

FT. McCLELLAN BCT MEETING MINUTES
 PARTNERING SESSION #43
 ALPHARETTA, GA
 APRIL 16 - 18, 2002

AGENDA ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY	NOTES
Check In Guest Introduction and Roles	Host: Jeanne Yacoub 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 April agenda, and proceeded accordingly. Attachment C provides the draft May agenda. Attachment D provides the April meeting summary.
Accept Previous Minutes	BCT	The team reviewed the draft February 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, like the BCP, requires the BCT to set aside schedule time to address.
Facilitator Observations	David Sanderson	David Sanderson attended his twenty-fourth meeting with the team. His notes and observations are provided at Attachment E.

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF ATTENDEES
BCT SESSION #43
ALPHARETTA, GA
APRIL 16 - 18, 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)
Wayne Sartwell, Alabama Army National Guard (AL-ARNG)
Jeanne Yacoub, The IT Group (IT)
Steve Moran, IT
David Sanderson, Eagle Point Consulting
Art Holcomb, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corp. (FWENC)

Guests:

Sharon Thoms, EPA
Cheryl Nybro, Gannett Fleming
Hugh Vick, Gannett Fleming
Josh Jenkins, IT
Troy Winton, IT
Rob Zimmer, IT
Rich Prann, IT
Randy McBride, IT
Greg Sisco, IT

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 MAY AGENDA

Tuesday, May 21, 2002

0800 – 0830	Check-in	BCT
0830 – 0900	Finalize Minutes/Agenda/Action Items	BCT
0900 – 1000	Passive Diffusion Bag Sampling	IT
1000 – 1130	SI Results (Area North of MOUT, Parcels 101 and 100Q, Parcels 88Q, 102Q, and 106Q)	IT
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1330	Old Water Hole RI Work Plan	IT
1330 – 1400	Former Decon Complex (Acetone)	IT
1400 – 1430	Range 23A SI Results	IT
1430 – 1500	Toxic Gas Area SI Work Plan	IT
1500 – 1530	Former Decon Area South of Toxic Gas Area	IT
1530 – 1700	Alternative UXO Removal at Rocket City area of Eastern Bypass	CEHNC

Breaks as Needed
Dinner Plans

Wednesday, May 22, 2002

0800 – 0900	JPA Update	Miki
0900 – 1130	TBD	
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1700	TBD	

Breaks as Needed
Dinner Plans

Thursday, May 23, 2002

0800 – 1130 TBD

1130 – 1300 Lunch

1300 – 1600 TBD

1600 – 1630 Meeting Reflections

David w/BCT

Breaks as Needed

Parking Lot

Results of Ecological Risk Assessment Subgroup May Site Visit

ATTACHMENT D

MEETING SUMMARY With ACTION ITEMS

Next BCT Meeting: May 21 - 23, 2002
Ft. McClellan, AL

Primary Agenda: See Item #9

April Meeting Summary:

Check-In - Team members introduced themselves and told the group why they were at the meeting and what they wanted to achieve.

Finalize Agenda and Minutes - The BCT reviewed the February minutes, and accepted them with a few changes as final. The team reviewed the April agenda, and removed the CWM EE/CA from the agenda. The team added the following items to the parking lot for discussion pending completion of the agenda:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| ➤ Mayor of Anniston Letter | USTs |
| ➤ ALDOT Letter on Right of Way | 30-year Calculation on the Fill Areas |
| ➤ Reuse Plan | Ground Rules |
| ➤ Landfill #3 | State Lands |

Action Items - The BCT reviewed April's action items; the updates are presented in Attachment D at the end of this text. During the update of action items, Ron indicated that the Army was not "recognizing" the reuse plan Miki had provided him as an official reuse plan because it was part of a transportation study. He also indicated that the JPA is concerned about placement of lead from the ranges into Landfill 4. He wants discussions between ADEM and the JPA to include the Army.

Ecological Risk Assessment for the Iron Mountain Road Small Arms Ranges - Jeanne reviewed the proposed structure of the discussion and inquired if everyone agreed with that approach. Sharon indicated her agreement and asked about the status of the IMR Range EE/CA. Jeanne replied that the EE/CA had been put on hold pending completion of the ecological risk assessment and development of cleanup standards to which the Army, ADEM, and EPA agreed. Jeanne indicated that the cleanup levels and ecological risk assessment would then be incorporated into the EE/CA and the Army would then resume the EE/CA process. Given the team's agreement with the agenda discussion framework, Randy McBride provided a review of the range characterization data, including past and recent data collection efforts. After the characterization review, Rich Prann presented the main points of the SLERA. During Rich's discussion, Doyle suggested that Sharon and Cheryl perform a site visit to Ft. McClellan to observe the ranges. Sharon mentioned that the State of Alabama has a new Fish and Wildlife (F&W) representative, and the Army should coordinate their activities with this individual. Ron informed Sharon that Bill Garland is the F&W's representative assigned to oversee F&W's interests at Ft. McClellan, and that Bill would be invited to participate in the site visit. Ron also reminded the group that any site visit would need to be coordinated through Lisa to address OE operations and access to the

sites. Steve proposed May 13, 14, and 15 for the visit. Everyone will check their calendars and respond back to Steve.

Sharon used Rich's table of Contaminants of Potential Ecological Concern (COPECs) to lead the discussion of the group's consensus on identification of actual COPECs. Based on the SLERA results, the BCT concurred that DDT, PAHs, Be, and Ag are not COPECs. The BCT considered that As, while occurring in three ranges and Remount Creek, appeared to be widely and randomly dispersed, is prevalent at many sites on the installation, and is not used in small arms ammunition. The BCT agreed that As is within the upper range of background levels at the installation, and made a risk management decision that it is not an appropriate COPEC going forward. The BCT also concurred that Sb, Zn, Pb, and Cu are COPECs that will be carried forward in the BERA. The four COPECs, Sb, Zn, Pb, and Cu, are for soils. Pb was a COPEC in surface water. There might possibly be one or more COPECs in sediment. Sharon indicated that if biological studies were planned for sediments that the preference would be to keep borderline chemicals in as COPECs, especially if they were in the same suite of chemical analysis as COCs. Rich asked where EPA would prefer to see the "lines of evidence" discussion. Sharon suggested putting it in the SLERA and the group agreed with that recommendation. The project team then reviewed the comments and responses to ensure that all issues were resolved. The only change to the responses was an agreement by the team that groundwater will be screened against surface water criteria as a potential ecological exposure point. Groundwater will also be screened against background values, and the discussion will be included in the uncertainty section of the SLERA. The team also agreed that future documents will not reference body-weight scaling of toxicity reference values...but existing documents do not have to be changed, since the values are only provided as information, and are not used in any fashion. The BCT also agreed to find and distribute to EPA the assessment report regarding the gray bat habitat that was prepared by the Army and to which FWS and ADEM had agreed.

Rob presented the proposal for the IMR Problem Formulation. The team agreed that IT will generate a Step 3 Problem Formulation followed by Step 4 Study Design Plan (locations, number of samples). Rob asked whether the team agreed on Habitat/Media. The team agreed to Rob's recommendations including exclusion of the range fans from further consideration. The project team discussed incorporation of other lines of evidence in addition to the statistically significant higher lead in safety fans, such as configuration of topography and the fact that low concentrations mean no unacceptable risk, as reasons not to continue the assessment of the safety fans. Doyle stressed that Army should not claim that safety fans were risk free. Rob asked for consensus on the Assessment Endpoints. The team agreed to 1A, suggested that 1B needed some rewording to include a population endpoint, and 1C needs to replace carnivorous mammals with insectivorous/omnivorous birds. For freshwater streams, the team agreed to Assessment Endpoint 2A, and determined that 2B was too general and needed to be changed to an avian insectivore and to also add amphibians. The group discussed this and decided that further discussion and the site visit would help to resolve the issue. Sharon indicated the endpoints may need a 2C reflecting protection of aquatic insectivorous mammals, ie., the gray bat. Rob indicated that the Army did not want to collect the gray bat...so a backup endpoint reflecting insectivorous/omnivorous birds was discussed. Rob indicated that the environmental setting was low quality foraging habitat, and suggested that the write-up emphasize that feature to justify omission of the aquatic insectivorous mammal. During this discussion, Doyle suggested that the risk assessors form a technical subgroup to develop recommendations that the BCT could then evaluate and make decisions. The team agreed to this suggestion, but also noted that it would be implemented going forward after this meeting's deliberations, since all the members were already present.

The team agreed that Rob, Rich, Sharon, and Cheryl would form a task group and work out Steps 3 and 4 for presentation to the BCT in May. Rich has responsibility for coordinating the task group's work efforts.

Randy then provided a characterization summary for the Bains Gap Road ranges. Sharon noted that she had only received the BGR SLERA the previous week and therefore didn't have written comments on it. Doyle suggested that all the discussion on the IMR ranges should be applied to the BGR ranges. Rich agreed noting that the terrestrial habitat, the contaminants, and the terrestrial receptors were the same. Rich did point out that the aquatic habitat for BGR is different than IMR because the creek at BGR is a perennial stream, whereas the creek at IMR is ephemeral.

The risk assessment site visit was proposed for May 8-10.

JPA Update - Miki informed the team that the JPA will undertake a UST removal project for 10 USTs because lending institutions will not finance property with USTs. The JPA contractor, CDG, will subcontract the UST removal; the first pull will address 10 USTs. (If contamination is discovered during excavation of the USTs, the Army will clean it up).

The JPA Board approved CDG to design an industrial road from Hwy 21 into the Reilly Lake area.

Miki indicated that landfills are a major concern for the JPA. She stated that the data and work quality is not an issue, but the long-term liability issues associated with the Army's recommended solutions troubles the JPA. JPA would like to see consolidation of the fill areas into a lined cell in landfill 4 with long-term monitoring. The JPA has requested a 60-day time extension on the EE/CA and would also like to meet with Army representatives to review the risk assumptions. The earliest date for a meeting would be the second week in May.

Miki indicated that the JPA has developed an updated reuse plan. Ron said the Army has not recognized the plan because it is only a map. The Army has requested some details.

CWM Sites SI Results, Parcels 180, 182, 511, 512, 513, 514, and 516 - SI data for these sites shows some VOCs in groundwater. IT recommended further investigations to provide nature and extent information. The Army has enough funding in place to develop RI work plans. IT proposed not issuing a final SI report, but rather providing RI work plans that incorporate the SI data presented at the meeting. Doyle wants to be able to administratively close out the SI effort. Jeanne asked if the RI work plan with the SI data couldn't be used to accomplish the administrative closeout of the SI. Doyle indicated that he thought it could. This area is the Auburn University area, and Ron mentioned that transfer may be complicated by the RI. Auburn has leased 125 acres for dog kennels, with the promise for more land in the near future. The BCT agreed to a RI work plan that would be titled "SI Report and RI Work Plan".

Naylor Field T-6, Parcel 183 - Data for this parcel shows VOCs in groundwater. IT recommended a RI for this parcel. This property is also part of the Auburn proposed reuse. The BCT concurred with the recommendation and agreed to use the same reporting strategy as for the CWM Sites above.

T-31, Parcels 184 and 185 - Philip suggested quarterly monitoring for a year to monitor VOCs in groundwater. Doyle indicated his support for NFA for the groundwater. Doyle's concern is with the metals in the surface

and depositional soils. Steve indicated that Range 31 is north of this area and there will be a lot of samples associated with that SI. The BCT can use the data from the Range 31 SI to evaluate the soil. The BCT agreed to one year of quarterly monitoring of groundwater, plus soil data from Range 31. Ron wants to examine the data before one year with the BCT evaluating each quarter's data.

Old Toxic Training Area, Parcel 188 - Based on the SI data, IT recommended NFA. The BCT concurs with the NFA recommendation and wants a PRA included in the final report. The BCT would also like an analogous "preliminary" ecological risk assessment in the final SI report.

Agent ID Area, Parcel 509 - Based on the SI data, IT recommended NFA. The BCT concurred with the NFA and wants a strong justification written in the final SI report, but does not want a PRA.

CBR Proficiency Area, Parcel 517 - Based on the SI data, IT recommended NFA. The BCT concurred with the NFA.

Former Motor Pool Area 3100, Parcel 146 - In August, 2001, the BCT recommended quarterly monitoring at this site for BTEX. One well, PPMP-146-MW02 showed a slight increase in benzene (above MCLs). This well is adjacent to a UST at the site. Ron indicated that the current UST is an upgraded UST that replaced a previous UST (1990s timeframe). This site is in the Auburn area, and was likely a gasoline UST location. Doyle suggested that this UST is a good candidate for a removal. Ron indicated the UST is not the problem; Doyle clarified that it would be acceptable to remove soil as well as the UST. Ron thinks it may have been the pipelines to the UST. Philip said it's still a source area. Ron asked if the UST and soil are removed, will the Army be able to eliminate the monitoring requirements for groundwater. Doyle indicated that if the Army removes the source, there would still be some monitoring required, certainly confirmatory sampling. Ron wants to be able to FOST the property. IT was asked to prepare a work plan for the removal action. The Army will need to obtain funding for this effort. The work plan will address removal of the UST, contaminated soils, and piping, and monitoring. Doyle wants the Army to perform the interim removal action (IRA), and write the SI report, incorporating the IRA into the SI report. Philip will check with ADEM to see if there are risk-based levels for closure at gas station sites.

Base Service Station, Parcels 21 and 22 - Philip indicated this site is a classic illustration of natural attenuation. Doyle wants to see 2 more quarters of sampling. Philip will check with ADEM on this site as well. Ron wants to get out of the monitoring business and transfer the property. Contamination appears to be localized and is not reaching the pond to the northwest of the site. Concentrations are very low, and the contamination appears to be attenuating.

Landfill #3 - Josh provided an update on activities at LF #3, and presented the January 2002 monitoring data. Miki indicated the concern by the Mayor of Weaver that contamination will contaminate the City of Weaver's water supply wells. Josh pointed out that recent groundwater monitoring data by the City of Weaver shows the wells to be uncontaminated by LF #3. Philip would like to know if the landfill lies within the water table. Steve responded that all the borings and trenches have been dry. Philip noted that Alabama has been experiencing a drought for several years and lack of water in the borings and trenches does not mean that in the past the water table couldn't have been higher. OLF G03 showed water at about 22'; G07 had water at about 51'. The fill area is likely to be 15-18' deep. IT will collect another round of groundwater data and will report back to the BCT.

Ranges West of IMR - The BCT addressed these sites in October, 2001, and at that meeting, requested a PRA to support the NFA recommendation. Greg reviewed the sites and data with the BCT. Doyle wants to see if the hot spots can be reduced or eliminated through an interim removal. After much discussion, the team decided that IT would resample at the hot spots and check remedial alternatives to address the groundwater issues...Doyle suggested bio-remediation for the explosives, and a remedy for the antimony. IT will perform the additional sampling without a work plan.

Ground Scar with Small Pit North of LF #3 - The BCT discussed this site in May, 2001, and concurred with the recommendation for NFA with unrestricted reuse. ADEM issued a letter in February, 2002 requesting more data points. Ron agreed that another sample is okay, as long as that ends it for this site. If the results are consistent, then the Army will look to risk it away. Doyle indicated the SSSLs are ultra-conservative and are meant to be indicators, not the last word. IT will resample, using standard turn-around time, and provide a PRA. When all information is available, IT will report back to the BCT.

Mayor of Anniston - Doyle indicated that a senior EPA manager had met with the mayor, and the mayor indicated that he was concerned about the way risk assessment is being accomplished at Ft. McClellan. Doyle indicated that he would be meeting with the mayor to hear his concerns, but did not have any details about the meeting.

ALDOT Letter to Regulators - Ron indicated this issue was adequately addressed in the letter on the Explanation of Significant Differences, and that he would not be providing any further correspondence on this topic.

State Lands on the Choccolocco Corridor - Philip wanted status on this issue. Ron indicated that the Army would handle investigations here under BRAC and not FUDS. Philip wants to ensure that these sites don't get dropped. Ron indicated that he communicates with three different individuals on these lands. Lisa will send Philip copies of the letters Ron sent on the properties the Army is investigating.

USTs - ADEM sent a letter requesting the Army screen UST data against ADEM ISL (initial screening levels) vs. the SSSLs. Ron indicated that not only had ADEM previously agreed to use the SSSLs, but also had a major role in the development of the SSSLs, and additionally, the Army is performing restoration activities, not compliance activities with regard to USTs. Ellis indicated the ISLs are lower than the SSSLs. Doyle wants Philip to get ADEM's position from Jim Grassiano and Steve Cobb. Miki also expressed a concern because the JPA expects to pull 10 USTs for which the Army is responsible. Ron says ADEM's ISLs are not relevant to Army evaluations, but might be to JPA's activities. Ron wants to bring this up at the next BCT meeting, but Ellis pointed out that the Army needs to respond to ADEM by May 2. Ron will send a letter to ADEM saying the Army is looking into the issue and Ron will discuss this at the next BCT meeting.

Later in the meeting, Philip reported that he had checked back with ADEM about the SSSLs. ADEM will accept the SSSLs instead of the ISLs. Lisa will write a letter to ADEM documenting discussion and resolution of the issue.

Ranges South of Range 25 - The BCT discussed these sites previously and requested a PRA. The PRA was done on all areas except the lead-contaminated area that is currently included in the BBGR EE/CA. The PRA

supports the NFA recommendation and unrestricted reuse for HTRW. Miki noted that this property has the largest trunk line for water and also will likely not go to a recreational reuse. The BCT concurred with the NFA recommendation.

Mortar Impact Area South of BGR - The BCT discussed this site previously and requested a PRA, then requested some seep samples for lead only. Based on the data, the BCT concurred with the recommendation for NFA with unrestricted reuse.

30-year Calculation for O&M at the Fill Areas - Miki asked what happens at the Fill Areas after the 30 years that are addressed in the EE/CA O&M costs. Doyle indicated that an exit strategy has not yet been established for Ft. McClellan. A 5-year review is usually built into the long-term O&M to address the necessity of monitoring beyond 30 years. Miki inquired if monitoring could be required after 30 years. Doyle responded yes, but 30 years is what is used in calculations for long-term O&M costs.

Alpha EE/CA - Dan advised Philip that the Army has had internal discussions and has changed their recommendations. Therefore, Philip should discontinue his review of the draft document he currently has. The Army will issue another draft final for regulator review. The Army's changes reflect the old reuse plan, not the new reuse plan. Miki requested that the EE/CA reflect the new reuse plan; Ron's guidance is to use the old plan.

ADEM LF #3 Letter - The Army received a letter from ADEM requesting a work plan addendum for the additional work at LF #3. Philip will check at ADEM to see what the letter meant, since the addendum was submitted, reviewed, and approved, and the fieldwork is nearly complete. Doyle is concerned that someone at ADEM is not coordinating with Philip. Ron would like a letter back from ADEM acknowledging that ADEM has received and already reviewed and approved the work plan addendum.

Soldiers' Chapel Soil Removal and SI Report - The BCT reviewed the Soldiers' Chapel site in September, 2001. Since that time, IT collected another round of groundwater samples and removed the metals contaminated soils. Excavations were back-filled with clean fill from the borrow area on the installation. Soil was disposed offsite. Doyle would like a PRA on groundwater residual issues. If the PRA indicates no unacceptable risk, the BCT will concur with the NFA recommendation. If PRA shows unacceptable risk, then the BCT must redress the site.

Future Meetings (3-month look ahead) - April 16 - 17, Ft. McClellan, May 21 - 23, Ft. McClellan, June 5 - 6, Ft. McClellan, July 17 - 18, Ft. McClellan, August 20 - 21, Ft. McClellan.

Status of Action Items

Action Item No.	Responsible Team Member	Due Date	Status	Action Item
01/12/1	Wayne	Jan 02	Done	Provide copies of ASR to Doyle and Hugh Vick.
02/2/1	Ron	Mar 02	Done	Send letter to EPA and ADEM requesting concurrence to transfer property to ALDOT with no further investigation or cleanup.
02/2/2	Dan	Mar 02	SNR	Provide Ron with new schedules considering the 40 additional acres associated with ALDOT's requirements.
02/2/3	Philip	Mar 02	SNR	Report back to BCT on ADEM's position on the Pelham Range Water Supply issue.
02/2/4	Ron	Mar 02	SNR	Report back to Miki and team on what Army will do with the guns near Truitt Hill.
02/2/5	Miki	Mar 02	Done	Resend Ron a copy of the revised reuse plan approved by the Board.
02/2/6	Ron	Mar 02	Done	Distribute revised reuse plan to team members.
02/4/1	Rich	May 02	SNR	Coordinate a site visit to FTMC for the ecological risk team, and work with Lisa to ensure adequate access to the sites.
02/4/2	Philip	May 02	SNR	Check with ADEM to ascertain if there are risk-based closure standards for gasoline stations (Former Motor Pool Area 3100 and the Base Service Station).
02/4/3	Lisa	May 02	SNR	Send Philip copies of letters pertaining to the Choccolocco Corridor investigations.
02/4/4	Lisa	May 02	SNR	Send letter to ADEM documenting that SSSLs and not ISLs have been accepted by the BCT and will continue to be used for sites on FTMC.
02/4/5	Philip	May 02	SNR	Check with ADEM management to clarify that ADEM has already approved the LF #3 work plan addendum, and inform that field work is underway.

SNR=Status Next Report

ATTACHMENT E
FACILITATOR NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

Meeting Summary

This 2-1/2-day BCT meeting took place on April 16-18, 2002, in Alpharetta, GA, again at IT Corporation's offices. On the 16th, Sharon Thoms and an associate in risk assessment from EPA were present to reach agreements on ecological risk assessment with IT's risk assessors. The discussion went well, beginning with Sharon and Jeanne Yacoub negotiating how best to approach the subject and the process the team would follow, and concluding with a variety of substantial agreements. The team also set up a technical task group, a way for the risk assessors to continue their conversation by conference call, leaving some of the details to them and asking for a report to the team at a future meeting. Team members' own observations on the day included such statements as "I was impressed by the risk assessors' willingness to work together" and "There was no posturing by either the EPA or IT staff members."

On the latter two days, the BCT turned to a variety of FTMC sites. The discussions were interrupted several times by two issues that could not be resolved by the BCT. One is the public/political concern about some of the landfills; the other is the Army's contention that the only valid JPA reuse plan is the one developed in 1997 vs. JPA's contention that it has approved an updated reuse plan the Army should recognize. There was some heat about these issues, and the BCT at last recognized that it could not resolve them. As is often the case, when the BCT focused on the means to clean up and dispose of property, it functioned well.

From my perspective, a significant development for the BCT came as the core team – Ron, Philip, and Doyle – considered the potential splintering of the team when political pressures are brought to bear on BCT processes and decisions, and recommitted themselves to a team approach and response to such pressures.

The team's own reflections on the meeting included these points:

- We closed out a lot of sites that have been controversial in the past.
- We have done what the regulators had asked for, and it's paid off.
- We have identified the areas of conflict we face and have some new insights into where people are and what they're thinking – especially about the fill areas.
- We have made good use of the preliminary risk assessment as a tool.
- We're considering reuse as an issue in our decisions.
- We've brought the team together in the face of outside influences.

Finally, asked about how to increase the reasonably good level of respect on the BCT, members made these suggestions:

- Empathize with other team members: evaluate the impact on others before making a decision.
- Be affirmative about an issue, even when you disagree.
- Communicate whenever necessary between meetings.
- Continue our social activities (meals, etc.) accompanying the meetings.