Message

From: Greene, Nikia [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=32A08A414A4F40199B557C0819EB7D0B-GREENE, NIKIA]
Sent: 12/17/2019 2:16:00 PM
To: Wall, Dan [wall.dan@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: ATSDR -- meconium study

FYI: I wasn't sure if Charlie had shared this with you.

Nikia Greene
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. EPA, Region 8
(406)-457-5019
greene.nikia@epa.gov

From: Greene, Nikia
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2019 12:04 PM
To: Elsen, Henry <Elsen.Henry@epa.gov>; Vranka, Joe <vranka.joe@epa.gov>; Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: ATSDR -- meconium study

FYI: Josh's thoughts on the Working Group and scope of the Health Study.

Nikia Greene
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. EPA, Region 8
(406)-457-5019
greene.nikia@epa.gov

From: Bryson, Josh <josh.bryson@bp.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2019 11:23 AM
To: Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>; Sullivan, Karen <ksullivan@bsb.mt.gov>
Cc: ehassler@bsb.mt.gov
Subject: RE: ATSDR -- meconium study

Thanks for looping me in,

Agree that there was not a formal selection process. How we ended up where we are at with the massive group we have today is a bit of a mystery. Like Nikia mentioned, the working group was originally configured to provide support and community engagement for the agency/superfund required 5-year health study/medical monitoring with focus on RMAP. We've deviated significantly from that scope and are now being used as a sounding board with work that is out of the purview of our original task. There were 35-40 participants on our last working group call. That's less of a working group, and more of an audience.

My suggestion for the next 5-year effort is to rein it in significantly. We need to be able to work efficiently to produce the 5-year report. To accomplish that task, I believe the core stakeholder's should form the nucleus of the working group (EPA (ATSDR), DEQ (DPHHS), AR, BSB (Health Dept.), CTEC). Beyond that, what additional need is there from any technical or transparency perspective? What value would be provided by expanding it beyond this? If I had to structure it today, the participants in the Superfund (5-year health study/medical monitoring) effort would include:

- Nikia and Charlie,

- Daryl and Laura,
- Karen,
- Eric,
- Josh (and Roz, technical support),
- CTEC Representation (e.g. Bill and Steve).

And that is really it. This is not to discount the contributions of Joe Griffin and Seth Cornell, but public representation needs to be carried out through CTEC in my opinion (this is why they exist and are funded), and it is their responsibility to report back to the CTEC constituency.

Independent of the superfund required activity, I feel it is the BSB Health Department's role to take the lead and form any "working groups" to continuously discuss community health and respond to alleged health crises. Fortunately, that body already exists – the Board of Health. We of course would be willing to participate as requested and provide resource as appropriate but we (the PRPs, excluding BSB Health) need to back away from this blurred line that is becoming ever more fixed between Superfund and non-superfund issues and activities.

Regarding an open public meeting (with media) – I am not open to that concept. There is no benefit or contribution to be had by inviting media to a technical meeting with the objective of delivering a data summary and interpretation report. I don't approach the health study any different than our other remedial/technical tasks we complete on a daily basis (though I do get emotionally charged due to the content). We need to focus on remaining technically sound and completing the task in accordance with CERCLA, produced by the PRPs under agency oversight and critique. We have provided for ample public participation (several meetings moderated by Steve) and public representation (CTEC and beyond, BSB Health Dept, DEQ, EPA, DPHHS, ATSDR). If the media wants more engagement, then they can attend the public meetings, request interview and comment, attend the CTEC meetings, etc. Beyond that, they of course can attend the board of health meetings and report back to the community in a fair and unbiased manner (such as Matt Vincent and his article in the Butte Weekly).

I feel EPA and BSB are doing a great job of juggling two independent issues at this time – technical review of pilot studies that have and will continue to have a damning effect on our community and our ongoing, deliberate, process and science based efforts to move this community forward.

Look forward to discussing more,

Josh

From: Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 14, 2019 9:14 AM
To: Sullivan, Karen <ksullivan@bsb.mt.gov>
Cc: Bryson, Josh <josh.bryson@bp.com>; ehassler@bsb.mt.gov
Subject: RE: ATSDR -- meconium study

Confidential
Do Not Release

Karen,

This is tricky and I am not sure what the right answers are, I think we need to include Josh and Eric and decide on a consistent message. Below is an attempt to start our conversation.

Draft answer:

There has been no selection process. It has always been a collaboration of volunteers and the responsible parties and EPA have welcomed experts, professionals, and community to join the remedial action technical meetings. The meetings

themselves are not required under Superfund, the submittal of the health study every five years is what is required by the responsible parties. The primary study objective to be addressed by the Superfund health study is the review and evaluation of available RMAP data that have been collected to date in order to objectively document the efficacy of the RMAP and identify any areas where improvement to activities conducted via the RMAP may be needed. To date, lead has been the primary focus of activities conducted under the RMAP. The Working Group now seems to have become a venue to discuss all health concerns, those directly related to Superfund and those that are not. In the future the responsible parties will discuss if it is appropriate to notice the technical meetings or to just focus on the requirement under Superfund and discontinue the Working Group. BSB board of health meetings will be the venue to discuss non-Superfund health issues.

Note: The disappointing thing here is that the Working Group has been successful and I think a lot of people will be upset to have it discontinued. I don't want that, but I also don't want it to be used as a mockery and put undue burden on the RMAP and other work. No matter how this ends up I think the message about BSB Health Department, BSB as a Responsible Party, AR, EPA, ATSDR, DPHHS, DEQ, CTEC, community professionals, etc. is that we will continue to collaborate on health issues in Butte. EPA is also working on messaging and I will share as soon as my management and communications team have decided on how to address the "Working Group" questions. (i.e. it might not be exactly the same as what I have suggested above).

So, maybe for now the simple answer is that there is no selection process, it is made up of a broad range of technical volunteer's to provide input to the required health study under Superfund and there is no plan to notice the technical meetings at this time.

Finally, I believe this now has become a discussion for the larger group and it might be a good idea to have it on the agenda for this week's CD call to discuss with our respected managers/legal (thoughts?).

Thanks,

Nikia Greene
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. EPA, Region 8
(406)-457-5019
greene.nikia@epa.gov

From: Sullivan, Karen <ksullivan@bsb.mt.gov>
Sent: Friday, December 13, 2019 6:17 PM
To: Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: ATSDR -- meconium study

Want to help me on this one?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** David McCumber <David.McCumber@mtstandard.com>
> **Date:** December 13, 2019 at 1:53:51 PM MST
> **To:** "Sullivan, Karen" <ksullivan@bsb.mt.gov>
> **Subject: Re: ATSDR -- meconium study**
>
> [http://www.bsb.mt.gov/ImageRepository/Document?documentID=10315]
> This message did not originate from a Butte-Silver Bow email account and therefore cannot be validated. Please ensure you respond accordingly and proceed with caution.

One quick question Karen — how was
the Health Study Working Group selected? Was it BSB, Arco, or both who picked members? And can you tell me why meetings are not noticed?
Thanks. D

David McCumber
Editor and General Manager, The Montana Standard
Regional Editor, Lee Enterprises, central Montana
Montana Standard | 25 W. Granite St. | Butte, MT 59701<x-apple-data-detectors://1>
Independent Record | 2222 Washington | Helena, MT 59601<x-apple-data-detectors://2>
Mini Nickel Marketing | Bozeman, MT
Office 406-496-5513<tel:406-496-5513> Cell 406-565-0402<tel:406-565-0402>

[news-plus2]<https://helenair.com/members>

Support local journalism
and become a member today!

Enjoy unlimited access on any device, email newsletters,
E-Edition, home delivery, access to archives and more. LEARN MORE<https://helenair.com/members>

On Dec 13, 2019, at 12:31 PM, Sullivan, Karen <ksullivan@bsb.mt.gov> wrote:

David: I wanted you to see the communication I and the state's lead epidemiologist, Laura Williamson, received this morning from ATSDR. Through Kai Elgethun, ATSDR's Region 8 director, the agency relays that it is concerned about the conclusion from McDermott/Lead/Hailer of a "potential public health emergency." Mr. Elgethun relays that ATSDR does not agree with this conclusion.

Thanks, David – Karen Sullivan

<image001.jpg>

Karen Sullivan, M.A., Health Officer
The City-County of Butte-Silver Bow
Health Department
25 W. Front St.
Butte, MT 59701
Telephone : 406.497.5003
ksullivan@bsb.mt.gov<mailto:ksullivan@bsb.mt.gov>

Messages and attachments sent to or from this email account pertaining to the City-County of Butte-Silver Bow business may be considered public or private records depending on the message content (Article II Section 9, Montana Constitution; 2-6 MCA).
<letter -- atsdr -- meconium -- dec. 13, 2019.pdf>

Messages and attachments sent to or from this email account pertaining to the City-County of Butte-Silver Bow business may be considered public or private records depending on the message content (Article II Section 9, Montana Constitution; 2-6 MCA).