

## MINUTES

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force  
Priorities Working Group

December 6, 1995 Meeting

Berkeley City Hall  
Berkeley, Missouri**APPROVED**Participants Attending

Tom Binz, Laclede Gas  
 Kay Drey  
 Norm Erickson  
 Jack Fraunhoffer, Mallinckrodt Chemical  
 Donovan Larson, St. Louis Co. Water Co.  
 Sally Price  
 Josh Richardson, City of Berkeley  
 Jan Titus, Lambert Airport

Support

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

Agenda ItemMinutesDetermination*Call to Order*

Jim Dwyer called the meeting to order at  
 9:35 a.m.

The working group developed the following  
 agenda:

- 1) Approve Minutes of September 6 and  
September 27 meetings
- 2) Review/Update Working Group Status
- 3) Report from Ballfields Subgroup
- 4) Criteria for Ad Hoc Decision Making
- 5) Coldwater Creek Panel Update
- 6) Utility Update
- 7) Miscellaneous
- 8) Dawn Mining Co.
- 9) DOE Field Office
- 10) Sanitary Waste Landfill Issues

*Approval of  
Minutes*

Mr. Dwyer then asked for comments on the  
 draft minutes from the September 6 and  
 September 27 meetings.

The September 6, 1995 minutes were

The September 6,  
 1995 minutes  
 were approved  
 without  
 amendment. The

approved as presented. There were changes to the September 27, 1995 minutes.

September 27,  
1995 minutes  
were approved as  
amended.

*Review/Update  
Working Group  
Status*

Mr. Dwyer asked participants to assess the status of the working group and to suggest what should be done next.

Donovan Larson said he would like the working group to determine how to address the concerns of landowners. Josh Richardson concurred with Mr. Larson. (See discussion of Ad Hoc Decision-Making Criteria.)

*Report from  
Ballfields Subgroup*

Mr. Richardson advised that Berkeley officials had met to discuss the ballfields issue. As to the question of whether the ballfields would be used if they were restored, Mr. Richardson said that, based on a certain population base, recreational facilities need to be provided, and can be presumed to be used.

He said that he cannot be absolutely certain that the ballfields would be used, without first surveying citizens for their reaction. However, Mr. Richardson said the subgroup believes the ballfields will be used if restored.

Kay Drey said the question to ask residents is not whether they would use the ballfields, but whether they would use them after they were cleaned up and located across the road from a radioactively contaminated site.

Mr. Richardson said that if the ballfields were available for use today, the residents would play there. He said Berkeley residents don't believe it is harmful to play on the fields. Long-time citizens played on those fields, and they don't see the site as a major health hazard.

Ms. Drey inquired how Berkeley officials would know that if they have not surveyed residents. Mr. Richardson said city officials receive phone calls "all the time" from

residents about the ballfields.

Ms. Drey also asked if the subgroup had looked for other sites within the city where ballfields could be built, as she had requested.

Jack Fraenhoffer said the working group operates on the basis that a cleanup priority is established by a need. He said the question to the city is "Do you want to use the ballfields?" The answer the working group needs if it is to pursue the cleanup recommendation is: "Yes, the city wants to use the ballfields and we are united in that."

Mr. Richardson said the City Council has been asked about the ballfields restoration and has indicated its support. That support has not been expressed in the form of a resolution from the council, but the council has voted on a ballfields restoration proposal, and it is known who is in favor and who is not. The question, according to Mr. Richardson, is not whether Berkeley wants the use of the ballfields; rather, the question is what is the cleanup plan.

Jan Titus said concerns about liability need to be addressed before any money is spent to put clean dirt on top of the ballfields.

Ms. Drey agreed that an important question to be resolved is the issue of liability. But she said she also wants to know what McDonnell Douglas would say about using the ballfields. She said that if McDonnell Douglas won't use the fields, then she can't imagine that mothers would permit their children to play there.

Mr. Fraenhoffer said McDonnell Douglas is not part of the issue. He said use of the ballfields is an issue for Berkeley and the City of St. Louis to resolve.

Mr. Richardson said the subgroup considered alternative sites for ballfields. He said there is ground within Berkeley that could

potentially be used, but he is not sure at what cost. One area near the main airport runway, and all of southeast Berkeley, are too noisy, he said, but an area around the cross-wind runway might be acceptable. The subgroup even looked at wiping out residential neighborhoods to create recreational facilities, he said. The subgroup's conclusion was that there is no land within the city limits of Berkeley that could be used for recreational facilities without disturbing residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Fraenhoffer requested that the subgroup indicate on a map or drawing those areas that could accommodate the ballfields so the working group could see what the subgroup evaluated, and then indicate the areas that are not suitable because of high noise levels.

Mr. Dwyer asked for a narrative as well. He explained that the working group is trying to build a record that establishes the issues that were considered and explains how decisions were reached.

*Ad Hoc Decision  
Making*

Ms. Price said she thought the working group needed to develop criteria for addressing concerns of property owners who request that their property be remediated because they are selling or making improvements on it. She said the recent example of the Fleischer property illustrated, at least to her, why such criteria are necessary. (A complete discussion of the Fleischer case is contained in the minutes of the November 14, 1995 Task Force meeting.)

Mr. Larson asked whether the Task Force has the authority to tell a property owner what criteria must be met before his property can be addressed. Mr. Fraenhoffer said that is not what the working group would be doing. He said it is not unreasonable to ask property owners who present cleanup requests to the working group to provide information in order to help

the working group understand their needs.

Mr. Larson expressed a need for a defined procedure that would ensure a thorough evaluation of any proposed cleanup before a recommendation is developed by the working group.

Mr. Dwyer echoed Mr. Larson's concerns and said Ms. Price's question about the potential for recontamination of the Fleischer property was never definitively answered prior to the vote of the Task Force on November 14, 1995 regarding the Fleischer property.

Ms. Drey said that because no defined process was in place and the Fleischer request for federal funds to cleanup the weapons-waste spillage was no different from two earlier sites for which federal cleanup funds were provided, she voted in favor of Mr. Fleischer's request. Ms. Price stated she supported Mr. Fleischer's request because there weren't clear guidelines for the Task Force. She said she hopes the working group can develop such guidelines today.

Mr. Richardson agreed. He said he receives requests from property owners who want to do work within contaminated areas and there isn't a prescribed way for them to be considered for interim recommendations. There should be criteria for addressing these kinds of projects so DOE is involved and so hazardous material isn't disposed of in an uncontrolled manner.

Dave Miller said that the Task Force did recommend that \$4 million be spent on these kinds of cleanups (haul route cleanup budget item) for FY 96 and 97. However, he said it might be useful to examine the issue of standardized criteria.

He said that because the Task Force doesn't yet have a long-term cleanup plan for these properties, it is operating in an interim

situation. Even interim situations can be dealt with in an orderly fashion, he said, adding that it may be that the Task Force will be unable to help some property owners in the short run.

He suggested that the working group might want to identify a proposed sequence of cleanups, perhaps by categorizing properties in zones and then prioritizing individual properties within each zone.

The working group then developed five criteria for use in evaluating any request for remediation of a site:

1. Is there documentation of an internally approved project (e.g., property sale proposed improvements, new installation) by the proponent?
2. Is the proposed action technically suitable?
  - a) Is the property subject to recontamination from another source?
  - b) What is the estimated cost to remediate?
  - c) Are reliable chemical and radioactive characterization data available?
  - d) Will the proposed action result in release of the subject property without restrictions and without potential for recontamination?
3. If it is not cleaned up, would contamination on this property be a potential source for contamination of other properties?
4. Is the proposed action consistent with Task Force values (social and economic benefits)?
5. Is adequate lead time for planning provided?

Mr. Miller said that the working group should recognize that these criteria are guidelines for consideration of any cleanup request, and are not strictly enforceable. A question

the group might want to consider is whether it wants to evaluate requests on a case-by-case basis, or to recommend these criteria to a third party who has the power to make these decisions?

*Coldwater Creek  
Panel Status*

Mr. Miller said the Coldwater Creek Panel will meet in St. Louis on December 13. He advised that there will be three technical presentations to the panel: a health risk and radiation primer; a visual presentation indicating the location of contamination (by isotope) at SLAPS; and 3-dimensional modeling of the groundwater system. That portion of the meeting will be open to the public and there will be opportunity for comments, but the panel will convene in executive session after 11 a.m.

*Utility Update*

Mr. Larson said he is becoming increasingly concerned about the ability of the St. Louis County Water Company to perform emergency repairs in contaminated areas because of a change in DOE practice. He said that DOE has in the past responded in emergency maintenance situations with their equipment and experts, but has advised recently that it cannot provide that service any more.

He explained that in the past, to the extent possible, DOE personnel have taken measurements at the site of a break and advised water company workers what to do if radioactivity was detected. He also said that, in the past, the water company was sometimes permitted to deposit modest quantities of contaminated soil on SLAPS.

Following discussion, the working group asked Mr. Miller to relay to Dave Adler that the utilities need 24-hour response to emergency situations by DOE, and interim storage capabilities for contaminated soil, and that the announced changes in procedure should be reconsidered.

Mr. Miller then said that the issue of

providing interim storage of contaminated soil is politically sensitive. Mr. Frauenhoffer said this issue needs to be addressed, regardless of political sensitivity, because soil has to be dealt with if it is dug up. Mr. Miller suggested that the Task Force develop a recommendation about interim storage options for contaminated soils excavated in these kinds of emergency situations.

Mr. Miller advised the working group that the concept of clean utility corridors is being developed in the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) document being prepared by DOE in connection with the Task Force proposal to remediate the ballfields site.

*Dawn Mining  
Company*

Mr. Dwyer advised that officials of both Envirocare of Utah and Dawn Mining Co. have requested an opportunity to present information about their facilities to the Task Force at the January meeting. He said he had discussed the matter with Ms. Price, who expressed some concern about having enough time for this at the January meeting, given that the Coldwater Creek Panel is expected to present its conclusions then.

Mr. Frauenhoffer suggested that it would be more appropriate to invite Dawn and Envirocare representatives to present their information to the Alternative Sites Working Group, which could then report to the Task Force.

Mr. Miller said that, in preparation for the Dawn Mining Co. and Envirocare presentations, the Task Force (or working group) should develop a clear understanding of how cost estimates are prepared, in order to evaluate the cost figures that will be presented by Dawn and Envirocare representatives.

Mr. Frauenhoffer asked Mr. Miller if he could prepare such a presentation. Mr. Miller said he would provide an expert on the subject

who could brief the working group.

**Sanitary Waste  
Landfill**

Mr. Miller informed the working group that he expects to be able to report at the January Task Force meeting on his efforts to identify local disposal sites that -- based on their design characteristics and ability to meet EPA exposure guidelines -- could potentially accept low-level radioactive wastes of the sort presently on the Fleischer property.

**Miscellaneous**

Ms. Drey reported that she had attended a meeting at which consultants hired by MDNR discussed their conclusions about whether thorium contamination from Weldon Spring is migrating into the Missouri River. She said the consultants concluded that there wasn't any migration, and she advised that copies of the report are available from MDNR. Ms. Drey also said she continues to have questions about their findings.

She also cited a 1969 article from *Analytical Chemistry*, "Radiochemical Determination of Uranium and the Transuranium Elements in Process Solutions and Environmental Samples," that discussed the sum-of-the-ratios guideline. (ATTACHMENT B)

**DOE Field Office**

Ms. Drey proposed that the working group discuss whether a request for a fully staffed DOE Field Office in St. Louis should be a high priority.

The working group agreed to consider this issue at a later meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:43 p.m.

The next meeting of the Priorities Working Group is scheduled for January 10, 1995.

Approved January 17, 1996

# St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force

---

## Priorities Working Group

### DRAFT CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF AD HOC CLEANUP REQUESTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

December 6, 1995

1. Is there documentation of an internally approved project (*e.g.*, property sale, proposed improvements, new installation) by the proponent?
2. Is the proposed action technically suitable?
  - a) Is the property subject to recontamination from another source?
  - b) What is the estimated cost to remediate?
  - c) Are reliable chemical and radioactive characterization data available?
  - d) Will the proposed action result in release of the subject property without restrictions and without potential for recontamination?
3. If it is not cleaned up, would contamination on this property be a potential source for contamination of other properties?
4. Is the proposed action consistent with Task Force values (social and economic benefits)?
5. Is adequate lead time for planning provided?

138676  
SL-747

00-1834

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)

# ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

for the St. Louis Site, Missouri



U.S. Department of Energy