Libby Superfund Site
June 11, 2014 – O&M Work Meeting Discussion Notes
Libby Schools Administration Building

AT A GLANCE:

Next meeting (tentative): September 10, 2014
8 a.m. – 10 a.m. Venue: TBA

AGENDA for the September 2014 Meeting

1. **Discuss components of the proposed plan:**
   - **A preferred alternative for the "engineered" remedy (excavation/disposal/capping), and**
   - **A preferred alternative for the "administrative" remedy (institutional controls)**
2. **Outreach schedule implementation progress and plans**
3. **Activity update: risk assessment, property count**
4. **September meetings with visitors**

PARTICIPANTS at the June 11, 2014 Work Meeting

Nick Raines, Jenn McCully, Donna Martin, Rebecca Thomas, Carolyn Rutland, Deb McKean, Liz Fagen, Geoff McKenzie, Jennifer Lane, and Tommy Cook; Facilitator: Sandy Matheny

AGENDA for June 11

1. **The planning schedule**
2. **Property count**
3. **"When is remediation complete?": strategies for resolution**
4. **Outreach planning next steps**

DISCUSSION NOTES for June 11

1. Planning Schedule Timeline:

- Now – November: Complete the risk assessment.
- November – Early January: Complete and publish the feasibility study (an analysis of all alternatives), and the proposed plan (a synopsis outlining the preferred alternative) by early January.
- January – May: Remedial design planning, "finalize" the documents by late April/early May, and select the remedy. Large changes are not anticipated.

2. Property Count

Total properties addressed in Libby and Troy through this year: 8, 142

- Removal not required: 2,393
- Removal complete: 2,020

Projected properties remaining for investigation: 1,480 – 2,382

The spread in the numbers above is due to properties being characterized differently during early removal; primarily in the 2002 to 2003 seasons and a very few into ’04, ’05 and ’06. What was originally a 5-pt. procedure has become a 30-pt. composite sampling procedure.

A pilot program will sample 30 of those properties this summer to check for significant differences and/or need to reinvestigate.

Projected properties remaining for removal: 400 – 600

The spread in these numbers is based on percentages experienced in the past (numbers of properties where owners refused, or dropped out, or could not be contacted).

Property numbers are “dynamic,” with owners changing their minds, property ownership changing, and/or property use changing. “Last call” may engender a change in response as well. In any case, the project is getting closer to “done.”

3. “When is Remedial Action complete?”: Strategies for resolution

Strategies for resolution between cooperating agencies can begin with a draft definition for when remedial action is complete. An option to start with:

“Remedial Action is complete when EPA has been to every commercial and residential property (in OU 4 and 7), and when no unacceptable exposure remains based on current projected or reasonably-anticipated future use of the property. (This excludes limited use and non-use areas of a property).

Interior removal is complete recognizing that material left behind (if any) is contained (e.g., within walls). Exterior removal is complete when the majority of the surface is non-detect (25 percent or less may have trace on surface and/or greater than trace at depth).”

Note: EPA will conduct a “last call” program. Despite best efforts, it is anticipated that not all property owners will choose to participate in the remedial program. Consider how to manage contamination that may remain on those properties.

4. Outreach Planning Schedule Timeline and Next Steps

Action: Jennifer offered to draft an outreach schedule and anticipated waypoints by the end of June. The plan will help guide community and cooperating agency participation efforts through the next year. We sketched out an outline:

Now – November:

Maintain internal cooperating agency discussions to determine agreed upon courses of action. Talk about risk assessment when it becomes available. Discuss what that means (and doesn't).

What the risk assessment answers:

- How toxic is it, in ranking?
- What diseases do we get?
- Does it have to be cleaned up?
- The nine criteria would be included in these discussions.

Review information available for the FS and proposed plan. Share information currently available and determine information still needed for decision. Continue public participation meetings (informal) with general information sharing and updates as they become available.

November – May:

With the RA information available, efforts can focus more on remedial design planning. The remedy is implemented, whatever it is. Some is removed and some is left in place. How do we design ICs to protect that investment?

An approach will probably include discussions around several IC scenarios and possible responses to those situations.

Continue public participation meetings (informal and formal required) to finalize FS and proposed plan.

There were no handouts for this meeting.