

MINUTES

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force

June 18, 1996 Meeting

Hazelwood Civic Center
Hazelwood, Missouri

APPROVED

Participants Attending

Dave Adler, DOE
Tom Binz, Laclede Gas Company
Bill Brandes, St. Louis Co. HazMat Team
Ric Cavanagh, St. Louis County Health Dept.
Kay Drey
George Eberle, Grace Hill Neighborhood Assn.
Jack Frauenhoffer, Mallinckrodt Chemical Co.
Gail Gary, Union Electric Co.
Anna Ginsburg, Vice Chair
Jim Grant, Mallinckrodt Chemical Co.
Leonard Griegs, Lambert Airport
Tom Horgan, U.S. Rep. Talent's Office
Lou Jearls, City of Florissant
Danovan Larson, St. Louis County Water Co.
Don Manning, City of Hazelwood
Bob Marchant, Metro. St. L. Sewer Dist.
Sally Price, Chair
Roger Pryor, Coalition for the Environment
Conn Roden, St. Louis County Health Dept.
Elsa Steward, MDNR
Dan Wall, EPA

Interested Parties

Ken Albin, Bechtel
Ken Alkema, Envirocare
Rick Booth, Golder Associates
Molly Bunton, St. Louis County
Chris Byrne, St. Louis Co. Health Dept.
Jean Dean, League of Women Voters
Bob Geller, MDNR
Ken Grothoff, Wagner Brake
Peggy Hermes, Coalition for the Environment
Linda Meyer, WSSRAP
Kristie Monroe, St. Louis Co. Health Dept.
Laurie Peterfreund, NCEIT
Mike Poligone, Bechtel
Mitch Scherzinger, MDNR
Tom Shepherd, Dawn Mining Co.
Clarence Styron, Wester and Associates
Jan Titus, Lambert Airport
Ted Trimpa, Dawn Mining Co.
Dave Wagoner, Envirocare

Support

Jim Dwyer, Facilitator
Dave Miller, SAIC
Sarah Snyder, FUSRAP

Agenda Item

Minutes

Determination

*Welcome, Opening
Comments,
Announcements*

Chair Sally Price called the meeting to order at 7:47 a.m. and asked if there were any comments or announcements.

Jim Dwyer advised that County Executive Buzz Westfall had appointed two new participants to the Task Force, William Brandes, deputy chief of the Creve Coeur Fire Protection District and chief hazardous materials officer for the county's Hazmat Team, and William Conant, a member of the St. Louis County Local Emergency Planning Committee and a retired chemical engineer from Monsanto Co. Both appointees were also named to the St. Louis County Radioactive and Hazardous Waste Oversight Commission.

Mr. Dwyer also introduced Gail Gary, who was participating on behalf of Union Electric Co.

Ms. Price then recognized Tom Horgan, who offered some remarks on behalf of U.S. Rep. James Talent.

Mr. Horgan said he would like Congressman Talent's position on the Task Force's remediation preferences to be reflected more completely in the minutes. He said Congressman Talent fully supports the Task Force cleanup objectives and said the only constraint may be the cost of complete remediation and remote disposal. He said Congressman Talent acknowledges that the cost of complete cleanup could be a problem, which is why he wrote Secretary O'Leary asking for an explanation of DOE's cost estimates for the St. Louis Site.

Mr. Horgan said DOE has replied to the congressman and has advised that the estimates of \$400 million (for local disposal) to \$900 million (for complete removal and remote disposal) are preliminary and that revised estimates are anticipated by July 31, 1996. Mr. Horgan said the congressman is not yet satisfied and is continuing to work on this issue.

He added that Congressman Talent supports the Task Force's efforts and recommendations. He said it's obvious what

the Task Force wants as a preferred method of cleanup. Mr. Horgan said the congressman will support complete excavation and remote disposal, within the limitations of fiscal reality. He said Congressman Talent believes that DOE has the money to do this type of complete cleanup in St. Louis and that it's primarily a question of prioritizing. He added that the congressman has talked to others about the cost estimates who also believe they are too high.

*Approval of
Minutes*

Ms. Price asked if there were any proposed revisions to the draft minutes of the May 21, 1996 Task Force meeting.

**The minutes of the
May 21, 1996
Task Force
meeting were
approved as
amended.**

Dave Adler said Les Price wanted the May minutes to include his comments about how DOE would respond to a congressional directive telling DOE to excavate contaminated material from the St. Louis Site and use a remote disposal site. Mr. Adler reported Mr. Price had said that if Congress as a body chooses to have DOE solve these types of problems this way, then DOE will do it. However, DOE needs something more than the view of just one congressman for it to be a directive.

Mr. Horgan said that DOE's budget is a general line item in the federal budget, and as such it does not have money earmarked for specific projects. He said there is not money set aside specifically for this project.

Mr. Adler agreed that DOE's overall budget is a general line item. But he said there have been instances in some budget bills in which funds have been set aside for specific projects. He said there is no such language yet for the St. Louis Site, to the best of his knowledge.

He said that DOE is required to make cleanup and funding decisions by rules. The rules in effect now are recited in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA).

However, if Congress were to direct DOE to implement a specific solution at a particular site, DOE would do as directed.

Mr. Dwyer asked if there were any additional proposed revisions to the draft minutes of the May 21, 1996 Task Force meeting. The minutes of the May meeting were approved as amended.

*Opportunity for
Public Comment*

Mr. Dwyer asked if there were any public comments.

Tom Shepherd, representing Dawn Mining Co., advised the Task Force that Seacrest Environmental, which has done work for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and EPA, has proposed a joint venture approach that includes a lower estimate for cleanup and disposal of contaminated material from the St. Louis Site. Seacrest has estimated that cleanup and remote disposal could be accomplished for \$450 to \$600 per cubic yard.

*Presentation of
Cost Estimates and
Risk Assessment
Information*

Mr. Dwyer then asked Mr. Adler to present the cost estimates and risk assessment information developed for each of the remediation alternatives identified by the Task Force. (Mr. Adler's overheads are ATTACHMENT A.)

Mr. Adler said that DOE prepared cost estimates based on the information provided by the Task Force. For example, when the Task Force included security personnel in a particular alternative, it was included in the cost estimate. He explained that these figures are summarized and said that the backup information is available for those who want to review it.

For the risk assessment calculations, Mr. Adler explained that a computer model calculates potential ways people are exposed (pathways), such as inhalation and ingestion, and how much exposure is likely under each scenario. He said one of the key assumptions is the amount of dust in the

environment. He said the model assumes a fairly dusty environment, with the greatest dust levels assumed for ditch workers.

Another key pathway for exposure is soil ingestion. The model assumes how much soil people may unintentionally ingest under various scenarios. For example, the model assumes that ditch workers will consume about 170 grams of soil per year.

A third significant assumption for the model is how long people are exposed to a contaminated environment (duration).

Cost estimates and risk assessments were calculated for each of the four remediation options for each component site as identified by the Task Force.

Mr. Adler said that natural background is about 300 millirems (mrem) per year. The doses calculated for the St. Louis Site are in addition to natural background. He said the doses are lower in some of the options because the contamination either is shielded or removed in those scenarios. He also said that, in general, minor differences in dose are beyond the precision of DOE's modeling capability.

He said it may seem counter-intuitive that Option 1 is so expensive when DOE is not doing any remediation. But he said that Option 1 does include ongoing activity, such as posting security guards.

Mr. Adler added that some of the remediation alternatives preclude certain land uses, which is why some scenarios, such as a resident/gardener use for the Riverfront Trail/Levee component, were not calculated in the model.

Anna Ginsburg asked what period of time was assumed for ongoing maintenance. Mr. Adler said the cost estimates assume a 30-year timeline.

Mr. Adler also explained that the dose estimates for SLAPS are not the current doses. He said DOE is unaware of any actual doses like those modeled based on the Task Force information.

He said that the differences between Option 3 and Option 4 on the matrices are fairly minor in terms of risk, but there is significant difference in cost. Technically, Option 3 is a little safer because of the capping, he said.

Kay Drey asked if the model included risks from the water pathway. Mr. Adler said none of the modeling assumes the use of groundwater.

Mr. Adler said the downtown vicinity property information is interesting because it illustrates another principle. He said that, based on the way the group has crafted the alternatives, it can be cheaper to excavate and ship away contaminated soil from smaller properties than to leave it in place and monitor it for 30 years. However, Mr. Adler said that while Option 1 is more expensive than Option 4, the dose estimates (risk assessment) are 1/20th of natural background for the area.

He said the risks associated with transportation are greater, based on actuarial data. Those data show that there is a one in 3 chance of a fatality associated with transporting excavated material, and that the risk increases with distance. Mr. Adler said he hoped that the Task Force will think about the hazards associated with radioactivity and also about the hazards that remediation workers will face. He said that throughout the DOE complex there have been three fatalities in the remediation program. He added that part of his job is to keep those statistics as low as possible.

Sally Price asked about the difference in cost if a two-foot cap were installed, instead of the one-foot cap modeled. Mr. Adler said the

model for the ballfields would be re-run assuming a two-foot cap.

*Report of the
Priorities Working
Group*

Mr. Dwyer reported that the ballfields cleanup proposal (as recommended to DOE by the Task Force) is not going to proceed this year. He said that about \$2.65 million that had been set aside for that project is available for reallocation and needs to be spent before the end of fiscal year in order to avoid recapture. The Priorities Working Group has discussed several possibilities for reallocation of those funds, including continuation of the vicinity property cleanup in North County and cleanup of the Riverfront Trail next to SLDS. DOE is preparing several cleanup options for the Riverfront Trail for the working group to consider.

He said the working group also asked DOE to develop a proposal, including cost estimates, for enhanced monitoring at SLAPS.

Bob Marchant asked about the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers position on digging up the levee.

Mr. Adler said the Corps of Engineers will probably not allow excavation of the levee. However, he explained that the proposed path of the Riverfront Trail is not on the levee; it is between the levee and river. He said it is very unlikely that any proposal would involve excavating the levee. The likely approach is to remove hot spots and cap.

Donovan Larson asked whether there has been an effort to characterize the levee. Mr. Adler said there is no reason to characterize the levee. The purpose of the current characterization is to allow construction of a bike trail next to the levee and to allow people to use it for recreational purposes.

Tom Manning said that while the Priorities Working Group waits for the Riverfront Trail

characterization data, it asked DOE to proceed with haul route cleanup in order to avoid idling the workers.

Mitch Scherzinger said there is a cost of \$30,000 a day if the project is shut down and the workers do nothing.

Mr. Adler said that DOE also is going to perform some maintenance work at SLAPS. He said that there is some erosion in one ditch where it enters Coldwater Creek and that DOE intends to stabilize that area and reseed part of the ditch.

Ms. Drey moved that the Task Force recommend to DOE that it continue cleanup of vicinity properties in North County, continue monitoring at SLAPS, set up procedures for utility emergency response and perform the maintenance at SLAPS as described by Mr. Adler. She also moved that a decision about the Riverfront Trail project be delayed until the characterization data have been analyzed.

The motion was seconded by George Eberle.

Mr. Manning suggesting amending the motion in order to avoid wasting a month.

Ms. Drey then suggested amending the motion to read that the Riverfront Trail project be approved in principle and that the Priorities Working Group be authorized to review DOE's proposal and give final approval.

Ms. Price said she didn't agree with authorizing the Priorities Working Group to make the final decision about the Riverfront Trail and said the delay would be less than a month.

The motion was amended to read that the Riverfront Trail project be approved subject to an approved remediation plan.

The motion was approved, with one abstention.

The Task Force then approved deleting FY '97 funding for exploring the use of in-state sanitary waste landfills for minimally-contaminated wastes because, according to Elsa Steward, state law prohibits it.

Mr. Larson then moved approval of the draft resolution prepared by the Priorities Working Group and distributed to the Task Force prior to the meeting.

The motion was seconded by Roger Pryor.

There was extensive discussion of the draft resolution and several changes were made. Ric Cavanagh moved that the resolution be adopted as amended. Mr. Manning seconded the motion. The motion was approved. (The revised resolution, as approved, is ATTACHMENT B.)

Ms. Drey then said she wanted to offer another motion for consideration. She read the following introductory statement:

"At the Task Force meeting on April 16, 1996, we used an electronic device to poll Task Force members in order to determine the level to which we wanted each of the St. Louis sites to be cleaned up. For every site, the majority voted for level #4, or cleanup to meet the Department of Energy guidelines for release of the site for unrestricted use.

"Although a formal vote was to have been taken at that same meeting after discussion, no such vote was taken.

"Following that meeting, at the Priorities Working group meeting on May 15, those in attendance voted to rank the sites in order of the preferred cleanup sequence. The site that received the highest priorities was the airport site, with its related vicinity properties.

"Since the Task Force as a whole has not yet adopted a cleanup sequence, I would like to introduce a motion at this time that will permit the Task Force to take a formal vote on the airport site today, and thus bring to closure the evaluating process we started in April. Since there remains only a very brief period in which funding requests will be under review for submission, I believe it is essential that we act now so that our preferred priority may have proper consideration in the fiscal year 1997 budget and beyond."

Ms. Drey then moved that the St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force notify the Department of Energy at this time that the St. Louis Airport Site is ranked as our highest priority for remediation and that we request that the Department of Energy initiate the cleanup of this site as soon as possible, for its eventual release for unrestricted use.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Pryor.

Mr. Manning said he thought it was premature to state a cleanup plan without first having the airport representative speak on the issue.

There was brief discussion following which Mr. Larson said he didn't think the motion should be considered at this meeting and asked if he could move to table the motion.

The motion was tabled.

*Development of
Draft Final Report*

Mr. Dwyer said the initial draft of the Task Force report is due on June 5. He said it is his intention to adhere to the schedule established by the Task Force.

Jack Fraunhoffer said the Task Force doesn't have a mechanism to go through the recommendations and to develop a preferred option for each of the ten sites. He said he would like the Task Force either to direct the

Priorities Working Group to address that issue or else set up another working group to develop preferred remediation options.

The Task Force agreed to create another working group to work on developing remediation options.

Old Business

Ms. Price asked for a report from the Technologies Working Group.

Jim Grant said the working group had received estimates for the cost of vitrification and is in the process of preparing its final report and recommendation to the Task Force.

The meeting adjourned 10:12 a.m.

The next meeting of the St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force is scheduled for July 16, 1996.

Approved July 16, 1996

00-2027

144387
SL-951

00-2027

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