

MINUTES**St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force
Priorities Working Group****May 22, 1996 Meeting****Berkeley City Hall
Berkeley, Missouri****APPROVED****Participants Attending**

Tom Binz, Laclede Gas Company
 George Eberle, Grace Hill Neighborhood
 Association
 Jack Frauenhoffer, Mallinckrodt
 Christina Flynn, City of Berkeley
 Bob Geller, MDNR
 Donovan Larson, St. Louis County Water Co.
 Tom Manning, City of Hazelwood
 Sally Price
 Jan Titus, Lambert Airport

Support

Jim Dwyer, Facilitator
 Dave Miller, SAIC
 Sarah Snyder, Bechtel
 Ken Albin, Bechtel
 Wayne Johnson, Bechtel

Agenda Item**Minutes****Determination*****Call to Order***

Jim Dwyer called the meeting to order at 9:20 a.m. He then asked all participants to introduce themselves for the benefit of those attending for the first time.

Christina Flynn advised that she has been appointed by Mayor Hoskins to represent the City of Berkeley at meetings of the Priorities Working Group.

***Approval of
Minutes***

Mr. Dwyer asked if there were proposed amendments to the draft minutes of the May 15, 1996 meeting. Bob Geller suggested two changes. The minutes of the May 15, 1996 meeting were approved as amended.

**The minutes of the
May 15, 1996
Priorities Working
Group meeting
were approved as
amended.**

Develop Agenda

Mr. Dwyer then asked the group to identify issues it would like to cover during the meeting. The following agenda was developed:

1. Review FY '96 recommendations
2. Reaction to Les Price's comments at the May 21, 1996 Task Force Meeting

*Fiscal Year 1996
Recommendations*

Mr. Dwyer said the primary task for today is to develop a recommendation concerning the use of FY '96 funds originally intended for remediation of the ballfields. The amount of money available to be allocated is approximately \$2.6 million. The working group had earlier identified three possibilities for the use of those funds:

- Riverfront Trail cleanup
- Continue haul route cleanup project
- Stormwater runoff improvements at SLAPS

Jack Fraenhoffer proposed the stormwater improvements at SLAPS because they already were included in the recommendations approved by the Task Force for FY '96, and would therefore require no further action.

Bob Geller said that MDNR generally supports the concept of drainage controls as an interim action, but advised that MDNR is not inclined to move forward with any major interim activities until the final remedy for that site has been determined.

Jan Titus noted that, without more current characterization and monitoring data, it's difficult to identify what the actual problems are. She said updated information also needs to be correlated with information that is gathered independently at the airport. She added that she would like to see flow gauges installed in Coldwater Creek downstream from SLAPS as part of an additional monitoring program.

Tom Binz said that before proposing additional monitoring, the working group should determine what kind of information would be helpful. What do we want these data for?

Christina Flynn said that Berkeley is opposed to spending a lot of money on risk analysis. The city would prefer to use the remaining FY '96 money on the haul routes first and then to stop erosion of contaminated soil into Coldwater Creek. She asked how enhanced monitoring relates to priorities.

Dave Miller said enhanced monitoring will help to better define what is happening to Coldwater Creek. Also, if remedial work is done on SLAPS, monitoring information will provide an indication of the long-term impact of those actions.

Tom Manning asked if the Riverfront Trail would require a separate Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) before cleanup work could be started.

Mr. Miller said it does not appear that a new EE/CA would be required for the Riverfront Trail, because there is an existing EE/CA for the downtown site (SLDS). However, he said that while there is no regulatory documentation required, timing is critical and a decision would have to be made quickly in order to get remedial action under way promptly and to complete the project this construction season.

George Eberle spoke in support of the Riverfront Trail project. He said that funds are available now to complete the trail, but that cleanup of contaminated material needs to happen first.

Dave Miller reported that the proposed route of the bike trail is actually in a high part of flood plain and not on top of the levee as was originally thought, which he said is

good because it simplifies coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which oversees activities involving levees. He said there are two basic contaminants at that site: thorium-230 and radium-226. The proposed route of the trail goes through a hot spot containing a couple of hundred picocuries per gram of contamination, and there is one sample (where uranium metal was found) that showed 20,000 pCi/g.

He said the good news is that the contamination is near the surface. He said there is only one point where contamination approaches the "sum of the ratios" cleanup guidelines, and he said that probably could be assessed away because it is under the levee and no one can get to it. The bad news is that this area was completely flooded in 1993 and current sampling data were obtained prior to that. Consequently, we cannot be certain what and where the contamination is today. It would be prudent to re-characterize the area, he said.

Wayne Johnson said re-characterization of the area would require about a month, including one week to gather the samples and then two to three weeks to obtain results of laboratory analysis.

Sally Price inquired whether design work could be underway at the same time.

Mr. Miller said it could. He added that the rough estimated volume of contaminated material is between 2,000 to 3,000 cubic yards. That translates into a total project cost of approximately \$3 million to \$5 million, which exceeds the funds available in FY '96. However, he said there is an opportunity to use the existing staging area at Mallinckrodt for temporary storage of excavated material and to defer disposal costs until FY '97.

Wayne Johnson said that he is very concerned about timing. He said work on the Frost Avenue Haul Route Cleanup Project will be completed next week, and that if the Task Force were to propose that DOE return to the haul route excavation project after an interruption, Bechtel would have the added challenge of trying to re-group the subcontractors and get them back to work.

Bob Geller said the key to the Riverfront Trail project is characterization. He said the state did some sampling after the flood in 1993 and the resulting data did not show significant migration of contamination.

Ms. Flynn asked if it would be more cost-effective to continue haul route cleanup.

Mr. Geller asked if DOE could move forward with haul route cleanup on Hazelwood Avenue on a short term basis, and keep other options open.

Tom Manning asked how quickly remaining funds would be exhausted if work on the haul routes is continued at the current pace. Ken Albin said haul route cleanup costs approximately \$250,000 a week, including disposal. Mr. Johnson said that use of all of the remaining \$2.6 million would result in cleaning up about five or six additional vicinity properties.

Ken Albin proposed that characterization of the Riverfront Trail area begin immediately while haul route cleanup continues on Hazelwood Avenue. He said this would result in spending about \$1 million between now and the June Task Force meeting. At that time the Task Force will have the characterization data about the Riverfront Trail project and can decide whether to proceed with it or to continue work on the vicinity properties.

Mr. Johnson said the lease for the staging area at Eva Avenue limits temporary storage to about 2000 cubic yards and runs only until the end of FY '96.

Mr. Geller said that while MDNR has supported interim storage at both the downtown site and in the county, the local communities have not necessarily accepted the concept of additional interim storage.

Ms. Price asked, if shipping were deferred until next year, whether that money would come from the FY '97 allocation for SLDS. She said it was important to consider the issue of equity, given that about \$10 million of the \$13 million available for cleanup projects this year conceivably could go to downtown projects, if the Riverfront Trail Project is implemented.

Mr. Frauenhoffer said the trail will not benefit only the downtown area. From a fairness standpoint, he said he sees the Riverfront Trail as a community issue, not a downtown issue. The trail will be a centerpiece for the entire community, he said.

Mr. Manning cautioned the working group not to get sidetracked by "us-versus-them" thinking.

Ms. Price said that she didn't bring up the equity issue to block the trail project. She raised the point because she believes the group needs to make its decisions in light of this issue since it was mentioned as an issue when the priorities were outlined last year in September. At that time, \$8 million to \$9 million would go to the North County area in the form of the ballfields proposal, and an equal \$8 million to \$9 million would go to SLDS. While there is nothing pressing in the North County area right now, there may be next year. For this reason, she cautioned that if the Task Force spends all FY 96

SLAPS/ballfields money on the trail, we will need to be flexible with next year's funding. Our budget appropriations will be defensible to the degree that we keep these issues in mind as we develop our priorities.

Mr. Frauenhoffer said we have somehow arbitrarily accepted that all we're getting is \$15 million for FY '97. Perhaps we can go back to DOE and say we need \$18 or \$20 million, he said.

Mr. Miller said the budget for FY '97 is \$15 million for the St. Louis Site and that is probably not subject to change. Funding for FY 98 projects has not yet been determined.

Mr. Frauenhoffer said he doesn't think the group ought to give up on trying to get more money from DOE for FY '97.

Mr. Dwyer then asked the working group if there is consensus on the proposal to continue haul route cleanup while establishing details of the Riverfront Trail remediation between now and the June Task Force meeting. The group responded affirmatively.

*Reaction to Les
Price's Comments*

The working group then discussed the presentation made by Les Price, director of DOE's Former Sites Restoration Division, at the May 21, 1996 Task Force meeting. The general comments of the group are summarized below:

Mr. Price's comments were seen by some as representing a setback, although it was acknowledged that getting \$1 billion to fund complete cleanup of the St. Louis Site may prove to be difficult.

It was suggested that perhaps one way to address the issue of cost is to re-examine disposal options, given that disposal costs represent a

significant portion of total cleanup costs.

It was observed that DOE may not be considering that suitable on-site containment of all contaminated material may end up being as expensive as shipping the same material to a commercial disposal site. If DOE wants another outcome, then it should provide information about other possibilities for the Task Force to consider.

Mr. Price's comments were seen by some as disappointing because he seemed to be telling the Task Force that DOE would not support total excavation and out-of-state disposal, because it is not reasonable.

Mr. Price's message was seen by others as a reality check. His presentation was aimed at getting the Task Force to recognize that there are finite resources. Perhaps, it was suggested, the Task Force should accept that it is not likely to obtain all the money it wants and should do the best it can with the resources available.

The message was seen by some as an affront and was not appreciated at this late date in the process. It was also noted that the Task Force is only now starting to grapple with the details of various remediation options, such as something less than complete cleanup (Option IV) for the Riverfront Trail.

The message was seen by others as a re-emphasis of what DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management Thomas Grumbly said a year ago: "Tell us what you would

have us do, but understand that we may not be able to afford it all." Mr. Price's comments were seen as a re-statement of ground rules already set out by Mr. Grumbly.

"This is going to be a long-term project, and our approach should be to ask for \$50 million to \$100 million over next few years."

Mr. Price's remarks were viewed as useful because "they force us to do some reality checking. But the Task Force shouldn't feel that it has wasted its time." Said one, "We were given a job to do and we've done it. If we end up saying nothing different, I will feel great because we've studied it and reached our own conclusions. We aren't here to design something that DOE can live with."

The meeting adjourned 12:10 p.m.

The next meeting of the Priorities Working Group is scheduled for June 4, 1996.

Approved July 2, 1996

00-1989

00-1989

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