

FT. McCLELLAN BCT MEETING MINUTES  
 PARTNERING SESSION #45  
 FT. McCLELLAN, AL  
 JUNE 5, 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	The BCT revised the June agenda, and proceeded accordingly. Attachment C provides the draft July agenda. Attachment D provides the June meeting summary.
Accept Previous Minutes	BCT	The team reviewed the draft May 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	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-sixth meeting with the team. His notes and observations are provided at Attachment E.



ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF ATTENDEES  
BCT SESSION #45  
FT. McCLELLAN, AL  
JUNE 5, 2002

***Attendees:***

Ron Levy, Ft. McClellan (FTMC)  
Lisa Holstein, FTMC  
Ellis Pope, Mobile District Corps of Engineers  
Philip Stroud, Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM)  
Doyle Brittain, 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  
JoAnn Watson, National Guard Bureau (by telephone)  
Jeanne Yacoub, Shaw Environmental and Infrastructure (Shaw)  
Steve Moran, Shaw  
David Sanderson, Eagle Point Consulting  
Art Holcomb, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corp. (FWENC)

***Guests:***

Porter Morgan, CEHNC  
Joe Cudney, Parsons  
John Chulik, Parsons  
Prabal Amin, Shaw  
Larry Lumeh, CC Johnson and Malhotra (by telephone)  
Josh Jenkins, Shaw  
Randy McBride, Shaw (by telephone)

## 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 JULY AGENDA

***Wednesday, July 17, 2002***

0800 – 0830	Check-in/Finalize Minutes/Agenda/Action Items	BCT
0830 – 0845	Installation-Wide Work Plan	Lisa
0845 – 0930	ADEM Concurrence on Minutes/Tier II Participation	Ron
0930 – 1030	Area North of MOUT	Shaw
1030 – 1100	The Blue Hole	Shaw
1100 – 1130	Document Status Tracking	Doyle
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1400	Options for Area South of POW Training Facility	Ron
1400 – 1700	Landfills: Hydrogeology and Latest GW Monitoring Results	Josh

Breaks as Needed  
Dinner Plans

***Thursday, July 18, 2002***

0800 – 0830	JPA Update	Miki
0830 – 0930	Mock Village at Yahou Lake	Shaw
0930 – 1130	Historical Ranges Parcels 92, 93, 107, 133, 134	Shaw
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1330	Impact Area N Central Main Post, Parcel 132	Shaw
1330 – 1430	Machine Gun Rifle Ranges, Parcels 98, 99	Shaw
1430 – 1530	Range 30 Options (EE/CA vs. RI/FS)	BCT

1530 – 1630            Parking Lot and Meeting Reflections

BCT

Breaks as Needed

***Parking Lot***

FS Remedial Action Objectives for MP 1500 and Parcel 66  
(Recap of TRADOC, USACE, and FTMC Discussions)



known to be inapplicable. A focused FS hones in on applicable remedial technology. Doyle indicated that although the term FFS was being used, a FS is what is being conducted. Steve pointed out that the BCT will need to make a decision on the end use of the property (Remedial Action Objectives). Doyle indicated that a clean up to anything less than residential will require land use controls. He wants to see an evaluation of 3 - 5 technologies that have some potential of working, as well as the No Action alternative. The BCT wants to include Chapter 6 Recommendations. Ron asked if both the RI and FS are issued as one document. Steve prefers to do it as a separate document because the RI is essentially done and can be issued final. Doyle indicated it can be done either way. Ellis also indicated it would be preferable from a timing perspective to issue the RI separately.

After hearing Prabal's presentation, Doyle pointed out that the site presents an "unacceptable risk" not a "threat" to human health. Contamination is restricted to groundwater and is about 1/10 of an acre in extent. The Army would like to release the property unrestricted if possible. Miki indicated that the property has water and sewer, so if the Army can save dollars and it doesn't affect the reuse, the JPA could accept the possible LUC. The LUC would involve development of a long-term groundwater monitoring plan and review of the administrative plan. Costs would be projected over 30 years. Doyle thinks because the plume is small and defined, this site offers good potential to clean up, possibly to unrestricted reuse. Ron asked that Shaw wait on discussions between himself and TRADOC to determine the Remedial Action Objective -- industrial or residential. Industrial would basically eliminate all alternatives except No Action and LUC/LTM.

Parcel 94, Motor Pool 1500 FS - Technology screening is underway for this parcel. Intended reuse for this site is active recreation. The project team has a discussion about why the Remedial Action Objective is so important; it drives what technologies get identified and evaluated. Doyle would like to see the FS examine hydrogen enrichment. The team decided on the same path forward for this site as for Parcel 66, that is, Ron will provide guidance on remedial action objectives.

Parcel 93 Acetone - Shaw requested clarification of the path forward for this parcel, since several alternatives were discussed last month and it wasn't clear which one was to be taken. The northern half of this parcel is to go to the JPA; the southern half is going to the Guard. Shaw recommended a RI on the southern half (Guard), and NFA on the northern half (JPA). After much discussion, the BCT decided to split these parcels according to end users, the JPA and the Guard. The northern portion requires installation of one new shallow (residuum) monitoring well close to GP26. The new well will be sampled for acetone only using the new method. The RI for the southern portion will need to address chromium, arsenic, and DNT as well as acetone in groundwater. JoAnn would like the recommendations captured in the SI report.

Pelham Range CWM Sites Investigation - Joe Cudney presented the SI results for the Pelham Range CWM sites. Parsons found no CWM at any of the sites. They don't yet have the results of the HTRW samples from the Old Water Hole. The draft CWM SI report was issued the previous week (week of May 26).

The Blue Hole - The BCT addressed this site in May 01, and again in December 01. ADEM wants more samples of the sediment. Philip would like another sample where the original one was taken. He needs to prove it is anomalous. Philip suggested that the Army consider another background study to raise background levels. Ron is disinclined to do it because of expense. Jeanne suggested putting this site on the July agenda for further discussion; the BCT agreed to that suggestion.

Filtered vs. Unfiltered Groundwater Samples - EPA SOP says no filtering of groundwater samples; however, Doyle recognizes that there are some instances when you can't remove turbidity regardless of what you do. Doyle thinks in those cases an unfiltered groundwater sample can provide information. Doyle made it clear that he is not advocating deviation from standard procedures. Porter Morgan suggested that 400 NTUs has been shown in studies as the point where groundwater quality degrades. JoAnn indicated that 400 NTUs is also a standard water quality criteria.

Skeet Range - The final SI report for this site identifies a suite of options for consideration by the Guard going forward. ADEM the responded with recommendations for remedial actions, further risk assessment, and land use controls. Lisa questioned whether this was an appropriate response. JoAnn didn't have a problem with the letter. The BCT considers that Ft. McClellan has concluded the SI and the NG will take ownership for further actions at the site.

ADEM/EPA Letters - The Army is concerned about missing the window of opportunity for ecological fieldwork at the small arms ranges, particularly Bains Gap Road ranges. Ron indicated the Army is considering sending letters to Jon Johnston and Steve Cobb expressing these concerns and asking for their support in meeting the schedule for review of the SLERA. These letters are a result of Glynn Ryan's discussions with both Steve and Jon about the issue. Doyle made the point that if we are going to have a team and call ourselves partnering, issues like this should be resolved at the table by Tier I. He also indicated he has spoken to Sharon about prioritizing BGR small arms ranges. He felt that the team would not be rushing around now trying to review these documents if the Army had followed the July 6, 2000, Final "Human Health and Ecological Screening Values and PAH Background Summary Report" and what EPA (Ted Simon, Sharon Thoms, and Doyle Brittain) told them to do in the June 25, 2001, meeting in Atlanta. After much discussion, Doyle urged Ron not to get into a letter-writing campaign as he felt it would strain the BCT working relationships unnecessarily; Ron indicated he needs assurances that EPA will meet the field dates. Lisa recommended providing Philip and Doyle with the list of priorities and speaking to Glynn about the letters. The team also considered the possibility of conducting an interim action at the small arms ranges; Doyle said he could support that, Philip also indicated support. Ron asked that topic be planned for the July BCT meeting as well.

Range 16 - This is the most contaminated UXO site on the Main Post. Steve suggested postponing all HTRW work until OE/UXO work is completed. Ron said the Army can't postpone the work because of his need to meet his DPE goals. Steve indicated the HTRW wells are outside the fenced area near the road. The data as presented would provide groundwater information. Philip indicated the data is not good enough. After discussion, Ron indicated that HTRW investigation should be postponed until after the OE work is done.

Soldiers' Chapel PRA - BCT saw this site previously. Shaw performed a soils removal to deal with metals in surface soils. Doyle indicated that he supports NFA with unrestricted reuse. Philip also agreed that NFA is acceptable and to include Paul's tech memo in the SI report.

Rocket City Sampling - Philip and Doyle had some questions from last month's presentation on mechanized removal action at Rocket City. Porter went back and examined all the data taken from the ranges. The shaking of soil should not produce any explosive releases. Porter indicated there will be nothing in the soils since data indicates no explosives in soils. Philip indicated he had seen some rounds that were cracked and had exposed HE. That's his concern; that the HE will mix with the soils. Philip would like sampling done to assure that HE

is not above 10% in the soils, and that HE will not be spread about the site. Art indicated that most of what is being found is practice. He also suggested letting ADEM's UXO contractor review the issue. Ron strongly indicated that the Army has already sampled the soils through HTRW efforts and the data shows no residual explosives in the soils. The Army will look at the data and will speak further with Philip on the issue.

RAB Meeting Agendas - Ted will attend the July RAB meeting to speak on risk assessment. Doyle has asked Ted to present a "non-technical" session on risk assessment. Ron also wants a presentation on ecological risk assessment. Doyle indicated that Shaw should take the lead on the ecological risk presentation. Paul Goetchius will attend the meeting, but Ted will take the lead on the presentation. Rich Prann or Rob Zimmer will provide a similar session on ecological risk assessment. Ron indicated presentations should be 10 - 20 minutes long, followed by 10 minutes of Q&A.

Document Tracking Status - Doyle would like to keep track of documents and discuss it during BCT meetings. He provided a hand-out as a depiction of what he is wanting to track. Ron stated he thought the document tracking matrix used at Ft. McClellan would provide all the information Doyle wants. He asked Lisa to email Ft. McClellan's document status.

July Events - RAB on July 15, site visits on the 16<sup>th</sup>, BCT meeting on 17 - 18. David will have at least 3 hours on the August agenda in the morning for team building exercises.

Future Meetings (3-month look ahead) - June 5, Ft. McClellan, July 17 - 18, Ft. McClellan, August 20 - 21, Ft. McClellan, September 17 - 18. The project team decided to allocate 3 hours one morning during the August meeting to David Sanderson for training and team building.

*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>
02/2/3	Philip	Mar 02	SNR	Report back to BCT on ADEM's position on the Pelham Range Water Supply issue.
02/5/1	Lisa	June 02	Done	Check to see if SuperFOST 3 includes Bldg. 3137.
02/5/2	Ron	July 02	SNR	Review options on the Area South of POW Training Facility and report back to the BCT.
02/5/3	Dan	June 02	Done	Provide CDs on mechanized UXO removal presentation to Doyle and Philip.
02/5/4	Jeanne	June 02	Done	Provide electronic copy of ecological risk subgroup minutes to Philip.
02/6/1	Ron	July 02	SNR	Provide guidance to project team on remedial action objectives for the feasibility studies at MP 1500 and Parcel 66.
02/6/2	Porter	July 02	SNR	Look at soils data for Rocket City and get back to Philip on issue of sampling for explosives.
02/6/3	Lisa	July 02	SNR	Email Ft. McClellan's document tracking status spreadsheet to Doyle.

SNR=Status Next Report

ATTACHMENT E  
FACILITATOR NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

**Meeting Summary**

The BCT met for a packed one-day meeting at Fort McClellan on June 5. Agenda items, including many topics suggested at the beginning of the day, were long and varied, ranging from plans for feasibility studies (first time for the BCT) to agreements about risk assessment presentations at the next RAB meeting. As usual, several items involved complex issues and extended discussions that challenged the team to stay involved and focused.

As several members noted at the end of the day, the climate of the meeting, like the agenda, was varied and complex. Shaw and Parsons representatives made fine, professional presentations on feasibility studies and the SI for Pelham Range CWM, and the following discussions were serious and productive. There was also a good deal of laughter throughout the day. And there were several episodes of raised temperatures from marked differences of opinion and from issues of loyalty and mutual support among team members. From my perspective, the team demonstrated the dual importance of attending to its relationships even while it focuses on its tasks.

Some specific observations and suggestions:

- The meeting, like last month's, included a conference call with JoAnn Watson and her contractor. Generally this process worked very well, though JoAnn was hampered at one point by not having the presentation materials. Whenever possible, materials should be sent ahead of time to those on conference calls.
- The Shaw Group's initial presentation on plans for a feasibility study allowed questions and comments from team members; the second presentation was given in full, followed by discussion, and I think that process worked better and should be followed in the future.
- One point of conflict arose around Dan Copeland's suggestion that soil sampling was unnecessary after OE removal in the "Rocket City" area, with Philip Stroud insisting that sampling be done. The argument quickly led to an impasse, with several people on one side, Philip on the other, and everyone restating their positions without much listening. When they became aware of what was happening, the conflict shifted dramatically and quickly: people began to ask how they could satisfy Philip's concern and also not hold up their removal work. It was a good example of turning confrontation into collaboration.
- The BCT again had to take time to deal with interventions by those above Philip in the ADEM hierarchy. In one case, a substantive issue about the adequacy of the preliminary risk assessment about the "Blue Hole," an ADEM official asserted the need for further sampling—after the BCT had already dealt with this site in May and December, 2001, including a site visit. As team members pointed out again, those who are not members of the BCT and involved in BCT discussions are second-guessing BCT decisions. The result was that the item must come up again in July when site data will be available.
- The second case involved the team's process: Jim Grassiano had told Philip not to approve the minutes of the May BCT meeting until he, Jim, had reviewed them. Several team members appropriately and

strenuously objected to this intrusion into the BCT's normal process of approving its own minutes. They argued that, as a member of the Tier II team, Jim was a guest at the May meeting and cannot approve or disapprove BCT minutes. Again, with the integrity of the BCT in focus, I point out the need for assistance and clarity from Tier II.

- Finally, the full agenda meant that the teambuilding session around managing conflict was postponed until August. Even so, as noted above, the team worked on its conflict resolution skills by taking on some real conflicts and finding ways to work through them. But I want to keep encouraging every team member to intervene as they can (rather than wait for me to do so) when other members are involved in conflict.