



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION IX

75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

1995 APR -7 PM 1:21

M60050.001778  
MCAS EL TORO  
SSIC # 5090.3

April 3, 1995

From: Bonnie Arthur, <sup>BA</sup>RPM  
Jane Diamond, Chief, Navy Section  
To: Addressee List

Enclosed please find the meeting minutes from the March 17, 1995 teambuilding for the MCAS El Toro project team. Thank you for your participation and continued commitment to this project.

- Addressee: Mr. Juan Jimenez, DTSC
- Mr. Larry Vitale, RWQCB
- Mr. Dana Sakamoto, SW DIV
- Mr. Joseph Joyce, MCAS El Toro
- Mr. Jason Ashman, SW DIV
- Mr. Dante Tedaldi, Bechtel
- Mr. Andy Piszkin, SW DIV
- Ms. Alice Gimeno, DTSC

Enclosure

NOTES FROM MCAS EL TORO MEETING, MARCH 17, 1995

**Attendees**

Navy: Dana Sakamoto, Joseph Joyce, Jason Ashman  
Cal/EPA: Alice Gimeno, Juan Jimenez, Larry Vitale  
EPA: Jane Diamond, Bonnie Arthur  
Bechtel: Dante Tedaldi  
Facilitator: Tony Lewis

Reminder of **team charter** from Oct. 1994: Maximize restoration and reuse by 1999; fast track remediation of MCAS El Toro to expedite reuse and protect human health and the environment.

**Team Meetings**

Characteristics of a MCAS El Toro technical meeting that went well (was efficient and effective):

- 1) Started and stopped on time
- 2) Organized
- 3) Agenda issued approx. a week in advance
- 4) Right issues
- 5) Right attendees
- 6) Grouping of topics completed and distributed by Navy's contractor with agenda

Problems with some MCAS El Toro meetings:

- 1) Insufficient advance notice of meeting dates
- 2) Different expectations related to information sharing vs. decision making
- 3) Agencies not having unified positions makes it difficult to make decisions
- 4) Decisions that don't stick; changes by management after the meeting
- 5) Meeting scheduling responsibilities
- 6) Not enough buy-in developing agendas; agendas being changed
- 7) Responsibility for developing agendas and getting them out on time
- 8) Having the right people there
- 9) Unrealistic agendas; too many items for the amount of time allotted
- 10) Agendas not being issued 7 days in advance of meetings
- 11) No structure for decision-making process
- 12) Action items from prior meeting are not checked for completion
- 13) Focus on people and positions, not on the interest/issue
- 14) Contractors aren't prepared
- 15) Attendees don't follow ground rules

- 16) Agencies not ready for meeting (positions are not unified)

Agreements on actions to improve meetings:

- 1) Agendas: Agenda should be largely set for the next meeting at the end of the current meeting or during a conference call. Navy is responsible for the agendas for project team meetings, including BCT/RPM meetings. If the BCT decides to meet alone (which is not currently anticipated), whoever calls the meeting will be responsible for the agenda.
- 2) Facilitation: For now a facilitator should be present at every meeting. If not needed for any particular meeting, the group can decide by consensus not to have one. SWDIV is working on a contract to secure facilitation services for SWDIV in general which can be used for El Toro. Jason will update the team on the status of the contract. Facilitator to be involved in meeting planning, reminding about ground rules, conflict resolution. If a regulator is doing the logistics for a meeting, s/he can ask the Navy to provide a facilitator.
- 3) Calling meetings: The entire BCT needs to be involved in determining the necessity of meetings on any given topic(s). Meetings should generally be held to engage in dialogue on issues and make decisions, not simply for information-sharing (such as contractor presenting information on a report they've just developed/distributed).
- 4) Meeting preparation: Regulators will attempt to coordinate within and across their organizations before scheduled meetings or calls with the Navy and its contractors to develop a consolidated message so that regulatory positions are clear. Regulators agreed to continue to use "regulator breaks" during meetings to provide clear oversight.
- 5) Meeting minutes: Navy will get minutes out in 7 days, possibly utilizing a laptop during meetings to expedite. Comments due back to Navy in 7 days (can be extended 7 days in extenuating circumstances), by fax or verbal dialogue (not by voice mail). Minutes will be revised, as necessary, and finalized within 7 days of last receipt of comments. (EPA agreed to prepare minutes from today's meeting.)
- 6) Conference calls in lieu of meetings: There was discussion of holding biweekly conference calls for now since few meetings are planned. First one scheduled for 3/21. Others will be set as needed (to be determined at the end of each call), depending on meeting frequency and items needing attention. Navy RPMs will be included on the calls. Logistics (setting agendas for calls, minutes, arranging the call) will be rotated among Joseph, Bonnie and Juan. Bonnie offered to set up the 3/21 call.
- 7) Monitoring meetings: We developed an evaluation checklist to be used at the conclusion of each meeting (see attached). The completed checklist will be given to Alice, Dana and Jane by the BCT to keep management informed of team productivity and unresolved issues. We'll continue to

consider other mechanisms for monitoring of meetings and project team functioning.

- 8) Ground rules: We agreed to add the following to the list of ground rules developed in 10/94: Stay for the full meeting and start on time. We also decided we didn't recall what was meant by the existing ground rule of "use control limits." The complete list of Ground Rules is attached.

### **Roles, Responsibilities and Lines of Communication**

Dante Tedaldi: Dante's contract allows him contact with any regulator for technical support. Dante will take responsibility for informing other regulators regarding information discussed, as appropriate. He will also notify Navy/regulators if he is not receiving documents. He will be reviewing all documents regulators review.

Joseph Joyce: Regulators **must** work through Joseph for each onsite visit for Marine Corps notification/coordination and health and safety reasons. Call Joseph and leave a message if he's not there as he checks voicemail frequently. Discussed ways of minimizing the logistics for these visits. Call Joseph first and if this does not work we will look at other options. Also, Joseph will evaluate team's workload prior to requesting regulator presentations for the RAB (other than basic agency presentations). Contractors may have to give more presentations if regulators are too busy reviewing documents. Regulators will try to accommodate RAB presentation requests, particularly those made by the community.

#### Misc. team contact:

Individuals can talk to each other (e.g., 1 BCT member can talk to a contractor without a representative from every other organization being present). The initiator of such a conversation should notify the rest of the BCT when 1) a recommendation is being proffered or 2) another BCT member could be expected to be interested in and/or benefit from the discussion.

Jason has requested that his contractors (CLEAN II) call and talk to regulators, or leave 2 messages, after each document is submitted, to answer questions and facilitate issue identification and resolution. The contractors will inform Jason of these conversations.

The RAC contractors do not have \$\$ in contract to respond to regulators' questions. CLEAN I and II do have this \$\$ available.

**Priorities/Strategy for MCAS El Toro over the next 6-9 months  
(in no particular order):**

Phase 2 OU2/3 workplan  
Revised OU1 FS  
Submittal date for 6 remaining EE/CAS to agencies??  
(EE/CAS will be ready 4/24)  
Draft Final OU1 RI  
Draft RFA (short-term)  
Fieldwork  
QAPP  
new removals (leaking USTs, OU 2 and 3 sites)  
CRP update  
Draft Final GWMP (4 monitoring intervals)  
OU1 ARARs; State expects to submit them by 4/10/95  
Update BCP Appendix A, Ch. 5 when funding becomes more certain  
CERFA/EBS (short-term)  
Alton Parkway  
FFA negotiations (done)  
RAB support  
Tank 398 (Draft Final)  
UST Site Assessments

All agreed that it is optimal to target more Operable Unit 3 sites for removal actions. Regulators will consider this during review of Phase II workplan and this may be discussed on 4/25.

Navy may have better idea of funding after 3/22. Navy will notify regulators. Known funding to date covers all of items under #1 above, except: implementation of the 7 removal actions for which EE/CAS have already been funded, OU3 RI fieldwork, new removals, and implementation of the GWMP.

**Meeting Evaluation**

- 1) Orally went through the checklist we developed but didn't record results.
- 2) List of accomplishments:
  - Protocol for agendas, meetings, meeting minutes
  - Consensus on interactions
  - Clarified lines of communication and roles
  - Developed monitoring system
  - Built trust; practiced communication
  - Management involvement
  - Good participation/input
  - Jason was a star!
  - Clarified procedures for access to base
  - Listed highest priorities for site
  - Agreed on Jason's flow diagram for decisionmaking (attached)

**NCAS EL TORO GROUND RULES**  
(updated 3/17/95)

- 1) Use "time out" if needed to clarify organizational opinions
- 2) Stay on time
- 3) One person speaks at a time
- 4) No side talk
- 5) Everyone participates
- 6) Commit to goals, stay focussed
- 7) Use control limits
- 8) RPMs need to attend meetings
- 9) No retribution
- 10) Create an "issues" sheet
- 11) Honesty and candidness
- 12) No hidden agendas
- 13) Timely information free-flow
- 14) \_\_\_\_\_ telephone
- 15) Commit to meeting
- 16) Start on time
- 17) Stay for the full meeting

**MCAS EL TORO MEETING EVALUATION CHECKLIST**

AREA OF EVALUATION	Y/N	COMMENTS: WHO, WHAT
Ground rules followed: -Start on time -Stay on time -Stay for full meeting -One person speaks -All participate -No side talk -Stay focussed -Right people there -Honesty/candidness -No hidden agendas -No retribution -Use "time out" -Timely info. flow -Create issues bin		
Realistic agenda issued 7 days in advance		
Prior meeting minutes out in 7 days		
Facilitator present and effective		
Agencies coordinated		
Contractors prepared		
On-time return from lunch and breaks		
Agenda reviewed at meeting start		
Cooperation evident among participants		
Prior meeting action items covered		
Sense of accomplishment		

List accomplishments:

---



---



---

List unresolved issues and indicate the number of meetings after which they've remained unresolved:

---



---



---