

**Basin Environmental Improvement Project Commission
BEIPC)/Citizen Coordinating Council (CCC) Meeting
Special Topic: Waste Disposal Area Information**

Draft Meeting Summary Notes

July 27, 2023 4:00 – 7:00 PM

Panhandle Health District, 35 Wildcat Way, Kellogg, Idaho

Attendees in Person: (See Attached List of Attendees)

Jerry Boyd, Chair of the CCC

Terry Harwood, BEIPC Executive Director

Gail Yost (Notetaker, BEIPC Assistant)

Presenters:

Tamara Langton (Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Jocelyn Carver (EPA)

Rafi Ronquillo (EPA)

Meeting Facilitator:

Julie Shapiro (Keystone Policy Center)

Attendees via Teams:

Julie Congdon (EPA, Meeting Moderator)

Sandra Treccani (Washington State Ecology)

Dana Swift (Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, IDEQ)

Michael McCurdy (IDEQ)

Rebecca Stevens (Coeur d'Alene Tribe, CDA Tribe)

Zoe Olson (IFHC)

Monica Fabbi

Natashia

Lily Hibbard

Ed Hagan

Eric S.

Ken Clark

Joan

Leslie

Call to Order

Jerry Boyd, Citizens Coordinating Council (CCC) Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. He introduced Terry Harwood, Executive Director (ED) of the Basin Environmental Improvement Project Commission (BEIPC). Terry gave a background on the BEIPC which was created by the Idaho State Legislature in 2002 when the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) expanded the Superfund Site from the original 21-square miles around the Kellogg area to the whole Basin – from Lookout Pass to the Spokane River in Washington. Further information can be located on our website at www.basincommission.com. The BEIPC is made up of

Commissioners from the States of Idaho and Washington; Shoshone, Kootenai and Benewah Counties; the Coeur d'Alene (CDA) Tribe; and the Federal Government represented by EPA in Region 10. Its purpose is to coordinate the effort of these 7 governments and around 23 agencies in cleaning up the environment for human health purposes and to re-establish natural resources. There is also another group working on natural resources called the Restoration Partnership which is a collaborative effort comprising the Coeur d'Alene Basin Natural Resource Trustees which are the U.S. Department of the Interior, represented by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM); the CDA Tribe; the U.S. Department of Agriculture, represented by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS); and the State of Idaho, represented by the Idaho Departments of Fish and Game (IDFG) and Environmental Quality (IDEQ).

Legal action was taken against the mining companies – settlement agreements and funds are available for cleanup actions. All the environmental cleanup work is performed through the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), which law has been in effect since 1980. Terry explained that there is not another Basin Commission like this, it is very unique. He has been the ED since 2004.

Jerry introduced Julie Shapiro - she will facilitate the program today. Julie represents a company called Keystone Policy Center. The EPA presenters introduced themselves – Tamara Langton, Rafi Ronquillo, and Jocelyn Carver. In addition to the participants in the room, there are others participating virtually. Julie went over the agenda, meeting guidelines and objectives.

Introduction to Bunker Hill Superfund Site

Tamara started her presentation on the Bunker Hill Superfund Site background. The CERCLA law, more commonly called “Superfund”, was passed by Congress in December 1980. It was a tax levied on the chemical and petroleum industries that was put into a Trust fund used for investigations and cleanups around the country. This tax expired in 1995, and the funds ran out in the late 1990’s. CERCLA allows federal authority to respond to hazardous waste spills, dumps & contaminated sites that pose risk to public health and the environment. The main goals were to clean up contaminated sites, make polluters pay for cleanup work, involve communities in the cleanup process and return Superfund sites to productive use. A 1982 guidebook to identify and cleanup Superfund sites was called the National Contingency Plan (NCP) and from this called for a list of the worst Superfund sites in the US – National Priorities List (NPL). Compliance with other environmental laws and regulations must be identified when considering cleanup goals and alternative ways to meet cleanup goals. EPA’s cleanup decision documents measure progress during cleanup actions as well as what was achieved at the end of each action.

The Bunker Hill Superfund Site (BHSS) stretches from the Montana border through North Idaho and ends at the Upriver Dam on the Spokane River in Washington. The site is divided into the Box and Upper & Lower Basins. The Box is the original 21 square mile area contaminated from mining and smelting operations. Within the Box are Operable Units 1 and 2 (OU-1, OU-2) with OU-1 being the populated areas and OU-2 the unpopulated areas. The BHSS was then expanded into the Upper & Lower Basin and OU-3 was created. Tamara gave some historical information on the mining and milling operations in the Silver Valley. As successful as the

silver industry was, some of their mining practices left a legacy of contamination – over 100 million tons of mine waste including 2.4 billion pounds of lead spread over thousands of acres. There are many ways contamination can get spread – rail cars transporting ore, the smelters – and a common practice that was accepted was direct mine and mill waste discharged in the creeks and rivers, one being the South Fork of the CDA River (SFCDAR). Some mills would put their waste in unlined ponds that often broke or leaked into the groundwater. Until 1958, 2,200 tons per day of mine waste was discharged into the SFCDAR.

Another primary way contamination was spread was through air emissions from the BH Smelter Stacks - one of these being the baghouse fire of 1973. This fire burnt through their pollution control system, at the time was owned by Gulf Resources. They continued to operate for another 18 months even though the emissions they were releasing were much greater than before – from 10 to 20 tons per month of lead up to 160 tons per month, containing 50 to 70% lead. Silver King school was located right below where this fire happened. This created a lot of attention both locally and nationally and prompted the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to start blood lead testing of children. A year after, in August 1974, the blood lead levels in children were 68.3 micrograms per deciliter (µg/dL) – the CDC reference value at that time being around 40 µg/dL. In 1975, the levels measured 47.1 µg/dL, still higher than the CDC reference value of 30 µg/dL. In 1983, the original 21 square miles of the Box – the BHSS was placed on the National Priority List (NPL) which allowed federal authorities to focus resources to come in and further investigate sources and do something about it. The blood lead levels in 1983 measured 30 µg/dL – CDC reference value at this time was 25 µg/dL.

The first priority in the cleanup was the risk to people with the primary contaminants of concern (COC) from lead, arsenic and cadmium in soils and sediment. Early cleanup actions started in the Box and Upper Basin in 1986, but the first EPA cleanup decision document didn't come out until 1991. The Lower Basin early cleanup actions followed in 1989 with the EPA decision document coming out in 2002 when EPA came out with their OU-3 Record of Decision (ROD), with an update to this document in 2012. The second priority were risks to the environment and wildlife with the COC being zinc and other heavy metals in the soil and sediment that impacted water quality. Tamara covered the Superfund process from the NPL listing through Remedial Investigations, Feasibility Studies and the ROD documents and amendments (RODA). The BHSS is now at the Remedial Designs (RD) and Remedial Action (RA) phase, with long-term monitoring that will take place into perpetuity.

30 years of cleanup highlights include:

Benefits to people –

- Reduced blood lead levels from 30 µg/dL in 1983 to almost 3.5 µg/dL, which is the current CDC reference value.
- 7,167 Residential & Commercial properties cleaned up.
- 571 road segments remediated as part of the Roads Program.
- 25 human health Remedy Protection projects completed.

Benefits to Environment and Wildlife –

- 2.8+ million cubic yards of contaminated soil and other source materials removed and consolidated into engineered waste disposal facilities.
 - 8 Waste disposal facilities constructed & operated.
 - 2 Repositories closed and capped.
- 1,000+ acres of barren hillsides revegetated.
- Implemented major upgrades to the Central Treatment Plant (CTP)
- Converted agricultural lands to clean waterfowl habitat.

All these actions have impacted the blood lead levels as Tamara provided a slide showing the decline and results from the Box and Basin through the years. Good news for the overall picture, and cases with elevated levels of concern were investigated as some years did have spikes.

Tamara closed out her presentation with an update on the cleanup funding – EPA, IDEQ & CDA Trust. She provided a breakdown as follows:

EPA Special Settlement Accounts for the Box

- All work in Operable Units 1 & 2 (the Box)
- Funds cannot be used for Operable Unit 3 (the Basin)

State of Idaho

- Box Institutional Controls Program (ICP) as RA; Box Long-term ICP and Operations and Maintenance (O&M); Box Discretionary Projects (e.g., Blood Lead Screenings); Box & Basin Remedial Action Cost-Share and O&M; O&M of the Central Treatment Plant (CTP)
- BEIPC Executive Director, Expenses & Clerical Support

EPA Appropriated Funds

- Pipeline (Planning, Investigations, Design, Monitoring)
- Remedial Action (Remediation/Construction/Cleanup)

CDA Trust – Can only fund CDA Trust Work in the Basin

- Basin (Operable Unit 3) Environmental Actions
- Cannot be used to fund Grants, Cooperative or Interagency Agreements with States, Tribes, Local Governments or EPA's Oversight of Trust Work.

She had previously stated that the Superfund tax that had been set up in the 1990's, which then expired, and funds depleted, has been reenacted just this past year with revenue available in the next calendar year 2024. Settlement agreement money is still currently being used for the Box and not appropriated dollars, but these are Box settlement dollars that can only be used in the Box and not the Basin. Some of these projects included the upgrade to the CTP and installation of the Ground Water Collection System (GWCS) both currently in use to treat contaminated mine water from the Bunker Hill Mine and groundwater from the Central Impoundment Area (CIA).

The 2008 Asarco Bankruptcy settlement in the amount of \$436.6 million was deposited into the Successor Coeur d'Alene Custodial and Work Trust (CDA Trust). A Federal Trustee is appointed to this fund and is financially responsible for the CDA Trust account including

investment of funds. EPA approves the annual CDA Trust workplans and budgets; the current annual budget is \$30 million. The total value as of June 30th is \$567.7 million, with total spent through June 30th of \$215.2 million.

Questions and Answers and Discussion

Ann Curry wanted to give some pre-history before the Superfund Site, in the early 60's and 70's there were no regulations for anything. She wanted to point out, to her knowledge, there has been no follow-up of the physical results to all of us who have been leaded. For instance, when her children were pregnant, she made sure they told their doctors they were leaded, but it doesn't do any good. She feels there has been little study or follow-up to the symptoms and diseases, and that they missed an opportunity to learn about what lead does to people's physical health. Tamara answered that EPA can only do what is in their authority under CERCLA to do, which is to cleanup and monitor contamination levels. There was an epidemiology study done back in the day from the University of Washington that had volunteers and kids come in to be studied to try and make that link between lead and disabilities. There were only a small number of people who did it and they weren't able to make a clear distinction. She wants to have experts in the field come here for people to talk to. Terry added the agencies responsible for cleaning up the environment and habitat aren't mandated to deal with the human aspect. It's a big problem that everyone needs to understand. The blood lead levels are tested to determine how well we are doing with the cleanup.

Henry Benson wanted to know if the CDC has any liability even though they had an official input into the decision to make it a Superfund Site – the CDC is doing nothing as far as evaluating what the problems are. Tamara has no idea what the CDC is liable or responsible for. They were here after the 1973 Baghouse Fire, first providing money and leading blood testing, but her understanding is they also left early too, giving the responsibility over to the Idaho Department of Health & Welfare.

Dave Fortier asked if the EPA has ever made a request for the CDC to do an evaluation of the people. When he worked for BLM in the Lower Basin, they made a request to the CDC to evaluate their lands and they did. Tamara does not think they have ever made a direct request to the CDC. They do work through an agency of the CDC called ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry) in Seattle and they have been involved in what is going on here. She will be speaking to them to come and see what their agency can do, or at least come talk and explain what they can or cannot do.

On-line chat questions from Monica Fabbi – she wanted to know if the law limits all uses of funds, exactly which laws regulate how money can be used, and can EPA train health care providers on lead health? Terry answered on the funding question, appropriated funds go through Congress each year for budget approval, and the settlement agreements are controlled by a court order for each settlement, and specifics on where dollars can be spent. Agreements made early on with responsible parties made sure the money was spent on actual work conducted within the site. Tamara handled the question on training health care providers – EPA does not train but provides money to people who do, like our Health Districts. At the BHSS, Panhandle

Health District (PHD) run programs called the Lead Health Intervention Program (LHIP) and the Institutional Controls Program (ICP), both entail a lot of education and outreach, and working with the medical community here in the Silver Valley and Coeur d'Alene. It is important that pregnant women and children have their blood tested primarily for lead and continue to work with the medical field on the dangers of lead exposure. Our education and outreach are focused on letting everyone understand the risks involved with lead exposure and what you can do to reduce exposure. Mary Rehnborg from PHD added that their focus is on intervention because you cannot treat historic lead exposure. Their goal is to make sure those exposures are cut off and not happening within the BHSS. PHD provides an educational program they do with Kootenai Health when they have a new circulation of residential doctors come through, a day is spent with them explaining the different hazards of lead, how it affects the human body, and how they need to be extra aware of that being an exposure problem in our area. Every time they do blood lead screening, letters are sent to local physicians to make sure they are aware of the results of this screening. Any time a child is identified as having high blood lead, in-home consultations are offered where they do sampling and provide information on where the lead is found and how to reduce exposures. Nutritional guidelines on how to flush the lead out of their bodies and referrals to their physicians with results are also provided, and follow-up within a couple of months to see if their levels are going down.

Waste Disposal Area Information – Session 1 – Jocelyn Carver, EPA

Waste Management Strategy and Needs

Over 100 million tons of contaminated waste were identified throughout the Upper and Lower Basin in the 2002 OU-3 ROD. Six alternatives were evaluated to address risks to humans and the environment using the 9 criteria per the NCP. These range from no action to a combination of different removal and treatment options. The remedy selected called for more extensive removal and limited treatment in very specific areas, chosen as the best trade-off for costs, better reduction of waste and greater implementation ability. The OU-3 ROD identifies a four-step process: site identification; technical evaluation; public input/notification; and decision documentation. The ROD estimated volumes of waste material that may require excavation and identified priority clean-up areas. The CDA Trust uses this information to help plan and forecast repository needs, and as of now are forecasting into 2042.

Repositories vs Waste Consolidation Areas (WCA)

There are three primary types of waste disposal facilities used throughout the site to contain contaminated waste: Repositories, Waste Consolidation Areas (WCA), and Limited Use Repositories (LUR). Some differences include their waste stream, locality, and construction. Similarities would include long-term engineered storage, monitoring throughout the lifetime of the disposal area, and effective and secure methods to remove contaminated sediments away from receptors such as humans and wildlife. There are several different programs generating waste throughout the site: ICP, source site remediation, Basin Property Remediation Program (BPRP), and human health recreational sites, and the now completed Paved Roads program. WCA's are designed to accept a specific type of waste and are typically open for shorter periods of time. They are located near the waste source and have a flexible footprint with enough area to accommodate future waste. Repositories are designed for varied waste streams for a longer

timeframe and are not always located near the waste source. There are four LUR's on-site that have been capped, closed, and monitored – these repositories were primarily used to dispose of waste (asphalt and concrete) from the Paved Roads Program.

Discussion of monitoring, operation, and closure procedures

Protection and monitoring of waste disposal areas occur throughout their lifetime – part of the design process is to come up with an O&M plan. This document includes a description of inspections, best management practices, and when and how often to perform them. Monitoring efforts can include ground water, surface water, the interactions between the two, or specific design features and are tailored specifically for each waste disposal area. The monitoring framework is specific to each waste disposal area as each differs in construction, location, setting and waste stream. Monitoring is typically conducted quarterly, including peak and base flow conditions, and more frequently during waste placement or inclement weather. Baseline monitoring happens even before construction to establish environmental and hydrological conditions to provide data for design. Performance monitoring provides information to assist in identification of adaptive management actions to improve remedial design and/or repository performance. Post closure and long-term care evaluates repository performance and remedial action effectiveness over time through the response in water quality. They are consistently monitored to make sure they are secure and protective, and that waste is not leaving the site. This includes evaluations during the Five-Year Review process. Best Management Practices (BMPs) can include erosion control and surface water management, dust suppression, and decontamination pads.

Questions and Answers

Lauren McCroskey stated they covered the monitoring and base line information during and after closure, she wanted to know where this data would be available, is this something the public can view? Jocelyn answered they can submit a formal request for information through the FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) process - they also upload documents on their website, if there is something you do not see you can submit the request. Mary also said that it is on the EPA website for the Superfund Site (on EPA.gov Region 10 Bunker Hill Superfund Site).

Dawn Wiksten from Friends of the River Coalition – how many of these sites have required over the years some remedial action of containment or upgrades. Jocelyn stated to her knowledge none of them have required any additional remedial action. Terry added that the LURs have been closed and capped and now available for commercial development.

Jerry Boyd asked if the monitoring continued after the closure and Jocelyn answered yes.

Henry Benson wanted to know what was involved in the capping process. Jocelyn said each repository is different and accepts different kinds of waste, and the cover is based on the design process – she will cover this a little more detail in her next slides.

Ed Moreen from EPA answered the question from Lauren on where to find the information on repositories – asked that she please reach out to Jocelyn or one of the team members and they will make sure it gets set up on the website. Our documents must -go through screening to make sure they are not revealing any personal identifiable information – and the most expedient way to get the information is to go through the FOIA process and request the document.

Monica Fabbi (on-line) said FOIAs are hard to make if you do not know the titles of the documents, how do you find out the names of monitoring data documents? Ed answered that they would need to know which repository they are interested in, but they have regular monitoring reports for each repository, just be specific to which one in your request.

Another on-line question from Eric in Harrison, he wanted to know what other metals or toxins are common that you are remediating for? Tamara said there are many contaminants in the area, but the primary ones impacting people's health would be lead and arsenic in soils - lead, arsenic, and cadmium in drinking water. For the environment and wildlife, these contaminants of concern would be arsenic, cadmium, copper, lead, and zinc in soils – these contaminants as well as mercury and silver in sediment in rivers and streams – copper, lead, zinc, and cadmium in surface water.

Terry stated that in most cases the siting for repositories is constructed on land that is already contaminated - cleaning up the site then capping it.

Waste Disposal Information – Session 2 – Jocelyn Carver, EPA

Overview of existing repositories and WCAs

Jocelyn showed a map of the current and existing repositories and WCAs within the site.

East Mission Flats (EMF) – located in the Lower Basin near I-90 by Cataldo across from the Old Mission in a non-residential area and accepts ICP waste. This repository was built in a heavily contaminated area, identified, constructed, and operated by IDEQ and holds ICP waste. The height and capacity were influenced by the public during the 30% design in which concerns were voiced over the visual impacts from the Mission. The sides are armored to protect from potential flood events – anticipated closure will be in 2042.

Page Repository – is located between Smelterville and Pinehurst. It is the only continuously operating repository in the Box taking remedial action cleanup project waste and ICP waste. It also was constructed on a heavily contaminated area. In 2012, they realized the need to expand its capacity and are currently constructing cell #4 out of an expansion of 6 cells. The estimated lifetime is about 22 years based on the current 5-year average.

East Fork Nine Mile Waste Consolidation Area – located in the Upper Basin in the East Fork Ninemile Creek basin. It accepts mine and mill site cleanup waste from the Nine Mile Creek Canyon. It has gone through 3 expansions and is currently in its last expansion taking Dayrock and Tamarack Complex cleanups. It was constructed in 2013 with anticipated closure to happen

in 2025/2026. There is an on-site quarry that is used as a borrow source for clean soil and rock which has resulted in cost savings and increased the waste consolidation capacity.

Canyon Complex Repository/Waste Consolidation Area (CCR/WCA) – is located near Woodland Park by Wallace. The CDA Trust obtained private property to the north, east, and south of the former Silver Valley Natural Resource Trustee (SVNRT) repository which was not properly constructed and released contaminated surface water. The Trust removed and relocated 615,000 cubic yards of waste in 2021/2022 from the SVNRT to CCR. This material was placed to form the footprint of the CCR/WCA which accepts mine and mill site cleanup waste from the Canyon Creek drainage. The decision to remove and relocate Silver Valley Natural Resource Trustee waste was compared against a number of alternatives that included installing a cutoff wall to isolate ground water and surface water from the repository, capping the repository in place, and continuous groundwater treatment. These alternatives were costly and not very feasible or protective which led EPA to make the decision to relocate SVNRT waste. There is an on-site quarry for clean material at CCR.

Big Creek Repository/BCR Annex (BCR/BCRA) – located in the Big Creek Watershed in the Upper Basin east of Kellogg. BCR was the former site of the Sunshine Mine Tailings Pond. It was constructed in 2002 and has gone through two expansions (2010 & 2016) and receives ICP and BPRP waste. The BCRA was constructed in 2014 to increase the capacity of BCR receiving the same waste stream.

Lower Burke Canyon Repository (LBCR) – located north of Wallace on the old Star Mine Tailings Pond. It was constructed in 2014 and takes ICP and Upper Basin RA site waste.

New Lower Basin WCA – the CDA riverbed sediments are a significant source of lead contamination in the Lower Basin. During high flow events, these sediments are picked up from the bottom of the river and carried down to CDA Lake, which accounts for 70% of the total lead contamination to the lake. Dudley Reach represents the first location in the Lower Basin where this process occurs, recognized in the 2002 OU-3 ROD as an ideal candidate for a Pilot Project to reduce particulate lead and other metal loading to the river. The preliminary design entails a partial dredge and cap approach which would require a local disposal site WCA. Community engagement started in 2020 regarding the siting of a new WCA which would take waste from the Dudley Reach project and future Lower Basin Remedial Actions. An extensive property search of 394 potential properties resulted in the identification of two CDA Trust owned properties – the South River Road and the Dredge Road. In 2022, a Project Focus Team (PFT) was convened to evaluate these WCA locations, EPA is still evaluating the recommendations from this PFT.

Public Engagement and Siting Criteria – Rafi Ronquillo (EPA)

Rafi began his presentation on how EPA engages with the public. Several tools are used on-line as well as physical to reach out to the community – fact sheets mailed to Lower Basin residents, virtual public information sessions, social media www.facebook.com/cdabasin, newspaper public notices, messages to project email, basin bulletins 3x a year, and BEIPC meetings. Coordination

happens between partner agencies for outreach efforts like IDEQ, PHD, BEIPC and the CDA Tribe.

In 2009, BEIPC, EPA, IDEQ, and local community members developed a waste repository siting criteria. The criteria are a checklist of issues local community members told the agencies were important to consider when selecting locations. In 2020, EPA asked whether these 2009 criteria were still relevant, and if there were other issues we should consider when finding a location for the new WCA. A 60-day public input period was held in which people could deliver their input. EPA issued the “Lower Basin Waste Consolidation Areas Siting Criteria: EPA Responsiveness Summary” to respond to all the input they received, attached here in this link:

<https://semspub.epa.gov/work/10/100285186.pdf>. Some of the concerns that came up in the 2009 citizen’s criteria were: impacts to wetlands; impacts to surface water, fish, and wildlife; impacts on floodplain; proximity to faults and landslide areas; impacts to people living or working nearby (residences and schools along truck haul routes); impacts to businesses along truck haul routes; trucking costs; potential for economic redevelopment once repository construction is complete; and storage capacity <https://semspub.epa.gov/work/10/100253223.pdf>. WCA site selection criteria are identical to the citizens criteria with the only difference between the two being the development of WCAs to generate clean soil or rock for remedial action construction and caps in the future.

Ways to continue to communicate with EPA:

Join our mailing list <https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/csitinfo.cfm?id=1000195>

Follow Coeur d’Alene Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/CDAbasin/>

Contact Community Involvement Coordination team:

- Rafi Ronquillo (206)603-6358, Ronquillo.Rafi@epa.gov
- Deb Sherbina (206)679-9667, Sherbina.Deb@epa.gov

Terry said in addition to EPAs contact information, you can contact the BEIPC Executive Director or www.basincommission.com.

Questions and Answers and Discussion

Lori Jenicek wanted to know what the actual existing lead levels in the river today that we see and have concerns about, and on the banks where she sees people recreating. And the second question regarding Dudley Reach, her concern is about working downriver from where the contamination is and the recontamination at some point in time. The original dredge hole is filling in and bank stabilization has not occurred in the deep areas of the river. She has seen a big drop along the banks in the last eight years from Cataldo to the dredge hole, and wonders what contamination is dropping into the river. If this is not addressed, what good is it work downstream first. Ed Moreen addressed Lori’s questions – why start at Dudley Reach, EPA has been looking at the river long and hard to try to figure out where the greatest amount of lead is

being generated. They see about 300 tons per year flowing into Lake CDA. About 15% of the lead contributing to the lake comes from the South Fork, about 15% comes from the banks, and the other 70% is coming from the riverbed. There are 37 river miles between Harrison and the confluence at Enaville. They are obviously not going to dredge 37 river miles, so they needed to figure out where the highest concentration of lead was coming from - to be smart about using their resources to really have an effect in reducing lead transport to the floodplains, residents, banks, and downstream to the lake. In all their monitoring and watching of the river during floods, they have found that there is a big spike downstream from the dredge hole. There is no consistent concentration of lead in the river except in this particular area. A pilot project is a test to see if we can be effective in dredging and capping at a certain location, and what kind of results we get. We do not know how successful this is going to be as it is a tricky channel and could be 30 to 40 feet deep. Lori asked if the lead deposited is that deep, the concern is how you dredge it up without stirring up problems, maybe capping is a good idea. Ed stated they are looking at both as they want to be very strategic in how they go about this project.

Concentrations in this area are high - they typically see the riverbanks at 3,000 to 5,000 parts per million (ppm) lead. This is a very big system, and every event is unique. This is why they are starting at this location - they realize there will be recontamination as there is lead still coming from the South Fork, even though they are continuing to address source areas upstream. The Dredge hole where the mining companies dredged have been sampled to determine lead levels and they do not seem to be as high as those downstream. The big areas that are getting scoured are the big contributors to the high levels of lead. There are plans for ongoing bank stabilization in the area between Enaville and Cataldo, but they are having trouble with access from some of the property owners.

Todd Kinsey wanted to know who thought it would be a good idea to put a repository in a floodplain. Jocelyn said given the unique lay of the site, some repositories might be located in a floodplain. They do their best to meet all the criteria and balance the needs, but it is important to note that they are siting the repositories in previously heavily contaminated areas. The proposed dredge road WCA/Repository site is already contaminated so having a repository on top of the contaminated material, which will be capped and covered, will reduce the amount of water infiltration through the waste and provide a clean area for wildlife. Dave Fortier added that the floodplain water is moving laterally underneath the repository. You may be cutting down immediate infiltration from the top, but you are not stopping the lateral flow.

Jamie Sturgess applauded all the work that has been done, he remembers what it looked like, and it was not an example of best mining practices but common ones for the times. He mentioned a letter Dave Leptich from IDFG wrote on the approval program, progress, and timing on the Lower Basin WCA siting in which he suggests August 5th as an important time, hoping final approval can be done because there are years and years of work that can't move forward - stalled for other remediation and clean-up programs - and if we missed this date for a decision, that would set other programs back a year or two due to the seasonality of the work and the long lead time for progress and approvals. Jamie representing Kootenai County and himself as he lives by Bull Run Lake, he would like to see this decision by August 5th. Jocelyn answered that making this decision is a complex process. The PFT re-evaluated and re-analyzed the potential siting

location which was a lot of information. It is important to take time and consider input from all the stakeholders before this decision can be made, but they are working on it.

Dawn Wiksten is curious about mitigating additional lead flows and testing upriver as she lives in the Enaville area. She stated they tested the soil and banks three years ago through Silver Valley Laboratory (SVL) and the arsenic level, due to the plant that was there by the Snakepit, tested 500 times the legal limit and the lead 10 times, which is all on record with the county. There was a hearing and lawsuit for allowing commercial development there, and now we are allowing All-Terrain Vehicles (ATV's) and commercial development in areas which is only causing additional wear and tear on these soils and banks. She's happy to pay again but hoping IDEQ would have these areas tested again. This is where the confluence is with high velocity during flooding. Some of these properties should not be allowed to be developed. Jocelyn thanked Dawn for working with them and helping gain access to some of the properties. It takes a village to clean up this site and is important to all of us.

Jocelyn wanted to go back and answer the question on ground water monitoring from a previous conversation – EPA conducts ground water monitoring frequently at all the repositories to see if any water is interacting with the waste. They have not found this to be the case at any of them through their monitoring program.

Dan Price stated several people have mentioned 4-wheelers getting into the river, he thinks we have a bigger problem. There is not too much we can do about the spring floods, but the lake boats coming up the river from Harrison to the Old Mission are slapping the banks without mercy. The river is getting wider and wider. The smaller bass boats, canoes, and pontoon boats use some common sense coming up the river and are alright. They do a little bit of erosion, but nothing like the big boats. He has noticed quite a difference on the banks from their wakes. Dawn Wiksten stated they are coming up higher than the Mission, they are going all the way up to Steamboat. Terry commented on the wakes from people he knows on the Lake and Spokane River whose docks are knocked over and torn up due to the big wakes. Kootenai County has issues with policing all the activity, but if we all get together and talk to someone who can deal with the issues, we can cooperate together.

Lori Jenicek spoke about coordination with PHD and Kootenai County, because Kootenai County Marine Patrol does not have the money to get more boats and more bodies. There is money within the CDA Trust if it could be used for any purpose, and coordinated correctly, to help with the sediment issues. Even if it was one or two boats and a couple of bodies on Friday's and Saturday's. The law is there but as more people move in there are less people available to enforce it. Terry said the law does exist, but the CDA Trust money cannot be used for that purpose and Lori understood that. Dawn Wiksten stated there is funding that is going to be made available, the Coast Guard is putting into place a marine patrol working with our officers here to help control the issues. Kootenai has more money than Shoshone through the vessel fund which is available – EPA is not the place to look for that, but the Coast Guard and vessel fund is. There are councils that can be done hopefully with Kootenai, Benewah, and

Shoshone Counties to develop a recreational district where the funds are portioned out appropriately.

Eric from Harrison asked if there was a cleanup action taking place at the current bird sanctuary construction site 5 miles NE of Harrison on the south side of trail, there is a lot of sediment being moved. Ed answered that he believed Eric was speaking about Gray's Meadow agriculture to wetland project. That is a multi-year project, about 700 acres, creating a wetland in the near future.

Monica Fabbi stated 1) that most of the community do not think their comments have been considered with any weight in the past, what is the proper process for getting comments heard and when are the next opportunities to do that for new sites; 2) How is East Mission Flats sited so close to schools and subsidized housing – at Amy Lynns and Shoshone Apartments? 3) Why was the Canyon Complex built right across the highway from subsidized housing at Canyonside? Jocelyn answered questions 2 and 3 first – East Mission Flats is not located near any subsidized housing or schools. The location was based on its distance away from people living and recreating, along Interstate 90 at the Cataldo exit in an already contaminated area. The Canyon Complex and Lower Burke Canyon Repositories were both constructed on existing tailings ponds. They are consistent with our goals in siting repositories in already contaminated areas. Mary with PHD wanted to make a comment on the Star Complex and Canyon Repository - before we were using those, there was no dust control or containment cells. Now those are maintained, and dust does not come off like it used to. As a local, she sees an improvement by us moving in and taking over by putting in a repository in that location. Rafi answered Monica's question on the public comment periods not being heard – they try their best to hear everyone's comments and concerns. He acknowledged that it is frustrating to feel like you're not being heard. The public comment period for the last WCA siting has already passed. However, our inbox is always open if you need to contact them with concerns or need more information.

Lori Jenicek stated that her previous question about the actual water contamination level was not answered. What are the lead levels in the streams and banks today? Terry stated that the sediment was tested one year after a high-water event with totals at the Rose Lake Boat Launch coming in high. Ed stated with respect to the water quality, the lead levels are pretty low when there is no high-water runoff but does not have actual numbers today. Most of their sampling focuses on high flow periods when we are looking at suspended sediment. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) does water quality sampling on a regular basis for EPA in the South Fork and the main stem of the CDA River. Those reports are on our website - they look at total lead in the water quality. Lori asked if they were concerned about the community's health. Mary answered if you are just swimming in the water and not drinking it, it does not permeate through the skin. The exposure comes from the sediments and the sand on the banks. They do have signs posted warning of the dangers, but it's a constant battle to keep them up, so people continue to recreate in these areas. It is an interesting dynamic to balance between we are not doing enough to you are doing too much. She addressed Dawn about PHD's legal authority to be able to tell people up the river they can't build a campsite on the banks – it is not in their law. She would love to be able to tell people they can't, but she doesn't have that authority.

Dawn Wiksten wasn't telling Mary she has the ability to tell people what to do or not to do, but you don't have to put a rubber stamp in Planning & Zoning and say yes, it's okay. She wanted to touch base on what Mary said about the kids playing on the banks, they were promised that the two big signs up by Enaville on each side of the road, that PHD allowed the owners to take the signs down due to their current renter's concerns. Dawn said that is PHD's responsibility to educate these people about the dangers around there. Mary addressed the sign issue, the signs were installed on private property under different ownership and when that property changed hands, the new owners did not want the signs there. They cannot force a private property owner to maintain a sign. Dawn said the other thing going on with these properties talking about the dust and dirt in the soils, is that people are using leaf blowers to get rid of debris and its crazy how much dust they are blowing around. Is there a way to say if they are going to utilize these properties it must be within some kind of healthy scope? Julie Shapiro wanted to get back to other questions due to time constraints.

Terry asked if they could explain ICP to everyone – Mary explained the Institutional Controls Program, it was implemented as part of the RODs here at the site and because the contamination was so widespread, there was no way to clean it all up. The ICP was created so they could do partial removals of contamination and replace it with clean soils. This program is in place to make sure these barriers that have been installed are protected and maintained for the rest of time. Any new development or projects where they are disturbing barriers or they are developing an area that hasn't been cleaned up, permits are issued to make sure they are sampling the soils and installing barriers with the development, or putting barriers back the way they were. The disposal sites have room for waste from homeowners and contractors for any contaminated dirt they need to dispose of and is a free service.

Lauren McCroskey asked for a better sense on the repositories – what is their actual design and what goes into one, is it the same technology that has been used for years or is there any new innovative technology being used. Ed answered that each repository is looked at from a site-specific standpoint and what kind of materials are going to be put into it. The whole design process is lengthy from site characterization, wells in place for ground water, data collection, looking at surface water, and soil characteristics. All this is put in place for the conceptual model design for each repository. Then they decide if using a liner or not makes the most sense. The end design is determined – how much material is going in, how much will fit into that area, how high and how wide it will be, what kind of surface run-off it will have like rainwater, and if it will have an earthen cap or a liner. The caps have trade-offs – the liners have lifespans but are not as penetrable, which also determines how thick the cap will be. All the caps and covers have some earthen components so they can have vegetation. The CIA in Kellogg has one of those liners underneath a foot of topsoil and a foot of sand, so all you see from the highway is a grassy knoll. The purpose is to shape it, drain it, and take care of it - it is monitored for ground and surface water, and monitor the surface to make sure it is not eroding. EPA is always looking for newer and greater technology through their Office of Research & Development (ORD) – always looking for a better answer than what we have.

Tamara explained a little more about Gray's meadow as she was asked on-line for more details. The soil there is contaminated and the concern for wildlife there is the lead. This project is not only cleaning up soil but also restoring it from a former agricultural area into wetlands.

Zoe Olson from the Intermountain Fair Housing Council (IFHC) asked if families with children, people with disabilities, women, people of childbearing age that are located at the Amy Lynns, Canyonside and Shoshone Apartments are receiving housing, playground, and garden remediation services and lead/heavy metal testing for their families. Also, what education has been done in the last year. Tamara explained that all three housing complexes are subsidized housing either through the federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) or the USDA. They are very much on their radar for EPA and PHD and are offered services like free blood lead testing, like everyone who lives here. They do a lot of direct education at these complexes – and the properties around them have been tested and remediated already. Mary added that direct outreach at subsidized housing includes welcome kits to all the managers for new residents and contains remediation information, sample data, remedies that have been completed at each property, and a few things to help protect their and their family's health. Shoshone Apartments is an adult only facility, but they do go to Canyonside and Amy Lynns and hold pizza parties, which were just held in June, and provide free giveaways – dust rags, soap, nail brushes - to promote cleaning and washing hands. If a particular person within one of these units requests additional sampling, they will absolutely do that as a free service through the health department. They can verify that they are all still clean, safe, happy places to live.

Julie said there was a comment from Monica Fabbi addressing the Amy Lynns and Shoshone Apartments – as the wind blows the fact that the lead does not follow the road except when it is in a truck driving down the road to the repository. Mary was not sure if Monica was referring to the trucks hauling ICP waste to the repositories, but if so, all trucks that are transporting contaminated materials are required to make sure their loads are covered. If they are creating dust, please give them a call. The contractor will be contacted and dealt with. If they are following the rules as required when they draw an ICP permit, it should not be a contributing factor for anyone living at any of these complexes. Jocelyn added that all repositories have a decontamination pad, and each truck is sprayed down and washed to help with spreading contamination.

Closing Remarks

Rafi wanted to reiterate the point made earlier on the information gaps, if you feel like you are missing any information or want any additional information, please feel free to reach out to us and we will do our best to get you that information.

Jerry Boyd said he grew up here, worked here, and knows a little bit about what is going on. He lives in Spokane now but has a place on CDA Lake, so he knows what they are talking about with the wake boats. He wanted to express his appreciation for everyone who came tonight, it is a joy to see so many people interested in what's going on. If you have a request for information or if you want to provide comments, you can send them to EPA or Terry.

The BEIPC and CCC have a mailing list so information can be sent that way as well. Terry stated that if you want to get on the email list, please send him a request and ask.

And...thank you Mary!!

Terry announced the BEIPC meeting/tour to be held on August 8th.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 6:48



CITIZENS COORDINATING COUNCIL (CCC) MEETING July 27, 2023 4:00 pm – 7:00 pm Panhandle Health District, Kellogg, Idaho

	Name (please print)	Representing	Contact information: E-mail or Address (only if new or a change)
1	David Post	BEIPC	
2	Andrew Hall	DEA	
3	Terry Boyd	CCC	
4	Tamara Leuxon	EDA	
5	Terry Howard	BEIPC	
6	David W. Kester	Friends of the River Coalition - Friends of the River	2020@gmail.com
7	KOB Archler	FORC	155 Valley View Rd Kingston. archer1@gmail.com
8	Tyler Johnston	BEA	
9	Ed Me	BEA	
10	Kyle Reuter	COA TRUST	
11	Paul K. Jinsy	PNE	
12	Jane Finlay	COA TRUST	
13	IAN ST. JOHN	COA TRUST	
14	Jane Price		
15	DAN PRICE		
16	Lauran McGrover	—	
17	Anthony Ann Curry	CITIZENS	ann.curry59@yahoo.com
18	Emily Woz	DHD	
19	David Fortier	self-	
20	David Fortier	NU	



CITIZENS COORDINATING COUNCIL (CCC) MEETING
July 27, 2023 4:00 pm – 7:00 pm
Panhandle Health District, Kellogg, Idaho

	Name (please print)	Representing	Contact information: E-mail or Address (only if new or a change)
21	Mary Reunborg	PHD	
22	Sharen Bostey	VOF	sbostey@vidaho.com
23	Ben Fritz	UI	benfritz@vidaho.com benfritz@vidaho.com
24	Mary Benson		
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			