

**Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment Dialogue
Meeting Summary
January 25-26, 2001
Lexington, Kentucky**

January 25-26, 2001 ACWA Dialogue Meeting Synopsis

The January 25-26, 2001 Dialogue meeting was designed to finalize input from the Dialogue representatives to the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) Program for the Supplemental Report to Congress. In order to do this, Dialogue participants first heard the final analysis of the Demonstration II testing from both the ACWA staff and technology providers. With this information Dialogue members finalized the "Message from the Dialogue," which appears in the Supplemental Report to Congress and includes consensus recommendations from the diversity of perspectives represented on the Dialogue. Additionally, Dialogue participants from each site outlined specific comments should their site be considered for an alternative technology.

Given the January meeting's intent, much of the conversation focused on refining and finalizing recommendations, please consider the Supplemental Report to Congress the primary synopsis of the meeting. The Report has been delayed, but should be distributed by June 2001. All Dialogue participants will receive the Report. In addition, the Supplemental Report to Congress will be made available on the Program Manager for ACWA (PMACWA) Web Site at: <http://www.pmacwa.org/start.asp>.

In addition to the primary goal of finalizing the Dialogue language for the Supplemental Report to Congress, the meeting also provided updates on other aspects of the ACWA Program such as the Defense Acquisition Executive (DAE) Review; Engineering Design Systems (EDS) I; National Research Council (NRC) Update; and an Environmental Update that provided information on the Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) being prepared by ACWA and the Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization (PMCD).

Meeting Summary Structure

This meeting summary is not intended to be a verbatim record of conversations, instead it is meant to provide an overview of the discussions and next steps committed to by various members of the Dialogue. The Supplemental Report to Congress should serve as the primary outcome of the January Dialogue meeting. Additionally, other key action items identified in the meeting and a synopsis of the questions and comments discussed during the various updates are listed below.

ACTION ITEMS

Action Item: Update Glossary of Terms for the ACWA Program. ***Responsible Entities:*** ACWA to update glossary in the Technical Report and Supplemental Report to Congress. ***Timeline:*** All Dialogue participants will be sent a Report to Congress that will include the updated glossary.

Action Item: Provide the Technology Evaluation Reports to Dialogue Participants and the public. The Technology Evaluation Reports will be included in the appendix section of the Supplemental Report to Congress. ***Responsible Entities:*** ACWA will post the reports to the Web Site once they are available.

Action Item: Post the goals and objectives of the Integrated Integrating Process Team (IIPT) as well as the meeting minutes to the Web Site. ***Responsible Entities:*** The Department of Defense (DoD) will share information about the IIPT and the Working Integrated Process Teams (WIPTs) with PMACWA. ***Timeline:*** As part of the DAE process, PMACWA will provide such information once it becomes available.

Action Item: Post key deadlines in the DAE process to the Web Site. ***Responsible Entities:*** DoD will share this information with PMACWA. ***Timeline:*** PMACWA will provide updates to the Dialogue about the DAE process as the information becomes available.

Action Item: Dialogue participants request that the DoD give additional consideration to how communities from sites other than Kentucky and Colorado provide input into the DAE process. ***Responsible Entities:*** Mike Parker will

request within the DoD process. **Timeline:** The various WIPTs will inform the stockpile site's Citizen Advisory Commissions (CACs) of the scope of the WIPT activities and extend an offer to the WIPTs to meet with the CACs and the public in those communities to provide additional outreach and to listen to community concerns.

Action Item: Inform Pueblo community of EIS meetings as soon as possible. **Responsible Entities:** PMACWA will provide this information as soon as they are aware of the dates. **Timeline:** The Pueblo EIS meetings are scheduled for June 6 and 7, 2001.

Action Item: Arrange for Technology providers and Dane Maddox to tour the Energetics Hydrolysis process. **Responsible Entities:** Scott Susman, in coordination with those interested, will arrange for a site visit to Holston Army Ammunition Plant to see the Energetic Hydrolysis process. **Timeline:** This site visit occurred on March 17, 2001.

Action Item: Provide data from February 7-8, 2001 meetings between PMACWA and the Colorado Department of Human Health and the Environment (CDPHE) to interested Dialogue participants. **Responsible Entities:** PMACWA is committed to providing brief summary results at the subsequent Colorado CAC meeting and will provide more detailed information as requested. If participants are interested in this information, please contact Scott Susman with the ACWA Technical Team. The CDPHE's web site (<http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/hm/pcdwipt.asp>) can also provide additional information about the Pueblo Chemical Depot Working Integrated Product Team (PCDWIPT) meetings.

Outline of Key Questions and Discussions during the January Dialogue 25-26 Dialogue Meeting

Opening Comments by Mike Parker, PMACWA

Mike Parker thanked ACWA Dialogue participants for attending this meeting. He indicated the importance of this meeting as the group would now be completing the task of providing oversight and final recommendations regarding the technologies identified and demonstrated within the ACWA Program. Mike Parker indicated that the future of the ACWA Program was changing dramatically as it moved toward the pilot stage and became one of many players in the Defense Acquisition Executive review that will ultimately select technologies for Colorado and Kentucky.

Program Overview

--Bill Pehlivanian, Deputy Program Manager for ACWA

Slides are available for this presentation by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Discussion regarding Administration changes and potential effects on the ACWA Program. It was discussed that Dr. George R. Schneiter, Dr. Anna Johnson-Winegar, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Chemical/Biological Defense, and Ray Fatz will all remain. Dialogue participants noted that with other political nominees moving into key positions, that there will likely be changes in management styles as well.

Question regarding the Citizen Advisory Technical Team's (CATT) role anticipated in the DAE process. Bill Pehlivanian stated there was no anticipated role for the CATT at this time, but further discussion could occur.

Technical Evaluation Overview for Demonstration II

--Jim Richmond, ACWA Technical Team

--Doug Hindman, CATT

--Jim Earley, SBR Technologies

Slides are available for this presentation by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Update regarding the Teledyne Commodore rocket incident. Mike Parker relayed that there is a workgroup exploring the stockpile stability issues while in storage, there are no conclusions to date.

Update regarding Teledyne Commodore's Demonstration II Testing. Teledyne Commodore was unable to validate its technology and therefore will not be recommended to go to pilot. The CATT is in full agreement with these findings.

Comments from Jeff Smith of Teledyne Commodore. Jeff Smith relayed that while Teledyne Commodore no longer has faith in ammonia as a cutting fluid, they do have confidence in the overall technical process.

Questions and Comments regarding Solvated Electron Technology, Silver II Technology, and the Neutralization/Supercritical Water Oxidation (SCWO)/ Gas Phase Chemical Reduction (GPCR)

Question regarding the Silver II Technology. A Dialogue participant wondered if some of the issues with the testing, and particularly with the large quantity of stored energetics, could be avoided if the process was designed as a batch process instead of a continuous process. Darren Dalton stated that the original proposal called for a semi-continuous process or batch and that the process could still potentially work as proposed.

Question regarding 15 month permitting timeline for Kentucky. Ralph Collins, Deputy Commissioner, Natural Resources, from the Kentucky Department of Environment, stated that while he was confident that Kentucky could beat the current record of five years for issuing a permit, he believed 15 months to be too aggressive whether permitting an incinerator or an alternative technology. Collins went on to say that he believed permitting an incinerator would take longer due to public opposition, and that there was no data on how an alternative technology might fare.

Question regarding permitting the Silver II process in the United States. Jim Richmond responded that while this technology has not been permitted in the U.S., there are some potential issues due to the Silver II throughput rate. If it takes more than two years to permit the Silver II technology, with the current throughput rate, the technology will surpass the Treaty date, even with the five-year extension.

Comments regarding the Cost and Schedule Information presented. Several Dialogue participants raised concern regarding the integrity of the Cost and Schedule information offered for the baseline incineration technology. Additionally some Dialogue participants cautioned ACWA staff against using the Treaty deadline as a key milestone in that it was unlikely that Russia and other countries would make the Treaty deadline. ACWA staff outlined that the technologies were being evaluated against the Criteria agreed upon by the Dialogue, which included assessing the technologies according to their ability to meet the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) Treaty deadlines. Several Dialogue participants noted that worker and public safety was of paramount importance when compared with cost.

Question regarding spent carbon and the Foster/Wheeler/Ecologic Technology. Brint Bixler of CH₂M Hill responded that this was also an issue for the Silver II Technology.

Question regarding Technology-specific costs versus generic costs for Foster Wheeler/EcoLogic/Kvaerner. It was explained that \$234 million of \$423 million is technology specific.

Question regarding Continuously Indexing Neutralization System (COINS). A Dialogue participant questioned why use this method, as it seems unnecessarily complicated versus reverse assembly. The technology provider stated that this was a way to take material from reverse assembly to SCWO. Kvaerner currently uses it in other proven applications. ACWA staff stated this is something that can be addressed in EDS II.

Question regarding analytical methodology for detecting agent in gas stream. It was explained that while they did not detect agent, it was not verifiable due to the flawed analytical method.

Question regarding what the new SCWO would look like versus the model used for Demonstration. The technology provider explained that while keeping the current infrastructure in place, there would be a different more efficient reactor, but it would be the same size.

Question regarding Closure. A question was asked as to what ACWA meant by “Operations Finished.” ACWA staff explained that meant that all munitions were processed and that secondary waste was disposed of. It does not include closure.

Defense Acquisition Executive (DAE) Process Update

--Mike Parker, Program Manager for ACWA

Slides are available for this presentation by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Question regarding DAE timeline. Mike Parker responded that while the schedule is still draft, and subject to change, it was anticipated that recommendations would go to the Overarching Integrated Process Team (OIPT) in mid to late August.

Question regarding public involvement in the DAE. Mike Parker stated that in his view the best place for input would be at the WIPT level. Each of those WIPTs will determine how to exchange information with the public. The current design is for the IIPT and the OIPT to receive direct advice from the Colorado and Kentucky CACs.

Question regarding the scope of the DAE process. Mike Parker clarified that while the scope, goals, and objectives are all still being designed, he anticipated the technology selection for Colorado and Kentucky will be approximately 20% of the total DAE effort that is designed to review a number of issues and programs within the greater chemical demilitarization program.

Question regarding how other states might provide input into the DAE process. Mike Parker explained this process is not his, and that he is one of many players. However, Mike Parker did say he would voice these questions and issues to Dr. Schneider.

Clarification regarding what the DAE process is designed to do. Pat Wakefield explained that the goal of the DAE is not to overturn past decisions, rather to update current information based on experience, inflation, and other factors.

Public Comment

A member of the public in Kentucky reminded all sitting around the ACWA Dialogue table, as well as the DoD not to forget there are real people and lives that they are making decisions for. He asked everyone to take this responsibility seriously and thanked the Dialogue group for the work thus far.

Comments from Dr. Anna Johnson-Winegar, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Chemical/Biological Defense

Dr. Anna Johnson-Winegar stated that she was happy to attend her first Dialogue meeting. She updated the Dialogue that she has now been in her position for a little over a year at this time. Dr. Johnson-Winegar updated the Dialogue that transition teams were in place within DoD. She also stated that she regularly received updates from Pat Wakefield, Bill Pehlivanian, and Mike Parker, and that she also reads the summaries from the Dialogue meetings and has a full appreciation for the work of this group.

Workgroup Proposal on Next Steps for the Dialogue Process

--Bill Pehlivanian, ACWA

--Craig Williams, Chemical Weapons Working Group

Bill Pehlivanian and Craig Williams, as representatives of the workgroup who worked on proposed next steps for the Dialogue process, presented a proposal for the Dialogue to consider. They agreed to the next steps outlined below after discussion by Dialogue participants. Please see some of the comments and points of discussion outlined below.

Comments from Craig Williams regarding the future of the Dialogue. Craig Williams outlined that there is a fear on behalf of some Dialogue participants that this process is the “only game in town,” that it is the one place that some Dialogue participants feel they have the ability to get questions answered.

Comments from Bill Pehlivanian regarding the future of the Dialogue. Bill Pehlivanian noted that it was essential to define the boundaries of the ACWA Program as the Program evolves. Pehlivanian also noted that the ACWA Program and therefore the public involvement strategy are constrained by the confines of the various laws.

Comments from Mike Parker regarding the future of the Dialogue. Mike Parker stated that he feels strongly regarding this issue. His concerns are first legal and fiscal in nature. On the legal issues, he is currently seeking counsel to ensure that continuing the Dialogue, in whatever form, falls within a viable legal framework. Mike Parker also emphasized that he has an obligation to ensure that he can, in fact, do something with input he receives. Due to the changing Program, and the extent to which ACWA becomes one of many players in the DAE process, Mike Parker is unable to take advice and affect outcomes in the same way as he is not the final decision-maker as the process moves forward, but rather one of many players. Mike Parker emphasized that a Dialogue for Dialogue's sake matters little. Mike Parker emphasized that given the current climate, and the tasks ahead, that the next Dialogue meeting will be the last within the current ACWA context. However, after the next meeting, the ACWA Dialogue would continue to receive information via the Web Site, but that there would be no other formal face-to-face meetings planned.

Support for changing role of the ACWA Dialogue. A Dialogue participant and member of the Oregon CAC stated agreement with the changing role of the ACWA Dialogue and that the next meeting would be the last one and articulated reservations regarding an on-going role for the ACWA Dialogue. The participant also noted concern about coalitions within the Dialogue and the away from the table discussions and agreements.

Next Steps for the ACWA Dialogue Process as Finalized by Dialogue on January 26, 2001

Overview

The ACWA National Dialogue will continue as an entity that provides advice to PMACWA. Given the changing nature of the Program, the role of the Dialogue should evolve to address the future goals and tasks of the Program. Dialogue members and the Project Manager (PM) agree that the following steps serve the needs of the ACWA Program and are within the scope of the Program's congressional mandate.

ACWA Dialogue Meetings

Dialogue meetings will continue to occur prior to major decision-making points for the ACWA Program. Decisions for convening such meetings will rest with the PMACWA, in consultation with the Dialogue. At this time, the PMACWA anticipates one additional meeting.

General Communication

PMACWA intends to maintain a transparent communication style with the ACWA Dialogue and the broader public. At a minimum, this will continue in the following ways:

- The PM will provide once a month updates to the ACWA Dialogue members. These updates will also be posted on the web so that the general public may have access.
- The PM will continue to maintain the website, including posting relevant, nonproprietary information regarding EDS.
- The PM will continue to include Keystone as a facilitator of information, suggestions, and needs for the Dialogue activities.

The CATT

The CATT's role will continue to involve participation in appropriate ACWA and NRC meetings, receipt and review of reports, and their reporting back to the full Dialogue via the best means available. PMACWA will ensure that the CATT will have access to a variety of technical advisors including SBR Technologies, A.D. Little, and Mitretek. The PMACWA will continue to fund SBR Technologies to serve the CATT in a limited capacity as a technical consultant on behalf of the entire Dialogue. PMACWA will solicit input from the CATT on the specifics of the SBR contract before it is finalized.

Engineering Design Studies (EDS) I Update

--Scott Susman, ACWA Technical Team

--Irene Kornelly, CATT Liaison Member

Slides are available for this presentation by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Question regarding titanium liners for the SCWO. While the titanium liners are less expensive, a question was raised regarding the disposal of such liners and the risk to worker safety in changing those liners and disposing of them. Scott Susman stated that it was their understanding all along that in this stage of EDS they would need to be able to make modifications, particularly to address the salt plugging issue. Scott Susman stated they are still gathering information and that the corrosion issue is of great importance. The current set-up is designed to be able to change out liners as needed.

Question regarding the gelled agent they have addressed at JACADS. Scott Susman stated that at this time DoD has only addressed this for HD munitions, the hope is that it can be more broadly applied to other munitions.

Environmental Update

--Jon Ware, ACWA Environmental Team

--Marsha Goldberg, Argonne National Laboratories

--Drew Lyle, Program Manager Chemical Demilitarization (PMCD) Environmental Team

Slides are available for this presentation by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

Recommendation regarding “No Action” alternative. A Dialogue participant requested that it be clear that the “No Action” is illegal given that it would put the United States in violation of the CWC Treaty.

Question regarding whether there is any current congressional language about the future use of a pilot or full-scale plant. An Army representative explained that the latest legislation states that the Governor of the State needs to approve future use. The Army representative stated it was not the Army’s intent to keep these facilities in operation past the goal of chemical weapons destruction, as they are very expensive.

Question regarding the addition of Demonstration II Technologies. A DoD representative explained that if the Demonstration II technologies are determined to be viable, they will be added to the potential options outlined in the EISs.

How to give Public Input to an EIS

--Debi Rogers, National Environment Policy Act (NEPA) Consultant; Instructor for Duke’s NEPA Workshop Series

Ms. Rogers provided guidance to Dialogue members about how to effectively review, analyze and submit comments on EIS documents. She discussed how Dialogue members could submit useful comments on the ACWA and PMCD EISs. She also provided Dialogue members with tools and advice that can be used as they interact with individuals and organizations in their communities who may be interested in reviewing and commenting on the EIS documents.

Slides are available for this presentation by calling Horne Engineering at 1-888-482-4312.

In addition to Ms. Rogers’ comments, Dialogue participants and others offered the following advice and points of clarification:

- A Dialogue participant recommended DoD not to be too rigid in their format for comments.
- A Dialogue participant cautioned other citizen representatives that if they do not participate in this element of the process, there is no ground for ejudication later, should that be necessary. The Dialogue participant encouraged those supporters and opponents to participate in the NEPA process.
- A Dialogue participant noted that it was important to keep the EISs separate so recipients understand what they are responding to.
- A Dialogue participant asked DoD to be clear by when comments must be post-marked in order to be included in the EIS process.
- A member of the DoD Legal Team stated that numbers of duplicative comments would not necessarily be a factor in the analysis of the material, however it might perhaps weigh into the final technology decision.
- Keep the use of acronyms in the documents to a minimum.

Closing Comments by Mike Parker, Program Manager for ACWA

In closing, Mike Parker thanked Dialogue participants for their contribution to the Supplemental Report to Congress. He added that the critical points in the future were finalizing the Technical Evaluation Report for Demonstration II, future EDS testing, and the NEPA process, all of which will feed into the DAE process that will ultimately select destruction technologies for Colorado and Kentucky. Mike Parker thanked Dialogue participants for their contribution to this effort thus far and asked for their continued support as the Program moves forward.