Libby Asbestos Superfund Site
February 10, 2015 – O&M Work Meeting Discussion Notes
Libby Schools Administration Building

AT A GLANCE:

Next Meeting: April 8, 2015
8 a.m. – 10 a.m. Libby Schools Administration Building

AGENDA for the Next Meeting

1. ***IC worksheet package; decision analysis***
2. ***Proposed plan outreach efforts planned and implemented***
3. ***Redevelopment, Regeneration and Redemption progress***
4. ***Eco-risk assessment for the mine site***

PARTICIPANTS at the February 10, 2015 Work Meeting

Participating: Dania Zinner, Tommy Cook, Nick Raines, Jenn McCully, Mandy Harcourt, Rebecca, Thomas, Donna Martin (TAG), Carolyn Rutland, Tom Stoops, Lisa DeWitt, Geoff McKenzie, Mike Noble (TAG), Christina Progess, and David Berry and Jennifer Lane via conference phone; Facilitator: Sandy Matheny

AGENDA

1. **ICs evolution**
2. **Outreach, participation, and decision analysis options**
3. **Redevelopment, Regeneration and Redemption progress**

DISCUSSION NOTES

1. Latest Evolution of ICs

Using the extensive work already done on ICs in TAG/CAG community forums, Trihydro's work, and input from other community groups, EPA will draft a set of preferred ICs to be included in the proposed plan. The preferred engineering remedy will also be incorporated. A shorter list of ICs not on the preferred list will also be available for discussion.

Note: The feasibility study, which does not include extensive detail pertaining to ICs, is still on schedule to be out in about a month. The proposed plan is projected for release by early April.

2. Outreach, community participation, and decision analysis options

We discussed a variety of strategies for encouraging involvement in the proposed plan. Our current thinking is to:

1. Refine the preferred ICs based on past work done by community groups and others involved over time.
2. Devise a worksheet package that describes the preferred ICs and provides an uncomplicated means to give meaningful feedback. The worksheets could be designed so that ICs can be prioritized (e.g., "Top 3 or 4, and Why") based on the importance to each participant. Also included will be some sense of the health risks abated and/or costs associated with each IC. The shorter list of ICs not making the preferred list will also be included.
3. Take it back to the community. Concurrent with the proposed plan public input period, we will use the worksheet package as a tool to gather input in small groups and one-on-one discussions. TAG/CAG will also (tentatively) offer community forum workshop(s) in June with the focus on feedback to the preferred IC worksheet package.

3. Redevelopment, Regeneration and Redemption

Taking advantage of where we are in the process, some of us were tasked to explore resources for augmenting community efforts in redevelopment. Several sources were explored:

- EPA's redevelopment group at the national level – Dania and Rebecca noted that EPA has a video production group skilled in creating redevelopment videos. Dania mentioned some possibilities (OU1, historical cleanup, industrial park (from Tommy), mine site eco-risk assessment, etc.). Be thinking about other possibilities and best options.
- SCORE and ENCORE – Nick's visit with these organizations indicate they are primarily resources for single, small businesses.
- State universities – Both University of Seattle and FVCC indicated to Dave Berry that they'd be interested and able. Grant funds would probably be needed.
- Jenn located a small PR firm in Seattle that feels like a good fit for Libby/Troy when/if the time comes for us to pursue this avenue.
- Dania is currently pursuing grant opportunities in general.
- Travel MT (Amy Reynolds, DEQ, has a contact) – this is still on the plate.

No handouts at this meeting