

1 BEFORE ST. LOUIS SITE REMEDIATION TASK FORCE

2 \* \* \* \* \*

3  
4 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

5  
6 \* \* \* \* \*

7  
8 TUESDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 17, 1996

9  
10 \* \* \* \* \*

11  
12 BE IT REMEMBERED, that on Tuesday,  
13 September 17, 1996, the herein described parties met  
14 at the Hazelwood Civic Center, Hazelwood, Missouri,  
15 and the following proceedings were had, to-wit:

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 HALE REPORTING, INC.

23 No. 4 Godfrey  
24 St. Louis, Missouri 63135  
25 (314) 524-2055

## I N D E X

	Page
Appearances. . . . .	03
Call to Order. . . . .	04
Approval of Summary Highlights . . . . .	06
Public Comment . . . . .	07
Draft Report . . . . .	35
Adoption of Report . . . . .	73
Acknowledgments. . . . .	79
Adjourn. . . . .	82
Reporter's Certificate . . . . .	82

## A P P E A R A N C E S:

James Dwyer, Facilitator

## MEMBERS OF THE ST. LOUIS REMEDIATION TASK FORCE:

Sally Price, Chair

Anna Ginsburg, Vice-chair

William Brandes, St. Louis County HazMat Team  
Virginia Cook, legislative aide for U.S.

Representative William Clay

Ric Cavanagh, St. Louis County Department of Health

William Conant, Jr., St. Louis County Local Emergency  
Planning Committee

Kay Drey, member Missouri Coalition for the  
Environment

George Eberle, Jr., Grace Hill Neighborhood Assoc.

Jack Fraenhoffer, Mallinckrodt Chemical Co.

James Grant, Mallinckrodt Chemical Co.

Leonard Griggs, Lambert International Airport

Tom Horgan, Congressman James Talent's Office

Lou Jearls, Jr., director of public works for the  
city of Florissant.

Ron Kucera, MDNR

Nancy Lubiewski, member County Commission

Tom Manning, City of Hazelwood

Bob Marchant, Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District

Molly Bunton, for Larry Mooney,

Conn Roden, St. Louis County Health Department

Paula Livingston-Thomas, for John Ross

Neal Slaten, Union Electric

Elsa Steward, MDNR

Daniel R. Wall, EPA, Region 7

1 TUESDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 17, 1996

2 (In Conference Room:)

3 THE CHAIR: Good morning. I just have a  
4 couple of announcements to begin with. Number one,  
5 David Adler is not here today because he needed to  
6 stay in Oak Ridge to be available to senior level  
7 management in Washington.

8 As I understand it, they are busy in  
9 Washington discussing our imminent report and the  
10 ramifications that might have on budget  
11 considerations and they are working hard to take care  
12 of those issues before October first.

13 So he needed to stay in Oak Ridge to be  
14 able to be accessible to the phone and he's been busy  
15 getting them reports back and forth in the last  
16 couple of days. We have Dave Miller and Wayne  
17 Johnson here, though, who can answer any questions  
18 according to our needs.

19 Okay. The other announcement I have is  
20 that a member of our group, Karen Acker, who hasn't  
21 been involved for the last few months, perhaps almost  
22 a year, has officially resigned as of August 14th and  
23 we neglected to tell you that at the August 20th  
24 meeting.

25 And the only other announcement I have is

1 there are some approved working group minutes from  
2 the Priorities Working Group and the Alternative Site  
3 -- or no, is that the one? / Yes, there was one  
4 minutes from there. I understand we might be  
5 reviewing the Technologies Working Group minutes here  
6 this morning but there are copies available so pick  
7 those up and be sure you get your copy.

8 And are there any other announcements that  
9 Task Force members have at this point? Okay. We  
10 have summary highlights -- I see on the agenda we  
11 haven't got approval of summary highlights from the  
12 August 20th meeting.

13 THE FACILITATOR: I don't know that we have  
14 adopted a step in this process of approving the  
15 summary highlights. I'm not really sure what we did  
16 last month.

17 THE CHAIR: Well, we approved them.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Did we?

19 THE CHAIR: So if you have any comments on  
20 those now would be the time.

21 MS. STEWARD: Sally, I have a minor one.  
22 Mitch Scherzinger was not at the meeting last time;  
23 he's listed as having attended so that needs to be  
24 deleted. Thank you.

25 THE CHAIR: Okay. Are there any other

1 amendments or revisions to the August 20th summary  
2 highlights? Okay. May I have a motion to approve?

3 MR. MANNING: So moved.

4 THE CHAIR: Tom Manning. Second?

5 MR. CAVANAGH: Second.

6 THE CHAIR: Ric Cavanagh. All in favor say  
7 aye? All opposed? Okay, the summary highlights of  
8 the August 20th meeting are approved and at that  
9 point we move to public comment. Do you have any?

10 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, there is one person  
11 who has signed up to speak.

12 MS. STEWARD: Could I make one brief  
13 comment? Ron Kucera has a handout for the Task Force  
14 members that he would like to distribute.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

16 MR. KUCERA: We can go after the public  
17 comment.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Well, there is one person  
19 who has signed up and you can be the second one if  
20 you would like.

21 MR. GELLER: I signed up and I thought it  
22 was the sign-in sheet.

23 THE FACILITATOR: That was not your  
24 intention?

25 MR. GELLER: No.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT

3 MR. KUCERA: I want to make a handout here  
4 that everybody on the Task Force could take a look  
5 at. This will only take one minute.

6 The reason that DNR put together the  
7 materials that you see in this handout which  
8 expresses the current position of Environmental  
9 Protection Agency with respect to cleanup standards  
10 and the exposure that you would receive is that we  
11 received from DOE, from Dave Adler specifically as  
12 comments were being offered on the various drafts, a  
13 suggestion that perhaps this Task Force may have be  
14 over reacting in that the risks are not really  
15 significant.

16 And so that coming from a federal agency  
17 prompted us to pull all the people in our DNR  
18 director's office together and call almost everywhere  
19 in the United States where there is a standard being  
20 set or where there is a cleanup underway and  
21 basically what you'll see here is that Administrator  
22 Browner of the Environmental Protection Agency is  
23 indicating that the 100 millirem standard, which DOE  
24 has frequently discussed here, EPA considers it to be  
25 too high and EPA in their discussions with Congress

1 regarding 100 millirem cite that the NRC has a 25  
2 millirem standard, that EPA has proposed a 15  
3 millirem standard for the WIPP site in New Mexico and  
4 are suggesting a 100 is too high for the Yucca  
5 Mountain facility. Those are desert facilities and,  
6 of course, our problem we're in the middle of a  
7 humid, urban area.

8           So I just would caution you that there are  
9 more stringent standards that are out there and I  
10 think the way the Task Force and DNR and everybody  
11 else can avoid getting in a bind on this issue is  
12 simply to assert what you want the cleanup to be  
13 for. If it's for release for unrestricted use then  
14 you all don't need to get in the middle of this  
15 contentious debate over exactly what the number would  
16 be. You can let the federal agencies fight that  
17 out. But to bring this to conclusion here, I think  
18 the materials that I have handed out and what we have  
19 found as cleanup levels at other locations like in  
20 West Chicago where they used 5 picocuries per gram as  
21 the health base standard. This suggests that  
22 everybody here has not been unreasonable in what  
23 they've been saying and that we're on very solid  
24 footing and we're consistent with what's going on  
25 around country. But DOE forced us into this



1 situation to look over everybody else's shoulder to  
2 find out what they're doing. Thank you.

3 MS. DREY: DOE is 5/15, there are 5  
4 picocuries per surface contamination permissible and  
5 15 below surface. Do you know what that translates  
6 in terms of millirems per year?

7 MR. KUCERA: It's my understanding, and  
8 anybody here correct me if I'm wrong, but that the 5  
9 picocuries would translate to a 15 millirem standard.  
10 Is that what other folks hear?

11 MS. DREY: You don't think it's a 100?

12 MR. KUCERA: No, I don't believe it's a  
13 100. I think it's about 15. If you're at 5  
14 picocuries per gram, if you depart from the  
15 health-based standard that was applied in the Chicago  
16 cleanup and you will go with 15 picocuries for  
17 residential, for instance, then you're probably  
18 moving into an area of higher exposures. And if it's  
19 a straight line, then that would be 45.

20 THE CHAIR: The 100 standard is the  
21 cumulative thing that DOE set for the standard from  
22 radioactive exposure of all sources, that's what I  
23 understand.

24 MR. KUCERA: Yeah. And again, these are  
25 all subject to debate. You'll see the final

1 point here was that when the National Academy of  
2 Sciences looked at this they were suggesting that a  
3 100 millirem, if it be used, not be used for a single  
4 source that that be used as the total exposure of all  
5 man-made, non-medical sources.

6 I don't think the Task Force needs to get  
7 into the complexity of this. We did this to make the  
8 point that the Task Force has not been unreasonable  
9 and we were concerned that DOE might be suggesting  
10 that the Task Force had gone overboard in its  
11 recommendations and that is, as we look around the  
12 country, is not true. Thank you.

13 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Are there any followup  
15 comments to that? Does anyone wish to elaborate on  
16 the question or the issue?

17 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: Ron, are you  
18 suggesting that the wording be changed where the  
19 numbers were given?

20 MR. KUCERA: I'm not suggesting that  
21 anything be changed. I am not familiar with every  
22 part of the latest version of this report. What I'm  
23 suggesting instead is that you may want to be careful  
24 if you're going to try and lock into numbers and keep  
25 the flexibility, so if you want a cleanup for an

1 industrial standard downtown for Mallinckrodt, for  
2 instance, that is what you say. If you want cleanup  
3 to residential standards then that is what you say,  
4 but don't bind yourself to a number that might not be  
5 adequately protective.

6 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Dave Miller  
7 and then Kay Drey.

8 MR. MILLER: I just wanted to elaborate a  
9 little bit on what Ron said. He's absolutely right,  
10 you can't translate picocuries to exposure unless you  
11 specify what your scenario is. So you're better off  
12 specifying what it is your objective is rather than  
13 saying what exactly the number should be because 50  
14 picocuries per gram exposure can mean different  
15 things depending on who's being exposed. And that's  
16 why EPA and DOE are working on millirems per year to  
17 individuals that they're modeling or that they're  
18 trying to protect. And I think Ron's comments are  
19 well-made here.

20 MS. DREY: I guess when we've used the 5  
21 picocuries per gram surface and 15 below the surface  
22 that we've tried to say a minimum cleanup of that and  
23 I think that's really important and I would hate to  
24 take those numbers out of our report because I think  
25 we need to show that we don't want it dirtier than

1 that. In nature thorium 230 is, according to  
2 Bechtel, .2 picocuries per gram. So already 5 is  
3 higher than .2 in nature.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Are there any other  
5 comments on that issue? I don't see any hands.

6 One other item that I think we ought to  
7 deal with under point two on the agenda is that we  
8 have today with us Virginia Cook who is a  
9 representative of Congressman Clay's office and  
10 Virginia is sitting to my left and she has, as I  
11 understand it, a letter from Congressman Clay that  
12 she would like to read into the record.

13 MS. COOK: And Congressman Gephardt.

14 THE FACILITATOR: I see.

15 MS. COOK: It was a joint letter that was  
16 sent to Mr. Thomas Grumbly, Undersecretary U.S.  
17 Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue,  
18 Southwest, Washington, D.C.

19 "Dear Mr. Grumbly: Two years ago under  
20 your leadership and guidance the St. Louis Site  
21 Remediation Task Force was created to identify and  
22 evaluate feasible remedial action alternatives for  
23 the cleanup of radioactively contaminated sites in  
24 the St. Louis area.

25 The establishment of the Task Force marked

1 a critical turning point in the Department of  
2 Energy's efforts to remediate the radioactive waste  
3 sites in the St. Louis community. Previously, the  
4 Department of Energy was often perceived as an  
5 impervious institution that was unwilling or  
6 incapable of addressing the concerns of the citizens  
7 of our community. This change is an excellent of  
8 example of Secretary O'Leary's Openness Initiative, a  
9 new policy that promises real results and savings for  
10 the taxpayers.

11 The St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force  
12 is expected to issue its recommendations to the  
13 Department of Energy this fall. However, we believe  
14 the Task Force has already achieved a remarkable  
15 level of success. Through this body the various and  
16 often competing local interests -- governments, civic  
17 groups and private concerns -- have found common  
18 ground and made substantial progress toward a  
19 workable agreement on a plan of action for the  
20 cleanup and restoration St. Louis' radioactive waste  
21 sites.

22 We are very pleased with this progress. We  
23 are hopeful that the long history of policy making  
24 connected with the St. Louis radioactive waste sites  
25 which had been characterized by discord, divisiveness

1 and distrust may be finally supplanted by the unity  
2 of purpose, spirit of compromise and commitment to  
3 accomplishment that is evidenced in the work of the  
4 citizens Task force.

5 In recent weeks we have heard from members  
6 of the Task Force who have expressed concern that  
7 Department of Energy officials may not prepared to  
8 give a full and unbiased hearing to final  
9 recommendations of the Task Force. We hope this will  
10 not be the case. We believe it is of the highest  
11 importance that you give full consideration to all  
12 recommendations of the St. Louis Site Remediation  
13 Task Force. To do anything less would jeopardize the  
14 unity of purpose that the Task Force has achieved in  
15 the St. Louis community and may once again set back  
16 all efforts to facilitate an acceptable cleanup of  
17 the St. Louis radioactive waste sites.

18 Also, we believe it would be of significant  
19 benefit if you were to meet with the Task Force to  
20 accept its final report. Such a meeting could  
21 greatly enhance DOE's future relations with the St.  
22 Louis community and vastly improve prospects for  
23 implementing a successful remediation program.

24 In addition, implementing swift cleanup  
25 action in response to the Task Force's specific

1 recommendations will be a vital demonstration of the  
2 department's good faith. We recommend that the DOE  
3 streamline its cleanup operations in the St. Louis  
4 area by establishing a dedicated local management  
5 office, such as was established at the Weldon Spring  
6 site. Not only will this help facilitate productive  
7 interactions with the community but it will help  
8 direct more resources into the physical cleanup of  
9 the site and reduce the level of resources currently  
10 expended for paperwork, studies, reports and overhead  
11 cost of prim contractors.

12 In closing, we want you to know that we are  
13 most appreciative of the commitment the Department of  
14 Energy has demonstrated towards the St. Louis  
15 radioactive waste problems during your tenure. Your  
16 contributions has been especially helpful. We  
17 encourage you to continue use the power of your  
18 office to maintain positive progress on the St. Louis  
19 radioactive waste cleanup program. Sincerely,  
20 William L. Clay, Member of Congress; Richard A.  
21 Gephardt, Member of Congress." This letter was dated  
22 August 29, 1994.

23 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much for that  
24 supportive letter.

25 THE FACILITATOR: I would like to point out

1 as well that that letter is incorporated into the  
2 final report; it's in the appendix section of the  
3 final report.

4 MS. COOK: Okay, thank you.

5 THE FACILITATOR: So it is officially a  
6 part of our recommendation to the Department of  
7 Energy. All right. Is there anything else that  
8 anyone believes ought to be covered under the public  
9 comment section? Yes, Nancy.

10 MS. LUBIEWSKI: Yes. Director of public  
11 works of Florissant, Lou Jearls and I had put  
12 together a resolution for the Florissant city council  
13 and had hoped to have had it passed by now, but it is  
14 not unfortunately. The mayor does support the  
15 resolution. I did run into some roadblocks with the  
16 Florissant city council so I'm not sure if it will be  
17 in the draft report or not.

18 Is there a deadline that I need to be  
19 concerned about?

20 THE FACILITATOR: Well, there is a  
21 production issue.

22 THE CHAIR: We will be inserting the public  
23 comment commentary from tomorrow night into the  
24 report up until Monday of next week. And since it  
25 would just be a separate appendix added to report, I



1 don't think -- would it be possible to get it within  
2 a week? Like by Monday?

3  
4 MS. LUBIEWSKI: We have Monday night  
5 meetings. So by Tuesday -- well, if it's too late,  
6 it's too late. I'll just have to let them know they  
7 blew it.

8 MS. GINSBURG: What about putting the  
9 proposed resolution in with a note saying we expect  
10 this to be passed such and such a date.

11 MS. LUBIEWSKI: That could work -- we're  
12 expecting passage.

13 THE CHAIR: You want it in the report  
14 saying you expect it to be passed? I don't think  
15 that works. I thought the purpose of the binder was  
16 so that we could add in and add in until the very  
17 last minute.

18 THE FACILITATOR: So, Nancy, I think the  
19 answer is please follow through and if it is passed  
20 on Monday night make sure Sarah knows about that as  
21 early as possible next Tuesday and has a hard copy of  
22 it so that she can get it duplicated.

23 MS. LUBIEWSKI: Okay.

24 THE FACILITATOR: All right. I there  
25 anything else that anyone wishes to address or to

1 cover under the public comment section of today's  
2 agenda? That being the case, we will move to item  
3 No. 3 on the agenda which is the principal reason we  
4 have gathered today and that is for a discussion of  
5 the initial draft report, which is this document.  
6 Copies of which are available at the front of the  
7 room for those of you who don't already have them.

8           There are four or five items that I would  
9 like to point out before we get into a discussion of  
10 the document itself, just to clarify where we stand  
11 at the moment.

12           First of all, on the sign-in table today  
13 there was a document entitled St. Louis Based Utility  
14 Forum, a single-paged document printed on two sides.  
15 This is essentially a position paper that represents  
16 the collective point of view of the St. Louis County  
17 Water Company, the Laclede Gas Company, the  
18 Metropolitan Sewer District and Union Electric  
19 Company and this was just made available in final for  
20 bearing the signatures of all four entities  
21 yesterday, so it is not incorporated into the present  
22 draft.

23           And in it, if you look at the back side of  
24 the document, the signatories have asked that --  
25 where am I? -- therefore the representative St. Louis

1 utilities request that FUSRAP Task Force members  
2 recommend by a vote of the membership at the next  
3 meeting, which would be today, that DOE assume the  
4 above responsibility and also appropriate the  
5 necessary funds from this and future annual budgets  
6 to accomplish this task. The task is described in the  
7 body of the report on the front page.

8           What I'd ask is, first of all, if there is  
9 anyone representing any of the utilities who would  
10 like to elaborate on either the document or what I've  
11 just said. And, if not, I would ask that you take a  
12 couple of minutes and read this document and see  
13 whether you are prepared to act on it.

14           THE CHAIR: Jim, Neal Slaten brought up the  
15 point that we did approve this letter at the last  
16 meeting but we had some revisions that were to be  
17 made and one of them was the inside address  
18 pertaining to me. But the other was the fact that we  
19 had received these signatures in the meantime.

20           So, were there any other substantive  
21 changes to the body of the letter? There have been  
22 no other changes.

23           MS. DREY: There is a grammatical mistake;  
24 it's the third line of the second paragraph.

25           THE FACILITATOR: Well, I would like to

1 suggest that while that's grammatically correct, I'm  
2 not sure that the addition of the apostrophe is going  
3 to confuse anyone who might be interested in this  
4 letter. I think that the impact of the letter  
5 remains the same.

6 MS. DREY: I get paid by how many  
7 grammatical mistakes I find.

8 THE FACILITATOR: I would like to point out  
9 as long as we're on trivia --

10 MS. DREY: Trivia!

11 THE FACILITATOR: -- that in the third line  
12 up from the bottom of that same paragraph the initial  
13 characters "VP" refers to Vicinity Properties and not  
14 the Veiled Prophet.

15 MR. SLATEN: While I'll concede in those  
16 errors, I don't think I want to take it back and get  
17 it signed again.

18 THE FACILITATOR: That was the delay, was  
19 getting the signatures. I had forgotten that we had  
20 acted on this. Is there any confirmation required or  
21 is it simply good enough to recognize in the record  
22 that the document has been modified and signed?

23 THE CHAIR: I think we approve the  
24 revisions is what we're doing here. Are there any  
25 objections? Okay. Then I say it's passed.

1 THE FACILITATOR: All right, we'll consider  
2 it approved.

3 THE CHAIR: Okay.

4 THE FACILITATOR: There are no objections.  
5 Then (b) is an unfinished item in that there has been  
6 no formal adoption of the Technologies Working Group  
7 report which was distributed at last month's meeting  
8 and the Technologies sections of this final report to  
9 the Department of Energy are based in large part on  
10 the recommendations of the Technologies Working Group  
11 as presented to this group.

12 As Sally and I were planning for this  
13 meeting, we agreed that it would be appropriate to  
14 take action on the Technologies Working Group report  
15 and to adopt it if that's your pleasure. So is there  
16 anyone who would like to discuss that or, if not,  
17 would someone be good enough to make a motion that  
18 the Technologies Working Group report be adopted  
19 formally.

20 MR. MANNING: I'll make the motion.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Is there a  
22 second?

23 MS. DREY: Second.

24 THE FACILITATOR: The motion and a second.  
25 Any discussion? We call the question then. All

1 those in favor of adopting the Technologies Working  
2 Group report please signify by saying aye? Opposed?  
3 Any abstentions It's unanimously adopted.

4 Third, there was on the table a draft  
5 version of a document titled Records of Public  
6 Comment. This document at the moment represents a  
7 synthesis of all public comments that have been made  
8 through the course of the last 23 or 24 months,  
9 however long we've been meeting. It is designed to  
10 be expanded in a number of ways.

11 First of all, with whatever public comment  
12 occurred today that would be added, whatever public  
13 comment may occur or will occur tomorrow night will  
14 be put into document form and then added to this and  
15 then anything that may occur on the 24th of  
16 September, which is a week from today and that is  
17 scheduled to be our last meeting in this process, so  
18 anything that might occur then will be added as well  
19 as any oral or written comments that are received  
20 outside of the context of the meeting but over the  
21 course of the next few days. Between now and Friday  
22 if anyone were to review this document, this draft  
23 report, and call in or write in with comments, those  
24 comments would be incorporated into this. And there  
25 is a Task Force telephone line, an 800 number and a

1 local number, which have been published in just about  
2 every document we have sent out to the public over  
3 the last two years. If anyone were to use that and  
4 to offer comments on this draft document, those  
5 comments would be incorporated into this document.  
6 And then in its final form it will be an attachment  
7 to this report. So the report is not complete at the  
8 moment in that sense. I just want you all to be  
9 aware of that.

10 And then finally the remediation options  
11 matrix which was a columnar document that was used to  
12 identify and define specific remediation plans for  
13 each of ten or eleven sites, I should get the precise  
14 number we wound up with, but ten sites. For each of  
15 those there was, first of all, a series of  
16 remediation options described and then from that a  
17 series of synthesized single remediation plan was  
18 agreed upon by this group. That was put into a  
19 single document which is a foldout, a Z-fold page in  
20 the initial draft of the report.

21 As I understand it, that's being  
22 reformatted so that in the long run it may not wind  
23 up being a foldout, it may be two sheets the same  
24 size as all the other sheets. But at the moment it  
25 is not in this draft and the point is that it will

1 be. And those are the only qualifiers that I know.

2 THE CHAIR: That's all I know of.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Is there anything  
4 anyone else is aware of that we ought to know about  
5 that is either missing from this draft document or  
6 needs clarification before we get into discussion?  
7 Okay, thank you.

8 MR. GRANT: That document that was handed  
9 out today, is that consistent with the one that was  
10 sent to the Task Force previously or have there been  
11 changes made in this beyond what we got in the mail?  
12 Is this different from the one we got in the mail?

13 THE FACILITATOR: When you say you got one  
14 in the mail, what are you referring to, what  
15 version?

16 THE CHAIR: The September 9th version.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, there are  
18 refinements.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Is there anyone who would  
20 like to address that issue?

21 THE CHAIR: I am sorry, but I only know of  
22 some as far as -- Molly, have you been working in the  
23 last week with some of the refinements to this latest  
24 version?

25 MS. BUNTON: Kay, would you say that most



1 of the changes we put in were the ones that you had  
2 requested just in the last week, the majority of the  
3 changes in the last week?

4 MS. DREY: Grammatical, yeah. I don't  
5 think there's anything substantive.

6 MS. BUNTON: No, I don't either.

7 THE CHAIR: I know the comments that I made  
8 in the version were few. I can point out on the  
9 Executive Summary, your version that you were mailed  
10 or couriered last week would have Weldon Spring  
11 included as a suitable site along with the DOE  
12 reservations and Envirocare and Dawn and that was a  
13 mistake that's been corrected in the new version --  
14 Weldon Spring was identified in the Alternative Sites  
15 Working Group as a potentially suitable site so  
16 that's taken out. Other than that, we changed some  
17 exhibits. That was the other purpose of the past  
18 week was to revise some of the maps.

19 MS. BUNTON: If I might just say, if you  
20 don't see the exact change that you had made it could  
21 be that someone else had made comments about that  
22 same section so we just tried to go for a consensus  
23 where we could.

24 THE CHAIR: I would suggest that everyone  
25 now look over what they have in front of them as far

1 as checking to see that the comments you made are in  
2 there. And, you know, we could go around the table  
3 and have the people who had made changes, like I just  
4 did, say what they were and point them out to us.  
5 That might be the simplest way.

6 MS. DREY: Is this still considered a draft  
7 or is this the final?

8 THE CHAIR: This will be the final report  
9 except for the public comment that we do not revise,  
10 that goes in verbatim.

11 MS. DREY: Because I raised a lot of  
12 questions about the glossary and it seems to me even  
13 that the best thing to do with this glossary is to  
14 leave it out entirely. It has a lot of words that  
15 are not used in this report and definitions that I  
16 think are questionable but, you know, a lot of it  
17 refers to Fernald, it doesn't refer to St. Louis, and  
18 I think it confuses more than clarifies the report,  
19 so I would even suggest that it be deleted. I think  
20 the acronyms are important but the glossary -- I made  
21 a lot of suggested changes. I don't think any of  
22 those are reflected, but I just think a lot of the  
23 words are not in this report.

24 THE CHAIR: But what's in there is helpful  
25 I think, don't you?

1 MS. DREY: No. I think some of it is  
2 confusing. You know, "millirem" is my favorite. I'm  
3 not sure millirem is even here but it says it's a  
4 safe dose and it's not that it's safe, it's that it's  
5 permissible. It says 500 is a safe dose. I don't  
6 know where the glossary is, I saw it a few minutes  
7 ago. It does mention Fernald. It mentions plutonium  
8 which we don't have. You know, I'd have to look. I  
9 just scribbled up the whole thing. I didn't bring  
10 that with me, but I don't see that it's helpful. Or  
11 at least if it is, if there is to be a glossary, I  
12 think it should be words that are in this report. I  
13 don't know where it is. Has anyone found it?

14 THE CHAIR: Well, we should certainly omit  
15 words that don't apply in the report, that's simple  
16 enough to do, by running down the list. But I just  
17 think when you have a document for the general  
18 public, that you assume that they're going to be  
19 trying to read, that you should include a glossary.

20 MS. DREY: Well, like looking at millirem,  
21 millirem a unit of radiation dosage equal to one  
22 thousandth of a rem. A member of the public can  
23 safely receive up to 500 millirems per year. I would  
24 find that very offensive.

25 THE CHAIR: Well, does anyone support the

1 idea of a glossary or not support it? I would kind  
2 of like to get a feel of what everyone feels.

3 MS. DREY: We also don't have high level  
4 waste here.

5 THE CHAIR: But maybe it's helpful from a  
6 comparative standpoint.

7 MS. GINSBURG: Yes, it's in the history.

8 MS. DREY: Well, at least then if you're  
9 going to have millirem in there I think you want to  
10 say it's a permissible dose and not a safe dose. And  
11 there are no standards now in this country that say  
12 up to 500 millirems is permissible. So I think at  
13 least that definition should be changed.

14 THE CHAIR: I like the idea of permissible  
15 rather than safe.

16 MS. DREY: And 500 is a really crummy  
17 number as Ron was saying this morning.

18 MR. FRAUENHOFFER: If it's a glossary do we  
19 even need what's a permissible level?

20 THE FACILITATOR: Speak into the microphone  
21 so everyone can hear you.

22 MR. FRAUENHOFFER: I thought I was, Jim. Do  
23 we even need anything other than millirem as a unit  
24 of radiation dosage equal to one thousandth of a rem  
25 and just stop right there. I mean, that's the

1 technical definition of what it is.

2 MS. DREY: I just think it needs to be  
3 changed. You know, whatever.

4 MR. FRAUENHOFFER: The glossary is not  
5 necessarily what's permissible or not permissible.

6 THE CHAIR: Well, let's omit that then.

7 MS. DREY: Yeah, that's fine. You know,  
8 you may want the word like pitchblende added in here,  
9 you may want Manhattan Project. Those were a couple  
10 that I had suggested be added. Underground storage  
11 tank, we don't have that.

12 THE CHAIR: Well, Manhattan Project --

13 MS. DREY: Leaking underground storage tank  
14 which was LUST. You know, I would have preferred  
15 that.

16 THE CHAIR: Kay, why don't we do Manhattan  
17 Project.

18 MS. DREY: Okay.

19 THE CHAIR: That's explained in the report  
20 where it's mentioned --

21 MS. DREY: So we don't need to do it.

22 THE CHAIR: I don't think so.

23 MS. DREY: All right. I quit. I just  
24 wanted to make the point if we could make that one  
25 change for sure.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Are there any other  
2 comments on that topic?

3 MS. DREY: Is Fernald deleted from it  
4 elsewhere? Okay.

5 THE CHAIR: Underground storage tank is in  
6 the glossary, Kay.

7 MS. DREY: Yeah, but it doesn't say leaking  
8 underground storage tank. We don't have underground  
9 storage tanks at the St. Louis site is what I mean.

10 THE CHAIR: I would not bet on that.

11 MS. DREY: Okay. As long as we correct  
12 millirem, I'll be happy.

13 THE CHAIR: Okay. We'll do that.

14 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Any other  
15 questions or discussion about that particular issue?  
16 Back to Sally's suggestion then that you look through  
17 the document to see that the comments that you made  
18 have either been adopted or not and if not you may  
19 want to inquire about why. Is that something you'd  
20 like to do? I'm not getting any reaction. Yes or  
21 no?

22 MS. DREY: I'm not a speed reader. I mean,  
23 I read at a third-grade level because I look for  
24 apostrophes and things.

25 THE FACILITATOR: So it's difficult...

1 There's a lot of document here to work with. I guess  
2 the question is how would you like to proceed.

3 THE CHAIR: Are any of you feeling it's not  
4 possible to review your changes? What we aimed for  
5 today was to approve this document as it sits here.

6 MS. DREY: Jim, was there something in  
7 particular that you -- I know there have been word  
8 changes and stuff. Is there anything in particular?

9 MR. GRANT: No. I was just trying to get a  
10 feel whether there were any substantial changes  
11 because we just got it but, you know, I'm willing to  
12 accept the comment that there were just grammatical  
13 and minor changes.

14 THE CHAIR: And corrections

15 MR. GRANT: Right. And I don't have any  
16 problem with that myself.

17 THE CHAIR: Okay. Ric?

18 MR. CAVANAGH: I would likewise say that I  
19 think -- and trust the people who put hours and hours  
20 and hours of time into this and we can obviously  
21 dissect and correct grammar and all of that, but I  
22 would like to move -- what would be the proper term,  
23 approval of this report or adoption?

24 MS. DREY: Second it.

25 THE CHAIR: Elsa?

1 MS. STEWARD: We had several comments  
2 which we had planned to submit today. Some of these  
3 things may have already been dealt with in this most  
4 recent draft but we don't have any way of knowing  
5 that without reading it, which we can't do at this  
6 meeting, so I guess what I'm saying is that I would  
7 like us to not vote to approve this draft today until  
8 all the members of the Task Force have had a chance  
9 to read it.

10 MS. DREY: Well, then I wonder if we could  
11 take some time. I mean, if we cannot approve this  
12 today then we can't present it to the public tomorrow  
13 night and we're really messed up. So could you and  
14 the other Missouri Department of Natural Resources  
15 people who are here today if we could recess for a  
16 half-hour and each of you take a hunk of it and let  
17 the rest of us have quiet --

18 MS. STEWARD: One of our people is going to  
19 go over it right now so the meeting can go on.

20 MS. DREY: Okay. Because I think it's  
21 extremely important to have this approved and if  
22 there are some, you know, really major mistakes, you  
23 know, maybe those could be corrected by tomorrow  
24 night. But our whole schedule will collapse if we  
25 can't proceed to approve this.



1 THE CHAIR: I agree with that.

2 THE FACILITATOR: We are trying to juggle a  
3 lot of different considerations here. We have this  
4 public meeting tomorrow night, we want to present  
5 what we believe is the final report of the Task Force  
6 for review and consideration. We also have a  
7 production schedule but that would allow for changes,  
8 physically it would allow for changers over the next  
9 couple of days if people were to come across --  
10 except for the appendices. The appendices are going  
11 to the printer -- Sarah? The appendices would go  
12 today or tomorrow. The body of the document needn't  
13 go that quickly but if there are refinements they  
14 could be incorporated in the next 48 hours  
15 physically.

16 MS. DREY: What about the half-hour  
17 recess?

18 THE FACILITATOR: Well, I think it's a good  
19 idea. I think it would give people an opportunity --

20 MS. DREY: And we can table our motion for  
21 a half-hour, would that work?

22 MS. STEWARD: Does anyone else want to read  
23 the report right now because if we're the only ones  
24 -- one of our people is reading it now and the rest  
25 of the meeting can go on while he's reading it and we

1 could just postpone this vote until after he's had a  
2 chance to look at it.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Well, let's see what the  
4 answer to that question is. Would others appreciate  
5 an opportunity to review the document, let's say,  
6 over the next half-hour and at nine o'clock we would  
7 reconvene and act. Does that make sense? I'm seeing  
8 several yeses. Any objection to that approach?

9 THE CHAIR: I'm sorry, I was distracted.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Well, it appears that  
11 people are favorably disposed toward stopping for  
12 half an hour and reviewing the document and  
13 reconvening at nine o'clock and picking up where  
14 we've left off.

15 THE CHAIR: I think that's an excellent  
16 idea. And if we cannot do that I was thinking that  
17 we might have open voting for the rest of the day  
18 here if we cannot resolve it. But we need to get  
19 this done.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, let's see where we  
21 are at nine o'clock.

22 MS. DREY: Is there anyone who cannot stay  
23 who is here now for a half-hour? Virginia Cook has  
24 to leave and I have her six votes.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Is that with or without

1 an apostrophe? Let's do that. Let's adjourn for a  
2 half an hour and work your way through the document  
3 and we will reconvene at nine o'clock.

4 (A short recess.)

5 THE CHAIR: We will resume discussion then  
6 of the draft report. And after all of you have had a  
7 chance to review it we will begin to take your  
8 comments.

9 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Who would like to  
10 start with comments or suggestions following your  
11 review of the draft document?

12 MS. HERMES: First of all, I would just to  
13 start off by saying that whoever put this into final  
14 shape should certainly be complimented. It think  
15 it's an incredibly clean document. And I'm not as  
16 slow or as painstaking a reader as Kay, I only found  
17 three typographical errors. Do we want to hear about  
18 them now?

19 THE FACILITATOR: I think we want to cover  
20 all bases right now.

21 MR. CAVANAGH: I was going to propose just  
22 a minor modification of my motion. We approve the  
23 final report as submitted today with the  
24 understanding that there may still be some need for  
25 correction of typographical or grammatical errors.

1 MS. DREY: But I just wondered if we could  
2 say, Ric, you know, that the change would be seen by  
3 Sally Price before finally going to the printer.  
4 Would that work? Assuming the grammar is all right  
5 in there.

6 THE CHAIR: Okay.

7 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Peggy, it's  
8 back to you.

9 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: These are really  
10 small I think, as well. But on page 2, not two but  
11 "ii" there is the reference to the standard and it  
12 does say --

13 THE FACILITATOR: Where are you? What line  
14 or paragraph.

15 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: The beginning of  
16 the paragraph that says, the Task Force agrees --  
17 it's about a third of the way down the page.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Yes.

19 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: I think we do want  
20 to alter that and refer to that as minimum  
21 standards. Later in the document on Section 3, page  
22 18, it does use those numbers and refer to them as  
23 minimum acceptable standards. So it seems to me,  
24 based on what Ron said, what Kay said, and  
25 consistency in the document, page ii should be.

1 amended.

2 MS. DREY: What about saying, cleaned to at  
3 least no more than. Because people get confused  
4 about minimum and maximum.

5 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: Well however you  
6 want to word it. But, I mean, I just think that that  
7 needs to be --

8 MS. DREY: -- for unrestricted use no  
9 greater contamination than 5 picocuries or  
10 something. I don't know.

11 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: Yeah, something  
12 like that. The other thing that I found that I think  
13 is just a lack of clarity in the document. It's page  
14 29, the top sentence reads at the July 23, 1996,  
15 meeting it was decided that the entire length of  
16 Coldwater Creek should not be cleaned to Option III  
17 level. I think --

18 MS. STEWARD: It is unclear.

19 MS. DREY: Yeah, I feel that way too. What  
20 would you say then?

21 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: I don't know. You  
22 know, we can work that out later.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Well, you were a  
24 participant in that group, what is your recollection  
25 of what the conclusion was?

1 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: Well, the  
2 conclusion was that we wanted to have No. 4 cleanup  
3 through the length of Coldwater Creek where it was  
4 possible. If there were pockets where No. 3 cleanup  
5 was the best we could do that without completely  
6 destroying the ecological system there then we would  
7 settle in spots for No. 3.

8 THE CHAIR: As I recall, it stated in our  
9 final version that we clean to a Level IV for the  
10 creek but that we do so in a way that is least  
11 destructive to the natural environs of the creek. I  
12 mean it was not language that ever said we agree to a  
13 III. I remember asking for that because I was afraid  
14 that they would say we'll just clean to a Level II or  
15 a I or nothing because it will destroy -- and I was  
16 trying, you know, to get a minimum in there but  
17 everyone decided that that was a dangerous way to  
18 proceed so we stuck with Option IV. And I think this  
19 is stated that way because we originally had agreed  
20 to a Level III cleanup coming out of those  
21 Remediation Option Working Group meetings and we  
22 changed it from the III to the IV at that  
23 twenty-third meeting.

24 So I think if you'd want it clarified you  
25 would say -- I wouldn't even mention that we ever had

1 an Option III. It was only a working group report  
2 and it got amended here. So I think if we just state  
3 what we said, which is easy enough to check back and  
4 see in the recommendation section, it probably is in  
5 there pretty clear and we can restate it. But I  
6 think we're getting into that area if we start adding  
7 Option III anywhere in there that was not the will of  
8 this group at that time.

9 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: But the sentence  
10 the way it's stated, that's not clear.

11 THE CHAIR: I agree.

12 THE FACILITATOR: The point I was making is  
13 when it's redrafted that there is guidance, and now  
14 we've got that. And we'll basically just extract the  
15 language from the final report.

16 THE CHAIR: That's what I would suggest.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Who would like to go  
18 next?

19 THE CHAIR: Well, first of all, we didn't  
20 resolve your first comment, though. What was it  
21 again?

22 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: I think we did. Or  
23 did we? Because it is stated later in the report on  
24 page 318.

25 THE CHAIR: See, I did not find it on 318.

1 Or something along that line. And I think there's  
2 also -- we're going to possibly address a couple of  
3 issues in the glossary and stuff. What I would like  
4 to do I guess is make a motion that we would approve  
5 the document largely as is but empowering Jim and a  
6 few others to get it in final form, to clean it up  
7 and catch any of these minor issues.

8 THE CHAIR: And just move on you mean at  
9 this point? Well --

10 MS. DREY: I second.

11 THE CHAIR: I would like to deal with the  
12 changes that are substantive. I know of a few. So I  
13 think we can lump all of what you said into the  
14 resolution and omit having to through page by page.  
15 Do you second that?

16 MS. DREY: I do. I would like to hear any  
17 suggested changes now. I would like to make one  
18 other suggestion.

19 THE CHAIR: Wait a minute, Peggy is  
20 involved here.

21 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: I'm happy to pass  
22 just a written note about the typographical errors  
23 but I did have a couple of substantive questions that  
24 I wanted to talk to.

25 THE CHAIR: Well, let's get to those.



1 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: Okay. Sorry, 317.

2 THE CHAIR: Okay.

3 THE FACILITATOR: And it's underlined. It  
4 is emphasized.

5 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: Right, not to  
6 exceed 5 picocuries.

7 MS. DREY: Oh that's good, not to exceed.

8 THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Peggy. Who  
9 else is next? Okay, William.

10 MR. BRANDES: Sally, I've got one comment  
11 on Appendix C on page 52. Appendix C talks about the  
12 contract between Mallinckrodt and Manhattan  
13 Engineering and on page 53 it states this document is  
14 currently being requested. Do we have anything  
15 further on that for this report?

16 THE CHAIR: That's a good question. Can  
17 MDNR help us out on that?

18 MS. STEWARD: I don't know where that -- do  
19 you know anything about that?

20 THE CHAIR: Ron, we have a question about  
21 Appendix C. You're requesting currently the contract  
22 between Mallinckrodt Chemical Company and Manhattan  
23 Engineering District. Your group states that it was  
24 under --

25 MR. KUCERA: I guess I was under the

1 impression that we had gotten that contract.

2 THE CHAIR: Apparently not.

3 MS. DREY: Well, that needs to be  
4 resolved.

5 MR. KUCERA: We ought to be able to find  
6 it.

7 MR. GRANT: Well, I guess my comment to  
8 that is there isn't any such animal. I mean, the  
9 original work was done on a handshake with the  
10 government. Over a period of time there may have  
11 been a series of various contracts that Mallinckrodt  
12 had with the government at different times and places  
13 with various amendments and as far as I know that  
14 complete set of things isn't even available today.

15 MS. DREY: I have it in my basement.

16 MR. GRANT: Okay.

17 THE CHAIR: Well, then where is it?

18 MS. DREY: I don't know if I have an  
19 original. I can look. But, in other words, you  
20 don't think Mallinckrodt has a copy so if I can't  
21 find something then we should leave that out?

22 MR. GRANT: Well, two things. I don't know  
23 that there is, you know, a complete set of all those  
24 documents. Second of all, I'm not even sure that's  
25 germane to be putting in the report, why would we put

1 it in the report?

2 MS. DREY: Because ~~it's~~ historically  
3 interesting.

4 THE CHAIR: Well, in the body of the  
5 history, though, they describe how they went to lunch  
6 and they agreed to do this so I mean the facts are  
7 there whether the document is producible or not is  
8 the problem right now.

9 MS. DREY: Well, those two pages should be  
10 maybe just deleted is that what you're thinking?

11 MR. GRANT: Yeah. I don't think we should  
12 leave it open.

13 THE CHAIR: No, I don't either.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Can we try to come  
15 closer on what the preferred option is?

16 MS. DREY: Could I look in my basement?  
17 They're really files that the Post-Dispatch had  
18 gotten when they were doing their series and send it  
19 down to you, Jim.

20 MR. GRANT: I mean I don't know what you  
21 have. But I know that all those documents haven't  
22 been available to my knowledge. So there is not a  
23 complete set available.

24 THE FACILITATOR: There is one other  
25 practical question I would raise. If Jim is correct

1 in saying that there was no initial document that it  
2 was a handshake agreement and there may have been  
3 subsequent documentation of arrangements from time to  
4 time, it might wind up being a lot of pages and I  
5 question whether there is real value in adding  
6 another however many pages that might be to what is  
7 already a thick document.

8 THE CHAIR: I don't see it as being  
9 particularly relevant to what we need to tell in this  
10 report.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Well, that's the question  
12 that Jim raised.

13 THE CHAIR: Right.

14 MS. DREY: It really was interesting that  
15 they did go ahead and begin the research on a  
16 handshake, they didn't have a contract initially.

17 MR. GRANT: That's correct.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Mr. Conan has suggested  
19 that we simplify things by simply removing the  
20 reference and not inserting the documents. Any  
21 comment on that?

22 THE CHAIR: I support it.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Any objection?

24 MS. DREY: Just remove these two pages, not  
25 the reference.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Yes.

2 MS. DREY: Well, then that means --

3 THE FACILITATOR: Renumber.

4 MS. DREY: A few pages and I don't know  
5 about the index.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Laurie? Not a problem.  
7 So shall we leave it that way then, we're not even  
8 going to search for the documents. We will remove  
9 those two pages, renumber subsequent pages as  
10 required and move on. Thank you.

11 MS. DREY: Subsequent pages and appendix.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Anyone else have  
13 comments or corrections to suggest.

14 MR. GRANT: The Technologies Working Group  
15 report, I guess that's four-thirty. The last  
16 sentence says Mallinckrodt requested that the  
17 physical soil washing also be evaluated. That should  
18 read the group requested that.

19 THE FACILITATOR: I'm sorry, the microphone  
20 wasn't up. Would you start from the beginning.

21 MR. GRANT: There's one sentence toward the  
22 bottom, it says Mallinckrodt requested that physical  
23 soil washing, et cetera. It should say the group  
24 requested that physical soil washing also be  
25 evaluated.

1 THE CHAIR: We're on page --

2 MR. GRANT: Four-thirty.

3 MS. DREY: I'm not/sure I requested it. I  
4 non-requested it.

5 MR. GRANT: Well, if that's the case --  
6 well, I don't know that everybody all the time  
7 specifically agreed with anything in the Technologies  
8 Working Group 100 percent so if that's the standard  
9 then there's probably no resolution.

10 THE FACILITATOR: The reference is to Roman  
11 numeral four dash thirty; is that correct?

12 MR. GRANT: Yeah, it's four dash thirty.

13 THE FACILITATOR: And it's in the  
14 Technologies Working Group report, the sentence is  
15 about two-thirds of the way down or three-quarters of  
16 the way down reads, Mallinckrodt requested, and Mr.  
17 Grant has proposed those words be changed to the  
18 group requested. Any objection to that change? No  
19 objection. Let's consider that change made.

20 THE CHAIR: Okay.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Next? Yes, Ron.

22 MR. KUCERA: This may seem minor and I  
23 don't think this is a controversial suggestion but in  
24 looking through the Executive Summary which for the  
25 most part captures very well what the Task Force

1 desired, there is a reference to the words dig and  
2 ship and that is normally in the parlance of the  
3 agencies who deal with cleanups. You just say more  
4 what you mean instead of dig and ship. It would be  
5 removal and transportation costs, just a reference to  
6 that action. And we'd suggest just using what's  
7 normally used.

8           Also, there's a reference to -- the word  
9 sabotage is referred to in there and I guess my  
10 concern is that as we've seen arguments over cleanups  
11 and over radioactive materials, frequently the word  
12 sabotage has been used in a way that suggests that  
13 the users of the word are at the fringe of the  
14 debate. I mean there probably aren't a lot people  
15 who would want to blow up a train that's carrying low  
16 activity wastes somewhere whether it was vitrified or  
17 whether it was soil that was locked in a train and my  
18 suggestion would be to strike the word sabotage so  
19 that this group doesn't look like it's an extremist  
20 group worried about things that are probably low --

21           THE CHAIR: Could you identify where that  
22 word is on that?

23           MR. KUCERA: I think it's on the second  
24 page or maybe at the top of the third on the  
25 Executive Summary.

1 THE CHAIR: Okay, I see it.

2 THE FACILITATOR: The very top of page  
3 little "iii," the last line of the first paragraph.

4 MS. DREY: I don't think that's farfetched  
5 to put that word in today.

6 MR. KUCERA: My only point is that I think  
7 that the Task Force report will have more credibility  
8 with the people that we have to persuade to get  
9 resources for the cleanup no matter what remedy is  
10 ultimately selected if we do not use the word  
11 sabotage.

12 MS. DREY: Okay. Well, then what about  
13 contamination of haul routes such as by spillage or  
14 accident.

15 MR. KUCERA: That's fine. I think that  
16 should be worried about. The history in St. Louis  
17 shows we've had spillage problem for sure and there  
18 are records of accidents as well where trucks tipped  
19 over.

20 And then just one other suggestion that I  
21 think all it takes is a sentence after the discussion  
22 on the microwave vitrification technology.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Are you in the  
24 Technologies Working Group report?

25 MR. KUCERA: No, this is in the Executive



1 Summary still. We'd suggest that -- so that DOE  
2 cannot undo you guys, we think it's great that  
3 there's a suggestion for the microwave vitrification  
4 demonstration and if it proves out -- fantastic. If  
5 it doesn't, though, I'd hate to see two years of work  
6 of this Task Force then go down the drain because DOE  
7 would say, well, it didn't work so we're going to  
8 establish a new Task Force that will work for two  
9 more years to come back at us with a recommendation.

10 And I would just suggest, I don't have the  
11 language for it now, but there simply be a sentence  
12 following the description microwave technology that  
13 says something to the effect irrespective of the  
14 approach ultimately selected that the Task Force  
15 desires that the cleanup be according to the  
16 guidelines as recommended by the Task Force. So that  
17 we don't get hung on a demonstration project or a  
18 particular technology because the Task Force put in a  
19 great deal of work to suggest what the cleanup  
20 guidelines should be for West Lake, for downtown  
21 Mallinckrodt and for a lot of the North County sites.

22 And so no matter what you do I think the  
23 fundamental work of this Task Force has been to  
24 suggest what they want done as far as cleanup. And I  
25 think that we need to wrap that suggestion back up to

1 We've got to provide protections to ourselves against  
2 -- DOE is very good with their strategies to avoid  
3 giving us what we want. And we need to admit that.  
4 They're very skilled and we need to be ready to say  
5 what we want and protect our recommendations. That's  
6 all I'm saying.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Laurie, are you  
8 comfortable with what you've heard? Okay, great.

9 THE CHAIR: I think that's a good  
10 suggestion.

11 MR. STYRON: It should also appear in the  
12 body. The Executive Summary shouldn't be the only  
13 place that appears.

14 MR. KUCERA: That would require a sentence  
15 in the Executive Summary and a sentence added in the  
16 base.

17 THE CHAIR: In the report overview.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Well, I think what  
19 Clarence has just suggested is that it be in the  
20 Technologies Working Group report; is that correct?

21 THE CHAIR: No.

22 THE FACILITATOR: So it's in the body of the  
23 report and not in the working group report. All  
24 right. Good. Okay, is everybody on board with  
25 that? Especially you, Laurie? Yes, okay.

1 MS. DREY: Yeah, I think that sounds good.  
2 And I wonder about -- you said guidelines chosen by  
3 the Task Force, what about -- I don't know if that's  
4 the right word -- time frame? Guidelines and timing  
5 or something like that?

6 MR. KUCERA: I would say however the  
7 drafters want to characterize what the Task Force has  
8 already recommended in way of cleanup.

9 MS. DREY: Yeah. I think "guidelines" is  
10 good but I'm just thinking if we could get the timing  
11 in there as well.

12 MR. KUCERA: I don't think the sentence has  
13 to be drafted now.

14 MS. DREY: Right.

15 MR. KUCERA: I just think we need to avoid  
16 the possible trap of having recommended a technology  
17 that doesn't necessarily prove out and then having  
18 DOE walk away from us and say your suggestion didn't  
19 work. We would hope that it does work. We hope that  
20 it gets 75 percent volume reduction and is very  
21 cost-effective and has all the benefits that we heard  
22 about before. But if it doesn't we don't want to be  
23 in a trap where DOE can walk away from us and ignore  
24 our suggestions.

25 I just think we need to reiterate that.

1 THE CHAIR: Are there any other changes?

2 MS. BUNTON: Ron, you passed out a document  
3 before I got here this morning that talks about EPA  
4 positions on radiation standards, it seems very  
5 impressive, it seems like there's information in here  
6 that would help our report. I'd just like to start a  
7 discussion about whether or not anyone else agrees or  
8 disagrees and what we can do because I'm not versed  
9 in millirems but maybe someone is and what should we  
10 do about this information. Does it support our  
11 position? Does it bolster our position? So if  
12 someone could help me out on this.

13 MS. LUBIEWSKI: I think that's an excellent  
14 idea. It shows that not everything is just submitted  
15 by the Department of Energy, there is other  
16 information out there and that is somewhat what we've  
17 based our decisions on. Does that make sense?

18 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. So that's an  
19 affirmative response. Nancy is saying she agrees  
20 with Molly's question.

21 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: There is a place in  
22 the body of the report where we talk about standards  
23 at other places, and I don't know where that it is,  
24 but I mean if you want to expand that with some of  
25 that. I think some of your numbers are even referred

1 to. I read it just a few minutes ago but I don't  
2 know where it is.

3 THE FACILITATOR: We're on page three dash  
4 nine at the moment.

5 THE CHAIR: It's also on page three-seven,  
6 we talk about New Jersey and New York.

7 THE FACILITATOR: There's two references --  
8 and page 37.

9 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: So maybe if we want  
10 to incorporate something from Ron's document into  
11 those sections.

12 THE FACILITATOR: And perhaps one of the  
13 state representatives would like to look at those two  
14 parts of the draft and see where you think it fits  
15 best or what you think fits best and give Laurie a  
16 hand. Maybe that's something that can be done before  
17 we all leave here today so that she walks out of here  
18 with your guidance. Okay? So there is no objection  
19 to incorporating that reference into the document  
20 wherever it seems most appropriate; is that correct?  
21 All right. I'm getting nods.

22 MS. DREY: Well, I don't know. The thing  
23 is this is all talking about the shipping, the  
24 transportation of high level radioactive waste out to  
25 Nevada. I mean, I think it's important for the

1 background of the Task Force but I think it would  
2 require explaining what you know S.1271 and so forth,  
3 what that's all about.

4 THE FACILITATOR: So what conclusion does  
5 that lead you to?

6 MS. DREY: I don't know. Peggy, you were  
7 just looking at what has been written about radiation  
8 standards in this report as it is already.

9 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: Yes.

10 MS. DREY: Do you think it's needed?

11 MS. LIVINGSTON-THOMAS: I would have to  
12 reread. I really was reading for clarity. I was not  
13 reading and writing notes to ask you what this means,  
14 you know.

15 MS. DREY: I almost have a feeling that if  
16 we put in the EPA positions that then the DOE may say  
17 it wants its position put in and the Nuclear  
18 Regulatory Commission and the Department of Health  
19 and so forth. I don't know. I think it may be  
20 making things more confusing.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Well, I guess that's the  
22 fundamental question is whether what is already in  
23 the document is adequate and if not where it ought to  
24 be modified.

25 MS. LUBIEWSKI: I don't think we have to

1 worry about what the DOE or anybody else wants to put  
2 in our report. This is the Task Force report. They  
3 can make their own report and spend years on theirs  
4 if they want to. This is ours.

5 MR. GRANT: I think Ron had stated earlier  
6 that the standards that were set, the 5/15, are  
7 equivalent to 15. We're setting a 15 millirem dose  
8 which is lower than anything stated there. So as far  
9 as the standard set in the report they're more  
10 protective than what's stated in their document.

11 THE FACILITATOR: So what conclusion does  
12 that lead you to?

13 MR. GRANT: Well, you know, I think we've  
14 got what we need in there but if we'd want to in some  
15 manner incorporate reference to this as an appendix  
16 or get it into formal materials, that's great.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Well, that was the  
18 question that was on my mind, whether the document is  
19 suitable for inclusion as an appendix and whether  
20 that would cover the concern that Molly raised.

21 MR. GRANT: The other thing is I think the  
22 EPA is going to be reviewing whatever standards are  
23 set and probably consider these types of things  
24 within that. They need to, okay. And as Ron  
25 mentioned earlier there is this debate going on in

1 terms of not whether the standard should be lower but  
2 to what level it should be lowered.

3 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Well, let's  
4 see if we can bring all this to closure and come up  
5 with a plan of action because time is ticking away.  
6 Either we're going to modify the body of the document  
7 or not. And if we don't we still would have the  
8 option of including the document prepared by MDNR in  
9 the appendices if it seems appropriate for that  
10 purpose. And, Ron, perhaps you're the authority on  
11 that since you introduced it.

12 MR. KUCERA: I'd suggest that perhaps we  
13 try and get the letters that reference this and just  
14 appendicize them. My main point in bringing this up  
15 was because since we met last there was a DOE letter  
16 that suggested that there were no significant health  
17 risks associated with wastes in the St. Louis area  
18 and I thought well if DOE is going to throw down the  
19 gauntlet and start that kind of an argument, I wanted  
20 to show that the discourse from EPA at the top, from  
21 the administrator of EPA, admittedly related to other  
22 cleanups and other standards for facilities but that  
23 the discourse from Administrator Browner suggests  
24 this Task Force is not crazy in what they've  
25 recommended. They have not gone overboard, this is



1 reasonable. And that's why I offered what I did this  
2 morning. If the group would like to appendicize  
3 materials, we can try and find them. All we have  
4 right now are faxes, plus the summary document I've  
5 put together.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Well then maybe just  
7 given the production challenges that we are faced  
8 with maybe the better approach, if it is important to  
9 address this somewhere in the document, is try to  
10 expand the language of the document rather than hunt  
11 around for originals of something that could be  
12 appendicized which is where we started with Molly's  
13 suggestion. Any suggestions? Any thoughts?

14 THE CHAIR: I like the idea that Ron just  
15 proposed.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Which is?

17 THE CHAIR: To appendicize the letters that  
18 pertain to these radiation standards if they can be  
19 found.

20 THE FACILITATOR: And let it go at that?

21 THE CHAIR: Yeah, I mean --

22 MS. DREY: I think it would be confusing to  
23 the reader. I think they would be so confused about  
24 S.1271. I have that letter. It deals with the  
25 transporting of high level waste through places like

1 Webster and Kirkwood.

2 THE CHAIR: But I think that overall it a  
3 standard set --

4 MS. DREY: It's not set.

5 THE CHAIR: It's not set?

6 MS. DREY: I'd be interested in Dan Wall's  
7 response as a member of the EPA staff.

8 MR. WALL: I would say that that paper put  
9 together here is correct. I'm not sure how relevant  
10 a debate regarding the 100 millirem dose standard is  
11 to this particular case. It's true that the EPA's  
12 draft regulations on cleanup -- or draft rule making  
13 on cleanup of radioactive sites indicates a 15  
14 millirem standard. And that correlates more closely  
15 with our risk range that's established under  
16 Superfund so that is closer to the range that we  
17 would be looking at in terms of determining whether  
18 the risks are in a protective range or not.

19 As Sally said the 100 millirem, I think,  
20 intended to apply to cumulative doses from all  
21 sources other than natural background and medical  
22 sources so it would not be appropriate to apply a 100  
23 millirem standard to a single site or to an exposure  
24 you might get from a single site.

25 So I'd say this is true but I don't how

1 much direct application it has in terms of what we  
2 could consider in reviewing a proposal by the DOE.

3 MR. KUCERA: I have a suggestion that might  
4 solve this here. I have not seen it in this draft  
5 because I just haven't had time to look at it but in  
6 an earlier version I think there is a reference to  
7 other standards used by other agencies and to cover  
8 EPA part since it is a fact that EPA is moving  
9 forward with a rule making that aims at a cleanup  
10 standard of 15 millirem even though it's in process  
11 right now and is a draft proposed rule, we could  
12 simple add that to the reference where we're talking  
13 NRC standards and say that EPA is currently involved  
14 in a rule making that recommends 15 millirem and that  
15 would cover I think. So all we would have to do is  
16 add a phrase or a sentence in the body referring to  
17 the EPA rule making and I'd say we're covered.

18 THE CHAIR: In Section 3, page 7, it talks  
19 specifically about where you're talking about. The  
20 second paragraph gets us into this with the statement  
21 that in the absence of certainty on radiological  
22 effect the trend is clearly to adopt the more  
23 stringent standards and we would fit it in maybe in  
24 that paragraph. That's the paragraph ahead of the  
25 Nuclear Regulatory Commission standard.

1 MS. DREY: Well, they seem to have a  
2 proposed rule making for the NRC and, Ron, you would  
3 be able to track down the date of the proposed rule  
4 making of the EPA with the 15 millirem?

5 MR. KUCERA: Yeah, or Dan could provide it  
6 perhaps.

7 MR. WALL: I'm sorry?

8 MS. DREY: Is it a pending rule making  
9 right now, there's been a proposed rule making that  
10 would be a 15 millirem?

11 MR. WALL: Yes.

12 MS. DREY: Because I know EPA allows 25 for  
13 nuclear reactors but you're saying it's going to be  
14 15?

15 MR. WALL: It's still a draft and who knows  
16 what the final version will look like.

17 MS. DREY: But it's proposed; it's been  
18 proposed as a rule making?

19 MR. WALL: I believe so.

20 MS. DREY: Well there could be a Federal  
21 Register date that we could use.

22 MR. KUCERA: It's not in the Federal  
23 Register yet with OMB. This is a fact. I mean we  
24 can state a simple fact that EPA has proposed a 15  
25 millirem standard.

1 MS. DREY: Ron, could you help with that  
2 sentence?

3 MR. KUCERA: I'll try and find the exact  
4 wording for that.

5 THE FACILITATOR: So following on Sally's  
6 suggestion where we would be focusing to bring this  
7 to closure is on Roman numeral three dash seven. And  
8 roughly halfway down, a little better than halfway  
9 down would be the area we'd be focusing on. Ron will  
10 help with the language and we'll get a reference in  
11 there to the effect that there is this proposed --

12 THE CHAIR: And it will also be added in  
13 the Executive Summary too.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Yes.

15 THE CHAIR: No, we're off of that. Do we  
16 want to? Do we want to just leave it in Section 3,  
17 page 7? Okay. I just remembered the other  
18 discussion then.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. So the answer is  
20 no will not be included in the Executive Summary.  
21 All right. Are there other proposed modifications?  
22 Lou?

23 MR. JEARLS: On page Roman numeral nine, at  
24 the top of the page, we talk about Coldwater Creek  
25 flowing through Overland, Breckenridge Hills, St.

1 Ann, it then passes through Hazelwood. I'd like to  
2 add the city of Florissant after the word Hazelwood  
3 and then the entire Florissant Basin.

4 MS. DREY: Where.

5 MR. JEARLS: Roman numeral three dash nine,  
6 top of the page.

7 MS. DREY: Does it also say unincorporated  
8 St. Louis County?

9 MR. JEARLS: Yes, it does.

10 THE FACILITATOR: So we're adding the city  
11 of Hazelwood.

12 MS. DREY: Florissant.

13 THE FACILITATOR: The city of Florissant to  
14 the list of municipalities through which Coldwater  
15 Creek flows, is that the idea?

16 MR. JEARLS: Correct. Yeah, just add it  
17 right after Hazelwood.

18 MS. DREY: Does it say Black Jack?

19 MR. JEARLS: Yes.

20 MS. DREY: It doesn't go through Black  
21 Jack.

22 MR. JEARLS: The northern edge of Black  
23 Jack.

24 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Actually I had  
25 that in the original draft and I was advised that was

1 inaccurate.

2 THE CHAIR: It is on the northern boundary.

3 MS. DREY: Did you say down to  
4 Florissant-something basin? What did you say?

5 THE CHAIR: Well, the report goes on to say  
6 the entire Florissant Basin. He just read out the  
7 sentence.

8 THE FACILITATOR: All right. So we're  
9 going to include the city of Florissant as a main  
10 municipality through which the creek flows in  
11 addition to the Basin. I assume the --

12 MR. JEARLS: That's a larger area.

13 THE FACILITATOR: -- the Florissant Basin is  
14 larger than the city limits.

15 MR. JEARLS: Correct.

16 THE FACILITATOR: All right, good. Any  
17 other comments, modifications? Yes, Bob.

18 MR. MARCHANT: At the conclusion of that  
19 sentence it should be joining the Missouri River.

20 THE FACILITATOR: All right. The same  
21 sentence Bob Marchant is proposing we add the word  
22 river after the word Missouri -- where it joins the  
23 Missouri River.

24 MS. STEWARD: On page Roman numeral three  
25 dash fifteen.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Let us catch up with you  
2 now.

3 MS. STEWARD: Okay. It's beginning Section  
4 3, Factors Affecting Recommendations.

5 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, three dash  
6 fifteen?

7 MS. STEWARD: Right. It's I think the  
8 seventh bullet down, Applicable or Relevant and  
9 Appropriate Requirements compliance dictates and we  
10 would like to add the words after the word "a" add  
11 the words maximum allowable activity of 5 picocuries  
12 per gram. This is in keeping with something that we  
13 discussed a little earlier.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Maximum allowable  
15 activity --

16 MR. SCHERZINGER: Above background.

17 MS. STEWARD: Maximum allowable activity  
18 above background.

19 MS. DREY: Allowable radioactivity,  
20 please.

21 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Radioactivity  
22 above background of 5 picocuries per gram at the  
23 surface.

24 MS. STEWARD: Right.

25 THE FACILITATOR: And the rest of the



1 sentence remains the same.

2 MS. DREY: Do you want to say radioactive  
3 level of?

4 MS. STEWARD: No, I don't think so. I  
5 don't think we need that.

6 THE FACILITATOR: All right. I just want  
7 to make sure Laurie is okay with that. Okay?

8 MS. STEWARD: We would also propose adding  
9 a bullet right after that one that we just discussed,  
10 adding one dealing with the site specific cleanup  
11 standard for U238.

12 THE FACILITATOR: And what would you  
13 propose that language be?

14 MS. STEWARD: The site specific cleanup  
15 standard for the St. Louis FUSRAP sites for uranium  
16 has been set a maximum of 50 picocuries per gram  
17 above background for U238.

18 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Let's have  
19 discussion on that.

20 MS. DREY: Could you read that again,  
21 please. Site specific --

22 MS. STEWARD: -- cleanup standard for the  
23 St. Louis FUSRAP sites for uranium has been set at a  
24 maximum of 50 picocuries per gram above background  
25 for U238.

1 MS. DREY. What about U235?

2 MS. STEWARD: Do we have U235?

3 MS. DREY: We sure do.

4 MR. SCHERZINGER: Yeah, we do but the  
5 cleanup levels are based on U238 here.

6 MS. DREY: Pardon me?

7 MR. SCHERZINGER: Our cleanup levels at the  
8 FUSRAP sites in St. Louis are set at 50 picocuries  
9 per gram, a maximum of 50 picocuries per gram for  
10 U238. We assume others are secular equilibrium.

11 MS. DREY: Bechtel referred it as being  
12 enriched because the level of uranium 235 is so high  
13 compared to anywhere else in the United States that  
14 they called it enriched in correspondence that I had  
15 had years ago. So I just wonder why we can't say  
16 uranium.

17 MR. MILLER: Well, because they're two  
18 different things. If you want to specify total  
19 uranium you'll have to consider U234 also.

20 MS. DREY: Which is okay.

21 MR. MILLER: But the whole point is that  
22 U238 setting at 50 picocuries per gram was intended  
23 to also cover all the other isotopes including those  
24 in the decay chain so that when you dig to that level  
25 you're also taking the other radionuclides with it.

1 In other words, there's U235 particles associated  
2 with the U238 but when you dig the U238 up to that  
3 level they come with it.

4 MS. DREY: Well, you're talking about  
5 daughters like thorium and radium.

6 MR. MILLER: Yeah, it's a way of specifying  
7 a very specific number that you can verify in the  
8 field where the other radioisotopes are based on it  
9 rather than having to specify everything that might  
10 possibly be present in the daughters with varying  
11 half-lives. It's a way of getting at a very precise  
12 cleanup level.

13 MR. GRANT: I just have a comment or a  
14 question for Dave. I thought in the feasibility  
15 study, the draft feasibility study, there was a total  
16 grain of standard also.

17 MR. MILLER: That's correct. And it  
18 assumes, like Mitch was saying, secular equilibrium  
19 where you have a 100 picocuries per gram total  
20 uranium. Now that as I understand it from the  
21 committee when the Task Force met, although I wasn't  
22 present at that with the various department  
23 officials, I don't think that was discussed.

24 MS. DREY: We only discussed uranium -- we  
25 only discussed radium and thorium.

1 MR. MILLER: Right.

2 MS. DREY: And I don't think I've ever been  
3 in discussion with this Task Force about a 100  
4 picocuries per gram permissible total uranium and I  
5 don't know -- Elsa, I didn't get your full sentence.  
6 You said the site specific cleanup standard for the  
7 St. Louis FUSRAP site and something at a maximum of  
8 50 picocuries --

9 MS. STEWARD: For uranium.

10 MS. DREY: Okay. What was the verb,  
11 though?

12 MS. STEWARD: For uranium has been set by  
13 DOE.

14 MS. DREY: Well, you know, now Jim Grant is  
15 saying that there's also a 100 total uranium. Is  
16 that right? In other words if you add U238, 234 and  
17 235 you get up to a 100.

18 MR. GRANT: I would have to go back and  
19 look at the feasibility study but I believe, and I  
20 think you confirmed that didn't you, Dave, there's a  
21 100 total --

22 MR. MILLER: That's what was proposed in  
23 the draft.

24 MS. STEWARD: Shall we just leave this  
25 bullet out?

1 MS. DREY: I would encourage you to leave  
2 the bullet out.

3 MS. STEWARD: All right. We're withdrawing  
4 our request to add that.

5 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. That simplifies  
6 it.

7 MR. STYRON: In the bullet immediately  
8 above do you need to say radium and thorium. For new  
9 readers do you need to say what isotopes you're  
10 talking about?

11 THE FACILITATOR: The question is when we  
12 refer to 5 and 15 do we need to say for radium and  
13 thorium?

14 THE CHAIR: I think that's very helpful.

15 MS. DREY: Sure. It's the element; it's  
16 not the isotope.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Any objections?

18 MS. DREY: Where would you put that?

19 THE CHAIR: Bullet No. 7.

20 MS. DREY: Yeah, but where would you put --  
21 just after the word subsurface just put radium and  
22 thorium cleanup standard after the word subsurface?

23 THE FACILITATOR: I don't know. Ask  
24 Clarence.

25 THE CHAIR: Well, would it be before --

1   unrestricted property use?   You would state the  
2   standard and then specify for what you're talking  
3   about?

4               MR. STYRON:   Fine.

5               THE FACILITATOR:   The answer is yes.

6               THE CHAIR:   So it would come after cleanup  
7   standard for and then you would put thorium and  
8   uranium.

9               MS. DREY:   Thorium and radium.

10              THE CHAIR:   And radium, I mean.

11              THE FACILITATOR:   I just want to make sure  
12   Laurie is with us.   Have you got that?

13              MS. DREY:   I think thorium really should be  
14   listed before radium since we have by far more  
15   thorium.

16              THE FACILITATOR:   All right.   So thorium --

17              MS. DREY:   And radium.

18              THE CHAIR:   And then go on and finish with  
19   for unrestricted properties.

20              THE FACILITATOR:   Okay?   Are there any  
21   other observations, comments, proposed changes?  
22   Okay.   I don't hear any or see any.   Does that mean  
23   we have come to closure on this part of the meeting  
24   and that we can with all of the modifications that  
25   have been proposed and accepted by the group and

1 acting on presumption that they will be incorporated  
2 accurately into the document that we now have a  
3 document that you're ready to approve.

4 THE CHAIR: And we have a motion on the  
5 floor as amended with regard to the typographical  
6 changes that will be needed; is that right?

7 MR. CAVANAGH: Yes.

8 MS. DREY: And grammatical and some  
9 glossary changes but with your approval.

10 THE CHAIR: Yes.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Is everyone clear about  
12 the motion or would you like it restated?

13 THE CHAIR: Let's try to restate it.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

15 MR. CAVANAGH: All right. The intent is to  
16 approve the document with the understanding that  
17 typographical or grammatical errors could be made as  
18 noted and also with the opportunity for anybody on  
19 the committee who wants to look at the glossary and  
20 convey their recommendations to the Chair who would  
21 then determine whether they be made or not.

22 THE CHAIR: Okay.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. That's a motion  
24 and there was a second. Does the second stand?

25 MS. DREY: Yeah.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Any  
2 discussion on the motion? Shall we call the  
3 question?

4 THE CHAIR: We'll call the question. All  
5 in favor of the motion please specify by saying aye?  
6 All opposed? Any abstaining? The motion is passed.

7 MR. CAVANAGH: And I think it should be  
8 noted unanimously.

9 MS. DREY: Good.

10 THE FACILITATOR: The Task Force has now  
11 adopted a report after two years of work. Terrific.

12 We are running a bit behind schedule so we  
13 will try to get through the rest of the agenda  
14 quickly. First of all, item No. 4 calls for  
15 discussion of future role of the Task Force. Is  
16 there anyone who has anything to suggest on that  
17 front?

18 THE CHAIR: Probably just me right now. I  
19 had talked with Dave Adler a week or two ago about  
20 this. Is it our charter or our mission, one of the  
21 two, we specify that with delivery of the report the  
22 Task Force has met its obligation, its mission,  
23 unless it agrees to an extension of it.

24 I'm not proposing that now but what I would  
25 like to say, and in talking with him, we will have



1 another meeting when we get a response from DOE and I  
2 don't know exactly when that will be but we will  
3 reconvene for the purpose of discussing the response.

4 So this is not finally, you know, over as of next  
5 Tuesday.

6 But how we proceed from that point on right  
7 now is not clear and by that time it will be more  
8 clear. So I think what we need to do is just take a  
9 well-deserved break and watch for a notification of  
10 another meeting, hopefully October or November and  
11 definitely hopefully by December, but we really  
12 aren't sure what time frame we're talking about.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Any questions about that  
14 issue? While we're talking about additional  
15 meetings, I just want to remind each of you, and  
16 everybody in the room actually, that there is a  
17 public meeting scheduled for tomorrow evening  
18 starting at seven o'clock at the Henry VIII Motel  
19 which is on Lindbergh, not far from here, north of  
20 Interstate 70, on the east side of Lindbergh and the  
21 purpose of that meeting is to present the highlights  
22 of this report to the public and to provide an  
23 opportunity to the public to comment and there will  
24 be ongoing opportunity through the end of the week as  
25 I outlined earlier when we were talking about the

1 public comment section of this report so that it  
2 isn't absolutely required that the public have its  
3 act together entirely by tomorrow night. There will  
4 be some opportunity for reaction on Wednesday,  
5 Thursday and even through Friday.

6 Secondly, there is another meeting of this  
7 group scheduled for one week from today. It is an  
8 evening meeting. It is scheduled to start at 5:30 on  
9 September 24th, a Tuesday night, at the Stouffer's  
10 Hotel, south of Interstate 70 and just east of  
11 Lambert Airport. It's where the Coldwater Creek  
12 panel held its meetings. We're not sure what room we  
13 will be in but there will be an indication of that in  
14 the lobby and the purpose of that meeting primarily  
15 -- Sally?

16 THE CHAIR: Was to have the signing of the  
17 report. We were going to have a signature page added  
18 in to the report which I now realize we didn't  
19 discuss at the time we discussed the report.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Well, we do it now.

21 THE CHAIR: Does anyone object to such a  
22 page?

23 MS. DREY: I think there should be  
24 signature page to be signed by the chairman and  
25 whatever Anna's title is.

1 THE CHAIR: Vice chair.

2 MS. DREY: I think to try to get everyone  
3 on the Task Force to sign would be an impossibility  
4 and would keep it from getting mailed in a timely  
5 manner. But I think it should be signed by the  
6 chairman and the vice chairman on behalf of the Task  
7 Force.

8 THE CHAIR: Okay. We have a method that we  
9 have devised for getting everyone's signature, which  
10 if we didn't get, we'll just type on the bottom of  
11 the page saying Unavailable for Signature.

12 MS. DREY: I don't think we need it. I  
13 want to ask a question. After the 24th when you talk  
14 of a recess for the Task Force, I really think it's  
15 important -- we have decided that you are the sole  
16 representative of the Task Force and I think we  
17 should decide today, or certainly on the 24th, that  
18 we're not going to dissolve the Task Force because  
19 otherwise you're not going to have a position to be  
20 able to -- and no one will be given permission to  
21 discuss this report with the media. So I don't think  
22 that this Task Force should dissolve itself at this  
23 time. I mean, I think this is a very important time  
24 -- we need representation in Washington, we need  
25 representation in St. Louis.

1 MS. BUNTON: We need to change our mission.

2 THE CHAIR: That's the point we're at with  
3 this on the agenda.

4 MS. DREY: Then I think we have to do that.  
5 I mean, I don't think we should be without a chairman  
6 and I don't think we should be non-existing because  
7 otherwise this report is going to be placed in limbo.  
8 There won't be a spokesman for it.

9 THE CHAIR: So how do we want to amend the  
10 mission then? It's a quick fix. Where is our  
11 mission?

12 MS. DREY: It's on the very first page of  
13 the report after the arch. The Task Force is a  
14 broadly based representative body -- that's one word  
15 because it's written in German -- formed in September  
16 1994 to identify and evaluate feasible remedial  
17 action alternatives and to petition the U.S.  
18 Department of Energy to pursue a cleanup strategy.

19 Now, I don't know if we're through  
20 petitioning the U.S. Department of Energy.

21 MR. MANNING: Well, my interpretation of  
22 pursue is until the cleanup is completed.

23 THE CHAIR: That's true.

24 MS. DREY: Or until they at least agree,  
25 until we get them down on their knees or something.

1 THE CHAIR: It was also an issue that was  
2 raised very early in the process about ongoing  
3 oversight and it was never dealt with in depth but  
4 the issue was put on the table -- what do we do once  
5 we've developed recommendations and presented them to  
6 the Department of Energy, how do we monitor or pay  
7 attention to what's going on to ensure that either  
8 the recommendations are adopted or we know or not.

9 MS. GINSBURG: I would like to propose that  
10 we deal with this on the 24th and among other things  
11 we need to know what support DOLE and Bechtel will  
12 continue to offer under what circumstances.

13 THE FACILITATOR: I think the notion of  
14 dealing with it on the 24th is a good one.

15 THE CHAIR: I think it is too.

16 THE FACILITATOR: It gives everybody a  
17 little bit of time to think about it and talk with  
18 each other about it.

19 THE CHAIR: It gives us another reason to  
20 have a meeting. A short one, though.

21 MS. DREY: Well, I think at least we should  
22 not say we going to shut down.

23 THE CHAIR: Well, that's not the intent  
24 either. We just you know, to be specific we need to  
25 make some changes to some of the documentation that

1 we have. Okay, that will be for the next agenda.

2 THE FACILITATOR: We will deal with that  
3 issue on the 24th. And then as you have noticed in a  
4 document that you should have received by fax  
5 yesterday, I think that's correct, that there will  
6 also be dinner served to the Task Force members  
7 following the business meeting and it is essential  
8 for Sarah to know by noon this Friday who is planning  
9 to be there for dinner so that appropriate  
10 arrangements can be made with the hotel.

11 THE CHAIR: Okay. I have a few  
12 acknowledgments I want to make before we break. I  
13 guess now is the best time.

14 I would first like to give special thanks  
15 to Laurie Peterfreund for the effort that she has put  
16 out in helping us develop this report for the last  
17 month along with Molly and others on her staff and  
18 Laurie's staff who assisted us.

19 Next is for Mayor David Farquharson and the  
20 city of Hazelwood and the Hazelwood Civic Center-East  
21 staff for hosting these meetings for us. Many times  
22 so early in the morning and then also on short notice  
23 as we have lately been adding in meetings so we  
24 appreciate all of their effort.

25 MR. MANNING: On behalf of the city of

1 Hazelwood you're welcome.

2 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Kay mentioned  
3 Berkeley. The Priorities Working Group worked there  
4 in a very regular fashion and they also assisted us  
5 in many ways with their staff. So we thank Berkeley  
6 also.

7 To the members of our public who have been  
8 regular attendees at these meetings, their presence  
9 and their frequent commentary has been supportive of  
10 our efforts and we thank them -- Mr. Ed Mahr, Peggy  
11 and others too.

12 And to our court reporter who has recently  
13 helped us with transcripts and to our sound staff we  
14 appreciate their help and support.

15 And I also want to thank Sarah Synder from  
16 Bechtel who has assisted with the setup of these  
17 meetings in many, many ways. To the Bechtel team  
18 Wayne Johnson, Gerry Palau originally, and also Ken  
19 Alvin, Chuck Jenkins. We appreciate the Bechtel  
20 support that we've received -- the donuts were always  
21 very good.

22 And also to Jim Dwyer and to Miranda Duncan  
23 for their support in facilitation of these meetings.  
24 Without their help we wouldn't have gotten where  
25 we've gotten and we appreciate the many hours and the

1 work that they've given us. I'm sorry, Dave, I had  
2 your name here and I didn't say it. I apologize.

3 Finally, I would just like to thank all of  
4 you Task Force members in the support you've given in  
5 my role as chair and for the many meetings you've  
6 attended, especially our people from Jeff City who  
7 have been here faithfully each and every month, as  
8 well as our Priority Working Group meetings and  
9 others.

10 This has been a very rewarding experience  
11 for me and I hope it has for you. Thank you.

12 MS. GINSBURG: I'd also like to thank Sally  
13 for stepping up to the plate and assuming leadership  
14 and really taking the responsibilities of chair  
15 seriously. I think you really helped move the  
16 process forward.

17 THE CHAIR: Thank you. That concludes all  
18 my remarks. Does anyone else have anything to say?  
19 Okay.

20 Do I have a motion to adjourn?

21 MR. MANNING: So moved.

22 THE CHAIR: All in favor. Okay, we are  
23 adjourned.

24 (Meeting adjourned.)

25



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## CERTIFICATE

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Court Reporter

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

146765  
SL-1072

00-2169

---

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