

Chemical Destruction Community  
Advisory Board  
Kent Clark / Craig Williams  
Co-Chairs  
105 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 206  
Richmond, KY 40475  
859.624.4700 / 859.986.7565

Kentucky Chemical Demilitarization  
Citizens' Advisory Commission  
Doug Hindman  
Chair  
105 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 206  
Richmond, KY 40475  
859.625.1528 / kycac@iclub.org

---

**Summary of Action Items and Discussions  
February 1, 2007  
Eastern Kentucky University  
Richmond, Kentucky**

**Citizens' Advisory Commission (CAC) and Chemical Destruction  
Community Advisory Board (CDCAB) Meeting Synopsis**

On February 1, 2007, the CAC and CDCAB held a special joint meeting designed to provide an update on the following recently released reports:

- *Analysis of Off-Site Treatment of Hydrolysates from Chemical Agent-Destruction Pilot Plants*, Mitretek Systems, December 2006
- *Hydrolysate Shipment Analysis for Pueblo and Blue Grass Pilot Plants – A Lean Six Sigma Assessment*, November 2006

**Meeting Summary Structure**

This meeting summary is not intended to be a verbatim record of conversations, but instead is meant to provide an overview of the discussions and next steps committed to by the government 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 at 1000 Commercial Drive, Suite 2, Richmond, KY, by calling 859-626-8944 or e-mailing [bgoutreach@bah.com](mailto:bgoutreach@bah.com).

**Action Items**

None

## **Outline of Key Issues and Discussions**

### **Welcome – Rebecca Toy, Community Outreach Specialist, Blue Grass Chemical Stockpile Outreach Office**

Toy welcomed the attendees and reviewed the meeting agenda.

### **Opening Remarks – Bob Miller, CAC Member, and Craig Williams, CDCAB Co-Chair**

Bob Miller and Craig Williams welcomed attendees to the joint meeting and thanked everyone for their participation. Williams explained that the meeting would be focused on off-site shipment of hydrolysate, a topic of discussion at previous meetings. Williams said that the program has tended to be “schizophrenic” in its execution – after 9/11 the focus was acceleration, but now the program is driven more by fiscal implications. He noted that many issues regarding the Blue Grass Chemical Agent-Destruction Pilot Plant (BGCAPP) have surfaced since the project’s inception, and the off-site treatment issue is another element in the process. He promised that the CAC and CDCAB would make a recommendation on this issue for Mike Parker, program manager of Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA), to consider. Williams also announced recent congressional movement on the military construction (MILCON) appropriation, noting that voting on the funding is under way.

### **Introductions – Jim Fritsche, BGCAPP Site Project Manager**

Jim Fritsche provided additional background regarding the purpose of the meeting. He highlighted the attendance of Mike Parker, George Bizzigotti from Mitretek Systems and Bill Pehlivanian, ACWA deputy program manager. Fritsche explained that Bizzigotti and Pehlivanian would be providing briefings on two recently released reports concerning off-site shipment of hydrolysate.

### **ACWA Update – Mike Parker, Program Manager, Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives**

Mike Parker thanked attendees for their willingness to give their time to participate in the program. He reiterated the good news regarding MILCON dollars, and noted that Jim Fritsche has accelerated some of BGCAPP's planning efforts based on the expected availability of funding. Parker also discussed the Nunn-McCurdy certification, stating that the process was driven by cost increases. The increases were incurred due to a schedule stretch demanded by the new fixed funding profile. He reminded attendees that after 9/11, the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) was very schedule-driven in regards to the ACWA program. However, the accelerated schedule produced a budgetary number that was not affordable. OSD subsequently sent ACWA back to the drawing board to develop a new cost and schedule estimate. ACWA has since

produced estimates that are more affordable. These estimates, which were certified under Nunn-McCurdy, include a fixed annual budget (with inflation adjustments) and a schedule stretch. Parker closed his discussion by noting that the project has a clear commitment to move forward, with a predictable funding profile, and that ACWA would continue to work in tandem with congressional delegations to ensure an efficient process.

Parker then introduced the meeting's focus: two independent reports on off-site shipment of hydrolysate. He summarized ACWA's previous invitation to the community to evaluate an engineering estimate to reduce the life cycle cost of the program by \$150 million. He stressed that ACWA is developing an Acquisition Program Baseline that includes funding and schedule estimates for on-site treatment of hydrolysate. However, ACWA is asking the community to give feedback on the option of off-site shipment of hydrolysate, which could eliminate the need to complete the on-site supercritical water oxidation (SCWO) system. The potential savings could be applied to accelerate other aspects of the project. To evaluate the risks associated with this option, Bill Pehlivanian was asked to use a process called Lean Six Sigma to examine programmatic implications, such as permitting, in pursuing the cost savings. Mitretek Systems, an ACWA contractor, was asked to examine the time values and community opinion concerning the option. Parker explained that these studies were important because they give ACWA the information needed to explain to OSD why potential cost savings might not be available (should a decision on off-site shipment be delayed significantly).

Craig Williams announced Mike Parker's upcoming retirement and acknowledged his service to the program and to the U.S. Army Chemical Materials Agency.

### **Mitretek Systems Assessment – George Bizzigotti, Mitretek Systems**

George Bizzigotti provided a briefing on behalf of Mitretek. He explained that Mitretek's task was to provide an independent, objective assessment of the off-site disposal of agent and energetic hydrolysates from the Pueblo Chemical Agent-Destruction Pilot Plant (PCAPP) and BGCAPP. The types of risks assessed included:

- Technical – Can the selected technology at the off-site facilities reliably and safely treat the hydrolysate?
- Economic – What are the associated cost savings, if any?
- Programmatic – How will delays due to permitting requirements or public opposition, both at the origin and at the destination, affect schedule and costs?

The briefing covered the approach of the evaluation, including the use of historical information and feedback from selected treatment, storage and disposal facilities (TSDF) and stakeholder communities in Colorado and

Kentucky. Bizzigotti also explained the seven scenarios that were developed to help weigh various types of risks. As a result of this work, Bizzigotti presented seven key findings related to stakeholder opposition, potential TSDF delays, regulatory complications, litigation and cost impacts. The assessment's final conclusion indicated that there appeared to be no significant cost advantage to off-site hydrolysate treatment for either Kentucky or Colorado.

Bob Miller asked which scenario incorporated Parker's suggestion that dollars saved from off-site shipment could be used to accelerate the program. Bizzigotti explained that Mitretek's analysis was completed with schedules the systems contractor provided in May 2006, and the current programmatic funding/schedule profile has changed since then. As a result, he was unable to speculate as to how these findings would transfer to the new funding profile, but as the schedule stretches, risks could lessen. Parker added that if there is unanimous community support in Blue Grass and in a receptor community (and regulatory hurdles are minor), the \$150-250 million SCWO requires could be reinserted into the project and could eliminate up to two years from the schedule. Miller reiterated that the local community has great interest in destroying the stockpile as quickly as possible. Pehlivanian added that identifying the exact savings for Blue Grass was more difficult than for Pueblo, and that FOCIS / SAIC (Focused Objective Creative Innovative Strategic / Scientific Applications International Corporation) is working on this analysis now. Once exact savings are identified, the information can be assessed against the current funding profile.

### **Lean Six Sigma Analysis – Bill Pehlivanian, Deputy Program Manager, Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives**

Pehlivanian began his briefing by stating that Lean Six Sigma uses a statistical analysis to reduce non-value added activities and to make better business decisions. Pehlivanian explained the objectives of the study, as well as the assumptions and historical data incorporated into the study. He noted that the study assumed that the decision for off-site shipment was made on October 1, 2006; facility costs and schedule data were taken from the June 2006 redesign life cycle cost estimates; risks were identified for off-site processing; and the current best case schedules were adjusted by applying schedule and cost risk for both options. Other factors considered included National Environmental Policy Act and permitting requirements, availability of a treatment facility, acceptance of recipient community and public involvement considerations based on historical information from the Aberdeen Chemical Agent Destruction Facility and the Newport Chemical Agent Disposal Facility.

Pehlivanian presented the results of the analysis, citing that off-site shipment could potentially extend the schedule 66 months and increase costs by \$147 thousand. He noted that the study's final recommendation is to treat hydrolysate on site.

Robert Bagby asked if direct funding impacts related to the war. Pehlivanian responded that although war funding comes from a different account, it could be surmised that Iraq and other factors could be contributing to the budget decisions.

Bob Miller asked why off-site shipment would jeopardize political support for PCAPP, as implied by a quote from the Pueblo CAC that Pehlivanian included in his briefing. Parker responded that according to the quote, pursuing an option that the Pueblo community opposes would put the cooperative relationship there at risk.

Miller requested clarification about on-site engineering or analytical hazards, as well as related public health hazards. Pehlivanian responded that risks are associated with first-of-a-kind equipment, and putting all the parts together could result in delays. With biotreatment, for example, it is hard to keep the elements in balance without killing microorganisms. SCWO requires replacing expensive liners. Those are the types of technical risks for on-site treatment. Pehlivanian also noted that there are no public health hazards – that engineering problems will impact only cost and schedule.

Craig Williams highlighted the fact that there are technical challenges with both on-site and off-site options and referred to technical challenges associated with Newport. He added that hydrolysate was more flammable than originally predicted and there were pretreatment issues, as well as the fact that the technology was never scaled up to see if it could handle the volumes of hydrolysate required. Williams also emphasized that the new funding profile is not necessarily acceptable and that many stakeholders (including some people in Washington, D.C.) would like to return to a completion date of 2014 or 2015. He also acknowledged that even if ACWA gains the support of the Blue Grass community and that of the recipient site, it would still be susceptible to litigation from others, such as those within the transportation route. Parker responded by acknowledging that SCWO still produces a waste stream that must be handled and that is subject to the risks that Williams outlined.

Carl Richards introduced DuPont, claiming that the New Jersey company was unable to obtain a permit and then reversed its decision. Parker clarified that DuPont had never signed any contracts or applied for a permit. Richards expressed concern that a facility would be willing to take the hydrolysate in 10-15 years.

Miller asked when the community needed to provide a recommendation to ACWA. Parker said that a recommendation from the CAC would be helpful to the government in moving forward with an ultimate decision. He noted that the Colorado CAC is already working on its formal resolution.

Eric Ringo asked Carl Richards if Newport is safer now that the agent has been neutralized and the hydrolysate is being stored on site. He also asked whether the weapons stored at the Blue Grass Army Depot would be safer using the same approach. Richards noted that it would be safer, but brought up his concerns associated with storing hydrolysate and the possibility that a leak could affect drinking water sources close to the depot. Parker said that a risk analysis could be done to determine risks with the stored hydrolysate and drinking water, as was done at Newport. Craig Williams, Col. Rick Mason and Lt. Col. Thomas Closs also agreed that the stockpile storage risk would be reduced if the agent was neutralized and the secondary treatment decision set aside.

Elizabeth Crowe expressed her appreciation for the fact that ACWA is looking for Blue Grass support before approaching a recipient site, but she also said she is not comfortable with separating the generating and receiving communities in terms of assessing public opinion. She also noted that trying to project a political reality 10-15 years in the future is impossible, and that the best use of time and energy is to obtain full funding for neutralization followed by SCWO as was originally agreed.

Toivo Puro advocated incineration as the best option for disposal and noted that the legislation allows the President to intervene in the interest of national security and order the transportation of weapons. Williams responded by recounting the legislation that prohibits the transportation. He also noted that when the Department of Defense was looking to accelerate disposal of all the chemical weapons stockpiles after 9/11, there was very strong opposition from all the sites against transportation. Parker added that it would be impractical to send the weapons to Anniston, Ala., because the facility has to be reconfigured for each different type of weapon and it would not be configured in the future to accept rockets from the Blue Grass Chemical Activity stockpile. Bill Scott pointed out that the activist effort to use unproven destruction methods (such as neutralization followed by SCWO) at Blue Grass had put the community at risk for years of additional storage. Williams countered that uneven funding efforts and changing program direction were the primary contributors to the lengthening schedule.

### **Next CDCAB Meeting**

The next CDCAB meeting is scheduled for March 13, 2007, at the Eastern Kentucky University's Carl D. Perkins Building, rooms A and B.