Camp Minden Dialogue Committee

Technical Workgroup Meeting February 23, 2015
11 AM to 1 PM

DRAFT AGENDA AND TOPICS

1. PROCESS AND STATUS

Below are the current planned steps and process for the technical workgroup.

1. Identify Technologies For Evaluation. We need to clarify the full list of technologies that we want to consider in our process.

Status:

- At the 2/12 meeting we were presented with a list that originated from the chemical weapons process (it was reported as the ACWA process but that is not exactly correct). We are working to clarify the origin and approval status of these technologies. In the meantime they have been placed on the list.
- We have received an ESB approved list for Ammunition and Explosives. These are now on the list.
- We have also asked the ESB to provide a list specifically for M6, and we believe that this may be available very soon. If this is not made available, we will move forward with what we have.
- As decided, open burn will also be considered for comparison purposes.
- While DDESB approval is not legally required under CERCLA, it would be considered as an ARAR and it does provide the best possible list of technologies which have been tested and are capable of handling this material.
- The goal is to have the list finalized no later than 2/25.

2. Preliminary Descriptions and Information. Create a basic description of each technology based on the factors identified by the technical workgroup.

Status:

- We have prepared a draft template of information for discussion today.
- We have asked EPA and the other agencies to assist in completing this template for all technologies on the list by the workgroup meeting on 2/25.

3. Initial Screening. Some of the technologies on the list may be clearly not appropriate for the materials or conditions at Camp Minden. These would be screened against a set of go/no-go criteria that allows us to focus our main attention on those technologies that appear most promising. We should also keep in mind that we may want to look at multiple processes or technologies to meet the ultimate needs of the project.

Status:

- At the 2/18 meeting have identified some key go/no-go factors including applicability to M6, availability, capacity, risks, and control of emissions.
- This initial screen can be discussed as early as 2/25.

4. Compile Detailed information. Identify additional information or details we may want to understand about different technologies in order to conduct full and balanced evaluations.

Status:

- EPA has assembled a team of experts to assist from the Region as well as other parts of the Agency
- The State will assist with its expertise as well
- We have some reason to believe that the Army will also begin to support this process as early as today
- We need to identify whether/how we might want to reach out directly to the vendors in a uniform way, recognizing that we may not get a uniform response.
- This will be done over the course of time from 2/27 through 3/6. Workgroup meetings on 3/2 and 3/4 will be used to share details on different technologies. Goal is to have all information in place to brief the full Dialogue on 3/5.

5. Conduct a Detailed Analysis. Organize and present detailed information against the full Dialogue criteria to provide insight and analysis.

Status:

- This will be done parallel to the compiling of detailed information
- Final evaluation and input from the workgroup will be done at its 3/9 meeting
- The full discussion and input from the dialogue will occur on 3/11 at the longer in-person meeting of the Dialogue.

2. SOME KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR OUR ANALYSIS AND FOCUS OF THE DIALOGUE COMMITTEE

It is important to understand a number of basic constraints on available technologies and the Dialogue process as we move forward.

1. Applicability to M6 and CBI
   - Not every technology on the list is necessarily applicable to M6 or CBI, and they will have different capabilities and destruction efficiencies

2. Location

- Most likely, any technology will need to be installed and operated at Camp Minden.
- Some of the technologies on DDESB lists are actually constructed facilities around the country and not transportable.
- DDESB Technical Assessment Visits (TAV) have noted that the M6 propellant and CBI are too unstable for offsite transport for disposal or treatment at another facility by rail or road.
- Any offsite transportation would require special permitting and approval by the Department of Transportation.

3. Capacity
- The available technologies have quite variable capacities and a number of them are very small, batch operations.
- A one year operation would require daily capacity of over 40,000 pounds per day if it operated continuously. Most systems will require some downtime for maintenance.

4. Stability of Material
- Folks have a lot of questions about the stability of the M6 and CBI at Camp Minden. It obviously affects technology selection in terms of timing/capacity and affects the implementation of any technology in terms of material handling.
- While we know that a 2013 estimate predicted the material could reach unstable conditions in between 2 and 10 years (the 2 year time being August 2015), we do not at this time have a precise deadline for the completion of the cleanup. The dialogue process will have to evaluate the relative speed with which different processes can handle the material.
- We are also expecting results of a December 2014 visit from the DDESB shortly which could provide further insight to the stability.
- Folks have raised the issues of worker safety and the potential need for robotics. These are obviously serious concerns, and they will apply to any technology that is selected. However the Dialogue Group needs to focus on the technology evaluation and does not have time to discuss and evaluate the potential need for robotics at this time.

5. Primary vs. Secondary Treatment
- The Dialogue committee is evaluating the main destruction technology that will remove the hazards of auto-ignition and explosion.
- In all cases, residue material will be produced at significant volume. How this residue is managed, whether it can be recycled, and/or disposal requirements are all items that must also be determined. However, these questions are beyond the current capacity of the Dialogue process between now and March 11 and will not be a detailed part of our overall analysis.

3. DRAFT FRAMEWORK FOR PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

- A draft list of technologies and framework for initial evaluation and screening has been developed and is attached.
- This is obviously not ready for use, we want to discuss the following questions:
    - Is this a useful format?
    - Are we arraying the right information for our initial screening?
    - What additional types of detail would you like to see added, keeping in mind that a more detailed description of each technology identified for final analysis will be prepared.