US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5
515293
931690

Bruce

7-9-80

Re: Reilly Tar & Chemical Company

Dear Erica:

Bob Leininger gave me the following information over the telephone regarding the property ownership issue in Reilly Tar. He said the title search company researched the present ownership of land conveyed by Reilly Tar to St. Louis Park. Oak Park Village Associates, a limited partnership owns lot 1, block 3; Rustic Oaks Condominium, Inc. owns lot 1, block 4; Philips Investment Co. owns lot 1, block 6. The Housing & Redevelopment Authority owns the rest. The title search company is forwarding a written report to Bob.

According to the Minnesota Corporations Division, Oak Park Village Associates is a limited partnership formed under the laws of the State of Minnesota with a certificate of limited partnership on file with Hennepin County, Minnesota. The general partners are Diversified Equities Corporation, 600 Chamber of Commerce

NON-RESPONSIVE

[redacted]

partner was Leslie E. Jensen located at The Chamber of Commerce Building address. The number of the original certificate of limited partnership was 435 0297. The numbers of the amendments to the original certificate are: 436-6817
437-6800
442-2491
455-9901

Rustic Oaks Condominium, Inc. is a Minnesota corporation with a registered office at 4601 Excelsior Boulevard, Suite 1600, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55426.

Philips Investment Co. is a Minnesota corporation incorporated in 1959. In 1980 it restated its articles of incorporation and listed its registered office as 2606 Kipling Avenue S., St. Louis Park, Minne-

sota 55416.

Dennis Devlin checked the 1976 Water Quality Criteria document which contains the water quality criteria which are currently in effect. This is no standard for PAH compounds. He also checked the background document for the RCRA regulations. They state that the only outstanding EPA standard for PAH compounds is the 1979 proposed standard which we gave you in the complaint.

On the issue of how to structure the phenol allegations, there are three approaches as I outlined on the telephone today. First, you can wait to see if the U.S.G.S. comes up with recent data for the compound of phenol and then compare that to the proposed phenol water quality criterion. Second you can take the existing

- for phenolic
' see attached) and
st for phenolic
we can take
rd for phenol
The test for phenolic
The way The complaint
. Frank says This
misleading because
proposed new standards
henolic compounds
The standard for
ed The standard for
st low standards for
enolic compounds.
henol standard is
ent and we exceed
ient standard by a

.
ng/l phenolic compound
om the Barr Engineering
is Devlin is calling
to ask Them to contact
to obtain a witness from

them who could testify about these results.

Once you have decided how to structure the chemical section of the complaint, the only remaining steps, as I understand it, are to get comments from the State and from the U.S. Attorney's Office and to forward the complaint to Tony for approval.

Maureen

Attachment

cc Dennis Devlin
Frank Biros
Robert Leininger