

REINHART | BOERNER | VAN DEUREN
NORRIS & RIESELBACH, S.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW



May 15, 1996

Mr. Scott Watson
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
North Central District Headquarters
107 Sutcliff
Box 818
Rhineland, WI 54501

Dear Mr. Watson:

Re: C.M. Christiansen Co.,
Phelps, Wisconsin
Pole Treatment Project

During the project meeting on January 30, 1996 a number of comments were made by either yourself or other staff of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources ("WDNR") regarding the scope and reliability of the August 11, 1995 Screening Site Inspection ("SSI") Report. We (White Water Associates, Inc., Coleman Engineering, Inc. and I) believe that some of these points are of sufficient importance to be part of the SSI. They are as follows:

- The C.M. Christiansen Co., the owner of the site, was at the time the SSI Report was being compiled, cooperating with the WDNR. Since the compilation was completed the Owner has continued to cooperate with the Department.
- Cooperation with the WDNR has been demonstrated by a significant expenditure of time and resources by the C.M. Christiansen Co. toward the environmental assessment of the property and its relation with the surrounding environment.
- The information contained in the SSI Report, including assessment of the environmental impacts at the pole dipping operation, is not necessarily verified merely because it appears in the SSI. Rather, in some respects, the SSI contains unconfirmed statements by residents (or former residents) of the Phelps, Wisconsin area. Information that

Mr. Scott Watson

May 15, 1996

Page 2

purports to rebut some of these statements has now been presented to the Department and, along with the results of the scientific investigation approved by the Department, are being evaluated by the Department.

- A detailed and extensive assessment of the property is being conducted by the Owner to determine the most efficient and cost effective means of site remediation that is protective of human health and the environment.
- A final report of the findings of the assessment is expected from the Owner's environmental consultant and should be viewed as more definitive than the SSI on the nature and extent of contamination at the site.

These statements would help resolve some of the confusion and contradiction contained in the SSI Report. If I can be of any assistance with this matter, please do not hesitate to call me.

The matters of further study by the Company's consultant of Military Creek and the Company's participation at a public meeting will be presented shortly to CMC Co.'s officers. When they have advised me of their position, I will notify you promptly.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Sincerely,



Raymond M. Roder