

**BROWNFIELDS STUDY GROUP
MEETING
July 18, 2008**

I. Attendees

John Angeli, City of Fond du Lac
Jim Bannantine, Arcadis (phone)
Sue Bangert, DNR
Erika Biemann, Giles Engineering Assoc.
Margaret Brunette, DNR
Kevin Bugel, Giles Engineering Assoc.
D.J. Burns, Drake Environmental
Chelsea Corson, Drake Environmental
Karen Dettmer, City of Milwaukee
Frank Dombrowski, We Energies (phone)
Laurie Egge, DNR
David Senfelds, Earthtech (phone)
Terry Evanson, DNR
Darsi Foss, DNR
Shelley Fox, DNR
Don Gallo, Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren (phone)
Mark Giesfeldt, DNR
Mark Gordon, DNR
Kate Juno, Natural Resources Tech. (phone)
Rich Klinke, Klinke Cleaners
Matt Kemp, Godfrey & Kahn

Bruce Keyes, Foley & Lardner
Louie Maier, Factotum
Carol McCartney, Ayres Associates
Roger Miller, STS Consultants (phone)
Jessica Milz, DNR
Duncan Moss, Godfrey & Kahn
Tom Mueller, TEMCO
Tom Mueller, Jr., TEMCO
Henry Nehls-Lowe, Dept. of Health
Eric Nelson, BT2, Inc.
Laura Olah, Citizens For Safe Water Around Badger
Mike Palm, MSA
Michael Prager, DNR
Al Rabin, Commerce
Andrew Savagian, DNR
Jillian Steffes, DNR
John Stibal, City of West Allis
Bob Strous, Jr., DNR
Mark Thimke, Foley & Lardner
Scott Wilson, Ayres Associates
Paul Zovic, Shaw Environmental (phone)

II. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Repair

III. Brownfields 2020: Moving the Initiative Forward – Policy Discussion

Darsi Foss summarized Brownfields Study Group successes of last 10 years – two major reports, SAG, Green Space, brownfields Commerce grants, SUDZ, etc.

Foss: For the next generation of brownfields incentives, what would the Study Group want to recommend? Some ideas include

Broader, Single, More Flexible Funding Source

Foss: More generalized criteria, more open, etc.; could morph SAG and Green Space into a bigger fund that did more things; would be available “24/7” vs. deadlines for applications; could also include funding for asbestos abatement, demolition, relocation dollars and cleanup money

Karen Dettmer: How would you envision the grant period?

Foss: Similar to EPA, i.e. two years; we could also give out loans as well

Mark Thimke: I've heard of comments from others stakeholders that there are a number of little funds and that it takes a lot of time to sort it all out, and wouldn't it be better if there was one big fund

John Angeli: Combining them into one fund with greater flexibility would be the way to go; the program has been growing by increments, and maybe now it's time to expand to that level

John Stibal: I like the idea of consolidation, makes it a lot more flexible; the down side is if we lose the reasons and basis for why these individual programs were created in the first place; so there needs to be a way to keep that language in there

Tom Mueller: I like this idea – demolition and relocation costs are our biggest issues; as many of us around this table know, you need to look at all the components of what makes a successful brownfields project

Scott Wilson: Anything you can do to get away from deadlines and make it more flexible is good; but are these statutory changes? Are we looking at years out before these are implemented?

Mark Giesfeldt: These could be part of the budget process right now; this is a good time to start

Mike Palm: Two points to hammer home; first, similar to what Tom said, brownfields have a hundred different components and we've got very specific programs, it might be better if we go with one broader program; second, I also agree with Scott, if a community comes to us a month after the SAGs are awarded, that's not good; and if they're interested in October doesn't always mean they're interested in April; that can be a long time between grant rounds for project timing

Area-wide Funding For Brownfield Projects

Foss: This is similar to the original SUDZ idea; with this funding you could look at area-wide or industry-specific themes, like waterfront redevelopment or the plating industry

Bruce Keyes: If we look at the area-wide concept we might also want to look at an inter-agency view of that; initial assessment work aside, there's real infrastructure and other factors involved in these projects that a number of state agencies need to be involved with; with area wide teams we might get a lot more bang to our buck for that

More Sustainable Cleanups

Foss: The question is how to have more "greener" cleanups; so far a lot of the dialogue has been with state-funded cleanups for orphan sites; but on the private side, how do you get greener redevelopments? How do you incentivize sustainable issues during cleanup? Cities have struggled with this idea as well; could create a tax credit program; Oregon has how offered so many tax credits per square foot for LEED certified buildings

Mueller: I think it's a great idea, but you're going to need a private incentive to make it worth their while; I like direct dollars vs. tax credits, the state record is not so great for those, and one of the reasons is the non-portability or transferability per site

Thimke: A number of these items have been raised on the governor's [global warming] task force; we need to look at what his task force is proposing

Stibal: If we were to model it after the new market tax credits, and make it available to everybody, including municipalities, that would be a better way to go about it

Keys: The Menomonee Valley Partners have set aside money to pay for a consultant to work with engineers and architects to work on sustainability; maybe having, as part of your grants funds, making a consultant available to work on LEED certified projects is a good idea

Tom Mueller, Jr.: What about points on grant scoring?

Foss: That's a good idea; Ohio has done this with their Clean Ohio fund; we're just not sure how to check that the applicants are actually following through on what they said they would do in their application

Keys: Follow through is a good point; with the MVP example, there was a financial incentive and a covenant on the deed

Dettmer: You could have a "performance deposit" – some sort of funds are given to the DNR and once they've followed through they get that deposit back

Erika Biemann: So you're talking about greener cleanups, but also sustainable technologies, correct?

Andrew Savagian: Yes, both ideas are on the table

Mueller: If we do this in 2009, we need some sort of subgroup to work on that

Thimke: But we could dovetail it with whatever the administration is going to do with the climate change report; that way you have some momentum to tie into

Mueller: When is that report coming out?

Thimke: It becomes final next week

Expanding/Clarifying TIF Law So Cleanups Are TIF-eligible

Stibal: You can give TIF money out for just about anything; that shouldn't be a problem now

Foss: But we don't really have the flexibility for the ERTIF

Stibal: I don't want ERTIFs to go too far or they would compete with municipalities on other developments; I like the idea of keeping it focused on environmental repairs

Michael Prager: It seems like the TIF is broad enough that there's no a reason to use the ERTIFs; however, DOR has stated TIFs might get more strict on communities getting TIF-ed out, which means municipalities might look at ERTIFS more in the future

Jon Angeli: We've created TIFs for environmental projects, and we looked at both TIFS and ERTIFS, and we just didn't see an advantage in the ERTIF; we don't think they're broken, just not as useful

Keyes: I'm in agreement also, the concept of the ERTIF is good; but I've had some obstacles where, with my strategy, if you're going to clean it up you want it be more flexible and get reduction in the assessed value; timing is also an issue

Stibal: That would be huge; if you find that huge value isn't really there and you could get it rolled back to zero

Keyes: The mechanism is there to roll back the assessed value; the problem is there's a length of time to make that request per requirements; if you could have language that could change that

Stibal: It would be easier to do smaller TIFs if you could roll that back to zero

Angeli: That would help in smaller communities

Mike Palm: There are a number of ERTIFs now, it would be nice to know where those are at; if 3/4s of the current ERTIFs are in townships, then maybe the ERTIFs are good vehicles for smaller communities vs. larger; they still may be a very viable tool for municipalities that don't have the ability to create TIF on a regular basis

Creating E-data Submittal/Retrieval Process

Foss: This would be similar to Indian's virtual library; we would start taking reports electronically, make those available on the web, and create a way to crawl back into the DNR files; of course, there are issues with those that don't have a computer; this would also help with security issues, in case files disappear, which has happened in the past

Mueller: It would be nice not to have to send the same report five times to different departments in the same agency

Thimke: It would also be nice to know the tracking via a calendar, so you know what is happening on this date, or when is submitted and when something will be coming up

Wilson: Do we have the server capacity?

Keyes: U.S. Bankruptcy Courts system uses a similar system

Thimke: So does Wisconsin Public Service

Prager: We also recommend looking at Indiana's virtual "File Cabinet"; interesting to see, they did it for the whole agency, for every program

Biemann: There are some states that have absolutely nothing

DJ Burns: There's also a sustainability component; if we frame it in that light, the cost of maintaining warehouses of records vs. e-files

Laurie Egge: Electronic data management can be a lot of things; if a consultant wants to look at boring logs, or where are the TCE sites in a county, they can do that, vs. just reading pdfs

Keyes: How do we move this particular topic forward? Because every year we don't do this it costs more

Fund Staff That Are Otherwise Funded Through Closure And GIS Fees

Foss: In other words, we get rid of the closure and GIS fees but we keep the rest; the fees are about \$1 million a biennium, so we'd need \$500,000/years; Commerce does not charge for closure fees, and we all know about some parties who've not gone through closure because they can't afford it; if we could come up with a different revenue source, we could keep the fees for general liability letters and VPLE

Stibal: Those can be kind of expensive for some potential buyers, and we want to keep them affordable; if you can somehow roll more fees into the remedial process, then those costs will become inconsequential

Keyes: We have to recognize that some times the fee portion of the project can be very significant; for those projects where the fees are consequential, give them the option to check a box or something else where they can ask to opt out

Mark Giesfeldt: If you go with the idea where we get a lot of checked boxes, how do you pay for staff?

Keyes: That's where we should raise fees to cover that cost

Palm: Is there a way to tie into the reduced/given fee to personal income? Don't want to be the big bad wolf, but you want to give the mom and pops a chance and maybe you have a way to check ability to pay

Wilson: On orders of magnitude, are we talking about doubling or just a smaller increase? Can you give us a sense?

Foss: I think we're looking for a different source vs. raising the fees

Mark Gordon: Around 85-90 percent of total fees go to GIS and closure; so if you take that out, you'd need to greatly increase the other fees to make up the difference; also, the other ones are voluntary, and if the prices go up a lot they may not want to pay for the assistance

Louis Maier: Instead of waiving the fees, can you set up a payment plan?

Palm: What about a deferred special assessment to be paid at the time of the sale?

Burns: Commerce uses a lien for the hardship deferments; how effective it has been is the question

Mueller: Are these ATP waivers on enforcement issues? Prior to DOJ getting involved?

Shelley Fox: Yes

Tom: Is that going on right now?

Giesfeldt.: Yes, about one a month

Thimke: To the extent that people aren't performing in the program and are punished, some of that can be healthy information to get to the outside to get people to play it straight; we set NR700 up so that those who don't play by the rules get hit and we go after them; is there any information that goes out to them? If you have examples you can point to for those people who say, "What if I don't do anything? What can happen?"

Dettmer: There's definitely a general knowledge that DNR does not have the enforcement staff; I get calls all the time from small business owners who an RP letter from the DNR and ask how real are the 30 and 60 day deadlines?

Plant Closing Due Diligence

Foss: We of course are all aware of the recent announcement about the GM plant closing; we've also had a couple of recent paper mill closings, Elkhorn lost the Selmer plant; in 2006 we were the 4th leading state in mass layoffs and closings; Wisconsin only has seven cities over 30,000, we are a rural state with small cities but lots of manufacturing; current state law on plant closings says any business with 50 employees or greater must public notice with the state if they are going to close their doors; what if there was a tie to environmental due diligence, i.e. a party would have to provide Phase I and II assessments with their notice to the DNR; if that doesn't occur and the plant closes, the local government would get automatic access to do Phase I's and II's

Thimke: Form a policy standpoint, I don't think anyone wants plants to close and leave legacy issues for the local government and state to deal with; under the exiting law, i.e. Chrysler, you have to go out and solve your problems now and not wait for a DNR letter, that's a basic premise we should be looking at; there's a potential carrot, most often plants don't just close, some times it's over a two to three year period; so they could leave and already have their due diligence done; then the community knows what the problem is and what to do to solve it

Kate Juno: Texas has that, as soon as you close out any permit, you have to demonstrate there are no environmental issues; they don't require Phase I and II but require that any issues are closed out before they can close

Stibal: I like the idea of statutory municipal access

Mueller: Might become a hindrance for new companies wanting to come to Wisconsin

Thimke: Law of the state is if you create the spill or possess or control, you are to clean it up, and we've created a very flexible way to do that

Keys: I think we've defined the problem correctly; what I'm concerned about is tying the terms into the plant closing law; the ones who are going to comply are the ones we are preparing for sale anyway, so we're not going after bad actors; I like John's idea of giving them time to comply and if they don't then the muni can go in, but at the same time I worry about the small town that doesn't have the capacity to go in and do that

Dettmer: There are vast amount of properties in Milwaukee that have these issues but are smaller manufacturers; and the companies that have 50 or more employees aren't closing, just leaving; but it's the smaller ones that are leaving

Mueller: I agree with all being said; but for access we're going to fight rather large lobbies, and as for the size, we're going to get the small business folks involved on that one

Bruce: It would be useful to better identify the universe of sites; again the smaller towns issue is something to consider; often the manufacturer there is well known and it's hard for the town to act, so it's not good to put it solely on the shoulders of the small town, the state may need to be involved; I also know of a whole bunch of sites where nothings happened for several years on investigation and cleanup, but the site is in the system and these companies are on the brink of bankruptcy; so in addition to the plant closing idea, we need to be deliberate for the sites that are already in the system and need some action as well

Mueller: Where you have the plant closing legislation already in place, maybe you can come up with ideas for the less than 50 employees vs. the larger 50 and over sites

Stibal: There's a layoff notice and a plant closing notice; let's make sure we're talking about the right thing

Study Group members agreed to set up two subgroups; 1) Discuss the overall Brownfields 2020 Vision; and 2) Discuss the due diligence idea at plant closings

IV. Dry Cleaner Environmental Response Fund (DERF) – Overview Discussion

Mark Giesfeldt gave a brief background; DERF needs fixing, financially its having problems right now; the last time Study Group met, they wanted to invite the dry cleaner folks to a future meeting

Rich Klinke: Thanks for inviting us; we have a small industry in the state, made up mostly of mom and pop operations; many have been around a long time; we want to help them clean up their sites and keep the businesses viable, as well as conduct the cleanups in a responsible way; most of these places would go under if they had to pay for the entire cost of the cleanup; most of these operations are a \$200,000 a year business; the DERF program has succeeded in that we've got a lot of sites in the program; however there's a lot more work to be done and we're very short on funds

Terry Evanson: The deadline to get into the program is end of August; from a cleanup perspective the program has worked very well; we have about 30-33 sites that have already closed and a few hundred still in the program

Jillian Steffes: Right now we have about 162 drycleaner or former drycleaners enrolled in the DERF program; the majority are ongoing cleanups; we're expecting to see a few more coming in before the program deadline; we also expect to see approximately \$10-14 million in the next three years; in 2008 we are out of money while claims continue to come in; right now we have mom and pop operations stopping their cleanups, and we don't reimburse on interest on loans so the backlog is costing the owners money too

Stibal: Will everyone will get paid off?

Evanson: Eventually, yes

Foss: One option is the federal brownfields money; years ago we had talked about repayments to the federal Clean Water Act fund; that's how we started the Land Recycling Loan Program; funds could be loaned to the DERF program

Klinke: We have the ability to repay the money; we have spending authority for the next 25 years plus; the problem is majority of money going to be spent in the next 3-4 years

Thimke: I have always had concerns with third party reimbursement mechanisms

Evanson: The industry, meaning then number of dry cleaners, is shrinking and consolidating; it's a two fold issue: 1) the cleanup, we have contamination issues, we want the cleanups and there are some nasty sites out there that need it; and 2) want to see properties reused and integrated back into communities

Keyes: Is bonding a solution?

Klinke: We've tried that, but it hasn't been politically viable; we tried to lump it with some other type of general bonding but it just hasn't been possible

Keyes: Is there a way to do bonding? Part of the issue is can you sell the bonds, will the market buy the bonds and is the state backstopping the funds; could you do some sort of tax exempt bond? Are people concerned about the backstopping? Is that the issue?

Foss: The most recent legislative report that didn't sound good for the state on bonding

Mueller: As a public policy situation, the program is basically broken; with the more flexible brownfields program you get \$20 back for every dollar vs. nothing back for money invested in the DERF, so I'm reluctant to want to put more money into the program

Foss: Short of re-doing the whole program, I do think the program has done a great deal of good, it's raised the issue

Stibal: The governor's council needs to go to the Legislature to ask for assistance to get this taken care of; it doesn't make sense to wait that long for the cleanups to get done; if they don't get it done, it falls to the city, so we have a vested interest in your success

Mueller: If we have 162 sites, and maybe 30 more coming in, are we talking about additional sites after that or no new sites? How many other sites are out there that are going to have to fall into other programs?

Klinke: We estimate there are probably 320 sites total, minus the 200; some of those are new sites that are uncontaminated, some of those are old sites that are contaminated; that's why we've seen the cost/cleanup drop dramatically in the last 5 years

To provide additional comments on the DERF program, contact Mark Giesfeldt at 608-267-7562, or mark.giesfeldt@wisconsin.gov

LUNCH

Please Note: Commerce now has a listserv for BEBR and other grant; Al Rabin will send the link to Andrew who will send it out to the Study Group email list

V. NR 700 Revisions

Mark Gordon gave a brief overview about NR 700; been working on updates and getting comments from staff, the Technical Focus Group and the Brownfields Study Group for some time now; and are still taking more comments before it goes through the formal public hearing process

Thimke: I'm pleased you're undertaking this effort; we've learned a lot, gained experience, can improve the program and glad we're doing it

Wilson: As you are making changes, are you thinking about making changes with e-submittals for site investigations (SI's)?

Gordon: We have been talking about that; we've got some guidance related to electronic submittals now; we've included some provisions in the draft rule changes related to e-submittals; for example, how do we deal with the mountains of paper that already exist in-house; basically the two areas to cover are our options for improving SI's and the simple site process

Margaret Brunette: A lot of this has to be in place to before we go ahead and do that; no place for people to view the e-files; we still need to give people a chance to look at this via open records law

Gordon: Other rulemaking we have -- NR 720 is on it's own path for revisions; the reason for separate is NR 720 changes are fairly significant while the rest of the NR 700 changes are fairly straightforward; with NR 720 there's a major change in how we've done things, i.e. getting rid of table values; but it's not out of the question that we might join those together as a single rule-making process, just not now; the NR 720 changes are about six months behind the NR 700 process

Foss: Do these issues occur at closure? It's a mater of your closure was denied because of a,b,c...they didn't do a thorough investigation; so I think backing that up we'd get more sites closed expeditiously and we don't deny it at the 11th hour

Mueller: If this is an across the board change, then it's an increase in cost and time, which will be detrimental to brownfield redevelopment; for most projects of any size or have any technical requirements, you're able to check them out before you submit an SI Report for review; most firms do that all the time; maybe not prevalent on a smaller project but for sure on the larger projects

Dettmer: I think there's already a mechanism in place to get that guidance, the city is a little more sophisticated than smaller clients, but when we have a question on the SI we'd request a meeting and pay the \$500 and get that assurance

Stibal: We can't spend enough money on consultants; with that said, there's nothing more frustrating than getting to the end of all that and miss a piece; so it's not that much money to get it right up front, guidance-wise for a little additional money up front

Brunette : We still get GIS packets in that are wrong, that go back several times for revisions

Gordon: For the review fee – generally, when folks give us a review fee and document, there are less problems at closure vs. just getting it the materials at closure; for a number of these, the SI is required and we try and look at and comment, but we don't always do that, we don't always have time; we're not saying there has to be a review up front; and we put some things in place that hopefully helps us review and, if there's a problem, make them go back and fix it

Stibal: The only way to expedite these more faster is the DNR has more staff, and that's not going to happen; so we need better reports; let's get it in the regulations and the code, then everyone's bidding on the same thing

Keyes: If we are moving to this rational world where we have good information available to the public before the point of closure so they know the risks, then having that site figure with the data on it and post it on the GIS system at the SI stage makes good sense

Laura Olah: Two specific points: from a community's perspective, the table is very helpful, it helps us in evaluating site specifics, for example at Badger Army; the other issue is, for Badger, most of the property is for conservation use, if there was more information there as far as what we can ask the RP for; in relation to the comment about spatial distribution, one of the most useful pieces I've got is where the contamination is both horizontal and vertical in relation to the wells; any information we can get like that is helpful, because a lot of times we get volumes of just the raw data

Gordon: Table values change with time; so having a fixed table in a rule doesn't often help us; if we have the algorithms it is a better way to go; but we'll also have a table on the web site that can show how to generate the numbers; that way if the tox values for TCE change, for example, we can change the numbers in that table on the web; in relation to pathways and specifically the uptake through food chains and ecosystems, NR 720 has some language; however, when you get to bioaccumulation in the food chain it can get complicated, which makes it hard to put in the rule and codify

Olah: It would be helpful to have something in there that represents a baseline; I am in favor of promulgating and enforcing regulations in NR 720 that address exposures/risks through the human food chain and to ecological receptors and systems

Foss: Are there any examples to follow?

Olah: Division of Health may have some of that information

Keyes: What about the vapor intrusion guidance?

Gordon: The biggest vapor intrusion issue is appropriate risk; we have worked our way through that with all the various agencies and have the updated draft guidance; it has to be reviewed internally and then we'll send it out to the public for comment; our plan would be to release it as a

draft guidance for review; if folks want a rule we could probably fit it into the process; the time line is long enough on NR 700 that we could still address that, as part of the response to comments

Gordon: In regards to the simple site process, we are interested in comments on whether we retain simple sites or not, and if so, how do we update this text and what compounds do we add to the list

Gordon: Also, we probably won't do an issue paper for every issue, but probably just flag the issues that people want to discuss

Study Group members agreed that the simple sites process is not needed anymore

Any future comments about the NR 700 and NR 720 rule changes go directly to Mark Gordon, at 608-266-7278, or mark.gordon@wisconsi.gov

VI. Brownfields Study Group 10 Year Anniversary – Update

Andrew Savagian gave a brief update on the anniversary event; will be held September 9, at Foley & Lardner's law offices, 40th Floor of the U.S. Bank building; will have a success story Walk of Fame, rooms with special recognition of brownfield projects, including one for the Menomonee Valley and the city of Milwaukee; agenda will include special recognition of the Study Group's success

Sign up for 10th Anniversary event set for September 9 in Milwaukee!! Drew will send out list to everyone; sponsor and seek sponsors and invitees; for more information contact Drew at 608-261-6422 or andrew.savagian@wisconsin.gov, or visit the following web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/org/aw/rr/rbrownfields/bsg/celebrate.htm>

VII. Potential DNR Grant & Loan Reimbursement Clarifications – Discussion

Foss: We looked at other reimbursement programs that other DNR programs and other state agencies do, including Commerce; we want to work with people and start discussions so we are more consistent and do things properly; from an auditing standpoint this just makes sense

Prager: One of our goals is to make sure this stuff is clear up front and as early as possible so, if a community is soliciting proposals from a consulting firm they are aware of what is covered and what is not; then when the contracts are prepared it's understood what's covered

Stibal: Depending on the complexity of the site, some times the consultant fees go up but the cleanup costs go down; so getting a percent might be hard to do

Dettmer: On a site by site basis, that could be established up front, and a certain percentage of consultant fees could be established

Wilson: DNR does a good job on outreach; have you thought of having a heavy focus on specific firms and communities?

Fox: Yes, we've talked about that; obviously it's been a focus lately since we've been seeing more problems with the reimbursements; it's taking us a lot longer to process the reimbursements when there are problems like this; but it's a mixture of both, there needs to be more outreach done, but also more clarification on what's covered and what's not

Keyes: I also think there's a whole universe out there where it's not a problem, so don't want to make it onerous in those areas

Rabin: Some steps to think about: first, when you do submit a budget have a detailed schedule supporting each item; secondly, to support that have detailed bids showing how your numbers were derived; another activity that helps eliminate gray area is the contract under the project should be detailed and equal what the project budget suggested

Biemann: In terms of SAG and Greenspace effort going out to municipalities, Milwaukee has very specific requirements

Carol McCartney: As the Ready For Reuse program matures, you'll be able to pick out the good projects that are more ready to go than others, and the soft costs will end up getting lowered

VIII. Review of Action Items/Adjourn

Study Group members agreed to set up three subgroups; 1) Discuss the overall Brownfields 2020 Vision; 2) Discuss the due diligence idea at plant closings; and 3) Discuss the grant and loan reimbursement issues

To provide additional comments on the DERF program, contact Mark Giesfeldt at 608-267-7562, or mark.giesfeldt@wisconsin.gov

Any future comments about the NR 700 and NR 720 rule changes go directly to Mark Gordon, at 608-266-7278, or mark.gordon@wisconsin.gov

Sign up for 10th Anniversary event set for September 9 in Milwaukee!! Drew will send out list to everyone; sponsor and seek sponsors and invitees; for more information contact Drew at 608-261-6422 or andrew.savagian@wisconsin.gov, or visit the following web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/org/aw/rr/rbrownfields/bsg/celebrate.htm>

Adjourn