US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5
515418

TO: Roger Grimes
FROM: Robert Leringer
RE: Reilly Tar trip report
DATE: 9-16-82

On September 15 I went to Minneapolis for the depositions of George Koonce, Larry Anderson and Herbert Finch. Anderson and Koonce had been noticed up by Reilly Tar since they had been state employees who were involved with the inspections of the site.

The deposition of Anderson was not noteworthy because he had only inspected the site once and could not recall anything significant beyond what was contained in his inspection report and some phone memos. The deposition of Koonce was cancelled because he has had a severe stroke and is unable to communicate.

After the Anderson deposition Steve Shakman, Dennis Coyne and I had a discussion with Reilly Tar's attorney with regard to the Hickok deposition. You may recall that the state had advised Reilly Tar earlier that it would seek a protective order in the event that the company pursued the deposition of Eugene Hickok & Associates. Reilly's attorney stated that the deposition of Hickok may not be necessary and he, therefore, withdrew his notice of deposition.

Because of the cancellation of the Koonce deposition I had some extra time left in the day. I used it to make several calls to Chicago and Lansing regarding the Velsicol case. I was able to use the FTS operator out of nearby Fort Snelling.

On September 16 we resumed the deposition of Herbert Finch, former plant manager at the site. Allan Hindelaker, attorney for St. Louis Park asked some questions and Dennis Coyne from the state also did some questioning. I asked Finch questions regarding the unions at the site and got some good information, including the fact that there were specific union contract provisions relating to which wells the drinking water was to come from on site. I also asked him questions relating to housekeeping, insurance, problems with the water system due to tar and tried to pin him down on various other issues relating to the deep well on site and the tar which was found to be in it.

This concludes the deposition of Herbert Finch. I think that we were very successful on developing testimony to show:

1. the operations at the site
2. the waste streams from such operations

3. the leaks, spills and other occurrences which caused products to be released into the open environment
4. the chain of command for decision making in the company
5. the names of persons involved at all levels and their positions and responsibilities
6. the pathway of contaminants from the site to surrounding areas.
7. housekeeping and waste management practices at the site.

During the week of October 10 we will be taking the depositions of Messrs. Lisches, Justen and Hennessey in Indianapolis. All three of these men were involved with decisions regarding the site but were further up the chain of command than Finch.

cc. Schaefer
Ullrich
Taliaferro
Constantelos
Bartelt
Bitter