

## MINUTES

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force  
Priorities Working Group

June 4, 1996 Meeting

Berkeley City Hall  
Berkeley, Missouri

APPROVED

Participants Attending

Dave Adler, DOE  
 Tom Binz, Laclede Gas Co.  
 Christina Flynn, City of Berkeley  
 Jack Fraenhoffer, Mallinckrodt  
 Bob Geller, MDNR  
 Dennis Henson, Union Electric Co.  
 Tom Manning, City of Hazelwood  
 Sally Price  
 Jan Titus, Lambert Airport

Support

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

Other Interested Parties

Chris Byrne, Co. Health Dept.  
 Ward Herst, Golder Associates  
 Kristie Monroe, Co. Health Dept. intern  
 Brenda Perkovich, DOE intern

Agenda ItemMinutesDetermination*Call to Order*

Jim Dwyer called the meeting to order at 9:11 a.m. and asked all participants to introduce themselves for the benefit of those attending for the first time.

*Develop Agenda*

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

- Presentation on cost estimates and risk analysis for each of the remediation alternatives identified by

- the Task Force
- Maintenance work proposed for SLAPS
- Discussion of enhanced monitoring program for SLAPS

*Presentation on  
Cost and Risk  
Information*

Mr. Dwyer said the main focus of today's meeting was to review cost and risk information prepared by SAIC for each of the remediation alternatives identified by the Task Force. He then turned the meeting over to Dave Miller (SAIC), who distributed copies of his viewgraphs. (ATTACHMENT A)

Mr. Miller said the purpose of the presentation is to summarize the dose calculations and cost estimates developed for each cleanup alternative described on the Task Force's remediation option matrices. Both sets of estimates use the assumptions and conditions specified by the Task Force.

He said that generally all the alternatives provide safe conditions but that the costs of the various remedial actions vary widely. He explained that there are typically several key activities for each option that drive the cost of that option. For example, he said off-site disposal costs are typically driven by excavation and backfill, transportation and disposal, whereas on-site remedies are generally driven by monitoring, sampling and analysis activities, administrative costs, and expenses associated with ongoing institutional controls.

Mr. Miller said the individuals (receptors) modeled for risk include, as appropriate, commercial employees, maintenance workers, ditch workers, security guards, recreational users and resident gardeners. Some of the modeled estimates for existing conditions show the potential for doses exceeding EPA and DOE guidelines.

However, he added, this is due to the underlying conservatism of the model. Current actual doses are within acceptable levels, he said.

Bob Geller asked if DOE developed risk calculations only for people who are known or presumed to be in contact with the site. Mr. Miller said that was correct, although if someone were to be on the ballfields for six hours a day, 40 days a year, DOE would be aware of this and could monitor that person.

Dave Adler added that there have been studies conducted by DOE and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) on the current risks at the site and that those studies have concluded that, given current land uses, there are not significant risks. However, there is the potential for greater risk if the land use were to change.

Mr. Miller said the calculated risks attributable to cleanup activities and transportation of contaminated material typically outweigh the residual risks associated with the matrix cleanup options.

Tom Binz asked what kind of model was used to calculate the risk estimates. Mr. Miller said it was a model known as RESRAD which was developed by Argonne National Laboratory.

Mr. Miller identified the primary pathways for individuals to come into contact with contamination: ingestion, inhalation, and exposure to dust.

Mr. Dwyer asked why the risk calculations for Option III cleanups seemed to be generally more protective than Option IV, according to the risk analysis. Mr. Miller said that was because of the presumed

effectiveness of the cap, which is a key element in Option III remedies.

Mr. Miller said potential next steps include calculating transportation risks, construction risks and the risk of exposure to remediation workers during cleanup for each alternative.

Mr. Adler encouraged the working group to request that information because he said it would be unfair to make a decision about cleaning up the St. Louis Site without a complete understanding of all risks. He said that while no one has been injured at the St. Louis Site, four people have died working at DOE sites across the complex. He said DOE has an obligation to consider those kinds of risks.

Jack Fraunhoffer agreed that he would need that additional information before he could make a final decision.

Ms. Price said that she understood what Mr. Adler was saying, but pointed out that DOE contracted with railroad and other workers who deal in the transportation/shipping industry as their way of making a living; presumably they will be doing that sort of work regardless of whether it is St. Louis soil being shipped for disposal or some other product being transported. The risk to transportation workers due to transportation accidents would therefore remain constant.

Mr. Miller acknowledged that Ms. Price was pointing out the difference between voluntary and involuntary risks.

Mr. Miller then discussed in considerable detail how the cost estimates were prepared and what activities are included in the various cost categories, such as excavation and backfill. He said this information is a

*Cost Estimate  
Information*

companion to the cost estimate package provided to the Task Force last month.

He then provided total estimated costs for each of the remediation options identified by the Task Force on the matrices.

The working group asked several questions about how the individual line item costs rolled up into a total project cost for each option. Mr. Miller explained the format and said he would prepare a simplified example.

He also said that the estimates do not include any consideration of costs for the following: compensation for past or future loss of use of property; compensation for economic benefits foregone; public awareness and education programs; a DOE area office, and financial provisions for future needs. He said it is not possible to calculate a value for these items.

Mr. Miller also told the working group that he had been unable to develop any cost or risk information about West Lake Landfill because it is not within the jurisdiction of FUSRAP.

Mr. Dwyer suggested that the working group use the cost estimates and risk analysis information to establish or confirm its general sense of direction. The Task Force can then refine the details and determine what, if anything, should be added to or subtracted from each option to make it finally acceptable. He said he envisions that process occurring between the first and second drafts of the final report.

*Maintenance at  
SLAPS*

Ken Albin advised the working group that DOE would like to perform some minor maintenance work on two drainage ditches

at SLAPS to mitigate migration of contamination to Coldwater Creek. He said that the vegetation in one ditch along McDonnell Boulevard had washed away and that another ditch was severely eroded in the vicinity of the gabion wall. The work proposed to replace the vegetation is to seed the ditch and then cover it with a cellulose fiber mat to keep birds from eating the seed. The proposal for the other ditch is to place approximately 4 cubic yards of pea gravel in the eroded area.

He said neither of the proposed activities would impact existing drainage patterns occurring at the site. He estimated the work would take about 4 days to complete and would cost about \$40,000.

Mr. Adler said there is no crisis prompting this action. If this were a DOE-owned property, DOE would do this work as part of routine maintenance. He said this work would have no impact whatsoever on selection of a final remedy for cleanup of SLAPS.

Jan Titus said she would arrange a meeting with airport officials to discuss the proposed work.

*Enhanced  
Monitoring at  
SLAPS*

Mr. Adler also said he would like to develop a proposal for some improvements to the monitoring program for SLAPS. He said enhanced monitoring would respond in part to the concerns expressed by the Coldwater Creek Panel and its recommendation that measures be implemented to improve the ongoing evaluation of the site.

He said DOE has a monitoring system in place that is "okay." DOE spends about \$1 million a year (or a little less) to monitor water and sediments. He said he would like

to write a proposal outlining some modest changes in the monitoring program for the Task Force to consider. He emphasized that none of these enhancements is proposed to make SLAPS suitable for a permanent bunker. Rather, the objective is just to allow for more information to be gathered about current conditions at the site and to measure the effect of future activities, especially on Coldwater Creek.

Ms. Price asked if this proposed monitoring would complement the monitoring that would be required for remediation. Mr. Adler said it would and added that the proposed enhancements would not require new wells and/or major structures.

Bob Geller said it has been a long time since samples were collected from Coldwater Creek. He proposed that DOE perform a "walkover" evaluation of Coldwater Creek and that it ensure that residents are informed of conditions in the creek.

Mr. Adler said it is important that notifications ensure that health objectives are met but not create panic among parents of small children. He said he would check to determine what has been done to inform residents living along Coldwater Creek.

Mr. Dwyer reported that Ms. Drey had told him emphatically that she is opposed to any additional monitoring because she believes there is enough information already. He said she also expressed her concern that monitoring has been used by DOE in the past as an excuse to delay cleanup.

*Agenda for Next Meeting*

The working group agreed to meet again at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, June 12, 1996. Mr. Dwyer indicated the main theme of the meeting will be discussion of the Riverfront

Trail project. He asked if there were other issues that needed to be addressed.

Tom Manning said he would like to develop cleanup recommendations for SLAPS and the ballfields that can be provided to DOE in time for FY '98 budget deliberations. "If our intent is to make SLAPS and the ballfields our highest priority, that will take a bundle of money and we need to start thinking about what level of cleanup we want."

Mr. Fraenhoffer suggested that the working group consider interim spending issues next week and also develop a plan that would lead to a final recommendation concerning SLAPS and the ballfields in time for the July Task Force meeting.

Mr. Manning said his intent was to put Task Force participants on notice. He said he is prepared to speak for the City of Hazelwood and he wants the City of St. Louis and Lambert Airport officials to say what cleanup levels they will accept. He said everyone needs to get ready to do that, especially the main stakeholders.

Jan Titus said Kay Drey had advised her that she wants to have the Task Force draft a letter to DOE by July 1, in time for FY '98 budget deliberations.

Mr. Adler said that DOE is in the midst of FY 98 planning, but that there is nothing magical about the July 1 date. He also said that while Ms. Drey might want all FY '98 monies to go towards remediation of SLAPS, that would leave out other property owners. He said that while the Task Force might want to focus on FY '98 funding, it also needs to remain cognizant of funding for FY '97. He said he had recently been asked to develop recommendations responding to a

potential 20 percent budget reduction in FY '97, because Congress has called for 20 percent reduction of DOE's overall Environmental Management budget.

He said his sense is that cleanup funding is not simply going to be allocated to the cities that get requests in first. He said that in addition to asking for increased funding, the Task Force needs to present a rationale supporting its request. Lobbying for more money may work, but it may be more productive to make a case for increased funding by proposing an overall remediation plan that is cost-effective. The more sophisticated the strategy, the better the chances of securing funding, he said.

Ms. Titus said she thought the immediate priority should be for the FY '96 funds. Then the group can develop a plan for FY '97. Ms. Price agreed, saying that FY '97 funding is an important issue because, if the money is not used, it's at risk of being recaptured.

Mr. Adler also said that the working group should be aware, regardless of how attractive remediating the Riverfront Trail may be, that DOE might not be able to do that work this fiscal year. As for the big picture of the budget, he said he cannot over-emphasize that the Task Force must have better reasons to support its recommendations than simply that Ms. Drey wants DOE to spend all available money on remediating one property, SLAPS.

*Stone Container*

Bob Geller said MDNR had been briefed by DOE on some remediation work that Stone Container plans to do at its plant.

Mr. Adler said the proposed renovations at Stone Container represent one of the better examples of coordination between DOE and

private property owners. He said that the property owners are going to make improvements as part of a new lease agreement with Stone Container. Instead of just asphaltting over the contamination, the property owner plans to clean up a small portion of the site and to store the contaminated material temporarily in an engineered pile on site. He said a very reputable firm is doing the work and that he is comfortable that they will do a first-class job and that the resulting conditions will pose no risk to human health or the environment. The property will be in better shape once the work is done, he said.

Mr. Dwyer asked if the property owner had unilateral authority to do this kind of work. Mr. Adler said yes, and added that the improvements are designed prevent recontamination as well.

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

The next meeting of the Priorities Working Group is scheduled for June 12, 1996.

Approved July 2, 1996

144427  
SL-962

00-2004

00-2004

---

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)

---

# ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

for the St. Louis Site, Missouri

---



---

Property  
of  
ST LOUIS FUSRAP LIBRARY

U.S. Department of Energy