

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

FUSRAP  
St. Louis Downtown Site (SLDS)  
Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan (FS/PP)  
Public Meeting  
April 21, 1998

Presented by Major Emmett L. Wood  
Deputy District Commander, St. Louis District  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Clay Elementary School  
St. Louis, Missouri

ST. LOUIS REALTIME REPORTING & VIDEO  
605 Windsor Hill Drive  
St. Louis, Missouri 63125  
Sandra L. Ragsdale  
Registered Professional Reporter  
Phone 314-544-0167 Fax 314-544-5743

## A P P E A R A N C E S

Major Emmett L. Wood - Moderator

FUSRAP Deputy District Commander

St. Louis District

United States Army Corps of Engineers

Dr. Robert Mullins

FUSRAP Project Manager

Mr. Lou Dell'Orco

Deputy FUSRAP Project Manager

Mr. Chris Haskell

Environmental Public Information Specialist

Mr. Dennis Chambers

Certified Health Physicist, USACE

## INDEX

## PAGE

Introduction by Major Wood.....6

Remarks by Dr. Mullins.....8

Question and answer session.....18

Mr. Bob Eck

Director, Missouri Department

of Natural Resources

St. Louis Regional Office.....18

Miss Anna Ginsburg

On behalf of Mayor Harmon

City of St. Louis.....20

Mr. Richard Cavanaugh, chairperson,

St. Louis FUSRAP Oversight

Committee.....24

Ms. Mimi Garstang

On behalf of geologist, Dr. James

1	Williams.....	27
2		
3	Ms. Sally Price	
4	St. Louis FUSRAP Oversight	
5	Committee Member.....	30
6		
7	Ms. Rita Bleser	
8	Vice President and General Manager	
9	Mallinckrodt, Inc. ....	31
10		
11	Father Creason	
12	Pastor, Holy Trinity Church.....	37
13		
14	Mr. Tom Bratkowski	
15	Neighborhood resident.....	38
16		
17	Ms. Carol Prombo	
18	City of St. Louis resident.....	40
19		
20	Mr. Doug Eller	
21	Neighborhood resident.....	45
22		
23	Mr. Frank Muehlheausler	
24	Principal, Clay School.....	50
25		

1	Ms. Judice Green	
2	Neighborhood resident.....	55
3		
4	Ms. Linda Ellenburg	
5	Neighborhood resident.....	57
6		
7	Mr. Tom Bratkowski.....	58
8		
9	Ms. Debbie Eisenbraun	
10	Neighborhood resident.....	60
11		
12	Mr. Dennis Chambers	
13	USACE.....	60
14		
15	Father Creason.....	61
16		
17	Mr. Mullins.....	62
18		
19	Ms. Prombo.....	63
20		
21	Mr. Eller.....	64
22		
23	Final comments by Major Wood.....	65
24		
25	Meeting adjourned.....	67

\*\*\*      \*\*\*      \*\*\*

(The hearing commenced at 7:30  
P.M.)

MAJOR WOOD:    I'd like to welcome  
everybody. This is me, Major Wood. I'm here  
representing my boss, Colonel Hodgini, tonight  
who would love to have been here I'm sure, but  
he got told by his boss he needed to be at Fort  
Leonard Wood for the next few days. So I'm here  
representing the Corps and Colonel Hodgini  
tonight.

I'd like to go over briefly the  
agenda that we're going to follow this evening.  
First thing we'll do is go over some ground  
rules. We've got sort of a mandatory slide that  
we put in all our briefings that talks about our  
Mississippi Valley Division. I'll just talk to  
that for a minute. I'll go over a little bit of  
the site history of the downtown site. Then  
I'll turn things over to Rob Mullins for the  
remainder of the bullets there. And after the  
summary we'll go to a question and answer  
period. Okay.

Here are the ground rules. They're  
pretty self-explanatory. We're going to have a

1        verbatim transcript of everything that goes on  
2        here tonight. I think everyone has a copy of  
3        the slide presentation.

4                Ask questions during the question  
5        and answer session after the presentation is  
6        over. I think our presentation will take on the  
7        order of 15 or 20 minutes probably to get  
8        through. We'll provide a mike to you during the  
9        Q and A. Make sure if you would please that you  
10       identify yourself and the organization so we can  
11       get that into the record. Please ask one  
12       question at a time. If you nest them, folks get  
13       kind of confused and it makes them difficult to  
14       answer. So if you would, ask your questions one  
15       at a time. Everybody will have an opportunity  
16       to speak who wants to speak. We'll be here as  
17       long as we need to to make sure that that  
18       happens.

19               Written comments will also be  
20       accepted. I was just talking to one lady a few  
21       months ago who wasn't able to stay for the whole  
22       meeting and intends to submit some written  
23       comments.

24               Next slide please. Here's our new  
25       division. We're the St. Louis District. We're

1 in the heart of the new division which is in the  
2 heart of the United States. We extend all the  
3 way from the Canadian border now down through  
4 the Gulf of Mexico. We picked up St. Paul  
5 District, Rock Island -- and what else did we  
6 pickup? That's it. And we're in the middle of  
7 all that, the confluence if you will of all  
8 that.

9 Next slide please. I guess  
10 everybody probably can read this. We wondered  
11 if this was going to be legible from the seats  
12 out there.

13 But this just kind of gives you  
14 from the start back in the 1940's up to the  
15 present day what the history of the SLDS site  
16 has been. Again this is in your written handout  
17 that you can take with you and look at more  
18 closely later for those of you that are  
19 interested. A lot of you folks probably already  
20 know a lot of this, but we provided this for any  
21 newcomers for the whole FUSRAP issue.

22 Okay. At this point I'm going to  
23 turn it over to Rob Mullins who will continue  
24 along with our presentation.

25 MR. MULLINS: I don't do very well

1 with microphones but I'm going to try very hard  
2 to keep it close so you can hear me.

3 A lot of work was done by the  
4 Department of Energy before the transfer of this  
5 program over to the Corps this past fall. This  
6 shows some of the areas that have already been  
7 remediated, some of the work that has been done,  
8 and what we hope to do is to build on that and  
9 push it through to completion.

10 And you can see the work that's  
11 been done on the riverfront, a lot of different  
12 plant areas down at Mallinckrodt had been  
13 remediated, but there's still much more to do.

14 We can go to the next one. This is  
15 just a different view of some of those areas.  
16 You can see some of the ones that have been  
17 done, especially the flattened out areas, places  
18 where there's now parking lots where in the past  
19 there were buildings. A lot of work has been  
20 done.

21 Let's go ahead and talk about where  
22 we're headed. The whole program, the Formerly  
23 Used Sites Remedial Action Program, was set up  
24 to try to clean up the impacts and the wastes  
25 that were generated in the production of the

1 atomic bomb and other things back in the 40's  
2 and 50's.

3 So these are the objectives that we  
4 had laid out in our feasibility study. And  
5 there's a lot of detail. For those of you who  
6 do not have copies of the feasibility study or  
7 the proposed plan, if you would take and leave  
8 your name with someone in the back. I know we  
9 brought some copies. I don't know if we had  
10 enough for everybody. But if you don't have  
11 one, indicate on your attendance card that we  
12 need to send one out to you. So if you don't  
13 have it we will get you one.

14 But there's a lot of detail in it.  
15 Primary objective is the first one, protection  
16 of human health and the environment. That's  
17 really why we're doing this, trying to also take  
18 and restore the property back to beneficial use  
19 and to minimize the adverse effects on area  
20 businesses while we're trying to do this. So  
21 these were our goals.

22 We looked at a number of  
23 alternatives. Again there's a lot of detail in  
24 the feasibility study itself and in the proposed  
25 plan on what we were going to do, but we just

1        tried to summarize it here. Again you have this  
2        information in your handout.

3                No action is a mandatory  
4        alternative. The Comprehensive Environmental  
5        Response, Compensation and Liability Act,  
6        CERCLA, mandates a EE/CA. I see one of the  
7        fellows that we work with, he was surprised that  
8        I got through all that. But that's what CERCLA  
9        stands for.

10               It mandates that we look at a no  
11        action, what happens if we don't do anything and  
12        just walk away. So we looked at that.  
13        Surprisingly, there's a cost associated with not  
14        doing anything. It's 22 million dollars.  
15        That's for doing a lot of monitoring, a lot of  
16        other things that would have to be done that  
17        would go on anyway just to track what's  
18        happening at the site.

19               We looked at institutional  
20        controls, what happens if we look at things like  
21        some land use restrictions where we can't use  
22        the land for things that it could be used for.  
23        There are a lot of other things we can do to  
24        prevent access to them. Again there's a cost  
25        associated with that. Incrementally it goes up

1 an additional 7 million dollars. It's a bit  
2 more work.

3 We looked at trying to bring most  
4 of the waste to a central point. That's our  
5 consolidating and capping alternative. That one  
6 gets to be fairly expensive, 100 million  
7 dollars. There's a lot of engineering work  
8 involved with centralizing those wastes in one  
9 place.

10 We looked at another alternative --  
11 the next three alternatives are really  
12 variations on a theme. They are: Dig up some  
13 of the really nasty material or all of it and  
14 ship it off some place, what you might hear  
15 referred to as a dig and haul alternative. But  
16 in this one we're look at trying to put in the  
17 top 2 feet in various plant areas at what you  
18 might think of as a residential type criteria.  
19 Below that, more of an industrial criteria, just  
20 try to get the material down to a safe level.

21 So that's what this alternative  
22 consists of. Again a lot of detail in the  
23 documents that we sent out.

24 Alternative No. 5 is basically  
25 cleaning up all of the hot and nasty stuff below

WILLIAM L. CLAY  
1ST DISTRICT, MISSOURI

COMMITTEE ON  
EDUCATION AND THE  
WORKFORCE

RANKING DEMOCRATIC MEMBER

MAILING ADDRESS:

2305 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-2501  
TELEPHONE: (202) 225-2406

HARRIET PRITCHETT GRIGSBY  
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT



# Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515-2501

April 29, 1998

DISTRICT OFFICES:

5261 DELMAR BOULEVARD  
SUITE B  
ST. LOUIS, MO 63108  
TELEPHONE: (314) 387-1970

12755 NEW HALLS FERRY  
NEW HALLS FERRY PLAZA  
FLORISSANT, MO 63033  
TELEPHONE: (314) 839-9148

PEARLIE L. EVANS  
DISTRICT ASSISTANT

VIRGINIA M. COOK  
DISTRICT COORDINATOR

Dr. Rob Mullins, Jr.  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
St. Louis District  
9170 Latty Avenue  
Saint Louis, MO 63134

Dear Dr. Mullins:

I have reviewed the Army Corps of Engineers plans for remediation of the St. Louis Downtown Site (SLDS) under the Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP). I commend the Corps for the timely development of these assessments and plans. I look forward to the expedient completion of this clean-up project; it is time the St. Louis community is relieved of the burdens brought by early weapons production.

I encourage the Corps to select and implement Site-Wide Alternative No. 6 - Selective Evacuation and Disposal. This alternative will minimize the future administrative and financial burdens to property owners and will minimize impediments to future development which would be created under Alternative #4. Although short-term cost to the federal government will be higher under alternative #6, this plan will prevent the need to shift more than \$10 million in costs for the management of soils not removed by Alternative #4 from the FUSRAP program to property owners. Alternative #6 will allow the most cost-effective development and expansion of SLDS properties while spurring economic benefits throughout the community. This alternative will also reduce the government's continuing obligation for the disposal of soils excavated by property owners.

Finally, I encourage the Corps to resolve any question of future responsibility for residues which are not removed under the current plan. Property owners must not bear a burden that is the government's responsibility; it is both appropriate and reasonable that the mechanism for establishing and guaranteeing such responsibility be established prior to the issuance of the Record of Decision.

Thank you for your consideration of my views. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "William L. Clay".

William L. Clay  
Member of Congress

1 the criteria that we've established. And  
2 shipping it off. In this case to a place most  
3 likely in Utah that accepts these kinds of  
4 wastes. It's a long-term stable storage area.  
5 And so we'd be getting it all off. The cost of  
6 that, 140 million dollars, fairly expensive.

7 If we look at this one, selective  
8 excavation and disposal, we're taking here and  
9 just getting some of the areas. And in this  
10 case in all of these dig and haul alternatives  
11 we have a number of vicinity properties around  
12 the Mallinckrodt plant area. They are all going  
13 to be cleaned up to a residential type standard  
14 which is consistent with what the St. Louis task  
15 force recommended.

16 Here what we're doing is we talked  
17 with Mallinckrodt about potential areas that  
18 expansion may occur in, and we went and actually  
19 dug out some additional dirt under this  
20 alternative to make those areas accessible  
21 without the federal government coming back in  
22 and doing any additional work.

23 So that's what goes into this is.  
24 You can see it's 114 million. This is in  
25 between alternative 4 and alternative 5 -- yes,

1 the cost is between alternative 4 and  
2 alternative 5.

3 What we've presented is our  
4 preferred alternative. In the proposed plan  
5 it's alternative 4, where we dig out a great  
6 deal of material, the top 2 feet. We're showing  
7 up there to a 5/15 criteria which is a  
8 residential type criteria. Below that we'll be  
9 looking at 50, 100 and 150.

10 Those criteria for cleaning up  
11 radium, thorium and uranium are based on risk.  
12 We did a risk analysis, what would happen in a  
13 residual state, and came up with that as a safe  
14 standard to shoot for.

15 Now part of what we'd be doing  
16 here, we'd be shipping some of the material  
17 off-site. Some of it would remain on site. And  
18 just be used in the backfill. We would also --  
19 because there's still going to be some  
20 radioactive material there, we'd be implementing  
21 institutional controls to maintain those areas  
22 and the inaccessible soils until they can be  
23 cleaned up.

24 So that's how the proposed plan is  
25 set out. Again this is described in great

1 detail in the documents that we have available.  
2 So you can look at those again at your leisure.  
3 If you don't have copies we'll get them to you.  
4 But this is our recommendation.

5 Right now if we look at the dates,  
6 we've got an open public comment period. We're  
7 accepting written comments through May 8th.  
8 That's when we have to get them in to make them  
9 a part of the record. All the comments we get  
10 in, we will respond to. So we will produce a  
11 document called a responsiveness summary that  
12 will go along with our record of decision. And  
13 it will address every comment we receive during  
14 this comment period.

15 Again there's our schedule. We're  
16 looking to try and get a record of decision, a  
17 document which documents our plan, to USEPA  
18 right before July 4th. That's our goal. This  
19 is a very tight schedule to try to make but we  
20 think it's doable.

21 And as a part of this process we  
22 are not necessarily locked in on alternative 4.  
23 When you read the feasibility study, when you  
24 look at what we've put out in the plan, we  
25 believe that it's a good mix of risk-based

1       assessment. We've come up with a plan that  
2       protects human health and the environment at a  
3       good cost for the taxpayers. A lot of things  
4       were mixed into that.

5               If the public comments come back as  
6       being overwhelmingly in favor of another plan,  
7       then we're willing to go back and re-evaluate  
8       our position.

9               We did that for those of you who  
10      were involved with the St. Louis Airport Site  
11      and the Hazelwood Site public meetings. We came  
12      out with an initial proposed plan there which --  
13      the details of the plans really aren't  
14      important -- but based on the public meeting our  
15      Commander, Colonel Hodgini, made a decision to  
16      change the selected alternative based on the  
17      public feedback.

18              So again we're opening to doing  
19      that if there appears to be good justification  
20      for doing that.

21              So that's our schedule. We're  
22      putting this information up on the World Wide  
23      Web so it's available.

24              We have a gentleman, Chris  
25      Haskell -- Chris, will you stand up please --

1 Chris is our environmental public information  
2 specialist. And for those of you who have  
3 questions you can get ahold of him at the site.  
4 He is also very responsive to e-mail for those  
5 of you who are on e-mail.

6 But we're putting our documents and  
7 a lot of information out there on the Web so we  
8 can be reached and searched. Again there's not  
9 any secrets here.

10 So right now I know that I've gone  
11 through a lot of detail. Many of the folks in  
12 the room have been involved in this for years.  
13 I've been involved with it for about 4 and a  
14 half months. And you all know a lot of the  
15 history of how we got here, what has been talked  
16 about in the past. We've told you a little bit  
17 about where we think we're going.

18 Basically we're going to clean up  
19 the vicinity property downtown to a residential  
20 standard. That's our recommendation. We're  
21 going to take and clean up the Mallinckrodt  
22 property itself, the downtown site proper, to a  
23 risk-based standard. And our recommendations  
24 are consistent with that risk analysis.

25 So at this point I guess I'll turn

1           it back over to Major Wood and take questions.

2                   MAJOR WOOD:   Okay.   At this point  
3           we're going to open it up for questions.   We've  
4           got a lot of subject matter experts here and  
5           comments.   I imagine we're going to have some  
6           comments to be read into the record.

7                   Questions that you have, the folks  
8           that we have here will address to the extent  
9           that we can here tonight.   All questions,  
10          however, will be addressed in the summary that's  
11          going to be part of the accompanying record of  
12          decision.

13                   So the first individual I have here  
14          is Mr. Bob Eck representing the Missouri  
15          Department of Natural Resources.   Sir.

16                   MR. ECK:   Thank you.   Good evening.  
17          My name is Bob Eck.   I'm the director of the  
18          Missouri Department of Natural Resources, St.  
19          Louis regional office.

20                   I'm here this evening on behalf of  
21          the Department Director, Steve Mahfood, to  
22          present the State's testimony.

23                   The State of Missouri prefers  
24          alternative 6 as the remedy for cleaning up  
25          radioactive contamination at the St. Louis

1       Downtown Site.

2               We believe Selective Excavation and  
3       Disposal provides the best vehicle for attaining  
4       the objectives of the St. Louis Site Remediation  
5       Task Force.

6               Only approved off-site borrow  
7       should be used to fill the excavations at the  
8       vicinity properties. Institutional controls  
9       will be required to ensure continued protection  
10      until a remedy for inaccessible soils is  
11      developed.

12              We do believe the remediation  
13      should clean up to industrial use criteria the  
14      Mallinckrodt site and 5/15 "any use" levels at  
15      any depth for the vicinity properties.

16              We believe alternative 6 can be  
17      accomplished in a manner that will leave  
18      property owners whole. Such will result in the  
19      best response to the federal nuclear weapons  
20      production legacy in this part of the community.

21              We thank the Corps for the work  
22      they've done so far and pledge our assistance in  
23      the completion of this project.

24              Thank you go for the opportunity to  
25      comment.

1 MAJOR WOOD: Thank you. We look  
2 forward to continue working with the State to  
3 achieve a great result with our FUSRAP program.  
4 Thank you.

5 Miss Anna Ginzburg representing the  
6 Mayor's Office of the City of St. Louis.

7 MS. GINZBURG: Thanks. Good  
8 evening. As the Major said, I'm Anna Ginzburg  
9 and I'm here tonight on behalf of Mayor Harmon  
10 and I'm going to read statement from him.

11 As Mayor of the City of St. Louis,  
12 I submit the following statement in response to  
13 the Army Corps of Engineers Proposed Plan for  
14 the downtown site dated April 1998.

15 The Mallinckrodt site should be  
16 cleaned up to the standards laid out in  
17 alternative 6 of the April 1998 proposed plan.

18 This alternative is most consistent  
19 with the recommendations of the St. Louis Site  
20 Remediation Task Force which states that the  
21 Mallinckrodt properties should be cleaned up to  
22 a depth of 8 feet. Cleanup to the 4 and 6 foot  
23 levels stated in alternative 6 will allow for  
24 the future development at the Mallinckrodt site.

25 The Mallinckrodt Corporation has

1 displayed outstanding corporate citizenship  
2 throughout the entire cleanup and public input  
3 process. They have made major in-kind  
4 contributions of time, energy and resources  
5 moving the site cleanup forward significantly.

6 The City of St. Louis values  
7 Mallinckrodt's commitment to the Near North  
8 Riverfront area and the other neighborhoods  
9 surrounding its facility.

10 The plan laid out in alternative 6  
11 will allow Mallinckrodt to undertake development  
12 and expansion that will help the company  
13 maintain and expand its positive presence.

14 Supporting Mallinckrodt development  
15 plan is a top priority for the City of St.  
16 Louis.

17 Alternative 4, which is the cleanup  
18 alternative recommended by the Army Corps of  
19 Engineers, does not take into account the long  
20 term costs related to on-going oversight and  
21 monitoring for the significant level of  
22 contamination that would remain.

23 It is unclear who would be  
24 responsible for the on-going management of this  
25 remaining waste. It is unfair to assume that

1 Mallinckrodt Corporation will accept this burden  
2 indefinitely.

3 In the long run it may be less  
4 expensive to clean up the Mallinckrodt site to  
5 the higher standard proposed in alternative 6.

6 The City of St. Louis has  
7 consistently called for the cleanup of the  
8 vicinity properties to standards for  
9 unrestricted use. These standards are 15  
10 picocuries per gram for Radium 226 and Thorium  
11 230 at surface the levels, and 15 picocuries per  
12 gram for these same elements at the sub-surface  
13 level. Uranium 238 should be cleaned up to  
14 levels of 50 picocuries per gram for both the  
15 surface and sub-surface.

16 These vicinity properties include  
17 several small businesses, as well as property  
18 owned by the City of St. Louis. The City  
19 property is adjacent to the recently opened  
20 Riverfront Trail. It is essential that this  
21 property be cleaned up to standards for  
22 unrestricted use in the near future since it is  
23 likely to be frequented by families using the  
24 trail.

25 The cleanup of the businesses

1 included in the vicinity properties must be  
2 closely coordinated with the business owners so  
3 that economic activity is not disrupted.

4 The Army Corps of Engineers should  
5 begin negotiations with these businesses in  
6 order to develop a cleanup plan.

7 Under no circumstances should the  
8 burden of cleanup costs or the responsibility  
9 for monitoring and oversight of continuing  
10 contamination fall on these businesses.

11 Cleanup of the vicinity properties  
12 to standards for unrestricted use is a matter of  
13 environmental justice. The Old North St. Louis  
14 and Hyde Park neighborhoods are adjacent to the  
15 contaminated area. In these neighborhoods the  
16 annual per capita income is just under \$6,000  
17 and the annual median household income is only a  
18 little bit over \$12,000. 59 percent of adults  
19 in these neighborhood have not finished high  
20 school and 63 percent of all individuals live in  
21 poverty.

22 At a minimum, we need to clean up  
23 the vicinity properties to the same unrestricted  
24 use standards that the City, the County and the  
25 State want to see utilized at the Airport Site

1 and adjacent properties in the much more  
2 affluent North County neighborhoods surrounding  
3 the Airport Site.

4 MAJOR WOOD: Thank you, Miss  
5 Ginzburg.

6 Next will be Mr. Richard Cavanaugh  
7 representing St. Louis County.

8 MR. CAVANAUGH: My name is Richard  
9 Cavanaugh. I'm the Chair of the St. Louis  
10 FUSRAP Oversight Committee. The committee  
11 itself has a resolution that Sally Price will be  
12 addressing somewhat later.

13 But I would like to read a  
14 statement from the County Executive. For those  
15 of you who perhaps are not as familiar with this  
16 entire FUSRAP project, you need to understand  
17 that both the Airport Site as well as the  
18 Downtown Site and adjacent properties and so  
19 forth, we're working collaboratively with the  
20 City to provide oversight and assurance that  
21 standards are maintained on the cleanup.

22 So that's why I'm representing the  
23 County here in the City.

24 So this is a statement from the St.  
25 Louis County Executive, Buzz Westfall.

1                   Since assuming the office of the  
2                   St. Louis County Executive in 1991, I have  
3                   championed the cause of complete remediation of  
4                   all St. Louis County and City FUSRAP sites that  
5                   are the result of the over 50-year legacy of  
6                   radioactive waste in St. Louis.

7                   I am most appreciative of the  
8                   recent efforts of the United States Army Corps  
9                   of Engineers to finally make progress towards  
10                  this end.

11                  I must, however, disagree with the  
12                  Corps of Engineers' current recommendation for  
13                  alternative 4 for cleanup of the St. Louis  
14                  Downtown site.

15                  Alternative 4 would only provide a  
16                  partial solution to the cleanup issue at the  
17                  Mallinckrodt plant. Most importantly, the  
18                  proposed plan for alternative 4 is not  
19                  consistent with the recommendations of the St.  
20                  Louis Site Remediation Task Force. The Task  
21                  Force recommendation -- based on over three  
22                  years of hard work and study by the Radioactive  
23                  Waste Commissions of both St. Louis County and  
24                  the City of St. Louis -- clearly calls for the  
25                  use of clean backfill at the St. Louis Downtown

1 Site.

2 The Mallinckrodt Corporation is a  
3 long standing and vital employer in the St.  
4 Louis region. Several other businesses operate  
5 in the nearby vicinity properties.

6 The proposed alternative 4 would  
7 result in radioactive contamination remaining in  
8 the ground on the north St. Louis site.

9 The perceived short-term cost  
10 savings of alternative 4 are overshadowed by the  
11 long term economic benefits of complete  
12 remediation of the Downtown Site.

13 It is the hope of the St. Louis  
14 community that Mallinckrodt will continue to  
15 operate a plant at the Downtown Site. Further,  
16 it's expected that Mallinckrodt will build  
17 future manufacturing facilities at that  
18 location.

19 When such construction is  
20 contemplated, further radioactive waste  
21 remediation would be required prior to  
22 construction. Both the cost and time involved  
23 in such future remediation will functionally  
24 argue against Mallinckrodt's consideration of  
25 the north St. Louis site for future economic

1 development.

2 Alternative 4 will have lasting and  
3 potentially devastating economic impacts both on  
4 the plant site in north St. Louis and on the  
5 employment picture for the entire St. Louis  
6 region.

7 Therefore, I urge the United States  
8 Army Corps of Engineers to reject alternative 4  
9 and instead move forward with alternative 6  
10 which will assure complete remediation of the  
11 Mallinckrodt Site.

12 Alternative 6 is a worthwhile  
13 investment in the future of a vibrant economy  
14 for our region. Any strategy short of the  
15 complete remediation outlined in alternative 6  
16 would be short sighted.

17 I urge the Corps of Engineers to  
18 reconsider its position and adopt alternative 6  
19 for the Proposed Plan of the Mallinckrodt Site.  
20 Thank you.

21 MAJOR WOOD: Thank you, sir.

22 Miss Mimi Garstang, Missouri  
23 Department of Natural Resources, Division of  
24 Geology and Land Survey.

25 MS. GARSTANG: Thank you. My name

1 is Mimi Garstang and I am pleased to comment on  
2 the Feasibility Study and the Proposed Plan for  
3 the St. Louis Downtown Site developed by the  
4 Corps of Engineers in March 1998.

5 I'm making these comments on behalf  
6 of the state geologist, Dr. James Williams.

7 You're probably all aware that the  
8 St. Louis Downtown Site is located on the  
9 Mississippi River flood plain. The facility is  
10 underlain by a major groundwater aquifer that  
11 extends from the northern reaches of the  
12 Mississippi River to the Gulf of Mexico. This  
13 aquifer supplies groundwater for private, public  
14 and commercial uses throughout much of its  
15 extent.

16 I recognize that the Mississippi  
17 River alluvial aquifer in the general vicinity  
18 of the St. Louis Downtown Site is not currently  
19 used for public water supply. However, the  
20 potential for such use cannot be discounted.  
21 The quantity as well as the quality of the water  
22 in this aquifer is adequate and suitable for  
23 many uses.

24 Protection of the aquifer is  
25 essential given the volume and reliability of

1 the water present.

2 The close proximity of the  
3 Mississippi River means that there is a  
4 measurable influence by the river on the  
5 aquifer. The bedrock aquifer to the west  
6 influences the alluvium to a lesser amount.

7 I realize that treatment of the  
8 water in this alluvium may be necessary prior to  
9 consumption. The extent of treatment may also  
10 be impacted by man-made influences on the  
11 aquifer.

12 However, that does not allow for  
13 contamination risks to exist that knowingly  
14 would or could cause degradation of water  
15 quality beyond reasonable limits for standard  
16 treatment by the user.

17 All remedial actions considered for  
18 the St. Louis Downtown Site should include  
19 efforts to eliminate the potential for  
20 radionuclides or other contaminants to adversely  
21 impact the alluvial aquifer usable as a water  
22 supply.

23 I want to thank you for the  
24 opportunity to present these comments on behalf  
25 of the state geologist.

1 MAJOR WOOD: Thank you for your  
2 comments.

3 Forgive me, I can't quite make out  
4 the first name but Miss Price, Mr. Price? Sally  
5 Price, FUSRAP Oversight Committee.

6 MS. PRICE: My name is Sally Price  
7 and I serve on the St. Louis FUSRAP Oversight  
8 Committee. I'm here this evening to speak on  
9 the committee's behalf.

10 At the committee's last meeting  
11 this past Friday on April 17, 1998 they  
12 discussed the St. Louis Downtown Site  
13 Feasibility Study and Proposed Plan.

14 As a result of the discussions, the  
15 committee unanimously approved a motion to  
16 support the alternative 6 cleanup option offered  
17 in the report.

18 Although the committee recognizes  
19 that the Corps of Engineers has proposed  
20 alternative 4 as the preferred option, it is the  
21 feeling of the committee that alternative 6,  
22 selective excavation and disposal, offers a more  
23 comprehensive cleanup which is more protective  
24 of human health and employee health as well as  
25 more conducive to the continued long term growth

1 and viability interests of Mallinckrodt Chemical  
2 Company.

3 The committee believes that the  
4 presence of a leading industrial company such as  
5 Mallinckrodt is important to help sustain the  
6 economic base of the North St. Louis City area.

7 The committee support will be  
8 submitted to the Corps in the form of a  
9 resolution within the time of the public comment  
10 period.

11 Thank you for the opportunity to  
12 speak.

13 MAJOR WOOD: Thank you.

14 Rita Bleser, Mallinckrodt.

15 MS. BLESER: Good evening and thank  
16 you for the opportunity to make a brief  
17 presentation on the Feasibility Study and  
18 Proposed Plan for the St. Louis Downtown Site.

19 My name is Rita Bleser and I'm Vice  
20 President and General Manager for Mallinckrodt,  
21 Inc. I am the plant manager of the St. Louis  
22 plant site which is the subject of the Corps of  
23 Engineers' proposal.

24 Mallinckrodt has made a  
25 significant, and has a growing presence, in

1 Missouri and the City of St. Louis. The  
2 company's headquarters is in St. Louis County  
3 and 2,300 Mallinckrodt employees work in 5 sites  
4 throughout the region. Over 1,000 of these  
5 employees work in the St. Louis plant.

6 The St. Louis plant is very  
7 important to Mallinckrodt for a number of  
8 reasons. It is one of our largest facilities  
9 and manufactures most of Mallinckrodt's bulk  
10 pharmaceutical products either for sale or to  
11 support the manufacturing operations at other  
12 sites, and it is also the site where the company  
13 was founded 130 years ago.

14 Over the last 10 years Mallinckrodt  
15 has invested more than 200 million dollars in  
16 new manufacturing and support facilities in the  
17 St. Louis plant. Over the next 5 years  
18 Mallinckrodt hopes to continue investment in  
19 upgraded and new facilities at the plant.

20 Mallinckrodt's interest in the  
21 continued development of the St. Louis plant  
22 makes it very concerned about the government  
23 cleanup of residual contamination under the  
24 FUSRAP program.

25 Mallinckrodt has been an active

1 partner in all FUSRAP activities. Employees  
2 serve on the Oversight Task Force, and we have  
3 committed staff and revenue to cleanup projects.

4 To facilitate FUSRAP remedial  
5 activities, Mallinckrodt has relocated on-going  
6 operations, utility systems and demolished  
7 structures.

8 Given our involvement in FUSRAP  
9 remedial activities and our continued desire to  
10 invest in and expand the St. Louis plant, we are  
11 concerned about the Corps' stated preference for  
12 implementation of alternative 4 of the plan.

13 This alternative simply does not  
14 remove enough contaminated soil to ensure that  
15 future investment in the plant is financially  
16 justified.

17 The presence of contaminated soil  
18 in future construction zones will add costs,  
19 complexity and time to the construction of  
20 manufacturing and support facilities at the St.  
21 Louis plant.

22 As a result, it may be more cost  
23 effective for Mallinckrodt to invest in  
24 facilities where such burdens do not exist.

25 The Corps' preferred alternative is

1 also not consistent with the recommendation of  
2 the St. Louis Site Remediation Task Force. In  
3 its September 1996 report this task force of  
4 community representatives recommended that soil  
5 contaminants be removed to a depth permitting  
6 general excavation for maintenance without  
7 concern.

8 Implementation of alternative 4  
9 would require that restrictions on future  
10 excavation be imposed according to the Corps'  
11 own risk analysis.

12 Thus, the proposed plan does not  
13 excavate enough contaminated soil to avoid these  
14 restrictions and meet the task force  
15 recommendation.

16 The Corps' plan also leaves its  
17 ownership of remaining contaminated materials  
18 unaddressed in this plan. Therefore, the cost  
19 of alternative 4 is understated.

20 As the agency responsible for  
21 implementing the FUSRAP program, and as the  
22 successor to the Department of Energy, the Corps  
23 is obligated to remediate all MED - AEC related  
24 residues. Any left-behind contamination remains  
25 the responsibility of the Corps.

1                   As the Mallinckrodt facility and  
2                   vicinity properties are further developed, soils  
3                   left behind under alternative 4 will be  
4                   excavated by Mallinckrodt and other property  
5                   owners and provided to the Corps for management  
6                   and disposal. These administrative and disposal  
7                   costs of the Corps are not included in the cost  
8                   of alternative 4.

9                   Most importantly, alternative 4  
10                  does not minimize potential employee exposure.  
11                  Remediation of more, not less, contaminated  
12                  soils at this time lessens overall worker  
13                  exposure.

14                 FUSRAP was implemented to ensure  
15                 that contaminated soils do not burden property  
16                 owners or present a risk to human health and the  
17                 environment when they are disturbed during  
18                 operation, maintenance and development of a  
19                 facility.

20                 Alternative 4 does not accomplish  
21                 these objectives.

22                 Because of these concerns,  
23                 Mallinckrodt recommends acceptance of  
24                 alternative 6. Implementation of alternative 6  
25                 would remove contaminated soil to a depth of 4

1 to 6 feet and backfill the excavated site with  
2 clean fill.

3 Therefore, contaminated soils  
4 likely to be encountered during routine  
5 maintenance and construction activity would be  
6 removed.

7 This remediation alternative is  
8 consistent with Mallinckrodt needs, the task  
9 force recommendation, and minimizes long term  
10 worker exposure.

11 We ask that alternative 6 be  
12 selected as the remediation choice of the  
13 Mallinckrodt's St. Louis plan. We believe that  
14 an analysis that compares all costs associated  
15 with alternative 4 and alternative 6 will yield  
16 a more favorable consideration of alternative 6.

17 Selection of this alternative will  
18 allow the remediation efforts to continue in the  
19 spirit of partnership which all of the  
20 stakeholders have worked so hard to obtain.

21 I thank you for your attention and  
22 ask you to give approval to remediation  
23 alternative 6.

24 MAJOR WOOD: Thank you, Rita.

25 The next speaker will be Mr.

1 Richard Creason -- Father Creason I think.  
2 Unless you're Redacted - Privacy Act. My wife's Redacted - Privacy Act and  
3 I'm Redacted - Privacy Act. So.

4 FATHER CREASON: That gives me an  
5 inside track then, right?

6 (laughter)

7 MAJOR WOOD: My boss is the boss.  
8 I'm just pitching in.

9 FATHER CREASON: Thank you for this  
10 opportunity. I am Richard Creason, the pastor  
11 of Holy Trinity Church, at 3519 North 14th  
12 Street, right at the corner of Mallinckrodt and  
13 14th.

14 So I thank you for this opportunity  
15 to address you this evening and encourage the  
16 selection of alternative 6. My reason for  
17 saying that is when I think about our life at  
18 the church -- we're a small church community of  
19 about 300 people, but we were founded in 1848.  
20 And that's 19 years prior to the founding of  
21 Mallinckrodt. That's how long we have both been  
22 in this community.

23 And I think we both strive to be  
24 very responsible citizens in this community, to  
25 make a contribution to the improvement to a life

1 and the well being of all who live here.

2 And I think when you look at the  
3 elements that go to constitute a community, that  
4 it's employment and housing and education, and  
5 those things that people cherish in terms of a  
6 strong family life.

7 I really would like to see  
8 Mallinckrodt stay here and continue to be that  
9 corporate citizen along with us.

10 I think that the choice of level 6  
11 or alternative 6 for remediation would help them  
12 to redevelop that property and help to  
13 strengthen an otherwise fragile neighborhood.

14 And so I think that that's my  
15 reason for saying that and I hope you will give  
16 that due consideration. Thank you.

17 MAJOR WOOD: Thank you, Father.

18 Next individual to speak will be  
19 Mr. Tom Bratkowski.

20 MR. BRATKOWSKI: Good evening and  
21 thank you for the opportunity to speak.

22 I speak as a resident of the Old  
23 North St. Louis neighborhood which is just south  
24 of this area. And I've lived here all my life  
25 and I'm raising my family here. My concern is

1 not in terms of an industrial site but as a  
2 residential neighborhood site.

3 And I would favor removal of all  
4 radioactive waste. We have to think somewhat  
5 beyond our life times and we know that  
6 radionuclides last a long time, thousands of  
7 years.

8 We've heard an expression of  
9 concerns about the geologic strata. We've heard  
10 concerns about revitalizing the economics of the  
11 city.

12 We need to remove any stigma  
13 associated with the Manhattan project from north  
14 St. Louis.

15 I think we need to underpin a  
16 neighborhood here in Hyde Park and Old North St.  
17 Louis that has struggled to survive. We need to  
18 encourage people to raise families here. We  
19 need to think in terms of rebuilding  
20 neighborhoods.

21 And the best way that that can be  
22 achieved is not by doing the minimum but by  
23 doing the maximum, to reinsure that every effort  
24 is made to remove radioactive waste as deep and  
25 as far as possible.

1                   So I think this is an investment in  
2                   the future. We can't think in terms of cheap  
3                   dollars today and long term costs tomorrow if we  
4                   ignore the opportunity to clean it up.

5                   I'm grateful to the Corps of  
6                   Engineers for undertaking the project. And I  
7                   don't know how else it would be done unless the  
8                   federal government became involved.

9                   But while they're involved I think  
10                  each of us in the community needs to engage each  
11                  other and realize that the maximum effort has to  
12                  be put out to clean up this site as quickly as  
13                  possible.

14                  So I would speak in terms of  
15                  alternative 6 if that means complete remediation  
16                  of the sites as effectively as possible.

17                  If alternative 5 is even better,  
18                  even though there's a difference in terms of  
19                  millions of dollars, I think that's money well  
20                  spent, and I think face my children with that  
21                  decision without any doubt in my mind that that  
22                  is money well spent. Thank you.

23                  MAJOR WOOD: Thank you, Tom.

24                  Miss Carol Prombo.

25                  MS. PROMBO: My name is Carol

1 Prombo. I'm here speaking as a citizen of the  
2 City of St. Louis, but also want to give you the  
3 context for my perceptions.

4 I got my Ph.D. in isotope  
5 geochemistry at the University of Chicago in the  
6 Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies. And  
7 I teach part time, I teach environmental science  
8 and earth science, at Washington University.

9 I don't live in this neighborhood.  
10 But I do live in the City of St. Louis. And I  
11 send my son to the public schools. And not too  
12 far from where I live are also hazardous waste  
13 sites. I have a terrible time with names and I  
14 can't remember the names, but there is the site  
15 not too far from where I live where there used  
16 to be a school for the handicapped where there  
17 is a lot of organic chemical contamination. Not  
18 all that far from my home there is also a site  
19 with lead contamination.

20 I strongly believe in personal  
21 responsibility. And as a woman I believe that  
22 everybody should clean up the mess that they  
23 make. My husband isn't always in agreement with  
24 me on this but -- (laughter)..

25 And the wastes that are present

1 here need to be in a more controlled, contained  
2 situation. I strongly support some sort of -- I  
3 strongly support a cleanup of the sites in this  
4 local St. Louis area, both the Airport,  
5 Hazelwood and Mallinckrodt sites.

6 I also speak as someone involved in  
7 community activities. I'm a volunteer with an  
8 ecumenical organization that works with people  
9 that have come out of prison. And most of these  
10 people have some kind of substance abuse  
11 problem. And most of them came from situations  
12 that were -- their homes -- they didn't have the  
13 best home life. Not that that's any excuse.  
14 And these are people that are trying to turn  
15 their lives around.

16 I look at all of the ways that we  
17 can spend our money as a society. I look at  
18 some of the lead sites. I look at piles of lead  
19 tailings that are not contained in anywhere near  
20 what the waste here is being controlled by. I  
21 look at the school system. And as I say, I  
22 strongly support a cleanup of all of the local  
23 radioactive waste sites.

24 And I guess this is more of a  
25 comment -- my next comment is more to our

1 political leaders, because the laws that are  
2 being followed here are laws that are set by  
3 Congress, you know, by the Senate and the House  
4 of Representatives. And they are set in  
5 response to the public.

6 Our public perception of the  
7 hazards from radioactive wastes is very high.  
8 We also have a number of other hazards locally  
9 where our perception is not as high where I  
10 would like to see an equivalent reduction of  
11 hazard.

12 When I look at all of the money --  
13 and this is in no way any criticism of either  
14 the Department of Energy or the Army Corps of  
15 Engineers because you have to follow the law and  
16 you'll either get fired or go to jail or  
17 something if you don't do this.

18 MAJOR WOOD: Court martial is in  
19 there too somewhere.

20 MS. PROMBO: And as a pacifist, I'm  
21 a Redacted - Privacy Act, a member of the Redacted - Privacy Act

22 Redacted - Privacy Act

23 And this whole situation is in many  
24 ways -- it's about reducing hazard and public  
25 health, but it's also about property values and

1 public perception and it's also about powerful,  
2 rich people being behind this.

3 And just as many of the people in  
4 St. Louis are concerned if a disposal site is  
5 set up for high level nuclear waste in Yucca  
6 Mountain about the transport of all of the spent  
7 fuel rods from the power plants east of the  
8 Mississippi going through St. Louis, I am not in  
9 support of taking waste that was produced here  
10 and dumping it on people with less power. And  
11 if we look at states like Utah and Nevada and  
12 Arizona, they don't have as many people in the  
13 House of Representatives as we do here.

14 I strongly support a cleanup that  
15 will reduce hazards to the people of St. Louis.  
16 I would like to see it done in a cost effective  
17 manner. I recently served on the NASA panel on  
18 the creation and planning team for extra  
19 terrestrial materials which oversees  
20 specifically the curation of our moon rocks.  
21 And NASA is switching from a philosophy of  
22 spending a lot of money on one mission to a  
23 faster, better, cheaper.

24 And I hope that some day when it  
25 comes to our hazardous waste disposal we'll go

1 to a faster, better, cheaper approach.

2 I just wish to say I strongly  
3 support the materials being cleaned up. It  
4 would seem that they could probably be done in a  
5 more cost effective manner and without dumping  
6 it on people that have less power than we do.

7 And thank you for the opportunity  
8 to speak.

9 MAJOR WOOD: The last speaker that  
10 I have a card from here is Mr. Doug Eller, a  
11 local resident.

12 MR. ELLER: I am Doug Eller and I'm  
13 a local resident on Redacted - Privacy Act. And I'm also  
14 active in the Hyde Park neighborhood community.  
15 I work at Grace Hill Neighborhood Services down  
16 the way here.

17 I work within Grace Hill with an  
18 Americorps group that is creating and developing  
19 the Riverfront Trail. So we've already had some  
20 awareness of the DOE's work on the trail and so  
21 forth. And we conducted a prairie planting on  
22 top of the site that was refilled with clean  
23 dirt. So we've had some understanding what's  
24 going on.

25 I would like to say that we are

1       also -- and I'm speaking for myself -- I'm also  
2       in support of the alternate 6. We believe that  
3       it's important that we keep what few anchors  
4       that we have in our community here.

5               Mallinckrodt is one of the few  
6       anchors as is Holy Trinity Church. There aren't  
7       very many left any more. We're trying to  
8       develop the Riverfront Trail to become an anchor  
9       in the community but it nowhere comes close to  
10      the impact that Mallinckrodt has had in the  
11      community here and continues to have. And we  
12      need to support that in any way possible. We  
13      want to make sure that it's economically  
14      feasible for them to remain here and that they  
15      can continue to be supportive.

16             They've done such things as employ  
17      people in the neighborhood. They sponsor,  
18      underwrite events within the community. They  
19      work at bringing people together and helping to  
20      problem solve when they're sometimes fragmented.  
21      And the list goes on to the point that it would  
22      be a grave loss to lose something as valuable as  
23      Mallinckrodt here.

24             So we want to -- especially me --  
25      want to make sure that we have this understood,

1           that we support alternative 6.

2                       And I also have a question. You  
3 haven't had a question yet. You've had all  
4 these experts here. But this is not a question  
5 on a technical basis. I didn't get a flier. I  
6 guess maybe you talked about this at the  
7 beginning, I missed the very beginning of your  
8 talk. But I didn't get any notification of the  
9 meeting today except at the last minute.

10                      And I know that our neighborhood is  
11 perhaps 75 or 80 percent African American. And  
12 I don't see very many African American faces  
13 here either as well as neighbors.

14                      So I think though that if you would  
15 have more people from the neighborhood here,  
16 they would also support the things that I'm  
17 saying. Because anybody coming in contact with  
18 Mallinckrodt has done so in a very positive way.

19                      But my question is how have you  
20 been able to reach people in the community to be  
21 here tonight?

22                      MR. MULLINS: I think what I'd like  
23 to do is have Chris Haskell talk about that  
24 because he's the coordinator of this.

25                      MR. HASKELL: Thanks. The quick

1       answer is we did the standard things, sent out  
2       press releases, notice in the paper. In fact,  
3       we're required to put notice, and we, in fact,  
4       did. And then also Anna from the Mayor's  
5       office, I thanked her for the suggestion of  
6       using a service that drops fliers around the  
7       community. I've never used that before and I'm  
8       regretful to hear it didn't work. Sorry. We  
9       did contract with this firm and we'll look into  
10      whether or not they, in fact, dropped those  
11      fliers. 2,000 fliers were distributed. That's  
12      their minimum, in fact, and we put it together  
13      and got it to them. And thanks for the  
14      feedback.

15               MR. ELLER: Was the notification  
16      like in the classified section?

17               MR. HASKELL: We're required to put  
18      a so-called legal notice. That's with the fine  
19      print. It's hard to read, granted. Then there  
20      was also an advertisement too in the St. Louis  
21      Post-Dispatch. Plus other papers too but  
22      primarily we looked to the Post-Dispatch.

23               MR. ELLER: Was there an ad in the  
24      American?

25               MR. HASKELL: An ad in the

1 American, yes, there was. I personally did not  
2 see it but it was ordered.

3 WOMAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: It was in  
4 the classified section of the St. Louis  
5 American.

6 MAJOR WOOD: Did you hear that,  
7 sir? She said it was in the classified section  
8 of the St. Louis American.

9 Any other comments?

10 MR. ELLER: No, I just feel again  
11 if there would have been a better notification  
12 of the residents in the neighborhood -- I know  
13 there's a lot of very involved people -- that  
14 there would have been a better turnout tonight  
15 and you would have heard a lot more from the  
16 people that this is actually affecting. That's  
17 my only comment. I think fliers aren't a bad  
18 idea. I think it might have been a bad idea to  
19 hire whoever you hired to have done that.

20 I think there's a lot of community  
21 networking that you could have gone through with  
22 the different organizations and people that  
23 would have gone a lot further than hiring an  
24 outside group to come in into the neighborhood  
25 to do that. That's my comments.

1 MS. GINSBURG: May I respond?

2 Doug, the neighborhood stabilization officer,  
3 Jimmy Miller, met with -- I know, Lou, you were  
4 there and I'm not sure else from the Corps. And  
5 we very much wanted to like take announcements  
6 to the different neighborhood meetings and  
7 things. Unfortunately, there was some problems  
8 with the date changes and so we weren't able to  
9 do as much of that as we would have liked. But  
10 I agree with you, I think that would have been a  
11 good way to get the word out.

12 MR. ELLER: If it's important to  
13 hear the residents in this whole process I would  
14 recommend for the record that you hold another  
15 one with a better beginning than what happened  
16 tonight.

17 MAJOR WOOD: Thank you. Those are  
18 the only formal -- we can open it up to the  
19 floor.

20 MR. MUEHLHEAUSLER: My name is  
21 Frank Muehlheausler and I'm the principal of the  
22 Clay School, the Clay Community Education Center  
23 here in inner city St. Louis. I didn't get a  
24 form to fill out or I would have been formal.

25 First of all, I want to preface my

1 statement by saying that I am for 6, alternative  
2 6, not 4.

3 And I don't want to talk about dirt  
4 and I'm not a chemist. But I want to talk about  
5 the community and about people.

6 This is an inner city school in the  
7 St. Louis public schools. I had somebody  
8 earlier saying this is a nice looking school.  
9 And it is. And I get that quite frequently when  
10 people come in and visit. And I have visitors  
11 come in all the time and I wish I could take you  
12 around the school to see it. I am going  
13 somewhere with this. But they say to me, I  
14 can't believe what I'm seeing. You know,  
15 looking at the walls, and they keep looking at  
16 the walls. And I guess they're looking for  
17 graffiti and gang slang and all the other mess.

18 And I say what do you expect when  
19 you come into a public school in the inner city  
20 of St. Louis. I guess when you watch TV and you  
21 see the body bags and all that stuff going on,  
22 you think it's a very depressing place to be.  
23 And you're kind of surprised when you see  
24 something that's clean and there isn't graffiti  
25 and broken windows.

1                   And I guess if you noticed outside  
2                   you won't see any graffiti on the walls out  
3                   here. As a matter of fact, we have a park and  
4                   playgrounds.

5                   What I'm getting to is this;  
6                   Mallinckrodt has been a responsible partner for  
7                   us for many years. We have a science lab in the  
8                   school which no other St. Louis public  
9                   elementary school or K through 5 has, with an  
10                  annual budget for that science lab, and we turn  
11                  out some very nice science projects in our  
12                  school.

13                  We have a not-for-profit agency  
14                  that works along with our school called Friedens  
15                  House that supports some social workers because  
16                  we need help in this community. If you listened  
17                  to Anna Ginzburg when she talked about those  
18                  statistics, they're startling when you talk  
19                  about the amount of income per capita that  
20                  people have in this neighborhood and the  
21                  education levels that they've achieved. It's  
22                  very depressing.

23                  I want to tell you 13 years ago  
24                  when I came to this school this place was  
25                  contaminated. Probably more so than that plant

1 over there. And when I say contaminated, I  
2 mean -- and for those of you that are residents  
3 in the neighborhood -- this was a very  
4 depressing place to be, it was very  
5 confrontational. The reason parents came up to  
6 get involved is because they wanted to beat up a  
7 teacher or chase the principal. I'm serious  
8 about this. There was more fighting going on  
9 out in the streets in front of the school than  
10 ever before.

11 What I'm getting to is this,  
12 partnership has played a big role in changing  
13 the school culture. And to a certain extent  
14 this neighborhood culture.

15 I've been here for 13 years and I  
16 live in the city. I've seen an evolution in  
17 this school because of partnerships like  
18 Mallinckrodt Chemical. They developed the CAP  
19 program which brings a lot of partners together  
20 from the community and we talk about issues.

21 This FUSRAP program is not new to  
22 us. We've heard about it at every meeting we've  
23 been to.

24 But what is important is that  
25 direction, that leadership, that they've

1 provided within this community. When we  
2 developed our Friedens House program, we've had  
3 people like Jack Frauenhoffer on our executive  
4 board and our advisory board, working along with  
5 us as we develop programs for people in this  
6 community, for families.

7 And I think that Mallinckrodt is  
8 very responsible. And that's what scares me.  
9 Because I see this whole issue of being one  
10 where Mallinckrodt has to be responsible to  
11 their business, they have to be responsible to  
12 their stockholders. And they will, I'm sure  
13 they will. Everything I know about these people  
14 from Mallinckrodt makes me believe that they are  
15 responsible.

16 That if they can't develop that  
17 property the way they want to, they're going to  
18 be responsible for their stockholders and  
19 they're going to move some place else. And that  
20 scares me. Because if we lose Mallinckrodt we  
21 lose an anchor in this neighborhood just like  
22 Doug said. And an anchor that's been here for a  
23 long time.

24 Clay School was founded in 1856,  
25 right around the time Mallinckrodt was. We need

1       them. We need them for our families. We have  
2       scholarships now, Mallinckrodt scholarships.  
3       We're going to begin -- we have a playground and  
4       a park and an amphitheater. We're about to  
5       begin our summer series of concerts out here and  
6       we're calling it the Mallinckrodt Summer Series.

7               As a matter of fact, we've got one  
8       coming up in about a week out here on our  
9       amphitheater.

10              I could go on and on about the  
11       involvement Mallinckrodt has had with not only  
12       this school but within the community. And it  
13       would be a loss, it would be a tremendous loss  
14       if they were to move.

15              So I want to just look at this at a  
16       different view, at a different angle, and say  
17       I'm not that concerned about the chemicals  
18       because I know you guys are going to do a good  
19       job, whatever you do. But it's very important  
20       to us that Mallinckrodt remains in this  
21       community and that's why I'm saying No. 6 to  
22       keep Mallinckrodt here. Thank you.

23              MAJOR WOOD: Thank you, sir. I  
24       think -- yes.

25              MS. GREEN: My name is Judice Green

1       and I'm a resident of Hyde Park and I've lived  
2       in this area for about 16 years. And I have  
3       raised my daughter here. She's 16. She was  
4       about 3 years old when I moved over here.

5               And when I came in here I was quite  
6       taken because I wasn't expecting this. I didn't  
7       know what really to expect when I received a  
8       notice. And I didn't receive a notice until  
9       yesterday. So it didn't make it in this  
10      neighborhood until yesterday. And that was the  
11      20th. Today is the 21st. So I really didn't  
12      get a chance to inform a lot of my neighbors. I  
13      don't know how many people I saw. I felt that  
14      there was interest, some serious interest. I  
15      needed to come out. If no one else came out  
16      then I needed to get the information to take  
17      back to my neighbors.

18             I agree with this gentleman here  
19      who made a comment that another forum should be  
20      made available to people, for the residents.  
21      Like I said I didn't receive notice until  
22      yesterday. And I think that was very short.  
23      And it wasn't put in the community or any  
24      organizations like the Hyde Park Lions, through  
25      measures like that, for the information to be

1 presented. I'm kind of -- I'm sort of offended  
2 to a certain extent, you know, because I wasn't  
3 informed in time.

4 But for my understanding since I've  
5 been here tonight I would be for the alternative  
6 for greater measures taken of cleaning up this  
7 contamination because I am greatly concerned  
8 because I have a daughter that I have raised in  
9 this area, and also I'm concerned about what are  
10 the effects this contamination has already had,  
11 if any. So that is also a question.

12 And also I agree with the gentleman  
13 in that there should be an extended date if  
14 possible. That's my great concern. Because  
15 like I said, the meeting that -- the means that  
16 you all have taken to give out this information,  
17 I'm disappointed, very disappointed. Thank you.

18 MAJOR WOOD: Thank you.

19 The lady back here in the pink  
20 jacket.

21 MS. ELLENBURG: Hi. My name is  
22 Linda Ellenburg and I have like a two-fold  
23 statement to make.

24 In 1964 I became an employee of  
25 Mallinckrodt Chemical. In 1975 I became a

1 resident of this neighborhood. Six years ago I  
2 moved to Jefferson County. And three months ago  
3 I moved back to Hyde Park. It felt good to  
4 leave and come back to my 13-room mansion.

5 I am very proud of what  
6 Mallinckrodt has accomplished. And needless to  
7 say, being an employee there and being a  
8 resident here, I have a two-fold concern about  
9 what's happening. I love the company and I love  
10 my home here. Thank you.

11 MAJOR WOOD: Thank you.

12 MS. ELLENBURG: By the way I got  
13 mine in a little green flier. That's how I was  
14 notified.

15 MR. BRATKOWSKI: I have a question.  
16 Does alternative 5 mean that Mallinckrodt would  
17 go out of business or disappear?

18 MR. MULLINS: No, it would not go  
19 out of business or disappear. It's just a  
20 greater measure of protection.

21 MR. BRATKOWSKI: Well, I don't  
22 understand why so many people have opted for  
23 option 6. Because if we can get the economic  
24 continuance of Mallinckrodt here in the  
25 neighborhood, and if we can get a cleaner site,

1 and if we're spending today's dollars to do  
2 that, it makes sense to go with alternative 5.

3 I thought when I made my first  
4 statement does it mean that if we clean the site  
5 up better that Mallinckrodt will disappear? If  
6 it doesn't, it makes more sense to go with  
7 alternative 5 because then that stigma of  
8 radioactivity disappears from that environment.

9 Failing that, realize, folks, that  
10 although Mallinckrodt has been a good neighbor,  
11 for reasons that go far beyond the radioactive  
12 contamination, that company could disappear  
13 tomorrow and their business would be lost. So  
14 that resource would be gone one way or the other  
15 and we have no control of it.

16 When Krey Packing Company went out  
17 of business in Hyde Park several years ago, a  
18 lot of jobs were lost and economic viability and  
19 that site was sitting vacant with poor use all  
20 that time.

21 So there are a lot of factors that  
22 come into play here about corporate partnership  
23 with neighborhoods. And we can't ensure that  
24 that company will be around forever. But we can  
25 ensure if we don't clean up the site that that

1       radioactivity will be around for thousands of  
2       years to come after we're gone.

3                   MAJOR WOOD:   Anyone else?

4                   MS. EISENBRAUN:   I have a question.  
5       My name is Debbie Eisenbraun.   I'm a resident of  
6       Old North St. Louis.

7                   And I know 15 years ago when my  
8       kids were young and they had detectable lead  
9       levels, the health department told us they  
10      weren't within a treatable range.   But since  
11      then the kids who come up with that same level  
12      of lead are treatable.   You know, the treatment  
13      range has changed.

14                  And I'm concerned about, similar to  
15      Tom Bratkowski, I'm concerned why not clean up  
16      at all.   I mean what happens if in 5 or 10 years  
17      the problem, you know, range expands?   Are we  
18      taking a risk of not cleaning it all up?

19                  One of my children has learning  
20      problems and I wonder, he has the highest lead  
21      level and it was untreatable at that time.   I  
22      just feel so -- we're risking our children.

23                  MR. CHAMBERS:   Dennis Chambers,  
24      certified health physicist here with the Corps.

25                  With respect to the residual risk

1 issues, the issues on the site, the allowable  
2 contamination going to be remaining there is  
3 being kept down to levels that are protective of  
4 the population, the workers there at the site as  
5 well as the environment.

6 So we will minimize any effect on  
7 the personnel on site, let alone personnel  
8 off-site. And the levels are sufficiently low  
9 that they will meet the EPA risk criteria for  
10 the remediation and will be protective of the  
11 population.

12 MAJOR WOOD: Father.

13 FATHER CREASON: I just want to ask  
14 a question. So if you did level 5, and then  
15 Mallinckrodt wanted to do some redevelopment  
16 work, what would that have to be to carry the  
17 problem further and what would that cost be?

18 MAJOR WOOD: What would the cost of  
19 an alternative 5 cleanup be?

20 FATHER CREASON: Say you did a  
21 lesser than 6 level, and then you wanted to come  
22 back later and do some more development to that  
23 property, that land, would there incur  
24 additional costs in remediation as well as the  
25 development costs to Mallinckrodt?

1 MR. MULLINS: I think, Father, that  
2 it depends. I hate to say that's the answer but  
3 it's true. The way we've taken and scoped this  
4 out, alternative 4 is a plan that is protective  
5 of human health and the environment. It meets  
6 all the requirements to ensure worker safety,  
7 residents' safety, that kind of thing.

8 We looked at a full range plan  
9 which is alternative 5 which is basically going  
10 in and trying to get out all the contamination  
11 that we can find. That's really what  
12 alternative 5 is. So that's kind of a maximum  
13 plan.

14 Then we looked at an in between  
15 plan, which is basically trying to match up what  
16 Mallinckrodt had as their potential future  
17 development, and try to say, okay, we go in and  
18 basically clean up the areas that they've  
19 targeted as potential future development plots  
20 of land around the plant, what would that cost.

21 We didn't cost out something that  
22 would be in between those two, which is  
23 basically in between alternative 4 and  
24 alternative 6, because we're not really sure  
25 what that would be. We'd just have to guess.

1                   So you basically say the costs  
2           would be between -- what was it -- 92 and 114  
3           between alternatives 4 and 6, or 140 million for  
4           the complete package.

5                   So I hate to say it depends but it  
6           depends. We didn't look at something there that  
7           was in between the in between plan and then the  
8           minimum plan.

9                   MAJOR WOOD: What you were confused  
10          about is that alternative 6 is actually between  
11          4 and 5 in terms of the level of cleanup.

12                  FATHER CREASON: Right, and whether  
13          or not it would be more costly to come back at a  
14          later date.

15                  MR. MULLINS: Again that would  
16          depend on where it was and what level of  
17          contamination you were trying to eliminate from  
18          that particular plant. Without having specifics  
19          we can't tell how much more expensive or less  
20          expensive it would be. I apologize for that.

21                  MAJOR WOOD: Yes, ma'am.

22                  MS. PROMBO: I would just like to  
23          make a general comment. Unfortunately, I didn't  
24          bring the map with me but actually Mimi Garstang  
25          is familiar with the map. But there's a map of

1 earthquake hazard for the St. Louis area. And  
2 my recollection is that this area is right in  
3 the thick of the liquefaction zone. Which  
4 essentially means if we have a moderate to large  
5 earthquake in this area, the ground is  
6 essentially going to behave as a liquid. Which  
7 means that -- well, when you're looking for a  
8 house, a liquefaction zone isn't, you know, your  
9 first choice of where you want to buy a home.

10 (laughter)

11 And as far as a level to which one  
12 is going to clean up, going after every last  
13 atom of contamination -- personally I don't  
14 think residential -- expanding residential use  
15 in liquefaction areas makes good sense for  
16 personal safety of individuals.

17 So as far as cleaning up to a level  
18 for industrial use, this sounds like a good use  
19 of resources. And not going to a more stringent  
20 residential standard for an area that's at a  
21 high risk for earthquake hazard.

22 MAJOR WOOD: Would anybody else  
23 like to make a comment or ask a question? Sir.

24 MR. ELLER: I haven't heard anybody  
25 for your recommendation of alternate 4. I

1 haven't heard anybody agree with the Army Corps  
2 of Engineers' recommendation.

3 MS. PROMBO: Well, I do.

4 MR. ELLER: Except for her.

5 MS. PROMBO: But I want cheaper.

6 MR. ELLER: She wants cheaper. And  
7 she doesn't live here.

8 MS. PROMBO: But I live in the  
9 city.

10 MR. ELLER: So most of the  
11 people -- let me qualify what I just said. Most  
12 of the people, the big most of the people,  
13 aren't for your recommendation. So what will  
14 happen next?

15 MAJOR WOOD: Well, in fact, I was  
16 just about to make some sort of closing comments  
17 and I was going to address just that issue.

18 I think that as Rob mentioned  
19 earlier in tonight's presentation, we took  
20 comments from the airport site and so there's a  
21 precedent if you will for the public comment and  
22 the public will have an impact on the cleanup  
23 decisions that are made. So all the comments  
24 that you've made here tonight -- and the  
25 questions are helpful -- they will be considered

1 and looked at and given serious consideration.

2 I think that part of what the City  
3 of St. Louis gained by this mission being  
4 conveyed from DOE to the Corps is that, while  
5 they may not live right in the areas that are  
6 immediately affected by the cleanup, folks that  
7 work for the Corps are St. Louis folks. They've  
8 got a vested interest in seeing the City  
9 maintain its economic viability.

10 We've heard from -- right in this  
11 area -- from citizens, to include corporate  
12 citizens. And I think that whatever plan is  
13 implemented is going to incorporate your  
14 comments and your desires, and it's going to be  
15 one that presents a balance from all the  
16 citizens and all the folks that have an  
17 interest, and again one that will be conducive  
18 to the viability of this area as a neighborhood.

19 We appreciate your comments and  
20 your questions tonight. And again everything  
21 that was brought up tonight will be addressed in  
22 the responsive summary. And we thank everyone  
23 for joining us this evening. Thank you very  
24 much.

25 MR. MULLINS: Remember, we'll be

1 taking written comments through May 8th.

2 (Whereupon, at 8:45 P.M. the  
3 hearing was concluded)

4 \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\*

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25


1 STATE OF MISSOURI )

2 COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS )

3  
4 I, Sandra L. Ragsdale, a Notary  
5 Public in and for the State of Missouri, do  
6 hereby certify that I caused to be reported in  
7 shorthand and thereafter transcribed the  
8 foregoing transcript of proceedings taken on the  
9 21st day of April, 1998.

10 I further certify that the foregoing  
11 is a true, accurate and complete transcript of  
12 my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid, and  
13 further, that I am not counsel for, nor in any  
14 way related to, any of the participants in this  
15 proceeding, nor am I in any way interested in  
16 the outcome thereof.

17 Witness my signature this 4th day of  
18 May, 1998. My Commission expires 7-20-2000.

19  
20  
21  
22 

23 Sandra L. Ragsdale  
24  
25

---

# Administrative Record for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) – St. Louis Downtown Site (SLDS)

St. Louis, Missouri

---

*Volume 86*

*October 1998*



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

SLDOWN\_000374