

26 June 2024 0I0001.006.018

Ms. Jennifer Laidlaw, Project Manager U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District 1616 Capitol Avenue Omaha, NE 68102

Delivered via email: jennifer.l.zorinsky@usace.army.mil

SUBJECT: NTCRA Libby – Public Meeting #2 Notes, May 2024, Contract W9128F20D0019, Task Order

W9128F23F0120

Ms. Laidlaw:

North Wind Advantage JV, LLC is pleased to submit the following deliverable.

• **Public Meeting #1 Notes** – PDF format

A certified transcript comprises the meeting notes.

Feel free to reach out with any questions.

Sincerely,

Troy N. Rosenbush

Project Manager

Jag N. Posenhal

Enclosure

cc: Mandy Rockwell, Forest Service

Nathan Gassmann, Forest Service Colleen O'Hara, Forest Service

Sarah Miller, USACE Connor Kelley, CDM Smith Allie Leber, North Wind

USDA FOREST SERVICE

KOOTENAI NATIONAL FOREST, LIBBY DISTRICT

Non-Time-Critical Removal Action for Fuels Management

Adjacent to Outside Operable Unit 3

Draft Final Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
in the Mitchell Jackson Project Area

Presented by: Nathan Gassman Gary Hazen Mandy Rockwell

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING #2

TAKEN AT KOOTENAI NATIONAL FOREST SUPERVISOR'S OFFICE

31374 U.S. HIGHWAY 2

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 2024

LIBBY, MONTANA

REPORTED BY: EMILY K. NILES, RMR, CBC, CRR WA CCR #2794; NV CCR #782

LIBBY, MONTANA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 2024; 1 2 5:33 P.M. -000-3 4 MR. GASSMANN: This is the discussion 5 presentation for the environmental -- or excuse me, the engineering evaluation/cost analysis for the Mitchell 6 7 Jackson Project that surrounds the 10,000 acres of the former vermiculite mine site. 8 So introductions. Nate Gassmann, district 9 10 I think I recognize everybody. And then we'll just go around. 11 12 MR. HAZEN: My name's Gary Hazen. I'm with the Advantage JV CDM Smith, supporting the 13 Forest Service and the EE/CA activities. 14 MS. ROCKWELL: Hi. I'm Mandy Rockwell. 15 Work 16 here at the supervisor's office and working as team lead 17 for this project. MR. ROSENBUSH: And I'm Troy Rosenbush. 18 I'm 19 also with the Advantage JV who's helping administer this project. 2.0 21 MR. GASSMANN: And as part of the CERCLA process, we have to have the meeting recorded, so we 22 have our very own recorder for this. And so if you guys 23 24 have questions later on, or if you make some statements or anything like that, please just say your name, and 25

then we have to put that into the record. 1 2 MS. LAIDLAW: Good evening. Jennifer Laidlaw. I work with the United States Army Corps of Engineers, 3 4 Omaha District. So we actually hold the contract with NorthWind-CDM Advantage JV, working on behalf of the 5 Forest Service. 6 7 MR. GASSMANN: Yeah. That's a great summary. So the Forest Service normally doesn't do EE/CAs. 8 9 don't usually engage in the CERCLA process, the CERCLA 10 authorities that we have. In 1970, whenever the -- when the legislation was passed, all the federal agencies had 11 their own regulations that were established post that. 12 So the Forest Service does have some of those things 13 sometimes, but traditionally, no, we're not doing that. 14 So we had to reach out and get more support on what this 15 16 is. And so I'm not sure if you guys have had the 17 chance, but it is published by the -- you can find the 18 EE/CA document on the project site. You can find the 19 maps, the supporting maps, and you can find the 2.0 supporting documentation. There's how many different 21 components for that. But it's all out there for what 22 23 this is. Jodi. We know her too. That's Jodi. 2.4

25

JODI:

Hi.

MR. GASSMANN: If you have any questions later
on, we're just getting started, but we are recording
this. And so if you say your name before you speak
later on, they would appreciate it.

So without any further ado, we're going to start getting into a little bit more details. And this is a pretty high-level look at what this is. We can give you some time frames and we'll get into some of those details. But please, as you -- as we go through these slides, if you have questions, just ask.

Gary?

2.4

MR. HAZEN: Sure. So as this indicates, this is a presentation about the engineering evaluation/cost analysis, or EE/CA for short, for the Mitchell Jackson Project Area. It's to support a non-time-critical removal action, which is a fancy term for implementing the action that this represents under CERCLA authorities that the Forest Service has.

So we can go on to the next slide.

You know, the key messages regarding this non-time-critical removal action is that US EPA Region 8 had defined a human health risk for firefighters inside Operable Unit 3, which is the former Libby vermiculite mine portion of the overall Superfund site during certain firefighting activities. So, you know, how this

affects our non-time-critical removal action factors
into this is that reducing fuels, meaning vegetative
fuels, in the Mitchell Jackson Project Area could help
reduce the potential for wildfires to move into that
Operable Unit 3, the former Libby vermiculite mine, by
improving the effectiveness of those fire suppression
tactics.

And also in conjunction with that, road system management in the Mitchell Jackson Project Area also helps access for that fire suppression. And by reducing those fuels, you'll reduce the flame length and the ability to attack -- direct attack, by the ground crews.

So the point being, there's a potential benefit in doing this work outside of Operable Unit 3 for the risks inside OU3 to wildland fight fighters.

MR. GASSMANN: I think that's the key message, that when you guys go out and people start asking you about this project, keep telling them this is not occurring inside the zone; that is the EPA's responsibilities. This is outside that. And in the maps -- well, which map? I mean, it's everything outside of the zone.

MR. HAZEN: And it's really, as we'll get into it, meant to, you know, supplement or enhance what's being done inside the zone or inside OU3. EPA and

W.R. Grace are working on a separate action specifically 2 for that. This is meant to enhance reliability and long-term effectiveness outside for the conditions 3 4 inside. 5 MR. GASSMANN: Right. But the actions that we're going to be taking outside will not affect 6 7 negatively anything that has the potential to violate the feasibility and the remedial actions as part of the 8 9 mine site activities. 10 MR. HAZEN: So next slide. So this is just a little diagram showing the 11 NTCRA process under CERCLA. There was authorization to 12 13 do the EE/CA which was done in approval memorandum. believe that's also available on the Web site. 14 MR. GASSMANN: Yep. It's posted up there. 15 16 MR. HAZEN: Basically just shows the 17 justification for conducting the NTCRA and doing an EE/CA to support. Then there was an analysis altering 18 the EE/CA, which is the subject of this meeting. We're 19 at the third point right now, which is public comment 2.0 and decisions. So the public comment period I believe 21 22 has started and --23 MR. GASSMANN: Today. First day. Day one.

public comment period under CERCLA. And then that will

MR. HAZEN: -- and there's 30 days' minimum

2.4

25

culminate once the Forest Service has looked at those
comments and, you know, created an action memorandum to
basically memorialize the decision on which alternative
that was presented to EE/CA to move forward with. And
then there's the actual implementation of the work,
which we'll file.

MR. GASSMANN: Yep.

2.0

MR. HAZEN: So when we say "site location"
here, again, we're talking about the Mitchell Jackson
Project Area, not, you know, the Libby Asbestos
Superfund Site. So the site is that darker shade
surrounding Operable Unit 3, basically is where you see
sort of the doughnut hole; and the Mitchell Jackson
Project Area is sort of the doughnut that surrounds
Operable Unit 3 on every side, except for maybe the
south side, where you have the river. But essentially
it's that darker shade all the way around Operable
Unit 3, and it extends, obviously, from Lake Koocanusa
on the east to, you know, pretty close to Libby on the
west side and, you know, bounds along the Kootenai River
from Lake Kootenai. So almost to Libby.

Next slide.

So a little bit of the history of the overall Superfund site. There was eight operable units. You know, most of the cleanup, I think as many are aware,

has already occurred, particularly in the towns of Libby 2 and Troy and along the river. Operable Unit 3, which we have been discussing, is sort of the remaining operable 3 unit that doesn't have a decision under the EPA 4 Superfund process yet. The feasibility study for that 5 work's under prior -- in progress, and there will a 7 suite of alternatives that address the forested area within Operable Unit 3 and then the mine footprint 8 within Operable Unit 3. But again, that's in progress, 10 and EPA is working with W.R. Grace on that right now. Next slide. 11 So this is a map showing site features. 12 13

So this is a map showing site features. I know it's sort of hard to see with the colors, but we do have, you know, maps along the walls, too, that you can look at a little bit later.

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

I think the important things are the bright yellow boundaries. The inner boundary is Operable Unit 3, so EPA's operable unit for the Libby Asbestos Superfund Site. And then the outer boundary is the outer edge of the Mitchell Jackson Project Area, and Nate or Mandy could probably speak a little bit more about exactly how that was selected. But it's basically a combination of topography and ownership and a few other features that help define that outer boundary.

Yeah.

MR. GASSMANN:

And Mandy, I'll -- make

1 | sure I don't misspeak.

2.0

2.4

A couple other site features I want to make sure you're aware of.

This greenish, with these dashed green lines, neon green lines, that's the inventoried wilderness area. We've got the private lands are delineated in that little dopple, you know, dots. So you can see there is a fair portion of lands that reside as private, and most of those lands are essentially lands that have been harvested and activities over the past ten years have taken place on.

And then the only other private lands that are nonindustrial on this Tubb Gulch side are some more Grace property components.

But everything else is National Forest. And I'm going to speak in rough numbers -- I always round up, usually by a little bit more than you probably should, but I'll still round up. So we're looking at total acreage-wise around 20,000 acres. That includes everything that is encompassing the site around it. And that's private, that's Forest Service, that's Grace, that's all lands.

And then when you break out the Forest Service lands only and you include the wilderness area, you're looking at about 15,000 issued acres. Take out the

wilderness area, you lose about 5. So roughly 2 10,000 acres of National Forest that surround that. Again, you have to go to the EE/CA to get the actual 3 4 numbers, but roughly, for simplicity, that's what we're talking about. 5 How do we get to the outer boundary? 6 7 evaluated the topography. We considered past fire history. We considered -- we did some rough modeling 8 and some ideas of what it meant for fire activities to 10 occur in and around the mine site back in 2016, I believe. Some folks were actually involved -- well, 11 12 nobody directly yet, but some folks might remember that. We had a fire team come in and help do some modeling and 13 some initial runs from that effort, which built upon 14 some efforts back in probably like 2008 to try to narrow 15 16 in what is going on here in the event of fires. So we 17 used that information. Fire spread was a big component to it and, you know, that and how far out we went, 18 that's how we ended up with about a 2-mile -- mile and a 19 half, 2-mile ring around the site. 2.0 21 Road systems. Long-established road systems, and we can get into some more of those details later, 22 but in reasons why we're working road systems are: In 23 the Tubb Gulch side, probably less than standard that we 24

would like to see, and so we can talk about some of

25

those things. The Jackson Creek, Alexander Creek side
is more robust and probably a newer system of roads that
is residing in there.

2.0

2.4

You do have a lot of -- intermixed with the lands with the private lands -- different easements and different accesses that the private landowners have that would continue, no matter this project or not.

Army Corps is aware of the project. You know, that's why some of these little pieces down here by the dam don't show up as treatment -- those corp -- Army Corps property stuff there.

The inside component to this project is the EPA boundary. And we stay out of that. So there's a few exceptions where we had to put some roads into that for short segments to make grades and things coming together to get to the outside. But that is the only exception that we were -- we followed through on.

Anything else you want to touch on the site?
On our side?

MR. HAZEN: I think the one other thing would be just because private lands are included within the Mitchell Jackson Project Area doesn't mean work's being performed on private land.

MR. GASSMANN: This decision, this action is only being performed in the National Forest.

Anything else? 1 2 MS. ROCKWELL: No, I think that covers it. MR. GASSMANN: Perspective of fire starts. 3 4 This is one of the components that we have been using to try to describe and utilize for what it means for fires 5 to occur in and around the zone. This is 1986 to 2021. 7 You can see where we've had different fires. Last year, we actually can add to this probably three more. 8 one just up Rainy Creek and just on the ridge of that 10 line, that yellow line, come off at about a hundred So that should be dead on the fire zone, and 11 yards. 12 then two more just to the south of that yellow one, 13 so ... That's where the -- that's where we've had 14 lightning and fire starts pretty much. 15 16 Removal action objectives. Gary, you want to 17 touch on what a removable -- removal action objective 18 is? So the basis of any CERCLA 19 MR. HAZEN: Yeah. action is the action objectives, and in this case, 2.0 because it's under the removal authority under CERCLA, 21 they're called removal action objectives. 22 basically, they're risk-related objectives or source 23 2.4 control-related objectives to provide adequate protection within the environment. That's CERCLA's 25

1 mandate, and that's the authority that the
2 Forest Service is using here.

2.0

So, again, we touched on it at the beginning, but we're trying to reduce the fuels, meaning the vegetative fuels, at the Mitchell Jackson Project Area using vegetative management activities and modifying the road networks to limit those human-caused fire starts and/or maintain or improve our firefighter access to those areas for response.

And ultimately the goal and the reason it's an objective under CERCLA is to reduce or lower that wildland fire intensity spread in the adjacent Operable Unit 3. Again, the exposure risks to Libby Amphibole asbestos are within Operable Unit 3. This action's intended to complement what work is done inside the zone -- or OU3 -- to provide better long-term protecting this inadequate protection within OU3.

So the risks that it's addressing are, you know, the wildland fires in OU3 that, you know, cause exposures to wildland firefighters, and that's from that Libby Amphibole asbestos being released in soil duff, ash that occurs if a fire occurs within Operable Unit 3. And it's also source control in that, if those materials burn, they can liberate that asbestos into streams and then migrate within Operable Unit 3.

So the intention of this action is, again, to 1 2 improve the conditions surrounding OU3 to lessen the potential for these unacceptable conditions in OU3. 3 4 Again, the direct addressing of that's going to be done by EPA within OU3 and working with W.R. Grace. 5 So, really, do you want to 6 MR. GASSMANN: 7 start to think about -- in our normal vernacular -removal action objectives, purpose and need statements, 8 9 those sorts of things is kind of what these are 10 capturing and actions to follow through with and why? We have two alternatives that we evaluated 11 based on those removal action objectives. They're 12 13 similar. We affect the vegetation, we affect the roads. And so for alternative one, we didn't add or take away 14 any of the road systems that were out there. We were 15 16 going to do work to the roads to potentially improve, 17 you know, through best management practices, bigger culverts, those sorts of things. But we weren't -- we 18 19 didn't add anything to what was already there. 2.0 Mandy? 21 MS. ROCKWELL: Focusing use on the open and gated roads. So they're already drivable motorized 22 23 routes. 2.4 MR. GASSMANN: Yep. So the idea that if the road existed just 25

because there's a two-track there, we didn't have a 1 2 system that was open and gated. So you've got -- over the course of time now, most people haven't been in 3 4 there for 20, 25 years, because the county had previously had that area closed. So we were utilizing 5 areas that had roads that were open traditionally and 7 that had the gates on them under our former system of opening and closing roads. And I don't remember the 8 I'm not even going to guess on that one.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

For Alternative 2, we did make changes to the road system to accommodate and address areas of desired and more effective treatments to respond to fire. And primarily we were looking at areas in the Tubb Gulch area to add those additional mileages and locations for road changes. Tubb Gulch being the place, drier site, spread of fire, all those sorts of things that we are looking at, moving across and into the zone itself on that Tubb Gulch, that westerly side.

So another difference here in the alternatives is up in the -- basically the ridge system that creates the Rainy Creek drainage itself up along the rim. We had additional treatments that we got proposed up in there. And then a few more, I guess kind of towards that Jackson Creek side to access a little bit more. That gets you into the -- closer into the zone than we

1 | would if we hadn't already had a road there.

MS. ROCKWELL: So new roads, but then this will also open up barriered roads during project access, some additional areas. So existing road system, but those that are currently closed to motorized use to be opened temporarily for access.

Yeah?

2.4

MR. CASTANEDA: Question. It's Bob Castaneda with Kootenai Forest Stakeholders.

Is Alternative 2 somewhat close to the maximum acres that could have been treated?

MR. GASSMANN: I would say that Alternative 2 is probably closer, but definitely not all of it. We didn't do any -- we did not add in any additional roads into the wilderness area, and we didn't do any prescriptive actions other than vegetation treatments with getting the weeds under control, especially the horse range, basically, that talks about the cheatgrass component and drying out sooner, so that if you get something started off the road -- off the highway, progresses up and then into the zone. So we didn't go in and maximize that. We didn't -- we could have added definitely more roads that would have gotten to every acre. We considered what that would look like. And some of those trade-offs were then in violation of

forest flame compliance, which we've listed as an ARAR, 1 2 which means --MR. HAZEN: Yeah. So it's a regulatory 3 4 consideration, I guess the way I'll put it. So there's different categories of ARARs which 5 are applicable, or relevant and appropriate 6 7 requirements; and then there's what's called TBCs or "to be considered," and that may have been actually a TBC. 8 9 But the point being, there's regulatory 10 considerations under CERCLA that you either have to consider or comply with, or waive. And like the 11 Forest Service said, to meet the objectives, the CERCLA 12 objectives, of providing that risk reduction --13 potential risk reduction within Operable Unit 3, we 14 didn't necessarily look at the entire universe of forest 15 16 within that Mitchell Jackson Project Area to accomplish 17 those objectives; we talked about it. MS. ROCKWELL: And then there were some places 18 that required roads, and with engineering folks looking 19 at them, there's a reason why there hasn't been a road 20 I mean, cliffs and just blasting rock, and -- I 21 mean, to put a road there would have been a major effort 22

MR. GASSMANN: And we were -- you know, some of those road additions were going to gain 5 acres,

to get to some of those places.

23

2.4

25

1 | 15 acres, and we just -- we did not want to add that to 2 | what is out there. So we scaled it back and considered 3 | something less.

2.4

Okay. We've got these maps on the wall.

We've got the Alternative 1, both alternative -- they're
the same map, just doubled.

And then Alternative 2 over here.

So, you know, I think by the time you evaluate the combination of reduction of -- or, excuse me -- the road system with the vegetation treatments, we're definitely going to be reducing fire intensity at the site. We're going to be reducing the fire spread potential into the zone. Our transportation management activities, we still have and will continue to have gate restrictions and those sorts of things that are out there that would be continued as part of this. So we would be looking to still reduce human-caused starts because of those.

And so the last one there is the improvement of firefighter response. If there's not as many trees and they aren't as thick and they can get there faster driving there, we can get a better chance of response time.

MR. HAZEN: And I think one thing to say about it, and Mandy could probably expand on it, but in the

EE/CA itself there's lots of different categories of 1 vegetation management. There's lots of different 2 categories of transportation management in terms of the 3 4 road classifications, the block classifications, and so And there's a lot of nuance and detail regarding 5 each of those vegetation management treatment approaches 7 and the road management approaches. So really, to --8 you probably need to read the EE/CA to look at the 9 details or nuance for any given location. 10 But I think the point is, when working together, all of those vegetation management approaches 11 for all those different locations down the road, 12 management approaches, again achieve those objectives 13 for CERCLA inside the Mitchell Jackson Project Area, 14 which is going to help Operable Unit 3, or is intended 15 16 to. 17 MR. GASSMANN: Yeah, we didn't -- on the maps, on these maps, in the EE/CA they're different. 18 There's 19 a few different maps. But these maps are more 20 broad-scale applications of treatment types. 21 Anything else, Mandy? MS. ROCKWELL: 22 No. 23 MR. GASSMANN: Again, this doesn't quite show 2.4 up, but different locations highlighted a little differently to show you the differences in where we 25

wanted to have more roads and more treatments to be more effective in reaching those objectives that we talked about earlier.

2.4

And again, I think that when you start to look at the difference in the maps, there will be subtleties, and I think you'll be able to see them. But really, it's that Tubb Gulch area is going to be the bigger change, and then up on that Rainy Creek rim.

MS. ROCKWELL: Kind of -- there's more -- definitely more into this piece and along that upper edge.

MR. GASSMANN: Really trying to draw that harder line by adding more roads to get to them.

MR. HAZEN: And then there is a little bit of additional vegetation management. There's a couple blocks, I think on the southwest side, that were added for Alternative 2. And then my understanding is, along the north edge, inner edge, which is the -- you know, the Operable Unit 3 boundary, there's some --

MS. ROCKWELL: Field treatment on the rim, mm-hmm.

MR. GASSMANN: Yeah. We do have some treatments pretty much right through here that come off the ridge. You guys hike the trail. It's right up the trail. Come in a couple hundred feet and we've got some

1 slashing and piling that we were going to conduct up in 2 there.

2.0

2.4

And again, like Gary and Mandy said, this band right through here is really the differences you're going to find from the overall vegetation plan. Jackson Creek, Alexander Creek were fairly static between the two alternatives.

You can see some of the fire modeling.
We got the Johnson report posted, right?

MS. ROCKWELL: It's an appendix in EE/CA.

MR. GASSMANN: It's an appendix in EE/CA. So our field specialist, Eric Johnson, he ran whatever that thing is called that he does for his demonstration of effects for fire spread and those sorts of different metrics. And there will be an appendix in EE/CA that -- that you can reference for what that looks like between the two alternatives.

Yeah, I would just say they're similar.

The -- there is a difference in cost between 1 and 2, obviously. And that ends up being substantial, I guess you would start to call it. Talks about substantial cost differences when you add more roads in more difficult areas, which is that Tubb Gulch side. So that's a bigger difference in cost 2.

And do you want to touch on the cost

components to this, since it is part of the title of it,
the significance of it?

MR. HAZEN: Yeah. So costs are order of 3 4 magnitude, and they're for -- the purpose is to compare alternatives. They're not meant to be a budgetary 5 The expected accuracy is plus 50 percent to number. 7 minus 30 percent of the actual cost of implementation. 8 So it can vary, you know, within that range once you go 9 to designing and implementing the action. But the point 10 being: Using a similar cost basis for both of the alternatives meets the CERCLA objectives of comparing 11 and contrasting alternatives to make sure the right 12 13 decision related to cost is factored into it.

As Nate mentioned, it's not the only thing that you look at in evaluating the selection or the recommendation of a removal action alternative. There's some other categories of effectiveness and implementability that also factor in to that decision. So the bullets up here are meant to represent some of that decision logic in recommending Alternative 2.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

But getting back to the cost point: Even though there's a few additional roads, overall it's not that significant relative to all the roads that are being, you know, I guess, maintained and, you know, improved for purposes of implementing the action within

the Mitchell Jackson Project Area. So it doesn't add
that much of a cost differential. I think the other
main cost component that's different is some
reforestation activities related to some of the fuels
management work, particularly in Alternative 2.

2.4

But the point being, like Nate said, a lot of the action is similar between the two, so you don't see much of a cost differential within that accuracy range indicated. But you do see, you know, some significant benefits in terms of the effectiveness and permanence of the action by doing the work under Alternative 2. Even though it's a small amount of additional acreage, it's in a fairly strategic location relative to fire spread, particularly the southwest area of the Mitchell Jackson Project Area. So Forest Service believes there's a lot of additional benefit for the small additional acreage and road addition.

MR. CASTANEDA: A follow-up question. Maybe you answered it. Maybe I didn't hear it correctly. Are the costs offset by economic benefits?

MR. HAZEN: So what they do in an EE/CA -- and this is typical for all CERCLA work -- they use constant dollar analysis, which means that you don't take into account, for instance, effects of inflation in the future. It's averaged out: A dollar a day is a

dollar -- worth a dollar tomorrow. So there is present 1 2 value analysis which does discount that, meaning that you assume money is put in trust and pays for it over 3 4 time. And again, this action's a fairly short duration action in the scheme of CERCLA, so there's not much of 5 an effect from present value analysis. But the point is 7 it doesn't necessarily reflect all of the economic analyses that you would do in designing this action. 8 9 And that's part of why the accuracy range is wider. You 10 know, plus/minus 50/-30 is a more simplistic analysis of 11 cost. Having said that, Forest Service has put a lot 12 of work into making sure that the unit costs used for 13 vegetation management and road building is the very best 14 information that they're using to design the -- this 15 16 kind of work. So it takes into account, you know, 17 inflation to date for the unit cost. It's just not necessarily forecasting the inflation into the future in 18

But as part of the removal action, design and implementation, there would be a more critical look at cost and the refining of the costs beyond what was presented in the EE/CA.

making this decision now.

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

I guess, Nate, anything to add to that?

MR. GASSMANN: [No response.]

```
1
              MR. HAZEN:
                          Okay.
2
              And I don't know if I answered your question.
    But it's a more simplistic analysis. It doesn't take
 3
4
    into account every aspect of economic analysis that
    could be done --
5
              MR. CASTANEDA: I could understand --
6
7
              MR. HAZEN: -- because CERCLA said it's not
8
   necessary.
              MR. CASTANEDA: -- the cost that it would take
9
10
    to implement the alternatives. But say that there is
    removal of timber and there's value to the timber, that
11
    value --
12
13
              MR. HAZEN: Oh, you're saying --
              MR. CASTANEDA: -- of the timber offsets the
14
15
    cost.
16
              MR. HAZEN: -- an offset.
17
              MR. GASSMANN: So we have -- the EE/CA doesn't
    determine that. That's the implementation strategy that
18
19
    we are developing. And so we, the Forest Service, have
2.0
    to account for the federal property, which are the trees
    and the roads. So this EE/CA did not do that for us.
21
              MS. ROCKWELL: Because it's considered
22
   differently, right? It's considered --
23
2.4
              MR. HAZEN: CERCLA, you know, it's atypical, I
25
   guess I'll say, for CERCLA to account sort of, I guess
```

I'll say, salvage value, is what they would call it 1 2 under CERCLA. It's not to say that you can't consider it, but it's highly speculative. And so for purposes of 3 determining a remedy moving forward, we have to assume 4 that it's potentially not salvageable for any reason. 5 MR. GASSMANN: And to be clear, he's using 6 7 "salvage" in a much different way than we would 8 traditionally use --9 MR. CASTANEDA: Right. 10 MR. GASSMANN: -- the word "salvage" under Forest Service rules. 11 MR. CASTANEDA: 12 Right. 13 The more typical situation in MR. HAZEN: CERCLA is an industrial facility that has a lot of scrap 14 metal, and you might be able to recycle the scrap metal 15 16 and get some money out of it. But in CERCLA that can 17 often be contaminated, and the cost of decontaminating it may outweigh the salvage value, and it's a wash. 18 know it's a little different with timber, but obviously 19 the timber that we're targeting here is timber -- and we 2.0 didn't touch on this much -- but a lot of it is timber 21 that's susceptible to fire, so it's already diseased or 22 has, you know, stressed or maybe has bugs. So maybe 23 24 it's not the optimal timber for harvest, typically. You would have to speak to that more. 25

```
But I think that was some of the reason, along
1
2
   with those sort of CERCLA reasons, to say for this
    action let's exclude that value of timber which CERCLA
 3
 4
    would consider a salvage value for making a decision.
   Again, particularly since the footprint doesn't vary
 5
           So even if you took that into account, it
   much.
7
   wouldn't make that much of a difference in selecting an
    alternative. But obviously, moving into actually
8
9
    implementing this, the Forest Service is going to work
10
    with that.
                             Yeah.
11
              MR. GASSMANN:
                                    I mean we have to.
                                                         Ι
   mean, we're bridging two worlds with the CERCLA
12
13
    regulations and our other traditional regulations.
    so the -- if we were to implement a portion of this with
14
    the timber sale, we would consider the value of the
15
16
    timber sale and go through the whole, you know,
17
    valuation of what that is. If we're doing a mastication
    contract, we'll evaluate cost breaker and implement
18
    through an IDOO contract or other ways to implement the
19
   project.
2.0
              Does that get to what you're looking for, Bob?
21
22
    For now?
23
                              [No response.]
              MR. CASTANEDA:
2.4
              MR. GASSMANN:
                             Okay.
                          So we touched on this earlier, but
25
              MR. HAZEN:
```

you're here on the process, that red box. So that's 1 2 what this meeting is, is to facilitate public comment, give you more information. Again, you have a 30-day 3 4 calendar period to provide comment, orally or in writing. You know, Nate and Mandy can talk about that a 5 little more. And then based on that feedback, along 6 7 with information Forest Service has already developed, an action memorandum will be created to actually 8 formally select the removal action alternative. And 10 right now, the recommended alternative is Alternative 2. MR. GASSMANN: So we're recommending 11 Alternative 2. 12 And to comment, a couple of different ways. 13 Mandy did these, so you can take this one home. 14 also got the project site in an e-mail that I'm pretty 15 16 sure most everybody received. You can go to there. And 17 then still want to keep pushing this, GovDelivery system, where you go in and you select on all the 18 projects that you think you might be interested in. 19 it's pretty easy. But if you have any questions or it's 2.0 21 not coming through, just let me know and we can work through it together. 22 23 But again, you can take these home. Or in 24 some of the e-mails I'm pretty sure some folks received, it will direct you to the project site, which then also 25

directs you to how to comment on there too. 1 2 So if we're here, how do we get to implementation? I don't think that's on the next slide, 3 4 though. 5 So why don't we close out with that. Next slide. 6 7 See? Okay. 8 Next question is how do we get to 9 implementing? We are expecting 30 days here. 10 going to be drafting and working through the non-time-critical action memo, and once we complete 11 that, we're looking at, you know, sometime in that 12 13 September time frame for a signature. And then we get signature, we're able to implement. 14 15 So that gives you kind of an idea of where we're at with actually doing something on the ground. 16 MR. CASTANEDA: Maybe it's a course on 17 semantics, but why do you call it noncritical time? 18 19 MR. GASSMANN: Non-time-critical action? MR. CASTANEDA: Yeah. Seems like this is 2.0 21 something that's important to get done right away. 22 words "noncritical" suggest that this is not too important. 23 2.4 MR. HAZEN: Well, so it has a formal CERCLA definition. And, again, Forest Service is using that 25

```
authority. Basically, "non-time-critical" means that
2
   you have more than six months of planning to implement
   the action. It doesn't mean it's not important. In
 3
   fact, in the CERCLA process, removal authority is
4
   typically more important. There's more of an impetus to
5
   doing work sooner than remedial action. But the point
6
7
   is, it's relatively quick in the CERCLA process. If you
   look at the overall Libby cleanup that EPA has done or
8
   even the Operable Unit 3 cleanup that EPA is conducting
10
   now, that's going on a fairly long time compared to how
   quickly, you know, Forest Service is intending to
11
   implement this action in that area. So, I mean, I could
12
13
   get more into detail on all the specifics of
   non-time-critical removal action, but --
14
              MR. CASTANEDA: That's a different authority.
15
16
   I can understand that.
17
              MR. HAZEN: But it's still important relative
   to remedial action, which is an authority that
18
   Forest Service could have used but typically doesn't
19
   use. And for this action, it's more important to get it
2.0
   done sooner.
21
              MR. GASSMANN: Right. Non-time-critical does
22
   not mean it's not important.
23
2.4
              MR. HAZEN:
                          Yeah.
              Yeah, Brent?
25
```

MR. TESKE: Brent Teske, Lincoln County 1 2 Commissioner. Is there a long-term maintenance plan, and 3 4 what authority will that fall under in the future? I mean, what happens 15, 20, 30, 50 years from now? 5 MR. GASSMANN: So the time that this is being 6 7 applied to, is it 15 years? 8 MS. ROCKWELL: Mm-hmm. 9 MR. GASSMANN: Right. 10 MR. TESKE: Okay. MR. GASSMANN: So this action is good for 15 11 So we expect to -- in a perfect world, we get 12 13 this thing signed, and we got this action signed on September 1st, 2024. That starts the 15-year time 14 frame. You can imagine, just knowing how this takes --15 16 how long it takes to get certain things done -- road 17 building and all sorts of things, that's why we have to bound it by time. So 15 years for this. At the end of 18 19 that 15 year -- or every year, then we report out what we've achieved through that year. And at the end of 15 2.0 years, it doesn't go away, but it doesn't continue. 21 There would have to be another EE/CA or something else, 22 maybe, at the time. Who knows 15 years from now what 23 2.4 that might be? But we would be evaluating it. I mean, we didn't go out 50 years, because it 25

has -- how did that work with the time component, 2 We had to -- we were -- we had to be certain that we could achieve the actionable items within a time 3 frame was a bigger factor. So 50 years from now, too 4 many variables. 5 MR. HAZEN: Removal actions are generally more 6 7 short-term, and there's no defined time, like if it goes beyond this point it can't be a removal action. 8 9 typically if it's going to go much beyond a decade or 10 two, you would shift to remedial authority, which again the Forest Service doesn't typically use. 11 But again, getting back to a point we made 12 earlier, this is meant to complement the EPA-led action 13 in Operable Unit 3 with W.R. Grace. And the point 14 being, and maybe it's optimistic, but that 15 16 Forest Service is, like, we can provide this action now 17 to help complement what work will be done in OU3, and presumably in 15 years EPA will have made the decision 18 and work with W.R. Grace to implement the action in the 19 forested area around the mine, and that by then it would 20 lessen the need to continue work in the Mitchell Jackson 21 Project Area under CERCLA. 22 23 MS. ROCKWELL: And give a different 24 perspective of what you're looking at, at that point,

based on what's happening inside.

25

MR. VINCENT: Bruce Vincent with Environomics. 1 2 The -- I think what Brent's trying to get to, and for community discussions it will become important, 3 4 but usually in a removal you're removing, and it's a permanent removal. The steel doesn't grow back. 5 time we're done with this round, it will be time for the 7 early entry areas to have another entry for 8 precommercial or to continue to reduce the fire danger, because as soon as we're done with this removal action, 9 10 the need for the next removal starts growing. So is future planning going to be under CERCLA? 11 12 MR. HAZEN: And see that's going to --Yeah. So the idea that the 13 MR. GASSMANN: trees don't stop growing, some of the silviculture 14 prescriptions that we're looking at, some of the 15 16 specific treatments that you're going to find in the 17 document, touch on more sustainable species of trees,

kind of typically see. But, yeah, at the end of 15 years, there's a different evaluation, like Mandy said. Maybe there's something else that affected it in a different place. Maybe we had another fire that we were able to catch and corral 5,000 acres and not have to go into OU3. That takes on a different analysis in consideration of what happens over there.

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

spacing of those trees, those sorts of things that you

So again it's like it -- we don't want the 1 2 trees to stop growing. We want to promote and have the trees in places that we want the species compositions, 3 4 those sorts of things that provide that resiliency to insect, disease and fire. And that's what you're going 5 to see as part of the overall implementation of it. But 7 in 15 years from now, I mean, we just cannot say for certain that that's going to be anything different. 8 15 years we felt very confident that we can achieve all 10 the different activities -- the road building, the domestication, the harvesting, all those sorts of 11 things -- in 15 years. That's kind of what we settled 12 13 on. So, yeah, it will be there. It's not going to go 14 away. Well, and some of the other OUs, 15 MR. TESKE: 16 you know, when they were -- when they went into 17 operational maintenance phase and the five-year review, you know, I didn't know if there would be something 18 established similar to that in the future to say, okay, 19 you know, we've got this, we're going to do a five-year 2.0 review. And we need to do some vegetation maintenance 21 in this section. You know, how's that going to be 22 evaluated in the future? 23 24 MR. HAZEN: So part of the reason or justification to do a five-year review is, if you don't 25

```
have unlimited use or unrestricted exposure scenarios --
 2
    and I know that's sort of a fancy term; we acronym it as
          But the point is, we're not addressing
 3
   UUEE.
4
    contamination in the Mitchell Jackson Project Area like
   a typical CERCLA Superfund site. So it already is UUEE.
5
    What we're affecting is conditions that affect the
6
7
    adjacent Operable Unit 3. So from that perspective
    there is no need to do a five-year review and --
8
9
              MR. TESKE:
                          I'm saying something similar with
10
    the intent of deciding whether or not there needs to be
    additional maintenance and work, so ...
11
              MR. HAZEN: Yeah, I think that's something, as
12
   Nate and Mandy mentioned, have to be assessed at a later
13
   date once the work's complete and --
14
              MR. GASSMANN:
15
                             Right.
16
              MR. HAZEN: -- see how the vegetation is
17
   performing in terms of, you know, the reforestation.
              MR. GASSMANN: I mean, we still can't get away
18
    from reforestation requirements part of the --
19
20
              MR. TESKE:
                          I get that.
              MR. GASSMANN: We still have to do that.
21
                                                         So
    anything that we would prescribe as regeneration
22
   prescription would have to be planned.
23
2.4
              Now, we're still then looking at species
```

composition for that. We're still looking at tree

25

spacing for that. So it's not a five-year review; it's 1 a yearly disclosure of what has occurred. Are we on 2 track? Did we get waylaid by something else that we 3 4 didn't get something done? I mean, those things can be 5 talked about and maybe massaged and those sorts of things. But we're still looking for that 15-year time 6 7 frame to be completed. And, yeah, I mean, we should be on the idea of the trajectory of what we set out to do, 8 to know were we successful. I think we'll see that 9 10 evolve over time for sure. MR. HAZEN: And ultimately CERCLA is about 11 protection of human health and environment from 12 13 contamination. So if the Operable Unit 3 action that the EPA is working on addresses that in a sufficient 14 manner, there wouldn't necessarily be a justification 15 16 for future removal action in Mitchell Jackson. 17 not -- the CERCLA action isn't to mitigate fire; it's to mitigate fire spread that causes those exposure risks to 18 the asbestos. So a little bit of a different slant than 19 20 the normal --21 MR. GASSMANN: Yeah. MR. HAZEN: -- Forest Service management of 22 23 the forest. 2.4 MR. GASSMANN: Yeah, that's a good point. Very good point. 25

```
MR. VINCENT: What's the health of the forest
1
2
   inside those inventoried roads? You know, that's some
   rough country.
 3
 4
              MS. ROCKWELL: Mm-hmm.
5
              MR. VINCENT:
                            That's why it has not been.
   you know what condition it's in?
6
7
              MR. GASSMANN: I mean, I don't recall
   specifically of what it was. I don't, no. I could find
8
9
   out, but I don't -- I don't know. And how it relates to
10
   the other components that we are trying to prescribe
   having treatments on. I don't.
11
12
              MR. HAZEN: And, Nate, you can -- and Mandy
   can probably speak to it, but I believe part of the
13
   reason there's not an emphasis on there beyond the fact
14
   it's roadless is those fire models were tending to
15
16
    indicate the southwest edge and more of the western edge
17
    than the southeastern edge in terms of an importance for
   fire spread into OU3. Isn't that --
18
19
              MR. GASSMANN:
                             Yeah.
2.0
              MR. HAZEN: -- generally correct?
21
              MR. GASSMANN: Generally speaking, we have
   been around here long enough that they've seen multiple
22
   fire seasons coming from the southwest generally, and a
23
2.4
   bunch of lightning, and continue to push everything to
    the northeast. And that's why, you know, when we're
25
```

looking at taking action, that's that Tubb Gulch, that
side, up and over to Jackson Creek, basically. That
side of the project area is really the starting point
for anchors for keeping fire to spread into and have the
cause of asbestos concerns to the firefighters inside
the zone. It didn't typically show up down in that -in that wilderness area.

2.0

Still, trying to address things through this EE/CA, though, is the cheatgrass component. I mean, we've got different prescriptions for how we can address some of the -- hopefully address some of the cheatgrass and get some more native species on site and those sorts of things so that we don't see those things drying out as fast at the beginning of the year, causing different scenarios for fires to start up sooner.

MS. ROCKWELL: We did consider prescribed fire in the IRA, some big burns earlier on, but our field folks felt that presents its own risk, you know, not having solid control lines to keep it from going over the top into the OU3 itself. So we looked at it, talked about it, but decided that was not the -- probably the best way to go.

MR. PECK: Probably a fairly short conversation.

MR. VINCENT: Alternative 2, which looks like

the way to go, more treated acres, eight additional road miles. Is there a road density? Are we in a BMU, or is 2 that going to require roads being addressed outside the 3 4 area to meet density requirements? Or is that separate? MR. GASSMANN: So just the Endangered Species 5 Act applies. So we had to produce a biological 6 7 assessment for the project and we've submitted that already. And then so BMUs --8 9 MS. ROCKWELL: Bores. 10 MR. GASSMANN: Bores, thank you. Take it. Go. 11 MS. ROCKWELL: So West Kootenai bores. 12 13 MR. GASSMANN: Go on. Just go through the whole idea. You know, we --14 MS. ROCKWELL: So it's not road density, but 15 16 the linear miles for open roads, total roads, gated 17 So that was part of the road management of what's open, what's gated. So most of our new roads for 18 Alternative 2 will have a gate on it to help keep the 19 open roads down. So it will allow our management and 2.0 fire responsibility, but it will keep -- public won't 21 have the use of some of those new routes. 22 But we were able to do the offset and the work 23 24 all within the project area. So it didn't extend beyond the project area to the greater bores area. 25 Yeah.

Still, we considered the 1 MR. GASSMANN: 2 wolverine, we considered the lynx. MS. ROCKWELL: Lynx critical habitat. 3 Yeah. 4 MR. GASSMANN: So this is a good map. Shows 5 the difference -- the different road system components that are part of the alternative. And you can tell 6 7 there's -- I mean --MR. HAZEN: And they have a CERCLA purpose. 8 9 Again, to do this under the removal action authority, 10 there needs to be a CERCLA purpose form so that the roads indicated, you know, are either needed to 11 implement the vegetative management for various blocks 12 of land or it's to help with firefighter response 13 related to, you know, that vegetation management. 14 MR. GASSMANN: Usually those two complement 15 16 each other pretty well. 17 MR. HAZEN: Mm-hmm. But that's part of why you've identified the 18 road maps you have and which ones are closed to the 19 20 public is to limit those human-caused fire starts but allow that fire response when needed to those trails. 21 MS. ROCKWELL: So this is Alternative 1. 22 some of the new roads are up in this area. So there 23 2.4 will be kind of the connection through here rather than having to go up one side or up through the other. 25

They'll be connected. And there's some roads up through here to get up towards that OU3 boundary to get up to 2 that edge. 3 4 MR. ROSENBUSH: And let me show that figure. I can scroll down on that one. 5 6 There you go. 7 MR. HAZEN: Yeah, the ones that have the white -- it's sort of hard to see, but the white dots 8 9 within are the new roads, typically, under Alternative 2. And the others are existing. 10 And existing roads, you know, under this 11 action could be realigned within. 12 13 MS. ROCKWELL: Yes. MR. HAZEN: So there could be improvements to 14 them, but they're not necessarily new roads. 15 16 MS. ROCKWELL: Right. So the main one, that's 17 that, and y'all are familiar with Tubb Gulch. And this is for both alternatives. But Rainy Creek, you've got 18 Tubb Gulch. And there's this lower Rainy road. 19 actually starts right here. Because right now it --2.0 folks are saying it takes like five-point turnaround 21 even for a pickup to make that turn to get up on that 22 road, and then it's really steep. So that is going to 23 2.4 be realigned in both alternatives to actually make it

accessible to large equipment, getting a lowboy up there

so folks can actually respond, rather than just like ATVs or that sort of thing. So -- but that is meaning 2 new road-building for realignment is in -- within OU3. 3 4 So that's a component of the project. 5 MR. GASSMANN: Mandy just touched on something that we just -- so the idea of I think the logging truck 6 7 getting there is different than a lowboy getting there with a dozer. So those are the considerations on how, like Mandy mentioned, that first big switchback off --10 coming off of Rainy Creek Road is -- the road's there, but we're realigning that road. We're going to do a lot 11 of work to that road to get it so that you can make the 12 13 corner and keep going on a lowboy. MS. ROCKWELL: Yeah, our engineer is very 14 15 pleased with his --16 MR. GASSMANN: He should be. 17 MS. ROCKWELL: -- his engineering on that one to make it happen. It was something he had to work 18 through a lot to figure it out and get it to work. 19 20 MR. HAZEN: And one point to make -- or 21 reiterate is on the vegetation management, it's all outside of Operable Unit 3. But we are touching on the 22 fact that there is some potential road improvement 23

within Operable Unit 3, Tubb Gulch area, and there's a

little seque right here too.

24

1 MS. ROCKWELL: Yeah. 2 MR. HAZEN: That work is going to be coordinated with EPA and W.R. Grace because it's in OU3. 3 4 So that's indicated in the EE/CA that there will be that coordination occurring. And there will be the proper 5 protective measures for the workers doing that road 6 7 improvement work within Operable Unit 3. 8 MR. CASTANEDA: Bob Castaneda again. 9 CERCLA is pretty new to a lot of us, so a 10 couple questions. The preferred Alternative 2, was it required 11 to look at more than one? 12 13 It's desirable to look at more MR. HAZEN: I wouldn't say it's required, but it also 14 than one. calls into question whether it was an objective review 15 16 of an action. So typically there's at least two. 17 MR. CASTANEDA: Okay. So the follow-up question: So the objective of the proposal is to 18 improve firefighter safety, reduce fire intensity, 19 2.0 reduce greater spread and those kind of things. The disclosure of the cost, does that -- is that relevant to 21 22 making a decision? 23 MR. HAZEN: Yes. 2.4 MR. CASTANEDA: And how does that fit with the benefits of improving firefighter safety and fire --25

1 reducing fire intensity and those things?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. HAZEN: So it is a requirement of CERCLA and the NCP. NCP is the implementing regulations for CERCLA to look at cost. Again, it's not a full economic analysis; it's a more focused analysis specific to comparing alternatives. It's one of many factors that are looked at, and I could go through the whole list, but there's basically seven or so factors beyond cost that are in the EE/CA that are looked at: But it has to do with the effectiveness and permanence of this action; short-term risk to workers and the environment and the public from implementing it; the actual implementation challenges of the work, both administrative and technical in doing the work. And there's a few other factors that aren't really relevant to this action, because again we're doing work outside the zone of contamination that normally would be assessed.

But the point is, all of those have weight in determining, you know, what action is the best action under CERCLA. And cost is just one of those. They call it a balancing factor. So it's one factor among some of the others that are compared to make the best decision.

MR. GASSMANN: Does that help?

MR. CASTANEDA: It's kind of vague.

MR. HAZEN: I mean, usually you would -- you

```
know, you would have very different alternatives under
2
   the CERCLA process. Like you might excavate and take to
   a landfill waste versus cap it in place. And so there
 3
   might be a very different spread of cost to where cost
4
   becomes more of an important consideration.
5
   majority of the work is similar between the two
7
   alternatives, so it's not as critical a factor as it is
   for some other removal actions under CERCLA.
8
              MR. CASTANEDA: Who's going to be the
9
10
   presiding officer?
              MR. GASSMANN: Regional forester.
11
12
              He's been briefed.
13
              Mark?
14
              MR. PECK: Mark Peck with Lincoln County Port
   Authority.
15
16
              And this is just because there's so much
17
   trying to figure out how to handle timber within OU3,
   even though the risk assessment says that it's okay.
18
   But I was just wondering if you've got plans -- you're
19
   not going to log inside OU3, but there's going to be
2.0
   right-of-away timber. And have you thought about the
21
   disposal of that? Are you going to try to sell it? Are
22
   you going to ...
23
2.4
              MR. GASSMANN: We have thought about it, but
   we didn't decide yet on what we're going to do with it.
25
```

```
1
              MR. PECK:
                         Okay. I just wondered for --
 2
              MR. HAZEN:
                          If it's in OU3, then EPA and
    W.R. Grace are going to have a say in what happens with
 3
    it, as well as Montana DEQ.
4
5
              MR. GASSMANN: And it's not much, considering
   what --
6
7
              MR. PECK:
                         Oh, no.
              MR. GASSMANN:
                            And to be clear, there is no
8
9
   risk of asbestos outside where we're working.
10
              MR. PECK: Oh, yeah, no, that's ...
11
              MR. CASTANEDA: One more?
12
              MR. GASSMANN:
                             Yeah.
13
                              Taking up all the questions.
              MR. CASTANEDA:
              Are you going to be able to quantify the
14
   benefits of this? So the objective being improve
15
16
    firefighter safety, so you do that by reducing fire
17
    intensity, fire spread, flame length. So are you going
    to be able to show in a quantitative fashion, not just a
18
   narrative way but in quantitative fashion, how this is
19
2.0
    an improvement over no action and how the two
    alternatives vary in those same measures?
21
              You talked about fire modeling, and there's an
22
    array of tools. But are you going to be able to show
23
2.4
    somehow numerically the differences between doing
   nothing, doing 1, and doing 2?
25
```

```
MR. GASSMANN: So the doing nothing part, we
1
2
    did not evaluate this project for the no-action
    component, right?
 3
 4
              MR. HAZEN:
                          Right.
              MS. ROCKWELL: And Eric -- Eric would have his
 5
    existing condition in his fuels report.
6
7
              MR. GASSMANN: So there's going to be the --
   you're going to be able to see in what Eric produced,
8
9
    the field specialist, for the differences.
10
    I'm guessing, but I think there's like six or eight
    different criteria that he ran these models for. So the
11
    existing condition didn't change in Alternative 1 and
12
   Alternative 2. The existing condition was the same
13
   because he had to keep that the same. And then it spits
14
    out the different metrics of percent this and that
15
16
    acres.
            So you'll see the difference in that. But that
17
    doesn't paint the entire picture, but it does get more
    into the discussion about where it is as much as how
18
19
   much is going on.
20
              So that's where the two alternatives in how we
    describe it in EE/CA, but we bring in Eric's supporting
21
    documentation into EE/CA to help narrate why
22
   Alternative 2 is preferred over Alternative 1.
23
2.4
              I never feel like I'm getting you answers.
              MR. CASTANEDA: No, I -- because all these
25
```

fuel reduction projects that were taken across the 1 2 forest, the objective is very similar in all of them. We want to reduce fire risk. We want to protect 3 4 communities. But it becomes more difficult when you try to put a comparison on those different alternatives, 5 because what we are good at, what you're good at, is 7 talking about the differences in a narrative way: Yes, we're going to reduce this, we're going to improve 8 9 forest health, but doing that in a way that's more 10 quantitative. Here's my very simple wish that we could do, 11 is say that right now the risk is 10. If we do nothing 12 13 up there, it's a high-risk area. If we do Alternative 1, do we reduce that risk by five? 14 Alternative 2 reducing that risk by two? That's what I 15 16 was hoping at some point we could be able to show on documents, because the public can understand that 17 improvement a whole lot easier than they can 18 19 understanding flame length, rate of spread, fire intensity. 2.0 MR. GASSMANN: 21 Okay. I understand a lot It's not coming out like that in this report. 22 better. But red is usually bad. Red is usually like, you know, 23 24 danger, and that's what you're going to see in the reports is that it goes from red to, I think it's like a 25

yellow and bluish-greenish color. The green good, red 1 2 bad is kind of that spread of how you can demonstrate the differences. But again, it's evaluating it based on 3 fire spread, you know, those sorts of components are 4 what it's more stovepipe to respond from. So it's --5 again, the narrative is important because it collects 7 all that to describe why, when you do all of it or you do one piece of it, it's not as good as everything else. 8 So that helps. I appreciate that. You've asked it before and I just -- that 10 definition of like 1, 2, 3, 4, that I -- you know, I can 11 use that. 12 13 MR. VINCENT: Green good, red bad. works. 14 MR. PECK: Mark again. 15 16 I think we also need to make sure on the 17 talking points that we go beyond firefighter safety and, you know, normal, because this isn't normal. And that's 18 the reason for the CERCLA is that we're trying to 19 mitigate the possibility of fire getting into an area 2.0 that is contaminated. And the primary release vehicle 21 for that is -- you know, we get a plume-dominated fire 22 inside OU3, and we've got a hundred-mile-an-hour treetop 23

uplift winds sucking all that duff off the forest floor

and throwing it 10-, 15,000 feet in the air, and it all

24

lands back in Libby, that's a whole different threat
than, you know, not that -- but that's what makes this
unique over normal wildland urban interface type of
language and management, I guess.

2.0

2.4

MR. GASSMANN: It does. But bringing it back to the EE/CA, what we had to evaluate is the firefighter that's going to put on the respirator, go into the zone, into the fire.

MR. PECK: Oh, no. Absolutely. Sure

MR. GASSMANN: That's been -- that's the risk part that we're trying to reduce for, as well as the other components for getting into the streams, potentially, you know, moving it from the site.

MR. HAZEN: Yeah. And to be a little more specific, this is based on EPA's human health risk assessment that was performed in OU3. So some of the risks that you're talking about aren't necessarily the ones that this is based on, like, you know, spread over the valley isn't a risk that we're mitigating; it's that the wildland firefighter doing mop-up in duff and ash and soil that's contaminated with asbestos in OU3. And so this is affecting fire spread that could, you know, create those conditions in OU3 that are unacceptable for the human health risk assessment. And then, as you mentioned separately, there's also a need for control

of, you know, post-fire ash that contains LA moving into streams and causing migration through streams. 2 again, EPA, W.R. Grace are working on that through OU3. 3 But if you have fire move in, there's more of a 4 potential than if there isn't. 5 So this is all sort of probabilities. 6 7 know, we're reducing the probability of that occurring in OU3. We're not eliminating it. We're not -- we 8 9 can't demonstrate exactly what risk reduction would 10 happen in OU3. That's really more for EPA and W.R. Grace to figure out. But this can only help the 11 12 conditions that cause this unacceptable risk in OU3. Ιt 13 wouldn't exacerbate them. MR. GASSMANN: So really, you're not going to 14 find what -- the concern, and it is a really concern, 15 16 but --17 MR. PECK: But say from a county standpoint, I mean, EmKayan Village right 18 that's a huge concern. 19 there having that smoke laying in on -- but anyway, 20 yeah, that's ... That's not to belittle what the firefighter 21 aspect to it is, either. 22 23 MR. GASSMANN: It isn't. But then again, 24 like, you know, when Gary said that about the, you know,

there's the rock hounder and the firefighter and the

person in the woods, you know, conducting the logging 1 2 activities, those are the -- that's what we're responding to as part of this project. 3 4 Thinking, John? MR. CRAIG: Yeah. 5 As far as this project's concerned, has there 6 7 been any coordination with EPA and W.R. Grace within the doughnut hole that will complement your treatments 8 9 outside of it? Because lightning is going to strike in 10 that doughnut hole and has for several years, and I can attest to that, having been out there. So what -- is 11 there any coordination that will complement what you're 12 doing inside that doughnut hole with EPA and Grace? 13 MR. GASSMANN: So, completely different 14 processes, just to start off with. So with the remedial 15 16 actions that are being evaluated -- right, remedial 17 actions, we have been participating in that because we've got -- the doughnut hole's 10,000-acre site, the 18 Forest Service has about 5,000 acres up there; the rest 19 is Grace properties. So, yes, we have been progressing 2.0 through and working with the EPA, Grace, DEQ to 21 understand what it means to take remedial actions 22 through those feasibility study alternatives. 23 2.4 So the EPA is working through the feasibility

study, with Grace as a responsible party.

Forest Service has participated in the development, in
the progression of this alternative over that
alternative and, you know, all those sorts of gyrations
that are occurring inside the zone.

2.0

Does Grace know about this project? Yeah, they know about it. They got notice of it. EPA knew about the project. DEQ knows about the project. You know, I think this is probably the first time that, you know, the whole picture came into light and then how we're looking at things. That's probably true. But as far as the Forest Service knowing and how -- and where some of the actions might be taking place inside the zone, that's where we feel more comfortable saying that. We're working out here, and we feel comfortable saying that the actions inside, no matter what they end up being, are complementing what is that alternative may be selected for.

MR. HAZEN: And then the other thing that factors into it is because it's based on the human health risk assessment for OU3, meaning the Mitchell Jackson work, you know, some of the consideration identifying the vegetation management areas took into account where there was elevated asbestos within Operable Unit 3. So it's not to say that it's complete coordination, but it's consistent. And that's what

CERCLA requires them doing: removal action that will be consistent with future remedial actions. And so it may not be fully integrated or complementary, but it's consistent. And that's what's important in CERCLA is to make sure you're not doing something contradictory that would defeat the work inside OU3. But we're relatively confident that's not the case here. I believe that you're only helping the conditions in OU3, not hurting them, by doing this work.

2.4

MR. CRAIG: I realize you're not hurting anything, but when you're talking about fuels and breaking up the continuity of fuels, it would be nice, if you have a puzzle piece on your side of the ridge, there could be something that could be done on the EPA/Grace's side that would complement, not -- the work you're doing. And that's what I'm looking at: Is there an overall plan that puts the pieces together in the end?

MR. GASSMANN: I think the plans are developing at two different time scales, and so we're getting out first. And so if there are opportunities to connect those puzzle pieces, there's potential for that to occur. There is. Will it occur? There's no answer to "Will it occur?" because all those decisions and processes still have to go forward. Inside the zone.

```
That's not how my head works, but
1
              MR. CRAIG:
2
   that's fine.
              MR. GASSMANN: In a perfect world, yeah, I
 3
   think it would be much easier to say that these things
4
   don't have a line. They'll bleed it across both sides.
5
   But that's not where we're at.
6
7
              MR. CRAIG: One last question. Is there -- I
   heard there was an RFP out for working with W.R. Grace
8
9
   within that CERCLA request for proposals?
10
              MR. GASSMANN:
                             Inside the zone?
11
              MR. CRAIG: Mm-hmm.
              MR. GASSMANN: I have not heard of that.
12
13
   not saying it's true or not. I just haven't heard.
              MR. CRAIG: Oh, it's true. I have heard that.
14
   I know some people who have submitted proposals for work
15
16
   within that. And I was just wondering if you had heard
17
   anything about it through the DEQ?
              MR. GASSMANN: I haven't heard anything about
18
           I mean, if that is a thing, then you'll
19
   need -- you know, that's the EPA's. That's what they
2.0
   have to take care of, so ...
21
                          I just thought there might have
22
              MR. CRAIG:
   been some coordination there.
23
2.4
              MR. GASSMANN:
                             There is -- there have been at
```

times RFPs put out that were considered, and we were

- 1 providing some consultation on some of those aspects.
- 2 | But I haven't heard anything recently.
- 3 MR. CRAIG: Thanks.
- 4 MR. GASSMANN: Somebody had their hand up over
- 5 here. I think it was Bob.
- 6 MR. CASTANEDA: Has anyone from EPA or the
- 7 | Forest Service or together contacted W.R. Grace to sit
- 8 down at the table and say: This is what the
- 9 Forest Service is proposing to do under CERCLA. We'd
- 10 | like to find out from W.R. Grace, what are your future
- 11 plans up here? Has anybody tried to arrange a
- 12 discussion of that nature?
- MR. CRAIG: That's what I said. Bob's just
- 14 | saying the same thing I did.
- MR. CASTANEDA: I can understand you're
- 16 | talking about coordinating, letting them know what's
- 17 going on. But I think the question is: Is there
- 18 | something more direct being done with W.R. Grace to get
- 19 | them to do something?
- 20 MR. GASSMANN: The Forest Service works weekly
- 21 | in coordination with W.R. Grace, the EPA, DEQ to see
- 22 actions and progress through their feasibility study to
- 23 | ultimately get to a decision to say this is what we are
- 24 going to do. We're there. We're exercising our CERCLA
- 25 | authorities through the EPA in that instance inside the

So we are not the lead. EPA is. And Grace is 1 zone. 2 the responsible party. Yeah, that's occurring. It's just not on the same scale. It's not on the same time 3 4 scale for what we're trying to achieve with this 5 project. And there's -- quite honestly, there's 6 7 different criteria being evaluated. There's similarities, but they're not the same. And the 8 differences may seem subtle, but they're significant. 9 10 So it's not happening together. It's the different place for different reasons. So we're not not doing it; 11 it just isn't there yet. That's why we feel confident 12 by these actions under this project, no matter what the 13 feasibility ends up being, to get to the decision and 14 all those other words I can't remember right now, we're 15 16 not going to impact negatively Mitchell Jackson to the 17 remedy that's going to be established for inside the 18 zone. 19 When the recorder's stretching her fingers, you know we've put some time in. 2.0 You guys feel like we got a good start to dive 21 into the document in more detail? It's not going to 22 read like a Forest Service document. It's going to have 23 2.4 all the different vernacular that's -- I mean, Troy had

it up here earlier. I mean, it's -- it doesn't look

```
like a Forest Service document. So it's going to take
1
2
    some time to get there.
              MR. HAZEN: There is a lot of technical
 3
4
    information, including quantitative information, though,
    in the cost estimates, with backup for acreages and
5
    quantities, you know, in the modeling. So, you know,
7
    there is a lot of technical and quantitative information
    supporting the analysis of the two alternatives.
8
9
              MR. GASSMANN: A lot of the appendices are
10
    just as -- almost as long as the document in total.
11
              MR. HAZEN:
                          Right.
              MS. ROCKWELL: I think it is, actually, yeah.
12
13
              MR. GASSMANN:
                            Ouite a bit.
              All right. Mark's hungry. I can see it.
14
15
              No?
16
              MR. PECK:
                         Thirsty, maybe.
17
              MR. GASSMANN:
                             Thirsty? Okay.
              I guess with that, with no more other
18
    questions, we'll stick around a little bit longer.
19
    We're here. So if you've got something else, just let
2.0
    us know, but with that, thanks for coming. Appreciate
21
    you guys being here.
22
23
              (Whereupon, the proceeding
24
               concluded at 6:49 p.m.)
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	STATE OF MONTANA)
3	COUNTY OF)
4	I, Emily K. Niles, Registered Merit Reporter,
5	do hereby certify:
6	That I reported in shorthand (Stenotype) the
7	proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the
8	place and date indicated.
9	That I thereafter transcribed my said
10	shorthand notes into typewriting, and that the
11	typewritten transcript is a complete, true and accurate
12	transcription of my said shorthand notes to the best of
13	my ability.
L4	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, under penalty of perjury,
15	I have set my hand in my office in the County of
16	Gallatin, State of Montana, this 17th day of June, 2024.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	EMILY K. NILES, RMR, CRR
25	

A ability 5:12 59:13	4:17, 4:21, 5:1 6:1, 7:2, 11:24	24:24 added 16:22	28:10, 28:12 38:25, 39:19	appreciate 4:4
		4UUCU 10.44	38:23. 39:19	49:9, 58:21
	12:16, 12:17	20:16	40:6, 40:22	approaches
	12:20, 12:20	adding 20:13	41:10, 43:11	19:6, 19:7
able 20:6, 26:15	12:22, 14:1	addition 23:17	47:12, 47:13	19:11, 19:13
29:14, 33:23	14:8, 14:12	additional 15:14	47:23, 47:23	appropriate
39:23, 46:14	22:9, 22:16	15:22, 16:4	48:14, 48:15	17:6
46:18, 46:23	22:25, 23:7	16:14, 20:15	53:2, 53:3	approval 6:13
47:8, 48:16	23:11, 24:5	22:22, 23:12	53:16	ARAR 17:1
above-entitled	24:8, 24:20	23:16, 23:16	alternatives 8:7	ARARs 17:5
59:7	27:3, 28:8, 28:9	35:11, 39:1	14:11, 15:19	area 1:8, 4:15
Absolutely 50:9	29:11, 29:19	additions 17:25	21:7, 21:17	5:3, 5:9, 7:10
access 5:10	30:3, 30:6	address 8:7	22:5, 22:11	7:14, 8:7, 8:20
13:8, 15:24	30:12, 30:14	15:11, 38:8	22:12, 25:10	9:6, 9:24, 10:1
16:3, 16:6	30:18, 30:20	38:10, 38:11	41:18, 41:24	11:22, 13:5
accesses 11:6	31:11, 31:13	addressed 39:3	44:6, 45:1, 45:7	15:5, 15:14
accessible 41:25	32:8, 32:13	addresses 36:14	46:21, 47:20	16:15, 17:16
accommodate	32:16, 32:19	addressing	48:5, 52:23	19:14, 20:7
15:11	33:9, 36:13	13:18, 14:4	58:8	23:1, 23:14
accomplish	36:16, 36:17	35:3	amount 23:12	23:15, 30:12
17:16	38:1, 40:9	adequate 12:24	Amphibole	32:20, 32:22
account 23:24	41:12, 43:16	adjacent 1:5	13:13, 13:21	35:4, 38:3, 38:7
24:16, 25:4	44:10, 44:15	13:12, 35:7	analyses 24:8	39:4, 39:24
25:20, 25:25	44:19, 44:19	administer 2:19	analysis 1:7, 2:6	39:25, 39:25
27:6, 53:23	46:20, 54:1	administrative	4:14, 6:18	40:23, 42:24
accuracy 22:6	action's 13:14	44:13	23:23, 24:2	48:13, 49:20
23:8, 24:9	24:4	ado 4:5	24:6, 24:10	areas 13:9, 15:6
	actionable 32:3	Advantage 2:13	25:3, 25:4	15:11, 15:13
	actions 6:5, 6:8	2:19, 3:5	33:24, 44:5	16:4, 21:23
32:3, 34:9, 57:4	14:10, 16:16	affect 6:6, 14:13	44:5, 58:8	33:7, 53:22
achieved 31:20	32:6, 45:8	14:13, 35:6	anchors 38:4	Army 3:3, 11:8
acre 16:24	52:16, 52:17	agencies 3:11	and/or 13:8	11:10
acreage 23:12	52:22, 53:12	air 49:25	answer 54:23	arrange 56:11
23:16	53:15, 54:2	Alexander 11:1	answered 23:19	array 46:23
acreage-wise	56:22, 57:13	21:6	25:2	asbestos 7:10
	activities 2:14	allow 39:20	answers 47:24	8:18, 13:14
acreages 58:5	4:25, 6:9, 9:10	40:21	anybody 56:11	13:21, 13:24
acres 2:7, 9:19	10:9, 13:6	altering 6:18	anyway 51:19	36:19, 38:5
9:25, 10:2	18:14, 23:4	alternative 7:3	appendices 58:9	46:9, 50:21
16:11, 17:25	34:10, 52:2	14:14, 15:10	appendix 21:10	53:23
1	actual 7:5, 10:3	16:10, 16:12	21:11, 21:15	ash 13:22, 50:20
39:1, 47:16	22:7, 44:12	18:5, 18:5, 18:7	applicable 17:6	51:1
	add 12:8, 14:14	20:17, 22:16	applications	asked 49:10
acronym 35:2	14:19, 15:14	22:20, 23:5	19:20	asking 5:17
Act 39:6	16:14, 18:1	23:11, 27:8	applied 31:7	aspect 25:4
action 1:4, 4:16	21:22, 23:1	28:9, 28:10	applies 39:6	51:22

aspects 56:1	16:18, 30:1	BMUs 39:8	calls 43:15	43:9, 44:2, 44:4
assessed 35:13	38:2, 44:8	Bob 16:8, 27:21	cap 45:3	44:20, 45:2
44:17	basis 12:19	43:8, 56:5	capturing 14:10	45:8, 49:19
assessment 39:7	22:10	Bob's 56:13	care 55:21	54:1, 54:4, 55:9
45:18, 50:16	beginning 13:3	bores 39:9	case 12:20, 54:7	56:9, 56:24
50:24, 53:20	38:14	39:10, 39:12	Castaneda 16:8	CERCLA's
assume 24:3	behalf 3:5	39:25	16:8, 23:18	12:25
26:4	believe 6:14	bound 31:18	25:6, 25:9	certain 4:25
attack 5:12	6:21, 10:11	boundaries 8:17	25:14, 26:9	31:16, 32:2
5:12	37:13, 54:7	boundary 8:17	26:12, 27:23	34:8
attest 52:11	believes 23:15	8:19, 8:24, 10:6	29:17, 29:20	CERTIFICATE
ATVs 42:2	belittle 51:21	11:13, 20:19	30:15, 43:8	59:1
atypical 25:24	benefit 5:14	41:2	43:8, 43:17	certify 59:5
authorities 3:10	23:16	bounds 7:20	43:24, 44:24	challenges
4:17, 56:25	benefits 23:10	box 28:1	45:9, 46:11	44:13
authority 12:21	23:20, 43:25	break 9:23	46:13, 47:25	chance 3:18
13:1, 30:1, 30:4	46:15	breaker 27:18	56:6, 56:15	18:22
30:15, 30:18	best 14:17	breaking 54:12	catch 33:23	change 20:8
31:4, 32:10	24:14, 38:22	Brent 30:25	categories 17:5	47:12
40:9, 45:15	44:19, 44:22	31:1	19:1, 19:3	changes 15:10
authorization	59:12	Brent's 33:2	22:17	15:15
6:12	better 13:16	bridging 27:12	cause 13:19	cheatgrass
available 6:14	18:22, 48:22	briefed 45:12	38:5, 51:12	16:18, 38:9
averaged 23:25	beyond 24:22	bright 8:16	causes 36:18	38:11
aware 7:25, 9:3	32:8, 32:9	bring 47:21	causing 38:14	classifications
11:8	37:14, 39:24	bringing 50:5	51:2	19:4, 19:4
	44:8, 49:17	broad-scale	CBC 1:24	cleanup 7:25
В	big 10:17, 38:17	19:20	CCR 1:25, 1:25	30:8, 30:9
	42:9	Bruce 33:1	CDM 2:13	clear 26:6, 46:8
back 10:10	bigger 14:17	budgetary 22:5	CERCLA 2:21	cliffs 17:21
10:15, 18:2	20:7, 21:24	bugs 26:23	3:9, 3:9, 4:17	close 7:19, 16:10
22:21, 32:12	32:4	building 24:14	6:12, 6:25	29:5
33:5, 50:1, 50:5	biological 39:6	31:17, 34:10	12:19, 12:21	closed 15:5
backup 58:5	bit 4:6, 7:23	built 10:14	13:11, 17:10	16:5, 40:19
bad 48:23, 49:2	8:15, 8:21, 9:17	bullets 22:19	17:12, 19:14	closer 15:25
49:13	15:24, 20:14	bunch 37:24	22:11, 23:22	16:13
balancing 44:21	36:19, 58:13	burn 13:24	24:5, 25:7	closing 15:8
band 21:3	58:19	burns 38:17	25:24, 25:25	collects 49:6
barriered 16:3	blasting 17:21		26:2, 26:14	color 49:1
based 14:12	bleed 55:5	C	26:16, 27:2	colors 8:13
28:6, 32:25	block 19:4		27:3, 27:12	combination
49:3, 50:15	blocks 20:16	calendar 28:4	29:24, 30:4	8:23, 18:9
50:18, 53:19	40:12	call 21:21, 26:1	30:7, 32:22	come 10:13
basically 6:16	bluish-greenish	29:18, 44:20	33:11, 35:5	12:10, 20:23
7:3, 7:12, 8:22	49:1	called 12:22	36:11, 36:17	20:25
12:23, 15:20	BMU 39:2	17:7, 21:13	40:8, 40:10	comfortable
I				

52.12 52.14	22.1 27.10	54.2 54.4	4 21.10	CDD 1.24
53:13, 53:14	22:1, 37:10	54:2, 54:4	cost 21:19	CRR 1:24 59:24
coming 11:15	40:5, 49:4	constant 23:22	21:22, 21:24	
28:21, 37:23	50:12	consultation	21:25, 22:7	culminate 7:1
42:10, 48:22	composition	56:1	22:10, 22:13	culverts 14:18
58:21	35:25	contacted 56:7	22:21, 23:2	currently 16:5
comment 6:20	compositions	contains 51:1	23:3, 23:8	_
6:21, 6:25, 28:2	34:3	contaminated	24:11, 24:17	D
28:4, 28:13	concern 51:15	26:17, 49:21	24:22, 25:9	J 11.10
29:1 comments 7:2	51:15, 51:18	50:21	25:15, 26:17	dam 11:10
	concerned 52:6	contamination	27:18, 43:21	danger 33:8 48:24
Commissioner 31:2	concerns 38:5	35:4, 36:13 44:17	44:4, 44:8	= :
	concluded 58:24	continue 11:7	44:20, 45:4 45:4, 58:5	darker 7:11 7:17
communities 48:4	condition 37:6	18:14, 31:21	<i>'</i>	dashed 9:4
	47:6, 47:12	· ·	costs 22:3, 23:20	
community 33:3	47:13 conditions 6:3	32:21, 33:8 37:24	24:13, 24:22 country 37:3	date 24:17 35:14, 59:8
compare 22:4			· ·	
compared 30:10 44:22		continued 18:16 continuity 54:12	county 15:4 31:1, 45:14	day 6:23, 6:23 23:25, 59:16
	50:23, 51:12 54:8	continuity 54:12 contract 3:4	51:17, 59:3	days 6:24, 29:9
comparing 22:11, 44:6	conduct 21:1	27:18, 27:19	59:15	days 0.24, 29.9 dead 12:11
· ·		contradictory	couple 9:2	decade 32:9
comparison 48:5	conducting 6:17 30:9, 52:1	54:5	20:15, 20:25	decide 45:25
complement	confident 34:9	contrasting	28:13, 43:10	decided 38:21
13:15, 32:13	54:7, 57:12	22:12	course 15:3	deciding 35:10
32:17, 40:15	conjunction 5:8	control 13:23	29:17	decision 7:3, 8:4
52:8, 52:12	connect 54:22	16:17, 38:19	covers 12:2	11:24, 22:13
54:15	connected 41:1	50:25	CRAIG 52:5	22:18, 22:20
complementary	connection	control-related	54:10, 55:1	24:19, 27:4
54:3	40:24	12:24	55:7, 55:11	32:18, 43:22
complementing	consider 17:11	conversation	55:14, 55:22	44:22, 56:23
53:16	26:2, 27:4	38:24	56:3, 56:13	57:14
complete 29:11	27:15, 38:16	coordinated	create 50:23	decisions 6:21
35:14, 53:24	consideration	43:3	created 7:2	54:24
59:11	17:4, 33:25	coordinating	28:8	decontaminating
completed 36:7	45:5, 53:21	56:16	creates 15:20	26:17
completely	considerations	coordination	Creek 11:1	defeat 54:6
52:14	17:10, 42:8	43:5, 52:7	11:1, 12:9	define 8:24
compliance 17:1	considered 10:7	52:12, 53:25	15:21, 15:24	defined 4:22
comply 17:11	10:8, 16:24	55:23, 56:21	20:8, 21:6, 21:6	32:7
component	17:8, 18:2	corner 42:13	38:2, 41:18	definitely 16:13
10:17, 11:12	25:22, 25:23	corp 11:10	42:10	16:23, 18:11
16:19, 23:3	40:1, 40:2	Corps 3:3, 11:8	crews 5:12	20:10
32:1, 38:9, 42:4	55:25	11:11	criteria 47:11	definition 29:25
47:3	considering	corral 33:23	57:7	49:11
components	46:5	correct 37:20	critical 24:21	delineated 9:6
3:22, 9:14, 12:4	consistent 53:25	correctly 23:19	40:3, 45:7	demonstrate
, , ,		,	<u> </u>	

49:2, 51:9	32:23, 33:20	11.11 11.16	economic 23:20	57:14
1	· ·	44:14, 44:16		
demonstration	33:22, 33:24	46:24, 46:25	24:7, 25:4, 44:4	engage 3:9
21:13	34:8, 34:10	46:25, 47:1	edge 8:20, 20:11	engineer 42:14
density 39:2	36:19, 38:10	48:9, 50:20	20:18, 20:18	engineering 1:7
39:4, 39:15	38:14, 40:5	52:13, 54:1	37:16, 37:16	2:6, 4:13, 17:19
DEQ 46:4	42:7, 45:1, 45:4	54:5, 54:9	37:17, 41:3	42:17
52:21, 53:7	47:11, 47:15	54:16, 57:11	EE/CA 2:14	Engineers 3:3
55:17, 56:21	48:5, 50:1	dollar 23:23	3:19, 4:14, 6:13	enhance 5:24
describe 12:5	52:14, 54:20	23:25, 24:1	6:18, 6:19, 7:4	6:2
47:21, 49:7	57:7, 57:10	24:1	10:3, 19:1, 19:8	entire 17:15
design 24:15	57:11, 57:24	domestication	19:18, 21:10	47:17
24:20	differential 23:2	34:11	21:11, 21:15	entry 33:7, 33:7
designing 22:9	23:8	dopple 9:7	23:21, 24:23	environment
24:8	differently	dots 9:7, 41:8	25:17, 25:21	12:25, 36:12
desirable 43:13	19:25, 25:23	doubled 18:6	31:22, 38:9	44:11
desired 15:11	difficult 21:23	doughnut 7:13	43:4, 44:9	environmental
detail 19:5	48:4	7:14, 52:8	47:21, 47:22	2:5
30:13, 57:22	direct 5:12, 14:4	52:10, 52:13	50:6	Environomics
details 4:6, 4:9	28:25, 56:18	52:18	EE/CAs 3:8	33:1
10:22, 19:9	directly 10:12	dozer 42:8	effect 24:6	EPA 4:21, 5:25
determine 25:18	directs 29:1	Draft 1:7	effective 15:12	8:4, 8:10, 11:13
determining	disclosure 36:2	drafting 29:10	20:2	14:5, 30:8, 30:9
26:4, 44:19	43:21	drainage 15:21	effectiveness 5:6	32:18, 36:14
developed 28:7	discount 24:2	draw 20:12	6:3, 22:17	43:3, 46:2, 51:3
developing	discussing 8:3	drier 15:15	23:10, 44:10	51:10, 52:7
25:19, 54:20	discussion 2:4	drivable 14:22	effects 21:14	52:13, 52:21
development	47:18, 56:12	driving 18:22	23:24	52:24, 53:6
53:1	discussions 33:3	drying 16:19	effort 10:14	56:6, 56:21
diagram 6:11	disease 34:5	38:13	17:22	56:25, 57:1
difference 15:19	diseased 26:22	duff 13:21	efforts 10:15	EPA's 5:19
20:5, 21:19	disposal 45:22	49:24, 50:20	eight 7:24, 39:1	8:18, 50:15
21:24, 27:7	district 1:2, 2:9	duration 24:4	47:10	55:20
40:5, 47:16	3:4		either 17:10	EPA-led 32:13
differences	dive 57:21	\mathbf{E}	40:11, 51:22	EPA/Grace's
19:25, 21:4	document 3:19		elevated 53:23	54:15
21:22, 46:24	33:17, 57:22	e-mail 28:15	eliminating 51:8	equipment
47:9, 48:7, 49:3	57:23, 58:1	e-mails 28:24	Emily 1:24, 59:4	41:25
57:9	58:10	earlier 20:3	59:24	Eric 21:12, 47:5
different 3:21	documentation	27:25, 32:13	EmKayan 51:18	47:5, 47:8
11:5, 11:6, 12:7	3:21, 47:22	38:17, 57:25	emphasis 37:14	Eric's 47:21
17:5, 19:1, 19:2	documents	early 33:7	encompassing	especially 16:17
19:12, 19:18	48:17	easements 11:5	9:20	essentially 7:16
19:19, 19:24	doing 3:14, 5:14	easier 48:18	Endangered	9:9
21:14, 23:3	6:17, 23:11	55:4	39:5	established 3:12
26:7, 26:19	27:17, 29:16	east 7:19	ended 10:19	34:19, 57:17
28:13, 30:15	30:6, 43:6	easy 28:20	ends 21:20	estimates 58:5

evaluate 18:8	F	42:19, 45:17	first 6:23, 42:9	forested 8:7
27:18, 47:2	-	51:11	53:8, 54:21	32:20
50:6	facilitate 28:2	file 7:6	fit 43:24	forester 45:11
evaluated 10:7	facility 26:14	Final 1:7	five 48:14	form 40:10
14:11, 34:23	fact 30:4, 37:14	find 3:18, 3:19	five-point 41:21	formal 29:24
52:16, 57:7	42:23	3:20, 21:5	five-year 34:17	formally 28:9
evaluating	factor 22:18	33:16, 37:8	34:20, 34:25	former 2:8, 4:23
22:15, 31:24	32:4, 44:21	51:15, 56:10	35:8, 36:1	5:5, 15:7
49:3	44:21, 45:7	fine 55:2	flame 5:11, 17:1	forth 19:5
evaluation	factored 22:13	fingers 57:19	46:17, 48:19	forward 7:4
33:20	factors 5:1, 44:6	fire 5:6, 5:10	floor 49:24	26:4, 54:25
evaluation/cost	44:8, 44:15	10:7, 10:9	focused 44:5	frame 29:13
1:7, 2:6, 4:13	53:19	10:13, 10:17	Focusing 14:21	31:15, 32:4
evening 3:2	fair 9:8	12:3, 12:11	folks 10:11	36:7
event 10:16	fairly 21:6	12:15, 13:7	10:12, 17:19	frames 4:8
everybody 2:10	23:13, 24:4	13:12, 13:22	28:24, 38:18	fuel 48:1
28:16	30:10, 38:23	15:12, 15:16	41:21, 42:1	fuels 1:4, 5:2
evolve 36:10	fall 31:4	18:11, 18:12	follow 14:10	5:3, 5:11, 13:4
exacerbate	familiar 41:17	21:8, 21:14	follow-up 23:18	13:5, 23:4, 47:6
51:13	fancy 4:16, 35:2	23:13, 26:22	43:17	54:11, 54:12
exactly 8:22	far 10:18, 52:6	33:8, 33:22	followed 11:17	full 44:4
51:9	53:11	34:5, 36:17	footprint 8:8	fully 54:3
excavate 45:2	fashion 46:18	36:18, 37:15	27:5	further 4:5
exception 11:17	46:19	37:18, 37:23	forecasting	future 23:25
exceptions	fast 38:14	38:4, 38:16	24:18	24:18, 31:4
11:14	faster 18:21	39:21, 40:20	forest 1:1, 1:2	33:11, 34:19
exclude 27:3	feasibility 6:8	40:21, 43:19	1:15, 2:14, 3:6	34:23, 36:16
excuse 2:5, 18:9	8:5, 52:23	43:25, 44:1	3:8, 3:13, 4:18	54:2, 56:10
exercising 56:24	52:24, 56:22	46:16, 46:17	7:1, 9:15, 9:21	
existed 14:25	57:14	46:22, 48:3	9:23, 10:2	G
existing 16:4	features 8:12	48:19, 49:4	11:25, 13:2	. 15.05
41:10, 41:11	8:24, 9:2	49:20, 49:22	16:9, 17:1	gain 17:25
47:6, 47:12	federal 3:11	50:8, 50:22	17:12, 17:15	Gallatin 59:16
47:13	25:20	51:4	23:15, 24:12	Gary 1:10, 2:12
expand 18:25	feedback 28:6	firefighter 13:8	25:19, 26:11	4:11, 12:16
expect 31:12	feel 47:24, 53:13	18:20, 40:13	27:9, 28:7	21:3, 51:24
expected 22:6	53:14, 57:12	43:19, 43:25	29:25, 30:11	Gassman 1:10
expecting 29:9	57:21	46:16, 49:17	30:19, 32:11	Gassmann 2:4
exposure 13:13	feet 20:25, 49:25	50:6, 50:20	32:16, 36:22	2:9, 2:21, 3:7
35:1, 36:18	felt 34:9, 38:18	51:21, 51:25	36:23, 37:1	4:1, 5:16, 6:5
exposures 13:20	field 20:20	firefighters 4:22	48:2, 48:9	6:15, 6:23, 7:7
extend 39:24	21:12, 38:17 47:9	13:20, 38:5	49:24, 52:19	8:25, 11:24
extends 7:18		firefighting 4:25	53:1, 53:11	12:3, 14:6
	fight 5:15	fires 10:16, 12:5 12:7, 13:19	56:7, 56:9 56:20, 57:23	14:24, 16:12 17:24, 19:17
	fighters 5:15 figure 41:4	38:15	58:1	19:23, 20:12
	inguit +1.4	30.13	J0.1	17.23, 20.12

		<u> </u>	ī	
20:22, 21:11	gives 29:15	36:24, 36:25	H	36:12, 37:1
24:25, 25:17	go 2:11, 4:9	40:4, 48:6, 48:6		48:9, 50:15
26:6, 26:10	4:19, 5:17, 10:3	49:1, 49:8	habitat 40:3	50:24, 53:20
27:11, 27:24	16:21, 22:8	49:13, 57:21	half 10:20	hear 23:19
28:11, 29:19	27:16, 28:16	gotten 16:23	hand 56:4	heard 55:8
30:22, 31:6	28:18, 31:21	GovDelivery	59:15	55:12, 55:13
31:9, 31:11	31:25, 32:9	28:17	handle 45:17	55:14, 55:16
33:13, 35:15	33:23, 34:13	Grace 6:1, 8:10	happen 42:18	55:18, 56:2
35:18, 35:21	38:22, 39:1	9:14, 9:21, 14:5	51:10	help 5:3, 8:24
36:21, 36:24	39:11, 39:13	32:14, 32:19	happening	10:13, 19:15
37:7, 37:19	39:13, 40:25	43:3, 46:3, 51:3	32:25, 57:10	32:17, 39:19
37:21, 39:5	41:6, 44:7	51:11, 52:7	happens 31:5	40:13, 44:23
39:10, 39:13	49:17, 50:7	52:13, 52:20	33:25, 46:3	47:22, 51:11
40:1, 40:4	54:25	52:21, 52:25	hard 8:13, 41:8	helping 2:19
40:15, 42:5	goal 13:10	53:5, 55:8, 56:7	harder 20:13	54:8
42:16, 44:23	goes 32:7, 48:25	56:10, 56:18	harvest 26:24	helps 5:10, 49:9
45:11, 45:24	going 4:5, 6:6	56:21, 57:1	harvested 9:10	Hi 2:15, 3:25
46:5, 46:8	9:16, 10:16	grades 11:15	harvesting	high-level 4:7
46:12, 47:1	14:4, 14:16	great 3:7	34:11	high-risk 48:13
47:7, 48:21	15:9, 17:25	greater 39:25	Hazen 1:10	highlighted
50:5, 50:10	18:11, 18:12	43:20	2:12, 2:12, 4:12	19:24
51:14, 51:23	19:15, 20:7	green 9:4, 9:5	5:23, 6:10, 6:16	highly 26:3
52:14, 54:19	21:1, 21:5, 27:9	49:1, 49:13	6:24, 7:8, 11:20	highway 1:16
55:3, 55:10	29:10, 30:10	greenish 9:4	12:19, 17:3	16:20
55:12, 55:18	32:9, 33:11	ground 5:12	18:24, 20:14	hike 20:24
55:24, 56:4	33:12, 33:16	29:16	22:3, 23:21	history 7:23
56:20, 58:9	34:5, 34:8	grow 33:5	25:1, 25:7	10:8
58:13, 58:17	34:13, 34:20	growing 33:10	25:13, 25:16	hold 3:4
gate 18:14	34:22, 38:19	33:14, 34:2	25:24, 26:13	hole 7:13, 52:8
39:19	39:3, 41:23	guess 15:9	27:25, 29:24	52:10, 52:13
gated 14:22	42:11, 42:13	15:23, 17:4	30:17, 30:24	hole's 52:18
15:2, 39:16	43:2, 45:9	21:20, 22:24	32:6, 33:12	home 28:14
39:18	45:20, 45:20	24:24, 25:25	34:24, 35:12	28:23
gates 15:7	45:22, 45:23	25:25, 50:4	35:16, 36:11	honestly 57:6
generally 32:6	45:25, 46:3	58:18	36:22, 37:12	hopefully 38:11
37:20, 37:21	46:14, 46:17	guessing 47:10	37:20, 40:8	hoping 48:16
37:23	46:23, 47:7	Gulch 9:13	40:17, 41:7	horse 16:18
getting 4:2, 4:6	47:8, 47:19	10:24, 15:13	41:14, 42:20	hounder 51:25
16:17, 22:21	48:8, 48:8	15:15, 15:18	43:2, 43:13	how's 34:22
32:12, 41:25	48:24, 50:7	20:7, 21:23	43:23, 44:2	huge 51:18
42:7, 42:7	51:14, 52:9	38:1, 41:17	44:25, 46:2	human 4:22
47:24, 49:20	56:17, 56:24	41:19, 42:24	47:4, 50:14	36:12, 50:15
50:12, 54:21	57:16, 57:17	guys 2:23, 3:17	53:18, 58:3	50:24, 53:19
give 4:8, 28:3	57:22, 57:23	5:17, 20:24	58:11	human-caused
32:23	58:1	57:21, 58:22	head 55:1	13:7, 18:17
given 19:9	good 3:2, 31:11	gyrations 53:3	health 4:22	40:20

hundred 12:10	45:5, 49:6, 54:4	56:25, 57:17	6:17, 34:25	49:18, 49:22
20:25	improve 13:8	instance 23:24	36:15	50:2, 50:13
hundred-mile	14:2, 14:16	56:25	JV 2:13, 2:19	50:18, 50:22
49:23	43:19, 46:15	integrated 54:3	3:5	51:1, 51:7
hungry 58:14	48:8	intended 13:15		51:24, 51:24
hurting 54:8	improved 22:25	19:15	K	52:1, 53:3, 53:5
54:10	improvement	intending 30:11		53:6, 53:8, 53:9
	18:19, 42:23	intensity 13:12	keep 5:18, 28:17	53:21, 55:15
I	43:7, 46:20	18:11, 43:19	38:19, 39:19	55:20, 56:16
	48:18	44:1, 46:17	39:21, 42:13	57:20, 58:6
idea 14:25	improvements	48:20	47:14	58:6, 58:21
29:15, 33:13	41:14	intent 35:10	keeping 38:4	knowing 31:15
36:8, 39:14	improving 5:6	intention 14:1	key 4:20, 5:16	53:11
42:6	43:25	interested 28:19	kind 14:9, 15:23	knows 31:23
ideas 10:9	inadequate	interface 50:3	20:9, 24:16	53:7
identified 40:18	13:17	intermixed 11:4	29:15, 33:19	Koocanusa 7:18
identifying	include 9:24	introductions	34:12, 40:24	Kootenai 1:2
53:22	included 11:21	2:9	43:20, 44:24	1:15, 7:20, 7:21
IDOQ 27:19	includes 9:19	inventoried 9:5	49:2	16:9, 39:12
imagine 31:15	including 58:4	37:2	knew 53:6	_
impact 57:16	indicate 37:16	involved 10:11	know 3:24, 4:20	\mathbf{L}
impetus 30:5	indicated 23:9	IRA 38:17	4:25, 5:24, 7:2	T A 51.1
implement	40:11, 43:4 59:8	issued 9:25	7:10, 7:19, 7:20	LA 51:1
25:10, 27:14	indicates 4:12	items 32:3	7:25, 8:13, 8:14 9:7, 10:18, 11:8	Laidlaw 3:2, 3:2 Lake 7:18, 7:21
27:18, 27:19 29:14, 30:2	industrial 26:14	T	13:19, 13:19	land 11:23
30:12, 32:19	inflation 23:24	J	14:17, 17:24	40:13
40:12	24:17, 24:18	Jackson 1:8, 2:7	18:8, 20:18	landfill 45:3
implementability		4:14, 5:3, 5:9	22:8, 22:24	landowners
22:18	10:17, 24:15	7:9, 7:13, 8:20	22:24, 23:9	11:6
implementation	28:3, 28:7, 58:4	11:1, 11:22	24:10, 24:16	lands 9:6, 9:8
7:5, 22:7, 24:21	58:4, 58:7	13:5, 15:24	25:2, 25:24	9:9, 9:9, 9:12
25:18, 29:3	initial 10:14	17:16, 19:14	26:19, 26:23	9:22, 9:24, 11:5
34:6, 44:12	inner 8:17	21:5, 23:1	27:16, 28:5	11:5, 11:21
implementing	20:18	23:14, 32:21	28:21, 29:12	50:1
4:16, 22:9	insect 34:5	35:4, 36:16	30:11, 34:16	language 50:4
22:25, 27:9	inside 4:22, 5:15	38:2, 53:21	34:18, 34:18	large 41:25
29:9, 44:3	5:19, 5:25, 5:25	57:16	34:20, 34:22	laying 51:19
44:12	6:4, 11:12	Jennifer 3:2	35:2, 35:17	lead 2:16, 57:1
importance	13:15, 19:14	Jodi 3:24, 3:24	36:9, 37:2, 37:6	legislation 3:11
37:17	32:25, 37:2	3:25	37:9, 37:25	length 5:11
important 8:16	38:5, 45:20	John 52:4	38:18, 39:14	46:17, 48:19
29:21, 29:23	49:23, 52:13	Johnson 21:9	40:11, 40:14	lessen 14:2
30:3, 30:5	53:4, 53:12	21:12	41:11, 44:19	32:21
30:17, 30:20	53:15, 54:6	June 59:16	45:1, 48:23	letting 56:16
30:23, 33:3	54:25, 55:10	justification	49:4, 49:11	Libby 1:2, 1:17

2:1, 4:23, 5:5	22:15, 24:21	making 24:13	27:12, 30:3	5:5, 6:9, 8:8
7:10, 7:19, 7:21	30:8, 43:12	24:19, 27:4	30:12, 30:23	10:10, 32:20
8:1, 8:18, 13:13	43:13, 44:4	43:22	31:5, 31:25	minimum 6:24
13:21, 30:8	57:25	management	34:7, 35:18	minus 22:7
50:1	looked 7:1	1:4, 5:9, 13:6	36:4, 36:7, 37:7	misspeak 9:1
liberate 13:24	38:20, 44:7	14:17, 18:13	38:9, 40:7	Mitchell 1:8, 2:6
light 53:9	44:9	19:2, 19:3, 19:6	44:25, 51:18	4:14, 5:3, 5:9
lightning 12:15	looking 9:18	19:7, 19:11	55:19, 57:24	7:9, 7:13, 8:20
37:24, 52:9	9:25, 15:13	19:13, 20:15	57:25	11:22, 13:5
limit 13:7, 40:20	15:17, 17:19	23:5, 24:14	meaning 5:2	17:16, 19:14
Lincoln 31:1	18:17, 27:21	36:22, 39:17	13:4, 24:2, 42:2	23:1, 23:14
45:14	29:12, 32:24	39:20, 40:12	53:20	32:21, 35:4
line 12:10, 12:10	33:15, 35:24	40:14, 42:21	means 12:5	36:16, 53:20
20:13, 55:5	35:25, 36:6	50:4, 53:22	17:2, 23:23	57:16
linear 39:16	38:1, 53:10	mandate 13:1	30:1, 52:22	mitigate 36:17
lines 9:4, 9:5	54:16	Mandy 1:11	meant 5:24, 6:2	36:18, 49:20
38:19	looks 21:16	2:15, 8:21, 8:25	10:9, 22:5	mitigating
list 44:7	38:25	14:20, 18:25	22:19, 32:13	50:19
listed 17:1	lose 10:1	19:21, 21:3	measures 43:6	mm-hmm 20:21
little 4:6, 6:11	lot 11:4, 19:5	28:5, 28:14	46:21	31:8, 37:4
7:23, 8:15, 8:21	23:6, 23:15	33:20, 35:13	meet 17:12, 39:4	40:17, 55:11
9:7, 9:17, 11:9	24:12, 26:14	37:12, 42:5	meeting 1:14	modeling 10:8
15:24, 19:24	26:21, 42:11	42:9	2:22, 6:19, 28:2	10:13, 21:8
20:14, 26:19	42:19, 43:9	manner 36:15	meets 22:11	46:22, 58:6
28:6, 36:19	48:18, 48:21	map 5:21, 8:12	memo 29:11	models 37:15
42:25, 50:14	58:3, 58:7, 58:9	18:6, 40:4	memorandum	47:11
58:19	lots 19:1, 19:2	maps 3:20, 3:20	6:13, 7:2, 28:8	modifying 13:6
location 7:8	lowboy 41:25	5:21, 8:14, 18:4	memorialize 7:3	money 24:3
19:9, 23:13	42:7, 42:13	19:17, 19:18	mentioned	26:16
locations 15:14	lower 13:11	19:19, 19:19	22:14, 35:13	Montana 1:17
19:12, 19:24	41:19	20:5, 40:19	42:9, 50:25	2:1, 46:4, 59:2
log 45:20	lynx 40:2, 40:3	Mark 45:13	Merit 59:4	59:16
logging 42:6		45:14, 49:15	message 5:16	months 30:2
52:1	\mathbf{M}	Mark's 58:14	messages 4:20	mop-up 50:20
logic 22:20		massaged 36:5	metal 26:15	motorized 14:22
long 30:10	magnitude 22:4	mastication	26:15	16:5
31:16, 37:22	main 23:3	27:17	metrics 21:15	move 5:4, 7:4
58:10	41:16	materials 13:23	47:15	51:4
Long-established	maintain 13:8	matter 11:7	migrate 13:25	moving 15:17
10:21	maintained	53:15, 57:13	migration 51:2	26:4, 27:8
1 -	22:24	59:7	mile 10:19	50:13, 51:1
long-term 6:3	• 4	maximize 16:22	mileage 15:9	multiple 37:22
long-term 6:3 13:16, 31:3	maintenance	maximize 10.22		
_	maintenance 31:3, 34:17	maximum 16:10		
13:16, 31:3		maximum 16:10 mean 5:21	mileages 15:14 miles 39:2	N
13:16, 31:3 longer 58:19	31:3, 34:17	maximum 16:10		N

name's 2:12	5:1, 29:11	occur 10:10	30:9, 32:14	18:16, 22:1
narrate 47:22	29:19, 30:1	12:6, 54:23	35:7, 36:13	24:9, 24:20
narrative 46:19	30:14, 30:22	54:23, 54:24	42:22, 42:24	34:6, 34:24
48:7, 49:6	noncritical	occurred 8:1	43:7, 53:24	35:19, 37:13
narrow 10:15	29:18, 29:22	36:2	operational	39:17, 40:6
Nate 2:9, 8:21	nonindustrial	occurring 5:19	34:17	40:18, 47:1
22:14, 23:6	9:13	43:5, 51:7, 53:4	opportunities	50:11, 52:3
24:24, 28:5	normal 14:7	57:2	54:21	participated
35:13, 37:12	36:20, 49:18	occurs 13:22	optimal 26:24	53:1
Nathan 1:10	49:18, 50:3	13:22	optimistic 32:15	participating
National 1:2	normally 3:8	office 1:15, 2:16	orally 28:4	52:17
1:15, 9:15, 10:2	44:17	59:15	order 22:3	particularly 8:1
11:25	north 20:18	officer 45:10	OU3 5:15, 5:25	23:5, 23:14
native 38:12	northeast 37:25	offset 23:20	13:16, 13:17	27:5
nature 56:12	NorthWind-C	25:16, 39:23	13:19, 14:2	party 52:25
NCP 44:3, 44:3	3:5	offsets 25:14	14:3, 14:5	57:2
necessarily	notes 59:10	Oh 25:13, 46:7	32:17, 33:24	passed 3:11
17:15, 24:7	59:12	46:10, 50:9	37:18, 38:20	pays 24:3
24:18, 36:15	notice 53:6	55:14	41:2, 42:3, 43:3	Peck 38:23
41:15, 50:17	NTCRA 6:12	okay 18:4, 25:1	45:17, 45:20	45:14, 45:14
necessary 25:8	6:17	27:24, 29:7	46:2, 49:23	46:1, 46:7
need 14:8, 19:8	nuance 19:5	31:10, 34:19	50:16, 50:21	46:10, 49:15
32:21, 33:10	19:9	43:17, 45:18	50:23, 51:3	50:9, 51:17
34:21, 35:8	number 22:6	46:1, 48:21	51:8, 51:10	58:16
49:16, 50:25	numbers 9:16	58:17	51:12, 53:20	penalty 59:14
55:20	10:4	Omaha 3:4	54:6, 54:8	people 5:17
needed 40:11	numerically	once 7:1, 22:8	OUs 34:15	15:3, 55:15
40:21	46:24	29:11, 35:14	outer 8:19, 8:20	percent 22:6
needs 35:10	NV 1:25	ones 40:19, 41:7	8:24, 10:6	22:7, 47:15
40:10		50:18	outside 1:5, 5:14	perfect 31:12
negatively 6:7	0	oOo 2:3	5:20, 5:22, 6:3	55:3
57:16		open 14:21, 15:2	6:6, 11:16, 39:3	performed
neon 9:5	objective 12:17	15:6, 16:3	42:22, 44:16	11:23, 11:25
networks 13:7	13:11, 43:15	39:16, 39:18	46:9, 52:9	50:16
never 47:24	43:18, 46:15	39:20	outweigh 26:18	performing
new 16:2, 39:18	48:2	opened 16:6	overall 4:24	35:17
39:22, 40:23	objectives 12:16	opening 15:8	7:23, 21:5	period 6:21
41:9, 41:15	12:20, 12:22	operable 1:5	22:22, 30:8	6:25, 28:4
42:3, 43:9	12:23, 12:24	4:23, 5:5, 5:14	34:6, 54:17	perjury 59:14
newer 11:2	14:8, 14:12	7:12, 7:15, 7:17	ownership 8:23	permanence
nice 54:12	17:12, 17:13	7:24, 8:2, 8:3		23:10, 44:10
Niles 1:24, 59:4	17:17, 19:13	8:8, 8:9, 8:17	P	permanent 33:5
59:24	20:2, 22:11	8:18, 13:12		person 52:1
no-action 47:2	obviously 7:18	13:14, 13:22	p.m 2:2, 58:24	perspective 12:3
non-time-critical	21:20, 26:19	13:25, 17:14	paint 47:17	32:24, 35:7
1:4, 4:15, 4:21	27:8	19:15, 20:19	part 2:21, 6:8	phase 34:17

pickup 41:22	21:9	11:23	53:5, 53:7, 53:7	puts 54:17
picture 47:17	potential 5:4	probabilities	57:5, 57:13	puzzle 54:13
53:9	5:13, 6:7, 14:3	51:6	project's 52:6	54:22
piece 20:10	17:14, 18:13	probability 51:7	projects 28:19	
49:8, 54:13	42:23, 51:5	probably 8:21	48:1	Q
pieces 11:9	54:22	9:17, 10:15	promote 34:2	
54:17, 54:22	potentially	10:24, 11:2	proper 43:5	quantify 46:14
piling 21:1	14:16, 26:5	12:8, 16:13	properties	quantitative
place 9:11	50:13	18:25, 19:8	52:20	46:18, 46:19
15:15, 33:22	practices 14:17	37:13, 38:21	property 9:14	48:10, 58:4
45:3, 53:12	precommercial	38:23, 53:8	11:11, 25:20	58:7
57:11, 59:8	33:8	53:10	proposal 43:18	quantities 58:6
places 17:18	preferred 43:11 47:23	proceeding 58:23	proposals 55:9 55:15	question 16:8
17:23, 34:3				23:18, 25:2
plan 21:5, 31:3 54:17	prescribe 35:22 37:10	proceedings 59:7	proposed 15:22 proposing 56:9	29:8, 43:15 43:18, 55:7
planned 35:23	prescribed	process 2:22	proposing 36.9 protect 48:3	56:17
planning 30:2	38:16	3:9, 6:12, 8:5	protect 40.5	questions 2:24
33:11	prescription	28:1, 30:4, 30:7	13:16	4:1, 4:10, 28:20
plans 45:19	35:23	45:2	protection	43:10, 46:13
54:19, 56:11	prescriptions	processes 52:15	12:25, 13:17	58:19
please 2:25, 4:9	33:15, 38:10	54:25	36:12	quick 30:7
pleased 42:15	prescriptive	produce 39:6	protective 43:6	quickly 30:11
plume-dominat	16:16	produced 47:8	provide 12:24	quite 19:23
49:22	present 24:1	progress 8:6	13:16, 28:4	57:6, 58:13
plus 22:6	24:6	8:9, 56:22	32:16, 34:4	
plus/minus	presentation 2:5	progresses	providing 17:13	R
24:10	4:13	16:21	56:1	
point 5:13, 6:20	presented 1:10	progressing	public 1:14	Rainy 12:9
17:9, 19:10	7:4, 24:23	52:20	6:20, 6:21, 6:25	15:21, 20:8
22:9, 22:21	presents 38:18	progression	28:2, 39:21	41:18, 41:19
23:6, 24:6, 30:6	presiding 45:10	53:2	40:20, 44:12	42:10
32:8, 32:12 32:14, 32:24	presumably 32:18	project 1:8, 2:7 2:17, 2:20, 3:19	48:17 published 3:18	ran 21:12, 47:11 range 16:18
35:3, 36:24	pretty 4:7, 7:19	4:15, 5:3, 5:9	purpose 14:8	22:8, 23:8, 24:9
36:25, 38:3	12:15, 20:23	5:18, 7:10, 7:14	22:4, 40:8	ranger 2:10
42:20, 44:18	28:15, 28:20	8:20, 11:7, 11:8	40:10	rate 48:19
48:16	28:24, 40:16	11:12, 11:22	purposes 22:25	reach 3:15
points 49:17	43:9	13:5, 16:3	26:3	reaching 20:2
Port 45:14	previously 15:5	17:16, 19:14	push 37:24	read 19:8, 57:23
portion 4:24	primarily 15:13	23:1, 23:15	pushing 28:17	realigned 41:12
9:8, 27:14	primary 49:21	27:20, 28:15	put 3:1, 11:14	41:24
possibility 49:20	prior 8:6	28:25, 32:22	17:4, 17:22	realigning 42:11
post 3:12	private 9:6, 9:8	35:4, 38:3, 39:7	24:3, 24:12	realignment
post-fire 51:1	9:12, 9:21, 11:5	39:24, 39:25	48:5, 50:7	42:3
posted 6:15	11:6, 11:21	42:4, 47:2, 52:3	55:25, 57:20	realize 54:10
post 3:12	private 9:6, 9:8 9:12, 9:21, 11:5	35:4, 38:3, 39:7 39:24, 39:25	24:3, 24:12 48:5, 50:7	realignment 42:3

19:7, 20:6 ref. 20:12, 21:4 ref. 38:3, 41:23 ref.	Ference 21:16 ining 24:22	12:16, 12:17 12:21, 12:22	responsible	50:17
20:12, 21:4 ref 38:3, 41:23 ref	0	12.21 12.22	50 05 57 0	
38:3, 41:23 ref	1. 4 04.7	12.21, 12.22	52:25, 57:2	river 7:16, 7:20
1	lect 24:7	14:8, 14:12	rest 52:19	8:2
1 44.15 51.10 23	orestation	22:16, 24:20	restrictions	RMR 1:24
11 .13, 31.10 2,	3:4, 35:17	25:11, 28:9	18:15	59:24
51:14, 51:15	5:19	30:4, 30:14	review 34:17	road 5:8, 10:21
reason 13:10 reg	garding 4:20	32:6, 32:8, 33:4	34:21, 34:25	10:21, 10:23
	9:5	33:5, 33:9	35:8, 36:1	13:7, 14:15
27:1, 34:24 reg	generation	33:10, 36:16	43:15	14:25, 15:11
	5:22	40:9, 45:8, 54:1	RFP 55:8	15:15, 16:1
reasons 10:23 Res	gion 4:21	removing 33:4	RFPs 55:25	16:4, 16:20
	gional 45:11	report 21:9	ridge 12:9	17:20, 17:22
1 '	gistered 59:4	31:19, 47:6	15:20, 20:24	17:25, 18:10
1	gulations 3:12	48:22	54:13	19:4, 19:7
	7:13, 27:13	reported 1:24	right 6:5, 6:20	19:12, 23:17
	4:3	59:6	8:10, 20:23	24:14, 31:16
	gulatory 17:3	Reporter 59:1	20:24, 21:4	34:10, 39:1
	7:9	59:4	21:9, 22:12	39:2, 39:15
recommended rei	terate 42:21	reports 48:25	25:23, 26:9	39:17, 40:5
	ated 22:13	represent 22:19	26:12, 28:10	40:19, 41:19
	3:4, 40:14	represents 4:17	29:21, 30:22	41:23, 42:10
	ates 37:9	request 55:9	31:9, 35:15	42:11, 42:12
1	ative 22:23	require 39:3	41:16, 41:20	42:23, 43:6
	3:13, 30:17	required 17:19	41:20, 42:25	road's 42:10
	atively 30:7	43:11, 43:14	47:3, 47:4	road-building
	4:6	requirement	48:12, 51:18	42:3
	ease 49:21	44:2	52:16, 57:15	roadless 37:15
recording 4:2 rele	eased 13:21	requirements	58:11, 58:14	roads 11:2
Ü	evant 17:6	17:7, 35:19	right-of-away	11:14, 14:13
1 *	3:21, 44:15	39:4	45:21	14:16, 14:22
	iability 6:2	requires 54:1	rim 15:21, 20:8	15:6, 15:8, 16:2
	naining 8:3	reside 9:8	20:20	16:3, 16:14
1	nedial 6:8	residing 11:3	ring 10:20	16:23, 17:19
	0:6, 30:18	resiliency 34:4	risk 4:22, 17:13	20:1, 20:13
1	2:10, 52:15	respirator 50:7	17:14, 38:18	21:22, 22:22
1	2:16, 52:22	respond 15:12	44:11, 45:18	22:23, 25:21
l '	4:2	42:1, 49:5	46:9, 48:3	37:2, 39:3
1	nedy 26:4	responding 52:3	48:12, 48:14	39:16, 39:16
	7:17	response 13:9	48:15, 50:10	39:17, 39:18
5:10, 18:11 ren	nember	18:20, 18:22	50:15, 50:19	39:20, 40:11
18:12, 44:1	0:12, 15:8	24:25, 27:23	50:24, 51:9	40:23, 41:1
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7:15	40:13, 40:21	51:12, 53:20	41:9, 41:11
51:7 ren	novable	responsibilities	risk-related	41:15
	2:17	5:20	12:23	robust 11:2
	noval 1:4	responsibility	risks 5:15, 13:13	rock 17:21
48:1, 51:9 4:	:16, 4:21, 5:1	39:21	13:18, 36:18	51:25

Rockwell 1:11 scales 5 2:15, 2:15, 12:2 scenario 38:15 14:21, 16:2 38:15 scheme 20:9, 20:20 scrap 2 21:10, 25:22 26:15 scroll 31:8, 32:23 scroll 4 37:4, 38:16 seasons	24:5 6:14	36:22, 52:19 53:1, 53:11 56:7, 56:9 56:20, 57:23	21:18, 22:10 23:7, 34:19 35:9, 45:6, 48:2	33:18, 34:4 34:11, 36:5 38:12, 49:4
14:21, 16:2 17:18, 19:22 20:9, 20:20 21:10, 25:22 31:8, 32:23 38:15 scheme scrap 2 26:15 scroll 4	24:5 6:14	56:7, 56:9 56:20, 57:23	35:9, 45:6, 48:2	,
17:18, 19:22 scheme 20:9, 20:20 scrap 2 21:10, 25:22 26:15 31:8, 32:23 scroll 4	6:14	56:20, 57:23		38:12, 49:4
20:9, 20:20 scrap 2 21:10, 25:22 26:15 31:8, 32:23 scroll 4	6:14	, and the second		
21:10, 25:22 26:15 31:8, 32:23 scroll 4		= 0.4	similarities 57:8	53:3
21:10, 25:22 26:15 31:8, 32:23 scroll 4		58:1	simple 48:11	source 12:23
		set 36:8, 59:15	simplicity 10:4	13:23
37:4 38:16 songong	1:5	settled 34:12	simplistic 24:10	south 7:16
37.4, 30.10 Seasons	37:23	seven 44:8	25:3	12:12
39:9, 39:12 section	34:22	shade 7:11, 7:17	sit 56:7	southeastern
39:15, 40:3 see 7:12	2, 8:13	shift 32:10	site 2:8, 3:19	37:17
40:22, 41:13 9:7, 10	:25, 12:7	short 4:14	4:24, 6:9, 6:14	southwest 20:16
41:16, 42:14 20:6, 2	1:8, 23:7	11:15, 24:4	7:8, 7:11, 7:11	23:14, 37:16
42:17, 43:1 23:9, 2	9:7	38:23	7:24, 8:12, 8:19	37:23
47:5, 58:12 33:12,	33:19	short-term 32:7	9:2, 9:20, 10:10	spacing 33:18
Rosenbush 2:18 34:6, 3		44:11	10:20, 11:18	36:1
2:18, 41:4 36:9, 3	8:13	shorthand 59:6	15:15, 18:12	speak 4:3, 8:21
rough 9:16, 10:8 41:8, 4		59:10, 59:12	28:15, 28:25	9:16, 26:25
37:3 47:16,		show 11:10	35:5, 38:12	37:13
roughly 10:1 56:21,	58:14	19:23, 19:25	50:13, 52:18	speaking 37:21
10:4 seen 37	:22	38:6, 41:4	situation 26:13	specialist 21:12
round 9:16 segment	ts 11:15	46:18, 46:23	six 30:2, 47:10	47:9
9:18, 33:6 segue 4		48:16	slant 36:19	species 33:17
routes 14:23 select 2		showing 6:11	slashing 21:1	34:3, 35:24
39:22 28:18		8:12	slide 4:19, 6:10	38:12, 39:5
rules 26:11 selected	8:22	shows 6:16, 40:4	7:22, 8:11, 29:3	specific 33:16
runs 10:14 53:17		side 7:15, 7:16	29:6	44:5, 50:15
selecting		7:20, 9:13	slides 4:10	specifically 6:1
S selection		10:24, 11:1	small 23:12	37:8
sell 45:2	22	11:19, 15:18	23:16	specifics 30:13
	cs 29:18	15:24, 20:16	Smith 2:13	speculative 26:3
43:25, 46:16 separate		21:23, 38:2	smoke 51:19	spits 47:14
49:17 39:4		38:3, 40:25	soil 13:21, 50:21	•
sale 27:15 separate	elv	54:13, 54:15	solid 38:19	13:12, 15:16
27:16 50:25	•	sides 55:5	Somebody 56:4	18:12, 21:14
salvage 26:1 Septemb	ber	signature 29:13	somewhat 16:10	23:13, 36:18
26:7, 26:10 29:13,		29:14	soon 33:9	37:18, 38:4
26:18, 27:4 Service		signed 31:13	sooner 16:19	43:20, 45:4
salvageable 2:14, 3		31:13	30:6, 30:21	46:17, 48:19
1 9		significance	38:15	49:2, 49:4
	:23, 13:2	22:2	sort 7:13, 7:14	50:18, 50:22
35:9, 41:21 17:12,		significant	8:3, 8:13, 25:25	ss 59:2
53:13, 53:14 24:12,		22:23, 23:9	27:2, 35:2, 41:8	Stakeholders
55:13, 56:14 26:11,		57:9	42:2, 51:6	16:9
says 45:18 28:7, 2		silviculture	sorts 14:9, 14:18	standard 10:24
scale 57:3, 57:4 30:11,		33:14	15:16, 18:15	standpoint
scaled 18:2 32:11,		similar 14:13	21:14, 31:17	51:17
, ,			,	

start 4:6, 5:17	gragget 20:22	take 9:25, 14:14	18:24, 21:13	time 1.9 15.2
1	suggest 29:22 suite 8:7	23:23, 25:3	22:14, 31:13	time 4:8, 15:3 18:8, 18:23
14:7, 20:4		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	
21:21, 38:15	summary 3:7	25:9, 28:14	42:2, 53:18	24:4, 29:13
52:15, 57:21	Superfund 4:24	28:23, 39:11	55:19, 56:14	29:18, 30:10
started 4:2, 6:22	7:11, 7:24, 8:5	45:2, 52:22	things 3:13	31:6, 31:14
16:20	8:19, 35:5	55:21, 58:1	8:16, 11:1	31:18, 31:23
starting 38:3	supervisor's	taken 1:15, 9:11	11:15, 14:9	32:1, 32:3, 32:7
starts 12:3	1:15, 2:16	48:1	14:18, 15:16	33:6, 33:6, 36:6
12:15, 13:7	supplement	takes 24:16	18:15, 31:16	36:10, 53:8
18:17, 31:14	5:24	31:15, 31:16	31:17, 33:18	54:20, 57:3
33:10, 40:20	support 3:15	33:24, 41:21	34:4, 34:12	57:20, 58:2
41:20	4:15, 6:18	talk 10:25, 28:5	36:4, 36:6, 38:8	times 55:25
State 59:2	supporting 2:13	talked 17:17	38:13, 38:13	title 22:1
59:16	3:20, 3:21	20:2, 36:5	43:20, 44:1	Today 6:23
statements 2:24	47:21, 58:8	38:20, 46:22	53:10, 55:4	tomorrow 24:1
14:8	suppression 5:6	talking 7:9, 10:5		tools 46:23
States 3:3	5:10	48:7, 49:17	7:25, 8:16	top 38:20
static 21:6	sure 3:17, 4:12	50:17, 54:11	11:20, 12:2	topography
stay 11:13	9:1, 9:3, 22:12	56:16	14:7, 18:8	8:23, 10:7
steel 33:5	24:13, 28:16	talks 16:18	18:24, 19:10	total 9:19, 39:16
steep 41:23	28:24, 36:10	21:21	20:4, 20:6	58:10
Stenotype 59:6	49:16, 50:9	targeting 26:20	20:16, 23:2	touch 11:18
stick 58:19	54:5	TBC 17:8	27:1, 28:19	12:17, 21:25
stop 33:14, 34:2	surround 10:2	TBCs 17:7	29:3, 33:2	26:21, 33:17
stovepipe 49:5	surrounding	team 2:16	35:12, 36:9	touched 13:3
strategic 23:13	7:12, 14:2	10:13	42:6, 47:10	27:25, 42:5
strategy 25:18	surrounds 2:7	technical 44:14	48:25, 49:16	touching 42:22
streams 13:24	7:14	58:3, 58:7	53:8, 54:19	towns 8:1
50:12, 51:2	susceptible	tell 40:6	55:4, 56:5	track 36:3
51:2	26:22	telling 5:18	56:17, 58:12	trade-offs 16:25
stressed 26:23	sustainable	temporarily	Thinking 52:4	traditional
stretching 57:19		16:6	third 6:20	27:13
strike 52:9	switchback 42:9	ten 9:10	Thirsty 58:16	traditionally
study 8:5, 52:23	system 5:8, 11:2	tending 37:15	58:17	3:14, 15:6, 26:8
52:25, 56:22	15:2, 15:7	term 4:16, 35:2	thought 45:21	trail 20:24
stuff 11:11	15:11, 15:20	terms 19:3	45:24, 55:22	20:25
subject 6:19	16:4, 18:10	23:10, 35:17	threat 50:1	trails 40:21
submitted 39:7	28:18, 40:5	37:17	three 12:8	trajectory 36:8
55:15	systems 10:21	Teske 31:1, 31:1	throwing 49:25	transcribed
substantial	10:21, 10:23	31:10, 34:15	timber 25:11	59:9
21:20, 21:21	14:15	35:9, 35:20	25:11, 25:14	transcript 1:14
subtle 57:9	15	thank 39:10	26:19, 26:20	59:11
subtleties 20:5	T	thanks 56:3	26:20, 26:21	transcription
successful 36:9	1	58:21	26:24, 27:3	59:12
sucking 49:24	table 56:8	thick 18:21	27:15, 27:16	transportation
sufficient 36:14	tactics 5:7	thing 11:20	45:17, 45:21	18:13, 19:3
Sufficient 50.14		unis 11.20	15.17, 15.21	10.13, 17.3
				

treated 16:11	46:20, 47:20	United 3:3	vegetative 5:2	we've 9:6, 12:7
39:1	48:15, 54:20	units 7:24	13:5, 13:6	12:14, 17:1
treatment 11:10	58:8	universe 17:15	40:12	18:4, 18:5
19:6, 19:20	two-track 15:1	unlimited 35:1	vehicle 49:21	20:25, 31:20
20:20	type 50:3	unrestricted	vermiculite 2:8	34:20, 38:10
treatments	types 19:20	35:1	4:23, 5:5	39:7, 49:23
15:12, 15:22	typewriting	uplift 49:24	vernacular 14:7	52:18, 57:20
16:16, 18:10	59:10	upper 20:10	57:24	Web 6:14
20:1, 20:23	typewritten	urban 50:3	versus 45:3	WEDNESDAY
33:16, 37:11	59:11	USDA 1:1	Village 51:18	1:18, 2:1
52:8	typical 23:22	use 14:21, 16:5	Vincent 33:1	weeds 16:17
tree 35:25	26:13, 35:5	23:22, 26:8	33:1, 37:1, 37:5	weekly 56:20
trees 18:20	typically 26:24	30:20, 32:11	38:25, 49:13	weight 44:18
25:20, 33:14	30:5, 30:19	35:1, 39:22	violate 6:7	went 10:18
33:17, 33:18	32:9, 32:11	49:12	violation 16:25	34:16
34:2, 34:3	33:19, 38:6	usually 3:9, 9:17		west 7:20, 39:12
treetop 49:23	41:9, 43:16	33:4, 40:15	\mathbf{W}	westerly 15:18
tried 56:11		44:25, 48:23		western 37:16
Troy 2:18, 8:2	${f U}$	48:23	W.R 6:1, 8:10	WHEREOF
57:24		utilize 12:5	14:5, 32:14	59:14
truck 42:6	ultimately 13:10	utilizing 15:5	32:19, 43:3	white 41:8, 41:8
true 53:10	36:11, 56:23	UUEE 35:3	46:3, 51:3	wider 24:9
55:13, 55:14	unacceptable	35:5	51:11, 52:7	wilderness 9:5
59:11	14:3, 50:23		55:8, 56:7	9:24, 10:1
trust 24:3	51:12	${f V}$	56:10, 56:18	16:15, 38:7
try 10:15, 12:5	understand		56:21	wildfires 5:4
45:22, 48:4	25:6, 30:16	vague 44:24	WA 1:25	wildland 5:15
trying 13:4	48:17, 48:21	valley 50:19	waive 17:11	13:12, 13:19
20:12, 33:2	52:22, 56:15	valuation 27:17	wall 18:4	13:20, 50:3
37:10, 38:8	understanding	value 24:2, 24:6	walls 8:14	50:20
45:17, 49:19	20:17, 48:19	25:11, 25:12	want 9:2, 11:18	winds 49:24
50:11, 57:4	unique 50:3	26:1, 26:18	12:16, 14:6	wish 48:11
Tubb 9:13	unit 1:5, 4:23	27:3, 27:4	18:1, 21:25	WITNESS
10:24, 15:13	5:5, 5:14, 7:12	27:15	28:17, 34:1	59:14
15:15, 15:18	7:15, 7:18, 8:2	variables 32:5	34:2, 34:3, 48:3	wolverine 40:2
20:7, 21:23	8:4, 8:8, 8:9	various 40:12	48:3	wondered 46:1
38:1, 41:17	8:18, 8:18	vary 22:8, 27:5	wanted 20:1	wondering
41:19, 42:24	13:13, 13:14	46:21	wash 26:18	45:19, 55:16
turn 41:22	13:22, 13:25	vegetation	waste 45:3	woods 52:1
turnaround	17:14, 19:15	14:13, 16:16	way 7:17, 17:4	word 26:10
41:21	20:19, 24:13	18:10, 19:2	26:7, 38:22	words 29:22
two 12:12, 14:11	24:17, 30:9	19:6, 19:11	39:1, 46:19	57:15
21:7, 21:17	32:14, 35:7	20:15, 21:5	48:7, 48:9	work 2:15, 3:3
23:7, 27:12	36:13, 42:22	24:14, 34:21	waylaid 36:3	5:14, 7:5, 13:15
32:10, 40:15	42:24, 43:7	35:16, 40:14	ways 27:19	14:16, 23:5
43:16, 45:6	53:24	42:21, 53:22	28:13	23:11, 23:22
I				

				rage / i
24:13, 24:16	36:21, 36:24	10,000 2:7, 10:2	3	
27:9, 28:21	37:19, 39:25	10,000-acre		
30:6, 32:1	40:3, 41:7	52:18	3 1:5, 4:23, 5:5	
32:17, 32:19	42:14, 43:1	15 18:1, 31:5	5:14, 7:12, 7:15	
32:21, 35:11	46:10, 46:12	31:7, 31:11	7:18, 8:2, 8:8	
39:23, 42:12	50:14, 51:20	31:18, 31:19	8:9, 8:18, 13:13	
42:18, 42:19	52:5, 53:5, 55:3	31:20, 31:23	13:14, 13:22	
43:2, 43:7	57:2, 58:12	32:18, 33:19	13:25, 17:14	
44:13, 44:14	year 12:7, 31:19	34:7, 34:9	19:15, 20:19	
44:16, 45:6	31:19, 31:20	34:12	30:9, 32:14	
53:21, 54:6	38:14	15,000 9:25	35:7, 36:13	
54:9, 54:15	yearly 36:2	49:25	42:22, 42:24	
55:15	years 9:10, 15:4	15-year 31:14	43:7, 49:11	
work's 8:6	31:5, 31:7	36:6	53:24	
11:22, 35:14	31:12, 31:18	17th 59:16	30 6:24, 22:7	
workers 43:6	31:21, 31:23	1970 3:10	29:9, 31:5	
44:11	31:25, 32:4	1986 12:6	30-day 28:3	
working 2:16	32:18, 33:20	1st 31:14	31374 1:16	
3:5, 6:1, 8:10	34:7, 34:9			
10:23, 14:5	34:12, 52:10	2	4	
19:10, 29:10	yellow 8:17	_	-	
36:14, 46:9	12:10, 12:12	2 1:14, 1:16	4 49:11	
51:3, 52:21	49:1	15:10, 16:10		
52:24, 53:14	Yep 6:15, 7:7	16:12, 18:7	5	
55:8	14:24	20:17, 21:19		
works 49:14		21:24, 22:20	5 10:1, 17:25	
55:1, 56:20	Z	23:5, 23:11	5,000 33:23	
world 31:12		28:10, 28:12	52:19	
55:3	zone 5:19, 5:22	38:25, 39:19	5:33 2:2	
worlds 27:12	5:25, 12:6	41:10, 43:11	50 22:6, 31:5	
worth 24:1	12:11, 13:16	46:25, 47:13	31:25, 32:4	
writing 28:5	15:17, 15:25	47:23, 48:15	50/-30 24:10	
	16:21, 18:13	49:11		
Y	38:6, 44:16	20 15:4, 31:5	6	
	50:7, 53:4	20,000 9:19		
y'all 41:17	53:13, 54:25	2008 10:15	6:49 58:24	
yards 12:11	55:10, 57:1	2016 10:10		
yeah 3:7, 8:25	57:18	2021 12:6	7	
12:19, 16:7		2024 1:18, 2:1		
17:3, 19:17	1	31:14, 59:16	782 1:25	
20:22, 21:18		25 15:4		
22:3, 27:11	1 18:5, 21:19	2794 1:25	8	
29:20, 30:24	40:22, 46:25	29 1:18, 2:1		
30:25, 33:13	47:12, 47:23	2-mile 10:19	8 4:21	
33:19, 34:13	48:14, 49:11	10:20		
35:12, 36:7	10 48:12, 49:25			
]			