

FT. McCLELLAN BCT MEETING MINUTES
 PARTNERING SESSION #41
 ALPHARETTA, GA
 DECEMBER 5 - 6, 2001

AGENDA ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY	NOTES
Check In Guest Introduction and Roles	Host: Jeanne Yacoub Leader: Recorder: Jeanne Yacoub	See Attendees List – Attachment A.
Ground Rules	BCT	Attachment B provides the ground rules, as revised in January, 2001.
Agenda	BCT	The BCT revised the December agenda, and proceeded accordingly. Attachment C provides the draft February agenda. Attachment D provides the December meeting summary.
Accept Previous Minutes	BCT	The team reviewed the draft October minutes, and accepted the minutes with revisions as final.
Action Items	BCT	Action items were reviewed and updated, as indicated in Attachment D.
Long-Term Planning (BCP)	BCT	Agnes Mayila of IT provided a draft BCP document in early September for review by the BCT at the October BCT meeting. The BCT and project team made excellent progress in reviewing the draft BCP, and assigned action items to various personnel to resolve remaining data gaps and report to Agnes so that she can incorporate updates into the final version of the document. The BCT and project team will provide their input to Agnes NLT November 16. Pending receipt of input from responsible project team members, Agnes will deliver a final BCP to the BCT before the Christmas holidays.
Goals/Metrics Update	BCT	The team began brainstorming this topic during the June, 1998 meeting, and

		also began development of preliminary goals for consideration by the group. This topic, like the BCP, requires the BCT to set aside schedule time to address.
Facilitator Observations	David Sanderson	David Sanderson attended his twenty-second meeting with the team. His notes and observations are provided at Attachment E.

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF ATTENDEES
BCT SESSION #41
ALPHARETTA, GA
DECEMBER 5 - 6, 2001

Attendees:

Ron Levy, Ft. McClellan (FTMC)
Lisa Holstein, FTMC
Ellis Pope, Mobile District Corps of Engineers
Doyle Brittain, US Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV (EPA)
Philip Stroud, Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM)
Dan Copeland, US Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville (CEHNC)
Wayne Sartwell, Alabama Army National Guard (AL-ARNG)
Bernie Case, AL-ARNG
Jeanne Yacoub, The IT Group (IT)
Steve Moran, IT
David Sanderson, Eagle Point Consulting
Art Holcomb, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corp. (FWENC)
Suzanne Murdock, CEHNC

Guests:

Josh Jenkins, IT
Randy McBride, IT
Troy Winton, IT
Paul Goetchius, IT (conference call)
James Bond, IT
Hugh Vick, Gannett Fleming
Betina Martin, CEHNC
Richard Satkin, Parsons Engineering
John Chulick, Parsons Engineering

ATTACHMENT B

BCT GROUND RULES

General:

1. Leave rank and title at the door, and have a free and open discussion on any subject affecting the BCT.
2. Work smarter, not harder: create ways to simplify and streamline the BCT process.
3. Identify and express individual team members' sensitive issues, and agree to keep them within the team.
4. Alert other team members of any changes in cost or schedules.
5. Rotate meeting leaders.
6. Have fun.

Meeting Behavior:

1. Come prepared; do your homework.
2. Participate fully: offer your perspective and advice for the benefit of the whole team.
3. Listen to others' views and opinions, try to understand their needs, respect them, and work to resolve differences, and support team decisions.
4. Draw out other members: be open to other ideas and different perspectives.
5. Avoid interruptions and side conversations.
6. Call time out when necessary.
7. Make decisions by consensus: all in agreement, all owning the decision.
8. Turn off cell phones.

ATTACHMENT C
BCT MEETING AGENDA

1. Check In
2. Guest Introduction/Role in Meeting
3. Review Ground Rules (Attachment B to these minutes)
4. Finalize Agenda with additions and/or subtractions (Item 9 of this Attachment)
5. Accept Previous Meeting Minutes
6. Review Action Items from Previous Minutes (Attachment D to these minutes)
7. Review Long-Term Planning (BCP)
8. Goals/Metrics Update
9. Accomplish Agenda Items (Item 9 of this Attachment)
10. Meeting Summary Review
 - Set next meeting date
 - Set next meeting agenda
 - Set time and date for conference call
 - Set meeting dates for next six months
 - Review action and consensus items
 - Review and evaluate Partnering Process

ITEM #9
DRAFT FEBRUARY AGENDA

Wednesday, February 20, 2002

0800 – 0830	Check-in	BCT
0830 – 0930	Finalize Minutes/Agenda/Action Items	BCT
0930 – 1000	Parcel 93 SI	IT
1000 – 1030	AAD Shell Tapping Area SI	IT
1030 – 1130	ALDOT Eastern Bypass Presentation	ALDOT
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1400	Range 4A, Fog Oil Storage Area SI	IT
1400 – 1500	Range K RI	IT
1500 – 1545	Forestry Compound SI PRA	IT
1545 – 1630	Skeet Range SI PRA	IT
1630 – 1700	Range I SI	IT

Breaks as Needed
Dinner Plans

Thursday, February 21, 2002

0800 – 0900	JPA Update	Miki
0900 – 1015	24A Source Investigation Work Plan	IT
1015 – 1130	T-38 Source Investigation Work Plan	IT
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1330	Range J Geophysics	IT
1330 – 1500	Historical Ranges (Multiple Sites)/Chocolocco Corridor Work Plans	IT

1500 – 1600	Parcel 247 SI	IT
1600 – 1630	Parcel 206 SI	IT
1630 – 1700	SOTS SI	IT

Breaks as Needed
Dinner Plans

Friday, February 22, 2002

0800 – 0900	Pelham Range Radiological Remediation Update	Ron
0900 – 1030	Road Fill Debris/Explanation of Significant Differences to the Action Memorandum	Dan
1030 – 1130	Parking Lot Items	BCT

Breaks as Needed
Parking Lot

ATTACHMENT D

MEETING SUMMARY With ACTION ITEMS

Next BCT Meeting: February 5 - 7, 2002
Alpharetta, GA

Primary Agenda: TBD

December Meeting Summary:

Check-In - Team members checked in briefly and introduced themselves as well for the benefit of Hugh Vick, EPA's oversight contractor from Gannett Fleming. Since Hugh had previously attended BCT meetings, he knew many team members, however, since his last attendance the team has added several new members whom Hugh did not know. Attendees turned quickly to the meeting agenda.

Finalize Agenda and Minutes - The BCT reviewed the November minutes, and accepted them with a few changes as final. The team reviewed the December agenda, and added the following items to the parking lot for discussion pending completion of the agenda:

- M1.01 Rideout Field
- ADEM Letters Expansion of the Eastern Bypass Right-of-Way
- Blue Hole

Action Items - The BCT reviewed November's action items; the updates are presented in Attachment D at the end of this text. During the action item updates, Ron indicated that Miki had sent a revised reuse plan, but that the Army would not use it, since it hadn't come from the Board and was not official. Also related to action items, Ron requested that Agnes get the latest schedules from Mary at Ft. McClellan.

Success Stories - Before addressing agenda items, David inquired if the team had received any feedback from Tier II or III on some of the issues that the team had previously raised. Doyle and Ron both indicated that the issues with ADEM were being addressed at higher levels. Ron also told the team that he had been asked to provide success stories for presentation to Tier II in February. Doyle offered to help write some of the success stories. He nominated a couple of topics for the team to consider for a success story, specifically, the EPA workload that he inherited and progress made to alleviate that backlog, and the progress made by the team towards property transfer at the installation.

Baby Bains Gap Road (BBGR) EE/CA Work Plan - Randy McBride identified the BBGR ranges as Ranges 18, 20, 23, 25, 26, Range 25 East, and the Main Post Impact Area (Parcels 74Q, 76Q-X, 79Q, 83Q, 84Q-X, 223Q, and 118Q-X respectively). He indicated that the purpose of his presentation was to receive BCT approval of the EE/CA work plan proposal he was presenting. After an overview that showed the relative locations of the BBGR ranges on Ft. McClellan, Randy addressed each range individually. He pointed out that the ranges overlap each other in several areas, and in the case of the Main Post Impact Area, is totally encompassed

within another range. He presented a comprehensive overview of the history of each of the BBGR ranges, including maps, chronological aerial photography and historical documentation to familiarize the BCT and project team with the operational background of each of the BBGR ranges. Summary discussion follows.

- *Range 18, Down Range Feedback (Known Distance) Range, Parcel 74Q.* Randy showed the proposed technical approach to Range 18, based on his interpretation of the aerial photographic and historical documentation. Hugh suggested an additional full-suite analytical sample behind the firing line. Bernie pointed out that the location should be centered approximately 10m behind the firing line, since trainees would stand at target lanes along the firing line to fire, and then move to a center location behind the firing line to clean their weapons if the weapons jammed during firing. Jeanne inquired whether the proposed analytical suite would be adequate to support ecological risk assessment, specifically the samples that Randy proposed only for lead analysis. Jeanne's concern was that other metals such as antimony and copper might be needed as well. She suggested that Randy have IT ecological risk assessors review all the range proposals to ensure that data from the proposed EE/CA investigations would enable extrapolation of ecological risk assessment from the Iron Mountain Road (IMR) ranges, and application to the BBGR ranges. Doyle expressed appreciation and support for Jeanne's concern and suggestions, and also took the opportunity to point out that Jeanne's concerns highlighted what he perceived to be a continued polarization of the project team on the issue of ecological risk assessment. He expressed his desire for the team to be able to address ecological risk assessment as a team, rather than as individual agencies with diverging interests. The BCT agreed to IT's proposal with the addition of a sample behind the firing line, and additional metals analysis on 10% of the proposed lead samples.
- *Range 20, Infiltration Course, Parcel 76Q-X.* Bernie provided very useful background information on this range. He indicated that weapons cleaning never occurred at this range because weapons were locked in place at 4 stations on this range. Instructors usually fired stationary weapons from 2 stations towards the impact areas over the heads of the trainees. If one of the weapons went down during training, the instructor would move to another station to continue firing. The inoperable weapon was dismantled and repaired or cleaned offsite. Ron noted the absence of groundwater samples on this range. Steve explained that the topography of this site prevents well installation. He also indicated that the monitoring wells from Range 26, just to the southwest of Range 20, are in the direction of groundwater flow, and will provide adequate groundwater data for Range 20.
- *Range 23, Trainfire (Record) Range, Parcel 79Q.* This M16 range had 16 firing points. Bernie indicated that weapons cleaning did occur at this range, and he was able to indicate on one of the aerial photographs where he thought cleaning would have occurred. The stream that crosses this range is a year-round stream. Steve indicated that existing wells from other nearby sites provide adequate groundwater coverage for this range. Those wells will be shown in the work plan. Subsurface samples on this range will be taken from the 2' to 4' interval to capture bullet penetration.
- *Range 26, Live Fire and Maneuver Range, Parcel 84Q-X.* Bernie indicated that weapons were cleaned at this range. As indicated during the discussion on Range 20, the groundwater monitoring wells on this site will also provide groundwater data for Range 20. Additionally, the sampling locations for Range 25 East will provide analytical coverage for the weapons cleaning area at Range 26.
- *Range 25 East, Parcel 223Q.* This range is a supplemental range to Range 25, the Known Distance Range.

Randy indicated that this particular range is documented as an historical range in the EBS and on the General Map of FTMC, but that no other documentation exists on it. The EBS indicates 1937 as the year operations began at this range, but aerial photography shows no activity from 1937 through 1954. Ron stated that the range may have been planned, but never constructed. Doyle inquired about the Archive Search Report (ASR) vs. the EBS. Steve stated that IT consults both documents when researching site histories. Doyle requested a copy of the latest (2000) ASR for himself and 2 copies for Hugh Vick. Bernie took the action to get those copies to Hugh and Doyle. Bernie also provided some information about a mortar impact area on or near this range. Dan will check to see if that mortar impact area is addressed under one of the OE EE/CAs and will report back to the group.

- *Range 25, Known Distance Range, Parcel 83Q.* IT is already collecting characterization data for this range under an approved work plan. IT's proposal for the BBGR Range EE/CA is to collect limited XRF data in the fan area, south of the northern historical ranges and the ridge road, to support ecological risk assessment. This effort is analogous to what the Army is doing with the IMR ranges. Bernie provided some background information on how the Army calculates fan distances for small arms ranges and impact areas. Army Regulation 385-63 provides the calculations for safety distances.

At the end of his presentation of the individual ranges, Randy provided maps showing all the ranges and proposed sample locations to demonstrate overall analytical coverage for the BBGR ranges. The BCT approved the work plan proposal for all the BBGR ranges, inclusive of the few additional samples requested. Doyle expressed his appreciation for Randy's comprehensive presentation of the ranges and also for Bernie's information, which brought realism to the site operations and is beneficial to the team and the EE/CA investigation.

M1.01 - Dan explained that the Army has a response action pending at M1.01. CEHNC will send out work plans and the Explosive Safety Submission; Dan requested an on-board review in January. Dan also proposed putting the draft and draft-final removal report on a CD. This is an after-action report. Doyle indicated that he now has contractor support available and will be requesting Gannett Fleming's review of OE documentation. Ron and Suzanne expressed concerns about reviewing documents that have already been approved. Suzanne also indicated that the Charlie work is much more easily and cost-effectively accomplished in the winter when the vegetation is minimal at Ft. McClellan, so schedule maintenance is also a consideration. Ron indicated that if there are major changes requested by EPA, he has no more money that he can apply this year. Art Holcomb will email the Charlie Area EE/CA work plan to Norrell Lantzer. Doyle stated his understanding of the Army's concerns.

ADEM Letters - Steve indicated that ADEM letters of concurrence contain caveats, and he wants to know if the BCT wants to issue new documents after the finals have already been delivered. David pointed out that this is an example of ADEM's management disrupting the BCT's process. There was much discussion on this issue concerning ADEM's demand for additional work after the BCT had agreed on previous sites. The BCT agreed that IT will provide revised text to the SI reports for the Ground Scar South of the Autocraft Shop, parcel 157(7), and the Ground Scar with Trenches at Littlebrandt Drive, parcel 154(7) only, not Decision Documents, to address ADEM's documentation concerns. Ron does not want ADEM's requested changes in the Army's Decision Documents.

With regard to the GSA Warehouse Area, Ron reiterated the Army's position that the GSA Warehouse Area,

parcel 151(7) does not represent a lead-based paint (LBP) issue, and that ADEM's request to address LBP in the Decision Document is not appropriate. Ron does not want to change any of the documentation associated with the GSA Warehouse Area.

Philip and Ellis had already discussed ADEM's request that additional samples be included in the final SSFSP for the IMR ranges. Jeanne pointed out that all samples, locations, and analyses were coordinated with both Doyle and Philip during a June site visit to the IMR ranges. Philip agreed that the additional samples were not required. IT will prepare a response to ADEM on the request for additional samples.

Blue Hole - Philip had ADEM geologists examine SI data for the Blue Hole. ADEM indicated the SI report lacked site-specific background and QA/QC samples, and shows exceedances of screening and background levels for antimony, arsenic, chromium, and lead. The BCT evaluated the Blue Hole data back in May and had agreed that NFA was acceptable for the site. ADEM is now requesting additional samples due to the exceedances. Ron pointed out that some of the comments reflect the reviewer's lack of background and experience with the Ft. McClellan project, since Ft. McClellan has established base-wide metals background values. Doyle and Ron disagree with ADEM's request for additional data, and Philip indicated he would review the site again with the ADEM reviewers.

Rideout Field - ATG, the Army's removal contractor at Rideout Field, has declared bankruptcy, and will likely default on their contract with the Army. The Army might have to go to another contractor to perform the Co60 removal at Rideout Field. The Army has notified NRC and EPA. Orysia Bailey of NRC will visit the site next week. There is still leased equipment and waste at the site.

Expansion of the Eastern Bypass Right-of-Way -- ALDOT wants to expand the Eastern Bypass Right-of-Way to meet their slope requirements. Ron has asked ALDOT to brief the BCT in January on concerns and issues associated with the requested change. The Army is waiting for the Bravo Area EE/CA to be completed pending a decision on ALDOT's request.

Fill Area EE/CA - Ron requested EPA and ADEM attention to the next iteration of the EE/CA and response to comments. The Army needs priority attention to this because of JPA's efforts to privatize the site. The Army wants EPA's and ADEM's support on the Army's fill area recommendations.

"Back of Envelope" Risk Presentation for Artillery and Mortar Impact Areas South of Bains Gap Road, Parcels 138Q-X, 139Q-X, 140Q-X, 141Q-X, and 142Q-X - IT presented the data for these sites to the BCT in October and recommended NFA. The BCT agreed, but wanted a "back of the envelope" risk assessment to support the NFA recommendation. Paul Goetchius joined the meeting via conference call and presented what he referred to as a "preliminary" risk assessment for the sites. Paul provided a brief background on the sites and data to refresh the BCT on the issues, and described in detail the steps he had taken to assess risk at the sites, including the following in order:

- Media of Interest and Data Selection,
- Site-Related Chemical Selection,
- Chemicals of Potential Concern Selection,
- Receptor Scenario Selection, and
- Risk Characterization.

Paul's conclusions indicate that exposure to surface soil, subsurface soil, surface water, and sediment poses no unacceptable risk for the resident. Lead in seep water, which Paul treated as groundwater in his risk assessment, might reflect a site-related release that exceeds the action level in tap water. Paul's preliminary risk assessment supports unrestricted reuse requiring no further action with the exception if groundwater is to be developed as a source of potable water.

The BCT discussed this information at length, questioning whether a seep is more representative of groundwater or surface water. Doyle and Philip would like IT to resample all three seeps for lead only and report back to the BCT.

Numerous Ranges on Northern Main Post; Multiple SI Work Plans - These work plans address several historical ranges on the northern portion of the installation, including the following sites:

- Range 30, Confidence Course (Firing Line), Parcel 88Q and Former Grenade Range/Area, Parcel 106Q-X (Site 1)
- Former Machine Gun/Rifle Ranges, Parcels 100Q, 101Q, and 102Q (Site 2)
- Area North of MOUT Site (Site 3)
- Impact Area for Former Machine Gun/Rifle Ranges, Parcels 100Q and 101Q (Site 4)
- Impact Area North-Central Main Post, Parcel 132Q-X (Site 5)
- Former Tank Ranges, Parcels 92Q and 93Q-X, Former Grenade Range, Parcel 107Q-X, and Impact Areas, Parcels 133Q-X and 134Q-X (Site 6)
- Former Rifle/Machine Gun Range, Parcel 98Q (Site 7)
- Former Rifle/Machine Gun Range, Parcel 99Q (Site 8)

"Historical" means that the ranges were inactive at the time the base closed. Steve provided an historical perspective of all the known activities at the ranges. He showed maps and aerial photographs, similar to what Randy had previously shown, that depicted the many overlapping ranges. Rich Prann will also review all these plans to ensure data will support ecological risk assessment, similar to the BBGR ranges work plans. Josh, James, and Steve presented each range individually. The BCT approved the proposed work at the sites with no changes.

Range 24 Upper, Parcel 80Q - Data for this site shows several metals exceedances in soils and sediment, along with low levels of explosives in detected in groundwater and surface water. Doyle and Philip both agreed that more work needs to be done at this site. Steve indicated that samples from BGR ranges to the south and west provide further characterization, and that including this site in the BGR EE/CA might be the best way to address this site. Lisa indicated that the Army has no funding for further work at this site at this time. The BCT agreed that the best course of action is to include this site in the BGR EE/CA, and the Army will request additional funding for the site. Additional funding will include limited additional sampling to characterize the site and include it in the BGR EE/CA.

Range 24 Lower, Parcel 81Q - The Army conducted no live fire at this range. All data was below SSSLs or background values. Doyle asked IT to ensure that selenium is explained (through a PRA) in the SI report so that ADEM concerns on documentation are addressed. The BCT agreed to NFA with unrestricted reuse for this site.

Ranges Near Training Area T-24A RI Data Presentation - Josh presented an update on the RI progress for this

site. This site includes a 1.5 acre fenced chemical munitions disposal area; the entire site addresses 5 overlapping ranges. There have been several previous investigations beginning as early as 1992. SAIC observed benzene in one 100' well; this event prompted further investigation by the Army. IT resampled existing wells in the area and confirmed the benzene and carbon tetrachloride in the deepest well. Josh presented maps indicating plan-views of carbon tetrachloride and total VOCs, as well as cross sectional views of the characterization data. IT has not yet issued a SI or RI report on data except in work plans. Doyle expressed his appreciation for the interim update and encouraged further updates of this nature as appropriate. Philip also voiced appreciation at being able to review the data and course of the investigation and to participate in determining future work efforts at the site. Both regulators agreed with Josh's suggestion that nature and extent of contamination need to be defined so that the Army can draw a clean line around the plume and consider a land use control for the site. IT will develop a technical proposal for presentation to the BCT for identification of source and delineation. There are also soils issues (lead) at some of the mounds that IT will also include in the proposal. Doyle would like the proposal available for BCT review at the next BCT meeting.

Small Weapons Repair Shop, Parcel 66 RI Data Presentation - Josh's presentation demonstrated definition of VOCs in groundwater. Steve indicated that IT would like to write the RI report and begin the FS. Doyle inquired about the sump in Bldg. 336. Steve indicated that the sump is associated with an old boiler plant (Bldg. 336). Doyle would like a sample from the sump. Steve also indicated that IT previously drained the sump, but it is cracked and it has filled up again with water. Doyle and Philip indicated agreement with definition of the plume and also that a sample from the sump was not necessary, based on Steve's discussion about draining and refilling of the sump. Doyle indicated that the FS must address the "No Action" alternative. He also suggested that pump and treat is an alternative, as well as insitu oxidation technologies.

Possible Range and Impact Areas, Choccolocco Corridor, Parcels 237Q-X and 238Q-X SI - Data for this site show explosives (dinitrotoluene) concentrations exceed SSSLs in groundwater, but are below EPA Health Advisory values. Iron exceeded SSSLs and background values in soils. Vanadium exceeded SSSLs and background values in one subsurface soil sample. Beryllium, copper, and iron exceeded ESVs in one surface soil sample. IT recommended NFA with unrestricted reuse. Jeanne pointed out that iron is not attributable to Army activities at the site. Ron indicated that this property belongs to the State of Alabama, and the Army cannot place restrictions on the property. The BCT agreed to NFA with unrestricted reuse for the site; Doyle requested that IT discuss the presence of iron, beryllium, and copper to address ADEM documentation concerns.

Ranges South of Range 25 SI - This presentation addressed areas of parcels that are addressed in the BGR EE/CA, but have been "carved out" of the EE/CA. The "carved out" areas of the parcels are areas on the range fans that are expected to be relatively free of contamination associated with small arms fire. Data for this site indicate antimony exceeding SSSLs and background in two soil samples, but both results "J"-flagged. Antimony, beryllium, and lead in soils exceeded ESVs; the antimony values "J"-flagged. Aluminum, antimony, iron, and chromium in subsurface soils exceeded SSSLs and background values; antimony was "J"-flagged, and Steve indicated the other metals appear to be unrelated to Army activities at the site, and therefore naturally occurring. Arsenic exceeded ESVs in one sediment sample. The BCT recommended IT perform a "back of the envelope" risk assessment on this data before making a decision.

CWM Amendment to the Site Safety Submission for Pelham Range - Richard Satkin of Parsons Engineering

presented the Amendment to the Pelham Range Site Safety Submission. The amendment addresses Lima Pond, the Old Water Hole, and the Former Decon Training Area South of the Toxic Gas Area. Parsons will begin 4 weeks of intrusive fieldwork in March 02. The geophysical survey is scheduled to begin in early February. Lisa will keep Betina informed of potential activity by ATG, who is working south of the Decon Area, also Lima Pond. All the roads will have to be closed down within a large radius of the sites once Parsons begins fieldwork. Bernie indicated that this requirement could have a serious impact on the training activities at Pelham Range. He suggested a visit to Major Sellers to inform him of the field requirements and schedule so that training activities can be coordinated during the period of time Parsons is in the field. Philip inquired about IT's fieldwork at Pelham as well. Steve indicated that at Lima Pond, Parsons will collect the surface water and sediment samples, and after they are cleared for agent, will turn them over to IT. IT's field activities at other sites will not be affected by the closed roads. Jeanne indicated that holding times for the VOCs analyses would likely be exceeded by the requirement to clear for agent.

EE/CA vs. RI - Doyle asked that someone go back through the minutes and tell him the BCT's rationale for deciding on an EE/CA rather than an RI/FS for the ranges. Jeanne will research the past minutes and send Doyle and Philip copies. Doyle indicated that a ROD is necessary even in the Army develops an Action Memorandum as part of the EE/CA process. Suzanne pointed out that Ft. McClellan is non-NPL and therefore does not necessarily require RODs. Doyle responded that EO 12580 requires that CERCLA be followed and directs that EPA and the State be involved. Suzanne indicated that the EE/CA process provides for public participation, and an Action Memorandum suffices to document the Army's decisions. Ellis will check with Army regulatory specialists about the differences between the EE/CA and the RI/FS processes.

BCP Decision-Making Flow Chart - Jeanne presented a flow chart depicting the BCT decision-making process for inclusion in the BCP. She asked the BCT to review the chart and provide feed-back so that the chart could be incorporated into the BCP. The BCT reviewed the chart and approved it for inclusion in the BCP.

Meeting Reflections - The team spent a few minutes reflecting on the meeting. Each individual indicated what about the meeting was positive and what could be improved. Several individuals complemented the technical presentations; several noted that discussion points are often repeated. David remarked that sometimes acknowledging someone else's comments might help curb the repetition that he also observed during the meetings.

Future Meetings (3-month look ahead) - January 15 - 16, On-Board Review of M1.01 Explosive Safety Submission, Ft. McClellan, Feb 5 - 7, Alpharetta, GA, March 20 - 21, Alpharetta, GA.

Status of Action Items

Action Item No.	Responsible Team Member	Due Date	Status	Action Item
01/9/3	Dan	Oct 01	Done	Provide Ron with analysis of impacts on UXO workloads resultant from ALDOT's potential Eastern Bypass realignment.
01/9/4	Ron	Oct 01	SNR	Provide a copy of team ground rules for signature by team members.
01/10/1	Ron	Nov 01	SNR	Provide example interim LUCIP to JoAnn for her evaluation of language and resource requirements.
01/10/2	Miki	Nov 01	Done	Provide revised reuse map to BCT.
01/10/3	JoAnn	Nov 01	Done	Provide BCP input to Agnes Mayila, sections ES, pg.3-17, sections 3.2.19 and 4.2.19.
01/10/4	Dan	Nov 01	Done	Provide BCP input to Agnes Mayila, section on OE conceptual site model, map for appendix.
01/10/5	Miki	Nov 01	Done	Provide BCP input to Agnes Mayila, text on reuse plan, clarification on sections 2.3.5 and 2.3.6, section 6.19.
01/10/6	Jeanne	Nov 01	Done	Provide BCP input to Agnes Mayila, text on BCT decision-making process for section 4.
01/12/1	Wayne	Jan 02	SNR	Provide copies of ASR to Doyle and Hugh Vick.
01/12/2	Dan	Jan 02	SNR	Check Bernie's information on a mortar impact area to ensure coverage in an OE EE/CA and report back to the BCT.
01/12/3	Art	Jan 02	SNR	Send Charlie Area EE/CA work plan to Norrell Lantzer.
01/12/4	Ellis	Jan 02	SNR	Speak to Army regulatory specialists about differences between EE/CA and RI/FS, and whether a ROD is required in addition to an Action Memorandum.
01/12/5	Jeanne	Jan 02	SNR	Check previous BCT minutes for discussion on EE/CA vs. RI/FS.

SNR=Status Next Report

ATTACHMENT E
FACILITATOR NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

Meeting Summary

The BCT met on December 5-6, 2001, in Alpharetta, GA at IT Corporation's offices. Like most other BCT meetings, the December agenda was packed, with many presentations by IT and Parsons staff members and many decisions made (this time mainly about a variety of range parcels).

The BCT's remarkable productivity came in spite of process issues that remain unresolved:

- As in the October meeting, the team spent at least a full hour on issues arising from ADEM's recently changed procedures. In this case, ADEM reviewers who are not BCT members had raised questions and made new suggestions *after* the BCT had completed its review of several parcels. Because those ADEM reviewers were absent from the meeting, the issues raised could not be resolved, and Ron Levy offered to respond to ADEM's comments on behalf of the BCT. In at least one case, team members noted that ADEM's reviewers appeared not to understand the site in question or certain background data.
- In my understanding, ADEM's approach violates the longstanding agreements that have guided the BCT's procedures until recently. At best, the approach wastes BCT time; at worst, it keeps the BCT uncertain that decisions will be honored and goes against the good faith necessary for partnering. I believe that, for the good of the BCT process, ADEM should stop allowing its reviewers to raise questions and make suggestions after the BCT has acted. ADEM's representative on the BCT should have the authority to speak for the agency.
- The BCT dealt at length with another procedural question – whether to continue doing an EE/CA on FTMC parcels or to move directly to an RI. This complex question needs to be resolved soon or it will continue to take up the team's time and energy.
- A third process issue, about communication during BCT meetings, led to my proposing a new ground rule – “Say what you have to say just once” – and suggesting that when a person makes a point, the point should be acknowledged. Even a brief response lets a person know that he or she has been heard and makes repeating the point less necessary.

The team's reflections at the end of the two-day meeting deserve special mention. Asked about what went well, members noted that IT's and Parson's presentations showed a lot of preparation and went well; that the team accomplished a great deal of work, with good cooperative agreements about work plans and investigations; and that various individuals had been especially helpful. Most important, I think, several members noted that the BCT has transformed itself in the past year and is doing great work. Suggestions for improvement included “don't repeat yourself,” “we're still fighting old ghosts – e.g., EE/CA vs. RI,” and “let's not rush our document reviews.”