

ENVIRONMENTAL Fact Sheet



St. Maries Creosote Site, St. Maries, Idaho

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10

July 2005

EPA Encourages Public Comment on Proposed Cleanup Plan

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) invites your comments on its Proposed Plan for cleaning up remaining contamination at the St. Maries Creosote site in St. Maries, Idaho. The Proposed Plan is available for your review at St. Maries Public Library (*see page 3*). EPA will consider all comments received during the comment period, from July 22 to August 22, 2005, before choosing a final cleanup plan for the site. You are encouraged to send written comments to:

Kathleen S. Johnson, Project Manager, U.S. EPA,
1200 Sixth Ave., ECL-113, Seattle, WA 98101-1128.

**COMMENT PERIOD CLOSSES
AUGUST 22, 2005**

WHAT WILL BE CLEANED UP?

Investigations conducted by the City of St. Maries, Carney Products Company, Ltd., and EPA found that sediments, soil and groundwater had been contaminated with creosote from the wood pole-treating plant. Although human contact with the contaminants is unlikely, they do pose a risk to bottom-dwelling animal life eaten by fish in the St. Joe River.

Creosote, derived from coal tar, is the most commonly used wood preservative in the United States. Creosote is made up of many chemicals, including polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). Seven of these PAH compounds have the ability to cause cancer. For more information on PAHs, visit the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) ToxFAQs website: <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/tfacts69.html>.

WHAT IS EPA'S PROPOSED PLAN FOR ?

EPA carefully evaluated the alternatives using nine established criteria (*see back page*). Based on these criteria, EPA proposes a remedy that provides overall protection of human health and the environment, and addresses challenges posed by a site that is subject to frequent flooding. The proposed cleanup plan for the St. Maries Creosote site includes:

Containing Upland Soils and Groundwater

Contaminated upland soils and groundwater would be sealed by installing an underground barrier called a sheet-pile wall, and by placing a cap over it to keep rainfall from getting in.

Removing Contaminated Soils and Sediments

Riverbank soils, shoreline sediment, and nearshore sediment would be removed to an average depth of eight feet. These soils and sediments would be

(continued on page 3)

EPA invites you to a public meeting about its proposed cleanup plan. Your oral and written comments will be accepted at the meeting:

**Thursday, August 11, 2005
7:00-9:00 p.m.**
Avista Building
502 College Street
St. Maries, Idaho

What Other Alternatives Did EPA Consider?

Alternatives	Upland Soils & Groundwater	Bank Soils, Shoreline Sediments, & Nearshore Sediments	Offshore Sediments
Alternative 1 (No Action) Cost: \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Action
Alternative 2 Cost: \$4,181,000 Construction Time: Less than 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of Groundwater Institutional controls to restrict groundwater and land use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of Bank Soils and Shoreline Sediments Off-Site Disposal Enhanced Natural Recovery of Nearshore Sediments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of Offshore Sediments and Use of Scour-Proof Capping (this prevents movement of contaminants during flooding)
Alternatives 3a, 3b, and 3c Cost: a - \$5,101,000 b - \$6,746,000 c - \$7,024,000 Construction Time: 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Monitoring of Groundwater; (b) Enhanced Biodegradation of Groundwater; or (c) Containment of Soils and Groundwater Institutional controls to restrict groundwater and land use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solidification of Bank Soils Removal of Shoreline Sediments Off-Site Disposal Nearshore Sediment Cap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Monitoring of Offshore Sediments and Use of Scour-Proof Capping (this prevents movement of contaminants during flooding)
Alternatives 4a, 4b, and 4c Cost: a - \$8,727,000 b - \$10,398,000 c - \$10,677,000 Construction Time: Less than 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Monitoring of Groundwater; (b) Enhanced Biodegradation of Groundwater; or (c) Containment of Soils and Groundwater Institutional controls to restrict groundwater and land use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solidification of Bank Soils Removal and Backfilling of Shoreline Sediments Removal and Backfilling of Nearshore Sediments Off-Site Disposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Monitoring of Offshore Sediments and Use of Scour-Proof Capping (this prevents movement of contaminants during flooding)
Alternative 5 Cost: \$28,291,000 Construction Time: 1 to 2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Containment of Soils and Groundwater Institutional controls to restrict groundwater and land use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated Removal and Backfilling of Bank Soils, Shoreline Sediments, and Nearshore Sediments Off-Site Disposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capping of Offshore Sediments
Alternative 6 Cost: \$44,039,000 Construction Time: 1 to 2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solidification of Upland Soils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal and Backfilling of Bank Soils, Shoreline Sediments, and Nearshore Sediments Off-Site Disposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of Offshore Sediments Off-Site Disposal
Alternative 7 Cost: \$67,186,000 Construction Time: 1 to 2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Removal of Upland Soils Off-Site Disposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Removal and Backfilling of Bank Soils, Shoreline Sediments, and Nearshore Sediments Off-Site Disposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Removal of Offshore Sediment Off-Site Disposal
Alternative 8 - PREFERRED Cost: \$10,239,000 Construction Time: 1 to 2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Containment of Soils and Groundwater Institutional controls to restrict groundwater and land use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal and Backfilling of Bank Soils, Shoreline Sediments, and Nearshore Sediments Off-Site Disposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of Offshore Sediments and Use of Scour-Proof Capping (this prevents movement of contaminants during flooding)

Note: Cost and construction time are estimates only

Removing Soils and Sediments *continued*

replaced with clean material, restoring the riverbed back to its original depth.

Capping Offshore Sediment and Monitoring

Most of the contaminated sediment would be capped with an erosion resistant material to withstand flooding. The actual material and its thickness would be determined during the design phase of the project. Offshore sediments would be regularly checked to make sure bottom-dwelling animal life in the river is protected in the future.

SITE BACKGROUND

The St. Maries Creosote site is on the outskirts of the City of St. Maries, Idaho, along the south bank of the St. Joe River. The site is owned by the City of St. Maries and located within the boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation. From the late 1930s until 1964, the facility operated as a creosote pole-treating plant. It was used for peeling, sorting and storing untreated wooden poles until it was shut down in early 2003.

In 1998 and 1999, the City of St. Maries and Carney Products Company, Ltd., two of the potentially responsible parties, removed some creosote seeps and contaminated soil along the riverbank, and took about 195 tons of debris and contaminated soil to a hazardous waste landfill.

Since then, creosote has been found in the river. The City of St. Maries and Carney Products have taken about 190 soil, sediment, groundwater, and river water samples. These tests found creosote in the upland soils, groundwater, and in the St. Joe River sediments, especially along the riverbank and shoreline in front of the site.

In December 2000, the site was proposed to the EPA National Priority List of the nation's most contaminated sites targeted for cleanup. In August 2001, the City of St. Maries and Carney Products Company signed a Consent Order with EPA, agreeing to study the site and evaluate cleanup options. EPA, in consultation with the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, has overseen the work.

NEXT STEPS

EPA will consider all comments received during the comment period before making its final decision on a cleanup plan. The final cleanup plan, also known as the Record of Decision, will be issued this fall. This document will explain any major changes from the proposed plan and will include responses to the public comments.

After issuing the Record of Decision, EPA will begin the design and construction phase of the cleanup plan. When the final engineering design is completed, EPA will keep you posted about what to expect during construction. Construction could possibly begin in the summer of 2007.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

EPA's complete Proposed Plan, with information about the other alternatives considered, is available for review at:

St. Maries Public Library, 822 W. College Ave.
St. Maries, Idaho 83861, 208-245-3732.

If you would like a copy of the Proposed Plan mailed to you, please contact **Tony Fournier** (*see below*).

QUESTIONS? Please contact:

Tony Fournier

EPA Community Involvement Coordinator
206-553-2578

fournier.tony@epa.gov

Kathleen S. Johnson

EPA Remedial Project Manager
206-553-8513

johnson.kathleens@epa.gov

EPA can be reached toll-free: 800-424-4372

On the Web: <http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/>



Alternative formats are available. For reasonable accommodation, please call Tony Fournier. TTY users, please call the Federal Relay Service at 800-877-8339.



U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Sixth Avenue, ETPA-081
Seattle, Washington 98101-1128

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

Your Comments Are Invited
St. Maries Creosote Site
St. Maries, Idaho
July 2005



Criteria for Evaluating Cleanup Alternatives

- Overall protection of human health and the environment
- Compliance with other state and federal laws
- Short-term effectiveness
- Long-term effectiveness
- Reduction of mobility, toxicity and volume of contaminants
- Ability to carry out the alternative
- State acceptance
- Community acceptance
- Cost