

12/1/61
M

MINNESOTA MINING AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY

cc: J. Ling
A. D. Martino
W. H. Fahl
H. J. Wessel

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

SUBJECT: Rebuilding and Relocation of
Sewage Pond - Chemolite Plant

December 1, 1961

TO: H. S. PARKINSON - ENGINEERING - 207-1W
FROM: I. C. ROUDER - FIELD ENGINEERING - 207-1W

May we suggest that consideration be given to include rebuilding and relocation of the waste pond at the Chemolite plant in the list of proposed expenditures for next year at an estimated cost of \$150,000. Reasons for this replacement are as follows:

As reported by Joe Ling in his report "The Waste Disposal Problem, Chemolite Plant" dated July 31, 1961, the pond does not remove any BOD and its leakage is a contributing factor to the contamination of the Chemolite well water.

Solids in an increasing amount are being carried into the ravine and river. The increased volume of chemical waste in recent years has made the skimming tank inadequate and considerable solids have been carried over into the pond. The pond has gradually been filling up with these solids. It has now reached the point where the waste flow is channeling through the pond and solids in an increasing amount are being carried over into the ravine and river. This is an aggravating and already unsightly and odoriferous condition in the ravine.

The present waste pond and chemical sewer location prevents the logical expansion of the Chemolite plant, particularly Building #26. Attached you will find a sketch showing this proposal which is the first step in solving the chemical waste disposal problems at Chemolite. On the attached Drawing AP-3 is shown the additional chemical sewers that would be required in addition to the skimming basin, sludge pond and blending pond. Also shown is a possible extension of the chemical sewer to serve the area northwest of the present buildings where the expansion of the Chemolite plant is most likely. This line needs further study since it is based on 10' contours which are inadequate for this purpose.

We will be happy to discuss this proposal with you further at your convenience.

I. C. Ruder
ICR:ps

Attachment

Exhibit
1031

State of Minnesota v. 3M Co.,
Court File No. 27-CV-10-28862