

NAS JAX Partnering Team Meeting
Swissotel-Atlanta, Georgia

32212-000
22.02.00.0007

Minutes May 31, June 1, 2, 1994

Members: Peter Redfern- ABB (Chairperson)
Jorge Caspary- FDEP
Catherine Perry- ABB Environmental (Consultant)
Tom Trainor- ABB Environmental
James Hudson- EPA
AnnMarie Weaver- ABB Environmental (Consultant)
Miriam Lareau- NAS JAX (Support)
Joel Murphy- SODIV
Kevin Gartland- NAS JAX
Dana Gaskins- SODIV
Gayle Waldron- Management Edge (Facilitator)
Wandy Browne- Management Edge (Facilitator)

Tier II Link: Mickey Hartnett- EPA Region IV (Present June 2
for approx. 40
min.)

Guests: Harry Doo- SoDiv, Contracts (9:00 am
COTR-Contracts Thursday, June
Officer Technical 2, 1994)
Representative
Debbie Davidson- EPA, Contract Officer
Doug Thompson- EPA, Project Manager

Meeting Commenced: 11:20 am May 31, 1994

Mission

To Structure and implement an effective program that achieves prompt environmental restoration at NAS Jacksonville, that will be a model for similar efforts elsewhere.

Agenda

- I. Opening Activities:
 - A. Team ground Rules were read aloud
 - B. Correct Meeting Minutes from March 16 and 17, 1994 (discussion stating that minutes should be distributed within 10 days after the meeting is held)
 - C. Joel Murphy stressed the need to begin every meeting in a similar manner.
 - D. Opening Format (Adopted only as a Guideline to Develop OUR OWN FORMAT)
 1. Team Huddle
 2. Introduction of Non-Team Members

3. Meeting Roles (Gatekeeper, Chairperson, etc.)
 4. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes
 5. Check-in (with time limit)
 6. Agenda
 7. Prioritized agenda
 8. Meeting Goals
 9. Start Discussion
- E. Closing Format - Needs to be developed
- F. Networking - Communication and Sharing of information
1. Action Item- Kevin Gartland is going to laminate a card with all of our phone numbers on it.
 2. Action Item- Jorge Caspray is going to bring to the next meeting current copies of applicable Florida State Regulations for general distribution.
- G. Review of Ground Rules
1. The team recognized that if the ground rules were not working, then either the ground rules or the teams behavior need to be changed.
 2. James Hudson recommended that #17 be modified.

II. Preparation for Tier II Meeting

- A. Mr. Hudson suggested that the meeting scheduled between Tier II and the NAS JAX Team would be a time to express issues and to get feedback concerning our progress.
1. The Team decided to do a short presentation for Tier II which would outline our shortcomings and the measurable methods we propose to correct them, as well as our successes (i.e. improvement plan). We would also state items that we want to accomplish. Peter Redfern was elected as the spokesperson.
 2. The Team also felt that guidance from Tier II was needed because there seemed to be discrepancies in the Team's understanding of their role. The Team also wanted to reiterate their perception of Tier II's role.
 3. Goals-Clarification of Team Building Rules/Edicts from TierII:

- a. Clarify the flexibility of team building, because we recognized that each team is different.
 - b. Receive guidance regarding risk management as it effects the Site Management Plan and the Execution Plan.
 - c. Clarify Tier II's perception of the RAC role in partnering and involvement in CLEAN III (SoDiv and the ROICC roles?).
 - d. Define Tier II's expectations of Jax team re: activities beyond our "station" (i.e. training).
 - e. Obtain specific suggestions for a solution regarding the CERCLA/RCRA concerns at:
 1. Cecil Field Waste Tank
 2. JAX Plating Shop
 3. JAX Pesticide UST
- B. Joel Murphy would like to request that we receive copies of Tier II's meeting minutes.
- C. The Team will prepare a written list of issues that need to be answered, and present it to TIER II.
- D. Brief outline of presentation the Team prepared for Tier II:
1. Challenges/Problems
 - personality conflicts
 - lack of trust
 - lack of commitment re: past decisions
 - lack of conflict resolution process
 - lack of group ownership of the project
 2. Solutions
 - Develop Team Charter and Flow Chart to guide us in overcoming our challenges by the next partnering meeting (June 30, 1994)
 - We will present the finalized Team Charter to Tier II on June 30, 1994
 - Finalize our Conflict Resolution process and present this to Tier II on June 30th
 - Review MBTI and resulting personality definitions to assist in Conflict Resolution "(However, we realize that these are just personality TYPES and that the TYPES should NOT predict BEHAVIOR)"
 - Finalize the Site Management Plan by August 30, 1994.
 - Our July Partnering meeting is in Tallahassee so we should be able to get

Kevin Lundgren to assist us.

Joel recommends that we do the footwork on the 27th of June and still take advantages of Kevin's services at the July meeting. However, time spent on SMP will be reduced because the footwork will be done.

- Once the SMP document is finished, everyone on the team is to sign off on it. All Team members signatures will indicate that there is no question of ownership, and the SMP will reflect that it is a true team document.

(Tier II's minutes from March 22, 1994 reflect that they view the SMP document as "an enforceable document which should be looked at programmatically as the teams best estimate with an understanding of flexibility."

III. Review Previous meeting notes

- A. Review of Minutes from March 16, 17, 1994- changes have been made as noted and the corrected minutes are attached.
- B. Minutes from the Partnering meeting held on May 27, 1994 were handed out on June 2, 1994.
- C. Action Item for the entire team- Everyone is to review their partnering notebook. Mission, responsibilities, guidelines, etc.

VI. Flowchart (Partnering)

- B. Mr. Trainor suggested that the Team put together a flowchart to illustrate the specific stepping stones in our improvement plan. This flowchart should include a timeframe. Jorge Caspary seconded this idea.

VII. ETC- (J. Crane/Jorge) Peter would like to discuss this item on Thursday

- A. J. Crane/ Jorge
 - 1. AnnMarie Weaver stated that in a previous meeting it was discussed that in the event either Jorge Caspary or James Hudson could not attend a partnering meeting, they could be replaced by a Tier II member for the duration

of that meeting.

2. Jorge stated that he went to his supervisors for help with this issue and received it. "The FFA states that if the RPM cannot there is an alternate." Jorge wanted clarification on the definition of a meeting. "Does a phone/ conference call constitute a meeting?"
 - a. Miriam Lareau commended Jorge for resolving his own issue, instead of putting it in front of the team for discussion.

- B. The Team recognized that we must have flexibility on this point. "The whole effort should not be stopped dead in the water just because of one person's unavoidable absence. The key word is UNAVOIDABLE. This is where trust comes in to play- we have to trust that each Team member is a professional who lives up to their responsibilities and commitments ."

IX. Subcontractors and Tier I Membership

- A. Action Item for Mickey Hartnett- We would like to get further information clarifying subcontractor responsibilities, re: potential subcontractor conflict of interest.
 1. Tier II's statements regarding this issue are found in their meeting minutes dated March 22, 1994 pages 4, 5, & 9. These minutes were distributed to us on June 2, 1994.
- B. Bechtel
 1. Joel stated that Bechtel has been contracted to:
 - a. OU1 GroundWater Extraction
 - b. OU2, 2, 41, & 43
 - c. OU3 Vapor Extraction
 - d. OU3 Radiological work

XI. Harry Doo-COTR (Contracts Officer Technical Representative)

- A. Purpose of Guest Speaker- to explain the Navy's contracting process under CLEAN I.
 1. The process usually takes 90 days, however, they are looking for ways to streamline this.
 2. Mr. Doo mentioned that he encourages an interface during partnering meetings to

discuss the scope of contracts and to improve the general process.

3. Joel stated that he feels that it is a group responsibility to narrow the details for the SOW.
4. The general feeling was that at a later date the group would discuss specific ways in which we could help Joel (SoDiv) speed this process.

Meeting Commenced 0800 June 1, 1994
Wyndham Gardens Hotel
Atlanta, Georgia

Cecil Field Team Comments

1. - Lack of feedback from Tier II
2. + Meet frequently
3. + Support one another with information
4. + Have learned to listen to one another
5. + Work as an entity
6. + Have established ground rules and a conflict resolution plan

Fillet Team Comments

1. + Chose "IRA route instead of IROD route"
2. + Team has adopted an approach to expedite RI work (this has helped them to speed on thru BRAC)
3. + Developed a meeting format
4. +/- Do not do a yearly SMP- theirs carries out to the year 2000 (however, it is redeveloped every October)
5. - Agenda covers too many issues instead of focusing on very important items only

TIER II Comments

Short Term vs. Master Planning

Short Term-	execution of immediate
Master-	build budgets for the long haul/do no incorporate great detail

Focus on Elimination of Regulatory Review Time

The Cecil Field Team talks about the document first with all players involved and puts the document together verbally- so there are no surprises

Tier II began Partnering to be able to better satisfy the regulatory agencies.

Tier II Perspective

Partnering:

1. Is about cleaning sites
2. A tool to help you in the conflict resolution process
3. A first try.
4. Successful if- you give up your authority/need to control and SHARE information
You make a commitment that it is going to work!

FFA

The FFA is only a contract; it is a vehicle to get sites clean. Each team should decide how it wants to enforce the FFA.

RISK MANAGEMENT

What are the boundaries? "x satisfies y?"

A document shouldn't define or stop progress at a site. Administrators usually give you wide latitude if you can demonstrate progress.

If you try something and it doesn't work, well, then it doesn't work! They would rather see us do something than struggle along trying to make it perfect.

"Guidance is just Guidance"

Law -	Stone
Regulations-	Stone
Guidance-	Muddy Waters

The "only" risk as they see it is deciding that you are not going to make it as a team. Tier II's point of view is that each team is responsible enough to handle their own baggage.

"You can move soil from one OU to another, remediate it, and then, move it back and if you try to group AOC's together, the answer from a regulator would most likely be yes if good explanations are provided as to why you want to group them together- it all depends on wording"

Preferred- How can we do this?

Not Preferred- Can we do this?

The only place an AOC exists is in permitting/ not in a law or

regulation

Tier II will be measuring our success very subjectively- they are not going to be setting specific measures. Each Team must provide them with the information. Tier II wants to come up with some way to reward the TEAM, not individuals.

Meeting
1500

TIER II/NAS JAX
Wyndaham Gardens Hotel
Atlanta, Georgia

Jacksonville Team

Challenges/Comments and Observations

1. Exhibits a lack of professionalism
 - No respect for each other
 - attack the person, not the problem
2. No progress made (in terms of the big picture)
3. No plan for progress
4. Not willing to give up old baggage
5. Blaming the process of partnering
6. Not using the tools given to the Team
7. Have ignored their own team norms and just about every other rule
8. Screwed-up priorities
9. Finally, at the ninth hour, they schedule meetings
10. Use the # of people involved as an excuse to avoid having meetings
11. Hung up on voting to avoid reaching consensus
12. Don't share info.
13. Covering the same ground
14. Can't informally network in a constructive manner

Tier II Comments

1. Expense (wasted)
2. Our professional success depends on this team's success
3. The JAX Team is putting all their energy into failing!
4. Silence in a meeting situation is avoidance, and if you are silent, you are equally responsible for the team's failure
5. The JAX Team needs to find a way to succeed because the people on the team will not just be moved!
6. Joel commented that he feels that partnering is a good idea, but doubts that TIER II has fully considered the resource allocation of what they are trying to accomplish.
7. TIER II's perception of the problem is that we are not making the time to meet.
 - Kevin Gartland commented that "Nothing is more important than the cleanup of NAS JAX, and that there is not a time problem."
 - Jorge Caspary volunteered that it was "not a time problem, but a scheduling problem."
 - The JAX Team admitted that they have to work with the scheduling problems because "we do not own either Jorge's or James's time."
 - James stated that he feel that he does not need to be at every single meeting and that he disagrees that his feeling indicate a lack of commitment.

8. Tier II stated that partnering meetings are necessary and that when they are scheduled they are not "1\2 a commitment."
9. Tier II suggested that the Team read the NORMS at the beginning of every meeting.
10. The Team's individual members can argue to achieve consensus, but individuals do not have the empowerment to prevent consensus.
 - An individual does not have the power to override everyone else. "Don't just be stubborn."
 - Obstinate members must have a good argument for preventing consensus, and be able to back that up. If it is not a rational or site specific argument, then it should be related to Tier II.
11. Behavior Modifications are required, however, if the JAX Team feels that this is impossible, then we should let them know.
12. The Team needs to work toward a common goal.
13. Once a consensus is reached, do not undermine the agreement- if you come up with new data that you feel negates the decision, then bring it up at the next meeting.
14. CONSENSUS = TRUST
15. It seems that the JAX Team gets lost in "the little stuff," i.e. process vs. content. Try the following approach- identify the real problem and how to solve it. (Obstinate vs. the wallflowers-both are equal partners in sabotage)
16. The team needs to work on their listening skills.
17. The team will need to unlearn the negative NORMS that have been enforced and have lead to our negative successes.
18. Tier II classifies us as a defiant group. We defy Tier II and we defy ourselves.
19. Tier II recognizes that it is not possible for everyone to develop the necessary communication skills to work in this atmosphere. However, there are consequences for failure-"The opposite of the best possible assignment is the worst possible assignment" and Tier II views partnering as the best assignment. "If you don't but into the partnering process, then there's the door."
20. Tom Trainor mentioned that he would like more Tier II influence in our meetings.
 - Tier II agreed to do so and mentioned that this has been a request of all 3 teams.

Goals

Develop Goals for the next quarter and for the next year

Team meetings should have some conclusionary format at the end.

Tier II's Closing Message:

The NAS JAX Team needs to find its own path to success. You need

to learn to rely upon and trust each other realizing that you have a common goal.

Read your norms and live by and with them!

Comments from Mickey Hartnett

June 2, 1994

1. Tier II expects immediate and sustained improvement/time frame is only a 30 day window. Tier II expects feedback at our next meeting.
2. Tier II has come to a consensus regarding the teams they are going to be expanding.
 - a. Mayport
 - b. Camp LeJune, NC.
 - c. Cherry Point, NC

They are hoping to schedule a training session in either July of August in Ashville, NC.

3. One word he wants to pass on and that is flexibility. Tier II would encourage us to keep this in mind.
4. Tier II would also like to remind us to keep in mind to only call NORMS on an individual when a real problem is encountered. "Avoid the norm game."
5. We are not to view partnering as an experiment any longer, it is how business will be conducted.

Agenda Items to be discussed

Execution Plan (DERA SCHEDULE)

Critique Charter for team from Tier II

Review SMP Schedules

"J" Values- All Samples

Base Tour...when?

Bill R. to discuss with the Base CO his interest, etc. for a meeting

Pending PSC identification (#4)

Team Personality Types based on the Myers-Briggs Test

Tom	ESTJ
Kevin	ISTJ
Joel	(ENTP) INTP
Dana	ESTJ
Miriam	ESFJ
Jorge	ESTJ
Peter	ENTJ
Wandy	ISTP
James	ISTJ