

FT. McCLELLAN BCT MEETING MINUTES
 PARTNERING SESSION #47
 FT. McCLELLAN, AL
 AUGUST 20-21, 2002

AGENDA ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY	NOTES
Check In Guest Introduction and Roles	Host: Ron Levy 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	Attachment C provides the draft September agenda. Attachment D provides the August meeting summary.
Accept Previous Minutes	BCT	The team reviewed the draft July minutes, and accepted the minutes without revisions as final.
Action Items	BCT	Action items were reviewed and updated, as indicated in Attachment D.
Long-Term Planning (BCP)	BCT	IT provided a final BCP on December 21, 2001.
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 requires the BCT to set aside schedule time to address.
Facilitator Observations	David Sanderson	David Sanderson attended his twenty-eighth meeting with the team. His notes and observations are provided at Attachment E.

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF ATTENDEES
BCT SESSION #47
FT. McCLELLAN, AL
AUGUST 20-21, 2002

Attendees:

Ron Levy, Ft. McClellan (FTMC)
Lee Coker, US Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District (USACE, Mobile District)
Philip Stroud, Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM)
Doyle Brittain, US Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV (EPA)
Dan Copeland, US Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville (CEHNC)
Miki Schneider, Joint Powers Authority (JPA)
Bernie Case, Alabama Army National Guard (AL-ARNG)
Wayne Sartwell, AL-ARNG
Jeanne Yacoub, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure (Shaw)
Steve Moran, Shaw
David Sanderson, Eagle Point Consulting
Art Holcomb, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corp. (FWENC)

Guests:

Chip Parrott, USACE, Mobile District
Bill Garland, US Fish & Wildlife Service
Hugh Vick, Gannett Fleming
Ben Bentkowski, Gannett Fleming
Josh Jenkins, Shaw
Greg Sisco, Shaw

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 SEPTEMBER AGENDA

Wednesday, September 18, 2002

1300 – 1400	Check-in/Finalize Minutes/Agenda/Action Items	BCT
1400 – 1700	Teambuilding, Conflict Resolution, Part 2 -- Tier I only	David

Breaks as Needed
Dinner Plans

Thursday, September 19, 2002

0800 – 0830	JPA Update	Miki
0830 – 1000	Range J RI Comment Responses	Shaw
1000 – 1130	Historical Ranges	Shaw
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1400	Sinkholes	Shaw
1400 – 1500	Landfill #3 Groundwater Subcommittee Recommendations	Shaw
1500 – 1630	TBD	
1630 – 1730	Parking Lot and Meeting Reflections	BCT

Breaks as Needed
Dinner Plans

Parking Lot

ATTACHMENT D

MEETING SUMMARY
With
ACTION ITEMS

Next BCT Meeting: September 18 - 20, 2002
Orange Beach, AL

Primary Agenda: See Item #9

August Meeting Summary:

Check-In - Team members introduced themselves and told the group why they were at the meeting and what they wanted to achieve.

Finalize Agenda and Minutes – The team reviewed the July minutes and accepted them as final. The following items were added to the July agenda:

- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| ➤ Document Status Tracking | IWWP |
| ➤ Draft Final Documents | RI/FS/BRA |
| ➤ US Fish & Wildlife Service | LRA - BCT |
| ➤ ADEM Tier II Empowerment | Moose Club Sharps |

Action Items – The BCT reviewed action items; the updates are presented in Attachment D at the end of this text.

Conflict Resolution Workshop – As previously requested, David conducted a conflict resolution workshop for the project team using the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument. His notes and observations are provided at Attachment E. After the workshop, Doyle indicated that he would like to see further training on this topic at the September BCT meeting.

Document Status Tracking – Lisa asked for clarification on how she should send the document tracking status spreadsheets. The BCT agreed that Lisa will email updated sheets after BCT meetings. Lisa asked that this topic be a standing agenda item for every BCT meeting so that priorities can be discussed at each meeting.

Pelham Range Water Supply – Ron pointed out that the Guard has not requested a drinking water permit for these wells, so what does ADEM need to find out? Ron asked that Jeanne coordinate a conference call with Philip on this topic.

US Fish & Wildlife Service (F&W) – Doyle indicated that F&W is a stakeholder at Ft. McClellan and that as such, EPA risk assessors are interested in their opinions. He suggested that Ron arrange for representation at BCT meetings by a representative from F&W. Lisa indicated that F&W have been

invited, but have declined to attend BCT meetings. Ron will speak to Bill Garland about attending BCT meetings. During a break, Ron was able to discuss this topic with Bill Garland, and Bill joined the meeting. Bill explained that F&W's organization assigns responsibility for environmental remediation impacts analysis to Ecological Services, and as a representative of Refuge Systems, he cannot speak for Ecological Services. He will attend BCT meetings as he can accommodate them, and he will coordinate issues with Ecological Services, but he will not offer an official F&W position on issues he feels are appropriately addressed by Ecological Services.

IWWP – Jeanne explained that the IWWP was revised only to incorporate changes the BCT had made to previously approved procedures, for example the change to low-flow sampling from the sampling procedure outlined in the IWWP. While the changes are captured in various minutes, they needed to be compiled into the IWWP, and since the IWWP was last issued in 1998, it was appropriate to incorporate the changes and reissue the document. The reissuance was never intended to generate an entire review by new readers who have not been privy to previous BCT discussions and determinations. After brief discussion, Doyle asked if anyone still has the old IWWP and EPA's old comments. Lisa will check her files and if she has the documentation, she will provide a copy of EPA's comments and concurrence letters on the previous IWWP to Doyle. Shaw will await ADEM's comments before finalizing the IWWP.

Tier II Empowerment – Ron expressed his disappointment with the result of Francine's discussions with Tier II about ADEM's representation on the BCT and the level of Philip's empowerment.

Puls-Barcelona Low-Flow Groundwater Data Comparison – Shaw has proposed Puls-Barcelona method as an alternative to the low-flow groundwater sampling method ADEM suggested and which is in current use. Shaw recommends the alternative method as a cost-saving measure considering the extensive well sampling efforts pending for the landfills and RIs. Steve distributed two EPA handouts on the subject as background to the presentation. Philip asked if the fracture is not in the screened interval of the well, then is Puls-Barcelona appropriate? Doyle asked if the hydrogeological subgroup should evaluate the technique and report back to the BCT. Josh will coordinate the issue with the hydrogeological subgroup and will report back to the BCT at the Orange Beach meeting.

Proposed RI for the Former Detection and Identification Area (Parcel 180(7)), Training Area T-5, Parcel 182(7), Blacktop Training Area, Parcel 511(7), Fenced Yard in Blacktop Area, Parcel 512(7), Dog Training Area, Parcel 513(7), Old Burn Pit, Parcel 514(7), and the Dog Kennel Area, Parcel 516(7) – Shaw summarized SI data and history for these sites, and provided recommendations for RI work at each site. The BCT concurred that the proposed RI work appeared headed in the correct direction. Doyle suggested that Shaw also begin formulating FS plans as well. Lee indicated that funding for FS would be available in the Nov/Dec 03 timeframe. Hugh would like 3 copies of the documents that he and Ben will review.

Proposed RI for Training Area T-6 (Naylor Field), Parcel 183(6) – Shaw summarized SI data and history at this site, and provided recommendations for RI work at the site. The BCT concurred with the proposed plan. Doyle again suggested that Shaw begin planning for the FS as well.

Proposed SI for Cane Creek Training Area – Shaw described the site and history of Army operations at this site, and provided recommendations for SI sampling at the site. (This site is adjacent to Naylor

Field, Training Area T-6). The BCT concurred with the proposed SI sampling plan.

JPA Update – Miki provided a brief update at the end of the first day. She indicated that the JPA submitted their comments on the Fill Area EE/CA and is currently coordinating with the Army to meet the 2nd week of September. Miki offered to have the JPA's consultant come to the September BCT meeting.

JPA Update Continued, LRA-BCT – Miki told the group that NAID (National Association of Installation Developers) is working to prepare communities for the 2005 BRAC closures, specifically NAID is working to fix the environmental issues. Recent BRAC legislation has removed the no-cost Economic Development Conveyance provision. The JPA has pulled 4 or 5 USTs on Ft. McClellan and has not found any contamination yet. The City was supposed to get the golf course in a Public Benefit Conveyance, but the Army has said that they want \$1.2 million for the course because it was built using non-appropriated funds. The City is compiling data to show that the course is still serving the military community. Senator Sessions will be at McClellan tomorrow to campaign and support the National Wildlife Refuge initiative. Hunjan has completed their renovation of Building 350. The National Archery Tournament will take place at McClellan this weekend. All the Buckner Circle homes have been sold. The big issue now is the barracks buildings. The JPA has been asked to give the buildings to Calhoun County for eventual development as a convention center.

Moose Club Sharps – Ron provided the team with copies of the August 16 Gadsden Times news article about the teenager who was stuck by a needle when he picked up a small tube on property near Ft. McClellan. Ron indicated that atropine auto-injectors are not CWM items; an auto-injector is an antidote to CWM exposures. Ron said the Army does not know how the auto-injectors got onto property the Army doesn't own, and never trained on.

Draft Final Documents – Lisa described the impact that the July BCT meeting decision to produce draft final documents will have on the document finalization and site transfer process, effectively adding 60 to 90 days to the process. Lisa said she doesn't understand the benefit or need for draft final documents, and she asked the BCT to reconsider its July decision. The project team discussed this topic extensively; Steve suggested the BCT consider dropping the on-board reviews as a cost-saving measure since there would now be an extra document iteration and written comments and responses. Lisa and Jeanne supported that recommendation. Steve and Jeanne also suggested that the team meet less often so reviewers would have adequate time to review the documents and comment responses before the meetings to enable decisions. Ron, Doyle, and Philip want to continue with the on-board review process because they see value in the information presented. After further discussion, the BCT decided that project schedules should be extended to reflect draft-draft final-final iterations for each document. The BCT reserves the right to eliminate document iterations based on on-board reviews and exchange of comments and responses. Shaw will continue site presentations as they have in the past.

Ranges West of Iron Mountain Road – The BCT agreed to supplemental sampling on these sites in April 02. Shaw re-sampled 5 wells for antimony and ADNT, and collected 8 additional surface soil samples for lead. The groundwater data did not show any antimony or ADNT. All the surface soil samples were above the SSSLs. Shaw recommended NFA for groundwater, and additional investigations for Parcels 114Q-X and 221Q-X, specifically to include 221Q-X in the IMR ranges clean up, since that parcel is abutting Range 19 at IMR. Philip wants another round of groundwater samples to confirm no

contamination; Steve and Greg indicated that the initial detections were very low. The BCT agreed that another round of groundwater samples would be appropriate, and that Shaw should take additional samples. If those samples are clean, Shaw will issue a draft SI report for review on the property excluding Parcels 114Q-X and 221Q-X. Parcels 114Q-X and 221Q-X will undergo further work. The BCT agreed that Parcel 221Q-X will be included in the EE/CA for the Small Arms Ranges at IMR.

Soil Sampling at Rocket City – Dan reminded the group of previous BCT discussion on soil sampling at Rocket City. Philip and Porter got together and discussed a strategy for accomplishing the sampling. Dan indicated that Philip and Porter agreed that two composite samples, including 6-8 composite points, would suffice. One composite sample will come from a "high" grid, and one from a "low" grid. Philip wants a draft plan for the composite sampling effort. Dan also indicated that Alvin McNeal is the new CEHNC PM who will be onsite at Ft. McClellan.

Further Conflict Resolution Training – Doyle expressed his opinion that the workshop David presented at this meeting is step one in the training. He indicated the plethora of tools available to the team, and he wants David to provide further training at the Orange Beach meeting. The project team also wants to have time as a team to conduct the workshop, so Jeanne was asked to send an email that indicates the workshop is for Tier I members only and will be on the first afternoon of the Orange Beach meeting.

September Agenda Items – The team identified the following items for the September meeting agenda:

- Alpha EE/CA Parcel M.101
- Conflict Resolution Workshop LF #3 Groundwater Subcommittee Recommendations
- Sinkholes Range J RI (pending receipt of ADEM comments)
- MP 1500 4 Historical Ranges

Lisa also suggested discussing ecological risk documentation. Doyle said that he would be very concerned if the risk assessors weren't communicating amongst themselves to accomplish their work and meet the Army's schedules. Steve indicated that Shaw and EPA risk assessors have been meeting and that the documents will go out at the end of August, as Shaw had committed. Sharon has agreed in principle to Shaw's recommendations, but it appears unlikely that the Army will have written concurrence from EPA before beginning fieldwork.

Future Meetings (3-month look ahead) – September 16 RAB meeting in Anniston; September 18 – 20 @ Orange Beach; October 16 – 17 @ Ft. McClellan.

Status of Action Items

Action Item No.	Responsible Team Member	Due Date	Status	Action Item
02/2/3	Philip	Mar 02	SNR	Report back to BCT on ADEM's position on the Pelham Range Water Supply issue.
02/6/3	Lisa	July 02	Done	Email Ft. McClellan's document tracking status spreadsheet to Doyle.
02/7/1	Steve	July 02	SNR	Have Shaw risk assessment personnel contact EPA risk personnel prior to responding to EPA comments on revised IWWP.
02/7/2	Philip	Aug. 02	SNR	Provide comments on revised IWWP.
02/7/3	Francine	Aug. 02	Done	Clarify Tier II role and report back.
02/7/4	Philip	Aug. 02	Done	Provide comments/revisions to May 2002 BCT meeting minutes.
02/7/5	Josh	July 02	Done	Organize groundwater subcommittee and begin discussing issues.
02/7/6	Philip	Aug 02	SNR	Report on the status of contacting the junkyard owners across from LF3
02/7/7	Steve	July 02	Done	Arrange meeting to resolve comments on IMR Problem Formulation and BBGR SLERA.
02/7/8	Steve	July 02	Done	E-mail comment responses on IMR Problem Formulation and BBGR SLERA to Doyle.
02/8/1	Lisa	Sep 02	SNR	Provide Doyle with copy of EPA's comments and concurrence letter on the previous IWWP.
02/8/2	Josh	Sep 02	SNR	Coordinate Puls-Barcelona evaluation with hydrogeological subcommittee; report to BCT at September BCT meeting.
02/8/3	Jeanne	Sep 02	SNR	Email September meeting attendees about conflict resolution workshop for Tier 1 on afternoon of September 18.

SNR=Status Next Report

ATTACHMENT E

FACILITATOR NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

Meeting Summary

The August 20-21, 2002, BCT meeting at Fort McClellan was productive in several respects, and yet the team's productivity came in spite of a context of frustration, from two sources. One source was the news from Tier II, which had been asked to resolve the issue of the empowerment of ADEM's BCT representative, and which simply reaffirmed the status quo for the BCT. As a BCT member put it, "The BCT forum is broken." If every decision the BCT makes is subject to a higher review, the costs in time, money, and the team's morale are and will continue to be extraordinarily high.

The second source of frustration was a set of internal misunderstandings and confusion around the intentions of team members about what process (EE/CA or RI/FS/BRA) is appropriate and adequate for the BCT in certain cases. The confusion began several months ago, and the team had not addressed it sufficiently; and I had not done enough to ensure that we did address it. However, I was impressed that here in this meeting Ron Levy, Doyle Brittain, and Philip Stroud themselves asked that we deal with it. A small group of seven people concluded the BCT meeting by airing their concerns and reaching agreement about the process to be followed. In the discussion, I think, the team members rebuilt some of the trust they have had. That remains crucial to the BCT's success.

Despite those frustrations, the team accomplished some useful things. At Doyle Brittain's suggestion, Ron Levy invited Bill Garland from USFWS to join the BCT, and he did. The team approved several work plans Shaw E&I presented and, after a complex technical discussion, agreed to a plan for additional investigation and remediation on the ranges west of Iron Mountain Road. I led a workshop on the first morning on conflict resolution styles. The BCT asked for a second round of conflict management work at its September meeting and discussed the BRAC training session scheduled for November 6-8.

Perhaps most importantly, at Lisa Holstein's request the team reviewed its decision last month to add a "draft final" report in the document review process. Lisa pointed out that routinely doing that would mean an additional 30-60 days for each parcel, and she asked for flexibility. That topic brought up the usually successful BCT practice of on-board reviews, and the team reaffirmed their importance even though members understood that higher reviews of BCT decisions appear to be inevitable. Steve Moran of Shaw E&I helped to get final agreement by offering to present an on-board review in September just as he had in this meeting, and the team agreed also to the possibility of moving directly to final reports, depending on the quality of comment resolution in any particular case.

The issues that arose in this meeting highlight the need for frequent, informal communication among BCT members between meetings – and the more informal and direct the better (e.g., phone conversations rather than emails). Staying in contact with one another as events proceed helps to avoid misunderstanding and promote clarity.