

ST. LOUIS SITE REMEDIATION TASK FORCE

* * * * *

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

* * * * *

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on Tuesday, July 23,
1996, the herein described parties met at the
Hazelwood Civic Center, Hazelwood, Missouri, and the
following proceedings were had, to-wit:

HALE REPORTING, INC.
No. 4 Godfrey
St. Louis, Missouri 63135

(314) 524-2055

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Call to Order	4
Public Comment	4
Report of Technologies Working Group Coldwater Creek Discussion	13
Motion	49
Kay Drey's Motion	70
Refined Cost Estimates	92
Public Information/Communication	111
Old Business	114
New Business	114
Agenda for Next Meeting	115
Adjourn	129
Reporter's Certificate	130

1 PARTICIPANTS ATTENDING: Dave Adler, DOE Tom
2 Binz, Laclede Gas Company William Brandes, St. Louis
3 Co. HazMat Team Ric Cavanagh, St. Louis County Health
4 Department William Conant, St. Louis County Commission
5 Kay Drey George Eberle, Grace Hill Neighborhood
6 Association Mayor David Fraenhoffer Jack
7 Fraenhoffer, Mallinckrodt Chemical Co. Anna
8 Ginsburg, Vice Chair James Grant, Mallinckrodt
9 Chemical Co Leonard Griggs, Lambert Airport Tom
10 Horgan, US Representative Talent's Office Theodore
11 Hoskins Christina Flynn, City of Berkeley Lou Jearls
12 Nancy Lubiewski Tom Manning, City of Hazelwood Bob
13 Marchant, Metro St. Louis Sewer District Sally Price,
14 Chair Roger Pryor, Coalition for the Environment Ray
15 Rolen Neal Slaten, Union Electric Co. Lee Sobotka,
16 Washington University Elsa Steward, MDNR Dan Wall, EPA
17 James Dwyer, Facilitator

1 TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 23, 1996

2 (In Conference Room:)

3 CALL TO ORDER:

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Welcome. And we'll begin
5 in just a few moments, so you can take your seats.
6 Okay. I have one announcement. Again, we have the
7 court reporter here this morning, and if you could
8 again state your name prior to speaking, it would help
9 her very much.

10 Are there any other announcements this
11 morning from anyone at the table? All right.

12 Jim, do you want take it?

13 THE FACILITATOR: Yes. Thank you, Sally. I
14 know that at least one person has signed up for the
15 public comment period. We have three people who have
16 indicated a desire to speak today. And, Mr. Baker,
17 the approach that we use is we try to confine public
18 comment to approximately 10 minutes. If it has to
19 take longer, that's okay, but we want to try to keep
20 things moving. So we'll start with Sandy Delcoure.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT:

22 MS. DELCOURE: Good morning. My name is
23 Sandy Delcoure and I live on Coldwater Creek. I
24 adopted Coldwater Creek under a Department of
25 Conservation and Conversation Federation of Missouri

1 sponsored program. I have tried to keep citizens in
2 my area aware of Coldwater Creek and its environmental
3 problems. I have also urged residents to get the
4 support of our congressional representatives to pass
5 the legislation that was needed for the funding of a
6 cleanup of the creek.

7 Since my own children live on Coldwater
8 Creek, I have especially tried to represent the
9 children's rights on the creek to live and play in a
10 clean and healthy environment. Last week I passed a
11 photo album with the neighborhood children's pictures
12 on the creek. Someone suggested to me that I submit a
13 map of the creek and indicate where the pictures were
14 taken. I will present that map for you today and for
15 the DOE. The location on the map is labeled Willow
16 Creek.

17 In 1991 I sought the assistance of the
18 Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance Program.
19 Through this program, the National Parks Service
20 provides technical assistance to state and local
21 governments and local organizations with respect to
22 establishing and managing River and Trail corridor
23 projects. This would have been a Greenway Planning
24 and Protection Project for Coldwater Creek.

25 I had collected letters of support from this

1 project from such sources as the Honorable Joan Horn,
2 County Executive Buzz Westfall, Colonel James Corbin
3 of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, Senator Kit Bond,
4 Executive Director of the Metropolitan Sewer District
5 Frank Kriz, Director of Florissant Parks and
6 Recreation Ron Veach, State Representative Kaye
7 Steinmetz, Hazelwood City Manager Edwin Carlstrom, the
8 Honorable William Clay, Senator Danforth, and Nancy
9 Lubiewski and E.A.R.T.H. Florissant and the
10 Environmental Quality Commission of Florissant.

11 Also collected was a petition of signatures
12 from the Willow Creek subdivision which has been part
13 of the Coldwater Creek Stream Team that supported the
14 National Parks Service Greenway Planning River and
15 Trails Program and advocated Coldwater Creek worthy of
16 assistance for a Greenway Project through the NPS.

17 I would like to submit this notebook of
18 these letters and signatures to the Task Force and DOE
19 to read and to see the support to protect and preserve
20 Coldwater Creek for the children and the community for
21 the future. Thank you.

22 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Sandy. Any
23 questions? The next person to sign up for the public
24 comment period is Ed Mahr.

25 MR. MAHR: My name is Ed Mahr and I'm

1 connected with various health food or quack groups, if
2 you would, that are in the United States. July 23rd
3 Meeting, these few pages are to be Appendix One to my
4 previous notes to the Task Force.

5 I'll keep it short. Of this entire mess of
6 papers here, there are only four that I'm going to
7 read and those are hand-printed. The final pages are
8 for your personal reading if you are interested in
9 what's contained in there.

10 Since this meeting will deal with Coldwater
11 Creek again, I thought some of my undersights should
12 be addressed in outline form. Those task members who
13 have an inclination can use this as a road map, a road
14 map to the area that I'm talking about. And I also
15 have three pages from Wunnenberg's as a road map to
16 help you find your way around to look at what I looked
17 at.

18 18. Quoting, the Florissant Karst and
19 sinkhole area is recognized as having the finest
20 example of deep funnel-shaped sinkholes in the Central
21 United States, end of quote. This comes from Page No.
22 5 of the New Jamestown Community Area Study presented
23 to the St. Louis County Planning Commission in 1987.

24 Submitted in the back of these pages are
25 Xeroxes of pages 0, 1, 5, 16, 29, and 30 out of a

1 total of 38 pages. The author of this is Kenneth E.
2 Smith, a registered Missouri engineer, his phone
3 number, can supply a copy of the above study. Or you
4 can call the St. Louis Planning Commission, they have
5 these on file.

6 19. A second study to the St. Louis County
7 Planning Commission in April '88 entitled Old
8 Jamestown Area Community Study -- these are the same
9 areas, they just decided to change the name -- also is
10 a source of information. Submitted are Xeroxes of
11 Pages 0, 1, 4, 9, 10, 25, 27, 32, 33, 37, 53, and 79
12 out of a total of 88 pages. Again, Smith can furnish
13 you a copy of this.

14 These two studies and the St. Louis County
15 Planning Commission determined the multi-acre -- I
16 believe it runs all the way up to about five, six
17 acres required per house -- zoning laws at the Karst
18 Sinkhole area from Coldwater Creek to the Missouri
19 River on the north, from Spanish Lakes and Highway
20 367, which is Lewis and Clark on the east, to Old
21 Halls Ferry on the west. The borderlines can vary
22 according to who's telling the story.

23 The next four pages after this one are Pages
24 3, 4, and 5 of Wunnenberg's Street Guide which gives a
25 road map and a Dave Murray one-tank trip orientation

1 of the previously-mentioned sink hole areas should the
2 Task Force members care to see their proximity to
3 Coldwater Creek.

4 The fourth page is Page 37 of the April '88
5 study which shows the flood plain in Coldwater Creek.
6 And that I don't think most of you have really seen,
7 but it's four pages back and it shows on the top, the
8 gray area is the area that the zoning was initiated
9 in. That doesn't mean that's the end limits of
10 everything, it simply means that's where they got the
11 zoning laws enacted. And down there on the bottom, of
12 course, you have the darker area which is the flood
13 plain.

14 Getting back to the reading. The creek bed
15 is less than a block from Avocado Street on
16 Wunnenberg's Page 4, Square J-5. Just to see how we
17 do this, Page 4 is actually called Page 26. I had to
18 do different numbering on it, but Avocado Street is
19 more or less the second arrow from the right and it
20 goes right up to Coldwater Creek and when it floods,
21 the street is flooded to some degree depending upon
22 the amount of water.

23 The same page, Page 37, which is the flood
24 plain of the Coldwater Creek, shows a bed of Coldwater
25 Creek under the Old Halls Ferry bridge and one block

1 away from Candlewyck Court shown on Wunnenberg's Page
2 4 again, Square L-5. Sinks Road, which is the major
3 road through the sinkhole area, is shown on Page 4,
4 and it's about three blocks away -- the end of it is
5 about three blocks away from Coldwater Creek. Again,
6 there is an arrow there more or less -- the third
7 arrow from the right if you're finding that Page 4 in
8 Wunnenberg's. To see the tremendous size, that is,
9 the volume of northern Coldwater Creek, take the Old
10 Jamestown Road to the bridge over Coldwater Creek just
11 south of Jamestown Mall on Wunnenberg's Page 5, Square
12 I-5.

13 These are simple ways to coordinate the
14 creek with the homes. To see the sinkholes, I suggest
15 you take Sinks Road.

16 All right. Getting on. 21. As more
17 development takes place in the Karst area, zoning laws
18 will be loosened by officials and shallow sinkholes
19 and lakes will be man filled causing the displaced
20 water to find other drain holes and probably enlarging
21 large the remaining sinkholes more rapidly. If a
22 sinkhole opens up to Coldwater Creek waters, there
23 will be no controlling it in its path to the Missouri
24 River or southward.

25 22. A radioactive metering device should be

1 installed in the Metro St. Louis Sewer District
2 Wastewater Treatment Facility on Coldwater Creek near
3 Old Halls Ferry Road. I think such a testing device
4 is long overdue as a safety precaution. Testing is
5 the basis of science. Testing is the basis of
6 science. Why has no one put a testing device on
7 Coldwater Creek to this day? Test results would go a
8 long way in resolving the radioactive water runoff
9 discussions of SLAPS, HISS and FUTURA that this Task
10 Force has been discussing for two years. Why has no
11 one tested the Coldwater Creek northward of HISS and
12 FUTURA?

13 24. Remember, Barry Commoner postulated:
14 Everything goes somewhere. And a section of the bank
15 at the SLAPS site measuring approximately 100 feet
16 lengthwise, 20 feet perpendicular to the creek bank,
17 and 20 feet vertically from the creek bed is no longer
18 there after 40 years of creek flow erosion.

19 And remember there's no such thing as a free
20 lunch -- again Commoner -- except if you drink the
21 St. Louis water. And remember another Commoner law:
22 Everything is connected to everything else. For
23 example, the SLAPS and HISS sites are connected to
24 ground water runoff into Coldwater Creek and into the
25 Missouri River right now, and maybe at some future

1 time into the underground streams through a sinkhole.

2 Lastly, remember the Weldon Springs Quarry
3 cleanup, which McCracken did and no one has really
4 objected to it, ostensibly because the field of water
5 wells of St. Charles County, not the city just the
6 county, were in danger. These water wells only
7 supplied 2,000 county residents with water, not the 2
8 million in the St. Louis area or the 20 million
9 downstream on the Mississippi River.

10 That's it. These are the studies. And
11 should you care to get involved in sinkhole topography
12 and geology, I'm sure you can get the rest of the
13 studies, or I could even give you Xeroxed copies that
14 I have. Thank you.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Mr. Mahr. The
16 third speaker today is James Baker who is director of
17 administration for St. Louis County. Mr. Baker.

18 MR. BAKER: Good morning. My name is Jim
19 Baker. I'm director of administration for St. Louis
20 County. I'm also the chief of staff for the county
21 executive. And I've got a very brief statement from
22 Mr. Westfall this morning who couldn't be available
23 here in person.

24 "The fact that the St. Louis FUSRAP site is
25 located in a highly populated metropolitan area

underscores the need to initiate remediation of these properties now. As a result of your efforts and by continuing to work closely with the Department of Energy, we expect that soon our children will be able to play on the ballfields and along Coldwater Creek again. Restoring this property to unrestricted use will allow our families to feel confident that this serious health and safety issue has been addressed, and it will also enhance our efforts to stimulate economic development in North St. Louis County. My administration continues to fully support the dedicated efforts of this group and looks forward to the day when remediation is complete. I am, therefore, asking the St. Louis County Council to approve a resolution which supports the Task Force's desire to secure appropriate funding for full remediation of the St. Louis FUSRAP site. The entire St. Louis region is indebted to each of you for your work. Your commitment will achieve a long-awaited conclusion to the Manhattan Project, closing one chapter in history and beginning a new one."

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you very much. Any questions for Mr. Baker? The next item on today's agenda is report of the Technologies Working Group.

REPORT OF THE TECHNOLOGIES WORKING GROUP:

1 MR. GRANT: Well, the Technologies Working
2 Group met last week after the Task Force meeting and
3 went back and reviewed the activities that it had been
4 working on over the last number of months. A draft
5 report has been sent out to members of the work group
6 for their comment. Once we receive their comments
7 back, we will finalize that report and issue it to the
8 Task Force. So that report isn't finalized yet, but I
9 guess what I'd like to do is at least share with you
10 the preliminary recommendations of the work group.

11 I think there were three key things in that
12 report. One was a set of criteria that the work group
13 thought would be useful and should be used for
14 evaluating any technologies that are used in the
15 future, since we believe this is sort of an ongoing
16 type of thing. As technologies are developed and
17 proven out, we may see some technologies in the future
18 that may be available that aren't available today.

19 But anyway there was a set of criteria. One
20 was volume reduction, stability of the final waste
21 form, management of ground and surface water that may
22 result in or around the technologies control of
23 contaminated emissions and generate controls that
24 would be used in conjunction with the technology
25 cost-effectiveness and analytical tools for

1 segregation of materials needing processing. Those
2 would be criteria that would be useful and should be
3 applied to reviewing technology.

4 The second recommendation, and I'll read it
5 to you, is the Technologies Work Group believes that
6 technology exists that holds promise for application
7 at the St. Louis site and requests that the DOE
8 evaluate them. These include, but are not limited to,
9 microwave vitrification, laser ablation nebulization
10 and gamma ray spectroscopy.

11 And the third recommendation, which is
12 something we've discussed before, concerns soil
13 washing. A lot of tests were previously done. We've
14 ruled out chemical extraction for soil washing. We've
15 basically ruled out physical soil washing for the
16 SLAPS site. But since the soil characteristics at the
17 downtown sites were different, we thought that these
18 also should be evaluated in terms of applicability for
19 physical soil washing. So there's a recommendation in
20 there to evaluate physical soil washing as a possible
21 technology for the downtown site.

22 So those are the three preliminary
23 recommendations that are coming out of the
24 Technologies Working Group.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Jim. First of

1 all, are there any questions for Mr. Grant?

2 MS. DREY: I guess I'm not certain that we
3 all agreed that we should proceed with the physical
4 soil washing, further research for downtown. I don't
5 remember that conclusion. What happened to me?

6 MR. GRANT: Well, that's a question that we
7 discussed many times in the Technologies Working
8 Group. And, in fact, the whole Task Force, that
9 particular recommendation had been brought back to
10 this whole Task Force and voted on for being brought
11 forward to the DOE and we actually had allowed for
12 some funding to be applied to that. Now, the work has
13 never been done, so the whole task has actually voted
14 on that issue previously.

15 MS. DREY: I thought we had put it to bed,
16 though, previously, too. So I guess I have some
17 question about it, that's all. I'm just raising a
18 question about that. When I read this draft, you
19 know, that was a question I raised. But I do think
20 also we did feel that -- we discussed ex-situ
21 microwave vitrification which would mean digging up
22 the stuff at the airport and treating it while it was
23 still on site and I think we did say that that has
24 promise.

25 And I guess I'm not clear enough in my mind

1 about what the difference is between physical soil
2 washing and chemical soil washing, but I know we did
3 oppose the chemical and I'm not sure we want to spend
4 more money on additional technologies. There are
5 thousands of them.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Well, may I suggest
7 that --

8 MS. DREY: Maybe not thousands, but dozens.

9 THE FACILITATOR: -- that that refinement is
10 something that could be negotiated between this draft
11 of the Technologies Working Group report and the final
12 report. And if there is a need to debate that issue
13 and come to closure on it, there is the opportunity to
14 do that. We ought to do it quickly. That's exactly
15 the type of thing that should occur between the draft
16 and the final.

17 MR. CAVANAGH: What specifically was the
18 mandate of the committee? If I'm hearing correctly,
19 or maybe I'm just dense, but we're at a point of --
20 actually getting to the point of almost making some
21 final recommendations and the committee has just
22 established some criteria.

23 THE FACILITATOR: No. The mandate of the
24 Technologies Working Group was to evaluate the
25 universe of known technologies, either proven or

1 emerging or whatever state they may be in, to
2 determine as best it could what technologies held
3 promise for application at the St. Louis site.

4 At the time the Technologies Working Group
5 was formed, there was already some testing going on.
6 There had been for some time testing going on at
7 Clemson Technical Lab in South Carolina concerning
8 chemical extraction and soil washing techniques. And
9 those tests were being performed on soil taken from
10 SLAPS but not from downtown. There was also a test on
11 some New Jersey soils.

12 It was concluded that for purposes of SLAPS
13 soils that technique did not hold promise. But the
14 question remained whether because of the known
15 differences between SLAPS and downtown soil
16 characteristics whether one or both of those
17 techniques may have application downtown.

18 Chemical extraction was deemed inappropriate
19 because of byproducts and side consequences that were,
20 it was determined, unacceptable. So the issue of soil
21 washing remained open, at least in some people's
22 minds, for downtown.

23 Beyond that the challenge was let's find out
24 what's out there, let's screen all known technologies
25 for potential application and see then if we can make

1 recommendations to the Task Force and then to DOE
2 about how to proceed with those.

3 The bottom line, as of last week, is recited
4 in this draft and was reported by Jim Grant.

5 Basically there are three technologies that have been
6 specifically recommended for additional study and the
7 notion was advanced that there may be others. And I
8 think that the draft report, at least as far as I'm
9 concerned, does provide adequate basis for meaningful
10 inclusion in the final report. I think there can be
11 direction and there can be objectives that may clear.

12 MR. CAVANAGH: Okay. Then I have to follow
13 up on that. Will there be a detailed report, not just
14 a summary of the meeting, but the analysis of the
15 various technologies made available to the Task Force
16 so that we know what we might ultimately be
17 recommending?

18 THE FACILITATOR: Jim, do you want to
19 respond to that, or do you want me to?

20 MR. GRANT: Well, as I said earlier, a draft
21 report has been prepared. It's gone out to the Task
22 Group members for their review and comment.

23 MR. CAVANAGH: I guess my question is, is
24 that a detailed report or is it just a summary?

25 MR. GRANT: I don't know what you mean by a

1 detailed report. No, it's not a detailed report in
2 the sense of a technical scientific report. But all
3 of the -- I think the key information that's been
4 provided to the Task Force will be attachments to that
5 report.

6 What will be included in that report is the
7 same basic information that the Task Force had. It
8 also will refer to other documents. Specifically,
9 there's a whole stack of documents about this high
10 that we had collected and used at one point to help us
11 develop our studies here, and there will be references
12 in there to what those documents are so if you want to
13 go back and review those documents, you'll be able to
14 do so and identify them and get copies of them.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Does that answer your
16 question?

17 MR. CAVANAGH: Yes.

18 MR. HORGAN: I just want to follow up on
19 Mr. Cavanagh's point. If there are alternative
20 technologies out there that are being studied, I'd
21 like to know a little more about them. Is there any
22 way that we can get either a detailed report or have a
23 presentation, a brief presentation, given to the Task
24 Force to see what's going on because I would like to
25 see, you know, some additional information on it

1 before we just delve headlong into it.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Perhaps it would help if I
3 told you what I think the sequence of events will be.
4 Given the fact that we have a draft report at this
5 point and not a final report from the Technologies
6 Working Group to present to you today, my assumption
7 was that I would incorporate whatever the Technologies
8 Working Group comes up with in the way of a final
9 report. I will summarize that and incorporate that
10 into my initial draft of the Task Force report. But
11 then there would be an opportunity at the August
12 meeting of this entire group to hear as much detail as
13 you would like to hear from the Technologies Working
14 Group and modify their report in any way you see fit.

15 But the intention, I think, from the
16 beginning has not been that the Technologies Working
17 Group would undertake any in-depth analysis of the
18 technologies. Rather, it would simply determine that
19 certain of them seem to hold promise or none do or
20 whatever and then would recommend that they be pursued
21 by the Department of Energy.

22 MR. HORGAN: Okay. Well, I just think
23 members of the Task Force would probably like to get
24 more information about the particular technologies
25 including microwave vitrification or whatever because

1 that's not my area of expertise and I'd just like to,
2 you know, see if we could get more information about
3 it to see if, you know, it's a potential possibility.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think it would be
5 helpful if, in the final report, we would attach, like
6 Jim Grant said, some two, three-page analysis of each
7 type of technology that has been suggested for review
8 and that would maybe solve the problem.

9 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Any other comments
10 or questions about the Technologies Working Group?

11 MS. DREY: I see that Mr. Golden is here who
12 is, I guess, the primary expert on the ex-situ
13 vitrification. Vitrification I've read about in the
14 past and it was to fuse together soil particles and so
15 on to solidify them. And I've known of problems with
16 vitrification in reading about high level radioactive
17 wastes for many years. I know it cracks, it can crack
18 at any rate, exposed to high levels of radiation.

19 But what was hopeful to me was to find out
20 that they could exhume the soils at the airport site
21 and vitrify them on-site with microwave radiation and
22 then ship them off-site and let the next state worry
23 about whether the blocks crack or not. But at least
24 it would give us a chance to transport these materials
25 in a form other than dirt that, you know, in the event

1 of a spill, which did happen by the way, I have a
2 report if anyone would want to look at it that I just
3 got about the derailment of a shipment from Wayne, New
4 Jersey, which was dirt and fortunately it had very,
5 very low levels of radioactivity in it, but there was
6 a train derailment. And in this case, the things
7 would be solidified on the way out.

8 Furthermore, I was encouraged to find out
9 that there are technologies that could, like, freeze
10 the border of the airport site so that -- and borders
11 and then underneath and so the ground water wouldn't
12 migrate into Coldwater Creek during exhumation.

13 I mean, I just felt really hopeful about a
14 month ago, or just a little more than that, hearing
15 about this as a possible way to handle downtown -- I
16 mean to handle the airport site. We did not talk
17 about it for downtown or the other sites. But I just
18 for the first time in 18 years felt that maybe there
19 were safe ways of digging it up out of St. Louis's
20 Coldwater Creek flood plain and taking it elsewhere.

21 And I don't know, maybe after the meeting if
22 we have a little time, maybe Mr. Golden could address
23 us briefly about this technology since he is here.

24 THE FACILITATOR: All right.

25 MR. CAVANAGH: Maybe I'm being redundant,

1 but I just want to make my point very clear. I think
2 there are at this point some competing priorities and
3 competing interests on the Task Force, which is normal
4 and to be expected, but I think it's very important
5 that we have detailed information from the Task Force.
6 And I guess I want to go on record and say I'm
7 disappointed in hearing a five-minute report on
8 something I thought would be rather significant in
9 detail.

10 And I think at least from my perspective,
11 and I hope it's shared by many members of the Task
12 Force, that we'd like the whole picture rather than
13 just a two or three-page summary even with
14 attachments. I mean, whether it's presentations by
15 individuals representing those technologies or from
16 the committee, but, frankly, one of the reasons I
17 requested that we have the special meeting was for
18 more detail and five minutes didn't tell me much,
19 especially with nothing in hand.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Any other comments
21 or questions at this point? There is one observation
22 that might be helpful. It occurs to me that, having
23 sat through most of the Technologies Working Group
24 meetings, there is one difference of perspective that
25 perhaps ought to be resolved by the full Task Force

1 ultimately and that has to do with whether part of the
2 mission or part of the objective in looking at
3 technologies is cost-effectiveness or whether that is
4 a secondary issue.

5 And I think from having paid attention for a
6 year and a half as this group has met that initially
7 the thrust was let's see if we can find technologies
8 that are productive in whatever way, but are also
9 cost-effective, that there isn't a premium cost
10 associated with. And I think that that issue has
11 never brought to closure.

12 MR. GRANT: As I said earlier, it takes data
13 and information to make an ultimate evaluation. The
14 Technologies Working Group has asked for specific
15 information from people reporting to technology.
16 There's information that this data is available that
17 has not been shared with the group, as far as I'm
18 concerned, in a detailed kind of way that will allow
19 evaluation of that.

20 The report will contain all of the
21 information that the Technologies Working Group has
22 been provided. And so you'll have everything we have
23 and there's not going to be anything in that report
24 that -- anything extra. You'll be able to use the
25 same information we've had to evaluate the situation.

1 MS. DREY: I know that I'm not going to feel
2 qualified to make any kind of -- to participate in a
3 vote on one technology versus another. I am not an
4 engineer; I pride myself on not being an engineer.
5 And I also am not an economist, and pride myself on
6 that, but I do think that if -- there was a sentence,
7 and I tried to find it quickly this morning, in my
8 notes that our working group, Technologies Working
9 Group, this past Wednesday or whenever it was, Tuesday
10 afternoon, we used the -- I think it was Jim's word,
11 we used the word "promising" or that some of the
12 technology -- or at least the ex-situ vitrification
13 technology and something else that I absolutely cannot
14 pronounce that I thought sounded like a Hebrew term,
15 but has something to do with -- I don't know what it
16 has to do -- I can't pronounce it. It had to do with
17 analyses and analyzing soils so that you maybe
18 wouldn't have to treat the same volume if you can have
19 a more efficient way of analyzing, more accurate and
20 precise.

21 But at any rate, I think that we may want --
22 we may, as a Task Force, want to recommend to the
23 Department of Energy that they consider certain
24 technologies. Whether they're cost-effective or not I
25 do not think is something that the Task Force was

1 asked to think about. I think we could ask for the
2 moon, as far as I'm concerned, because what we want is
3 our sites cleaned up safely and permanently.

4 And so I think -- I mean, there was another
5 point I wanted to make, but I'm afraid I've forgotten.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

7 MS. LUBIEWSKI: I myself also do not know
8 anything about the sciences and technologies. I
9 avoided the Technologies Working Group, vehemently
10 avoiding it I think the word might be. For me the
11 Technologies Working Group will, I believe, confirm
12 what I want to have done at the airport site, the
13 Coldwater Creek site. What I'm going to recommend
14 from my personal point of view, and what I'm going to
15 fight for, it can done. I'm not recommending
16 something that's a pie in the sky. The report will
17 confirm that the technology is available. As long as
18 it's in the report, then I recommend it and I'll be
19 comfortable with that.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Any other
21 comments?

22 MS. DREY: I just remembered. And that was
23 that I think that although I don't think we should be
24 saying to the Department of Energy categorically we
25 think a certain technology is more or less

1 cost-effective and effective technologically, but we
2 are going to be making decisions about the minimal
3 amount of money that we have to spend in St. Louis and
4 I certainly thought we clearly decided not another
5 cent for the chelating agent Clemson, South Carolina
6 technology and I wonder whether we should spend any of
7 our St. Louis money on any technology investigation.
8 I think we should get on with the cleanup.

9 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

10 MS. DREY: Let the Department of Energy
11 decide which technology.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Any other
13 comments or reactions to the Technologies Working
14 Group report or anything that's been said? Okay.
15 Thank you.

16 COLDWATER CREEK DISCUSSION:

17 THE FACILITATOR: We'll move on then to Item
18 No. 5 on the agenda which concerns Coldwater Creek.
19 And at the time -- a week ago today when we decided we
20 would meet today, the one issue that was on the table
21 or one report that we expected to hear was either an
22 oral or written report from John Lark who was referred
23 to by Roger Pryor last week as someone had knowledge
24 of Coldwater Creek from a planning perspective and who
25 might be able to help the Task Force put especially

1 the lower end of Coldwater Creek into perspective.

2 You will recall that the Remediation Options
3 Working Group generated a recommendation that the
4 upper end of the creek which generally flows through
5 industrialized areas be remediated to an Option IV
6 standard and that the lower end of Coldwater Creek
7 which, generally speaking, is bucolic and wooded and
8 rural, in order to protect it from damage in the
9 remediation process, that it be subject to an Option
10 III level of cleanup rather than Option IV. There was
11 some debate about that issue, and so Roger suggested
12 that perhaps John Lark could help. John could not be
13 here today, but we do have a written presentation,
14 which we will distribute, and Roger will summarize
15 this for you.

16 Before you begin, Roger, though, I want to
17 point out a couple of other things that may be
18 helpful. We have at the back of the room some colored
19 photographs and a map and a chart indicating degree of
20 contamination by location on the creek. Those
21 photographs were put together in the last few days by
22 Sarah and other people from Bechtel and by Nancy
23 Lubiewski. There is also a video that Nancy and Sarah
24 made yesterday afternoon which we thought would be
25 helpful in just establishing context for those of you

1 who have not walked the creek.

2 My suggestion is that we take a look at the
3 video first and then get into the substantive
4 discussion. Does that make sense to everybody? Is
5 that all right? Okay. We would like to run the video
6 then. There is no sound, so, Nancy, as we go through
7 the video, if you could tell the Task Force whatever
8 you can remember about the three places where the film
9 was made.

10 (Videotape was shown.)

11 MS. LUBIEWSKI: This is Saint Ferdinand
12 Park, City of Florissant. It's right next to Field 10
13 and a parking lot, as you can see. The left side is
14 the park side; the right side is the residential side.
15 And there were kids fishing.

16 This is down by the Bellefontaine Park, the
17 county park. You drive through the compost center and
18 go down the gravel roads on a dry day. We did a
19 residential area, then we did a real wildlife area,
20 and then we went back to a residential. This is the
21 landfill that butts up to the far end of the drive to
22 the creek. Bellefontaine Park is, I believe, an old
23 landfill.

24 This is Coldwater Creek in the Florissant
25 area, Lindbergh, Charbonniere, Saint Denis. Okay. To

1 the right is the shot of Bellefontaine Creek. Here's
2 Coldwater Creek. If you keep walking ahead, they meet
3 up there. This is the area where Coldwater Creek and
4 Bellefontaine Creek and any backwash would happen.
5 This is a heavy flood area during heavy rains that go
6 up into the commercial area, over the bridges. We've
7 had bridge rescues of people hanging onto the sides of
8 the bridge, between Lindbergh Graham and where Graham
9 turns into Saint Ferdinand.

10 (End of videotape.)

11 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you. So we
12 have the video, we have the photographs at the back
13 and the map and the other charts for you to look at
14 after you've heard the presentations and engaged in
15 discussion.

16 Roger, would you like to walk us through the
17 John Lark letter?

18 MR. PRYOR: Well, I think the letter, you
19 know, if you get a chance to read it, speaks for
20 itself. I quickly ran off some copies this morning.

21 MS. DREY: You what, Roger?

22 MR. PRYOR: Ran off some copies this
23 morning. I hope there are enough copies for
24 everybody.

25 John just got in town last week and I got

1 ahold of him after our meeting last Tuesday and he
2 went out and revisited the area, the lower end, on
3 Thursday. And as might be expected, he came up with
4 probably more questions than he had answers.

5 But I think several things are significant
6 on what he has said here. You know, there is some
7 information he needs from DOE to give a more complete
8 evaluation. But I think in the last paragraph, he
9 makes a very -- there's a typo here, too, I see. The
10 word "buy" in the next to third to last sentence or
11 second to last sentence in the next to the last
12 paragraph, it should be "but."

13 MS. DREY: Where?

14 MR. PRYOR: It says, "improper buy
15 ethically"; it should be improper but ethically. It's
16 the fifth line before the sincerely.

17 And he points out because the creek it does
18 look very muddy and not very clear and the -- it does
19 attract kids, they do swim in it and play in the
20 creek, that he, you know, finds it very difficult in
21 his own mind to not clean it up to the highest degree
22 possible.

23 He is concerned, and I think he expresses
24 that in Paragraph 2 of the letter that, you know,
25 depending on what the technique is for doing this sort

1 of cleanup -- and he asked me if I knew and I said I
2 really wasn't sure, but, you know, I guess on a scale
3 of one to ten, with ten being some kind of really
4 heavy mechanized thing where you have bulldozers going
5 down and scraping the creek, he expressed that
6 definitely that type of activity could certainly have
7 a lasting impact in scarring of the area. But he
8 suggests that perhaps for the last three miles because
9 of scenic attributes that a more expensive, less -- or
10 a more moderate mechanized approach might be
11 appropriate.

12 Again, he has questions concerning, and
13 maybe DOE can help on these or not, but questions
14 concerning about the extent of the contamination down
15 there, to the extent that it goes up the slopes and
16 sides as well as the creek bottoms, what the impact of
17 back flooding of the Missouri River has been and to
18 what extent the outcrops -- the bedrock outcrops would
19 be affected, and I don't know the answer to that
20 either, but my assumption all along has been -- we're
21 talking about cleaning up the sediment, is not
22 scraping up bedrock.

23 Anyway he makes a pitch that he thinks it
24 should be cleaned up to the highest degree possible.
25 He suggests that it's probably going to take special

1 skill and effort to do that in a way that doesn't
2 detract from the area's other scenic qualities. And
3 then there's additional information that if we want to
4 provide, he'd be happy to pursue on the question of
5 the coalition.

6 I don't know if this -- this may not answer
7 all of our questions certainly, but it gives us a
8 little more things to think about. And he did say
9 that he thought that if he had the information that he
10 needed here, he could give a more definitive answer in
11 time for our next meeting and would be willing to do
12 so.

13 He apologized for not being here today, he
14 had to be somewhere at 8:30 and, as I said, I caught
15 him just as he got back in town from being out of town
16 and this was pretty much last minute. But if there
17 are any questions you might have about what he has to
18 say here, I'll do my best to try and answer them.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Questions?

20 MS. DREY: Can you just give us a brief
21 background of his involvement? He is a landscape
22 architect, right?

23 MR. PRYOR: Right. He has his own firm in
24 Webster Groves. His specialty is park planning, open
25 space planning, scenic landscape design for commercial

1 development and historic preservation.

2 He had gotten involved in Coldwater Creek in
3 a major way, as he refers to it here, back in the late
4 70s, early 80s because he got the contract from
5 St. Louis County to study the possibility of linear
6 parks in St. Louis County and four of the creeks --
7 they did four creeks and did fairly extensive studies:
8 Botanical, geologic, all sorts of studies, and
9 inventory and recreational use and residential use and
10 flooding and all sorts of things that occurs along
11 these creeks.

12 We have that study on Coldwater Creek at our
13 office in U City. The information in it is old. I
14 mean, it's basically, well, it's going on 20 years
15 now. Well, 16, 17 years. But this is the sort of
16 thing he does for a living and he does have some, you
17 know, personal expertise with that area, that's why I
18 thought I'd asked him --

19 At the time he did the study, he was aware
20 and we were just becoming aware of the fact that
21 Coldwater Creek had this kind of contamination in it.
22 And we weren't sure if it all went down to the lower
23 end because at that time there had been no testing
24 down at the lower end, but that was suspected. So he
25 did address that issue, at least in a very tangential

1 way, in his report 16 years ago. That's sort of his
2 background. He's done a lot projects, park projects,
3 for the county and the municipalities in the area.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Any additional
5 questions or comments?

6 MR. KUCERA: I don't really intend to bring
7 up another controversial subject, but related to this,
8 and I think it's relevant, is our Times Beach cleanup.

9 I was heavily involved in negotiating that
10 consent order that drives the cleanup. And we were
11 very concerned that as Times Beach itself was being
12 cleaned up that the same thing we're talking about
13 here would be lost, that the natural and scenic
14 amenities that made Times Beach a nice place to live
15 and a nice place to float by if you were on the
16 Meramec would be lost if we just left this with a
17 simple cleanup requirement where people would be free
18 to use bulldozers, knock down all the trees, and just
19 make it as easy as possible for them.

20 And also, knowing the inclination toward a
21 lot of these contractors to use the biggest bulldozer
22 possible just because they like to, not because they
23 need to, but because they like to, and we specified in
24 the cleanup requirements that they were to be diligent
25 about protecting the natural amenities. And that has

1 been successful.

2 I think Times -- and we're not inviting
3 everybody to go down there now. Hopefully, in a few
4 months we'll be able to do that. The cleanup has
5 occurred in Times Beach. The other work there related
6 to incinerators is not done, of course, but the
7 cleanup in the streets and home areas has been done.

8 And I'd say an excellent job was done in
9 protecting all the scenic amenities. It proves that
10 it's possible to do that, to clean up to the standards
11 which involve the removal of soil and sediment, but
12 yet to protect the scenic amenities. We have a case
13 study in that right here in St. Louis County.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Any other
15 comments or observations?

16 MR. EBERLE: A question. Is there an
17 agreed-upon reclamation plan for Coldwater Creek by
18 the county quite apart from any radiation factors?

19 MR. PRYOR: I'll just address the linear
20 park idea. The linear park concept, after extensive
21 study, actually fell by the wayside due to local
22 concerned citizens and local communities that -- well,
23 sort of this whole thing you've heard before, but I'm
24 sure having bike paths and foot paths running along
25 the creek on the opposite side from where people

1 lived -- a lot of the people wanted the springs and so
2 the project sort of fell by the wayside. As far as I
3 know, the county has no particular ongoing project
4 there other than the fact that they've always
5 recognized that lower section Coldwater Creek was one
6 of the better quality creek areas remaining in
7 St. Louis County.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Does that answer your
9 question?

10 MR. EBERLE: I was just pursuing the thought
11 that wouldn't it make sense to have a plan that people
12 wanted so that whatever, and I'm not questioning the
13 fact that we have a responsibility to do something
14 about that, I'm not questioning that all, but what we
15 do about it and what is it that the people there say
16 they want and how do you do the different things that
17 he talks about in his letter but in keeping with some
18 kind of plan as opposed to the objective simply being
19 removing those contaminated spots.

20 MR. PRYOR: You know, I wasn't at the
21 meeting this came up. This was the second pizza
22 night, I guess. But there are a number of people here
23 on this Task Force who, you know, either live on or
24 are concerned about -- and we had Sandy Delcoure last
25 time and we heard from Ed -- people who are concerned

1 about Coldwater Creek and I think the concerns, I've
2 always heard, have been of two types. One is that we
3 want Coldwater Creek cleaned up because kids play in
4 the creek, it's in our backyards; and two, we want it
5 cleaned up because it's also, hey, it's a neat creek
6 in many places.

7 And those two concerns, I think, are both --
8 not speaking for people like Nancy and Sandy Delcoure,
9 but I think both those concerns are high in their
10 minds. And I don't think there -- there's not so much
11 a reclamation plan in mind, but there is the fact that
12 just two weeks ago they were confronted with the idea
13 that maybe they couldn't have both these things. It's
14 either or. And I think John's suggesting that's not
15 necessarily the case, we can maybe have both.

16 MS. DREY: You mean, you can clean up but
17 you can also preserve the quality.

18 MR. PRYOR: You know, I don't think anyone
19 has, in county government, you know, whether anyone in
20 county government has a plan for that.

21 MR. EBERLE: My final question is don't we
22 have to be very careful as we carry out our
23 responsibility we move into a local community and
24 begin to do things which either restrict or change or
25 condition or affect what they choose to have happen in

1 their community, and how do we resolve that? Because
2 as you pointed out, Roger, what has happened is we
3 keep hearing the controversy about different things
4 and should we be the ones that in order to do this act
5 in ways that may draw those conclusions?

6 THE FACILITATOR: It seems to me that
7 ideally we ought to integrate all the available
8 information. We ought to ask those questions and make
9 sure we're sensitive to whatever answers we get or
10 clues we get.

11 MR. MANNING: The Corps of Engineers plans
12 for flood control on Coldwater Creek actually show the
13 creation of a linear park and a walking or slash bike
14 trail alongside of Coldwater Creek once they have done
15 the flood control measures for Coldwater Creek. And
16 that was placed on hold about ten years ago mainly due
17 to the coalition to get Coldwater Creek cleaned up at
18 that time. And that's one of the things the city of
19 Hazelwood and I believe the city of Florissant would
20 like to see put back into motion. And one of the
21 reasons why the city of Hazelwood is pushing so much
22 for the cleanup of Coldwater Creek is so that we can
23 look at the flood control issue again -- or the
24 flooding issue along Coldwater Creek.

25 THE FACILITATOR: So there are really three

1 issues. There's the desire to clean up the
2 radioactive contamination, there is the desire to
3 maintain the conditions, at least at the lower end of
4 creek, and there's the desire to manage flood water
5 throughout the length of the creek and somehow -- and
6 then when you add whatever the concerns of those who
7 are most directly affected by the creek to that
8 equation, those are the issues that need to be integrated
9 it seems.

10 MR. EBERLE: It seems like somebody has to
11 have a plan so that when we do our part in this, we're
12 not in there messing up the works.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Well, one way we could
14 handle that I think is by -- since we are on a tight
15 schedule, our report, at least in its draft form,
16 could say something to the effect that community input
17 ought to be integrated into this equation, but here
18 are our objectives from a remediation point of view
19 integrating what we know from those at the table about
20 flood water control and the general objective of
21 preserving the character of the lower end of the
22 creek. Then we do have a plan that includes a public
23 comment opportunity, a review and comment opportunity
24 prior to our finalizing our recommendations to DOE,
25 and it could even be an ongoing, open-ended thing if

1 we don't feel that we have enough information.

2 MS. LUBIEWSKI: Every community that is
3 impacted by Coldwater Creek has been invited time and
4 again to be a part of this committee. If the
5 communities of Black Jack and Spanish Lake are
6 impacted by Coldwater Creek, if they wanted to be
7 here, they could be here. If they choose to wait for
8 the public comment period, that's their choice. Mayor
9 Egan, City of Florissant, has sent Lou Jearls to be
10 representative for the administration of the city, so
11 Florissant is represented. And St. Louis County,
12 where Coldwater Creek runs through, is also
13 represented on this committee. So I have no problem
14 with the decision this Task Force makes on Coldwater
15 Creek because everybody hasn't had an opportunity and
16 will have an opportunity to speak on the issue.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: I just wanted to briefly
18 say that it sounds like we've had several plans
19 mentioned and one other group that was speaking this
20 morning was Operation Stream Team -- is that the name
21 of it? -- from Sandy Delcours and it sounded as if
22 there was a possible project in their minds, but I
23 still think we are primarily concerned with cleaning
24 this up and that should be our focus. That's the most
25 active issue at the moment. These other things are

1 speculative and they can still follow after our
2 action, but you can't put their action ahead of ours.
3 So I think we should focus on the cleanup aspects and
4 remain open minded to these other things as
5 information is provided.

6 MS. FLYNN: Good morning. I need to leave
7 here this morning and so I wanted to jump ahead a
8 little bit to Kay Drey's motion and say that if there
9 is some type of formal vote on it that the city of
10 Berkeley wanted to go on record as being in favor of
11 the motion here as it is amended.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Christina
13 indicated earlier to me that she had to leave at 8:45
14 and asked for an opportunity to express that thought
15 before she had to leave.

16 MS. DREY: Christina, are you two votes?

17 MS. FLYNN: Am I two votes? Yes, I'm two
18 votes.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Well, that's
20 interesting.

21 MS. FLYNN: I'm speaking for Ted Hoskins and
22 Josh Richardson, so that's two votes.

23 THE FACILITATOR: All right.

24 MS. FLYNN: So if I take me, then that's
25 three votes.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Why stop there? What's
2 the population of Berkeley?

3 MS. FLYNN: We're 12,900. Thank you.

4 THE FACILITATOR: All right. I saw a couple
5 of hands. I saw Ric first and then Roger.

6 MR. CAVANAGH: Could someone explain this
7 particular handout, where it came from, since it does
8 pertain to Coldwater Creek?

9 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, there is also a copy
10 of that chart mounted at the rear of the room. As I
11 understand it, and please whoever created it jump in,
12 but as I understand it that chart indicates degrees of
13 contamination at points along Coldwater Creek where
14 testing has occurred.

15 MR. ADLER: That's correct. It's the
16 results of a sampling program conducted at specified
17 locations up and down the creek. The data is
18 represented against distance so it's concentrate
19 versus distance.

20 THE FACILITATOR: So the spikes would
21 indicate locations along the creek where higher
22 concentrations of contamination were found?

23 MR. ADLER: Was detected.

24 THE FACILITATOR: And what's the distinction
25 between red and blue?

1 MR. ADLER: I'm not certain, but I think
2 it's left side, right side or center line or outside
3 the line.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. So it's location
5 within the creek then.

6 MR. ADLER: Location within the creek in
7 the --

8 THE FACILITATOR: Laterally.

9 MR. ADLER: -- in the dimension.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Good.

11 MR. ADLER: It only captures data from
12 within the creek bed itself. And there's another blue
13 line for the cross field which identifies five
14 picocuries per gram as a benchmark. Five picocuries
15 per gram is the standard that we've used for
16 residential property cleanup. So if you were trying
17 to ensure that that creek bed could be drained and
18 developed for residential purposes then consistent
19 with the old application, otherwise you want to knock
20 out all those spikes and go five.

21 MR. CAVANAGH: So if I'm understanding this
22 correctly, then, the spikes are significant 12,000
23 feet downstream from SLAPS?

24 MR. ADLER: Well, I think you've got a data
25 point there about 50 picocuries per gram or so

1 probably.

2 MR. CAVANAGH: Yeah. I guess the question
3 is, in reading this, if I'm interpreting this
4 correctly, obviously the further away from SLAPS you
5 get, the less problem there is.

6 MR. ADLER: That's correct.

7 MR. CAVANAGH: And I guess can someone
8 define then like how far 22,000 feet downstream from
9 SLAPSS get us? Does that give us a point of
10 reference.

11 MR. ADLER: I know that most of the peaks --
12 yeah, and I've asked that that be done, but it hasn't
13 been done yet. But most of the high peaks are from
14 270 south. There's detectable contamination past that
15 too, but once you get north of 270, you're into the
16 lower peak range.

17 I think another point I'd just make on the
18 chart is that if we were attempting to draw that flat
19 blue line currently at five picocuries per gram at a
20 level suitable for other end-points such as swimming
21 and fishing and recreational use, but not agrarian,
22 farmer, residential use, that line would be longer, I
23 believe. I haven't seen that line calculated for
24 purposes of this creek, but given the lesser exposure
25 associated just with swimming and fishing and

1 accidental ingestion of water and stuff, you'd
2 probably have a higher line. I'm not sure what it
3 would be. It would probably be above some of the
4 peaks from on the lower end of the chart.

5 THE FACILITATOR: All right.

6 MR. PRYOR: Well, just to follow up on that
7 question, I also have a motion, how long is Coldwater
8 Creek from the tarmac from the SLAPS site down to the
9 Missouri in miles? This covers about eight miles here
10 on this chart.

11 MR. ADLER: Correct. Yeah, let Dave. He's
12 more knowledgeable.

13 MR. MILLER: Yeah, I might be able to speak
14 a little bit to this and answer some of the technical
15 questions associated with it.

16 The samples are sediment samples, they're
17 not water samples. They're taken from the center of
18 creek in the sediments and then the banks of the creek
19 also, not just simply in the stream bed.

20 This shows basically from the McDonnell
21 Boulevard bridge at the SLAPS to the mouth of the
22 Missouri River, it's about eight miles, I think, eight
23 or nine miles. And I don't know exactly where it
24 crosses 270, but I think it's somewhere around the
25 eight to 12,000 foot downstream mark. This data was

1 sampled at approximately every thousand feet or so
2 from three locations across the stream as proceeding
3 downstream. And I would be happy to answer any other
4 specific questions related to this data. It comes
5 from the RI done by Bechtel in 1994.

6 THE FACILITATOR: All right. This is
7 Remedial Investigation?

8 MR. MILLER: Yes.

9 MS. DREY: Is it based on Coldwater Creek --
10 I mean, the Corps of Engineers study, was it?

11 MR. MILLER: No, this was done by --

12 MS. DREY: The Corps of Engineers.

13 MR. MILLER: I'm sorry. It was done --

14 MR. ADLER: I'm aware of it, yes. The Corps
15 paid for some of it, Kay. All of it was implemented
16 by Bechtel; some of it was funded by the Corps.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

18 MR. BRANDES: I believe he answered my
19 question. This was '94 study?

20 MR. MILLER: Well, the report was published
21 in '94. The samples were actually taken around 1990
22 or '91. I'm not sure of exact date, but it was
23 approximately that time.

24 MR. BRANDES: Okay. Down on the bottom of
25 your chart then, 366 is not the date?

1 MR. MILLER: No, that's the page number out
2 of the RI.

3 MR. BRANDES: Thank you.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, Roger.

5 MR. PRYOR: I would propose a motion that I
6 think -- let me ask a clarification, first of all. We
7 have not -- have we actually approved, as a Task
8 Force, any of the recommendations? We talked about
9 them last time that were made by the special meetings,
10 and there was some discussion, but I don't recall
11 actually --

12 THE FACILITATOR: Unfortunately because the
13 meetings have only been, you know, a week apart --

14 MR. PRYOR: Yeah.

15 THE FACILITATOR: -- and there was a crunch
16 in order to get ready for this meeting, I have not
17 read the complete transcript of last week's meeting
18 and therefore I don't know the answer to your
19 question.

20 MOTION:

21 MR. PRYOR: Well, if it's appropriate I
22 would like to at least offer a motion that the Task
23 Force would reconsider the consensus that was
24 supposedly expressed last time that Level III be
25 applied to the lower end of Coldwater Creek and that

1 instead that we would urge that Level IV be
2 considered, if it can be shown it can be done in a way
3 consistent with the concerns very few people expressed
4 here about the creek, but -- and I think also with
5 respect to George and Ric's comments that it be done
6 in a way that is consistent with other agencies and
7 communities and their expectations for the future of
8 Coldwater Creek.

9 It seems to me the best -- you know, I think
10 we could ask John to do more for us, but it seems to
11 the best we can do as a Task Force is to recommend
12 that we go for as much of a cleanup in Coldwater Creek
13 as we can that meets everybody's other objectives.

14 And I'd hate for us to recommend Level III,
15 for example -- this is not part of the motion --
16 recommend Level III and we find out later on that a
17 higher level cleanup would be achievable without
18 creating the damage that we're concerned about.

19 But, you know, if it's appropriate now or
20 it's appropriate later, I would certainly hope that we
21 would reconsider where we're headed at least last
22 week.

23 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Let's first
24 see if there is a second to the motion.

25 MS. DREY: Second.

1 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Thank you,
2 there is a second to the motion. I saw a couple of
3 hands. Sally?

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: I was just going to second
5 the motion.

6 THE FACILITATOR: I see.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Actually, I'm so pleased
8 because this is what I said last week. This is
9 exactly what I said. I hoped that we could do a very
10 limited hand -- I don't know if you're going to like
11 that but, I mean, a very small scale type of operation
12 that would not impact the creek, but yet would catch
13 the numbers that we need to get removed, so I accept
14 the motion as stated. I'll second it, if that's what
15 you wish, Kay.

16 MR. CAVANAGH: Point of order, I don't think
17 the Chair can second.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: I didn't think I could.

19 MR. MANNING: I was going to second, but it
20 leads into the resolution that the city of Hazelwood
21 passed at a council meeting last week basically
22 endorsing the recommendations that came out of the
23 working group and we're asking that they consider a
24 Phase IV or Cleanup IV level for the lower level of
25 Coldwater Creek, if it can be done without destroying

1 the environment, and that it be cleaned up to a level
2 that would permit the Corps to proceed with the flood
3 controls for Coldwater Creek is basically what the
4 resolution was.

5 THE FACILITATOR: I'm circulating the
6 resolution now. I was actually saving that for the
7 new business portion of the agenda, but since it has
8 been brought up, that's what's going around the table.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Tom, did you just say that
10 you supported a Level III for the lower end of the
11 creek in your resolution?

12 MR. MANNING: No.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: You did not.

14 MR. MANNING: No, we supported IV for the
15 lower end.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's what I thought.
17 Okay.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Would anybody else like a
19 copy of this? There are still a few. This is the
20 Hazelwood resolution, city council resolution. Okay.

21 MR. CAVANAGH: Just for clarification, since
22 the motion got long-winded. Basically what the motion
23 is --

24 MR. PRYOR: I resent that.

25 MR. CAVANAGH: -- is that the Task Force

1 support a Level IV cleanup for all Coldwater Creek
2 with the proviso that special care be taken at the
3 lower end to maintain the integrity of the natural
4 environment.

5 MR. PRYOR: Yeah. And also I think to
6 incorporate, to the extent we can, the concerns and
7 plans of other agencies and communities regarding
8 Coldwater Creek.

9 THE FACILITATOR: All right. So there is a
10 motion on the floor, it has been seconded, and now
11 we're into discussion.

12 MS. DREY: I just wonder too, though, Roger,
13 why just that section of the lower end? I mean, I
14 realize it should be at the lower end, but I think,
15 you know, there are parks and so on along there.

16 MR. PRYOR: The recommendation for IV had
17 already been for a IV on the upper end.

18 MS. DREY: But IV doesn't need to be big
19 bulldozers either is what I'm saying.

20 MR. PRYOR: Well, okay.

21 MS. DREY: I think that the beauty of the
22 creek should try to be preserved as much as possible.

23 MR. PRYOR: Well, I guess maybe I'm naive,
24 and maybe Dave can speak to this, but I assume that
25 DOE when they contract with somebody what they

1 contract to do, say, clean up the ballfield site or a
2 SLAPS site that they would contract somebody for
3 Coldwater Creek and would certainly do it in a very
4 different way. I mean, that they would certainly be
5 certainly mindful of the fact there's a slightly
6 different environment involved.

7 MR. ADLER: Sure. I think that if the group
8 can just state among other performance objectives, a
9 performance objective of minimizing some of the
10 ecological impacts and then leave it to us to figure
11 out what --

12 MS. DREY: Minimize what?

13 MR. ADLER: To minimize ecological impacts
14 and leave it up to us to figure out how to do that.

15 MS. DREY: Okay.

16 MR. ADLER: I think that, and it may be
17 misleading a little bit, I think that ultimately we
18 have two objectives -- one to be able to drain the
19 creek and build homes in the bottom of it, which is
20 what the Level IV cleanup would provide, and to
21 minimize ecological impact. They may, and I could be
22 wrong, but they may be mutually exclusive end-points.
23 It may not be possible to render it suitable for
24 unrestricted future use, drain the creek, bring in the
25 homes, and have minimal impact on the creek bed. We

1 need to find that out. I mean, at Times Beach they
2 had a -- at Times Beach they actually cleaned it up to
3 totally unrestricted release standards without
4 impacting vegetation -- or minimizing the impact of
5 vegetation. So I suppose it depends on how much
6 impact of vegetation you can withstand.

7 MR. CAVANAGH: Then I think the question of
8 whether or not houses would be built or whatever is a
9 planning and zoning issue for the municipalities and
10 the unincorporated areas.

11 MR. PRYOR: Well, barring events that
12 usually take time, I don't think anybody will be
13 building homes in the creek anytime.

14 MR. ADLER: I don't either. And that's why
15 I would think it sensible to consider a relaxed
16 standard. I don't know. You know, III and IV mean
17 different things to different people. To me, if the
18 performance objective is to have the creek itself
19 restored for all potential recreational uses --
20 fishing, swimming, things of that sort, ecological
21 endpoints, and then I guess being able to build homes
22 up to the edge of the creek or something like that,
23 then we can probably pull off a cleanup that maintains
24 the ecological integrity of the creek.

25 MR. PRYOR: Just for the record, I'm not

1 going to debate the issue, but the Coalition
2 Environment feels that recreational use, in many
3 cases, demands and deserves as much -- as high a level
4 cleanup as residential use. And sometimes certain
5 cases maybe even more so because of the way people
6 interact with the area.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: I have one question about
8 this motion. If in the lower end of creek there is
9 some contamination that would need to take the
10 excavation phase of the project to achieve a Level IV,
11 are we saying that we would do that then?

12 MR. PRYOR: I don't think we're making a
13 hard --

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: I guess what I'm asking
15 is, is there any area of the creek that we are going
16 to agree to a Level III cleanup level in order to
17 maintain the natural integrity of the creek? -- you
18 know, in a particularly nice area.

19 MR. PRYOR: Well, I think what the
20 resolution says is that it is the desire of Task Force
21 that Level IV cleanup be achieved given these
22 constraints that we put on there. I don't think we
23 can go on and second guess anymore than that because
24 we don't know. You know, there's a lot of what-ifs
25 that might come up, but what we're saying is that it's

1 possible to do it under these -- these other
2 considerations involved and if that's what you want to
3 see done.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: So you're a DOE contractor
5 and you go in and you find soil that in order to
6 maintain the trees and the rock formations and keep
7 things as they are, you would need to go to a Level
8 III cleanup, but we state it's our desire for a Level
9 IV. I mean, that's the kind of question I think we're
10 leaving unanswered with this. We're not saying that
11 yes, in fact, maintaining the integrity of the creek
12 is our primary concern. You know, it sounds like
13 we're still saying Level IV so that we still open the
14 door to full excavation. And, you know, that may be
15 what we want. I just wanted to make sure.

16 MR. PRYOR: Well, my goal was not trying to
17 resolve all the questions because I didn't think they
18 were resolvable --

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

20 MR. PRYOR: -- but rather I didn't want to
21 see us go the other way and then decide irreversibly
22 that we thought Level III was okay, thought it was all
23 right, because we were worried about these concerns
24 that we ought to still strive for Level IV and to keep
25 concerns live and current, but not just not

1 automatically -- Level III, not knowing what's going
2 to happen. You know, if someone has a suggestion in a
3 way of us, you know, of doing this in a way that gives
4 us more certainty, you know, I think you're smarter
5 than I am.

6 MR. ROLEN: Yes, just a point of observation
7 in this whole process is that I don't see it --

8 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

9 MR. ROLEN: I don't see a process for a
10 mechanism for who makes the day-to-day decisions on
11 what's taken out and what's left in. And then if a
12 plan is approved and funded, will the government hold
13 itself immune to local ordinances and laws? For
14 instance, if you need an access road and the local
15 community doesn't want an access road, then how do you
16 resolve those differences?

17 THE FACILITATOR: Well, I think we have a
18 couple of shots at doing our best job. I mean, this
19 is all productive discussion. It will inform what is
20 written in the initial draft. There will then be an
21 opportunity for people to react to that initial draft
22 and refine it before it goes to the public. And then
23 there will be the opportunity for the public to say
24 here's what's on our mind. And we'll do the best we
25 can and whatever caveats we can come up with, we'll

1 include and after that I don't know. If we think that
2 it's open-ended or too open-ended, then we'll have to
3 perhaps recommend that there be some ongoing
4 oversight -- local oversight. And there might be a
5 lot of ways of doing that.

6 MS. DREY: I would like to request that a
7 clear definition of the Department of Energy's term,
8 quotes, release for unrestricted use, DOE's wording
9 for that, to define that, would be helpful to have in
10 the final report. I know Dave Adler, DOE, often says
11 residential. To me you can have unrestricted use
12 where people don't actually have houses.

13 And I would like to say, too, that I hope in
14 the mention of the concerns about Coldwater Creek that
15 kids fish there -- I mean, people fish there and they
16 swim there and they sit on the banks and eat snow and
17 all kinds of recreational activities, but they also --
18 the creek does flood and people do have back yard
19 gardens and I think that's very important to put into
20 the report.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Is there any more
22 discussion on the motion?

23 MR. EBERLE: Might it be helpful if we asked
24 the county and the state and the municipalities to
25 give us guidance how to proceed on this? Because the

1 fundamental issue, and Roger alluded to that -- or no,
2 not alluded -- it was stated in his motion that we do
3 this in accordance with future use. So it does seem
4 like we've got to say to them, look, you know, we have
5 to make the decision so we want to be guided by you,
6 what do you see as future use. That also, I think,
7 can help get to the point Ray was making about
8 somebody out here in the county or the state has to
9 decide who's going to arbitrate between all these
10 people who want to do different things and not get
11 stuck.

12 THE FACILITATOR: And the key at this point
13 is that we may not know all those different things
14 yet.

15 MR. EBERLE: Yeah, but I guess all I'm
16 saying is can we emphasize that they have to tell us,
17 not that we're going to be guided by what we think it
18 is or that everybody has had an opportunity to do
19 that, but what are their recommendations for that
20 future use. If they don't they don't know, then they
21 say they don't know.

22 MR. HORGAN: Okay. I think the Congressman
23 would definitely support the principle and theory of
24 the motion. There's two caveats that I'd like to
25 throw out for the committee to think about. First of

1 all, one of the -- it's not really a caveat -- I think
2 the Congressman would want it to be so that Hazelwood
3 could get in a position, whether full cleanup what
4 have you, so that they can eventually start their --
5 the Corps can go back to work on the flood control
6 project that they tried to start ten years ago and
7 have been on hold ever since, that would be pretty
8 important.

9 The other thing is in terms of the theory
10 and the content of the motion, I think the Congressman
11 would be very receptive to supporting it. However,
12 we're talking in general terms right now and I don't
13 know what these different motions and points are going
14 to have on the total cost, but I just caution the Task
15 Force that we deal -- the fiscal reality of it may not
16 let us do what we want to do.

17 I think Congressman Talent will work hard to
18 abide by what the Task Force does, but, you know,
19 there's 435 other members of Congress and I think we
20 need to be cautious about that. But, like I said, I
21 just want the Task Force to be aware of the potential
22 fiscal realities and the politics involved in it.

23 MR. PRYOR: I was just going to comment that
24 George's concerns here actually apply to all those
25 sites that we're -- everything we're recommending. I

1 mean, we don't know how this is going to cut with, you
2 know, the community until we put it out there for them
3 to see. I mean, there could be -- it's not just
4 Coldwater Creek that, you know, every one of these
5 sites, every one of these proposed for cleanup is
6 going to have to, you know, go before public scrutiny
7 and, you know, will probably be more scrutinized by
8 the individual communities and governmental officials
9 than it has been to date.

10 MS. LUBIEWSKI: We can ask the different
11 cities what they want to do, but politicians and
12 politics change all the time. People come and go,
13 their ideas change. All I want to do is clean up the
14 park and then give the cities -- or the Coldwater
15 Creek area, and give the cities then an opportunity to
16 decide what they want to do with it.

17 If we ask a city what they want to do, the
18 response could be in a month, it could be in a year
19 before they get back to us. April is elections again
20 so the response we get in a month could be totally
21 different than in April. The public comment, they'll
22 come back and change their mind again depending on
23 who's in office. We can only provide a clean creek so
24 that they can then make their decisions.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Is there any other

1 discussion on the motion? Are you ready to vote on
2 the motion? Is that a yes?

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Could we restate the
4 motion? Could someone restate the motion?

5 THE FACILITATOR: Well, I can synthesize it.
6 And there is a record that is made, so we will have an
7 accurate record of the motion, but as I understand it
8 in the simplest form, the objective is to achieve the
9 highest level of cleanup throughout the length of
10 Coldwater Creek that can be achieved without
11 undesirable damage to the environment, the creek
12 environment. And we, as George Eberle proposed, want
13 to incorporate to the best of our ability any
14 additional information in the way of planning for the
15 creek or community desires or individual desires and
16 the way those may impact on the cleanup.

17 MS. DREY: Roger, didn't you say you were at
18 Level IV?

19 MR. PRYOR: Well, I'm assuming that is the
20 highest level that we're talking about here.

21 MR. EBERLE: Is that what you said, Jim,
22 Level IV?

23 THE FACILITATOR: Well, I said the highest
24 level, but we've defined Option IV as the highest
25 level and so that's the objective.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: But that does not mean IV
2 to me. If you say highest level without impacting the
3 creek, DOE could interpret that as something other
4 than a IV. That was my question -- what are we really
5 saying?

6 THE FACILITATOR: Level IV to the extent
7 achievable without compromising those other
8 objectives. And I'm getting a confirmation --

9 MR. GRIGGS: Do you want the highest level
10 possible or the highest level?

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Excuse me?

12 MR. GRIGGS: Do you mean the highest level
13 possible that's attainable, or everybody carte blanc
14 wants IV? The highest level to possibly obtain or we
15 could demand IV.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's two different
17 things.

18 MR. GRIGGS: That's two different issues.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

20 MR. MANNING: Yes, I would like the motion
21 to be amended like the city passed, the city of
22 Hazelwood passed a resolution. And it simply states
23 that the Hazelwood City Council urges the Task Force
24 to consider amending this to an Option IV for the
25 area, provided that a more extensive cleanup can be

1 done without destroying the trees and surrounding
2 environment. We believe the areas proposed for the
3 flood control measures should be cleaned up to a Level
4 IV, if it needs to be cleaned up to a level that will
5 support the flood control measures. If it's anything
6 less, it will not allow the Corps access to the --
7 basically the Corps will take a hands-off policy.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Is that clear?

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: That is clear. I still
10 don't know if we're requiring a Level IV or if we're
11 just asking for the highest attainable.

12 THE FACILITATOR: I think what we're saying
13 is that that's the desired objective.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: What is?

15 MS. DREY: Well, your resolution says IV.

16 MR. PRYOR: I think my motion really said
17 IV, too, but it's been a while. If it would make
18 things easier and this is cleaner, I'd be willing to
19 withdraw my motion in favor of us adopting the
20 resolution that Hazelwood submitted because it's
21 certainly clear.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure. Can the
23 Chair add an addendum?

24 MR. CAVANAGH: I believe it can be accepted
25 as a friendly amendment if the person who made the

1 motion plus the person who seconded -- am I correct?

2 THE FACILITATOR: Yes.

3 MS. DREY: I seconded it.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Actually the seconder has
5 to accept it first.

6 MR. PRYOR: There's no pride of ownership
7 here. Whatever will convey this. I think the sense
8 is we want a Level IV if it can be done in a way that
9 doesn't screw everything else up.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Well, if you're
11 comfortable with what Tom Manning has just read, then
12 certainly that's a simpler approach because it's
13 already typewritten and it's not subject to --

14 MR. PRYOR: I would accept Tom's written
15 version here as a friendly amendment, substituted
16 amendment, to my original motion.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Who seconded?
18 Kay seconded it. Kay said yes.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: I have an amendment that I
20 understand someone is going to have to offer for me,
21 but my amendment would be that we make some statement
22 clear in there that it would be a minimum Level III.
23 I'm just worried that if we don't state something
24 minimally because we're leaving it subject to the
25 language of -- without destroying the trees and

1 surrounding environment.

2 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Well, the
3 concept is put on the table. Does anyone want to
4 react to that, that the threshold be established at
5 Option III, but that the objective be expressed as
6 Option IV?

7 MS. LUBIEWSKI: I know exactly what you're
8 getting at, I understand it completely, but I think
9 this motion is just to send a message that IV is what
10 we want. It can be done. It may or may not be
11 costly, we don't know. At this point, we don't know.
12 But if IV can be done, we as the committee want it
13 done and we want it done with the method of preserving
14 the environment around it.

15 There's always time later to negotiate down,
16 but our first message should be very strong in the
17 desire. And I'm not comfortable with saying with a
18 minimum of Option III if need be at this point in
19 time. At this point in time, I think we should come
20 on real strong, get the point across pointblank, and
21 then let the DOE come back later and say, well now, we
22 have to try and work around this. And then that's
23 when the Oversight Committee would come into play
24 after this committee is all finished and we start
25 observing what they're doing.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. I'm comfortable
2 with that.

3 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Where does
4 that leave us?

5 MS. DREY: The motion that Roger now has on
6 the table is just to change the first few words of the
7 Hazelwood motion. Is that right, Roger?

8 MR. PRYOR: Well, in fairness, it's not the
9 whole Hazelwood motion.

10 MS. DREY: No, no, just that one -- two
11 sentence -- the one sentence, right? The Hazelwood
12 City Council, this would be the St. Louis Remediation
13 Task Force endorses --

14 MR. PRYOR: Well, if I may put this into
15 words that sound like a motion from us, we would drop
16 out the part Hazelwood City Council urges and say the
17 Task Force recommends Option IV for the lower end of
18 Coldwater Creek provided more extensive cleanup can be
19 done without destroying the trees and surrounding
20 environment. We believe all areas imposed to flood
21 control measures should be cleaned up to Level --
22 Option IV. And that's something additional there
23 which we're adding. But we put it in form, not as
24 Hazelwood motion, but as our motion.

25 THE FACILITATOR: All right. That is the

1 motion then. The slightly adapted language extracted
2 from the next to last paragraph, is it, Section 3 of
3 the Hazelwood Resolution No. 9610 which was circulated
4 earlier. So that is the motion that's on the floor
5 now as I understand it. Kay was the seconder and she
6 is amenable to that; Roger moved and he's amenable to
7 it. Are there any objections to that being the
8 motion?

9 MS. DREY: Now, you said lower end?

10 MR. PRYOR: Because they referred to this
11 area and so I had to stick it in there. It said lower
12 part, I believe. I left out the first sentence.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'll call the question.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Is there anything more to
15 be said on this motion? All right. The question has
16 been called. All those in favor of the motion as
17 amended please signify by saying aye. All those
18 opposed, please say nay. One nay vote. Any
19 abstentions? Thank you.

20 We have eleven minutes left on our schedule
21 and we are now at, I believe -- unless there is
22 anything more to be said about Coldwater Creek today,
23 we can move to Item 6 on the agenda which is Kay
24 Drey's motion which is actually a different motion
25 than was originally introduced. And there were copies

1 of this available for you, I believe, on the table as
2 you came in today. Is there anyone who does not have
3 a copy of a faxed document with a date of 07/22 at the
4 top left corner, 4:02 p.m.? Okay.

5 KAY DREY'S MOTION:

6 MS. DREY: Our parliamentarian has suggested
7 that I introduce this as a new motion because
8 otherwise things have to happen like having to do with
9 the table. I move that -- now what? Do I read it?
10 Okay -- that the motion as distributed dated July 22,
11 I move that.

12 MR. CAVANAGH: Second.

13 THE FACILITATOR: All right. There is a
14 motion and a second. Is there any discussion?

15 MR. MANNING: I just want a clarification so
16 that we all know that even though we're saying -- and
17 I concur that we did establish this as our number one
18 priority -- that this does not mean that all funding
19 is going to be directed just toward that one project,
20 that the other projects will continue on as we have
21 already got basically in progress.

22 MS. DREY: Yeah, Tom I did try -- may I
23 answer?

24 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, it's a question to
25 you.

1 MS. DREY: Okay. I did try to say that. It
2 was partly why I thought it was important for this all
3 to be one motion so it couldn't be, you know, severed.

4 MR. MANNING: Well, that's the way I
5 understood --

6 MS. DREY: And is it does say --

7 MR. MANNING: -- that's why I wanted it
8 clarified.

9 MS. DREY: Yeah. Good, Tom. But the second
10 paragraph it says that the Task Force requests that
11 remediation for unrestricted use continue or begin at
12 the various -- you know, those sites. And then again
13 I think the next paragraph, No. 3, says continue or
14 begin. So definitely. Now, if you would like to, you
15 know, amend it to make that more clear?

16 MR. MANNING: No, that's what I wanted that
17 clarification in the record.

18 MS. DREY: Good.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Any additional questions
20 or comments?

21 MR. GRANT: Yeah, I just wanted to point
22 out, other than as we just voted, I guess the
23 requirements here aren't quite exactly the same as
24 what the pizza committee had proposed, and I don't
25 believe we did, but that discussion came up before and

1 I don't think the Task Force has ever voted on those
2 and I think the one difference here is whether West
3 Lake landfill ought to be Option IV or Option III.
4 This proposes Option IV for West Lake landfill. I
5 believe the pizza committee proposed Option III.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Did everyone hear what Jim
7 said? Thank you. Any additional comments?
8 Questions?

9 MR. ADLER: It's not really so much a
10 comment --

11 MS. DREY: Can't hear you.

12 MR. ADLER: Not so much a comment as a
13 request for a clarification that may not be necessary.
14 If the intent isn't to direct funding as a priority
15 matter to SLAPS, what is the function of establishing
16 the priority, just for clarification?

17 MS. DREY: Can you say that again? I'm
18 sorry.

19 MR. ADLER: I think what this resolution
20 says is start cleaning everything up, keep on cleaning
21 up what you're cleaning, and start cleaning up the
22 airport site also. That's the net thrust of this to
23 me.

24 And if the implementation, kind of the
25 operational interpretation of that, is split the money

1 up and spread it evenly across those different
2 categories, that's one thing. If it's refocused from
3 one thing to another, that's another thing.

4 I guess I'm trying to get a handle on what
5 the priority establishment means. If it doesn't mean
6 budget, what are you asking the department operational
7 to do with the newly established priority? How is
8 that to change what we do in '97 or '98?

9 MR. CAVANAGH: I can speak to that. That
10 second sentence states -- you know, if we're going on
11 record that the airport site is the highest priority,
12 but the specific request is that DOE start that
13 cleanup at site in fiscal '97 and at the same time
14 continuing, you know, other efforts and so forth. I
15 think that seems to be the intent. I'm interpreting
16 Kay's writing, but --

17 THE FACILITATOR: Are you going to respond
18 to that, Kay or can Tom speak?

19 MS. DREY: Sure, Tom.

20 MR. BINZ: Yeah, at this point in time, it's
21 apparent to me that we really haven't debated issues
22 such as equity or other priorities. I think maybe
23 this is the point in time where we maybe should go
24 back to the Priorities Working Group and discuss the
25 realities of cutting up the pie or equity issues that

1 seem to be left unattended at this point in time.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Yes. I saw a couple of
3 hands.

4 MR. HORGAN: I just want to say that that's
5 a very good point because that would be one of the
6 things DOE will have when they get the recommendation,
7 and if it should be approved or what have you, they're
8 going to have to figure out how to do it. And if
9 SLAPS is a priority for this Task Force, I think we
10 have to indicate it -- I mean, the Task Force has
11 indicated, but they also have to be as specific as
12 possible for DOE.

13 MR. GRANT: Yeah, I did want to point out
14 too if you go back and look at the minutes of the
15 Priorities Working Group, I believe they had some
16 discussions in terms of prioritizing, I guess, the ten
17 individual units we're talking about and I think they
18 brought them into four groups of units and discussed a
19 priority, but I don't know that it was ever brought
20 back to the Task Force or even voted on the Priorities
21 Committee. Maybe some members of the committee could
22 comment on that.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Let me make sure I
24 understood the question. You don't know whether what
25 happened?

1 MR. GRANT: Well, I know I'm looking at the
2 minutes of the Priorities Work Group that they looked
3 at these individual units we're looking at like SLAPS,
4 the ballfields and they developed a priority --

5 THE FACILITATOR: Yes.

6 MR. GRANT: -- for those.

7 THE FACILITATOR: They did indeed.

8 MR. GRANT: I don't think they've ever come
9 back to the Task Group, though, with a recommendation
10 to adopt those.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Well, actually there was a
12 presentation and I'm guessing now it was at the May
13 meeting and it did --

14 MR. GRANT: I think that's correct.

15 THE FACILITATOR: There was a specific set
16 of recommendations in order of priority. There was,
17 in addition to that, a numerical ranking. There was a
18 point system that was used --

19 MR. GRANT: Right. Right.

20 THE FACILITATOR: -- to determine and SLAPS
21 clearly was the highest --

22 MR. GRANT: Right.

23 THE FACILITATOR: -- ranked. It was 37
24 points and the next one was perhaps 27 or 28 points,
25 and so there was a clear -- yes, Jack.

1 MR. FRAUENHOFFER: Jim, the rankings were
2 like 27, in terms of points, 24 and 24.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Is that it?

4 MR. FRAUENHOFFER: Statistically what we're
5 basically saying is a third, third, and third which is
6 what we've said all along.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Would you speak into the
8 microphone because I couldn't hear you?

9 MR. FRAUENHOFFER: The numbers were 27, 24
10 and 24. So statistically we're talking basically a
11 third, third, and third with a slight preference for
12 SLAPS for the people who were there. To my knowledge,
13 the whole Task Force -- it was reported to this group,
14 but the whole Task Force did not take up an equivalent
15 vote to that particular vote for the Priorities
16 meeting.

17 THE FACILITATOR: That's what I was going to
18 get to. There was no vote actually taken at the Task
19 Force meeting. The information was presented, there
20 was an opportunity to discuss it, I believe some
21 discussion did occur, but there wasn't ever a formal
22 vote taken on whether the Task Force embraced the
23 recommendation of the Priorities Working Group.

24 MR. CAVANAGH: I think in light of the time
25 schedule that you established last month in terms of

1 getting the final report generated, or a draft report
2 at least for this committee, I think that at this
3 point we probably need to start dealing with all of
4 these issues as a Task Force as opposed to going back
5 into working groups, moving to the point of, again,
6 making some final decisions rather quickly.

7 Otherwise, this could, you know, get into more
8 committee stuff and so forth. And I strongly support
9 the approach we've taken in the past, but I think now
10 it's time for all of us to deal with these issues and
11 if the Task Force votes differently than, you know,
12 these subcommittees so be it. Why worry? The Task
13 Force is the ultimate decision-making body.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Any additional?

15 MS. DREY: Could I ask -- is Elsa still
16 here?

17 MS. STEWARD: I'm still here.

18 MS. DREY: I wonder if you could speak to
19 the question of West Lake, the state's position? I
20 know you did mention that at the Priorities Working --

21 MS. STEWARD: No.

22 MS. DREY: Or maybe it was the pizza working
23 group.

24 MS. STEWARD: Can I ask a question first?
25 Has there been a second on this motion, Kay Drey's

1 motion?

2 THE FACILITATOR: Yes.

3 MS. STEWARD: And what was your question,
4 Kay?

5 MS. DREY: Well, somebody just raised the
6 question about West Lake landfill which it says on
7 this motion, the removal of these wastes to the Option
8 IV cleanup level. And I believe at the pizza meeting
9 you mentioned something about the state's position
10 with respect to West Lake with respect to its being in
11 the flood plain of the Missouri River.

12 Does the state have a position on West Lake
13 Landfill for the cleanup?

14 MS. STEWARD: No. What I said was that the
15 state would prefer an Option IV cleanup for the West
16 Lake Landfill because of its location in the flood
17 plain.

18 MS. DREY: That's why I guess -- somebody
19 said a few minutes ago that at this pizza meeting that
20 maybe we haven't taken a position on West Lake
21 Landfill and that's why I'm --

22 MS. STEWARD: We took a vote. We voted on
23 that.

24 MS. DREY: And what was the decision?

25 MR. MANNING: Actually it was a III.

1 THE FACILITATOR: That's right.

2 MR. MANNING: This is what came out of the
3 report that last meeting.

4 MS. DREY: Well, if somebody -- you know, if
5 there's a problem with that, you know, perhaps we
6 could say to the Option III or IV cleanup level if
7 somebody -- you know, if people would prefer that. I
8 don't remember that vote. I don't even remember how I
9 voted.

10 MR. ADLER: We're spending a lot of time
11 talking about do we call it a III or a IV. Just a
12 point to throw out. By time the report or
13 recommendation goes to some senior manager in
14 Washington we'll probably have to find a different
15 language. They won't know what III or IV is.

16 MS. DREY: Well, it's going to be defined.

17 MR. ADLER: For example, Kay, in here is
18 very clear and useful. She says that a IV means these
19 things. So we have to have someone say what it means.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, we have understood
21 that.

22 MR. ADLER: You need to move away completely
23 from III and IV and get to a cleanup to recreational
24 standards or a cleanup to some thing that people can
25 understand.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Well, we spent a great
2 deal of time, as you know, defining each of those
3 options.

4 MS. DREY: Well, I did try to say that in
5 the first paragraph what Level IV means.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Dave just acknowledged
7 that.

8 MS. DREY: Okay.

9 MS. GINSBURG: Kay, would you be open to
10 looking at the first three paragraphs as a single
11 motion and for the time being not dealing with the
12 fourth paragraph?

13 MS. DREY: Sorry.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Is that a yes or a no?

15 MS. DREY: I'm saying I would like West Lake
16 Landfill included. Now, if there's some way -- I
17 mean, it has a little historical background and I
18 think it's very clear, we've agreed on this from the
19 beginning, that the mission of this Task Force is to
20 include those radioactive wastes. And I tried to be
21 specific and not take in all the other crummy stuff
22 that's out there.

23 MS. GINSBURG: I'm not saying don't deal
24 with it; I'm saying divide it into two separate
25 motions.

1 MS. DREY: Yeah, I think it has to be one
2 motion, Anna. I'm sorry. But if you-all want to
3 make, you know, the Option III or IV, make it some
4 other way. I think we have to include it.

5 THE FACILITATOR: All right. There are two
6 points, then, that have been made. One is that the
7 motion stands as it is, it has been seconded as
8 offered, and that it does call for an Option IV
9 cleanup at West Lake Landfill. Whereas, the
10 Remediation Options Working Group recommended an
11 Option III. There was also confusion. It was not a
12 unanimous recommendation. There were some people on
13 the Remediation Options Working Group who felt they
14 didn't know enough about West Lake landfill to offer
15 any recommendation and there were some who felt that
16 it was really ultimately not the business of this Task
17 Force to determine what the cleanup ought to be, that
18 it has to do with a separate process that has been
19 established and is, as I understand it, underway. But
20 nevertheless, the recommendation out of that working
21 group was, with respect to West Lake Landfill, to
22 strive for an Option III cleanup.

23 MS. DREY: I do want to say I tried to
24 reflect that by saying requests the DOE in
25 consultation with the U.S. Environmental Protection

1 Agency, (lead agency at West Lake) and the Missouri
2 DNR develop a plan.

3 But, Tom, you're clear that we voted for
4 Option III?

5 MR. MANNING: On the back of the resolution
6 those were copied directly from the report from last
7 week.

8 MS. DREY: Well, should we say III or IV?

9 MS. STEWARD: How about saying a minimum of
10 III?

11 MS. DREY: That sounds good to me.
12 Excavation and removal of these wastes to a minimum of
13 Level III cleanup.

14 THE FACILITATOR: All right. This is an
15 amendment that has been proposed. The person who
16 proposed the motion in the first place is indicating
17 acceptance; is that correct?

18 MR. CAVANAGH: No.

19 THE FACILITATOR: No?

20 MR. CAVANAGH: Yes.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Which is it? So yes, the
22 answer is yes. Who seconded the motion?

23 MR. CAVANAGH: I did.

24 THE FACILITATOR: And does the seconder
25 agree? Yes. So we have an amendment to the

1 resolution. So we have changed it to a minimum of
2 Option III standards for West Lake.

3 MS. DREY: Are we saying level? Should we
4 be consistent?

5 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, we should be
6 consistent. We should try to be consistent.

7 MS. DREY: Option?

8 THE FACILITATOR: It should be option, not
9 level. Is there any more discussion on this motion?

10 MR. GRANT: Just another comment. I think
11 some of us had talked about maybe looking at each of
12 these different areas independently and maybe taking a
13 separate discussion or look at those. This would
14 finalize it all in one swath, okay. Because there are
15 some places or some of those areas where we've talking
16 about is, you know, there's going to be extensive
17 amount of monies, like at SLAPS, spent and through the
18 risk evaluation there's no reduction in risk and we're
19 concerned about the fact that we would spend hundreds
20 of millions of dollars and not see any risk reduction
21 in something like that. I just want to point that
22 out.

23 The other thing I'd want to point out too,
24 which was brought up in the first pizza committee
25 meeting, I think there were some comments that I think

1 Roger Pryor stated and I think Dan Wall stated when
2 Dan talked about the constraints under the Superfund
3 law in terms of having to balance cost versus risk and
4 that if we went for Option IV everything would outside
5 of that. And so I think Roger stated that, well, we
6 can go outside of the box if we want as a Task Force,
7 which I agree, then that brings us into a political
8 solution in terms of having to go fight for the
9 priorities or funds in Congress. So clearly those are
10 two paths we have when we decide whether we go full
11 bore and go for the political issue which may or may
12 not work or can we find a way to compromise and work
13 inside the Superfund box and get something moving
14 forward.

15 MS. LUBIEWSKI: I don't get what's going on
16 here. I'm not good in mornings as it is. This is
17 getting very difficult for me to pay attention to, I
18 guess. So maybe I'm saying something that may be out
19 of context, please forgive me. But the airport site
20 is the top of the all the other North County sites.
21 If it is not cleaned up 100 percent, there will then
22 be further contamination of the other sites. So all
23 the cleanups would then be wasted through underground
24 water travel, through above ground, through time.
25 Somewhere along the line, if we don't do the airport

1 right, then the ballfields will be recontaminated,
2 Coldwater Creek will be recontaminated, and everything
3 will have been for nothing.

4 Money is an issue to a lot of people, but
5 why bother spending a penny if it's not going to be
6 done right? It may cost a lot, but I can't put a
7 price -- I can't understand how anybody can put a
8 price on a clean environment and say oooh, that's too
9 much. That just -- that boggles my mind.

10 I did bring an article, and there's copies
11 up there, Nuclear Waste Cleanup Will Cost 230 Billion.
12 It's an old article. It's prior to the new -- the
13 replacement of Tom Grumbly. And if you look at the
14 numbers, what we're talking about in the big picture
15 doesn't add up to a hill of beans, even with total
16 cleanups of all the sites.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Any additional comments on
18 the motion? Yes, Dave.

19 MR. ADLER: I guess -- it just occurs to me
20 that basically what this motion does, is that it
21 identifies each portion of the site, including West
22 Lake, and it identifies the cleanup approach for each
23 portion of the site for all sites except McDonnell --
24 downtown identifying a IV.

25 So in effect what this motion does, I guess,

1 is to identify how to clean up the site. This motion
2 becomes a recommendation. This is the recommendation.
3 So it's a significant event. It basically does
4 everything that was proposed for the report in one
5 piece of paper and proposes that everything be fired
6 up in '97.

7 To the extent that it may be outside of the
8 box, as Jim said, beyond what the normal existing laws
9 and congressional guidance would guide you to, it's an
10 even heavier moment I believe. What we're basically
11 doing is making decisions on all sites for IVs outside
12 of the box. Let it rip. That's what this thing does
13 it seems to me. So it's worth thinking about that.
14 You can do it now, but it seems to me that's what this
15 does basically.

16 In terms of setting priorities, which will
17 be my task for the next couple of years, it doesn't
18 really tell me what to do first, I think, because what
19 I'm being told is it doesn't say do SLAPS first to the
20 exclusion of anything else. It says everything is a
21 priority.

22 So to the extent we get a set budget, maybe
23 it's 5 million, maybe it's 15 million, maybe it's 50
24 million, that's what the political process will
25 determine, but it will be a set budget each year. We

1 will not, I guess, be in a position to say well this
2 one really matters to us today because of economic
3 development pressure, this one matters to us today
4 because of risk things. We're basically just saying
5 they're all a priority, push them all forward as
6 quickly as you can.

7 So this is a pretty significant thing, I
8 think. It tells us how to clean up, it tells us on
9 what basis to clean up, how far to go and, you know,
10 in what sequence. It seems to me that's the gravity
11 of what is being proposed right here.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Additional comments?

13 MR. PRYOR: Well, I think Dave hit the nail
14 on the head. And I think it's about time we did do
15 this. You know, I think this -- it would be hard for
16 anybody to argue that we haven't belabored over this
17 ultimate decision. For, you know, the last six
18 months, certainly, this has been focus we're heading.

19 And speaking to what Jim said, we broke this
20 down and took them each them separately. I don't
21 think at this point the results would be different
22 than this. You know, I think -- I would like to see
23 us go ahead and do this and then address the more
24 serious issues. I think from my point of view this is
25 what we want and I think we seemed to be headed that

1 way and I'm certainly comfortable with it.

2 Then the serious issue before us is how we
3 convey this in the report. A large burden is falling
4 on you to put that in draft form and how then we take
5 that report and turn that into meaningful action that
6 carries this statement out. But I think further delay
7 on deciding what think of these sites is only going to
8 make these other tasks more difficult and delayed.

9 THE FACILITATOR: What the motion doesn't do
10 and that we have been cognizant of a need to do all
11 along is to justify or support by explaining the
12 rationale that was used to get to these conclusions
13 and that presumably would be now based on what's
14 before you if this motion is adopted then the
15 principal objective or role of the report would be to
16 explain how we got there.

17 MR. WALL: I just thought of one point that
18 might be useful. By essentially indicating to the
19 Department of Energy that complete cleanup of
20 everything is a priority, that does not really give
21 them any instruction as to how to prioritize things
22 given some set budget that they're going to receive.
23 So perhaps it's something that would be better
24 explained in the report that you put together, but I
25 think it would be helpful to say that, you know, this

1 is what we think ought to be done first, perhaps
2 indicate whether it's more important to clean up --
3 let me see, how do I say this -- is it more important
4 to clean up two sites to a lesser or more relaxed
5 standard than it is to clean up one site to a complete
6 standard. Things like that will help the DOE figure
7 out how first to proceed when in a situation where
8 they're given not enough to do everything at once.

9 MS. GINGSBURG: I think there is a big
10 difference between a resolution and a final report. A
11 resolution say this is what we think; whereas, a final
12 report says these are the actions we want to see
13 taken. And I think, you know, this is simply a
14 mechanism to say at this particular time this is what
15 we think.

16 MR. GRANT: Based on earlier comments I
17 made, I just wanted to point out, and I think Dave and
18 Roger pointed it out very well, that this is a sort of
19 a final vote. It's important. So if anybody -- I
20 want everybody to understand at that and if anybody is
21 uncomfortable with that, say what they want. I concur
22 with what Anna said maybe there's a way, if we feel
23 there's some additional prioritizations or something
24 that need to be done, maybe it could be rolled into
25 the final report.

1 MR. KUCERA: One of the reasons that the
2 state and this Task Force are facing the difficulties
3 of deciding among different sites or frequently will
4 have the difficult discussions that I think Dave Adler
5 keeps trying to have us have is because we don't have
6 adequate fiscal resources to this very significant DOE
7 radioactive waste problem in our St. Louis
8 Metropolitan area.

9 It's important for us to say something about
10 what we believe there ought to be a cleanup without
11 being concerned right now about the ultimate strategy
12 later on which is in the political realm about how
13 we're going to get adequate fiscal resources.

14 We do need to say what we think. And if we
15 do believe that there are certain minimum cleanup
16 levels that are appropriate to all the St. Louis
17 sites, which by our count number over a hundred
18 properties, then we ought to say it.

19 And then if we can collectively pull
20 together and get the right resources from DOE to do
21 this, a lot of the problems about fighting between the
22 various entities who want the resources will go away,
23 if we can get adequate resources like other parts of
24 the country have been able to do. But if we don't say
25 what we want, we'll never get started. And that's why

1 it's important to make a statement about how St. Louis
2 feels -- we deserve some certain minimum level of
3 cleanup.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Is there any other
5 comment?

6 MR. PRYOR: Well, just again, I think we're
7 saying it, but I think the resolution is to get us off
8 the dime so we can address these other issues and, you
9 know, I don't want to speak to the priority thing per
10 se, but I think it's no secret our organization
11 strongly feels -- I assume many of you have seen the
12 movie Independence Day -- that we consider SLAPS to be
13 the mothership of this problem at least for most of
14 the North County and that the way to deal with this
15 problem is to get the mothership first and then pick
16 off the satellites afterwards. But I think that's
17 something that is beyond the scope of this motion and
18 we need to do this and move on.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Any additional discussion
20 on the motion? No additional discussion. Does
21 someone want to call the question?

22 MS. STEWARD: Call the question.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, Elsa. Okay. The
24 question has been called. All those in favor of the
25 motion as amended, please signify by saying aye. All

1 those opposed please signify by saying nay. Are there
2 any abstentions? Okay, it's a unanimous vote to adopt
3 the motion.

4 REFINED COST ESTIMATE FOR ST. LOUIS SITE:

5 Item No. 7 on the agenda is the refined cost
6 estimates for the St. Louis site. That was a
7 tentative issue, we weren't at all certain that those
8 would be available. They actually weren't promised
9 until the 31st of July. Does anybody know anything
10 about the status of those?

11 MR. ADLER: They are available if people are
12 interested, maybe they're not. It would take a couple
13 minutes to go through it.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Well, let's see, we are
15 running late and I know that some people are
16 anxious --

17 MR. ADLER: Let's describe what it is,
18 especially for Tom's benefit. Congressman Talent
19 specifically requested that we do a re-rack of our
20 costs to look at off-site disposal of waste versus
21 on-site disposal of waste. So in doing the cost
22 analysis, we're not trying to promote one option over
23 another, we're simply looking at the two options that
24 the congressman asked us to look at.

25 He wanted to ensure that we were giving due

1 consideration to off-site disposal and not unfairly
2 pumping up their cost and pumping ours down and things
3 of that sort. So we went through a whole new
4 re-racking of the costs. The costs have been produced
5 and are available.

6 David could go through them, but I see we
7 don't have an overhead projector and we don't have
8 handouts for everybody, so why don't I just describe
9 them very quickly? I think that would be fastest at
10 this point.

11 Basically, what we show is a complete
12 excavation and commercial disposal out west -- these
13 are numbers generated by SAIC -- total around \$800
14 million, 780 would be the rounded number. Complete
15 excavation and on-site disposal runs at about \$490
16 million, 500 to keep it even. So you're looking at,
17 what, maybe a 250, 300 million dollar delta at that
18 level.

19 Now, probably what we'll hear some people
20 present is that well that includes a bunch of overhead
21 and contingency and things of that sort. So in order
22 to net out that kind of noise, if you will, we've also
23 calculated what we would estimate the projects to cost
24 assuming everything does go well -- there is no volume
25 growth, there is no requirement for program support,

1 monitoring activities of that sort. That gives you
2 smaller numbers, but the relationship between the
3 numbers stays the same and the delta is still
4 significant, I guess in my view. When you look at the
5 numbers that way, again minus contingency and so
6 forth, then you're looking at a complete excavation
7 and relocation to a western commercial disposal cell
8 at \$566 million.

9 THE FACILITATOR: 566?

10 MR. ADLER: Correct. And you probably ought
11 to round to -- you know. And then on-site being 356.
12 So roughly a \$250 million difference between the two.
13 About a, what, 50-100 percent difference in costs.

14 MR. PRYOR: Can you explain again how you
15 got the higher figures and the lower figures?

16 MR. ADLER: Yeah. We typically, when we
17 project a cost estimate look at the expected cost,
18 direct cost of subcontracts, labor, et cetera, and
19 then have a factor called contingency and we typically
20 apply that as a 25 percent multiplier onto the base
21 case. We do that because it's our experience that
22 sometimes volumes grow, sometimes things get more
23 difficult than you expect. We hope not to have to
24 spend that 25 percent, but often do.

25 MR. PRYOR: Is that what you call a fudge

1 factor?

2 MR. ADLER: That's what a biologist like
3 myself would typically call a fudge factor, yes. But
4 what will happen is that some of the commercial firms
5 will come in and bid numbers minus contingency, and
6 then if we're presenting numbers that include
7 contingency and they're presenting numbers that don't,
8 we're comparing apples and oranges and it's not a
9 productive exercise. So our intent was to produce
10 them both ways so that we can pick the apple to
11 compare to.

12 These numbers will be made available to the
13 group along with a brief narrative description
14 describing what the difference sub-elements are.

15 The primary reason for a difference between
16 the cost of the two options is, as you would expect,
17 that in the case of a western disposal, you have a
18 transportation cost which by our accounts runs at
19 about \$117 million and then you have a tipping fee out
20 there which you wouldn't have. It's pretty
21 straightforward. That's the primary difference
22 between the two.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Are there any questions
24 about that at this point? Yes, sir.

25 UNIDENTIFIED: What kind of assumptions did

1 you make on the maintenance of your on-site facility
2 and how much of that is built into your on-site costs?

3 MR. ADLER: We made assumptions that had to
4 be perpetually taken care of and those were built into
5 the cost estimates.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: I just wanted to know how
7 you were going to provide that information to us?

8 MR. ADLER: Well, I just flew it up here in
9 my briefcase today, so I didn't get Xeroxes done quick
10 enough. Oh, Dave's got copies we'll set on the table.
11 I'm sorry, I didn't realize you had those Xeroxed
12 already.

13 THE FACILITATOR: All right. So we'll
14 circulate those. Those of you who get a copy today
15 will walk out with one. Anyone who was not here today
16 or was here and has left will be faxed a copy. And
17 when we do our conventional follow-up mailing to those
18 who were not here at all, we'll include that document.

19 Is there anything more to be said on that
20 agenda item?

21 MR. KUCERA: The two different sets of
22 numbers that you just described, the higher number and
23 the lower number, where you talk about the 25 percent
24 contingency, did you adjust out in the lower number
25 the oversight fees, for instance, that are normally

1 paid to companies like Bechtel? Did you back those
2 out in these computations as well?

3 MR. ADLER: To the extent they could be
4 backed out. We don't envision a scenario under which
5 there is absolutely no oversight cost, of course, but
6 yes.

7 MR. KUCERA: How much did you back it out I
8 guess is the question?

9 MR. ADLER: I'd have to dig into the numbers
10 and figure it out. One thing you can do by the way
11 it's broken out, Ron, is that you can see how large a
12 factor site construction management and project
13 management is in the first place. When you're looking
14 at the paper, you'll see that there's only a 100
15 million to total with in the first place. So if you
16 assume that that was the total wash, then you would
17 still be left with a fairly significant delta -- any
18 detailed questions related to cost things I can't deal
19 with right now, but can deal with on an almost
20 near-time basis.

21 MS. LUBIEWSKI: For complete excavation and
22 on-site disposal, this is 30 years is what you have
23 estimated this at? Thirty years site management?

24 MR. ADLER: You estimate -- well, first of
25 all the activity -- the primary remedial activity

1 MR. ADLER: That's correct.

2 MS. DREY: So we're again talking about an
3 82-acre dump.

4 MR. ADLER: I think you end up -- I'm not
5 what the footprint ends up being, Kay.

6 MS. DREY: Well, that's what the city voted
7 to give --

8 MR. ADLER: Right.

9 MS. LUBIEWSKI: The city had voted to give
10 the Department of Energy 82 acres. It's now 22 acres.
11 But what you're saying is this would take in like
12 you're talking about on-site disposal, the first one,
13 remedial action, \$174 million would mean the
14 excavation of all our St. Louis sites and taking the
15 waste to the airport and I guess when you dig up the
16 stuff at the airport, exhume it, then you'd pile it on
17 the ballfields temporarily. So that's what this \$174
18 million --

19 MR. ADLER: Yes.

20 MS. DREY: -- that's all it would cost?

21 MR. ADLER: Yes.

22 MS. DREY: It would seem to me it would be a
23 lot more expensive than that.

24 MR. ADLER: Okay.

25 MS. DREY: Because you're talking about, you

1 know, like at least three major sites plus 90 plus --

2 MR. ADLER: Well, the 174 is based -- if you
3 can think of it this way, it's the cost of getting all
4 the contamination out of whatever medium it's in,
5 removing contaminated soil, taking down contaminated
6 buildings, and getting it all to a staging location
7 which I believe the purpose of this analysis was in
8 the North County area. That's what's captured under
9 remedial action.

10 MS. DREY: To the staging areas?

11 MR. ADLER: To the staging are. Then if you
12 think of your options being, okay, converged something
13 close to the staging area into an untrapped like cell
14 as one option or sending it out west as the second
15 option, those costs are uniquely captured in the
16 subsequent columns.

17 MS. DREY: So --

18 MR. ADLER: What it does, though, as your
19 pinning it down, it does, as the on-site option,
20 envision a North County centralized disposal area and
21 a disposal cell similar to ones used to manage UMTRA.

22 MS. DREY: Okay. So this would be
23 above-site, above ground?

24 MR. ADLER: Above grade. A line not as
25 elegant a cell as a RCRA subtitle C facility, that

1 would bump the costs up some, 50 million probably.
2 And it would basically be storing it in a cell pretty
3 consistent with the way a lot of the commercial
4 disposal cells do it and the RCRA sites.

5 MS. DREY: But it was the above the water
6 table?

7 MR. ADLER: Yes.

8 MS. DREY: Which is three feet from the
9 surface?

10 MR. ADLER: Yeah. I believe it would about
11 grade, actually.

12 MS. GINSBURG: Am I missing something here?
13 I was under the impression that the people in both
14 St. Louis County and the city do not want a permanent
15 disposal site at the airport. We do not want the
16 waste consolidated at the airport. Why are we
17 considering this?

18 MR. ADLER: We're not promoting this, we're
19 simply responding to a question that was directly
20 asked. If you were interested in what on-site
21 disposal kind of compares with, it's kind of a III.
22 There are less expensive options that a lot of health
23 physicists will tell you are protecting the
24 environment and there are far more expensive options.
25 We're not pushing anyone towards anything.

1 simply to provide a cost comparison.

2 MR. KUCERA: But what's important in
3 discussing the numbers maybe closer than what DOE and
4 their consultants are telling us --

5 MR. ADLER: In fact, these numbers are
6 closer than the last estimate.

7 MR. KUCERA: And they may even be closer.
8 And in Missouri if we were building a facility, a
9 single cell that we regulators are looking at, we in
10 this humid environment might have different desires
11 and degree of protection than is provided out in Utah
12 or the state of Washington, so there may be logical
13 reasons why there would be differences there and
14 you're not reflecting those in this.

15 MR. ADLER: Not in this table. We have
16 other charts that we produced that can be done and
17 ultimately these are estimates for purposes of getting
18 a general sense of what costs what. When a direction
19 is selected by everyone who is involved in selecting a
20 direction, and a plan is in place, we'll simply go out
21 in the marketplace and get the most competitive bid we
22 can get to do whatever it is we would like to get
23 done, so we may see bigger or smaller numbers.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: My name was called and
25 this is my question, so I would like to jump back in

1 here. If you're going to talk cell, though, here in
2 this area, which is my point with what Ron was saying,
3 is that it would have to be something more --
4 constructed in a way that would be more protective of
5 the water and ground water conditions is the point.
6 So if we're going to discuss on-site here in
7 St. Louis, and I think you need to take that into
8 consideration, so I would like everyone to add 50
9 million to that cost.

10 MR. MILLER: May I address that? I think
11 that for one thing 50 million is a guess.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right.

13 MR. MILLER: Now, I also think that there's
14 a presumption here that the cell design that was used
15 for this is less protective than a regular-type cell.
16 Those are questions that a technical person or group
17 of people should be answering. They're all issues
18 that are technical issues and I'd like to just let you
19 know that we provided Dave with these numbers on a
20 quick turnaround basis so that he could have them for
21 the Task Force today and he really doesn't have the
22 preparation to answer all these questions.

23 I would like to offer the opportunity to
24 anybody who would like to direct any questions related
25 to this topic at all to me and I will see that they

1 are answered and also to make sure that, you know,
2 that was in response to a very specific question.
3 There are any many other processes out there that have
4 been incorporated in these ideas that you're talking
5 about right now.

6 MR. PRYOR: Well, my question isn't so
7 technical, but I think you answered part of it because
8 you said that the remedial action cost 174 in both
9 cases. The case of on-site includes consolidated
10 materials to a staging area so it does include
11 transportation cost on a local level.

12 I guess the question I have is that under
13 the scenario that the stuff be moved away from here
14 out west, it is -- that all this material would be
15 taken to a single staging area for ultimate shipment
16 out west, is that the way it has to be done? I mean,
17 it doesn't make sense to me to take stuff I mean from,
18 say, downtown --

19 MR. ADLER: Right. It may be that the
20 downtown site there, because of contiguous staging
21 areas, there would be a more straightforward way to
22 go. Certainly for the North County you'd probably
23 want to pick one general staging area to consolidate
24 things.

25 Another real quick point. This analysis

1 isn't specific to St. Louis. At Weldon Springs they
2 looked at taking stuff to Utah and leaving things on
3 site, at Rocky Flats -- there were several sites,
4 Denver Radium, that have comparable quantities of
5 soil. The group is free to look though the requisite
6 decisions and feasibility studies at all those sites
7 and draw their own conclusions about the relative
8 expense of the two options. But this finding here, by
9 my view, comparison is consistent with those general
10 findings there also. In each of those cases, the
11 general conclusion was there was a difference, cost
12 estimators could play with the numbers on either side
13 to make the differences bigger or wider. The
14 difference seemed in each case to be significant after
15 that activity is completed. And in some cases they
16 chose to go to Utah, and in some cases they chose to
17 stay on-site.

18 MR. CAVANAGH: Real quickly. These numbers
19 could be adjusted downward or at least modified would
20 be if we utilized some type of technology like the
21 microwave vitrification or something else that would
22 reduce the volume, there would be an adjustment on
23 that; is that correct?

24 MR. ADLER: If in fact that's the way it
25 played out. If the costs of the vitrification didn't

1 more than offset the volume reduction benefits. To
2 date the analyses done -- there actually have been
3 quite a bit done -- to look at that issue haven't
4 identified technologies which, in fact, had
5 significant cost-reducing effects for campaigns
6 dependent upon shipment out west.

7 But, yes, that is why we researched this
8 technology to see if it's a way out of this box, a way
9 of getting the radioactivity out of Missouri, but not
10 having to ask Congress for more money.

11 MR. CAVANAGH: The other comment I'd make,
12 and I realize time factors may not work, but, you
13 know, it may be to our advantage to have some
14 people -- I know Dr. Golden is here today representing
15 one of those technologies and maybe some other people
16 that could give some type of input on that.

17 THE FACILITATOR: What's the pleasure of the
18 group?

19 MS. DREY: I would so move.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Does anyone else wish to
21 comment? The suggestion is --

22 MS. DREY: I move that we ask Dr. Golden to
23 address us for a few minutes about the technology that
24 we've been hearing about to the whole Task Force.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Any reaction to that?

1 MR. PRYOR: The only reaction -- I don't
2 know how long we're planning on going, but is there
3 anything else on the agenda that we already planned to
4 take up?

5 MS. DREY: Nobody seconded my motion.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Well, first of all, let's
7 go back to basics. Is there a second to Kay's motion?

8 MS. DREY: I second.

9 THE FACILITATOR: Perhaps if Christine were
10 here, we could get a couple of seconds, but --

11 MR. CAVANAGH: I would be interested. I
12 think there's a time factor.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Well, I think that time is
14 a factor. Traditionally we have adhered pretty
15 closely to our schedule and that was pretty much of a
16 commitment that was made up front. We also have an
17 agenda, and we have traditionally adhered rigorously
18 to our agenda.

19 MS. DREY: That's what Roger was saying. Is
20 there anything --

21 THE FACILITATOR: If there is an item that
22 someone believes ought to be aired before the entire
23 Task Force, then there is always the option of
24 scheduling another meeting. There is already a
25 meeting scheduled for August 20th.

1 MR. CAVANAGH: I'm wondering if maybe --
2 could we request at the August 20th meeting that we
3 have some presentations on some of these different
4 technologies?

5 THE FACILITATOR: Actually Item No. 11 is an
6 opportunity to discuss anything that you might want to
7 include on the agenda for the next meeting whenever
8 that meeting is.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think we should proceed
10 with the agenda and get to that in new business -- or
11 in developing the agenda.

12 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Is that
13 acceptable to everybody? The next couple of items
14 should not --

15 MS. DREY: When is the next meeting?

16 THE FACILITATOR: August 20th. The next
17 couple of items should not take very long. Item
18 No. 8, Public Information/Communications Working
19 Group. There was a question raised at last week's
20 meeting concerning promulgation of this product that
21 we create in the form of a final report.

22 There was also, I think, a question of what
23 steps would be taken between the initial draft and the
24 final report that would allow public review and
25 comment. But more importantly -- was it you, George,

1 who brought up this question of what happens beyond
2 the end of this Task Force's mission?

3 MR. EBERLE: I was looking at it from the
4 one point that we have to muscle out as much money as
5 we can. Then we want to be sure that we've designed
6 this report in a way not to distort the facts or
7 anything, but within that document we create the
8 strategies that we need in order to get the most
9 money.

10 THE FACILITATOR: All right.

11 MR. EBERLE: So somebody has to pay
12 attention to that is all that I was saying.

13 THE FACILITATOR: What I didn't recall last
14 week, and I'm not even sure there was time to react to
15 it in any meaningful way, was that the Communications
16 Working Group -- there was such a group, it was a
17 rather small one, and some basic work was done and was
18 presented to this Task Force, I don't recall when, but
19 at least six months ago, maybe nine months ago, and
20 I'm sure we've ever taken action on it and there
21 really hasn't been time between last week and today to
22 figure all of that out and do something about it. We
23 could develop a presentation that would be distributed
24 prior to the August meeting and which could be
25 discussed at the August meeting for inclusion in the

1 second draft, if that will satisfy your concerns?

2 MR. EBERLE: I think that would.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Does that work for
4 everybody? All right. We'll resurrect the
5 Communications Working Group information, we'll find
6 out what action was taken by the Task Force, we'll
7 summarize that, and we'll distribute the rest of it
8 for consideration.

9 MR. FRAUENHOFFER: I would suggest that
10 anyone who would be interested in participating on
11 that Communications Working Group join us now rather
12 than waiting. We had a very small group, about four
13 of us, a very effective group, but I think we need a
14 broader input.

15 THE FACILITATOR: I wasn't even suggesting
16 that there be another meeting of the working group
17 unless people decide that's appropriate. I was simply
18 talking about resurrecting the information and getting
19 it out.

20 MS. DREY: I thought maybe the next Task
21 Force meeting, the full Task Force is August 20. I
22 believe, Jim, you said something last time about maybe
23 having a public meeting, a meeting for the public on
24 September 10th, which is a Tuesday.

25 THE FACILITATOR: That was a date that I

1 come in.

2 MR. MANNING: We already took care of that.

3 THE FACILITATOR: That's right.

4 MR. MANNING: I guess the next thing is to
5 develop the agenda.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Yes. So there is no new
7 business.

8 DEVELOP AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING:

9 THE FACILITATOR: Then Item 11, develop
10 agenda for next meeting. We have already identified
11 one topic. Yes, Ray.

12 MR. ROLEN: I have a request of Ms. Price
13 when she develops the order to place that presentation
14 either at the beginning of the meeting or at the end
15 so that those of us who have seen or know the process
16 can either come later or earlier.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: You're speaking about the
18 microwave vitrification presentation? Okay, we can
19 certainly do that.

20 MR. ROLEN: Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: What would be -- since
22 you'll be one of them that will want to avoid it,
23 which time frame is better for you?

24 MR. ROLEN: Since we tend to take votes at
25 the end of the meeting, I'd rather see it at the

1 beginning.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: At the beginning? Okay.

3 THE FACILITATOR: Any other suggestions for
4 inclusion on the agenda for the August 20th Task Force
5 meeting.

6 MR. MANNING: I would like to see more than
7 just the vitrification. I mean, is it possible to
8 have a 20-minute presentation from each one of the
9 groups again? How many different systems were the
10 Technologies Working Group looking at?

11 MR. GRANT: Well, I think the primary
12 technology was vitrification. There was a soil
13 washing and there was some analytical methods, field
14 type analytical methods that could cut down costs and
15 help delineate where the contaminated soils were
16 located. I mean, those were the key things.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Actually three -- I'm
18 sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you.

19 MR. GRANT: I mean, there's a whole network
20 or details of a lot of different technologies that
21 came out of some of the DOE reports that we have
22 listed, but we focused on volume reduction
23 technologies, and the vitrification and the soil
24 washing were really the two key technologies from a
25 treatment point of view.

1 THE FACILITATOR: First of all, in response
2 to your question, there are three technologies that
3 are recited in this draft report that Jim circulated
4 yesterday. They all were proposed by the same group
5 of people. And the proposal is that they be
6 integrated. They're separate technologies, but that
7 they be integrated into a system so that there is a
8 package that enables those who were using it to
9 identify radioactive waste more quickly, more
10 efficiently, and thereby minimize the amount of soil
11 that has to be treated -- segregate that which must be
12 treated from that which doesn't need it.

13 So as far as the three technologies, other
14 than soil washing, that have been identified in the
15 draft report are concerned, there would be just one
16 proponent who would be capable of explaining the
17 merits of each those.

18 What I would like to propose is that we try
19 (1) to wrap up the Technologies Working Group report
20 in fairly short order and get that out in the mail to
21 everybody in advance of next month's meeting, and that
22 in the early part of the agenda we not only hear a
23 presentation about microwave vitrification and the two
24 other technologies associated with it or proposed for
25 use with it, but that we hear an overview from Dave

1 Miller who assembled most of the technical data for
2 the working group, we hear a 10-minute perhaps or
3 15-minute overview of what was considered, how it was
4 sorted out, screened, and why some things were
5 discarded and others embraced.

6 MR. MANNING: Yeah, that's what I was trying
7 to basically get at.

8 MS. DREY: Well, as I see it, you're talking
9 this one which is ex-situ microwave vitrification, two
10 kinds of soil analyses technologies so that's one.
11 But then I wonder if in this draft report of the
12 Technologies Working Group which was sent to the
13 working group members yesterday, there's mention also
14 of physical soil washing. I think we've eliminated
15 chemical soil washing because of the chelating agents,
16 but physical soil washing. So I would think that the
17 Task Force, if it's being asked to consider putting
18 money into further potential use of the -- you know,
19 into further studies of physical soil washing for
20 downtown St. Louis, I think a presentation
21 specifically about physical soil washing and its
22 relevance to the downtown St. Louis properties should
23 be included, because otherwise I don't think we should
24 spend money on it.

25 THE FACILITATOR: I'm seeing an affirmative

1 nod from Jim, so we can include that as well.

2 MR. GRANT: I mean, one other item, too,
3 could be also a concept of where do we go from here,
4 and as we would proceed with these technologies what
5 would be a next logical step. I mean, we're
6 recommending to the DOE that these ought to be
7 evaluated, but what does that really mean?

8 I think part of the problem we've had is
9 there is not a lot data available to say yeah or nay,
10 and we didn't view our job as saying yeah or nay, but
11 to say based on what we have, here are some things
12 that, you know, ought to be moved forward. But how do
13 you move those forward? How do you develop the data?
14 What type of plan or process do you lay out to go
15 ahead and find out for sure whether these things are
16 worthwhile or useful? We can talk a little bit about
17 that, too, or at least our concepts of what should be
18 done along those lines.

19 THE FACILITATOR: We ought to keep in mind
20 that the principal objective of the August meeting is
21 to review and comment on the initial draft of the Task
22 Force report, so I don't think we want to jam up the
23 agenda with anything that is unnecessary. I haven't
24 heard anything to that effect yet, but we shouldn't be
25 looking for things to fill the agenda.

1 MS. DREY: Yeah. I guess my feeling is I'd
2 rather hear more about the ex-situ microwave
3 vitrification and physical soil washing and not just
4 an overview that we're not considering anyway at this
5 point.

6 But I do think that the Task Force members
7 should think about a possibility that we've discussed,
8 at least in the Technologies Working Group, and that
9 is that maybe St. Louis, the St. Louis site, could
10 qualify for major funding from the Department of
11 Energy for a field demonstration project for the
12 airport site. In other words, use special money from
13 the -- you know, not use up FUSRAP money, but use up
14 big DOE money funds as a possible field demonstration
15 for ex-situ vitrification and even the freezing of the
16 boundary which I like.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Any comments?

18 MS. DREY: Then we're not held to the tiny
19 little \$15 million per year FUSRAP maximum.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Any additional comments?
21 Any additional suggestions for inclusion on the agenda
22 for the August meeting? Is it agreed that we're not
23 planning to meet between now and August 20th? Okay.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: I just think we've already
25 jammed our agenda and I'm looking at the fact that we

1 met today on the 23rd and originally the first draft
2 was to be completed by this Friday. So can you give
3 us a timetable as far as when this first draft will be
4 out, how much time we need to review it, how much time
5 you need to incorporate what we say? We're still
6 getting these bits and pieces pulled together even at
7 our next meeting, then we're talking about early
8 September having public review of our final draft. At
9 the risk of suggesting that we stretch this out, I
10 don't see how we can concurrently have a review of a
11 final draft --

12 MS. DREY: Not final. It would be a review
13 of a final -- oh, final draft, that's right. Okay.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: We would be reviewing a
15 final draft and then holding public hearings. You
16 need sufficient time to read and comment and get back
17 to you, and then you need to incorporate and we need
18 check back. I mean, I'm going through this with this
19 EMAB committee and it's taking months just on revising
20 the report. You know, we've already had our input
21 meetings and we're still having input meetings. So
22 help me out.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Well, I'll help you
24 out as best I'm able. I'll tell you what I was
25 thinking. Before it became apparent that we were

1 going to meet today, I assumed that I would go into
2 seclusion and start writing that afternoon and that I
3 would be able to adhere to the schedule. I think I
4 hedged a little bit by saying perhaps it won't be
5 Friday the 26th, perhaps it will Monday the 29th. I
6 may need the weekend and Monday to print, but that we
7 were going to stick to the schedule.

8 There were a half a dozen people who
9 encouraged me, some at the meeting and some subsequent
10 to it, not to start writing because of the importance
11 of the issues that were going to be aired today. And
12 just given the logistics of trying to pull a summary
13 report together of what happened last week and to
14 prepare for today, there really wasn't a lot of time,
15 so I have not started writing.

16 Sarah and I tried to map out a schedule last
17 night and I told her I'm planning to stick with the
18 schedule. I don't know how I'm going to do that, but
19 that's the plan.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Could you just now review
21 that real quickly?

22 THE FACILITATOR: Well, at the moment, the
23 way I see it is that since it's going to be Tuesday
24 afternoon in a few minutes, I will the rest of this
25 week, through the weekend, and into the early part of

1 next week to generate the first draft. You know,
2 that's my objective.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: So what date would that
4 be?

5 THE FACILITATOR: Well, I hope that the
6 draft will be in the mail to you by the end of the day
7 Monday. And the objective is to get it out in plenty
8 of time for people to review it and to confer with one
9 another and to sort out their thoughts about the
10 initial draft in advance of the August 20th meeting.
11 The schedule that I've just outlined would allow three
12 weeks. If I encroach on it by a day or two days at
13 the early part, it's still, I think, not fatal. You
14 still have plenty of time to deal with it.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Before you gone, we
16 would get back to you by a certain date prior to that
17 meeting with our comments so that you could
18 incorporate another draft by the August 20th meeting?

19 THE FACILITATOR: That was not my plan. My
20 plan was that unless the greeting to this first draft
21 was so outrageous, you know, everybody thought it was
22 terrible and off the mark by, you know, 300 degrees
23 that --

24 MS. DREY: You mean, 360?

25 THE FACILITATOR: No, 300 degrees. The

1 debate would occur on August 20th, but I'm assuming
2 that people who had an axe to grind or an issue that
3 they wished to refine would get on the phone with one
4 another and would come to the meeting pretty well
5 knowing where they stand and where others stand and
6 that hopefully the process wouldn't be a painful one.
7 And that we would walk away, whether it's in two hours
8 or two and a half hours, we'll walk away from that
9 meeting on the 20th with what we need in order to
10 develop a second draft which we would do in five days.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

12 MR. PRYOR: If you get this thing out next
13 Monday, hats off to you. But if that's the case, I
14 would urge, you know, that people be asked to read
15 this thing and if they have substantive comments on
16 parts of it that they would get those in to you by a
17 certain date so they can be circulated to us. Maybe a
18 drop dead date, say, a week prior to the August 20th
19 meeting that any comments you receive be circulated as
20 a packet to everybody so we can look that over just to
21 facilitate that meeting so we don't have to, you know,
22 it goes more smoothly.

23 THE FACILITATOR: I would be glad to include
24 that sort of a proposal in the cover letter. I should
25 tell you, though, I've asked on numerous occasions and

1 it's difficult, I think, for people to reduce their
2 thoughts in writing. Kay does it/very well. She gets
3 it to you before the question is even out, but for a
4 lot of people, it's --

5 MS. DREY: Is that a compliment?

6 THE FACILITATOR: I think so. I intended it
7 as a compliment. It's great anticipation.

8 MR. PRYOR: Well, if it's at all possible,
9 it would certainly make the meeting run more quickly,
10 I believe, than everybody sitting around and start
11 airing their opinions the first time at that meeting.
12 I'll do my best.

13 MS.. DREY: Roger, you're going to be out of
14 town the week of the 11th.

15 MR.. PRYOR: Well, I have nothing to do in
16 Minnesota but write comments on this thing.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Well, certainly I would be
18 glad to have anything faxed in or mailed and I would
19 be glad to circulate any comments to the entire Task
20 Force. And it remains to be seen whether you'll be
21 taking your hats off to me or not. I mean, I may get
22 into it and discover that I absolutely can't get it
23 out by early next week.

24 MS. DREY: Say the schedule again.

25 THE FACILITATOR: The schedule is that by

1 this next week you should have, or approximately this
2 time next week, you should have the initial draft of
3 the report.

4 MS. DREY: Okay. So that is July --

5 THE FACILITATOR: 29th or 30th. And we're
6 scheduled to meet three weeks later on August 20. So
7 that would allow that much time for review and
8 generation of ideas for refinements or new directions
9 or whatever. We would come together on the 20th and,
10 to the extent that we have documents that can be
11 circulated, they will be in advance of that meeting
12 and then we'd get together on the 20th and people say,
13 well, I think we need to tighten this up or we need to
14 refine that and hopefully it's not more than that.

15 MS. DREY: Now is that going to be August 20
16 your draft number two will be available?

17 THE FACILITATOR: No. August 20th you would
18 generate the information that will enable me to
19 generate a second draft and that would be out in five
20 days, by that following weekend or that Monday, August
21 24th or sixth and then the notion -- and this gets
22 back to Sally's question about how do you jam all this
23 and make it work, I don't know. I just know that we
24 had chosen September 17th as the day we hoped to be
25 able to adopt a final report.

1 MR. PRYOR: So the second draft will be the
2 one that will be circulated to the public?

3 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, that was my thought.

4 MS. DREY: And that's the August 26, right?

5 THE FACILITATOR: That's right. And then
6 depending on what the public says and what additional
7 refinements are suggested by members of the Task
8 Force, there would be a final draft generated sometime
9 following the -- I guess immediately following the
10 September 17th Task Force meeting.

11 MS. DREY: Well, then you're saying that the
12 August 26, that would be draft number two, and let's
13 say September 10th would be this public meeting, is
14 there any input or will the Task Force see draft
15 number three before the citizens?

16 THE FACILITATOR: The Task Force will
17 generate draft number three at its September 17th
18 meeting. It will have had a week -- assuming we meet
19 with the public on the 10th of September, the Task
20 Force participants who attend that public meeting will
21 have a week to reflect on what the public has had to
22 say, would presumably come to the September 17th
23 meeting prepared to say, well, I think we need to
24 modify this because of what we heard last week.

25 MS. DREY: So the Task Force will look at

1 draft number three for the first time on September
2 17th or shortly before that?

3 THE FACILITATOR: No. The Task Force will
4 create draft number three at its meeting on
5 September 17th; we'll incorporate those refinements
6 promptly, and that will be the final report.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: So the Task Force will not
8 be able to review final draft three or whatever we're
9 talking about here before it goes to DOE and they need
10 to, they need to see the document done and all agree
11 to it before. I mean, in other words, if we see it
12 and form it on the 17th, you incorporate changes and
13 then just hand it to DOE, I don't agree with doing it
14 that way.

15 THE FACILITATOR: That's all there's time
16 for really. So we have to change the schedule if you
17 want to change the process.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think we need to do
19 that.

20 MR. CAVANAGH: I would suggest that we wait
21 until we see how it goes. I mean, if it's pretty
22 close to being okay as opposed to a disaster that has
23 to be totally rewritten, let's wait and see. I would
24 agree we need to all finally sign off. So with your
25 name as chair --

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: That is exactly right.

2 MR. CAVANAGH: But there are a number of
3 different ways we can do it. I mean, we could defer
4 it to a small committee for wordsmithing. We could,
5 you know, let an executive committee or something
6 handle it. I just think we need to move on. I need
7 to go.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, everybody needs to
9 go. Everybody is getting a little anxious. Is there
10 anymore to say about the schedule? Anything else you
11 want to put on the table today? Shall we adjourn?

12 MR. MANNING: So moved.

13 THE FACILITATOR: We're adjourned.

14 (Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30
15 a.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

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

Bessie Hunter
Court Reporter

29 July 1894
Date

144718
52-985

00-2093

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

for the St. Louis Site, Missouri



Property
of
ST LOUIS FUSRAP LIBRARY

U.S. Department of Energy