

Meeting Summary
 Kentucky Chemical Destruction Community Advisory Board
 Meeting Date: October 4, 2004, 1 –5 p.m.
 Location: Eastern Kentucky University
 Richmond, Kentucky

Overview

The following serves as a summary of the fourth 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 may be obtained by contacting the Blue Grass Chemical Stockpile Outreach Office at (859) 626-8944.

CDCAB facilitator Doug Thompson welcomed everyone to the CDCAB meeting. The facilitator summarized the meeting agenda and reviewed the status of actions items from the May 24 meeting.

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

Key Updates/Activities

CDCAB Co-Chairs Judge Kent Clark and Craig Williams began the meeting with introductory remarks. Judge Clark thanked everyone for coming and being involved. Craig Williams joined Judge Clark in welcoming the attendees. Williams added that the two working groups had met and were very successful. Williams said these two working groups are models for the future.

Lt. Col. George Shuplinkov, Commander, Blue Grass Chemical Activity, gave the Board a briefing on the change out of stainless steel plugs on a one-ton container that holds a mixture of just over 170 gallons of GB (Sarin) nerve agent and agent decontaminate. He said this is a planned maintenance activity necessary because of corrosion on the plugs that could lead to leakage if not replaced. He said that safety is factored into every aspect of the mission. He said this is possibly the last plug change out that will need to be done and that a test tube size sample of agent will be taken

during the process and analyzed to determine purity and chemical makeup for future demilitarization. In response to a question, LTC Shuplinkov indicated that the container is approximately two-thirds full and contains both GB and decontamination agents.

Craig Williams commented that the CDCAB appreciates being briefed prior to the activity.

Bill Pehlivanian, Deputy Program Manager, Program Manager Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives, provided an update on budgetary matters for the ACWA program and for the Blue Grass site. Pehlivanian said that the Pueblo site in Colorado is nine months ahead of the Blue Grass site schedule. As Pueblo is part of the PMACWA program, he wanted to report that there is an ongoing analysis of alternatives for a less costly facility and process at the Pueblo site. He said that the Inspector General's office is looking at various parts of the design and the final IG report should be available soon. He also reported that Mitretek has been retained to conduct an independent review of the Pueblo design, as is also the National Research Council. He said that Pueblo has been given direction to put the third phase of the project on hold; this means that Pueblo can continue getting ready to build a structure and that anything not in contact with agent can proceed while the government takes another look at the design. He said that there has been no decision to suspend any design or any work at Blue Grass. However, ACWA has to brief the undersecretary of defense, and the probability exists that there will also be an analysis at Blue Grass. If the construction is delayed at Blue Grass there will be a probable impact to the schedule with any implications for funding an issue that remains to be determined.

The following discussion took place:

Q. Is it the technology that the government is looking at? Is the technology for Blue Grass likely to change?

A. The current technology is not in question. It is the design to implement the technology that is in question. There has been no decision to change the technology.

Craig Williams indicated there are numerous indications that the Kentucky site could follow the Pueblo site. While the cost of the program is increasing, he hears that the budget is decreasing. This indicates a serious situation here in Kentucky in the out years. Craig proposed that Kentucky not wait like they did in Colorado. He proposed that Kentucky make government officials aware that funding to dispose of these weapons needs to be adequate.

Question from the facilitator: What is the sense of the members on Craig's proposal?

Answer from Jeanne Hibberd (summarizing the Board discussion): We support that action. Not much time has passed between the decision to accelerate and now the decision to study the technology.

The CDCAB authorized Kent and Craig (CDCAB co-chairs) to draft a communication to elected officials about this issue that if feels to be most critical. Judge Clark commented that once the letter had been prepared, he would ask county executives, county delegates and KDEP to take a look at the timeline so that this project won't be delayed.

Jim Fritsche, Site Manager, Blue Grass Chemical Agent-Destruction Pilot Plant, presented a site update. He began by giving the status of the Blue Grass team. He said that the Kentucky Chemical Demilitarization Citizens Advisory Commission (CAC) has lost one of its co-chairs, Worley Johnson, but they still have the other co-chair Doug Hindman. He observed that the CDCAB is going well, citing in particular that the two working groups had met and made good progress. On the regulatory side, he commented that the Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection is filling positions and is working steadily on the Research, Development and Demonstration (RD& D) permit. The systems contractor (Bechtel Parson Blue Grass), the government and the regulatory agencies stay in touch and keep getting better and better at communication.

He observed that things are going well with the Blue Grass Chemical Activity and that things seem to be falling into line. The Corps of Engineers has some new people, two engineers. FOCIS Associates, a consultant that works out of the Richmond office advises both the site manager (Fritsche) and the project office.

He noted that Dr. Tom Webler was in attendance. He said that Dr. Webler was in Richmond to evaluate the outreach program on behalf of the National Research Council. He recognized the other PMACWA headquarters representatives attending the meeting, including its business manager, budget officer and public affairs officer.

On the design side, Fritsche said he was very impressed with the 30 percent design review. He said it was very professionally done. He commented that the emphasis on safety is very apparent in all that is done. He asked the question, “How good is super critical water oxidation (SCWO)?” He said that in November we would go out and do a study to verify its effectiveness.

Chris Midgett, Project Manager, Bechtel Parsons Blue Grass, gave a brief update on the project. He said that the project continues to work injury-free with not even a first-aid event. The project is in its 16th month now and has completed 30 percent of the design. This is a cost plus incentive fee contract, and the systems contractor has completed 11 total Performance Based Initiatives (PBIs).

Midgett gave the list of completions to date.

- Design Build Plan issued and approved
- RD&D Environmental Permit Application submitted to the Commonwealth of Kentucky.
- Initial Design submitted and accepted by the government.
- Clean Air Act permit modification application submitted to Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Midgett discussed upcoming milestones:

- Construction budgetary cost estimate – November 2004
- Munitions Demilitarization Building Intermediate design (60% completion) – February 2005.
- Start “early construction” infrastructure work in January 2005.

He said that the main plant construction, scheduled to start in late 2005, includes the Munitions Demilitarization Building and SCWO Building and is expected to take at least three years.

Midgett showed a series of 3-D design photos of the facility. He said that Chris Haynes, the Design-Build Manager, has shown these photos and provided a walk through of the facility for employees at Blue Grass Army Depot, the Richmond-based staff of Bechtel Parsons Blue Grass and the Corps of Engineers. Midgett made the offer that Chris Haynes could do this 3-D design walk through for the next CDCAB meeting if there is interest.

Mentioning a few other significant events, Midgett said that he had briefed the National Research Council on BGCAPP initial design on September 22.

- Issued requests for proposals for site safety survey work and will be issuing requests for access road brush cutting and clearing work.
- Conducted a vendor fair for 150 participants on Sept. 29.
- Full-scale energetics batch hydrolyzer mockup delivered to San Diego for testing.
- Initial SCWO testing indicates significant improvements over previous ACWA testing (salt transport, liner corrosion, system control).
- Initial testing at Battelle indicates that consistent analytical monitoring techniques for mustard in hydrolysate are achievable.

Tim Thomas, Assistant Commissioner, Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection, discussed the status of the environmental permitting activities. He said that a permit was issued on September 30 that covers industrial chemicals at the facility. On August 9, a permit was approved for the change out of the plugs on the one-ton container (see section on presentation by Lt. Col. Shuplinkov).

The permitting process continues on the Research Development and Demonstration (RD&D) permit. He discussed a notice of deficiency (NOD) that was filed on September 21 and explained that a NOD is simply a request for more data. He said that the regulators are meeting regularly with Bechtel Parsons Blue Grass and the Blue Grass Army Depot to develop the additional data. He gave a tentative timeline for the permitting actions. He said that the Army will respond to the NOD and by mid-December there will be a first draft of the permit, with a public hearing in March. The RD&D should be issued by the end of April 2005.

Thomas said that the Kentucky Environmental and Public Protection Cabinet, Division of Waste Management, has assembled its team to head up the Blue Grass project. The team, which officially came together in mid-August, consists of two engineers, a geologist, an inspector and a program coordinator. John Jump, a licensed professional engineer and a regulator since 1998, is the project manager. He felt the collaboration was going smoothly and that his team had regular interaction with the Blue Grass project team.

Public Comment on Briefings

A member of the audience commented that he was really glad to see the CDCAB “jump on the budget problems.”

Finalization of the CDCAB Mission Statement and Governing Procedures

The facilitator brought the issue of finalization of the CDCAB Mission Statement and Governing Procedures before the board. The board accepted the present version as final. The Mission Statement and other information on the CDCAB can be seen at <http://pmacwa.army.mil/ky/publicinvolvement.htm>.

Chemical Agent Monitoring System Update

Greg St. Pierre, Director, Risk Management, U.S. Army Chemical Materials Agency, reported on a Sense of the Congress directive to the Secretary of the Army to pursue two actions related to the CMA Monitoring Program. Specifically, the directive says that the Army should develop chemical agent monitors that would be more sensitive to specific agent releases and to have a faster response time and that the Army should deploy these more sensitive monitors at chemical storage and disposal sites. He reported that in early April the CMA sent representatives to brief Senator Bunning's staff regarding the CMA monitoring program, which resulted in several follow-on actions. The first was to hold a monitoring technology workshop at a neutral site. The public section of the workshop was held on August 23 where the group developed qualitative objectives for the monitoring system. On August 24, a monitoring technology workshop was held. St. Pierre reported that some of the technologies required some further work and testing. Some were already deployed.

Plans were made to have a follow-up meeting sometime in January 2005. He directed the audience to a web site that lists all information provided at the August sessions. It is www.chemicalagentdetector.com.

Jim Richmond, Blue Grass Lead, Program Manager for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives, provided information on agent monitoring with a focus on the Blue Grass Chemical Activity igloo monitoring. He said there is weekly monitoring of any igloo containing munitions and daily monitoring of any igloo that has housed GB (sarin) rocket leakers. The procedures provide for continuous monitoring during any operations inside an igloo.

He said the leaks are mainly vapor; seldom is there a leaking of liquid. He said that the Army has the ability to detect very small leaks. By monitoring on a weekly basis, they can do the operations safely without any risk.

Worker safety is the paramount consideration. He said that during the construction phase, there will be 600 – 1,000 workers on the site and monitoring is just one of many elements of the process to keep workers safe.

Q. Is selection of monitoring a global decision? Or is it site specific?

A. (Greg St. Pierre) The answer to both is yes.

Q. So anything used for monitoring would have to be DOD validated?

A. (Greg St. Pierre) Yes, a standing arrangement at Dugway Proving Ground is that anything would be a part of that process. We are hoping to better identify what we look for as part of the abstract that goes out to industry.

Q. Is it [monitoring] separate from the Bechtel Parsons design process?

A. (Jim Richmond) Yes, the systems contractor will use whatever is validated by the agency.

Q. Are we talking about years to make a decision on monitoring?

A. (Greg St. Pierre) A monitoring system is in place. We are simply looking at other enhancements.

Q. When will testing for the Optical Remote Sensing take place? Are there any other better technologies?

A. (Greg St. Pierre) No, based on what we saw, the Optical does not meet the technical requirements

Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program Discussion

Carl Richards, Acting Director, Madison County Emergency Management Agency and Executive Director, Madison County Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, gave a summary of CSEPP community survey results. The survey of 34 questions included a total of 873 residents in Madison County. Residents from Estill, Rockcastle, Clark, Garrard, Powell and Jackson Counties participated as well. The University of Louisville randomly selected the participants in the telephone survey.

Here are the questions and results:

- How would you be alerted of a BGAD incident? Forty percent knew sirens, tone-alert radio and TV and radio would alert them.
- Do you know what to do if there were a BGAD emergency? Thirty percent would know what to do.
- What action would you take if there were an accident? Forty-seven percent would evacuate.
- Do you know what zone you live in? Less than 4 percent knew their zone.

Richards gave the date of the annual Emergency Exercise as October 27.

Environmental Permitting Working Group Report and Discussion

Doug Hindman, chair of the RD&D Permitting Working Group, gave the summary of the first meeting of the Environmental Permitting Working Group, which was formed to explore permit issues in general and specifically issues related to concerns about public perceptions about the amount of GB munitions that would be demilitarized under the RD&D permit. Hindman noted that the report of the Environmental Permitting Working Group is included in the package distributed at the October 4 CDCAB meeting,

Following is a summary of the working group recommendations:

- Adequate funds should be provided to assure that KDEP could provide active and effective oversight.
- The RD&D permit should stick as closely as possible to Environmental Protection Agency guidelines with some leeway granted if the systems contractor demonstrates they can operate at full process speed.
- The RD&D permit should require periodic public participation sessions to review progress and agree on desirability of continuing operations.
- The RD&D permit should include clear statements emphasizing the uniqueness of this permit application and program.
- CDCAB should appoint a permanent committee on permit issues.

Tim Thomas, KDEP Commissioner, stated he was comfortable with the process the Working Group had recommended.

Secondary Waste Working Group Report and Discussion

Craig Willams, chair of the Secondary Waste Working Group, reported that the impetus for formation of this Working Group was the issue raised at the May 24 CDCAB meeting on the disposition of the wooden pallets associated with the munitions stored at the Blue Grass Army Depot.

Williams summarized the three fundamental issues addressed by the working group, which are also included in the group's report that was included in the meeting package for all Board members.

Citing the continuing mission of the Secondary Waste Working Group, Williams said the group consensus is that classification, treatment and disposal of this particular waste stream is deserving of continued focus by the Board, the government, regulators, and contractors. He said the group concurred that the Secondary Waste Working Group should become a standing committee of the CDCAB.

Schedule and Location for Upcoming Meetings

CDCAB members stated that they are comfortable meeting at the Perkins Building on the campus of Eastern Kentucky University. The Board did state a preference that the working groups continue to meet at the project outreach office at 301 Highland Park Drive. They discussed the possible dates for meetings for 2005 and decided on the following dates: Tuesday, February 8,¹ Tuesday, May 24, Tuesday, September 13 and Tuesday, December 6.

Meeting Wrap Up

Action Items	Assigned	Due Date	Status
Draft letter regarding Blue Grass funding	Co-Chairs Craig Williams and Judge	ASAP	Complete

¹ Note that the meeting planned for February 8, 2005 has now been postponed one week until February 15, 2005.

	Kent Clark		
Set agenda for next quarterly meeting. (February 15 , 2005)	Co-Chairs Craig Williams and Judge Kent Clark	February 1st	Pending
Set up presentation on 3-D design of facility. (Chris Haynes)	Mickey Morales/Chris Midgett	By next meeting	Pending
Set future meetings of working groups.	Doug Hindman/Craig Williams	TBD	Pending
Prepare draft summary of October 4, 2004 CDCAB meeting	Bechtel Parsons Blue Grass and The Keystone Center	November 5, 2004	Complete

Attendance

CDCAB members present included voting members Dr. Robert Bagby, Rob Rumpke, Craig Williams, Judge Executive Kent Clark, Diane Kerby, Carl Richards, Mary Kemper, Teresa Scenters, George Wyatt, Doug Hindman and Jeanne Hibberd. Nonvoting members present were Col. Martin Jacoby, Lt. Col. George B. Shuplinkov, Jim Fritsche, Tim Thomas, Malcolm Franklin, Geoff Reed, Bill Pehlivanian and Kim Irwin.

CDCAB members not present included voting members Jill Cornelison, Rev. Robert Blythe, Dr. Byron Bond, Mike Brewer, Mike Caudill, Gary Conkin, Sate Sen. Ed Worley, Rev. Tiger Pennington, Dr. Robert Miller and State Rep. Harry Moberly, Jr.

###