

Re: Complaint filed with EPA re: Beaver Dam

Mendoza, Ramon <mendoza.ramon@epa.gov>

Thu 3/22/2018 9:18 AM

To: Luebke, Amy C - DNR <Amy.Luebke@wisconsin.gov>;

Cc: Alan Mannel <amannel@cityofbeaverdam.com>; John Kreuziger <jkreuziger@bdpd.org>;

Thanks . Please cc us on the final reply so we have it for our records. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 22, 2018, at 8:40 AM, Luebke, Amy C - DNR <Amy.Luebke@wisconsin.gov> wrote:

Hi Ramon,

I think it would be best for Fire Chief Al Mannel to address your question. I've copied him on this reply.

Al: here's some draft language to get you started...

If it was just a matter of demolishing the building because it was a total loss, knocking it down would have been an option. This wasn't the case, however. The problem we were trying to address was rendering safe the highly volatile chemicals that were present in the apartment building. After consultation with the FBI and other experts in the kind of materials that were present, we came to understand that thermal destruction was the only viable method to render these materials safe. The purpose of burning the structure down was to produce the heat necessary to break down the chemicals. The continued presence of those materials put everyone's safety at risk.

We are committed to service excellence.

Visit our survey at <http://dnr.wi.gov/customersurvey> to evaluate how I did.

Amy Luebke

Phone: (715) 421-7875

amy.luebke@wisconsin.gov

From: Mendoza, Ramon [<mailto:mendoza.ramon@epa.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 8:18 AM

To: Luebke, Amy C - DNR <Amy.Luebke@wisconsin.gov>

Subject: Complaint filed with EPA re: Beaver Dam

Hello Amy, We received this complaint on our EPA website asking why it had to be burned down instead of deconstructed. I can refer it to you for a response to the complainant directly or you can send me the response you approved (sounds like an FAQ) .

For EPA we understood that clearing the apartment was tried but there was a sympathetic detonation which confirm the presence of other explosive material (after the controlled explosion). The building was unsafe for workers and the public for the deconstruction remedy and incineration through a controlled burn was deemed safer overall.

Let me know how you want to respond please.

Thanks Ramon Mendoza
OSC
USEPA Region 5
312-802-1409