

FT. McCLELLAN BCT MEETING MINUTES  
 PARTNERING SESSION #52  
 FT. McCLELLAN, AL  
 FEBRUARY 11-12, 2003

AGENDA ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY	NOTES
Check In Guest Introduction and Roles	Host: Ron Levy Leader: Ron Levy 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 April agenda. Attachment D provides the February meeting summary.
Accept Previous Minutes	BCT	The team reviewed the draft January 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 thirty-third meeting with the team. His notes and observations are provided at Attachment E.

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF ATTENDEES  
BCT SESSION #52  
Ft. McCLELLAN, AL  
FEBRUARY 11-12, 2003

***Attendees:***

Ron Levy, Ft. McClellan (FTMC)  
Lisa Holstein, 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)  
Bob Daffron, Alabama Army National Guard (AL-ARNG)  
Jeanne Yacoub, Shaw E& I  
David Sanderson, Eagle Point Consulting  
Art Holcomb, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation (FWENC)

***Guests:***

Glynn Ryan, FTMC  
Karen Pinson, FTMC  
Paul James, FTMC  
Joe Gibson, ADEM  
Mark Harrison, ADEM  
Jim Grassiano, ADEM  
Linda Breland, Alabama Forestry Commission  
Richard Cumbie, Alabama Forestry Commission  
Peter Conroy, FTMC RAB  
Porter Morgan, CEHNC  
Alvin McNeal, CEHNC  
Todd Biggs, FWENC  
Steve Neill, FWENC  
Hugh Vick, Gannett Fleming  
Bill Garland, US Fish and Wildlife Service  
Josh Jenkins, Shaw E & I  
Greg Sisco, Shaw E & I  
Troy Winton, Shaw E & I

## 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 APRIL AGENDA

***Tuesday, April 22, 2003***

0800 – 0900	Check-in/Finalize Minutes/Agenda/Action Items	BCT
0900 – 0915	Document Status Tracking	Lisa
0915 – 0930	National Wildlife Refuge Plan Update	Ron
0930 – 1000	Range L Data Presentation/Recommendations	Shaw
1000 – 1030	Old Water Hole Data Presentation/Recommendations	Shaw
1030 – 1100	Range K Data Presentation/Recommendations	Shaw
1100 – 1130	T-31 Qtrly Sampling Data Presentation/Recommendations	Shaw
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1330	SOTS Data Presentation	Shaw
1330 – 1500	Re-Present Parcels 207 and 211 (Old Toxic Training Area) for new National Guard representative	Shaw
1500 – 1530	LF #3 Well Spring Survey Results	Josh
1530 – 1630	30-60-90% Updates	Josh

Breaks as Needed

***Wednesday, April 23, 2003***

0800 – 0830	JPA Update	Miki
0830 – 0930	UXO Update	FWENC
0930 – 1130	Choccolocco Corridor Ranges RI Work Plan	Shaw
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1700	TBD	
1700 – 1730	Parking Lot and Meeting Reflections	BCT

Breaks as Needed

***Parking Lot***

Soldiers' Chapel SI (ADEM Comment Resolution)

CBR Proficiency Area SI (Comment Resolution)

Medders' Well Sampling



Small Weapons Repair Shop – EPA concurred with responses to EPA comments. The project team reviewed responses to ADEM comments 1, 3, 9, 11, 12, and 13, since the other comments and responses did not present a need for resolution. ADEM concurred with all the responses. In particular, ADEM concurred that additional wells are not required to complete the groundwater delineation (comment #1), but wants to also review the comment with Joe. Additionally, Shaw will expand the discussion on response 12 to summarize section 5.3.1.2 of the report. The next step is for Shaw to submit a draft final report and include the expanded comment responses with the report.

Motor Pool Area 1500 – The team resolved EPA's comments and then turned to ADEM comments 10, 12, 17, 20, and 24 that needed some discussion. The team proceeded to discuss each comment, with the resulting action that on response 24, Shaw will expand the response to address Philip's concerns about adequate purge volume prior to sampling. After reading Shaw's response to comment 12, Philip indicated he wanted to check the response with Ted Simon at EPA. He will let Jeanne know of his decision. In order to expedite resolution of the comment, Doyle asked Lisa to fax Shaw's response to Ted with a request for Ted to review the response and get back to the BCT that day. Ted responded via fax; his response is included at Attachment F to these minutes. Based on resolution of all the comments, Shaw will issue the draft final RI report with the comment response package.

Old Toxic Training Area – ADEM offered no additional comments beyond the three EPA comments. EPA concurred with the responses to the three comments and asked Shaw to finalize the SI report. EPA's final concurrence letter is contingent upon review of the final document to assure that all comment responses have been incorporated into the final SI.

Y-Area Removal Action – Todd Biggs presented an update on the removal action planned for the Y-Area of the Eastern Bypass. FWENC is currently amending the existing plan. The Army will clear to depth and then complete the BRAVO EE/CA and Action Memorandum. Ron wanted it very clear that the removal does not require a regulatory approval of an Action Memorandum right now, but he does want concurrence on the work plans. Dan will send a transmittal letter to Philip, Doyle, and the Army. Philip asked that Spencer also be sent a copy. Philip asked to be notified if HE frag is encountered. Ron inquired if Spencer could sit with FWENC to review the work plans in order to facilitate and expedite ADEM's review. Miki asked if Michelle (Matrix) should also be present

Parcel 247Q – Philip did not revisit this parcel, but Joe Gibson did, along with the groundwater subcommittee. Based on the outcome of that visit, Shaw will install two more deep wells, not 75 feet in depth. Shaw will prepare a response to comments specifying well depths and locations. Ron agreed to the additional wells based on ADEM's promise to concur with NFA if the samples are clean. Ron inquired if the scrap metal would qualify as a solid waste. Bill Garland raised the issue about this concern on every parcel. If people find something years later that resembles a piece of ordnance, they will come back to the Army and ask about it, and the Army will be required to investigate and respond to each inquiry. Bill pointed out that this is not an efficient or cost-effective process for the Army, particularly if the items being found are scrap metal. Ron told Philip he needs a regulatory driver to enable a response action by the Army. Philip responded that even though it's not a CERCLA waste, ADEM views the scrap metal as a solid waste requiring removal.

Base Gas Station Quarterly Monitoring Recommendation – The BCT discussed this site in November 2002, and last month. After further consideration of the data, both ADEM and EPA support NFA and

unrestricted reuse. Shaw will issue the SI report with recommendation for NFA and unrestricted reuse.

Former Decon Complex – The BCT concurred with recommendations for NFA and unrestricted reuse for the northern half of this site (JPA); the southern half (National Guard) will receive recommendation for a RI. Doyle suggested that the report include a paragraph describing the transfer of responsibility to the Guard.

Impact Area South of the POW Training Facility – The BCT reviewed this site as early as May 2002, and again in July 2002. Shaw's PRA and PERA showed potential risks for residential reuse, however the industrial reuse scenario presents acceptable risk. Doyle asked if the BCT could visit the site the following day after the visits to the Choccolocco Corridor sites. He also suggested that the Army consider a removal of soils and then resample. Jeanne pointed out that the property would still require a LUC to manage groundwater exposure.

30-60-90% Updates – Josh provided updates on the RIs at T-6, T-5, T-38, T-24, and Landfill #3. He also briefed the BCT on the resampling of the potable water well at SOTS on Pelham Range. The pump has been removed, the well has been redeveloped, and is scheduled for resampling next week. The well is 178 feet deep. He also provided an update on the well spring survey. The Army has received a good response to the survey mailing. The next step is to go door-to-door to question the well owners about their well usage.

Weaver Groundwater – Doyle noted that the Mayor of Weaver presented the results of Weaver's groundwater study to the RAB, and there was no hydraulic connection with McClellan's groundwater. Weaver's study shows groundwater flowing to the southeast, parallel to McClellan's flowing to the northwest. The Mayor's concern is that McClellan's groundwater could be making a "U-turn" and flowing back into Weaver's groundwater supply.

Laboratory Artifacts – During a RAB presentation, acetone and methylene chloride were referred to as common laboratory artifacts. Doyle wants all references to laboratory artifacts to be substantiated by conclusive evidence such as quality control blanks or field procedures.

Slip Pages – Discussions between ADEM and the Army resulted in ADEM requesting slip pages from the Army for document revisions in order to save filing space. ADEM keeps all iterations of each document and does not discard versions that are superceded by updated iterations. Jeanne explained that Shaw provides slip pages when it makes sense to do so, that is, when slip pages are a relatively simple update to an existing document. She pointed out that slip pages require the document owner to find the previous document, follow the instructions for replacement, and also replace covers and spines. In addition, Shaw must prepare not only revisions to the document, but also detailed instructions for each recipient to do the replacements. Philip explained that ADEM wants the slip pages to show the original text with colored strike-throughs, followed by replacement text. The project team discussed this request and overwhelmingly expressed the group opinion that this was not a viable option for the amount of documents and changes the team reviews. Doyle indicated that EPA does not want to see documents like that. Ron indicated he had not understood ADEM to be requesting red line changes. All were in agreement that redlining the succession of document changes as ADEM appeared to be requesting would result in documents that would be very difficult to follow, particularly if the document undergoes extensive iterative changes such as the GSA Warehouse SI Report, or the Landfill EE/CA. Philip will

talk further to Steve Cobb about this issue.

Ecological Risk Cleanup Levels for Small Arms Ranges – EPA would like to propose alternative cleanup levels for the small arms ranges based on actions at other facilities. Ron wants CHPPM to be part of the discussion. The Army and EPA will work out the meeting details.

JPA Update – The JPA and Army have met to facilitate the early transfer of properties. The JPA needs to get the draft ESCA (Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement) to the Army in May. ADEM is working with the JPA to get a Consent Agreement accomplished. Ron indicated there would also be a meeting between Tom Lederle and Tier III (Jon Johnston and Steve Cobb).

National Wildlife Refuge Plans – Ron distributed the transfer timelines to the group and indicated that the draft LUCIPs have also been given to ADEM and EPA. He indicated there is a lot of positive communication taking place between the Army and USF&WS.

Former Decon Area South of Toxic Gas Area – This half-acre site was previously used in the 60s for chemical decontamination training activities. Parsons completed a CWM investigation and found no CWM in the area. SI data showed 6 metals exceeding SSSLs in subsurface soils. Results were within SSSLs or background for surface soils and groundwater. Philip suggested additional sampling and then perform a PRA. Doyle wants the Army to collect more samples to determine nature and extent of metals contamination. Jeanne responded that the metals do not necessarily indicate contamination; their concentrations above SSSLs was sporadic and at varying depths. Ron also indicated the reason for examining this site is because of Army decon training, not anything that would result in metals contamination in soil. Bill Garland also indicated that the Cane Creek furnace had been located within half a mile of the site; it would not be unexpected to find metals in the area, since they were mined in the past. ADEM and EPA will not concur to the recommendation for no further investigation and land use control for military reuse or to perform a PRA to evaluate unrestricted reuse.

Former Toxic Gas Area – This is a 300-acre area on Pelham Range proposed for military training reuse by the National Guard. SI data indicates presence of chlorinated solvents in groundwater, also metals in soils. Shaw recommended remedial investigation and the BCT concurred with the recommendation. The MOA between the Army and the National Guard indicates that further work at this site is the responsibility of the National Guard. Shaw will prepare the SI report and include text that indicates transition of this site to the Guard. Doyle recommended a Pelham-Range wide ecological risk assessment for consideration by the Guard. The project team also decided that it makes sense to address the site as one unit. Shaw will prepare one SI report recommending further investigation for all the sites within the Toxic Gas Area. Jeanne suggested the BCT consider inclusion of the Former Decon Area South of the Toxic Gas Area, since that half-acre site is contiguous to the Toxic Gas Area, and the BCT wants further investigation of that site as well. The BCT agreed with that recommendation too.

Ranges West of Iron Mountain Road – The BCT has reviewed these sites previously beginning in October 2001, when initial SI results were presented. Shaw presented a PRA in April 2002, and performed two additional rounds of groundwater sampling that were presented respectively to the BCT in August 2002 and now at this meeting. Greg recapped the chronology of the investigation and summarized the data and the BCT's deliberations and directions throughout the course of the SI. The SI encompassed 19 parcels on 766 acres, and the Army collected 217 soil samples, 55 groundwater

samples, 19 surface water samples, and 19 sediment samples. Chemical analyses included metals, explosives, perchlorate, and VOCs. After reviewing the previous and most recent resample data, the BCT concurred with the recommendation for NFA and unrestricted reuse for all parcels, except 114Q-X and 221Q-X. Parcel 114Q-X will undergo a remedial investigation to address lead in surface soils, and 221Q-X will be included in the RI/FS for the Small Arms Ranges at Iron Mountain Road. Shaw will prepare a SI report recommending NFA with unrestricted reuse for the remaining parcels.

RAB Meetings – Doyle noted that some members of the RAB ask very detailed technical questions. At the last meeting, a request was made for some information that had been previously provided. Doyle suggested another briefing on the hydrology/geology at Landfill #3 again to address any existing questions or concerns. Josh indicated his understanding that the RAB was looking for more information from Weaver; the Army had provided its current interpretation. Ron indicated that new information is currently being collected. Miki suggested sending the RAB member a copy of the package on Landfill #3. Josh will email the presentation and pdf files to Ron; Ron will send it to RAB members who have expressed an interest in seeing it again.

Geochemical Evaluations – Shaw will list issues surrounding this topic and send to Ron. Ron will forward the list to Doyle and Philip. Jeanne indicated her opinion that this topic is separate from the small arms ranges proposal that Sharon has previously made, and that it should not be included in the meeting Sharon proposed, since it involves different people to address it. She indicated her understanding that the purpose of the meeting Sharon proposed was for the Army to listen to EPA's presentation of work at other small arms ranges within wildlife refuges, and to hear EPA's proposal for cleanup of the small arms ranges based on the work done at other sites. Jeanne also stated that it appeared the risk assessment subcommittee needed clearer direction from the BCT as to what it was to accomplish. The last conference call they had did not result in any resolution of the issues surrounding implementation of the geochemical evaluations as a tool to evaluate background values.

March BCT Meeting – The BCT agreed to cancel the March meeting due to Philip's workload. The BCT will meet in the future according to the schedule indicated below.

Alabama Forestry Commission – Linda Breland and Richard Cumbie, representing the Alabama Forestry Commission, joined the meeting prior to the scheduled site walks to the Choccolocco Corridor sites. Ron stated that the Army's lease on the property had expired and the Army was no longer using the properties. Richard replied that the Forestry Commission still had not released the Army from the lease. Ron and Glynn indicated they would provide reports for SIs that have already been accomplished. Ron indicated that the Army has a right-of-entry to the properties, and asked that logging activities be curtailed as the extensive disturbance of the soils renders any investigations by the Army useless. Richard indicated that the area continues to be managed as a wildlife management area where hunting is permitted. Ron stated that hunting is no problem, but wanted to know why those activities were happening if the Army hadn't been released from the lease. Richard indicated that hunting was an allowable activity under the lease. Ron stated that the Army would address any cleanup activities under BRAC program funding, not FUDS. Richard asked why the Choccolocco Corridor was the last priority for funding, and Ron said he expected to get the funding for the remedial investigations, but that he does not establish the priorities. Richard expressed some of the Commission's concerns, for example, timber and harvesting constitutes a part of their budget. There is also some discussion about trading some lands with the USF&W service.

The group then departed for the site visits to the Choccolocco Corridor sites. After visiting those sites, the BCT also visited the Impact Area South of the POW Training Area, as Doyle had requested the previous day. During inspection of the site, Doyle reiterated his desire that the Army consider a cleanup or removal of soils at the site.

Future Meetings (3-month look ahead) – Small Arms Ranges meeting on February 28 in Alpharetta, RAB meetings on March 17 and April 21, BCT only on March 18 and April 22, Project Team meeting April 23-24 @ ADEM office in Montgomery, RAB meeting on May 19, Project Team meeting on May 20-21 @ Ft. McClellan, RAB meeting on June 16, Project Team meeting @ Ft. McClellan on June 17-18.

***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>
03/1/2	Philip	Feb 03	SNR	Submit clarified ADEM concurrence letter on the Agent ID Area.
03/1/3	Philip	Feb 03	Done	Have ADEM UXO contractor perform site walk on parcel 247Q before ADEM concurrence to NFA; also talk to Ben about groundwater issues as well.
03/1/4	Josh	Feb 03	Done	Check to see if there is water in the dry wells at Parcel 247Q.
03/1/5	Josh	Feb 03	Done	Coordinate groundwater subcommittee evaluation of acetone issue at the Former Decon Complex. Report to BCT in February.
03/1/6	Philip	Feb 03	SNR	Discuss need for additional well at Range K with Ben.
03/1/7	Philip	Feb 03	SNR	Review Soldiers' Chapel Removal Report in light of written comments on the SI report for discussion during February BCT meeting.
03/2/1	Doyle	Mar 03	SNR	Email Ron on risk assessment subcommittee.
03/2/2	Philip	Apr 03	SNR	Discuss slip page issue with Steve Cobb and report back to BCT.
03/2/3	Josh	Mar 03	SNR	Provide Ron with landfill presentation and pdf files for RAB.
03/2/4	Ron	Mar 03	SNR	Provide RAB members (who want it) with landfill presentation and information.
03/2/5	Jeanne	Mar 03	SNR	Provide Ron with list of issues on geochemical evaluation.

SNR=Status Next Report

ATTACHMENT E  
FACILITATOR NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

**Meeting Summary**

The BCT met on February 11-12, 2003, at Ft. McClellan. The meeting took place in the general context of large-scale property transfer and coming changes for the BCT. The two major forces are the JPA's coming privatization of 4700 acres and the transfer this spring of property to the Fish and Wildlife Service for its wildlife refuge.

The tone of the meeting on the first day was fine, especially since the agenda included a variety of comments and responses that needed to be resolved. Jim Grassiano of ADEM was present, and he and Philip contributed to a discussion marked by professionalism and collaboration. In the afternoon, the BCT made a series of decisions on various sites and in several instances found creative solutions to procedural complexities. There was time at the end of the day to deal with many items that had been put in the Parking Lot.

The second day included an afternoon series of site visits in the Choccolocco Corridor (and an orientation for guests from the Alabama Forestry Commission and the JPA) and another site which had produced disagreement about further action. In the morning, focusing on two Pelham Range sites, the BCT dealt well with conflicting opinions, and afterwards Jeanne Yacoub proposed rolling the two sites together for the remedial investigation, a suggestion others quickly agreed to.

I think the single most important decision the team made in this meeting was to formalize its expectations of the various risk assessors. This process had begun last month, when several risk assessors had attended the meeting, but a subsequent conference call among the assessors had not produced the kind of agreement that enabled them to make recommendations to the BCT. At first BCT members dealt with this issue by blaming and defending (depending on their perspective) and then took a larger view, agreeing to create a risk assessment subcommittee – much like the groundwater group – and to give the risk assessors a clear charge including the BCT's expectation of ongoing communication among subcommittee members. If this new group fulfills its role, it will be a major help to the BCT in the complex decisions ahead. Even though the discussion ended in general agreement, it left a sour taste for team members and may have led to the team's foregoing its usual check-out at the end of the day. There were things to be learned from the meeting, most of which was productive and amicable, and I urge the BCT to return to its usual procedures in its next meeting.

ATTACHMENT F  
Ted Simon Review of ADEM Comment Response #12  
Motor Pool Area 1500

It is a great misfortune for the field of risk assessment that spreadsheets have introduced the notion of false precision. Because of the flawed and incorrect manner in which spreadsheets format the results of calculation, many practitioners of engineering and science have lost touch with the concept of significant figures.

The number of significant figures associated with a value is reflective of the uncertainty around that value. Reference doses are the noncancer toxicity values used to calculate HI values. As Paul Goetchius indicated, the reference dose for any chemical has an associated uncertainty of at least an order of magnitude. Reference doses are developed with so-called "uncertainty factors." Basically, any lack of knowledge or extrapolation requires dividing the threshold dose by 10. The combined effect of uncertainty factors when creating a reference dose is to make the observed no effect level in animals up to 10,000 times smaller when applied to humans.

If one thinks about actual human thresholds for adverse effects rather than the protective RfD, then an HI of 1 could be more realistically a value of 0.1 or 0.01 or even 0.0001. Hence, it makes no sense to argue about the second and third significant digit when the uncertainty in the number is so great.

Regarding the guidance RAGS, Paul Goetchius is correct in his interpretation of RAGS. The HI calculated as 1.23 is presented as 1 - using correctly a single significant digit.