UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 5

230 SOUTH DEARBORN STREET

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604

WAUSAU WELLFIRLD SUPERFUND SITE,
PUBLIC MEETING
WAUSAU CITY HALL
407 GRANT STREET
WAUSAU, WISCONSIN
OCTOBER 17, 1988
7:00 p.m.

APPEARANCES:

Georgette Nelms, U.S. EPA, Moderator

Michelle DeBrock-Owens, WDNR, Project Manager

Ken Quinn, Hydrogeologist, Warzyn Engineering

Christine Diebels, WDNR

Margaret Guerriero U.S. EPA, Project Manager

Kevin Adler

Felipe Gomez, U.S. EPA Attorney

NINA BOSTWICK, RPR, CM
609 Scott Street
Wausau, WI 54401
(715) 842-2118

Georgette Nelms: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Georgette Nelms and I'm the Community Relations Coordinator for the United States Environmental Protection Agency out of Region Five in Chicago and I will be your moderator for this evening. I would like to thank each and every one of you for coming out to participate in this public hearing this evening and I would like to acknowledge and thank Mayor John Robinson and the members of the council for allowing us to give them a briefing of this meeting earlier today. I would also like to acknowledge the other local dignitaries who are in our audience today. There is a representative here from Congressman, where is the gentleman?

Dave GErhardt: Right here.

Georgette Nelms: Yes. Could you tell me your name again? I'm sorry, I didn't get it?

A. My name is Don Gerhardt, I'm from Congressman Dave Obey's office.

Georgette Nelms: Okay. We had a meeting in Wausau last year at the beginning, a RI/FS investigation into the nature and the

extent of contamination at the site. The RI is finished and we are into the feasibility study at this point. The purpose for this public hearing is to solicit from you, the community and the public, public comment on a phased plan of action to be undertaken during the feasibility study. I would like to take this time to introduce members of our panel to you at this time. I have Michelle DeBrock from Wisconsin Department of, I'm sorry, Michelle DeBrock-Owen, from Wisconsin's Department of Natural Resources, she is sitting to my left. I have Ken Quinn, and he is with Warzyn Engineering, Incorporated. Where is Ken? And Ken is to my right. Margaret Guerriero is sitting right behind me. She is from the USEPA. And you will be hearing from each of them later on in the program. Also we have with us as members of our team, Christine Diebels.

Christine Diebels: Diebels (Deebels).

Georgette Nelms: Diebels, from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, we have Dennis Iverson and he's with Warzyn Engineering Company, and we have Felipe Gomez, who is from the Office of Regional Counsel,

USEPA, Kevin Adler, he's the project manager and he's with USEPA. And although they will not be making presentations to you, they will be available to you during the question and answer period. I also would like to advise you that this meeting is being recorded twice. We have a court reporter, Nina Bostwick. She will be recording this meeting and we also have a member of the Mayor's staff who is also recording the minutes, this meeting.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the format of the meeting, and I think it's important, I think I passed out some agendas and if you don't have a copy of one, let me just briefly talk a little bit about how the meeting is set up. And in terms of expediency, we would like to try to follow as closely as possible to the setting up of this agenda. We will have three presentations. And after all three presenters have made their presentation, we will at that point entertain questions. So again, we will have three presentations after which the panel and other members of our team will entertain questions from you.

At the conclusion of the question and

answer period, we will open the, open the hearing up for public, for public comment. Okay. I'll talk a little bit more about public comment period and the question answer period as we move along. Just to do a brief review of the Superfund circular law, I brought with me a Superfund chart that talks about the process that we go through in terms of Superfund projects. The Superfund law as you all know was passed in 1980. It was funded at one point six (1.6) billion dollars. The Superfund Reauthorization Act, which is commonly called SRA was passed in 1986 and funded at eight point five (8.5) billion dollars. These acts were passed and reauthorized for the express purpose to establish a program to identify sites from which releases of human substances into the environment might occur or might have occurred. So that's the reason why these acts were enacted by Congress. A release is that what affect human health and the environment, and/or the environment. Okay. Let's look a little bit at the chart, because this chart is going to tell us where we are in this particular case at the Wausau well field. The site was identified and

that is the first step that we take, an identification of the site. Usually it's identified by the State, in this case it was identified by the State, Wisconsin state. There is an assessment made of the site and if warranted, and in this case it was warranted, the site is then placed on the NPL list, the National Priorities List. After it is placed on the National Priorities List, a Remedial Investigation and feasibility study is undertaken. In this particular case, the feasibility, the Remedial Investigation has been completed at this point and we are in process, in the progress of completing a feasibility study. Okay. And after, after going through steps one, two, three and four, we move into step five and we're not there yet in this process.

The purpose of this meeting though is to talk about what needs to be done before we can conclude the feasibility study. And that is the phase action plan at this point. What I want to do now is to introduce to you our first speaker and we'll move on with our three presentations. The first speaker is Michelle

DeBrock-Owen, and she, what she is going to do is give you history of this site and the State's involvement. I'd like to add that Michelle has been with this site since it became a site, so she'll give us some background on the site at this time.

Michelle DeBrock-Owens: I won't take up a lot of time. I just have a little bit of a brief history here. Volatile organic compounds or VOC's were first discovered in city well number four in 1975. The concentrations were not considered a health risk at that time. Higher levels of VOC's were then found in 1982. Analysis show that city wells three, four and six were contaminated. First the city blended the water to dilute the contaminant concentration and to meet the city's water demand. The city then with the aid from the DNR tried to mitigate the problem and to locate the source. These attempts were unsuccessful. In 1983 the city of Wausau was awarded a federal grant by EPA to design and install an air stripper to provide sufficient water and acceptable quality to the city's residents. In May, 1984, the USEPA installed a granular

activated carbon, or GAC unit, as a treatment system on city well six as an interim measure. This system was then removed in 1984 because in the summer and the fall of 1984 two air strippers were installed, one from the grant, one paid for by the grant, the federal grant that was awarded in 1983, and the second one was bought by the city of Wausau. The Wausau city well field was then placed on Superfund's National Priority List. This site is an EPA funded site. EPA and its contractor, Warzyn Engineering, began work on this site in the fall of 1987. That's a little bit about the brief history of the contamination in the city of Wausau.

The State's involvement with the Superfund process is determined by what is called the cooperative agreement that the State has with the United States Environmental Protection Agency. This cooperative agreement lists tasks that the State performs, the State performs these tasks, Superfund then operates in the State of Wisconsin. A couple of these tasks are oversight of all field investigations, reading and commenting on all reports that are

produced from these investigations, and then aiding in community relation activities, such as tonight. And that's all I have, Georgette. Thank you.

Georgette Nelms: Thanks, Michelle. Next we're going to hear from Ken Quinn. Ken is a member of the Warzyn Engineering, Incorporated, and is the actual person who is performing the study at the site. What Ken is going to do at this point is to talk about the findings from the Remedial Investigation. Are you there, Ken?

Ken Quinn: I'm going to go through real briefly the results of the Remedial Investigation that we've completed so far. Just to orient everyone here, can everyone see that? The site consists of the two city wells on the east side of the river, city well three and city well four, and city well six, which is located on the west side of the river. These three wells were found to be contaminated with trychlorethylene, or perchlorethylene generically referred to as volatile organic compounds or VOC's. There was a number of studies done before the USEPA initiated their

remedial investigation. The city started investigating the problem shortly after it was identified. The State of Wisconsin had a contractor do some investigating trying to find the source of contaminants. One, or two of the industries in the area did some investigations on their own facilities. USEPA started with a real preliminary investigation and so when we started our investigation last fall, we had quite a bit of information to start with.

Our objectives in conducting the Remedial Investigation were to identify the probable sources of contamination identified at these three wells and to collect enough information to determine the chracteristics of those sources, and the extent of contamination within the aquifer. We started our investigation by talking to a number of the industries within the general vicinity of the contaminated wells trying to identify what the possible sources of contamination were. We carried that investigation into doing a screening of individual sites, trying to determine whether there were sources of contamination in the general vicinity of the

wells and based on that investigation, we then started drilling wells and sampling water quality and soils to identify or to collect samples to actually determine whether VOC's were present on an individual site or in the ground water at that location. Through our investigation we and previous investigators determined the source of the ground water to the municipal wells came from a sand and gravel deposit within the Wisconsin River valley so we had a better ac, it was not an aquifer, it was the pre-cambrian digging with the metamorphic rocks and within this area here, you had a sand and gravel deposit and the municipal wells, for instance the city well three right here, was drawing water from the sand and gravel deposits, the ground water flows from the highlands in the, around the Wisconsin River, and from the Wisconsin River itself towards the wells that are pumping within the sand and gravel.

And to jump right to the main conclusions of the Remedial Investigation, we identified essentially four different source areas of, probable source areas of contaminants in the area. There were two sources of VOC's to

the soils and ground water located in the vicinity of Wausau Chemical on the east side of the river. They correlated with known spills that were reported to DNR on that facility. There was a probable source of contamination in the vicinity of an old city land fill located on the west side of the river and there was also some contamination attributed to an area where one of the city wells had been discharging, being pumped to waste and that water that was being pumped to waste went into a tributary to the Wisconsin River. That well was being pumped to waste to protect the municipal wells that are located to the north of that well, city well six. So that city well six was pumping and protecting city well seven and city well nine.

As you can see from these contour maps, the source on the east side of the river, two sources on the east side of the river, probably affected city well four, which is located right here and city well three which is located here. The source from Bos Creek was relatively shallow source of contamination and the contamination stayed fairly shallow in the aquifer and probably moved to city well six

located here. This probable cause area right here was sitting right on the divide between moving to city well six and moving to city well three, so that the contaminant plume went both to the north toward city well six and under the river to city well three. And in cross section through the north leg of this plume, we're looking in cross section through that area, the contaminant plume which originated in the vicinity of an old landfill moved down through the aquifer, then moved horizontally and ended up in the city well six. The shallower plume here is associated with the recharge that came in from Bos Creek, moved through the upper part of the aquifer, and appears to have moved into city well six also. So it was kind of recirculating. Pumping city well six to waste going into Bos Creek, the tributary to the Wisconsin River, created a divide between flow to the Wisconsin River and flow to city well six, and what appears to have happened is that the plume is actually separated because of recharge coming in in the middle of the plume, and that can be seen in this plan view also where there's higher concentrations both north

of Bos Creek entering into city well six and south of Bos Creek back towards the, the original source area. So at this point city well six was then going to be used, transferred across the river to the water treatment plant where it was going to be treated and this discharge into Bos Creek was going to discontinued discontinue so at that point was when it was decided to pursue a, an interim remedial action to take advantage of the fact that the plume had been broken and there was some cleaning up occurring and one of the objectives of this remedial action was to keep the contamination that was back at the source back in this area, and to prevent it from moving north to city well six. So with that, we'll just go onto Margaret's portion of the presentation.

Georgette Nelms: I'd like to introduce Margaret Guerriero. I can never get it, pronounce the name correctly and that's okay. But I want to say a little bit about Margaret. Margaret is with the USEPA, she is what we call the project manager and it's been her task to make sure that this project goes

according to the regulations as established by federal guidelines. And let me give you Margaret now.

Margaret Guerriero: Okay. First of all before I start, I want to refer all of you to the fact sheet that was located on the chairs when you came in. In that fact sheet, it goes through some of our objectives for this interim remedial action that we're taking or we're proposing here, and also discusses in de--, a little more detail what the alternatives that we looked at, the criteria that we looked at, and also what our preferred remedy is. As Georgette pointed out, this is an interim remedy that we're proposing, meaning that our final remedy for the entire site is not being addressed right now. We are addressing the plume that, let's see if I can.

Person in crowd: Could you speak into the microphone, please.

Margaret Guerriero: Sure, I'm sorry. What we are addressing in this interim response action is this plume on the west side of the river moving towards city well six, and as Ken pointed out, the reason this opportunity has

arisen to address this plume while we are still ongoing with our study, before we have determined what a final remedy will be is that conditions have changed such that well six is now, instead of being pumped away, it is now being pumped to one of the air strippers for treatment prior to distribution to the city supply. And Joe, is it on line at this point?

Joe: Yes, it is.

Margaret Guerriero: What our objectives for this interim response are are to provide protection to that city well six now that it's being used as a supply well and also now that it is no longer discharging to waste and creating a divide between contamination and higher concentration of contamination in the plume. I want to point out before I go into it the alternatives that we looked at are, that EPA is required by law to develop and evaluate alternatives when we are proposing to do a response action at a Superfund, a remedial response action at the Superfund site.

The alternatives that we looked at, and these are also laid out in the fact sheet are these. The first alternative, no action is

essentially what it says. We would not take any action at this point at the site. This alternative as required by law, it's required by law that we evaluate this alternative and it gives us a basis for determining whether or not an action is necessary at the site at this time. Alternative number two is the placement of an extraction well north of Bos Creek, between the city well six and Bos Creek. I'll get the slide to show the location of that. Okay. That would be this location here. This is Bos Creek, city well six is located right here. So the alternative number two proposes an extraction well there, and this extraction well entails installation of a high capacity well to extract ground water, treatment of the ground water, removal of volatile organic compounds, VOC's and then discharge of that treated water to the Wisconsin River. Okay. This, this alternative would remove contaminants from the middle of the plume before reaching alternative, or before reaching city well six. And this alternative is estimated to cost about $432,000 for the initial construction cost and then the first year of operation and maintenance is

estimated at about $105,000 with cost of about $80,000 in subsequent years for operation and maintenance. Okay. Alternative number three is an extraction well located south of Bos Creek and it's essentially the same action, entails the same action, which is extraction of ground water treatment and discharge to the Wisconsin River. The location of that well is here and it's located east of the easternmost building on the Marathon Electric property. Okay. That, this extraction well is expected to extract contaminants from the beginning or the southernmost part of the plume as it, as the contaminants are released to the ground water from the source area. Okay. It also will cost about $422,000 with similar operation and maintenance cost as alternative number two. Okay. Alternative number four is essentially a combination of alternatives two and three. And that would be the installation of two wells, one north and one south of Bos Creek, one located in the center of the plume and one located at the beginning of the plume and they would extract, treat and discharge the ground water. Okay. What I failed to point out about the southern

extraction well is that it would also serve to control migration of this contaminants across the Wisconsin River which is what, it would serve to control the migration of these contaminants under the Wisconsin River. Okay.

Now the, the way that we evaluate what the best alternative at the site is is we use nine criteria that are laid out in the fact sheet that you have. And these criteria help us to determine what the best alternative, based on those factors are and if you are interested in the detail on how we evaluated each alternative based on these nine criteria, I would direct you to the feasibility study, which is available in the public repositories, which the addresses and locations are also in your fact sheet. Okay. Based on the nine criteria that we use to evaluate the alternatives, EPA's preferred alternative for our proposed plan is alternative number three, the southern extraction well with a provision to implement alternative number four if it becomes necessary. Alternative number three includes extraction of the water, treatment to remove volatile organics, discharge to the Wisconsin River. And the cost as they're

laid out.

Now the reasons that we feel that alternative three is the best alternative for this interim action is because alternative three provides the best protection against future migration from this source area north to city well six. It's also expected based on the zone of influence that it will create from pumping and changing the ground water levels that it will create to pull back some of the contaminants that have already moved into the plume from the source area. In addition, as I mentioned, it would control migration of contaminants under the river. Now as I mentioned, we are recommending this alternative with the provision to implement a second extraction well should EPA and the State of Wisconsin determine that this one extraction well is not meeting our objectives, and that is mainly whether or not alternative three addresses the plume far enough north of Bos Creek. The way that we will determine its effectiveness is through monitoring of existing monitoring wells and water quality and we will basically determine how far the influence of

this extraction well extends and based on that, we'll determine whether or not it is controlling in the lower part of the plume. Okay.

I also want to mention real quickly what our schedule for the final remedy at the site is. We are in the process of preparing the Remedial Investigation report. That will encompass phase one of the RI that Ken went over the results with you, and also phase two of the RI, which we performed this summer. And following that report, we will put together a feasibility study for the site, and we are, that is expected to be out approximately the spring of 1989. Okay. Hand you back over to Georgette.

Georgette Nelms: Before we begin our question and answer period, I just want to stress one point to each of you, and that is that we would very much appreciate your asking questions about what's being proposed here. We realize that this information is technical, and so that if there's any part of the information that you don't quite understand or you need clarification on, please feel free to just ask and we'll try to get the information to you now,

right now, with the experts we have here now. I'd like to see you challenge them. So if there's any problem here, or anything that you really don't understand, please, let's come on with the questions, I'm very sincere and clear on that.

The other thing is that before asking a question, please understand that the meeting is being recorded and that we would very much appreciate it if you would give, if you would give us your name, your affiliation, if you like, but speak clearly so that it can be recorded by both our recorders. And also, this is very important, during the question and answer period and following this period, when we go into our comment period, we will be entertaining questions and answers regarding this particular site, Wausau well fill site. We will not be entertaining any questions regarding any other Superfund sites at this time. On that note, I'll open the meeting to questions and answers. Questions please.

Gene Lewis: Georgette, if I may please.

Georgette Nelms: Yes.

Gene Lewis: Gene Lewis from WRIG in town here. There's been a lot of technical explanations here, which I appreciate. In just plain English for a lot of us who are non-technical, what does this all mean, how bad is it, and how long is it going to take to clean up, and who is going to pay for it?

Georgette Nelms: Okay. One of our experts? Who would like to take that question?

Gene Lewis: Pardon me?

Margaret Guerriero: There's a lot of questions asked.

Gene Lewis: There's three questions, yes, I realize that.

Georgette Nelms: How bad is it.

Gene Lewis: Okay. Number one, how bad is it really. If you'd get up to the microphone so we could hear you please.

Margaret Guerriero: Sure. What Michelle went over a little bit in her presentation is the history of the ground water contamination in Wausau and she mentioned that one point as the city along with the DNR and a grant from the EPA has installed two extraction, or, I have extraction on the brain, two air

strippers on the city, at the city distribution center, and to date, and a recent sampling has shown that these air strippers are providing ample protection to the public, meaning that they treat the water to a level that is below what the maximum concentration is allowed to be in drinking water.

Gene Lewis: So at this point there is no problem with the drinking water in the city of Wausau?

Margaret Guerriero: Right.

Gene Lewis: Okay. And then that answers the second one. And the third one, what is the bottom line as far as the cost goes for all these really neat things that everybody has been explaining here tonight?

Margaret Guerriero: Well, the cost for this interim remedy is about four and a half thousand, $422,000, for the construction itself, and then the operation and maintenance per year is in addition to that.

Gene Lewis: Okay. And the taxpayers take care of how much?

Margaret Guerriero: It, I guess it's, depends, it's all dependent on whether or not

EPA does this, doesn't influence the remedy or the potential responsible parties, which the city has been named as one.

Gene Lewis: The major one?

Margaret Guerriero: No, one of five.

Gene Lewis: Thank you.

Robert Ashur: I'm Robert Ashur from Channel 9 in town. Along those same lines about the five probable responsible parties when will it be decided who is more responsible than the other, when will that all take place?

Felipe Gomez: Felipe Gomez, I'm EPA's attorney on this case. We currently have a filed lawsuit seeking approximately $500,000 in past costs, which were incurred during the 1984 USEPA removal, wherein granulated activated carbon filters were attached to the city water system. Parties are potentially responsible as identified by EPA. However, a judge will make the final determination of liability as well as how much, how much, how much responsibility and how much cost should be paid by the parties.

Robert Ashur: And when will that take place?

Felipe Gomez: Generally cost recovery

actions follow the final incurrence of cost, in the remedial action, there can be more than one cost recovery suit. For instance, in this case, we filed suit for our past costs for the removal action, and at the same time are currently incurring costs for the remedial actions and investigations, and it's possible that the suit would be brought at the later date for that at which time I, I, I don't have the knowledge. It's to hard to determine at this time.

Georgette Nelms: Are there no more questions? I mean we all understand what's going on here with the phase plan of action? Terry, yes.

Terry Rutlin: Terry Rutlin with the Wausau Daily Herald. Will your final plan address the contamination on the east side of the river as well?

Margaret Guerriero: Yes. Are you referring to what pointed the out what our findings were?

Terry Rutlin: Right.

Margaret Guerriero: Yes, we will. The final remedy will include all of the sites.

Felipe Gomez: I think one other item

for the record is that currently the city and Marathon Electric are negotiating with the EPA to try to implement the proposed alternative, which the EPA has presented to you today, and we hope to move along in those negotiations, and in the spirit of cooperativeness, try to begin jointly addressing the problems at the site between the State, the federal government and potentially responsible parties.

Terry Rutlin: I have one more question, Michelle, this would probably be directed or anybody from DNR. It seems like a major difference between the city and EPA right now is whether or not this water should be treated after it is brought out through this extraction well. EPA wants the water to be treated through an air stripper and the city wants it treated through an aeration riprap system. Is it possible to have that riprap system installed?

Michelle DeBrock-Owens: Well first of all, the final decision has not been made on what treatment is going to be used. Margaret, you might want to explain why the air strippers were chosen for the alternatives, and then I can

go in further when the, you know, the choice will be made.

Terry Rutlin: Is it EPA's decision on the final treatment or DNR's decision on final treatment?

Michelle DeBrock-Owens: It is DNR, when the design phase comes for the extraction well and the treatment to take place, the DNR will decide, with of course EPA helping us, but it is our waste water people who will decide on the final treatment, whether it be an air stripper or passive, such like is in a Cascade riprap system that you have referred to. But that, that final decision has not been made yet. That will be made during the remedial design phase.

Margaret Guerriero: Okay. I'd like to point out that EPA, it's not that EPA is preferring air stripping over another treatment for these volatile organic compounds. What we are, the reason we have evaluated an air stripper and costed out an air stripper in our feasibility study is because the Clean Water Act requires that when discharged to a body of water whether it be a river, lake, stream, whatever,

is being proposed, that regardless of whether or not, I shouldn't say regardless of whether or not the limits are being met, but even if limits are being met, the law says that you should still evaluate and seek out what the best available technology or treatment of that water prior to discharge is, and that available technology should be used prior to discharge. So it's a law that we must follow that was laid down by Congress in the Safe Drinking Water Act. So what we, we use their stripping in our feasibility study because we, it was relayed to us from the DNR that air stripping would definitely be considered a best available technology for treatment, and it doesn't necessarily mean that something else wouldn't be as well. So for us to be able to evaluate alternatives and to estimate costs, we used an air stripper.

Felipe Gomez: The Clean Water Act, not Safe Drinking Water Act.

Margaret Guerriero: I'm sorry.

Felipe Gomez: Also known as the Federal Water Pollution Congressional Act, is the official name.

Joe Gihan: Margaret, under alternative number one, no action, you've indicated no cost or the estimated O and M. Would it be fair to say that if well six is going to be running would that be fair game to cost that out into that, because we knew that it costs us $35,000 a year to run the well when you're discharging to the river?

James Lonsdorf: That question was by Joe Gihan of the city of Wausau for clarification of the record later.

Margaret Guerriero: I guess actually what I should say is that there will be no additional caution for treatment, therefore.

Joe Gihan: Over and what?

Margaret Guerriero: Treatment at this time.

Joe Gihan: Over and above what it is at this time?

Margaret Guerriero: Right.

Joe Gihan: Okay. What about alternate number four, where you're going through use or potentially use a south well and a north well extraction system. Is it possible to converse costs by treating it through one stripper?

Margaret Guerriero: Both of the wells?

Joe Gihan: Yes.

Margaret Guerriero: Yes, and we did not evaluate what that cost would be. We, we, we used two separate strippers.

Joe Gihan: Oh, all right.

Margaret Guerriero: But it is possible that the same stripper could be used for both wells, two different wells.

Michelle DeBrock-Owens: If air stripper is the choice.

Margaret Guerriero: Right, if air stripper is designed, recommended.

Mark Johnson: Mark Johnson, Wausau resident. If either two, three or four alternatives are chosen, would those extraction wells function with water supply wells after the contamination is cleaned up?

Margaret Guerriero: No. They don't use great enough, pump a great enough capacities to, I would think, but no, that's not the intention of. Haven't thought about that.

Jim Schafer: Jim Schafer, Wausau resident. Several questions. This is a partial

remedy to a much larger situation, isn't it, much larger problem?

Margaret Guerriero: Yes, yes.

Jim Schafer: Okay. So we're talking half a million dollars. Several parties have paid a lot of money to try to take care of part of this problem already. What does the EPA submit the final cost to clean up the whole area is going to be?

Margaret Guerriero: Well, since we haven't developed a feasibility study for the final remedy, we haven't chosen different alternatives, we haven't developed them, we haven't evaluated them. I don't think we can say at this point what the final remedy would cost.

Jim Schafer: It would be four, five, six million dollars?

Margaret Guerriero: It's really impossible to say.

Jim Schafer: But it could be?

Margaret Guerriero: It could be.

Jim Schafer: Depending on what the final outcome and what the EPA decides to do with the whole site?

Margaret Guerriero: Right. It could be. We've had sites that cost 30 million dollars.

Jim Schafer: Now my next question. You said in the fall of '89 you would have a plan to finalize what would be done with the whole site.

Margaret Guerriero: Right. In the fall of '89 we will come forth with our proposal for our final remedy at the site.

Jim Schafer: My question then is how much is it going to cost to study how much it's going to cost before you bring a proposal in here to tell us how much it's going to cost in a year from now.

Margaret Guerriero: Well, this is an ongoing study that we started last year and last year when we presented it out estimated cost was one point one (1.1) million dollars, to complete the study, and evaluate the alternatives. That cost hasn't changed, our estimate is still the same.

Jim Schafer: But you could run up a million dollars between now and the fall of next year?

Margaret Guerriero: Well, it wouldn't be likely, because we've already, last year we put down the schedule and budget, we haven't varied too much from that. I should mention that our, this phased feasibility study was costed out separately, and there's a potential that doing this additional work could, you know, you know, at the end of the study be, could increase to one point one million, I mean, I guess.

Christine Diebels: Margaret, you might bring out the fact that your accounting budget, projects, I mean you've set a figure and everything is budgeted, all the tax that might be helpful.

Margaret Guerriero: When we start, right.

Mark Johnson: But if we, if no one did anything you could continue to drink that water like we have been now for a year, two years, three years, four years, five years?

Margaret Guerriero: The water that you're drinking is treated.

Mark Johynson: Right.

Margaret Guerriero: So that the, the

levels are safe. What you're drinking is safe.

Mark Johnson: Right. That's the main point I wanted to get across, right.

Margaret Guerriero: Thank you.

Felipe Gomez: Just to emphasis on the point, the waters are safe based on the maximum contaminant level set by the federal Safe Drinking Water Act. The levels which they are set at are also the levels which the analytical devices cannot detect below, so when we say your water is safe to drink, it's safe as determined by the safe drinking water maximum contaminating levels. However, it's unclear whether the levels are zero or whether they're something between zero and five micrograms per liter, mainly because of the fact that devices are not capable of detecting below that limit and I see Mr. Gihan shaking your head there.

Joe Gihan: Detection limits are a lot lower than the standards. We're down to tenth or two tenths. Whereas the standard is five parts per ml.

Felipe Gomez: My understanding is that the acceptable detectable limit is equivalent, is one? Okay, so I stand corrected

then. One microgram per liter or less. But we're not saying that they're zero but it is safe to drink.

Joe Gihan: I might be willing to say it's nondetect, which is a lot different than detect.

Felipe Gomez: But it's different from zero as well is it not.

Joe Gihan: You, it may be, sir. You can't say it's not zero.

Felipe Gomez: And you can't say it is.

Joe Gihan: You're right.

Ken Quinn: There's an enforcement standard here too what's legally defensable in court is another value.

James Lonsdorf: Margaret, Jim Lonsdorf, special counsel for the city of Wausau. You mentioned some additional costs, but isn't it correct that insofar as the cost of the phase feasibility study which was conducted by Warzyn Company that in fact that was a cost that was shared by the city of Wausau and Marathon Electric and was paid in advance to the EPA, so that you weren't including that, were

you?

Felipe Gomez: Which costs are you speaking of?

Jim Lonsdorf: The $50,000 for the study that was just done.

Felipe Gomez: I'm not aware of that having been paid yet.

Margaret Guerriero: Well, the reason I tacked it on, I said it could be tacked on to the one point one (1.1) million was because we, even though it's been discussed at that the city and Marathon Electric are interested in paying that amount, since it hadn't been determined, or it hasn't been settled.

Felipe Gomez: Are you stating that it will be paid by the city and Marathon Electric?

Jim Lonsdorf: Well, that was a portion of the agreement, was it not, with the Environmental Protection Agency, upon which you went ahead?

Felipe Gomez: Correct. We had negotiations of what it was discussed, the city and Marathon Electric would pay for that. But I was not aware of it having been paid and if you are then that would be new information to me.

James Lonsdorf: It was my understanding that that was to be invoiced to us and to be paid.

Felipe Gomez: To be paid.

James Lonsdorf: When invoiced.

Felipe Gomez: Okay.

James Lonsdorf: But you were not including that or were you including that?

Margaret Guerriero: What I was saying, was that we estimated the study was going to cost one point one million (1.1) dollars. What I mentioned about the additional money for the feasibnility study was since we haven't, there hasn't been a definite settlement and it hasn't been paid that it could, it could be added on, but it wasn't at one point one (1.1) million that we had already estimate.

Felipe Gomez: One other point with regard to Superfund funding. The funds that are derived from the Superfund are not derived from the taxpayer funds. They're derived from a direct tax on federal stock for the various industries that produce toxic and hazardous chemicals. So it is not taxpayer dollars that you're speaking about when EPA investigates a

site. It is, it is tax dollars, but they're not tax dollars that come from the general FISC.

James Lonsdorf: Unless a PRP happens to be a municipality.

Felipe Gomez: Well, in that eventuality then that particular PRP would draw on whatever funds it has it's in availability. Some of those funds could be taxpayer funds, there could be alternate funds or sources as well.

Terry Rutlin: Terry Rutlin from the Daily Herald again. How much has the EPA spent so far at that site to date?

Felipe Gomez: Approximately one and a half million dollars.

Person in crowd: Margaret, are we in the question and answer phase yet or in the public comment phase?

Margaret Guerriero: Well, after the question and answer, we'll go to the public comment. Once we're finished with the questions.

Georgette Nelms: Was that designed to move me to?

Person in crowd: No, I was wondering

where we are much like where we are with the pollution thing.

Georgette Nelms: Do we have any more questions, are we?

Joe Gihan: Joe Gihan from the city, mentioned one point five million. Does that include the, the work that was done on the emergency response or only the work that's been done?

Felipe Gomez: That's a lump sum to date, EPA at the site. That includes removal cost.

Joe Gihan: Does that include that five hundred thousand for that GAC unit.

Felipe Gomez: Yes.

Joe Gihian: So that number includes the number you just gave us, all the work since 1984?

Felipe Gomez: Approximately one point five million dollars, and that was the figure I was given about approximately a month ago. So the costs are probably somewhat higher than that now, but not by any more than $10,000.

Mark Johnson: Mark Johnson again, is the old city landfill continuing to impact

ground water quality and could the situation get worse?

Georgette Nelms: Who is going to take that one?

Ken Quinn: I'll take it. The city landfill or the vicinity around the city land fill has not been, there's been no action taken to stop contaminants from leaving the area and it appears to be a relatively old source, and so that we don't expect concentrations to increase beyond what they are right now.

Georgette Nelms: Are there any other questions? If not, I'd like to open the hearing for public comments. I'd like to also say that if at this point you don't feel that you want to make a comment because you're just not ready or because you need to review our fact sheet some more or whatever, on your fact sheet you will see at the bottom of the second page, my name and address here. You can send in a comment to us. The dead line on that is midnight, October 24. For those of you who are prepared to make a comment at this time, we encourage you to do so. Again, please let us know who you are in a nice clear voice and we'll take your comments.

Wayne Kleinschmidt: I'm Wayne Kleinschmidt, city of Wausau. Members of Warzyn, EPA and DNR. After review of the EPA's proposed plan for remedial action and acting on behalf of the residents in the city of Wausau as the council president, I would encourage the EPA immediately approve alternate three to solve the extraction well. Since the city and Marathon Electric had offered earlier this year to proceed with this corrective measure, I would reiterate our offer to expedite this installation. Without this corrective measure, we continue to place our west well field at risk, at risk. Especially the clean wells. We feel very strongly the extraction wells should be installed this fall and placed in operation as soon as possible. Since I also need to justify this expenditure to my constituents, I feel it is prudent to proceed with a passive treatment prior to discharge to the Wisconsin River.

I also would like to make a plea that the EPA release the necessary engineering documents that would define the recharge area and protection zones around our wells. The city

is very interested in developing a well head protection ordinance and needs this technical data to proceed. We can no longer put at risk Wausau's present and future water supply. Based on what has been learned, it is imperative we proceed immediately. I thank you.

Georgette Nelms: Thank you.

John Robinson: I'd like to officially welcome you to Wausau, John Robinson, Mayor of the city. I think we ought to give you from our perspective a brief history of where, where we are or how we got here. In September of last year a proposal was developed on the part of Marathon Electric and the city of Wausau calling for the installation of the extraction wells. In October of a year ago, it was proposed and presented to the EPA. On April 29 of this year, I had my first opportunity to experience this, and we met again with the EPA in Chicago to try to put forth the reasons where we thought that the extraction well should be located. At that time we agreed to pay our portion of the $50,000 to have a phased plan go into effect. And this is the result of that, and we're concerned because we thought and we hoped that we would

have had this season to have that, that extraction well in place, and because of the inner workings of the EPA and others, we were unable to arrive at that this year, so we've lost one construction season and further compounded in our estimation the problems associated with that ground water clean up.

The city and its water utility have not been putting their head in the sand and trying to avoid this issue. From, from the date that we first were notified of contaminated water, we have initially started blending our water, and in an attempt to hold down the contaminants to meet the standards. After that did not work the, the granulated carbon was used, and later air strippers were installed, and the grant that you talk about is part of that one point five million dollars which the PRP's, of which the city of Wausau is one, will be repaying, and it is not a free grant to the citizens of Wausau. Some firm or taxpayers will wind up paying for that.

We've also taken well number six, which is one of the contaminated wells and we've pumped that into the river, and pumped it into

the waste system to try to, to keep it out of our system. We no longer use that and until we recently completed our water line from the west side to the east side so we could run that water through our air strippers and we've made the commitment to proceed with the extraction well. We've also begun work on a ground water protection ordinance. Tonight I'm here as the Mayor, as the president of the water utility, as a person concerned about the environment and also as a person being sued by the EPA, and we're concerned about your recommendation, we're concerned about it and would recommend that you adopt 3A which was embodied in the testimony of the EPA and which was our original proposal which would call for the installation of an extraction well at the southern site with that be pumped using riprap or rocks to aerate that water and to take out the volatile organic compounds, which is a simplified air stripping system, and then discharging it into the Wisconsin River. It saves us money, recognizing that the action that we are taking is not final action, that there is a great deal more that needs to be done, we would strongly request that

you consider that option, trying to save us dollars and you have the ability to come in at a future date to order additional remedial action. But what it does is for us is it gives us the most cost effective, the most, you know, the quickest most immediate response to the problem at hand. We are concerned about the overall cost of this project. We have two million dollars invested in this, approximately two million dollars invested in this project to this point, the one point five million that has been invested by the EPA through the grants and through hiring the consultant and the additional cost that the city of Wausau has incurred through its water utility and other activities relative to our building of that water line to treat that water. And all we see is that price going up. We would urge you to be as cost effective as you can, to use Eau Claire, which has been granted passive treatment or the aeration of, natural aeration as, as a treatment option. We would, we encourage you to look at that and to grant the same opportunity to the people named here.

Georgette Nelms: If there are no

other comments, I would like to remind you again that there's still time to make comments and if you'll check on your fact sheet, you'll see our name and address listed on that. We will be accepting public comments through October 24 midnight. At this point, and if there are no other comments, this hearing, we'll bring this hearing to a close. I want to thank the Mayor, Mayor Robinson has been very cooperative, and I really appreciate his taking the time, him and members of the council to listen to us earlier. We did a dress rehersal in front of them and also for providing this place for this hearing. Thank you very much. Good night.

(Whereupon proceedings were concluded at 8:10 pm.)

STATE OF WISCONSIN)
) SS.
MARATHON COUNTY)

I, NINA BOSTWICK, a Notary Public in and for the State of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me.

That the appearances were as noted initially.

That the foregoing proceedings are true and correct as reflected by my original machine shorthand notes taken at said time and place.

Dated at Wausau, Wisconsin,
this 24th day of October, 1988.

Nina Bostwick

Registered Professional Reporter
Notary Public, State of Wisconsin
My commission expires 9-30-90.