

**MANDAN REMEDIATION TRUST (MRT)**  
**October 6, 2015**

**Meeting:** 264th Official Meeting  
**Date:** October 6, 2015  
**Location:** Mandan City Hall, 205 2nd Ave. NW  
**Time:** 10:00 A.M.

The MRT meeting was called to order by Jim Neubauer. Francis Schwindt and Dave Glatt were present. Also, Scott Radig and Marilyn Mertz, North Dakota Department of Health, were present.

**Minutes.** The September 1, 2015 minutes, as amended, were reviewed.

**Motion.** Glatt moved to approve the September 1, 2015 minutes as amended; second by Neubauer. All ayes. Motion carried.

**BND.** Bank of North Dakota statement received for period ending August 31, 2015 showing a balance of \$6,717,490.44. It appears that all of two payments have gone through. Interest was \$280. No issues or questions.

**Pay Request.** We have a billing from Leggette, Brashears and Graham of \$26,631.31 dated Sept. 25, 2015. Comments: A little higher than normal. Radig noted the service check for the thermal oxidizer. That is not typical. They have to do it every so often, but as far as the time put in by LBG staff is about average. If it wouldn't have been for the \$8,200 from Angull Environmental Systems it would have been pretty close to normal.

**Motion.** Glatt moved to approve Pay Request 370 to LBG in the amount of \$26,631.31; second by Schwindt. All ayes. Motion carried.

**Pay Request.** We have the city of Mandan's third quarter billing for \$15,474.85. Comments: Radig noted it's pretty atypical.

**Motion.** Glatt moved to approve Pay Request 371 in the amount of \$15,474.85 to the city of Mandan for the third quarter billings; second by Schwindt. All ayes. Motion carried.

**Pay Request.** Request for city of Mandan wastewater treatment charges for the period of August 1 through 31, 2015 for \$1,053.06; volume 65,816 cu. ft. Comments: Radig notes it was a little higher than normal. Not sure why but the water flow was a little higher.

**Motion.** Schwindt moved approval to pay payment to the city of Mandan; second by Glatt to approve Pay Request 372 to the city of Mandan for \$1,053.06 for industrial wastewater charges. All ayes. Motion carried.

Glatt – The question we are going to talk about on the phone is to make it clear it is just a process when we go through closure. LBG had brought up some questions on if they are uncertain or if they just want more documentation. We got a letter from the Health Department saying we are good to go. Is that alright?

Radig – Right. One comment I have is down by the Depot area Manifold 3-1 Well 3108 down in the corner the previous recommendation we did get some fuel come back in that well and they had previously recommended it be abandoned as of last December, but now this spring it has come back.

Glatt – Do you want to hold off on that one?

Radig – I would ask Paul [Donovan] what their recommendation is if they can keep the well open and use a vacuum from a different well or if they just want to keep that whole manifold open to remediate that one well.

Schwindt -- I'm just wondering if we shouldn't just leave everything open on the south of Main so if something happens along the railroad.

Radig – That may be the last area to do final closure.

Glatt – I think that's a good recommendation in light of the fact if they find something else.

Radig – It didn't pop up since last year.

Schwindt – I'm wondering about closing much of the area down between Main and First. We have a spot everywhere.

Radig – That's why I shaded them differently. The ones in pink the recommendation was to take out the entire manifold, all the wells, the buildings, the manifold, everything. The other ones I think there is enough wells. It doesn't make sense to take it all out yet. You don't have to operate all the recovery wells, but you could leave them in place just like the one south of Main. If something did show up, it is still there.

Dave – The northern tier I don't have any objection to that. That's where we would start closing. If it doesn't meet our criteria except for the groundwater level.

Radig – Well, right, groundwater elevation is higher than we had initially set, but we don't know—about 1.5 to 2 feet.

Dave – Is it above the screens?

Radig – No. They had hoped to have the elevation lower so you could better

remediate the soil part of it, but who knows when that water level is going to go back down.

Schwindt – I guess because the closure plan was never formally approved or whatever should we maybe look at modifying that closure plan to more closely reflect what we are currently dealing with?

Glatt – That’s probably not a bad idea.

Schwindt – Those were the points that Tim Kenyon brought up that it was never approved, formalized or finalized whatever the term was used.

Glatt--This is the way I look at it is as a guidance document that helps us in making our decision knowing that there are conditions that aren’t going to be textbook all the time--just the right water levels. You look at the criteria and in mass if it meets that it would indicate a lower level of guesswork because the water level isn’t the same. I think we address that but as far as approving we are using the guidance and we need a letter saying this is what we have been using for closure. Keeping in mind that it’s environmental conditions or geology or things change that may not be totally right or fall into line, but the vast majority is. Does that make sense? Does the MRT need from the Department saying this is the criteria we are using to determine whether or not you’re OK in closing that area. There are some flexibilities.

Schwindt – I don’t know if it is necessarily the MRT that’s looking for that versus LBG.

Glatt –...Department of Health would have to concur. All 3 should be on the same page.

Neubauer – I think as the trustees would have to—our guidance would come from the Health Department saying this is recommended closure.

Glatt – LBG says we think these are the areas. The Department would have to concur and then the MRT would have to concur. With the information available, the Department and all of us would have to be on the same page.

Schwindt – I think that is the process we had been using.

Glatt – I guess where does it go? Do we need a better—we’ve had these recommendations from LBG we have looked at. The Department says we concur with the northern tier. Present it to the MRT then the MRT goes, yes, we agree, that looks good and move forward.

Schwindt – Typically, what we have done is a little bit different than what you just outlined. The MRT normally makes a motion to abandon the recommended areas and then I think you guys have the final approval on that. The data should be checked off by

all groups.

Neubauer – We say we have a closure guideline, closure plan, are we solid enough to say that's ... so LBG makes a recommendation in accordance with that site closure guideline it comes to the MRT and then goes to State for final or comes to the State and then the MRT for final.

Glatt – I think the MRT would say that you would propose or approve this contingent upon the Department.

Schwindt – Maybe it would make more sense to have Department approval first and then the MRT makes the final.

Glatt – This is a scenario -- it looks good and somebody says they have odors in their basement and then we go back.... I think if we do it first we can say based upon LBG's recommendation looking at conformance to the guidance we have noted that the water levels are a little bit higher. We really don't think that is an issue here based on the monitoring that has occurred based on the MRT.

All agreed it was OK.

Glatt – It is up to us to do a letter then the MRT would say yes we concur then we can direct it to LBG to go ahead and close it based on the letter from the State.

Radig – So you would like me to revisit the closure plan. I haven't read through it for a while.

Glatt – I think I would make sure that what is being proposed. I think this area down here we should probably just layoff for now anything along this right-of-way line. If these conform to the closure plan, if there are any anomalies such as the water levels we note them and if they are not that significant enough and then based on the conformance to the closure plan we concur that these can be closed out.

Radig – At next month's meeting do you want me to send out the closure plan for your guys to read so that you formally accept it or how do you want to do that? It really has never been finalized.

Glatt – At the end of the day though what it would do is we developed a plan and went out with public meetings and received input so I think it is all based on that this is what we are using to determine closure. So I don't know. You say it is officially approved. It is a guidance that we are using to determine and it has gone through a process, a public bidding process.

Schwindt – Do we spell out in that letter to LBG so they know how you're using the document and how they can use the document?

Glatt -- It is as a guidance based on--it is one step of the process. It is a candidate for collecting other information from the MRT.

Neubauer – Call it a Site Closure Guideline to be utilized as a document that the LBG, Department of Health and MRT can rely on for site closures.

Glatt – I think that would be the opening paragraph. It is recommended that we use this guidance document and process to determine site suitability or closure suitability. Based on those conditions from what we have seen something to that effect. We recommend to the MRT that an area is OK with closure.

Neubauer – In essence, as I take it, LBG would rely on the site closure plan as it exists today in making recommendations to the Department of Health.

Glatt – Yes, but that is all it is -- a recommendation.

Neubauer – The Health Department makes a recommendation: yes, we agree or no, we don't. It depends on the MRT. The MRT says, yes, close then we start the process of close. Fair?

Glatt – Yes. Have they recommended these for closure or are these just things you have put out?

Radig – That was their recommendation from their June review of fluid levels. The pink one was recommended last December, I think it was.

Glatt – At this point we don't know if that is coming from the tracks.

Radig – It's been there before so whether it is just revolving right in that area.

Glatt – We will just hold off.

Radig – I doubt that it is actually moving migrating north.

Glatt -- Just remnants of what's there.

Schwindt – One of the things that I noticed going back through this stuff in the last several days here, is that they failed to include in this document all this area up here. There is no data north of First. It's not in there.

Radig – I think they were looking at—that's because those areas were already recommended to be closed from the previous evaluation we asked them to do.

Schwindt – True, but we were going to look at water level data and the fluid.

Radig – I think they did. If you look at the map the legend shows that.

Schwindt – They presented data here on a lot of this stuff between First and Main. This is the area that these charts focus on.

Radig – But they did all the measurements, but they all came out as zero. If you look at all the dots that are red they were measured.

Schwindt – I guess to me I would feel more comfortable if they had all of the manifolds included in this list.

Radig – OK, we can ask Paul to do that.

Schwindt – Wouldn't you rather have the data because where does it say other than just an email from Brad [Peschong] saying there was zero fluid levels?

Radig – The map shows that. They didn't put it in a table, but it is on the map.

Schwindt – It doesn't say that. It just says that they measured it.

Radig – It does have the measurement next to the well number: 0.00 on all of them.

Schwindt – OK.

Glatt – Do they have water level?

Radig – It doesn't present the water level elevation.

Glatt – Do they have that?

Radig – I'm sure they do.

Glatt – They can just send us a table of that to make sure our files are complete.

Radig – We will ask Paul.

Schwindt – That was kind of what I would like to have.

Glatt – Having a complete file folder.

Schwindt – They have all the data here why didn't they include it for all the other manifolds?

Glatt – I think that is kind of critical because when we make that decision then you're driven by contractors to make that decision.

Schwindt -- I guess that is kind of my thinking. It just wasn't clear where that data was other than like you said I found an email from Brad saying it was all zero.

Radig – They have a database or spreadsheet or something.

Schwindt – There are a couple of areas in here that could be considered for inclusion and that is the parking lot area right across the street over here to the west of this area right in here. Most of that is clean. Most of it has if I remember right, has never had any free-product in it.

Radig – The way I have made the manifold map, I only colored the ones where every well could be taken out and the entire manifold removed. The other ones that are the light blue there may be only a couple of wells that still need to be operated and every other well could be plugged and abandoned based on the closure criteria, but you could close.

Glatt – Section 2 and parts of 1-2.

Radig – Yeah.

Schwindt – What I was able to figure out was that we have to keep the wells along Second Avenue here. They tie back in to the manifold by Wells Fargo there. There's a little glitch in the as-builts because it shows this line going here, but it doesn't show it going anywhere. Initially, I was thinking maybe it comes across here. I think it goes back into here.

Neubauer – Back here, here and here, a manifold here, Wells Fargo and it heads over.

Schwindt – I think that is how it goes. It doesn't show this connection here.

Glatt – It shows a line that goes almost there.

Neubauer – You need some other connection. The manifold is close.

Schwindt – Except if you ran it across here and brought it into here. Mine shows it goes into a dash line coming in here. I think what they did was they manifold these together and they came out with 1 line or 2 lines and brought them over here and the same with these 2 buildings. I think these are single lines coming out of the buildings, but they don't have a single manifold.

Glatt – We can clarify that.

Schwindt – Because we have stuff out here, but maybe we can do away with the well in the buildings so they don't have to go in and mess with the building owners any more.

Radig – That’s an operational decision. You still have to retain part of the manifold.

Glatt – I think that’s a discussion we have with Paul.

Schwindt – The other ones I guess were the building right next to Vicky’s where 53 and 54 are in there.

Radig – Fifty-four meets the criteria, but there is a trace of product in there .01. Less than the .1.

Schwindt – That’s why I wanted to bring it up, I did have a call from the potential buyer yesterday about wanting to put a false floor in just because the floor is so uneven. He was wondering about access and things like that. I said leave access through the floor that you put in so we can get to the wells. But then I was looking at this data, it seems like most of that is pretty darn clean, so do we want to accommodate that particular building owner as well and say, it is good enough.

Neubauer -- Hasn’t there been traditional product in that area though?

Glatt – They show some. Now, that is not following the guidance, per se.

Radig – It is because it is less than.

Schwindt -- LBG is recommending abandoning those two. Well 53 has shown some product. The last one was back in 2009 and 2010. The fourth quarter of 2010. The other one 54 there was no product since 2009.

Glatt – What do we have going on around it?

Schwindt – Those just kind of come back into the treatment building here. We had some over on this side but not on this side.

Glatt – Nothing else in the alley?

Schwindt – Sixteen through 22 I think those were all good.

Glatt – My question is do we still have vapor extraction?

Schwindt – We have 18 that had some; 24 is over here. It has some.

Glatt – Twenty-four had some problems.

Schwindt – I don’t have strong feelings one way or another on those wells interior to the building. They have ... potential.... If we leave them in there, I don’t have a

problem with that at all.

Glatt – I'm pretty solid on this.

Radig – My feeling is kind of especially in this main area leave, unless there is a special circumstance like accommodating the building owner, leave the wells.

Glatt – They are pretty solid because of historical we are still seeing some periodic product show up.

Radig – Like these over on the west edge I am more comfortable than these over on the east edge. If you start getting into this middle area, this kind of stuff moves around a little once in a while. I would keep it as long as possible.

Glatt -- I'm OK with this for sure, if they want to evaluate these areas good. Keep this and the second part because that is where the product area is, if they can accommodate us on access with those wells in the building. I feel better about having them there. Knowing full well a year from now we may be pulling those out.

Neubauer – So we are OK with 1, 2, and 3 and 21, 22, 23, 24. Those based on manifold.

Radig – The only one that is abandoned is that little green square on the corner there that's the manifold. The building was taken out and that well.

Neubauer -- The pipes going to that manifold.

Radig – There is nothing going on. It's dead. That one you might as well plug, because it is gone. All the wells near it can be plugged.

Neubauer – We have the manifold by my office and the one at the courthouse. Probably 2 at the LEC, 1 on the east side, 1 on the west side.

Schwindt – One on the south side. There are 2 of them there. The 1 behind Library Square II and the 1 right out front.

**At 10:35 a.m. phoned Paul Donovan of LBG to discuss site closure.**

Radig – We can ask Paul for all the data to present everything.

Schwindt – Just to try to clarify are you guys looking for a letter from the Health Department saying that they are OK with closure on certain areas? Is that what you guys are looking for?

Donovan – Yeah, I think what Tim [Kenyon] would like to see and Brad

[Peschong] and myself something just affirming that the MRT has read and reviewed the recommendations and concurs with the decision, something in writing that we can put into our file. It is a pretty extensive list of closure items and since the draft the closure criteria is essentially a draft document. I don't know if it was ever finalized or approved. We just want that assurance for our files.

Schwindt – Do you want that coming from the Health Department or the MRT?

Donovan – Well, I think the MRT. The Health Department is part of the MRT so if it came from the MRT so I guess that would be fine.

Glatt – The MRT pays the bills.

Schwindt – The Health Department is responsible for the cleanup.

Glatt – I think what we will end up doing. LBG makes the recommendations based on the guidance we think these are appropriate areas to close. Based on that and the record we receive the Health Department will look at it and then we will draft a letter saying basically we concur, if we do. If there are any issues, we would give that to the MRT and then the MRT would say based on LBG's recommendation the Health Department's review of any other issues the MRT would have then, part of the minutes they would approve. I don't know if we necessarily need a letter from the MRT other than that you have the Health Department, you have the minutes saying it has been reviewed and approved and allowed to move forward. Would that meet your needs?

Donovan – Would the minutes of the MRT meeting are they signed or just something to assure?

Glatt – They are reviewed.

Donovan – Just something to assure us, yes, this has been approved by the MRT by the NDDoH, absolutely. Anything we can put in our files saying it was reviewed by others and the decision was concurred.

Glatt – The MRT minutes they are reviewed and evaluated and then there is a motion to approve and all that kind of stuff.

Schwindt – I think maybe to increase their comfort, maybe we should draft a letter from the MRT saying at such and such meeting a motion was made and approved. These are the areas to close.

Glatt – We could do that.

Schwindt – Is that appropriate, Jim?

Neubauer – Did you get all that, Paul?

Donovan – I did. So NDDoH would draft a letter to the MRT. Is that what I heard?

Neubauer– Yeah that we concur. It would probably be based on I think we were talking about the process before we got you on the line thinking that LBG's recommendation goes to the Department of Health. The Department of Health then informs the MRT that they concur or don't concur. Then the MRT makes a motion to approve these closings. That's probably what a form letter would say to LBG to close the loop. Does that make sense?

Donovan – Yes. So then forgive me if I don't understand how everything is going up to this point. So should we direct a letter to the NDDoH or has that essentially already been done?

Radig -- Paul this is Scott. We have a recommendation dated June 11, [2015], however, and there was a previous one approximately a year ago. That previous one included all the manifolds north of First Street to be closed and Manifold 3-1 south of Main Street so they weren't really included in this June 11 evaluation. But I would like just as you were talking about to have full data in one package so that the spring 2015 fluid levels would also be included in the final recommendation.

Donovan – OK.

Glatt – So we have complete records.

Radig – Yeah, one of the reasons is because in Well # 3108 which had previously been recommended for closure.

Donovan -- Closure, right. Then product had shown up.

Radig – Yeah, that had rebounded back to .2 feet and right now I don't think I would recommend that well to be closed.

Donovan – I wouldn't either.

Radig – What we will ask and I can send an email to you and Brad just to clarify.

Donovan – I really appreciate that. That way I can follow up with Brad a little more clearly on what was decided.

Radig – I guess we would just like to look at all the manifolds at once rather than have one recommendation from 2014 and one recommendation from 2015 that covered different areas.

Donovan – So basically combine the two documents and prepare an updated

one and get that to you.

Radig – But use the most current data.

Donovan – But using the most current data, obviously.

Schwindt – That was my concern, that the fluid level data for that area north of First was not included in that June 11 letter from Kenyon. It just seems we should have the entire database in one place.

Donovan – Right. OK. I'm just writing this down.

Radig – I will follow up with a letter and email to you and Brad just so you get it all. A couple of other things I would like to talk about is not just which wells to be closed, but how they are closed.

Donovan – Yes, that was something that Brad had mentioned too that a lot of these wells being in sidewalks and streets obviously we just can't pull a cap off and abandon the well with bentonite. We would want to basically cut them out and probably pin and dowel in concrete. I'm sure there is probably going to be a lot more strict closure criteria for these wells. Is that your understanding?

Radig – We haven't specifically addressed that in the closure guideline or closure plan. But I think as far as city liability you don't want some section, a little square in the sidewalk heaving up.

Donovan – Exactly.

Glatt -- So we can consult with the City in what they want.

Radig – I wouldn't suspect that those should be pinned. Cut out and pinned when they are re-done.

Schwindt – In some of my discussions so far with Jeff Wright with the City, as far as those that are in the city streets and sidewalks and things like that, he's thinking that maybe we don't go in. We certainly have to go in and plug them, but rather than cutting the wellhead out and re-pinning them and pouring them back in with concrete and trying to make a patch out of it that perhaps we are better off leaving them as they are and the city can then address each individual site as it becomes an issue whether they hit it with a snowplow or it just cracks up. Maybe they end up doing street replacement or sidewalk replacement at some time in the future then that wellhead is just taken out at that point in time. That is some of my initial discussions with the Public Works Department.

Glatt – I think that would be a good discussion to have. I don't want to necessarily wait till they hit it with a snowplow and we have to replace the front end of

the snowplow or somebody trips on it and create a liability issue. I want it taken care of fairly quickly so we are done. We have to be sensitive to what the City wants, but I am also concerned that we don't leave it for a potential liability. If they don't address it, then it becomes a problem.

Radig – We may want to finalize the counts before that happens as well and the City wouldn't be left covering it themselves.

Glatt – That's a discussion we need to have in how to proceed forward with that.

Neubauer – Maybe the MRT meeting in November we can bring in Jeff Wright and Justin Vander Linden from Public Works and Engineering and find out what they want to do. My initial reaction is it isn't broke now, can you plug it and just put a metal cap back on it and we would obviously have a supply of metal caps from the other ones that get abandoned and taken out. We are not going to have a shortage there, but if it is not a problem now, do we want to create one. I'm not sure on the plugging process if you need to have that stuff out of it. Can we just open the cap up; pour the magic syrup down and the way we go.

Radig – There should be a cap on top. Normally, it should be cut off and a cap put on as well as putting in the bentonite.

Schwindt – There are 2 caps: One is the main metal cap that is on top then you take that off and then there is a cap on the PVC pipe inside there. Typically, what Roger [Schmitt] does is takes that PVC cap off, puts the bentonite chips in there along with water to activate it and then puts both caps back on and then we are done. That's how he plugs the well.

Glatt – I would like to talk to the City.

Schwindt – Would you be OK with that kind of a process, Paul?

Donovan – As long as the City is OK with that, the Public Works. The interface we are talking about and just leaving the vault in place, tightening the bolts down, just leaving it there until they need to make some changes, right.

Schwindt – Yes.

Donovan – I guess from our perspective that's fine so long as the City is OK with it.

Neubauer – We will have that discussion in November.

Schwindt – Do you think that would be a good enough way to go, I guess? Do you create other issues by going in and cutting the well out right now and trying to get compaction in a little area? Certainly, you can pin in concrete and things like that.

Asphalt you really can't do that. You go in and if you excavate down a couple of feet or cut the pipe off down low enough, do you then create a bigger issue because you can't get re-compaction on that little area?

Donovan – Well, I think what we will end up doing with a special tool is cutting the well about 2 or 3 feet below grade pulling that section of PVC up. If we were to do that we wouldn't want to pin and dowel.

Schwindt – Right. When you are in concrete you can pin and dowel the concrete patch in, yes. When you are in asphalt you are in a different situation.

Donovan – Yes, now asphalt locations would be a little trickier. I think what we would want to do is cut the vault out if it is just asphalt and up to the wall. I think a lot of those areas where there is a well in asphalt there is actually a concrete pad as well.

Schwindt – Yes.

Donovan -- I think in those situations we would pin and dowel into the existing concrete or we would ask the City how they wanted them abandoned. Do you want that entire pad cut out and that whole area asphalted back up? I don't know.

Schwindt – OK.

Glatt – We have a plan.

Neubauer – Any questions for us Paul?

Donovan – Another thing as we are abandoning sections of the system, we are actually accumulating quite a bit of used equipment like actuated ball dowels, we have heaters, we have even some of the blowers in the system that we are no longer using. We have an oil water separator. There is a lot of equipment left over. How would the MRT like to handle that equipment in terms if there is any value in it getting that value out? Or do you want to auction it or how would you prefer that equipment be handled?

Neubauer – Are you putting most of that in the main remediation building or what are you doing?

Donovan – Some of it is in the main remediation building. A lot of it is in one of the storage sheds right next to the remediation building. There are control panels as well. Some of the equipment has some value to it. What I did, Fritz, if you recall last time I was out there with you that there are certain companies in the country that buy and sell used remediation equipment. We could get some money from that and put that back into the MRT. Again, I don't know how you guys would like to handle that.

Schwindt – I remember that discussion that we had that day. I was looking for some kind of recommendation from you guys on what you suggest on how to get rid of

some of that.

Donovan – I did, after we had talked I made some preliminary calls to some of those companies. I got minor interest back from one of them on a couple pieces of equipment. I had not followed up with them though. Going forward like you said as we close areas especially north of First Street, we are going to have a lot of actuated ball valves, some of which are practically new.

Neubauer – I think the equipment becomes the property of the City and we would have to go through the channels that we have to dispose of equipment. We can do it several different ways whether we have approval to auction it on E-Bay, Bis-Man Online or if you have contacts out in the world that are in the market for this stuff, what kind of value are we talking?

Donovan – Pennies against a dollar, a lot of this especially with the bigger pieces of equipment they lose their value pretty quick.

Neubauer – Do you keep an inventory of what you have on hand?

Donovan – I have asked Rusty [Krikava] to actually start putting together an inventory list. I know the valves that we are accumulating are getting pretty numerous. As far as panels we might have 4 or 5 control panels from some of the remote manifolds that have been abandoned and 4 or 5 heaters. I will definitely follow up with Rusty and I will start putting together a list for you guys.

Neubauer – If you can get that list to us and we will take it. Normally, what I would do is shop it around to our city departments and see if there is anything in there that Public Works could use or anything like that and then we would determine of how to best dispose of it.

Donovan – OK.

Neubauer – If it's in a couple different places, when we get that list from you, then I will have our guys go take a gander at it and we can get in contact with Rusty I think and say, show us what you have got.

Donovan – You bet.

Neubauer – Explosion proof lights, I am assuming, if we had any lights in the manifolds.

Donovan – There are no lights in the manifolds, but most of the electrical equipment that we will have will be explosion proof except for the panels that mostly sit outside.

Schwindt – I think the only explosion proof lights are the ones in the 3 treatment

buildings, right?

Donovan – Yeah, the 3 treatment buildings pretty much, right.

Neubauer – Anything else, Paul?

Donovan – No, that will do. Just one last little item. There are a couple of drums that are in one of the sheds that I think are in storage pre-dating LBG's involvement with the project. They have some liquid in them. We have been investigating. It looks like they have some old labels on them. We are pretty sure we know what they are, but we may have to have Clean Harbors come out and do some testing to get rid of them. We're getting calls for that now. We will send that to you guys with a review.

Neubauer – Sounds good. Thanks Paul, have a good afternoon.

The phone call ended.

Discussed drums in storage. Schwindt thought there were some drums in there when they took it over. He thought all of their stuff was taken, but they must have missed some.

Schwindt – We forgot to ask him about the buildings on the west side. You can ask him that.

Neubauer – Is there anything else?

### **Ventilation System.**

Schwindt – What do you want to do with that ventilation system for the LEC? That was the bid, the initial bid. We couldn't get that guy to do it. I called him again on Friday to find out whether he had any idea and can't even get a call back.

Glatt – This includes everything except the....

Schwindt – Basically, it is the same system, but just different people doing it.

Neubauer – It's gone from \$700 to \$1,993.

Glatt – He's going to do it.

Schwindt – In 3 to 4 weeks something like that. Once they get authorized then they work it into their schedule. I guess I could try getting some other bids from other contractors.

Glatt – There is no guarantee that it is going to be any good. We have tried one guy, couldn't get him to do it, checked another place, got a bid but they are going to be

way out.

Schwindt – I guess what I would suggest we do is I will continue to try to get a hold of Gray Wolf and if he can give me a decent time to get it done within the next month or so, we would go with him. But if we can't get it, then we would go with ....

Glatt – H. A. Thompson & Sons. Sounds like a plan.

**Motion.** Glatt moved and second by Schwindt if Fritz can get a hold of Gray Wolf within the near future and if he can do it, otherwise, we would go with H. A. Thompson & Sons for their quote of \$1,993. All ayes. Motion carried.

**Next Meeting.** November 3, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.

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