

MINUTES

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force
Technologies Working Group

November 14, 1995 Meeting

St. Louis County Health Department
Clayton, MissouriParticipants Attending

Kay Drey, Missouri Coalition for the
Environment
Norm Erickson, City of Berkeley
Robert Geller, MDNR
Jim Grant, Mallinckrodt Chemical
Laurie Peterfreund, NCEIT
Sally Price
Mitch Scherzinger, MDNR
Robert Wester, R.M. Wester & Associates

Support

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

Agenda ItemMinutesDetermination*Call to Order*

The meeting was called to order at 1:17
p.m.

*Approval of
Minutes*

The minutes of the October 11, 1995
meeting were approved without amendment.

*Discussion of
Technologies*

Dave Miller distributed an outline he
prepared of remediation technologies that
are potentially applicable to the St. Louis
Site. He said he had already screened the
technologies in terms of how long they
would require for implementation; he
selected only those technologies that are
available now.

Kay Drey said she was surprised to see that
there were so many technologies related to
characterization. She said that she thinks the
site has been characterized for "four
centuries." She also asked about the Ames

Laboratory study?

Mr. Miller said he just received the documentation from Ames. In response to Ms. Drey's comment about characterization, he said there are many technologies that can be applied to a site. The treatment-type technologies fall into the category of remedial action, for example. But he said the working group should recognize that characterization is not simply something that happens at the beginning of remediation. As an example, he explained that more sophisticated characterization technologies would allow better segregation of waste streams during remediation.

He also cited the example of the Fleischer property. Initial characterization was based on approximately five sample points along Hazelwood Avenue; one sample showed contamination. At that point, there was only enough information to conclude that one sample area was contaminated, but its limits were not defined. During the second round of characterization, a more precise sampling was conducted, with denser sampling points. The result of this recharacterization was that the original estimate of 130 cubic yards of contamination was reduced to 8 cubic yards.

Mr. Miller then explained the organization of the outline. (ATTACHMENT A). Jim Grant asked whether background documents will be created for each of the technologies listed in the outline. Mr. Miller said he would provide more detailed information on each technology for the working group to evaluate.

Mr. Grant inquired whether beneficial reuse could be considered a technology. Mr. Miller replied that beneficial reuse is not generally thought of as a technology.

Ms. Drey said she wanted to rule out chemical chelation, which she has said is not an appropriate technology for the St.

Louis Site soils. Mr. Miller said it might be better to refer to the process as chemical extraction, as it differs from another technology, acid extraction. He said that he grouped the extraction technologies in Section II, C, 4, b of the outline.

Mr. Miller said there are many technologies actually being implemented on FUSRAP sites. He said final reports on soil treatment and waste minimization techniques are nearly complete and ready to be issued as drafts.

Ms. Drey asked about prioritizing technologies. She said there is a finite amount of money available for remediating the St. Louis Site. Mr. Miller said cost is driven somewhat by volume, so technologies that can reduce volumes generally reduce overall costs.

Sally Price inquired why volume estimates for the downtown site (SLDS) did not correspond to the volumes actually excavated during recent remediation activities. Mr. Miller said the sampling density was the reason for the differences between estimated and actual volumes.

Next Steps

The working group generally agreed with the approach proposed by Mr. Miller, as illustrated in his outline. Mr. Miller asked the group whether it preferred to rank the technologies by using the ORNL ranking system he discussed at the October 11, 1995 meeting or by developing a different ranking process.

Mr. Miller said there are several documents that might be good references:

- the Initial Screening of Alternatives
- the DOE (Clemson) Soil Treatment Report
- the Feasibility Study
- the Waste Minimization report

He said he would send copies of the Initial Screening of Alternatives document to working group members.

139548

The working group accepted Mr. Grant's offer to draft initial language about technologies that can be incorporated into the final report of the working group. He said he would try to have the draft language available by the December Task Force meeting.

The working group agreed to meet immediately after the December 12, 1995 Task Force meeting to determine a time, date, and location for a longer meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

Approved February 20, 1996

00-1807

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

for the St. Louis Site, Missouri



U.S. Department of Energy

Property
of
ST LOUIS FUSRAP LIBRARY