



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ST. LOUIS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
8945 LATTY AVENUE
BERKELEY, MISSOURI 63134

Project File

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

July 19, 2001

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program

SUBJECT: Transmittal of Final Annual Environmental Monitoring Data and Analysis
Report for CY00 and Final SLAPS Implementation Report

Mr. Dan Wall
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region VII, Superfund Branch
901 North Fifth Street
Kansas City, KS 66101-2907

Dear Mr. Wall:

Please find enclosed one copy each of two final documents related to the St. Louis District's Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP): (1) *Annual Environmental Monitoring Data and Analysis Report for CY00*, and (2) *SLAPS Implementation Report*. Due to the volume of data contained in the documents' appendices, they are being provided electronically on CD-ROM at the end of each document.

Also enclosed are responses to Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) comments to the St. Louis Airport Site (SLAPS) Implementation Report, received in a comment letter dated October 26, 2000 and in subsequent discussions. We have reviewed the final report and confirmed that the MDNR comments were appropriately incorporated into the document.

Copies of these reports are being forwarded to Mr. Robert Geller at the Missouri Department of Natural Resources. If you have questions or require additional information, please call Dr. Greg Hempen at (314) 260-3939.

Sincerely,

Sharon Cotner
FUSRAP Program Manager

Encls

SLAPS Implementation Report – Response to Comments
Discussion is based on meeting minutes from the November 3, 2000 Technical Working Group Meeting

Section	Comment	Response
Page 1-1, 2 nd paragraph.	Why weren't HISS and VPs included if confirmation of site conditions and assumptions were needed to prepare the FS/PP?	The scope of this document concerned SLAPS; the objective of the Kansas City TPP in 1998 was the SLAPS' evaluation. The only HISS data included is piezometric data (no chemical data from HISS is included). A subsurface characterization for HISS will be conducted after the HISS pile removals are completed.
Page 1-3, Current Site Conditions, 2 nd paragraph	It is stated that "more than two-thirds of the land within 0.8 kilometers of SLAPS is used for transportation-related purposes...The remaining land is used for commercial and industrial purposes." What about the residents just north of Latty Ave. and east of Hazelwood Blvd.?	Concur. The following statement has been added: "The nearest residential properties to SLAPS are located approximately 0.6 km (0.4 mi) to the northeast, on Frost Avenue in the City of Berkeley." Additional information concerning residential properties in the area is being provided in the latest draft of the North County Feasibility Study.
Page 1-6, Section 1.7 – Site Geology, 1 st paragraph:	• There is a discrepancy between two documents concerning the direction of bedrock dip at SLAPS. According to the subject document, the bedrock dips gently to the north-northwest. This may be a typographical error, because it is stated on page 2-17 of the August 2000 SLAPS Feasibility Study that the bedrock dips to the north-northeast. This inconsistency needs to be resolved. This question is not a significant concern as far as the review of the subject document but may have future implications. • 1st paragraph: "Illinoisian" glaciation should be spelled <i>Illinoian</i> glaciation. The spelling should be corrected. • 1st paragraph: There are two stratigraphic nomenclature errors in this paragraph. The shale unit is incorrectly identified as the Cherokee Shale Formation. The correct name is the Cherokee Group. The limestone unit is incorrectly identified as the St. Genevieve Formation. The correct name is the St. Genevieve Limestone. St. Genevieve is misspelled in several places in this document. • 5th paragraph: Origins of all the soil subunits are described except for Unit 4. An interpretation of the origin of Unit 4 should be provided.	• Concur. The text has been revised to indicate that bedrock dips regionally to the north-northeast. • Concur. The misspelling has been corrected to "Illinoian". • Concur. The nomenclature errors have been corrected as suggested and "Ste. Genevieve" has been replaced with "Mississippian Limestone" here and other locations in the document. • Concur. The following sentence added concerning Unit 4: "The coarse-grained nature of some of the sediments that make up Unit 4 suggests deposition was in a high energy environment."

Section	Comment	Response
Page 2-6, Section 2.3	Please note the wells that have been installed recently.	The discussion in Section 2.3 is limited in scope to the wells installed at SLAPS and CPs during 1998. However, USACE will make sure that the description of the conceptual model and site hydrogeology provided in this document is consistent with the additional data provided by the new wells on SLAPS..
Page 4-2, Table 4-1	The potential soil IAL values do not correspond to those shown in the FS/PP page D-40. The Potential Soil IAL subsurface value for U Total (234, 235, 238) should be 50 pCi/g.	The Investigation Levels (IAL) values derived from the Kansas City 1998 Technical Planning Process (TPP) for the investigation of SLAPS are not the basis of values presented in the FS/PP. IALs are not cleanup levels. IALs should be at least as low as the preliminary remediation goals (PRGs). The Implementation Report does not suggest that this is what the FS should have as any remediation goal. IALs are identified to make sure that the detection limits are sufficiently low for later assessments. They are used as a guide for acceptance of field sampling. Both the DOE and NRC potential soil IAL subsurface values for total uranium values are shown, but 50 pCi/g is the lower value. The higher value is only used as a reference to evaluate data previously collected by others. The 100 pCi/g value might indicate a need to resample these areas if previous data did not fall within the criteria.
Page 4-10, Table 4-3	The values in the above mentioned table do not correspond to those in Appendix D-14, Draft FS/PP (Nov. 1999).	The NC FS background values for radionuclides provided in Appendix D are based on 78 background soil samples from the North County Site. The background soil values listed in Table 4-3 are based on a more limited dataset (23 background samples from the 1998 soil-sampling program conducted at SLAPS) and so those values are not from the same population as the NC FS background values.

Section	Comment	Response
Page 4-26, Section 4.4.1 - Soil Gas Survey, 4 th and 5 th paragraphs	It is stated in the 5 th paragraph that no soil gas anomalies were detected by the soil gas survey. However, numerous VOCs at very low concentrations were detected at many sampling points according to the information presented in the 4 th paragraph. It is unclear why the VOC results are not considered anomalies.	Organics were occasionally detected but not of major magnitude. There was no indication of a near surface soil gas source in the survey area. TCE was not detected in any samples in Soil Gas Survey. An "anomaly" was considered a major concentration (non-dispersed). Low detection limits and the lack of persistence led us to believe there are no VOCs found at significant levels. USACE has revised the "anomaly" statement.
Page 5-2, Section 5.3, 5 th paragraph	It states, "...sampling results confirm that hazardous characteristics are not associated with any of the radionuclide-impacted soils." However in the 2 nd paragraph it states that arsenic, barium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, cobalt, copper, lead, etc. were found above their respective screening levels. These are all RCRA hazardous wastes, and therefore exhibit hazardous characteristics. Due to this fact, it appears these two paragraphs are in conflict. Please clarify.	There are detects of hazardous constituents above IALs, but this does not indicate presence of hazardous waste or indicate hazardous characteristics.
Page 5-3, Section 5.4, 5 th paragraph	It states, "TCE and 1,2 DCE were detected above their respective MCLs of 5 µg/L and 70 µg/L, although at low concentrations." This statement is misleading because on page 4-37, section 4.6.3.1, it states that the highest concentration of TCE found was 840 µg/L. This is not a low concentration especially when it is compared to the MCL of 5 µg/L.	Concur. The text has been changed as follows: "TCE and 1,2 DCE were detected at concentrations above their respective MCLs of 5 µg/L and 70 µg/L, although at low concentrations at SLAPS. There was a detection of 840 ug/L TCE in B53W17S on the ballfields." IA-1 at SLAPS has shown some TCE at depths that will be removed when USACE take soil actions at West End. USACE will continue to monitor for TCE in ground water, but it is not a COC. USACE will not release water with even moderate TCE concentrations. USACE will remove TCE contaminated, commingled soils in excavations. Discovered sources of TCE will be removed.

Section	Comment	Response
Additional MDNR Comments:		
Page 1-8	Flow in HZ-C is west to northwest. Maps in Figures 1-26 through 1-29 show flow direction is to northeast.	The flow direction indicated by the present figures is correct. The text in the first paragraph of page 1-8 has been revised to state that flow in HZ-C is north to northeast. Previous information used wells completed in other low horizons (not HZ-C). This larger group of data distorted the evaluation of the surrogate (HZ-C) for the Mississippian aquifer.
Page 3-38	Potentiometric surface in lower zone. The highest potentiometric surface is at the eastern end of SLAPS	Concur. The text will be modified to indicate that the highest potentiometric surface elevations for HZ-C are at the western end of SLAPS and the ballfields.
Figures 1-26 through 1-29	Cluster at eastern edge of figures was based on estimated riser elevation for one well point.	The database was checked to make sure this is a valid point. The top of casing elevations of the monitoring wells were resurveyed.. These elevations will be used in generating future potentiometric surface maps.



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ST. LOUIS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
8945 LATTY AVENUE
BERKELEY, MISSOURI 63134

Project Title

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

July 19, 2001

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program

SUBJECT: Transmittal of Final Annual Environmental Monitoring Data and Analysis Report for CY00 and Final SLAPS Implementation Report

Mr. Robert Geller
Missouri Department of Natural Resources
1730 East Elm
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Mr. Geller:

Please find enclosed two copies each of the two final documents related to the St. Louis District's Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP): (1) *Annual Environmental Monitoring Data and Analysis Report for CY00*, and (2) *SLAPS Implementation Report*. Due to the volume of data contained in the documents' appendices, they are being provided electronically on CD-ROM at the end of each document.

Also enclosed are responses to Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) comments to the St. Louis Airport Site (SLAPS) Implementation Report, received in a comment letter dated October 26, 2000 and in subsequent discussions. We have reviewed the final report and confirmed that the MDNR comments were appropriately incorporated into the document.

Copies of these reports are being forwarded directly to Mr. Eric Gilstrap of your staff and to Mr. Dan Wall at the United States Environmental Protection Agency. If you have questions or require additional information, please call Dr. Greg Hempen at (314) 260-3939.

Sincerely,

Sharon Cotner
FUSRAP Program Manager

Encls

SLAPS Implementation Report – Response to Comments
Discussion is based on meeting minutes from the November 3, 2000 Technical Working Group Meeting

Section	Comment	Response
Page 1-1, 2 nd paragraph	Why weren't HISS and VPs included if confirmation of site conditions and assumptions were needed to prepare the FS/PP?	The scope of this document concerned SLAPS; the objective of the Kansas City TPP in 1998 was the SLAPS' evaluation. The only HISS data included is piezometric data (no chemical data from HISS is included). A subsurface characterization for HISS will be conducted after the HISS pile removals are completed.
Page 1-3, Current Site Conditions, 2 nd paragraph	It is stated that "more than two-thirds of the land within 0.8 kilometers of SLAPS is used for transportation-related purposes... The remaining land is used for commercial and industrial purposes." What about the residents just north of Latty Ave. and east of Hazelwood Blvd.?	Concur. The following statement has been added: "The nearest residential properties to SLAPS are located approximately 0.6 km (0.4 mi) to the northeast, on Frost Avenue in the City of Berkeley." Additional information concerning residential properties in the area is being provided in the latest draft of the North County Feasibility Study.
Page 1-6, Section 1.7 – Site Geology, 1 st paragraph:	• There is a discrepancy between two documents concerning the direction of bedrock dip at SLAPS. According to the subject document, the bedrock dips gently to the north-northwest. This may be a typographical error, because it is stated on page 2-17 of the August 2000 SLAPS Feasibility Study that the bedrock dips to the north-northeast. This inconsistency needs to be resolved. This question is not a significant concern as far as the review of the subject document but may have future implications. • 1st paragraph: "Illinoisian" glaciation should be spelled <i>Illinoian</i> glaciation. The spelling should be corrected. • 1st paragraph: There are two stratigraphic nomenclature errors in this paragraph. The shale unit is incorrectly identified as the Cherokee Shale Formation. The correct name is the Cherokee Group. The limestone unit is incorrectly identified as the St. Genevieve Formation. The correct name is the St. Genevieve Limestone. St. Genevieve is misspelled in several places in this document. • 5th paragraph: Origins of all the soil subunits are described except for Unit 4. An interpretation of the origin of Unit 4 should be provided.	• Concur. The text has been revised to indicate that bedrock dips regionally to the north-northeast. • Concur. The misspelling has been corrected to "Illinoian". • Concur. The nomenclature errors have been corrected as suggested and "Ste. Genevieve" has been replaced with "Mississippian Limestone" here and other locations in the document. • Concur. The following sentence added concerning Unit 4: "The coarse-grained nature of some of the sediments that make up Unit 4 suggests deposition was in a high energy environment."

Section	Comment	Response
Page 2-6, Section 2.3	Please note the wells that have been installed recently.	The discussion in Section 2.3 is limited in scope to the wells installed at SLAPS and CPs during 1998. However, USACE will make sure that the description of the conceptual model and site hydrogeology provided in this document is consistent with the additional data provided by the new wells on SLAPS..
Page 4-2, Table 4-1	The potential soil IAL values do not correspond to those shown in the FS/PP page D-40. The Potential Soil IAL subsurface value for U Total (234, 235, 238) should be 50 pCi/g.	The Investigation Levels (IAL) values derived from the Kansas City 1998 Technical Planning Process (TPP) for the investigation of SLAPS are not the basis of values presented in the FS/PP. IALs are not cleanup levels. IALs should be at least as low as the preliminary remediation goals (PRGs). The Implementation Report does not suggest that this is what the FS should have as any remediation goal. IALs are identified to make sure that the detection limits are sufficiently low for later assessments. They are used as a guide for acceptance of field sampling. Both the DOE and NRC potential soil IAL subsurface values for total uranium values are shown, but 50 pCi/g is the lower value. The higher value is only used as a reference to evaluate data previously collected by others. The 100 pCi/g value might indicate a need to resample these areas if previous data did not fall within the criteria.
Page 4-10, Table 4-3	The values in the above mentioned table do not correspond to those in Appendix D-14, Draft FS/PP (Nov. 1999).	The NC FS background values for radionuclides provided in Appendix D are based on 78 background soil samples from the North County Site. The background soil values listed in Table 4-3 are based on a more limited dataset (23 background samples from the 1998 soil-sampling program conducted at SLAPS) and so those values are not from the same population as the NC FS background values.

Section	Comment	Response
Page 4-26, Section 4.4.1 - Soil Gas Survey, 4 th and 5 th paragraphs	It is stated in the 5 th paragraph that no soil gas anomalies were detected by the soil gas survey. However, numerous VOCs at very low concentrations were detected at many sampling points according to the information presented in the 4 th paragraph. It is unclear why the VOC results are not considered anomalies.	Organics were occasionally detected but not of major magnitude. There was no indication of a near surface soil gas source in the survey area. TCE was not detected in any samples in Soil Gas Survey. An "anomaly" was considered a major concentration (non-dispersed). Low detection limits and the lack of persistence led us to believe there are no VOCs found at significant levels. USACE has revised the "anomaly" statement.
Page 5-2, Section 5.3, 5 th paragraph	It states, "...sampling results confirm that hazardous characteristics are not associated with any of the radionuclide-impacted soils." However in the 2 nd paragraph it states that arsenic, barium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, cobalt, copper, lead, etc. were found above their respective screening levels. These are all RCRA hazardous wastes, and therefore exhibit hazardous characteristics. Due to this fact, it appears these two paragraphs are in conflict. Please clarify.	There are detects of hazardous constituents above IALs, but this does not indicate presence of hazardous waste or indicate hazardous characteristics.
Page 5-3, Section 5.4, 5 th paragraph	It states, "TCE and 1,2 DCE were detected above their respective MCLs of 5 µg/L and 70 µg/L, although at low concentrations." This statement is misleading because on page 4-37, section 4.6.3.1, it states that the highest concentration of TCE found was 840 µg/L. This is not a low concentration especially when it is compared to the MCL of 5 µg/L.	Concur. The text has been changed as follows: "TCE and 1,2 DCE were detected at concentrations above their respective MCLs of 5 µg/L and 70 µg/L, although at low concentrations at SLAPS. There was a detection of 840 ug/L TCE in B53W17S on the ballfields." IA-1 at SLAPS has shown some TCE at depths that will be removed when USACE take soil actions at West End. USACE will continue to monitor for TCE in ground water, but it is not a COC. USACE will not release water with even moderate TCE concentrations. USACE will remove TCE contaminated, commingled soils in excavations. Discovered sources of TCE will be removed.

Section	Comment	Response
Additional MDNR Comments:		
Page 1-8	Flow in HZ-C is west to northwest. Maps in Figures 1-26 through 1-29 show flow direction is to northeast.	The flow direction indicated by the present figures is correct. The text in the first paragraph of page 1-8 has been revised to state that flow in HZ-C is north to northeast. Previous information used wells completed in other low horizons (not HZ-C). This larger group of data distorted the evaluation of the surrogate (HZ-C) for the Mississippian aquifer.
Page 3-38	Potentiometric surface in lower zone. The highest potentiometric surface is at the eastern end of SLAPS	Concur. The text will be modified to indicate that the highest potentiometric surface elevations for HZ-C are at the western end of SLAPS and the ballfields.
Figures 1-26 through 1-29	Cluster at eastern edge of figures was based on estimated riser elevation for one well point.	The database was checked to make sure this is a valid point. The top of casing elevations of the monitoring wells were resurveyed.. These elevations will be used in generating future potentiometric surface maps.

FUSRAP Document Management System

Year ID

00 2666

Further Info?

☐

Operating Unit

St. Louis Sites

Site

Area

MARKS Number

FN:1110-1-8100g

Primary Document Type

Site Management

Secondary Document Type

Correspondence

Subject or Title

Transmittal of the Final Annual Environmental Monitoring Data and Analysis Report for CY00 and Final SLAPS Implementation Report

Author/Originator

Sharon Cotner

Company

CEMVS-PM-R

Date

7/19/2001

Recipient (s)

Dan Wall, Robert Geller

Company (-ies)

USEPA, MDNR

Version

Final

Original's Location

Central Files

Document Format

Paper

Confidential File?

☐

Comments

SAIC number

Bechtel ID

Include in which AR(s)?

☒ North County

☐ Madison

☐ Downtown

☐ Iowa

ETL

1.12

Filed in Volume

1



Administrative Record for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) North St. Louis County Sites

St. Louis County, Missouri



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**
St. Louis District®

Volume 1.12c
Site Management –
Sampling/Analysis Data & Plans

SLAP_000707