

Libby Community Advisory Group

Meeting Summary

September 13, 2007

Introductions

The members of the Libby Community Advisory Group (CAG) and its facilitator, Gerald Mueller, introduced themselves. A list of the members and visitors in attendance is attached below as Appendix 1. After the meeting, Phillip Erquiaga decided to join the CAG as a member. His contact information is: 408 W. Flower St., Libby, MT 59923; (406)293-2393; and perquiaga@fineart-world.com.

Agenda

The CAG agreed to the following agenda for this meeting:

- CAG Power Point Presentation;
- CAG Letters;
- EPA FY2008 Budget;
- Agency reports; and
- Public Comment.

CAG Power Point Presentation

Bill Patten showed the Power Point presentation he developed using historical information gathered by the CAG Facilitator from past meeting summaries. See Appendix 2 below for the content of the presentation. CAG members can use it as a part of their presentations to community groups. Mr. Patten asked for suggested changes to the presentation from the CAG.

CAG Member Comment - The list of original CAG members should include Sandy Wagner and Clinton Maynard.

CAG Member Comment - The list of CAG accomplishments should include forming the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and its continuing pursuit of a declaration of a Public Health Care Emergency as a means of obtaining funding for Libby's asbestos disease-related health care.

Response by Bill Patten - I will make these two suggested changes, and will make the revision available via email and also on disks available at the Hospital.

CAG Letters

Bill Patten reported that he prepared and mailed the two letters that he volunteered to write at the August CAG meeting. CAG members signed signature pages for both letters. One letter was to Senator Baucus thanking him for holding the town meeting in Libby on August 6, 2006. The letter made two other points. One dealt with the declaration of a Public Health Emergency for the Libby area. At the town meeting, EPA Administrator Johnson stated that a declaration would not solve Libby's problems. He committed to meeting with Secretary Leavitt of the US Department of Health and Human Services to seek an alternative to the declaration that would address Libby's health care needs. The letter asked Senator Baucus to follow up to ensure that the Administrator keeps his commitment. Finally, the letter asked the Senator not to rush the risk assessment process in a way that would jeopardize the validity of the assessment. The second letter invited Joan Miles,

Director of the Montana Department of Health and Human Services (MDPHHS), to attend the October 11, 2007 CAG meeting to discuss Libby's health care needs. Copies of both letters are included below as Appendices 3 and 4, respectively.

Gerald Mueller read a letter to EPA Administrator Johnson drafted by DC Orr and LeRoy Thom thanking him for coming to Libby and asking that he meet with Secretary Leavitt in search of a solution to Libby's asbestos-related health care needs. When finalized, this letter with a signature page will be available at St. John's Lutheran Hospital so that CAG members can sign it.

Audience Member Comment - The letter to Administrator Johnson should ask for a response within a certain time.

CAG Response - The CAG agreed to adding language to the letter asking that the Administrator respond in a timely manner.

Audience Member Comment - The CAG's letter is a good idea, but letters or emails from individuals would also be helpful.

Response - The Secretary's email address is johnson.stephen@epa.gov.

EPA FY2008 Budget

Paul Peronard stated that the budget for next year's cleanups and investigations is under development. He made an initial budget request last month. In past years, Mr. Peronard and his predecessor developed the budget unilaterally. This year, Mr. Peronard would like advice from the community regarding priorities for cleanup and investigation activities. He provided and explained two handouts related to the budget, a list of potential project prioritization criteria and a cleanup project priority matrix. See Appendix 5 below for a copy of these handouts. Included in the matrix is an estimate of the cost of each of the cleanup projects. Mr. Peronard stated that he will provide the CAG a similar matrix for investigation projects. Mr. Peronard asked the CAG for questions regarding the handout material and for advice about whether and how to proceed with a prioritization at the next CAG meeting in October.

CAG Member Comment - Trying to divide an inadequate amount of money between the needed cleanup and investigation projects is not the right approach. It will be divisive. Instead, you should tell us how much funding is needed to conduct all of the needed work. Senator Baucus has told us that he will attempt to get the money we need. Once we know how much is needed to get all of the work done, we will work with Senator Baucus to obtain that amount.

Response - The budget process has not worked this way in the past. We have always been given an amount of funding and asked to get the most we can out of that amount. Libby gets 10% of all Superfund cleanup dollars, the largest allocation to any site. Even if the amount of funding was not at issue, we would still have to prioritize potential projects because there is a limit to how much money we can spend effectively in one year.

CAG Member Question - What is the total EPA budget?

Answer - EPA does not yet have a budget for the next fiscal year. I will get you the total amount for this year.

CAG Member Question - How much money can you spend effectively next year on cleanup and investigation projects?

Answer - I do not have this number. Based on the matrix costs and other work we are doing on investigations, I estimate roughly that we could use about \$29 million for cleanup projects and another \$9 million plus for investigations. I will develop this information and provide it at the next CAG meeting.

Question by the CAG Facilitator to the CAG - Do you want to limit CAG's actions to pursuing the total amount of money that EPA could spend effectively on Libby cleanup and investigation projects next year and leave Mr. Peronard to develop the priorities on his own, or do you also want to provide advice about budget priorities?

CAG Decision - After a discussion, the CAG decided that it should both pursue the total amount of funding that could be expended effectively next year and provide advice about budget priorities. The CAG also agreed that the best way for EPA to obtain the advice is through a CAG sponsored community meeting, separate from a CAG meeting. CAG members should solicit community participation in the meeting through one-on-one conversations and as a part of CAG member presentations to community groups. Information about needed projects and their costs should be included in the Power Point presentation that Bill Patten is developing. An effort should be also be made to advertise the community meeting and its purpose in the local print and radio and television media. The date for the community meeting was set for the normal CAG meeting date in November, November 8, 2007. The meeting will be in lieu of the normal November meeting and will be held at location different than the normal CAG meeting venue.

EPA Report

Ted Linnert reported that on Wednesday, September 26, 2007 scientists from EPA's Office of Research and Development and National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory (NHEERL) will be in Libby to discuss and answer questions about the plans for the toxicity studies currently being developed as part of the Libby Action Plan. These scientists will hold a public meeting from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. in the Fjord Room of the Venture Inn.

Other Agency Reports

Because of the length of the budget priority discussion, reports from the state, TAG, CARD, etc., were postponed until the October CAG meeting.

Public Comment

Audience Member Question - Where does the state fit into funding for the cleanup work in Troy?
Answer by Paul Peronard - We are still trying to figure out how to make best use of the state's resources.

Audience Member Question - Which operable units were included in your rough estimate of next year's investigation costs?

Answer by Paul Peronard - My rough estimate included only the residential and business property cleanups in Libby and Troy. It did not include the mine or the screening plant site or the bluffs.

Audience Member Question - Wouldn't you agree that seeking an expansion of the budget to include all effective expenditures is not realistic?

Answer by Paul Peronard - It is not my place to advise you about how to lobby for funds for Libby.

Audience Member Question - Wouldn't it make sense to give highest priority for cleanups to those residences with small children?

Answer by Paul Peronard - We have considered prioritizing cleanups for residences with small children. We haven't done so because residential occupants change.

Audience Member Question - Does EPA have guidelines for cleanups?

Answer by Paul Peronard - Yes, EPA has guidelines for Superfund cleanups. They don't apply to asbestos cleanups, however.

Audience Member Comment - If people are informed about the risks involved, they will make reasonable choices among the cleanup projects.

CAG Member Comment - While I understand the desire to get the project and budget information out through the media, such as the newspapers, the public will not likely read an article long enough to explain the projects, risks, and costs. This information should be addressed at the community meeting so that the public can judge the emotions, tone, and attitudes of EPA personnel as well as the factual information. I also do not support a voting process to determine the priorities.

CAG Member Comment - Even if the prioritization at the community meeting does not work well, the education about the cleanup and investigation projects will be beneficial.

CAG Member Comment - We should invite representatives of the Governor and our Congressional delegation to the community meeting.

Audience Member Comment - I do not agree with the last comment. We should limit the meeting to the Libby community.

Next Meeting Agenda Topics

- Discussion of investigation project matrix.
- Discussion of the design of the community meeting.
- Report on the CAG member outreach efforts, including which groups have been addressed.
- If MDPHHS Director Miles accepts the CAG's invitation, the current situation regarding asbestos disease-related funding will be discussed.
- Agency reports.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. on October 11, 2007 in the Ponderosa Room of Libby City Hall.

Appendix 1
CAG Member & Guest Attendance List
September 13, 2007

Members	Group/Organization Represented
David F. Latham	<i>The Montanian</i>
Clinton Maynard	Area Asbestos Research Group
Dr. Brad Black	Lincoln County Health Officer
K.W. Maki	Libby Schools
DC Orr	City of Libby
Rita Windom	Lincoln County Commission
Ted Linnert	EPA
Kevin Kirley	Montana Department of Environmental Quality
Paul Peronard	EPA
Eileen Carney	Montana State Board of Respiratory Care
LeRoy Thom	Former Grace Employee
Bill Patten	St. John's Lutheran Hospital

Appendix 2
Libby Community
Advisory Group
Presentation Overview

- What is the Cleanup About?
- Why Does the CAG Exist?
- CAG History
- Purpose
- Membership
- Accomplishments
- Current Work Plan
- What We Need from You

What is this cleanup about?

- The EPA has been working in Libby since 1999 when an Emergency Response Team investigated local concerns about asbestos-contaminated vermiculite.
- The area has been designated a "Superfund Cleanup Site" and the EPA has been working to clean up contamination and reduce risks to human health.

Pictures

Cleaning up outside...

Cleaning up inside...

The Monster Vac!

The Monster Vac!

Why Does the CAG Exist?

- One of the ways communities can participate in site cleanup decisions is by forming a Community Advisory Group (CAG).
- Its purpose is to provide a public forum for community members to present and discuss their needs and concerns related to the Superfund decision-making process.
- The EPA does not control the way each CAG is formed or the topics it discusses.
- A CAG is a committee, task force, or board made up of a diverse collection of community people affected by a hazardous waste site or other environmental problems.
- Forming a CAG is one of the most effective ways community members can help decide how to clean up the site or deal with other environmental issues.
- The CAG provides a public forum where community members can discuss their concerns about the site.
- The CAG is also a communication conduit to Montana's Congressional delegation (state and federal).

- A CAG can assist the EPA in making better decisions on how to clean up a site.
- It offers the EPA a unique opportunity to hear and seriously consider community preferences for site cleanup and remediation.
- The existence of a CAG does not eliminate the need for the EPA to keep the community informed about plans and decisions throughout the Superfund process.

History

- Libby has had a CAG for many years.
- The Libby CAG first met on February 3, 2000
- Until March 2002, the Libby CAG generally met twice a month. It has met once a month since then.
- CAG meetings have consisted of two parts:
 - Discussions of topics of interest to the CAG
 - Reports from the EPA and state and local agencies/organizations
- As of November 10, 2004, three additional CAG responsibilities were added:
 - Facilitating the creation of new organizations as needed;
 - Initiating the release of relevant information; and
 - Serving as a point of contact between the Libby community, Montana's Governor and other elected officials.

Accomplishments

- Through August 2007, the CAG has met 105 times!
- The CAG has provided a community forum at which more than 65 federal, state and local government officials, attorneys, and researchers have provided information and answered questions.
- The CAG has been instrumental in 3 critical decisions for Libby:
 - Convinced Governor Martz to use the "silver bullet" to place Libby on the Superfund National Priorities List;
 - Encouraged the EPA to remove asbestos-contaminated insulation from Libby businesses and residences; and
 - Insisted that the EPA conduct a toxicological study to determine the safe level of cleanup for Libby.
- The CAG continues to lobby for the declaration of a "Public Health Emergency."
- The CAG has insisted to both state and federal officials that a solution for Libby must include:
 - Clean up of all contamination along with long-term monitoring;
 - Provision of medical screening, care, and research;
 - Appropriate compensation for victims; and
 - Restoration of business vitality.
- The CAG:
 - Wrote the original grant request for the Technical Advisory Group (the TAG)
 - Has written numerous letters to federal and state officials and other parties such as W.R. Grace.

- Testified at several public hearings requesting funding and actions related to the asbestos cleanup and the provision of health care for those suffering from asbestos-related diseases.
- Specific requests the CAG has made:
 - Funding for the CARD Clinic and asbestos-related disease research;
 - Funding for the Lincoln County Community Health Center;
 - To hold Libby area businesses and residences harmless from asbestos contamination cleanup costs;
 - To obtain funding from the Montana legislature to provide short-term support for asbestos-related health care services;
 - For approval of an adequate EPA budget for the Libby cleanup.

Membership

- CAG members are self-selected.
- Membership qualifications – must be willing to:
 - Act as communication conduit between the EPA and members of the Libby and Troy communities,
 - Attend CAG meetings or send an alternative in their place, and
 - Have his or her name and telephone number published in the local newspapers.

Membership – Original List

- **Ron Anderson, Director**
 - Lincoln County Environmental Health
- **Kerry Beasley, Board Chair**
 - St. Johns Lutheran Hospital
- **Linda Beaulieu**
 - Chamber of Commerce
- **Gayla Benefield**
 - Lincoln County Asbestos Victims Relief Organization
- **Mayor Tony Berget**
 - City of Libby
- **Dr. Brad Black**
 - Lincoln County Health Officer
- **Grayson Casey, Realtor**
 - Kootenai Homes and Land Realty
- **Susan Feedback, Realtor**
 - Kootenai Homes and Land Realty
- **Ralph Heinert**
 - Community Member
- **John Konzen**
 - Lincoln County Commissioner
- **David Latham, Editor**
 - The Montanian
- **Cyrus Lee**
 - Kootenai Valley Headstart
- **Denis Leonhardt**

- **Concerned Citizen**
- **Kirby Maki, Superintendent**
 - **Libby School District**
- **Wally Moreau**
 - **Former W.R. Grace employee**
- **Les Nelson**
 - **Ministerial Association**
- **Rick Palagi, CEO**
 - **St. Johns Lutheran Hospital Inc.**
- **Carol Ray**
 - **Montana Covering Kids**
- **Norita Skramstad**
 - **Asbestos Victims**
- **Mike Switzer**
 - **Retired W.R. Grace employee**
- **Leroy Thom**
 - **Former Union President**
- **Bob Tunis, Director**
 - **Economic Development Council, Inc.**
- **Don Wilkins**
 - **Lumber and Sawmill Workers #2581**
- **Lloyd Douglas Williamson**
 - **Taxpayer**
- **Wilbur Wilson, President**
 - **Lincoln County Council on Aging**
- **Rita Windom**
 - **Lincoln County Commissioner**
- **Bob Zimmerman**
 - **Cabinet Resource Group**

A total of 27 names!

Membership – Current List

- **Dr. Brad Black**, Lincoln County Health Officer
- **Eileen Carney**, Montana Board of Respiratory Care
- **Mike Giesey**, Center for Asbestos Related Disease
- **Kenny Hays**, Libby Senior Citizens
- **David Latham**, Editor, The Montanian
- **Kirby Maki**, Superintendent, Libby School District
- **Bill Patten**, St. John's Lutheran Hospital
- **DC Orr**, City of Libby
- **Gary Swenson**, Libby Volunteer Fire Department
- **Leroy Thom**, former W.R. Grace employee
- **Rita Windom**, Lincoln County Commissioner

A total of 11 names!

More Members are Needed!

- The current members of the CAG are concerned that the group may not be meeting the community's needs.
- The survey:
 - The CAG has developed a survey in an effort to gauge the community's knowledge about the CAG
 - The survey will help decide what changes residents want to see in the scope and mission of the group.

Plans for the future...

- The CAG is currently working to:
 - Identify a funding source to meet Lincoln County's need for the long-term provision of asbestos exposure related health care.
 - Ensure that a scientifically valid risk assessment is completed in a timely manner so that the cleanup protects the health of Lincoln County residents.
 - Provide advice to the EPA about the cleanup budget priorities for the coming fiscal year.
- The CAG is currently working to:
 - Obtain the funding appropriated by the 2007 Montana Legislature to help provide health services over the coming biennium.
 - Reorganize the CAG to better serve the local Libby and Troy communities.
 - Recruit more CAG members!!!

What Does the CAG Need?

You!!

- Participate on the CAG.
 - A broadly unified community voice helps us get the funding and actions we need to ensure an adequate cleanup, obtain health care, and revitalize our local economy.
- Complete our survey (hardcopy or online)
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=wbcsg0baNDUkWNihBQmyZA_3d_3d
- Attend the November 8 Town Hall Meeting

Questions?

Thank You!

Appendix 3

August 15, 2007

Senator Max Baucus
511 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington DC 20510

Subject: Your Recent Visit to Libby

Dear Senator Baucus:

Thank you for your recent visit of August 6, 2007, to Libby, Montana. The Libby Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) is appreciative of your efforts to hear our concerns and address our issues. Your regular visits clearly demonstrate your commitment to helping us meet the difficult challenges we face.

Much of the discussion during the Town Hall meeting you hosted centered on the topic of declaring a Public Health Emergency for the Libby area. As you could tell from the many public comments, this issue is of paramount importance to the citizens of Libby and the surrounding communities.

As you know, our medical situation in Libby has steadily worsened since the discussion of declaring a public health emergency first began in 2002. The situation has been made worse because the incomes of many who have been exposed to asbestosis, those who need expensive healthcare services, have steadily declined. We now have over 1700 patients seeking medical care and screening at our Libby Center for Asbestos Related Disease (CARD).

The following examples underscore the severity of this situation. The Grace Medical Plan continues to deny coverage of essential healthcare services. These denials include medical procedures, essential diagnostic tests, and oxygen, all of which have been ordered by the attending physician. The Libby Area Medical Plan (LAMP), originally funded with monies received from an EPA fine against W.R. Grace, will soon be exhausted as well. The CARD, St. John's Lutheran Hospital, and our local physicians have borne the brunt of this impact, and cannot bare them much longer.

The members of the CAG who attended the Town Hall meeting heard the message, to paraphrase, that a public health emergency will not likely solve our problem. Accepting this for the sake of argument, we respectfully ask, "If not a public health emergency then what?" If this is not the tool for caring for the victims of asbestos exposure in Libby, then we need your help and that of Administrator Johnson to please help us find the better alternative.

During the Town Hall meeting Administrator Johnson committed to meeting with Secretary Leavitt of the Department of Health and Human Services to seek such an answer. The undersigned members of the CAG implore you to follow up on this commitment. It is vital for the health of our community.

In addition, the CAG members discussed your desire to accelerate completion of the Risk

Assessment. We want to share with you several concerns we have on this topic.

1. We want to be sure the science is done right. It is our understanding that a number of the studies that are underway or planned must occur sequentially, that is, one cannot begin until the results of the previous study have been completed and analyzed.
2. We believe it is important that all of the results of these studies be appropriately peer reviewed. The entire medical community must scrutinize the scientific processes and resulting data. This step is essential in order to assure that any conclusions are universally accepted.
3. It is vitally important that time be allowed for public comment throughout this process. As you have learned, we tend to have strong opinions and don't hesitate to share them with our elected officials as well as those involved in research. We believe that it is imperative that our community be given the chance to respond to assessment data/results throughout the process.

With these thoughts in mind we urge you to allow the Environmental Protection Agency the time needed to complete the Risk Assessment in an orderly and systematic manner. We believe Libby will only have one shot at this so we need it done right. The CAG members who were present at the meeting unanimously agreed that we should urge you not to unduly rush this process in any way which may jeopardize the validity of the assessment!

Thank you again for your concern and your ongoing support of our community!

With Warm Regards,

Dr. Brad Black
Lincoln County Health Officer

Eileen Carney
Montana State Board of Respiratory Care

Mike Giesey
Center for Asbestos Related Disease

Kenny Hays
Libby Senior Citizens

David Latham, Editor
The Montanian

K.W. Maki
Libby Public Schools

Bill Patten
St. Johns Lutheran Hospital

DC Orr
City of Libby

Gary D. Swenson
Libby Volunteer Fire Department

Leroy Thom
Former Grace Employee

Rita Windom
Lincoln County Commissioner

Appendix 4

September 7, 2007

Joan Miles
Director
Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services
111 North Sanders, Room 301
PO Box 4210
Helena, MT 59620-4210

Dear Ms. Miles:

As you know, the EPA has been working in Libby since 1999 when an Emergency Response Team investigated local concerns about asbestos-contaminated vermiculite. Since that time, the area has been designated a "Superfund Cleanup Site" and the EPA has been working to clean up contamination and reduce risks to human health.

As part of the Libby community's response to ongoing exposure concerns and the resulting clean-up efforts, a Community Advisory Group (CAG) was formed as a way for community members to help decide how best to perform the cleanup and deal with related environmental issues. The CAG provides an important public forum where community members can discuss their concerns and receive current information about the cleanup efforts and other topics related to asbestosis exposure.

For the last few months one of the issues the CAG has been exploring relates to the funding that is necessary to meet asbestos exposure related healthcare needs. In an effort to provide a temporary fix for a limited number of such needs, our group spearheaded the recently passed House Bill 407. We are concerned that the mechanisms by which these funds can be made available to our community have not yet been defined.

On behalf of the Libby Community Advisory Group (CAG), I would like to invite you to our October 11th meeting. We would like to share with you our specific concerns/needs and look forward to hearing your ideas for how this important issue can be resolved. The CAG meets in the Ponderosa Room, which is located in City Hall. The meetings start promptly at 7:00 and typically end by 9:00. Gerald Mueller serves as our facilitator.

Please let me know if you will be able to join us. I can be reached at 406-293-0177 or bill.patten@sjlh.com.

Sincerely,

Bill Patten
CAG Member representing St. John's Lutheran Hospital

Appendix 5

Libby Asbestos Superfund Site - USEPA

September 2007

Potential Project Prioritization Criteria for Libby

- 1) Risk/Potential Risk at the Affected Area
 - a. Exposure intensity (airborne concentration)
 - b. Exposure duration
 - c. Exposure frequency
 - d. Exposure groups (e.g. kids, workers)

- 2) Community Use/Value of Affected Area
 - a. Frequency of community use
 - b. Number of community users
 - c. Visibility/Image
 - d. Impact to way of life

- 3) Individual/Family Level Impact
 - a. Disruption
 - b. Economic impact
 - c. Medical condition(s)
 - d. Children

- 4) Economic Value of Affected Area
 - a. Number of jobs impacted
 - b. Revenue stream
 - c. Tourist draw?
 - d. Impact to transaction(s)

- 5) Cleanup Cost
 - a. Total cash needed
 - b. Available cash
 - c. Cost vs. Risk reduction

- 6) Ability to Reduce Risk
 - a. Eliminate vs. Reduce vs. Manage
 - b. Overall feasibility

Project Priority Matrix [DRAFT]

CLEANUPS:

Libby	Risk	Community Value	Individual/Family Impact	Economic Value	Cost	Ability to Reduce Risk
Properties	Complete exposure pathways exist. Frequency is often high and for most of the year. Generally levels found today are lower than those removed in prior years. People of all ages face potential exposure. Exposure duration is highly variable.	High	High	High	A fully loaded cost for a typical property (including design, sampling, clearance, disposal, etc) is now roughly \$75,000 per home (indoor and outdoor). With some larger properties more, smaller ones less.	Currently being verified through ABS, but thought good. Issues remain with residuals left in walls, crawl spaces, and carpets. Also there is an issue with use of PLM for outdoor soils confirmation.
Creeks	Complete exposure pathways exist, mostly in summer months. Material contains a high level of asbestos, with potential for tracking elsewhere. Flower Creek appears to have more contamination than either Granite or Callahan Creek. Exposure group is mostly children. Frequency during summer months is likely a few times a week, with duration a couple of hours.	High. Only place for kids to swim in summer. Flower Creek appears to be used more than Granite Creek, both of which see more use than Callahan Creek.	Moderate?	Low	Undetermined at this time. If a full excavation is required (likely on Flower Creek) is required cost (including restoration) would likely exceed \$500k	Warning signs and cover provide notice and limited protection. A physical removal would greatly minimize (if not eliminate) the potential for exposure.

CVCC	The greens and tee boxes of the original 9 holes have vermiculite as a drainage layer. ABS (mowing) scenarios showed exposures up to 0.002f/cc. Workers would be exposed daily in warmer months. Exposure to golfers is likely, but levels unclear.	High. The CVCC sees a lot of use by Libby residents and LHS. There are a number of out of town users as well. Because of this there is a fair amount of visibility. There is a somewhat intangible value to the golf course by providing exercise and enjoyment.	Low to moderate? Greatest effect on workers and players.	High. CVCC provides jobs, and with 18 holes would provide for a larger economic draw.	A design is in progress but costs will be high. This is a fairly large scale removal and restoration costs will be significant. Likely to exceed \$1.5M.	Interim measures, short of asking the CVCC to close the 9 holes, would be ineffective. Physical removal would greatly reduce (if not eliminate) potential exposures.
-------------	---	--	---	---	--	--

ERS	Risk	Community Value	Individual/Family Impact	Economic Value	Cost	Ability to Reduce Risk
Service	Most calls (30-50 per month) do not involve direct or on-going exposures, but do involve future exposures (e.g. a planned renovation involving vermiculite.)	Moderate to High. The ERS position is providing lots of information that will be quite germane to long-term O&M issues. Clearly, lots of community members are using this service.	Moderate. Mostly to individual property owners and tradesmen.	Moderate? The service has helped facilitate renovations and home transactions.	Roughly \$10,000 per month to have 24-hr. phone coverage, handle routine calls, and to do property visits/screenings.	Hopefully prevents exposures by providing education and consulting service.
Cleanups	Usually involves either an immediate cleanup of an accidental release of vermiculite (e.g. -a hole knocked into a wall) or a semi-planned, small scale removal to allow a homeowner to proceed with a renovation. We have been doing 5-10 of these per month.	Low. By and large these are single property owner issues, with some exceptions.	High. Impact to an individual's life can be substantial.	Moderate? These actions have helped facilitate renovations and home transactions	Roughly \$12,000 to \$18,000 per month.	Varies. Many actions involve interim fixes.

Demos	Potential exposures after a catastrophic event (e.g. a house fire) are usually small since the property is typically uninhabited. Homes with outdoor contamination are similar to those on the cleanup cue.	High. These homes tend to be eyesores, attract weeds, and attract vermin. The City and County are often after us to accelerate the demolitions.	High. Usually the property owner can not rebuild until the demolition /cleanup is complete. This also affects insurance and financing	Moderate to high. Impacts to property owner and those in the immediate area.	Depending on restoration requirements demolitions typically cost \$130,000 to \$250,000.	High. With removal of the building and contaminated soils the risk for residual material being left at the surface is quite small.
--------------	---	---	---	--	--	--

Troy	Risk	Community Value	Individual/Family Impact	Economic Value	Cost	Ability to Reduce Risk
Properties	Based on the screening results in hand, some of the properties in Troy might have higher potential for exposure than those in Libby.	High	High	High		Currently being verified through ABS, but thought good. Issues remain with residuals left in walls, crawl spaces, and carpets. Also there is an issue with use of PLM for outdoor soils confirmation.