

Presentation of Citizen Comments to the Basin Commission Board - DRAFT

July 21, 2010

Written Comments

No written comments were provided at the CCC meeting

Verbal Comments

Verbal comments provided at the July 21, 2010 CCC meeting are reflected in the CCC meeting summary and paraphrased below.

Comments

Commenter

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Why is so much of the Upper Basin cleanup was focused on zinc? That's not considered a human health issue.</p> <p><i>Andy Mork, Idaho DEQ, responded that zinc is a concern for fish. He mentioned that the cleanup will also focus on arsenic and lead, but zinc is the main contaminant in the Upper Basin.</i></p> | <p><i>Serena Carlson, citizen and representative for HECLA mining</i></p> |
| <p>Why are there standards for water quality if EPA intends to go beneath the site-specific standards as part of this plan?</p> <p><i>Another citizen responded that the site-specific standards were established as exceptions to the Clean Water Act and that EPA intends to bring these sites back to the national water quality standard.</i></p> | <p><i>Serena Carlson, citizen and representative for HECLA mining</i></p> |
| <p>You're going to be piping water out of the upper reaches in Canyon Creek and shuttling into the central treatment plant in Kellogg. Doesn't that de-water the river quite a bit? It seems funny to me that you're saving the fishery by de-watering it.</p> <p><i>Terry Harwood responded that EPA is going to develop a water budget to show what the effects of this action would be, but they have said that removing some of the contaminated groundwater will not dewater the fishery.</i></p> | <p><i>Serena Carlson, citizen and representative for HECLA mining</i></p> |
| <p>I think if you're going to do this plan of moving water from Canyon Creek to the central treatment plant, it would make more sense to put all the active mine water into the same pipe and treat it as well. NPDES compliance is costing more than it costs to run that treatment plant.</p> | <p><i>W.C. Rust, citizen</i></p> |
| <p>HECLA Mining is concerned about the costs of the Upper Basin Cleanup Plan.</p> | <p><i>Serena Carlson, citizen and representative for HECLA mining</i></p> |

Comments

Commenter

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Where is EPA and Idaho going to get money to fund the groundwater cleanup in the Box?</p> | <p><i>W.C. Rust, citizen</i></p> |
| <p>We should discuss funding questions of the Cleanup at the next CCC meeting with an EPA representative.</p> | <p><i>Vera Williams, CCC Vice-Chair</i></p> |
| <p>If a citizen is interested in learning more about Basin cleanup, I would recommend approaching any PFT members, or sitting down with Terry Harwood or EPA staff to discuss the issues.</p> | <p><i>David Fortier, citizen</i></p> |
| <p>If you want children to be tested for blood lead, pay the parents. Spending money to run ads in the newspaper is costing more than giving incentives to parents.</p> | <p><i>W.C. Rust, citizen</i></p> |
| <p>Quite a few people think that the agencies do not want to know what the blood levels are and so do not want people to get tested.</p> <p><i>Denna Grangaard, Idaho DEQ, said that the blood lead testing program is not used to justify any cleanup actions but to ensure safety and health.</i></p> | <p><i>W.C. Rust, citizen</i></p> |
| <p>You need more data and more longer-term data to really understand the East Mission Flats groundwater monitoring results from a contamination point of view.</p> | <p><i>David Fortier, citizen</i></p> |
| <p>Using the Star and Osburn sites for repositories were poor choices. The prioritizing scheme that was used was set up to make those sites the preferred ones from the beginning. However, if you are going to continue with these sites, develop good reference studies or the state is inheriting the high risk of contamination that is leaving from those sites. There is no way to separate out old contamination from the new contamination that you will put it. One of my concerns with the Osburn site is that it is right over top of the old river bed.</p> <p><i>Andy Mork, Idaho DEQ, responded that the old versus new contamination issue is a concern for DEQ, and so they have developed background studies. For the siting criteria, Andy noted that the criteria were developed by the citizens and weighted by elected officials, appointees, and agency representative during Repository PFT meetings.</i></p> | <p><i>David Fortier, citizen</i></p> |
| <p>Are you planning to plant trees along the toe toward the interstate on the EMF site? This would be helpful from a flood protection standpoint and as a visual barrier.</p> <p><i>Andy Mork, Idaho DEQ, responded that more than 360 trees have been planted near the location indicated.</i></p> | <p><i>David Fortier, citizen</i></p> |
| <p>The white rock chosen for the EMF site just lights the area up. I would recommend that future sites not include that color rock so that they blend in more with the landscape.</p> | <p><i>David Fortier, citizen</i></p> |