

ST. LOUIS SITE REMEDIATION TASK FORCE

* * * * *

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

* * * * *

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1996

* * * * *

BE IT REMEMBERED that on the 5th day of December, 1996, a public hearing was conducted at the Clayton Community Center, Mark Twain Circle, Clayton, Missouri 63105, and the following proceedings were had:

HALE REPORTING, INC.

No. 4 Godfrey
St. Louis, Missouri 63135
(314) 524-2055

ORIGINAL

INDEX

Page

Opening Remarks:

Mr. Westfall. 03

Remarks:

Mr. Talent. 07

Mr. Grams 08

Mr. Bosley. 09

Mr. Grumbly 12

Question-Answer Session 33

Adjourn 63

1 THURSDAY AFTERNOON, DECEMBER 5, 1996

2 (The proceedings were called to order at
3 approximately 3:10 p.m.)

4 OPENING REMARKS:

5 MR. WESTFALL: Can I have your attention?
6 Let's get started, we're already starting late and
7 the undersecretary has got a busy schedule. I'm Buzz
8 Westfall, county executive.

9 Before I make some very brief remarks let
10 me introduce a couple of distinguished guests here
11 today -- Thomas Grumbly, who obviously will speak
12 later, is the undersecretary for the Department of
13 Energy. And I'd like to announce today, with the
14 news we've already been briefed on, he's our good
15 friend in Washington.

16 (Applause).

17 MR. WESTFALL: Jim Olendorf (phonetic) and
18 Jim Werner from the U.S. Department of Energy, Dennis
19 Grams from Region VII, he's the Region VII
20 administrator for the U.S. Environmental Protection
21 Agency. Tracy Henke is here from Senator Christopher
22 Bond's office, who could not be here unfortunately.
23 Governor Carnahan was here earlier for a meeting with
24 the undersecretary but he had to leave for other
25 business.

1 The first thing I'd like to do is to thank
2 the Task Force and Sally Price in particular for
3 having chaired it. They've worked diligently, they
4 have a very dedicated group, we have a certificate to
5 give all of them a certificate of accomplishment.
6 It's a very small thing but it indicates how grateful
7 the St. Louis community is to their efforts. And I
8 think Tom Grumbly will tell you that their efforts
9 were truly essential to the news that we're going to
10 hear today.

11 As county executive -- Mayor Bosley and I
12 two years ago convened this group to make
13 recommendations to the Department of Energy
14 concerning the clean-up of the St. Louis FUSRAP
15 sites, those are the radioactive sites, for lack of a
16 better word. This group represented every segment of
17 our community.

18 After many months of intense work and
19 deliberation, the committee has presented a final
20 report to the Department of Energy. I applaud their
21 efforts and the community as a whole owes you a debt
22 of gratitude for the service that you have rendered.
23 So thank you very, very much and let's give a round
24 of applause to our Task Force. Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

1 MR. WESTFALL: Where's Sally? And Sally
2 I'm going to ask you to chair this last meeting of
3 the Task Force, I have to go to a council meeting
4 after I make introductions and I've already told the
5 undersecretary I won't be here to hear his remarks
6 and he says he understands.

7 Just very briefly, St. Louis was here when
8 America needed us during World War II, that was
9 during part of the Manhattan Project in building the
10 bomb, and many of our parents worked in the war
11 effort fifty years ago and paid a big sacrifice and
12 the problem has been with us ever since, as it has
13 been in some other parts of the country.

14 Now, the federal government is stepping up
15 to the plate and saying thanks and finally going to
16 solve the problem -- they're going to at least
17 address the problem and help us solve it.

18 I want to thank Governor Carnahan too, as
19 I've said was unable to be here, for his persistent
20 efforts in raising the level of attention of this
21 problem.

22 Obviously, it helps when your local
23 officials -- it's one thing when you have the
24 governor of the state helping as well to get the
25 federal government's attention, that helps immensely

1 reasonably lengthy statement.

2 First, obviously, I'd like to echo the
3 comments that have been made already and express my
4 sincere appreciation to each and every member of St.
5 Louis Site Remediation Task Force upon the completion
6 of your work.

7 I'd particularly like to thank Sally Price
8 for the dedication and the time that she's spent
9 here. I think she really deserves a word that is too
10 little used in our vocabulary these days and that's
11 the word citizen. The word that really has the
12 public connotation of what we're supposed to be like,
13 people who not only care for ourselves and care for
14 our families but who care for the rest of us as well
15 and I'd really like to thank you again for the work
16 that you've done.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. GRUMBLY: This is a very tough
19 assignment that this Task Force took on. Your
20 efforts have helped move this forward to resolving I
21 think the fifty-year-old legacy in the St. Louis area
22 and I am confident that we will now begin the
23 large-scale clean-up to protect the public health and
24 environment at these sites, both in the city of St.
25 Louis as well as in the St. Louis area.

1 I would also like to thank the many local
2 officials who have worked towards clean-up of the St.
3 Louis sites especially County Executive Buzz Westfall
4 and Mayor Freeman Bosley. Earlier this afternoon I
5 had a meeting with Governor Carnahan who expressed
6 his very strong support and his desire to get on with
7 the clean-up.

8 I have to tell you that if it was not for
9 the support of the governor, the members of Congress
10 including Congressman Clay, Congressman Gephardt, and
11 Congressman Talent, who's here today, as well as the
12 mayor, we would not be where we are today.

13 People like to, I think, talk about federal
14 officials having money. Well, we don't have money.
15 We're simply the stewards of the money that all of
16 you give to us. And without the support of the local
17 and state and federal officials that we have we
18 wouldn't have anything at all. And I'm happy to say
19 that we've got that support here in this area. It's
20 a level of support that I won't say is unique in the
21 United States but it is uncommon.

22 You know, it's not unheard of but it's rare
23 that I get letters from an entire delegation, from
24 both sides of the aisle, expressing the same view.
25 But in this particular case that's been the truth and

1 state with community involvement over the next six to
2 nine months. It's my objective that we have a record
3 of decision on this site as close to the end of this
4 fiscal year, which is to say by September 30, as
5 possible.

6 I can tell you that we will not be
7 constructing a bunker site as had been proposed here
8 when I first traveled here in ninety-three and I can
9 also tell you that our primary approach will instead
10 be to remove soil to an out-of-state disposal
11 facility and to remove absolutely as much soil as
12 necessary to protect public health and the
13 environment.

14 That decision in 1993 I think it's fair to
15 say was a turning point in the history of radioactive
16 waste clean-up in the St. Louis area. We are now
17 poised I think to take another major step. One that
18 I hope we can all be equally as proud of when we're
19 judged by future generations.

20 The next set of decisions will be more
21 difficult. I don't believe that either you or I will
22 shrink from this challenge. We may not welcome it
23 but I think that working together we will be able to
24 be equal to the challenge that confronts us at this
25 point.

1 As we consider the challenge before us I
2 think it's useful to take stock of what we've
3 accomplished together in the last two years because
4 it's clear that this department has not been standing
5 still.

6 First, we've already begun clean-up at this
7 site. Thanks to the input of the Task Force we've
8 completed the clean-up of more than nineteen
9 contaminated vicinity properties in the past two
10 years. This has involved the removal of more than
11 thirteen thousand cubic meters of contaminated soil
12 which would be enough to fill this meeting room more
13 than thirteen times.

14 In fiscal year 1996 we also completed the
15 clean-up Plan 10 at the downtown site industrial
16 property, basically an entire city block of land
17 area. And this removed an additional fourteen
18 thousand cubic meters. And we've also completed the
19 clean-up of the Riverfront Trail for recreational use
20 which entailed removing an additional eight hundred
21 and fifty cubic meters. So the total amount of
22 contaminated material removed in the last two years
23 was nearly twenty-eight thousand cubic meters or
24 nearly thirty times the capacity of this room.

25 Secondly, we have dramatically increased

1 the funding that's dedicated to this site. In 1993
2 when I first started working at DOE, and at the
3 beginning of the Clinton administration, the annual
4 budget for the site was eight million dollars. For
5 this fiscal year the budget will be for sure, already
6 appropriated by the Congress, more than twenty-three
7 million dollars, almost three times the amount of
8 money that we had on the table just three years ago.

9 Third, and perhaps most importantly for the
10 long run, we are changing the way we do business. By
11 establishing the St. Louis Task Force we began the
12 process of bringing the community into the
13 decision-making process. You deserve an incredible
14 amount of credit for this.

15 I know that virtually all of this work has
16 been done on a volunteer basis, that all of you have
17 spent countless hours reviewing documents and
18 attending meetings and writing an extensive report.
19 I can assure you that this report is getting
20 absolutely the most serious attention that the
21 government can give a report and is being given the
22 very strongest consideration that it can possibly
23 get.

24 I have to tell you that the work on this is
25 not yet complete. The bad news, I'm afraid, is that

1 some of you at least probably have not reviewed your
2 last document nor attended your last meeting on this
3 subject. The good news is that the expertise that
4 you've developed, the patterns of communication that
5 you've put in place and the progress that you've made
6 so far are not only not in vein but are the building
7 blocks for how we're going to work through the
8 remaining issues.

9 We know that because the St. Louis site is
10 on EPA's national priority list we need to work with
11 EPA and the Missouri Department of National Resources
12 to develop the specific final clean-up approach for
13 these sites. We know that whatever remedy we put in
14 place needs the support of the community if it's
15 going to be successful so that we need to continue to
16 involve the public in this process.

17 Today, because of the record that all you
18 have established, we begin crossing the watershed
19 into the next phase of the clean-up of the St. Louis
20 sites. I don't know all of the answers yet that are
21 going to be before us. I submit to you, however,
22 that one thing is clear -- the only way we're going
23 to get there is by continuing to work together.

24 I'd like to begin our discussion here today
25 by offering some things, by putting some things on

1 the table. The most important of which I think is my
2 word and the word of this administration. I have
3 always in the past been very careful to meet every
4 commitment that I make to you, to the people here and
5 to people at every other site that I have
6 responsibility for and to avoid making any
7 commitments that I cannot meet.

8 I think there are three levels of issues
9 that I would like to discuss with you today: General
10 commitment, commitments that are in response
11 specifically to the Task Force recommendations and
12 commitments and response to issues that have been
13 raised by the state and local community as well as by
14 members of Congress subsequent to this coming out.

15 First, as a government agency I think we
16 have to keep in mind our two fundamental obligations
17 under the law. We must be committed to protecting
18 human health and the environment and we will take
19 whatever action is necessary to provide this
20 protection.

21 This is a commitment that is not
22 constrained by the dollars that are necessary. It is
23 our job as public officials to muster the case, to
24 muster the evidence, to muster the dollars and to
25 muster the support that we need in Congress in order

1 to make the dollars available to get on with the
2 clean-up.

3 And we commit to undertaking continued
4 clean-up of the St. Louis site in a matter that not
5 only protects human health and the environment but
6 also facilitates economic development in coordination
7 with the communities here by insuring that the timing
8 and extent of clean-up allows for specific land
9 uses.

10 Next, to your Task Force report and the six
11 specific recommendations. Frankly, and I'm being
12 completely honest with you, a couple of these
13 recommendations go further than I'm able to respond
14 fully at this time. A complete response will require
15 working together and in the future. But I think I
16 can give you some initial response and some very
17 concrete things on each of the six areas that we're
18 talking about.

19 First, with respect to funding. Your
20 report recommends that the department, quote, commit
21 sufficient funding to continue and accelerate the
22 clean-up. The Department of Energy is taking steps
23 to significantly increase the funds for the St. Louis
24 sites to be made available up to twenty-three million
25 dollars for this year, fiscal year 1997, the current

1 fiscal year.

2 For the next fiscal year, fiscal year 1998,
3 we have proposed a substantial increase in the budget
4 account that sites like the St. Louis site will
5 receive. I can't tell exactly the FY 98 funding
6 level yet because it's still subject to budget
7 deliberations, but since I've put this statement
8 together, I'm happy to be able to say that the White
9 House Office of Management and Budget has indicated
10 its very strong support, based upon the support of
11 the president, for nearly a doubling of the amount of
12 money that's available in this budget for sites like
13 St. Louis and three or four other sites around the
14 nation. And I can assure you that this increase will
15 be sent to the Congress of the United States in
16 February of 1998.

17 These funds will be allocated using the
18 same method that we've been using for the past couple
19 of years by coordinating with the community as well
20 as with the EPA and state regulators on the specific
21 task that should be performed with available
22 funding.

23 Our first suggestion will be to use the
24 funds that are available now, to accelerate and
25 expand the clean-up of the so-called haul routes and

1 the downtown site in consideration of the Task Force
2 recommendations and community concern as well as from
3 our own sense of the risk priorities and prudent
4 management.

5 Moreover, we remain committed to requesting
6 adequate funds from Congress to clean up the St.
7 Louis sites in accordance with the final decision on
8 the remedy and to achieve clean-up as swiftly as
9 possible. In fact, it's my objective that we have
10 these St. Louis sites cleaned up by 2004 in time for
11 -- I think it's the bicentennial or centennial of
12 this particular region -- the centennial of the
13 World's Fair.

14 I think that eight, while it's a long time
15 in most of our lives, will be an incredibly short
16 time in terms of dealing with this site given what
17 everybody has had to deal with so far. And that
18 length of time is really the only thing that's
19 contingent upon the funding that we get.

20 The clean-up of this site we commit to you
21 we will request the money from Congress that is
22 necessary to get the clean-up that we need. I think
23 all of us recognize, all of us who are citizens of
24 this country recognize that there are pressures to
25 reduce the federal budget deficit, that these budget

1 pressures are real and that they're intense and that
2 they're only going to increase.

3 Indeed, the increases that we're talking,
4 the increases that the president will propose for
5 this site and four or five others in the United
6 States comes in the face of an overall declining
7 budget that the DOE environment budget will have.

8 So we are raising these sites in a level of
9 priority far beyond what we're doing at many other
10 places in the United States and that means we're all
11 going to have to work together -- local, state,
12 federal officials -- to make sure those increases are
13 actually realized because we're in a very competitive
14 budget environment.

15 We have to all work together to ensure that
16 the dollars are spent as efficiently as possible and
17 that any clean-up is adequately justified if we're to
18 succeed in obtaining approval for the funding that's
19 necessary.

20 Secondly, you make some recommendations
21 about removing soil according to the standards
22 recommended in the report. The report recommended
23 very specific clean-up standards for specific areas.
24 We are prepared to accept the public health and
25 technical basis for most of these specific sites such

1 as the haul routes, the vicinity properties being
2 cleaned up to residential standards and we're also
3 prepared to move ahead with cleaning up the downtown
4 site right away to, quote, commercial, industrial and
5 recreational use standards as you indicated.

6 I have to acknowledge to you, however, and
7 I have to be very straight up with you about this,
8 that the issue of what to do about the so-called
9 SLAPS site and the Latty Avenue storage site and how
10 to fund them is not an easy one for us.

11 I recognize that the Task Force recommended
12 clean-up for these sites to, quote, unrestricted use
13 levels and that was particularly, as I understood it,
14 to protect the groundwater and to ensure that the
15 water doesn't run off and contaminate Coldwater Creek
16 and other parts of the property.

17 What we think we need to do now is to work
18 out what level is appropriate and how we can achieve
19 this. What we need to do working together -- us,
20 Missouri DNR, the EPA -- is to very quickly over the
21 next ninety days to put together a further review of
22 the hydrogeological situation that exists in this
23 area, particularly the SLAP site, so that we have the
24 scientific basis of evidence for deciding whether we
25 need to clean up this part of the site to

1 unrestricted use.

2 The fact of the matter is, Ladies and
3 Gentlemen, is that with the level of evidence that we
4 have now I would have a very difficult time both
5 within the administration as well as with the
6 Congress in persuading people that unrestricted use
7 for the SLAP site is an immediately obvious solution
8 to this problem.

9 But as I told Governor Carnahan, as I've
10 told Mayor Bosley, as I've told everybody else, we
11 continue to be open to that as a solution but it
12 needs to be driven by the scientific evidence that we
13 can accumulate over the next six to nine months or
14 so. We acknowledge that this is an issue and we need
15 to work out ways to move forward.

16 We're not saying here today that we don't
17 accept your recommendation, what we're saying here
18 today is that this is an issue that we need to
19 continue to work on even as we move forward right
20 away to begin the enhanced clean up of this sites.
21 We're not going to sit here and do nothing while we
22 study this issue, we're going to move ahead with the
23 parts of the clean-up right away that we all agreed
24 to and come back to this issue in the final record of
25 decision hopefully by the end of this fiscal year.

1 We know that the Task Force has expressed
2 serious concerns about the potential threats to
3 groundwater. The results of the expert panel
4 indicates the need for more data in order to draw
5 firm conclusions and we commit to working
6 collaboration with all of our citizens to develop a
7 more complete hydrogeologic assessment.

8 Let me move on to the airport site first.
9 Your report recommended that the airport site be
10 cleaned up first. As we understand this
11 recommendation this reflects a concern that unless
12 it's cleaned first that the clean-up of the airport
13 site would lag behind and possibly be forgotten.

14 I want to assure you that the SLAP site
15 will not be last. It will be wrapped into this
16 entire remedy and we will move out on this as rapidly
17 as we can possibly can. We are not intending to make
18 this SLAP site the last site on the curve and to have
19 the most expensive part of the clean-up lag far
20 behind.

21 Frankly, Ladies and Gentlemen, the reason I
22 want to clean up this site in eight years, even
23 though it's the centennial that's here, is because I
24 want to be sure that there are enough members of
25 Congress left who remember the Cold War and the

1 reasons why this stuff happened so that we can get on
2 with it.

3 So we are going to move forward together,
4 we are not going to lag behind the airport site but
5 we do have to set some priorities and we have to
6 recognize, at least I recognize, that we have to deal
7 with some of the technical difficulties surrounding
8 the SLAP sites before we can make a final decision on
9 this.

10 The fourth recommendation concerns an
11 on-site office. We commit to establishing and
12 providing on-site federal staffing for a St. Louis
13 clean-up office for the duration of the progress.
14 Our first person will appear -- a full-time federal
15 employee will appear on this site not later than
16 February first and we will enhance our presence at
17 this site, this set of sites as much as we have to,
18 to ensure that we get the kind of adequate
19 communication that we need as we go forward.

20 I can also tell you that this office will
21 report directly to Jim Olendorf in Washington. They
22 won't report through the Oak Ridge site so again we
23 will have the kind of direct communication on this
24 site that we need to have to ensure that the public
25 knows what it's getting.

1 Finally, let me talk about recommended new
2 technologies. We appreciate the attention paid by
3 the Task Force subcommittee to new technologies. In
4 particular, we strongly agree with the overall
5 conclusion that there is some potential for new
6 technologies to improve the effectiveness and reduce
7 the cost of the clean-up over traditional remedies.

8 I have to tell you, however, at the moment
9 that I think for the most part while we want to
10 examine some things quickly, and we may perhaps use a
11 workshop to do that, that I'm basically feeling that
12 we're probably going to have to truck this stuff out
13 of the area.

14 If there's anything that we can do to
15 separate clean from dirty, clean from radioactive,
16 we'll do that. We'll do that in a short period of
17 time. But I think fundamentally we're going to have
18 to take most of this stuff that we take we're going
19 to have to take it away.

20 In addition, I think there are a number of
21 commitments that I'm prepared to make today on behalf
22 of the department in response to concerns that are
23 raised for local officials, your congressional
24 delegation, others in the community. I think these
25 are all vital issues for moving the process forward.

1 First, we commit to continued support for a
2 specific St. Louis Remediation Task Force, including
3 assistance in converting this Task Force which we see
4 as ending today to a site-specific advisory board if
5 that's what the community chooses to facilitate
6 effective communication.

7 As part of our overall Superfund efforts as
8 an administration at every significant Superfund site
9 we're establishing community advisory boards drawn
10 from a broad section of the community, not selected
11 by the Department of Energy but selected from an
12 independent source to help us govern and oversee what
13 happens here in St. Louis over the next eight years.

14 We're also changing the way we hire and
15 manage contractors. We're aware, and Congressman
16 Talent I think deserves credit for bringing this
17 problem to our attention as much as anybody else,
18 we're concerned about how much money goes into
19 overhead at our sites, we're concerned that not as
20 much money historically has gone into actual clean-up
21 as needs to go into clean-up.

22 The contract under which we clean up these
23 sites expires in 1998. We are examining and will
24 turn this contract into a performance-based contract
25 in which people only get paid in terms of their

1 profit for what they do as opposed to showing up.

2 And we're going to examine very closely
3 whether we're going to separate this contract from
4 the other contracts that we have to clean up FUSRAP
5 sites so that we can get specific focus on this site
6 over of the next seven to eight years.

7 The written material that I have says we're
8 designing a plan for ten years. Eight years. Eight
9 years is the number for this place if we can get the
10 kind of support, continuing support, from the
11 political leadership -- local, state and federal --
12 that's demonstrated here today.

13 I think all of us who work in the public
14 sector understand that these things move forward.
15 Not a single person has sufficient power in the
16 equation to do itself, that's how the founders set it
17 up. Working together with you, I commit to you that
18 we will begin immediately to make major clean-up
19 progress at this site. We will work out whatever
20 remaining issues exist in response to the Task Force
21 report and hopefully by the end of this fiscal year
22 we will have a final record of decision.

23 I look forward to being back here nine
24 months from today as we announce the decision about
25 what we're going to do. If public officials aren't

1 willing to stand up -- if I have to have bad news,
2 I'll stand up and take the heat. But I'd love to
3 have it be good news totally. But all of you need to
4 know that we will be here, we will stay here, we will
5 not run away from this problem.

6 Thank you all very much.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. GRUMBLY: And I turn it over to Sally.
9 I know there are probably questions and it might be
10 useful if everybody around the table had a chance to
11 make some comments. And I'll retreat to my seat if
12 that's okay.

13 MS. PRICE: Thank you very much, Mr.
14 Grumbly. On behalf of the Task Force I can tell you
15 we appreciate your being here today, we appreciate
16 your response to many of our recommendations that are
17 favorable and I am sure on questions and the issues
18 that remain the Task Force members will be anxious to
19 talk with you now.

20 But before we do that if everyone would
21 quickly -- as I remind you, Mr. Grumbly is on a tight
22 schedule and needs to catch a plane at five o'clock
23 -- if you would begin on my left and just state your
24 name and go around the table for the sake of people
25 in the room.

1 QUESTION-AND ANSWER SESSION:

2 MR. MARCHANT: I'm Bob Marchant and I'm
3 with the Metropolitan Sewer District.

4 MR. GRUMBLY: Sally, could I suggest if
5 people want to make a comment or ask a question as we
6 go around that maybe they could do that and I'll
7 certainly be willing to stay until everybody has had
8 a chance to ask a question.

9 MS. DREY: My name is Kay Drey. And one
10 thing for sure I want to thank you for your role as a
11 very fair person. I really appreciate the fact that
12 you came here two years ago and were willing to
13 listen to us and to get this process started. I am
14 forever gratefully.

15 And since the airport site is my favorite
16 radioactive waste dump, I have to say that I hope
17 when you get more geohydrologic data that you will
18 agree to clean it up. And maybe it doesn't have to
19 be the highest standards but the whole twenty-two
20 acres are contaminated and I think that to put it off
21 it just gets -- this is stuff with really long
22 half-life, like four and a half billion years times
23 ten I hope that, you know, we will take care of it in
24 this generation and not sometime down road. And it's
25 not just the impact on the groundwater and Coldwater

1 Creek but also on the air, radioactive dust, and
2 radon gas. But that you again.

3 MR. GRUMBLY: Fair enough.

4 MR. HOSKINS: I'm the mayor of the city of
5 Berkeley where basically the SLAP site is presently
6 located. I'd like to thank you for taking the
7 opportunity to come here. However, my number one
8 priority is to remove the radioactive dirt at the
9 site and hopefully we can work towards those goals.

10 MR. GRUMBLY: Let me make it clear. We are
11 going to remove a lot of material from that site and
12 we aren't going to let it lag behind the rest of what
13 we do. But the issue of whether it gets cleaned up
14 to a light industrial or residential use, residential
15 unrestricted use, is the issue that we need to work
16 on and at least my technical guy's view is that the
17 path to truth in dealing with that is to try to
18 understand as best we can, as quickly as possibly,
19 the hydrogeologic problem that exists.

20 But I want to make sure people understand
21 we're not going to get back into a period of extended
22 long-term study before we act here. I have the
23 commitment I think from the EPA regional
24 administrator as well as the head of the Missouri DNR
25 that we are going to move together as rapidly as

1 possible to come to a record of decision so we can do
2 the work that needs to be done here.

3 MR. MANNING: I'm Tom Manning, I'm director
4 of public works for the city of Hazelwood. We thank
5 you definitely for stepping in and listening more to
6 the community's comments and community's needs. The
7 HISS site is in our community, we definitely would
8 like to see these properties cleaned up and put back
9 into use to basically generate revenues for the
10 community.

11 MR. LARSON: Mr. Grumbly, I work for St.
12 Louis County Water Company and I've been on the Task
13 Force. I'm primarily concerned with the exposures
14 that our people have who are in the field to the
15 radioactive waste in the various ditch lines and
16 other areas in that part of the county. We've been
17 dealing with this exposure problem for a number of
18 years and we would like to see it end as soon as
19 possible.

20 We also, just speaking as a representative
21 of the Task Force, would like to see the city of
22 Berkeley and Hazelwood get the properties back that
23 are in their areas that potentially have a high value
24 in industrial and retail use back to tax rolls.

25 I think the criticalness to the health of

1 the communities is important as well as the health of
2 the workers for the various utilities in the St.
3 Louis County. So I urge you to pay attention to
4 that.

5 Also, to let the people on the Task Force,
6 whatever that group will look like, in the future to
7 have access to the results of the geohydrologic
8 data. That's been a controversial point and I think
9 it deserves review, close review, and I'm sure the
10 people in the group will want to give it close review
11 in the future.

12 MR. GRUMBLY: Well, let me say right now
13 that the availability of the data that's generated
14 through this process, that data will be quality
15 assured to make sure it's the right data and when
16 that data is quality assured it will be released to
17 everybody to have a crack at it.

18 You pointed out the issue of worker safety
19 which I sort of neglected I think in my talk. I want
20 to emphasize that one of our highest priorities,
21 while obviously is protection of the public as a
22 whole, we are very attuned, because we work so
23 closely with literally tens of thousands of nuclear
24 workers around to country, to attend to the worker
25 safety issues as soon as we possibly can.

1 successful. First, I need to say that the whole
2 notion of community involvement in decision making
3 with respect to hazardous waste sites is one that our
4 colleagues at EPA are really in the lead on. It
5 forms the basis for a lot of the reform that we'd
6 really like to see statutorily. We're doing it as an
7 administrative basis at this point.

8 What I think we see happening is probably
9 some combination of the county executive, the mayor,
10 the other locally affected officials asking someone,
11 and where it's worked best they've asked someone,
12 say, at a local university who has the respect of
13 people to kind of convene a selection process in
14 which that person would put into the public record
15 whether it's into a newspaper or a variety of other,
16 you know, forms of media the fact that the department
17 is interested in convening a site-specific advisory
18 board for this process to advise on what the decision
19 ought to be about the clean-up as well as to oversee
20 the clean-up once it's underway.

21 Anybody who is interested in serving would
22 respond to this person who may be a small
23 subcommittee of people. They would do some
24 interviewing and try to make a reasonably balanced
25 selection across various interests, geographics, you

1 that exist and I think there's kind of no way to get
2 out that.

3 So I don't expect it will all be sweetness
4 and light as we go through this but, you know, this
5 has been one reasonably successful way to involve a
6 broader cross-section of individuals in our
7 decision-making processes.

8 MR. LARSON: A quick question. I would
9 like you to expand, if possible, on the DOE's
10 thoughts regarding the soil vitrification suggestion,
11 just a little piece of the recommendations and yet it
12 has a lot to do with the safety, we believe, with
13 which material will be transported. Has much thought
14 been given to that on your staff?

15 MR. GRUMBLY: Is Jim Olendorf here? Can I
16 ask you to come up, Jim? Jim is actually in charge
17 of the environmental restoration program and before I
18 enter into uncharted areas I'd like to ask him.

19 MR. OLENDORF: I think what we're agreeing
20 to do is that we're going to establish a technology
21 review and we want to do that here in the St. Louis
22 area and it's primarily a couple things.

23 We want to layout the six areas that we
24 have and say here's the characterization of these
25 areas and then have firms come in and give us cost

1 and performance data, working with EPA certainly and
2 the state and anybody who is interested in this, you
3 know, review or workshop.

4 Folks come in with cost and performance
5 data, where they've done it at other places, and say
6 for this particular site what would your cost be to
7 clean it up. So we lay out on the table what would
8 it take to do this.

9 And if the vitrification folks can come in
10 and demonstrate what their costs are and that's
11 what's needed to protect workers as well as, you
12 know, human health and the environment and that will
13 be certainly considered in our remedy.

14 MR. GRUMBLY: I don't want to spend an
15 infinite amount of time examining technologies that
16 won't work out. You know, we've spent a fair amount
17 of money on technology development. We obviously
18 don't want to spend anymore money than we absolutely
19 have to achieve these purposes because there are
20 plenty of other public purposes that we need to do
21 but I think we need to look at that vitrification
22 suggestion as quickly as possible in an orderly way.

23 MR. LARSON: I was also concerned about
24 local involvement so I appreciate your answer.

25 MS. PRICE: Are there any members in the

1 back of the room that have questions? But just to
2 review what I've heard so far, it appears that the
3 time frame for the formation of the SSAB is
4 approximately six months; is that right?

5 MR. GRUMBLY: Quicker if we could do it,
6 but one has to be realistic I think.

7 MS. PRICE: And then the hydrogeologic
8 assessment would be three months hopefully. And then
9 the technical review, any time frame on that?

10 MR. GRUMBLY: Well, I think the aim -- I
11 wish I had the time line to draw out. I don't know
12 if we'll be able to meet this but what I'd very much
13 like is to bring all this together so that by
14 September thirtieth we have the ability to come back
15 again and say here's what we're going do.

16 By that time we'll know what kind of
17 resources are likely to be available. We'll be
18 through, you know, the messy budget process. You
19 know, in a previous meeting Congressman Talent was
20 right to point out that, you know, these things get
21 dicey down towards the end so we're all going to have
22 to be on top of that.

23 But the budget, the technical side, the
24 community side, will come together so that by the
25 thirtieth of September or roughly beginning of fiscal

1 year 1998 we're really ready to go forward in that
2 major way.

3 MR. EBERLE: If I recall correctly you said
4 in your comments that this was like our last meeting
5 of this group and that you will then have a process
6 to create another site specific advisory group. How
7 do you plan on getting citizen input in that interim
8 period?

9 MR. GRUMBLY: Well, I think we're -- that's
10 a good question. I think we're going to continue
11 informally to consult the folks who have worked so
12 hard on this committee. It would be stupid not to do
13 so. But I think what we want to try do is to draw a
14 clear demarcation between the task that the Task
15 Force was set out to do on the establishment of the
16 oversight board.

17 Actually, I would welcome suggestions that
18 you might have about how to do that as we go
19 forward. Frankly, this is the first situation that
20 we've had where we ask that kind of an ad hoc group
21 to come up with this where we didn't already have
22 established one of these site-specific advisory
23 committees.

24 But I think out in Colorado in the Denver
25 area with respect to the Rocky Flats plant there were

1 several different kinds of committees that had been
2 established over time. We continued to consult
3 individuals on those committees and particularly
4 people who were interested while we made the
5 transition from those committees to a more formal
6 advisory board. This is not an attempt to keep
7 people out. It's a very good question, though.

8 MR. EBERLE: Well, Sally is our leader.

9 MS. PRICE: I get my direction from all of
10 you. Are there any questions?

11 MS. DREY:. I guess I sort of wanted to
12 make a pitch for a collection of technologies that
13 was presented to us and I don't know to what extent
14 it was in our report and it may be pie in the sky but
15 because -- talking again about the airport site right
16 now, it's a flood plain site, so it's a wet site and
17 we were told that maybe the four sides of the
18 twenty-two acres could be frozen and the bottom and
19 then there could be a tent over -- which would help
20 the groundwater situation and then there could be a
21 tent over the top which would help the radioactive
22 dust and radon gas.

23 MR. GRUMBLY: You're getting beyond me,
24 Kay.

25 MS. DREY: No, no. You'd freeze the

1 boundary, the dirt. I don't know how. There's some
2 kind of chemical, and I can't remember what it is,
3 and then you exhume it and all the contamination
4 would not be flowing off-site into the creek and into
5 the groundwater.

6 MR. GRUMBLY: Sounds like the subject for
7 the technology workshop.

8 MS. DREY: Well, is it naive to think we
9 could ask the DOE for the airport site to be a field
10 demonstration project for a collection of these
11 technologies.

12 MR. GRUMBLY: That is a perfectly
13 reasonable suggestion. I think it's something that
14 we're -- I mean I was serious in saying I think we
15 need to include -- if there is a vendor for such
16 technology we need to locate them and get them
17 involved in this technology workshop.

18 Secondly, we will have to work together
19 with Missouri DNR and EPA to make sure that we're
20 utilizing technologies that at least have a
21 reasonable chance to produce something useful. And
22 because we have been beaten up in the past
23 legitimately for -- when I say "we" the government
24 for not being too successful in technology
25 development, I want to be sure that we're using

1 technologies that we have some cost and performance
2 data on already so that we're not just flushing money
3 down the tube.

4 But, you know, I think it's a perfectly
5 reasonable suggestion to see if we can put it
6 together.

7 MR. TALENT: If I can just follow up on
8 that. When Kay mentioned demonstration project it
9 was something I hoped you. Subject to the
10 constraints that you've talked about, obviously you
11 want something that's feasible and you may be
12 discussing this with this new group in the technology
13 workshops come to an agreement, but there might be
14 two alternatives out there and I'd like to urge the
15 department to be open to an affordable demonstration
16 project. There's no better way to determine whether
17 something will or won't work and to actually try it
18 on a trial level if that's feasible with that
19 technology.

20 MR. GRUMBLY: I'm hearing you. You know,
21 I've been sucked in by a lot of snake oil salesmen
22 and I want to be sure that doesn't happen. But I am
23 with you on the point.

24 MR. LARSON: Mr. Grumbly, I'm not quite
25 sure how to ask this but I think it would be a fair

1 question. I know you don't own a crystal ball but
2 with the change at the top of your department when
3 the Secretary O'Leary leaves what is the chances of
4 the just the whole concept in strategy of DOE's
5 approach to the problem we're dealing with here
6 today, how likely is it that there might be some
7 change in those policies?

8 MR. GRUMBLY: I mean the concepts and
9 strategies that we're using are ones that the
10 president and particularly the vice president, who I
11 think everybody knows has an abiding interest in the
12 environment, that they both feel strongly about.

13 So while I'm certain -- you know, people
14 have their own styles and have their own ways of
15 doing business but the interest and the commitment to
16 deal with these problems and to deal with them in an
17 open way is one that I can only see getting stronger
18 rather than weaker. It continues to form and will
19 continue to form one of the bases of our
20 recommendations to the Congress about how to reform
21 the Superfund law so that we expect this kind of
22 collegial process will hopefully get actually enacted
23 into the statute so you don't have to depend on any
24 individuals.

25 I mean there are a lot of things in the

1 Superfund statute. I'm actually pretty optimistic
2 that again with the emphasis on at least working
3 together on some matters of policy and particularly
4 in the environmental policy area that we will be able
5 to get to an agreement with the Congress in 1997 on
6 Superfund reform and this kind of way of doing
7 business will become part of the law.

8 MS. DREY: How long are you going to be
9 here this afternoon? I mean, I just wondered how
10 many more questions I get to ask. I mean, I looked
11 around and nobody else had their hand up.

12 MR. GRUMBLY: How about two more questions,
13 Kay.

14 MS. DREY: Well, I have one question, sort
15 of like two questions.

16 MR. GRUMBLY: So you have one question.

17 MS. DREY: Some of us have sort of thought
18 that because -- thank you for coming Congressman
19 Talent and for your help and for Tom Horgan's help by
20 the way.

21 Some of us have thought that we in St.
22 Louis, our waste which we say are the oldest
23 radioactive wastes of the atomic age, deserve to be
24 treated the way, say, Rocky Flats, Oak Ridge, and we
25 think that ours, in fact, may be the oldest nuclear

1 bomb factory in the United States. What would it
2 take for us to be put onto the defense side of the
3 budget which is a more lucrative -- you know, it has
4 more money.

5 MR. GRUMBLY: It's a good question and it's
6 one that we're actually still debating. There are
7 pros and cons to both sides.

8 What I would say, first of all, when I
9 talked about an overall reduction in the amount of
10 money that's likely to be available to the whole
11 environmental program actually most of that reduction
12 is going to be coming out of the defense part of
13 program. So it's not clear that it would be wise
14 really to put it over there at this point.

15 Secondly, if you think about competition
16 for resources which is something I think you do have
17 to think about. On the defense side -- I won't argue
18 with you about whether these are the oldest wastes,
19 they have to compete with plutonium stabilization,
20 with high level liquid radioactive waste which is to
21 say with some other wastes that I have to be honest
22 with you if I were going to look at it on a risk
23 profile and what makes me uneasy when the phone rings
24 after ten o'clock at night, it's not what happens
25 here, it's what happens at those places and what can

1 actively happen at those places. So it's not clear
2 to me again for that reason that it would complete
3 better on the defense side.

4 Actually I believe really very strongly
5 that the opportunity that exists in the development
6 and passage of the '98 budget is for people in
7 Missouri to band together with people and the
8 representatives from states like New York, New Jersey
9 and Ohio, which are the states that have the other
10 kinds of sites like this, to ensure that this money
11 actually gets passed into law.

12 And those are all states that have large
13 congressional delegations and very active
14 congressional delegations and I think it would be
15 very much a mistake to have it turn into a
16 competition for resources. There needs to be some
17 coalition building. We talked about this in the
18 meetings that I had with both members of Congress,
19 their staff and the governor beforehand and I think
20 they all agreed.

21 So I think if we keep this money on the
22 table and target it in the non-defense account for
23 this year we really have an opportunity to get it
24 enacted into law. I mean I could make the other
25 case, I suppose. I have made it in the past. I'm

1 gratified that that the additional money that we're
2 proposing seems to be surviving a very intensive
3 budget process at the moment.

4 MS. DREY: I have another question.

5 MR. GRUMBLY: Let's make this the last
6 one.

7 MS. DREY: Can you just describe what it
8 means for us in St. Louis to work directly with
9 Washington, D.C. instead of Oak Ridge?

10 MR. GRUMBLY: Well, I think the main thing
11 is you don't have the -- if we make this work right
12 there won't be sort of what I would call the
13 communication fuzz that sometimes happens.

14 I work with very competent people in Oak
15 Ridge, they work very hard, they have a tough job,
16 but I think I've been concerned that at various times
17 that there's been, you know, what I would recall just
18 some lapses in communication. And at least as we get
19 this going and get this underway I'd like to be sure
20 that I only have one phone number to push and that's
21 Mr. Olendorf's number. I know where his office is
22 and I know where I can get to him.

23 MS. DREY: What is his number, please?

24 That's all right.

25 MR. GRUMBLY: But it's mostly ease of

1 communication and also making sure that the people
2 who are here full time -- you know, there are not
3 going to be very many Feds here full time, don't feel
4 like one you've sort of been deserted in the world
5 and also to make sure that they are getting their
6 direction on the site, you know, from the program.

7 Thank you very much. I really appreciate
8 it.

9 (Applause.)

10
11 (THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT APPROXIMATELY
12 4:30 P.M.)

13 * * * * *

14

15 CERTIFICATE

16

17 I hereby certify that the foregoing is an
18 accurate and complete transcription of my shorthand
19 notes taken at the aforesaid time and place.

20

21

22

23

24

25


Court Reporter


Date

00-2211

00-2211

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

for the St. Louis Site, Missouri



U.S. Department of Energy

Property
of

ST LOUIS FUSRAP LIBRARY