

**Summary Notes
Camp Minden Dialogue Committee
Full Dialogue Committee Meeting
Community House, Minden, LA
February 12, 2015
Draft Document as of 2/23/15**

KEY DISCUSSIONS AND RESULTS

Opening Activities

1. A media availability session was held in advance of the meeting.
2. A meeting agenda and attachments to the agenda can be found on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) website: http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015/02/documents/draft_meeting_agenda_2112015_2.pdf
3. A Planning Committee selected dialogue participants. Planning Committee members included:
 - Rep. Gene Reynolds
 - Frances Kelley, Louisiana Progress Action
 - Dr. Brain Salvatore, LSU
 - Wilma Subra, Subra Inc.
 - Marylee Orr, Louisiana Environmental Action Network
 - Dolores Blalock, ArkLaTex Clean Air Network
 - Karen Price, LDEQ
 - Col Ronnie Stuckey, Louisiana National Guard
 - Ron Curry, EPA
4. An updated list of Dialogue participants can be found here: http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-02/documents/minden_dialogue_committee_volunteers_list_2.13.2015_0.pdf.
5. The Regional Administrative of EPA, Ron Curry, the Louisiana National Guard Installation Commander for Camp Minden, Ron Stuckey, and Senior Environmental Scientist for the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ), Karen Price, made opening comments. Each stated a strong commitment to participating in the Dialogue process and listening to input.

Overview of the Problem

1. Colonel Ron Stuckey provided an overview of Camp Minden, the type of materials needing remediation, and potential risks of the site. The PowerPoint presentation can be found on the EPA Minden Dialogue website here: http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-02/documents/dialogue_committe_louisiana_national_guard_briefing_12_feb_15-1.pdf.

2. The facilitators presented an overview of the history of the situation, details on the type of waste stores at the site, the risks of these waste, and some of the legal decisions that have been made to this point. PowerPoint presentation can be found on the EPA Minden Dialogue website here: http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015.02/documents/part_1_facilitator_dialogue_presentation_11.12.15.pdf. And here: http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-02/documents/part_2_-_facilitator_dialogue_presentation_2.12.2015.pdf. Some slides in this presentation were controversial and are clearly marked as such. These issues will be returned to during future Dialogue discussions.

Work of the Dialogue

1. The Facilitators presented drafted ground rules, goal statement, and criteria for evaluating alternative technologies as developed by the Planning Committee. These drafts can be found here in Attachments B, C and D: http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-02/documents/draft_meeting_agenda_2112015_2.pdf. The ground rules were accepted as written. Dialogue participants made recommendations for improving the goal statement and criteria for evaluating alternatives. These revisions were presented at the next Dialogue conference call and can be found here: http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-02/documents/agenda_and_materials_2.19.15_minden_dialogue_web_pres.pdf. As of 2/24/15, final copies of all of these documents can be found on the EPA website.
2. The group established a Technical Working Group. The list of members can be found here: http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-02/documents/dialogue_technical_subcommittee_participants_2.20.15.pdf. EPA, DLEQ, and Louisiana Military Department (LMD) staff and other experts will support this group of individuals.

Technology Evaluation Process

1. The Dialogue discussed that there are three basic ways of dealing with this type of material
 - Combustion: burning or detonating, either in chamber or open air
 - Neutralization: water or chemical process to change the nature of the material
 - Recycling/reuse: using the material for another purpose, changing the nature of the material and using residue for a positive reuse
2. A member of the public noted the need to only look at technologies that have been certified by the Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board (ESB) since getting a new certification would take too long. She summarized the following technologies as having their certification:
 - DAVINCH

- Dynasafe
- Controlled Detonation Chamber
- Hydrolysis
- SWCO-Super Critical Water Oxidation
- Actodemil
- Open Burn/Open Detonate

In the future, this list would become known as the 2/12 technology list.

3. The group had much discussion about this list and agreed that the Dialogue should limit their evaluation of technologies to those that have been certified, if this certification is required. The group discussed whether technologies are certified for specific materials or in general. EPA agreed to ask the ESB to clarify these issues.

Additional Next Steps

1. The Dialogue identified several topics that will need to be addressed at future meeting, including:
 - Dioxins,
 - Emergency declarations,
 - EPA post-dispersion model
 - The significance of the August 2015 date in regard to the stability of the waste
 - Information about the risk level of the waste in general.
 - Measures that can be taken to further stabilize and monitor the waste

Public Questions and Comments

The public asked a variety of questions, noted here with answers to the extent they are known

1. Will folks need to be evacuated during the destruction process? Generally no, but public actions will need to be determined once a technology is finalized.
2. A member of the public noted that there is always risk that pellets will auto-ignite. There are test kits available.
3. A member of the public noted that under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), Congress outlawed open burn where other alternatives are available.