

FUSRAP St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force
Alternative Sites Working Group
February 21, 1995

A meeting of the Alternative Sites Working Group was held on February 21, 1995 at 9:30 AM at the Hazelwood Interim Storage Site trailer. In attendance at the meeting were:

Jim Dwyer
Eileen O'Connor
Kay Drey
Jan Titus
Jack Fraenhoffer
Sally Price
Dan Wall
Dan Tschirgi (by phone)

The objective of the meeting was to continue to work on the alternative sites matrix categories.

There were lengthy discussions regarding use of the Callaway site or other Missouri sites, the low level waste compact process, and other DOE sites.

When the meeting began to focus on the matrix categories, Jan Titus offered to finalize and distribute the matrix after the meeting so everyone could work on filling in the matrix for the next meeting.

The group spent the remainder of the meeting discussing and defining the categories. Changes from the February 7 meeting were made to better define the categories and make them more amenable to use. The matrix does not include protection of human health and the environment as specific categories, which were the most important criteria to the whole Task Force for overall site cleanup. The group decided that these are overriding factors that affect all criteria for the alternative sites matrix.

The revised categories will be attached to this meeting summary.

The meeting concluded at 1:40 PM.

2/28/95

Assumptions and Definitions

Assumptions:

The following assumptions are applied to each alternative site:

- each disposal site is to be considered as a consolidated disposal site for all St. Louis FUSRAP material
- each site will provide a properly designed, contained facility for the disposal of all waste
- the removal of waste will be done in the same manner in each case
- there will be a uniform level of cleanup
- the planning horizon for which this evaluation is based is the foreseeable future
- the evaluation criteria applied to a ten mile radius around each site

Definitions:

The following redefines the evaluation categories:

I Site Suitability

A. Geology/Hydrogeology (doesn't account for design safe guards; what would happen if the structure failed))

1. Floodplain (proximity of disposal structure to 100 year flood plain; ponding that would occur during a heavy downpour)
2. Impact on groundwater (i.e., if the disposal cell fails, what impact is there on ground water)
3. Impact on surface water (how close is the cell to surface water)
4. earthquake potential (as delineated in the book "Physical Geology" by L. Don Hunt, Seldon Judson and Marvin E. Kauffman, 1978.

B. Local Area Impact

1. land use (compatibility with current and projected land use)
2. population density (recreational, residential and work place)
3. health effects (facility worker, neighbors)

C. Accessibility

1. transportation routes (including rail and road)
2. seasonal consideration (is the site accessible during all seasons)

2/28/95

D. Capacity

1. existing capacity
2. potential to expand

E. Acceptance criteria *

1. current for 11e(2) material
2. need to be modified

***11e(2) material is defined as: ".... the tailings or wastes produced by the extraction or concentration of uranium or thorium from any ore processed primarily for its source material content."**

II Timing

A. Approval process

1. political jurisdictions (number of elected officials)
2. number of permits needed
3. site characterization
4. design
5. funding allocation
6. ownership
7. administrative/agency jurisdictions (local, state and federal)

B. Construction

1. transport routes
2. weather constraints
3. facility development

III Cost

A. Transportation

1. material to location (distance and method)
2. build infrastructure routes

B. Disposal

1. development
2. construction
3. fees
4. operating/maintenance (including post closure)

IV Community Issues

A. Acceptance

1. citizens
2. government
3. business
4. advocacy groups

2/28/95

B. Economic Impact

1. property values
2. development potential
 - a) local (immediate surroundings)
 - b) regional
3. revenue generation (jobs, taxes, infrastructure)

	HISS	SLAPS	SLDS	WSSRAP	UE Surplus PROPERTY CALLAWAY COUNTY	*New Missouri Sites	Envirocare	NTS	Oak Ridge	Hanford
I. Site Suitability										
A. Geology/Hydrogeology	2	2	1	3	3	4	4	4	?	?
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	1	0	3	3	4	5	5	?	?
4. earthquake potential	2	2	1	2	3	4	1	2	2	?
B. Local Area impact										
1. land use										
2. population density										
3. health effects										
C. Accessibility										
1. transportation routes										
2. seasonal considerations										
D. Capacity										
1. existing capacity										
2. potential to expand										
E. Site Status										
1. permitted 11e (2) material										
2. degree of contamination present										

0 - Unacceptable/unfair

1 - bad

2 - poor

3 - neutral

4 - satisfactory

5 - good

? - Unknown to working group

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

134491

	HISS	SLAPS	SLDS	WSSRAP	plus PROPERTY CALLAWAY COUNTY	*New Missouri Sites	Envirocare	NTS	Oak Ridge	ford
II. Timing										
A. Approval process										
1. political jurisdictions										
2. number of permits needed										
3. site characterization										
4. design										
5. funding allocation										
6. ownership										
7. admin/agency jurisdictions										
B. Construction										
1. transport routes										
2. weather constraints										
3. facility development										
III. Cost										
A. Transportation										
1. material to location										
2. build infrastructure routes										
E. Disposal										
1. development										
2. construction										
3. fees										
4. operating/maintenance										

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

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

134491

2/28/95

D. Capacity

1. existing capacity - *existing capacity needed*
2. potential to expand

E. ~~Acceptance criteria~~ *Site Status*

1. ~~current for 11e(2) material~~ *1. DETECTABLE LEVEL OF CONTAMINATION POINT*
2. ~~need to be modified~~

*11e(2) material is defined as: "... the tailings or wastes produced by the extraction or concentration of uranium or thorium from any ore processed primarily for its source material content."

in the U.S. Atomic Energy Act of 1954

II Timing

A. Approval process

1. political jurisdictions (number of elected officials)
2. number of permits needed
3. site characterization
4. design
5. funding allocation
6. ownership
7. administrative/agency jurisdictions (local, state and federal)

B. Construction

1. transport routes
2. weather constraints
3. facility development

III Cost

A. Transportation

1. material to location (distance and method)
2. build infrastructure routes

B. Disposal

1. development
2. construction
3. fees
4. operating/maintenance (including post closure)

IV Community Issues

A. Acceptance

1. citizens
2. government
3. business
4. advocacy groups

(2011-11-11)

	HISS	SLAPS	SLDS	WSSRAP	UE Surplus PROPERTY CALLAWAY COUNTY	*New Missouri Sites	Envirocare	NTS NEVADA TEST SITE	(Doc-) Oak R'dge RESERVATION	(Doc-) Hanford RESERVATION
I. Site Suitability		1.75								
A. Geology/Hydrogeology	2	2	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. land use	1	1	2	2.33	3.33	3.33	4.5	4.5	3.66	4.5
2. population density	1	1	4	4	3	3	5	5	5	5
3. health effects	1	1	1	2	4	4	5	5	3	5
C. Accessibility										
1. transportation routes										
2. seasonal considerations										
D. Capacity										
1. existing capacity	1	3	1.5	3.5	4	4	4	4	4	4
2. potential to expand	0	4	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
E. Site Status										
1. permitted 11(c) material	3	3	3	2	2	2	4	4(?)	4(?)	4(?)
1. degree of contamination present	5	5	5	5		1	5	5	5	5
2. CONTINUOUS OR IS CONTINUOUS TO										

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

INFEASIBLE

1. HAS PERMIT FOR 11(c) 2

2. HAS ACCEPTED 11(c) 2 FROM OFF SITE

3. IS CONTAMINATED BY 11(c) 2 MATERIAL

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

(6)

4. HAS PERMIT FOR 11(c) 2 MATERIAL FROM OFF SITE
 1. PERMITTED FOR 11(c) 2 MATERIAL FROM OFF SITE
 2. MATERIAL FROM OFF SITE

4. ARE SITE VALUES DEPENDENT ON CONTAMINATION

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

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

134491
SL-596

00-1634

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