

FT. McCLELLAN BCT MEETING MINUTES  
 PARTNERING SESSION #38  
 FT. McCLELLAN, AL  
 AUGUST 21 - 23, 2001

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	The BCT revised the August agenda, and proceeded accordingly. 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 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 for review by the BCT at the July 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 in the next iteration of the document. The BCT decided to address the BCP again at the October BCT meeting, by which time Agnes will have received input from everyone and will be able to provide a complete updated version of the document for final review.
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 nineteenth meeting with the team. His notes and observations are provided at Attachment E.

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF ATTENDEES  
BCT SESSION #38  
FT.McCLELLAN, AL  
AUGUST 21 - 23, 2001

***Attendees:***

Lisa Kingsbury, Ft. McClellan (FTMC)  
Ron Levy, 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)  
Suzanne Murdock, CEHNC  
Jeanne Yacoub, The IT Group  
Steve Moran, The IT Group  
David Sanderson, Eagle Point Consulting

***Guests:***

Miki Schneider, JPA	Agnes Mayila, The IT Group
Josh Jenkins, The IT Group	James Bond, The IT Group
Debbie Tague, CEHNC	Tom McMeans, CEHNC
Michael Smith, CEHNC	Tom Baksa, CEHNC
Jim Manthey, CEHNC	Betina Martin, CEHNC
Bill Garland, USF&WS	Wayne Sartwell, AL-ARNG
Francine Cole, TRADOC	JoAnn Watson, NGB
Bernie Case, AL-ARNG	Colonel Lyda, AL-ARNG
Richard Satkin, Parsons Engineering	Rebekah Morrison, Parsons Engineering
Paul James, FTMC	
Jack McIlrath, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation (FWENC)	
Phil Potter, FWENC	

## 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 19, 2001***

0800 – 0830	Check-in	BCT
0830 – 0900	Finalize Minutes/Agenda/ Action Items	BCT
0900 – 1000	Discussion on Privatization	Doyle
1000 – 1130	Fill Area EE/CA Review	IT
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1700	Fill Area EE/CA Review	IT

Breaks as Needed  
Dinner Plans

***Thursday, September 20, 2001***

0800 – 0930	JPA Update	Miki Schneider
0930 – 1130	Fill Area EE/CA Review	IT
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1600	Fill Area EE/CA Review	IT

Breaks as Needed  
Dinner Plans

***Parking Lot***

ADEM Workload Solutions  
Base-wide Ecological Risk

## ATTACHMENT D

### MEETING SUMMARY

With

### ACTION ITEMS

***Next Meeting:*** September 19 - 20, 2001  
Orange Beach, AL

***Primary Agenda:*** Fill Area EE/CA

#### ***August Meeting Summary:***

Check-In - Team members checked in; many noted the full agenda, and large number of attendees.

Finalize Agenda and Minutes - The BCT reviewed the July minutes, and accepted them without change as final. The team recognized that adjustments might be necessary to the agenda depending on how much time each item consumed, but proceeded with the August agenda.

Action Items - The BCT reviewed July's action items; the updates are presented in Attachment D at the end of this text. During the update of his action item, Dan indicated that he would send a letter to Ellis authorizing IT's access to the CWM sites once he had the data back from ECBC.

GIS - JoAnn requested that someone help her organization with access to FTMC's GIS database; Steve will check on the information for her.

1<sup>st</sup> CERFA Parcel FOST (Super FOST) - Agnes provided a very succinct review of the 1<sup>st</sup> CERFA Parcel FOST. There are 122 facilities to be transferred to the JPA, on 2,520 acres. Asbestos and lead-based paint surveys are included in full as Appendices. Ellis inquired about whether those surveys could be pulled out of the FOST document, and referenced within, but Lisa indicated that FTMC wants to provide stand-alone FOSTs so everything must be included in the document. Lisa will also send Francine an electronic copy of the draft FOST. Doyle reminded Lisa that she needs to ensure that FTMC has concurrence letters on all the parcels in her files. Lisa responded that she checks all the parcels against her file of concurrence letters.

Risk Assessment - Doyle has contract funds to provide risk assessment support in reviews. He requested that two copies of all documents be sent to Gannett Fleming. He also reiterated the need to follow EPA's guidance on ecological risk assessment closely, that is, follow the 8-step process. Jeanne explained the conflicts between the 8-step process and the Army's/IT's implementation of that process for the Iron Mountain Road ranges, and voiced concerns that the product would not meet EPA's risk assessors' expectations. She wanted to make sure the BCT was fully aware of the risks associated with continuing to try to collect samples during this season, and sought confirmation once again from the BCT before spending funds to produce what IT believes will be an unacceptable product to EPA. Ron, Doyle, and Jeanne discussed this issue at length, specifically noting the conflicts between the ALDOT property transfer dates and the risk assessment/EE/CA process schedule. The BCT discussed the possibility of an interim removal to meet ALDOT's schedule, and Doyle expressed his support for that idea. Jeanne pointed out that the Army might encounter other risks associated

with that option. An interim removal would not allow for public review of the proposal, since opportunity for public review happens during the EE/CA process, in this case, after any interim removal. Doyle indicated that public notification and discussion could happen through a RAB meeting before the interim removal. Ron noted that the property that ALDOT actually needs for the bypass construction is a very small portion of the ranges, and is located behind the firing points where there is no expectation of contamination. He presented the idea of "carving out" that portion of the ranges for transfer and proceeding according to EPA guidance for the contaminated areas of the ranges. He also requested that he be given time to speak to his management about the issue before making any decisions. Jeanne indicated that a decision was necessary that day or tomorrow if IT was to maintain the current schedule for ecological sampling this season. She also expressed strong support for Ron's idea, since it would allow the Army to transfer property to ALDOT, while simultaneously permitting IT to proceed with the ecological risk assessment according to EPA dictates. She pointed out that the disadvantage to that alternative would be a delay of cleanup of the IMR ranges, and the associated lack of funds expenditure by the Army.

UST Closure Reports - James Bond presented discussion on IT's UST investigations/closure report. Philip inquired about compliance of the effort with ADEM protocols. Steve responded that the entire program was developed and conducted in accordance with ADEM UST regulations.

Parcels 16 and 135 are in the National Guard enclave. Philip inquired about sampling at the UST locations. Steve indicated that there had been previous SI work at the UST locations including soil and groundwater sampling. Ron indicated that the geophysical surveys may provide useful information in the future if the National Guard wants to perform construction activities at any of these sites. Sampling results indicated concentrations of SVOCs slightly above SSSLs, and detections of lead and BTEX all well below SSSLs. Doyle inquired about why PAHs were slightly elevated and James replied that the areas are paved. Doyle wants explicit language in the report that explains the source of the PAHs, and why PAHs are not an issue. The BCT agreed to NFA subject to the revisions in the final report.

AAD Shell Tapping Area - Paul James and Bernie Case did independent research on this site and reached the same conclusion, that is, that the area is not and was never an impact area. AAD has placed sand on the hillside to prevent ricochets, and Bernie indicated that the items found there were ricochets. No HE (high explosives) rounds were ever fired. Ron explained that this area is an active range under the munitions rule; the range is active, the rounds are on the range, and the rounds were shot for their intended use, therefore they don't need to be removed as hazardous waste. Also, IT can safely enter the area to continue any work activities. Ron expressed his opinion that the previous concerns have been addressed and the issue is resolved.

Small Weapons Repair Shop (Parcel 66) - This site used to be part of FOMRA (Parcel 75). Elevated levels of vinyl chloride resulted in a RI. Philip and JoAnn engaged in a discussion/clarification of hydraulic gradient and how IT determines hydraulic gradient. IT presented groundwater/RI results and asserted that the plume is defined by current data. To tighten up the delineation, Doyle would like 3 more wells to the SE and SW of MW6. IT will also examine as-builts and plumbing in the building. Doyle suggested starting to think about the FS requirements. Josh indicated that he had already had some preliminary discussions with IT engineers and had identified some potential remedial technologies including potassium permanganate, HRC, molasses, etc.

Skeet Range (Parcel 127Q) - This is a National Guard site. Analytical data showed lead slightly above SSSLs, antimony, and PAHs. Doyle pointed out that lead concentrations are not significantly higher than SSSLs, are

not widespread, and do not indicate a problem in his opinion. Antimony is also isolated, no pattern; same with PAHs. Concentrations are scattered, and low enough that they could be scraped up in Doyle's opinion. Doyle suggested an interim removal. Only soil, only areas of exceedances to get concentrations down to SSSLs. Steve pointed out that property is going to the Guard for continued reuse. Also any subsequent cleanup activities are Guard responsibilities. Doyle maintained that if cleanup does not happen, land use controls would be required. Guard plans to use the property for training of troops and junior ROTC. Ron explained that LUCIP would have to be enforced and reported in accordance with the LUCAP. BCT discussed NFA with LUCIP as final recommendation, but JoAnn wants to postpone finalization of the SI report until NGB has a chance to identify the preferred path forward. This item is an October BCT agenda item.

Forestry Compound (Parcel 84) - This is a National Guard site. It is a former pesticide mixing facility, currently used for gravel and culvert storage. Analytical data showed three exceedances of SSSLs, arsenic and antimony, and chromium in soils. Doyle feels the concentrations are high enough to warrant RI; Ron wants to query the database to screen metals at all sites and compare that information to the concentrations at this parcel. He feels the concentrations may reflect high background metals presence. Steve took the action to collect the information from the database and present it at a future BCT meeting.

Former Decontamination Complex (Parcels 93, 46, 70, and 140) - Analytical data for this parcel showed several exceedances of SSSLs. IT proposed supplemental SI fieldwork including residuum and bedrock wells as well as additional soil samples. This site is divided between the Guard and the JPA. Building 1298 was used to rinse out the installation's dumpsters. JoAnn would like to see soil samples from proposed well locations; IT indicated there are already samples from those locations. The BCT concurred with supplemental SI fieldwork.

Hand Grenade Range 32 (Parcel 90Q-X) - Analytical data for this site indicated low levels of explosives in groundwater. Reuse is passive recreational but the site is outside the National Wildlife Refuge. This is part of the M3 parcel for the JPA. The BCT agreed to NFA with unrestricted reuse.

JPA Update - Ron distributed the JPA's priority listing of properties. Miki reviewed the previous day's agenda items to ascertain whether there were issues resulting from those discussions that might affect the JPA. The JPA is expecting to begin some demolition work and road improvements, including a new access into McClellan on the northern part of the installation. New houses on the golf course (8 single-family homes). New church is going to be built. Honda supplier is also moving onto the installation. Anniston Star has begun construction activities. The governor has funded an arts council study that is considering construction of a multi-use cultural resource center at McClellan, specifically an amphitheater to accommodate the Alabama Symphony, Ballet, etc. They have already identified a benefactor who has agreed to support the project. The Alabama Film Department is also considering a project. Demolition activities are slated for the WWII-era buildings in the 800 Area. Doyle indicated that demolition will have to comply with RCRA regulations. He would like a list of the buildings. If the buildings have lead-based paint and/or asbestos, EPA will consider them to be hazardous waste. Miki indicated that the JPA would expect their contractor to comply with all applicable regulations. Doyle indicated that the JPA, not their contractor, is ultimately liable for ensuring compliance with regulations. Doyle and Philip intend to send inspectors to the site to oversee JPA's demolition activities to ensure regulatory compliance.

Parcels 232 and 234 - During the July BCT meeting, Philip and Doyle requested a visit to these parcels to reaffirm Ellis' belief that the BCT agreed to NFA these sites while Bart and Chris were members of the BCT.

The BCT visited these sites to review previous agreements between Philip's and Doyle's predecessors and the Army. The BCT agreed that the two sites can be administratively closed through a letter from the Army to EPA and ADEM explaining the rationale for the action, and referencing the site visit today with concurrence by the BCT for closure. Jeanne will prepare a letter to EPA and ADEM for Ron's signature requesting official concurrence.

Lead-Based Paint (LBP) in Soils - ADEM management has looked at the SI Report for the GSA warehouse and questions the BCT concurrence for NFA with unrestricted reuse, based on the potential presence of LBP in the exterior soils. Ron cited some precedence on the issue with the Navy where EPA wanted the Navy to clean up LBP on Navy bases. The Navy's position was that EPA cannot regulate the DOD differently than it does for private residences where LBP is present. Doyle indicated that EPA agreed not to enforce RCRA statutes on LBP in soils until the buildings get demolished, then EPA will enforce. He also indicated that states can enforce more rigorously, but not less than EPA. Philip needs past documentation to support the NFA. He also indicated that ADEM is questioning whether every building on the installation might need LBP remediation.

Range 23A (Parcels 109, 152Q-X) - This site comprises 41 acres in north-central Pelham Range, specifically the area in front of the bleachers. Army engineers trained in demolition procedures at this site. The Hasty Mine area is an anti-personnel area where clay-more mines would have been used. Bernie Case and Col. Lyda provided detailed and helpful explanations of the different types of training that occurred on the area. This site also contains 29 IDW drums from a previous investigation by CH2MHill. The drums are all identified in terms of where the IDW originated. CH2MHill submitted a SI report showing metals, SVOCs, TPH, and explosives in soils. The Army also constructed a sediment retention pond to try to control runoff from the site. IT's proposed plan reflects CH2MHill's report and subsequent recommendations. Ron also indicated that this is an active range, even though there will be no further "Wall of Flame" or nuke simulation, only Guard demolition training will occur in the future. Doyle expressed concern about the sedimentation pond, the wetland, and where the creek exits the parcel. Philip wants data on groundwater flow. Colonel Lyda indicated that if necessary, he would coordinate range operations to accommodate the well installation. JoAnn wants VOCs, SVOCs, and not TPH. Also include explosives and metals. The BCT agreed to the supplemental SI activities with amendments.

UXO Risk Methodology - Jim Manthey of CEHNC presented Huntsville's proposed risk methodology for UXO. Huntsville advocates "OERIA" (OE Risk Impact Assessment), a qualitative method consisting of three steps: 1.) Risk Factor Selection, 2.) Baseline Risk Assessment, and 3.) Assess Response Action Alternatives. Ron prefers OERIA rather than trying a more quantitative methodology. He expressed his desire for ADEM and EPA buy-in so that down the road, there is a clear understanding of how the Army is proceeding. The BCT agreed that this methodology is acceptable for usage in the EE/CAs.

Fort McClellan CWM Site Characterization - Fieldwork was completed in July at the 33 sites. Institutional Controls is one of the alternatives that must be considered. Parsons representative Rebekah Morrison wanted to do an Institutional Analysis with the BCT and project team; Ron requested that this be done at another time, not at the BCT meeting.

Pelham Range CWM Site Characterization - Richard Satkin, the Project Manager from Parson's proceeded to brief the BCT on the status of the CWM EE/CA. He indicated that the DDESB submission is being amended to move the Interim Holding Facility (IHF) to Pelham Range from Main Post, since it is not necessary at Main Post (no CWM found there).

Richard explained that his presentation is not a Pelham Range CWM EE/CA, but rather a site characterization of 3 CWM sites on Pelham Range, Lima Pond, the Old Water Hole, and the Decontamination Training Area South of the Toxic Gas Training Area. The IHF will be relocated near the Old Water Hole.

CEHNC will dig every anomaly that the geophysical survey reveals, unless one of the anomalies indicates the presence of CWM. If that happens, digging ceases, since the site is then a CWM site. If there are anomalies in the pond, Parsons will drain the pond to enable digging of all anomalies.

Ron noted in Richard's presentation materials that "Static Firing of Chemical Munitions" perhaps should be restated as "static detonation." CK, CG, and G are all phosgene. CEHNC will carefully examine the wording of this activity, since Ron and guard personnel strongly objected to allegations of firing of chemical munitions. Dan and Betina indicated that the ASR calls this out.

Range 25 - Ron clarified that Range 25 is to be characterized for consideration for phytoremediation. Doyle expressed his support for the characterization, by expressly stated his negative feelings about any phytoremediation efforts. IT will characterize the range for full suite analysis, not just lead. There are 4" Stokes Mortars and this is where the Levins round was found. The BCT agreed to the proposed plan.

Surface Soil Sampling - Steve indicated that the IWWP currently defines surface soil as 0 - 1' deep. Steve suggested considering surface soils to be 0 - 6" because of potential ecological risk impacts down the road on the historic ranges. Surface soils are the primary ecological pathway, and right now any lead on the historic ranges is well covered with layer of organic material. Digging a foot below the surface might indicate contamination that is actually not available for surface exposure. Doyle did not support this idea, but indicated he would check with his risk assessors to see what they think about it.

UXO Issues - Phil Potter presented the Charlie Area Work Plan and methods for sampling on the steep slopes. Plan originally called for an EM61 detector, but it is difficult and unsafe to walk those slopes with that gear. FWENC proposes to use the EM61 on slopes less than 40 degrees, but use a different method on slopes greater than 40. On slopes less than 40 degrees, grid sampling will be performed instead of transect sampling as originally proposed in the work plans. No brush clearance is necessary for transects in the slopes greater than 40 degrees. Bill Garland indicated that he would like FWENC to exercise diligence in the old growth and spring seep areas. Hand-held devices will not collect digital data. Locations will be GPSed; UXO will be flagged. There will be lots of shell casings and metal along the fire lanes. There will probably be 200' exclusion zones for essential personnel, and approximately 1200' for civilian personnel safety. Ron indicated that there are some areas on the backside of the mountain that need to be sampled. FWENC indicated that there will be sampling done on the backside of the mountain. Bill Garland inquired whether the investigation will be adequate to persuade the public of safety for walking purposes. CEHNC and FW will have to redo plans to reflect this changed methodology.

Doyle expressed concern about safety of the worker in accomplishing the task. He also doesn't want future usage to be dangerous either. Doyle wants CEHNC/FWENC to do at least a visual in some areas where equipment cannot be used; the highly inaccessible areas. He used his personal experience with Boy Scouts rappelling on the slopes as an example to demonstrate the need to get into inaccessible areas. Bill Garland suggested a controlled burn to clear some of the surface vegetation to improve visual observation. He indicated that his organization would support a controlled burn and the BCT and FWENC also voiced support

for that idea. Dan Copeland took responsibility to coordinate a subgroup to discuss the logistics and details for arranging a controlled burn on the mountain. He will contact Bill Garland to set up a meeting, identifying a date, time, attendees, and an agenda for the meeting.

CEHNC has encountered very thick vegetation on the hillsides in the Bravo Area. Work is very slow. Suzanne indicated that FWENC is proposing another change to their approved plan to accomplish the work more quickly. They will use a hydro-ax to accomplish brush clearing. FWENC also wants to do shorter, but wider transects, more like grids instead of transects. The change would provide for the same amount of sampling, but it would be different distribution. Another idea is to forego transects, but do more grids. Again, same amount of data, but different distribution and location. In a low-density area, the BCT agreed that as long as data quality objectives remain the same, the modification to grid sampling vice transects is approved. CEHNC will need to send a work plan modification through to EPA and ADEM. Bill Garland will also accompany FWENC to identify grids that minimize damage to long leaf and old growth forests.

Ecological Risk - Ron spoke with his management at TRADOC about the path forward for the IMR ranges. The Army will conduct the 8-step ecological risk process at Iron Mountain Road. The Army will also prepare a letter on the IMR/ALDOT properties indicating that the BCT agreed that transfer of the property behind the firing lines is acceptable, and that the Army will proceed with ecological risk work on the remaining parts of the IMR ranges.

Metrics - Ron asked Mary Graves to examine what information the Army has already developed in terms of metrics. Mary made an excellent and well-received presentation to the BCT and project team on metrics and possible routes for the team to choose in developing their own metrics. Mary will present further information to the team at the September BCT meeting.

IMR Range 19 - IT has drilled 70' deep and has not encountered water in the residuum. Intent was to install a cluster of wells, one in the residuum, one in the bedrock. Steve recommended that if IT doesn't find water in the residuum, then they should drill to water and install a single well and dispense with the cluster. Doyle and Philip agreed that if residuum water is very deep, don't put in clusters as specified in the work plan. This applies only for this site. IT is to notify the BCT if this happens at other sites as well. Doyle supports this action because he feels that lead can be expected in 10 - 20' depths, but not at 70' depths.

Motor Pool 3100 (Parcels 146, 212, 24, 25, and 73) - SI has been done, also Supplemental SI. Site showed benzene in one well. EPA did not consider this to be a major concern. ADEM wanted more sampling. IT collected more samples. Groundwater levels are rising. Josh thinks increasing concentrations reflect benzene in the residuum that is being flushed by rising groundwater. Doyle suggested quarterly monitoring for a few rounds to see what happens. IT to do two more quarters of sampling, don't finalize the SI report until the BCT has a chance to examine the additional data and discuss as a group.

Base Service Station - Supplemental SI showed benzene in wells. IT collected more samples at ADEM's request. 3 of the 4 wells showed decreasing levels, one well spiked (MW06). MW06 is hydraulically up/side gradient of the site. The BCT agreed to the same strategy as for MP 3100, that is two more quarters of sampling, then review and discuss the additional data.

Impact Area at Stump Dump - SI data shows a hit of antimony slightly over SSSLs. BCT agreed to NFA with unrestricted reuse for HTRW for this site. This parcel still requires UXO clearance prior to transfer.

CWM HTRW Sites - Doyle will prepare a letter of concurrence for the Army.

Fill Area EE/CA On-Board Review - Philip cannot attend the meeting on August 29 - 30. The BCT agreed to reschedule the review to the September BCT meeting, and move the BCP review out to the October BCT meeting.

Miscellaneous Actions - Dan will get Doyle and Phil a CD on the CWM presentation after corrections are made. He will also provide a copy of Parson's CWM RAB presentation to Josh. Dan will additionally provide coordinates of sumps, pits, etc., that Parson's found so that HTRW samples can be optimally sited.

Meeting Reflections - The team spent a few minutes reflecting on the meeting. In general, everyone expressed positive results, though it was a tiring 3 days. A couple participants echoed David's earlier observations that the size of the meeting was too large. Others felt that all stakeholders need to be present to hear the discussions and deliberations of the BCT.

Future Meetings (3-month look ahead) - September 4, Ft. McClellan (Controlled Burn Logistics), September 19 - 20, Orange Beach, October 16 - 17, Ft. McClellan.

***Status of Action Items***

<b>Action Item No.</b>	<b>Responsible Team Member</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Action Item</b>
01/2/3	Glynn	Mar 01	Done	Provide metrics information to Ft. McClellan project team for consideration in development of team metrics.
01/7/1	Ron	Aug 01	Done	Speak to Francine Cole and Bob Mashburn about example metrics from other Army installations.
01/7/2	Philip	Aug 01	SNR	Check with Larry Bryant about Tier II metrics.
01/7/3	Dan	Aug 01	SNR	Provide a letter allowing Mobile/IT access to work at the CWM sites where Huntsville's fieldwork has shown no CWM.
01/7/4	Steve	Aug 01	Done	Resample wells at Former Motor Pool 3100 and the Base Service Station.
01/7/5	Dan	Aug 01	Done	Update UXO/CWM schedules for input to the Ft. McClellan Master Schedule in time for the August schedule coordination meeting.
01/7/6	Steve	Aug 01	Done	Update HTRW field schedule for input to the Ft. McClellan Master Schedule in time for the August schedule coordination meeting.
01/7/7	Agnes	Sep 01	SNR	Provide next iteration of draft BCP to the BCT before the September BCT meeting in Orange Beach.
01/7/8	Ellis	Aug 01	Done	Extend CTC program schedule to include RD/RA activities.
01/7/9	Miki	Aug 01	Done	Provide Doyle with latest version of the Reuse Plan.
01/7/10	Steve	Aug 01	Done	Email Ron with information on issues and recommendations for improving GIS controls at Ft. McClellan.
01/8/1	Steve	Sep 01	SNR	Check on database availability for JoAnn.
01/8/2	Lisa	Sep 01	Done	Provide electronic copy of 1 <sup>st</sup> CERFA FOST draft to Francine.
01/8/3	Steve	Oct 01	SNR	Query FTMC database for metals information. Report to BCT.
01/8/4	Jeanne	Sep 01	SNR	Letter to ADEM and EPA for Ron's

signature on Parcels 232 and 234.

01/8/5	Dan	Sep 01	SNR	Coordinate controlled burn with Bill Garland and appropriate personnel. Report to BCT on progress.
01/8/6	Jeanne	Sep 01	SNR	Letter to ADEM and EPA for Ron's signature on ALDOT/IMR property transfer.
01/8/7	Dan	Sep 01	SNR	Provide CDs of Parson's CWM presentations to Doyle, Philip, and Josh.
01/8/8	Dan	Sep 01	SNR	Provide Steve with coordinates of sumps, pits, etc., that Parson's discovered and investigated on the CWM sites so that IT can place HTRW samples.
01/8/9	Doyle	Sep 01	SNR	Provide a letter of concurrence to the Army on the CWM Sites HTRW Work Plan.

SNR=Status Next Report

ATTACHMENT E  
FACILITATOR NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

**Meeting Summary**

The BCT met at Ft. McClellan on August 21-23, 2001, a 3-day meeting because of a very full agenda. For me there were several highlights and one issue for further monitoring.

**Highlights:**

- On the process for conducting risk assessments, a conflict arose between IT's need to modify the process in order to meet deadlines and EPA's insistence that the process be followed exactly. Jeanne, Ron, and Doyle addressed the differences directly and at length in an excellent discussion characterized by respect and an interest in finding agreement. By the end of the meeting, Jeanne and Ron brought a compromise proposal that Doyle immediately accepted – a good example of creative problem-solving.
- The contractors forthrightly raised an issue that the regulators had not been aware of, and Doyle and Philip responded with appreciation and a cooperative “let's get it fixed” approach. As I mentioned toward the end of the meeting, this is the third time in my knowledge that Ron and the contractors have brought crucial information to the BCT and the team has dealt with it together. It's important for two reasons – it demonstrates the trust that exists among team members, and at the same time it strengthens that trust.
- During a long discussion of changes in UXO sampling techniques on the third morning, the team engaged in particularly good collaborative work. Suzanne, Dan, and their contractors explained the difficulties they were having and the changes they wanted to make and noted the regulators' suggestions. Team members not directly involved in the work also contributed to the discussion. With the help of Bill Garland of US F&W, the team agreed to work toward a prescribed burn to benefit both the forest and the quality of Huntsville's sampling.

**The issue of BCT size:**

Most of the time there were about 16 BCT project team members present in this meeting, plus as many as 4-6 guests. When I raised this issue because of my own sense that a team of about 12 is ideal, team members expressed different viewpoints. Some members felt that the size of the BCT was beginning to complicate the meetings, making for more confusion, side conversations, and so on. Others said that it was important for all the stakeholders to be present so decisions were understood and supported by all. I thought it was a good open discussion of an issue that can be sensitive for a team. Incidentally, my raising the issue has nothing to do with individuals, but only with the number of people and how size can affect a team.

**Conclusion:**

The BCT continues to develop in significant ways. The agenda for this meeting was ambitious, and the team willingly took the greater part of three days to deal with everything. Discussions were marked by directness, openness, and mutual respect. Different team members are taking on key tasks the team needs to have done and are expanding their roles. Tense moments are increasingly balanced by moments of humor. The team finds creative options frequently.