

Crossland, Ronnie

From: Edlund, Carl
Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2015 12:15 PM
To: Crossland, Ronnie; Webster, Susan; Phillips, Pam
Subject: FW: Camp Minden Inquiry

[Another item crossed off the list](#)

From: Edlund, Carl
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2015 8:43 PM
To: Salvatore, Brian
Subject: RE: Camp Minden Inquiry

Dear Dr. Salvatore: Thank you for sending me these articles. At the end of our meeting with Representative Reynolds on Tuesday, I mentioned to you that I read the Canadian report to say that pollution can be created by open burning of M6 on the ground (or snow) and that one of the reports recommendations to correct that problem was to use controlled open burning on trays. I understand that you disagree with this reading of the report. I also read the article on recycling munitions EPA promotes reuse, recycling and repurposing as an overall approach; however, as you stated in your remarks, the concept described in the report has not been built or tested so it would not be a viable option in this time-critical response.

Best regards, I am confident that we will have opportunities to discuss these matters further in the near future.

Carl E. Edlund, Director
Superfund Division
EPA Region 6
214-665-8124

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: [Salvatore, Brian](#)
Sent: 1/9/2015 5:53 PM
To: [Edlund, Carl](#)
Subject: Re: Camp Minden Inquiry

Dear Carl,

I am just checking to see if you received the two articles by now. They came from the AOL account. The PDF files would not go through from this email account.

I have also opened a communication channel with the Canadian military scientist who served as the principal investor on that study about the residual dinitrotoluenes in the burning of these single base military propellants, and I will have more information to share about the public dangers of the open burning of gun propellants.

As soon as this paper was published, the Canadian government banned the open air burning of M6 in Canada. You cannot even burn one ounce of this stuff up there in Canada!
The ban went into effect in 2010.

The sooner we can find safe alternatives to this EPA plan, the sooner all of the media tumult will quiet down, I believe.

I favor a safe recycling and repurposing of the chemicals in M6, according to the US Army's own studies and published technical report. Even if the safe process costs twice as much.....so what! In the long run, it is the right thing to do.

Please confirm that you have indeed received both articles today.

Than you,
Brian

On Jan 9, 2015, at 4:38 PM, Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov> wrote:

Dear Dr. Salvatore: When we discussed issues related to destruction of M-6 propellant on January 7, you offered to send me information that you had on the toxicity of emissions from burning the material. I believe that you said it was a Canadian study that was different than the one I was aware of. I'd appreciate receiving a copy as soon as possible. I checked my 'junk mail' to see if my system misrouted your message but didn't find it there.

Sincerely

Carl E. Edlund, Director
Superfund Division
EPA Region 6
214-665-8124