

MANDAN REMEDIATION TRUST (MRT)
February 21, 2012

Meeting: 222nd Official Meeting
Date: February 21, 2012
Location: Mandan City Hall, 205 2nd Ave. NW
Time: 10:00 A.M.

The MRT meeting was called to order by Jim Neubauer. Fritz Schwindt and Dave Glatt were present. Scott Radig and Marilyn Mertz, North Dakota Department of Health, and Ellen Huber, city of Mandan, were present.

LBG Annual Report. A conference call was held with Tim Kenyon and Ken Kytta of LBG. Kenyon indicated the annual report doesn't change a lot from previous years.

“What did we get done in 2011?” Fourth full year of system operation. We suspended the MPE for a while and that was really not an impact to the system as it was the stuff we are sending to the wastewater treatment plant. They were having some serious challenges this summer. And we reduced the RTO temperature to reduce the operating costs—less gas we are using because we are just not getting that much out of the soil anymore. We need that support gas to keep the temperatures up so in 2011 those were really only the things that changed from 2010.

“Remediation Recovery Totals” Liquid, Vapor, and Bioattenuation 2011 total numbers. So we are still having an impact. We still get things out of the ground so there is still stuff there to be had. It's harder to get at all the time. Do you see the recovery totals on the next line 300,000 gallons? The next one is the pounds of methane. We are closing in at 2.5 million pounds of hydrocarbons out of the subsurface. The recovery is slowing a little bit. That is to be expected.

The next series of slides goes from Sept. 2006 where we see lots of red. As you page through Oct. 2007 less red; Oct. 2008 less red; Oct. 2009 almost no red and a bunch of blue; Nov-Dec 2010 I think our actual concentration there was 3.7 in that monitoring well right outside the front door of the bookstore. That one is proving to be persistent. If we look at Nov-Dec 2011 there is not much left. It is not a recovery well it is a monitor well. So I think one of the things we want to do this year is hit that a little harder in that specific well as we can.

“What has been Spent?” It is \$17.2 million and of that certainly when we made the estimates a long time ago there were some extra things that happened. The planned task was \$13.5 million so there is some left over.

“Overview of System Costs” You have all seen this before and those numbers just ratchet up a little bit with the 2011 costs.

“What has been Spent? Subcontractors” The only one there that has changed is lab costs. “Specialized Remediation Equipment/Services” in the process of turning down the heat on the RTO we had consulted those folks. The numbers didn’t really change a lot.

“Where Are We Going in 2012?” Operation and Maintenance, Efficiency Enhancements again targeted MPE Operation, Continuing System Shutdown in the Areas and the last one is the big chunk: Site Strategy Plan Implementation: there are areas at the site if you just saw our assessment of the Iverson building in that area. I think there are some areas of the site that where the wells—it’s done and we could enter that post-remedial monitoring stage, but in fact there are many areas of the site where even though it hasn’t been formally done, we really do have a year or so of post-remediation monitoring so it depends on how a regulatory agency is going to view that. I think there are some areas of the site that are done and can be stopped and probably even some of the wells and piping can be decommissioned. So if there is a big nut in this presentation, it’s probably that bullet right there.

“Future Costs” is the same as last year. That was the presentation intended for the commission.

Questions: JN: What are your plans for the bookstore well? KK: They have been doing the stinger for the last couple of years in the monitoring wells that are showing product in them. This one is a little bit more of a challenge because it is right on Main Street but that is a priority for the MRT we can cone it off and essentially we are using the vacuum from the nearest well there and putting the stinger in and getting the product out of there. It is basically, a summer time operation. You can’t do that during the winter and also kind of a daytime operation when we can keep an eye on the stinger so that nobody messes with it. TK: One of the challenges there is that it is right outside the bookstore. That presents a challenge from the business and all the businesses.

FS: Would there be any advantage to construct a new well there? TK: You mean abandon that one and put a well in that is not as near the front door? KK: I think what Fritz is getting at is put in an additional recovery well near that location increasing the spacing. TK: If you recall way back when we did that, there was a real challenge putting stuff out in the sidewalk in front, plumbing and heated sidewalks and all those issues. KK: That certainly would help. The other thing – a few years back which would be less intrusive or less of a disturbance would be doing a surfactant injection and mobilize the product in that area. We are getting to the point where we see this at multiple sites that it is just a travel time issue. You can pull the product out of the well, but it just takes time to mobilize that...product and get it to a well so that’s really the pockets we have left that’s the issue we are dealing with. One of the ways you can address that is with a surfactant injection to help mobilize the product. TK: We really just have 6 wells that are in that condition: 1 over by the firehouse; 1 just northeast of the firehouse on the corner; those 4 wells on the west side: 1 in front of the bank; 1 outside the bookstore; 1 next door to the video building just outside the west door and

then 1 way down in the parking lot. That one we have over a foot. That's where the issues exist. KK: The one to the south, I think we have discussed this in the past also, those will continue to be problematic because I think beyond the property boundary there is still a source there that will continue to bleed so the ones from the south will continue to be an issue. TK: The one I am talking about is Monitoring Well 34, 129.19. That is near the old Conoco station so there is the potential when they dug up the station and took the tanks out, you may have kind of a reservoir there. But really we are down to those 6 wells and that's not bad when there was 100 or so with product in.

MPE. FS: How many of the wells are you doing MPE on right now? Primarily those 6 or are you doing some others as well? KK: It's more than that because it is basically wells that are surrounding that we are still operating. I don't have an exact number for you. We still operate the wells in and around there because we still get product removal from them. TK: And some of those wells are not recovery wells. For instance, the one in front of Wells Fargo is PK 9W or 8W and that is not a recovery well. The same thing with the one out in front of the bookstore and the one just to the south of that those are monitor wells not recover wells. If you want us to, we can do the stinger thing in those. The one in the south parking lot is a little easier to handle as well as the one by the fire station. The other ones are in public areas or actually in streets. KK: So if we are going to be more aggressive on the stinger thing in the next year like Tim mentioned if we can get help from the city as far as contacting business owners to help work with Rusty Krikava so Rusty isn't necessarily the bad guy would certainly be helpful. FS: We can certainly meet with the business owners to discuss with Rusty. We need to find out exactly what needs to be done in each situation in order to let them know what to expect. KK: We are probably a couple of months away from that to be able to do that like you said it is something we want to have temperatures above freezing when we are doing them so we have a little bit of time. TK: For instance, by the well next to Wells Fargo there right outside their east door they have run a pipe from whichever recovery well is nearest and run the stinger down the monitor well so you would have this piping running across the surface and it sets there with kind of a gurgle so people can't be messing with it and driving over it and that sort of thing.

FS: Should I talk to Rusty about where those are going to be located and what would need to be plumbed. TK: There isn't any full time permanent plumbing. It is a pipe laid across the ground surface utilizing vacuum nearby from a recovery well. KK: So it is just a temporary setup. It comes up and down every day. TK: They would go bright and early every morning to set it up and at the end of the day take it down and sporadically check on it during the day. FS: Like the one by the bookstore, I'm not sure where we would plumb that other than try to get back into the building. TK: Or down around the corner or up the street. That's a challenge. No doubt about it. FS: So if we could identify where we need to go with each of those that is basically my question. If I talk with Rusty about those, he would be able to figure that out? TK: Oh, sure. FS: Maybe we can string some temporary pipe in the gutter line in order to accommodate that, too. TK: Sure. We will talk to Rusty and figure out from each one. Ask him to go out and look at it. From each of those--really 6 problematic wells and see what we can do. FS: Do you want to have Rusty give me a call after he has it figured out and you

guys have had a chance to visit, then we can figure out what we need to do from there whether the city can do something or how we want to accomplish that? TK: Sure can do.

Groundwater. FS: How much do you think the rising groundwater affected everything? From 2010 to 2011, basically, it hasn't changed much, but with the rising groundwater I almost think we have to look at things as the groundwater decreases again to see exactly what has transpired. KK: Certainly you are going to get some product that moved a little bit with the water levels coming up so we are going to see that again as the water levels come down. The good news is that with the water levels coming down it is going to be good for SVE. The main product is going to resmear and get removed by SVE as the water table comes down so that is a good thing. TK: Fluctuating water tables are tough on product. They tend to spread it around, but in this instance they spread it around so the SVE can get at it. DG: You mentioned something about (maybe I misinterpreted) you think there may still be a continuing source from BN property? KK: No, not a source but there is still going to be because we have not done product removal on BN property underneath I think that there is probably still free product there that we are drawing from the original source. TK: It is down gradient, it's downhill from us. We don't see a lot of product in those marginal wells. You see in FR5 and 3212 we've got some deminimis free product. DG: So you think once the system's shut down it should not be a problem with drawing it back? TK: I don't think it will. It would have to flow uphill. DG: That's what I thought, but I wanted to get that clarified. KK: That's what I'm getting at while we are still operating we are still going to still see those little dips but once we are done with remediation it's all down gradient.

Data. TK: So this is a pretty good situation we are looking at. When we started this a few years ago this is the place we thought we would be about now. JN: What do we need from the Health Department? Yes, monitor for another year or go ahead and start decommissioning or what? TK: For instance, look at the block there is just nothing there anymore. We could still run SVE. You will probably get drips and drabs, but that area is essentially done as we contemplated it would be done when the Site Strategy Plan was first drafted. Quite a few of those wells we have years of data that show there's nothing there. We have data in some of the wells that had a little product to show it is not there now. The question is that is not post shutdown. The active remediation hasn't been fully occurring there so maybe for the regulatory accepted time frame. I think there is a strong argument to say that we have an updated—there doesn't need to be any more monitoring even. We can just shut them off and they are done. That's a regulatory interpretation. DG: I think what we would have to do is take a look at all the data and assess it. I haven't seen all the data in one area. TK: And the way we would likely look at that from an operational standpoint is like we did down at the Iverson building is focus on a zone from a remote manifold. DG: Then you establish boundaries for that area and whether or not that meets the requirements of the Health Department for no further action. TK: Really, it boils down to the question for a specific manifold, let's shut it down. Do you think we need any more monitoring or do we have enough already? FS: Does the Health Department want to look at that by itself or do you want some areas proposed by LBG for you to consider? DG: I think I would like to

have areas proposed by LBG for us to consider and then take a look at the data because they would have a better feel what is an endpoint for them technically and we can look at the policy to see if it meets our criteria for an endpoint. TK: Exactly. We can sure do that. SR: The plan called for 2 years of monitoring so if we got 2 years of data that shows that it has met the criteria then we are pretty much there. DG: Was it 2 years after shutdown? TK: Yes, it was. DG: So we will have to look at that and see how the data plays out. FS: Does that shut down the MPE? Or SVE? TK: Everything. SR: There are certain zones you already have essentially shut down, isn't it? FS: I don't think there are any zones that occasionally they are still running SVE on everything is my understanding. KK: Correct. There are certain zones that we have not operated MPE on in a long time but SVE there has still been operations almost in all areas.

Shutdown. TK: The thing to remember though is our shutdown criteria is presence of free product and SVE is not going to encourage or discourage free product migration. DG: I think we will take a look at it and we may do a hybrid where we use some of the data, have it shut down and not go for 2 years or go a year and it stays the same. We will have to take a look at the data. TK: I propose that we go through this on a remote manifold basis and put the data together and see how it comes out. DG: I would recommend that. TK: Excellent. FS : My thought would be even though we have been running SVE that somehow that not be considered operating the system. I don't know if the shutdown plan would allow that definition but I think that is something we need to consider. DG: We can consider that. I think we need to look at it. The vapors can still be an issue for us. So we have to have a level of comfort that we don't get a buildup of vapors. It may not be free product but we also have to take care of that the vapors aren't going to be an issue and should be good to go. SR: I think the plan is flexible enough. TK: You are exactly right, Fritz, that can be construed as the shutdown of the system that would influence the free product. FS: That's a good way to interpret it.

Iverson Building. JN: If I read your conclusion properly, it was like we should be done there. KK: Yes, those 2 are both...correct? TK: And with respect to free product and again we are back to that issue how much post shutdown monitoring do you need? We are down to the point where we are not going to make it any better.

FS: Has there been any MPE in any of these 2 manifolds for how long?

KK: I can't give you exact days. I can look it up, if you like. TK: They are not hitting anything but MPE that would be in this scenario, especially those 2 manifolds. There's nothing out there anymore. FS: Perhaps these 2 can be part of the process that we are trying to establish between you guys and the Health Department as far as shutting down an area. TK and KK agreed. TK: You guys have looked at the Iverson building. Is there any data that you need that is not currently included in that report? The reason I ask that is that report would be kind of a template by which we do the other reports by which we do the remote manifolds. SR: I really haven't looked at this in-depth. I can get back to you guys later this week. TK: Take a look at that and let us

know what else you might need.

DG: In years past we had problems with the sump there. Not that I expect us to have any problems with the sump in the Iverson building. Have we checked that at all. SR: We haven't checked it since they did the survey the beginning of frost. TK: I understand the sump there may have an oily smell or may have a very light sheen. DG: I understand that but it's something I would like to check off.

FS: If you look at 3402, this is within a two-year period, because it goes back to February 17, 2010. We had .12 product thickness in there so it really doesn't meet the criteria for abandonment. We need to have 2 years of less than .1, right? SR agreed. TK: It comes pretty close though. KK: That's a case where I made the recommendation that we stop at more of a development standpoint here. That is the kind of decision that has to be made. TK: How close is close enough? FS: Right. Is that where that sump is at, Dave, because that is right in the interior of the building? DG: I never looked at the sump. TK: If they are going to inhabit that building we did work at the Berube Apartments to kind of vent that sump and that certainly could be done in this building if that's a concern. JN: That's not hooked up to anything else 3402? FS: It should be. It should be hooked onto the end of the manifold yet. Kenyon agreed. KK: If you recall, that's the issue we have been having. That's the building we have been having issues getting access to for monitoring. FS: I didn't realize that, but OK. KK: They have had issues getting in there with the property owner. FS: If he wants the system shutdown, he will probably have to allow additional monitoring. JN: It probably has been more of an issue of not necessarily or not willing to let you in just the matter of not being around in the neighborhood, right? KK: I think it is a little bit of each. I think many times it has been a coordination issue. FS: It is my understanding they wouldn't be starting development until this fall. JN: Correct. FS: So we have some time to work through these issues. KK: Get some more data. JN: I think as they start planning their parking and all that other stuff I think they will want to know as soon as possible if the remote manifolds can go away on both sides of the building. Or what they are saying is if it stays, how it will look like a dog house compared to what they want to put there.

FS: Is there an easy way to replumb that 3402 if that is an issue? Is there a way to run that MPE system back over to the main treatment building and eliminate that manifold? TK: How much are they going to tear that area up to redo it? EH: I don't think they would tear the west side much at all. JN: The west side would stay intact. They would have to repave and all that stuff on the east side. TK: Conceptually, what that would be is the pipes would come back to that remote manifold from that well and would be re-plumbed underground to the pipe that goes back to the treatment system so you would have a one well manifold. Everything else would be done, cut off the piping below grade and that can actually stay below grade because you wouldn't need a valve on it anymore because it is a single well manifold. Does that make sense, Ken? KK: Agreed. If the manifolds are eliminated, we do not have another manifold between there and the Remediation building. TK: It's kind of a short circuit to piping. JN: Or if it is simply a venting issue that would be similar to what we have at Berube's, right? TK:

If you are venting the sump or venting the well. JN: If you are venting the air that comes out of there. There is no product going in there. TK: If the sump were an odor issue, you could put a vent on that similar to Berube. The odors would go outside. JN: I don't think they plan on finishing the basement. It is all going to stay as storage for their clients on first, second and third floor so it's not going to be a habitable working space. TK: And that could make it even easier. In fact, we have to consult a plumber for code, but you might even dump that into the building sewer vent system. FS: So they wouldn't necessarily need to get rid of the manifold on the west side. Is that what you are saying, Jim? JN: They would prefer that it would all go away. TK: I'm sure they would prefer to not have the manifolds in their parking lots as well.

Data Points. FS: It seems like we probably need to get some additional data points if there is a way to get a hold of would it be AI to work out a schedule where Rusty or Jason could get a schedule to get into the building so we can monitor? It seems like if we can eliminate that manifold that would be the preferred thing to do, but at the minimum if we need to keep one well or two wells operating we could eliminate the manifold and reconnect the piping below grade. That's what I heard you say, right? TK: That's the concept. And would it be even better if that well were appropriate to not even have to do that--get plumb rid of it altogether. FS: You haven't been in there since Oct. 2011. TK: It has been just Feb. 2010 since we had product. Feb. now would be two years. JN: If we need to get into the building, I think AI Leingang is out of the country. Huber: He's here—he leaves tomorrow. JN: He's here today, but gone tomorrow for 3 to 4 weeks. TK: Did he leave you with a key? JN: I'm sure we can get one. FS: That would be the best way to do it if we could get a key. TK: Since it is in his best interest. JN: I don't think that is a problem.

TK: So Scott you are going to take a look at that Iverson report to see if there is any additional data that you need going forward with other remote manifolds—with that one and other ones. SR: I will take a look at that hopefully this week.

FS: Another one would be PZ4. That is back in 2008. TK: That is just west of the building and sidewalk. It had some back in 2008, but not a lot recently.

TK: One of the challenges with this kind of thing it was fluctuating groundwater. You could measure all the wells in increasing frequency and you would find stuff that would just pop out and then it would go away. To entirely shut down the criteria, the decommissioning criteria to absolutes is kind of difficult because you are going to have a well like that that shows up with .1 or .2.

FS: What would be involved in dismantling the manifolds? They have electrical running through them. Where does that electrical come from? TK: It comes from the Remedial building typically. FS: So we would have to hire an electrician to come in and disconnect those manifolds where they are tied into the Remediation building. TK: In the Remediation building you should turn the switch off and pull the breakers. If there is a place where there is power coming from another source, just shutdown that source and decommission it, cap off the lines below grade, the electrical wires below grade,

cap off the plumbing below grade and cover it over.

Plugging Lines. FS: Would there be any merit in plugging the lines with bentonite or cement slurry. It seems we talked about that at one time. I thought we had talked about not doing it that way. Is there any merit in plugging those lines? TK: I don't think there is. There is 22 miles of line. You can spend days and weeks plugging that stuff with no impact really. If somebody digs into it, dig a posthole or whatever, and that is kind of evitable for as much that is out there. They will have to not necessarily repair the pipe but just fill it up and keeping that open.

TK: You know, Jim, we have had some correspondence about possible geothermal heat. There are a lot of pipes in the ground. JN: We chatted with Wenck Engineering last week and I think between 3 and 6 feet there is not much that they are going to gain. You will have to go down a couple of hundred feet or whatever and if it is staged. It is all HDPE pipe and I am not recalling how thick that is. TK: It is pretty heavy stuff. It is too thick to be of much use. TK: And it is not deep enough. Down on the south end of Main Street that stuff is all buried below frost—7 feet. But even then the geothermal grade is pretty skinny. JN: That's why I thought it was odd that the one diagram I sent you has the parallel loops running 3 to 6 feet in the ground. TK: It kind of depends on the climate you are in. I don't think that will work up here from what I am told. TK: No. In the winter time you are not going to get a lot of heat out of it. In the summer time you might be able to put some heat into it but at what cost? But going back to decommission the lines, we have so many lines and they go so many directions, it would be very, very difficult to plug in a...in those with any kind of slurry or anything and have the assurance that you got everything. JN: If they were cut and capped, you could potentially reuse them if worse comes to worse, correct? TK: If worse comes to worse, if the railroad spills another bunch we know where the manifolds are at. You take down and come back up and go for it. FS: Except we might have to plug and abandon the wells. TK: That's a regulatory decision. It is. This is somewhat of a special case and if you would want to preserve those for future usage, otherwise an abandonment scenario for those wells is you pull the manhole cover, you dig down 2 or 3 feet, fill it up with slurry, you cap it off, put cement on the top and restore the surface. Now given the pipes to those wells are down below where we would cut the top of the well off, that is somewhat mitigating. You could probably go back and rehab those wells to some degree of success. It would be a challenge.

TK: I think we have to look at this whole system is once it is done, it is done. And there would have to be some sort of absolute catastrophic release that would cause this to come back to life. Keep in mind also when the system is done—the monitoring is over, and if it's not being monitored, if you are not listening, you are not going to hear it. Again, unless there was some impact that came, all of a sudden, someone has diesel in their basement as a worse case thing, but it is just not there.

Unplugged Wells. FS: I wouldn't feel comfortable leaving the wells unplugged. SR: Not forever. It might be the last task to be done or something like that. TK: The plugging and abandonment of these wells is going to be a construction effort. There is

going to be a lot of street to repair and there is going to be a lot going on for a while. As well as the abandonment efforts for those wells in the basements of buildings that will be essentially handwork. I'm sure that the people that own the buildings will want the plumbing actually removed from the buildings as well. FS: Would we need to be doing a whole lot of work in the streets other than when we inject the well bores. TK: Well, you have to remove the manhole cover. SR: You will have to saw cut around the manhole cover. FS: Would we be better off doing that or leaving them in place? I guess we will need to talk to the city guys about that. TK: Anybody that drives a snowplow doesn't want that manhole staying in place. As the manholes degrade they are essentially a pothole waiting to start. You will end up taking them all out eventually anyhow. I can't imagine the city would care to have those remain. Keep in mind in addition to all the wells we put in, from the several preceding generations of assessment, the maps you see here don't have all the wells on them by any stretch. There are tons more out there. And those should be gotten rid of as well. JN: It sounds like a street maintenance project. TK: I think that is how it is going to look while it is being done. FS: My only concern in doing that would be are we creating a bigger problem by going in and saw cutting around each of those and putting in a concrete plug. TK: What we have done in other places, you dig down as near to 3 feet as you can, put cap on top of the well and pour a stack of concrete on top of it. Really, what the concrete does is keep someone from casually getting back into that well or hitting it by mistake. Prior to that you fill the well bore and then you put dirt, compacted dirt on top of it and restore the surface to whatever the surface was. And the streets had hot patch on, I guess or concrete where there is concrete. With concrete it is a little simpler you can sometimes just bust out the manhole and just repatch the concrete. Asphalt would be a little different. If it happens to be in a heavily traffic roadway you may end up pinning as well in a concrete roadway. FS: We may have a few of them on First Avenue, I suppose. TK: There is a bunch as well as the new Collins, in front of the Fire Hall and up and down that street. It is something that will have to be done eventually. That would seem to be a process that could happen all in one master chunk when it is all done. A single contractor bid.

Authorization Package. TK: We sent you the authorization package for 2012. SR: It is essentially the same as last year. TK: Down a little bit. SR: \$10,000 less, but not much difference. TK: That could be impacted favorably from your viewpoint if you begin to shut big chunks of the system down. FS: If we are not operating much of the system anymore, are we getting to the point where we should consider discontinuing the use of the RTO? TK: If we start cutting back and cutting back more of the system and ceasing SVE, we may be getting below the concentrations where you would need it. It is a possibility. It is not there yet. KK: Something that we got last year and the one thing they are considering even if we are below criteria, was the potential owner issues. That was one of the issues that was brought in last year for continuing to operate it especially for Fourth of July, Buggies 'n' Blues, especially now with the development next door. That is something to consider even if we are below criteria there may still be an odor. TK: We may get down to the point where we don't have to operate it. It doesn't mean you might not want to. SR: I did talk to Rick Stoor last week or before when they were up here doing some testing after they had dropped the

temperature down to 1,200 degrees. Did he talk to you guys about that? KK: Essentially, what they found is that by increasing it back to 1,300 we got the OPM readings or PID readings down to zero. I think they were in single digits or in the teens prior when it was at 1,200 degrees. They did it in a step approach from 1,200 to 1,250. It reduced the PID readings down to about nothing, but when they went to 1,300, it completely eliminated them. At 1,200 we actually didn't exceed discharge criteria. TK: We knew going into that it would be a little bit of an interim process. At 1,200 as the goal it just didn't turn out that was possible at this point. FS: It's good we didn't offer the 600 then. That's all I had.

LEC. Any thoughts on the LEC and the operation of that system? KK: It's a good thing we had the drain tile in place or there would have been a problem this summer. TK: It worked as design to work and fulfilled its obligation, its objective. I can imagine in the county there should be smiles all over the place. FS: In response, they went and secured the basement and now you can't get into it anymore. TK: Why? FS: I just went over there before the meeting and they got it buttoned off so you have to go through and get a badge in order to go into the basement. TK: Is that because it is being more fully utilized now? That's not due to any kind of smell or anything is it? FS: No. JN: I don't think they have any more people working down there now then there was before. TK: It is just a restricted space now? JN and FS: Yes. TK: I guess it is their building. JN: I don't believe they are using the filters, are they? FS: No. TK: It ought to be about done pumping, shouldn't it? FS: A month and a half ago, they were still going about 2,000 gallons a day. That's what I was going to check before the meeting, but I didn't have time to go through their whole security process. JN: I think that is it, gentlemen. TK: Good talking to you guys. I kind of wish I could be there in person but you know. Call ended.

Iverson Building. I guess the answer on the Iverson building for the developer would be at this point and time, we won't have to move any lines. Radig has to review the information provided by LBG. SR: It would be nice to maybe monitor those 2 indoor interior wells maybe one more time since. FS: I would say even more than that, several times by this fall. DG: Overall, there is a cautiously optimistic potential that development can happen. JN: I think if we give them a time frame and say, there trying to plan out where the parking whether to put this and that in it. FS: I think as far as the east manifold, I think that is OK. They could do whatever they need to do and we will plan on taking that one out. The ones we have questions on is the west manifold and what we would have to do here. If we have to keep a couple of wells, we can eliminate this manifold building and replumb it directly back over to the remediation building. EH: What kind of cost is associated with that? FS: I wouldn't think it would be a lot of cost in just replumbing that. You would obviously tear a building down and determine which pipes. You would maintain the pipe going back to the main well. SR: Basically, it would be a straight connection. You would cut off the valving and manifold and tear the building out. FS: Just reattach everything. It wouldn't be a significant cost, A couple thousand dollars to dig down and isolate the pipe. DG: Would we just do that as a shared cost with the developer? Would we take care of the building? FS: That's how we approached it in the past where if they wanted modifications to the system. DG: We

would still want to keep it operating. Eventually we would remove that manifold anyway so the MRT could cover that cost. The cost to connect and operate could be the developer's cost. SR: That part would be pretty minimal once you go through the process of pulling up everything anyway, it's not going to be much. JN: Do you want me to work on getting access? FS: Then if they can get a key where Rusty could have access. If we could get in there soon and then maybe get another one early this summer sometime and another one this fall to give us some additional data points because we are just missing data points. SR: That one there is infrequent..., but if we could get the end of this winter, this spring and one the end of the summer. FS: Do you guys agree on that east manifold? SR: It has always looked pretty good. DG: It looks marginal. Look at the data of all the criteria. That one looks to me more cut and dried than the one in the building.

Minutes. Jan. 3, 2012 minutes were reviewed and revisions were made.

Motion. Glatt moved to approve the Jan. 3, 2012 minutes; second by Schwindt. All ayes. Motion carried.

BND Statement. Bank of North Dakota statement ending January 31, 2012 balance was \$7,939,164.15. We have interest on the account. So noted by Glatt.

Pay Request. City of Mandan's wastewater charges of \$1,998.37 for two months; one for \$546.63 and the other for \$1,451.74.

Motion. Schwindt moved to approve payment to the city of Mandan in the amount of \$1,998.37 for wastewater charges for two months; Second by Glatt. All ayes. Motion carried.

Pay Request. LBG statement dated February 15, 2012 for \$21,587.59. Radig noted it looked fine.

Motion. Schwindt moved to approve payment to LBG in the amount of \$21,587.59; second by Glatt. All ayes. Motion carried.

Pay Request. Statement dated Dec. 31, 2011 for MDU and water charges for Remediation buildings for \$14,804.26. The cost has come down.

Motion: Glatt moved to approve \$14,804.26 for fourth quarter 2011 MDU related charges for the Remediation building; second by Schwindt. All ayes. Motion carried.

Audit. Discussed entering into an agreement with Brady Martz to do the 2011 audit as we have done in the past.

Motion: Schwindt moved; second by Glatt to enter into an agreement with Brady Martz to do the 2011 audit for the MRT and SEP. All ayes. Motion carried.

Task. Radig noted there is a 2012 Task. We talked about it briefly during the call. Essentially, it is the same--just about \$10,000 less than last year. It does reflect the 4 percent increase in the Consumer Price Index and the 1 percent increase by LBG. The CPI rate has been verified.

Motion. Glatt moved; second by Schwindt to approve the 2012 costs. Radig noted the actual billed costs for 2011 were quite a bit less than the projected costs because of the period of time the system was shut down. They only did one bio respiration test instead of two. It is still less than the projected cost for last year but I anticipate the real cost will still be probably higher than 2011 after billed costs. Neubauer: It includes 2012 remediation system O&M, the quarterly fluid measurements, and also the bio respiration rate testing. It is a total of \$276,032. All ayes. Motion carried.

Next Meeting. March 27, 2012 at 10:00 a.m.

No new system issues.

Motion to Adjourn. Glatt moved; second by Schwindt to adjourn the meeting. All ayes. Motion carried.