

Colorado Chemical Demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commission

Irene Kornelly, Chair
1602 Clemson Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
Home 719-591-5157
Cell 719-248-8346
Fax: 719-591-1305
Email:
ikornelly@pcisys.net

Memorandum

To: Kevin Flamm, Program Manager,
Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives
From: Colorado Chemical Demilitarization Citizens'
Advisory Commission
Date: October 5, 2007
Re: Statements of Work for Noblis and NRC Studies

Members:

Hon. Jeff Chostner
Tom Enrietta
Terry Hart
Richard Robb
Joan Sowinski
Rebecca Swanson
John Thatcher
Ross Vincent

Thank you for the opportunity to suggest items that we, as members of the CO CAC, consider important to include in the Statements of Work for the Noblis contract and the National Research Council. The following items were discussed at the CO CAC meeting on September 26, 2007. A draft of the meeting minutes are available from Jeannine Natterman at CDPHE should you wish to see the context of these comments.

Please provide to the CO CAC at the earliest opportunity copies of documents describing the scope of these studies including questions to be addressed and methods to be used.

Noblis Study

1. When considering an expanded stakeholders list, include individuals from potential recipient sites and potential sites along any transportation routes.
2. Precedence for the shipment of hydrolysate appears to come from two sites – Aberdeen and Newport. While the Aberdeen site was relatively successful, the Newport site has been a PR and legal problem. Include in the study the differences in sites, as well as the costs for failed PR, contract costs, judicial matters, etc. at Newport.
3. Consider the economic losses to the Pueblo community should a decision be made to ship the hydrolysate.
4. Allow for a review by members of the CO CAC of the Noblis Study prior to publication, so that their comments can be included in the final report. The GAO is a model for this: allowing agency comments prior to release of the study to Congress and the public.

NRC Study

1. Include committee members who have been involved with previous ACWA studies and not those who have been exclusively involved with CMA studies involving incineration sites.
2. Include committee members who can help the committee to address the ethical issues raised by offsite shipment.
3. Include a public involvement specialist in the ACWA study, since a portion of the study must look at public involvement strategies.
4. Include in the budget a means for CACs and communities to have copies of the report without charge.
5. Include in the budget the ability of members of the NRC study to actually visit the sites in question rather than gather data through questionnaires, conference calls or other less personal means.
6. Consider the need for a new transportation risk study (last one done for Pueblo is almost 10 years old) and a health risk assessment prior to any final decision.