



# Libby Asbestos Superfund Oversight Committee Meeting

## August 29, 2025

### 1:00 PM

#### Location of Meeting:

Virtual attendance with in-person in Libby, MT.

#### 1:00 pm Call to Order

The Libby Asbestos Superfund Oversight Committee conference call was called to order at 1:00 PM on August 29, 2025, with the Pledge of Allegiance.

This was the 33<sup>rd</sup> meeting in accordance with the Montana Code Annotated 75-10-1601. Public notice of this meeting was provided via newspaper ads, press release, social media, and the DEQ website.

#### 1:01 pm Roll Call

Chairman Teske conducted a roll call of attendees and confirmed that a quorum of oversight committee members was present. The following people were present or attended remotely.

Oversight Committee Members:		
Director of DEQ or designated representative	Sonja Nowakowski	Present electronically
Lincoln County Commissioner designated by the Commission	Chairman Brent Teske	Present in Libby
Member of the House of Representatives whose district includes at least a portion of Lincoln County appointed by the speaker of the House	Representative Tom Millett	<b>Absent</b>
Citizen of Lincoln County nominated by the Lincoln County Commission and selected by the governor	George Jamison	Present in Libby
Member of the Senate whose district includes at least a portion of Lincoln County appointed by the Senate president	Senator Mike Cuffe	Present in Libby

Other Interested Attendees	Affiliation	
Amanda Harcourt	ARP	Present in Libby
David Berry	ATSDR	Present electronically
John Kaufman	ATSDR	Present electronically
Ted Larson	ATSDR	Present electronically
Jon Morgan	DEQ	Present electronically
Katie Garcin-Forba	DEQ	Present electronically
Kevin Stone	DEQ	Present electronically
Melody Kraayeveld	DEQ	Present electronically
Dania Zinner	EPA	Present electronically
Jamie Miller	EPA	Present electronically
Jason Fritz	EPA	Present electronically
Corrina Brown	Lincoln County	Present in Libby
Ray Stout	Reporter	Present in Libby

<b>1:01 pm</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Review and approve minutes of June 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2025, meeting	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> All right, thank you everybody for attending the meeting. Our first order of business is to review and approve minutes from the June 25th, 2025 meeting. I believe everyone should have a copy, I believe it was twelve pages long. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> I went through them earlier. I did not find anything.</p> <p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> I'd entertain a motion to approve. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> I move to approve. <b>George Jamison:</b> Second. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> All right. Any further discussion or corrections, gentlemen. Hearing none. All in favor signify by aye. <b>All:</b> Aye. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Opposed? Same sign. All right. Thank you. They're approved.</p>
<b>1:03 pm</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Site Budget and Funding Report- Melody Kraayeveld	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> Next up, we have site budget funding report from Melody. Everybody have a copy of that. I believe it's eight pages. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> So the only thing that I have to point out on that is I know at our last meeting we were still waiting for final approval on our EPA grant. So that has been finalized and awarded. So we are officially funded for O &amp; M through September 30th of 2026. Does anyone have any questions or comments on the document. <b>George Jamison:</b> I have two comments. Maybe two questions. This is George Jamison. Melody on page six, below table three, the last sentence says DEQ has used this funding source for <i>current</i> OU3 bankruptcy legislation which is anticipated to be reimbursed and I think we forgot probably several meetings ago to change that. I think we could leave out the word <i>current</i> now and just say <i>which was</i> reimbursed because that's done now. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> That is accurate. We can update that language to correctly reflect what's happening. <b>George Jamison:</b> Okay. Then, you reference the new the new agreement. So if you look on page seven, you have now in there and I think it might have been in there last meeting or before but this table seven, which is your new grant, right. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> Yes, that's correct. <b>George Jamison:</b> Okay. So I would suggest since on these others when we introduce a table we put down which table number it is. So maybe after that little sentence above the table you could just add parenthetically table seven. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> Can do. <b>George Jamison:</b> And then the only question I have is, I'm glad to see the breakdown here in this table. You've got a breakdown by OU's for expenses to date. Do you anticipate that you'll populate that column with total awards broken out or is the grant not broken out in that detail? <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> The grant is not broken out. So it is a lump sum. So we will not see that. <b>George Jamison:</b> Okay. I had one other question that's slipping my mind at the moment here. Let me see. Um, okay. Well, I was looking for the part where oh, here it is. I'm sorry. Table six. Well, that's your old grant. Um anyway, it'll come to me later. So, thank you. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Anything else? <b>George Jamison:</b> That's all I have. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> I would entertain a motion to accept the funding and budget report. <b>George Jamison:</b> So moved, as amended. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Second. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Any further discussion. None. All in favor signify by aye. <b>All:</b> Aye. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Opposed same. All right. Thank you. Approved.</p>
<b>1:05 pm</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Support of Property Owners Report- Melody Kraayeveld	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> Next item is support of property owners report. A front and back page. Again, Melody. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> I'd just like to note that we are in a new fiscal year. The state fiscal year runs from July 1st to June 30th of every year. So we are now in fiscal year 26. Does anyone have questions or comments. <b>George Jamison:</b> I do, sorry, <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Sir. <b>George Jamison:</b> Melody going back to this table seven. I'm not going back in documents but in table seven you show the new and current grant for O&amp;M and in table three of this report that we're looking at now, it shows the various grants. It seems to me that it might be appropriate to add a column to the right of the old grant, the one that ends in 41701 to maybe add in this new grant 39600 that's in table seven because I think that rolls up into those numbers. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> Would you like them to be separate columns for the different grants or would you like it to be a column just for EPA funded reimbursements. <b>George Jamison:</b> Well, I think it seems to me like the table seven grant, just the totals is a new cost category. It's your new grant. So, shouldn't that just simply be added as a column because that's where we're going to start seeing numbers roll up going forward with that grant or going forward with O &amp; M activities. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> Yes, we can do it that way. <b>George Jamison:</b> I mean, doesn't that make sense. Isn't that part of where money comes from for these different things. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> it is. It does make sense. <b>George Jamison:</b> Okay. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Good. <b>George Jamison:</b> Okay. Thank you. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Anything else, sir. All right. Thank you. I'd entertain a motion to accept the O &amp; M support property owners report. <b>George</b></p>

	<b>Jamison:</b> So moved. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Second. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Motion and a second. Any further discussion. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Call for question. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. Hearing none. All those in favor signify by aye. <b>All:</b> Aye. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Opposed, same. Thank you.
--	--

1:08 pm	Discussion
O&M Update – Melody Kraayeveld and Mandy Harcourt - Activities at OU1, 2, 4, 5, 7, & 8	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> All right, we'll get an O &amp; M update. Who would like to start, we got Melody and Mandy on here. <b>Amanda Harcourt:</b> I can go ahead and start if that's all right, Melody. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> Good with me. <b>Amanda Harcourt:</b> Today's ARP update will cover activities completed and ongoing since June. ARP has responded to 50 hotline calls and 195 utility locates and conducted 27 site visits between June and August. Libby and Troy scopes of work completed or ongoing. 186 Pioneer Road contaminated stockpile removal. GID 5730 Port property exterior excavation and facilitated ongoing property development there. 721 Flower Creek Road exterior sampling which resulted in an exterior removal. 963 Northwood Ave, soil sampling scope work. 3274 Farmer Market Road, we had a property contact us who had found a bag of vermiculite in the back of the shed and ARP responded to it to see if it needed an abatement. And it ended up being pretty interesting because what they found I'd never seen here before and it was a bag of Verxite. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Verxite, yeah. Nutrient carrying. What's it say. <b>Amanda Harcourt:</b> So, it's a nutrient carrier, binding agent, bulk agent for poultry, cattle, sheep, swine, dog, and cat feed. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> But it's a product of WR Grace Zonolite division. <b>Amanda Harcourt:</b> Yep <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Interesting. <b>Amanda Harcourt:</b> Yeah. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> I haven't seen that before either. <b>Amanda Harcourt:</b> And if you can see the date on it, it's been in there for about 40 years. So, we went out and we collected that. The bag was in pretty good shape, so we were able to suit up and get in there and clean that one. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Is there testing being done on the product inside that to see if that's something we need to be aware of. <b>Amanda Harcourt:</b> No, we didn't do any confirmation clearance. It was pretty well contained and it wasn't leaking out extensively. It was in the bag and he had kind of a shop that had been packed full of stuff and dirt and everything and he had literally found it just sitting in the corner and we went over there and we were able to double bag it and pack it all up and get the area cleaned. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Interesting. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Amazing. If I might make an aside comment. When I was managing the plywood plant for Champion International, we had a claim on some plywood in North Dakota, delamination. I said, well, just send us a- we had to see the mill sale before we approve it. Okay. Anyway, got the mill sale and it said it said J Neil's division St. Regis Paper Company and it was right after the plywood plant had been created. It went through broker in North Dakota, went to a little old town and here this one batch of plywood had been sitting there and people come buy a sheet every once in a while and we're 34 years later. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> That'd be an old one. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> That's got like this is 40 years old. <b>Amanda Harcourt:</b> Libby and Troy properties upcoming abatements and sampling. 217 Dawson Street this is a NOPEC property that's going to be coming up for you guys for approval, but we tried we tried several times to get it knocked out this this year, but the property owner has passed and the heir- he just couldn't make it to town yet. So that's slated for spring of 2026. OU by swim ponds sampling and scope work for use area changes out there. G7787 this is the new O'Reilly's construction that's coming in right by the dollar stores out there. OU5 new staging yard an exterior sample. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> thank you. Melody. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> I've got a few other updates to share. DEQ was able to present at EPA's public meeting on July 14th and after that we did receive some complaints about dust and concerns from the community about potential asbestos contamination from OU5 and the development out there. And so ARP was willing to do a little extra work and we did some ambient air testing at the end of July. And I am happy to report that those were all non-detect and we did not observe any asbestos in the dust that's coming off of OU5. Subsequently we did our annual inspection on July 16th. That report is currently being drafted and I should have it by early October to share with you all. And then finally, we're just kind of looking at some updates to for ARP as they move forward. We're recognizing that Lincoln County is growing and development is happening and that's putting more work onto ARP. So, we are looking at potentially adding an additional employee as well as doing some more trainings, especially with a focus on realtors. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Good. All necessary. Anything else. Any questions, gentlemen. All right. Thank you for the update.</p>

1:14 pm	Discussion
---------	------------

DEQ/EPA Site Update – Melody Kraayeveld <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Activities at OU3 &amp; OU6</li> </ul>	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> We'll move into the DEQ/EPA site update. Looks like you're on again, Melody. Activities at OU3-. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> For OU3, currently we did receive a date for the draft FS feasibility study. So, we are anticipating having a draft March 31st of 2026. Those of you who are driving through that area may have seen that there's a little bit more activity up at the mine right now. That is work being performed under the DNRC high hazard dam permit. They're going to be starting construction on the lower spillway and they're doing some investigation over this summer. As far as OU6 goes, I don't have a ton of updates. I do know that BNSF came in and did their inspection in August and so I will be looking forward to a report on that in the near future. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Thank you. Questions gentlemen. Yes, sir. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Not on this one. I'd like when we're done with this, I'd like to drop back to the— <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Anyone have anything else for the DEQ EPA site update. No. Okay. So, you'd like to go back to O &amp; M, sir. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Yeah, I just had a question on— I think that Melody said that they were looking at hiring another or creating another FTE position. Is that right, Melody. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> Yes, we're looking into that as an option. <b>George Jamison:</b> Yeah. For ARP. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> local. Yeah. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> And like what kind of cost is that. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> We're still looking into that. That's sort of the phase we're at is getting some cost estimates together and then putting a proposal forward on that. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Okay. Thank you. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> All right. Anything else before we move on. Okay.</p>
--	--

1:16 pm	Discussion
Updates-DEQ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information Portal</li> <li>- EPA PM2.5 White Paper Comments</li> <li>- Legislatively Required Goal Setting for LASOC</li> </ul>	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> We'll move on to next agenda item is updates from the DEQ. And we'll start with the information portal. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> I think this one's me as well. So, I don't have much of an update. We're still hoping-Butte is working on an information portal. Um, and they are putting one together. And I think once we have that, we're going to take a look at it and see if it would meet the needs for the Libby asbestos site and if we could use that same formatting. <b>George Jamison:</b> I have a comment, please. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Sure. <b>George Jamison:</b> This is George Jamison. We- Melody and Kevin and Mandy and I talked a little bit about this several weeks ago. I think- you know at one time I had made the suggestion that there might need to be an information portal created at DEQ for a vast array of documents and things. I really don't think that we probably need to pursue that anymore. I think that understanding that EPA has made available for searching quite a number of additional files now. It's our understanding that's occurred. I think we're probably okay with that and could probably find documents better than we could before. I think we can probably, other than upgrades perhaps to websites or something, I think we can probably drop the other information portal issue unless we find it's a problem where we can't find documents. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. Sir, you good with that Senator. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Yup, okay. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> All right. So Mandy, I mean are you okay with that or is that still something that you want to pursue for a different purpose. <b>Director Nowakowski:</b> Mr. Chairman, this is Sonja if I might add something. This is an issue that we have included in some of our smart goals that are legislatively required. So perhaps after I provide that update on those goals, maybe we can circle back to this and revisit it. It is something I personally think could be useful and would like to keep in this, but certainly we'll defer to LASOC and what their thoughts are, but maybe after we get to that next agenda item down the line, we can revisit that. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> All right. Are you good with that Sir. <b>George Jamison:</b> Sure. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. All right. Thank you. Yeah, these items here on our agenda don't have assignments, so I guess I'll let whoever's addressing them primarily address them. So the next one is EPA PM2.5 white paper comments. That's something you had placed on the agenda, sir. <b>George Jamison:</b> Yes. I mean a brief summary from last meeting was that we agreed that any comments from us locally in the county here about this document could be provided to DEQ for them to include with their comments on the white paper and we did that. We didn't have many and we did that right at the end of July. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. <b>George Jamison:</b> That's the only thing I have. And they may want to comment on where they are because they had comments they were making. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. Anyone from the EPA like to comment on the PM2.5 white papers. Oh- it's DEQ's comments. Okay. I'm sorry. DEQ's comments. <b>Dania Zinner:</b> Oh, yeah. Go ahead, Melody. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> I just wanted to update that air quality is finalizing their comments and then they will be combined and will be sent to EPA and that will include Lincoln County or LASOC's comments — those local comments will be included — and we will also loop you guys into those combined comments so you can see them. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> All right. <b>George Jamison:</b> Thank you. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Any other comments. <b>Dania Zinner:</b> This is Dania Zinner, EPA. Yeah, happy to look at any comments on the white paper and try to incorporate them. So, thank you</p>

guys. **George Jamison:** Thank you. **Chairman Teske:** All right, last item under this update is a legislatively required goal setting for LASOC. **Director Nowakowski:** You bet. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. This is Sonja. I wanted to just walk through — and please, Senator Cuffe, feel free to jump in at any point, you probably know this better than I do. Back in 2023, the legislature passed House Bill 190 which required agencies to do some smart goals, which includes some strategic outcomes and goal setting, as well as key measures and metrics for tracking that. And in 2025, the legislature revisited that and they added in that all programs that are part of an agency budget have to include and do that smart goals and again, setting of those key measures. So for DEQ, what that meant was we — outside of just having our agency goals — and our agency goals are for air, energy and mining, water quality, and waste management and remediation, both LASOC and the petroleum board are gonna be required to also do this goal setting and bring in these outcomes. These are due on September 1st. They are high level, and then they will be presented to our interim budget subcommittee Section C at their meeting on September 16th. So I wanted to share with you kind of, as an agency, where we landed on some general goals — three goals for LASOC. And they're pretty standard, but I think they'll be of importance and something Senator Cuffe can also track since you're fortunate enough to have a member on that budget subcommittee with kind of intimate knowledge of this subject. So the first strategic outcome that we identified obviously for LASOC is protection of human health. We outlined that LASOC provides funding recommendations to DEQ for sampling and/or abatement of properties that previously hadn't been cleaned up for asbestos. And the key measures that we would then provide to the interim budget committee — and these measures are provided on an annual basis — are essentially the number of properties sampled, number of properties abated, number of Notices of Potential Environmental Condition withdrawn, as well as numbers of documents reviewed and documents commented on. The feedback we got from Representative Mercer, who is the sponsor of these bills in 2023 and 2025, is that they do like the key measures or metrics to be numbers — things that we can clearly report out. So that's the first strategic outcome we identified for LASOC. The second strategic outcome was — also falls under kind of the umbrella of protecting Montana's way of life — and that's the short-term and long-term funding of remedy operations and maintenance. So identifying that DEQ is the agency responsible for O&M of the Libby Asbestos Superfund Site Operable Units 4 and 7, identifying the funding sources for O&M, and then in terms of key measures: reporting out the dollar amounts in the Libby Asbestos Cleanup Trust Fund in 75-10-1603, as well as dollar amounts in the Libby Asbestos Cleanup O&M account in 75-10-1604, and dollar amounts in the State of Montana's Libby Asbestos Bankruptcy Settlement Fund. So doing regular updates and then of course obviously with those dollar amounts, bringing forward any concerns or recommendations for changes, and that would be done clearly at the request of LASOC. Finally, the third strategic outcome we identified was transparency and citizen engagement, which we realized was one of the drivers for the creation of LASOC — was about better engaging with the Libby community. So the key measures which we've talked about both of these now is first: money obtained to hire a consultant and/or to create a community advisory group. And then also a commitment that DEQ's GIS expert would develop an information hub with input from LASOC members, and that would include linked reports as well as maps. And we would track the number of clicks or visits to that website. Again, those outcomes being that creation of that information hub and then looking at and obtaining funding to hire an environmental consultant to support those community efforts. So, happy to answer questions. Wanted to see your comfort level with those three strategic outcomes being presented to the Interim-IBC Section C at their upcoming meeting. **Chairman Teske:** I mean going over the statute 75-10-1601 that established the Libby Asbestos Superfund Oversight Committee, it looks like all of that is parallel and in line with what the roles and responsibilities of the Oversight Committee are. I don't see where there would be any conflict or any issues moving forward with that. So, it's all right there. I had it all highlighted before. **Senator Cuffe:** I think it's there. **Chairman Teske:** Yeah. **Senator Cuffe:** And I think that meeting is the 16th, correct. September 16. **Director Nowakowski:** Yep, September 16th. And I would certainly defer to Senator Cuffe in the intent to House Bill 190 and then the follow-up in 2025 with the addition. And this is something that all state agencies and attached boards are doing along these same timelines. So this will be something, like I said, each Interim Budget Committee will hear from every— **Chairman Teske:** Would it be possible to get an email copy of that narrative that you just commented. **Director Nowakowski:** Yeah, absolutely. We are planning to send that to the Department of Administration and then there'll be a link to it on our website, and so I will email you that copy as well as the link for the website. **Chairman Teske:** Thank you. That'll help. All right. **George Jamison:** Could I comment real quick? I mean you,

	<p>Director, you mentioned that it touches on the subject of the information portal and what I heard you say sounds great to me. I mean I don't see any — I mean, more power to you. I think that's fine. <b>Director Nowakowski:</b> Okay, great. Thank you. Then we'll continue to plan on that hub and then report out and work with you on what that looks like and share that information out. It would be through GIS, so some sort of mapping would kind of be primarily what we will look at. <b>George Jamison:</b> Thank you. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Thank you. Anything else, ma'am, no. Okay, we'll move on to the next agenda item.</p>
--	--

<b>1:27 pm</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<p>Response to EPA's Five Year Review Report- George Jamison</p>	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> This is a response to EPA's five year review report. A lot of activity this week. I'll let Mr. Jamison start if you'd like or would you like me to review the most recent activity. <b>George Jamison:</b> Why don't you go ahead. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. All right. <b>George Jamison:</b> I know you're anxious. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> I am anxious. <b>George Jamison:</b> You have a platform to speak. So, go ahead. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. So, at our last meeting, we approved a letter that we sent to EPA- Administrator Weston concerning some issues with the five year review. And they wanted more of an in depth understanding of what our problems and concerns were. So, as we were working on that, I'd sent him an email letting him know that that was coming. And then we drafted a, I believe it was a 10-page long reply that was very in-depth, very to the point. And that's where we were when we sent that out to the committee Monday or Tuesday with that letter. And then it was kind of brought to our attention that this might be a little brass, a little harsh. I'm not a good observationalist of that because that's kind of where I operate. But I was willing to listen. So I made the concession and reached out to the director, spoke with her about it on the phone and they had kind of drafted a letter as well that they were going to send. And as we were talking, we decided, you know, it'll probably be better if we coalesced those and even though they were going to be separate entities that they more echoed each other. And so we went through a draft of that. Cut it down to, I believe, five pages. Five pages. And we were getting prepared to present that and we got an email from Dania day before yesterday. Uh, what's that. <b>George Jamison:</b> Yeah, that's right. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Yeah. Day before yesterday. Okay and that kind of took the majority of our issues off the table with them being willing to discuss them in a meeting and talk to what the points and concerns are. And so we drafted a basic short reply, a copy of which everybody should have got. It's in your packets as well and I'd like to review that and George can make- <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Where's it at. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> It's this one here that says, you might have it over there. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Okay, yep. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Anyway, that's kind of the evolution that we went through to get where we're at now. We greatly appreciate the EPA's willingness to work with us on these issues. Primarily putting the temporary pause on delisting OU4 and OU7 and letting us reassess and rehash what our issues are with that. George, would you like to expound. <b>George Jamison:</b> Yeah. Well, that was a good description. It's been a been a busy week for sure, but I think there's something magic about the 48 hours before a meeting. But anyway, this letter is just, you know, very brief. In fact it'd be one page if we didn't have such a long signature block, but it basically recognizes the offer that EPA's made as Commissioner Teske said to commit to collaborative process, which we're happy to participate in. And that was one of the things in the letter that you didn't see that we emphasized we wanted. So it satisfied that. So basically we're looking forward to that process. It accepts that offer for engagement and says that we'll defer our detailed concerns and presenting those to you until we have an appropriate forum and we can kind of get ourselves organized about how we do this. It's going to involve I think several entities as Dania suggested could be involved from the county and so forth. Then we can get moving on that. The other thing is we strongly encourage the use of a facilitator from the very beginning on this to assist us in organizational issues and then subsequently in our technical discussions. This committee actually quite some time ago when we were in our infancy with this and were trying to draft bylaws, at that point in time, for various reasons it was a fairly-very contentious process and thank goodness we're past that. We had the services of a very gifted facilitator then some of you have met, Brett Romney and he's assisted the county in interaction with other federal agencies in the past and he does a phenomenal job. He would be wonderful to have assist us. Us being the committee people in the county that participate and DEQ and EPA to just help us coalesce this together and make it be a more efficient process. Anyway, that's kind of a commercial for that, but that's what the letter says. It just basically says, Yep, hey, we'll get down to details later. Let's get organized. Thank you for doing this. Again, as Brent said,</p>

we are very appreciative of the temporary pause on the emphasis for delisting. We're very thankful for that. So that's all I have about the letter. **Chairman Teske:** You have anything sir. **Senator Cuffe:** Well, to say the least, it's been an interesting ride for the last little while, but particularly this week, I very much appreciated the step forward by EPA and that's kind of where we need to be and we've operated quite a number of years now in a pretty cooperative manner. I think this kind of gets us on track there and whether any of us had some misunderstandings, it gets them on the table where we can talk about it reasonably and I think the more this world we have working on emails and those sorts of things. It takes the emotion in a letter becomes what the reader decides it is. And it's different from being talked. You know these meetings where even though they're on a screen and we are here at least see the person and communicate became back and forth directly and you can see them grasps an issue, you can see a guy's surprise on their face with something and see when it's time to move on. So I think it's a great step and gets us over a hump that was headed for kind of a hard confrontation that I don't think needed to be had. I appreciate it very much and appreciate the response you've had to it Mr. Chairman. **Chairman Teske:** Yep. Yes, sir. **George Jamison:** I have one other comment. Director, I apologize for not mentioning this sooner but embodied in this very short letter that Brent and I crafted yesterday. I retained as a footnote in that letter the recognition that you may have- we need to preserve your independence in this. And we did that mainly because our letter that this follows up to the June 27th letter was a letter from the Lincoln County contingent. And frankly, we didn't know yesterday whether to leave it that way. But we also recognize that you were probably quite supportive of this process, but we wrote the letter this way. It is not intended to exclude you. It was only intended to preserve that same independence and certainly if you wish or want to speak independently about how you feel about being in this process why we welcome that but I just wanted to let you know that we weren't quite sure how to handle that and that's what we did. **Director Nowakowski:** Thank you so much and I really greatly appreciate that. I think you handled it spot on. I can really appreciate that. **Chairman Teske:** Any comments on the letter, ma'am, while I've got you on. **Director Nowakowski:** No, I think I, you know, I look forward to kind of taking a little closer look at it and then formulating whether or not we'll respond and working with our EPA partners on better understanding and talking about next steps. Also, we would welcome a little bit more information from EPA on kind of how they arrived at this decision and what they expect next steps and timelines to look like if they're available. Also understand this has all happened within the last 48 hours and so probably still gathering information. **Chairman Teske:** Okay, thank you. Do you have a comment sir before I get to Dania. **Senator Cuffe:** Yes. Yes, I do. I had it kind of figured out. I had some feedback from the kind of the father of this this committee, Chas Vincent, former representative and senator. I replaced him in the House, then I replaced him in the Senate. Senator Vincent reached out to me and we talked and was reminded back to those days and it was his brainchild. I helped him work it through the process and in particular some work in the world of orphan share funding and have had some follow-up dealings now that he's been gone. So anyway, I just wanted to give him credit for encouraging us to focus on the important things of why we created the committee, what all we have been successful in accomplishing and there's a lot as well as what the potential future could be and different things that he dreamed about even back in that time. I just want to give credit where credit is due and some of that goes to former Senator Chas Vincent. Thank you, Mr. Chair. **Chairman Teske:** Thank you. Dania, did you have anything you'd like to say. I saw you come off mute there one time. **Dania Zinner:** Yeah. Hi. Can you guys hear me. I'm having some connection issues. **George Jamison:** Yeah, we hear you real well. **Dania Zinner:** Oh, okay. Sorry. Sorry if I'm so loud. Yeah, I'd like to thank everyone. Thanks for all the conversations this week and yeah, happy to participate in a series of meetings virtual or in person, can definitely come to Libby. I'd like to start off with meetings with my risk assessors, toxicologists, Dr. David Barry and Jason Fritz. And then as you can see here, Ted Larson and John Kaufman with ATSDR. We want to wrap them in later as well. Just to continue all the conversations. Happy to talk about all the points in the original letter too. That's completely fine. Happy to have a facilitator. So yeah, however you guys want to do the next series of meetings. We we're available and yeah, I'll let you take the lead on that. And yeah, I don't I don't have any ideas about timelines right now. So we'll have to get back to you all. Thank you. **Chairman Teske:** All right. Thank you. I'm sorry I didn't get back to you about the meeting date, but as this thing was rapidly changing, I wasn't sure what was going to happen. So now that we're kind of in a uh in a spot, we can start working on some times and some dates. **Dania Zinner:** Okay, great. Yeah, completely flexible, too. If another week works better, that's totally fine. Thanks all. **Chairman Teske:** All right. So, gentlemen, we have the letter as presented. You have something else. **George Jamison:** Guess we got to do something

	<p>with it. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> We got to do something with it. I would entertain a motion to forward the letter to Administrator Weston as written. <b>George Jamison:</b> So moved. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Just give me a second. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. A second for review. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> I'm gonna have to second this motion. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Alright, motion seconded. Any further discussion. None. All in favor by aye. <b>All:</b> Aye. Opposed. All right. Thank you. Is this my signature line, no, here. <b>Amanda Harcourt:</b> Yep. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> All right. Thank you.</p>
--	--

1:41 pm	Discussion
<p>OU3 Technical Support and Review Options- George Jamison and DEQ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support options for County and DEQ</li> <li>- Collaboration /independence</li> </ul>	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> All right. Next agenda item is OU3 technical support and review options. Mr. Jamison looks like you're slated for this. <b>George Jamison:</b> Okay. Basically at the last meetings DEQ and the committee we decided it'd be helpful to just sit down and chat with DEQ folks when they were in town for the upcoming public meetings just about some of our work things on our list and particularly about options for technical support among other topics. Of course, that becomes a little more timely now that we know when we're supposed to see the feasibility study. But I'm not going to go through all the things we touched on, but we went back and jointly kind of talked about options to get technical support for the county from EPA. And as you've heard on a number of occasions that's either a technical advisory group or a TASC technical assistance for services for communities. Both of those are potential options. We heard some interesting and valuable input from DEQ about what they have seen on other sites with the experience of other communities working with both of these options and that was helpful. I came away from that discussion thinking that probably the TASC if we choose one of those two options would probably be our better choice. And Melody and Kevin had offered to put us in touch with some other folks in communities and talk about their experiences with the TASC method as well as the TAG. And I think if they're still willing to do that, that would be helpful. We also talked briefly about other options for getting technical services to help with our review. By that I mean the Lincoln County folks and DEQ. We talked a little bit about kind of a joint review with DEQ or we didn't have any consultant ourselves and relied on the use of their consultant and more we talked about that we felt like we could get along and work in that with that understanding but it really wasn't probably the best approach. Thought we would get more independence a little bit if we needed it if we kind of went our separate ways. But it also has I think more so than anything the benefit of getting another independent view of what a consultant would look at when they see this draft FS to kind of match up against what DEQ sees with Weston as they look. So I guess our approach there and this was all just brainstorming that's what this session was. We think that the best approach is collaboration close collaboration with DEQ, doing our own separate examination of things and then coming together at various times and sharing our observations and things. So that report is just kind of letting you know we said last meeting we were going to get together and talk about some of these things and we did and I felt like it was it was helpful. That's all I have. I hope they offer anything they want to add there. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Alright, anyone from DEQ like to comment. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> I don't have anything additional. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> Oh, I did send over some contact information for some of the TASC members for CFAC. I can reforward those over to you, George, if you would like. <b>George Jamison:</b> Oh, please. I missed it somewhere. Thank you. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> All right. Any further discussion on this topic, gentlemen. ma'am. All right, we'll move on.</p>

1:46 pm	Discussion
<p>Formation of LASOC Subcommittee (Bylaws III.B.) – Jamison/Teske and DEQ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Purpose and Scope</li> <li>- Membership</li> <li>- Develop specific proposal</li> </ul>	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> Formation of LASOC subcommittees. Mr. Jameson, you're first up, then me. <b>George Jamison:</b> I mean, I wish I listed your name first. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> I'll let you introduce this. <b>George Jamison:</b> Well, as probably- first of all, we don't have this agenda item is not presenting any formal proposal and all the committee members have kind of a talking point sheet here that you can refer and I'll just work from that. But how we got to this point, we've been thinking about the efforts to review the feasibility study and now even potentially thinking about how we organize efforts and so forth for the five year review. It kind of raises a theme about you know how do we communicate and what makes the best sense and there is a provision in our bylaws that allows for the creation of a subcommittee and in fact when that subcommittee approach was used when we when we wrote the bylaws and resulted in the bylaws. I put just a reference there that talks about the bylaw requirements. It gives examples in the bylaws about it's meant for research briefings and documentation development background information and be a wide variety of things. It needs to be established by a formal motion and action to this committee</p>



and then it lists the required elements like what are we going to do, who's going to be on the committee, how are we going to report and talks about a facilitator role specifically if any. So it recognizes that potential need and then it talks about timelines. Chairman Teske said you know let's see if we can kind of put together a straw man. So what I did was I took each of the required elements of a motion to create a subcommittee and for example purpose and scope in this and then I just said you know this could provide a structural approach to facilitate collaboration and we could have some venue sharing on progress and topics and examples would have been bylaws, the information portal, standard reports and so forth. And then we could think you know what's the name of the committee or whatever. But for a straw man, which I put in bold, we'd say, okay, for a little stick figure here, let's call this straw man the OU3 FS Review. Members of a committee like that- we're required to have at least one member of LASOC, people from the DEQ staff subject of course to the director's approval and then you can include outside parties. So for the straw man we just put in there LASOC, DEQ, ARP, Board of Health rep and a technical consultant. Reporting: I listed there what the report requirements are and then straw man says we'd make regular reports and have other milestones timeline that we tie that to the review period whatever the review period is by EPA. So, on the back of that page, the straw man example takes each of those kind of highlighted things and just puts some suggestions there about what a straw man might look like for the OU feasibility review subcommittee. Basically this is just to generate discussion here because we have no proposal developed or anything and I guess the question that should be before us is should we try to develop something not only for the feasibility study review but even potentially for the activities on the five year review. I think mainly just get a kind of a general feel from the committee about what next. Now add what you can please. **Chairman Teske:** Well, like I said, when this proposal was kind of brought to me, it's easier for me to wrap my head around a structure like this. So I asked them to put something together that we could present to the to the committee and start a discussion on how that should look and how that should lay out you know and at the time we were talking about the OU3 feasibility study and you know and now we're looking at another process. I don't know and it'd be up to the committee whether or not this discussion with EPA that we're going to have here soon and DEQ really warrants this much in-depth preparation and participation. In my mind I think this is something that we should be able to work out among the agencies or organizations that are kind of already involved in that part of that process but as far as the OU3 feasibility study that's way beyond a lot of our capacity and capabilities and that's where you know if we're going to have input, if we want to be involved I think we need to develop something along this line here and have a discussion about how that structure looks or when-did she say March-when that feasibility study comes out we should have our ducks in a row before then. And that's just that's my opinion of it. But like I said, I asked for this primarily so I could see what that structure would look like and you know kind of what the idea was so we could bring it forward for discussion. Mr. Cuffe, do you have anything. **Senator Cuffe:** No, I appreciate the effort put in and I do not have anything to add. **Chairman Teske:** Okay. Do you think this structure would be necessary for the conversations and meetings we're going to have with EPA and DEQ. **Senator Cuffe:** I think it could certainly help. **George Jamison:** Additional discussion now with the DEQ about what they think about the use of a subcommittee like this for the five year review and if that's the structure we need. We need some kind of structure. I'm not sure where that structure should be. If it should be in this committee, if it should be in DEQ itself or if it should be in the board of health which has basically had no involvement, well some, but not much. So this effort needs a home so I guess that's- **Chairman Teske:** All right so this was-go ahead. **Director Nowakowski:** I appreciate the thoughts and the idea. Um, just would maybe like to take until the next meeting to kind of sit in this a little bit to spell out maybe some parameters just in terms of DEQ perspective. We have a lot of ongoing work and a lot of ongoing sites and assignments. And I always, I will just speak from my legislative experience. I always get a little bit leary of subcommittees. I feel like committees as the whole should be the decision makers and the ones doing work but also recognize the role that subcommittees can play. I think, you know we can support the group but would also want to talk about sort of a little bit better understanding of resource commitment from DEQ's perspective and examining what your expectations are. What you think DEQ will be bringing to the table for these meetings and frequency and timelines. I would just kind of put that out there for a little bit more development. **George Jamison:** Well, ma'am, I assume you're referring to the five year review or are you talking about both that and the feasibility study. **Director Nowakowski:** Well, that's kind of there. And until I have a better understanding, do you need one. Do you need two. I can't commit to DEQ folks being able to be a part of all of these to the level depending on what your expectations are of DEQ. Obviously, we're going to be a part of these

	<p>conversations and want to be involved. Is a subcommittee the best format for that. I'd like a little bit more time to maybe reflect on that but certainly want to be a part and applaud the committee for digging in and wanting to take a deep dive on this issue of both of those issues. <b>George Jamison:</b> Well, honestly, we right now we don't know what we want. At least I don't. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Yeah, this was this was presentation only today to open it up for discussion and consideration. <b>George Jamison:</b> So I think, see I'm not sure, I guess this kind of gets over into the next topic about next steps, you want to go there. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Well, let me see if anyone else online has any comments about the potential subcommittee formation for straw man. Is there any other suggestions or recommendations that we should consider as we move forward with this. Okay.</p>
--	--

<b>1:56 pm</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<p>Discussion and Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Date and Location of next Meeting</li> <li>- Summary of Action Items</li> </ul>	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> So, we'll move on to discussion and next steps. Did you want to open with some more discussion on this. <b>George Jamison:</b> Yeah, I will. You know, this reminds me of last meeting when we left the meeting and we said we need to have some dialogue and just have a chance to talk as we did with some of the folks from DEQ and as I said that was very helpful. And now we've got quite a number of things to talk about. You know-how do we kind of move forward on two very significant topics the first the higher priorities the five year review. I would suggest that we have some more of that informal dialogue and just talk a little bit with each other about how do we see approaching this in a collaborative manner. And then that will give us granular opportunity to also think about how we involve other entities, particularly the board of health, of course their representatives, the commissioners both there and here but so we need to think about that too. I guess I'm kind of wandering around here, but I think a next step is for us to talk internally here and then just have some informal discussions- to kind of see how we might want to begin to go forward with this. I would like to have a little bit of discussion about the facilitator. As I've said, I think that's very important and I would like to just put out there that we were lucky before when we had the facilitator for a while because the county commissioners happened to have an existing agreement with Brett that they had some funding left in. They were able to provide his services to us through that agreement, but that's long gone. I'd like to know is there any- one of the topics I think needs to be how would we fund the work of a facilitator. Let's just talk about the five year review and not an outside consultant technically. I don't know if we there are possibilities to do that but that needs to be one of the things we talk about at some point. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> I guess the one thing I would add is I'm not sure- it's been kind of a wandering discussion a little bit and I'm hesitant on forming subgroups or whatever we want to call this without knowing- You know, we need a purpose, where we're going, where we think we're going, what problem we're solving, why do we do this. Definitely want to account for our responsibilities and are we going outside the responsibilities or are we passing off our responsibilities. I think a little thought that way of what and why- you know obviously as we have some conversations and that's where I'm at and that's a little bit what Sonya said, I think. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Yeah. <b>George Jamison:</b> Yeah. George again. Well, Senator Cuffe, you're absolutely right. One of the things that's listed here in this discussion here is one of the things we're required to do- bring forward as a formal motion to LASOC is a statement of the purpose and scope of committee. Which outlines why do we want to do it and who's going to be involved and a lot of things. So that's part and parcel of this and that's what we saw when we wrote those bylaws that has to be clearly articulated before it's brought to the committee and then they have- <b>Chairman Teske:</b> And I mean the primary established purpose you know is to collaborate, coordinate, assist, share information, you know no matter what topic is. So that would be the primary but I get what you're saying and like I said this was an introduction and presentation today. So, we'll have some time but between now and then there needs to be some discussion of some activity. So, if something comes up please reach out. Anything else on discussion on that topic before we move into date and location the next meeting. <b>Director Nowakowski:</b> As you pursue that discussion, I think we would also welcome your insights on what you see as the pros and cons of maybe subcommittees versus a TASC. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. And we'd appreciate your opinion on that as well. I mean, you've got more experience with how that works and so that would be very beneficial to us. Things we're probably not even thinking about. <b>Director Nowakowski:</b> Right. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Alright, thank you. So this time we did it mid quarter. That correct. So September. So it would be October, would be mid quarter. Does October work for everybody before we get into the holiday crazy seasons-November, December. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> So what were the dates. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Well, we haven't picked a date yet. I just want to make sure that mid-quarter month of October is going to work. We got no trips to Ireland or anything planned. Can you</p>

	<p>put the calendar up so I can look for dates. Typically for me the first and the third weeks are super crazy. How about the week of the 20th to the 24th of October. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> That may be a problem for me. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Okay. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> The 27th we could. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> The 27<sup>th</sup>, that's the next week, the end of the month. And for you sir. And I don't know about Mr. Millett. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> The week of the 6th is okay. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> So before Okay. So either way, I can make it work. Yeah, either the sixth or the 27th. Basically the start of the second week or the third. So what works for the most. <b>George Jamison:</b> Like sixth. Well, no, the sixth is not good. And the 27th those two weeks is not good. But not the whole week. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Well, I mean, within that week span, do you have some openings. All right. So, we'll send out a doodle poll, pick one or two out of that week from the 6th to the 10th and one or two out of the 27th to the 31st to see where we're at on that. Everybody go with that. All right. We have a summary of action items we've discussed it in great detail. We're going to have some communication about the straw man and what we want to have that look like or whether or not we think it's necessary. Anything else you can think of that is an action item we need to summarize. <b>George Jamison:</b> I would suggest I've got a bunch of things coming up the next few weeks. Maybe I think if we could- Melody, you and whoever else from DEQ would like to talk briefly and just see if we could set up a time to kind of like by phone and just kind of talk about some things like we did when you and Kevin were down here. Maybe next week or something. I think that'd be good. If you want to call me after the meeting here or something to see what will work. <b>Melody Kraayeveld:</b> Yep. I will give you a call and we can get something scheduled. <b>George Jamison:</b> Okay. Thank you. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Thank you. Anything else. <b>George Jamison:</b> No, except as you've said, as we work our way along in this process, we need to keep EPA advised because they've offered to post meetings and things and we appreciate them. Now that they overwhelmed us with the offer to work on this. We're kind of a deer in the headlights, you know. We need to be cognizant of the fact they're waiting on us now. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Sure. All right. Thank you. <b>George Jamison:</b> That's a problem with progress, you know. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> So, true. Anything, sir. <b>Senator Cuffe:</b> Thanks, it's been a good meeting. <b>Chairman Teske:</b> Yes. All right. If there's no more discussion and next steps.</p>
--	---

<b>2:09 pm</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Public Comment	<p><b>Chairman Teske:</b> We'll open it for public comment. Sir, you're the only one in the room. No. Anyone online have public comment. Is there anyone from the public. Does not appear so. All right. That being said thus fulfilling our agenda, we can adjourn the meeting. Thank you everyone for coming out-2:09.</p>

Meeting Adjourned 2:09 pm