To: Hagan, Lela[Hagan.Lela@epa.gov]
Cc: Knighton, Erin[Knighton.Erin@epa.gov]
From: Barrows, Judy
Sent: Mon 12/7/2015 8:31:41 PM
Subject: FW: Region 5 UST/LUST Funding Requests

From: Gerber, Linda
Sent: Monday, December 07, 2015 3:30 PM
To: Miller, Paul <Miller.Paul@epa.gov>; Barrows, Judy <Barrows.Judy@epa.gov>; Knighton, Erin <Knighton.Erin@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Region 5 UST/LUST Funding Requests

~~~~~~

Linda Gerber

Director, Release Prevention Division

Office of Underground Storage Tanks

703-603-7163

From: Kamke, Sherry
Sent: Monday, December 07, 2015 12:24 PM
To: Gerber, Linda <Gerber.Linda@epa.gov>
Cc: Victorine, Gary <victorine.gary@epa.gov>; Harris, Michael <harris.michael@epa.gov>; Guerriero, Margaret <guerriero.margaret@epa.gov>
Subject: Region 5 UST/LUST Funding Requests

Linda,
~~~~~~

Please see the Region 5 response to the request for 2016 funding below.

STAG funding for state grants – Zero

Comments: I have asked our states about this but no one seems to need this yet. The states that have SPA are likely to come in for it again. If they do come in for SPA, STAG money supports regulation development whereas LUST prevention money (the typical source of money for UST grants) does not.

EPM funding total- $110,000

EPAct related: $110,000

This would be for maintaining the Ohio SEEs that are currently in place with BUSTR conducting inspections per EPAct. Available reserves will last until April or May 2016. BUSTR would like to extent this funding for the 2 SEE inspectors for one full year.

Petroleum Brownfields related: Zero

Comments: We haven't attempted to work with our states but we would like to pursue this work with tribes. Right now, no tribe has expressed interest in doing petroleum brownfields planning. Only one tribe, Oneida, has asked for money for demolition and remediation for a brownfield site.

TRIBAL RSO REQUESTS

LUST Prevention Funding Requests $327,500

Comments: We are requesting the amount of money that we used to fund our DITCAs last year (when we were able to use some deobligated money) except for a small increase for Red Lake because they need more money to cover work outside of Red Lake. We believe we have funded the largest tribes or otherwise have a mechanism to cover compliance assistance and inspections in most of the tribes that have the largest universes. We are looking to expand more coverage into Wisconsin tribes either by using Oneida's expertise or by encouraging MN DITCA grantees to cover them.

InterTribal Council of Michigan DITCA (covers 33 facilities in 11 tribes in MI) $78,000

Oneida DITCA (covers 22 facilities in Oneida. we will ask them to pursue formal agreements with other tribes to inspect outside Oneida once Mike Arce is credentialed) $70,000

Red Lake Band of Chippewa DITCA (covers 10 facilities in Red Lake plus has formal agreement to inspect 17 more facilities in 8 other reservations. John LeBlanc is credentialed inspector. $75,000

Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe DITCA (covers 15 facilities in Mille Lacs. Tribe is working on credentialing new inspectors. Tribe had formal agreement in place to conduct inspections 8 other facilities at 4 other tribes. $33,000

Leech Lake DITCA (covers 19 facilities in Leech Lake. Ben Beloit is in final stage of getting his credentials. $39,000

White Earth DITCA (covers 19 facilities in White Earth). Richard is moving towards credentials but does not have them. $32,500

LUST Cleanup Funding Requests $850,000

Comments: We requested $510,000 in FY15 and was approved for $382,500. We didn't request any LUST cleanup money to fund Joan Downey because money acquired for Fred Becker in FY14 was still available. We are reassessing our UST and LUST SEE needs at this time. We still have money left over (estimated at $50,000) in the Site 383 account [Downey] that we can apply to a combined UST/LUST SEE. That amount may be enough to fund a SEE for close to a year. Exact figures will be to the region on 12/8/15. Estimate need at $20,000

Tower Standard (Lac du Flambeau, WI)- Field work indicates that soil and groundwater is heavily contaminated and moving toward the nearby lake and under a motel. Additional wells are needed to complete plume definition on land, lake bed sampling is necessary to determine if contaminated groundwater is upwelling into the lake, soil sampling is needed to better define the source area, and soil vapor sampling is required to determine if motel residents are at risk from VI. Additionally, soil removal may be necessary to respond to the tribe's concerns about a continuing source of contaminants moving to the lake and other nearby water bodies. Request- $275,000

Preston's (Red Lake, MN)- Preliminary data from the site investigation in fall 2015 indicated that groundwater is contaminated from the source area to near the river, and soil vapor levels exceed screening levels at locations between the source and the residence. The next phase of

work will include permanent monitoring wells, additional soil vapor sampling in or around the home, gw sampling and possible source soil removal. Request- $175,000

Boivin (Menominee, WI)- We are completing the last round of sediment pore water sampling this fall. The site Conceptual Site Model will need to be updated and the investigation report finalized using the new data, including an estimate of contaminant loading to the river. An information package will need to be prepared to share with the tribe during the consultation process. We will need a corrective measures study/feasibility study prepared if remedial action is needed after consulting with the tribe. Request- $120,000.

Rosebush (Isabella Saginaw Chippewa, MI) Field work completed this year included the installation of 2 new wells to determine whether contaminated groundwater is moving off-site. Three more rounds of gw samples will need to be collected, and then a feasibility study written to share with the tribe. Possible remedial action to follow. Request- $110,000

Chief's Place (White Earth, MN)- Additional work was delayed due to lack of funding. Two additional monitoring wells need to be installed to complete plume definition, and 3-4 rounds of samples collected from all wells. Once this is completed we can determine whether cleanup is necessary. Request- $90,000

Status Memos for Sites for the Consultation Process (various reservations)- Some RP-lead sites are actively seeking closure and we have a need to produce status memos for RP-lead sites to share with tribes as part of the consultation process. We need to produce a document for the file which provides the current status of the site, contamination history, ownership, etc., that we can share with the tribes when we ask for their input as part of the closure process. These memos will serve as part of our Administrative Record for the site and as basis for moving forward with closure requirements, such as ICs. Because some of the files are voluminous and are housed at the Region 5 office, it would save money and time to have funds available in our REPA contract to provide this service. Files could be borrowed and returned, negating the need to scan reports or make copies for transmittal to BERS. Propose to start with 3 sites. Request- $60,000

Total LUST Cleanup Funds Requested for Direct Site work- $830,000

SEE for LUST Cleanup Work $20,000

EPM Funding Requests

Comments: The UST SEE function may be combined with the LUST SEE. No funds requested under EPM for UST needs.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this.

Sherry

Sherry A. Kamke

Underground Storage Tank Section Chief

RCRA Branch

Land and Chemicals Division

U.S. EPA Region 5

77 W. Jackson Blvd. (LR-8J)

Chicago, IL 60604

(312) 353-5794

kamke.sherry@epa.gov

From: Gerber, Linda
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 12:02 PM

To: OUST Regional Program Managers <OUST_Regional_Program_Managers@epa.gov>; Vargo, Steve <Vargo.Steve@epa.gov>
Cc: OUST Regional Liaisons <OUST_Regional_Liaisons@epa.gov>; Miller, Paul <Miller.Paul@epa.gov>; Barrows, Judy <Barrows.Judy@epa.gov>; Gerber, Linda <Gerber.Linda@epa.gov>
Subject: INPUT REQUEST: STAG/EPM and Tribal funding requests for 2016

Greetings

Although we don't have our annual appropriation for FY 2016 yet, we would like to initiate the planning process as we do each year. I'd like to hear from each Region regarding your program budget needs for funding from HQ. Note that I am asking for your tribal funding needs as well with this email. The aim is to streamline the number of emails you are asked to respond to and hopefully make this more efficient. So please send to me all your requests and I will ensure everything gets to the right person to review and evaluate. Please respond using the three categories listed below:

- State STAG grant funding

- EPM funding

*to help meet the Energy Policy Act inspections mandate (or other EPAct provisions), or

*petroleum brownfields

-Tribal

*Prevention Funding Requests

*Cleanup Funding Requests

*EPM Funding Requests

Please send your budget requests to me by December 4. Your responses will be helpful in our planning process, and it may even be possible to fund a few projects/grants before receiving our final budget.

Here is additional information about the 3 categories of requests:

STAG funding for your state grants - *specific questions? Contact Paul Miller*

Some states need limited amounts of STAG funding for their UST (Prevention) programs, despite the majority of program funding being provided under LUST prevention funds. Also, as we have discussed previously, states might be interested in working on their SPA packages now and so might wish to access additional STAG funding. Please let us know if any of your states need STAG funds this year, and how much they need.

EPM funding - *specific questions? Contact Paul Miller for EPAct related items; Contact Steve McNeely for Petroleum Brownfields related items*

EPAct related: Many regions have used contract inspectors, SEE's and other alternatives to supplement inspections by EPA Regional and state inspectors. If any of your states need continued assistance in FY16 while they strive for self-sufficiency, or if states have other EPAct related projects, please let us know. Please include in your request any specific funding needs for inspections at federal facilities. We expect our EPM extramural funds to be more limited in FY16, but we hope to have sufficient EPM funding to meet at least some of your needs.

Petroleum Brownfields related: EPM $ can be used to support communities, local governments, and states in the upfront planning aspects of petroleum brownfields work. This typically involves collaborating with Brownfields staff in the Region as well as State voluntary cleanup programs and takes the form of EPM $ being used to pay for a contractor to support community planning activities (e.g., visioning, design charrette) to identify ways to reuse abandoned LUST sites in an area. Several Regions have used this approach to help get the ball rolling in redeveloping LUST sites, which is one approach for reducing the LUST backlog and in line with the Administrator's priority of making a difference in communities! **NOTE:** EPM $ cannot be used for site assessment or cleanup work.

Tribal – specific questions? Contact Erin Knighton on Prevention related items and Judy Barrows for Cleanup related items

1. Once we have received all your tribal requests for 2016, we will utilize the same process you have experienced in the past. With that in mind let me share again the caution that Carolyn shared with you last year - Caution: I continue to believe it is important for you to coordinate with your tribal partners while preparing your requests. However, we all know that the budget will be tight again this year and I anticipate not being able to fund every worthwhile project. I encourage you to keep this in mind when discussing potential projects and grants with tribal partners so as not to unduly raise expectations.

2. Recall that last year, based in the budget we had to distribute and in consultation with the Regional Division Directors, we implemented a national policy on when to give grants and issue federal credentials to tribes based on a minimum threshold number of UST facilities. This might be something that is considered and utilized again this year. If so we will discuss it with you once we know our budget, and know better how conservatively we will need to draw that minimum threshold.

3. Finally, in the last couple of years, Carolyn has made a decision on EPM funding first and then LUST prevention and clean-up funding a few weeks later. I anticipate this will be the same strategy used this year as well.

4. And, yes!, I am not asking you to provide your responses in the form of the RSO workbook this year. Just send me the details and we will fill in the necessary information.

5. Further details will follow regarding the scheduling of the Indian country RSO calls.

Look forward to hearing from you,

Linda

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Linda Gerber

Director, Release Prevention Division

Office of Underground Storage Tanks

703-603-7163

Sherry A. Kamke
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Underground Storage Tank Section Chief

RCRA Branch

Land and Chemicals Division

U.S. EPA Region 5

77 W. Jackson Blvd. (LR-8J)

Chicago, IL 60604

(312) 353-5794

kamke.sherry@epa.gov

Sherry A. Kamke

Underground Storage Tank Section Chief

RCRA Branch

Land and Chemicals Division

U.S. EPA Region 5

77 W. Jackson Blvd. (LR-8J)

Chicago, IL 60604

(312) 353-5794

kamke.sherry@epa.gov