

FUSRAP St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force
Alternate Sites Workgroup
March 6, 1995

A meeting of the Alternative Sites Workgroup was held on March 6, 1995 at 9:30 AM at the Hazelwood Interim Storage Site trailer. In attendance at the meeting were:

Dan Wall
Sally Price
Jim Dwyer
Kay Drey
Jim Grant
Dan Tschirgi
Eileen O'Connor

The meeting started with work on the alternative sites matrix at category "I.E. Local area impact". This item was completed. After discussing "I.C. Accessibility," it was determined that those issues are addressed in the "timing" and "cost" categories and that I.C. is therefore redundant. Some minor changes to other matrix definitions were discussed (not noted in these minutes) and will be forwarded to Jan Titus, for incorporation into a current matrix. Category "I.D. Capacity" was completed. A lengthy discussion occurred regarding "I.E.1. Site Status" as drafted, and whether it should be revised. The decision was made to drop "I.E.1. permitted for 11e(2) material" from the category and replace "I.E.2. degree of contamination present" with "I.E.1. levels of radioactive contamination present" and "I.E.2. contains or is contiguous to major concentration of radioactive material."

It was decided that an asterisk would be used to indicate matrix scores where an irreconcilable difference of opinion exists between two or more workgroup members. These differences will be presented to the Task Force for further discussion later. Unless an asterisk appears, the score indicates that consensus was achieved, i.e. that everyone on the workgroup can "live with it," not necessarily that there was total agreement.

Dan Tschirgi distributed copies of documents titled "Framework for DOE Low-Level and Mixed Low-Level Waste Disposal: Current Overview" dated June 1994, and "Performance Assessment Handbook for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Facilities" dated February 1992.

The next meeting will be at 9:30 AM on March 13, 1995. The group will try to complete the matrix in that meeting. At a minimum, the blank matrix form will be distributed at the March 14 Task Force meeting and a short presentation made.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.

	Hazelwood Interim Storage Site	St. Louis Airport Site	St. Louis Downtown Site	Weldon Spring Superfund Site	UE Surplus Property, Callaway County	*New Missouri Sites	Envirocare (Utah)	DOE Nevada Test Site	DOE Oak Ridge Reservation	DOE Hanford Reservation
I. Site Suitability										
A. Geology/Hydrogeology	2	1.75	1.33	3	3	4	4	4.25	?	?
1. floodplain	2	2	1	4	4	4	5	5	?	?
2. impact on groundwater	2	2	2	3	2	4	5	5	?	?
3. impact on surface water	2	1	0	3	3	4	5	5	?	?
4. earthquake potential	2	2	1	2	3	4	1	2	2	?
B. Local Area impact	1	1	2	2.33	3.33	3.33	4.5	4.5	3.66	4.5
1. land use	1	1	4	4	3	3	5	5	5	5
2. population density	1	1	1	2	4	4	5	5	3	5
3. health effects	1	1	1	1	3	3	4	4	3	4
C. Capacity	1	3	1.5	3.5	4	4	4	4	4	4
1. existing capacity	0	4	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
2. potential to expand	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
D. Site Status										
1. detectable levels of radioactive contamination ^{presence of} present	2	2	2	5	3	1	5	5	5	5
2. contains or is contiguous to major concentration of radioactive material	3	3	3	5	1	1	5	5	5	5
	1	1	1	5	5	1	5	5	5	5

0 - Unacceptable/infeasible
 1 - bad site
 2 - poor
 3 - neutral
 4 - satisfactory
 5 - good site
 ? - Unknown to working group

*hypothetical Missouri site: values the site should meet to be considered as an alternate site

RAW SCORES
 WEIGHTED SCORES
 POLAR OPPOSITES
 UNKNOWN
 DISQUALIFIERS

■ polar opposite views- detailed presentations

	Hazelwood Interim Storage Site	St. Louis Airport Site	St. Louis Downtown Site	Weldon Spring Superfund Site	UE Surplus Property Callaway County	*New Missouri Sites	Envirocare (Utah)	DOE Nevada Test Site	DOE Oak Ridge Reservation	DOE Hanford Reservation
II. Timing										
A. Approval process	16 2.3	16 2.3	17 2.4	18 2.6	12 1.7	12 1.7	34 4.9	28 (4)	25 3.6	27 3.9
1. political jurisdictions	2	2	2	2	1	1	5	4	3	4
2. number of permits needed	3	3	3	2	1	1	5	4	4	3
3. site characterization	3	3	3	2	1	1	5	5	5	5
4. design	3	3	3	4	3	3	5	4	4	4
5. funding allocation	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3
6. ownership issues	1	1	2	4	2	2	5	4	4	4
7. admin/agency jurisdictions	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	4	2	3
B. Construction										
1. transport routes	5	5	5	4	3	3	5	?	?	?
2. weather constraints										
3. facility development	1	1	1	3	1	1	5	4	3	4
III. Cost										
A. Transportation										
1. material to location	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	1
2. build infrastructure routes	3	3	3	3	2	3	5	5	4	4
B. Disposal										
1. development	1	1	1	3	1	1	5	4	2	3
2. construction	1	1	1	4	2	1	5	5	5	5
3. fees	5	5	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	1
3. operating/maintenance	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	5	5	5

*hypothetical Missouri site :values the site should meet to be considered as an alternate site

3421
2

0 - Unacceptable/infeasible
1 - bad
2 - poor
3 - neutral
4 - satisfactory
5 - good
? - Unknown to working group

3