

## St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force

July 11, 1995 Meeting

Hazelwood Civic Center  
Hazelwood, Missouri**Participants Attending**

David Adler, U.S. Department of Energy  
(ex officio)  
Tom Binz, Laclede Gas Company  
Jack Fraunhoffer, Mallinckrodt Chemical Co.  
Anna Ginsburg, City of St. Louis  
Robert Geller, Missouri Dept. of Natural  
Resources  
Col. Len Griggs, Lambert Airport  
Tom Horgan, Congressman Talent's Office  
Nancy Lubiewski  
Eileen O'Connor, Union Electric  
Sally Price, Community Representative  
Conn Roden, St. Louis Dept. of Health  
Barry Siegel, Washington University  
School of Medicine  
Elsa Steward, Missouri Department of  
Natural Resources  
Daniel Wall, U.S. EPA, Region 7

**Support**

Jim Dwyer, Facilitator  
Patti Hazel, FUSRAP  
Chuck Jenkins, FUSRAP  
Wayne Johnson, FUSRAP  
Dave Miller, FUSRAP  
George Stevens, FUSRAP  
Sarah Snyder, FUSRAP  
Joe Williams, FUSRAP

**Other Interested Parties**

Wayne Black, St. Louis County Department of  
Health  
Bradley Brown, St. Louis County Water Co.  
Jean Dean, League of Women Voters  
Thomas Manning, City of Hazelwood  
Linda Meyer, Weldon Spring Site Remedial  
Action Project  
Robert Morgan, Berkeley Research Associates  
Laurie Peterfreund, NCEIT  
Jan Titus, Lambert Airport  
Robert Wester, R.M. Wester and Associates

<b><u>Agenda Item</u></b>	<b><u>Minutes</u></b>	<b><u>Determination</u></b>
<i>Welcome, Opening Comments, Announcements</i>	<p>Vice Chair Anna Ginsburg called the meeting to order at 7:37 a.m. She turned the meeting over to Jim Dwyer, who asked for public comment.</p> <p>Tom Manning, City of Hazelwood, said city officials are discussing with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers stabilizing the banks of Coldwater Creek pursuant to a plan developed approximately 10 years ago and</p>	

put "on hold" pending resolution of radioactive waste disposal issues. He explained that recent flooding has caused a serious problem and that city officials are concerned about spreading contamination as a result.

Dave Adler, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE-FUSRAP) said DOE has done a lot of characterization along the creek and that the agency has a good idea where the contamination is located.

There was no further discussion of the matter.

Mr. Dwyer introduced and welcomed Sarah Snyder, who most recently worked with the DOE's advisory board at the Fernald site in Ohio, and has been hired by Bechtel to help support the Task Force.

#### *Approval of Minutes*

Vice Chair Ginsburg asked for approval of the minutes from the June 13, 1995 Task Force meeting.

The minutes were approved without amendment.

#### *Working Group Progress Reports*

##### *Alternative Sites*

The Alternative Sites Working Group had nothing new to report.

##### *Mallinckrodt Proposal*

Jack Fraunhofer reported that Buildings 80, 81, and 82 have been demolished and the site has been turned over to the Department of Energy for remediation of the soils. He said the work is on schedule and is expected to be completed this year.

##### *Health Risk/ Clean-up Standards*

The Health Risk/Clean-up Standards Working Group had nothing new to report.

##### *Priorities*

Jack Fraunhofer reported that the Priorities Working Group is continuing its efforts to complete the matrix distributed to members at the previous meeting. When all the information is developed and included in the matrix, it will be presented to the full Task

Force for review and consideration. The working group is evaluating approximately 35 individual sites in the matrix, which will then be grouped into similar categories, such as the haul routes.

Mr. Dwyer said the matrix effort is designed to enable the Task Force to recommend different remedies for different conditions, rather than a single remedy for the entire St. Louis Site. The matrix will contain information about volumes, contaminants, risk, projected cost, land use, and social and economic value for each site.

Mr. Frauenhoffer said that one of the reasons that the group's efforts are not proceeding as fast as it would like is that the group has been sidetracked almost every meeting with special issues of an urgent nature.

For example, at the last meeting the working group considered a request from a property owner who wanted prompt remediation of a 60-foot by 60-foot parcel because he was trying to sell his property. The site has relatively modest contamination on the perimeter, close to Hazelwood Avenue. The group estimated that remediation would involve removal of approximately 130 cubic yards of soil at a cost of about \$1,300 per cubic yard, or a total of about \$175,000, to ship the material to Envirocare.

Mr. Dwyer explained that the working group was unable to recommend that this request be given immediate attention because the group has not yet determined overall priorities and, therefore, there is no context in which to evaluate this project.

Sally Price asked what the levels of contamination were. Dave Miller of SAIC said that only one sample from the property that was 11 picocuries per gram. The maximum level found adjacent to the property was 21 picocuries per gram.

Mr. Frauenhoffer said the working group visited the site and that the visit led members

to believe that they did not have enough information to make a decision about immediate action. He added that a lot of thought and time went into considering the property owner's request.

Mr. Dwyer said he is committed to the goal of having the group finish its work within the next three weeks so that the full Task Force can receive the working group report in advance of the August meeting.

Mr. Adler added that about 80 property owners along Hazelwood Avenue have some contamination. He compared the typical levels of contamination to that of flyash and suggested that an industrial landfill might be able to take this type of low-level waste. He suggested this would be a low-cost, politically viable solution for this soil.

Nancy Lubiewski said this case illustrates the need for the DOE to develop a disposal site within the State of Missouri. She said she believes the best and most feasible in-state location is the Union Electric surplus property in Callaway County. She said the existence of geological studies which concluded that the area was suitable for a nuclear power plant made Callaway County a good choice in terms of time and money.

Eileen O'Connor said that while characterization studies have been done for the area, they were specifically for the nuclear power plant. She said Union Electric has not evaluated the surplus property. She explained that the Missouri Department of Natural Resources would require a full study, so it probably would be years before that site could accept waste.

She also said the surplus property is now being used as a wildlife area under an arrangement with the Missouri Department of Conservation. She added that Union Electric had no interest in exploring the possible use of the land for disposal and that the property is not for sale.

Ms. Lubiewski said there is not enough information about an in-state disposal option, so the Task Force cannot discuss a recommendation. She said she agreed that the issue could not be resolved at today's meeting, adding that she has some information she can distribute to interested members. She said she has seen some information about state compact sites, and suggested that more information might be useful.

Mr. Adler said the DOE needed to identify a nearby disposal facility relatively quickly. Even if there were an in-state facility like Envirocare designated for receiving this kind of waste, it would take years before it could be built because of the required regulatory approvals and political and social acceptance. He said there are property owners who want to buy and sell their land today, which is why the Task Force should consider finding an existing in-state disposal facility that can receive this low-level radioactive soil.

He said that because of the potential controversy, the DOE has not chosen to look at siting a disposal facility in-state, which is why there are not concrete cost estimates. However, he said it is possible to "spec out" a cost without committing to a particular in-state disposal site. He emphasized that the Task Force needs to find some way to deal with the dirt "outside the fence" that is scattered along these private properties.

Mr. Adler added that the DOE has the authority to dispose of wastes at a commercial landfill if it can convince itself that such a site is viable in all respects. This is a tough question, but where a technically adequate option can be identified, the DOE can allow itself to use it. However, this kind of option would require coordination with state officials, he advised.

Barry Siegel asked if the state would consider such an action, to which the Department of

Natural Resources officials answered with a qualified "yes."

Tom Binz asked if the DOE has polled landfill operators to see if there is acceptance of this kind of material. Mr. Adler said that most operators were concerned about two issues: 1) is it legal to accept this? 2) is it safe to accept this? He explained that the landfill operators weigh the risks against the costs, but he pointed out that they have accepted flyash, which has some similar characteristics. Transportation is a key economic issue for this option as well, Mr. Adler said.

Mr. Dwyer suggested that Task Force members consider both permanent and interim disposal options. He said the notion of disposal in a local landfill presumes permanent disposal. He said property owners with urgent remediation needs might be accommodated more quickly with an interim strategy.

Ms. Price asked whether landfills temporarily store materials. Mr. Adler replied that, typically, landfill storage is considered permanent. He said interim storage would be more likely at another FUSRAP property, rather than at a landfill. He added that it would be an inefficient use of resources to load waste on a truck and send it somewhere, only to have to move it again.

Ms. O'Connor said that the Barnwell disposal site in South Carolina reopened this month. Mr. Adler said that the disposal fees there are very high and that transportation costs would be similar to Utah.

#### *Communications*

The Communications Working Group was formed as a result of Task Force members' concern that there should be more public participation in the process as well as a plan for effective lobbying once a comprehensive remediation program has been developed.

Mr. Frauenhoffer said the working group needs more participation, especially from

people with particular expertise in communication issues. He said there needs to be a final remediation plan adopted by the Task Force before the group can do anything. The goal of the working group is to be prepared so that when the Task Force report is prepared in November, the group will have a plan in place to promote the program.

*Status of MDNR  
Funding*

Bob Geller advised that the DOE and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources are in the process of finalizing arrangements for funding, which would allow MDNR to participate more fully in the process.

*DOE Budget and  
Program Update*

Mr. Adler reported that the DOE will be able to complete all activities planned for this fiscal year, despite the fact that the administration has chosen to pull back some money from this year's budget and apply it to fiscal year 1996.

He advised that the plan still calls for \$30 million over next two years (\$15 million each in fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997). He said one of the key tasks for the Task Force is to propose a set of projects for those two years. Beyond fiscal year 1997, he anticipates that the DOE managers in Washington will not continue to fund cleanup programs that don't have community-supported priorities. Absent some kind of long-range plan, he believes funding would drop back to levels that would permit only monitoring activities.

He reminded Task Force members that budgets are being scrutinized very closely. He has heard that Congress may demand another 30 percent reduction in non-defense DOE program funding, which would be a \$17 million cut for FUSRAP next year. He said cost is going to be a key issue for the next few years.

Mr. Binz said that the Task Force members who toured the Clemson Technical Center want to continue talking about the soil washing/chemical extraction tests. Ms. Lubiewski said the issue was discussed at DOE's EM Advisory Board (EMAB) meeting, and the material presented was very helpful. However, she said most of the soil here doesn't appear to be suitable for this technology.

*Work to be Done*

Mr. Dwyer distributed a copy of a draft outline of the final report as he envisions it. (ATTACHMENT A) He requested that Task Force members review the outline and get comments to him as soon as possible.

The outline will be the principal tool he will use during the next three weeks as he begins to draft a final report. He acknowledged that this will be a challenging part of the process, but he said he is committed to adhering to the schedule and submitting the report to DOE in November.

The schedule calls for him to start drafting the report now and to have a draft to the Task Force for consideration prior to the August meeting. Then members can debate and negotiate refinements during the remainder of August. He said the schedule calls for him to develop a final version of the document by the September Task Force meeting. The objective of the September meeting is to develop as close to a final document as possible, one which can be available for public review from around September 13 to October 4 -- dates Mr. Dwyer said are flexible.

The plan at present calls for a public meeting on October 4. Then the Task Force, at its October 10 meeting, would discuss the public comments and revise the report if necessary. Between October 11 and the end of the month, the report would be refined and revised. By using this approach, there would be three opportunities for the Task Force to react to draft versions and to negotiate



revisions. Additional Task Force meetings can be scheduled if required in order to meeting deadlines.

Mr. Dwyer said he anticipates presenting the report to DOE at the November Task Force meeting. He said this schedule requires a lot of work, especially since there still is some critical information missing. He asked members to prepare their thoughts about final recommendations and to communicate this information to him as soon as possible so he can incorporate it into the initial draft report.

*Agenda for Next Meeting*

Mr. Adler requested about 15 minutes at the next meeting to speak about possible options for near-term cleanup. He said he would like to see some progress on setting priorities so the \$30 million expected to be available over the next two years can be utilized efficiently.

There being no further business, Col. Len Griggs moved to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 8:33 a.m.

Approved September 12, 1995

135.112  
SL-639

00-1724

---

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