

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Welcome, Introductions, and Meeting Format

Amy Dean, Office of the Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization (PMCD) convened the meeting of the CO Environmental Working Integrated Product Team (WIPT) and welcomed the attendees. Introductions of the group and the observers were made. A list of attendees is attached.

Jon Ware, Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) program reminded the group that the meetings were open to the public and there would be sufficient time for questions, answers, and comments from the public.

1.2 Ground Rules and Goals of the CO Environmental WIPT

Since it had been 7 months since the last meeting of this group, Jon Ware reviewed the Ground Rules and Goals for the CO WIPT.

1.3 Review of Previous Meeting Minutes

WIPT members reviewed and approved the last meetings minutes. The WIPT members also reviewed past action items and provided a status on or closed each item. Voting members approved the 30 October 2001 meeting minutes and actions as revised.

2.0 Update on Infrastructure Projects

Steve Lewis, US Army Corps of Engineers (COE), presented information on the Infrastructure Construction Projects supporting the Pueblo Chemical Agent-Disposal Pilot Plant (PCAPP) at the Pueblo Chemical Depot (PCD). These activities are occurring in an effort to expedite the construction process, prior to the selection of the Systems Contractor (SC). These projects are located outside of the proposed double-fence footprint and have been approved by the WIPT for construction prior to issuance of the RCRA permit. Appropriate NEPA Environmental Documentation is still required prior to award of any individual project.

The Communications System is being constructed in two phases. Phase I is approximately 7 miles of fiber optic cable and was awarded to Martinez International. Construction is approximately 86% complete. Phase II is the construction of a Telephone Utility Building (TUB) and the necessary communications equipment. This contract was awarded to Faith Enterprises and is approximately 10% complete. A Record of Environmental Consideration (REC) has been completed by PCD for both phases.

The Water Distribution System Contractor is Martinez International. The project includes installation of pipe from the four wells designated to support the PCAPP, a pump house and a 500,000-gallon water tank. Installation of the pipe should begin mid-May. Construction is approximately 3% complete. A REC has also been completed by PCD for this project.

PCD has requested to upgrade Running Route 3 rather than Running Route 1. This plan would restrict POV traffic to Running Route 1, which was upgraded several years ago; truck traffic to Running Route 3; and emergency response traffic to Running Route 2. This plan contributes to PCD's operational effectiveness in terms of traffic safety and emergency response. The Access Road Upgrade Project is ready to be awarded to a Small Business 8(a) contractor, as soon as PCD's request is approved. A REC has also been completed for this project by PCD.

Negotiations are underway with Aquila, Inc., who holds the GSA contract to provide power to PCD. The scope of the project includes installation of a 15MVA, 13.2kv substation and transmission line. Negotiations are scheduled to be complete and the contract awarded late June. An Environmental Assessment (EA) has been completed for this project by PCD.

The Process Support Building (PSB) includes two administrative support buildings with utilities planned to support approximately 220 government and systems contractor office personnel working onsite. The two buildings are approximately 20,000 square feet each and will be located outside the PCAPP double fence. Procurement actions are underway to award this contract to a Small Business 8(A) contractor as soon as the EIS ROD for the PCAPP is issued. The SC will be responsible for the interior layout to include procurement and installation of the systems furniture.

Proposals have been received on the Wastewater Lagoons and this construction project is ready to be awarded as soon as the PCAPP EIS ROD is issued. Concerns raised on the use of wastewater lagoons are addressed in Section 3.0 below.

An amendment to the GSA Contract with Xcel Energy to provide gas service to the PCAPP will be negotiated next year so that possible non-usage fees can be minimized. Therefore, this project will not begin until the schedule is further developed.

It has been strongly recommended for Faith Enterprises and Martinez International to utilize the local labor force as much as possible.

3.0 Update on NEPA

Amy Dean reported that the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Site-Specific Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was published in the Federal Register on 19

April 2002 and the EIS was distributed at that time. The ROD will be issued no sooner than 30 days from the date of the NOA publication. However, the actual date of the ROD is not certain.

Jon Ware reported that the ACWA Program Final EIS has not been released for distribution at this time. It is currently awaiting final approval from the Office of the Secretary of the Army.

Irene Kornelly presented a list of comments and concerns regarding the Site-Specific EIS. This list and responses from WIPT meeting attendees are listed below:

Comments on Final Environmental Impact Statement for Pueblo (as presented by Irene Kornelly)

General Comments

Many of the suggestions and comments during the DEIS process were incorporated into this document.

Preferred alternative is neutralization followed by bioremediation.

This is the alternative that is preferred by the overwhelming majority in the community.

Specific Comments

- Page 1-15: CAC geographic area is not 500 miles, but 50 miles.

Response: Correction has been noted as 50 miles.

- Page 2-3: Document fails to acknowledge that the environmental cleanup of the Depot is one of the on-going missions.

Response: Correction has been noted – the information on environmental cleanup on the depot is noted in some sections of the document, but not all.

- Page 2-3: Document fails to acknowledge that most of the buildings on the Depot are under a master lease to the Development Authority.

Response: Noted. Any buildings used that are under the master lease must go through the Development Authority.

- Page 2-9: What are the proposed alternative utility plans for the Depot that have been recommended by other organizations? No further reference is made to this within the document and no discussion of these alternative plans has ever been brought to the community or the WIPT.

Response: This is a misleading statement. There are no alternative utility plans.

- Page 2-9: Evaporative lagoons are not an acceptable alternative as a wastewater treatment system.

Response: There are concerns that similar wastewater lagoons have a history of failure. Irene Kornelly will provide information on the design and past failures to Amy Dean and Jon Ware, so that a comparison can be made to the lagoons, which are proposed in the Final EIS and those referenced by Irene Kornelly.

Steve Burciaga informed the group that the current plan is to use evaporative lagoons with a robust design, which is used at other sites, including Utah. This particular design has not had any regulatory issues reported in Utah.

A briefing on the design, history, and reliability of these evaporative lagoons will be proposed to be included on the agenda of the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off Meeting.

The State and EPA will also provide a briefing on their experience with evaporative lagoons, specifically the water quality control statistics. Joan Sowinski, CDPHE, indicated that all lagoons leak to some degree and there is, to her knowledge, no design that is 100% guaranteed not to leak.

- Page 2-11: Reference is made to a risk assessment study for transportation. When will this assessment be completed so that the community can review it?

Response: A briefing was provided to the Pueblo County Commissioners last year and the comments received at that meeting were incorporated; however, the report was never finalized. It was decided to delay this report until a technology decision was made. This report was originally prepared for incineration and will need to be modified for the agency-preferred alternative neutralization/biotreatment. A completion date for this document

has not been set. PMCD will share their information prepared to date on this issue with PMACWA.

- Page 3-9: Reference is made to a risk assessment concerning the alternatives for transporting the munitions from the igloos to the destruction facility. When will this assessment be completed so that the community can review it?

Response: This is the same report referenced on Page 2-11. The plan is for one-way traffic. The primary route will be cleared with enforced speed limits. Munitions movement will be very slow and only at certain hours of the day.

Erna Waterman, EPA, had a concern that it was not clear from the EIS exactly how the munitions will get to their destination (route, safety measures, etc.) and this should be made very clear in the transportation risk assessment.

- Page 3-10: Reference is made to the fact that the frozen munitions will be cut open. Previous discussions with the Army indicated that the munitions would be punched to allow for access for purposes of incineration. Is this a change in plans?

Response: This reference was based on modified baseline as the chosen technology. Fracturing occurs after the energetic is removed. Four methods were tested by PMCD, for creating sufficient cavity in frozen simulant rounds that would allow the simulant to evaporate once the rounds are introduced into the furnace. The burster-well press fracture method was found to be the most reliable and repeatable method without failure, and was planned to be implemented in the project had the modified baseline process been selected. The test report is available upon request.

Irene Kornelly pointed out that this was not in the Draft EIS, but may be a moot point with the agency-preferred alternative being neutralization/biotreatment.

- Page 3-11: Reference is made to a decision in November 2001 concerning the type of energetic destruction facility that will be built for the on-site destruction of contaminated energetics. If this decision was made in November 2001, when will the public be informed of this decision? This also raises the issue that the Pueblo community has requested on many occasions that all energetics be destroyed on-site and that no energetics be removed from the Depot.

Response: Ms. Dean stated that this information is not consistent with statements concerning this issue in other sections of the document. Based on overwhelming opposition from the public to the off-site shipment of uncontaminated energetics proposed by PMCD, PMCD had added a Deactivation Furnace (DFS) into the design to provide a complete on-site solution for all energetics, if the modified baseline process were chosen for Pueblo. However, with the designation of neutralization followed by biotreatment as the agency-preferred alternative, this issue has become a moot point.

- Page 4-9: Section 4.3 Water Supply and Use; The Army has made considerable progress in understanding Colorado's unique water laws. However, the Army does not appear to understand that the right to pump water from the wells does not mean that the water will be available in the wells. If the water is not available, as a result of drought or preemption by senior water rights, the Depot will have to purchase water. This process is not as simple as purchasing a commodity from the local Wal-Mart. If water must be purchased, the increased prices for water could impact downstream users who may no longer be able to afford water for agricultural purposes (see pages 4-87 and 4-90). This economic impact has not been taken into consideration in this document.

Response: In an effort to ensure that the water rights and economic impacts to the community are understood, a briefing on water right issues will be proposed for the agenda of the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off meeting. This briefing will be provided by a water rights attorney/expert to be identified by Irene Kornelly.

The CO League of Women Voters has available a booklet on CO water laws. Copies are available for \$9.00 each. Irene Kornelly can obtain copies if desired.

Bobby Templin pointed out that when preparing the Final EIS, the water laws and issues were carefully looked at, but these are not easy to break down into one paragraph.

- Page 4-10: Does the water requirements table take the recycling of water by the alternative technologies under consideration?

Response: Yes, the water consumption stated in the EIS takes into consideration the recycling of water by the alternative technologies.

- Page 4-88: Does the rate of recharge into the aquifer take into consideration drought conditions?

Response: Yes, drought conditions were taken into consideration in the site specific EIS and the Program EIS.

- Page 4-129: Section 4.20 Socioeconomics; The use of 2000 census data in some places and the use of earlier data in other places is confusing.

Response: The 2000 census data was not available when the Final EIS document was prepared in March 2002. Therefore, the new data was not included.

- Page 4-160: Closure and Decommissioning; the implied use of the JACADS closure plan for Pueblo is unacceptable. JACADS has been built on an island in the middle of the Pacific Ocean and there is no proximity to population centers. The uniqueness of the Pueblo community and the redevelopment plans established by the Authority should be taken into consideration in developing the closure and decommissioning plans.

Response: The closure and decommissioning plans for each community are unique. JACADS is being followed as a model and for information only. The JACADS closure plan will not be the same as the closure plan for Pueblo, but will be used as a reference.

4.0 Update on Acquisition Process

Scott Susman, PMACWA, presented an update on the acquisition process. The philosophy of the acquisition process is to have a performance-based contract, which allows the systems contractor (SC) to use their expertise in the design, construction, and operation of the facility. The intent is to allow the SC to take on additional responsibilities and accountability, which will foster greater ownership of the program.

The requirements will be for the SC to design, construct, systemize, pilot test, operate, and close a facility that will destroy the stockpile of chemical munitions at PCD in a safe and environmentally acceptable manner using neutralization followed by biotreatment.

The evaluation criteria for the SC will include the 1) the proposed management approach, which will include things such as the principal and sub contractors, coordination and integration, and public involvement; 2) the technical approach, which will look at schedule and acceleration initiatives, experience, safety, and environmental; 3) past performance; and 4) cost.

The schedule presented by Mr. Susman included:

- 7 September 2000 Industry Day
- 5 December 2000 Pre-proposal Conference
- 10 April 2002 Issue Sources Sought Announcement
- 1-3 May 2002 One-on-One Sessions with Prospective Offerors
- 24 June 2002 Issue Request for Proposal
- 22-26 July 2002 Receive Proposals/Conduct Oral Presentations
- 30 August 2002 Select Contractor
- 13 December 2002 Award task to develop Design-Build Plan
Award Design Requirement

Currently, there are two teams who have expressed interest in bidding:

- Bechtel, Parsons, Washington Group
- EG&G (teaming partners have not been identified, at this time)

Both teams have extensive experience and backgrounds in the area of chemical demilitarization. The SC will have the opportunity to present new ideas and approaches.

A greater emphasis in the decision-making will be placed on the oral presentations in an effort to minimize written responses.

Joan Sowinski inquired about the working relationship between the SC and COE on the design and construction, specifically how this relationship will work.

Scott Susman informed the group that the specific plans for this were still being formulated. However, the COE will be more management and oversight and the SC will do the actual work. The degree of oversight by COE will be decided on when the SC is selected and on board to ensure the most efficient process.

Joan Sowinski stated that the COE has directed other contractors onsite to do things which violated regulations and that it will be very important for the COE/SC relationship to be understood up front. She also stated that any arbitrary changes directed by COE will not be welcomed; therefore the role of the COE must be stated up front. Ms. Sowinski referenced the changes at Umatilla directed by COE, which required 300 modifications to the permit.

Steve Lewis, COE, stated that the changes Ms. Sowinski referenced at Umatilla went through the appropriate change control and configuration management boards before implementation. Mr. Lewis also pointed out that the primary source of changes at all sites is the PMCD Programmatic Lessons Learned Program. The role of the Corps of Engineers will be to support PMACWA with management oversight during the facility design, construction, and equipment installation phases.

5.0 Update on Agricultural Assessment Work Plan

An Agricultural Assessment is required under the County's Certificate of Designation (CD). As part of this assessment, a workgroup was formed to get input from the local farmers and ranchers. The last meeting of this workgroup was held in October 2001 and subsequent meetings have not been scheduled due to the delay in the technology decision and a lack of information to share with the group. Additionally, seasonal work of the farmers and ranchers has impacted scheduling.

An item will be added to the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off Meeting to provide an update on this workgroup's activities and to determine if further meetings of this workgroup are required.

One item that has not been completed from the last meeting of this workgroup is an ACWA analyte list for neutralization followed by biotreatment, which must be identified. Additionally a draft sampling plan for neutralization biotreatment needs to be developed.

Frank Sobolik suggested meeting the night before the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off meeting to discuss these issues and be prepared to present accurate information. Jon Ware, ACWA, will arrange this meeting.

Irene Kornelly suggested putting the agricultural assessment information in the read-ahead package for the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off Meeting so the meeting attendees can be prepared to discuss before the meeting and have a basis for comparison.

6.0 Process Options

Scott Susman presented a notional schedule without process options applied, which is based on preliminary data and plans. Mr. Susman stressed that this is not the final schedule and is only what is known at this time. He also informed the group that this information will drastically alter as the process moves along. This schedule does not include closure.

The process options with the greatest potential for cost and schedule impact include construction beginning before the RCRA Part B Permit is issued; streamlined processing to include enhanced reconfiguration; and off-site shipment of secondary waste. The offsite shipment of secondary waste is a major concern of the community.

Any construction done before permits are issued will be done in compliance with all applicable regulations. The RCRA permit will be in place before any operations begin. However, construction before permits are issued could save an estimated 14 months.

Mr. Susman inquired as to what steps need to be taken in order to get approval to begin construction before the permits are issued. The State representatives noted possible options include a consent order or a construction permit.

Doug Knapp, CDPHE, stated that the State will provide an outline on the regulatory process and how the RCRA permits can be issued with possible options such as the consent order and/or construction permit as noted above. He indicated that this may be able to be accomplished in a phased approach in which addendums will be issued at each phase of construction. This will require goals to be set as the construction proceeds. This process would provide opportunity for public input.

Irene Kornelly indicated that the county is working to expedite the CD approval so construction can begin. The State law has recently changed so new ways of issuing the CD must be explored by the County anyway. Ms. Kornelly will provide an outline on this process at the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Meeting. The CD schedule would fall in line with the RCRA activities.

Jon Ware indicated that it will be necessary to closely coordinate the RCRA permit and the CD to ensure both are issued in the same timeframe.

The main processing facility would be the first one to begin construction due to the size and elaborateness and affect on the overall schedule. The buildings that do not process waste will not save that much construction time by being the first things to be built.

Mr. Susman stressed that there must be a plan to deal with storing the energetics and munition bodies to avoid any overlapping in the reconfiguration so that there is not a halt in the process.

Brad Still stated that storage space has been investigated for packaging, storage, and disposal options and it would require approximately 3 – 4 igloos and this may not be sufficient. To designate these areas for storage would require a permit modification.

Joan Sowinski stated that the State will need to discuss this further and decide whether to address the storage of the energetics as munitions or waste. She also indicated that the distance and quantities for transporting this material are a big issue and that systemization cannot begin until the facility has been fully permitted. Mr. Susman explained that the systemization efforts will not include any agent or energetics. But Ms. Sowinski again stated that systemization efforts could not begin until the facility was fully permitted.

Ms. Kornelly expressed concern that the appearance may be that there are two permits. Ms. Sowinski explained that one option was to have one permit and a Class 3 Modification to that permit.

Additional streamlined processing will take advantage of knowledge gained in PMCD and PMACWA programs, the size process lines will balance capital costs with operating costs. These combined with enhanced reconfiguration will have a potential schedule savings of 4 years and a cost avoidance of approximately \$350M. The figures quoted by Mr. Susman include water and agent and is based on stockpile and throughput rate.

Things to consider with the offsite shipment of agent and energetics hydrolysate are a cost reduction of approximately \$100M, which includes the cost of shipping to a commercial treatment, storage, and disposal facility (TSDF). Also, additional benefits include a simplified process for construction and processing, a schedule reduction of approximately 3 – 4 months. This option does include shipment of liquid wastes by road and/or rail. The option of offsite shipment of waste was not well received at the 22 April Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off Meeting.

Mr. Susman presented another schedule showing the time savings if the process options are applied.

The total estimated water consumption for treatment options includes:

- Original Neutralization Biotreatment Basis
 - 11.4 million gallons
- On-site Neutralization Biotreatment (Using sequencing batch bioreactors)
 - 4.5 million gallons
- Off-site shipment of agent and energetic hydrolysate
 - 6.5 million gallons
- Off-site shipment of agent hydrolysate and unprocessed energetics
 - 6.1 million gallons

Funding and schedule will be adjusted as the process continues. ACWA is currently looking at funding available and updating schedules.

Mr. Gerald Starnes covered the emissions estimates for the various treatment options. This information assumes complete reactions in the process and is from early demonstration testing and the Engineering Design Studies (EDS). The dioxin emission information presented is for the total process. This information does include the CatOx process; however, there is no emissions data available for the sequencing batch reactor. This data is needed so that the dioxin emissions from these units can be reviewed by the WIPT. Mr. Starnes will provide this information at the next WIPT meeting.

7.0 Update on Permit Review

Jon Ware reported that the OPSEC comments have been incorporated into the draft permit and these have been sent to the State.

8.0 Previous Action Items

- ITEM 30: Forward detailed environmental sub-schedule to Ms. Lisa Woodward, CDPHE.
ASSIGNEE(S): Ms. Amy Dean, PMCD-EMO; Mr. Jon Ware, PMACWA
ORIGINATOR: Ms. Woodward
SUSPENSE: 7 March 2001
STATUS: Hold pending technology decision.
- ITEM 32: Determine the permit that will regulate the Maximum Achievable Control Technology rule in the State of CO.
ASSIGNEE(S): Mr. Poul Poulsen, CDPHE
ORIGINATOR: Ms. Amy Dean, PMCD-EMO
SUSPENSE: 7 March 2001
STATUS: Hold pending technology decision.
- ITEM 34: Prepare point of contact listing for potential questions from the Pueblo community.
ASSIGNEE(S): Ms. Jeannine Natterman, CDPHE
ORIGINATOR: Ms. Amy Dean, PMCD-EMO
SUSPENSE: August 2002
STATUS: Hold until ADM decision
- ITEM 53: Study the possibility of incorporating public input into the RFP process.
ASSIGNEE(S): Ms. Amy Dean, PMCD-EMO
ORIGINATOR: Ms. Dean
SUSPENSE: Next WIPT meeting
STATUS: Ongoing.

9.0 New Actions

ITEM 56: The next meeting is scheduled for 24 July 2002
ASSIGNEE(S):
ORIGINATOR:
SUSPENSE:
STATUS:

ITEM 57: Provide information on the design and past failures of waste water lagoons in Pueblo County for comparison with those proposed in the EIS.
ASSIGNEE(S): Ms. Irene Kornelly
ORIGINATOR: Ms. Amy Dean and Mr. Jon Ware
SUSPENSE: Early June 2002
STATUS: Open

ITEM 58: Provide a briefing on the proposed evaporative lagoons at the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off meeting
ASSIGNEE(S): Mr. Jon Ware
ORIGINATOR: Ms. Irene Kornelly
SUSPENSE: 14 June (for read-ahead package)
STATUS: Open

ITEM 59: Provide a briefing on the State's experience with evaporative lagoons, specifically water quality control issues at the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off Meeting
ASSIGNEE(S): Ms. Joan Sowinski
ORIGINATOR: Mr. Jon Ware
SUSPENSE: 14 June (for read-ahead package)
STATUS: Open

ITEM 60: Coordinate a briefing from a CO water rights expert for the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off
ASSIGNEE(S): Ms. Irene Kornelly
ORIGINATOR: Mr. Jon Ware
SUSPENSE: 14 June (for read-ahead package)
STATUS: Open

ITEM 61: Provide a briefing on the Agricultural Assessment Working Group Update at the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off meeting
ASSIGNEE(S): Mr. Jon Ware
ORIGINATOR: Ms. Irene Kornelly
SUSPENSE: 14 June (for read-ahead package)
STATUS: Open

ITEM 62: Coordinate a meeting with the Agricultural Assessment Working Group for the evening of 20 June to discuss the future of the group and prepare for the presentation at the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off Meeting
ASSIGNEE(S): Mr. Jon Ware
ORIGINATOR: Mr. Frank Sobolik
SUSPENSE: 14 June 2002
STATUS: Open

ITEM 63: Provide information/data from the SBR at the next WIPT meeting
ASSIGNEE(S): Mr. Gerald Starnes
ORIGINATOR: Ms. Joan Sowinski
SUSPENSE: 24 July 2002
STATUS: Open

ITEM 64: Provide an update of the WIPT activities at the 21 June Pueblo Chemical Weapons Kick-Off Meeting
ASSIGNEE(S): Ms. Amy Dean and Mr. Jon Ware
ORIGINATOR: Mr. Bill Pehlivanian
SUSPENSE: 14 June 2002 (for read-ahead package)
STATUS: Open

10.0 Meeting Attendees

Kevin Blose, PCD - 719.549.4458

Steve Burciaga, PMCD - 410.436.8627

David Caldwell, Washington Demilitarization Company - 303.843.3579

Kimberly Collins, ACWA (Horne Engineering) - 410.515.5802

Ellie Crandall, EPA Region 8 - 303.312.6621

Amy Dean, PMCD - 410.436.7030

Tom Enrietta, Local Union # 20 - 719.560.9100

Dennis Grant, Honeywell/PAI - 970.416.8650

Neal Hall, CBCTC - 719.372.6639

Chris Hambric, PCD-EMD - 719.549.4291

Om Handa, PMCD - 410.436.1424

James Hindman, CDPHE - 303.692.3345

Bill Kelso, Parsons - 303.831.8100

Bob Kennemer, PCD Outreach Office - 719.546.0400

Andy King, ACWA (Jacobs Engineering) - 410.436.7353

Doug Knappe, CDPHE - 303.692.3414

Terri Knudsen, SBCCOM-PCD - 719.549.4878

Irene Kornelly, Office Pueblo County Commissioners - 719.591.5157

Steve Landry, EG&G - 410.638.9249

Christine Lehnertz, EPA - 303.312.6649

Steve Lewis, US COE - 256.895.1397

Paul Lucas, SBCCOM-PCD - 719.549.4670

Thomas McCord, Washington Demilitarization Company - 703.271.0017

Jeannine Natterman, CDPHE - 303.692.3303

Bill Pehlivanian, ACWA - 410.436.3498

Lester Pilcher, US Army Center for Health Promotion & Preventive Medicine -
410.436.6820

Poul Poulson, CDPHE - 303.692.3194

Frank Sobolik, CSU Cooperative Extension - 719.583.6566

Joan Sowinski, CDPHE - 303.692.3359

Gerald Starnes, PMACWA - 410.436.3187

Brad Still, PCD - 719.549.4883

Scott Susman, ACWA - 410.436.5749

Joe Tarlton, Bechtel - 702.862.8085

Bobby Templin, ACWA (Argonne National Lab) - 303.986.1140

Jon Ware, ACWA - 410.436.2210

Erna Waterman, EPA - 303.312.6762

Lisa Woodward, CDPHE - 303.692.3451