

CF
POR
NSIC
NTIS
LPOR

MINUTES

Michigan Environmental Review Board
July 26, 1982
Room 1-B, Baker-Olin West Building
Michigan Department of Public Health
3500 North Logan Street, Lansing, Michigan

50-329/330

Membership Present/Represented:

Dr. William Cooper, Chairman
Mr. Francis Bennett, Public Member
Dr. Frederick Brown, Public Member
Mr. Jack Fluharty, Public Member*
Dr. Rolf Hartung, Public Member
Dr. John Moore, Public Member
Mr. Orson Myers, Public Member (--4 p.m.)
Dr. Richard Passero, Public Member
Mr. Robert Adams, Department of Transportation
Mr. Norman Brown, Department of Agriculture
Ms. Carol Hoffman, Department of Commerce
Dr. Donald Inman, Department of Natural Resources
Mr. W. Verspoor/L. Jager, Department of Public Health
Mr. Paul Wileden, Department of Management and Budget

Membership Not Present/Represented:

Mr. Gerald Barnes, Public Member
Mr. Warren Suchovsky, Public Member
Department of Attorney General

Staff Present

Mr. Boyd Kinzley, Executive Secretary

Others Present:

Ron Hauxwell, Pathfinder Associates
Patricia Iseler, Columbus Township Clerk
Edward Schings, Columbus Township Supervisor
Barbara Gardner, St. Clair Co. Solid Waste Planning Committee
Wayne Schmidt, MUCC
Jocelyn Mitchell, U.S. NRC
David Rohrer, U.S. NRC
E. Adensam, U.S. NRC
R. Herman, U.S. NRC
J. Hoppenjans, Bowser Morner
J. Leech, Consumers Power
P. Hittle, Consumers Power
O. Petersen, Consumers Power
Michael Putnam, Consumers Power

Jack Nichols, Waste Management
David Young, Down Chemical Co.
Peter Kliejunas, Department of Transportation
Elain Urbon, Department of Transportation
Geraldyn Ayers, Department of Transportation
Ron Kinney, Department of Transportation
Ron Gaskill, Michigan Farm Bureau
Regis Michling, Potterville Planning Commission
Marianne Pokerwinski, Waste Management
R. Hilprecht, DMB
J. Garrich, Lansing State Journal
Ray Kellas, Michigan Waste
Lani Wiegand, U.P.I.
George Henry, Keck
John Tironi, St. Clair Co. Health Department
Mary Davis, U.S.-27 Alert
W. Beckman, Consumers Power
B. Henton, Consumers Power
Bob Burnap, Michigan Waste Report
Fred McLaughlin, Citizens Concerned About I-69
Wayne Rolinsin, Citizens Concerned About I-69
Paul Dills, Citizens Concerned About I-69
Frank Belobraidich, DNR
Valerie Burgess, DNR
Jeff Passeno, Waste Management Inc.
George Carpenter, PSC
Ralph Green, Consumers Power
Bill Westrick, Columbus Township
David Birchler, Columbus Township
Larry Holcomb, TSCC
John Ulrich, Dow Chemical Co.
Tom Work, DNR
Richard Noden, DNR
David Rymph, Iisirkco & Assoc. Inc.
Joseph Hennigan, MDPH
Thomas Turnbull, Commerce
Gerald Heyt, DNR
Terry Hartman, DNR
David Sommers, Consumers Power
John Bradley, Murray & Trettel Inc.
Jim Boulton, DNR
Gary Gettle, DNR
Marvin Johnson, DNR
Ray Ellison, DNR
Ekiles Boyd, Detroit Edison Co.
Dorin Ellis, Dorin Ellis Co.
Tom Tarr, Tom Tarr Landfill
Gerlad Feenstra, Medeing Van Kookn & Assoc.
Richard Quist, Tom Tarr Landfill
Alyce Heft, Wright Township Planning Commission
Ann Malewitz, Wright Township Trustee
Gary Voogt, Wright Township Engineer
Betty Ragotzy, Barn Theatre
Charlotte Runnello, Grand Rapids

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by Chairman Cooper.

Approval of Minutes

The third line of the third paragraph on page three was revised to read: at Pointe Mouille (delete Sterling State Park).

The second line of the fourth paragraph on page five was corrected to read: and ... (10⁻⁷ cm/sec).

It was moved by Dr. Inman, seconded by Ms. Hoffman to accept the minutes of June 28, 1982 as so corrected. The motion carried (u)1/.

General Announcements and Comments

Dr. Cooper noted the distribution of a memo regarding the Geological Survey Division's (DNR) Compliance procedures and suggested that the members comment on an individual basis.

Dr. Cooper noted that the International Joint Commission had developed a series of eight radio programs on the contamination of the Great Lakes. He read a letter from the MUCC to the DNR regarding the impacts that the proposed expansion of the Spenser Memorial Airport would have on a nearby Huron rookery. Dr. Cooper noted on article on the siting of hazardous waste landfills.

Dr. Cooper noted receipt of a notification of no significant impact for a Corps of Engineers dredging project and a short discussion ensued regarding the compatibility of the testing methods used by the DNR and Corps of Engineers. Dr. Cooper briefly reported on scoping efforts for a City of Detroit project. Dr. Cooper reported that the Attorney General's office had been asked by the DNR to provide a legal opinion regarding the incorporation of a withdrawal rate for cooling water in the NPDES permit for the Midland Nuclear Plant. He also indicated that the General Accounting Office had criticized the EPA for not living up to the agreement with Canada for water quality work in the Great Lakes.

Dr. Cooper related that the IJC had issued a report on the build-up of the by-products of fuel combustion in lake sediments and he indicated that some of the natural compounds were carcinogenic.

Dr. Cooper noted receipt of a letter from the Macomb County Soil Conservation District which contended that the Detroit Edison Company had not contacted the District regarding the siting of the 765KV transmission line. Mr. N. Brown related that there had been a misunderstanding by the survey crew and the Detroit Edison Company would honor its agreement with the Board.

Dr. Cooper commented on the receipt of a letter from the Department of Commerce regarding the installation of pollution control equipment for the new VW plant, and a short discussion ensued regarding a delay in putting the plant on line and VW's commitment to putting the plant into production.

Dr. Cooper reported that the Air Quality Control Commission had approved a permit for the Dow Chemical Company to incinerate certain low level radio active waste.

Dr. Cooper noted the distribution of the N.E. Regional Transportation Study. Mr. Adams indicated that there was no need for a formal review because the Study did not contain specific recommendations. A short discussion ensued regarding the transportation of rail cars across Lake Michigan.

Dr. Cooper noted receipt of a letter from Mr. Barnes regarding a proposed health study for the ELF project and he suggested that the MDPH have any draft program reviewed by MERB prior to submittal to the Navy.

Dr. Cooper commented on a letter from the Toxic Substances Control Commission to the DNR regarding a compliance schedule for the SEOCIA landfill where carcinogens had been identified in the leachate, and which requested the testing of six landfills.

Dr. Cooper commented on a statewide health plan which contained three sets of recommendations which appeared to duplicate DNR responsibilities.

Mr. Myers reported that Ottawa County had completed a solid waste management plan.

Dr. Inman commented on the DNR's interpretative statement regarding the grandfathering of landfills under county solid waste management plans. He also noted the distribution of responses to issues raised regarding the Twin Oaks SLF.

Additional Items of Business

None

CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

EIS 260-M-69: I-69, Charlotte to Lansing

Dr. Cooper briefly explained the history of the project noting the public concerns which had been raised and the federal DOT's decision to have alternatives along the existing U.S.-27 r-o-w considered.

Mr. Adams briefly noted that he had some objections to the subcommittee report.

Mr. Francis Bennett reviewed the subcommittee report explaining the meaning of the do-nothing alternative and indicating that the alternatives in the forth paragraph should read A-1 and C-1.

It was moved by Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. N. Brown to approve the subcommittee's recommendations as stated in the report.

Mr. Adams noted that the "do-nothing" alternative had only been brought up during the last subcommittee meeting and that the alternative had been covered

in a previous EIS which had been approved by the federal government. He explained that the previous Secretary of Transportation had asked for an evaluation of alternatives along the existing r-o-w. In response to a question about the appropriateness of reconsidering the need, Mr. Adams indicated that the need for the interstate had been considered by congress and the DOT. According to Mr. Adams:

- It was doubtful if some of the projected changes regarding the effects of fuel cost, etc. to reduce travel would occur;
- It was important to close a short gap in the I-69 system;
- If the construction was delayed beyond 1986, it would still need to be built; and
- State monies would have to be used for late construction.

Mr. Adams related that the federal government was switching funds from construction to maintenance (4R funds) and the funds would be allocated on an annual basis. He indicated that if 4R funds were used for the construction of I-69, the money would have to be diverted from badly needed maintenance. A short discussion ensued regarding the implications of different financing schemes.

Mr. Adams related that the segment of highway in question was unsafe, it was necessary to go to limited access to reduce the hazards, and the DOT was losing costly law suits due to outdated highway designs. According to Mr. Adams it made more sense to build the road up to interstate standards when there was federal money for construction rather than waiting until interstate maintenance or state monies had to be used. Mr. Adams suggested that the statement be revised to say recommend and that the subcommittee's term regarding the severity of impacts could not be supported by factual data. Mr. Adams related that the DOT had evaluated the foreseeable growth in Eaton County and had concluded that if the entire growth were on one acre lots, it would not take up as much space as some had predicted. He asserted that the urban growth patterns did not follow roads in the greater Lansing area. According to Mr. Adams the Indiana Bat was an endangered species only when it was confined to a narrow range of winter habitat in another state.

A short discussion ensued regarding why the do-nothing was raised at the last subcommittee meeting, opportunities for altering freeway standards, traffic projections, the potential impacts that the freeway would have on land uses near interchanges, the Farmers Home Administration's policy of granting mortgage money for non-farm housing in rural areas, and MSHDA's policy of not funding housing on prime agricultural lands.

Dr. Inman contended that the approved alignment would have significant impacts on wetlands and a short discussion ensued about how such impacts could be mitigated.

Mr. Bennett suggested amendments to the subcommittee's recommendations.

Ms. Mary Davis, U.S.-27 Alert, addressed the Board to contend that:

- farm land could be continued to be sold for development;
- there was no assurances that the land would be kept in farm production;
- zoning would not maintain the agricultural lands and no unit of government was purchased development rights;

- relocating along U.S.-27 would not save farmland;
- the state could buy wetlands to compensate for the impact of following the approved alignment,
- the economic losses along U.S.-27 had been underestimated; and
- the EIS should have presented a more balanced economic evaluation.

Mr. Regis Michling, Potterville Planning Commission, read a resolution supporting the selection of an alignment along existing U.S.-27.

Mr. Paul Dills, Citizens Concerned About I-69, addressed the Board contending that the "approved" alignment would accelerate urban development.

Mr. Wayne Rolinsin, Citizens Concerned About I-69, addressed the Board to relate that the DOT had acquired less than half of the r-o-w for the approved route and to contend that the business operators along U.S.-27 must have been aware of the possibility of the road being made limited access.

Mr. Fluharty questioned how far state monies would go toward the construction of the highway.

The question was called on the motion to accept the subcommittee's recommendation (revised) regarding EIS 260-MF-69, I-69 Charlotte to Lansing, to wit:

The the Board recommends that the "approved" alignment be rejected because of its impact on the agricultural industry, wetlands, of flood plains, and wildlife habitat, and because the other alternatives along U.S.-27 are viable.

The final EIS should concentrate on the engineering design of an alignment which includes alternatives A-1 and C-1 along with some combination of the B Alternatives which lessens the environmental and social impacts while maintaining inter-state standards.

The motion carried (u).

EIS Re: Midland Nuclear Plant

Dr. Cooper briefly reviewed the history noting that a safety evaluation report had been released during May. He suggested concentrating on finding out what extra safety precautions were required to locate in an urban area and whether or not the spent fuel storage could be used for the overflow from other nuclear plants.

Mr. Ronald Herman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, noted the distribution of answers to MERB questions which had been forwarded to the NRC by the Governor's office, and that a final EIS was scheduled for distribution in the immediate future. He indicated that the issue of soils engineering was still under evaluation and the issue would be covered in a supplement to the safety evaluation report.

Dr. Cooper raised a question regarding the sequences of preparing an evacuation plan subsequent to the design stage.

Mr. David Rohrer, NRC, explained that:

- the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) had responsibility for off-site emergency planning;

- the NRC had responsibility for on-site emergency planning;
- a Regional Assistance Agency (RAA) reviewed local (state/county) plans for a ten and 50 mile radius;
- plans were reviewed for adequacy against criteria; and
- the NRC reviewed the applicant's plans.

Dr. Cooper reiterated his question regarding why the safety plans were developed after the design stage.

Mr. Rohrer related that until the accident occurred at the Three Mile Island plant (TMI) the NRC had thought that the licensing could be based only on the design/construction of a plant, and after the accident the NRC tightened the regulations on emergency preparations to require much more information from the applicants and states.

Mr. Rohrer indicated that the requirements had been changed during the licensing procedures for the Midland plant and emergency preparedness was now part of the licensing process along with the design and construction phases. He explained that there was no difference in the design standards for plants located in urban areas as those located in rural areas, and all plants were designed to limit the release of radio active materials to the greatest degree possible. It was reported that there was no standard plant design, but all plants had to meet certain criteria which did not vary in terms of location, and plant designs might have to be altered to meet the criteria. Mr. Rohrer explained that the TMI accident had revealed shortcomings in the emergency preparedness, an emergency plan for the Midland plant was due out this fall, and FEMA had the responsibility for the off-site plan. He related that FEMA forwarded findings and determinations regarding the local emergency plan to the NRC and the NRC used this plan in its consideration for licensing.

Dr. Cooper asked about the proximity to the Dow Chemical Company and whether or not the NRC had experience with similar evacuation situations. Mr. Rohrer indicated that a similar situation involving a steel plant did exist and the NRC did not anticipate problems with a limited re-entry for the purposes of maintaining equipment, etc. He indicated that there were dose limits which had to be followed.

It was explained that FEMC acted as an advisory body to the NRC, the NRC could hold up the licensing of a nuclear plant until the agency was satisfied there was an adequate emergency plan, and the NRC could not control the actions of other companies such as Dow. According to the NRC, the local government was responsible for off-site preparedness and the Consumers Power Company was required to make recommendations to the local government.

According to the NRC:

- emergency planning zones covered a ten-mile radius for inhalation and a 50-mile radius for ingestion,
- the aim was to give a warning for the ten-mile zone within 15 minutes after a decision is reached on an accident;
- the state would provide a draft plan to the Regional Assistance Agency;
- the county was responsible for evacuation planning; and
- there were new regulations (0654) on the criteria for emergency plans.

Dr. Cooper asked about the extrapolation of data from other sites regarding the degree of fogging at the Midland plant, and mitigation measures for the problem. Mr. Herman noted that the issue was covered in the final EIS and he indicated that the NRC was satisfied that the extrapolations were valid. He indicated that Consumers Power was obligated to monitor fogging, and the final EIS covered mitigation measures.

Dr. Cooper raised a question regarding the storage of spent fuel from other plants. It was reported that the NRC had not finalized a policy regarding the transfer of spent fuel rods and that transfers between plants had taken place. According to the NRC, the operating license would have to be amended to allow for transfers and the Consumers Power Company had not made a request for the transfer of spent fuel in its license application.

Dr. Brown commented on the number of mixing zones in the river and asked how the NRC considered the zones. It was reported that the NRC considered the mixing zones in terms of aquatic biology, the NRC depended on the state's NPDES permit review, and the NRC was not concerned if the state was satisfied that the NPDES permit conditions would be met. It was noted that the NRC retained control over radioactive discharges.

A discussion ensued regarding the release of specific radioactive compounds and the variety of chemicals discharged to the river during which the NRC indicated that it had not experience with the overlapping of chemical and nuclear plant discharges.

Dr. Brown commented on the need to contact the City of Saginaw because the city had a water intake down stream of the nuclear plant. The NRC indicated that it was the state's responsibility to notify the City in case of need.

It was reported that FEMA would be holding public hearings on the emergency preparedness plans.

A short discussion ensued regarding the responsibility for maintaining the quality of life in the area surrounding the nuclear plant.

EIS 261-M-182-ND: Richmond Hills Type II SLF

Dr. Inman briefly reviewed the history of the project noting the need for an Act 346 permit to re-route a stream, the site met the standards for a natural area, and that the DNR felt that the county health department's questions had been adequately answered.

Mr. John Tironi, St. Clair County Health Department related that the S.E. Michigan Resource Recovery agency had identified outstanding issues involving the intercepting ditches and the impact on domestic water supply wells. He contended that the assessment did not identify the extent of sand lens beyond the site boundry.

Mr. Wayne Schmidt, MUCC, indicated that a local sportsmens club wanted more adequate data regarding water resources.

Mr. Tom Work, Resource Recovery Division of the DNR, indicated that the hydrogeological conditions were known.

Dr. Passero commented on the need to address the number and placement of monitoring wells down gradient. It was reported that the site was 30 feet above the flood plain.

Mr. Edward Schings, Columbus Township Supervisor, read a letter (distributed) from the Township listing fourteen points for objecting to the site.

It was reported that the county's solid waste management plan had been submitted to the DNR on July 22, 1982, the plan was not yet official according to the Attorney General's office, and it would take three months to get final approval for the plan.

A short discussion ensued regarding the timing of the solid waste management plan relative to permits.

It was reported that the DNR had to follow the Attorney General's advice on being able to deny an application on the basis of an approved plan, that the company would have to apply for a rezoning of the site, and the DNR could not base a denial on zoning.

Mr. Larry Holcomb, TSCC, commented on the finding of toxic materials in the leachate from landfills, the residential zoning which had been in force since 1959, and his contention that this was another example of poor site location. He also stressed the social issues involved and contended that the Board should try and avoid the creation of a problem site.

PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Mrs. Betty Ragotzy, Born Theatre, addressed the Board regarding the proposed Twin Oaks SLF.

She read a prepared statement noting:

- a denial of a zoning change for the site;
- township plans for solid waste management;
- the probable source of waste;
- an alternative landfill site in Calhoun County;
- poor management practices at the Cereal City SLF (managed by Waste Management);
- potential for odor problems;
- a lack of complete knowledge regarding the use of bentonite clay for a liner;
- that the finished landfill would reduce direct sunlight; and
- fears of groundwater contamination.

Mrs. Ragotzy indicated that 2,000 people had signed letters expressing concern about the impacts that the proposed SLF would have on the environment of the area around the theatre.

Dr. Inman noted that the Cereal City SLF had been purchased by Waste Management, and the Company had improved conditions after acquisition.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Tom Tarr SLF

Dr. Cooper briefly reviewed the background noting the Board's recommendation to declare it a major state action. He noted receipt of a letter from the landfill owner's attorney which challenged the Board's rationale for recommending that the landfill be declared a major state action. Dr. Cooper related the background of the Act 641 rules in terms of allowing the use of a 30 mil plastic liner material in lieu of clay, and explained the Board's rationale for questioning the use of the plastic liner.

Dr. Inman noted that the Act 641 rules were permissive regarding the use of plastic liners, and the question was whether or not to issue a permit.

Mr. Tom Work, DNR, reviewed the history of the provision allowing the use of a plastic liner, and the rationale for including the provision, and he explained that the liner would be sloped to collect the leachate. He indicated that moisture could only enter the landfill from the top and proper capping would prevent infiltration after closing.

In response to a question, Mr. Work related that plastic liners had been retrieved after 25 years showing only some loss in elasticity.

Dr. Dorin Ellis, Dorin Ellis Co., explained:

- that he represented the supplier of the liner material;
- the supplier was a fabricator;
- he did not know the chemical composition of the plastic;
- heat would cause a loss of the plasticizer in the material;
- samples taken from underneath sewage treatment ponds had only shown a loss of elasticity;
- the liners were guaranteed for one year for workmanship and materials;
- the PVC liner should last up to 40 or 50 years;
- common household chemicals did not affect the PVC liner; and
- some chemicals would affect the integrity of the liner.

A short discussion ensued on the guarantee and Mr. Ellis stated that he could not assure that the PVC would hold up for a hundred years.

Dr. Hartung explained that some plasticizers were carcinogenic and they would leach out of the PVC and a short discussion ensued regarding the problem.

Mr. Ellis explained that oil resistant PVC was supplied for landfill liners.

Dr. Brown commented that plastics lost halogens over time,

Dr. Passero noted that different stress conditions existed under landfills as compared to ponds, and he indicated a need for data on the integrity of the seams.

Mr. Ellis related that:

- the seams were made as strong as the material;

- no post operational test had been made on PVC liners under landfills;
- the supplier required the placement of two feet of sand over the PVC material and that a factory representative be on site during the placement of the liner; and
- the supplier had no control over the type of refuse deposited in a landfill.

A short discussion ensued about how long a PVC liner would last.

Dr. Inman suggested that there were two issues (the specific Tom Tarr site and generic re: PVC liners), and he asked for a recommendation on the Tom Tarr site.

Dr. Cooper indicated a need for more information about the site and PVC liner.

It was reported that the Tom Tarr site was underlain by clay.

Mr. Gerald Feenstra, consulting engineer, reported that the site was located over clay deposits with a permeability of about 10^{-6} cm/sec. According to Mr. Feestra:

- the clay ranged from six feet in depth at one end of the site to about two feet at the opposite end;
- there would be no excavation into the water table (the bottom of the clay being six-eight feet above G.W.);
- the PVC liner was being used because the clay tested out at 10^{-6} cm/sec. instead of the required 10^{-7} cm/sec.;
- there was about 12 feet between the bottom of the SLF excavation and the groundwater;
- the sides of the SLF were clay; and
- the county would incorporate the landfill into the county's solid waste management plan if a permit was issued.

Mr. Richard Quist, attorney for Tom Tarr, indicated that the county would include the landfill in the solid waste management plan if a permit was issued. It was related that a registered professional engineer would have to certify the placement of the PVC liner and the need for a PVC liner was dictated by economic considerations.

Mr. Gary Voogt, Township Engineer, contended that the soil boring logs did not support the contention that the landfill would be located on a natural clay site. He questioned whether or not the DNR could not use its discretion if the location was a unique site, and he reported that 400 people had signed petitions against the site. According to Mr. Voogt, a HUD flood hazard boundary map showed that the flood plain intruded into the site. He indicated that the local people did not trust the DNR, and he questioned the need for the site in light of the available landfills.

A member of the township planning commission commented on the potential for a local recycling program and for locating a SLF.

Storage of Brine in Dry Oil Well, Wexford County

Dr. Cooper explained that a legislator had written regarding the disposal of brine in an oil well, the well has been drilled and the permit granted.

Mr. Ray Ellison, Geological Survey Div., related that:

- the well is located in Sec. 18 of Liberty Township; and
- it had been drilled for gas in a deep formation (10,000 feet deep).

He dist. ed well logs and explained why the well could be used for the disposal of brines from petroleum drilling operations. Mr. Ellison described the system of casings used for the well and how the well had been cemented in.

Mr. Fluharty noted that it was a normal practice to use disposal wells for brines.

Mr. Ellison explained that the disposal zone was between the 2,300 and 2,500 foot depth, the zone was sealed off at the top by the Antrim Shale formation and the well had been plugged at the bottom of the disposal zone.

Dr. Brown commented on the synthetic chemicals added to drilling muds and questioned whether or not these chemicals could cause problems.

Mr. Ellison related that the well would be used for the disposal of brines from other petroleum wells along with some other fluids associated with drilling. He also emphasized that the shale formed a seal and there was practically no drilling in the Township. According to Mr. Ellison, there was very little difference between an oil production well and a brine disposal well, and the well would be located on state lands.

A short discussion ensued about whether or not the brines would displace the original fluids and act to interfere the mineral rights or subsurface storage rights beyond the lease boundary. Dr. Brown stressed the need to assess the impacts of horizontal migration on privately held subsurface storage rights. Mr. Ellison explained that the fluid movements were extremely slow under pressure and there normally was no movement of the underground fluids.

A short discussion ensued regarding the ability to measure the void spaces, etc in the disposal zone.

It was reported that the company was expected to limit disposal to the brines from company wells and not to allow other companies to use the well.

Mr. Wayne Schmidt, MUCC, related that the township was concerned that the well would serve as a regional disposal facility and that the DNR was not trusted. He suggested that MERB conduct an independent assessment.

Dr. Hartung commented that the issue apparently was before the Board because of public concerns and there were apparently no significant environmental impacts. Dr. Cooper suggested that the DNR might include a proviso in the permit to limit the disposal to just the company's brine, and noted that a public hearing would be held.

Mr. Myers suggested that the state should charge for disposal rights. Dr. Passero noted that brine pits had been causing groundwater contamination and deep well injection offered a better state of the art relative to disposal. Mr. Jager commented on the history of brine contamination noting that a death had been recently caused by sour brine. He suggested that deep well disposals should be reviewed with the help of the MDPH and public.

A short discussion ensued regarding the procedures for changing the status of a well from an operational oil well, etc., to a deep disposal function.

Dr. Cooper suggested following up on local contacts and he indicated that there was no apparent need to take formal action on the issue.

Shiawassee Flats Flood Control Project

Dr. Cooper briefly described the project noting that it would result in the loss of agricultural lands while being designed to reduce the damage to farmlands from flooding.

Mr. Gary Gettle, DNR, reviewed the history of the project noting:

- the project had been initiated during the late 1950s as a result of flood damage;
- the DNR had spent \$780,000 by 1978 acquiring and developing land for wildlife management;
- about 1,500 acres were share cropped producing an income of between \$150-200,000/year;
- the original proposal called for a system which would result in the flooding of over 900 acres during a 100 year frequency event;
- the DNR had asked for mitigation measures because of its investment;
- the Corps had investigated mitigation measures and had reduced the level of flood protection to a 2½ year frequency event; and
- the 900+ acres of state wildlife habitat would not be flooded under the revised project plan.

A short discussion ensued regarding questions raised by Senator Albosta, cost/benefit ratios, diking of the Flint River, sediment ponds, bridge openings/removals, and the Shiawassee Flats wildlife area.

Detroit Edison Sulfur Dioxide Variance

Mr. Jager reported that the Air Quality Control Commission had failed to act (three different motions failed) on the application, and the consent order stayed in affect. Dr. Moore reviewed a subcommittee report (distributed) on the issue, and explained the rationale for the recommendations. Mr. Jager commented on monitoring and enforcement strategies, and briefly explained Detroit Edison's position.

It was moved by Dr. Moore, seconded by Dr. Hartung to accept the subcommittee report.

A representative from Detroit Edison and Ms. Hoffman asked for more time to review the report.

Dr. Cooper asked to have the motion tabled until August and there were no objections.

Leaking Dike at Pt. Mouillee

Dr. Inman related that there was uncertainty regarding whether or not there were leaks; the Corps of Engineers were investigating the dikes around the

cells intended for contaminated spoils for leaks; and the cells had not been put in to use. He also noted that the EPA was proposing approval for toxic-hazardous waste SLFs with only a synthetic liner and the installation of monitoring wells.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. (the next meeting being scheduled for August 23, 1982).

* for Mrs. Marlene Fluharty

l/u = voice vote with no dissensions

Materials Distributed at Meeting

MERB subcommittee report re: EIS 260-MF-69, I-69 Charlotte to Lansing DNR
report re: Twin Oaks SLF;
Statement re: Richmond Hills SLF by Columbus Township Supervisor;
MERB Subcommittee report on Sulfur Dioxide Emission Limitation;
Well log and schematic re: Liberty 1-18 Brine Disposal Well;
641 Rules - Consideration of PVC liners;
Responses to MERB's Comments re: DEIS for Midland Nuclear Plant (NRC)