



Doug Hindman
Chair

Chemical Demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commission
Chemical Destruction Community Advisory Board
105 5th Street, Suite 206
Richmond, KY 40475
859.624.4700 / 859.986.7565



Kent Clark
Craig Williams
Co-Chairs

**Chemical Demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commission (CAC) and
Chemical Destruction Community Advisory Board (CDCAB) Meeting
Summary of Action Items and Discussions
March 13, 2012
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, Kentucky**

Attendees

Kentucky Chemical Demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commission (CAC): Tony Hatton, Mark Klaas (for Brig. Gen. John Heltzel), Doug Hindman, Diane Kerby, Robert Miller, Sheila Pressley and Craig Williams

Chemical Destruction Community Advisory Board (CDCAB): Lt. Col. Steven Basso, Dan Bayens, Robert Blythe, Jeff Brubaker, Regina Crawford, Mendi Goble (for David Benge), Tony Hatton, Jeanne Hibberd, Doug Hindman, Mike Hogg, Terry House, Scott Jackson, Steve Karcher, Diane Kerby, Mark Klaas (for Brig. Gen. John Heltzel), Darcy Maupin, Tom McKinney, Harry Moberly, Randy Neeley, Carl Palmer, Sheila Pressley, Kevin Regan, Carl Richards, George Shuplinkov (for Col. Brian Rogers) and Craig Williams

Media Attendees:

The Richmond Register: Bill Robinson
Lexington Herald-Leader: Greg Kocher

Meeting Synopsis

The meeting provided information on the following:

- U.S. Army Element, Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) Program Leadership Update
- Blue Grass Chemical Agent-Destruction Pilot Plant (BGCAPP) Update
- Bechtel Parsons Blue Grass Update
- Igloo Filtration System (IFS) Update

- Monitoring Working Group Update and CAC/CDCAB Explosive Destruction Technologies (EDT) Recommendation

Meeting Summary Structure

This meeting summary is not intended to be a verbatim record of conversations, but instead will provide an overview of the discussions and action items of government representatives and various members of the CAC and CDCAB. Key action items identified in the meeting and a synopsis of the major questions and comments discussed during the various updates are noted below. Copies of slides and handouts presented during the meeting can be obtained from the Blue Grass Chemical Stockpile Outreach Office (ORO) at (859) 626-8944 or bgoutreach@iem.com.

Action Items

Action Item: Distribute forecast of economic impact information for life of BGCAPP project.

Responsible Entity: Craig Williams, CDCAB co-chair.

Timeline: June 13, 2012.

Action Item: CAC/CDCAB to choose a date, May 3 or 8, for a tour of the BGCAPP construction site.

Responsible Entity: Chris Higginbotham, Blue Grass Chemical Stockpile Outreach Office manager.

Timeline: Before May 3, 2012.

Outline of Key Issues and Discussions

Welcome and Introductions – Chris Higginbotham, ORO, Outreach Manager

Chris Higginbotham welcomed the attendees, reviewed the meeting agenda and noted the following action items from the Dec. 13 CAC/CDCAB meeting:

Action Item	Steps Taken	Date/Status
EDT Working Group and CAC/CDCAB to provide recommendation on EDT to ACWA.	The CAC chair and CDCAB co-chairs delivered their recommendation to ACWA.	Jan. 31, 2012

Distribution of EDT Static Detonation Chamber lessons learned and emissions data report.	The emissions data report has been distributed and the lessons-learned information will be distributed as soon as it is finalized.	Dec. 2012 and TBD
--	--	-------------------

Opening Remarks – Doug Hindman, CAC Chair, and Craig Williams, CDCAB Co-Chairs

Hindman welcomed members and attendees and congratulated Conrad Whyne on his new position.

Williams also welcomed members and noted Kent Clark would not be attending the meeting. He introduced and welcomed new members, then recognized George Shuplinkov, Blue Grass Army Depot chief of staff, and welcomed him back to the Blue Grass. Williams then discussed ACWA funding, noting that the 2013 budget request of \$778.7 million was 66 percent higher than the 2012 budget, and that he was pleased to see the increase.

Key Updates

U.S. Army Element, Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) Program Leadership Update – Conrad Whyne, ACWA, Program Executive Officer

ACWA Program Executive Officer Conrad Whyne introduced himself and explained the difference between a program manager and program executive officer (PEO), clarifying that the PEO is the highest level the Department of Defense has in its acquisition program and that the change was recommended during the Nunn-McCurdy process. He noted the Program Executive Office is still being developed. Whyne reiterated that he will always consider community input before making decisions and that he remains committed to safety, safe destruction and transparency. He said he is proud with the work the citizens’ groups have completed and how they’ve helped the project, and he looks forward to working with them as the PEO. He promised to discuss the Acquisitions Program Baseline (APB) in detail when it is released.

Williams asked Whyne to explain what an APB is. Whyne said it is a document that outlines the schedule and budget for the life of the program and that it will designate funding for each year.

BGCAPP Update – Jeff Brubaker, BGCAPP, Site Project Manager (SPM)

Slides of this presentation are available by contacting the ORO at (859) 626-8944 or bgoutreach@iem.com.

Brubaker gave a recap of the major activities and accomplishments of the BGCAPP project since the last meeting and said the project is poised to reach the 50 percent complete construction milestone this summer. He noted that the project's focus since 2009 has been the advancement of the Munitions Demilitarization Building and that the last of the massive concrete placements for the blast-containment area is scheduled for April. Brubaker discussed the installation of some of the essential facility equipment, such as the Aluminum Filtration System Reactors and the soon-to-arrive Thermal Oxidizer units, noting the only processing equipment yet to arrive are the three Supercritical Water Oxidation Reactors and feed system skids. SCWO Unit number 1 will be systemized and then tested for approximately ten months before delivery to BGCAPP. Any lessons learned will be captured for incorporation into SCWO Units 2 and 3. Regarding construction, Brubaker said wiring and cabling work will become more extensive and that the site shelter-in-place system was almost complete, with one more test in the near future. He then discussed the recent National Research Council (NRC) study on the BGCAPP Water Recovery System, which will be used to treat and recycle approximately 70 percent of BGCAPP process water back into the facility. He acknowledged there is likely to be some tweaking involved in the water recovery process, and the NRC assessment may be helpful in making plans for that. Brubaker said the NRC will be working with BGCAPP again to research and make recommendations pertaining to disposal techniques for non-contaminated rocket motors. He thanked the CAC and CDCAB for their involvement and recommendation on the EDT topic, and said the focus now is shifting to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and that an Environmental Assessment will begin soon to supplement the 2002 Environmental Impact Statement. He estimated the process would take about one year to complete, including a 30-day public comment period, and noted project planning efforts will continue during the assessment to keep progress going.

Hindman asked if the EDT decision process would begin before or after the NEPA process. Brubaker said NEPA is a tool to help management make a decision on a specific destruction process, and that no specific EDT technology decision will be made until after the NEPA process is complete.

Jeanne Hibberd asked what the water source is for the plant. Brubaker answered it is the depot's Lake Vega, which he believes is the source of all of the depot's water. Williams asked if a public meeting would be planned around the NEPA process. Brubaker said he felt there would be one in the 30-day public review and comment period. Whyne added that one is planned near the end of the 30-day period to allow the public to read the documentation and formulate questions.

Williams asked about the purpose of the Nitrogen Receiver Vessel. Brubaker explained it will be used to support processing by helping to prevent combustible environments, and would be used to blanket the Energetics Batch Hydrolyzer Room as part of an emergency response process if an explosive gas buildup is detected.

Bechtel Parsons Blue Grass Update – Tom McKinney, Bechtel Parsons Blue Grass, Project Manager

Slides of this presentation are available by contacting the ORO at (859) 626-8944 or bgoutreach@iem.com.

McKinney informed the group of the current safety statistics and noted several minor accidents since the beginning of the year, the most serious being a broken finger. He covered the project's economic impact, employment, recruitment and involvement with area educational institutions. He noted that total project employment is down since the last meeting, but that is to be expected as fewer people are needed at off-site locations. The overall Richmond numbers are up as jobs move to the site. People from other sites are being hired for this project to support systemization, to leverage lessons learned from those other sites and provide chemical demilitarization expertise. McKinney then updated members on the Thermal Oxidizer successful fabrication and upcoming installation and said that the project is always prepared for issues like this so that construction can still move forward.

Harry Moberly, Jr. asked if there were any employment projections available to the end of the project or further. Williams said there are projected numbers, but he suspects they will change when the new APB is released.

Robert Blythe asked if sufficient testing of the Hydrolysate Storage Tanks had been done to be confident of the tanks working at BGCAPP with no concerns. Brubaker said yes, BGCAPP has benefited greatly from experience gained at the Aberdeen and Newport facilities, and the Pueblo site will be using them as well. He is very confident they will perform as expected.

Igloo Filtration System (IFS) Update – Lt. Col. Basso, Blue Grass Chemical Activity, Commander

Slides of this presentation are available by contacting the ORO at (859) 626-8944 or bgoutreach@iem.com.

Basso began by thanking Tom Thoner, U.S. Army Chemical Materials Agency (CMA); and Dr. David Bradley, Science Applications International Corporation, for their assistance with the IFS effort. He then explained the purpose of the IFS, which is to look at igloo temperature and humidity storage conditions, and said the objective was to create optimal storage conditions for the weapons. He said the five options the study

considered were: A) Powered IFS, B) Hybrid IFS (combine a filter unit with option A) C) Filter unit only, D) No equipment added, and E) Some form of IFS only at the three currently closed igloos. Basso added that there are multiple igloo configurations right now— some have tarps, some have vents open and some have vents closed, all based on Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection requirements. He said there was not a huge variation between the options and that cost was not considered a limiting factor for any path forward. Basso noted that all the options considered were acceptable and no single option measurably outperformed the others. 25 igloos have been tarped to keep water out, with two more to be done by the end of the year. He also said tarping is being done on an as-needed basis, as it would cost about \$3.5 million to tarp all 44 igloos. Optimal storage conditions are defined as no water entry and no mold or mildew growth within the igloo. For the igloos with water problems, the tarps have been an effective solution. He recommended maintaining the status quo, and thanked the CAC and CDCAB for their assistance and input in getting to a good middle ground.

A member of the public asked what was meant by “tarping.” Basso replied an igloo is covered with a special geomembrane tarp, which costs approximately \$80,000.

Hindman asked if tarps would be available any time an igloo develops a water problem. Basso said yes, that CMA understands this issue and is prepared to address it, and the non-tarped igloos are all dry right now.

***Monitoring Working Group Update and CAC/CDCAB EDT Recommendation –
Craig Williams, CDCAB, Co-Chair***

Slides of this presentation are available by contacting the ORO at (859) 626-8944 or bgoutreach@iem.com.

Williams thanked Basso and his staff, members of the Monitoring Working Group (MWG) and Thoner and Bradley for their involvement with the IFS study. Williams showed the group the draft recommendation letter regarding the IFS generated by the MWG and said there had not been enough time for it to go through the CAC/CDCAB review process – he noted it remains a draft and will be fully reviewed as soon as possible. Williams said the group had been working with CMA and BGCA for a number of years to identify different methods for increasing the protection of workers at the BGCAPP site immediately adjacent to the Chemical Limited Area, and mentioned the site escape hoods and the overpressurized Kelly Building 2. He said it was an extremely unlikely event that would allow agent to escape outside of an igloo or on the BGCAPP site, but it was not impossible, and stated the MWG’s recommendation was for all of the igloo vents to be properly functioning and fully closed and for more inspections be performed if necessary under the changed conditions. Basso noted that a recommendation to change the status quo would need to be reviewed and signed by the Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection (KDEP) and George Shuplinkov said the same would apply for the depot commander. Tim Hubbard of KDEP said he doubted KDEP would have any major questions on the matter.

Hibberd asked if there were negative consequences to closing the vents. Basso said not since the water issue had been mitigated, and that the igloos were rigorously inspected. Hubbard said KDEP has had a very good working relationship with Basso and his predecessors in looking at making the igloos safer and more protective. Basso said his mission was safe and secure storage, and BGCA will do what it needs to do to fulfill that mission every single day.

Hindman questioned what closing the vents would do to airflow. Thoner replied there would be no airflow, but the vents would not completely seal, as the connection was metal-on-metal. Hindman asked if there was a metal plate over the door vent and Thoner replied yes, and louvers on the top vent, and BGCA would make sure they were all operational.

Williams then spoke on the subject of EDT, presenting the group's January recommendation letter to Whyne to the attendees. He said initial steps have been taken with regard to environmental processes and selection.

There were no questions on the EDT recommendation topic.

Closing Remarks – Doug Hindman, CAC Chair, and Craig Williams, CDCAB Co-Chair

Hindman thanked attendees for their time and attention, and said he hoped to keep this level of transparency and cooperation going.

Williams thanked everyone for their attendance, especially the new members. He said he wished Whyne well and looks forward to working with him.

Next CAC and CDCAB Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 13 at 1:30 p.m. at the Eastern Kentucky University's Carl D. Perkins Building, Rooms A and B.

#