

MINUTES

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force

April 16, 1996 Meeting

Hazelwood Civic Center
Hazelwood, Missouri

APPROVED

Participants Attending

Dave Alder, DOE
 Tom Binz, Laclede Gas
 Ric Cavanagh, St. Louis County Health Dept.
 Kay Drey
 Dave Farquharson, City of Hazelwood
 Jack Frauenhoffer, Mallinckrodt Chemical Company
 Anna Ginsburg, Vice Chair
 Leonard Griggs, Lambert Airport
 Tom Horgan, U.S. Rep. Talent's Office
 Lou Jearls, City of Florissant
 Donovan Larson, St. Louis County Water Company
 Nancy Lubiewski
 Tom Manning, City of Hazelwood
 Bob Marchant, Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District
 Sally Price, Chair
 Roger Pryor, Coalition for the Environment
 Josh Richardson, City of Berkeley
 Conn Roden, St. Louis County Health Dept.
 Ray Rolen, City of Bridgeton
 Elsa Steward, MDNR
 Dan Wall, EPA

Support

Jim Dwyer, Facilitator
 Miranda Duncan, Co-Facilitator
 Dave Miller, SAIC
 Sarah Snyder, FUSRAP

Other Interested Parties

Wayne Black, St. Louis County Health Dept.
 Chuck Blumenfeld, Dawn Mining Co.
 Bradley Brown, St. Louis County Water Co.
 Margaret Gilleo, Sierra Club
 Bob Geller, MDNR
 Peggy Hermes, Coalition for the Environment
 Ken Grothoff, Wagner Brake
 Charles Judd, Envirocare of Utah
 Paul Kos, Stone Container
 Ron Kucera, MDNR
 Linda Meyer, Weldon Spring Site Remedial Action Project
 Gerry Palau, FUSRAP
 Jan Titus, Lambert Airport
 Mitch Scherzinger, MDNR
 Tom Shepherd, Dawn Mining Co.

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Determination</u>
<i>Welcome, Opening Comments, Announcements</i>	Chair Sally Price called the meeting to order at 7:50 a.m. and asked if there were any comments or announcements. Tom Horgan advised that U.S. Rep. James Talent has initiated action to determine whether present estimates of the cost of off-site disposal (currently estimated to be \$800	

million to \$900 million) might be excessive. Based on the emergence of a second licensed disposal facility and on information provided by representatives of Envirocare, the congressman believes that the cost for excavating the St. Louis Site and disposing of the material off site could potentially be significantly lower, perhaps as low as \$400 million, plus transportation costs of about \$60 million to \$70 million.

Mr. Horgan said that, because those figures are considerably lower than the estimates used by DOE, Rep. Talent has written to Secretary O'Leary inquiring about the differences in the cost estimates and requesting an updated analysis.

*Approval of
Minutes*

Jim Dwyer asked if there were any proposed revisions to the draft minutes of the March 19, 1996 Task Force meeting. The minutes of the March meeting were approved without amendment.

**The minutes of the
March 19, 1996
Task Force
meeting were
approved without
amendment.**

*Opportunity for
Public Comment*

Mr. Dwyer asked if there were any public comments. Chuck Blumenfeld, representing Dawn Mining, asked if it would be appropriate to comment at this time on the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the ballfields.

Mr. Dwyer said discussion of that document was scheduled for later in the meeting and asked Mr. Blumenfeld to wait until then.

Charles Judd, executive vice president of Envirocare of Utah, said he would like to address the issue of disposal cost. He said Envirocare representatives have been examining costs for several months and, based on their experience at other sites, they believe off-site disposal would be less expensive than current DOE estimates.

Mr. Judd said there are a couple of reasons why actual costs may prove to be significantly lower. One is that DOE's cost estimates are based on smaller volumes, whereas with larger volumes, such as those

from the St. Louis Site, economies of scale can be achieved and the unit cost decreases, he said. A second reason is that certain overhead and contingencies are calculated as a percentage of base costs. As the base cost of disposal is reduced, so are the costs related to the other categories.

He said he would keep the Task Force apprised of ongoing developments concerning this issue.

*Discussion of
Remediation
Alternatives*

Mr. Dwyer said the principal objective of today's meeting is to provide an opportunity for Task Force participants to express their preferences on the remediation alternative options that were developed for each of ten sites in special working sessions over the past several weeks. He said he had intended to use The Innovator system in order to facilitate the process and to record votes electronically. The system allows votes to be recorded anonymously, which he said may be attractive to some participants.

However, he advised that MDNR has indicated its belief that the state's public meeting (Sunshine) law requires public, open voting. Mr. Dwyer explained that there are differences of opinion as to whether the law applies to the Task Force, inasmuch as it is not an elected body and it has no authority other than to develop recommendations. He asked the Task Force for guidance.

There was extended discussion about the method of voting, following which the group decided to use Innovator for compiling statistics and, at the same time, to indicate votes by a show of hands.

Mr. Dwyer outlined how he envisioned the process of determining preferences on the remediation alternatives. He proposed two

rounds of voting. In the first round, participants would indicate their preferred option from the four remediation alternative options on each of the ten matrices without prior discussion. In that round there would be an "undecided" option for those who are uncertain of their preferences. He proposed that the group would then discuss the various options, with an opportunity for participants to lobby for a particular position or to ask questions. Following discussion there would be a second vote on the options, with no "undecided" category.

He said the objective of the exercise is simply to identify a sense of direction from the Task Force for use in the development of the initial draft of the Task Force final report.

The Task Force then voted on the preferred options for each of the ten sites. The results (as determined by show of hands) were:

- St. Louis Airport Site (SLAPS):
 - Option I -- 1
 - Option II -- 0
 - Option III -- 6
 - Option IV -- 11
 - Undecided -- 1
- Ballfields:
 - Option I -- 1
 - Option II -- 1
 - Option III -- 5
 - Option IV -- 15
 - Undecided -- 1
- Hazelwood Interim Storage Site (HISS):
 - Option I -- 1
 - Option II -- 0
 - Option III -- 4
 - Option IV -- 14
 - Undecided -- 1

- Coldwater Creek:
Option I -- 0
Option II -- 0
Option III -- 3
Option IV -- 16
Undecided -- 1
- Futura Coatings:
Option I -- 0
Option II -- 0
Option III -- 3
Option IV -- 16
Undecided -- 1
- North County and Latty Avenue
Vicinity Properties and Haul Routes:
Option I -- 0
Option II -- 0
Option III -- 1
Option IV -- 17
Undecided -- 2
- Mallinckrodt Plant (SLDS):
Option I -- 1
Option II -- 0
Option III -- 0
Option IV -- 17
Undecided -- 1
- Downtown Vicinity Properties (SLDS):
Option I -- 0
Option II -- 0
Option III -- 0
Option IV -- 17
Undecided -- 1
- City Levee and Riverfront Trail (SLDS):
Option I -- 0
Option II -- 0
Option III -- 1
Option IV -- 18
Undecided -- 1
- West Lake Landfill, Operable Unit 1:

Option I -- 2
Option II -- 0
Option III -- 5
Option IV -- 10
Undecided -- 3

Mr. Dwyer then called for discussion and questions regarding the remediation alternatives.

Peggy Hermes proposed some changes to the language in the final versions of the options matrices. She said that Option IV's cleanup objectives should be stated as the actual cleanup standards of 5/15 picocuries per gram, rather than the words "residential/gardener use," which is similar to the language used for Option IV in the West Lake Landfill matrix.

Kay Drey moved that the Task Force adopt Ms. Hermes' proposal. The motion was approved unanimously.

Elsa Steward pointed out that the changes in the language should not apply to Option IV for Coldwater Creek because, in that instance, there are different numbers for the cleanup standards. The Task Force concurred.

Mr. Horgan clarified why he had cast "undecided" votes. He explained that U.S. Rep. Talent is first interested in obtaining a sense of the general direction established by the Task Force, following which he will determine his preferences.

Donovan Larson said he observed a trend toward erring on the conservative side in selecting preferred remediation preferences. He said he thinks this establishes a good direction. He also asked that discussion of the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis

(EE/CA) for the ballfields be deferred until the next Task Force meeting.

Roger Pryor said he would not like to see the results of the vote influenced because people somehow perceived it to be cheaper, and therefore more reasonable, to select Option III. He said he knows that there is a tendency on the part of some Task Force participants to want to appear to be reasonable, but he reminded participants that negotiations about the cleanup budget will be worked out by Congress. He said that people should vote in terms of an ideal world, and let the issue of money be addressed in the future.

Ms. Steward said MDNR's reason for voting for Option IV in all cases is that complete cleanup is the only viable option because the contaminants are so long-lived. She also said that no one should assume the availability of perpetual funding for ongoing management activities, as would be required under the other options.

Ms. Price said she generally voted for Option III because she considered the consistency of the land uses surrounding the component sites. She said she is aware of an example in New Jersey where complete excavation of contamination was not required, because of the likely land use. Ms. Price said she feels that Option III is protective in most instances, even though there still would be some contamination below grade.

Dan Wall said he voted for Option III in most instances for reasons that are similar to Ms. Price's. He said he tried to vote within a framework of established policies and initiatives within EPA that focus on targeting cleanup standards to likely future land uses.

Josh Richardson said he wanted to clarify some of the Berkeley votes. He said he voted for Option IV for all the component sites at this point.

Jack Frauenhoffer said he also considered which options would be protective of the community and what the available resources for cleanup might be. He said that in the case of an industrial site, it may be impractical to clean up to the most pristine scenario of Option IV.

Mr. Dwyer said that once a sense of direction is established, there may be new interests and insights that arise. By way of example, he said, if it were believed that there would be a significant difference in the length of time to implement Option III versus Option IV, that might have a bearing on final preferences.

Anna Ginsburg said that although she voted for Option IV for the levee cleanup, she said she is not sure what risks would be associated with complete cleanup of the levee.

Leonard Griggs said the same is true of SLAPS. In addition, because that property is at the end of a runway, he said he wants to maintain total restricted use there.

Tom Manning said that when the cost starts getting down to the same for removal of material as for on-site disposal, then it makes economic sense to utilize off-site disposal. He said the City of Hazelwood's basic position is that all the contaminated waste should be removed from the communities.

Donovan Larson also noted that the perception of risk, should any contaminated

material remain in North County, might have a negative economic impact on the cities of Berkeley and Hazelwood. He said it might be necessary in the long-term to consider complete cleanup for that reason.

Nancy Lubiewski said she wants Coldwater Creek restored to pristine condition because it runs through people's yards and poses a health risk to those families.

Ms. Drey said she doesn't think the concept of hotspot removal, which is contained in some of the Option III scenarios, is viable because the sites are not well-defined. She said she believes it would be helpful if all participants could be united on the need for Option IV remedies for all sites. She then inquired about the next steps.

Mr. Dwyer said the schedule calls for the Priorities, Alternative Sites, and Technologies working groups to develop final reports and recommendations based on the general sense of direction identified today. He said those working groups are scheduled to complete their work and report to the Task Force in about one month's time.

Mr. Larson asked when cost estimates for each remediation option would be provided by DOE. Mr. Dwyer said he has been working with DOE on that issue and expects the information to be available shortly.

The Task Force then discussed whether there was a need to take a second vote and agreed another vote was not necessary at this time.

*Discussion of
Ballfields EE/CA*

Mr. Dwyer suggested that, due to the late hour, discussion of the ballfields EE/CA be deferred until the next meeting.

Mr. Fraenhoffer suggested that the EE/CA be referred to the Priorities Working Group for review and analysis. He said he thought waiting another month might jeopardize FY '96 funding that has been earmarked for work on the ballfields. The Task Force agreed to refer the EE/CA to the Priorities Working Group.

Old Business

Mr. Dwyer asked Dave Miller of SAIC to report on the status of the DOE technical memorandum summarizing the efforts to identify local sanitary waste landfills for potential disposal of minimally contaminated 11(e)2 material.

Mr. Miller said that information, as well as a summary of the in-state siting effort, will be available to the Task Force by the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.

The next meeting of the St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force is scheduled for May 21, 1996.

Approved May 21, 1996

00-1945

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