Message

From: Bryson, Josh [josh.bryson@bp.com]
Sent: 12/18/2019 3:43:11 PM
To: Greene, Nikia [Greene.Nikia@epa.gov]; Reed, Daryl [dreed@mt.gov]; Hassler, Eric [ehassler@bsb.mt.gov]; Sullivan, Karen [ksullivan@bsb.mt.gov]
Subject: RE: Summary of CTEC meeting last night

I think you covered it nicely, Nikia.

And I appreciate the suggested division of the medical monitoring working group and that of what should be addressed to the health department.

Josh

From: Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2019 8:05 AM
To: Reed, Daryl <dreed@mt.gov>; Bryson, Josh <josh.bryson@bp.com>; Hassler, Eric <ehassler@bsb.mt.gov>; Sullivan, Karen <ksullivan@bsb.mt.gov>
Subject: FW: Summary of CTEC meeting last night

Did I miss anything important or got it wrong below?

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

From: Greene, Nikia
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2019 7:58 AM
To: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>; Vranka, Joe <vranka.joe@epa.gov>; Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>
Cc: Barnicoat, Dana <Barnicoat.Dana@epa.gov>; Elsen, Henry <Elsen.Henry@epa.gov>; Mutter, Andrew <mutter.andrew@epa.gov>
Subject: Summary of CTEC meeting last night

All,

The CTEC meeting was well attended (25+) last night, the Butte Weekly and Nora Saks from the media were there (Not the MT Standard). Many new faces, 4 council members, Karen Sullivan and many more agency folks were also there. I have to admit it was probably one of the most candid and cordial CTEC meetings I have been to. The three topics discussed were:

1. Feasibility review of a restored creek: Elizabeth Erickson (WET) described the process of the review and the challenges that they have encountered, emphasis on infrastructure. John Ray of course asked many questions with pointed objectives. The main one to note was his question about how this review can influence the remedy. Northey spoke up and reminded everyone that this was just a review to "prove or disprove" statements made about a stream being compatible with the remedy. I reminded everyone that EPA funded CTEC and there are certain restrictions and requirements about how CTEC can use the information. All and all this discussion was good and Northey and Elizabeth alluded to results showing that it is feasible. The review is estimated to be complete by mid Jan, 2020.

2. Health Study Work Group and recent Meconium Study: Joe Griffin looked to me for an update and first provided, to the audience, a copy of the Work Groups Letter to the Journal (of the previous McDermott study) and a copy of ATSDRs letter. Joe actually read out loud the first statement in the letter from ATSDR. I concurred with ATSDRs initial findings and expressed that EPA has seen no evidence that there is a potential public health emergency. I further described our process and explained that I had asked for the laboratory data and physical samples from both Butte and Columbia. I let everyone know that Katie Hailer has provided the lab data and McDermott and Lead have not. When describing the process I explained that we are reviewing the information we have and when the EPA and ATSDRs verification process is complete we would like to present that to the BSB Board of Health. Everyone agreed and Karen Sullivan spoke about how she thinks that is the appropriate venue and welcomes the idea. I proceeded to discuss the challenges of the Superfund Work Group and the original vision of what it is. Eric and others jumped in and we described the requirements under Superfund for the PRPs and how the vision was to include expert volunteers and representatives from the public (CTEC, professionals, etc.). The discussion became candid about noticing these work group meetings in the press and making them public. I encouraged that the dissemination of the technical information was part of CTECs role and to my surprise many audience members spoke up about that and agreed. Further conversation, led to how to be more open and transparent, some saying how can they be more transparent and others talking about the sunshine act. By the end of the discussion, everyone had a better understanding of the requirements under Superfund and the challenges that Butte faces with receiving answers to public health concerns. Finally, the discussion started to lean towards keeping the work group solely for the Medical Monitoring Study (naming it a health study confuses people). The idea of having a separate work group (starting with the board of Health) and having EPA, ATSDR, DPHHS, support was brought up by Nora Saks and Karen Sullivan in a side conversation. So, I think I will have this on the agenda for the next work group meeting to narrow the Superfund Work Group and explore how we can support the board of health. (thoughts?)

3. MR and BSB Silver Lake Water agreement: This discussion was led by Mark Thompson and the only statement I made was that EPA does not have an authorization role in this matter and does not fall under Superfund.

Thanks,

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