

1 PICHER PUBLIC MEETING

2 OCTOBER 7, 2003

3

4 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Good evening. As
5 soon as everyone takes their seats, we'll get started.
6 We're already late. Anyone here think it's hot? It's
7 not hot. I already told you guys up here, it's just a
8 state of mind. As long as you don't think it's hot,
9 it's not hot. That's Army training. That's what we
10 told them, we said, "It isn't hot if you don't think
11 it's hot."

12 AUDIENCE: What do you do if it gets too hot
13 for you?

14 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: What do I do if it
15 gets too hot?

16 AUDIENCE: Yeah.

17 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I'm not going to get
18 too hot.

19 AUDIENCE: Oh, okay. We'll see.

20 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: For those of you
21 that don't know me, I'm Colonel Bob Suthard. I'm with
22 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Tulsa Engineer
23 District. I command that entity. And I'm happy to be
24 here with all of you. I was here, I think, a couple of
25 years ago, wasn't it, Mayor? Something like that.

1 They didn't put me out on a train or anything, or
2 anything like that. Now with us tonight, of course, we
3 have, of course, Mayor Freeman, from the City of
4 Picher, and we have representatives from the United
5 States Geological Service, the Environmental
6 Protection Agency, the Oklahoma Department of
7 Environmental Quality, the Grand Gateway Economic
8 Development Authority, and the Eastern Shawnee Tribe.

9 Did I leave out any other group that's out
10 there?

11 (NO RESPONSE.)

12 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Good. Good.

13 I welcome all of you here tonight, and with
14 that -- Let me see. This is what we're here for, the
15 Tar Creek and Spring River Watershed Management Plan.
16 And that's truly the essence of our study. We had two
17 of your elected legislators to support this, and
18 without them we would not be here. And the only reason
19 they supported it is because you-all asked them to
20 support it. And that was Senator Inhofe and
21 Congressman Carson. And we got the funds for that and
22 hence we're moving forward.

23 When are we going to get this thing
24 completed? That's always the big thing. We're
25 supposed to have this thing complete by August of next

1 year, and that is rather lightning speed for the Corps
2 of Engineers.

3 You see that's a completion date up there. I
4 expect you to hold us to that. And from that, we will
5 have recommendations on where to proceed, and it will
6 be up to your federally-elected officials as to whether
7 or not we proceed any further at that point, and your
8 input to them will be vital.

9 We're going to have an opportunity for
10 questions. Mr. Gene Lilly will be making a
11 presentation, and then we'll have three minutes each
12 for questions. Now it's not that we don't want to go
13 longer for questions, but frankly we want to make sure
14 that everyone's heard from, and you will have the
15 opportunity to write down things and give them to us
16 and mail them to us. And we have envelopes with
17 already stamps on them. Right, Jonna? And at the end
18 if you have additional questions, feel free to ask any
19 of the staff during that presentation.

20 There will be future meetings. Now how many,
21 I don't know at this point, but there will probably
22 certainly be at least one more between now and
23 August of next year.

24 And with that -- Where is Mr. Gene Lilly?
25 Mr. Gene Lilly from the Corps of Engineers is going to

1 proceed down and give the presentation to you.

2 Gene.

3 GENE LILLY: We appreciate your participation
4 tonight, having the opportunity to meet here in your
5 community school. This is an important part of your
6 community of Picher and Cardin. Most of you here are
7 well aware of all the issues in the Tar Creek and
8 Spring River watersheds. Many of the issues are
9 related to past mining activities, and those activities
10 provided the United States with lead at crucial times
11 in our nation's history, but it contributed to issues
12 that include health and safety effects, flooding,
13 subsidence, water quality, mine shafts, mining waste,
14 and American Indian concerns.

15 The watershed issues impact people living in
16 Picher, Cardin, Miami, North Miami, Commerce, and
17 Quapaw. Those issues also impact cultures of people
18 from the Eastern Shawnee, Miami, Modoc, Ottawa,
19 Peoria, Quapaw, Seneca Cayuaga, Shawnee, and Wyandotte
20 Tribes.

21 Recently released information indicates
22 water-related concerns in the Neosho River near Miami.
23 The epicenter of the mining took place in the Picher/
24 Cardin area that impacts a great number of people in
25 both the Tar Creek and Spring River watersheds.

1 During the last several years, numerous
2 local, state, tribal, and federal technical experts
3 have suggested that a comprehensive approach to address
4 the watershed issues could be more cost effective than
5 addressing each issue independently. Because of the
6 multitude of issues impacting the Tar Creek and Spring
7 River watersheds, we need a variety of technical
8 expertise to help solve these problems. Currently, no
9 one federal agency has all the expertise or the
10 authority provided by congress to address all these
11 issues. So we need to work together to resolve the
12 issues here.

13 In an effort to respond to that need for
14 multiagency response, a memorandum of understanding was
15 signed in May of 2003, by the senior leaders of the
16 United States Environmental Protection Agency, the
17 United States Department of Interior, and the United
18 States Army Corps of Engineers. A portion of the
19 memorandum reads, "This MOU seeks to foster
20 environmental improvement to ensure the protection of
21 public health and to encourage sustained economic
22 stability and future environmental recovery. This MOU
23 is being entered into for the purposes of coordinating
24 response, reclamation, and restoration activities under
25 the various applicable statutes. The tribal, state,

1 and local government officials and community members
2 are encouraged to play an integral part in planning the
3 short- and long-term solutions for the Tar Creek area."

4 Our authority, the Corps of Engineers'
5 authority, to participate in this effort is provided by
6 the Grand Neosho River, Oklahoma/Kansas Authority. And
7 that's the authority we're proceeding under with this
8 reconnaissance effort.

9 One of the memorandum of understanding tasks
10 recommended for the Corps of Engineers is to develop a
11 Watershed Management Plan for the Tar Creek and Spring
12 River watersheds. To accomplish this task, a planning
13 process that consists of a reconnaissance phase, and
14 contingent on approvals, follow-on feasibility phase,
15 planned development, and implementation.

16 The goal of the reconnaissance phase effort
17 is to use a team approach to identify the favored
18 preliminary Watershed Management Plan and several
19 promising alternatives using existing information and
20 professional judgement. This is the reconnaissance
21 phase. And that's that arrow that's colored blue (on
22 the Power Point slide). We believe that using existing
23 information and professional judgement is the most
24 efficient and expedient way to conduct the
25 reconnaissance phase effort.

1 Subject to approvals, the favored
2 alternative, along with several promising alternatives,
3 would undergo a final comparison in a follow-on
4 feasibility phase effort.

5 To summarize, the purpose of the Watershed
6 Management Plan will be to provide holistic solutions
7 to area problems that will serve as a framework for
8 actions to be implemented by various federal agencies
9 and other entities. So it's a team effort, and you're
10 a very important part of that team.

11 Our goal is to complete the reconnaissance
12 phase effort by August, 2004. We have a lot of
13 existing information, but as we develop this
14 reconnaissance plan, we're likely going to have data
15 gaps that we will need to address in the follow-on
16 feasibility phase. But we want to use the existing
17 information that we can, and where we don't have
18 information, we'll begin to focus on a comprehensive
19 solution for the area.

20 The development of the plan will complement
21 concurring construction and other ongoing activities by
22 the State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma University and other
23 entities. We have a great opportunity to utilize that
24 information generated by those projects. They will
25 provide us examples of efficient plan development,

1 construction practices, monitoring techniques, adapted
2 management techniques, and will provide us recent and
3 reliable cost information to help us develop a plan.

4 The following slides are just kind of a
5 summary of the guiding principles for this
6 reconnaissance phase effort.

7 Particularly important is the open process
8 and your participation. We're also going to need a lot
9 of support from our congressional interests. The
10 planning process, it's an excellent process, it's an
11 open process. We have no preconceived ideas. It's a
12 six-step planning process. The first step is to
13 identify problems and opportunities. And we realize
14 we've heard a lot of problems and opportunities.

15 In our displays over here, we've started
16 writing those and documenting those for you. But if
17 you see something we've overlooked or if you want to
18 express more interest in particular problems and
19 opportunities, we invite you to do that.

20 Follow-on public meetings, we'll start
21 systematically working through the six steps until we
22 get down to the sixth step, and that is to identify
23 several promising alternatives that are holistic in
24 their approach to address the issues here.

25 Some of the existing information, we've got a

1 lot of existing information. These are a couple of
2 examples. We have work that was done, for example, by
3 the Oklahoma Geological Survey; Ken Luza, he has a lot
4 of existing mine-working information, mine shafts
5 information. We hope to augment that local experience
6 and expertise. We also would like your input as we
7 work through this process to help us update that
8 information. The information that Ken Luza did was
9 back in the '80s, so we need to update that using your
10 expertise if we can, and it will help, and your
11 experiences.

12 The other types of information we have from
13 some tribal governments, we have this CD. I'm assuming
14 it's the latest version. But if it needs to be
15 updated, please let us know that. We'd like the most
16 recent information we can get regarding the tribal
17 government issues and concerns for the watersheds.

18 But again, the most important part are from
19 the people in working through this process, and that's
20 why we very much appreciate you being here tonight. We
21 hope you will continue working with us as we go through
22 this process.

23 Now this next several slides are intended to
24 be an example of what could potentially come about.
25 There's work in other parts of the United States where

1 there were mining problems. The example I want to show
2 you is High Ore Creek in Montana. And on your left is
3 a picture of Tar Creek. On the right there is a
4 picture of an area in High Ore Creek in Montana. And
5 they had also just dumped mine tailings right into the
6 creek.

7 The Bureau of Land Management began a process
8 of removing the tailings, disposing of the tailings,
9 started reshaping the stream banks. And then they
10 vegetated that area with native vegetation. And that's
11 an example. Now I'm not suggesting we have that easy
12 of a project here at Tar Creek, but it is an example of
13 what we can begin to do. And we feel there is hope to
14 begin to restore the environment.

15 This completes my presentation. Colonel
16 Suthard, unless you have something else to
17 contribute --

18 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I think the main
19 thing everyone has to understand really, this is your
20 time to give us input, and your part of this process is
21 just as important as anything that we do because we
22 take a lot of what you do and examine all the right
23 things.

24 This could be, in combination with some other
25 things that are going on with ODEQ and other funding,

1 possibly the beginning to a solution. I think that
2 that is a real possibility here. And I think we can
3 come out with some type of impact like that when we get
4 through, then that's going to make all this really
5 worthwhile. But then it will be the next hard step,
6 and that will be to determine whether or not any of the
7 possible solutions will be funded. Okay?

8 So that's where it lies right now. And I
9 think the other important point, as Gene Lilly brought
10 up, is we don't have any one particular plan that
11 we're saying this is the right one. We're examining
12 many different options at this point in time. Okay?
13 And I think that's probably one of the things you
14 really want to get out of this.

15 So, now's your opportunity to ask any
16 questions.

17 AUDIENCE: I'd like to ask one.

18 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Let me see. Where
19 is my minute timer? And you're probably going to --
20 Who's got their hand up? I saw a couple of hands go
21 up. I didn't see your hand back there.

22 GENE RAGSDALE: My name is Gene Ragsdale.
23 August the 4th of 2004, this part of the deal will be
24 done. How many more times are they going to have to
25 get money to keep going? I mean, how many -- They

1 treat dogs better than they treat these children up
2 there. So how many more times are they going to have
3 to get money and study and study and study until this
4 is a final deal?

5 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: That's, in some
6 ways, a million-dollar question, literally a
7 multimillion-dollar question.

8 Gene, do you want me to keep answering, or do
9 you want to speak your part? I guess I'll keep going.
10 I might as well dig myself in a deep hole here while
11 I'm at it.

12 The real deal here is if we can identify some
13 good solutions. To date, have we had any solutions
14 identified as if we do this, this will be an end
15 thing? So if between now and August we at least get to
16 that stage, we can start to see hopefully the light at
17 the end of the tunnel, which won't necessarily be the
18 train coming at us. Exactly where it goes from there,
19 I don't think you can say until you see what those
20 possible solutions are. And, you know, what might
21 be -- what I might think is the right solution, you may
22 not think is the right solution, and that's something
23 we'll have to work out at that point in time. Then the
24 timing issues become involved and everything else goes
25 along with that.

1 years ago.

2 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: We just got the
3 funding for it. How long have we had the funding?

4 SUE HASLETT: We got the funding in August.

5 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: In August.

6 AUDIENCE: We actually had -- We had a
7 meeting, I think, in September of 2000.

8 SUE HASLETT: We had a meeting in September
9 of 2000. We talked about the possibility of doing
10 this. At the time we did not have the funding or the
11 approval from anyone to do it. At the time we thought
12 we were going to be able to do a cost-shared study with
13 the State of Oklahoma and, you know, the State has got
14 funding issues and funding problems and -- We got
15 approval from our headquarters to do a study at full
16 federal expense. It's a very limited scope. But the
17 idea is to put together a plan that will start building
18 for the future. A year from now, a year from actually
19 last August, we'll be able to answer your question.

20 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: But I think the
21 other part that Sue just said is -- I don't know what
22 you said, but I'm going to come back to it -- is we
23 really thought we were going to have to cost share this
24 thing with the State of Oklahoma, and we didn't think
25 we'd be able to do anything because normally --

1 Was it 50/50?

2 SUE HASLETT: Yes.

3 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: So this is kind of
4 unusual that this part of it is going to be taken up
5 with full federal expense.

6 MARIA WEGNER: Colonel, if you could please
7 use the microphone so that everyone could hear and the
8 court reporter.

9 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: And really what we'd
10 like for you-all to do, we would really like for you to
11 come up and talk in the microphone. We have a reporter
12 over here. Would that be a problem? I'm sorry. I
13 should have said that in the very beginning. I've just
14 been remiss.

15 PATTY BARNER: My name is Patty Barner. I'm
16 a resident of Picher; born and raised here. And in
17 addition to what Mr. Ragsdale was telling you, is that
18 for years now we've heard reports. In the
19 demonstration we just saw, they talked about the Ken
20 Luza report, and I know for a fact that there's been
21 additional monies handed out on grants through State,
22 through federal, and we've never seen any updates from
23 these so-called reports that are being updated. Ken
24 Luza's report is a wonderful report, but it's not -- it
25 does need updating. We know for a fact that these

1 reports have all been updated from time to time from
2 different people, different organizations, yet we never
3 see the results. And I think that's where a lot of the
4 bitterness comes from.

5 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Well, you know, the
6 report that we come up with, you'll get to see the
7 results.

8 AUDIENCE: Well, that will be the first time
9 in 20 years.

10 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: That's just the way
11 we operate.

12 JONNA POLK: I think that's another reason
13 that we wanted to emphasize to everybody what the date
14 is that you can expect it so you can look forward to
15 that and anticipate that we will issue a final report
16 and you can expect it in August, 2004.

17 SUE HASLETT: And Jonna and I should
18 probably introduce ourselves. Jonna Polk is the
19 project manager. She's working very closely with Gene
20 on this project. And I'm Sue Haslett. I'm the chief
21 of planning branch. So if Gene does you dirty, I'm the
22 person you talk to. But Gene won't do you dirty. He
23 does good work.

24 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Really I know
25 there's a lot of frustration on the fact of reports and

1 everything else.

2 AUDIENCE: You have no idea.

3 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: When I was here two
4 years ago, we had this exact same frustration. Okay?

5 AUDIENCE: It's just gotten worse.

6 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: And frankly, I would
7 like to have done something a lot sooner.

8 AUDIENCE: And we would like to have --

9 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: But I can tell you,
10 as a federal agency, we cannot move forward without the
11 funding. That's absolutely -- Just can't do it.

12 AUDIENCE: There's little chance of being
13 bought out here if you can't get the funding to do the
14 study.

15 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Now we've got the
16 funding to do the study, and we'll just have to see
17 where that goes.

18 AUDIENCE: All these organizations are
19 getting the money and you never see any reports from
20 them.

21 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I understand. But I
22 think -- And I understand, once again, there's a lot of
23 frustration. But I really believe what you want to
24 concentrate on here tonight, to keep you focused, is
25 you want to concentrate on those things that are

1 related to the report, because that -- Huh?

2 AUDIENCE: Before we ever see one?

3 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Well, you're going
4 to see it a year from now or there are going to be some
5 people dying around me. Okay? I say that with a
6 little bit of jest. I mean, there's a lot of pressure
7 on my staff to make sure this thing is out before I go.
8 And I kind of have a commitment to you-all to get this
9 thing turned around. And I'll tell you, your federal
10 legislators also want to see something. They also say,
11 you know, Gosh, it's been studied, it's been reported
12 on. I said, Hey, this is a way to maybe get to the
13 final solution. That's our goal here -- or a goal.

14 Now once again, for you to help us, we need
15 comments regarding what we're getting ready to do. And
16 I know that you've got the past history, but let's try
17 to focus on that as much as possible. And with that,
18 I'm going to try to pull Gene up here because he's the
19 one that's going to take a lot of that. All right?
20 Because that's what we want to do is move ahead.
21 Right?

22 AUDIENCE: Well, we have been hoping for that
23 for a long time.

24 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I understand. But
25 let's move ahead.

1 And with that, we're going to stick to this
2 microphone and you've got to come up here and talk and
3 we're going to try to keep to so many minutes per
4 person.

5 JOHN MOTT: I don't think I need this
6 microphone, but I'm John Mott, and I've lived here all
7 my life and I've been working on this Tar Creek project
8 since day one, 1980, July 1980. And I come here
9 tonight to look at some things that you were going to
10 do and to put my input into them, but all I can see is
11 what you might do. And whenever you have a meeting to
12 see what you're going to do here and plan, I'd like to
13 be at that meeting where I can say and show why it will
14 work or it will not work.

15 SUE HASLETT: We want something better, sir.

16 AUDIENCE: Okay.

17 SUE HASLETT: We want you to play now,
18 because you already have ideas. Like you said, you've
19 been working on it since the day you were born.

20 JOHN MOTT: I'm sitting there at home
21 waiting, not doing anything but hunting and fishing.

22 SUE HASLETT: Today is your chance. We need
23 to have your input.

24 JOHN MOTT: Okay.

25 SUE HASLETT: That's what we're asking.

1 JOHN MOTT: Well I'm here and I've got
2 information on underground and water discharge, and
3 I've even got -- I built a wetland back in '85, and
4 it's been going since '85. I fish in it. And when I
5 built the diversion dike across Talila Creek to Tar
6 Creek, my water pit became a fishing, a wetland. Now
7 I've stocked it and I've planted it and I've worked it
8 since 1985.

9 SUE HASLETT: And we need to come see it.

10 JOHN MOTT: Okay. Well I'm here and all I
11 need is to the people to get the right information,
12 because I've got it right there in that briefcase.

13 SUE HASLETT: Before you leave tonight -- You
14 see that gal in the black sweater right there?

15 JOHN MOTT: Yes.

16 SUE HASLETT: She is our public involvement
17 specialist, and I want you to give her your
18 name and number and we're going to come see it, because
19 we don't want you to wait until we come up with ideas.
20 We want you to play now.

21 JOHN MOTT: Well, I've got it, any
22 information, you know. I know a lot, and I don't know
23 what you want to know, but if I --

24 SUE HASLETT: We want to know everything you
25 know.

1 JOHN MOTT: Oh, well --

2 MARK OSBORN: My name is Mark Osborn. I'm
3 the local physician, and I can't imagine a more
4 unattractive job than being a court reporter at a
5 public meeting. I have real empathy for you.

6 I have several questions. One is -- The
7 first is not a question. I really appreciate the Corps
8 proceeding with this because I think one of the
9 things -- The simple thing we've been lacking is some
10 kind of comprehensive plan to approach the multitude of
11 issues here. And I appreciate the Corps taking that
12 task on.

13 My concerns generally come in my activity --
14 (inaudible) -- with the children. And I have some real
15 concerns about the current DEQ plan to move all this
16 chat, which I think will obviously create a real
17 toxicity issue for the children. I also have problems
18 with plans to do things before you have an overall
19 plan. I mean, it doesn't seem like a very good idea.
20 Now I think the University of Oklahoma study is going
21 to be helpful, but I would suggest that we need to wait
22 until we know the consequences of moving chat before we
23 expose these children. And what I would suggest that
24 you would do is the human health risk assessment, where
25 the EPA did not do any dust deposition studies and

1 compare that with Bob Lynch's most recent data that
2 shows deposition of dust to the level of the HUD
3 standard for lead in the house after only eleven days
4 of exposure.

5 And I think until you can take those two bits
6 of information and explain Lynch's study and do more
7 and more extensive air quality studies, we shouldn't
8 move chat.

9 The other thing that I would suggest is that
10 we need to include a multitude of both private agents
11 or private businesses and the expertise of different
12 government agencies to come up with a master plan. And
13 I would ask -- I've never talked with the DEQ, but I
14 would like to know who came up with their ideas.

15 SUE HASLETT: They're here tonight and the
16 idea of what we're hoping is that we'll be able to lead
17 a coalition of state and federal agencies and local
18 entities to help facilitate -- I guess may be a better
19 term -- to facilitate the developmental solution.
20 Because, you know, one agency alone can't do it. You
21 know, it's going to take the expertise of a whole lot
22 of folks to get the job done and put together the plan,
23 and that's what we're going to do. We're going to work
24 with those folks. That's why Grand Gateway is here
25 tonight, USGS is here, the DEQ folks are here, is

1 because we all want to work together.

2 MARK OSBORN: Do you think it's wise to move
3 chat before we know what it's going to do to these
4 kids, particularly in close to town?

5 SUE HASLETT: I'm certainly not an expert on
6 that, and I think that's something that I'm sure the
7 DEQ will think through on.

8 MARK OSBORN: Should we move chat before we
9 know?

10 SUE HASLETT: Again, I'm no expert on that.
11 Those are the kinds of questions that need to be asked.

12 JONNA POLK: One of the agencies that we're
13 coordinating with is the agency --

14 (Applause.)

15 JONNA POLK: -- like Gene and Sue have said,
16 we're working to bring in the resources and develop a
17 plan that's more of a team approach. And one of those
18 agencies -- We're not experts in toxicology and so we
19 recognize that, and it's important for us to work with
20 agencies that are experts. And one of the agencies
21 that we've contacted and will be meeting with us is the
22 Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

23 Dr. Banner, in Tulsa, who is a I'm sure
24 you're familiar with them. And we'll actually be
25 meeting with them probably sometime in the next month,

1 for them to give us input into our plan. And so we'd
2 be glad to contact you when they're going to be in
3 town.

4 MARK OSBORN: Dr. Banner, in Tulsa, who is a
5 toxicologist and is on the ATSDR Lead Prevention For
6 Children Committee has written an article that states
7 that to move this stuff with these people present is a
8 really bad idea. Now his credentials far outweigh
9 mine. I mean, you know, he's a pediatric intensivist
10 and toxicologist, and so that would be my first
11 concern.

12 My second concern is, is that I'm not sure
13 that the lead is the real issue. And what I mean by
14 that is, we spent \$107 million here and we still have
15 enough lead in the air to contaminate a house in eleven
16 days. And somebody missed the point. Now it wasn't
17 because anybody was evil or because they were bad. It
18 was because they missed the point. There are enough
19 dangers to human life here -- mine shafts and
20 subsidence and all those kind of things -- that people
21 should not live here. And if the ATSDR just sticks to
22 metals and just sticks to lead, they have not done a
23 human health risk assessment.

24 And that would be, I think, a real tragedy if
25 they don't look at the overall site, so --

1 JONNA POLK: Well, we're here to listen.
2 That's why we want to get your input and we want to
3 make sure that those contacts that we have with those
4 agencies, that that information gets transferred to
5 them as well. So if you've not had an opportunity to
6 express that to ATSDR, then we'll be glad to pass that
7 on.

8 MARK OSBORN: Actually they only spent three
9 hours in town and they didn't invite anybody else.

10 JONNA POLK: Okay.

11 FRANK WOOD: I'm Frank Wood and I agree with
12 everything that the doctor's saying here. It seems to
13 me that we're getting fixed to spend this \$45 million
14 that Senator Inhofe is getting to doll out to some
15 federal agencies. We're getting the cart before the
16 horse. And as far as I'm concerned, the Colonel is --
17 you know, he's holding to his promise that he made us
18 that this thing was going to get done before he hikes
19 off to somewhere else. And I think a lot of this
20 needs -- All these interim programs and grants and
21 things, this all needs to be put on hold, including
22 removing this chat, until you guys get done.

23 There's too much interaction. They start
24 moving chat and so forth. What effect is this going to
25 have on the reconnaissance study that you-all are

1 trying to put together? What effect is that going to
2 have upon any appropriations down the line?

3 But in the meantime, there's a couple of
4 things I have suggestions for you. Before they all up
5 and die, you need to interview all these old miners
6 around here. You really need to talk to them and
7 listen and hear what they've got to say. You know, I'm
8 telling you right now, in 1983 if they'd have listened
9 to a whole bunch of these guys, we wouldn't be in the
10 plight that we are now.

11 (Applause.)

12 FRANK WOOD: Most of them tried to talk to
13 these people about the underground water flow in this
14 particular area, and nobody wanted to listen to them
15 because they were just old, ignorant miners. And you
16 know, I'm well educated myself, but I, you know, my
17 task on the governor's task force was to interview
18 these miners, and I had a healthy respect for all the
19 important things they had to say.

20 The other thing that I think that you should
21 have, if you haven't procured already, Grand Gateway
22 was funded to update the Luza report; mine shafts and
23 things like that. There was a great amount of money
24 put out for that. If you folks don't have that, you
25 need to see Grand Gateway and get that.

1 Thank you.

2 GENE LILLY: Frank, thank you. We do want
3 to -- That is one of the things on our schedule, a
4 task, is to try to visit with the miners' alumni. And
5 we think that is valuable information. We think the
6 mining industry could contribute tremendously to
7 resolving some of the issues, and we want to integrate
8 that into the process.

9 And so I appreciate that comment, appreciate
10 the information we hope John Mott is going to help us
11 with also in getting this expertise from the miners and
12 the mining industry.

13 MAYOR FREEMAN: If you're going to talk to
14 these old miners and get at least two out of three to
15 agree on any one thing, good luck.

16 You know, we've been waiting about, seems to
17 me like, 22 months to get this announcement tonight
18 that this study is going to go on. We've been waiting
19 about 20 years, or 20-plus years, on this whole
20 project. Now tonight you tell us it's going to be
21 another ten months before you can do your report, and
22 given your best case scenario, you do the report, it's
23 accepted, you convince the federal legislators to fund
24 it, when we going to get some action?

25 GENE LILLY: We are hopeful that we will be

1 able to identify some short-term and long-term features
2 of this plan. Now as we go through this process, we'll
3 be able to give you a definitive answer on that,
4 assuming everything works through the system. But
5 that's our goal. We also have some potential
6 concurrent projects that could possibly happen through
7 funding by Senator Inhofe. But that's got to work
8 together.

9 And we need to use that information, that
10 experience of working through those projects, integrate
11 that into a holistic approach. We need to identify
12 short- and long-term features of a plan and get that
13 laid out so people can see how this plan will progress,
14 how we will get it implemented. And that's one of the
15 goals of this reconnaissance effort.

16 We also -- We're not looking at this from any
17 one agency perspective. The idea is for a technical
18 team, working with the public, working with local,
19 state, tribal interests, to come up with the best plan
20 we can that's reasonable, that's practical. And there
21 may be some congressional authority gaps. It could be
22 there's some parts of that plan that no authority
23 exists, and we need to identify those too. So that's
24 the goals.

25 But as we work through this, Mayor Freeman,

1 that's what we want to be able to tell you and report
2 to you what our anticipated implementation is for the
3 various features of the plan.

4 MAYOR FREEMAN: You have a child here tonight
5 that's a year old --

6 GENE LILLY: Right.

7 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I was going to try
8 to answer your question first.

9 MAYOR FREEMAN: Okay. Let me finish and I'll
10 go sit down.

11 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: All right. Well,
12 you had a question and we didn't answer it.

13 MAYOR FREEMAN: Right. And I don't think
14 you're going to answer it.

15 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I'll try.

16 MAYOR FREEMAN: But you have a child here
17 tonight that's a year old and you're going to do
18 another ten months of study, then it's going to take a
19 year, possibly two, to get the project funded, you
20 know, to start a short-term remediation or, you know,
21 whatever it is, to help the children. And that's what
22 we're supposed to be here for, you know. From what
23 I've seen in the past, from every state, federal, and
24 local agency, you know, you're talking about a real
25 long-term. It's not going to protect the child five

1 years from now that hasn't even been conceived yet
2 tonight. And we have children living here today that
3 need something done.

4 This Luza report was done in the '80s. The
5 library's full of reports that have already been done.
6 You know, two years ago or three years ago, the Corps
7 was trying to get funded to do this very study, and I
8 thought you were being prepared and already doing some
9 work on this study prior to having today to, yes,
10 you're funded to do it. And maybe you ought to share
11 that information of what the Corps has already put
12 together on this project, you know, before you actually
13 got funded for it, because I'll probably never live to
14 see this place cleaned up.

15 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: You know, you're
16 wrong on a couple of points there. One is, what have
17 we done before we were funded? Well, you know, we're
18 really not supposed to do a whole lot before we're
19 funded. Okay?

20 MAYOR FREEMAN: But I know you have. And I
21 appreciate it.

22 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Anyway -- I'll let
23 Gene talk to you a couple of minutes. A lot of it's
24 just collecting a lot of the data. We have been
25 working doing some types of things as far as collecting

1 data that was within our authority for coming up here.

2 You asked when could something happen. You
3 know, it really depends on what the options are and how
4 they are supported in congress. I mean that's the
5 bottom line. Certainly there's some other things that
6 are going on, as you-all have mentioned other funding
7 that might be federal dollars that may be coming to the
8 state and things like that, and hopefully those types
9 of things can be incorporated into some of the things
10 that we're talking about. But you know, once the
11 reconnaissance report is out, I mean, it can go really
12 quick. You know, if congress decided, Hey, we like
13 this one and we're going to authorize it and
14 appropriate it, it can happen right away. Then there's
15 the standard Corps process which can take, you know,
16 much longer. Now what is "much longer"? Well, it can
17 be months to years. I mean, that's just the way it is.
18 But it doesn't have to be that way.

19 I think what you've got though, which is
20 really different from the reports that you've got
21 currently sitting on the shelf is, this is the first
22 time we're trying to start to point towards, okay, this
23 would be a final solution, at least to the Watershed
24 Management Plan.

25 Now the question is, how much of this is it

1 going to really -- the Watershed Management Plan, as a
2 holistic plan, take in? We don't know that yet, and it
3 would be premature for me to say it's going to take in
4 every single thing.

5 But the bottom line is, your original
6 question was, how long after this? And frankly it's
7 going to be up to the legislators in Washington to make
8 a decision, and somewhat the State, as to how quickly
9 they want to implement the things that are in the plan.
10 Okay?

11 MAYOR FREEMAN: That's the reason I asked for
12 a best case scenario.

13 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Literally, it can be
14 within a year. I mean, that can happen.

15 MAYOR FREEMAN: Wait a minute. Is that going
16 to be two months after your report is finished? Ten
17 months --

18 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: No. Once the report
19 is complete.

20 MAYOR FREEMAN: Okay.

21 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I mean, I'm just
22 looking at the typical appropriations authorization
23 process in congress. If it went through at lightening
24 speed -- okay? -- it's just not going to happen 60 days
25 after we complete the report. I mean, I think you'd be

1 looking at a year, minimum, for the -- Let's see, we'd
2 finish in August. That would be the end of FY '04 --
3 First of October is actually the end of the FY federal
4 government. So I think you'd be looking at the next
5 year. And if it was authorized in the next year, then
6 you'd look at maybe the first of October of the
7 following year.

8 Now could funds be freed up under some other
9 authorities and things like that? It's possible. We
10 have CAP projects and things like that, that would be
11 smaller in nature. But at least then you would have a
12 mark on the wall of where you might be headed towards.
13 We don't have that now. Okay? So at least it's
14 something towards the future.

15 So hopefully that answers some of your
16 questions, Mayor.

17 And Gene, we didn't answer the other part of
18 the mayor's question is, he wants to know some of the
19 things that we've already done. I think most of it is
20 data collection and things like that, but you can talk
21 to that.

22 GENE LILLY: We were asked to participate in
23 the Governor Keating's Tar Creek Task Force. We served
24 on several subcommittees from that effort. We have
25 completed what we refer to as a 905(b) Analysis Report.

1 That's just a very preliminary effort to identify
2 potential for federal and local interest in this
3 watershed. That has been completed. And then we have
4 begun working on putting together a team, a schedule, a
5 scope of work for this reconnaissance phase activity
6 that we are beginning, yes, coordinating with federal
7 agencies, state agencies, and the area tribal
8 governments, and local governments.

9 REBECCA JIM: I'm not sure if I -- maybe I
10 heard the answer and I wasn't sure. I'm Rebecca Jim.
11 And I just wondered -- and maybe you just said it and
12 it's another language and it didn't get to me. But at
13 the end of your ten months, will your study be able to
14 say, yes, people here need to be moved? Is that one of
15 the questions you're asking in your project? I mean,
16 the people in Picher and Cardin that are most at risk
17 for all of the reasons we know. Is that one of the
18 answers that will be given by the report?

19 My other question. I appreciate the vision,
20 and you know that, for the holistic view. I really do.
21 And I believe that there can be solutions. Just a few
22 miles from here in Kansas, in Baxter Springs where
23 Spring Creek runs, I know what can happen. You can
24 literally move the creek, clean it out and put it back.
25 Okay? I know that can happen. So I have a vision of a

1 totally clean place, you know.

2 But I don't think this particular spot and
3 that dream can happen while people are living here
4 safely. I think it may be a hope for my future and the
5 future in generations that they may be able to move
6 back here to live. It may be safe enough by then; it
7 may be secure enough. So that was my question.

8 GENE LILLY: Well, the relocation component
9 of a comprehensive plan may be considered during this
10 reconnaissance phase effort. Now what we indicated was
11 that we may have several promising alternatives that
12 would carry forward for a final comparison, and a lot
13 of that is going to depend on the amount of data we
14 have and the amount of professional judgement we have
15 to exercise.

16 But, yes, we feel relocation needs to be
17 considered as a component of a comprehensive plan. Now
18 whether there will be a federal interest, I can't
19 answer that. Whether or not it would carry forward as
20 a recommendation, I can't answer that tonight. But we
21 are going to address it, working with you.

22 AUDIENCE: How much are politicians able to
23 influence your recommendations? I mean, I'm serious.
24 I mean, you're an independent body. Right?

25 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: All right. Number

1 one, you didn't walk up to the mike.

2 I tell you what, in our recommendations there
3 isn't going to be a political influence on our
4 recommendations.

5 AUDIENCE: Is or is not?

6 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Is not.

7 (Applause.)

8 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I must be nearing
9 the end of my career. No, I'm just kidding on that.

10 Really, there's never been the intent that
11 the political process influences the recommendations
12 that we have out there. Now how the political process
13 influences is frankly which recommendation is set
14 forth. In other words, which one they're going to
15 fund, if they decide to fund any. You know, they need
16 to look at the options just like you-all, and you-all
17 have your time to meet with them and tell the, Hey,
18 this is what we would like to see done, or whatever.

19 But there hasn't been any political effort
20 whatsoever to influence the recommendation that we've
21 come up with. They're very hands-off on that.

22 SUE HASLETT: No, I don't anticipate there
23 will be any.

24 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I think you can feel
25 pretty confident of that.

1 Yes, sir?

2 JIM JENNINGS: My name is Jim Jennings, and I
3 went to the health department and I asked them, I said,
4 "Why not do a study to determine what causes the lead
5 in these households contaminating the kids?" And they
6 said -- As far as I can tell, there's no determination
7 that tells if it's from mining waste or that it's from
8 lead-based paint. In my own personal feelings, I think
9 it's lead-based paint. Where I base that is the fact
10 that they burn lots of derelict houses around here, and
11 it just spreads vapor all over -- fumes if you want to
12 call it that -- all over the city and town.

13 I think maybe the chat is getting a bum rap
14 here, in the fact that the real problem is lead-based
15 paint, just as it is in inner cities in Chicago, et
16 cetera, where the kids are also leaded.

17 AUDIENCE: You live here now?

18 AUDIENCE: I was born in Picher.

19 AUDIENCE: Do you live here now?

20 AUDIENCE: I live in Quapaw now.

21 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Well, you know, the
22 bottom line is, whether it's lead-based paint or
23 whether chat piles, frankly to us at this point is
24 irrelevant. Because what we're focusing on is the
25 Watershed Management Plan. Okay? And it will

1 encompass the chat. The chat has a big impact on how
2 the watershed is. Okay? So one way or another on that
3 particular aspect of it, in some ways while it's
4 relevant to the group here, it's probably -- it
5 wouldn't be that relevant as to how we move ahead on
6 the study other than the fact of, you know, maybe
7 moving the chat and the impact that it has. Okay?

8 GENE LILLY: That's correct. Also we are
9 coordinating with other agencies; the Grand Gateway
10 Economic Development Authority is working on a
11 lead-based paint abatement program, and so we will be
12 coordinating that. That type of information would be
13 available during our public meetings.

14 AUDIENCE: How about the stopping the burning
15 of houses, old houses? Sometimes they bring the fire
16 department out for practice putting the fire out. I
17 think that's tremendously putting the kids at risk.

18 AUDIENCE: That's urban renewal Picher style.

19 SUE HASLETT: Unfortunately we don't have any
20 authority for that.

21 AUDIENCE: Somebody should.

22 SCOTT VANHOOSE: My name is Scott VanHoose.
23 I have a couple of quick questions. One: Is this
24 going to be based on any of this work that's being done
25 out here by Inhofe, out on the McNeely place, I guess

1 40-some acres? Is that going to be affecting any part
2 of you-all's decision on that?

3 GENE LILLY: It won't affect our decision,
4 but we will certainly -- we need to recognize the
5 projects that are going on and we need to be able to
6 identify those, use that information where it can help
7 us, our plan needs to complement the existing efforts.

8 SCOTT VANHOOSE: Now if you go and to look at
9 it and it says, okay, this is good in certain ways and
10 bad in other ways, how can that be put to use in Picher
11 and Cardin where there is trees being left, houses
12 being left? What they're doing is out there in an open
13 field that no one will ever live on, where, you know,
14 all of our tax dollars, in my opinion, are just wasted
15 out there. How can you take that and shift that into
16 the Picher/Cardin area and say, Okay, this kind of plan
17 works, but we don't recommend a buyout?

18 You know, that's going to be defeating the
19 purpose, because to watch EPA, you watch the work out
20 there, they bulldoze over the trees, they're shoving
21 down the shafts. It's totally cleared off. And here
22 in town where they do it, they go way around the tree,
23 maybe two inches or an inch of dirt off and put that
24 back on top. You've got all the lead that's underneath
25 the house, where the house has been moved in or God

1 forbid a house catch on fire and burn down, I mean,
2 you've got the yard where the house sits is still
3 contaminated with the lead. You know, how are you
4 going to look at that in that aspect?

5 GENE LILLY: That particular project you're
6 referring to is situationally different. Okay? It's
7 not right in the middle of the community. We're going
8 to have to look at the situational issues and problems.
9 Now where that project could potentially help us in
10 identifying a plan is, for instance, is the method of
11 disposing of that mining waste, is it working? I
12 believe the proposals are to monitor that. Can we put
13 it in the ground? I think some of the materials are
14 being put in a dry part of the subsidence area, some of
15 the materials are being put in the wet part of the
16 subsidence area. It's information like that, that we
17 can use.

18 Now regarding safe handling practices in a
19 highly populated area, we're going to have to address
20 that issue separate from --

21 SCOTT VANHOOSE: Okay. So it won't be looked
22 at the same way that's being looked at, is what I'm
23 asking.

24 GENE LILLY: That's right. But we will gain
25 from that project what we can gain, and then we will

1 apply situationally other techniques and expertise
2 where we need to.

3 SCOTT VANHOOSE: Okay. And also on the map
4 where we had Picher, Cardin, Quapaw and all of that
5 where it's been affected, you guys need to go on down
6 the line and go ahead and add Grove, all of Grand Lake
7 area, where the lead has contaminated Grand Lake as
8 well in your figures.

9 ED KEHELEY: My name is Ed Keheley. My
10 concern is not so much the details of your plan,
11 because I think those will work out and take care of
12 themselves. My concern is really whether or not you're
13 going to have the full cooperation of the federal
14 agencies that you need and the state agencies as well.
15 Because there's been a tremendous vacuum in this area
16 up here as far as leadership is concerned on the part
17 of the state and on the part of the federal government,
18 and I'm hoping that what you're going to be doing is
19 going to be providing leadership, you know, for the
20 first time up here in a way of coordinating all the
21 federal agencies and the state agencies in a manner of
22 which you can pull together this plan.

23 So far up here we've had a long series of
24 independent studies. Each of the federal agencies and
25 the state agencies scurry around, you know, to find as

1 much money as they can to do independent studies, which
2 are not necessarily linked to drawing of conclusions
3 and making future plans.

4 Sue made a comment earlier, I think, that the
5 state was having, you know, trouble with funding and
6 didn't match the \$300,000 50/50 match to do this study.
7 I really don't think that's true. The State was able
8 to pull \$4 million out of the rainy day fund and then
9 they chose the projects that they were going to work
10 on, and one of them is the project that you were
11 mentioning out here just east of town. That's not an
12 Inhofe-related project per se, but that's something the
13 Oklahoma Conservation Commission sort of designed for
14 out there.

15 The concern that people like myself have with
16 that particular project is that that land was worth
17 \$300 an acre before they started, and it's only going
18 to be worth \$300 an acre when they finish. Now
19 they're going to seed it now to put grass in, and 54
20 acres of land will feed 35 cows. And so we've spent
21 \$500,000 to feed 35 cows out there basically, you know,
22 east of town, when that \$500,000 could have been put to
23 much better use, such as helping support this
24 particular study. But instead the State decided -- or
25 DEQ decided -- they were not going to use the money,

1 you know, to support this particular study, and
2 therefore you had to go ahead with full federal
3 funding.

4 So there's a real disconnect as far as I'm
5 concerned. I can cite other examples. But there's a
6 real disconnect that exists between the state agencies
7 and some of the federal agencies, you know, and in
8 particular your effort here. Now I'm concerned that
9 you're not going to get the cooperation out of a lot of
10 these agencies that you really need in order to make
11 this a reality. Because what this really means is the
12 end to a lot of independent studies; a lot of
13 independent funding that's going to the various federal
14 agencies, to where at some point in time everybody
15 would have to be working towards a common goal. And
16 that's going to be very difficult here.

17 And so I hope that what I'm suggesting will
18 not be true and I hope that you will get all the
19 support that you can use from all the state and federal
20 agencies. But I haven't seen evidence of that yet.
21 But I'm optimistic and I hope that you'll be able to
22 work your way through that.

23 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I understand your
24 concern. I will tell you that just lately that our
25 senior staff has met with the -- you've got a change in

1 administration; the Keating administration to your
2 current governor. And we did meet with senior
3 environmental officials in the State. I think that was
4 a pretty positive meeting. And I, at this point in
5 time, I can only think that we're going to have
6 cooperation, and hopefully we will, and I don't have
7 anything that's going to indicate otherwise at this
8 point in time.

9 Certainly if we don't have cooperation,
10 you're right, it would be very difficult. But at this
11 point in time, so far everything looks very
12 cooperative. We'll just have to see where it goes.
13 And as I said, right now I'm optimistic. Okay?

14 GENE LILLY: And I echo that. Tonight you'll
15 see a tabletop display by the Oklahoma DEQ, and we also
16 have a map here that DEQ is working hard on a
17 geographic information system. We've been meeting with
18 DEQ staff to begin this process. And we're encouraged.
19 We hope that at future public meetings you'll see other
20 agencies and government resources participate and begin
21 to work together. So we are very optimistic, and we
22 appreciate the agencies that are here tonight and
23 encourage future participation.

24 ED KEHELEY: You're sugar-coating the issue.

25 SUE HASLETT: I don't think he is. I really

1 believe that we, you know, what we're finding is --
2 Gene is meeting, Gene and Jonna are meeting with the
3 other Federal agencies, with the State agencies. What
4 we're finding is, we've got folks who are just as
5 concerned as the citizens here -- maybe not as
6 concerned, but they are truly concerned and they want
7 to help.

8 You know, somebody said tonight -- I think
9 the doctor mentioned that, you know, the folks who came
10 and did this study weren't bad people. Well what we're
11 finding is these are good people. You know, they're
12 people we haven't worked with before.

13 Federal agencies, as you know, tend to look
14 at their own missionary and to focus on that. And the
15 Corps is just as guilty of that as anybody else. But
16 our missions are flood control and ecosystem
17 restoration, and now watershed management.

18 And I think this is such a complex problem
19 that no one federal agency has the authority to fix it
20 all. No one federal agency has the capability to fix
21 it all. At least that's my view. And what we're
22 seeing is folks who really want to help, who truly want
23 to help fix the problem. And maybe we're just seeing
24 it at the working level, and if you get up to the
25 secondary level in Washington, you know, they're all

1 backbiting. I don't know. I don't think that's the
2 case because now we have an MOU that hopefully will set
3 those folks on the same path that we're seeing here.
4 But what we're seeing here is folks willing to work
5 together. And you know, maybe I'm naive. I've been
6 accused of that before, and I can see the look on your
7 face.

8 AUDIENCE: You'd have to live up here to see
9 how we've been treated by these agencies.

10 SUE HASLETT: Pardon?

11 AUDIENCE: You'd have to live up here to see
12 how we've been treated by these agencies. If you live
13 here for three months, you'll think the same thing of
14 them.

15 SUE HASLETT: Well, I hope that's not the
16 case and I hope that we can turn that around.

17 AUDIENCE: Just in response. You have very
18 little money actually to pull this off.

19 SUE HASLETT: That's correct.

20 AUDIENCE: Your funds are tight. The only
21 thing that talks with federal and state agencies is
22 money. So you really don't have enough money to throw
23 around to a number of agencies to really get out of
24 them what you need. So you're really going to be
25 asking these agencies to foot part of the bill.

1 SUE HASLETT: Yeah.

2 AUDIENCE: To help you with this.

3 SUE HASLETT: Yeah.

4 AUDIENCE: And I'm just saying that that
5 often, whether it's federal or state, doesn't work very
6 well. And so, you know, whatever powers of persuasion
7 and, you know, whatever you can do, you're going to
8 have to do it, I think, to really be able to get all
9 these agencies in to help you.

10 AUDIENCE: How much would it cost to do this
11 study right?

12 SUE HASLETT: I think we are doing it right.

13 AUDIENCE: But I mean to really make a
14 comprehensive plan. What would it cost compared to
15 what you're funded?

16 SUE HASLETT: I think it's a how-much-you-got
17 question, you know. That's my opinion, is, you know,
18 how much you got, we can do it for that.

19 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I think a lot is,
20 you know, what we talked about earlier. The more
21 cooperation we get, there's a lot of stuff that's
22 already out there. Our plan is to make the \$500,000
23 work.

24 Isn't it 500,000?

25 SUE HASLETT: (Nods head.)

1 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: And we're going to
2 execute that to the best of our ability and we're going
3 to give you what we've got and you're going to get your
4 money's worth. Okay?

5 You know, when you think of all the money
6 that's been spent up here, it isn't very much, is it?

7 AUDIENCE: No, it isn't.

8 AUDIENCE: But you requested more, didn't
9 you? You requested additional funding?

10 SUE HASLETT: When we were going to do it at
11 a higher level of detail, yes.

12 AUDIENCE: How much additional funding did
13 you request?

14 SUE HASLETT: I don't remember.

15 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: It's no secret.
16 We'll tell you whatever it was. I just don't know
17 right off.

18 MARK OSBORN: In my job, detail matters.

19 (Applause.)

20 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I understand. You
21 know, that's a little bit of difference between moving
22 something with a bulldozer and a scalpel, I guess.

23 But yeah, I got you.

24 AUDIENCE: Sue, I just wanted to make a
25 comment about what you said, you know, about agencies

1 and things. People in politics all start with the
2 letter "P." Don't ever forget that. And along that
3 line to give you an example of how politics
4 snookerdoodled all of you-all and everybody else here
5 was the tomfoolery that went on with the CEQ report.
6 Now there's a prime example of technical information
7 put together by a competent bunch of people that went
8 down the tube as a consequence of politics.

9 (Applause.)

10 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I'm not going to
11 address the CEQ report. I mean, really, that's outside
12 of my purview and I didn't come up with the report.

13 AUDIENCE: The Corps had input on it.

14 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: We had some input
15 and the only thing I can think is maybe somebody
16 examined that thing and maybe they got some input and,
17 you know, they looked at the input and they came up
18 with an answer. I'm just -- That's really outside of
19 my purview.

20 Yes, sir?

21 AUDIENCE: Originally wasn't this study
22 supposed to cost \$600,000 and take six months, and
23 300,000 was set aside by the State out of a \$4 million
24 to pull from the rainy day fund a year or two ago?

25 AUDIENCE: Right.

1 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: That's right.

2 AUDIENCE: That makes you feel good, doesn't
3 it.

4 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Yes, ma'am?

5 AUDIENCE: Are you folks aware that there's a
6 new cave-in in Quapaw that's three feet from Highway
7 69?

8 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I don't know --

9 AUDIENCE: They filled it in once and it
10 caved in again.

11 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Actually Gene Lilly
12 says we are aware of it. But actually there are new
13 cave-ins all the time, aren't there?

14 AUDIENCE: Okay. Well then my question is:
15 It's so close to the highway, what agency is going to
16 be responsible --

17 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: That will be the
18 State.

19 AUDIENCE: -- if a busload of children go
20 down?

21 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: The State.

22 AUDIENCE: The State?

23 AUDIENCE: That's a county road now it's on.

24 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: State, county. I
25 mean, we don't have the authority over the roads or

1 anything like that presently.

2 AUDIENCE: Well, they filled it in once and
3 it caved in.

4 GENE LILLY: Would you repeat that, please?

5 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: She wanted to know
6 who had the responsibility for the --

7 AUDIENCE: In case a busload of children go
8 down on that highway.

9 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Yeah. There's a
10 road that has a cave-in. I think it's probably been
11 publicized. It's outside of Quapaw.

12 AUDIENCE: It's three feet from the highway.

13 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Frankly, telling us
14 that -- We're not truly the right agency to be talking
15 to about that. Okay?

16 AUDIENCE: The county commissioner is working
17 on it.

18 AUDIENCE: I know.

19 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Okay.

20 AUDIENCE: Are you addressing subsidence at
21 all?

22 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Can you come to the
23 microphone, please? We're absolutely killing -- We'll
24 get a microphone to you. We're killing our court
25 reporter over here.

1 ED ROSSMAN: She's doing a great job, by the
2 way.

3 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: She's issuing me
4 death threats over to the side. I bet she doesn't type
5 that in.

6 AUDIENCE: Are you addressing subsidence at
7 all?

8 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Yes. Somewhat.

9 AUDIENCE: Your agency is?

10 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Not subsidence as on
11 a daily basis. It's subsidences as to how it affects
12 the Watershed Management Plan.

13 Did I answer that correctly, Gene?

14 AUDIENCE: Don't you think that when you
15 build a house, you should start with the foundation
16 first?

17 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Well, you see, I
18 said that we're addressing it as it applies to the
19 Watershed Management Plan.

20 AUDIENCE: I mean, I'm thinking of it as
21 people living here, plain and simple, just --

22 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I understand. But
23 you know what our authorities are, is what we're
24 addressing. And then the ancillary part of that is
25 what we do if the Watershed Management Plan, how that

1 affects everyone else, then how we can go about
2 actually doing whatever we need to do and where
3 everyone is located at that point in time.

4 AUDIENCE: I think about it as, if you spend
5 millions and it all caves in, what have you
6 accomplished?

7 (Applause.)

8 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: That gets kind of
9 addressed, actually.

10 The short answer to your question is, that
11 part is addressed. Okay?

12 AUDIENCE: Okay.

13 MARK OSBORN: What round is this?

14 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: I tell you what, for
15 a physician you don't get it. You've got to come to
16 the microphone.

17 MARK OSBORN: All I want to say is that I've
18 always appreciated a group of people that can take a
19 good ass-chewing, and I do appreciate that. And I
20 really do feel like this is the next thing that we have
21 to do to make progress here so that every project that
22 we do leads to something else so we can come to some
23 kind of conclusion. And I appreciate you guys being
24 here and doing this. Anyway, that's all I had to say.

25 (Applause.)

1 MARIA WEGNER: Since there's a lull in the
2 questions, I'm going to address the public involvement
3 concerns that you guys have expressed, as I understand
4 them. And so I guess that means you can hit on me
5 now -- I mean, beat me up.

6 We do have several things going on. We are
7 currently updating the web site, and the web site we
8 have is on the Tulsa District web site, and I know some
9 have pens. I could tell you what it is, if you go --
10 Everybody's getting their pens out real quick. It's
11 www.swt.usace.army.mil I know that's a little bit
12 long. And down on the left side of the page, there is
13 a little box that says "Local Projects," and if you
14 click on there, one of the projects is the Tar Creek
15 and Spring River Watershed Management Plan. So the
16 information, as it becomes available, will be on our
17 web site, including the 905(b) report. It's currently
18 there. So if you did want to see that and you have
19 access to the web, you can get it.

20 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: It's actually
21 written right up front there. There's the web site.

22 MARIA WEGNER: And once again, it's under the
23 local projects and it will state the Tar Creek and
24 Spring River Watershed Management Plan.

25 We also, tonight, do have comment forms. It

1 looks like this. And quite honestly, I would welcome
2 getting a hundred of them a day if it means that you
3 guys are getting involved, because that's my job. And
4 also to make it easy, we do have a stamped envelope.
5 So if you go home tonight and you feel like you didn't
6 get to say enough, you know, fill out the form, add
7 additional pages. That's fine.

8 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: If you add too many
9 pages, it may need another stamp. We just want to make
10 sure it gets to us.

11 MARIA WEGNER: The other form that's up there
12 to fill out, our communication suggestions, and this
13 will be used directly in the public involvement plan,
14 which I am writing and is available in draft form. And
15 what that is, is it lays out exactly how we will be
16 involving you through each step of the process. And so
17 if you think that, you know, we're not having enough
18 meetings or we're having too many meetings or, you
19 know, the newsletter that will be coming out just
20 totally isn't addressing your needs, then I want to
21 hear about it, because obviously I'm not doing my job
22 then. My name is Maria Wegner. It's W-e-g-n-e-r.

23 AUDIENCE: What's your capacity?

24 MARIA WEGNER: I am the public involvement
25 specialist and I work directly under Sue and Ed. And

1 the court reporter report will be available as well.

2 ED ROSSMAN: It's what she writes down so
3 people can see.

4 MARIA WEGNER: Right. The court report will
5 be public. So if you want to review what we talked
6 about tonight, it will be available.

7 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: The only thing
8 that's going to be edited out of that report is going
9 to be where I said something about killing my staff if
10 they don't have this. And you can bet that's not going
11 to be there. But they just know they've got to get it
12 done.

13 AUDIENCE: They got a ass-chewing too.

14 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: A couple of words
15 like that. We'll just kind of --

16 MARIA WEGNER: If you do have concerns about
17 the public involvement, I am here to listen. And if
18 there's problems with the web site, I sure would like
19 to know about that too. If it's too hard to get to, if
20 it's just not meeting your needs. I hope that kind of
21 helps for you to know what you can get from us and for
22 us to effectively communicate that to you.

23 Now if there are more questions, I will leave
24 the microphone.

25 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: If you didn't know

1 it, we're doing this, the exact same thing --

2 When, Gene? Thursday night?

3 GENE LILLY: Thursday night.

4 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: What time?

5 GENE LILLY: 5:30.

6 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: 5:30. Where?

7 GENE LILLY: Miami Civic Center.

8 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: Miami Civic Center.

9 Okay?

10 SUE HASLETT: If you want to come chew some
11 more --

12 ED KEHELEY: I do have one nonconfrontational
13 question. In your presentation, you address the Neosho
14 and Spring River watersheds. But there's a significant
15 difference between the Neosho watershed versus the
16 Spring River watershed. What kind of balance are you
17 planning on using in addressing those two watersheds?

18 GENE LILLY: Well of course you're right.
19 The epicenter is the Picher/Cardin area in the Tar
20 Creek watershed, of course there's going to have to be
21 more effort spent on that, just because of the
22 magnitude of the problem and the issues with the
23 communities and the population.

24 Now in the Spring River watershed, however
25 though, we have tribal concerns, Elm Creek being one,

1 and also, you know, some mining practices that have
2 resulted in some issues there. Not of the same
3 magnitude.

4 But yes, we would be addressing a more
5 concentrated effort in the Tar Creek area just because
6 of the magnitude and complexity of the problems. But
7 we do want to address the watershed in Spring River
8 also.

9 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: It really looks like
10 we're starting to dry up on questions. I'll tell you
11 what we're going to do, our staff is going to
12 certainly stay around here until up to 8 o'clock, if
13 there's anything else that you want to talk to them
14 about individually or one-on-one.

15 We've really enjoyed the evening, believe it
16 or not. I mean, really, we want your input. You've
17 got to give us your input. Your meaningful input will
18 be greatly appreciated.

19 Did you have something else? What else do
20 you have?

21 JONNA POLK: We'd just like to let you know
22 that we do intend to have -- we do want to have follow-
23 on meetings at very important points in our process so
24 that we can continue to have your input, and also for
25 you-all to be aware of how our plan is developing and so

1 that you have that confidence and knowledge about how
2 it's developing so that you're confident, you feel as
3 confident as he does, that we're going to give you a
4 report in August, 2004. We want to continue to get
5 your input.

6 One other point that we want to make is that
7 we'd like your input in the forms as to whether or not
8 you want a daytime meeting or an evening meeting, if
9 you have a preference one way or the other. And if you
10 don't like the format that we've chosen tonight, if
11 you'd like a different meeting format. We just like
12 your input. That's just the bottom line. Thanks.

13 COLONEL ROBERT SUTHARD: End of July, 2004.
14 Okay?

15 Okay. Thank you so much. And really, feel
16 free to come up and ask any of the staff or any of the
17 other agencies that are here. I know they're willing
18 to answer too. Thank you.

19 (END OF MEETING.)

20 -----

21

22

23

24

25