

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region VII
POLLUTION REPORT

Date: Friday, April 17, 2009

From: Janice Kroone

To: Dave Williams, US EPA

Subject: Central Mining District Camden County Lead Site
Camden County, MO
Latitude: 38.0094000
Longitude: -92.7569000

POLREP No.:	26	Site #:	A7L9
Reporting Period:	April 3 - 17, 2009	D.O. #:	
Start Date:	9/22/2008	Response Authority:	CERCLA
Mob Date:	9/22/2008	Response Type:	Time-Critical
Demob Date:		NPL Status:	Non NPL
Completion Date:		Incident Category:	Removal Action
CERCLIS ID #:	MON000705679	Contract #	
RCRIS ID #:			

Site Description

Contamination from mining activities potentially impact 37,050 residents of Camden County.

The Camden County Mining area was mined from 1830 to 1910, with lead as the principal product. After 1910, most of the mining had been for barite, with galena (lead) as a minor byproduct. Lead production in the Central Mining District up until 1947 had totaled 24,855 short tons. Since 1950, no lead and very little barite have been mined. Mining operations and associated lands in the CMD area have been owned, operated, and managed by various entities and/or private citizens (USGS and Missouri Division of Geological Survey and Water Resources 1967). Hazardous substances typically associated with historic mining sites in Missouri include arsenic, barium, lead, and cadmium. The mining waste products often end up on driveways, in yards, and in children's play areas.

The CMD-Camden County covers approximately 655 square miles in central Missouri. The climate of the area is characterized by cool winters and hot summers. The average total annual precipitation is about 38 to 42 inches. Camden County site soils range widely in texture, natural drainage, depth to bedrock, and other characteristics. The predominant soil types are deep to moderately deep, sloping to very steep, very cherty silt that forms on uplands.

Several properties in the CMD - Camden County area were found to exceed the removal action level for lead. Sampling is continuing in this area.

Site assessment activities were conducted July - November 2006. Properties were sampled based on the Geological Survey and Resource Assessment Division's (GSRAD) Inventory of Mines, Operations, and Prospects database which located more than 900 mining locations in the five county Central Mining District area. The locations were then mapped out and door to door sampling began. A total of 646 properties were sampled in the Central Mining District area. Thirty one properties were found to have lead greater than EPA's MCL of 15 ug/l, one property was found to have cadmium exceeding 5 ug/l and eight properties were found to exceed the arsenic MCL of 10 ug/l. A Regional Decision Team (RDT) meeting was held on 27 February 2007 where the proposed future actions of a second phase of sampling would be conducted. The purpose of this second phase was to sample residents that responded after November 13, 2006 when site assessment activities ended and also expand sampling into the other mining areas where limited sampling was conducted. At this meeting it was also agreed that site assessment would investigate the potential for naturally occurring contamination vs mining contamination. Also ENSVs toxicologist was tasked with completing a site specific streamlined risk assessment. The naturally occurring contamination project and associated sampling event and receipt of data was completed in October 2007. This sampling event included sampling all properties that were found to exceed the MCL of 15 ug/l for lead, 5 ug/l for cadmium and 10 ug/l for arsenic. At that time both wellhead and tap samples were taken. This information was provided to the removal program. In June 2007, draft action memos were

developed for the Central Mining District to address alternate drinking water sources, soil contamination and continued drinking water sampling. On September 21, 2007, EPA's toxicologist completed a site-specific removal action levels for lead in the Central Mining District memorandum. This memo set the Removal Action Level (RAL) for lead in drinking water at 30 ug/l. This memo is an attachment to the signed action memo.

The action memo for Camden County was signed on September 22, 2008. The response action includes continued sampling of drinking water sources, excavating contaminated soils in yards, and providing alternative drinking water sources to properties which exceed the RAL for this site.

Current Activities

No onsite activities were conducted during this reporting period.

This period was spent in reviewing data, sending out data letters to residents and calling residents to resample wells and drinking water taps.

Over two thousand residents have responded and EPA is contacting those requesting additional information.

Planned Removal Actions

Continue to conduct soil and water sampling activities in Camden County and respond to resident inquiries.

Resample at the tap and the wellhead, those properties found to be above 15 ug/l for lead, 10 ug/l for arsenic and/or 5 ug/l for cadmium.

Schedule installation of four filters at properties which were at or exceeded 30 ug/l of lead at the tap.

Next Steps

Continue to conduct soil and water sampling in Camden County.

Send data to residents. Contact those properties that were sampled at the wellhead that found heavy metals above the following limits: above 15 ug/l for lead, 10 ug/l for arsenic, and/or 5 ug/l for cadmium in drinking water to schedule resampling at the tap.

Key Issues

None

Estimated Costs *

	Budgeted	Total To Date	Remaining	% Remaining
Extramural Costs				
ERRS - Cleanup Contractor	\$75,000.00	\$42,000.00	\$33,000.00	44.00%
RST/START	\$248,900.00	\$148,000.00	\$100,900.00	40.54%
Intramural Costs				
USEPA - Direct (Region, HQ)	\$60,000.00	\$9,200.00	\$50,800.00	84.67%
USEPA - InDirect	\$157,333.00	\$8,800.00	\$148,533.00	94.41%
Total Site Costs	\$541,233.00	\$208,000.00	\$333,233.00	61.57%

* The above accounting of expenditures is an estimate based on figures known to the OSC at the time this report was written. The OSC does not necessarily receive specific figures on final payments made to any contractor(s). Other financial data which the OSC must rely upon may not be entirely up-to-date. The cost accounting provided in this report does not necessarily represent an exact monetary figure which the government may include in any claim for cost recovery.

