

Meeting Summary
Kentucky Chemical Destruction Community Advisory Board
Meeting Date: May 24, 2004, 1-5 p.m.

Overview

The following serves as a summary of the third meeting of the Kentucky Chemical Destruction Community Advisory Board (CDCAB or “Board”) and briefly reviews key issues discussed and decisions reached at the meeting. Formal presentations and documents reviewed during the meeting are available upon request by contacting Jill Abner at (859) 626-8944.

The CDCAB members introduced themselves, followed by various agency representatives, members of the public, media, and co-facilitators, Doug Thompson and Kristi Parker Celico. Special welcome was extended to new participants from Berea Hospital, Berea Chamber of Commerce and the Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection.

The facilitators presented an overview of the meeting agenda and reviewed the status of five action items from the February 2003 meeting. The status is as follows:

Action Item	Status
Media Release for CDCAB Meeting	News release and ads were sent to local papers and radio May 10
Blue Grass information resources fact sheet	Submitted for review on May 6 th and in read ahead packet
Committees or working groups	To be discussed
Proposed final mission statement and governing procedures	Draft version in read ahead packets for approval
Discussion on location of meetings	To be discussed

Key Updates/Activities

CDCAB Co-chairs Judge Kent Clark and Craig Williams began the meeting by welcoming the group. Craig Williams addressed the perimeter monitoring issue, which has received recent media attention. He stated the goal is to ensure that the most advanced and capable technology is employed for monitoring the stockpile. He is working with Senator Bunning to secure the allocation of funds for the monitoring equipment. This issue will be brought before the Board at another meeting.

Lt. Colonel Dennis Cantwell, Commander of Blue Grass Chemical Activity informed the group of the change of command on July 8. Lt. Colonel Cantwell introduced Lt. Colonel George Shuplinkov who will assume leadership for the chemical activity. Lt. Colonel Cantwell assured the group the stockpile is safe and secure and stated the project shows excellent potential for how a program should run.

Bill Pehlivanian, Deputy Program Manager, Program Manager Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives provided an update on the funding issues for Blue

Grass and Pueblo. For year fiscal year 04 and 05 funding for Blue Grass remains intact; however, there are still questions regarding funding for Pueblo. An internal investigation by the Department of Defense Inspector General is being conducted at Pueblo. The investigation focuses on an assessment of the program in relation to affordability and the accelerated schedule. The outcome of the investigation could affect the budget. Blue Grass has a vested interest in Pueblo because of data and lessons learned which will be shared between the sites. A lag in schedule at Pueblo could affect the Blue Grass schedule.

Mr. Pehlivanian also:

- Recognized Lt. Colonel Cantwell's excellent service to the program and wished him well as he heads to his next assignment
- Introduced Jim Fritsche as the new PMACWA Blue Grass Site Manager
- Introduced Don Herring as a new member of the team as a resident engineer
- Presented an award, Certificate of Appreciation for Patriotic Civilian Service, to Ralph Collins on behalf of Mike Parker for his contributions to the program

Chris Midgett, Project Manager, Bechtel Parsons Blue Grass provided an update on the project status:

- 20% of the design is complete, with the 30% design package due by July 30
- The RD&D permit application has been submitted to the Commonwealth of Kentucky for review
- Risk reduction tests are taking place at five locations around the country. Some test issues have occurred, but no "show stoppers"
- Bids for construction of the access area will be posted in August with construction beginning in January 2005
- Safety--over 180,000 hours have been safely worked
- Current 3-D models of the site plan, munitions demilitarization building and support building were shown
- A video demonstrating a test of robotic equipment to be used in the processing of projectiles was shown

April Webb, Supervisor, RCRA Permit Section, Hazardous Waste Branch, Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection reported for Tim Thomas, Deputy Commissioner. The RD&D permit application is currently being reviewed by KDEP and by Region IV EPA. Collaborative meetings between KDEP, BGAD, BPG and ACWA are being held to discuss the application. There are five open personnel positions required to support the permit review. Applicants are currently being solicited. KDEP hopes to issue the permit by the first part of next year

Public Comment on Briefings

Craig Williams informed the group that he and Doug Hindman, met May 13 with the new administration at KDEP The group included, Lloyd Cress, Commissioner, Tim Thomas, Deputy Commissioner, Mike Welch, Hazardous Waste Management Branch, and Geoff Reed from Congressman Chandler's office. A past, present, and future overview of the program was provided. The goal of the meeting was to elevate the perception of the program to the policy makers at the state level.

Mission Statement and Governing Procedures

The facilitators reported on the status of the draft Mission Statement and Governing Procedures by characterizing the situation as one of “incremental progress.” The CDCAB reviewed an earlier draft of the document at the February 23rd meeting. Based on that discussion and other comments received, the meeting packet contained a new draft. Further review of the Mission Statement and Governing Procedures identified several key issues:

- Whether or not the document should specify who is the recipient of the CDCAB’s views about issues
- Potential advantages to establishing the CDCAB as a working group to the CAC.
- The roles of the co-chairs with respect to CDCAB correspondence
- Whether or not funding issues, should funding be included in the document
- Whether or not the conflict of interest rules are too restrictive

The previous draft specified the “Madison County Fiscal Court” as the recipient of the CDCAB’s advice. The current draft deletes the specific reference to the Fiscal Court and since a number of entities might consider the views of the CDCAB. The current draft identifies the CDCAB as a working group to the CAC as doing so might have several advantages:

- The CAC is congressionally mandated by law and recognized as an entity to provide advice to the government, thus as a working group, the CDCAB would have clearer and more secure standing
- The CDCAB under the CAC would help address potential concerns about FACA requirements
- Working group status would facilitated and legitimize any funding relationship between the CDCAB and the CAC
- The conflict of interest statement would mirror that used in the ACWA dialogue process

The current draft contains a new provision relating to correspondence generated by the CDCAB or by the co-chairs on behalf of the Board. This new section essentially anticipates three situations: routine correspondence (e.g., letters of invitation or appreciation); significant letters of substance; and letters that may fall between the above two categories.

The current draft eliminates the section related to funding for two reasons. First, it did not seem to fit within the document as a whole—a mission statement. Second, it appeared that funding for the CDCAB could be drawn from different sources and in various ways. Since a precise formulation may be difficult to construct and a general statement of little meaning, the funding reference was removed from the current draft.

The CDCAB discussed these proposed changes. It supported striking the reference to the Madison County Fiscal Court in Section I of the document and the new provision about CDCAB correspondence. It also posed no opposition to the CDCAB becoming a working group of the CAC. (The CAC has been canvassed and agreed in principle to this arrangement and will propose a formal resolution at the next meeting on July 12.)

The CDCAB did not reach a clear consensus about whether and how to address the funding issue. While some felt that such a provision was not necessary in this type of document others believed that it might be helpful to make some reference to funding. Bill Pehlivanian indicated that it might be possible to use some formulation of language from an earlier draft indicating that ACWA would provide basic funding for the CDCAB. However, he stated a detailed legal review is still needed.

CDCAB members suggested several other corrections in language for clarity and accuracy. One member of the public commented that the language about sustainable development on the first page was awkward and did not convey the intended meaning. He also felt that some reference to funding was warranted.

CDCAB Issue Identification and Consensus Procedure

The facilitators presented a draft outline (a one page narrative and a flow chart) relating to CDCAB issue identification and review. The premise is that the characteristics will vary from issue to issue in terms of complexity, depth and breadth of interest on the part of the CDCAB, degree of urgency and ease or difficulty of reaching consensus. The approach attempts to identify the steps that would be common to such diverse issues. Identified steps were: Issue Identification; Screening; Diagnosis; Evaluation; and Result.

The CDCAB supported the draft approach. Judge Clark suggested the CDCAB establish *ad hoc* rather than standing committees when needed to review certain issues. The CDCAB generally endorsed this approach with one suggestion being that it may prove useful to create a standing committee to screen issues as they arise.

The facilitators asked the group to review the CDCAB fact sheet enclosed with the packet. They also requested Board members review and vote for one of three proposed for the CDCAB to use on official documents.

Destruction of GB Munitions under RD&D Permit

Tom Kurkky, BPBG Environmental Manager, presented an overview of the schedule for GB munitions destruction. KDEP has expressed concern over the proposed schedule and public perception based on the number of munitions that could possibly be destroyed under the RD&D permit. KDEP has proposed a 50% limit on the number of munitions to be destroyed under the RD&D permit. BPBG maintains the schedule is designed to ensure a safe start-up of the facility, but the limitation by KDEP could possibly impact the ability to meet the test requirements for a Part B RCRA permit.

CDCAB and Public Input

The Board and general public asked the following questions:

Q. Why is a 50% limitation being put on the number of GB munitions to be destroyed?

A. 50% is only a suggested number to being an evaluation.

Q. Is the ramp up scheduled only for GB?

A. The neutralization of VX will have been tested at Newport.

Q. Will experienced operators be brought in for the process?

A. Yes, 25% of the workforce will be experienced people from other facilities, 75% will be trained local hires.

Q. When do you anticipate the testing to begin?

A. The pilot testing is scheduled to begin in 2010. The community will be well informed of start-up dates.

Q. Why is there a concern about how much is processed?

A. KDEP wants to see data from testing to ensure agent is destroyed adequately.

The group felt a more in-depth evaluation was needed on this issue. An *ad hoc* committee will be formed to further review the issue.

Off-Site Treatment and Disposal Considerations for Waste

Jim Richmond, Blue Grass Lead, PMACWA presented an overview of waste treatments for some of the hazardous wastes produced by BGCAPP. He listed three materials, which will require disposal considerations. Those include aluminum filter cakes, brine salts, and agent uncontaminated wood pallets.

Chris Midgett, BPBG Project Manager, brought forth the disposal of uncontaminated wood pallets (aka “dunnage”) for consideration. His presentation included the advantages and disadvantages of off-site shipment. The Board was asked to support the off-site shipment of agent uncontaminated wood pallets.

Public Input

The Board and public asked the following questions:

Q. How do you know if the wood is contaminated?

A. If the wood hasn't come in contact with agent, it is not contaminated. The igloos are constantly monitored for leakage.

Q. Who makes the final decision on this issue?

A. BPBG will make a request and the government will make the final decision and will validate compliance with regulations.

Q. If the waste is shipped off-site, what will be the perception from the recipient community?

A. Important to review lessons learned. Public involvement will be important in the recipient community

Judge Clark supported the off-site shipment of the wood dunnage. However, he wants the economic impact to the community to be considered for future disposal decisions.

The Board will create an *ad hoc* committee to review secondary waste issues.

Information that would assist the committee in making decisions include:

- Economic impact-- ship off-site vs. job numbers

- Consider potential reuse
- Public involvement required at recipient site
- How safe is safe?
- Can the toxicity be reduced

Meeting Wrap-up

The facilitators queried the board regarding meeting dates and facilities. The board felt it would be helpful to establish a pattern for the meetings and schedule the dates in advance. The Board agreed to the continued use of the Perkins Building for future meetings.

Future meeting agendas may include the following issues:

- Monitoring
- RD&D Permit
- CSEPP
- Secondary Waste

With input from the Board, the facilitators listed the following suggestions for future meetings:

- Slow down on technical information
- Have critical items at the beginning of the meeting, with housekeeping at the end
- Consider an evening meeting if topic warrants
- Provide more information on issues prior to meetings

Action Items Resulting from the Meeting

Responsible Person/Entity	Topic	Action Required	Due Date
Keystone/Outreach Office	Meeting Dates	Establish next three meeting dates	June 23
Outreach Office	CDCAB Logo	Announce logo selection	June
Keystone/Co-Chairs	Mission Statement/ Governing Procedures	Revise Mission Statement/ Governing Procedures into final form	Next meeting
Keystone/Co-Chairs	Subcommittees	Convene RD&D Permit Subcommittee and Wood Pallet (Dunnage) Subcommittee	June-August

Attendance

CDCAB members in attendance included: Robert Bagby, Robert Blythe, Byron Bond, LTC Dennis Cantwell, Mike Caudill, Judge Executive Kent Clark, April Webb representing Tim Thomas, Jill Cornelison, Dave Easter representing Col. Martin Jacoby,

Jeanne Hibberd, Doug Hindman, Mary Kemper, Diane Kerby, Robert Miller, Bill Pehlivanian, Carl Richards, Rob Rumpke, Teresa Scenters, Craig Williams, George Wyatt. Approximately 52 people attended the meeting, including CDCAB members, program staff, two reporters, and the general public.

CDCAB members absent include: Malcolm Franklin, Mike Brewer, Kim Irwin, Rep. Harry Moberly, Jr., Sen. Ed Worley, Gary Conkin, Rob Rumpke, and David Bohannon.