

ST. LOUIS SITE REMEDIATION TASK FORCE

\* \* \* \* \*

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

\* \* \* \* \*

TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 16, 1996

\* \* \* \* \*

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on Tuesday, July 16, 1996, the herein described parties met at the Hazelwood Civic Center, Hazelwood, Missouri and the following proceedings were had, to-wit:

PARTICIPANTS ATTENDING:

Dave Adler, DOE  
Tom Binz, Laclede Gas Company  
Bill Brandes, St. Louis Co. HazMat Team  
Ric Cavanagh, St. Louis County Health Department.  
Kay Drey  
William Conant, St. Louis County Commission.  
George Eberle, Grace Hill Neighborhood Association  
Jack Fraenhoffer, Mallinckrodt Chemical Co.  
Neal Slaten, Union Electric Co.  
Anna Ginsburg, Vice Chair  
Jim Grant, Mallinckrodt Chemical Co.  
Tom Horgan, U.S. Representative Talent's Office  
Tom Manning, City of Hazelwood  
Bob Marchant, Metro St. Louis Sewer District  
Sally Price, Chair  
Roger Pryor, Coalition for the Environment  
Conn Roden, St. Louis County Health Department  
Elsa Steward, MDNR  
Dan Wall, EPA  
Nancy Lubiewski  
Ray Rolen, City of Bridgeton  
Lee Sobotka, Washington University  
Christina Flynn, City of Berkeley  
Jan Titus, Lambert Airport  
James Dwyer, Facilitator

HALE REPORTING, INC.

No. 4 Godfrey

St. Louis, Missouri 63135

(314) 524-2055

1 TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 16, 1996

2 (In Conference Room at 7:46 a.m.)

3 THE COURT: We have one more Task Force  
4 member signing in and then we ought to be ready to  
5 go. I will point out for those of you who are here  
6 for first time today and those of you who may not  
7 have paid attention, that our next meeting is  
8 Tuesday, August 20 in this room at the same hour,  
9 7:30 a.m.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Are there any  
11 announcements that anyone on the Task Force has at  
12 this time?

13 MS. DREY: Yes, real quickly. I wrote  
14 something about millorams and radiation dose and I  
15 made a typographical mistake on the second line of  
16 the second paragraph. I said a picocurie is a  
17 thousandth of a curie and I should have said  
18 trillionth. Lee Sobotka caught it and said I'm off  
19 by a factor of I don't know how many  
20 something-or-others. But it should be trillionth,  
21 with a "TH" on the end. Trillionth.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

23 MR. KUCERA: Madam Chairman, we have a  
24 state representative here and I would like for him to  
25 be able to introduce himself. It doesn't mean that

1 we're beginning litigation or anything like that and  
2 the presence of attorneys doesn't mean anything like  
3 that but, Bill, if you could introduce yourself and  
4 say who you work with.

5 MR. BRYAN: My name is Bill Bryan and I  
6 work for the Attorney General's Office for the State  
7 of Missouri.

8 THE FACILITATOR: In that regard, I'd like  
9 to point out that there is a sign-in sheet that was  
10 not on the table at the earlier part of the morning  
11 and perhaps some of you may have missed it. It is  
12 very important for our purposes that we have a good  
13 record of who attends, both as an active participant  
14 and as an observer. So if you have not signed the  
15 sign-in sheet please do that before you leave here  
16 today. It is on the table behind me at the west end  
17 of the room.

18 I have one other announcement. There are a  
19 couple of changes that I think are obvious to those  
20 of you who have been before. First of all, the  
21 format has changed a bit and that is simply a matter  
22 of the fact that Sally and I need to be able to  
23 communicate effectively during the course of the  
24 meetings and it was a little difficult for us when  
25 she was sitting next to me, the point is she wasn't

1 able to get me attention, and now she can do that.

2 And secondly, we have a reporter in the  
3 room today who is going to make a transcript of this  
4 meeting. And many of you know that we have been  
5 recording the meetings.

6 Sarah, we are not making a tape today; is  
7 that correct? We are.

8 So this is a duplication but we're to use  
9 this document as the basis for the development of  
10 minutes. And while we do not intend to distribute  
11 the transcript it will be available upon request if  
12 there is a need for it to be distributed on an  
13 individual basis if anybody feels the need for it.

14 That's all I have on that front.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other  
16 announcements? Okay. We'll move on to approval of  
17 the minutes. Are there any corrections or  
18 modifications to the minutes that you have from last  
19 month's meetings?

20 THE FACILITATOR: These are the minutes of  
21 the June 18 meeting and again copies of this document  
22 are available for everyone on the table at the front  
23 of the room.

24 MRS. DREY: I move they been accepted.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: A second?

1 MR. MANNING: I'll second.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All in favor? All  
3 opposed? The minutes are approved.

4 Jim, it occurs to me that there are some  
5 people here who are not -- well especially for our  
6 court reporter, would it be helpful if people spoke  
7 and told their name before they spoke or is that too  
8 formal?

9 THE FACILITATOR: No, I think that that  
10 would be helpful and in another context as well. It  
11 would certainly help the reporter to make an accurate  
12 record of who is saying what but we also have some  
13 new participants and it would be helpful I think for  
14 them to get know who everyone is and for everyone to  
15 know who they are.

16 Mr. Conant, William Conant is a recent  
17 appointee to the County Commission and this is his  
18 first Task Force meeting. And is there anyone else  
19 here today for the first time? Mr. Slaten, Neal  
20 Slaten is representing Union Electric Company and  
21 this is his first Task Force meeting. Any others?  
22 Okay, good.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

24 THE FACILITATOR: I'm sorry. Christina  
25 Flynn representing the City of Berkeley is also

1 here. Is this your first Task Force meeting?

2 MS. FLYNN: Yes.

3 THE FACILITATOR: It is, okay. So we have  
4 three new participants as of this morning.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: So from here on let's  
6 have opportunity for public comment if you want take  
7 the meeting.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Yes. There are three  
9 people who have signed up requesting an opportunity  
10 to speak. And for those of you who are not familiar  
11 with this we try to keep the public comment period to  
12 approximately ten minutes and there are three people  
13 who have signed up so I would ask you to keep that in  
14 mind as you speak.

15 The first to sign up Ward Hurst  
16 representing Golden & Associates Inc. Mr. Hurst  
17 misunderstood the list, he thought he was signing in  
18 as an observer not as a speaker. So thank you, Mr.  
19 Hurst.

20 The next person who signed up to speak is  
21 Larry Gooden from the Kiesel Company. Mr. Gooden,  
22 there is a portable microphone which we'll get to  
23 you. And I'd like to make good use of this portable  
24 microphone so any of you who choose to speak  
25 throughout the course of the meeting please wait for

1 us to get it to you. Mr. Gooden.

2 MR. GOODEN: Thanks very much. Madam  
3 Chairman, Members of the Task Force, my name is Larry  
4 Gooden and I represent the Kiesel Company along with  
5 an environmental group from Minnesota known as the  
6 West Central Environmental.

7 And for the past year we have been working  
8 with the Department of Energy and SAIC at our expense  
9 in developing a process that will basically  
10 neutralize the low level radioactive materials in the  
11 soils. We currently are in the process of testing  
12 our experiments now under the guise of SAIC at an  
13 independent testing laboratory.

14 We just wanted to make you aware of the  
15 fact that we are trying to develop processes that are  
16 less expensive and that they will bring the low level  
17 radioactive materials to its final resting place.

18 So we appreciate the time and we would like  
19 to I guess monitor and keep advised of the processing  
20 and at least be in the bidding, if you will, for the  
21 project. We understand that, as in most cases, if  
22 you'd like to dig and haul it, remove it totally, we  
23 feel that there is a potential that the material can  
24 be totally neutralized and that it can be converted  
25 to inner salts that will render it totally harmless.

1           So from that standpoint, I appreciate your  
2 audience that morning.

3           THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your  
4 comments. Any questions of Mr. Gooden? All right.  
5 Then the third person who has signed up to speak is  
6 Sandy Delcoure representing the Missouri Stream  
7 Team.

8           Ms. Delcoure, where are you? We will bring  
9 the microphone to you.

10          MS. DELCOURE: Hello. My name is Sandy  
11 Delcoure and I live on Coldwater in unincorporated  
12 North County. I became interested in the creek and  
13 its environmental problem when we built a new house  
14 there about eight years ago. Controversy has  
15 continued over the years and it seems the stories  
16 have all changed from the contamination from the  
17 creek being serious to that of being hardly anything  
18 at all.

19          I became quite resigned to it all and I  
20 joined the Missouri Stream Team which is sponsored by  
21 the Missouri Department of Conservation and the  
22 Conservation Federation of Missouri. I adopted  
23 Coldwater Creek and won the first Stream Team award  
24 for my freelance writing and photography work in  
25 local newspapers to increase public awareness of the



1 creek and its problems.

2           What has renewed my interest and concern  
3 now is that my grandson, who is three and lives with  
4 us, has a playground in our backyard which is a 150  
5 feet off of Coldwater Creek. He plays outside every  
6 day despite all weather and is often barefoot, as are  
7 we all in the family, as we work and play outside  
8 around our house year round.

9           Could the Department of Energy please tell  
10 me if we are safe to do this when the people who do  
11 studies at the waste sites off the creek at the  
12 airport wear moonsuits while working there? Perhaps  
13 the DOE could come to my house and do some soil and  
14 water samples to ensure me, my family and all the  
15 families that live on the creek like us that we are  
16 safe in our daily living there.

17           Perhaps you might leave the contaminated  
18 waste on the creek if it were not a populated area.  
19 It seems the best solution would be to remove the  
20 waste so that it doesn't leak into the soil and water  
21 of the flood plain.

22           This past year was the first year that  
23 funding for Stream Team projects was provided by the  
24 Missouri Department of Conservation. I have kept the  
25 DOE up to date on that through the help of Sarah

1 Snyder and have a copy of the latest newsletter on  
2 the issue for the DOE today.

3 I hope that the next year we might get a  
4 project description together and budget and submit it  
5 for funding to help in our efforts on Coldwater  
6 Creek. It isn't a whole lot of money but it might  
7 help a little. Thank you for help.

8 And now I'd like to pass around a photo  
9 album for you to see.

10 THE FACILITATOR: And may we have a copy of  
11 your statement for the record? Was that your  
12 intention?

13 MS. DELCOURE: Well, I gave it to David  
14 Adler.

15 THE FACILITATOR: You did.

16 MR. ADLER: She gave me a copy and I'll  
17 give you one.

18 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Thank you for  
19 your comments.

20 Before we move to Item 4 on the agenda,  
21 which is the report of the Priorities Working Group,  
22 I want to point out that there is an awful lot of  
23 paper on the table at the front of the room and it  
24 might appear to be overwhelming to some of you but  
25 there are a lot of important documents there.

1           In addition to the minutes of the June  
2 meeting, which were just approved, there is a set of  
3 the minutes from the May meeting of the Task Force,  
4 which may be of interest to some of you. There is  
5 also a copy of a letter from Sally Price to Secretary  
6 Hazel O'Leary forwarding a resolution that was  
7 adopted by this Task Force on June 18, 1996. And  
8 that may be of interest to many of you.

9           There are also two bound handouts. One of  
10 them is a summary of the evaluation results of a  
11 survey that was taken with respect to Site Specific  
12 Advisory Boards, including this Task Force. And it's  
13 basically an assessment of how the participants feel  
14 about the effectiveness of those boards. And it may  
15 be of interest to you.

16           And then finally there is this fairly large  
17 bound report prepared -- is this the Keystone  
18 Report? It is the Keystone Report titled Final  
19 Report of the Federal Facilities Environmental  
20 Restoration Dialogue Committee and there is a lot of  
21 information in here, some of which may interest you.

22           So please, if you're inclined, take copies  
23 of these documents with you, read them, and if you  
24 have questions or comments let us know.

25           Item 4 on the agenda today is a report of

1 the Priorities Working Group. The Priorities Working  
2 Group has focused recently almost exclusively on the  
3 development of a plan for the Riverfront Trail which  
4 was something that arose fairly recently as a  
5 potential action item for 1996. And there was, first  
6 of all, an effort to determine what level of cleanup  
7 or what general type of cleanup would be suitable to  
8 accommodate the bike trail and for the long term, the  
9 community. And then once the principals were  
10 established, to develop a detailed plan. David Adler  
11 is going to report today on the status of that  
12 project.

13 Yes?

14 MR. EBERLE: I would like to make possibly  
15 a minor correction in your statement. The bike trail  
16 was always part of the downtown site. And it was in  
17 the development of, you know, the most expeditious  
18 way to deal with our problems that we separated the  
19 Mallinckrodt site proper from the levee site but that  
20 had always been part of what we were talking about.  
21 So what came up rather suddenly was not the inclusion  
22 of the trail into our thinking, but rather the  
23 immediacy of that phase of the project.

24 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

25 MR. ADLER: Okay. It has been discussed I

1 guess at two recent meetings in terms of what general  
2 approach we would take for the bike trail. I think  
3 the news is generally very good. The bottom line is  
4 it appears that we are able to get that project going  
5 this fiscal year assuming the group remains  
6 supportive of it.

7           We talked about the near term Priorities  
8 Working Group meeting the week before last, remember  
9 we talked about it at the Wednesday night Pizza  
10 steering session meeting last Wednesday night also.

11           In both cases the group seemed to be, if  
12 not unanimous -- I don't remember specifically how  
13 the votes came out -- nearly unanimous in support of  
14 an Option III type approach. I think everyone now  
15 knows what Option III means in this parlance for  
16 getting the bike trail up and running.

17           It basically involves not removing every  
18 picocurie and not attempting to clean the site up to  
19 residential standards but cleaning the site up to  
20 standards that are suitable for future recreational  
21 use.

22           My task was to go and see if we could get  
23 that done that year and if all the practical elements  
24 of it were workable. And it appears that they are.  
25 I'm now very confident that I've got the money to

1 remove the soil. I'm quite confident I also have the  
2 money to ship the soil away so we don't have this  
3 issue of staging it temporarily and people worrying  
4 about a temporary storage problem.

5           There was an issue about what to do with  
6 the soil during the interim period between when you  
7 dug it up and when you're loading it onto the trains  
8 and I believe that Mallinckrodt is willing -- Jack,  
9 correct me if I'm wrong here -- Mallinckrodt is  
10 willing to allow us to use their staging area right  
11 next to the railroad tracks there to stage the soil.  
12 So that's kind of them to allow us to move soil from  
13 the city property onto Mallinckrodt property for a  
14 very temporary stage while it's loaded into cars and  
15 shipped away.

16           So it appears that we have the money, I  
17 think we have general consensus on how to proceed,  
18 it's scheduable, we could get it going this summer so  
19 as to be out of the trailmakers way when they come  
20 down the road.

21           So my proposal is we go ahead and schedule  
22 it and do it. I've got a lot details. I've  
23 obviously gone over it in very general terms now.  
24 I've got lots of pictures and details on where  
25 contamination is and isn't and where we would and

1 would not be digging, where the trail would be laid  
2 out and I'd be happy to share that paper to anyone  
3 else who wants to see it later.

4 But the general news is that we appear to  
5 have a plan, we do appear to have money, and a  
6 scheduable approach to getting it done.

7 Does anybody have any questions about the  
8 proposal? Yes, Kay.

9 MS. DREY: Could you please tell us the  
10 difference between the standards used for Option III  
11 and Option IV? In other words, Option IV being for  
12 unrestricted use?

13 MR. ADLER: Yes.

14 MS. DREY: I mean numbers. I don't mean --  
15 you know, like in picocuries per gram.

16 MR. ADLER: You mean in picocuries per  
17 gram.

18 MS. DREY: Right.

19 MR. ADLER: Yeah. We looked at -- I'm  
20 trying to make sure I don't get the numbers all  
21 messed up because I've already done this once. We  
22 actually only looked at three approaches. One was to  
23 basically lay the trail down on top of the conditions  
24 as they currently exist and to rely upon the  
25 shielding provided by the trail itself to ensure the

1 safety of bike riders. So there is very little to  
2 know, removal of contamination under that option,  
3 Option 1.

4 The second option we looked at was to go  
5 throughout the entire area and remove any location  
6 where the soil levels exceeded 50 picocuries per gram  
7 which is the hot spot level thrown around in all of  
8 our Option III discussions for this group.

9 And then the last option that we looked at  
10 was the option of simply removing all contamination  
11 that exceeds five and fifteen thereby restoring the  
12 site to near background conditions and making it  
13 suitable right next to the river for any type of  
14 future development.

15 Our conclusion was that all of those  
16 approaches left the bike riders and the occasional  
17 person who strays off the trail and holds a picnic to  
18 the side of the trail or fishes or something like  
19 that, ensures that they receive no significant  
20 radiation dose.

21 The numbers are in the paper I can hand out  
22 but they were in the single digit millirems per year  
23 range, a fraction of a percent of the natural  
24 background radiation dose we all receive.

25 So the cutoff between the middle road



1 option and the most aggressive option is the  
2 difference cleaning up to 50 picocuries per gram and  
3 cleaning up to five and fifteen picocuries per gram.

4 MS. DREY: Fifty for thorium and radium?

5 MR. ADLER: Fifty for thorium and radium.

6 MS. DREY: Or is it adding all up to 50?

7 MR. ADLER: No.

8 MS. DREY: Or is it 50?

9 MR. ADLER: Yeah. It turns out that by the  
10 time you've gotten 50 on either one you've achieved  
11 50 for the other. They're generally co-located  
12 contaminants.

13 The difference in cost between the  
14 recreational endpoint and a residential endpoint was  
15 pretty significant. If I'm not mistaken we're  
16 talking about 750 cubic yards to make it suitable for  
17 aggressive recreational activity and we're talking  
18 about 4000 cubic yards to restore it to the same  
19 guidelines that we use for residential properties out  
20 here in North County. So roughly the differences in  
21 cost are the differences between about \$750,000,  
22 which we can handle this year, and \$4 million which  
23 we cannot handle this year.

24 So there is a difference in soil volume,  
25 there is a difference in cost. By all of the

1 analyses we've done, there is no significant  
2 difference in the risk for the utility of the land  
3 for recreational use.

4 So the group seemed to be centering on that  
5 center option and that's what I propose we proceed  
6 with.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Questions? Ric.

8 MR. CAVANAGH: Yes. What is this going to  
9 cost in terms of Option III? Number two, what impact  
10 does that have on the other sites or our ability to  
11 get funding for all of those sites in the near term?  
12 And thirdly, and I guess this is a larger question,  
13 now what exactly is the role of this Task Force? Is  
14 it to sanction your recommendation? Is it to bless  
15 DOE, and I don't mean this caustically, or do we make  
16 recommendations? You know, where does this all fit  
17 in because I think a number of us are still not  
18 clear.

19 MR. ADLER: Sure. Good questions. In  
20 terms of impacts on other project, basically this  
21 project is made possible by underruns, or anticipated  
22 underruns in projects already planned.

23 In particular, the work that we have  
24 planned for later on this summer at the downtown  
25 plant it now appears it will be less expensive than

1 was originally expected. We put contracts out for  
2 bid and the bids have come in at a lower level than  
3 we expected so that freed up some money. So it  
4 doesn't require that we compromise or reduce any  
5 other activity that this group has promoted. The  
6 project would cost about \$750,000 plus or minus a  
7 \$100,000. You never really know until you get into  
8 these things.

9           The role of this group generally on this  
10 matter has been to kind of be the stewards of the \$15  
11 million that we got at the start of the year. And  
12 most of this took place actually before you started  
13 participating with the group. But at the start of  
14 the year this group was given the opportunity to tell  
15 DOE how to spend pretty much the entire \$15 million  
16 because we didn't want to proceed with a project that  
17 the group was opposed to, where there was strong  
18 option to, and generally we like to have the general  
19 support of the group before we proceed on spending  
20 millions of tax dollars.

21           So the general process we've gone by is  
22 that the group has held some votes on whether or not  
23 to, whatever -- encourage, suggest, direct -- DOE to  
24 spend money on projects.

25           MR. CAVANAGH: I guess the specific

1 question is if we say no does DOE go ahead and do it  
2 anyway because they feel like it?

3 MR. ADLER: If you say no and there are  
4 enough people saying no then DOE has a hard time  
5 moving ahead because you all are our clients on this  
6 job.

7 I'm unaware of any project this year that  
8 we have proceeded with where the group said no. And  
9 I'm only aware of projects that we did proceed with  
10 where the group said yes. I don't think we've  
11 officially handed over a unilateral veto authority.

12 MR. CAVANAGH: I guess I'm playing  
13 hypotheticals relevant to some of the future  
14 discussions but, I mean, you know, again, is there a  
15 certain majority of this Task Force, say, a simple  
16 majority enough to advise DOE?

17 THE FACILITATOR: The objective from the  
18 beginning has been to achieve consensus support for  
19 whatever recommendations are made to the Department  
20 of Energy and the expression from the very beginning  
21 has been recommendations.

22 The notion is, at least I understand it,  
23 that the Task Force hasn't been given or assumed even  
24 the authority to dictate. On the other hand, it has  
25 been agreed by all parties, including DOE and its

1 contractors, that the input of this Task Force is  
2 very important and will be given due consideration  
3 and that language was developed in the context of a  
4 final report and recommendations.

5 What has happened is that we have made  
6 interim reports and recommendations which include the  
7 notion that the Riverfront Trail would be substituted  
8 for another project that wasn't proceeding this  
9 year.

10 MR. CAVANAGH: If I could just then follow  
11 up with a comment. My larger concern and some of us  
12 have spoken about this, you know, in just kind of a  
13 run through in terms of our abilities to access large  
14 sums of money quickly this fiscal year and to move  
15 quickly on these fronts and, you know, frankly, I'm  
16 concerned if we nitpick and take a little bit of the  
17 piece of the pie are we going to be jeopardizing our  
18 capabilities of getting more funds to larger sums of  
19 money quickly.

20 MR. ADLER: I really think decisions on  
21 this matter and other similar matters simply speak to  
22 how we apply FY 96 dollars. I don't see it as having  
23 a big impact on your decisionmaking. One thing it  
24 does is demonstrate that the group can make  
25 decisions. But in terms of impacting future budgets,

1 I don't see that as an issue.

2 One point, if there were a situation where  
3 EPA said DOE we as your regulators demand that you  
4 take some action and the Task Force were to say we  
5 don't really like that action, then we've got to obey  
6 the law. And the law says we comply with the input  
7 of our regulators. That situation has not come up so  
8 far, but that's one situation I can vision where we  
9 had to kind of split things up.

10 Secondly, if there's just some situation  
11 where we felt, DOE felt, that some quick measure was  
12 necessary to protect human health and the environment  
13 from an imminent exposure hazard we would do that. I  
14 think we would do that even if it were politically  
15 unpopular and the majority of the Task Force didn't  
16 like it we would just have to proceed with that.

17 Most of the items that we have talked about  
18 doing this year have been fairly discretionary from a  
19 risk standpoint. They weren't absolutely essential  
20 to protect the near term safety of folk but they were  
21 good things to get done.

22 And at least in one case the Task Force  
23 chose to set us on a path and then as we got further  
24 into it chose to take us off the path and we  
25 willingly dropped it. The ballfield project was one

1 where there was a proposal to take measures to  
2 restore the ballfields and ultimately the Task Force  
3 -- difficulties arose and a second vote was held to  
4 drop that one and we did.

5 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, Kay.

6 MS. DREY: Does your \$750,000 Option III  
7 estimate include fencing along the levee?

8 MR. ADLER: Yes, it does.

9 MS. DREY: So the kids can't get onto the  
10 levee?

11 MR. ADLER: Well no. Thanks for asking the  
12 question. One element of the proposal is to build a  
13 fence on the western side of the levee so that in  
14 effect everything east of the fence, the dike and the  
15 lands to the east of the dike, are suitable for the  
16 type of recreational activities that are envisioned  
17 for that area. But we thought it a good idea to go  
18 ahead and get a fence up on the western side of the  
19 levee so that when kids do climb up on the levee for  
20 a view if they're tempted to go down the other side  
21 and head off into Mallinckrodt's chemical works  
22 they're precluded from doing so by a fence. Well,  
23 obviously, you have to have gates and coordinate with  
24 the Corps and make it possible for people to get back  
25 and forth through the fence but we thought the fence

1 was a reasonable barrier to trespass onto the  
2 Mallinckrodt plant.

3 MS. DREY: Well, since the levee will still  
4 be contaminated have you considered putting the fence  
5 to keep the kids off of the levee, put it on the east  
6 side of the levee?

7 MR. ADLER: I guess there continues to be  
8 debate over whether or not the levee is contaminated  
9 or not.

10 MS. DREY: I'm going to be meeting with  
11 Dave.

12 MR. ADLER: I know you're going to be meet  
13 with Dave about it. But there would be no need to do  
14 that from a risk standpoint. It's our view that the  
15 child or adult who climbs up onto the levee to eat a  
16 peanut butter and jelly sandwich or kick up some dust  
17 and breathe that, those types of activities, wouldn't  
18 yield significant exposure.

19 MS. DREY: I'm not thinking about the  
20 people who bike through, you know, once every six  
21 months, I'm talking about the children who live in  
22 the neighborhood who will be attracted to the trail.

23 MR. ADLER: Absolutely. And they are the  
24 most, you know, sensitive target and they are what  
25 we've looked at most closely, that endpoint has been



1 evaluated.

2 MS. GINSBURG: I'm confused. Wouldn't the  
3 east side of the levee be in the river?

4 MR. ADLER: No, the fence goes on the west  
5 side of the levee.

6 MS. GINSBURG: Right.

7 MS. DREY: But it would be on the river  
8 side, right?

9 MR. ADLER: There's a fair amount of land  
10 between the levee and the river.

11 MS. DREY: Where you're going to put the  
12 trail.

13 MR. ADLER: And that's actually where the  
14 bike trail goes.

15 MS. GINSBURG: The trail will be in the  
16 river too; isn't that right?

17 MR. ADLER: No, the trail is between the  
18 levee and the river.

19 MS. DREY: So it's east of the levee too.  
20 It's in the river?

21 MR. ADLER: Yeah.

22 MS. DREY: And it floods.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: I have a clarifying point  
24 on the funding. We had alluded in other discussions  
25 that maybe funding from projects in New Jersey and

1 New York would be used to do this project if we  
2 didn't have enough of our own and today it sounds  
3 like you're saying we have enough of our own if we do  
4 the 750,000 project; is that right?

5 MR. ADLER: Correct.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Is that the end of  
7 discussion on that topic? Anymore questions or  
8 comments?

9 MR. EBERLE: The significance of this  
10 project is not a bike trail for tourists who come  
11 from other places to enjoy the river, the  
12 significance of this project is what it can do for  
13 economic development of north St. Louis.

14 There have been numerous discussions that  
15 are continuing and have gone on quite successfully  
16 that uses the bike trail as the focal point for  
17 community policing for the work of the State's  
18 Department of Labor and Education, the Department of  
19 Conservation, the Department of Economic Development  
20 in order to generate the kind of economic activity  
21 that could change the circumstances of many of the  
22 people in north St. Louis.

23 An example of that is that the old Chain of  
24 Rocks Bridge, the costs have come in on that, and  
25 that will cost about \$820,000, which is not an

1 unreasonable goal to be achieved, which would connect  
2 the bike trail over to the confluence trail in  
3 Illinois which would increase the tourism  
4 possibilities which can increase the kinds of  
5 activities that would benefit the people who live in  
6 that area, and then I could go on and say more about  
7 that, but it would be important for the members of  
8 the Task Force to know that it's the pressure that we  
9 seem to be placing on you is not to have a bike trail  
10 but it is to enable the kind of economic development  
11 which would materially change the circumstances of  
12 the lives of many people.

13           The importance for us is the scheduling  
14 problems and this is why this was in a sense intruded  
15 in your deliberations. The funding is available and  
16 we can begin the grading and paving as early as  
17 October of this year. If we don't fit in to that  
18 schedule then we will have lost another entire year  
19 for this kind of economic development. It does seem  
20 that the costs are within reason for that larger  
21 project, so I would just ask you to think of this in  
22 terms of a larger good that can be accomplished.

23           And then finally, I have over the time that  
24 we have been working together I have been impressed  
25 with the knowledge and wisdom of all of you. So I

1 can't speak to whether it should be Option I or II or  
2 III and I don't know whether we got the right numbers  
3 or don't have the right numbers, and I don't know  
4 anything about that stuff and I defer to the wisdom  
5 of the group of people who know and understand those  
6 things, so my assumption is that you're all satisfied  
7 that a plan has come up which will protect the people  
8 who use that property. I am only speaking to the  
9 significance of this for welfare reform plans, for  
10 employment plans and economic development.

11 MS. GINSBURG: I'd just like to add,  
12 George, I mean I don't think this is particularly  
13 just an economic and community development project  
14 for the city but I think it has implications for the  
15 entire St. Louis region.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Are there any other  
17 comments or questions concerning the Riverfront Trail  
18 project?

19 MR. ADLER: Just to make sure I'm clear. I  
20 intend to schedule this work and do it in time for  
21 the graders and pavers to come through and do it. I  
22 don't know if we need to hold a vote or anything like  
23 that. If people come up to me and say I'm going to  
24 do it, and they're being very clear, that's good  
25 enough for me. But it is our intent now based on the

1 analyses that have been done and the general input  
2 we've received from the group, the availability of  
3 the funds and the coordination between the city and  
4 Mallinckrodt to go ahead to put this deal together  
5 and do it. I have to, as a practical matter, start  
6 the wheels in motion pretty soon in order to line up  
7 the labor and the equipment and all that good stuff  
8 to make it to happen this September.

9 THE FACILITATOR: I think the intention all  
10 along has been to try to bring this to closure as  
11 quickly as possible and I think at one point we  
12 really hoped that we could do that last month.

13 MR. ADLER: And we were close.

14 THE FACILITATOR: And that turned out not  
15 to be possible.

16 MR. MANNING: My question is with MDNR.  
17 Has MDNR given its blessings to this plan? And is  
18 the cleanup acceptable to the state of Missouri?

19 MS. STEWARD: We voted at the Working Group  
20 meeting for an Option III for that area.

21 MR. CAVANAGH: I don't want to belabor this  
22 but I think it's important that we move forward with  
23 this, that is why I raised some of the questions that  
24 I raised because, frankly, what I'm hearing you're  
25 going to do it anyway.

1 MR. ADLER: Well, no. Well, if everyone  
2 were to jump up and say --

3 MR. CAVANAGH: And again, I don't know mean  
4 exaggeration for a fact. But it raises the question  
5 does the final decision come from the Task Force?  
6 Does it come from working groups? Does it come from  
7 other groups?

8 My personal bias is if we're going to have  
9 this Task Force then it should be a Task Force  
10 decision as opposed to the smaller groups, number  
11 one. Number two, in order to make sure the Task  
12 Force is adequately informed on at least future  
13 decisions. For instance, if I were to be asked to  
14 vote on this right now I have nothing in writing,  
15 I've not seen the cost figures, I have not looked at  
16 outputs, outcomes. It would be pretty hard for me to  
17 justifiably stand up and say that I've got enough  
18 information to make a decision.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, I'm going to  
20 address some of your comments about whether the  
21 working groups decide or we decide. It's been the  
22 practice that the working groups have more or less  
23 taken the job of studying these various interim --  
24 especially the Priorities Working Group -- they've  
25 studied the interim projects in further detail and

1 hashed out all these sorts of things in those  
2 meetings and then on the basis of those meetings come  
3 up with the recommendation that they've brought  
4 here.

5 At our last meeting we did have some report  
6 on -- let's see, June 18 -- no, we did not have the  
7 report at the Task Force meeting.

8 MR. CAVANAGH: I would feel more  
9 comfortable, you know, again, in having a packet that  
10 we voted on and we could say we approved this packet,  
11 Exhibit A, and, you know, didn't approve B, C, D,  
12 whatever it is, for future reference because it gets  
13 to the point now you begin to wonder what we did  
14 approve. And I'm concerned both for our own personal  
15 integrity and professional integrity as well as  
16 potential litigation down the road or whatever,  
17 because God knows that can always happen, that we  
18 have, you know, adequate documentation on exactly  
19 what the Task Force has approved.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sarah, could you help me  
21 and review what -- we had some materials given to us  
22 in the Priorities Working Group, those did not go  
23 out?

24 MS. SNYDER: No.

25 MR. ADLER: Are they not on the table up

1 there today? Okay. I think what's happened, Ric, is  
2 that the type of information that you would like to  
3 have was presented to this subcommittee and discussed  
4 once or twice. I guess the subcommittee did not  
5 formally make a recommendation this time as they  
6 usually have on these types of proposals, that's the  
7 difference between this and all the other activities  
8 --

9 THE FACILITATOR: Normally that would be  
10 the case, and I'm reaching here, I don't remember  
11 exactly what the missing links were but I do know  
12 that normally there would be a document sent out in  
13 advance of a Task Force meeting, that document would  
14 contain a recommendation, there would then be  
15 discussion of that recommendation at the Task Force  
16 meeting and action on it one way or another.

17 Clearly, and this has been consistent from  
18 day one, the decisionmaking authority rests with the  
19 full Task Force not with the working groups.

20 MR. CAVANAGH: Personally I'm not opposed  
21 to it, and I'm not trying to imply that, but I do  
22 think and I've sent a letter to Jim to this effect  
23 that I think it is very important for this Task Force  
24 at this point in time to tighten up its work a little  
25 bit better, get proper documentation, have paper



1 trails and be in it court or for auditors that we  
2 have that information available.

3 MR. MANNING: This issue was discussed last  
4 month at the meeting and basically the motion was  
5 made to proceed and then it was brought back with the  
6 amendment that it came back to the committee this  
7 month based upon the final report. I guess from the  
8 characterization and that from Dave Adler that we go  
9 ahead and make our decision at this time whether to  
10 proceed or whether to drop this project.

11 MR. ADLER: And then that meeting occurred  
12 and that was the meeting that occurred a couple of  
13 weeks ago at the Berkeley City Hall where we  
14 presented all the data and went through it in some  
15 detail.

16 The only outstanding item after that  
17 meeting, to my recollection, was that Kay wanted some  
18 information on the levee. And there was the open  
19 issue of what to do with the soil that we knew we'd  
20 have to stage at some point. And some people  
21 requested additional information with regard to the  
22 backup for the risk assessment which was provided.  
23 But that was it. It was could you give us these last  
24 few bricks and those have been provided. They didn't  
25 seem to change anybody's thinking.

1 THE FACILITATOR: There was also the  
2 question until some point fairly recently the  
3 question of what level of cleanup was the appropriate  
4 level and that was based on -- or the determination  
5 was based on the characterization data which weren't  
6 available to us a month ago.

7 MS. DREY: I thought that the working  
8 group, whatever it was, the Priorities Working Group,  
9 we did agree on Clean Option III. You know, that was  
10 a formal agreement.

11 THE FACILITATOR: I think we did too. And  
12 I can't recall, as I sit here, why the document  
13 evidencing that hasn't been --

14 MS. DREY: Is it in the minutes, Sarah?

15 THE FACILITATOR: I don't even remember  
16 exactly what the date of that meeting was.

17 MS. DREY: It was the pizza meeting. It  
18 wasn't Priorities, it was the pizza.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Well, we're going to get  
20 into that. That's a separate thing altogether.

21 MS. DREY: That doesn't have any --

22 THE FACILITATOR: Well, there hasn't been a  
23 report about that. But you'll hear about that in  
24 five minutes if we get to it. We were focusing on  
25 the Priorities Working Group and I think maybe there

1 is a set of minutes from whatever the date of that  
2 working group.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: June second. The  
4 Priorities meeting, is that what you're asking?

5 THE FACILITATOR: That long ago? Well, in  
6 any event, I don't know how to explain that.

7 MR. ADLER: I have an idea. I guess there  
8 are two ways we can handle this. I'm sensitive and  
9 understand Ric's thought there.

10 One way we could do it is we could back up  
11 -- I don't like this one so much -- but we could  
12 back up and open the table and the information to  
13 anyone who wants to have a second meeting focused on  
14 this issue and try it again.

15 Another thing is that we could not have a  
16 vote, the Task Force could not make any strong  
17 recommendation one way or another. I could simply  
18 describe the department's intent and our basis for  
19 that intent and proceed.

20 I don't think that -- I think when the  
21 lawyers come out, Ric, they're going to come after me  
22 in any event. I think that all of these decisions --  
23 this group actually doesn't make decisions for the  
24 Department of Energy, it makes recommendations.

25 MR. CAVANAGH. To be honest, the lawyers

1 will come after you and the reporters will come after  
2 me.

3 MR. ADLER: Right. Maybe they'll talk to  
4 me first. I'm sure you're right, though. But one  
5 option would be for me to go ahead and say here is my  
6 intent, anyone who has residual concerns should feel  
7 free to tell people they don't know all the facts  
8 they'd like to know and they want to talk to the  
9 Department of Energy about it and DOE would be happy  
10 to talk to you about it.

11 In the interim DOE is comfortable with its  
12 ideas and comfortable that there are enough people  
13 who are sufficiently informed of it and comfortable  
14 with it that they should proceed, take the risk, and  
15 goes ahead and starts doing it.

16 MS. DREY: I brought the data that I was  
17 given on picocuries per gram and the levee and so  
18 forth along with me today and I'm meeting with David  
19 Miller afterwards of SAIC to ask him some questions  
20 and I'm sure anyone who would like to sit in on that  
21 would be very welcome.

22 MR. GRANT: I was just going to suggest,  
23 obviously it's been looked at, some recommendations  
24 have been made, maybe some type of scope could be  
25 developed, not a real big document but a couple of

1 pages describing just what's going to be done.  
2 That's what people seem to be asking for.

3 MR. ADLER: We've already done that, and  
4 that was what was presented to the last group and we  
5 can just share that to a broader audience. I just  
6 hadn't intended to today bring this group to the same  
7 level of detail that we brought the other group  
8 through earlier.

9 MR. MANNING: Being one of those fortunate  
10 ones that is a member of the Priorities Working  
11 Group, I make the motion that we go ahead and accept  
12 this project using current funds out the '96 budget  
13 and that we adopt the cleanup plan that has been  
14 proposed.

15 We request that DOE submit a copy of that  
16 basically for the record, include in the record.  
17 Since that plan has been both presented to and  
18 basically concurred by the Department of Natural  
19 Resources for the state of Missouri and that we just  
20 go ahead and get the trail cleaned up and move on.

21 MR. EBERLE: Second that.

22 MS. STEWARD: We would like to add one  
23 contingency to our approval of Option III and that is  
24 we're waiting for the state Department of Health to  
25 approve this cleanup level on a risk basis and we're

1 not expecting that for another two to three weeks is  
2 my understanding. We're willing to go with the III  
3 conditioned upon the Department of Health's approval  
4 of the cleanup level.

5 THE FACILITATOR: Is there any reaction to  
6 that? Okay. Is there anymore discussion on the  
7 motion?

8 MR. MANNING: I was going to ask is that  
9 going to cause a problem as far as the time frame.

10 MR. ADLER: I don't think so. I'm very  
11 comfortable that I can predict the result.

12 MR. MANNING: In that case, I'll accept  
13 that as amendment to the motion.

14 THE FACILITATOR: You're saying that you're  
15 accepting that as an amendment, that qualification --

16 MR. MANNING: Right.

17 THE FACILITATOR: -- that this is as far as  
18 you are concerned you are proposing that the project  
19 go forward subject to review and approval by the  
20 state Department of Health.

21 MR. MANNING: Correct. I think George has  
22 concurred with his second.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Any additional discussion  
24 on the motion as amended? Shall we call the  
25 question? All those in favor of the motion please

1 signify by saying aye? Opposed? The motion carries  
2 unanimously. Are there any abstentions?

3 MS. FLYNN: Nay.

4 THE FACILITATOR: I'm sorry, I didn't hear  
5 that. Thank you. There is one nay. Yes, Ric.

6 MR. CAVANAGH: And one abstention.

7 THE FACILITATOR: And one abstention, Mr.  
8 Cavanagh. Okay. If there is nothing more on that  
9 subject we can move to item number five which is a  
10 report of the Remediation Options Working Group and  
11 I'd like to explain briefly what has gone on and what  
12 documentation exists so we can anticipate the sort of  
13 question that Ric just raised with respect to the  
14 Riverfront Trail.

15 The Remediation Options Working Group is  
16 actually a special -- it was a series of two special  
17 meetings of the Task Force. All members, all  
18 participants on the Task Force were invited to these  
19 meetings, their occurrence was the result of Jack  
20 Fraunhoffer's suggestion at the June Task Force  
21 Meeting that while we seemed close to reaching  
22 closure, close enough to at least start on our way  
23 toward first draft of a final report, we weren't  
24 quite there in his estimation. And he thought that  
25 we needed a forum that would allow people an

1 opportunity to speak in detail about which type of  
2 cleanup -- and when I say that I'm talking about the  
3 four Roman numeral options that the Task Force  
4 identified earlier in the spring, which type of  
5 cleanup was suitable in each person's estimation for  
6 each of the ten component sites that were  
7 identified. And that probably sounds like Greek to  
8 many of you, but the information is available if you  
9 would like it see it.

10               So the first of those meetings was held on  
11 June 25. And there is a set of approved, not minutes  
12 actually, but summary notes from that meeting. This  
13 handout is on the table at the front of the room.  
14 There are still copies of it up there. The group  
15 consisted of about 15 people that night, including  
16 both EPA and MDNR representatives, and they spoke  
17 from their regulatory points of view and then we  
18 started through a process of initially the principal  
19 interested party for each of the ten component sites,  
20 assuming there was one, speaking up and saying this  
21 is how I envision the future for our site.

22               Anna Ginsburg, for example, spoke for the  
23 city and the airport authority with respect to the  
24 airport site and the ballfields. Jan Titus  
25 supplemented her remarks, as I recall.



1                   And went through a succession of that sort  
2 of conversation in the first meeting and then we met  
3 again last Wednesday night, July 10, and brought that  
4 process to closure. We then presented each  
5 participant with an opportunity to speak whether or  
6 not he or she had a direct interest in a particular  
7 site there was nevertheless an opportunity to say  
8 what he or she thought ought to be the appropriate  
9 remedy for each site.

10                   That meeting has not yet been documented.  
11 Or at least the documentation has not been circulated  
12 to the entire Task Force because the meeting occurred  
13 just last Wednesday night. There are minutes that  
14 have been handed to most of those who were present  
15 last Wednesday night to give them an opportunity to  
16 review and comment on those minutes. As soon as I've  
17 gotten all the comments, this document will be  
18 finalized and distributed to each of you.

19                   In the meantime, we're strategizing for  
20 today's purposes and we felt we couldn't wait another  
21 month in order to get this information on the table.  
22 And so it was agreed, basically Sally and I agreed,  
23 that we would present an overview of the conclusions  
24 that have been reached which ought to give you a  
25 sense of where we think the Task Force is headed at

1 the moment, where we think the final report will  
2 suggest that DOE head, and then I will give a quick  
3 overview of what went on last Wednesday and the  
4 conclusions that were reached, then each of the  
5 participants who were there last week will have an  
6 opportunity to modify that or say where they  
7 dissented or whatever they want to say and then the  
8 entire Task Force will have an opportunity to  
9 question or comment.

10 The bottom line is that after a lot of  
11 discussion we settled on essentially one or two  
12 options for each site, either an Option III or an  
13 Option IV. There was no consideration in the final  
14 analysis given to Option I or II type cleanups.

15 Option I is essentially no action; Option  
16 II is minimal action on a particular site and I think  
17 the collective agreement among all participants that  
18 we were not considering options 1 and 2. We were  
19 narrowing the consideration to whether Option III or  
20 Option IV type cleanups would be appropriate in each  
21 case.

22 Option III, for those of you who have not  
23 been participating in this process to date, is  
24 essentially removal of hot spots and capping of what  
25 remains. That's a very simplified point of view and

1 the details would change from site to site but  
2 fundamentally we're talking about removing the  
3 hottest material, shipping it somewhere for permanent  
4 disposal and then capping what remains.

5 And an Option IV type cleanup would be  
6 essentially exhumation of all of the contaminated  
7 waste and remote disposal or it could conceivably be  
8 disposal on-site under certain circumstances as you  
9 will hear about in a minute.

10 As you will recall, the entire St. Louis  
11 site was broken into ten component parts and when all  
12 the dust settled as of last Wednesday night, the  
13 recommendations that were adopted, I believe by  
14 consensus among all those participating, were as  
15 follows:

16 Option III type cleanups were approved for  
17 the Riverfront Trail, as you have heard earlier  
18 today, for the Mallinckrodt plant site downtown, and  
19 Mallinckrodt representatives will be available to  
20 speak to the rationale behind that; to West Lake  
21 landfill and to the lower portion of Coldwater  
22 Creek. And there will be ample opportunity to  
23 discuss why the creek has been divided into two  
24 sections. And by the way not everyone agrees with  
25 that conclusion but it is the consensus.

1           Option IV type cleanups which would mean  
2 excavation or exhumation of the contaminated material  
3 and disposal of it in appropriate circumstances.  
4 Option IV remediations were approved for  
5 recommendation for a SLAPS, and by that I mean the  
6 principal airport site. We sometimes speak of it  
7 within the fence.

8           The SLAPS vicinity properties which would  
9 mean all of the North County haul routes and vicinity  
10 properties, the ballfields, the downtown vicinity  
11 properties and the distinction there is that they are  
12 properties that are not controlled. They are  
13 privately owned and they're generally accessible.  
14 Another consideration was that they're generally  
15 modest volumes and therefore it's not a particular  
16 challenging undertaking, the HISS piles above grade  
17 and below and the upper portions of Coldwater Creek.

18           With respect to Coldwater Creek there  
19 hasn't been a definitive demarkation point between  
20 upper and lower but essentially the distinction that  
21 was discussed has to do with the area of the creek  
22 that is adjacent to SLAPS and that runs through  
23 industrialized or highly developed areas as distinct  
24 from the lower portions of the creek which tend to be  
25 more bucolic and therefore worthy of preservation in

1 their current state as much as possible.

2 So that's the overview. What I'd like to  
3 do is suggest that we simply go around the room and  
4 that those people who participated in the development  
5 of these recommendations elaborate as they see fit.  
6 and I'd like to start over here with Jack.

7 MR. FRAUENHOFFER: I presented the  
8 perspective for Mallinckrodt and we were looking at  
9 an Option III cleanup. The reason for that is that  
10 the area that that plant is built on is basically  
11 fill material already so it doesn't make a lot of  
12 sense to try to clean up that site. I guess I'll  
13 call it to residential Greenfield type standards when  
14 you're in a fill arena to begin with. There's also  
15 an ongoing active chemical plant that's been there  
16 for a 130 years, and it's my intent to retire from  
17 there in about another ten, and I hope it goes for  
18 another hundred or more after that at least. So  
19 there is not a lot of reason to go for an Option IV  
20 for that particular facility.

21 For the same reasons, and I'll talk a  
22 little bit about the Riverfront Trail because it's  
23 contiguous to our property, the same reasoning  
24 applies there. It's fill area beneath that. You  
25 also have a levee that's an integral part of the

1 flood control plan for the area. If the integrity of  
2 that levee is damaged you end up with the potential  
3 for inundating the whole industrial arena from the  
4 riverfront area in north St. Louis all the way down  
5 to Anheuser-Busch in south St. Louis because it's  
6 connected by huge interceptor beneath the ground  
7 facility. So we don't want to interfere with the  
8 functioning of that particular levee.

9 The other areas that I spoke to were the  
10 vicinity properties. And my recommendation there is  
11 that would be Option IV because those are private  
12 properties and they don't have the same level of  
13 management available that Mallinckrodt provides for  
14 its property.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Jack.

16 MR. RODEN: I was present at the meetings  
17 and was more of an observer than I was actually  
18 making presentations as to any particular properties  
19 affected or any particular site. On that particular  
20 evening, I did not vote and I abstained from voting  
21 until I had acquired a little bit more information  
22 from the administration of St. Louis County.

23 And I had my own personal perspectives of  
24 things that were going on but we were not -- although  
25 we have a generic interest obviously in the welfare

1 of each particular site in St. Louis County, we did  
2 not present a presentation on each particular site.

3 We are prepared to vote in the future but  
4 from information that I have inquired now, but at  
5 that time I was not prepared.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Conn. I'm  
7 looking around the room to see who was there. I'm  
8 thinking particularly of last Wednesday night. Elsa,  
9 do you want to elaborate at all on what I have said  
10 in the way of overview?

11 MS. STEWARD: I don't think so at this  
12 time.

13 THE FACILITATOR: No? Okay. Dave, you  
14 were a participate.

15 MR. ADLER: The pizza was great and I  
16 didn't vote.

17 THE FACILITATOR: The pizza wasn't that  
18 great. The pizza was adequate.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: You know, I think it was  
20 a good meeting and I basically came out on the same  
21 side as all of the things you just overviewed except  
22 for West Lake. I didn't vote on West Lake. I didn't  
23 feel like I know enough about West Lake to do that.  
24 But I knew it wouldn't be a IV so, you know, that's  
25 about the best I could do on that.

1           The creek became a pretty big issue for me  
2 personally in a way that it hadn't been in the past.  
3 As we discussed it -- I don't know how many of you on this  
4 Task Force are really familiar with Coldwater Creek  
5 from the airport area all the way out to the Missouri  
6 River or the Mississippi, but it has a very woodsy,  
7 rustic kind of a feel down toward the distal end, I  
8 call it, of the creek. And there are wild life that  
9 winter over. I mean, you can drive by -- I've seen  
10 various hawks and things though the winter. It's a  
11 real pretty area of the creek.

12           And when Dave was explaining about the  
13 Option IV cleanup and what type action that actually  
14 would take and the form of, he mentioned bulldozers  
15 and things of that sort, so I envisioned these  
16 hundred year old trees being knocked down and so  
17 forth and for the sake of contamination in the middle  
18 of this stream in the sediment that very few people  
19 really would be in contact with.

20           So it started to kind of develop in my mind  
21 that we could hit this in two forms and maybe do a  
22 level IV up high where it really is, through  
23 industrial use and so forth more or less a trash bin  
24 in certain areas. I mean, there's bottles and all  
25 kinds of dirt. And to clean that out would be



1 improvement. But to do spot cleanup further down and  
2 try to be as least impacting upon the creek as  
3 possible to me would be a much more sensible  
4 approach.

5 But, you know, again I don't know a lot of  
6 the details. And Peggy Hermes was there, and she was  
7 representing the coalition, and I had occasion to  
8 speak with her last night and I hope that Roger can  
9 help shed some light for us. He was aware of someone  
10 who was familiar with the creek but maybe if you were  
11 able to reach him last night you would have some  
12 opinion on that. Do you have anything to add?

13 MR. PRYOR: Yes, I'd be glad to add if this  
14 is the appropriate time. I was not able to reach  
15 John. John Lark was out of town all last week and  
16 will be back Sunday sometime and both Peggy and I  
17 missed him. He was at his office for a while. He  
18 had been away from his family for a week so he and  
19 his wife and kids went to celebrate somewhere and  
20 what time they got back I'm sure it was after ten  
21 because they still were not answering their phone.

22 At any rate, John is a landscape architect  
23 in Webster Groves and back in 1977 the voters in St.  
24 Louis County passed a park bond issue which included  
25 at the time a look at the creation of possible linear

1 parks along several creeks in St. Louis County. And  
2 John was the architect who got the contract to do  
3 these studies. And one of the creeks they looked at  
4 quite extensively was Coldwater Creek.

5 I have all his reports and everything. And  
6 John was aware at the time of the contamination  
7 issue. And my recollection, and I want to talk to  
8 him to confirm this, was he thought it was possible  
9 to clean up the creek without impacting the natural  
10 -- I mean, the creek is not pristine in the sense  
11 that I consider pristine because it is contaminated.  
12 Not only that there's an old landfill that cuts  
13 through back in there and there's a lot of other  
14 stuff in the creek. The water quality could  
15 definitely be improved. But that lower end, the  
16 lower three miles or so certainly by St. Louis  
17 standards looks like a pretty neat area. And no one  
18 denies that.

19 And what I would like to suggest, and I  
20 don't know how our time frame is but if I can get  
21 ahold of John today and if he could make an opinion,  
22 you know, available to this group as to what he  
23 thinks would be possible to do down there and maybe  
24 need to consult with Dave to get a sense of what  
25 would be necessary from his point of view, I would

1 like to get, you know, someone who has experience in  
2 doing this kind of park restoration and cleanup work  
3 in an area trying to protect the natural qualities  
4 before we make the final decision on that.

5 I'm sorry that he was out town and I wasn't  
6 able to get ahold of him. But, like I say, he  
7 probably knows that creek as well as anybody and I'm  
8 sure he would be more than happy to lend his  
9 assistance to us.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, I think that's the  
11 kind of information that I know I need. I would like  
12 to see us do a marginal cleanup in that area, but a  
13 good enough cleanup. I mean, that's the question.  
14 So I'm not positive on the three level of cleanup in  
15 that area but I am hoping that that is attainable.

16 THE FACILITATOR: The fundamental issue  
17 here is how can you get the creek clean enough to be  
18 safe and not destroy it at the same time and that's  
19 why it was divided into two categories. And it  
20 seemed based on what we thought we knew last  
21 Wednesday night that an Option III seemed to be the  
22 right approach for the lower end and an Option IV for  
23 the upper end.

24 MS. DREY: I did want to say that I think  
25 that it's correct that not all of the people who

1 attended the second pizza meeting agree on the  
2 distinctions within Coldwater Creek. You know, one  
3 of my concerns is not only the beauty of the creek as  
4 a linear park but the creek flows into the Missouri  
5 River upstream from where the city of St. Louis gets  
6 its drinking water at the Chain of Rocks Water  
7 Treatment Plant. Even though that is on the  
8 Mississippi River, it's Missouri River water and then  
9 Coldwater Creek flows into the city of St. Louis's  
10 drinking water source.

11 I also want to say that I don't believe  
12 that everyone agreed on Option III for West Lake  
13 landfill either because it is in the Missouri River  
14 flood plain. In fact, is upstream from where the  
15 city of Florissant gets its drinking water intake or  
16 at least there is an intake in Florissant just below  
17 West Lake landfill.

18 And I guess my only other question, Jim,  
19 was when you described Option IV for the group just  
20 now, you said I believe exhumation, meaning digging  
21 up buried stuff and disposal in an appropriate  
22 location. As I understand it, it's disposal away  
23 from Metropolitan St. Louis. Or taking it away not  
24 it leaving it on-site. I thought that was a part of  
25 Option IV.

1           THE FACILITATOR: The reason I expressed it  
2 that way was that there was a discussion about  
3 whether there were any circumstances under which a  
4 more local disposal than the types we have been  
5 talking about would be suitable. And by "more local"  
6 I don't necessarily mean in St. Louis County or at  
7 the airport even but might be a regional solution  
8 whether there are any circumstances under which that  
9 might work.

10           And the response from the Missouri  
11 Department of Natural Resources, which I think is  
12 consistent with everything I've heard from that  
13 agency for as long as I have been involved, was that  
14 theoretically yes if a cell were properly  
15 constructed. And the definition of a properly  
16 constructed cell has not been finally determined, I  
17 think that's a site specific issue. But nevertheless  
18 if one were to be properly designed then  
19 theoretically a regional disposal facility might be  
20 acceptable to at least that agency.

21           The question remains whether -- there are  
22 several questions -- whether that is feasible and  
23 whether there is any financial advantage to that  
24 approach. So I didn't want to foreclose it if it  
25 wasn't appropriate.

1 MS. DREY: I can't remember, though, what  
2 it said on Option IV when we all went through those  
3 things.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Yes. I don't have the  
5 matrix with me. Sarah is telling me that it doesn't  
6 specify a disposal site. It simply says excavation  
7 and disposal. And I think the idea was -- first of  
8 all, we were dealing with ten different sites and  
9 there were different conditions that we were trying  
10 to grapple with so there even may have been slightly  
11 different wording from site to site.

12 MS. DREY: Elsa, can you describe just  
13 really briefly what the state would allow for, you  
14 know, what Jim was saying the state would agree to  
15 on-site disposal.

16 MS. STEWARD: We're not taking a position  
17 on that at this time. We would have to find out what  
18 would be involved with that on-site disposal and  
19 whether it would be sufficiently protective.

20 THE FACILITATOR: The only model we have  
21 that I have heard referred to is the model  
22 established at Weldon Spring. And that at least  
23 offers a circumstance that has been reviewed and  
24 approved by the Missouri Department of Natural  
25 Resources. It is within the region. In many ways is

1 instructive. It isn't necessarily conclusive I don't  
2 think but it helps.

3 MR. PRYOR: I think we've been down this  
4 slippery slope before but this is one of the  
5 situations where -- I think everyone here knows the  
6 original proposal deal was the idea of making a cell,  
7 a bunker, whatever, at the airport site expanding  
8 northward over what's now the ballfields and some  
9 larger area there approaching I think 80 acres or  
10 more and it seems to me that that's the only site in  
11 St. Louis city and county that I understand was ever  
12 under consideration for that.

13 If the recommendation of the group which  
14 seems to be going that ballfields and the airport  
15 site be cleaned up to level IV and as I understand  
16 the city is not interested in having this sort of a  
17 facility there as have the voters previously and, you  
18 know, we sort of went around this before. I guess  
19 the question that always comes back to me is we're  
20 talking about a possible local regional site.  
21 Exactly where is that, because I don't think there is  
22 one that anyone is going to agree to.

23 The other possibility is, indeed, the  
24 Weldon Spring bunker which I think presents political  
25 problems, all sorts of political problems, which I

1 doubt the state would want to get in to. But I know  
2 at the time -- it's no longer in his district but the  
3 time that site was agreed upon it was Congressman  
4 Volkmer who had that site at one time in District 9  
5 and made it very clear that people in St. Charles  
6 County would take care of their own stuff but there  
7 would be hell to pay if they were asked to take on  
8 anyone else's waste. So I just want to know frankly  
9 where this local site is that we keep talking about.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Nobody has suggested it.  
11 But I was simply responding to Kay's question about  
12 disposal and how specific the recommendation is in  
13 that regard.

14 MR. BINZ: Jim, I supported the Option IV  
15 cleanup for the haul route and vicinity properties  
16 primarily from the perspective of utility workers  
17 health and safety. At this point in time the gas  
18 company, as an example, does not maintain OSHA  
19 1910.120 training certification for utility workers  
20 excavating any contaminated material. It was that  
21 perspective primarily that led my management to  
22 deciding for a Class IV option.

23 There was another reason as well probably  
24 worth mentioning. At one point in time, utility  
25 companies were in support of a clean corridor



1 concept. That concept where a clean area would be  
2 provided for utility companies to relocate utility  
3 systems, be reimbursed for those costs for  
4 relocation. It appears, though, that that concept  
5 seems to be falling away and it appears to be more  
6 consensus in terms of a more aggressive cleanup so  
7 that I think ultimately led to the decision for a  
8 Class IV cleanup.

9 THE FACILITATOR: Now, there were two other  
10 participants at last Wednesday's meeting who are not  
11 voting members of this Task Force but who are active  
12 participants at the working group level and regular  
13 attendees at these meetings.

14 Peggy Hermes, do you have anything to add?  
15 No? Okay. And Mitch Scherzinger, where are you?  
16 You don't have anything to add either. Okay. That  
17 covers all of the people who participated in last  
18 Wednesday's meeting.

19 Now, for the rest of you are there  
20 questions or comments that you would like to put on  
21 the table? Okay.

22 What we will do is -- I don't know whether  
23 I said this or not, bear with me if I did, I am  
24 distributing to those who did participate last  
25 Wednesday draft minutes from that meeting. I am

1 asking that those of you who haven't gotten them yet  
2 please make sure you get them before you leave the  
3 room today and that you go through the minutes and  
4 fax to me any proposed amendments to this draft. And  
5 Sarah and I will then produce the approved version of  
6 these minutes and send them out to everyone on the  
7 Task Force. So as soon as I get the comments, we  
8 will develop the final approved version.

9 MR. PRYOR: A procedural question. When I  
10 was mentioning John Lark, Sally seemed interested in  
11 hearing what he had to say and I took from Dave  
12 Adler's nod that he'd probably welcome talking to him  
13 as well. If I get ahold of John today and get him  
14 involved, how could we best make his information  
15 available to everybody in a way that would be  
16 useful?

17 THE FACILITATOR: Either of two ways. What  
18 I have been assuming -- the (b) half of the  
19 proposition we could call another special meeting of  
20 this group. And actually when I say special meeting  
21 I'm talking about all of you being invited, all Task  
22 Force members, we happen to call it the Remediation  
23 Options Working Group but you are all welcome. We  
24 could do another one of those for that special  
25 purpose if that seems appropriate.

1           Alternatively, and what I have been  
2     assuming would happen starting today, is that -- or  
3     starting tomorrow morning actually, I will start  
4     drafting the initial draft of the final Task Force  
5     report. My objective is to have that draft completed  
6     ideally by a week from Friday, ten days from today.  
7     I may need the weekend but it will either be on its  
8     way to you as of a week from Friday or not later than  
9     the following Monday, twelve days from now.

10           Once you have that initial draft I am  
11     certain there will be all sorts of questions, there  
12     will be all sorts of proposals for refinement, there  
13     will be all sorts of negotiation that will have to go  
14     on in order to tighten the draft up. And I expect  
15     that sort of conversation to dominate at the August  
16     Task Force meeting and so it would be possible if it  
17     seemed appropriate, Roger, to have John participate  
18     at the August Task Force meeting.

19           I'm actually dealing with the next item on  
20     the agenda, we might as well just finish it, Item 6,  
21     and that is you will have an initial draft in  
22     approximately two weeks. I would ask that you engage  
23     in whatever conversation seems appropriate to you,  
24     whether it's among yourselves or whether it is  
25     comments that you want to direct to me, whether it is

1 comments or questions that you want to address to the  
2 Department of Energy or any other way you want to  
3 communicate in order to get from the initial draft to  
4 clarifying your thoughts for development of a second  
5 draft. If you do that prior to the August meeting of  
6 the Task Force, August 20, so you would have  
7 approximately three weeks in which to accomplish all  
8 of that.

9           We will come together on August 20, we will  
10 engage in whatever discussion seems appropriate then  
11 and I hope to be able to leave that meeting with  
12 enough information to refine that initial draft in  
13 five days time. So it's essential that you come  
14 prepared for debate or persuasion or whatever you  
15 think is right and you help me by -- if you can give  
16 me written documents, whatever you can do that will  
17 enable me to get the second draft, a highly refined  
18 second draft generated in five days time, that would  
19 put us at approximately August 25 and we are  
20 scheduled to meet again then on the seventeenth of  
21 September at which time to agree on a final report  
22 and recommendation to the Department of Energy.

23           We would also propose to squeeze into that  
24 narrow window between the end of August and the  
25 seventeenth of September an opportunity for public

1 review and comment on this refined second draft. So  
2 the notion is as soon as we have the second draft out  
3 we would distribute it not only to the Task Force but  
4 to our extensive mailing list which would include  
5 anybody who has ever expressed an interest in this  
6 subject. And we would schedule a public meeting  
7 probably during -- perhaps September 10,  
8 approximately a week prior to the Task Force meeting,  
9 so there would be an opportunity to hear public  
10 reaction and to incorporate that into our final  
11 deliberations on the seventeenth.

12 So as of shortly after the seventeenth of  
13 September I would expect us to have a final document  
14 and we are scheduled to present that to the  
15 Department of Energy one week later on Tuesday,  
16 September 24 in this room.

17 Questions?

18 MR. CAVANAGH: First of all, I appreciate  
19 the time frame you've got yourself into on that one,  
20 that'll be tough.

21 THE FACILITATOR: I didn't get myself into  
22 it, you guys got me into it.

23 MR. CAVANAGH: I guess several concerns.  
24 One is that this Task Force has not received the  
25 report from the Technology Assessment Group which I

1 understand is meeting this afternoon, am I correct?

2 THE FACILITATOR: That's correct.

3 MR. CAVANAGH: And that raises concern at  
4 least among a few folks, you know, that I've talked  
5 about because apparently there are a number of issues  
6 out there relative to what technology might be  
7 utilized, how that impacts cost, volume, et cetera.  
8 And I, frankly, am concerned, significantly  
9 concerned, that this Task Force has not been privy  
10 to, you know, some of that final information and so  
11 that's a key issue.

12 THE FACILITATOR: That point was made, as  
13 you will see when you finally get these minutes, at  
14 the July 10 meeting, just last Wednesday night. The  
15 question was posed what outstanding issues are there,  
16 what pieces of information are there that we really  
17 ought to have in order to develop a final report?  
18 And the one that was brought up was that the  
19 Technologies Working Group has not presented a report  
20 and recommendations to the Task Force.

21 There is a meeting scheduled for two  
22 o'clock this afternoon. The Technologies Working  
23 Group has been considering one technology of late --  
24 considered a host of them initially. The one that is  
25 being considered is ex-situ vitrification and it is

1 hoped that after this afternoon's meeting there will  
2 be a report and recommendation forthcoming. If  
3 that's the case, it will be mailed promptly to  
4 everyone.

5           The overriding notion I think is that any  
6 technology that may prove to have application at any  
7 portion of our site, or at the entire site, would fit  
8 into the equation neatly regardless of when it  
9 becomes apparent that it's suitable. And by that I  
10 mean what we're talking about basically is volume  
11 reduction. And if the final recommendation of this  
12 Task Force is essentially let's excavate this  
13 material and ship it somewhere for disposal to the  
14 extent that we reduce volume we are enhancing, it  
15 would seem, our ability to accomplish that goal. So  
16 I'm not sure that it has to be absolutely sequential  
17 that we know everything before we can develop our --

18           MR. CAVANAGH: I hear what you're saying,  
19 I'm not sure I would agree with that.

20           (Nancy Lubiewski entered the meeting at 9:10  
21 a.m.)

22           MR. CAVANAGH: The second issue, and it's  
23 all related, is the time frame that I'm hearing  
24 relative to budget development in Washington. At  
25 this point in time those numbers are being crunched,

1 the DOE and everybody else, relative to what fiscal  
2 '97 is going to be. And even with, you know, you  
3 really hustling and getting our final report and so  
4 forth together that's probably going -- if we develop  
5 the report and approve it, say, on the seventeenth of  
6 September, correct me if I'm wrong from anybody else  
7 who knows differently, that's probably past the time  
8 in all likelihood that the federal budget for some of  
9 these projects for fiscal '97 will be established.

10 Does anybody know or can speak to that?

11 MR. ADLER: I can speak very generally and  
12 then Les Price who is scheduled to speak a little  
13 later can speak probably in a more informed way.

14 There have been two messages sent to DOE.  
15 Of course, the governor has sent a letter saying give  
16 us 40 million I think for '97. This group has sent  
17 resolution, not specifying a number but just saying  
18 we're looking for a lot because it's a big job. The  
19 actual process for setting the budget within Congress  
20 of course can continue well into '97, as it did this  
21 year, so I don't think there is a dropdead date so to  
22 speak that we can or have missed. It's more of an  
23 ongoing process and there are those early messages  
24 that I think have been sent pretty clearly. I think  
25 Less will have more to add to that later.



1 THE FACILITATOR: Sally?

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: I just generally want to  
3 remind -- I mean, I know you know this but it needs  
4 to be focused on -- that this is a multi, multi-year  
5 project and we can't be rushing things just for the  
6 sake of the next fiscal year. It's a wise move what  
7 we did with the resolution but everything doesn't  
8 need to be, in my opinion, generated on that basis.

9 MR. CAVANAGH: I hear what you're saying.  
10 Let me finish my thoughts on this. There are some  
11 political considerations, this being an election  
12 year. It's a far more political issue than a  
13 rational issue, I guess is what I'm saying. And I  
14 think, you know, we need to maximize our position.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure.

16 MR. CAVANAGH: And if the election year is  
17 the time to maximize it, I'd say go for it. So I  
18 would like to make a motion that this Task Force  
19 reconvene a week from today at which time we receive  
20 a report from the Technologies Working Group,  
21 whatever the title of the group is, and perhaps Roger  
22 making another contact with -- was it Mr. Lark? --  
23 that might be an appropriate time so that we would  
24 have, you know, all that information, have facts and  
25 figures that perhaps would help you a little bit even

1    though, you know, you're going to be in the middle of  
2    it anyway, thank God for word processors, but  
3    likewise I think would give all of us a greater  
4    picture of information and facts relative to putting  
5    that together so I would so move that we meet again  
6    next week, same time,, same station.

7                   MR. CONANT:   I'll second that.

8                   MR. EBERLE:   Early on we had had  
9    discussions about the need for dealing with the  
10   public relations components and the community  
11   awareness components and political action components  
12   that would be required if we were to aggressively get  
13   the resources that we needed to do the job that we  
14   thought had to be done, not do the job that other  
15   people were giving us money to do.  So I think that  
16   we began by saying that the task was not just  
17   budgeting the \$15 million but the task was to do the  
18   job that everybody expected to get done.  And one of  
19   key ways of doing that was to recognize some of the  
20   points that Ric is making and to structure our  
21   activities in a way to assure that that occurred.

22                   As I recall, our decision was well we had  
23   to begin to get the plan together and we had to  
24   decide what it was we wanted and we tended to defer a  
25   broader community understanding of the problem and a

1 broader political action framework for dealing with  
2 those things.

3           So my question is would not this be the  
4 time to consider a concurrent track that we pursue  
5 just as we've done, which I think you've all done  
6 exceptionally, but at the same time we now begin to  
7 look at how do we gather public opinion for dealing  
8 with the larger tasks and bring together a committee  
9 or a group that would begin to look at how we might  
10 accomplish that.

11           In a sense then we would not be put in a  
12 position that Ric was put in as how do we take  
13 advantage of that opportunity and deal with these  
14 things in a piecemeal way but rather we could have a  
15 structured plan for community awareness.

16           MS. DREY: I think also speaking in favor  
17 of the motion, Ric Cavanagh's motion that there be a  
18 meeting a week from today, I feel that it would be  
19 good if the Task Force could give you, Jim, a little  
20 more direction about what should go in the report  
21 before it's written particularly with respect to  
22 prioritizing the cleanup.

23           And I did introduce a motion at the last  
24 Task Force meeting, which still has been tabled, and  
25 I believe that it would be good if the Task Force

1 could address that motion which says that the airport  
2 site should be our primary remediation site.

3 But I think that there are people on the  
4 Task Force who feel that they would like more  
5 information before they vote on that motion so I  
6 would like to -- I don't know the rules about  
7 Robert's Rules of Order, and most other rules either  
8 about meetings as you all notice. I even called the  
9 downtown public library and said how do you get  
10 something off the table and there was just all  
11 chaos. Nobody knows.

12 THE FACILITATOR: That's why I questioned  
13 whether it really ought to be tabled. I wanted to  
14 clarify the issue and then Ric wasn't certain I  
15 handled that right and so I went out and bought  
16 Robert's Rules of Order.

17 MS. DREY: It doesn't matter. They were  
18 looking at the modern Robert's Rules of Order, there  
19 are various versions. No one knows, including my  
20 husband.

21 THE FACILITATOR: I have the fourteenth or  
22 the ninth edition, I'm not sure which it is, but I  
23 think for our purposes we should, as I said last  
24 month, I don't think we ought to be so hidebound by  
25 rules as much -- we ought to be guided by them, but

1 we ought to accomplish what we set out to  
2 accomplish.

3 MS. DREY: I just didn't know if you table  
4 something -- somebody told me if you table it, it has  
5 to come up automatically the next meeting.

6 MR. CAVANAGH: If I could speak. It  
7 remains as an issue of old business and then it would  
8 require a motion and a vote from the committee to  
9 remove it from the table and put it back on the  
10 table.

11 MS. DREY: Today it has to do that?

12 MR. CAVANAGH: No, any time.

13 THE FACILITATOR: No, it doesn't have to be  
14 today.

15 MR. CAVANAGH: It can stay there in  
16 perpetuity I guess.

17 THE FACILITATOR: We will get to old  
18 business in just a second.

19 MS. DREY: Well, anyway just speaking on  
20 behalf of Ric Cavanagh's motion I think it would be  
21 helpful. Although we've been meeting for 612 months,  
22 once a month, I think it would helpful now that it's  
23 down at the end of our time, I think it would be very  
24 helpful if we could have a meeting a week from today.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. There are three

1 people now who have spoken clearly in favor of that.  
2 Anybody else want to address that issue?

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, I'll address both  
4 Ric's and George's comments. And I agree with Ric, I  
5 think it's a good idea to do that because of the  
6 timeliness of that information for your purposes for  
7 the draft. We might as well try and put out as good  
8 a first draft as possible.

9 And for George, are you suggesting then  
10 that some members of this group maybe form some sort  
11 of a lobbying type group to work on funding for the  
12 large project, is that what you're suggesting?

13 MR. EBERLE: I would stay away from the  
14 choice of words like lobby. But I do think that when  
15 you prepare the draft, the draft should be prepared  
16 in a way that empowers us as a Task Force and  
17 empowers our communities to aggressively move forward  
18 on the larger plan. And that if we didn't pay some  
19 attention that in the preparation of the draft, we  
20 might lose some opportunities to set ourselves or to  
21 stage ourselves for that forward action. In other  
22 words, I would hate to see us say okay we've done it,  
23 the report is in, now we all go home. I think the  
24 job is that we move forward to make sure that all of  
25 those things happen and that's going to require a

1 different way of looking at the problem. And I do  
2 think a subcommittee might be helpful in doing that  
3 if that's what we choose to do.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, thanks.

5 THE FACILITATOR: Any additional comments  
6 on the motion? There is a motion on the floor. Yes,  
7 Roger.

8 MR. PRYOR: Well, I would like to talk  
9 about George's thing if I could, but I'm certainly in  
10 favor of Ric's motion.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Well, we'll come  
12 back to your point. Roger has something to add to  
13 it. Let's see if we can come to closure on the  
14 motion that's on the table. Yes, Jim.

15 MR. GRANT: As far as us getting back  
16 together again next week, what would be the agenda?  
17 I mean are we going to have enough things  
18 accomplished to really discuss things.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Well, the proposal is  
20 that we would integrate information that presumably  
21 would be available to us from the Technologies  
22 Working Group.

23 MS. DREY: John Lark, also.

24 THE FACILITATOR: And John Lark. So there  
25 are two pieces of information that presumably would

1 be available to us within the next week that would  
2 perhaps have an impact on where we go.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: In addition to that I was  
4 rereading a letter that Hazel O'Leary had sent to, I  
5 believe it was Congressman Talent, and in the last  
6 paragraph she mentioned that there would be some  
7 further data clarifying some of the cost estimates by  
8 July 31. Is that your understanding?

9 MR. HORGAN: That's correct. The cost  
10 estimates are preliminary and that they are working  
11 on revised figures to give a better assessment of the  
12 cost and they would have something to us right around  
13 July 31.

14 MS. DREY: About what, Tom?

15 MR. HORGAN: The Congressman as you know  
16 wrote the letter to Hazel O'Leary inquiring about the  
17 cost of excavation, off-site disposal and what have  
18 you -- full cleanup.

19 MS. DREY: Of the airport site?

20 MR. HORGAN: Yes. And since this Task  
21 Force began, we've seen preliminary estimates from  
22 DOE that range from 800 to 900 million. We've gotten  
23 feedback from different groups that that might be  
24 inflated. So we have made an inquiry on that, that  
25 we have to get an accurate assessment of the costs.



1 We got the letter back. It really didn't say a lot  
2 except that those early costs were preliminary and  
3 that they're in the process of working on a better  
4 assessment of the costs and they should have  
5 something relevant to show us in terms of numbers  
6 right around July 31, 1996.

7 THE FACILITATOR: I have made note of three  
8 issues now. We can certainly inquire and determine  
9 whether there is --

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: There may not be any  
11 information by next Tuesday then if they said the  
12 thirty-first. We're a week ahead of that.

13 MR. HORGAN: As soon as I get any  
14 information on it, I'll definitely let you know.  
15 There's no question about that.

16 MS. DREY: I don't know that the Task Force  
17 has been asked to find the cheapest cleanup or the  
18 fastest or the most permanent or anything. I think  
19 we're sort being asked what do we want done with the  
20 St. Louis site wastes. But I do think if the working  
21 group is meeting this afternoon I think it would be  
22 good if Technologies Working Group could report back  
23 to this Task Force.

24 And again, my interest personally is to try  
25 and have as much input as possible into your report

1 which is going to represent us and I think it would  
2 be much better to have the input before the first  
3 draft rather than after and I would be happy to serve  
4 as part of a committee if you want.

5 I'm just reading about a new word that  
6 everyone has known for years, but I haven't,  
7 wordsmithing. I mean, if we could have a wordsmith  
8 working group?

9 THE FACILITATOR: Are you asking me?

10 MS. DREY: And I'd be willing to help you  
11 with that.

12 THE FACILITATOR: I'm not surprised. I  
13 have assumed --

14 MS. DREY: I have a violin, I can even  
15 accompany myself.

16 THE FACILITATOR: You don't need the  
17 violin, you do not need the violin.

18 First of all, the plan is that the initial  
19 draft ought to -- has assumed all along that you  
20 would do your very best to make sure I understood,  
21 each of you, to make sure I understood what was on  
22 your minds and then it becomes my job to try and  
23 synthesize that into a single document. But that  
24 document would not be distributed beyond the  
25 participants in this Task Force, the initial one. It

1 may be that I'd be off base, it may be that there  
2 would be a lot of things that you would want to  
3 refine before you would want anybody else to see it.  
4 So intentionally it would not go beyond this group in  
5 the first wave. But that if I do a decent job and  
6 you do your wordsmithing well, the second one ought  
7 to be clean enough to be distributed to the public.

8 MS. DREY: Well, I was thinking too of the  
9 motion that I introduced last week, I really feel is  
10 an important one to have this Task Force deliberate  
11 about and vote on.

12 THE FACILITATOR: So we would add that to  
13 the agenda for next week's meeting. Is that what  
14 you're saying?

15 MS. DREY: Right.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

17 MS. DREY: The motion that's on the table.  
18 In fact, I have a proposed addendum and I don't know  
19 how you do that since I don't even know what to do  
20 with the thing that's on the table.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Well, we'll need a week  
22 to research that just to make sure we do it right.

23 MR. CAVANAGH. I think it would be  
24 appropriate to discuss that and then, Kay, maybe at  
25 next week's meeting, you know, introduce it and I'll

1 tell you how you can to do that procedure.

2 MS. DREY: Okay.

3 MR. CAVANAGH: But I think the intent was  
4 to get as much information as possible and to give us  
5 an opportunity to have discussion on some of these  
6 issues so that committee members can ask questions.

7 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Well, there  
8 is a motion. Is there anymore discussion on that  
9 motion?

10 MS. DREY: To have a meeting in one week?

11 THE FACILITATOR: Yes.

12 MS. DREY: Would we be able to meet here?  
13 Is that possible?

14 THE FACILITATOR: Well, we don't know that  
15 yet. But let's first determine whether we want to  
16 meet and then we'll figure out what the logistics  
17 are. We'll assume for the moment that we would be  
18 meeting here but we will confirm that and let you  
19 know right away.

20 So, shall we call the question on that  
21 motion? All those in favor of meeting a week from  
22 today, presumably in this room at the same time  
23 please signify by saying aye? Opposed? It appears  
24 that we will be meeting a week from now and we'll  
25 check before we leave here on the availability of

1 to me. One is to -- well, the main thing is to  
2 advise DOE and there is some indication that our  
3 recommendation won't all be embraced by DOE unless  
4 there is considerable political support, public  
5 support out there to push those issues.

6 And so I think it behooves us if we're  
7 serious about what we come up with in this final  
8 report, and we want to see it done, then I think we  
9 have to address the issue somehow that it's going to  
10 take more than a public hearing and then passing the  
11 support on to DOE to make sure this happens.

12 And I think that's sort of what George is  
13 talking about. And it actually does come down to the  
14 L-word I'm afraid. I don't know how you cut it but  
15 somebody has to be out proselytizing --

16 MS. DREY: Is that liberal?

17 MR. PRYOR: No, it's lobbying. And  
18 lobbying can be either side of the spectrum. But we  
19 have to be in a position where we can proselytize  
20 this report in a way that gives us some meaning and  
21 hopefully public acceptance in the community and  
22 acceptance in the political community.

23 And, you know, I'd like to see us, you  
24 know, go hand in hand with Tom and his boss and the  
25 other members of the delegation and see this come

1 about but it's going to take a lot of I think public  
2 support behind this position. And I don't think it's  
3 going to be DOE's responsibility, nor do I think it's  
4 their intent, to go out and ensure the public support  
5 for the recommendation of this Task Force.

6 So I think George's point is well taken and  
7 maybe something we need to talk about a little bit  
8 too, where do we go once we reach our decision.

9 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

10 MR. CAVANAGH: To the political issue, it's  
11 my understanding there have been some conversations  
12 already with some of our congressmen and so forth and  
13 there is a good bit of bipartisan support. I know  
14 coming from the mayor's office, the county executive  
15 office and so forth. The governor's office has been  
16 alluded to so that's very positive. So I would ditto  
17 those comments and I think we do need a strategy to  
18 -- you know, this is kind of a good news, bad news  
19 situation. I'm glad that most people in St. Louis  
20 County, for instance, really have no idea what we're  
21 doing and the severity of perhaps some of the issues  
22 that we're dealing with.

23 On the other hand, this may now be the  
24 time, you know, to get appropriate information out to  
25 the public so that there can be a ground swell of

1 support because -- I'll be very frank to some of the  
2 comments made about Coldwater Creek. I live on  
3 Coldwater Creek too and I'm quite well aware that  
4 most of my neighbors have no idea really of what is  
5 involved in some of these issues.

6 I know very few people, certainly most  
7 people in St. Louis County, have no idea what sits  
8 out at the airport. And whether or not this is just  
9 a perceived danger or a real risk, the bottom line  
10 is, you know, county and city residents I think need  
11 to be informed of that.

12 I think this is a very good time. But,  
13 frankly, we have a story to tell. I mean, even when  
14 I got involved in this, I had no idea, and I've lived  
15 in St. Louis County 25-plus years, I had no idea of  
16 the history of where this stuff came from and so  
17 forth. It's a true story. It's, quote, marketable.  
18 And I mean that, you know, in the positive sense and  
19 we need to get that message out and that will create  
20 a local ground swell.

21 THE FACILITATOR: The tension from my  
22 perspective is, first of all, there has always been  
23 the desire to get a final report as soon as possible  
24 so that we have a something to work with and  
25 proselytize about and that has taken all sorts of

1 forms. We've done resolutions because we were  
2 anxious about getting our bid in for increased  
3 funding. We have at the same time wanted to be  
4 deliberative and thorough and cautious about what it  
5 is we finally develop in the way of recommendations  
6 and somewhere they have to meet.

7 Originally this process was scheduled to  
8 take one year. We were supposed to be finished by a  
9 year ago September. And now it's this September.  
10 So, you know, somewhere something has to give if  
11 we're going to do our job and get it wrapped up.

12 So we are scheduled to meet a week from  
13 today. We now have four potential agenda items, one  
14 of which may or not be available to us, and that  
15 would be any revised cost estimates that DOE may be  
16 developing and hopefully would have something to say  
17 about next week, but we're not certain of that, the  
18 Technologies Working Group report, John Lark and his  
19 observations about especially the lower end of  
20 Coldwater Creek and the motion that was tabled at the  
21 June meeting.

22 Okay. Old business. Is there any old  
23 business to discuss?

24 MS. DREY: Am I supposed to do something?

25 THE FACILITATOR: No, I don't think so.



1 MR. CAVANAGH: No, not until next week.

2 THE FACILITATOR: New business? I'm sorry,  
3 old business.

4 MS. GINSBURG: It's my understanding that  
5 the St. Louis Board of Aldermen had passed a  
6 resolution identical to our resolution which was sent  
7 to Hazel O'Leary. No? Okay, identical or similar.

8 MS. DREY: I would like a copy of that.  
9 Maybe we should all have a copy of that.

10 MS. GINSBURG: I think you already have a  
11 copy of it, Kay.

12 MS. DREY: So we'll know the date of it,  
13 when it was finally passed. Or at least the date.

14 MS. GINSBURG: Okay. I'll get copies to  
15 Jim and maybe he can get copies out to everybody in  
16 the next mailing.

17 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Thank you.  
18 Any other old business?

19 MS. DREY: Would it be helpful for the St.  
20 Louis County Council to do something like that?

21 THE FACILITATOR: That's new business.

22 MS. DREY: I knew that, Jim.

23 THE FACILITATOR: We do have one person who  
24 has expressed an interest in speaking in the new  
25 business category so I want to make sure we allow

1 time. We've got about three minutes according to our  
2 formal schedule.

3 First of all, is there any other old  
4 business? All right. New business. Kay's question  
5 would it be helpful.

6 MR. CAVANAGH: We'll take it back to the  
7 County Executive's Office and the County Council.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Les Price,  
9 you indicated a desire to speak.

10 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Jim. I'd like to  
11 thank the Task Force for allowing me a few minutes to  
12 speak again. I won't talk as long as I did the last  
13 time I was here and I hope not as controversially as  
14 I did last time.

15 But I did want to make you aware of  
16 something that's going on in the Department of Energy  
17 circles, not to detract from what you're doing, in  
18 fact, I hope is it doesn't, but you do need to be  
19 aware of sort of what's going on in the bigger  
20 picture from the standpoint of DOE's planning of the  
21 Environmental Management Program.

22 Since I was here in May a couple of things  
23 have happened that I want to talk about. On one hand  
24 we issued something called the Baseline Environmental  
25 Management Report, that's affectionately known as

1 BEMR within government circles, and at the same time  
2 we issued that our new boss, Al Alm who replaced Tom  
3 Grumbly as assistant secretary for Environmental  
4 Management, basically said that that report was not  
5 an acceptable basis by which to manage the program  
6 and he has initiated a new effort that we call the  
7 Ten Year Plan. And that's what I wanted to talk  
8 about.

9 Just to give you a little bit of background  
10 about this kind of thing, the Environmental  
11 Management Program of which FUSRAP and these sites  
12 are a part was basically created around 1989,  
13 collected together the programs of that nature that  
14 existed a number of different places and the  
15 Department of Energy put them under this  
16 Environmental Management umbrella. And over the next  
17 several years that program has grown to be a \$6  
18 billion a year effort.

19 MS. DREY: FUSRAP? Not FUSRAP?

20 MR. PRICE: Not FUSRAP, the Environmental  
21 Management Program. Tom Grumbly's empire, if you  
22 will.

23 MS. DREY: Is now what?

24 MR. PRICE: Is now about \$6 billion a year  
25 now, the program that Al Alm is responsible for

1 managing. As that development was occurring, the  
2 efforts at the major sites around the country were  
3 trying to understand what the problem was and how  
4 they might deal with that. This is often called the  
5 Cold War legacy.

6 The question that was being increasingly  
7 asked by Congress in particular was how much is this  
8 whole thing going to cost and how long is it going to  
9 take. They, in fact, asked that we develop answers  
10 to those questions and that's what grew to be called  
11 BEMR that I just referred to.

12 The report that we just issued a few weeks  
13 ago was the second in Baseline Environmental  
14 Management Report and it sort of describes the course  
15 that the program has been on. And if you look at its  
16 conclusions it was coming up with something of the  
17 order of \$235 billion over the next 70 years to  
18 complete this task. Those are staggering numbers.

19 As Al Alm was getting ready to take the  
20 helm as assistant secretary and talking with people  
21 around the country and talking particularly with  
22 people in Congress I think, I think he formed the  
23 conclusion that that was not a politically viable  
24 basis for the Department of Energy to continue on  
25 that path and so he has challenged us to look at

1 something different.

2           And that challenge that we're working on  
3 now is basically to try and complete the cleanup part  
4 of the program in ten years and to do that and  
5 maintain the other elements of the program fall  
6 within a constant budget pegged at about what we  
7 expect to ask for in fiscal '98. So what that means  
8 is that over the next ten years he's looking at about  
9 a \$65 billion program and he would like to complete  
10 the cleanup in that time frame.

11           That probably doesn't mean completing the  
12 whole task of the Environmental Management Program  
13 because there are some tasks like high level waste  
14 and spent nuclear fuel and transuranic waste that  
15 probably cannot be completed in that time. But all  
16 the things that we tend to call environmental  
17 restoration or cleanup, he would like to find out  
18 what would it take to get that job done in ten years  
19 and he has asked all of us in the field, such as  
20 myself, all around the country are trying to put  
21 together plans as to how would we do it if that were  
22 our objective and if we were going to try to meet  
23 that objective. And I wanted you all to be aware of  
24 that.

25           The schedule that we are on is that the

1 individual programs around the country will make an  
2 initial submittal to headquarters by the end of  
3 July. In the following two months the people in  
4 headquarters will try to integrate those, look for  
5 inconsistencies, iron those out and make sure they're  
6 conforming to the sort of guidelines that Al has laid  
7 out and issue a draft by the end of September and  
8 then that draft will be worked on, commented on -- a  
9 lot of people will have input to that -- and the hope  
10 is that the plan will be ready or will be completed  
11 before the end of November. That's my understanding  
12 of the general schedule. So we're working on that.

13           We're trying to develop ideas how we might  
14 complete FUSRAP in ten years, what are the things we  
15 would have to do. It would come to no surprise to  
16 you all for St. Louis to meet those kind of targets  
17 it will involve a combination of things -- leave some  
18 material in place, control access on other materials  
19 perhaps or other properties and remove some and put  
20 in disposal somewhere else. And we're going to be  
21 developing those ideas and we'll keep you informed  
22 about it.

23           I think that says that there are really  
24 three activities underway that are of interest to you  
25 all. First and foremost are your own deliberations

1 that you've been talking about all morning. Those I  
2 expect will stay on track. I'm not trying to say  
3 anything that should interfere with that process.

4 The second thing that's going on is the  
5 EMAB process is still underway. Sally, I'm not sure  
6 when the EMAB itself is supposed to meet and hear the  
7 report to the FUSRAP committee but I still think it's  
8 in the September time frame. I haven't heard any  
9 firm schedule on that.

10 And so the thing then is this Ten Year Plan  
11 development that we'll keep you informed about as it  
12 evolves over the next several months. That's all I  
13 wanted to say about that.

14 I'll entertain questions now or after the  
15 meeting. I will also try to respond to a question  
16 about the appropriations process, someone asked about  
17 that. I've been trying to find out an answer to that  
18 myself and I've gotten two answers. One is that  
19 Congress is anxious to actually complete the  
20 appropriation on schedule because they all want to go  
21 back home and campaign. And so the people who tell  
22 me that are optimistic that we will have an  
23 appropriation before October first. That is  
24 consistent with the fact that some of the  
25 subcommittees, I believe in the House, are starting

1 to mark up the bill and so it is developing. So far  
2 my understanding is that they have not taken any  
3 major actions on the Environmental Management  
4 budget.

5 There are other people who think Congress  
6 will try to avert a crisis and basically will vote  
7 for a continuing resolution that goes for a long  
8 period of time, maybe as much as six months if not  
9 the whole year. A continuing resolution means  
10 continue on the path you're on, you've got the same  
11 funding level that you had last year and just sort of  
12 keep doing what you're doing. Right now I don't know  
13 which of those paths Congress will follow.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Questions?

15 MS. DREY: Okay. The scuttlebutt at least  
16 is that Congress would like to complete the budget on  
17 time, is that before October 1? Congress before  
18 October 1; is that right?

19 MR. PRICE: Yes.

20 MS. DREY: Okay. And what about the DOE's  
21 input to Congress? When does the DOE complete its  
22 input to Congress on the budget?

23 MR. PRICE: Well, DOE proposed a budget.

24 MS. DREY: Already?

25 MR. PRICE: The administration proposed a



1 budget in February and that then is sort of put on  
2 the table and that's what Congress starts with as  
3 they act on the budget that the administration  
4 submits.

5 MS. DREY: So you all aren't discussing  
6 fiscal year '97 anymore at all?

7 MR. PRICE: We are explaining and defending  
8 the budget that we propose.

9 MS. DREY: I guess my other question is,  
10 and I think I understand this, but when you said that  
11 Al Alm said \$235 billion over the next 70 years is  
12 not politically viable, it's not acceptable, is he  
13 saying both too many years, a 70 year cleanup and  
14 \$235 billion is too much, both time duration and  
15 money?

16 MR. PRICE: I think it's both. I haven't  
17 heard him make a distinction between those two  
18 elements.

19 MS. DREY: So this includes all the  
20 abandoned nuclear bomb factories such as  
21 Mallinckrodt?

22 MR. PRICE: Yes. And I think you were at  
23 Weldon when he described this.

24 MS. DREY: On the television?

25 MR. PRICE: On the television on June 26.

1 Nothing has changed since that time except that the  
2 momentum is building within all the elements of the  
3 department as we're trying to figure out how to do  
4 this. It is a challenge. And right now he's asked  
5 us how would you do it and he likens it to -- he says  
6 in the corporate world you often set forth a goal and  
7 try to figure out how to reach it without knowing  
8 when you start whether you can or how you can.  
9 That's sort of the way he describes this. It  
10 certainly is a very ambitious target to try to  
11 reach.

12 MS. DREY: Well, is anyone at the DOE  
13 headquarters meddling with the cleanup guidelines  
14 like five and fifteen and say we want to leave it  
15 dirtier and one of the options is just leave it  
16 there?

17 MR. PRICE: Right now everything is an  
18 option. I think he said be creative, be innovative,  
19 try to come up with ideas that allows us to meet this  
20 target. He hasn't ruled anything out. Certainly we  
21 will be working with all the stake holders, we'll be  
22 working with the regulators and so no one loses their  
23 place at the table as this process evolves. Everyone  
24 still needs to be involved in it.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Nancy Lubiewski has a

1 question.

2 MS. LUBIEWSKI: I would like to see from  
3 this Al -- what's his last name?

4 MR. PRICE: Alm, A-L-M.

5 MS. LUBIEWSKI: A goal statement, an  
6 emission statement, whatever his purpose is when he  
7 sent out the initial memos, his initial request,  
8 there has to be a purpose to his instructions to the  
9 Departments of Energy. If you have something like  
10 that, I would like to see it please?

11 MR. PRICE: I have a vision statement in my  
12 briefcase.

13 MS. LUBIEWSKI: Yes, that would be good.

14 MR. PRICE: It's kind of along the lines of  
15 what I said. The vision is to complete the cleanup  
16 in ten years.

17 MS. LUBIEWSKI: Okay. Could I have a copy  
18 of that? I don't need it today.

19 MR. PRICE: Sure.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Are there other questions  
21 or comments with respect to Mr. Price's remarks?  
22 Okay. I would like to remind you, those of you who  
23 did not sign in when you arrived this morning please  
24 do that before you leave here today so we have a  
25 complete record of who was in attendance.

1           As soon as we break up we will seek to  
2 confirm the availability of these facilities for a  
3 week from today. Once we know their availability we  
4 will advise -- they are available. We have confirmed  
5 their availability so we are scheduled to meet here a  
6 week from today at 7:30 a.m. You've seen the  
7 agenda. We will do everything we can to be prepared  
8 for that meeting in every way possible. And unless  
9 there is any other new business, we will entertain a  
10 motion to adjourn.

11           MS. DREY: So moved.

12           THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

13           MR. MANNING: Second.

14

15

\*\*\*\*\*

16

17

CERTIFICATE

18

19           I hereby certify that the foregoing is an  
20 accurate and complete transcription of my shorthand  
21 notes taken at the aforesaid time and place.

22

23

24

25

*Rosanne Hamilton*  
-----  
Court Reporter

*July 18, 1996*  
-----  
Date

00-2077

---

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)

---

# ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

for the St. Louis Site, Missouri

---



U.S. Department of Energy