

Memorandum

To: Dialogue Participants, Alternates, and Staff

From: The Keystone Center

Subject: Follow-up from the July 12-14, 1998 Dialogue Meeting in Washington, DC

Date: June 28, 2004

Meeting Summary Structure and Deadlines

The following draft summarizes the discussions from the Dialogue on Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) meeting, which occurred on July 12-14, 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: As a reminder, please note that ACWA staff phone numbers have changed their prefix to 436.

Action Item: Please note that Todd Barker of the Keystone Center has had a change of address, phone, and fax. Todd's new information is: 29 Tarbox Road, Jericho, Vermont 05465. Phone number is (802) 899-3342, fax number is (802) 899-3363. Todd's e-mail remains the same.

Action Item: The Program Manager (PM) for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) Program will re-distribute a revised outline of the Report to Congress to the Dialogue via the Dialogue Exchange. *Responsible Entities:* Dialogue participants should respond with comments regarding the outline to Phil Dunegan at pdunegan@horne.com or by telephone at (410) 436-8831. *Time Line:* The revised outline will be posted to the Dialogue Exchange by July 31, 1998, with a response date noted. *Update since last Dialogue:* This action item was completed on July 24, 1998.

Action Item: The Keystone Center will convene the Report to Congress Working Group who will draft the "Message from the Dialogue" for the rest of the Dialogue to consider. *Responsible Entities:* Keystone will work with Dialogue work group

members identified at the DC Meeting, David Christian and Paul Walker. Additionally, Keystone will work to identify a regulator to participate on this work group. *Time Line:* This group is scheduled to talk on September 8.

Action Item: Determination of agenda items for the next Dialogue meeting. The following updates will be included in the next Dialogue meeting taking place in October or November: Demonstrations; Report to Congress; Public Outreach/Public Involvement; National Research Council (NRC); Broad Agency Announcement (BAA); Environmental Team Activities; Citizens' Advisory Technical Team (CATT); and Treaty Requirements. *Responsible Entities:* Please get any additional potential agenda items to jbrewer@keystone.org or by phone at (970) 513-5800.

Action Item: Participants who have not yet done so should identify an alternate to serve on the Dialogue when they cannot attend. This decision should be made in consultation with a Keystone Center staff person. *Responsible Entities:* Dialogue participants from the states of Oregon should consult with Todd Barker at tbarker@keystone.org or by phone at (802) 899-3342; participants from Colorado should consult with Janesse Brewer at jbrewer@keystone.org or by phone at (970) 513-5800; and participants from Kentucky, Arkansas, and Alabama should consult with Kristi Parker at kparker@keystone.org, or by phone at (970) 513-5800. Keystone, in coordination with Horne Engineering, will add those persons to the information systems so that your alternate receives all Dialogue participant information and correspondence. *Time Line:* Dialogue participants should contact Keystone by September 25, 1998.

Action Item: The Dialogue generated ideas on the types of procurement information they would like to review after the award of CLIN 0003. Keystone will act as a clearinghouse for any additional requests. Depending on the number and frequency of requests, Keystone may determine whether the formation of a work group on this issue is warranted. If a work group is formed, all Dialogue participants will be notified and can choose to participate. *Responsible Entities:* Keystone will forward all requests to Chuck Comaty who will coordinate with the technology providers. *Time Line:* Requests can be routed to Keystone on an on-going basis. Those requests should be directed to Janesse Brewer at Keystone at jbrewer@keystone.org or by phone at (970) 513-5800. Keystone will then compile and direct those requests to Chuck Comaty who will respond to the Dialogue participant.

Action Item: In an effort to chronicle public outreach efforts by Dialogue participants regarding the ACWA Program, Dialogue participants should continue to forward the date, time, and nature of the outreach effort to Horne Engineering. *Time Line:* Dialogue participants should forward this information to kcollins@horne.com on an on-going basis.

Action Item: Distribute list of CATT members who have visited various technology provider sites in the past and provide information regarding future CATT visits to sites or demonstrations on an on-going basis. *Responsible Entities:* The Keystone

Center will compile and post this information via the Dialogue Exchange. *Time Line:* A list of past site visits will be distributed by August 31, 1998. Future CATT visits will be listed on an on-going basis by SBR Technologies to the Dialogue Exchange.

Action Item: Determine whether moving money from PMCD to ACWA for fiscal year 1998 will affect incineration construction and/or operations. *Responsible*

Entities: Dr. Prociv stated that he would work with Mr. Bacon's office to determine this and report back to the Dialogue. Bill Pehlivanian, Deputy Program Manager for the ACWA Program will coordinate with Prociv's office. *Time Line:* As information becomes available.

Action Item: The Dialogue requested copies of the slides for use in describing the various technologies. *Responsible Entities:* Horne Engineering will distribute slides to Dialogue participants according to the list generated at the Dialogue meeting. If you were absent from the DC Dialogue meeting, please contact Horne Engineering by August 31, 1998, to request this document. *Time Line:* Horne already has distributed this information to those who requested it.

Action Item: Revise ground rules according to Dialogue discussion at the DC meeting, send revisions to the Dialogue for comment via the Dialogue Exchange.

Responsible Entities: Keystone will work with Doug Hindman to revise the ground rules based on discussions at the DC meeting. A draft will be posted to the Dialogue Exchange for final comment. *Time Line:* Proposed changes will be posted to the Dialogue Exchange by September 25, 1998 for comment.

Action Item: The CATT will distribute input-output analysis to the Dialogue for their use. *Time Line:* The CATT will distribute this information to the Dialogue by September 30, 1998.

Action Item: Keystone, in coordination with the Public Outreach Team for ACWA, and Horne Engineering, will distribute calendars to Dialogue participants in an effort to set up site-specific calls focusing on next steps for public involvement.

Responsible Entities: Keystone will coordinate and distribute calendars for conference call availability. *Time Line:* Keystone will distribute calendars to Dialogue participants by September 25, 1998.

Action Item: The Public Outreach Team will revise and edit the proposed ACWA video and set up a mechanism by which Dialogue participants will have another opportunity to view and comment prior to finalization. *Responsible Entities:* The Public Outreach Team will make the necessary edits to the film and re-distribute to the Dialogue for comment. Additional questions should be directed to Lynda Dubrow of Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312. *Time Line:* The Public Outreach Team is hoping to finalize the video by the last week in August. Correspondence regarding the final review of the video will happen prior to that time.

Summary of Meeting

The meeting summary is not intended to be a verbatim record of discussion, but rather to: provide a summary of the topics briefed and discussed; an overview of any concerns raised; and a record of decisions made. The following areas are outlined in the meeting summary:

- Opening Comments by Michael Parker, Program Manager for ACWA;
- CATT Reflection on the process of awarding CLIN 0003;
- Decision-making Process for the Award of CLIN 0003;
- Information Availability with the End of the Procurement Process;
- Update on NRC Activities;
- Update on the BAA;
- Overview of Next Steps for the ACWA Program;
- Demonstration Update and the Role of the ACWA Technical Team;
- Treaty Update;
- Proposed Role of the CATT;
- Environmental Team Update;
- Comments by Sherri Wasserman Goodman, Assistant Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security;
- Discussion regarding the Report to Congress;
- Discussion regarding the proposed changes for Dialogue Ground Rule amendments; Feedback on the ACWA video;
- Discussion regarding the technology matrix;
- Comments by Dr. Ted Procriv, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Chemical Demilitarization); and
- Closing Comments by Michael Parker, Program Manager for ACWA.

The following Dialogue participants were in attendance at the July 12-14, 1998 meeting: Kathryn Cain; David Christian; Daniel Clanton; Ralph Collins; Elizabeth Cotsworth; Ned Covington; Gerald Hardy; Doug Hindman; Worley Johnson; Karyn Jones; Cindy King; Irene Kornelly; Dane Maddox; James Michael; Bob Palzer; Michael Parker; Bill Pehlivanian; Ted Procriv; George Smith; Wesley Stites; Wayne Thomas; Ross Vincent; Paul Walker; Lisa Weers; J.R. Wilkinson; Craig Williams; and Suzanne Winters.

Opening Comments

--Michael Parker, Program Manager, ACWA Program

Michael Parker thanked everyone for taking both their personal and professional time to be at the Dialogue meeting on Sunday and for their dedication toward the continued journey of finding methods to dispose of chemical weapons in a safe and effective way. Parker noted how hard everyone has been working and the related challenges of demonstration, given the aggressive schedule, working with the multitude of different demonstration sites, and dealing with resource constraints. Due to the complexity of these restraints, particularly in regard to funding, Parker has delayed the CLIN 0003 decision. Parker stated that the ACWA Program is fully able to meet the mandate of Public Law 104-208 in a timely manner with the funding and work force available.

However, the delay in the decision is due to an effort to evaluate beyond the minimum and make a best value decision.

CATT Reflection

--Paul Walker, CATT Liaison Member

--Irene Kornelly, CATT Liaison Member

--Bob Palzer, CATT Liaison Member

--Doug Hindman, CATT Liaison Member

Liaison members described the Best Value Decision Meeting as frank, open, and deliberative. Liaison members felt confident that the CATT had represented the range of concerns voiced in the larger Dialogue. While Liaison members wished that the CLIN 0003 announcement was public, they reassured the Dialogue that they should feel comfortable with the PM ACWA's decision to delay the announcement while looking for additional funds.

Comment by Dialogue participant: One Dialogue participant stated that he was impressed by both the quality and quantity of work in the last time period, and that while it was important for the decision to get made, it was equally important that it be done well.

Clarifying questions regarding the delay of awarding CLIN 0003: A Dialogue participant asked for further clarification regarding what the financial barriers were at this time. Parker explained that \$40 million was enough to demonstrate two technologies with a modest amount of money left over. However, Parker further explained that it has always been the intent of the Program and of Congress to go beyond the minimum of two if a larger number met the Request For Proposals (RFP) Criteria and a sound Best Value Decision could be determined. Parker clarified the financial issue facing the ACWA Program is one of timing. Parker explained that in order to make the awards, the Program needs to have the cash-in-hand, Chuck Comaty must be able to directly access funds in the "ACWA bank account" in order to legally make the CLIN 0003 awards. Because it is late in fiscal year 1998, this is extremely difficult to accomplish while still meeting the demonstration schedule. Michael Parker explained that if, for example, Research and Development funds were to be moved within the Chemical Demilitarization Program, then it is not necessary to go back to Congress, it is simply an issue within the Department. However, if funds specified for R&D were to be transferred to Operations and Maintenance, then Chemical demilitarization would need to return to Congress for approval.

Questions regarding how the retention of funds for the ACWA Program might potentially effect the Incineration Program: A Dialogue participant asked what amount of money the ACWA Program was looking to move from Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization (PMCD) and would the moving of those funds impact the construction or operations of the incineration program. Several Dialogue participants expressed concern if the retention of these funds might, in any way, slow down PMCD's work and the destruction of chemical weapons by the incineration program. Parker explained that

PMCD and ACWA are exploring that question and others. ACWA has asked if PMCD has extra funds available that would have no impact on the incineration program, do they have funds available with an acceptable impact? Dr. Prociv addressed these questions later in his comments.

Clarification regarding the issue of timing and funding: A Dialogue participant asked why Congress has not provided additional funding to the ACWA Program so that the program could meet its intent as expressed by Congressional members and the Dialogue. Michael Parker clarified that timing was an important issue. The ACWA Program needs fiscal year 1998 funding in order to award contracts prior to September 30, the end of the U.S. Government fiscal year. Congress does not yet have fiscal year 1999 money appropriated, therefore ACWA's only option is to find excess 1998 money within the individual departments. Another Dialogue participant asked if it was simply a matter of timing, could they make some awards now and then award others in October with the start of the next fiscal year. Parker responded yes, but the delay would cause complications regarding the availability of test sites and qualified work forces.

Comments regarding the moving of funds in government: Several Dialogue participants noted that government agencies frequently shift funds around within their departments to address changing needs.

Decision-making Process for the Award of CLIN 0003

--Scott Susman, ACWA

--Joe Novad, ACWA

--Doug Hindman, CATT Liaison

--Dan Cassidy, CATT

Slides were presented which summarized the process for awarding CLIN 0003 and describing the impact that the CATT and Dialogue input had on this process. Briefing slides for the presentation (Attachment A) can be requested by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Information Availability with the End of the Procurement Process

--Chuck Comaty, ACWA

--Irene Kornelly, CATT Liaison

This discussion focused on access to information Dialogue participants after the award of CLIN 0003. Dialogue participants should send any additional requests to Janesse Brewer of The Keystone Center at jbrewer@keystone.org or by telephone at (970) 513-5800. Requests will then be compiled and forwarded to Chuck Comaty who will work with the technology providers and the individuals making the request. Comaty stated that both the work plans and proposals would be available with the awarding of CLIN 0003.

The following items were listed as documents/information of potential interest for members of the Dialogue: characterization and amounts of the secondary and tertiary wastes; water use--both consumptive and not; rationale for why some unit operations

will be demonstrated and others will not; data/information on inputs and outputs; information regarding effluents, hazardous or solid waste management, recycling; technology specific information such as scaling information, handling of materials, and others; and questions regarding timing between data availability and the April Supplemental Report to Congress.

Comments regarding information availability: One Dialogue participant stated the importance of giving the public time to familiarize themselves with the information regarding technologies. He went on to say that receiving the information incrementally was certainly acceptable, but that as much information as possible should be made available as soon as possible.

Request regarding information about which unit operations would not be demonstrated and supporting data: A Dialogue participant expressed his interest in information regarding major unit operations that would not be tested and the data that supports those decisions.

Question regarding when information about the types and quantities of wastes produced by the technologies will be available: Members of ACWA staff explained that some of that information was available now and, additionally, the demonstrations would provide additional data regarding these issues.

Question regarding whether the demonstrations would include toxicology tests and whether the demonstrations would include any tests beyond normal operating conditions: Members of the ACWA Technical Team clarified that the demonstrations would not include toxicology tests and that the demonstrations would only test at normal operating conditions.

Question regarding when regulators would be able to see information pertinent to permitting: Michael Parker explained his interest in getting all relevant materials to the state regulators as soon as possible given their important role in making the 2007 deadline.

Comments from Technology Providers regarding information dispersal: Technology providers continue to offer to address requests for information on an individual basis. One technology provider indicated that most information in many of the proposals is not proprietary with the exception of cost information. Another technology provider stated that the lack of clarity regarding how they would be dealt with for any follow-on work might make it difficult to share information to the extent individuals were interested.

Summarize Recent National Research Council (NRC) Activities and Describe the NRC's Work for July to December 1998

--Bob Beaudet, Assembled Chemical Weapons (ACW), Chair

Bob Beaudet presented slides discussing the recent activities and next steps of the NRC. Briefing slides for the presentation (Attachment B) can be requested by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Concern regarding the timing of the NRC Report: A Dialogue participant asked how useful the NRC Report would be if it was not going to be inclusive of all the data from the demonstrations. Bob Beaudet responded that he felt they would be able to comment on all the technologies adequately given the information they would have available from the demonstrations in progress, the proposals, work plans, and demonstration reports. Additionally, Beaudet stated that the Committee would be commenting on things such as is this technology “controllable?”

Clarification regarding the number of technologies to be commented on in the Report: Beaudet clarified that all seven technologies which passed the Threshold Criteria would be commented on in their Report. Rob Bailey, Program Director for the ACW Committee emphasized that, as of now, the plan is to evaluate all seven technologies, but that there was always the possibility for that decision to be re-evaluated depending on the number of technologies going to demonstration, the identification of what information is proprietary, etc.

Comments regarding the Public Acceptance piece of the Report: NRC Committee Member Hank Jenkins-Smith explained that this section of the Report would explore how robust the “technology bundles” are in terms of going to the next stage. Part of his section will be qualitative reports regarding the technologies and those technologies most likely to withstand a great deal of scrutiny. Jenkins-Smith stated his interest in talking with all Dialogue participants present about these qualitative reports and their thoughts regarding the technologies and their characteristics.

Broad Agency Announcement Update

--Chuck Comaty, ACWA

--BAA work group participants

Chuck Comaty stated that to date they had received a total of nine BAA proposals. Given recent activity regarding the total solution proposals, not all of the BAA proposals have been evaluated thus far. Comaty reported that he was encouraged by the two to three phone calls he received each week and hoped that more BAA proposals would follow. Comaty thanked David Christian and Cindy King for their on-going input regarding the BAA process. During the last call of the BAA Work Group, Christian stated his concern that perhaps the announcement was not reaching key individuals or firms that may have a partial solution. Comaty agreed to talk with additional people in other branches within the demilitarization field. The closing date is currently August 25, 1998, at which point the BAA Work Group participants and the CATT will meet and continue to provide input into the BAA evaluation process. Comaty noted there was the possibility of extending the BAA closing date, depending on requests from industry or others.

Overview of Next Steps in the ACWA Program: July 1998 to April 1999

--Bill Pehlivanian, Deputy Program Manager, ACWA

This presentation provided an overview of the remaining activities scheduled for the ACWA Program. Slides for this presentation can be requested (Attachment C) by contacting Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Demonstration Update and the Role of the ACWA Technical Team

--Joe Novad, ACWA Technical Team

--Armand Balasco, A.D. Little

--Bob Palzer, CATT Liaison

This presentation informed the Dialogue how and when the Dialogue will be informed of the locations of demonstrations and potential opportunities for comment and questions following the announcement. Slides for this demonstration can be requested (Attachment D) by contacting Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Kudos to the Demonstration Team: Bill Pehlivanian thanked the demonstration team for their efforts and productive interaction with all the other teams in ensuring that all the demonstration and site needs would be addressed.

Question regarding the difficulty of meeting schedule constraints thus far: Balasco noted that the schedule has been incredibly difficult, particularly with getting equipment in a timely manner. To address this issue the demonstration team included contract penalties if vendors do not meet the delivery date, and added incentive money if they do meet the specified delivery time. Additionally this team has worked to ensure that everyone is ready at sites, and that utility requirements can be met.

Treaty Update

--Joe Novad, ACWA Technical Team

Below is a summary of the Treaty Update Joe Novad provided to the Dialogue.

The ACWA demonstration program will use over 2700 Kg of chemical agents for demonstration testing. The demonstration testing must be done in compliance with and under the guidelines of the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) or Treaty. Agent testing will use two different Treaty designations of chemical agents.

The first designation is Schedule 1. The US is allotted 1 metric tonne (1000 Kg) of agent per year for “activities not prohibited under this convention (CWC) under article VI, e.g., research and development (R&D) work. Work with this agent is called “Schedule 1” and is reportable but not verified by the physical presence of inspectors under the Treaty. The metric tonne is currently allocated as follows: Department of Defense (DoD) receives 440 Kg (kilograms) of that allotment, the Department of Commerce gets the

balance (560 Kg). Note: DOD received an increase in its Schedule 1 allocation to 750 kg in 1997 and to 770 kg in 1998 to support alternative technology destruction programs.

The second designation is Chemical Weapons (CW). Work with the chemical agent with this designation is verifiable by the inspectors from the Technical Secretariat (TS) of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). Any agent work performed under this designation must be done at a declared destruction facility.

Both Schedule 1 and Chemical Weapons designations of chemical agents will be used for the ACWA demonstration testing. The agent testing planned for the Dugway Proving Ground (DPG) will be conducted using Schedule 1 material; therefore, a detailed facility information package (CWC requirement for any declared CW destruction facility) for DPG's test facility would not be required. The agent testing at the Chemical Agent Munitions Disposal System (CAMDS) and the Edgewood Research, Development and Engineering Center (ERDEC) will be done at declared CW destruction facilities. The ACWA activities at CAMDS and ERDEC involve CW destruction to provide hydrolysate waste products to support post-treatments including biodegradation testing and super critical water testing.

PM-ACWA representative, Joe Novad traveled to The Hague (Netherlands) the week of June 22, 1998 and briefed the ACWA program to Dr. John Gee, Deputy Director-General of the Technical Secretariat and other TS staff. The presentation covered the background of the program, requirements for executing it, timelines for the program, test facilities to be used and site locations, chemical agents, and descriptions of the six technologies under consideration for demonstration. Dr. Gee appreciated the presentation and asked to be kept informed of ACWA developments.

Question regarding Treaty limitations versus number of demonstrations: A Dialogue participant asked whether the ACWA Program could currently comply with the Treaty if only two technologies were being demonstrated. Joe Novad stated that the ACWA Program would still be out of compliance.

Proposed Role of the CATT: July through December, 1998

--Doug Hindman, Kentucky CAC/CATT Liaison

This presentation highlighted the CATT's proposed role in the next six months. For copies of presentation slides please request Attachment E from Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Discussion regarding having the CATT act as a "steering committee:" Some Dialogue participants voiced concern regarding having the CATT act as a steering committee, given that its initial purposed was not to serve in this capacity. Participants felt more comfortable with the CATT remaining in their "watchdog" role and to continue be a sounding board and liaison to the Dialogue.

Kudos to SBR Technologies: Paul Walker reminded the group that part of the CATT is the technical consultant, SBR Technologies. Walker commended Dan Cassidy, and his replacement, Ping Sih. Walker went onto say that SBR Technologies is scheduled to continue for the time being, thanks to Parker and Pehlivanian.

Discussion regarding adding a regulator to the CATT: Several Dialogue participants recommended adding a regulator from one of the proposed test sites. Other Dialogue participants felt that the CATT's role would be diminishing, not increasing after the award of CLIN 0003 and therefore, it did not make sense to expand the membership and scope of the CATT's role. Feedback from the regulators largely indicated that they were satisfied with their role thus far. The regulators did relay that their role would be increasing in the next few months and that they would have access to all pertinent information regardless of whether they are included on the CATT. A proposal was finally made and agreed upon that Keystone would work to include regulator representation more regularly, when appropriate, but that a regulator would not officially be added to the CATT.

Question regarding the role of the CATT in the future: Some Dialogue participants indicated that the CATT had served its purpose and that a sunset date should be set for this group. Other Dialogue participants expressed their continued comfort knowing that this group watches and impacts the ACWA Program on procurement sensitive issues. Some Dialogue participants indicated that they felt it was important for the CATT to continue to interpret and explain data related to the proposals and demonstrations. Bill Pehlivanian indicated that the CATT have been extremely helpful thus far in the ACWA Program in providing advice to Michael Parker and he would propose that they continue in their role at this time and that the CATT's role be re-evaluated in January.

Next Steps regarding the CATT: Keystone will work to involve regulators in CATT activities as appropriate. The CATT would continue in their current capacity as a "watchdog" group and advisor and liaison to the Dialogue citizen participants. The role of the CATT will be revisited in the January time frame.

Environmental Team Update

Greg Mohrman, ACWA Environmental Team

Bob Palzer, Sierra Club/CATT Liaison

This presentation referred the Dialogue to the written summary of recent Environmental Team activities (Attachment F). Additionally the presentation included a discussion of next steps for the ACWA Environmental Team. For copies of attachments contact Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Kudos to the ACWA Environmental Team: Cindy King stated that the ACWA Environmental Team has been superb in the State of Utah.

Opening Comments

--Sherri Wasserman-Goodman, Assistant Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security, DoD

Sherri Wasserman-Goodman thanked the Dialogue group for their work and the opportunity to speak. Goodman indicated that while she is not current on the intricacies of the ACWA Program, she is strongly in support of the ACWA Program, and indicated to participants that the Program has the support of the Department overall. Goodman indicated that she talked with Jacques Gansler, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, and discussed the ACWA Program earlier in the day. Goodman praised the Dialogue on the good work that has happened to date and commended participants on their commitment.

Report to Congress

--Bill Pehlivanian, ACWA

This presentation solicited feedback on the draft Report to Congress outline for December 1998 and discussed the Dialogue's role in developing that Report. Briefing slides for the presentation (Attachment H) can be requested by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Additional topics suggested for the Report to Congress: One Dialogue participant recommended that the information from the Reality/Reality Check slides be clearly articulated in the Report to Congress. Another Dialogue participant recommended that there be a section on the Treaty and its interface with the ACWA Program. Another suggestion was for a section explicitly on funding issues. Another participant recommended that information regarding the Treatability Studies be folded into the Report.

Next Steps regarding the Report to Congress: PM ACWA will incorporate suggestions into the outline for the Report to Congress and will re-distribute the outline to the Dialogue for comment via the Dialogue Exchange. David Christian and Paul Walker agreed to be a part of the work group that drafts the "Message from the Dialogue" for the larger Dialogue to comment on and ultimately approve. It was also recommended that a regulator should be a part of this work group and Keystone will work to identify an individual willing to do so. To the extent possible, ACWA will strive to have the entire Report be a consensus document, not just the "Message from the Dialogue." The Report will need to go through a similar review process within ACWA, Prociv's office, and the Department of Defense.

Discussion Regarding Dialogue Ground Rules

--Irene Kornelly, CATT Liaison

--Doug Hindman, CATT Liaison

To request copies of the recommended Dialogue changes please ask for Attachment I by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Discussion regarding the proposed ground rule regarding the circulation of documents: Bob Palzer described the proposed change in this ground rule as an exercise in communicating accurately. Palzer stated that in submitting his most recent article to the ACWA circulation system that he was able to correct several factual errors that other Dialogue participants caught. Palzer additionally indicated the challenge they had in Oregon when an editorial was published which had not gone through the clearinghouse. This article surprised many individuals associated with the ACWA Program and it also contained a number of factual inaccuracies. Bill Pehlivanian indicated that when a controversial article is published which surprises him or the ACWA Program, or has inaccuracies in the document, it takes a tremendous amount of his time trying to correct the inaccuracies and mitigate internal and external politics. A citizen Dialogue participant discussed the difficulty of exercising “editorial control” over affiliates not participating in the Dialogue group. A Dialogue participant expressed concern regarding the “attack counterattack” issues between different chemical demilitarization programs. Finally, a concern was raised that words not only be carefully chosen when discussing the ACWA Program, but that participants are conscious of leaving an accurate impression of the facts as well.

Next Steps regarding the revision of the ground rule regarding the circulation of public documents: The Dialogue participants agreed that the purpose of this ground rule was to avoid any “surprises” regarding public materials. Keystone will work with Doug Hindman to make some minor changes to this ground rule. The ground rule amendment will then be circulated to the Dialogue for comment and final approval via the Dialogue Exchange. Keystone additionally agreed to speak specifically with a few individuals not present at the DC meeting who had a particular interest in this topic at the Anniston meeting.

Ground Rule change regarding participants identifying alternates to their positions: Dialogue participants agreed to the substance of this recommended change.

Next Steps regarding Ground Rule change for participants identifying alternates to their positions: The Keystone Center will make the wordsmithing changes to this proposed change and circulate via the Dialogue Exchange for final approval.

Discussion regarding the proposed ground rule change regarding the replacement of Dialogue participants: Participants agreed to the amendment with the additional recommendation that replacements to the Dialogue should be made in consultation with Keystone, the departing participant, and other individuals from that site if appropriate. Dialogue participants recommended that some parallel language be inserted regarding the potential resignation of citizen representatives to the Dialogue.

Next steps regarding the proposed ground rule change regarding the replacement of participants: Keystone agreed to make the above changes and circulate to the Dialogue via the Dialogue Exchange for final approval.

Public Outreach post CLIN 0003

--Bill Pehlivanian, ACWA

--Ann Gallegos, ACWA

PM ACWA outlined that they anticipated the Supplemental Report to Congress to have an evaluation of each technology demonstrated, as well as the likelihood of public acceptance of any given technology at a site. The evaluation of each technology being demonstrated will be based on technical evaluation according to demonstration criteria and public input into the criteria. PM ACWA is looking to collect more information regarding the likelihood of each technology to be acceptable in a given community. It was proposed that this information be collected between July 1998-January 1999. Part of the outreach to communities would focus on public education about the ACWA Program and the technologies being demonstrated. The other focus would be on receiving input from communities regarding what types of characteristics of technologies would be most acceptable, and for getting input on a list and priorities as defined by each community. Follow up outreach would occur between February and March 1999 for the purposes of public education and public input based on data from the demonstrations. In an effort to support informational outreach to communities, DoD agreed to financially support one public meeting per state that has a stockpile. It was decided that while each state had some preliminary ideas about what would be the most effective way to reach their own community, that further discussions needed to happen on a site specific basis. It was agreed that Keystone would work with Horne and the Public Outreach teams to set up these calls.

Feedback on the ACWA Video

--Ann Gallegos, ACWA

Feedback regarding the ACWA video: The Public Outreach Team received a number of comments and suggestions regarding the substance and format of the proposed ACWA video. The Dialogue recognized the balance of producing a versatile video which meets a variety of potential needs, with the necessity of finishing the video in a reasonable amount of time. For a detailed list of comments please contact Ann Gallegos at (410) 436-4345.

Clarification regarding timing: The Public Outreach Team clarified that they are planning on having the video available for mass distribution by the last week of August.

Distribution of the video: It was proposed that several copies of the video be made available for check-out through the public outreach offices at each site.

Next Steps regarding the ACWA video: The Public Outreach Team will work to incorporate as many suggestions as possible given the timing and budget constraints. The Public Outreach Team will provide the Dialogue with an additional comment period after revisions are made.

Closing Comments

--Dr. Ted Prociv, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Chemical Demilitarization)

Dr. Prociv used a slide (Attachment J) for his presentation. For copies of this slide please call Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Dr. Prociv opened his statements by saying that he had talked to the Comptroller and he is working diligently to try to help with the necessary funding in order to go beyond the minimum of two technologies. Prociv spoke of the \$855 million budget for chemical demilitarization, the cuts that the House and Senate made, and anticipates that the total chemical demilitarization budget for next year will be \$804 million. Prociv stressed that in fiscal year 1998 the Chemical Demilitarization Program voluntarily took budget cuts and so the surplus amount is far less than ever before. ACWA has done a good job working on funding thus far, in line for \$12.6 million and \$18 million, and Prociv, himself, has asked for \$22 million for the ACWA Program. In an effort to explore the options of moving funds from PMCD to ACWA, Prociv's office has identified \$3 million, and is targeting an additional \$4 million. The struggle, according to Prociv, is that unless those funds can be restored to PMCD next year, PMCD will not be able to do everything that they want to for next year. In closing, Prociv stated that the quest for additional ACWA dollars is not over yet, and that PMCD, as well as other government programs will be looked at very carefully. Prociv concluded by emphasizing that DoD wants to see this Program succeed.

Questions concerning the potential transfer of funds from PMCD to ACWA: Several Dialogue participants stated their concern regarding any movement of funds between programs that might impact operations at Tooele or JACADS. Suzanne Winters from the State of Utah requested specific information from Prociv regarding any impact to Tooele operations. Prociv responded that he understood and added that shuffling money always has an effect somehow, but that he could send her a profile as to what would be impacted and how it would be impacted. Other Dialogue participants stated their interest in wanting to aid Prociv and others in their quest for dollars and asked how much money was needed. Michael Parker stressed that divulging that type of information started to tread on procurement sensitive information. Prociv stated that if the Chemical Demilitarization Program received \$840 million versus \$804 million, then the ACWA Program would be able to demonstrate more than the minimum. Parker cautioned that \$36 million should not be assumed to be the amount necessary in order for ACWA to demonstrate beyond the mandate of the Public Law 104-208.

Questions regarding potential savings that could be applied to the ACWA Program due to delays in the PMCD Program: A Dialogue participant inquired if there was surplus money from Tooele operations since they were not running at full scale as originally anticipated. Prociv stated that whether that operation runs full or less than full scale, the costs are the same.

Discussion regarding unobligated funds: One Dialogue participant stated that he used to serve as a Congressional Staffer regarding the funding of the chemical demilitarization

Program as well as others. He stated that there is always “loose change” built into these budgets, and felt that if one wanted to search out those funds, they could be found relatively easily. The Dialogue participant stated that the tightness of the budget seemed unconvincing and he urged Prociv to find funds for this incredibly successful program. The Dialogue participant asked Prociv what the unobligated funds were for this year, i.e., those funds that if you do not spend them, you lose them. Prociv replied that currently there are \$32 million in unobligated funds and that it was anticipated that by the end of July there would be \$18 million. Prociv went on to say that due to this being the last quarter of the fiscal year in combination with the large cuts the Program took last year, he anticipated that there would be no unobligated funds by the end of the fiscal year.

Comment regarding the difficulty of explaining a potential demonstration strategy to constituents in communities: A Dialogue participant stressed the difficulty in explaining to constituents in communities that DoD was thinking of limiting the number of demonstrations, and ultimately potential options for a community by eliminating some technologies based on lack of funding.

Discussion regarding shifting the schedule so that the Program can demonstrate technologies under the next fiscal year: Some participants questioned whether the demonstrations could be delayed until fiscal year 1999 when additional funding is available. Pehlivanian stated that the states have been accommodating, and that there are just a number of factors regarding testing facilities if they miss this window of opportunity.

Comment regarding the intent of Congress: A Dialogue participant stated that it is impossible for the intent of Congress to be met if only two technologies are demonstrated since Congress has been explicit in the desire to demonstrate more than the minimum technologies if more than two pass the RFP Criteria. Additionally, the participant noted that the competition on the implementation side of things will be scarce if only two technologies are demonstrated, thus driving up the cost of implementation and the Chemical Demilitarization Program.

Comment and discussion regarding trade-offs: A Dialogue participant urged Prociv to think about the long term effects of this decision. He argued that if more than two technologies are demonstrated, then in the long term DoD would increase competitiveness, decrease prices, decrease political pressure in Colorado and Kentucky, etc. The Dialogue participant urged Prociv to find the funds in the short term. Prociv responded that he does believe it is feasible that money can be found by the end of the fiscal year.

Comment and discussion regarding the Presidential Letter: A Dialogue participant reminded Prociv that a letter from President Clinton stated that this Program should be receiving the highest priority within the Stockpile Program, and why is it not receiving that status currently? Prociv responded that the Administration additionally requested he give his priority to meeting the 2007 Treaty deadline.

Public Comment: An individual from Alabama indicated that he was in support of the already proven technology of baseline incineration and that he would be upset if anything regarding the baseline incineration program was de-railed.

Resignation by Suzanne Winters

Suzanne Winters indicated that she will be taking a two year leave of absence from her position with the State of Utah. She thanked the Dialogue and expressed that she has grown as a result of this process. Winters indicated that she would be working with Keystone in order to ensure that her position with the Dialogue was filled.

Closing Comments

--Michael Parker, ACWA

Michael Parker indicated that in keeping with the ACWA Program's schedule, the Program will need to make awards shortly. He indicated that some initial awards would be made, and that additional awards will be made based on cash flow. Parker indicated that he will do everything he can to take this program forward and make as many awards as possible.

278/08/014jlb