

Hnat, John J

From: Rabin, Alan [arabin@commerce.state.wi.us]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2004 10:22 AM
To: Hnat, John J
Subject: FW: New Brownfield Application

Bishop's Creek CDC questions

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott, Jason - COMM
Sent: Tuesday, December 07, 2004 2:26 PM
To: Rabin, Alan
Subject: FW: New Brownfield Application

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Mueller, Stephen D. - COMM
Sent: Tuesday, December 07, 2004 2:16 PM
To: Scott, Jason - COMM
Subject: RE: New Brownfield Application

Jason:

You are right, this one was a bit challenging to evaluate, especially as I am use to micro-managing scopes of work (SOWs) and costs, and took a lot longer and was more technically detailed than was probably necessary. Here goes.

General issues:

- The requested dollar amounts are gross estimates that are not supported by detailed plans/cost breakdowns for spending the funds.
- Of the requested \$750,000.00, \$450,000.00 is for environmental remediation (non-PECFA eligible) and I have little clue as to what, how much, and how they propose to remediate. The two Phase II ESA reports (by HNTB and Drake) document contamination encountered, but do not present degree and extent and a SOW(s) to address/remediate the issues. There are no detailed cost estimates, let alone "competitive bids."
- The remaining \$300,000 is for "demolition." Does this include asbestos and lead abatement and mercury switch, fluorescent tube, transformer, remaining drums, etc., removal and disposal? Or, are those part of the proposed remedial budget?
- Environmental issues associated with underground utility corridors have not been evaluated or reported. For example, John Hnat, the WDNR project manager responsible for this site, told me about a fuel oil impacted 24-inch sewer lateral that MMSD had to deal with during the Lincoln Creek flood control construction project. Apparently, the lateral is stubbed and a sump was constructed for collection and removal/disposal of contaminated fluids. It was not mentioned in the BF Grant application, other than as referenced in WDNR Secretary Scott Hassett's Nov. 11, 2004 federal BF grant application support letter.
- As you indicated, possible environmental issues due to the recent fires have not been evaluated.

Specific (but not necessarily all) issues:

- Soil arsenic (As) levels exceed NR 720 generic RCLs across the entire site. To minimize remedial costs, an evaluation of As concentrations relative to natural background soil concentrations is necessary, as naturally occurring As in soil is often above the NR 720 generic RCLs and does not necessitate remediation.
- The Drake Phase II ESA report stated that chromium (Cr) was above the NR 720 RCL of 14 mg/kg in 10 of 13 soil borings. This RCL is for hexavalent Cr [i.e., Cr(VI)]. The RCL for trivalent Cr [i.e., Cr(III)], the common form, is 16,000 mg/kg. Based on the Cr(III) and Cr(VI) results in the HNTB report, neither form were detected above the respective RCLs, including Cr(VI) at SB12 where Cr(III) was 1,700 mg/kg.
- Although Cr was not encountered in soil at concentrations above NR 720 RCLs, the concentration in groundwater at HNTB monitoring well MW01 (boring SB12) indicates that higher concentrations of Cr (above 1000 mg/kg??) may pose a limited groundwater issue. Conversely, there appears to be a possible groundwater issue due to Cr, barium, and cadmium at HNTB well MW02, without an identified soil metals issue at that location. *NOTE: the groundwater results table (Table 2) is missing from the HNTB Phase II ESA report, which makes it more cumbersome reviewing the results.*
- The Jatkar Remedial Investigation Report in App. VI of the HNTB Phase I ESA report documented elevated

- Cr, As, and/or Pb concentrations at several "bore" locations, at least one of which (Bore No. 5) was located near a former tanning vat area. However, the location of the boring (as well as Bores No. 6-15) are unknown.
- Other RCRA metals in soil, esp. mercury, should be evaluated relative to EPA screening levels for groundwater pathway and direct-contact.
 - There appears to be a possible groundwater issue due to Cr, lead (Pb), and selenium at Drake temporary well TW-4, without an identified soils/metals source in that area. However, the temp well sample was a "grab" sample; "grab" groundwater samples tend to be much more turbid than groundwater samples collected from NR 141 constructed wells. Furthermore, I cannot verify (via report text or lab chain-of-custody form) that the TW-4 "grab" sample was field filtered or not. If it was not, then the metals results would be skewed high.
 - Based on the soil/groundwater data collected near previously fire-damaged Bldg.. 9, 9A, and 12, it appears possible that the recent fires in other site buildings may not have had a substantial environmental impact. However, that has yet to be determined.
 - Based on the volatile organic compounds (VOCs) data for soil and groundwater samples collected near Bldg. 16 and 17, it appears that any petroleum contamination due to above- and underground storage tanks in the buildings may be minor, i.e., far less costly than the \$380,000 PECFA maximum proposed in the application.

In conclusion, I suggest that the applicant needs to fully evaluate all data collected to date, collect additional data where possible environmental issues have not been evaluated or have changed (e.g., due to fires), and develop a defined scope of work and costs to remediate the site to the level that the site environmental activities can be closed by the WDNR. Of course, this requires money, which the applicant is trying to obtain via a BF Grant before incurring the costs. Therefore, I am not sure how/if Commerce would approve a grant based on very gross estimates. Can the grant be approved in whole, but distributed only as needed?

Good luck. Please let me know what else you need for this review.

Steve

Stephen D. Mueller
Senior Hydrogeologist
Site Review Section, Bureau of PECFA
Wisconsin Department of Commerce
(414) 220-5404
smueller@commerce.state.wi.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott, Jason - COMM
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2004 10:09 AM
To: Skinner, Jennifer; Mueller, Stephen D. - COMM
Cc: Rabin, Alan
Subject: RE: New Brownfield Application

Sorry to hear you're not feeling well. Thanks for trying.

Steve, this project might be a little difficult in that the environmental info was based on assessments performed in the Spring 2004. They have since had a significant fire which the DNR is concerned may have caused immediate health and safety issues. I don't believe there's much info currently as to how the fire may have changed the environmental condition of the property yet, although I recently found out that the property owners will be meeting with the DNR in a couple of weeks to discuss this further. I'm sure we'll want to know the results of that meeting.

Jason Scott
Brownfields Grant Program
608-261-7714

-----Original Message-----

From: Skinner, Jennifer
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2004 9:53 AM
To: Scott, Jason - COMM
Cc: Mueller, Stephen D. - COMM
Subject: RE: New Brownfield Application

Jason,

I'm feeling really crummy again and Steve has graciously agreed to take this Brownfield case. Thanks.