

## MINUTES

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force  
Priorities Working Group

February 7, 1996 Meeting

Berkeley City Hall  
Berkeley, Missouri

APPROVED

Participants Attending

Lori Batton, City of Berkeley  
 Tom Binz, Laclede Gas  
 Donovan Larson, St. Louis County Water  
 Co.  
 Tom Manning, City of Hazelwood  
 Jean Montgomery, City of Berkeley  
 Sally Price  
 Mitch Scherzinger, MDNR  
 Jan Titus, Lambert Airport

Support

Jim Dwyer, Facilitator  
 Sarah Snyder, FUSRAP

Agenda ItemMinutesDetermination*Call to Order*

Jim Dwyer called the meeting to order at  
 9:39 a.m.

*Develop Agenda*

Mr. Dwyer asked the group to identify issues  
 it would like to cover during the meeting. He  
 said there are two outstanding issues from  
 the prior meeting: *i.e.*, 1) the question of  
 liability regarding the ballfields and 2) follow-  
 up on the working group's request for a map  
 and narrative summarizing the efforts of the  
 Ballfields Committee of the City of Berkeley  
 to identify potential alternative locations for  
 ballfields in Berkeley.

The following agenda was developed:

- Approval of minutes
- Report on ballfield liability issues
- Follow-up on Ballfields Subcommittee  
 report

- MDNR response to ballfields proposal
- Discussion of Roger Pryor's letter of January 31, 1996 to Sally Price

*Approval of  
minutes*

Mr. Dwyer then asked for comments on the draft minutes of the January 17, 1996 and January 31, 1996 meetings.

The minutes of the January 17, 1996 and January 31, 1996 meetings were approved as amended.

Tom Binz requested that Kay Drey provide the source for her numbers about contamination at SLAPS, as reported in the January 31, 1996 minutes. Mr. Dwyer said the request would be noted in the minutes.

The minutes were approved as amended.

*Report on Liability  
Issues*

Jan Titus advised that she had had difficulty contacting the attorney in the city counselor's office who is responsible for dealing with the ballfields liability issues.

Jim Dwyer reported that Mike Garvin (the city's attorney) was apparently having trouble reaching the City of Berkeley's attorney. Mr. Dwyer asked Jean Montgomery to encourage the Berkeley city attorney to contact Mr. Garvin.

*Follow-up on  
Report by the  
Ballfields  
Committee of the  
City of Berkeley*

Josh Richardson was not at the meeting and there was no report on the status of the requested maps and narrative describing the efforts of the Ballfields Committee to identify potential alternative sites for ballfields in Berkeley.

*MDNR Response  
to Ballfields  
Proposal*

Mitch Scherzinger said that MDNR could not respond to the ballfields proposal because the draft Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) is not yet available. He said that EPA and MDNR are not required to provide comments while the document is being drafted, although MDNR will comment once the draft is issued.

Lori Batton said she thought Tom Binz's idea of moving ahead and developing possible engineering solutions for the airport site, which was offered at the January 31, 1996 Priorities Working Group meeting, was a

good one. She said she didn't want to see the idea dropped.

Mr. Dwyer recalled that the working group initially had thought such action was premature. He suggested that the working group first determine its recommendations for remediation of SLAPS, and then focus on engineering solutions. He said the group also needs to determine cleanup priorities, *i.e.*, whether SLAPS must be addressed immediately, or whether other sites should be dealt with first (or concurrently).

He added that Ms. Drey has proposed that SLAPS should be the first priority for cleanup. He said Ms. Drey believes that SLAPS must be excavated (to approximately 18 feet) to remove contamination that is in contact with groundwater and has stated that she does not believe that hotspot removal will be effective.

Donovan Larson said that people generally have expressed doubts about the likely effectiveness of engineering solutions for mitigating contaminant migration at SLAPS. He said that developing engineering options now would further complicate an already complicated issue.

Mr. Dwyer asked Mr. Binz if he would be comfortable deferring the creation of a subcommittee to develop engineering solutions. Mr. Binz said yes.

*Roger Pryor's  
Letter of January  
31, 1996*

Sally Price said that she copied the Task Force on Roger Pryor's letter of January 31, 1996 and her response because she thought it was important for Task Force participants to be aware of his concerns and her response.

She said that the issues raised in his letter will be discussed at the February 20, 1996 Task Force meeting. She acknowledged that there isn't a detailed written plan on how the initial draft of the report is to be developed, although the format is described

out in minutes of previous meetings.

Mr. Dwyer said he would like the working group to decide on its preference for developing the draft final recommendations. He said that it has been his intention to develop an initial draft based on the information and conclusions that have been developed over the past 17 months. He said this is the approach that has been used successfully by both the Alternative Sites Working Group and the Priorities Working Group, and is the approach that was described when he distributed a proposed outline of the final report at the July Task Force meeting.

However, he said that there may be other workable approaches. One possible way would be to schedule a session to run all day (or spread over several days), for all who are able to attend, to debate the important issues and to develop principles from which an initial draft can be created.

Ms. Titus said she has worked on large committees in which participants have marked up an interim draft of a document and then those comments are incorporated into a revised draft. Any unresolved issues are brought to the group for discussion.

Mr. Binz suggested a survey as a way to elicit information from Task Force participants about their thoughts regarding remediation of the various sites. He said the survey could help to identify areas of consensus and issues on which there still is a great deal of difference.

Ms. Price said she and Mr. Dwyer had discussed using a matrix to identify and define remediation options. She said it is important that she be comfortable with the process because, as chair of the Task Force, she could be asked to respond to questions about the process and must be prepared to defend its integrity. She said the process should be public. She asked Mr. Dwyer to

explain his thoughts about the matrix.

Mr. Dwyer said that he envisioned the creation of a matrix that would describe four option scenarios that would range from "no action" to "complete excavation and remote disposal." There would be two intermediate options, with one being closer to the "no action" approach and the other closer to "complete excavation." He said those options, which would be developed by Task Force participants, would then provide a clear basis for discussion and evaluation of a range of remediation alternatives.

The working group endorsed the matrix concept, and asked Mr. Dwyer to develop a draft form that could be discussed at the February 20, 1996 Task Force meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

The next meeting of the Priorities Working Group is scheduled for February 21, 1996.

Approved April 24, 1996

141996

00-1884

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