

MINUTES

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force
Priorities Working Group

January 17, 1996 Meeting

Berkeley City Hall
Berkeley, Missouri

APPROVED

Participants Attending

Lori Batton, City of Berkeley
 Tom Binz, Laclede Gas
 Kay Drey
 Jack Frauenhoffer, Mallinckrodt Chemical
 Bob Geller, MDNR
 Dennis Henson, Union Electric
 Tom Horgan, U.S. Rep. Talent's Office
 Paul Kos, Stone Container
 Donovan Larson, St. Louis County Water
 Co.
 Tom Manning, City of Hazelwood
 Jean Montgomery, City of Berkeley
 Sally Price
 Josh Richardson, City of Berkeley
 Christian Willauer, MIT

Support

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

Agenda ItemMinutesDetermination*Call to Order*

Jim Dwyer called the meeting to order at
 9:40 a.m.

He introduced Christian Willauer, who is
 working on a research project at MIT
 assessing public participation at various
 FUSRAP sites around the country. The study
 is funded by DOE, EPA, and the Agency for
 Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
 (ATSDR). Ms. Willauer attended the meeting

as an observer.

Mr. Dwyer also introduced Paul Kos, plant manager of Stone Container Corp. at 9150 Latty Ave. Mr. Kos said Stone leases its facility and is negotiating with the property owner over a lease extension and improvements. He said the existence of contaminated soil on the property will affect negotiations. He said discussions are underway with the landlord, the landlord's engineering firm, and DOE about how to proceed with the renovations. However, Mr. Kos said he wants to be involved in the Task Force process and be aware of the process required for remediation of privately owned property.

Develop Agenda

The working group developed the following agenda:

- Approval of December 6, 1995 minutes
- Request for fully staffed DOE field office in St. Louis
- Application of cleanup request criteria (e.g. commercial properties) developed at December meeting
- Establishing a process for handling requests for cleanup of commercial properties
- Stone Container Corp.
- MDNR letter of January 12 re disposal of rad waste in sanitary landfills in Missouri
- Union Electric project at intersection of Banshee and McDonnell Blvd.
- Discussion of Coldwater Creek Panel report

Donovan Larson also said he would like the working group to revisit the issue of whether DOE has the ability to purchase another property to relocate the Berkeley Ballfields,

in view of its spending limitations. The working group agreed to pursue the issue at a later date.

*Approval of
Minutes*

Mr. Dwyer asked for comments on the draft minutes from the December 6, 1995 meeting. The minutes were approved as amended.

The minutes were approved as amended.

*Request for DOE
Field Office*

Kay Drey said she would like the Task Force to recommend that DOE fully staff a field office because she believes that the existence of a fully staffed DOE field office will result in the St. Louis Site being cleaned up more quickly. She cited Weldon Spring and Kansas City as two sites that got remediation underway once field offices were established.

Mr. Dwyer suggested that this issue be dealt with in the final report. He said that if the Task Force agrees that having a field office is an important part of implementing a final remedy, then that recommendation should be included in the final report.

Ms. Drey said she thought having a field office in St. Louis is the highest priority. Dave Miller said he thought that once full scale remediation gets underway, you can't really do something like design and engineering oversight from a distance. However, he said that if the Task Force wants to recommend establishing a field office prior to the Record of Decision, the group needs to be explicit about the advantages for creating an office.

Lori Batton said she thought it was clear that the field office recommendation would be part of the long-term recommendations to DOE.

Bob Geller said the work can take place

without a DOE field office, but added that having a field office expedites the work. He said MDNR has requested that a field office be established, and DOE has committed to it.

Jack Frauenhoffer said having a fully staffed DOE field office would give the project a sense of urgency. An on-site DOE representative could push through funding requests.

Mr. Dwyer asked if anyone disagreed with making a request for a fully staffed field office a top priority. The working group agreed.

*Application of
Cleanup Request
Criteria*

Mr. Frauenhoffer said that the working group needs to develop a process for using the criteria it approved at its December 6, 1995 meeting. Ms. Drey said she thought there should be language explaining to an applicant that the Priorities Working Group is requesting the following information. She said there should be a standardized form, which is not legally binding, that can be handed to anyone who comes to the working group.

Mr. Dwyer said he will draft a document and circulate it to the working group for review and comment.

*Establishing a
Process for
Handling Cleanup
Requests*

Lori Batton asked whether the job of evaluating these requests should be done by the entire working group or by a subgroup?

Mr. Frauenhoffer suggested the following process:

- Requests from property owners be directed to Mr. Dwyer
- Mr. Dwyer would send out the criteria to the property owner.
- Mr. Dwyer then notifies DOE and asks

for the appropriate information about that site.

The property owner and DOE send the information to Mr. Dwyer. Mr. Dwyer distributes this information to the Priorities Working Group.

Mr. Dwyer then schedules a Priorities Working Group meeting to which the property owner is invited to discuss his request.

Then the working group makes a decision about the request.

Ms. Price said she thought it would be appropriate to advise the Task Force that this process is in place, and she suggested that each participant be given a copy of the process. She said the working group also might want to send Task Force participants copies of information that comes from DOE.

Josh Richardson asked if the working group wanted to use this process to make funding requests for specific properties. Mr. Dwyer said the final recommendations of the Task Force ought to include language about a standardized approach for any activity, whether by private contractors or DOE.

Dave Miller said the sequence that the working group is proposing is that the Priorities Working Group make recommendations to the Task Force. He suggested that something be in place for when the Task Force is not meeting.

Mr. Dwyer agreed that the administrative work needs to be continued in some way, but that is not provided for at the moment.

Mr. Fraenhoffer said the working group needs to discuss this with DOE, because the Task Force was convened at DOE's request. He said it is DOE's decision how to proceed

once it receives the Task Force's report.

Mr. Miller said he asked the question because it raises a bigger issue in terms of what properties are addressed first. He said he would like to discuss this issue at a future meeting.

Bob Geller said there will be a need for some kind of process to continue. Maybe the recommendation to DOE should be to empower four people to hear these requests. He said that is part of the process the working group needs to examine.

The working group approved the process suggested by Mr. Frauenhoffer.

Mr. Geller asked if it would be distributed to Task Force participants. Mr. Dwyer said it would.

Stone Container

Mr. Kos said the working group already had discussed many of the issues of concern to him. He said Stone leases the property from General Investment/First Management Group, which is the entity proceeding with the improvements to the facility.

Mr. Richardson asked what improvements were planned.

Mr. Kos said his company produces corrugated shipping material and it needs to expand and improve the facility. He said the landlord's consultants have been talking with DOE and are getting the appropriate permits. He said he needs the support of the working group to get this project done. Mr. Kos said the issue is whether to take care of the contaminated soil at the same time the improvements are being made, which is why he wants to cooperate with the working group.

Mr. Dwyer asked Mr. Kos to communicate his needs to the City of Berkeley and to respond promptly to the questions on the list of criteria.

Ms. Drey asked about the potential for recontamination, saying that she thought Stone's proximity to the piles at HISS would increase the likelihood of recontamination.

Mr. Kos said his facility is upstream from HISS. Ms. Drey said there could be wind deposition and radon.

Mr. Miller said the working group will have to ask DOE for help with some of these other questions.

Ms. Price said the proposed criteria had not yet been approved by Task Force. Mr. Dwyer responded that the criteria still can be used by the working group as a guide for evaluating a request for remedial action.

MDNR Letter

Ms. Drey cited a January 12, 1996, letter from MDNR's general counsel, Melissa Manda, to Dave Adler in which she responded to Mr. Adler's inquiry about disposing of minimally-contaminated waste in a sanitary landfill. In her letter, Ms. Manda said the state's laws do not allow disposal of any radioactive waste into a sanitary landfill. Ms. Drey said she thought it was important that working group discuss this letter.

Mr. Miller said he realizes that disposal of minimally-contaminated radioactive material in a sanitary landfill is a sensitive issue. However, he said he wanted to ensure that the concept gets a fair hearing across all the agencies and not be abandoned simply on the basis of one agency's general counsel's

opinion.

Mr. Geller said the letter represented the opinion of MDNR. But Mr. Miller said several issues are raised by this letter, including the question of where coal and mine wastes are disposed. He said these kinds of cases are not addressed in the letter. He said the working group should be asking those questions in order to fully evaluate the option of using sanitary landfills.

Mr. Miller said DOE has been asked to lay out a clear evaluation of the sanitary waste landfill option with all perspectives so the Task Force can fully explore the issue.

Ms. Drey then inquired about the status of the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the ballfields.

Mr. Miller said there are two EE/CAs being developed for North County work. One is focused on the ballfields, and DOE is reviewing the initial draft at present. The second EE/CA will address the haul roads and what interim measures DOE can take to manage that soil. That EE/CA is not fully conceptualized yet.

When the documents are complete, they will be provided to the Task Force and the public for review and comment.

Mr. Dwyer said he was not aware that an EE/CA is required for the haul routes. Mr. Miller said the current (existing) EE/CA only covers out-of-state disposal, and the Task Force is exploring other disposal options.

The working group asked Mr. Miller to request that Mr. Adler try to bring to closure as quickly as possible the issue of disposal in sanitary landfills.

*Union Electric
Project*

Dennis Henson advised the working group that there have been some problems with the feeders along Banshee Road and that Union Electric is going to be doing some work at the intersection of Banshee Road and McDonnell Boulevard. A feeder runs overhead along the railroad tracks and crosses McDonnell on the south side of Banshee and then goes underground on the north side of Banshee.

Union Electric plans to rebuild the overhead lines to a point on the east side of McDonnell Boulevard in the grassy area south of the railroad tracks. Then the utility will bore a 24-inch casing across the road, go underground at an existing manhole to airport property.

Ms. Drey asked why the feeder needs to be underground? Mr. Henson said it was necessary for airport clearance. He advised that the work is scheduled to start in February and that Union Electric has been coordinating with DOE.

Mr. Richardson asked what will be done with the contaminated soil. Mr. Henson said several options, such as containerizing the soil, are being discussed with DOE.

Ms. Drey asked if the Priorities Working Group could make DOE containerize the soil.

Mr. Henson said the volume is estimated to be about 100 cubic yards. He added that this work is not part of the clean utility corridor being discussed by the working group.

Mr. Miller pointed out that this area is well-characterized and that the contamination is

shallow and very low level.

Ms. Price asked if there might be a need for two utility corridors.

Mr. Richardson asked about the possibility of recontamination. Mr. Miller said the groundwater flows the other way, so the risk of recontamination is minimal.

*Coldwater Creek
Panel Findings*

Mr. Dwyer said Jean Montgomery (who had left the meeting) asked that discussion about the Coldwater Creek Panel be tabled because no one from Hazelwood, Berkeley or the airport was at the meeting.

The working group agreed to meet at 9:30 a.m. on January 31, 1996 to discuss the Coldwater Creek Panel's findings.

Mr. Dwyer asked that working group participants develop their thoughts on the panel's findings and be ready for discussion at the next meeting. He said he would call David Miller and find out when the written report will be available.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

The next meeting of the Priorities Working Group is scheduled for January 31, 1996.

Approved February 7, 1996

00-1882

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