

recollection is that this topic was discussed in the later part of 1996, when the Non-stockpile Chemical Weapon Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement was available for public comment.

Thank you for the information about EDS. Representatives of CDPHE have talked with a variety of people about this system. While it seems particularly well-suited to the RMA bomblet situation, our understanding is that it isn't quite ready for full-scale application. We are very interested in following its development. As I mentioned to you on the telephone, I will try to get some additional information on this for you.

I hope this information is useful to you.

>>> Susan <susanenviro@yahoo.com> 10/23/00 09:43PM >>>
Hello All,

With news of the most recent bomblet found in Basin A, I find myself wondering once again about the exclusion of the Arsenal from the Army's Nonstockpile Chemical Materiel Program (NSCMP). I believe NSCMP began in mid 1996.

I do not believe the exclusion of the Arsenal from the NSCMP have ever been satisfactorily addressed; I have had conversations about the exclusion with Col. Libby, former chief of the NSCMP, his assistant, and others. This is an issue that remains unresolved and problematic.

As a member of the Non-Stockpile Chemical Weapons Citizens Coalition (<http://www.cwecg.org/nsmission.html>), I am still as puzzled today as I was approximately four years ago when I returned from a NSCMP briefing in Washington, DC with questions about how the program related to the Arsenal. I was a member of the Restoration Advisory Board/RAB at that time, and did not recall any information given out about the NSCMP to the RAB.

At the time I thought this was odd, because the Arsenal is CLEARLY a nonstockpile chemical weapons site, and fits into the NSCMP profile.

According to definitions listed in the NSCMP's Survey and Analysis Report, nonstockpile chemical materiel is divided into five categories: buried chem warfare materiel, recovered chem weapons, former chem weapon production facilities, binary chemical weapons and miscellaneous chem warfare materiel. RMA has it all(except binary, I believe).

Why then the exclusion from the NSCMP?? During this same time, I also remember sharing information on alternatives to the Army's standard practice of open burn/open detonate technologies the NSCMP folks had briefed us on. I do not recall receiving a response from the Army on either of these subjects.

I believe RMA and the surrounding community would benefit from the transportable technologies NSCMP is developing. Although some of the transportable technologies are not yet out of R&D phase, Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG) is testing a "tent and foam" technology that would be used to help contain

emissions from a detonation blast. The tent has not been proven 100% successful, but I hear the local community folks are advocating that it be used even if it's not completely successful, because they believe SOME containment of blast emissions is better than NO containment.

So, if anyone knows why the Arsenal was excluded from the NSCMP, I would sure like to know.

And, I'd also like to know if the RMA will consider using some alternative types of technology when the next bomblet shows up...

Sue Maret