

**MINUTES****St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force  
Technologies Working Group****April 25, 1996 Meeting****World Trade Center  
Clayton, Missouri****APPROVED****Participants Attending**

Kay Drey  
Jim Grant, Mallinckrodt Chemical  
Laurie Peterfreund, NCEIT  
Mitch Scherzinger, MDNR  
Robert Wester, R.M. Wester & Associates

**Support**

Jim Dwyer, Facilitator

<b><u>Agenda Item</u></b>	<b><u>Minutes</u></b>	<b><u>Determination</u></b>
<i>Meeting Order</i>	Jim Grant called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and distributed an agenda.	
<i>Approval of Minutes</i>	<p>Jim Dwyer then asked for comments on the draft minutes of the February 20, 1996 meeting.</p> <p>There were two amendments proposed and adopted. The minutes were approved as amended.</p>	<b>The minutes of the February 20, 1996 meeting were approved as amended.</b>
<i>Cost Comparison Data</i>	<p>Mr. Grant then distributed twelve pages of cost analysis data prepared by SAIC evaluating the relative costs of exhumation and remote disposal of contaminated material at SLAPS (hog and haul) versus estimated costs of various technologies which had been identified as potentially suitable for use at SLAPS.</p> <p>Particular attention was paid to the cost estimate for ex-situ microwave vitrification</p>	

and to assumptions regarding transportation and disposal costs.

It was agreed that participants and other interested parties would review the cost estimates in detail and would develop comments and questions over the next week, to be followed by a conference call with David Miller (SAIC).

It was requested that cost estimates for treatment of contaminated water be prepared and that an "apples to apples" cost comparison be prepared for soil washing (for potential use at SLDS) and for solidification techniques (compaction, concretization) versus "hog and haul" estimates at SLAPS.

The requested data would be used by the working group to compare the estimated cost of each potentially suitable technology versus projected costs for complete exhumation and remote disposal of wastes, in each case to achieve release of contaminated areas for unrestricted use.

Jim Grant then distributed three tables from the Initial Screening of Alternatives (ISA) describing potential remedial options for:

1. Surface water and groundwater
2. Soils/sediments
3. Buildings and structures

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Approved September 16, 1996

146363  
SL-1051

DO-1961

---

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