

**Fifth Chemical Destruction Community Advisory Board
(CDCAB) Meeting
Perkins Building, Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky
February 15, 2005**

Summary of Action Items and Key Decisions

CDCAB Meeting Synopsis

More than 80 persons signed the attendance log for the Feb. 15 quarterly meeting of the Chemical Destruction Community Advisory Board (CDCAB). The purpose of the meeting was to provide site and project updates, budget information and opportunity for CDCAB board and the public to comment and ask questions.

Meeting Summary Structure

This meeting summary is not intended to be a verbatim record of the meeting, but instead is meant to summarize the site and project updates, budget information, board and public comments and questions.

Action Items

- Reschedule Blue Grass Chemical Agent-Destruction Pilot Plant (BGCAPP) design presentation by Chris Haynes to a future meeting.
- Prepare for next quarterly meeting tentatively scheduled for May 24.
- Distribute list of CDCAB members upon request.

Outline of key questions and Discussions during the February 15 meeting

Opening Remarks from the CDCAB Co-chairs

CDCAB Co-Chair Kent Clark, Madison County Judge-Executive, said that the community and its leaders have come together as a team in the face of possible budget cuts and delays in BGCAPP. He said he feels comfortable that things will work out because everyone is working together. Co-Chair Craig Williams, executive director of the Chemical Weapons Working Group, said that he is in agreement with Judge Clark's assessment. He also pointed out that the ACWA staff in the room are not the decision makers on budgetary or transportation issues. Williams called on the audience to be aware that the decisions are made by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and that the ACWA staff are subject to OSD.

Key Updates/Activities

Jim Fritsche, BGCAPP site project manager, gave an overview of the eight sites in the chemical demilitarization program. Four are operational sites and two, Newport and Pine Bluff, are under construction. The two left are Pueblo in Colorado and Blue Grass in Kentucky. He said that resources are tight, that the operational sites cost money whether disposing or maintaining the capability. He said that slowing down these last two projects is cheaper than going full speed ahead. But slowing down will affect the schedule. "If we change the priority on Blue Grass from getting it done quickly to simply getting it done, it gives us some cost savings priorities," he said. Fritsche also summarized the Congressional budget cycle as it relates to fiscal year 2006 funding for BGCAPP and said that budget numbers are not likely to be known until the process is further along, probably later in the summer.

Chris Midgett, Bechtel Parsons Blue Grass project manager, spoke first of the systems contractor's outstanding safety record. There have been zero accidents since contract award in June 2003. At the time of the CDCAB meeting, BPBG had logged over 600,000 hours without even a first aid case. "We are very proud," Midgett said. "We plan to keep it as the project moves forward."

Midgett then summarized the design progress and showed an automated slide showing the unique design of a key operation in the Munitions Demilitarization Building, which has been described as the heart of the demilitarization facility. Midgett discussed the excellent progress that has been made on the permitting process and gave much credit to the state regulators and the systems contractor environmental team.

Bill Pehlivanian, deputy program manager for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives, gave an overview of budget matters for the ACWA program and the Blue Grass site. Pehlivanian said that the Defense Acquisition Board met in November of 2004 to review the chemical demilitarization funding options and issue a path forward. Next, the Department of Defense issued a decision in December of 2004 that gave priority to funding for the operating and constructed sites over the ACWA sites which are still in the design phase. That direction is reflected in the President's budget for fiscal year 2006, which reduced funds for Blue Grass and Pueblo. Pehlivanian cited direction that ACWA had received from the Department of Defense, which includes developing alternatives to achieve the treaty deadline with alternatives that are safe and cost effective, to include relocation. He said that DOD directed the Army to address safeguarding the stockpile at each location, whether or not it is relocated. He said the alternatives and safeguards are to be delivered to DOD by late March.

Questions and Comments from CDCAB

CDCAB members were called on first by the facilitator to make comments and ask questions. Questions were asked by Dr. Bob Miller and Dr. Douglas Hindman about future funding and schedule. Jeanne Hibberd asked how much has been spent on the project to date. She was told that the systems contractor has used \$65 million for design, testing and project support and that the total cost to date has been some \$90 million.

Carl Richards asked about the cost of neutralization versus the cost of incineration. He was referred to the Chemical Materials Agency for a specific amount, but Bill Pehlivanian said that the original estimates have fluctuated as have the ACWA estimates for neutralization.

Craig Williams commented that the current uncertainty is a “surreal nightmare.” He cited the long list of accomplishments of the Blue Grass project and said he was astonished that the reward for successful execution of the project and integration with the community was a change in momentum and abandonment of commitment.

Questions and Comments from the Public

Members of the public took the opportunity to comment both for and against transportation of the chemical weapons for destruction at another location. Several praised the public participation process that has gone on for 20 years. Dick Futrell said the ACWA Dialogue was a model of the democratic process. He commented that the decision to withhold funding for the project was “egg in the face.”

Comments from the public were led off by Bill Scrivner who expressed support for transportation if that is what it takes to get rid of the chemical weapons. Both Craig Williams and Doug Hindman stated that transportation is illegal.

Rob Rumpke asked what the CDCAB could do next to save the project. Liz Crowe said that the CDCAB can gauge public sentiment and let people know what the public is thinking. “We need to get rid of these weapons as safely and as quickly as possible,” she said.

Bill Pehlivanian was asked what ACWA can do until a clear decision can be made? He replied that ACWA and its contractor can find ways to reduce the cost of the facilities. “We are looking at cost savings,” he said.

Judge Clark brought the session to a close. “On behalf of the county, thanks for coming out and being involved.”

Caucus Meeting of CDCAB Membership

After the hour-long session set aside for key updates, questions and comments, the CDCAB voting members and other stakeholders met in a caucus session which was not attended by government and contractor staff

Voting Members Present: Myrt Wilson, Mary Kemper, Dr. Robert Bagby, Jeanne Hibberd, Dr. Douglas Hindman, Craig Williams, Kent Clark, Rob Rumpke, Carl Richards, George Wyatt, Dr. Robert Miller, Diane Kerby and Dr. Byron Bond.

Non-Voting Members Present: LTC George Shuplinkov, COL Martin Jacoby, Carl Richards, Kim Irwin, Jim Fritsche, Denisa Davidson, Geoff Reed, Kevin Atkins and Tim Thomas.

The CDCAB meeting notes for previous quarterly meetings can be accessed on the Project Manager for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Web Page at www.pmacwa.army.mil. Or copies can be requested by calling the Outreach Office at (859) 626-8944 or by e-mail at outreach@bechtel.com.