

MINUTES

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force
Technologies Working Group

January 16, 1996 Meeting

World Trade Center
Clayton, Missouri

APPROVED

Participants Attending

Tom Binz, Laclede Gas
Kay Drey
Bob 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

Other Interested Parties

Christian Willauer, MIT

Agenda ItemMinutesDetermination*Call to Order*

Jim Dwyer called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m.

Jim Grant reviewed numerous documents that were distributed to the working group. (The documents are listed on Attachment A).

*Discussion of
Coldwater Creek
Panel Report*

Working group participants then discussed their initial reactions to the findings of the Coldwater Creek Panel, which had been presented at the Task Force meeting earlier in the day, and the potential impact of those findings on the role of the working group.

Mr. Dwyer suggested that the Task Force had identified important considerations, such as social and economic impact, that were not taken into account in the questions posed to the Coldwater Creek Panel. He said that even if the Task Force were to decide to recommend that some or all of the

contaminated material remain at the airport site (SLAPS), there is no reason for the working group not to evaluate potential technologies that may be useful.

Bob Wester said the working group should remember that the site is composed of many different areas with varying conditions, and that each should be evaluated on its own merits.

Evaluation of Technologies

Kay Drey inquired whether vitrification of soil adds to the volume of material. Mr. Grant said that can be the case, because some wastes require the addition of binders in order for the process to work.

Dave Miller said the goal should be to avoid adding anything at all. He also said that vitrification is an expensive process, because it requires a great deal of electricity.

Mitch Scherzinger asked if there is enough silicate present in soil at SLAPS for the vitrification to work. Mr. Miller said there is. He added that vitrification testing had been conducted at Oak Ridge and it had been concluded that vitrification adds approximately \$300 a cubic yard to the cost of remediation.

The working group then proceeded to discuss the merits of vitrification and what might be required to vitrify SLAPS material. Laurie Peterfreund pointed out that she thought the working group was getting ahead of itself and should first identify all potentially applicable technologies before debating the merits of specific ones.

Discussion of Schedule

Mr. Dwyer asked if the working group should plan to meet prior to February 20 in order to develop input for inclusion in the initial draft of the final report.

Mr. Grant suggested that the working group should first review the materials distributed

today. (See Attachment A.) He proposed that the working group plan to meet in an extended session on February 20, immediately following the Task Force meeting. Then, if the group needs to meet more, it can.

Mr. Miller suggested that the working group develop a list for screening potential technologies based on whether they would lead to an alternative disposal or remediation action. For example, there might be a treatment technology that would enable DOE to ship a small volume of contaminated material to a disposal facility and release the remaining soil in place. He suggested that those kinds of technologies should be given higher priority than technologies used for characterization.

Mr. Dwyer said that process can be started without an interim meeting. He asked each working group participant to identify a list of promising technologies, which the group can review at the next meeting. Mr. Grant suggested that everyone provide his or her list to Mr. Dwyer by February 6. He said it might then be useful to narrow the list of possibilities by focusing on one or two technologies that seem to offer the greatest potential for the St. Louis Site.

Ms. Peterfreund agreed that it was important to evaluate technologies that are not too far back in the research and development phase. That will narrow the list considerably.

The meeting adjourned at 2:41 p.m.

The next meeting of the Technologies Working Group is scheduled for February 20, 1996.

Approved February 20, 1996

ATTACHMENT A

Technology Documents

- *Review of Three Reports on FUSRAP Properties at St. Louis, Missouri*, Dahlin et al, May 11, 1995
- *Characterization of Soil Samples from the St. Louis, Missouri FUSRAP Site*, Mardock and Dahlin, August 10, 1995
- *Draft Field Screening Technology Demonstration Evaluation Report*, DOE, November 1995
- *Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram Executive Summary*, DOE, June 30, 1993
- *Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram Indexes*, DOE, September 1993
- *Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram, Volume 1, Technology Evaluation, Part A Decontamination and Decommissioning*, DOE, September 1993
- *Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram, Volume 1, Technology Evaluation, Part B, Remedial Action*, DOE, September 1993
- *Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram, Volume 1, Technology Evaluation, Part C, Waste Management*, DOE, September 1993
- *Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram, Volume 2, Technology Logic Diagram, Part A, Decontamination and Decommissioning*, DOE, September 1993
- *Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram, Volume 2, Technology Logic Diagram, Part B, Remedial Action*, DOE, September 1993
- *Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram, Volume 2, Technology Logic Diagram, Part C, Waste Management*, DOE, September 1993
- *Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram, Volume 3, Technology Evaluation Data Sheets, Part A, Characterization and*

139549

Decontamination, DOE, September 1993

*Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram, Volume 3,
Technology Evaluation Data Sheets, Part B, Dismantlement and Remedial
Action, DOE, September 1993*

*Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technology Logic Diagram, Volume 3,
Technology Evaluation Data Sheets, Part C, Robotics/Automation and Waste
Management, DOE, September 1993*

00-1864

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