

## **Camp Minden Dialogue Committee**

Technical Workgroup Meeting March 18, 2015

### **DRAFT AGENDA, version 4**

#### **1. Considerations on participation in the Technical Workgroup**

- Participation is limited to dialogue committee members (we could not make choices on who outside the dialogue to accept or not in a timely fashion), and technical experts from the agencies
- There are both technical and non-technical dialogue members on the committee to provide balance and because not all of the criteria will be purely scientific

#### **2. Does anyone have any conflicts of interest with any technology companies or contractors?**

- Please disclose any potential financial or family ties to any of the companies that might be under consideration for this work

#### **3. Should we use the Explosive Safety Board (ESB) approved technologies as a starting point for evaluation?**

- We need to decide on the range of technologies to evaluate. At the Dialogue meeting it was stated that a technology must be certified by the ESB already if it is to be implemented in a timely fashion. To date, no Dialogue participant has provided information to the contrary.
- The list discussed at last weeks meeting was not specifically for M6 or propellants. EPA has requested a list of approved technologies from ESB for the materials at Camp Minden. Response to this request is pending.
- If do we not use that as a starting point, what alternative exists?
- The full Dialogue group will discuss whether open burn is included tomorrow.

#### **4. How do we wish to put together our information, what technical resources should we use?**

- We anticipate that basic sources of information will include the EPA, LA National Guard, LDEQ and input from the Army. Are there any other important sources we need to engage?
- Workgroup participants will also bring forward valuable technical information for consideration.
- As a basic process for this very fast-moving project, the workgroup will identify what is needed and Doug Sarno can work with the agencies between meetings to assemble the basic information for workgroup consideration.
- Members can also send additional information and comments directly to Doug for inclusion in summary materials as they are produced. Doug and members will work to fact-check all information before it is presented.

## 5. Basic Technology Description

- We want to create a basic description format to present the technologies, some topics for the description are suggested below, with discussion to add or amend:
  - Name
  - What is the technology?
  - How does it work? (possible use of photos or short videos)
  - Has it been used for M6 before? With what results?
  - On-site vs. Off-Site?
  - What is the availability of the system?
  - What type of residue stream is produced?
  - What are the disposal requirements of the residue stream?
  - What types of emissions are produced?
  - What is the maximum capacity/throughput of the system?

## 6. Should we create an initial screen of key go/no-go decisions to create a short list of alternatives?

- This would allow us to not carry forward alternatives which will clearly not do the job at Camp Minden
- The detailed analysis will be conducted using the full set criteria established by the dialogue committee.

## 7. Potential Short List Criteria

If we want to create a short list, we need to identify the criteria that would be used to identify technologies and approaches to be evaluated in detail:

- Does the technology have demonstrated capability or the clear potential to address the M6 material present at Camp Minden?
- Is it likely to be commercially available to begin cleanup in a timely fashion?
- Can it be scaled up to the capacity needed at Camp Minden to complete the cleanup in a reasonable timeframe?
- Can any potential emissions/ impacts to the local community be sufficiently controlled?
- Does it present any potentially unacceptable risks to worker safety?
- Are there any other factors that would make it unsuitable for use at Camp Minden?

## 8. Schedule

- Do we need to make any adjustments to the proposed conference call dates?
- See schedule.

## **Committee – Draft Schedule**

As of February 17, 2015

### **February 18, 2015 Technical Workgroup Conference Call**

**11 AM – 1 PM**

Agenda Items:

- How to decide on range of technologies
- Basic process for evaluation, need for screening
- Agreement on sources of information, use of experts
- Potential conflicts of interest

Desired Outcomes:

- Agreed process to move forward

### **February 19, 2015 Dialogue Committee Conference Call**

**11 AM – 1 PM**

Agenda Items:

- Finalize goals, criteria and other outstanding items
- Present proposed technical approach

Desired Outcomes:

- Final criteria
- Input to technical approach

### **February 23, 2015 Technical Workgroup Conference Call**

**11 AM – 1 PM**

Agenda Items:

- Review initial technology descriptions
- Discuss screening criteria for short list
- Discuss additional criteria for detailed comparison
- Discuss possible ranking system

Desired Outcomes:

- Input to technology descriptions
- Finalize screening criteria for short list
- Finalize additional criteria for detailed comparison

### **February 25, 2015 Technical Workgroup Conference Call**

**11 AM – 1 PM**

Agenda Items:

- Review technologies vs. short list criteria for preliminary screening
- Discuss final full criteria and possible ranking system

Desired Outcomes:

- Proposed short list of technologies

### **February 27, 2015 Full Dialogue Committee Conference Call**

**11 AM – 1 PM**

Agenda Items:

- Present Technology Descriptions
- Present short-list criteria and preliminary screening

Desired Outcomes:

The Minden dialogue committee is made up of a group of individual volunteer citizens, community leaders, local and statewide organizations, scientists, elected officials and state representatives that are coming together to look at alternatives to address materials at Camp Minden in Webster Parish, Louisiana. This group, along with the public, will have the opportunity to provide individual input. The group is not convened under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and questions should be directed to Suzanne Murray, Office of Regional Counsel (214) 665-2110.

- Feedback on descriptions and short list process

**March 2, 2015**  
**11 AM – 1 PM**

**Technical Workgroup Conference Call**

Agenda Items:

- Begin detailed comparison of technologies

**March 4, 2015**  
**11 AM – 1 PM**

**Technical Workgroup Conference Call**

Agenda Items:

- Continue detailed comparison of technologies

Desired Outcomes:

- Preliminary evaluation of alternatives

**March 5, 2015**  
**11 AM – 1 PM**

**Full Dialogue Committee Conference Call**

Agenda Items:

- Review preliminary evaluation of alternatives

Desired Outcomes:

- Feedback on preliminary evaluation of alternatives

**March 9, 2015**  
**11 AM – 1 PM**

**Technical Workgroup Conference Call**

Agenda Items:

- Continue detailed comparison of technologies
- Incorporate full committee comments

Desired Outcomes:

- Final evaluation of alternatives

**March 11, 2015**  
**9 AM – 2 PM**

**In-person meeting of the Full Committee**

Agenda Items:

- Detailed discussion of side by side comparison of alternatives
- Identification of best options

Desired Outcomes:

- Recommendations on preferred technology