

MEETING MINUTES

March 14, 2005, revised July 26, 2005

Project: Former Camp Butner Restoration Advisory Board
Date: February 24, 2005, 6:30 – 8:50pm
Place: Butner Town Operations Building,
Butner, North Carolina
Attendees: (Facilitator); (Co-Chair, Government Representative); (Federal Representative);
NC Division of Environment and Natural Resources (State Representative); (Co-
Chair, Local Representative); Resident/ Clean Water for NC; Butner Town
Manager; Granville County Resident/Granville County Planning Board; Butner
Public Safety; Granville County Resident; Durham City employee; Granville
County Senior Planner; Public (see attached)

Prepared By: Laura Kelley, Parsons
Topic: RAB Meeting 2

Ms. Gretchen Hastings (RAB facilitator) welcomed all members and guests. She explained that the information packet distributed to all RAB members included the meeting agenda, reference material, and the minutes/information from the previous meeting. Ms. Hastings noted that the agenda was aggressive in terms of the amount of information to cover and asked that everyone stay focused on the task at hand. Ms. Hastings requested all additional government and contractor representatives to introduce themselves and reminded the RAB members that all of these individuals were available to answer questions regarding technical/Butner investigation questions. The representatives present included: Mr. Bob Keistler, Mr. John Baden (USACE Wilmington), Mr. Don Silkebakken, Ms. Meredith Tredeau, and Ms. Laura Kelley (Parsons). It was mentioned that Ms. Penny Schmitt (USACE Wilmington Public Affairs Office) was unable to attend the meeting due to illness, but was also available as a resource for the RAB members.

Ms. Hastings referred the RAB members to their packets to look over the information provided regarding the purpose of a RAB. She reviewed the Ground Rules agreed upon at the last meeting and asked if there were any additional rules that should be discussed. None were noted.

Ms. Hastings turned the meeting over to the Co-Chairs, Ms. Amy Blalock and Lt. Col. Bud Jones for opening comments. Ms. Blaylock thanked everyone for their time and commitment to the Board. Lt. Col. Jones added that it was time to stop talking and start doing. He emphasized the need to make progress in order to maintain momentum. He noted that he will be leaving in four weeks for duty in Iraq, but assured everyone that he will arrange for a capable replacement in his absence.

Ms. Hastings moved to agenda item #2 – Discussion of the 11-9-04 Minutes. Ms. Blaylock asked that the minutes be corrected to remove the reference to her being a resident of the Lakeview Subdivision. Mr. Art Shacter mentioned that he had provided several comments to USACE Wilmington which had already been incorporated in the version included in the packet. A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes with the corrections made.

Ms. Hastings asked Ms. Blaylock for the status of the first action item from the previous meeting – RAB Mission/Purpose Statement. Ms. Blaylock replied that the RAB first needed to

decide how the Board would make decisions. She stated that Mr. Kent Cash had prepared a presentation on Decision Making Models to assist the Board in selecting the appropriate process to be used for making decisions as a group. He will present the slides later in the meeting. Lt. Col. Jones noted that one thing he thought was missing from the Mission Statement was the “Why” and asked that the Board incorporate this into their revised Mission Statement.

Mr. Keistler provided an update on the web posting of the previous meeting’s slide show presentation. He stated that the report for the Groundwater Sampling has been posted and the presentation and corrected/approved meeting minutes will also be posted within the week. He was unaware of the status of the RAB “Community Posting/Message Board Website”. Ms. Schmitt would have to provide that information subsequent to the meeting. Mr. Keistler then provided the status of the Action Memoranda prepared for the Camp Butner site. He reported that all four Action Memoranda had been reviewed and approved by NCDEHNR and EPA. The two Action Memoranda (the Site-Wide Institutional Controls and the Removal Action in the Cantonment Area) that require signature by the District Colonel are anticipated to be signed by next week. The other two (for the two Range Complex Areas) are en route to USACE Headquarters and signatures are expected within 3 to 4 months. Approved current funding for this fiscal year is \$450K - \$500K. USACE Wilmington is currently working with the USACE Center of Expertise, Huntsville, to get a request for proposal (RFP) prepared so it can be sent out as soon as the first two Action Memoranda are signed. USACE Wilmington was unaware of any additional funds at this time; however, surplus monies are usually not available until the end of the fiscal year. This concluded the overview provided by USACE Wilmington.

Ms. Hastings introduced Mr. Cash to present his slideshow on Decision Making Methods. The presentation is attached to the conclusion of the minutes. He described the four methods of decision making:

- minority,
- majority,
- consensus, and
- unanimous.

He provided the pros and cons of each method and provided a narrative on which one is most effective for different situations. At the conclusion of his presentation, Mr. Cash solicited questions and comments. Mr. Shacter motioned that the Board eliminate “minority” and “unanimous” from the selections. Mr. Mike Arrington seconded. All members of the Board voted to eliminate minority and unanimous from consideration with the exception of Mr. Ken Lucas. Mr. Tom McGee expressed some concern in eliminating minority after the vote based on his concern that some technical issues may not be fully understood by all RAB members. Mr. Cash asked what would happen in such an instance. Mr. Edgar Smoak replied that it is still a Board issue. He further commented that the RAB members who understand the technical aspects should explain to the rest, then the entire Board votes. Lt. Col. Jones recommended that the Board strive for consensus, but be prepared for majority if consensus cannot be reached. Mr. Cash agreed that the Board could use a combination of methods. Ms. Hope Taylor-Guevara stated that some Boards try for consensus twice, and then use the majority. Lt. Col. Jones stated that the Board should be the voice of the community and aside from decisions that go against rules, regulations, and funding issues, that he would vote with the community residents on the Board. Mr. Barry Baker seconded the motion. He motioned that the Board try for consensus and if not achievable, then the Board would use majority. All members of the Board voted the motion with the exception of one abstention, Mr. Lucas. He requested a distinction between consensus and majority. Lt. Col. Jones stated his thought process as far as the RAB is concerned. If he

disagrees with a position, he would state his opinion, but would vote with what the community members wanted. He explained that consensus is more a team mindset and provides more support on the decisions of the Board even when one disagrees. It presents a more unified group to the public. Mr. Lucas stated he has a problem with that concept because he fears is that people will go along with others just to get along rather than expressing their real feelings on the issue. Ms. Blaylock reminded everyone that the expectation of the RAB is for everyone to speak their mind and noted that the intent when selecting the mix of people for the RAB was to include representatives from a diverse cross-section of both the local and regulatory community. The Board voted again with 10 votes for the motion and 1 abstention.

Ms. Hastings asked Ms. Blaylock about how the RAB was going to perform the ranking/prioritization of the sites. Ms. Blaylock asked for clarification on the Board's action item and the timeline for conducting the action. Ms. Hastings explained that the Board should decide the methodology to perform the ranking as well as conduct the ranking and be prepared to present the results at the next meeting (tentatively scheduled for July 14). Lt. Col. Jones suggested a sub-committee to work on the recommendations to present to the Board. Mr. Smoak suggested letting all Board members speak about each site and their thoughts on the appropriate rank, and then allow all Board members to rank each site. The ranks for each site would be added and the lowest number would be first, the next lowest second, etc. This approach would allow all RAB members to express their opinion in the same forum and the entire Board's opinions would be taken into account. Mr. Smoak believes this provides consensus by default. Ms. Taylor-Guevara said the Board still needed to talk about the sites and the numerical ranking was only a step in the process. Mr. Lucas added that one factor that has to be answered in the process is 'how imminent is the need for action' for each site. Ms. Hastings responded that there are many factors that have to be addressed prior to an educated ranking process including imminent need, risk, size of the project, funding, etc. Lt. Col. Jones agreed that the Board needed to develop evaluation criteria to use in the ranking for the individuals. Then, the ranking would be compiled with actual information, rather than "gut feel". He also reiterated that he thought the decision for ranking should be weighted more heavily by the local residents' thoughts because they are more in tune with community desires. Mr. Keistler reminded the Board that the ranking list will not be static, but will be a moving target based on the changes in the community and land use. The Board will need to re-evaluate the sites based on the chosen criteria over time to meet the ever-changing conditions of the sites. Mr. Shacter stated that he sees Mr. Smoak's suggestion as the second step and that the Board needed to come up with the criteria to look at each site uniformly to come up with comparable rankings. Mr. Cash asked if this wasn't an appropriate situation for a sub-committee. He suggested that a sub-committee come up with the evaluation of the sites. Lt. Col. Jones agreed that was an option or the sub-committee could decide on the evaluation criteria and provide that to the Board for the entire Board to rank the sites. Mr. Cash stated the sub-committee could perform a two step process: 1) determine the method for ranking and 2) go through the evaluation process and present the results to the Board. Mr. Lucas noted that some level of expertise will be required to come up with the evaluation criteria and the sub-committee should not necessarily consist solely of Butner area residents. Ms. Hastings reminded the Board that the first step is to determine if the RAB wants to utilize a sub-committee before deciding the make-up of the committee. Mr. Lucas made a motion to create a sub-committee. Ms. Blaylock seconded the motion. The Board voted 10-1 to create a sub-committee. Mr. Smoak stated he did not understand why a sub-committee was necessary. The Board knows the sites and did not see why the criteria should include funding. Mr. Cash replied that they need to look at the criteria taking the funding into account because there was too much work for the amount of funding available. They need to determine the best use of the available funds based on priority and what they can accomplish.

Mr. McGee stated he believed the RAB should meet more frequently than every 6 months. He also stated that he thought the RAB was supposed to include individuals with the expertise necessary to educate the group. Mr. McGee recommends more meetings and added that USACE Wilmington should be included to provide the appropriate level of expertise. Ms. Taylor-Guevara stated that USACE Wilmington does bring expertise to the Board, but that it doesn't want to impose of the prioritization of what the community wants. Mr. Smoak noted that if the sub-committee presents the criteria at the tentatively scheduled July 14 meeting, then the Board would not have met the timeline of presenting the results at that meeting. Ms. Blaylock proposed that the sub-committee formally present the ranking criteria at the July 14 meeting and then allow the Board to rank based on that criteria at the meeting. Mr. Smoak said he still prefers allowing everyone to prepare their position on all seven sites and have everyone state their case at the next meeting, then vote numerically. Then everyone has a say in the ranking. Mr. Lucas stated he thought what Mr. Keistler said was being overlooked – If circumstances change before the funding comes through to conduct any actions, then what? Does the Board go through the whole process again at that time? If the sub-committee develops criteria that includes expertise to properly evaluate the sites, then it could reapply the model with consideration of the available funding stream. Mr. Baker asked about the ranking performed by Parsons as part of the EE/CA document and the criteria used for that ranking. He also stated he thought the RAB had ranked the sites in a group exercise during the previous meeting. Ms. Hastings replied that the ranking process started at the earlier meeting was not completed. Mr. Shacter stated that he agreed that the RAB should get a group started that included the technical expertise to examine the criteria. Lt. Col. Jones suggested that the technical expertise could also be obtained through email, phone, etc. Mr. Keistler furthered that while he, Mr. Baden, and Parsons Representatives are not on the RAB, they are always available to utilize as a resource, as needed. Mr. Smoak questioned whether the group/sub-committee now being discussed was to establish the ranking or the criteria for ranking. Lt. Col. Jones replied he thinks the sub-committee should establish the criteria of how to rank. Ms. Hastings stated that if she was facilitating that group, she would suggest starting at the end, the meeting on July 14, and work back to establish the timeline to get to that point. Lt. Col. Jones reminded the RAB that the end would need to be before July 14 in order to have the rankings completed to present at the meeting. Mr. Cash recommended that the sub-committee bring the methodology for the ranking process to the July 14 meeting. Ms. Hastings suggested that the sub-committee create the roadmap, develop the criteria and send the criteria to the entire RAB for approval. Once the criteria were finalized through a central point on the sub-committee, it could be sent back out to the RAB for the members to use in their individual ranking of the sites. All RAB rankings could be compiled by the sub-committee and the results presented to everyone at the July 14 meeting. Mr. Lucas inquired as to how many members would be on the sub-committee...3? Lt. Col. Jones asked if there were any volunteers. Ms. Taylor-Guevara recommended adding a step to the process presented by Ms. Hastings. She proposed that a discussion of the rankings be included after the presentation of the ranking compilation at the next meeting. Mr. Silkebakken noted that the Parsons ranking and information used for the evaluation was included in the RAB member packets. He stated that this could be used as a good starting point for the RAB. Ms. Hastings proposed taking a vote on the development of a sub-committee to formulate the ranking criteria. The vote was unanimous, with one abstention, Mr. Smoak. He stated that he still preferred to hear all RAB members' opinions on the sites prior to ranking. Ms. Blaylock asked for volunteers. Mr. Mike Arrington, Ms. Taylor-Guevara and Ms. Blaylock volunteered to sit on the sub-committee to set the ranking criteria.

At 7:50 pm, the RAB took a 5 minute break.

At 7:55 the RAB resumed the meeting with the Institutional Controls update provided by Meredith Tredeau of Parsons. She noted that the Community Relations Plan (CRP) had been finalized and was submitted on February 10, 2005. She stated that each of the two Administration Records had been updated to include a copy of the plan, but reminded everyone that this is a living document that will change as the community changes. In addition, USACE Wilmington, the State of North Carolina, and the County Manger's office of each county were provided a copy of the CRP. Ms. Blaylock was given a copy of the plan upon arrival at the meeting.

Ms. Tredeau provided an update on the educational video. She stated that all comments provided during the previous meeting had been incorporated. A summary of the changes was included in the RAB members' packets. The script is currently in final review by the USACE. Once finalized, the video is ready for production. Mr. Doug Logan has agreed as a local Emergency Management representative to participate in the video.

Ms. Blaylock asked Ms. Taylor-Guevara to speak to the assistance offered through the group in Chapel Hill with the school education program. She said the Environmental Resource Program had been active for 20 years. A representative of the group, Ms. Dianna Degen, was present and provided a brief summary of the assistance they can offer. Ms. Degen stated that the Program received Federal funding and was able to provide community outreach tasks. The group is already working on curriculum for K-12 and is available to help the RAB in whatever capacity they might see fit. Mr. Cash asked if the curriculum would be brought to the RAB for review. Ms Degen said they could do that.

Mr. Lucas asked Ms. Tredeau if Parsons would only provide 25 DVDs of the video. If so, and more were determined to be necessary, could the RAB make additional copies? Ms. Blaylock asked if the money for the video was coming from the current funds for activities at Butner. Mr. Silkebakken responded that the video was funded through money from previous years and is not part of the current funds that the RAB has to work with. Mr. McGee asked about the problem of the video scaring the children – shouldn't the RAB review the video before distributing to the schools? Lt. Col. Jones suggested reviewing it at the next meeting. Ms. Blaylock requested the RAB review the script prior to production. Mr. Silkebakken said that Parsons would forward the script to Ms. Blaylock once it was finalized by USACE Wilmington. Ms. Blaylock could then forward the script to the rest of the RAB members. Mr. McGee noted that as Town Manager he now has to send notices, etc. in Spanish based on the Hispanic population in the area. He asked if the video was going to be produced in Spanish as well. Mr. Silkebakken replied that the current scope of the video did not include a Spanish version. Ms. Taylor-Guevara asked what the cost would be to add captions or to dub the English version in Spanish. Ms. Tredeau said she didn't have the figure on hand at the meeting. Mr. Cash responded that if the video was for the school system, that the children should speak English and noted that it was probably more the parents of the Hispanic children that don't speak/read English.

Mr. Silkebakken provided an update on the warning signs to be produced for the former Camp Butner area. He noted that the signs are another institutional control already funded by the Corps, so the money for the signs would not be coming from the current funds. He stated that Parsons was scoped to produce 40 signs and asked the Board to review an example sign in their packets. The only difference in the signs for the three counties would be the emergency contact phone numbers on each. Parsons needs some guidance from the Board to determine the number of signs to produce for each county, so this task can be completed. Mr. Lucas believes the "Danger, Keep Out" language is too strong – especially since much of this is private property.

Mr. Silkebakken indicated that the signs have not been made yet, so the wording can be changed to “Warning” if the RAB preferred. Mr. Arrington stated as a property owner in the area, he did not approve of the sign. Mr. McGee suggested that the signs be placed in the areas most likely to contain residual munitions. The Board agreed to change the wording to “Warning”, rather than Danger. Ms. Taylor-Guevara asked if there was funding for posting the signs and if so, what type of posts would be used? New posts or would they utilize posts, poles or trees already present in the areas? Mr. Silkebakken replied that the scope for Parsons just allows for the production of the signs. The posting of the signs would be performed by USACE Wilmington. The Board voted unanimously on the signs with the words “Danger Keep Out” changed to “Warning” (11-0). Ms. Taylor-Guevara said she did have some issues with taking the “Keep Out” language off all signs because there are definitely some areas in which people need to be kept out of for their own safety. Mr. Silkebakken asked for the breakdown on the number of signs for each county. Ms. Blaylock made a motion based on the breakdown of the site by county sizes that Granville County get 36 signs and Durham County and Person County each get 2 signs. Mr. Cash seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously for this distribution of the signs.

Ms. Tredeau passed out the Draft version of the updated Brochure for review and comment. She noted that these were just color copies of the brochure and they had not gone to print yet. The Board had several recommendations for the Brochure as follows:

- Remove the “s” from person County
- Typo on ordnance
- Need captions for photos on back of brochure
- Simplify font for ease of reading
- Reword to make less technical, use more lay-person language
- Need to bold the type for “Do Not Touch or Remove” on back
- Change reference of Ordnance to Explosives
- Change map figure in brochure – hard to read. Replace with the bomb clip art on the sign.
- Try to use the map as a watermark on the 2nd page or cover.

The Board was asked to get any additional comments to Ms. Blaylock by Monday, February 28, 2005 for incorporation into the final version. Ms. Blaylock will be responsible for forwarding all comments to USACE Wilmington.

Ms. Tredeau showed the RAB members an example of a children’s activity book that Parsons’ produced for another sight. The members were asked for suggestion of themes for the activity book. Mr. Baker suggested “Danny the Deer” since there are so many deer in the area. The RAB members were asked to think about this and be prepared to discuss at a later date.

Mr. Keistler gave an update on the Groundwater sampling. He noted that the report had been finalized, placed in the Admin Repositories, and posted o the website. He provided a brief summary of the detections indicated by the results. There were 23 wells each sampled and analyzed for 188 constituents. There were 9 detections; however, only 2 may be from the Department of Defense activities – lead and perchlorate. There were two perchlorate detections, one of 3.6ppb and one of 10ppb. EPA has not established a drinking water standard for perchlorate; however, in February 2005, EPA adopted the findings of the National Research Council and established an official reference dose of 0.0007 mg/kg/day of perchlorate. This reference dose equates to a drinking water equivalent of 24.5 ug/L or parts per billion (ppb). Both of the detections at former Camp Butner were well below this reference dose. Based on the

low level detections of perchlorate, the USACE Wilmington has decided to focus on the ordnance risks.

Ms. Hastings asked the audience members if they had any questions for the RAB members. No questions were asked.

Ms. Hastings noted that the next meeting is scheduled for July 14. She had a request to start the meeting a little earlier (6:00pm). After several members discussed the hardship of getting there by 6:00, especially those members who work in other areas, it was decided to leave the meeting time at 6:30. Mr. Keistler asked if Thursday night still worked for everyone. Several Board members expressed an interest in moving the meeting to the 4th Thursday of the month based on other Board meetings in conflict with other Thursdays. Mr. Baker motioned to move the meeting to the 4th Thursday. Mr. Smoak seconded the motion. The Board voted 11-0 to change the meeting to July 28th at 6:30pm.

Mr. Keistler assured the minutes would be provided in a timely manner. Mr. Keistler expressed once again that the Corps is willing to help in whatever capacity the RAB members needed. He also offered whatever they might need to more effectively and efficiently carry out their mission. He added that the State of NC, EPA, and Parsons are all here as resources.

Ms. Blaylock had some closing remarks for the Board:

1. She thanked Ms. Taylor-Guevara and Mr. Arrington for volunteering for the sub-committee to establish the ranking criteria.
2. She asked Lt. Col. Jones if his replacement will be contacting her or if she should be contacting someone? He replied that his replacement would be contacting her.
3. She noted that she will provide the deadlines for the various activities requiring input from the Board over the next 5 months and asks that everyone respect the deadlines in order to complete all tasks.

Mr. Cash made a motion to adjourn at 8:47pm. Mr. Baker seconded. The Board voted unanimously to adjourn.

ACTION ITEMS:

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Coordinate review of the mission/purpose of RAB – point of contact (POC) : Amy Blalock2. Set up community web site for postings by RAB members – POC: Penny Schmitt3. Develop criteria for ranking process; Sub-committee4. Next meeting: July 28 2005, Town of Butner Operations Building |
|--|