

**MINUTES****St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force****September 12, 1995 Meeting****Hazelwood Civic Center  
Hazelwood, Missouri****Participants Attending**

David Adler, U.S. Department of Energy  
(ex officio)  
Lori Batton, City of Berkeley  
Tom Binz, Laclede Gas Company  
Joseph Cavato, St. Louis County  
Kay Drey  
Dave Farquharson, City of Hazelwood  
Jack Fraenhoffer, Mallinckrodt Chemical  
Co.  
Anna Ginsburg, City of St. Louis  
Robert Geller, Missouri Dept. of Natural  
Resources  
James Grant, Mallinckrodt Chemical Co.  
Tom Horgan, Congressman Talent's Office  
Nancy Lubiewski  
Eileen O'Connor, Union Electric  
Sally Price, Community Representative  
Conn Roden, St. Louis County Dept. of  
Health  
Daniel Wall, U.S. EPA, Region 7

**Support**

Miranda Duncan, Co-Facilitator  
Jim Dwyer, Facilitator

Patti Hazel, FUSRAP  
Chuck Jenkins, FUSRAP  
Dave Miller, SAIC  
Sarah Snyder, FUSRAP

**Other Interested Parties**

Wayne Black, St. Louis County Department  
of Health  
Bradley Brown, St. Louis County Water Co.  
Mal Donahue, Berkeley resident  
Mark Gibson, Dawn Mining Co.  
Margaret Hermes  
Donovan Larson, St. Louis County Water  
Co.  
Thomas Manning, City of Hazelwood  
Ed Mahr  
Linda Meyer, Weldon Spring Site Remedial  
Action Project  
Robert Morgan, Berkeley Research  
Associates  
Bob Nelson, Dawn Mining Co.  
Laurie Peterfreund, NCEIT  
Josh Richardson, City of Berkeley  
Tom Shepherd, Dawn Mining Co.  
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</i>	Vice Chair Anna Ginsburg called the meeting	

*Comments,  
Announcements*

to order at 7:45 a.m. She welcomed Joseph Cavato, Director of Public Policy for St. Louis County, who has been appointed to the Task Force by the county executive. Ms. Ginsburg then turned the meeting over to Jim Dwyer, who asked for public comment.

*Public Comments*

There were no public comments.

*Approval of  
Minutes*

Vice Chair Ginsburg asked for approval of the minutes from the July 11, 1995 Task Force meeting.

**The minutes were  
approved without  
amendment.**

*Discussion of  
Schedule*

Mr. Dwyer said both the Priorities Working Group and the Communications Working Group have been very active for the past several weeks. He advised that the Priorities Working Group has developed a set of recommendations for near-term cleanup priorities for FY 96 and FY 97 and an interim report.

He also said the Priorities Working Group has identified a major issue that must be resolved before a final report and recommendations can be developed. The issue concerns the impact of contamination at the St. Louis Airport Site (SLAPS) on Coldwater Creek. Mr. Dwyer said the Priorities Working Group needs to clarify the extent to which groundwater and surface water from SLAPS contribute to contamination in Coldwater Creek.

He further advised that a decision had been made to convene a panel of expert geologists and hydrogeologists to examine the available information and to develop an independent conclusion about the significance of the SLAPS site and its impact

on Coldwater Creek. Mr. Dwyer said that once that information is obtained, it will be possible for the Priorities Working Group to develop a final report and to recommend cleanup priorities for the St. Louis Site.

Mr. Dwyer said the Coldwater Creek Panel will start its work on September 15, at which time panel members will tour the site and be provided with an overview of the relevant information. The panel then will meet at least once, perhaps twice more, before issuing its findings, hopefully in October.

Mr. Dwyer said the tentative schedule would delay the Task Force final report until March 1996, although the schedule depends on the Coldwater Creek Panel doing its work in a timely manner.

Nancy Lubiewski said she thought it was important for the panel members to tour Coldwater Creek so they could see the destabilization along the bank.

Mr. Dwyer suggested that she convey her thoughts about possible tour stops to Dave Miller. He said the meeting is to be at the Stouffer Concourse Hotel and is scheduled to start at 9 a.m. and end at 4:30 p.m. The format is expected to be similar to the EMAB FUSRAP meeting held in St. Louis earlier this year. He added that the quality of this panel is impressive.

*Priorities Working  
Group*

*Interim Report*

Mr. Dwyer discussed the interim report prepared by the Priorities Working Group. He explained that the report utilizes a matrix that groups the individual sites into several generic categories. The rationale is that there are some characteristics that some sites share, and grouping them into categories simplifies the task for the working

group.

He said the working group made some uniform assumptions about some factors such as disposal cost. There was no attempt to fine-tune the cost category which assumes disposal in Utah at a cost of \$1,100 per cubic yard.

Mr. Dwyer also explained the information presented in each of the matrix categories. For example, the category "Level of Exposure," assesses who is likely to be exposed to radiation by access to the contaminated property. Information about the "Degree of Contamination" for each site was taken from the Feasibility Study and grouped into "low," "medium," and "high" designations by the working group. A low degree of contamination does not assume that there are not hot spots at the particular site, but that overall the degree of contamination at a particular location is low as compared to other sites.

The interim report also includes several attachments that explain in more detail the thinking of the Priorities Working Group in developing the matrix. Mr. Dwyer said a revised (improved) version of Attachment A will be distributed with the draft minutes.

Mr. Dwyer said Attachment B of the interim report is an attempt to explain in layman's terms the concept of the "sum-of-the-ratios," which is an equation used to accommodate the fact that any soil sample is likely to contain more than one contaminant. There are different cleanup standards for different isotopes, so the "sum-of-the-ratios" is used to reduce the multiple contaminants to a single, comprehensive value. The equation yields a number. If that number is one or less than

one, then the combined contamination in that location is within the cleanup standards. If the number is above 1, then the contamination exceeds cleanup standards. If the number is 2, it is two times above cleanup standards. If the number is 50, it is 50 times above cleanup standards.

Dan Wall asked how the "degree of contamination" and "level of exposure" information corresponded to sum of the ratios.

Mr. Dwyer said the working group used the mean level of contamination for each site and then determined categories based on the mean for the sum-of-the-ratios. He acknowledged that there could be "hot spots" of contamination that greatly exceed the "mean" for a particular site, but explained that this approach was useful in simplifying the organization of the component sites into general categories.

Mr. Wall asked if the level of exposure was calculated under current land use assumptions. Dave Miller said yes, the level of exposures are based on the current land use scenarios taken from the Baseline Risk Assessment for the site.

Lori Batton said Task Force members might find it helpful to have the breakdown of the means and the maximums of the contaminants. (ATTACHMENT A) Mr. Dwyer said he would distribute this document with the draft minutes.

Bob Geller asked if there were areas of dissension that should be pointed out as Task Force members review this matrix. Kay Drey said she had written a minority report in which she opposed use of FY 96 and FY 97 funds for certain components of the

working group's recommendation.

Josh Richardson said one major point of contention is the discussion about the degree of contamination. He said that while the information showed the means and the maximums, it did not clearly show that there are hot spots in the sites. Hot spot contamination may not be reflected in the "degree of contamination" category.

Mr. Geller said he commended the Priorities Working Group for its hard work.

*FY 96 and FY 97  
Priorities*

Mr. Dwyer said the Priorities Working Group also recommended activities for FY 96 and FY 97. Fiscal year 96 begins October 1, 1995. He said the working group developed some guidelines for determining priorities. For example, the working group members felt that equity among the sites was very important. The working group also felt that it should attempt to focus on projects that it hoped would be consistent with whatever the Task Force's long-term objectives may turn out to be, and would yield tangible results in the meantime.

Mr. Dwyer then went through each of the recommended priorities. (ATTACHMENT B)

• Evaluate use of local disposal facilities for minimally contaminated soils.

Mr. Dwyer said this activity would allow DOE, EPA and MDNR to explore whether disposal of some low-level material may be possible in an existing commercial disposal facility.

• Identify and evaluate suitable location(s) for a new in-state disposal or interim storage facility.

Mr. Dwyer said there was no guarantee of success for this activity, but that the working group felt it important to try to identify an in-state facility for interim storage or permanent disposal. He added that no one on the working group thinks that disposal at Envirocare for all St. Louis FUSRAP materials is financially or politically feasible.

- Remove contaminated soils from haul route properties located in North County.

This would be a continuation of work that has been underway for the last year.

- Restore and stabilize Airport-Owned properties.

Mr. Dwyer said the final details of this proposal will be driven by the outcome of the Coldwater Creek Panel investigation.

- Continue cleanup efforts at the St. Louis Downtown Site (SLDS).

He said the working group wanted to continue work at the downtown site so that the property can be put to productive use.

- Continue soil treatability investigations for the St. Louis Site.

This activity would allow continued exploration, using St. Louis Site soils, in the hope that there may be some technological approaches that could reduce volume and/or cost.

Mark Gibson, representing the Dawn Mining Company, said Envirocare is not the only licensed disposal facility. He said Dawn received its license earlier this year and the company hopes to be operational by Spring 1996. The facility can take about 35 million

cubic feet of material. Dawn Mining is located in eastern Washington, about 30 miles outside of Spokane.

Ms. Lubiewski asked about the inclusion of clean corridors for utilities.

Donovan Larson said the working group's main concern was exposure to contamination by maintenance crews. He said the most obvious solution is to locate utilities in uncontaminated corridor.

Ms. Lubiewski asked about the risk of recontamination, if the area were cleaned. Mr. Larson said the working group does not want to spend money to clean up a corridor only to have it recontaminated.

Mr. Dwyer said the utility corridor(s) would be in an area that would not be subject to recontamination.

Ms. Lubiewski also asked about the proposal regarding the Berkeley Ballfields. Mr. Dwyer said the initial proposal was to remove the hotspots from the ballfields and ship that material to a licensed disposal facility (Envirocaro) and then relocate the rest of the soil to SLAPS.

But he said there was some controversy because the working group was not sure that storage should be at SLAPS. So the proposal now is to remove the hotspots from the ballfields and then put a protective cover of clean soil over the remainder of the site.

Ms. Lubiewski suggested that the soil from the ballfields be put in containers at HISS. Ms. Drey said another suggestion for the ballfields is to find an alternative location for Berkeley's ballfields. She said she believes the ballfields will continue to be



recontaminated until SLAPS is cleaned up.

Mr. Dwyer suggested that the Task Force might want to reach agreement on the amount to spend on work at the airport site and then refine how that money would be spent.

Ms. Batton said she can understand concerns about allowing any contaminated soil to remain. She said there is not any other land in Berkeley for the ballfields because any parcels of land large enough for ballfields either would be too noisy to play on or else had been purchased by the airport.

Ms. Drey said there might be a liability question. Ms. Ginsburg said she had referred the proposal to the city counselor and he is looking at the liability question.

Sally Price said she finds the idea very interesting and worth exploring. However, she said she is concerned about recontamination. She asked if there are any estimates of the contamination that would be left at the site and inquired about EPA guidelines.

Daye Adler said the EPA regulations are based on assumed exposure levels. With the clean soil on top cutting off exposure, the remaining contamination would be below regulatory levels of exposure.

Mr. Richardson said one way to avoid recontamination is to engineer the cleanup properly.

Ms. Drey read her minority report to the Task Force. (ATTACHMENT C)

Mr. Larson said not everyone on the working

group disagrees with Ms. Drey. He said one of the group's big concerns is that the proposal for the ballfields will be viewed as a permanent solution when it is intended to be a temporary measure. The idea that the public might conclude that the area has been totally cleaned up is a valid concern.

Ms. Lubiewski asked whether the Task Force would vote on each priority separately or as a package. Mr. Dwyer advised that he would ask for a vote on the entire package first, and only if that vote failed would he ask for a vote on each component of the recommendation separately. Ms. Lubiewski also asked the cost of remediating the ballfields if all the material were shipped elsewhere.

Dave Miller said the clean cover would cost approximately \$1 million to \$2 million. Storing the soil in containers is more expensive than shipping to Utah because each container costs about \$10,000. The volume at the ballfields is about 50,000 cubic yards and each container only holds 10 to 15 cubic yards of soil. Shipping all of the soil to Utah would cost about \$50 million.

Ms. Lubiewski asked whether Berkeley officials would want to wait for 100 percent cleanup or would they like to do what is proposed.

Ms. Batton said the city supports this proposal.

Tom Horgan said that before he could vote, he would have to meet with constituents first.

Mr. Dwyer then called for a vote on the proposed cleanup priorities for FY 96 and FY

97. 11 voted in favor; 2 opposed, and 3 abstained.

Ms. Ginsburg said the Task Force basically has voted to encumber the money so it cannot be taken away. She said the Task Force still has the option to re-examine and define each facet of the plan.

Ms. Drey said she wants an explanation some place other than in the meeting minutes that no work is to be done if there is the possibility of recontamination.

*Communications  
Working Group*

Mr. Fraenhoffer explained that the Communications Working Group has been developing a program that addresses the needs of community.

He said that the group plans to develop proposals, distribute them to the Task Force for review and comment, incorporate comments, then present the revised materials to the chair for implementation.

Task Force members also were asked to review and comment on several draft documents presented by the Communications Working Group, including:

- A draft information sheet about the Task Force
- A proposed plan for a public meeting to be held by the Task Force
- Proposed letterhead for the Task Force

Mr. Fraenhoffer asked Task Force members to provide comments on the letterhead and draft information sheet by next Tuesday, September 19. He also asked Task Force members to be prepared to discuss the

proposed public meeting plan at the next Task Force meeting on October 10.

The working group also distributed a list of proposed fact sheet topics. Mr. Fraenhoffer asked Task Force members to identify any additional topics that should be addressed in a fact sheet or briefing paper. He asked that all comments be given to Sarah Snyder.

Ms. Ginsburg said she thought it would be useful to call all Task Force members who don't participate regularly and inquire whether they want to continue being a part of the Task Force.

Ms. Lubiewski said the working group is focusing on sending information to people who are potential stakeholders. She added that the working group wants to develop summary fact sheets that are clear and simple. The concern the working group is addressing is the potential for a person to come in at the last minute and say "How come we didn't know about this?"

She said the Task Force also needed to select a new chairperson because the Task Force will need a spokesperson.

Mr. Geller said he would like to see the working group develop a news release about the FY 96 and FY 97 priorities.

#### *Discussion of Chair*

Mr. Dwyer reported that Alpha Bryan resigned from the Task Force on Monday, September 11 due to the extraordinary demands of her new job. He said Mr. Cavato was appointed to the Task Force because he is the Director of Public Policy for St. Louis County, and that he was not appointed as a replacement for Dr. Bryan. Mr. Dwyer said the Task Force needs a chair to sign

documents and serve as spokesperson.

Ms. Ginsburg said she doesn't think she could assume the job of chair, adding that she is willing to continue as vice chair.

Mr. Dwyer said he would like to have a chair selected at the next meeting. He asked members either to volunteer or to nominate another to serve as chair.

The next meeting of the St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force is scheduled for October 10, 1995. The meeting adjourned at 10:13 a.m.

Approved October 10, 1995

MATRIX LOCATION	SUM OF THE RATIOS		DEPTH	
	MEAN	MAX	MEAN	MAX
<b>SLAPS</b>				
MAIN SITE	22	1001	4.3	18
DITCHES	21	1000	1.9	8
BALL FIELDS	16	581	0.2	5
N & W RR	15	441	1.3	4
BANSHEE RD.	0.8	8	1.3	9
COLDWATER CREEK	0.5	3	2.1	13
<b>SLDS</b>				
50 SERIES	60	> 1000	8.4	23
K SERIES	3	10	5.4	10
REMAINING PROPERTY	542	> 1000	1.6	6
RIVERFRONT TRAIL	5	407	1.2	39
N & W RR	2	16	0.5	1
SL TRRA RR	2	43	0.7	2
B & N RR	6	91	0.9	4
MC KINLEY IRON	2	7	0.6	2
THOMAS PROETZ LUMBER	2	17	0.6	1
PVO FOODS	0	0	0	0
<b>HISS</b>				
MAIN	1	18	1.7	4
FUTURA	4	204	3.2	15
HR-EVA	0.9	10	0.7	1
HR-FROST	1.1	47	1.1	3
HR-HAZELWOOD	8.3	963	0.8	3
HR-MCDONNELL	1	31	1.1	7
HR-PERSHALL	9.4	980	1.2	14
HR-LATTY PROPERTIES	0.6	5	1	4
N & S RR	14	260	0.5	0.5
WAGNER BRAKE	5.7	162	0.8	8
STONE CONTAINER	14	1142	0.7	3
QUAKER OIL	1.2	12	0.5	0.5
GRAHAM PKG	0.6	1.4	0.5	0.5
MIDWEST DISTRIB.	0.7	2.8	0.5	0.5
SYSCO FOODS	1.1	5	0.5	0.5
SEEGER & HAZELWOOD	0.2	4	0.8	1

TOP LEVEL

**LOCAL PRIORITIES WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ST.  
LOUIS SITE REMEDIATION TASK FORCE (SLSRTF) FOR APPLICATION OF FY  
'96 AND '97 ST. LOUIS SITE FUSRAP FUNDS  
(not listed in order of priority)**

● Evaluate use of local disposal facilities for minimally contaminated soils.

**Scope:** Attempt to obtain approvals from appropriate regulatory agencies, particularly the State of Missouri. Coordination with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency would also be required.

- \* Find a local vendor of disposal services and establish necessary contractual mechanisms.

**Cost:** \$200,000 per year (total \$400,000).

● Identify and evaluate suitable location(s) for a new in-state disposal or interim storage facility.

**Scope:** Work with the State of Missouri to identify a location(s) for construction of a permanent disposal or interim storage facility. Establish and utilize state criteria to identify land areas for evaluation as potential sites.

- \* Critically evaluate existing geological surveys and other siting studies for hazardous waste facilities. Perform supplementary evaluations as needed incorporating values, criteria, and objectives stated in the alternative sites working group report of April 18, 1995.

**Cost:** \$200,000 per year (total \$400,000).

● Remove contaminated soils from haul route properties located in North County.

**Scope:** Continue cleanup efforts along Frost and Hazelwood avenues (public and private properties) by excavating soils alongside the roadways, then restoring roadsides using clean soil. Material located underneath roadways would not be removed. Generated soils could either be stored on a local property under engineered and monitored conditions, or shipped to a licensed disposal facility.

**Cost:** \$4,000,000 per year (\$8,000,000 total) - disposal option determined by the SLSRTF.

● Restore and stabilize Airport-Owned properties.

Scope: Projects include:

- Initiate actions to address the findings of the Coldwater Creek Impact Study.
- Based on findings of that panel, address current erosion by mitigating the concentrated contamination in roadside ditches along McDonnell Boulevard.
- Create clean corridor(s) for relocation of multiple utility lines currently located on the south side of McDonnell Boulevard.
- Excavate and remove ballfield hotspots; cover remainder of contaminated ballfields with two feet of clean soil. Release ballfields for use.
- Ship soils generated by selected hotspot excavations to a licensed disposal facility.

Cost: \$3,500,000 to \$4,000,000 per year (total \$7,000,000 to \$8,000,000).

● Continue cleanup efforts at the St. Louis Downtown Site (SLDS).

Scope: Mallinckrodt planners are currently determining priorities for FY '96 and '97 funds. Actual site restoration measures/techniques would be similar to those applied this year for the City Block 1201 cleanup at the SLDS. Resultant soil/rubble with above guideline contamination could either be managed onsite or shipped to a licensed disposal facility. Cleanup 50 Series buildings and soils on a phased basis over two fiscal years.

Cost: \$4,000,000 to \$4,500,000 per year (total \$8,000,000 to \$9,000,000).

● Continue soil treatability investigations for the St. Louis Site.

Scope: Options range from continuation of laboratory-based evaluation/refinement of technical treatment techniques to deployment of onsite pilot plants to conduct applied tests of field-scale treatment technologies. Use local resources where possible.

Cost: \$100,000 to \$250,000 per year depending on scope of effort.



To: the St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force

From: Kay Drey -- 9/12/95

Re: a minority-of-one report on the proposed priorities

Although I knew the goal of the Local Priorities Working Group (LPWG) of the Task Force was to achieve a consensus on the priority expenditure recommendations for an expected \$15 million per year from the Department of Energy for each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997 -- and although other members of the LPWG had tried to rephrase the wording of some of the priorities to accommodate my criticisms and concerns, I did not vote for the final report as approved at the September 6 meeting. I also did not vote against it because more debate would have ensued, and I could only have kept repeating what I had been saying.

For the record, here is my position regarding the LPWG recommendations to the Task Force: I do not believe that any of our minimal St. Louis Site money should be spent on the first or last listed items -- (1) the search for an existing nearby sanitary-waste landfill, the owner and host community of which would have to be willing to accept wastes containing allegedly "below regulatory concern" levels of radioactive contamination (a concept of dubious legal and political reality), and (6) the search for a way to wash or chemically treat our contaminated soils (a concept of dubious environmental and technological worth).

I also do not believe any money should be spent on the second bullet of the fourth item -- that is, on the cleanup of the McDonnell Blvd. ditches -- until the source of the ditch contamination is removed. Since we have agreed to wait for the findings of the geologists' panel, we should not encourage the DOE to proceed with the ditch cleanup until we have had an opportunity to study the panel's findings. Otherwise the ditches and the clean fill may become recontaminated and cleanup would be required again.

I believe the Airport Site needs to be cleaned up, and that the Task Force should request the necessary funding from the Department of Energy. The Fernald plant in Cincinnati produced uranium feed materials for nuclear weapons purposes just as Mallinckrodt Chemical Works had here in St. Louis. The DOE is expecting to spend approximately \$2 billion over the next thirty years for the Fernald cleanup, with approximately \$280 million per year initially. Approximately \$1 billion will have been spent for the Weldon Spring cleanup.

As of next year, the St. Louis Airport Site will have been hosting radioactive wastes for fifty years. A temporary token cleanup of just the ditches would be misleading to today's public and to future generations.



138114  
SL-752

00-1754

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