

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force

A G E N D A

Meeting of December 6, 1994
Hazelwood Civic Center

1. Welcome, Opening Comments, Announcements--Dr. Bryan
2. Public comment (10 minutes)
3. Status of residential cleanup--David Adler
4. Review and adoption of Charter and Mission Statement
5. Review and adoption of Ground Rules
6. Overview of Remedial Investigation, Risk Assessment, and Remedy Selection--
David Adler
7. Review timeline
8. Identify work that needs to be done between now and the next meeting
9. Prepare agenda for next meeting (January 10, 1995)

MINUTES

St. Louis Sites Remediation Task Force

November 1, 1994

Attendees

Mayor David Farquharson
 Dr. Wayne Black
 Jim Dwyer
 Dan Tschirgi
 Eileen O'Connor
 Daniel Wall
 David Miller
 Col. Leonard Griggs
 Gerry Palau
 Dale Lakenberger
 Steve Ackerman
 Paul Kes
 Tom Manning

Chris Byrne
 J. K. Grant
 Jack Frauenthoffer
 Bob Geller
 Thomas Horgan
 Kay Drey
 Cynthia Pavelka
 Dr. Alpha Fowler Bryan
 Jean Leadbetter
 Karen Acker
 Bob Staniforth
 Ron Key
 Anna Ginsburg

Glenn Carlson
 Miranda Duncan
 Nancy Lubewski
 Mitch Scherzinger
 David Adler
 Conn B. Roden
 Sally Price
 Patti Hazel
 C. Heberstut
 Tom Binz
 Doug Mendoza
 Roger Pryor

Agenda Item/
Subject Discussed

MinutesDetermination

*Welcome/
 Announcements*
Public Comment

Dr. Bryan welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked for announcements. There were none.

Steve Ackerman spoke during the public comment session concerning the effects the current status of the clean-up efforts would have on someone starting a business in the area, and how the clean-up work would affect existing businesses in the area, i.e. creating forced shut-downs, greater risk of exposure due to a higher concentration of airborne contaminants caused by the cleanup, etc. He noted the contamination in the HISS area goes down 14 feet. Mr. Ackerman asked if any protection was being offered by federal agencies against liability from the cleanup. He feels there should be some sort of indemnity for businesses to protect them from potential lawsuits by employees or others who could claim health risks from exposure, and there should be some protection from possible shut-down of business during the cleanup. Mr. Ackerman, at Dr. Bryan's request, agreed to submit a written summary of his comments to the Task Force.

Concern voiced in public comment session about liability, loss of business and increased health risk during clean-up.

*Soil Washing
 Tests--(Update*

There was no update on the status of the soil washing tests. David Adler provided copies of a report on the soil washing technique.

Agenda Item/
Subject Discussed

Minutes

Determination

*Residential
Cleanup--Update*

The residential cleanup began on time. There is a current shortage of inter-modal boxes, but that should be corrected shortly. The real problem, as expected, is traffic control. They have gone to 24-hour traffic control.

Residential cleanup has begun. Traffic control caused some problems.

David Adler informed the Task Force that a proposal for the cleanup of Plant 10 (old Plant 4) had been submitted by Mallinckrodt to the Department of Energy (DOE). The DOE felt that appropriation for this purpose of part of the funds available from DOE for the St. Louis site is in line with Tom Grumbly's goals. Mallinckrodt identified their highest priority site based on risk of spreading contamination and proximity to public access. Plant 10 is close to traffic and pedestrian areas. There are some buildings on the site, some with contamination. The buildings would be torn down and sorted into non-contaminated or contaminated debris. The non-contaminated debris would be hauled away and DOE would take care of the contaminated debris. There would still be enough funds left of the \$15,000,000 to do improvements to the airport site. Bechtel is totaling estimated costs of the residential cleanup, the Mallinckrodt proposal and airport work.

Proposal being considered to begin work on a portion of the Mallinckrodt downtown site which poses risk for spread of the contamination. David Adler will provide a schematic and summary of the proposal.

David Adler said documentation of the proposed Mallinckrodt work will be sufficient to meet Super-Fund requirements. They are estimating 5,000 to 7,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil at the proposed site, besides the building debris. Dr. Bryan asked David Adler for a schematic and summary of this proposal.

*Process Overview/
Timeline*

Jim Dwyer and Miranda Duncan began a review of their proposed timeline/process overview. Each month will have projected accomplishments. The timeline covers October 1994 through June 1995. Jim Dwyer said they plan to take comments from the floor, adjust the timeline, and get copies to everyone. He pointed out that the greatest amount of work would have to be accomplished between meetings if the timeline is to be adhered to.

Facilitators present the proposed timeline.

Agenda Item/
Subject Discussed

Minutes

Determination

Anna Ginsberg suggested ongoing identification of those points that have consensus and areas of difference or conflict in order to identify common ground. David Adler suggested taking full advantage of information already gathered. Jim Dwyer pointed out the need for consistency in attending the meetings. There was discussion concerning whether there is a need to develop a firm participant list.

*Review/Adoption
Charter, Mission
Statement*

Jim Dwyer asked for a review and adoption of the draft Charter and Mission Statement. The Mission Statement was discussed first, and Kay Drey suggested including the words "formed in September, 1994," and leaving out the word "all". There were no objections to these changes.

Two changes to proposed Mission Statement were accepted.

Kay asked about the 4th line of the Mission Statement which refers to the St. Louis FUSRAP sites, whether that term included the West Lake landfill. David Adler voiced an objection to including West Lake with the present project because West Lake is on its own time table. It would cause delay to wait for West Lake to progress to the point of the present project. Roger Pryor expressed agreement with Kay's concern that the West Lake landfill will be overlooked and should be included in the current project since it is historically part of the same problem. Dan Wall of EPA assured the Task Force that West Lake would not be forgotten as it is currently being addressed under SuperFund as an independent project. Sally Price noted that Tom Grumbly had been open to discussing the West Lake landfill and that this group should not hasten to exclude it.

Discussion concerning inclusion of the West Lake landfill in the current project. Jim Dwyer and Miranda Duncan will contact individuals to draft possible language concerning West Lake.

There followed a very long discussion concerning the history of the West Lake landfill. Dr. Bryan made the suggestion to include an addendum to the Mission Statement to say West Lake could be included if it becomes appropriate to at a later time. After more discussion Jim Dwyer suggested he and Miranda contact the people who have been voicing

Agenda Item/
Subject Discussed

Minutes

Determination

concerns to draft appropriate language concerning West Lake that could be considered at the next meeting. Dan Wall agreed that the EPA's information concerning West Lake would be provided to the Task Force. Jim said he felt the prevailing sentiment was to keep West Lake open for possible discussion and/or possible inclusion. Anna Ginsberg suggested just adding the words "and West Lake" to the FUSRAP sites sentence since it begins with "if appropriate".

Jim Dwyer suggested placing the adoption of the Charter on hold until the Mission Statement is resolved. All agreed. David Adler cautioned Jim to be sure the Mission Statement and Charter did not have language that would conflict with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Adoption of Charter placed on hold.

*Ground Rules--
Review and
Adoption*

The proposed Ground Rules were reviewed for adoption. Glenn Carlson questioned item 7 concerning a media representative. He wanted to be sure the Task Force is kept informed of media contacts. After discussion, he clarified that he did not mean it was necessary to inform the Task Force prior to media contacts or to get approval. Only that the Task Force be kept informed when there is contact and what it concerned. There was some discussion about the need for a media spokesperson and if one person is sufficient. Jim Dwyer explained that he thought it was best to have one person speaking for the Task Force, and it would not preclude anyone from speaking for themselves or their constituents. Dr. Bryan was the suggested spokesperson, and she pointed out that she usually refers media to the most appropriate individuals who can supply the information needed. Kay Drey asked about whether there could be a designee and there was discussion about specifying the Chair, Vice Chair or designee to handle media relations. Roger Pryor pointed out that the media are welcome at the meetings. He agreed that individuals could talk to the media, but only as individuals, not representing the Task Force. That should be left to the spokesperson. Anna Ginsberg stated she felt "media relations" implied a proactive involvement with the media. She suggested using only "media spokesperson". All approved that language.

Ground Rules reviewed. Item 7 about media relations discussed. Some changes were suggested and agreed to. Chair will be spokesperson, and she may designate a more appropriate contact to provide requested information.

Agenda Item/
Subject Discussed

Minutes

Determination

Item 1 of the Ground Rules was reviewed and Kay Drey suggested having a specific time limit rather than a "brief" period. After discussion, all agreed to limit public comment to 10 minutes. It was also suggested that an address be provided to mail written comments to.

Item 2 of the Ground Rules was reviewed and Kay Drey suggested changing the word "participate" to "speak". All agreed. The question arose as to who are actually duly appointed Task Force members as described in Item 2. Dr. Bryan said the members of the two Commissions and invitees of the Summit were members. Beyond that any others who feel they need to be there could be considered members. The only duly appointed members are the members of the City and County Commissions. There was lengthy discussion on defining the group, or defining what constitutes a member. Dr. Bryan stated the list used for the Summit meeting reflects the fullest representation. Roger Pryor pointed out that the Charter also refers to Task Force members and the adoption of the Ground Rules may need to be delayed until the Charter is adopted.

Jim Dwyer suggested individuals should send suggestions about the Ground Rules to the facilitators and perhaps include a list of Task Force members as they think it should be composed. Jim and Miranda will consolidate the suggestions and lists to send out for review and comments before the December meeting.

Jim Dwyer asked the Task Force to be prepared to come to closure on the Charter, Mission Statement, Ground Rules and Participant List at the December meeting.

Dan Tschirgi suggested having a requirement for all Task Force members participating at the time the recommendation is made to take a position, either for, against, or indifferent, but on the record, so all views may be expressed. Tom Horgan agreed, stating it would eliminate any questions concerning the result if all positions are disclosed.

Agenda Item/
Subject Discussed

Minutes

Determination

Dr. Bryan agreed with the statement by David Adler that although DOE is involved in the meetings, they really should not be considered part of the group with a voice in the decision-making process. She also suggested that one vote per individual for the proposed alternatives may not suffice to show consensus. She stated if there were five alternatives, as an example, and each individual had three votes to indicate their preferences, these preferences would tally up to indicate more clearly the mind-set of the Task Force by outlining the greater and lesser preferences. Jack Fraenhoffer suggested Jim Dwyer could define "consensus" for the purpose of the Task Force. Voting as a group on day-to-day issues is not excluded from the process.

Ground Rule #3 was reviewed and it was felt the language was not clear about substitution. It was also suggested that it would be appropriate to add a representative from Bridgeton to the Task Force.

Kay Drey mentioned that in Ground Rule #6, bullet points 3 and 10 looked like duplicates. Jim will consolidate those.

*Vice Chair
Appointment*

Anna Ginsburg of the City's Commission was chosen as Vice Chair.

Vice Chair chosen.

*Subcommittee's
Report on
Criteria, etc.*

Glenn Carlson explained the handouts provided by the subcommittee concerning the criteria, values, and other information proposed to be used in reviewing and comparing alternatives and developing recommendations. This material is to be reviewed because the criteria, etc., will be discussed at the December meeting. Dr. Bryan suggested providing a list of the members of subcommittees for reference and documentation purposes.

Criteria, etc. to be reviewed for discussion at December meeting.

*Agenda/
Adjournment*

After discussion it was agreed that the Agenda for the December meeting will be the same as the November agenda. Jack Fraenhoffer suggested the members should send any comments or suggestions they have to the facilitators before the meetings.

Agenda set for December meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Transcribed by J. Leadbetter
November 9, 1994

SL-449
123443

00-1596

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