if there are any potential issues regarding proprietary information in the Report to Congress.** *Responsible Entities:* Lisa Simon and Chuck Comaty will discuss this issue with each of the technology providers. *Time Line:* Lisa Simon and Chuck will report back to the Dialogue at the July meeting in Washington, DC.

**Action Item: As requested by citizen participants, SBR Technologies and PM ACWA will continue to work with Prociv's office and PMCD to collect information regarding the baseline incineration for input to the technology matrix being prepared for SBR Technologies.** *Responsible Entities:* Bill Pehlivanian will follow-up with Prociv's office on this tasking. *Timeline:* Bill Pehlivanian will report back to the group as to the status at the next meeting. *Update post-meeting:* *Since the Anniston meeting, ACWA staff have discussed this issue with congressional staffers and were informed that it is not appropriate or necessary for the ACWA Program to undertake a study comparing baseline and the proposed alternative technologies at this time. This effort is currently on hold and will be discussed at the July Dialogue meeting.*

**Action Item: The Dialogue requested ongoing and updated information regarding the formation of a new Integrated Program Team (IPT) between PMCD and ACWA. Additionally, some members asked for representation outside of DoD to be considered in the event that this group would be making substantive policy decisions.** *Responsible Entities:* Bill Pehlivanian will report back to the Dialogue regarding the potential nature of the IPT work and the appropriateness of external involvement from those outside of DoD. *Time Line:* Bill Pehlivanian will report back to the group prior to the July Dialogue meeting.

## Meeting Summary

The following is a meeting summary of the May 3-4, 1998 Dialogue on ACWA Meeting. Its intent is to provide a summary of the topics addressed as well as to capture the issues, concerns, agreements, and decisions that emerged from the discussions. It is not intended as a verbatim record of the discussions.

### Opening Comments

--Michael Parker, Program Manager, ACWA Program

Michael Parker thanked participants, members of the public, technology providers, and others, for attending the meeting on a Sunday. Parker then stated that the ACWA Program were almost out of the “paper” stage of the program, and that the alternative technologies would be actually tested and the ACWA Program would have more information about whether the alternative technology was suitable to address the challenges associated with the demilitarization of assembled chemical weapons.

Parker went on to acknowledge the hard work and long hours that the DoD Technical Team, the technology providers, and the CATT had dedicated to the data gap process. Michael Parker particularly acknowledged the four CATT Liaison members who are not compensated for their time and efforts toward the ACWA Program’s goals.

Next, Parker noted that due to the workload associated with the ACWA Program, that Ann Gallegos, head of the Public Outreach Team for ACWA, would be joined by Lynda Dubrow, of Horne Engineering, to aid in the efforts associated with public outreach.

Finally, Michael Parker stated that six companies were awarded CLIN 0002 task orders: AEA Technology; Burns and Roe; General Atomics; Lockheed Martin; Parsons and Allied Signal; and Teledyne Commodore. Parker noted that one company was not awarded CLIN 0002 based on the DoD Team’s evaluation of the company’s proposal against the RFP’s Demonstration Selection Criteria. However, that company has expressed interest in submitting a proposal for the ACWA Broad Agency Announcement (BAA).

### **Citizens’ Advisory Technical Team Meeting Objectives and Review of Ground Rules**

--Paul Walker and Doug Hindman, CATT Liaison Group

*This briefing updated the Dialogue on the CATT’s decision to request a Dialogue meeting in May, the objectives of such a meeting, and the reasons associated with choosing Anniston as the location. Briefing slides for the presentation (Attachment A) can be requested by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.*

Paul Walker, member of the CATT Liaison Group, reminded participants that the full Dialogue had originally agreed not to meet until CLIN 0003 was awarded in July; however, the CATT felt it was important to meet prior to July 6 to ensure that the Dialogue understood and provided into: the CLIN 0002 award; issues related to demonstration and the demonstration location selection strategy; and the CATT’s role from CLIN 0002 to CLIN 0003. Walker briefly explained that Anniston was selected for the Dialogue meeting for two main reasons: 1) As a courtesy to technology providers since a public meeting was scheduled for Monday, May 5, 1998 in Anniston; and 2) the Dialogue agreed to attempt to hold meetings near stockpile sites to gather public input.

Doug Hindman, member of the CATT Liaison Group, reminded the Dialogue that they had first met almost a year ago and that the Dialogue process was a fragile and complex process. Doug Hindman reviewed key ground rules and reminded participants of previous agreements made to each other and the process.

### **ACWA in Perspective: Reality Check**

--Bill Pehlivanian, Deputy Program Manager

--Irene Kornelly, CATT Liaison Member

*Bill Pehlivanian and Irene Kornelly presented slides clarifying what the ACWA Program and the Dialogue is and is not. Briefing slides for the presentation (Attachment B) can be requested by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.*

Key questions regarding this briefing and discussion on what the ACWA Program and the Dialogue is and is not:

*Question regarding the maturity of Alternative Technologies:* A Dialogue participant requested that an Anniston schedule for the incinerator be made available for comparison.

*Facilitator Note: This was distributed during the meeting. Please call Horne to request this document (Attachment C)*

Another Dialogue participant stated that he thought that five to seven years seemed a lengthy estimation, but understood that the government procurement process, and the complex regulatory process factored into that estimation. He felt that his experience in the private sector proved most technologies could mature much quicker. Michael Parker indicated that the five to seven year figure was an estimation he and his staff made when asked the question on the Hill. The estimation was made taking a backward-looking approach. Parker indicated that the ACWA Program had considerably cut down time associated with most procurement processes and considers that to be a good indication that some perceived road blocks could be removed or streamlined and thus alter potential time frames.

*Clarification regarding the applicability of Public Law 104-208 to sites other than Colorado and Kentucky:* A Dialogue participant clarified that embodied in the supplemental language of Public Law 104-208 is discretionary language that can be interpreted that an alternative technology may be implementable at sites other than Colorado and Kentucky if the technology is cost-effective, safe, and protective of human health and the environment. Another participant then asked if the legislation was intended to potentially effect more than the Kentucky and Colorado site, then why were those two sites specifically mentioned in the law? The first Dialogue participant responded that delegations from those states were particularly involved in the drafting of the legislation. Michael Parker, Program Manager for ACWA clarified that the law's intent was to be inclusive of any sites with assembled chemical weapons.

*Questions regarding the comparison of baseline incineration to the alternative technologies:* Questions surfaced regarding PMCD's progress in completing the working matrix which is intended to provide information in a variety of categories for a number of technologies. PMCD has requested additional clarity regarding the types of information, both content and form, that the Dialogue is looking for regarding the baseline system. A Dialogue participant asked if the alternative technologies were not going to be compared to the baseline system, then by what measure would they be compared? Bill Pehlivanian from DoD indicated that the alternative technologies were being compared to the criteria. Bill Pehlivanian went on to say that it was his

belief that a comparison to the baseline incineration process would happen eventually, but that it would likely be post-ACWA.

*Concerns regarding potential future interfacing between PMCD and ACWA:* Bill Pehlivanian stated that an Integrated Program Team (IPT) is being formed to look at issues related to the potential implementation of any alternative technology. The IPT would be a group of people from DoD and the Army who are empowered to make decisions and to bring ACWA and PMCD together in a formal setting. It is estimated that the IPT would first meet at the end of May and conclude after the final report to Congress was issued in April 1999. A Dialogue participant requested that the Dialogue remain apprised of this effort and requested, that if appropriate, that a non-DoD member of the Dialogue be invited to participate. Michael Parker clarified that it was his understanding that the group would mainly be tasked with “housekeeping” or administrative duties and that it would not be making significant policy decisions regarding chemical demilitarization. PM ACWA agreed to keep the Dialogue informed regarding this issue and to consider adding a non-DoD Dialogue participant in the event that this group is being set up to be anything other than to facilitate administrative duties.

#### **Award of CLIN 0002 and the “WatchCATT” Role**

--Chuck Comaty, DoD Procurement Officer

--Jim Richmond, ACWA Technical Team

--Bob Palzer, Jim Earley, and Dan Cassidy, CATT

*This presentation provided an overview of how the Demonstration Selection Criteria were applied and used during this assessment phase. Additionally, the CATT outlined their role and oversight in this process. Briefing slides for the presentation (Attachment D) can be requested by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.*

*Comments by Jim Richmond, ACWA Technical Team:* Jim Richmond stated that the two main goals of this past assessment phase were 1) to apply the demonstration selection criteria; and 2) to strive for consensus among DoD members, in coordination with the CATT, regarding the award of CLIN 0002. Richmond additionally indicated that the CATT, particularly the four Liaison members, continued to serve the Dialogue in their role as a “WatchCATT” by keeping an eye on the integrity of the Program and as non-voting participants in the process. He indicated that the conversations were always open, honest, and candid. Richmond stated that he and the rest of the DoD Technical Team valued the CATT’s perspective and appreciated the richness they added to the serious discussions related to applying the Demonstration Selection Criteria.

*Questions regarding the Demonstration Selection Criteria and the award of CLIN 0002:* A Dialogue participant asked the DoD Technical Team if after applying the Demonstration Selection Criteria, there were any holes, or gaps in the criteria or Request for Proposals, that became apparent to the team. Members of the DoD Technical Team stated definitively no-- they believed that the criteria was thorough and comprehensive. A member of the DoD Technical Team did indicate that they perhaps would have structured the criteria slightly different for ease of application to the alternative technology proposals.

*Questions regarding the data gaps identified by the DoD Technical Team:* A Dialogue participant inquired whether the data gaps identified by the DoD Technical Team would become public after CLIN 0003 was awarded. The Dialogue participant clarified his specific interest in whether the Data Gap Resolution Reports would be accessible to the public after the award of CLIN 0003. Comaty stated that he was not certain at this time, and that he would need to evaluate that on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the technology providers.

*Concern regarding the release of information after the award of CLIN 0003:* A Dialogue participant voiced concern regarding the release of pertinent information. Michael Parker stated that the contractors needed to validate the claims they were making in the demonstrations. Additionally, due to the fact that the alternative technology providers are competing against the criteria and not against each other, it was in their own best interest to release as much information as possible.

*Clarification regarding proven alternative technologies:* Dialogue participants discussed the fact that alternative technologies have proven successful for the bulk agent and metal parts, but not for all the challenges associated with the assembled chemical munition.

### **Broad Agency Announcement**

--Chuck Comaty, Procurement Officer

Chuck reported that he talks to interested firms daily regarding the BAA, which is due to close in August 1998. He will work to set up a conference call with the BAA work group to discuss next steps regarding the BAA.

### **Update on National Research Council (NRC) Activities**

--Robert Beaudet, Chair of NRC Committee on Review and Evaluation of Alternative Technologies for the Demilitarization of Assembled Chemical Weapons

*This presentation provided an update to the Dialogue on the NRC's work and activities since the Salt Lake City Dialogue meeting and Reported on the NRC's next steps. Briefing slides for the presentation (Attachment E) can be requested by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.*

*Clarification regarding what kind of information is required for potential peer reviewers of the ACW NRC Report:* Bruce Braun of the NRC, clarified that names should be submitted to Rob Bailey, Senior Program Officer, by September 1, 1998. Information should include name, contact numbers, and relevant resume materials. Braun clarified that neither he nor Bailey choose the reviewers, but that he would submit the names. Furthermore, Braun stated that potential reviewers do not have to be members of the Academy to be considered as a reviewer.

*Question regarding the NRC Scope of Work:* A Dialogue participant asked whether the Committee would be addressing the issue of technology maturity in their report. Bob Beaudet stated that the Committee would comment on the maturity of each technology.

### **Next Steps in the Assessment Phase: CLIN 0002 to CLIN 0003**

--Jim Richmond, ACWA Technical Team

--Chuck Comaty, DoD Procurement Officer  
--Doug Hindman, CATT Liaison Member

*This presentation provided an overview of how the full set of Demonstration Selection Criteria will be applied to the final step of the Assessment Phase. Additionally, the CATT solicited feedback regarding their role for this final Assessment Phase. Briefing slides for the presentation (Attachment F) can be requested by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.*

*Discussion regarding the role of the CATT during from CLIN 0002 to CLIN 0003: After some discussion, the Dialogue agreed that the CATT should 1) continue to have an on-site representative in Edgewood interacting with the DoD Technical Team; 2) the CATT will continue to have conference calls on an as needed basis; 3) the CATT will continue to provide weekly updates to the Dialogue; and 4) the CATT will be present for the CLIN 0003 Decision Meetings June 29-July 1, 1998 in Edgewood.*

### **Demonstration**

--Joe Novad, ACWA Technical Team  
--Armand Balasco, A.D. Little  
--Irene Kornelly, Dan Cassidy, and Paul Walker, CATT

*These briefings were provided to increase understanding regarding demonstration including the definition and the demonstration location strategy. Briefing slides for the presentation (Attachment G) can be requested by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.*

The following were key questions raised during the demonstration selection:

*Question regarding cost as it relates to demonstration: A Dialogue participant asked if a contractor could volunteer to subsidize some or all of their true costs in their proposal demonstrations. Chuck Comaty said that for the purposes of the Demonstration that they are simply looking at whether the cost is reasonable. Joe Novad stated that in the final demonstration report that the technology providers will need to provide a full scale cost estimate.*

*Clarification regarding the potential downselecting of one or more technologies: A Dialogue participant asked for clarification on whether if a company receives a “fail” on a pass/fail criteria, that despite their other rankings, they would not proceed to demonstration. The answer from DoD was affirmative.*

*Clarification regarding Resource Considerations as a component of the Best Value Decision (BVD) meetings: A member of the ACWA staff clarified that resource considerations included financial considerations as well as facility availability.*

### **Environmental Team Update:**

--Greg Mohrman, ACWA  
--Bob Palzer, CATT

*The Environmental Team's update provided an overview of the current status of the Environmental Assessment (EA) and the draft Treatability Document. The Environmental Team solicited feedback regarding the suggested Public Involvement Strategy outlined in the Treatability Document as well as to solicit additional input for avenues to distributing the EA. Briefing slides for the presentation (Attachment H) can be requested by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.*

*Demonstration Location Strategy:* While the entire demonstration location strategy matrix will be available at the July Dialogue meeting, the following information was made available regarding demonstration locations and the companies proposed to test at those locations. AEA will test at Aberdeen Proving Ground and in Porton Down, UK. Burns and Roe will test at ERDC. General Atomics will test at CAMDS and Dugway Proving Ground (DPG). Lockheed Martin will test at CAMDS and ERDC. Parsons-Allied Signal will test at CAMDS and DPG and Teledyne Commodore will test at either Aberdeen Proving Ground or DPG.

*Concerns regarding "over-promising:"* Dialogue participants raised the concern that some Dialogue participants were over-promising, or creating inappropriate expectations for the ACWA Program. Another Dialogue participant stated that while his expectations are high for the ACWA Program and while he has high hopes that there is an alternative out there that can address the assembled chemical weapon in a sufficient amount of time, he would not characterize his enthusiasm as false expectations. Another participant expressed her enthusiasm for DoD's "new way of doing business," and was concerned that trust may be diminished due to this over-promising issue. Michael Parker expressed frustration regarding this issue of overpromising and the potential effects it could have for the ACWA Program, he asked for participant's help in addressing this issue. Some suggested that PM ACWA create an estimated time line for demonstration to implementation. Parker and Pehlivanian were concerned that such a charge was far beyond their scope in the ACWA Program, but they additionally saw the benefit of everyone speaking the same language in regard to the ACWA time line and potential implementation of technologies.

*Question regarding raw data from the demonstrations:* A Dialogue participant questioned whether the raw data from the demonstration tests would be accessible to the public. A member of the ACWA staff stated that data reports from the tests would be made public, but that the raw data would not be made public.

*Clarification regarding testing conditions:* The DoD Technical Team clarified for a Dialogue participant that the demonstrations would only be run under normal conditions. This prompted the Dialogue participant to question how this program differs from Alternative Technology I Program. The ACWA Program Manager clarified that the previous program did not focus on the assembled chemical weapon, only bulk agent and metal parts. The Program Manager emphasized that the demonstrations would focus on what new information can be obtained about the demilitarization of assembled chemical weapons.

*Comments regarding Public Outreach in Maryland:* John Nunn, CAC Chair from Maryland, reminded participants that different sites and communities have different public outreach needs.

Nunn felt strongly that the extensiveness of public involvement strategy laid out in regard to Utah's Treatability Study should not happen in Maryland at this time.

*Comments regarding the Environmental Assessment (EA):* One Dialogue participant commented on the thoroughness of the EA. He felt that some familiar with those types of documents may read it like an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and that may open the program up to some criticism. The Dialogue participant recommended that perhaps the document contain a very short "citizen summary." The Environmental Team joked that he was signing up for such a task, but said they would take it under advisement.

*Transportation of agent:* Several voiced concern regarding the transportation of agent from one site to another for demonstration purposes. One participant asked how much agent would need to be transported and from what location to what location. The ACWA Technical Team responded that one shipment would need to be made and that a combined total of seventy liters would be comprised of HD, VX, and GB.

*Citizen Opposition at Dugway:* A technology provider inquired as to whether the citizen opposition to using the Dugway site in Utah was still an issue. A Dialogue participant stated that he had spoken to the individual who was most vocal at the Utah public meeting and felt that while that individual would object to demonstrations at Dugway, he would not impede the process. A Utah Dialogue participant explained that Dugway has endured a credibility problem for years, but that she did not feel that it would impede the process. Another Utah participant stated that she had spoken to the individual and that it is her belief that his issues can be addressed.

### **ACWA Public Outreach and Related Activities**

--Ann Gallegos, ACWA

Ann Gallegos reminded Dialogue participants that at the end of the Salt Lake City meeting it was determined that each state had very different public outreach goals prior to the July meeting. The Public Outreach Team, in coordination with Keystone, was working to set up calls where Dialogue participants could work to address the individual outreach needs of that particular state. A summary of state-by-state public outreach activities will be distributed via the Dialogue Exchange prior to the July Dialogue meeting.

### **Report to Congress**

--Bill Pehlivanian, ACWA

--Lisa Simon, DoD Legal Counsel

Bill Pehlivanian stated that he would be circulating a draft outline for the December Report to Congress to participants via the Dialogue Exchange. Dialogue participants interested in being a member of the Report to Congress work group should contact Janesse Brewer of The Keystone Center at [jbrewer@keystone.org](mailto:jbrewer@keystone.org) or by phone at (970) 513-5847 by June 30, 1998.

Lisa Simon, DoD Legal Counsel, reminded participants that Federal law prohibits the government from using money to lobby. Government representatives can go through official channels to pose legislation. Given the nature of the Report to Congress, Lisa Simon requested she be given some

time to discuss potential ramifications, of including Dialogue participants in providing feedback on the Report to Congress, with her colleagues before the next Dialogue meeting.

*Question regarding the Report to Congress and any procurement issues:* A Dialogue participant asked whether there would be any procurement sensitivity information in the Report to Congress. Lisa Simon responded that there would not be an issue with procurement sensitivities, but that there was the possibility of some limited access due to proprietary information. Lisa Simon and Chuck Comaty committed to discussing this issue with the technology providers.

*Comments regarding the identification of central messages in the Report to Congress:* A Dialogue participant commented that PM ACWA and others need to discuss the intended message of the December Report. Is it simply a status report, or will it set markers for Congress to consider? This Dialogue participant noted that Congress' focus question will be "are any of these technologies efficacious?"

### **Proposed Changes to the Dialogue Ground Rules**

--Keystone Center

--Doug Hindman, CATT

*The purpose of this discussion was to discuss amendments to the Dialogue Ground Rules drafted over one year ago. A hand out of proposed changes was distributed at the meeting, please contact Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312 for a copy of this document (Attachment I).*

***The Dialogue participants agreed to accept the following amendments:***

#### **Meetings and Conduct (page 4):**

Dialogue participants will clarify when speaking in public that views expressed are their own or their organization's and are not on behalf of the Dialogue.

#### **Record of Media Coverage (addition):**

Dialogue participants and Keystone agree to send copies of all media coverage regarding the ACWA Program to Horne Engineering for the purpose of record keeping. Horne will work with Radian to post these documents on the Public Web site, as appropriate, Dialogue participants will be notified by Horne via e-mail of the title, publication, and date, of such publications so that participants are aware of new postings to the Web.

***Dialogue participants agreed to the following next steps regarding the "Interaction with the Media" ground rule:***

After a rich discussion, the Dialogue agreed to adhere to the ground rule as originally written until the July meeting. The original ground rule text follows:

*...all Dialogue participants agree to send a draft of any press release regarding the dialogue process to Horne Engineering for distribution to all dialogue participants. Participants desiring to respond should do so directed to the author within a specified time. The original author of any press release ultimately is the final decision maker regarding the text of the Press Release, but thus must also bear the consequences of any controversial statements. Press Releases should be factual in nature and should not attempt to characterize the opinions of other dialogue participants.*

The Dialogue tasked the CATT with drafting proposed revisions to the ground rule which would be circulated to the Dialogue via the Dialogue Exchange for comment and reaction.

**Interaction with the Media (page 5 of current ground rules):**

*Discussion regarding ground rule amendment regarding the publication of public documents:* It was discussed that the distribution and publication of documents by participants can help or hinder the goals and objectives of the Dialogue and the ACWA Program. Some participants felt that increased limitations bordered on censorship. Others reminded the group that it was the Dialogue group that set up their own ground rules which they agreed to and can choose to change. One participant clarified that the recommended amendment still recognized that the author of the proposed publication still had the final say and could choose to accept or reject others' comments. Several Dialogue participants agreed that it was not so much what was being purported, but who was saying it, and who the individual was representing at the time. It was recommended that efforts should be made to clarify at what times participants on the Dialogue were speaking for themselves and at what times they were representing their organizations or agencies. Some Dialogue participants reminded the group that the Dialogue process remains fragile and that it would be unwise to have false expectations create fights in the media.

**Closing Comments by Ted Procriv, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Chemical Demilitarization)**

Ted Procriv talked about the Defense Reduction Initiative (DRI) which reduces the size of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) in an effort to streamline bureaucracy. The Chemical Demilitarization Program will be managed by OSD, but executed by the Army. Procriv went on to talk about the Overarching Issues Assessment (OIA) group and their last meeting where they largely focused on the issue of managing money for chemical demilitarization programs. Additionally, the OIA group discussed ACWA at some length, particularly on the issue of over-promising what the ACWA Program can do. Procriv stated that he wanted the ACWA Program and the OIA group to interact at some point and would arrange for that in the future. The OIA group also reviewed the Arthur Anderson Report, which outlines the cost and schedule implications for the baseline incineration program.

*Question regarding the Arthur Anderson Report:* Paul Walker, a Dialogue participant, stated that he had formally requested a copy of the Arthur Anderson report from PMCD. Walker was told that the report was only in its draft stages currently and that due to the proprietary nature of the report it was uncertain as to whether the report would ever be released to the general public.

Prociv stated that he believed only two of the chapters contained proprietary information and that it would be possible for the public to have access to the vast majority of the report.

*Questions regarding Devolvement and Reporting Chains:* A Dialogue participant asked the status of the devolvement effort. Prociv stated that his office had now merged with Gorrel's Office and that things were still changing and not yet finalized. Another Dialogue participant asked if Prociv still had the authority to task PMCD with work. Prociv stated yes. Prociv recommended that the Dialogue work with his office regarding the working technology matrix.

*Questions regarding the potential for modifying incinerator construction schedules and activities:* A Dialogue participant asked if any progress had been made in looking at the potential for modifying the incinerator construction schedules in order to accommodate the potential of an alternative technology found to be safer than baseline incineration. Prociv stated that informally engineers had discussed this, but that the issue had not been formally addressed and would not be unless they were formally directed to do so.

*Questions regarding funding:* A Dialogue participant noted that there was money for fiscal year 1998 and that the money for the ACWA Program would currently stay with OSD. Ted Prociv stated that chemical demilitarization funding looks fine for now, but that this issue would need to be re-addressed for next year.

### **Closing Comments by Michael Parker**

Michael Parker, Program Manager for the ACWA Program thanked everyone for attending and participating in the meeting. He recognized there was a great deal of work to accomplish between now and July and looked forward to seeing everyone in mid-July in Washington, DC.

k:/data/278/08/012jlb.do