

MEETING MINUTES

November 25, 2004

Project: Former Camp Butner Restoration Advisory Board
Date: November 9, 2004, 6:30 – 9:50pm
Place: Butner Town Operations Building,
Butner, North Carolina
Attendees: Gretchen Hastings (Facilitator); Col. Harvey Jones, USACE Wilmington (Co-Chair, Government Representative); Ken Lucas, EPA Region IV (Federal Representative);
Art Shacter, NC Division of Environment and Natural Resources (State Representative); Amy Blalock, Resident (Co-Chair, Local Representative); Hope Taylor-Guevara, Granville County Resident/ Clean Water for NC; Tom McGee, Butner Town Manager; Edgar Smoak, Granville County Resident/Granville County Planning Board; Lt. Strickland (for Major Tom Hobgood), Butner Public Safety; Mike Arrington, Granville County Resident; Kent Cash, Durham City employee; Doug Logan, Granville County Emergency Management Coordinator; David Currin, Granville County Commissioner; Barry Baker, Granville County Senior Planner; Public (see attached)

Prepared By: Laura Kelley, Parsons
Topic: RAB Meeting 1

Mr. Bob Keistler (USACE Wilmington District [CESAW]) opened the meeting at 6:30pm by welcoming all of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) members and guests. Mr. Keistler introduced Ms. Gretchen Hastings, the facilitator for the meeting, and subsequently turned the meeting over to her. Ms. Hastings again welcomed all members and guests and asked all RAB members to introduce themselves to the group. Ms. Hastings provided a Draft Mission Statement for the RAB and discussed the purpose of the RAB. The committee was given their first action item for the RAB.

ACTION ITEM: The RAB is to read over the draft mission statement and prepare proposed changes to the mission statement prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Hastings provided some ground rules for the meeting and asked the RAB members if there were any they would like to add. The list of agreed-upon ground rules is as follows:

- One person speaks at a time
- Stick to the topic
- Make statement, invite comment
- No cheap shots
- Maintain “safe-zone”
- Respect and value others’ opinions
- Cell phones off
- Honesty, openness, and consideration
- Step up-step back

The public was asked to wait until the end of the meeting for a comment/question period.

Ms. Hastings introduced Colonel Harvey (Bud) Jones (USACE Wilmington District) as the Government Representative Co-Chair and explained that the local members of the RAB were to elect a Community Representative Co-Chair. She asked for nominations from the board. Ms. Hope Taylor-Guevara (Granville Co. resident, Clean Water for NC) nominated Ms. Amy Blalock, Lakeview Subdivision resident, and Mr. Currin (RAB member, Granville County Commissioner) nominated Mr. Edgar Smoak, (Granville County planner) also a longtime resident of the area. Col. Jones asked if either of the nominees wanted the position and Ms. Blalock asked for clarification on the responsibilities. After a brief synopsis of the position responsibilities, both agreed to serve as co-chair if elected. Both nominees briefly described their background and willingness to serve in the position. The community members of the RAB voted via paper ballot with the following results:

Ms. Amy Blalock – 5 votes (elected Co-Chair); Mr. Edgar Smoak – 4 votes

While the votes were being counted, Mr. Ray Livermore (USACE Wilmington District) presented a brief discussion of the drinking water well sampling that was conducted in the former Camp Butner area in August 2004. The PowerPoint slide show presentation is attached. The following questions were asked by RAB members regarding the sampling/sampling results.

Question: Why were some non-detect values higher than the regulatory levels?

Answer: It is a limitation of the available methods for analysis.

Question: Was there a pattern to the perchlorate detections?

Answer: No, there were non-detects right next to hits. The results are more dependent upon the aquifer that the water is coming from and not the geographic location at the former Camp. We do not have the information on the various aquifers in the area.

Question: Were the two perchlorate hits exceeding the project reporting levels close to each other?

Answer: No, they were at opposite ends of the former Camp.

Mr. Livermore reported the anticipated timeline for the final report. USACE plans to complete the report by the end of November 2004 and will post it on the USACE Wilmington District website. If the report will not be completed by the end of November, Mr. Livermore said the Corps will let the RAB members know the revised completion date.

Question: What was the timeframe for the sampling included in the report?

Answer: August 9-11, 2004

Mr. Smoak stated that there were some test wells installed around Lightning Lake and inquired if they were included in this sampling event. Mr. Livermore stated that there were 4 monitoring wells installed around 1992 to test if there was a potential landfill in the area. The wells were not included in the August sampling.

Mr. Smoak asked if the wells were still there. Mr. John Baden (USACE Wilmington District) stated that the wells were abandoned after the results indicated there was not a landfill issue in that area. Mr. Smoak stated that the RAB can help dispel rumors that get started and address community concerns with their increased knowledge of the activities in the area and communication.

Ms. Laura Kelley (Parsons) announced the results of the election to the RAB as presented above. Ms. Hastings introduced Mr. Don Silkebakken (Parsons) who has been the Project Manager for the activities for the former Camp Butner since 1999. Mr. Silkebakken presented an overview of all activities conducted at the former Camp Butner associated with the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and the Time Critical Removal Actions (TCRA). The PowerPoint slide show presentation is attached. The following is an outline of the topics covered in the presentation:

- Historical Background
- Initial Areas of Interest
- EE/CA findings
- TCRA to 6" depth conducted at Lakeview in tandem with EE/CA
- Additional TCRA conducted at Blalocks
- TCRA digital geophysical mapping at Lakeview
- Introduction to new areas of interest
- Final EE/CA Recommendations and Action Memos

Ms. Blalock mentioned that she was just informed that the land that backs up to her property (approximately 1000 acres) is being sub-divided for sale to multiple owners. She is concerned that more people will buy property without knowing the history of the area and the potential for residual ordnance on the land.

The following questions from RAB members were directed toward Mr. Silkebakken.

Question: How much money is available for the Butner area?

Answer: Mr. Silkebakken stated that the Corps would have to address that issue. Mr. Keistler provided a brief description of the Department of Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) for Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS). He stated there are approximately 7000 DERP FUDS sites nationwide. Between 750-1000 of those 7000 are UXO-related sites. The budget for all sites nationwide is \$200 million this year. The USACE is responsible for evaluating and prioritizing the sites. The Southeast budget is approximately \$20 million this year. The Wilmington District's budget for this year is \$2.2 million which includes funding for nine sites. The following is the funding currently budgeted for activities at the former Camp Butner:

FY 05 (fiscal year) - \$650,000
FY 06 - \$1.1 million
FY 07 - \$1 million
FY 08 - \$1.3 million
FY 09 - \$1.3 million

Mr. Keistler explained the Action Memorandum process. These documents are prepared by the USACE based on the EE/CA and TCRA findings and recommendations to serve as the decision document for the site(s). The Action Memorandums are the mechanism used to obtain funding for further activities. Due to the large amount of funds necessary to complete all activities at former Camp Butner, the USACE broke up the response actions into four Action Memorandums to facilitate funding requests. The Action Memorandum approval authority is dependent upon the cost associated with the activities. If the Action Memorandum is less than \$2 million, the USACE Wilmington District Colonel can approve. Between \$2 and \$10 million, the Action Memorandum must be approved at the Headquarters. If an Action Memorandum exceeds \$10 million, approval must go through Washington D.C. and is very difficult to obtain.

The former Camp Butner Action Memorandums were prepared as follows:

- Site-Wide Institutional Controls,
- Range Complex 1,
- Range Complex 2, and
- Area 1A – Flamethrower Range.

Question: What is being done with the current year's \$650,000?

Answer: Work Plans have to be written prior to commencement of any response activities, so the plan is to consolidate all areas of interest at Camp Butner into one work plan, to reduce redundancy and save money. Then, as funds become available, USACE will be ready to start the field work based on the priority of the sites. Mr. Keistler also mentioned that all budgeted military funds must be expended in the FY. Often other districts have funds left over that were not spent during the year and if a project is ready to use the money, it can be transferred for immediate use. This is another benefit to having a General Work Plan.

Question: We are looking at 10 years to complete the response actions. Will potential new buyers be told of the issues in the area (i.e., "Buyer Beware")?

Answer: Mr. Keister stated that USACE has no authority to step in and tell potential buyers anything. He noted that Mr. Dudley Watts (Granville County) volunteered to start adding notations on the zoning permit after attending a Public Meeting presenting the EE/CA results. Mr. Barry Baker (RAB member from Granville County Planning Department) stated this has been implemented already. Mr. Keistler added that these kinds of situations are why the RAB was established and are one of the responsibilities of the board. Col. Jones added that the response actions don't have to take 10 years. That is the estimated based on the current USACE funding. He encouraged all members of the RAB and the community to continue working through their Congressmen to give Camp Butner a higher profile.

Mr. Keistler reiterated that the year-end funding transfers happen every year, so that is also a possibility to reduce the timeline. He mentioned that the Blalock TCRA is an example of year-end funding. They were able to obtain \$250,000 at year-end to perform the TCRA.

Question: If we don't spend the \$650,000 this year, will we lose it?

Answer: Yes, the funds must be committed by the end of the FY (September 30). Mr. Keistler stated that the \$650,000 is not in jeopardy – it will be spent.

Question: Will local people be allowed to bid on the work? That would be a significant boost to the local economy.

Answer: Yes, but the people would need to be trained personnel. Maybe locals could be hired as subcontractors to trained personnel.

Ms. Taylor-Guevara stated that Representative Miller is very active and aware of the issues at former Camp Butner. She indicated that the door is open for discussions with the rep. and urged people to take advantage of the support.

The RAB members took a break at 7:55pm.

Ms. Hastings called the meeting back to order at 8:00pm.

Mr. Doug Logan (RAB Member, Granville County Emergency Management Coordinator) provided a brief synopsis of the ordnance-related activity in the former Camp Butner area over the past 10 years. He stated that on average they received 5-6 calls per year from residents finding actual or suspected ordnance. His department responds initially and calls Fort Bragg explosives ordnance disposal (EOD) unit for removal and disposal of the items. The items found include a wide range from window weights to 155mm projectile. Mr. Logan stated he has detected apathy about the danger of the ordnance from some long-time residents. He further commented that there appears to be an increased concern with the growth of the area and many residents from outside the Butner area moving in.

Ms. Hastings asked the RAB members to break off into small groups of 3-4 people each to participate in a Ranking Exercise. The slide with the EE/CA Project Team prioritizations was provided. Each group was tasked to come up with a recommendation for the priority of land use criteria based on the most important criteria to the community. They were also asked to include any new information or land use status changes they may be aware of and include the groundwater issues.

Groups were given 5 minutes to discuss their prioritizations, then all reported back to the group.

The following were the priority recommendations for each group:

Group 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any property owned by the State has the lowest priority. 2. Groundwater issues don't appear to be high priority. 3. Want to know the cost of the TCRA to be ready for the future.
Group 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Priority given to private landowners. 2. Important to cover the institution development. 3. Concern for agricultural use, but feel residential is higher priority. 4. Flamethrower range for possible chemical contamination as well as ordnance contamination. 5. Possible groundwater issues, not high priority.
Group 3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prioritize based on population density. 2. Groundwater issue is low priority with education to community. 3. High priority to communities where ordnance has been found.
Group 4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct a hazardous risk assessment to prioritize (i.e., high traffic areas versus remote areas). 2. Important to provide education campaign to homeowners (especially new ones). 3. Hospital site should be a high priority.

Col. Jones emphasized that whatever the RAB decides, the most important function of this group is to maintain communication to and from the community. He also stated that it was important for something physical to occur each year to maintain an active presence and trust with the community.

Question: Is there any rhyme or reason to the priority list as provided in the EE/CA?

Answer: Mr. Silkebakken replied that the ordnance-related risk is equal at the sites; however this was the recommended priority based on land use (current and imminent).

Mr. Smoak questioned if the activities focus solely on ordnance-related issues, then when and who will investigate for chemical contamination? He noted that he owns land adjacent to the Flamethrower Range area and grass will not grow on his property at all. Mr. Silkebakken noted

he is not aware of any chemical contamination in that area, as Parsons has only been involved with the ordnance investigations. He explained the priority of the Flamethrower Range was based on the daycare facility and hospital planned for construction in the area. In addition, ordnance was found at the Flamethrower Range during the EE/CA.

Question: Have any items exploded in the area?

Answer: Doug Logan reported that no ordnance items have exploded on the official record. There are stories of items exploding, but none have been documented. He continued with an encounter 3-4 years ago in Area 4 when he responded to a report of blasting caps found. The homeowner asked them to look at something else while they were there. He walked out of the woods carrying a 155mm on his shoulder. He said he used to beat on the 155mm with a hammer when he was growing up. Mr. Shacter inquired whether this area was included in the site-wide IC. Mr. Keistler answered yes, all of former Camp Butner proper is included. Mr. Silkebakken noted that some IC activities are already underway with last year's funds.

Mr. Lucas asked why the daycare facility postpone construction or move to another location. He also asked wouldn't it be cheaper to buy the land and fence it in?

Ms. Hastings responded that the RAB could talk for weeks on this topic and other related issues, but the meeting was not the forum for these discussions. Mr. Mike Arrington (RAB member, Granville County resident) asked if the RAB wasn't supposed to set the method to prioritize? Ms. Hastings asked the RAB members when they would like to do this? Mr. Smoak asked why they would prioritize at all? He noted the RAB knows how much money they have for the year, why not apportion the funds equitably across all areas – addressing the highest risk in each area rather than making others wait for all of one area to be completed. Ms. Hastings stated this is a discussion the RAB needs to have another time. Mr. Smoak suggested if we have \$600,000, why not give \$100,000 to each area? Mr. Lucas asked about surface removals rather than subsurface removals in the areas to address higher risk ordnance on the surface first? Mr. Silkebakken noted it could be done this way, but ultimately it would cost a great deal more. Additionally, Mr. Silkebakken stated that ordnance on the surface is not anticipated for some area, like the Flamethrower Range.

Ms. Hastings stated that all of the discussion between RAB members is good. The group needs to buy in to the criteria. If all do not stand behind the decisions and understand the reasoning for the criteria, it can not be conveyed accurately to the community. Mr. Tom McGee (RAB member, Butner Town Manager) stated he sees the prioritizing as triage in medical environment when they need to assess all and deal with the highest risk first. Col. Jones stated that he understands everyone's concern with deciding the priority of the response actions, but noted that Congress wants to buy something that can be completed rather than many little pieces of projects that aren't finished for many years. He believes it would be easier to sell them on areas rather than spreading money all around. Ms. Taylor-Guevara suggested that maybe an intermediate option of working on a couple of areas rather than all areas at the same time would work. She stated that the RAB needs to learn more about the inefficiencies of working multiple areas before making a decision.

Lt. Strickland (RAB member, Butner Public Safety) asked for clarification on how the project team came up with the priorities presented in the EE/CA. Mr. Silkebakken explained that the concentration of UXO and ordnance related scrap, current land use, and development planned for the areas were all evaluated to prioritize the areas. Mr. Terry Steuart (USAESCH PM for Camp Butner) noted that it was important to keep in mind that it is much easier to clear land without residences due to the evacuations necessary to conduct the intrusive activities. He noted also that

in some cases people refuse to evacuate and the land can not be cleared. Mr. Keistler added that the RAB did not have to make a decision immediately as it will be spring before field activities are initiated.

Ms. Hastings moved to the next agenda item by introducing Meredith Tredeau of Parsons to provide information on the activities included in the Site-Wide Institutional Controls. Ms. Tredeau listed the following activities planned or underway for the former Camp Butner area:

1. Community Relations Plan – Includes community-specific planning information. Promotes meaningful community involvement. Draft version due 1st Quarter 2005, Final due Fall 2005.
2. Signage – warning signs to educate people of the dangers of ordnance and who to call if it is suspected.
3. Brochures – Update of the current Granville County brochure is planned.
4. Educational Video – Completing draft script based on the video prepared for the Tierra Santa area (brought copy for the RAB to watch and comment on).

The RAB watched the video provided by Ms. Tredeau and asked for comments on the video as this was the model for the Butner draft script. The following were comments from RAB members:

Mr. Currin expressed concerns with the video. He stated that Butner doesn't have a fire station that can handle ordnance. Ms. Tredeau replied that this video was only used as a model for Butner's video and only Butner-specific information will be included. Mr. Currin continued that he thinks the video will cause a tremendous outcry from the community that it will destroy land values. He said the group needs to be very careful how to approach the video or other educational tools.

Mr. Kent Cash (RAB member, Durham City employee) stated there were several areas to address with this, 1) the environmental hazard, 2) public perception, and 3) economic issues.

Mr. McGee asked who would see the video? He asked if individuals from the fire department and local officials could not go into the schools without the video to accomplish this task? Ms. Tredeau responded that the video is only one component of the educational awareness and also that the video could be put in the library and provided to local cable stations. Mr. McGee stated he has an issue with the sensationalism of TV without going in depth to educate rather than just scare people.

Mr. Currin stated that there are no schools, no churches, no playgrounds in the immediate area and feels this takes money away from the response tasks. Mr. Smoak stated he felt a video should be made, but did not like this model for the video. He feels this video was made to scare, not enlighten the public.

Mr. Cash asked if they instruct people to call 911, as they did in the model video, what would happen? Do they automatically call Emergency Response? The dispatchers are always changing, so how would they know what to do? Mr. Logan responded that there is already a standard procedure in place and if someone calls 911, the dispatchers always notify Emergency Response. Mr. Currin noted that this is a voluntary procedure, not one that went through the Board of Commissioners. He stated that there needs to be an official procedure in place as Mr. Logan doesn't really have the staff in place for this.

Ms. Blalock commented on the video's consistency of message. She noted that in order for a message to stick, you have to tell people what you are going to tell them, tell them the message, and tell them what you just told them. Ms. Blalock asked if there was any research on the effectiveness of the Tierra Santa video? Have they received more calls? Ms. Tredeau responded that Parsons was working on obtaining that type of information as well as any lessons learned by the educational awareness process in Tierra Santa.

Mr. McGee stated that he like the message, just not the delivery in the video. He also thought the RAB was to provide input as to whether a video was even needed for the former Camp Butner. Mr. Silkebakken answered that to show good faith, USACE started the Community Relations Plan, signs, and video with last year's funding. The RAB will provide input as to where, when, how some of these things will be implemented.

Ms. Taylor-Guevara stated the video creates a bottom line tool to provide information to the public. She equated the behavior change to the switch to self-service gas pumps and the hazard of smoking while pumping gas. She believes the image is needed to bring home the message and to modify behavior, but perhaps not as graphic as the one portrayed in the other video. She also stated that the model video seemed a little long. Ms. Penny Schmitt (USACE Wilmington District Public Affairs Officer) asked the RAB to consider that there have been no tragedies in this area yet and the video may not need to be as graphic, but that could change if they were in an "after" situation.

Mr. Shacter added the following comments:

1. The accident in the video occurred 10 years after the cleanup,
2. the property values have not declined,
3. Mr. Logan can receive help from the State of NC for classroom education.

Ms. Blalock reminded all RAB members to keep in mind the target audience for the video is children and they are viewing the film as adults.

Ms. Hastings moved the meeting on to the next agenda item by introducing Ms. Laura Kelley from Parsons to provide information on the Administrative Record and Geographic Information System (GIS) Update. Ms. Kelley reported that there are two locations for the Administrative Record – one at the Town of Butner Operations Building (the location of the meeting) and the South Branch of the Granville County Library. The following documents are present in the admin records:

- 1993 Archives Search Report (hard copy and CD)
- 2002 Final EE/CA Work Plan
- 2004 Final EE/CA Report
- 2002 Final TCRA Work Plan
- 2003 Final TCRA Report

Parsons is in the process of obtaining the Blalock Property TCRA Work Plan and Report, the Sampling and Analysis Plan for the Drinking Water Sampling, and the Final Drinking Water Report. As soon as these documents are received, they will be placed in the Administrative Record locations.

Ms. Kelley stated that Parsons is currently updating the GIS information for USACE. Parsons has obtained the current GIS data from Persons and Durham counties and should be receiving

data from Granville County within a month. All of this information will be merged into one database and installed on the USACE Wilmington District's GIS system.

At this point, Ms. Hastings opened the meeting up to the audience members for questions and comments:

Audience member, Ms. Megan Hazelman, introduced herself and Ms. Diana Degen as members of an outreach group at UNC-Chapel Hill available to help communities deal with hazardous waste problems. They can serve as resources for technical information, historical information, and educational aspects of IC.

Mr. Richard Veazy (Granville County resident) thanked the board for their dedication and commitment. He stated he would like to be kept informed of the RAB meetings and decisions.

Ms. Blalock asked if the RAB members could get copies of the slides used in the presentation tonight? Ms. Schmitt replied that the slides will be posted on the USACE Wilmington District's web site at:

www.saw.usace.army.mil

Ms. Schmitt said to follow the link to Camp Butner under the "Hot Topics" banner on the bottom left of the page.

An audience member stated that he realized that the RAB had to be active in the face of safety. He asked about the following scenario - if a landowner with large number of acres without plans to develop his land is given low priority, then he dies and his son wants to develop/sell the land, should land restrictions be placed on the land? Or information be listed on the plat? Ms. Hastings tried to restate the question: Is there going to be some mechanism to review land use? The audience member said that really wasn't his question. He restated: If Mr. Veazy has 116 acres that are not cleaned up and someone else has 126 acres that they are developing now (so it is cleaned up), there is no benefit to Mr. Veazy's property now, therefore there has to be a negative impact.

Mr. Arrington said this is making assumptions on how criteria will be set, which hasn't occurred yet. The audience member replied that safety has to be the first concern. Ms. Taylor-Guevara responded that what she was hearing was the acknowledgement of the difficulty of prioritizing and maybe they need to have conservation easements and possible tax relief for those landowners with property not cleaned up. The audience member acknowledged that was exactly what his point was.

Mr. Currin extended an invitation to the Co-Chairs to attend a Board of Commissioners meeting to educate the Board of the actions/responsibilities of the RAB. He noted that the Board meets the 1st and 3rd Mondays of the month.

Mr. Keistler asked to clarify the project team's recommendations in the EE/CA. He stated that the team worked very hard to fairly cover all homeowners in the area. He continued that the project team tried to treat each situation the same while minimizing safety risks.

Mr. Cash asked if it was going to take 6 months for the video? Ms. Schmitt replied that USACE could receive from the RAB without waiting for the next scheduled RAB meeting (initially planned for 6 months from now). Mr. McGee asked why wait 6 months for the next meeting

when there are so many issues/actions that need to be addressed? Also asked if the RAB would be getting direction on the Decision Making Model? Mr. Keistler responded that the RAB could meet as often as the group agrees upon. He recognized the commitment made by the members of the RAB and stated as long as there are productive agenda items, he will support the RAB meetings as often as deemed necessary. He also answered that the Decision making criteria should be set by the RAB.

Col. Jones agreed that the RAB should meet prior to the initial 6 months schedule and suggested the RAB meet in early January to work on the criteria. He believes the RAB members should work on this via email in the interim to have a good start prior to the meeting, then focus on finalizing during the meeting. Ms. Taylor-Guevara proposed a half-day weekend work session to work through all the details. Col. Jones noted he did not know if they should invite the public to sit in on a work session like that. He also thought that a half-day session would be a good team building opportunity for the RAB members.

Mr. Keistler asked that the RAB members not limit their discussion of priorities to just the \$650,000, but rather to include all areas. Col Jones agreed that the RAB should look at it unfettered, but know that it may not be what happens based on available funding.

Mr. Keistler stated that whether the RAB meets in Jan or not, USACE was moving forward with securing a contractor to begin work on the plans, so they would be ready to go into the field in the Spring. Mr. Cash asked how much money it would take for the plans? Mr. Keistler replied he couldn't place an exact amount on it, but maybe \$200,000 as a guess. An audience member asked if they couldn't use the previous experiences at Butner to reduce that cost? Mr. Keistler responded that they would look to all avenues to reduce costs, but there is a certain level of effort required for each site.

Ms. Hastings asked RAB members to look at possible dates for the working meeting...January 11, 2005 at 6:00 pm was agreed upon. Ms. Hastings then reviewed the action items for the RAB members.

ACTION ITEMS:

- 1. Coordinate review of the mission/purpose of RAB – point of contact (POC) : Amy Blalock**
- 2. Coordinate ideas for the Decision Making Model – POC: Amy Blalock**
- 3. Post RAB presentation slides on the USACE web site – POC: Penny Schmitt**
- 4. Set up community web site for postings by RAB members – POC: Penny Schmitt**
- 5. Next meeting: January 11, 2005, Town of Butner Operations Building**

Ms. Hastings said she appreciated everyone's efforts tonight to keep the meeting productive and on track. Mr. Keistler asked for feedback from the RAB members on what they liked or did not like about the meeting and the process.

Ms. Hastings adjourned the meeting at 9:50pm.