

MINUTES

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force

March 19, 1996 Meeting

Hazelwood Civic Center
Hazelwood, Missouri

APPROVED

Participants Attending

Dave Alder, DOE
 Joseph Cavato, St. Louis County
 Kay Drey
 Jack Fraenhoffer, Mallinckrodt Chemical
 Company
 James Grant, Mallinckrodt Chemical Co.
 Peggy Hermes, Coalition for the Environment
 Tom Horgan, U.S. Rep. Talent's Office
 Donovan Larson, St. Louis County
 Water Company
 Nancy Lubiewski
 Tom Manning, City of Hazelwood
 Bob Marchant, Metropolitan St. Louis
 Sewer District
 Jean Montgomery, City of Berkeley
 Eileen O'Connor, Union Electric
 Sally Price, Chair
 Josh Richardson, City of Berkeley
 Elsa Steward, MDNR
 Jan Titus, Lambert Airport
 Dan Wall, EPA

Dave Miller, SAIC
 Sarah Snyder, FUSRAP

Other Interested Parties

Thomas Aley, Coldwater Creek Panel
 Wayne Black, St. Louis County Health Dept.
 Bradley Brown, St. Louis County Water Co.
 James Cox, Coldwater Creek Panel
 Mimi Garstang, Coldwater Creek Panel
 Mark Gibson, Dawn Mining Co.
 Margaret Gilleo, Sierra Club
 Bob Geller, MDNR
 Ken Grothoff, Wagner Brake
 Lou Jearls, City of Florissant
 Paul Kos, Stone Container
 Ron Kucera, MDNR
 Angel Martin, Coldwater Creek Panel
 Linda Meyer, Weldon Spring Site Remedial
 Action Project
 David W. Miller, Coldwater Creek Panel
 Gerry Palau, FUSRAP
 Arlene Sandler
 John Rockaway, Coldwater Creek Panel
 Conn Roden, St. Louis County Health Dept.
 Mitch Scherzinger, MDNR
 Tom Shepherd, Dawn Mining Co.

Support

Jim Dwyer, Facilitator
 Miranda Duncan, Co-Facilitator

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Determination</u>
Welcome, Opening Comments, Announcements	Chair Sally Price called the meeting to order at 7:43 a.m.	
Approval of Minutes	Jim Dwyer asked if there were any proposed revisions to the draft minutes of the	The minutes of the February 20, 1996

February 20, 1996 Task Force meeting. The minutes of the February meeting were approved without amendment.

Task Force meeting were approved without amendment.

Opportunity for Public Comment

Jim Dwyer asked if there were any public comments. Mark Gibson, representing Dawn Mining Co., informed the Task Force that Dawn Mining Co. had submitted an unsolicited proposal to DOE to dispose of 11(e)2 material from the New York FUSRAP sites at its facility in Ford, Washington. He distributed copies of the executive summary of the proposal to the Task Force.

Coldwater Creek Panel Report

Mr. Dwyer advised the Task Force that all members of the Coldwater Creek Panel were present at today's meeting. He then introduced the panel's chair, David W. Miller of Geraghty & Miller.

Mr. Miller said the panel was available today to discuss its draft final report, which was distributed to the Task Force in February. Mr. Miller said he had received several written comments, one of which requested that the panel provide more detailed information about the number of years it would take for contaminants to move through bedrock at the site. Mr. Miller said that while such questions raised important issues, they were beyond the ability of the panel to answer precisely.

He then introduced Mimi Garstang, the MDNR representative on the panel, who wished to make a statement about the draft report to the Task Force.

Ms. Garstang explained that she had been unable to review the draft prior to its distribution to the Task Force. She said that she has since amended the draft report and submitted her proposed revisions to the panel for discussion. She also provided

copies of her revised version to Ms. Price and Mr. Dwyer, who said he would distribute her version to the Task Force along with the final version of the panel's majority report.

Ms. Garstang advised that several panel members felt that her concerns were beyond the scope of the panel's inquiry. However, she said her comments were based on eight years of experience with the St. Louis Site, which enabled her to consider more information than was presented to the panel as a whole. She said her comments also addressed her concern regarding the presence and potential impact of other contaminants besides radionuclides at SLAPS.

Ms. Garstang said the conclusions presented in the panel's draft report are essentially the same as those in her version, but that some of the discussion leading to those conclusions is more detailed in her report.

Kay Drey said she would like to hear some of the points raised in Ms. Garstang's report.

Ms. Garstang said that one concern addressed in her comments is the computer modeling that predicted there would not be significant impact to Coldwater Creek from SLAPS for at least 100 years. She said she noted in her draft that there is a monitoring well approximately 800 feet north of the SLAPS site in which the presence of radionuclides has been detected, thereby providing some evidence that contamination is moving. She said the question of whether that is significant is open to debate.

She said she also suggested in her version of the report that there be more investigation into the presence of volatile organic

compounds at the site. She acknowledged that perhaps some of her points were primarily issues of semantics, rather than technical differences.

Mr. Miller agreed that the real issue is one of semantics. He said the panel has made some changes in terminology in its report to incorporate Ms. Garstang's comments, but that those changes do not alter the conclusions expressed in the report. He said he expects to make the report final in the next few days, and anticipates that there will be no substantive change from the oral presentation at the January Task Force meeting.

Elsa Steward said that a key issue for MDNR is the potential migration of chlorinated hydrocarbons. She asked if solute modeling could answer questions about the potential for migration of those contaminants.

Angel Martin said there may be enough data available to develop such a model, depending on what questions one would want the model to address.

Ron Kucera asked whether Mr. Martin could address the question of TCE and toluene contamination at the site. He asked, assuming there were data indicating contamination in the range of 1000 parts per billion for TCE, whether Mr. Martin thought groundwater modeling would show TCE contamination reaching the bedrock aquifer.

Mr. Martin said he was uncomfortable comparing modeling of radionuclide contamination with TCE contamination. He said a model has not been prepared for the purpose of answering questions about TCE and toluene.

Ms. Garstang said the panel discussed its concern that not enough is known about the nature and extent of contamination directly beneath the center of the site.

Thomas Aley observed that there are a lot of different opinions and varying perspectives represented in the room. He said that when the Task Force reads the report, with which he said he concurs, it also should review the questions the panel was asked to consider. Mr. Aley said some people probably would have liked the panel to answer different questions. He said it was important to understand that the panel was asked specific questions.

Donovan Larson said he had proposed in his comments to the draft report that additional information be provided in the final report. He said the Task Force doesn't need to know the panel's conclusions. Rather, he said the Task Force needs to understand why the site is not suitable for permanent containment. He said the panel report does not tell the Task Force what it needs to know.

Nancy Lubiewski said she was disappointed that the panel relied on existing data, rather than obtaining new information.

Ms. Garstang said that the panel did note that there were data inadequacies.

Mr. Miller said the panel could only use the available data. He explained that the questions the panel was asked were general enough that the panel felt it could respond to them, despite the existence of some data gaps. As for TCE contamination, he said the panel didn't think that should be a focus of the report, given the far greater extent and potential impact of radionuclide

contamination.

Ms. Drey said that part of her concern about TCE is that it is a solvent. As such, it can dissolve radioactive materials and stay bonded to them, thereby potentially enhancing mobility. Ms. Drey also inquired about the computer model and whether it accounted for the absence of an aquitard under the east end of the site.

Ms. Garstang said the panel members understood that the aquitard doesn't exist on the east side. However, she said it is not clear where the aquitard disappears.

Dave Adler said that it was his understanding that the model assumed the absence of an aquitard for the entire eastern portion of the site and that the model utilized a conservative assumption on where the aquitard pinches out.

Ms. Price said she believed that the panel had answered the panel's questions, although perhaps not to the detail everyone would like, adding that the panel was not engaged to gather new data. She said the panel's report seems to indicate that there is not an immediate threat of radioactive contamination migrating to Coldwater Creek from SLAPS. She then inquired how the Task Force might learn more about existing conditions at the center of the site.

Mr. Miller said developing a detailed work plan to gather additional data is beyond the scope of work assigned to the panel. He said a work plan involves such matters as determining where and how to drill wells. He added that the panel's report provides the basis for formulating detailed work plans.

Mr. Kucera said it is technically possible

(with great care) to drill wells through contamination to the clean aquifer below the center of the site. He added that, just because millions of dollars have been spent on characterizing the site, that doesn't mean we understand the site adequately.

Jack Frauenhoffer asked if it is possible to address TCE separately so it can be removed from the site and not affect the migration of radioactive contaminants.

David Miller suggested that the Task Force consider the problem of TCE from the perspective of what prompts action at the site. He said that, at all contaminated sites, there are certain forms of contamination that are of primary concern and therefore drive action. TCE and other solvents are not present in sufficient quantities at SLAPS to drive action at this site. He also said he doesn't think it is feasible to address the TCE separately. However, while the presence of TCE should not drive action at this site, it should be among the constituents monitored, as suggested by the panel.

Ms. Drey said she agreed that TCE is not the contaminant of concern. She said thorium-230 is the contaminant of concern.

Mr. Larson asked how many wells were monitored in order to reach the determination that no plume has developed.

Ms. Garstang said that five or six wells located on the other side of McDonnell Boulevard are sampled and they have shown low levels of contaminants.

Ms. Price asked if there are wells that are not being tested, and if so, how many and where? She also asked whether a plume

could develop in the future.

Mr. Miller said not all the wells on the site are being monitored and not all the contaminants are being sampled for at wells that are monitored. He also said a plume could develop in the future.

Josh Richardson said that, as is the case with any type of technical report, the panel's draft final report has raised additional questions. He reminded the Task Force of the reason the panel was formed: to determine whether contamination is presently migrating (or can be expected to migrate in the foreseeable future) from SLAPS to Coldwater Creek and contributing to radioactivity in the creek. He said he thought the panel had answered that question. In the short-term, SLAPS doesn't pose a significant threat to the creek. Mr. Richardson said the panel's report also suggests very clearly that surface runoff presents ongoing concerns and should be addressed immediately.

Jim Grant said he wanted to commend the panelists for their work.

Ms. Drey asked Mr. Adler if he anticipated using the panel's report as a basis to reject a possible recommendation from the Task Force to dig up SLAPS and dispose of the contaminated material elsewhere.

Mr. Adler said it is not his role to make that sort of decision. However, he said he could imagine someone in DOE headquarters questioning how the Task Force could justify that recommendation. He said the Task Force would need to explain the reasons supporting a recommendation that the material at SLAPS be dug up and moved.

Mr. Dwyer reminded the Task Force that the panel's report is but one element that will be evaluated in developing final recommendations to DOE. He said the values established by the Task Force should be taken into consideration and integrated into final recommendations. He suggested that the Task Force accept the panel's report on Coldwater Creek and use the information in whatever manner it sees fit.

*Development of
Draft Final Report*

Mr. Dwyer said Task Force participants have been working diligently for the past month to identify and define a set of four remediation alternatives for each of ten discrete components of the St. Louis Site. The objective is to develop a range of options, ranging from "no action" to "complete excavation and remote disposal." He said the matrices are not yet complete, but that work is scheduled for completion later this week. Once the draft matrices are completed, they will be distributed to Task Force participants for review and discussion.

He said that, now that the Coldwater Creek Panel report has been presented and remediation alternatives will soon be defined, he has developed a revised Task Force schedule, which he distributed for review. (ATTACHMENT A). The revised schedule projects that the Task Force will present its recommendations to DOE in September. He asked participants to review the proposed schedule to determine whether adequate time had been allocated to each of the tasks that are identified.

Ms. Drey asked when the public would have an opportunity to comment on the draft report and recommendations.

Mr. Dwyer said the proposed schedule calls for distribution of draft recommendations for

public review and comment in August.

Ms. Drey suggested that the schedule take into consideration the fact that many people vacation in August.

Mr. Frauenhoffer said the Task Force many want to consider scheduling more than one public meeting.

Old Business

The Task Force deferred action on the Communications Working Group proposal for distributing the draft final and final Task Force reports.

Dave Miller (SAIC) advised that the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the ballfields would be available for distribution to the Task Force prior to the April meeting. He asked stakeholders to indicate on the sign-in sheet if they were interested in receiving a copy of the EE/CA.

Mr. Miller also informed the Task Force that a technical memorandum concerning the possibility of using local sanitary waste landfills for disposal of minimally-contaminated radioactive materials should be available by the April Task Force meeting.

New Business

Mr. Adler said DOE will begin remediation work in North County next month by removing contaminated soil from the roadway frontages of seven commercial properties on Frost Avenue. Total volume is estimated to be about 3000 cubic yards.

He said the remediation plan calls for the excavated soil to be trucked to a staging area at McDonnell Boulevard and Eva Avenue, where it will be loaded into gondola rail cars and shipped to Envirocare for disposal.

Ron Kucera said he had been instructed by MDNR director David Shorr to inform the Task Force that, in its capacity as the environmental regulatory agency for the State of Missouri, MDNR cannot support any remediation plan that does not include exhumation of contaminated material that is below the water table at SLAPS. Leaving the wastes in place below the water table is not acceptable to MDNR.

Mr. Kucera also said that MDNR is drafting a history of the site for the Task Force to consider using in its final report. That draft should be completed by the end of March and will be distributed for review and comment shortly thereafter.

Mr. Dwyer explained that MDNR had earlier offered to develop the initial draft of the historical background section of the Task Force report.

*Develop Agenda
for Next Meeting*

The only item proposed for inclusion on the April agenda was discussion of the Ballfields EE/CA.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

The next meeting of the St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force is scheduled for April 16, 1996.

Approved April 16, 1996

St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force

141371

Milestones/Schedule Revised 3/25/96

March 19	Task Force Meeting Coldwater Creek Panel - Final Report
March 22	Complete Remediation Option Matrices
March 25-April 12	Obtain cost estimates and risk analysis
March 25-April 19	Task Force identify preferred alternatives
April 16	Task Force Meeting
March 19-May 17	Technologies Working Group Identify potentially applicable technologies Develop recommendations Report to Task Force
April 22-May 17	Priorities Working Group Develop cleanup priorities Report to Task Force
April 22-May 17	Alternative Sites Working Group Develop recommendations Report to Task Force
May 21	Task Force Meeting Act on recommendations of Technologies Working Group and Priorities Working Group

May 22-June 5	Develop initial draft of Task Force Report
June 6-18	Task Force review/respond to initial draft
June 18	Task Force Meeting Identify areas of agreement/disagreement
June 19-July 10	Negotiate differences Develop second draft of Task Force Report
July 11-16	Task Force review/respond to second draft
July 16	Task Force Meeting
July 17-24	Incorporate refinements Distribute draft report to public
July 25-August 31	Public review period Conduct public meeting(s)
August 20	Task Force Meeting
September 1-10	Incorporate public comment Develop final draft Submit to Task Force for final review
September 17	Task Force Meeting Adopt Final Report
September 24	Present report/recommendations to DOE

141371
SL-866

00-1948

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