COPY

THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

WELDON SPRING SITE

REMEDIAL ACTION PROJECT

THURSDAY

DECEMBER 16, 1992

7:00 P.M.

THE COLUMNS BANQUET AND CONFERENCE CENTER

711 Fairlane

St. Charles, Missouri 63303

REPORTED BY SANDY MCGRAW

1 MS. SCHNEIDER: My name is Sue Schneider. I am a
2 native of St. Louis County and an interested citizen and I
3 am a freelance writer and have been asked to moderate the
4 hearing this evening.
5 What I would like to do is give you a little bit of an
6 outline of what we'll be doing this evening, and I'll talk
7 in detail with some specifics about what this hearing is
8 about tonight.
9 There will be some elected officials that are with us
10 this evening, and we will be having some comments from
11 them. We also will be starting out with a presentation by
12 representatives from the Department of Energy as well as
13 the Environmental Protection Agency in terms of the
14 context for this evening, which is looking at alternatives
15 for the cleanup of the Weldon Spring Site.
16 Okay. Let's try this again. What I would like to do
17 first is to read you some information that is a little bit
18 of legalese but it's something that we need to start out
19 with because this is a public hearing and public record.
20 So let me give you some information. It will give you an
21 idea of the specifics of what we're here for and we'll go
22 from there.
23 The purpose of the meeting is regarding the cleanup
24 activities at the Weldon Spring Site. These are being
25 conducted in accordance with both the Comprehensive

1 Response, Compensation and Liability Act, known as CERCLA,
2 as amended, and the National Environmental Policy Act,
3 known as NEPA. An integrated Remedial Investigation/
4 Feasibility Study-Environmental Impact Statement has been
5 prepared in accordance with CERCLA and NEPA to assess site
6 problems and to analyze alternatives for site cleanup.
7 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive public
8 input on this Remedial Investigation/Feasibility
9 Study-Environmental Impact Statement. This is your
10 opportunity to express opinions and ask questions on this
11 proposal.
12 Comments and questions received tonight will be
13 entered into the public record, and we do have a court
14 reporter here who will be taking all comments and a
15 transcript will be prepared.
16 This transcript will be made available for public
17 review at the Information Repositories at the Project
18 Office in Weldon Spring, the Francis Howell High School and
19 three local libraries. The locations of these repositories
20 are listed at the back of the Proposed Plan for this action
21 and in the Informational Bulletin and copies of those are
22 available in the front lobby.
23 The public comment period for the Department of
24 Energy's proposal began November 20th and will extend
25 through January 20th of 1993. This provides a sixty-day

1 period during which the community can submit written
2 comments and questions into the record. Comments received
3 after January 20th will be considered to the degree
4 practicable.
5 The Department of Energy will prepare a Responsiveness
6 Summary to provide written responses to both oral comments
7 received at this meeting and written comments received
8 tonight and through January 20th. Oral and written
9 comments will be given equal weight.
10 This Responsiveness Summary will be made available for
11 public review at the same five information repositories I
12 just mentioned and will be distributed for review as a
13 Final Environmental Impact Statement for thirty days.
14 During segments of the meeting tonight, Department of
15 Energy and Environmental Protection Agency representatives
16 will be responding verbally to questions and comments. And
17 recognizing the difficulty inherent in responding to
18 questions without prior preparation, there may be some
19 clarification required in the written responses.
20 So that's -- that's one of the things we needed to get
21 out of the way, and I needed to read that word for word so
22 that it's crystal clear for the record. What I'd like to
23 do is explain to you the components of what we have planned
24 for this evening, and then we'll go ahead and go into the
25 presentation.

1 Primarily what we're talking about again is the
2 presentation and hearing on the alternatives for the site
3 cleanup. And it's really important that we stay on that
4 topic because that's what most of you are here tonight to
5 talk about. And those that are here need the time to be
6 able to comment as well as clarify questions.
7 In some ways, it's kind of a four-part event tonight.
8 One is presentation by federal officials with the EPA and
9 with DOE. Another is an opportunity for local elected
10 officials to comment and that will follow the initial
11 presentation. Then we'll be taking a short break, at which
12 time we will be compiling these cards.
13 If you -- as you came in there was a blue card that
14 was made available to you. If you would like to make a
15 comment or if you have a written question, this is your
16 opportunity to do this. We would ask that you fill those
17 out. If you have one now that you have not handed in, if
18 you want to put it up or throughout the entire presentation
19 until we take the first break after the elected officials,
20 we will continue to collect these cards.
21 Later on, during the public comment period, we will be
22 taking, as these come in to us, we will be calling on
23 people to make their comments. So again, if you have these
24 and want to make a comment or have a written question, then
25 please fill one of these out and just go ahead and put it

1 up and one of the staff people will feel free to come by
2 and collect that.
3 And again, we will be taking a break. After that
4 there will be a question-and-answer period and then we'll
5 go into the public comment period.
6 My job is really kind of traffic director. I'm going
7 to be keeping time and we will have some time restraints
8 when we get to the public comment section so that everybody
9 who wants to make a statement will have an opportunity to
10 do so. So we will have some time limits and also to make
11 sure that we keep to the topic of waste treatment and
12 disposal.
13 The other thing that I'll mention, when you get to the
14 period for public comment is that you have the option of
15 saying yes, I would like to make this comment and I don't
16 really want a response from anybody with DOE or EPA. If
17 you'd like to do that, please state that. Otherwise, the
18 officials that are here would like to have the option to
19 clarify or answer your questions or respond in some way.
20 But if you would not like that to happen, and I'll bring it
21 up again later when we start that question-and-answer
22 period or public comments, so you do have that option.
23 That's basically it. What I would like to do now that
24 we've had an opportunity to kind of lay out the agenda for
25 this evening is to go ahead and make some introductions and

1 let the presentations begin.

2 We have two people -- actually we have several people,

3 but one of them is Dan Wall.

4 Dan, if you want to just raise your hand.

5 He's on the end over there. He's the environmental

6 engineer, remedial project manager with the Region VII

7 Superfund of the United States Environmental Protection

8 Agency in from Kansas City and he will be representing EPA.

9 Steve McCracken, who is manager of the Weldon Spring

10 Site Remedial Action Project, is representing the United

11 States Department of Energy, and he will be representing

12 the other -- excuse me, introducing the other panel members

13 who are up here.

14 So with that, let me go ahead and turn that over for

15 you to -- to make those introductions and begin your

16 presentation.

17 MR. McCRACKEN: Thank you.

18 Did we lose a mike when that last noise occurred? All

19 of a sudden I didn't hear anything.

20 Okay. So everybody can still hear.

21 On your left is Kenny Meyer. He is the head of our

22 Environmental Safety and Health Group at the Weldon Spring

23 Site.

24 On your -- on my immediate left and your right is

25 Dr. Margaret MacDonell. She is with Argonne National

1 Laboratory. And she played a major role, was the team
2 leader, in preparing many of the documents that we'll be
3 discussing tonight.
4 Next to Margaret is Rick Ferguson. Rick Ferguson is
5 in charge of the activities at the site that are related to
6 -- also to preparing those portions of the documents that
7 we are discussing tonight that were the result -- that were
8 the responsibility of our contractor at the site.
9 Sue, with those introductions, you want Dan Wall to go
10 ahead and speak or you want to --
11 MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes, please.
12 MR. McCRACKEN: Okay. Dan?
13 MR. WALL: Can you hear me? Can everybody hear
14 me? No.
15 On behalf of EPA, I'd like to express our appreciation
16 to each of you for coming out tonight.
17 My immediate purpose here is to give a brief overview
18 of what EPA's role is in this project, and I've got a few
19 slides, hopefully that will illustrate that.
20 I was assured that if I pressed these two buttons --
21 As was in the introduction, I'm from EPA, Region VII,
22 and our regional office is in Kansas City, Missouri.
23 Okay. And in giving you a little overview of what our
24 involvement is, I'll begin with the regulatory framework.
25 The primary environmental statute that has application

1 for our site is the Comprehensive Environmental Response,
2 Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, and that's more
3 simply and commonly referred to as Superfund, and the
4 National Contingency Plan, which is the regulation that
5 details how we go about implementing Superfund.
6 One of the primary tools we have for defining our
7 respective responsibilities under Superfund is the IAG or
8 Interagency Agreement and it sets out -- we currently have
9 an agreement in place, the Department of Energy and EPA are
10 a party to it -- it sets out schedules and procedures for
11 implementing the, both the investigations and the cleanup
12 activities that are required under Superfund. And both
13 those investigations and cleanup activities are abbreviated
14 at the bottom of the slide there.
15 We have the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility
16 Study, which represents the investigatory phase. And it
17 provides the basis for the cleanup decisions that we make
18 and that -- those documents are currently available in the
19 five information repositories for public review.
20 Subsequent to making the decision, we entered the
21 remedial design or remedial action phase or RD/RA which is
22 just the actual design and construction of the remedy.
23 As a regulatory agency, we see our roles as -- more
24 specifically as we enforce the schedules, we review and
25 approve the submittals such as the Remedial

1 Investigation/Feasibility Study we just spoke of, we
2 oversee selected field activities, assure compliance with
3 environmental laws and have an approval role in the remedy
4 selection.
5 And that pretty much sets the tone. And I'd like to
6 conclude -- wrap this up by saying that we have spent a
7 significant amount of time and energy in trying to
8 understand the work that the Department of Energy is doing,
9 and we have provided some guidance and input where we
10 thought it was appropriate. And we have found the
11 Department of Energy to be responsive in that regard.
12 And at this point we do believe that the -- that the
13 proposed action that is outlined in the Proposed Plan is
14 the -- is protective and is the most prudent of the options
15 available to us.
16 And I would also like to say this is your opportunity
17 to provide input to the process and I would encourage you
18 to go to the repositories, read the Remedial
19 Investigation/Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan so you can
20 make some informed comment.
21 If there is anything that you think that we've
22 overlooked or anything you think we need to have called to
23 our attention, this is your opportunity to do it. And if
24 you'd like to comment directly to the Environmental
25 Protection Agency, you can do so at that address right

1 there.

2 And that concludes what I have to say. Go to you,

3 Steve?

4 MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes, go ahead.

5 MR. McCRACKEN: We have a well-greased machine

6 here.

7 Can everybody hear me? No.

8 How about now? Okay.

9 The -- not to be out done by the EPA, on behalf of the

10 Department of Energy, I'd also like to thank you for being

11 here. I'd also like to thank you on behalf of the more

12 than two hundred and sixty people that work full-time every

13 day at the Weldon Spring Site to make that a safer place

14 for the people in St. Charles County.

15 I will be very brief, and I'll be brief in order to

16 get to the important part of the program tonight, and that

17 is to receive your input and to discuss that input with

18 you, if that's what you want to do.

19 I thought what I'd do is start out with a very brief

20 description of the site, go through a little bit, very few

21 slides on the work that we've done to date and summarize by

22 talking very quickly about the Proposed Plan that is being

23 presented tonight by the DOE and which is being concurred

24 on by the EPA.

25 My arm is going to get tired if I have to stand here

1 with my arm up. A little propaganda there.

2 For those of you that are not familiar with our site,
3 we're located about thirteen miles, twelve or thirteen
4 miles, south of here on Highway 94. There are two areas to
5 our site. They're the small yellow dots that you see on
6 the left-hand side of the screen. There's a large chemical
7 plant that we're dealing with. There's also a quarry
8 that's about four miles south of the chemical plant that is
9 also along Highway 94.

10 There are more than forty buildings and structures on
11 this site. It was an old uranium ore processing facility.
12 Those forty buildings and structures on the site are all
13 radiologically and chemically contaminated to some extent.

14 If you look at the back side of the site, there's four
15 large waste pits. The waste that's in those pits are
16 called raffinate sludges. Those sludges are about like
17 pudding.

18 We estimate that there's about two hundred and twenty
19 thousand cubic yards of sludges in those pits, but all of
20 those sludges are, of course, radiologically and chemically
21 contaminated. On top of the sludges we estimate that there
22 is somewhere between fifty and sixty million gallons of
23 contaminated water.

24 Down the road from the chemical plant site, outlined
25 in white on the left-hand side of the screen, is the Weldon

1 Spring Quarry. It was an old limestone quarry mined by the
2 Army, I believe back in the early forties, for aggregate
3 for road construction. It was then used by the Army and by
4 the Atomic Energy Commission, now the Department of Energy,
5 for the disposal of contaminated debris.
6 This is a picture of what that looks like today. We
7 estimate that there is about a hundred thousand cubic yards
8 of contaminated material in that quarry, consisting of
9 structural debris, soil, concrete, drums, those kind of
10 things.
11 You'll notice in the foreground that there's a small
12 pond. That pond contains about three million gallons of
13 water. That water is in contact with the waste, and it is
14 leaking into the groundwater system and it threatens the
15 St. Charles County Well Field.
16 Now, as a result of the studies that we have done to
17 date, meetings like this one and proposals that have been
18 developed into decisions, roughly two hundred million
19 dollars' worth of work, of cleanup work, is either underway
20 or complete at the Weldon Spring Site.
21 A number of activities have been undertaken to
22 stabilize the site or we've made surface water
23 modifications to minimize the outside migration of
24 contaminants through surface water pathways. We've removed
25 virtually all the PCB oils from the site. We have

1 stabilized large quantities of viable asbestos. That is a
2 -- that was a potential threat to workers on the site.
3 We've gone throughout all the buildings and gathered
4 up the many small containers of chemicals. Many of those
5 containers are badly deteriorated. We have sampled every
6 one of those containers and we put that material into safe
7 storage.
8 There's been a number of these small, but important,
9 activities that we've been doing, have done to stabilize
10 the site. We've also done a number of major activities.
11 Although major activities have begun, these activities
12 include water treatment.
13 This is a picture of the water treatment plant that is
14 now operational at the quarry. We also have a water
15 treatment plant up at the plant site that is nearly
16 commissioned.
17 Those of you that have been reading the newspapers
18 have probably seen a lot of media coverage about these
19 water treatment plants over the last few weeks. The reason
20 for that is that they're nearly operational. In fact, in
21 the quarry we have treated the first batch of water. The
22 results, the analytical results that are coming in from our
23 laboratories as well as four other government agencies are
24 all showing that we have treated that water to a -- far
25 better than the permit requirements imposed on us that we

1 have to meet with the state and far better than is
2 required to protect human health.
3 Other major activities that are now underway at the
4 site are the decontamination and demolition of all the
5 buildings. Also a major activity underway at the site is
6 the removal of that waste that is in the quarry and
7 threatens the St. Charles County Well Field. In fact, what
8 we've done is we have completed the support facilities for
9 this material, and we expect to begin exhuming it probably
10 in the next several months or in the spring.
11 Now, all of this important work has substantially
12 improved our ability to not only monitor the site but to
13 also control the potential for impact to human health or
14 the potential for damage or loss of natural resources like
15 the St. County Well Field. But we're not here tonight to
16 talk about these things. Sue mentioned that.
17 This work is -- that's underway is -- it's really
18 important stuff, but once it is done we have to know what
19 is next. We have to look ahead.
20 Looking ahead means looking beyond the completion of
21 the work that is underway. Completion of all of this work
22 establishes a baseline or a starting point for the cleanup
23 proposal that was issued to you several weeks ago on
24 November 20th and which we are here to discuss tonight.
25 If all of the work that I showed you earlier were

1 completed, the quarry, bulk waste -- can you focus that a
2 little bit, Gene? -- the quarry, bulk waste would be in
3 storage in what we call a temporary storage area, the large
4 yellow area on the bottom of the screen.
5 Now, this is an artist's rendering of what that area
6 will look like once that waste from the quarry is in
7 temporary storage. Under this condition we'll be able not
8 only to monitor what's happening with that waste material,
9 we'll also be able to control it.
10 If all the work that I've already described for you
11 were done, the buildings would be down. They'd be in
12 storage in what we call material staging area, that's the
13 large yellow area at the top of the screen.
14 This is an artist's rendering of what that would look
15 like with the buildings down and in storage, as segregated
16 by physical configuration.
17 The staff besides wanted me to clarify that the artist
18 used quite a bit of discretion in the geometry and color of
19 what this would look like. I can assure you it won't be
20 that pretty but it will be safe.
21 All right. If all the work were done, we'll also have
22 operational water treatment plants. They're shown in the
23 bottom right of the screen. Asbestos would be in storage
24 in a staging area that's on the north end of the site. You
25 can see it at the bottom of the picture here. Those are

1 sealed containers in which we'll store the asbestos.

2 The starting point for the discussion tonight, though,
3 would leave the raffinates pretty much alone. They would
4 be the same as they are today because we don't have any
5 interim actions underway that deal with the raffinate pit
6 sludges. Nor do we have any interim actions underway to
7 deal with the contaminated soils that are in and around the
8 buildings.

9 But using this picture as a baseline or a starting
10 point for the proposal, that's what we're here to discuss
11 tonight, and that is how to finally treat and dispose of
12 the waste that is represented by this picture.

13 If I broke that down by waste volumes, we estimate
14 that it would be about nine hundred thousand cubic yards of
15 waste material, consisting of the things that I've
16 described for you, being raffinate sludges, contaminated
17 soil, structural debris, some vegetation and small
18 quantities of waste that will be generated as we remove
19 contaminates from the water that we are treating with the
20 quarry and the site water treatment plants.

21 Almost five years ago in 1987 we also presented a plan
22 for final waste treatment disposal. The state and the EPA
23 and the public insisted at that time that our proposal was
24 not backed up by sufficient data collection and studies. I
25 won't say that we willingly, but we certainly ultimately

1 agreed with that, and thus began an intensive effort on our
2 part and everybody's part to prepare documents that were
3 issued to you in November and which are the subject of
4 discussion tonight.
5 And this shows a picture of those documents if I can
6 make this thing change.
7 Now, we tried our best to make our five years of work
8 look as impressive as we could. These are the documents
9 that we've been working so hard on over the last five
10 years. Those documents consist of a Remedial Investigation
11 report. The Remedial Investigation report looks at what
12 are the site conditions, where are the contaminates, what
13 kind of contaminates are there, how deep in the ground are
14 the contaminates or what is the geology of the site, what
15 are the physical characteristics of the site.
16 We also prepared a Baseline Assessment. Well, that
17 baseline looked at the risk to human health and the ecology
18 under the current conditions that exist at the site. What
19 we found is that the current risks at the site are low but
20 if not -- if something is not done, the future risk could
21 be higher and thus some remedy or some cleanup is certainly
22 required.
23 We also prepared a Feasibility Study. That
24 Feasibility Study looked at all the available technologies
25 for treatment and disposal. It assembled those

1 technologies into alternatives, then compared the
2 alternatives against the Baseline Assessment for risk, and
3 then against one another to look at which alternative would
4 be the best solution for the waste at Weldon Spring.
5 We also -- for those people -- Dan Wall encouraged
6 everybody to read all these documents. I would ask for a
7 show of hands of people that read all those documents but
8 I'd probably embarrass all of us because there is two
9 thousand pages of text there, and it's very difficult to
10 read.
11 Therefore, if you're interested in understanding the
12 meat of what's in those documents, then I suggest that you
13 read the Proposed Plan, because the Proposed Plan
14 summarizes the information that's in the RI/FS. It
15 references back to important information that's in those
16 documents, you know where to go. It identifies the -- it
17 discusses some of the alternatives that are in the
18 Feasibility Study and it identifies the one that we, in the
19 EPA, believe is the preferred alternative.
20 Now, within the Feasibility Study there are four --
21 five alternatives actually discussed. There's a no-action
22 alternative. We have no intention that the no-action
23 alternative would be selected. It's one that is required
24 to look -- that you are required to look at in order to
25 establish a baseline, a baseline against which to compare

1 the other alternatives.

2 We looked at two on-site alternatives. The difference

3 being the type of treatment that you would apply to

4 significant quantities of the waste, the two treatment

5 technologies that we looked at, the vitrification which

6 would treat the waste to essentially a glass form. And we

7 also looked to what is called CSS and that's chemical

8 stabilization/solidification and stabilization of the

9 waste. You add cement mixtures to the waste to create a

10 grout-like or cement-like substance.

11 The reason those are yellow is because, as most of you

12 know, our preferred alternative, the one that we think is

13 best under the conditions that exist at Weldon Spring, is

14 the on-site alternative. We believe that CSS is the best

15 treatment alternative, but we also recognize vitrification

16 as a good alternative and believe that it should be

17 retained as a backup in the event that we would need it.

18 The other two alternatives that we looked at were

19 off-site alternatives. One being vitrification and

20 disposal of the waste at a commercial disposer in Clize,

21 Utah, that we would assume would be ready in the time frame

22 that we need it.

23 And also we looked at an off-site facility that could

24 be constructed at the DOE site in Richland, Washington.

25 Briefly looking at the important parts of these

1 individually, the off-site alternatives would require that
2 we build a rail siting at the nearest railroad, that is
3 near Wentzville, Missouri. We would construct the rail
4 siting, we would treat the material. That material that we
5 would -- Let me back up a little bit.
6 Just so that it's clear, we are proposing that you
7 would treat approximately four hundred thousand cubic yards
8 out of the nine hundred thousand cubic yards of waste that
9 is the most highly contaminated. That's the raffinate pit
10 sludges, the soils from the quarry and some other small hot
11 spots.
12 But under the off-site alternative we would use, we
13 would use vitrification as the treatment technology. The
14 reason being that reduces the volume, it decreases the cost
15 of shipment and the cost of building an off-site facility.
16 We would load that into approximately thirty-eight thousand
17 four hundred trucks. We ship it up to the rail site that
18 we would construct in Wentzville or near Wentzville, load
19 it on trains and take it out West. The estimate for the
20 off-site alternatives ranges between three hundred and
21 three hundred and fifty million dollars.
22 Looking at the on-site disposal alternative -- I
23 didn't put vitrification, that's a backup technology. But
24 looking at the preferred treatment and disposal alternative
25 that we believe is best for the site, there are a number of

1 things that we would have to do in any case and that is
2 excavating material, treating material. The CSS or the
3 chemical stabilization could result in a treated waste
4 that's in the form of a grout material for pouring around
5 solid objects that would be in the disposal cell or we
6 could also produce a soil-like product that could be placed
7 much like soil and could be compacted.
8 Of course, we would build a disposal facility and the
9 estimated cost would be around a hundred and fifty-seven
10 million dollars. If we used vitrification as treatment,
11 the treatment technology, the cost would be around a
12 hundred and eighty, hundred and eighty-two million
13 dollars. Cost is not a significant consideration in
14 selection of the treatment technology.
15 As far as the location where we would propose to
16 locate a disposal facility on the site or conceptually
17 where we would propose to put it is in the footprint of
18 where the buildings exist today. Now, the reason for that
19 is that is where the greatest clay overburden exists. We
20 have a very low permeability of clay that is from twenty to
21 thirty feet thick in that area.
22 Looking at a conceptual cross-section of the facility,
23 one of the questions that we often get is how can you be
24 sure this cell will work. And what that means is, how can
25 you be sure that water will not penetrate the cell, contact

1 the waste, mobile contaminates, take those contaminates to
2 the groundwater and then potentially affect human health.
3 In describing that and in trying to answer that,
4 really we try to emphasize multiple components of this
5 facility that minimize the ability for water to penetrate
6 the facility.
7 First of all, the multicomponent cover is made of --
8 it has layers and materials in it that prevents frost from
9 damaging the cell cap. We have drain systems in there. We
10 have an infiltration barrier, being compacted clay, or
11 perhaps a manmade synthetic liner.
12 And if water were -- if that were to fail and water
13 were to get through, then you have the next barrier, and
14 that barrier is the waste material itself. That waste
15 material will be compacted in place. It will also be -- a
16 significant quantity of that will be treated and a very
17 important aspect of that treatment is to immobilize
18 contaminates such that water cannot remove those or
19 solubilize those contaminates and take them out of the
20 facility if water does penetrate the waste pile.
21 But if the cap failed and the waste pile failed then
22 we also conceptually are proposing a leachate collection
23 system. A leachate collection system would collect any
24 water that would penetrate the cap in the waste pile. It
25 would divert that water to a collection system where we

1 could treat it as necessary.

2 Below that leachate collection system there would be a
3 synthetic liner. Below the synthetic liner there would be
4 three feet of the compacted clay. And then beneath the
5 three feet of compacted clay there would be what we would
6 call a foundation. And the foundation is a minimum of
7 twenty feet of very low permeability of clay.

8 So given all those things, that gives you some idea of
9 the many components that are in a facility like this and
10 which are designed to minimize the ability of water to
11 transport contaminates from the -- from that cell to the
12 groundwater.

13 This is what the site looks like today. Using the
14 electronic age that we have today, this is what it would
15 look like using the conceptual design that we are
16 proposing.

17 We really didn't under -- know what the sense of the
18 humor of the people here would be tonight because we
19 thought about throwing this thing up there and saying,
20 guess what, we finished it this week and -- but I didn't --
21 we didn't know if that would be a good idea or not. So we
22 decided not to do it.

23 In closing, the message we received in 1987 that we
24 needed to go back and do more work, that was very clear.
25 We have responded to that. The data collection has been

1 far more extensive. The engineering and science is more
2 comprehensive. We are better able to articulate the
3 potential risk to workers and the public.
4 I think that equally important is we have done
5 something that we did not do well enough before and that is
6 we have followed a very methodical, logical, step-by-step
7 process that has been continually shared and discussed with
8 the EPA, the state and the public.
9 Those five years have been important in that they have
10 given us, meaning DOE and our contractors, an opportunity
11 to gain confidence in our ability to perform work at the
12 site in a safe manner. We've made significant progress in
13 stabilizing the site, in making it a safer place.
14 We've made promises and commitments to protect the
15 public and the environment, and we have kept those
16 promises. We are ready to safely carry out whatever
17 cleanup decision is made.
18 I've said this before and I'll say it again, and that
19 is that we who are doing this work are also
20 environmentalists. Those who are overseeing us doing this
21 work are environmentalists. We have a bias for action. We
22 would not sacrifice health and safety of workers or the
23 public, however, in favor of that bias.
24 I believe if you look at our reports you'll see that
25 the biggest risk to the public would be to select the

1 no-action alternative. Indecision or no decision would, by
2 default, select the no-action alternative. I believe that
3 would be unfortunate. And I would like to suggest that
4 it's time to make a decision about the Weldon Spring Site
5 and get on with the work.
6 That's all I have.
7 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
8 Okay. What we would like to do next then, I would
9 like to give you all a reminder that we do have, again,
10 these blue cards. We will be collecting them shortly. If
11 you --
12 Can't hear me in the back? Okay.
13 We will be collecting these cards for about the next
14 ten minutes or so while the public officials will be making
15 some comments. And at that point we will be taking a short
16 break and be compiling these answers, trying to sort
17 through and consolidate some that are similar.
18 So again, if you have a card that has a question or
19 want to get some information in here so that you can make
20 some public comment, please do that now. Again, if you
21 just want to hold it up some of the staff people will
22 collect those.
23 What we would like to do now, we do have several
24 elected officials that are here that would like to make
25 some comments. And what I'd like to do is start out, I

1 believe, one of the people who is here is State
2 Representative Ted House. And if you would like to come up
3 and give us some comments, that would be -- are you still
4 here?
5 UNIDENTIFIED: Have you got names or anything?
6 MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes, I have several.
7 Is Representative House still in the area?
8 Okay. I would also like to welcome -- Senator Fred
9 Dyer is here. If you would just like to put your hand up
10 so we could say Hi, we would like to welcome you to being
11 at this meeting.
12 Steve, I don't know, did you want to make a comment by
13 chance? Okay.
14 Representative Steve Ehlmann is also here attending
15 the meeting, getting some information.
16 If you don't have Representative House, what I'd like
17 to do is go ahead. We do have a representative from the
18 Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Dave Bedan, and
19 if you would like to come up and make some comments.
20 MR. BEDAN: Thank you. My name is David Bedan,
21 and I'm representing the Missouri Department of Natural
22 Resources.
23 As most of you know, our department has followed the
24 events at the Weldon Spring Site for almost twenty years,
25 the very beginning of agency.

1 In 1982 and again in 1987, U.S. Department of Energy
2 prematurely proposed solutions at the site without having
3 adequately studied the site. As a result of the last five
4 years of the remedial investigation, the site is now far
5 better understood.
6 We are also pleased by the initiatives taken by the
7 DOE to perform many interim actions which have already
8 improved environmental conditions at the site.
9 However, the recently released Proposed Plan for the
10 final disposal of the waste and contaminated materials at
11 the site will lead to the most important decision in the
12 entire project, and it must be considered very carefully.
13 The plan proposes a cement-based treatment of much of
14 the waste and disposal in an engineered on-site disposal
15 facility.
16 Now at this time, the DNR reserves its decision on
17 whether to concur. DNR will formulate it's position after
18 a final review of the plan and after consideration of the
19 comments by the public.
20 For several years we have taken the position that
21 certain basic principles should be followed in the cleanup
22 and in any proposals for on-site disposal facilities. We
23 will be reviewing the Proposed Plan in light of those
24 principles, which are:
25 1. If the Department of Energy's Weldon Spring Site

1 is used as a waste disposal site, it should only be used as
2 a disposal site for waste from the Weldon Spring Site
3 itself. No other waste should be brought to the Weldon
4 Spring Site for disposal.
5 2. Any on-site disposal facility should essentially
6 meet the substantive siting and design requirements of the
7 state and federal hazardous waste laws and regulations.
8 3. The remedial alternative to be chosen must be
9 protective of human health and the environment. Cleanup
10 procedures, designs and standards should meet all the
11 applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements of
12 state and federal environmental, health and safety laws and
13 regulations.
14 In addition, under the Atomic Energy Act, human
15 radiation exposures must be reduced to a level that is as
16 low as is reasonably achievable. The Weldon -- we believe
17 the Weldon Spring project should be conducted with the
18 design objective that no member of the general public ever
19 receives a radiation dose from the project that exceeds
20 twenty-five millirem per year above background radiation.
21 if further reductions in dose are reasonably possible, they
22 should also be pursued.
23 4. The DOE should commit to cleanup of the
24 contaminated vicinity projects, including the adjacent
25 state and federal lands so as to permit completely

1 unrestricted land use.

2 5. The project should achieve protective and

3 permanent waste disposal solutions using natural barriers

4 and engineered materials, methods and designs to the

5 maximum extent possible. Reliance on any institutional

6 control measures should be minimized and used only as a

7 last resort if absolutely necessary. Most importantly, the

8 disposal facility should remain under the control and

9 ownership of the Department of Energy.

10 6. The Department of Energy must commit to a long

11 term monitoring and maintenance program to verify and

12 maintain the performance of the disposal facility.

13 7. The DOE must commit to additional follow-on

14 studies of the residual groundwater contamination and, if

15 necessary, undertake remedial action for groundwater

16 cleanup after removal of the sources of decontamination.

17 The DNR appreciates the opportunity to comment on this

18 Proposed Plan and we will be forwarding our final comments

19 after reviewing the public comments. Thank you.

20 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much.

21 You want --

22 MR. McCRACKEN: I don't -- I don't know that I

23 got it all, Dave, but just very briefly. One point I'd

24 like to make that I did not make clear in my presentation

25 is we are committed to cleaning up adjacent properties.

1 There are some parts, there are some small areas on the
2 Army property that require cleanup.
3 The opportunity will also exist to -- even though it's
4 a very low risk, the opportunity may -- will exist in the
5 future to do some cleanup work in the Busch Wildlife lakes
6 that have been lightly contaminated. It's our intent to
7 take advantage of that.
8 In the Feasibility Study we have said twice that we
9 would -- the only plans are to accept or to dispose of
10 waste that is at Weldon Spring. We will meet -- we can
11 meet the substantive siting requirements of the state
12 (ARARs). We will meet using natural materials. We agree
13 that that is the -- those are the best materials for
14 disposal design. Remain under DOE ownership, I don't know
15 who else would want it but my assumption is that we would
16 -- maybe Bob and them would like to have it.
17 UNIDENTIFIED: No way.
18 MR. McCRACKEN: As far as maintenance goes, yes,
19 we have, we will have plans for maintaining the facility,
20 and we do have plans for studying groundwater. So we'll
21 have further discussions, I'm sure, and get into more
22 detail, but I feel pretty good about that.
23 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you.
24 Just in case -- let me do a quick check because we
25 don't have anybody else listed that was listed.

1 Are there any other state or federal elected officials
2 or other representatives here that would like to speak? If
3 you could put your hand up if there are.
4 Okay. Are there any other local elected officials or
5 representatives who would like to speak on this before we
6 take a break?
7 Okay. All right. Again, if you have a last minute
8 question or want to make a comment, if you could fill out a
9 card and give it to one of the appropriate staff people,
10 then we will take a break. We will come back at right
11 around 8:05.
12 And in the meantime, those of you that have come in
13 maybe a little bit late, if you want to take the
14 opportunity to go through the exhibit next door.
15 Thank you.
16 (Break)
17 MS. SCHNEIDER: If we could go ahead and begin
18 again, we are going to have some questions and answers.
19 I would like to explain again how we're set up with
20 this particular part of the evening.
21 If I could have your attention, please. Thank you.
22 What we will be doing now is beginning a question-and-
23 answer period. We have taken the written questions that
24 have come in to us, we have sorted them by topic, and they
25 have been divided out and distributed to the appropriate

1 staff person that has expertise in that particular area.
2 So we'll be going through several different people who will
3 be responding to the questions that you have.
4 From there we will go into an open forum of hearing,
5 and at that point, we do have a number of people who have
6 handed in cards asking to be able to make some comments.
7 When you do, when your name is called, if you would come to
8 one of the two microphones on the floor, one here in front
9 and one midway back. Our court reporter asks that you
10 spell your last name to make sure that we have it
11 accurately for the record.
12 And again, if you have a question or a comment and you
13 would like to do so without any response from the
14 officials, from EPA or DOE here tonight, if you would make
15 that known. Otherwise, they would like to reserve the
16 option to respond back, to be able to clarify or whatever.
17 Again, if necessary we may take one more short break
18 if this looks like this may go on for a while. If not,
19 then we'll just go right on through it, and so far it looks
20 like it's going to be fairly -- like we may be out of here
21 at a reasonable hour the way it looks right now.
22 So what I'd like to also mention as we get into the
23 question-and-answer period, after we have gone through the
24 written questions and the comments, we will have an
25 opportunity for those of you that may have a question that

1 comes out throughout this next section but have not written
2 anything, you will have an opportunity. I will call out to
3 the floor to see if there are any additional comments or
4 questions. So you will have a last chance that may get
5 stimulated from some of the content that comes up here.
6 And again we do ask that if there has already been a
7 question addressed that you try not to repeat the same
8 question, because again, we're trying get to as many
9 different areas of interest that people have.
10 So with that, what I'd like to do is begin with the
11 people who will be responding from among the staff. I
12 would like to start with Margaret MacDonell. And to get
13 some information, she does have both question as well as a
14 response. And, Margaret, if you could -- and all of you
15 really, if you could, when you read the question if you
16 could also note who that question did come from so -- again
17 for our court reporter as well as the audience. Thank you.
18 MS. MacDONELL: This question is from Dr. Rao
19 Iyyagari at Lindenwood College in St. Charles, Missouri.
20 He asks us to explain why the risk for general public
21 within five kilometers of the site, three times the sum
22 minus three, is higher than the risk for the remedial
23 action worker, one times ten to the minus three to eight
24 times ten to the minus five. And he references pages 49 to
25 50 in the Proposed Plan document.

1 Actually the risk that we have estimated as a generic
2 estimate for the general population is the population risk
3 basis and we've estimated a population of about ten
4 thousand seven hundred people. So that's about four orders
5 of magnitude lower on an individual risk basis, if you're
6 comparing the population risk to the individual remedial
7 action worker. Meaning that would be about one in ten
8 million to one in a hundred million and not one in a
9 thousand which we've estimated for the individual remedial
10 action worker. So it's a comparison of population versus
11 individual.
12 I also would note that that population was
13 conservatively estimated based on 1990 Census data using
14 the average population density for St. Charles County and
15 just apportioning that to the five kilometer radius. In
16 fact, the radius of impact for the site would be lower than
17 that conservative estimate and the population would also be
18 lower, so that the values would be even lower than the ten
19 to the minus seven, ten to the minus eight individual
20 risk.
21 MS. SCHNEIDER: Did you just have that one
22 question?
23 MS. MacDONELL: Yes.
24 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay. All right. What I'd like
25 to do next is go to Rick Ferguson for his questions and

1 responses.

2 MR. FERGUSON: I also have a question from

3 Dr. Iyyagari.

4 It says, "Can you elaborate on monitoring procedures

5 after the cell is built, meaning after the ten-year period

6 that's referenced on page 47 of the Proposed Plan?"

7 One thing that's important to note here is that by

8 requirements in the national contingency plan, the EPA is

9 required to revisit these decisions every five years.

10 Beyond the revisiting of the overall decision these --

11 initially quarterly monitoring and we may relegate to an

12 annual monitoring program, but at least key systems,

13 include the monitoring of the leachate collection and

14 removal system Steve described in the -- and the liner

15 system, is part of the disposal cell, and groundwater that

16 would be monitored would be a series of monitoring wells

17 constructed ringing the disposal facility.

18 In addition to these type of environmental monitoring,

19 the engineering features of the cell would also be

20 inspected, including analysis of settlement, erosion, the

21 overall integrity of the cell, including the integrity of

22 the institutional controls through regular inspections.

23 You heard the Missouri Department of National

24 Resources' stipulations that long term monitoring be

25 provided and those specific plans and procedures will be

1 developed in consultation with their staff.

2 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you.

3 Next we have John Peterson. And, John, if you would

4 want to respond?

5 MR. PETERSON: I had the same question that

6 Margaret had.

7 MS. SCHNEIDER: Oh, okay.

8 All right. Next we have Ken Meyer.

9 MR. MEYER: I have two questions, two sets of

10 questions that are related, a total of four questions.

11 The first question is by John Hayes of St. Charles.

12 His question is, "Are the people doing hazardous waste

13 cleanup fully qualified?"

14 Yes. They are qualified to do the work. The workers

15 have received the required occupational safety and health

16 administration training, asbestos training, as required by

17 the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act. They've also

18 received site specific radiation and safety training. And

19 they're overseen by professional and construction

20 engineers, by scientists, by certified health physicists

21 and certified industrial hygienists.

22 The second related question is by Jim Norwood. I

23 believe of St. Charles also.

24 Question is, "How safe is the removal of your asbestos

25 contractor, Ecologic."

1 They're one of the contractors doing asbestos
2 abatement for the project now as a subtiercontractor.
3 Their work is done in accordance with our site
4 specifications. Their monitoring indicates that the work
5 is done properly. Their workers are properly trained. And
6 our monitoring also indicates that their work is done
7 safely. No asbestos is leaving the containments.
8 The second two questions relate to the safety of
9 Francis Howell High School.
10 The first is by John Jacobs.
11 His comment is, "The documents at the library seem to
12 minimize the closeness of the high school and the fact that
13 most of the people in this county live closer to the site
14 than St. Charles City."
15 The question is, "Please explain in detail what
16 safeguards are to be in place to protect the high school
17 children."
18 Okay. First of all, the Department of Energy has
19 committed to having no measurable impact to the children
20 at the high school and that is a commitment they're
21 intending to keep.
22 How do we know we're having no measurable impact?
23 That's through monitoring. The first step in protecting
24 the children at the high school is protecting our workers
25 on site. By monitoring our workers, the work area where

1 the work is being performed, our site perimeter and the
2 high school, we can detect a problem where it originates,
3 document that it doesn't get to the high school, stop the
4 work before it even leaves the general area.
5 In addition, the Department of Energy currently funds
6 the high school to secure its own consultant to review our
7 work and monitoring results.
8 The second to the last question is by John Rigby,
9 Country Ridge Drive, I'm assuming St. Charles again.
10 "Could you please tell us how the students at the high
11 school could be affected by your work? What are the
12 risks?"
13 As I've said, the department has committed to no
14 measurable impact to the students at the high school from
15 contaminates from the site.
16 Now, there are other aspects of our work, such as
17 trucks bringing equipment and materials to the site. Those
18 activities will be coordinated with the high school to
19 minimize their impact, such as noise disturbance, dust,
20 things like that. We've worked with the high school in the
21 past in shipping hazardous waste and material by the high
22 school to avoid high traffic times and will continue to
23 coordinate the entire remedial action with the high
24 school.
25 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you.

1 A number of the questions have been assigned to Steve
2 McCracken. So I'll let you go ahead and get started with
3 those.
4 MR. McCRACKEN: Thank you, Sue.
5 I have got a lot of questions here, but they are
6 essentially the same question. I'll read one of them, and
7 then I will try to answer them.
8 One of the questions is, "I have been told that we do
9 not -- we don't have the trained people to do the work.
10 Who trains the workers? Why don't we have local
11 contractors and workers doing some of the major work?"
12 I think a lot of that is also reflected in the leaflet
13 that's being passed out tonight. And within that, there
14 are a number of questions, and I think that if I take those
15 questions, I will probably also be answering the questions
16 that are on these cards.
17 And basically the questions are, I've been trained to
18 do the work, why am I not getting to work at Weldon
19 Spring?
20 The questions in the leaflet, the first one is, are
21 the people imported from other states presently doing the
22 remediation properly -- wait a minute -- are the people
23 presently doing the remediation properly? Wait a minute.
24 I'm not getting this very good.
25 Are the people properly trained to do the work?

1 The answer to that is yes. We cannot dictate to our
2 contractors who the people are that do the work. But what
3 we can dictate and do dictate to our contractors is the
4 criteria or the certification and the experience and the
5 training the workers must have to work at our site, and we
6 do that. And we do checks to be sure that those people are
7 certified to be doing the work at our site.
8 Why aren't workers from the local community, like the
9 trained members of Laborers Local Union 660, given the
10 opportunity to do the remediation? Why aren't local
11 contractors being utilized?
12 We have about forty something subcontracts on the site
13 right now. Thirty of those are being -- are local
14 contractors it's my understanding.
15 Admittedly, I don't think that those are the larger
16 contracts. There's a couple of things that you have to get
17 to in answering that question.
18 One is that this is a federal government project and
19 that means that we have to follow fair and open competition
20 and that competition determines who gets the work.
21 All bidders are given an equal opportunity to compete
22 if they're qualified to do the work. For some of the
23 larger contracts that we have awarded, they have not gone
24 to local contractors, and, in fact, there hasn't been a lot
25 of local competition for that work. Perhaps -- I don't

1 know what the reasons are. Perhaps they don't have the --
2 well, the reasons that they don't bid, I really can't say.
3 But there has not been a great deal of local
4 competition for some of the larger contracts that we have
5 awarded, such as the buildings demolition and the quarry
6 bulk waste removal.
7 Are the children attending the senior high school near
8 the plant in danger?
9 The answer to that is no and Kenny talked about that.
10 What about the community at large?
11 The answer is no.
12 The work that -- we have a single mission at Weldon
13 Spring and that is to protect human health and the
14 environment. That means that we will protect human health
15 both during the time it's being -- that the work is being
16 done, and as a result of the work that we are doing. We
17 will not compromise the safety of the public to get the
18 work done.
19 Since the Department of Energy is policing itself at
20 the site, isn't it foolish to assume that health and safety
21 regulations are being aggressively monitored and corrected?
22 I'm not sure exactly how to answer that except to say
23 that it's a different world that we live in nowadays.
24 There is a significant personal liability to me if the work
25 is not done safely. There is a significant liability to

1 our contractors if the work is not done safely. We take
2 that very seriously, and we do not -- we have no tolerance
3 for safety violations at our site.
4 Are the most competent people training -- are the most
5 competent people training the workers employed to do the
6 remediation?
7 Are the most competent people training the workers
8 employed to do the remediation?
9 We do have the -- we do provide training on the site
10 for workers at the contractor's discretion. The reason
11 that I can't say why particular people do not -- that are
12 trained do not get to work at our site, all I can say is
13 that the way the packages are constructed, if you already
14 have training, that should, in fact, improve -- if a
15 contractor has workers that are already trained, that
16 should improve his ability to compete for the work.
17 The reason being that then he doesn't have to pay us
18 if he wants us to train those people and he doesn't -- or
19 he doesn't have to pay somebody else to do the training.
20 I am aware that the -- some of the local unions have
21 training programs. We have been talking to them some about
22 those training programs. We're interested in understanding
23 more about that.
24 Other questions that I got, will -- are really,
25 they're all one question. "Will uranium be shipped to the

1 disposal facility from any other sites? Will this site
2 become a magnet for waste from other areas of the Midwest,
3 especially if the incinerator is built?"
4 First of all, to answer the question will other waste
5 be disposed off at this site, the answer to that is that we
6 have no plans to dispose of other waste at this site.
7 In the Feasibility Study we have prepared, at least in
8 two places, we state that in one place -- I anticipated
9 this question by the way so I brought this with me. The
10 material from these or other sites would not be taken to
11 Weldon Spring, meaning the downtown airport sites or the
12 downtown St. Louis sites. There is another place in the
13 document where we talk about waste not coming from
14 St. Louis or Westlake Landfill.
15 And also the State has asked a similar question and
16 our Responsiveness Summary that we will prepare as a result
17 of this meeting will reflect what I've just said.
18 Now, especially if an incinerator is built, will this
19 become a magnet? Well, it won't become a magnet, but we
20 also don't have any plans to build an incinerator.
21 I will say that if we use the vitrification
22 technology, that is a high heat process much like an
23 incinerator. In fact, probably in comparing cement
24 stabilization and vitrification technology, the fact that
25 it was a high heat process would require additional

1 engineering controls was one of the factors that led us to
2 choose cement stabilization. And that is our primary
3 technology we intend to use.
4 We will only use vitrification if we need to as backup
5 technology. Although I can say that it's a really -- it's
6 a good technology. I expect it to be used more in the
7 future at other sites.
8 MS. SCHNEIDER: Is that it?
9 MR. McCRACKEN: That's it.
10 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay.
11 Let's -- We'll go ahead and begin now with some of the
12 public comments. We've kind of taken a look at what kind
13 of demand we have in terms of the number of people, and
14 when we could, like to try to wrap this up. So what I
15 think we want to do is allocate up to about four minutes
16 per speaker, and I will be giving you time. I'll let you
17 know when you have a minute left and then let you know when
18 your four minutes is up.
19 So again, if you could please work with us to
20 accommodate that so everybody has an opportunity to speak
21 that wants to.
22 I wanted to start out with Mary Halliday who is with
23 St. Charles Countians Against Hazardous Waste. And while
24 she's coming up, for our court reporter, her last name is
25 spelled H-A-L-L-I-D-A-Y.

1 Mary?

2 MS. HALLIDAY: Thank you very much. I am

3 speaking as a member of the St. Charles Countians Against

4 Hazardous Waste and also as a twenty-three-year resident of

5 St. Charles County, and I live about four miles from the

6 site.

7 I am the person who at the Scoping Meeting in 1984

8 made the statement: Little boys are taught to clean up one

9 mess before starting another one. And what happened here?

10 Fortunately since that time, my question of that

11 evening has been very positively answered in many ways,

12 and I feel much better about the Weldon Spring Site since

13 1982. But we're not finished yet.

14 I have spent hundreds of hours caring about the WSSRAP

15 Site since 1982, and I'm very simply pleased at what has

16 happened. However, when an important decision such as this

17 one is made, which is the final resting place for the

18 waste, factors extending beyond how many dollars, necessary

19 cleanup years, and even the next two hundred years, need to

20 be recognized and factored into that decision.

21 For these reasons, I believe that the aboveground

22 on-site storage with chemical stabilization and

23 solidification or the Alternative 6A to be a secondary and

24 inferior choice to that of vitrification and disposal at

25 the Clize, Utah Site, or Alternative 7B.

1 Although I'm generally very pleased with the progress
2 which has occurred at the WSSRAP Site to this time, it is
3 my nature to try to prevent problems rather than to fix
4 them. And I feel that the choice that has been here will
5 present another cleanup required in St. Charles County. It
6 could happen anywhere between a hundred and three hundred
7 years from the time when it is rested here. That should be
8 a quicker cleanup, but I do have fears that it could
9 happen. If the disposal cell failure does occur, it most
10 likely would be a result of the integral loss of the double
11 bottom liner due to the coarse geology or from the tons of
12 the new weight on top of it or from the earthquake or from
13 the appearance of a new sinkhole to join with the many
14 others there in the area.
15 MS. SCHNEIDER: You have one minute, Mary.
16 MS. HALLIDAY: Okay. I'll be very brief here
17 then.
18 I again want to say that I am very pleased with what
19 the Department of Energy has done, and I will conclude with
20 a heartfelt thank you to the Department of Energy and
21 especially to Mr. Steve McCracken who represents the fresh
22 thinking of the branch of government, who has had far too
23 many cleanup sites such as the WSSRAP Site put in front of
24 it. And I thank you very much.
25 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you and thank you for

1 corporation on timing.

2 I'd like to go -- and I do want to remind you again if

3 you would not like a response, if you would state so. I

4 don't know if anybody wants to -- Steve, if you wanted to

5 make a comment to her or not.

6 MR. McCRACKEN: No, I don't really want to make a

7 comment. Mary Halliday is probably one of the people that

8 -- within the St. Charles Countians that along with others,

9 Ken Gronewald, Meredith Bollmeier, Mike Garvey and others

10 who deserve a lot of the credit and a pat on the back from

11 the people of St. Charles County for getting this project

12 going.

13 As far as commenting on Mary's comment, well, you

14 know, obviously we've got somewhat of a disagreement. But

15 I know that it's one that's sincerely made and I respect

16 that.

17 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay. Before we go on, just as

18 another county resident, I'd like to echo what Steve said

19 in terms of the St. Charles Countians Against Hazardous

20 Waste. I certainly thank you all from my perspective.

21 So what I'd like to do is go on. Next, Roger Pryor

22 who is with the Construction and General Laborers Local

23 660. His last name is spelled P-R-Y-O-R.

24 Roger, are you still here?

25 UNIDENTIFIED: He'll be back in one second.

1 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay. Put him back a moment
2 then.
3 UNIDENTIFIED: Here he comes.
4 MS. SCHNEIDER: Roger, if you can make your way
5 to the microphone, and again, I don't know if you were out
6 of the room, but we are asking people to have a four-
7 minute limit, and I'll give you a one-minute warning.
8 MR. PRYOR: I'll be real short.
9 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay.
10 MR. PRYOR: Mr. McCracken was saying that they
11 didn't have much control over who they gave those contracts
12 to. Well, we know better than that. We think that if the
13 DOE, MK-Ferguson, those people that came in to hire these
14 local people, they would do it. They've done it for three
15 years.
16 Kimmins is on the job right now. Three years ago he
17 was out there. He came in and used our people and did
18 that work. This time we went out and talked to him he
19 said, "We don't need you."
20 We think that -- six hundred and fifty million dollars
21 is a lot of money, and we think the workers in this
22 community are entitled to part of that, especially if
23 they're going to bury it in our backyard. Otherwise, make
24 a sixth option. Let them people that are coming out there
25 and making that money take it back to their hometown and

1 bury it in their yard.

2 So we think we should be entitled to the jobs and we

3 don't think they're being straight with us.

4 (Loud applause and cheering.)

5 MS. SCHNEIDER: I'm assuming you might like to

6 respond.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. McCRACKEN: All I can tell you is that the --

9 we require our contractor to follow the federal procurement

10 regulations. And to our knowledge, and we audit that, they

11 are doing that.

12 If anybody ever pointed out anything to the contrary,

13 I'm sure that our contractor would correct it very quickly

14 even without our support, but we would certainly support

15 that.

16 We have certain laws and regulations that we have to

17 follow and I don't have any alternative but to do that.

18 MR. PRYOR: Well, it seems funny that the school

19 boards in this area, the municipalities in this area, the

20 community college in this area, to pass resolutions that

21 they're going to use local contractors plus local workers

22 on all their building projects, but you, the DOE, can't do

23 it. How can these people do that and you say you can't?

24 MR. McCRACKEN: I don't know. I mean I'm a

25 federal -- I work --

1 MR. PRYOR: Maybe --

2 MR. McCRACKEN: Wait a minute. It's my turn.

3 You asked a question. Now it's my turn.

4 MR. PRYOR: Okay.

5 MR. McCRACKEN: All I can tell you is that we are

6 very careful to follow the federal procurement regulations.

7 What colleges do, what other people do, I don't know how

8 they're regulated. But I do know how we are regulated and

9 we follow those regulations. And that's all I can tell

10 you.

11 MR. PRYOR: Well, this --

12 MR. McCRACKEN: -- And if there is something that

13 needs to be changed about that, then --

14 MR. PRYOR: We will write our Congressman, we'll

15 also write our Senators --

16 MR. McCRACKEN: That's great. That's great.

17 MR. PRYOR: And we are going to start screaming

18 to high heaven.

19 MR. McCRACKEN: That's fine.

20 MR. PRYOR: Because we want those jobs.

21 MR. McCRACKEN: That's fine. I would like to see

22 local people get these jobs too, but there are certain

23 laws, regulations, that we have to follow.

24 MR. PRYOR: Well, let me tell you something. If

25 you and MK told these people to use these local people just

1 like you spend all that money on PR around here, spend a
2 little on PR and put these local people to work and that
3 will do you more PR than all the money you're spending.
4 (Applause.)
5 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
6 Next up we have Michael Garvey who is affiliated also
7 with St. Charles Countians Against Hazardous Waste. And
8 his last name is spelled G-A-R-V-E-Y.
9 Mike?
10 MR. GARVEY: I do appreciate the opportunity to
11 speak at the hearing this evening. Very pleased generally
12 with the quality of the documentation of the material
13 presented. Feel that it's more superior than the original
14 DIS that was presented in 1987.
15 Ideally, I myself, like others present, would like to
16 see the treated waste removed, in light -- but in light of
17 the political climate regarding removal of waste, the
18 decision making difficulty in locating a final permanent or
19 long-term storage site and the time frame for this to
20 occur, it's not acceptable I don't think.
21 I feel that should higher level of radioactive
22 material be present in the quarry or elsewhere, these
23 realistically be considered to be vitrified and moved
24 rather quickly to a more permanent storage site that's
25 geologically sound.

1 One of my concerns is like the DNR, that only waste
2 for the Weldon Spring Site are stored at Weldon Spring,
3 especially with the political climate of St. Louis and
4 what's going to be going on there in the future.
5 My chief concern is, and always has been, the quality
6 of the water of the Weldon Spring Well Field. Based upon
7 the testing results thus far, I'm very confident that it is
8 quite safe.
9 Another concern of mine has been that the money for
10 the cleanup keeps coming from Washington, especially in
11 light of the cutting of the budgets in the past and I hope
12 our elected officials keep that money coming because the
13 time delays can only increase the potential for these
14 contaminates to move.
15 Concerning the above -- the groundwater quality during
16 the remediation for disposal cell construction, raffinate
17 pit removal, in light of the needs to keep the waste wet,
18 Steve McCracken said years ago that one of his biggest
19 challenges was to please the public locally. And I can
20 tell him that he and the DOE has satisfied me. And I'm
21 somewhat convinced that the St. Louis people will also be
22 satisfied with the work that will be done.
23 And I'm very grateful in addition to the DOE, to the
24 EPA, and DNR and all the agencies involved and very glad
25 that these agencies are communicating with each other and

1 cooperating and that they're listening to each other.
2 Again, thank you very much.
3 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Mike.
4 Next up we have Dennis Schneier. If you could come
5 up. This is -- if this is spelled right, S-C-H-N-E-I-E-R.
6 MR. SCHNEIER: That's correct.
7 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
8 MR. SCHNEIER: Yeah. Is a representative with
9 the contractor here tonight? I just have a comment. I'd
10 like to know why -- I have the training for the job for
11 cleanup of the Weldon Spring. I took an eighty-hour course
12 using the federal Superfund money. And if there's a
13 contractor representative here tonight, I'd like to ask him
14 why I can't go out there and go to work. And if there is
15 no contractor representative, how come he isn't here?
16 MR. McCRACKEN: I'm the only DOE person up
17 here. Sometimes it's hard to -- well, and there is one EPA
18 fellow.
19 The question that you're asking of the contractor, we
20 have people here that are not sitting up here that I think
21 would be better to answer your question. But the answer is
22 the one that I stated before, and that is that our
23 contractor competitively bids the work that we do and
24 selects contractors on a competitive basis. And then those
25 contractors go out and hire the people that they need to do

1 the work. And all that we do is make sure that those
2 people they hire meet the training requirements that must
3 be met to do the work at our site.
4 I don't -- I really don't know much -- know what more
5 to say than that.
6 MR. SCHNEIER: Is the contractor representative
7 here? If so, would they please stand up?
8 UNIDENTIFIED: I'm the project director --
9 MR. McCRACKEN: Hey, Jim, if you're going to say
10 something, come on up to the mike because you have to
11 identify yourself and say something.
12 MR. POWERS: Yes. My name's Jim Powers. I'm the
13 project director for the PMC and PMC is the MK-Ferguson
14 Company. So I guess I'm in charge of the contractors.
15 And the question that you asked has been answered. We
16 do carry out our operations with subcontractors.
17 Subcontractors are selected using the rules and regulations
18 of the federal procurement system. And those contractors
19 in turn hire employees such as yourself. Since you have
20 the training that you have, puts you with one of those
21 subcontractors in a better competitive position. So that's
22 the system, simple as that.
23 MR. SCHNEIER: So where are they getting these
24 people? Are they getting them from where the contractors
25 are coming from, out of state, getting their people from

1 down there?

2 MR. POWERS: Where did your last employer find

3 you?

4 MR. SCHNEIER: Through my union hall here in St.

5 Charles County.

6 MR. POWERS: The next employer has the same

7 opportunity.

8 MR. SCHNEIER: Well, as a project -- can't you

9 direct them down to my union hall and have them call us up

10 and send us out there?

11 MR. POWERS: No.

12 MR. SCHNEIER: So you're really interested in

13 putting the local people to work then, aren't you?

14 MR. POWERS: I follow the rules and regulations.

15 MR. SCHNEIER: All I know is I'm glad I wore my

16 boots tonight because there's a lot of crap down here

17 tonight.

18 (Laughter and applause.)

19 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

20 Okay. Next up is Earl Brown, as in brown, Labor Local

21 660.

22 MR. BROWN: Well, my question was basically the

23 same as his, but since DOE is here, do you know how much it

24 costs to train us, now, the people that's out there, how

25 much does it cost to train them?

1 MR. McCRACKEN: I don't know. And the -- I know
2 what we bill a contractor if they want to be trained on our
3 site. I do not know what a trained person costs other
4 than that. And the reason I don't know is because we
5 competitively bid these jobs. Which means that we are
6 looking for qualified people using competitive rules. And
7 those -- the cost for having trained those people is
8 included in the price. And that's just the way you do
9 federal work.
10 MR. BROWN: Well, you know there are some
11 laborers here that live in that area and there are people
12 here tonight that live in that area. Maybe they would like
13 to know that the people that are out there working now are
14 trained as well as the laborers here. There has to be some
15 kind of cost, some kind of deficiency or something that
16 would make a difference. It might make a difference to the
17 people that are living there. But we won't know that, will
18 we?
19 MR. McCRACKEN: Well, the work that we do is
20 audited frequently. If you would like to -- well, we met,
21 I know, some with Roger Pryor to discuss how we select
22 people to do work. Yeah, I would -- there's -- I would
23 like to see local people do the work also, but that -- I
24 cannot bend the federal rules to accomplish that. I mean,
25 that would be -- I just can't do that.

1 MR. BROWN: But you did do it before?

2 MR. McCRACKEN: No.

3 MR. BROWN: And it can't be done again.

4 MR. McCRACKEN: No, I can't change -- I cannot

5 bend the federal rules. Roger had a good point. You can

6 write your congressman. You can talk to elected officials

7 and if they can affect a change, yeah. I'm a federal

8 employee, I follow -- I follow the rules that are given to

9 me to implement.

10 MR. BROWN: Yes, we have your name and it could

11 be changed too, by Mr. Clinton.

12 (Laughter and applause.)

13 MR. McCRACKEN: Well, I'd like to rest.

14 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

15 Next up is Dan -- Don -- I know I'm going to butcher

16 this name, Moennig, M-O-E-N-N-I-G, with Labor Local 660.

17 You might want to say your name the way it's supposed to be

18 said because I'm sure I didn't say it right.

19 MR. MOENNIG: It's Moennig, M-O-E-N-N-I-G.

20 I'd just like to reiterate on this same subject

21 tonight. How many -- how many laborers are on this job?

22 MR. McCRACKEN: I don't know.

23 Jim, do you have any idea?

24 MR. MOENNIG: Do you have any idea how many

25 local?

1 MR. POWERS: I'd be guessing.

2 MR. MOENNIG: How many out of town?

3 MR. POWERS: I don't know.

4 MR. McCRACKEN: I don't know.

5 MR. MOENNIG: Okay. That was my question.

6 MR. McCRACKEN: Okay.

7 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

8 MR. McCRACKEN: We will get you an answer to

9 that though.

10 MS. SCHNEIDER: Next up is Darrin Sach, Sachs?

11 UNIDENTIFIED: I've got no comment.

12 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay.

13 Next is Phil Pryor, with -- it's P-R-Y-O-R, with Local

14 660.

15 MR. PHIL PRYOR: All I wanted to say is that, you

16 know, you could work a lot of local people here the same

17 way, you know, you got to pay prevailing wage, so, you

18 know, how -- it's got to cost them more to bring people in

19 than us. I don't know why, you know, they're not working

20 us.

21 MR. McCRACKEN: I don't either. And I would like

22 to know why. Under the competitive -- the way we compete

23 the work, I'm not sure that we could be very exact in

24 knowing why it is that contractors that might come in from

25 other areas can complete and win the work when local people

1 cannot. But, I mean, it's a -- it's a question that I
2 think deserves some study because it would be a -- I think
3 it would be a value for all of us to understand perhaps.
4 I don't know if we can get the information, but, I
5 mean, it is a -- you're raising a good point. And I don't
6 know all the reasons why, but maybe we can figure it out.
7 MR. PHIL PRYOR: You don't know how many people
8 is working out there now, how many laborers?
9 MR. McCRACKEN: I don't. I think there was a
10 total of about four hundred and fifty people or so at the
11 site. How many of those are laborers, I don't know. I
12 know that two hundred and sixty or seventy of those people
13 are full-time people working for MK-Ferguson and Jacobs.
14 So if you subtract that -- what, Jim, is there about
15 another two hundred people on the site?
16 MR. POWERS: Of those, how many are laborers?
17 MR. McCRACKEN: I don't know. That's information
18 that -- Is that available to us?
19 MR. POWERS: Yes. I think --
20 MR. PHIL PRYOR: Well, we know how many laborers
21 from the local area is out there, but what we don't know is
22 how many is out there working now.
23 MR. McCRACKEN: Yeah.
24 MR. PHIL PRYOR: And you got to pay them
25 prevailing wage?

1 MR. McCRACKEN: Right.

2 MR. PHIL PRYOR: And I don't see why you can't

3 pay people from the local area. That's what I can't

4 understand.

5 MR. McCRACKEN: Yeah.

6 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

7 Next we have Kenneth Gronewald who's with St. Charles

8 Countians Against Hazardous Waste. And his name is spelled

9 G-R-O-N-E-W-A-L-D.

10 MR. GRONEWALD: Thank you.

11 The question I have is I would like to know about how

12 far down the line is it before we know definitely that the

13 material will be stored on the site at Weldon Spring or

14 whether it will be hauled to Utah or somewhere else. How

15 far hence is that?

16 MR. McCRACKEN: It will be about August or

17 September of this -- of next summer, Ken.

18 The process we've got to go through is to -- with the

19 meeting tonight and the end of the comment period on

20 January 20th, we'll take all the questions we get and we

21 will prepare written responses. And along with that we

22 will write a document called a Record of Decision. And

23 that document will go through what sometimes to me seems

24 like an endless review of the federal agencies and

25 ourselves. And all that will take until about next August

1 or September to be completed.

2 MR. GRONEWALD: Thank you, Steve.

3 MR. McCRACKEN: Yeah.

4 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

5 Next up is Dan Hunter, who is with Local 660.

6 MR. HUNTER: Yeah, I think I got the same

7 questions that these guys back here from 660 have been

8 asking. But one thing I did want to ask, are they training

9 on the job site --

10 MR. McCRACKEN: Yeah.

11 MR. HUNTER: -- for these?

12 They are, okay.

13 MR. McCRACKEN: Yeah. Some of the training is

14 being done on the job site. We offer that to contractors

15 but they have to pay for it. We don't give it away. And

16 so that's the reason that does -- should not affect the

17 competitive nature of the work -- I mean of the bids.

18 MR. HUNTER: That just seems ridiculous when

19 there is hundreds already trained --

20 MR. McCRACKEN: Yeah.

21 MR. HUNTER: -- here, they got to bring them out.

22 MR. McCRACKEN: Well, there's -- we have -- the

23 two hundred and sixty people that we have also have to have

24 a lot of the same training that you guys have, and in order

25 -- that training has to be updated frequently.

1 And we made a decision about two years ago that it
2 made a lot of sense to have training capability on-site as
3 opposed to sending these people to who-knows-where to get
4 trained. And with that training capability on the site, it
5 seemed to us to make sense to also extend that to the
6 contractors if they wanted to pay for it. And that's what
7 we did.
8 Now again, I'll say that there has been -- some of the
9 union representatives have been to us talking about the
10 training that they now do. And we have been talking about
11 that, interested in learning more about that.
12 MR. HUNTER: Whatever. Thank you.
13 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
14 Next up is Meredith Hunter, who is with St. Charles
15 Countians Against Hazardous Waste.
16 MS. HUNTER: Good evening.
17 Okay. I'm Meredith Hunter and formally known as
18 Meredith Bollmeier. And I'm a member of St. Charles
19 Countians Against Hazardous Waste Board of Directors.
20 As one of the original founders of the organization I
21 must admit that there were times when I didn't think I'd
22 ever see this day, that we'd ever get to this point, so it
23 sort of feels good. That was before I was aware of this
24 other problem, which there is always something new.
25 While I was reviewing the multiple reports that have

1 gone into the Department of Energy's Proposed Plan, I was
2 struck by their completeness and candidness that was absent
3 in the 1986 reports prepared for the draft Environmental
4 Impact Statement. It just points out how important it is
5 to acknowledge existing facts if existing problems are to
6 be solved. All the meetings, research and correspondence
7 since then has borne fruit at this time.
8 Tonight there will be questions and comments about
9 your technical progress. However, I choose to comment on
10 your civic progress. That was also written in not knowing
11 about this.
12 I witnessed a metamorphosis within the Department of
13 Energy. Looking back over ten years, it was ten years in
14 August of '82 when we had our first meeting, the first five
15 years we in the organization -- we had to deal with a very
16 overbearing and very inflexible DOE. Then, since 1987, we
17 observed a marked change in the attitude that has continued
18 in its evolution to a point which can honestly be described
19 as cooperation and mutual respect.
20 This huge transition was, and still is, very
21 important. And because a major change of attitude occurred
22 -- let's see, because a major change of attitude occurred
23 on DOE's part, it allowed the essential cooperation to
24 develop that will ultimately achieve the goal, our goal, of
25 the safest possible cleanup at Weldon Spring.

1 Our group has always thought in win-win terms. In our
2 hearts we truly felt that we were entitled to a thorough
3 and safe cleanup. And that in the long run was -- that
4 that in the long run was also the best thing for DOE.
5 In 1983 I said to a long-gone -- to someone who's long
6 gone now -- DOE representative, that if DOE made Weldon
7 Spring the crown jewel of their remedial action program, we
8 could honestly accord them good public relations that they
9 would deserve for doing so. And it didn't receive very
10 open reception at the time.
11 Therefore, it was my pleasure to hear that, those very
12 words, in 1990 when you, Steve, commented to some of our
13 board members that DOE wanted to make Weldon Spring the
14 crown jewel of its remedial action project -- program. And
15 it is. Citizens in St. Charles County are definitely the
16 beneficiaries of that commitment.
17 MS. SCHNEIDER: Meredith, you have one minute.
18 MS. HUNTER: Okay.
19 What was so great was -- no one said those words about
20 crown jewel any time between '83 and '90. So it just
21 trickled down or trickled up through the process.
22 Apparently in 1988 after the big public meeting at
23 Hollenbeck, DOE reevaluated their position, which led to
24 the metamorphosis I spoke of, which in turn produced a
25 wholehearted commitment to a quality at -- for Weldon

1 Spring cleanup.

2 Goethe, the 18th century philosopher, wrote: "Until
3 one is committed there is hesitancy, and a chance to draw
4 back is always ineffectiveness. Concerning all acts of
5 initiative there is one elementary truth and ignorance of
6 which kills countless ideas and splendid plans, that the
7 moment one definitely commits themself, then providence
8 moves too. All sorts of things occur to help one that
9 would never have otherwise occurred. A whole stream of
10 events issued from that decision raising in one's favor all
11 manner of unforeseen incidents and meetings and material
12 assistance, whatever you can do or dream you can, begin it.
13 Boldness has genius and power and magic in it. Begin it
14 now."

15 In 1982 the citizens of St. Charles County committed
16 themselves to the safest possible cleanup of Weldon Spring
17 and a whole stream of events issued from that decision. In
18 1987 the Department of Energy committed themself to the same
19 thing and all sorts of things occurred to help them that
20 would never have otherwise occurred. And we thank you for
21 that commitment.

22 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

23 Next up is Keith McCulloh, who is with the Laborers
24 Local 660. And the last name is spelled M-C capital
25 C-U-L-L-O-H?

1 MR. McCULLOH: That's correct.

2 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thanks.

3 MR. McCULLOH: We've all heard our other

4 brothers speak about what's going on. I have another idea

5 that's bothering me, or it's something that's bothering

6 me. They were bringing people from out of town to do this

7 work. Now, we spend a great deal of time learning how to

8 do our craft. Now they're talking about putting this thing

9 together to hold all this stuff. Would you rather have

10 somebody that's trained to do the work, that's been doing

11 the work for years and years, or would you rather have

12 somebody that's learning how to do the work as they do the

13 work? That's my only question.

14 MR. McCRACKEN: We want to have people that are

15 trained to do the work and that's what we're requiring.

16 MR. McCULLOH: We're here. We are here.

17 MR. McCRACKEN: Okay.

18 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

19 Next up is Edwin Mahr, Jr., M-A-H-R, and he's

20 affiliated with Health Food Groups.

21 MR. MAHR: First of all, my congratulations to

22 Mr. McCracken. He has certainly mellowed in the job and

23 gained a lot of stature over the years. I didn't like him

24 at first but he certainly is a lot easier to take now.

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. McCRACKEN: I didn't think you liked me
2 because we didn't put that stuff down those Texas oil
3 wells.
4 MR. MAHR: Well, it's a theory.
5 Your exhibit outside is very well done, and I had
6 fifteen minutes to look at it, but it's in color and you
7 have a lot of technical stuff out there. We assume it's
8 right but for me it's gonna take three or four or five or
9 six hours or days or something. You have a lot of money at
10 your disposal. You've done a good job.
11 Let's make some, not necessarily full size but full
12 color brochure, maybe a hundred pages, a large book, big
13 enough to have the eight-by-eleven's that you already have
14 out there or reduce them in Xerox size, because I got a
15 totally different idea of the size of everything, including
16 the quarry.
17 And you can take this fine when you can compare
18 newspaper articles and whatever to go back and see exactly
19 what they're talking about. And no other project that I
20 have ever heard would have this option to actually see --
21 from a newspaper you can't tell what really they're talking
22 about as far as physical placement and where it is. You
23 have to be up in an airplane to know this.
24 So let's make a book. I mean, you've got a lot of
25 money.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. MAHR: You can give it out and all these

3 people could, you know, put their nose in the book and it

4 would be good PR. Thank you.

5 MR. McCRACKEN: I think that's a great idea.

6 We'll take that and see what we can do with it.

7 MS. SCHNEIDER: In terms of format, I might note

8 that Mr. Mahr on his card suggests a Madonna size book. Is

9 that --

10 (Laughter.)

11 MS. SCHNEIDER: So he could read at his leisure

12 he said.

13 Next up is Jim Norwood. I notice there's no

14 affiliation so you might mention that.

15 MR. NORWOOD: I'm with Laborers International.

16 And we got a few problems. I'd like to ask a couple

17 of questions about safety. How about your training, is

18 that -- how many hours is that on-site? Does anybody here

19 know?

20 MR. McCRACKEN: Well, we do a minimum of the

21 forty-hour OSHA training. There are also other

22 miscellaneous training requirements related to radiation

23 safety. There's also a training requirement, although I

24 don't think we provided it at the site, for asbestos

25 workers. Then there's the routine updates that occur as

1 required to meet OSHA requirements.

2 MR. NORWOOD: You have like a forty-hour class?

3 MR. McCRACKEN: Yes.

4 MR. NORWOOD: That's it, probably, right? You

5 don't have the twenty-four-hour on-site --

6 MR. McCRACKEN: Oh, yeah, we do. We got --

7 MR. NORWOOD: You incorporate that into the forty

8 hour week?

9 MR. McCRACKEN: Right. There's some of us that

10 don't need the whole forty hours. There's some of us that

11 only require --

12 MR. NORWOOD: How can you incorporate that into

13 the forty hour week when it's supposed to be at least

14 sixty-four hours? See, laborers are offering eighty-hour

15 classes plus they're getting the twenty-four hours when

16 they get there. I'd like to state that. I don't

17 understand how that's happened.

18 We have an asbestos problem there with your contractor

19 you got there now. They're just removing it in any

20 haphazard way. They're not getting monitored anyway.

21 They're taking off the roof where the high school is three

22 quarters of a mile away, you know, is that blown or is that

23 just dead space up there?

24 MR. McCRACKEN: If you have any idea of the

25 specifics that we are doing that you think are safety

1 violations, you bring them to my attention and I guarantee,
2 I guarantee we'll fix them.
3 MR. NORWOOD: We don't want them to die here.
4 We're trying to take a few safety --
5 MR. McCRACKEN: Fine. And it'll take that much
6 longer to get a safety problem fixed. I would strongly
7 suggest that you bring it to our attention so that if you
8 think there is a problem that it gets fixed immediately.
9 Don't wait for it to go to Washington and then come back
10 down. That would not make safety or health sense.
11 MR. NORWOOD: Well, we'll see what happens there.
12 MR. McCRACKEN: Well, let me ask you a question.
13 Does it make sense to wait days and weeks to prevent a
14 safety problem?
15 MR. NORWOOD: It's already been filed so --
16 MR. McCRACKEN: So what are we going to do? We're
17 going to wait and get it solved when it comes back from
18 Washington?
19 MR. NORWOOD: Well, if you're willing to work
20 with us besides give us the brush off answer that we've
21 been receiving, we'll work with you.
22 MR. McCRACKEN: Okay. Good.
23 MR. NORWOOD: On the contracts, aren't they a
24 fifty/fifty type deal on technological stuff and then the
25 cost?

1 MR. McCRACKEN: Yeah, a few of them have been,
2 yes.
3 MR. NORWOOD: It seems like were losing the
4 contracts, the lower cost jobs, because they're modifying
5 them as they go. After the contractors bid, they find
6 something else out there they supposedly don't know about
7 that they're getting modified and that's more money coming
8 back to them. That's twenty percent -- twenty percent
9 difference is a lot of money.
10 MR. McCRACKEN: Is it my turn?
11 MR. NORWOOD: I just wanted to state that so
12 everyone knows it.
13 MR. McCRACKEN: Well, for the benefit of the
14 people here, there are a few of the contracts at our site,
15 one is the quarry bulk waste removal, that we feel are such
16 a safety concern that they deserve to be awarded with
17 consideration of cost but also a consideration of technical
18 capability. In other words, we don't want to just award it
19 to the first low -- to the low bidder on cost.
20 Therefore, we've constructed a contract package that
21 let's us look at both technical capability as well as
22 cost. I will defend that to anyone as the smart way to do
23 work that has a high potential for safety problems for
24 workers.
25 MR. NORWOOD: I agree that's the smart way to do

1 it, but I don't think it's being handled correct. I think
2 there's too many modifications on the job when they're
3 filling up. After they're awarded, I think there's too
4 many modifications. I think they should maybe check into
5 that.
6 MR. McCRACKEN: Okay.
7 MR. NORWOOD: That's about all for now.
8 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
9 Next up is George Farhner, and Farhner is spelled
10 F-A-R-H-N-E-R.
11 George, if you could come up. And again, I don't have
12 an affiliation so if you would mention if you have one.
13 UNIDENTIFIED: He's St. Charles Countians Against
14 Hazardous Waste.
15 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay. Great. Thanks.
16 MR. FARHNER: Hello. My name is George Farhner.
17 I've been a resident of St. Charles for seven years. I'm
18 on the board of directors with St. Charles Countians
19 Against Hazardous Waste. My other duties include
20 volunteer service as project manager for a technical
21 assistance grant administered by the EPA Region VII out of
22 Kansas City. It is in that capacity that I speak tonight
23 on this upcoming Record of Decision on the Proposed Plan
24 for remedial action at the Chemical Plant area of the
25 Weldon Spring Site.

1 The time frame that we must work in is the Department
2 of Energy's and not our own. Coupled with the Thanksgiving
3 and Christmas holiday interruptions, the brevity of time
4 makes it difficult for our technical advisers to review all
5 the volumous materials, approximately two thousand pages
6 and five books.
7 Federal and state employees working on these site
8 related activities have a forty-hour work week in which to
9 do so. It is much more difficult for our -- others to find
10 the necessary time to do all the required paperwork within
11 a sixty-day time frame.
12 The Weldon Spring Record of Decision date has been
13 changed repeatedly only to cause further delay in our
14 hiring new technical advisers. As I see it, the main
15 problem is one of timing. New technical advisers can't be
16 hired for services without document availability.
17 Therefore, in conclusion I would like to request that
18 an extension on the deadline for RI/FS comment from January
19 20th, 1993, for a time period up to sixty days from January
20 20th, 1993. This should give our four technical advisors
21 sufficient time to prepare written comments after the
22 review of the Proposed Plan for remedial action at the
23 Chemical Plant area of the Weldon Spring Site.
24 Those four technical advisers are Rao Iyyagari,
25 microbiologist from Lindenwood College; Tom Ahling, land

1 hydrologist; Bill Vaughn, air monitoring; and John
2 O'Connor, water treatment plant and disposal cells.
3 MR. McCRACKEN: I don't guess we could negotiate
4 that a little bit, could we? Sixty days is a long time.
5 Can we talk about that, George? We'll talk about it
6 outside of here and see what your requirements are and see
7 what we can work out.
8 MR. FARHNER: Well, it's likely that it would
9 take less than that, but I just want to have some leeway
10 there for the technical advisers to review their specialty.
11 MR. McCRACKEN: Obviously we're interested in
12 your technical advisers getting a chance to look at this
13 and maybe we can talk about that outside of here and try
14 and figure out what we could do. How does that sound?
15 MR. FARHNER: Does that mean an extension has
16 been granted?
17 MR. McCRACKEN: I'd like to talk about it some to
18 see how much we can skinny that down, frankly. What we're
19 really trying to do is get the decision-making process
20 underway, and it requires us to prepare that written
21 response. And see, the EPA over here is putting me in a
22 significant squeeze to get the decision made in a
23 reasonable time. And I think that it's reasonable that we
24 do push that. But again, I don't want to -- I think -- I
25 want to accommodate you guys and we'll try to figure out

1 what we can do to do that.

2 MR. FARHNER: Okay. That sounds good.

3 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

4 That's the end of the questions or comments that we

5 have written on cards. If there is -- are there any

6 additional people who would like to make a comment or

7 question?

8 Okay. Gentlemen, if you would state your name and

9 spell your last name, please, since we don't have any

10 written information on you.

11 MR. FEMMER: My name is John Femmer, F-E-M-M-E-R.

12 I'm with the Operating Engineers in St. Louis.

13 I prepared written questions that were answered there,

14 but we talked a lot here about the rules and regulations

15 and I'd like to direct this to Mr. Powers of MK-Ferguson.

16 They say there is about thirty local contractors up

17 there that bid this work. The rest of them are out-of-town

18 companies. MK-Ferguson is allowing nonunion contractors up

19 there to bid work in 1985 prevailing wage determinations.

20 And to this date I haven't received anything that these

21 have been updated.

22 The local contractors are bidding the work up there at

23 1992 prevailing wage rates, which is about three dollars an

24 hour difference, and this is not a level playing field for

25 the local contractors. And I would like to see something

1 like a written letter under the Freedom of Information Act
2 and I'd like to see an answer to that in the next few
3 days. Thank you.
4 MS. SCHNEIDER: Sir, if you would again spell
5 your last name for the court reporter.
6 MR. QUIBBLY: My name is Bill Quibbly and I am
7 the coordinator for the training of Local 513.
8 And everybody, you know, you've already heard how much
9 the people are trained and that, but I would like to
10 emphasize our training is certified by the EPA to DOE.
11 We're also certified with the Department of Labor. We have
12 an eighty-hour course at our disposal where our people do
13 the certification, we include CPR and first-aid in our
14 training, and for us not to have any responsibility here is
15 just kind of obnoxious to my way of thinking.
16 So, I mean, we have not even been given the chance and
17 our qualifications is all recognized by these people
18 already and our program is honored by having the only
19 certification from the Department of Labor.
20 And I'd like to -- Steve, I'd like you to comment on
21 that.
22 MR. McCRACKEN: My bid is that your training
23 program is very good. I don't know much but about it, but
24 I'd be surprised if it weren't.
25 I can't make any comments on comparing the two

1 training programs, ours or yours or any other training
2 program, the people may get. I hate to sound as
3 repetitious as I do, because I know it's not satisfactory
4 to you. But with the competitive rules that we have to
5 live with, you know, I just don't know what -- what -- what
6 things that we can do that would not -- that would -- that
7 would satisfy the -- your all feeling that you ought to be
8 getting more of the work.
9 MR. QUIBBLY: Well, you know, we also include in
10 our training, supervisory training. I'm not so sure that
11 the training that you have, the eight-hour -- and it is an
12 eight-hour requirement, right?
13 MR. McCRACKEN: Uh-huh. Well, that's an update.
14 MR. QUIBBLY: You include that in your forty
15 hours, I'm not sure that is regulation.
16 MR. McCRACKEN: Well, why don't we get together
17 and talk about your training program. I mean --
18 MR. QUIBBLY: I believe -- I thought from -- John
19 and we were supposed to have a little meeting but it's
20 never occurred.
21 MR. McCRACKEN: Well, let's make it occur.
22 MR. QUIBBLY: I thank you.
23 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Anyone else?
24 (Applause.)
25 UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible) -- Francis Howell

1 High School and I support the extension of the deadline.
2 I'm one person reviewing that document. It is massive. I
3 don't think I need sixty days but any additional time we
4 can get would be appreciated. Thank you.
5 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Anyone else?
6 Yes, sir. In the back, and again if you would spell
7 your last name.
8 MR. WRIGHT: Wright, W-R-I-G-H-T.
9 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
10 MR. WRIGHT: I'd just like to make a statement to
11 the citizens here --
12 MS. SCHNEIDER: Could you get closer to the mike,
13 please.
14 MR. WRIGHT: -- to join with us and write your
15 congressman and see if you can get some of these qualified
16 trained people out there from this area.
17 MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
18 (Applause.)
19 MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes, ma'am?
20 MS. ROTH: My name is Jane Roth and I live in
21 Defiance, which is right past Weldon Spring, and I pass the
22 Quarry Plant every day on my way to work.
23 And I wanted to know what the projected date of the
24 inground, the dome, how many years?
25 MR. McCRACKEN: 2001.

1 MS. ROTH: Oh.

2 MR. McCRACKEN: That's if things go right.

3 MS. ROTH: Well, you know, you've been talking

4 about millions of dollars and you tossed the figures around

5 like, you know, two hundred million, it really don't sound

6 like a lot to you or something.

7 And I'm really wanting to talk about the esthetics of

8 the plant. Since I pass there every day, it seems like

9 you've improved the outside. The parking lots now look

10 like -- I don't know, shopping centers, paved with lights.

11 Even on the Weldon Spring you have a basketball net. Who

12 plays basketball?

13 MR. McCRACKEN: That's my personal basketball

14 net. I took it off my garage and took it out there and put

15 it up. So that's not the government's. And I'm taking

16 it with me when I leave.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MS. ROTH: And one more thing. This summer when

19 I passed, there was two men that spent the bigger part of

20 the summer painting the fence.

21 MR. McCRACKEN: Right.

22 MS. ROTH: Who cares about a painted fence?

23 MR. McCRACKEN: I told them to paint just the

24 front of the fence on the road. The reason being, that

25 thing's got to stand up for another ten years, and I wasn't

1 sure that it was going to. So --

2 MS. ROTH: Paint has nothing to do with the fence

3 standing up.

4 MR. McCRACKEN: Well, it's --

5 MS. ROTH: I just think you're wasting a lot of

6 money is what I mean.

7 MR. McCRACKEN: Okay.

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. SCHNEIDER: Anyone else?

10 MR. McCRACKEN: Can I make one comment? I'll

11 tell you how to save the most money on this project and

12 that is get the work done. My experience has been that if

13 you want to save costs on these kind of projects, then push

14 them to get them done, but do it without sacrificing

15 safety.

16 MS. ROTH: Well, you say you have two hundred and

17 sixty employees and each of you people up there all have

18 some sort of important title. Where's the workers?

19 MR. McCRACKEN: Well --

20 MR. ROTH: What's the payroll of all these

21 people?

22 MR. McCRACKEN: A lot.

23 MS. ROTH: I assume --

24 MR. McCRACKEN: And that's the reason it would be

25 very good to make decisions and get on with it. Because

1 every year that this project is extended, you're going to
2 pay for those two hundred and sixty people.
3 MS. ROTH: Who makes the decisions? You?
4 MR. McCRACKEN: Makes the decision on -- we're
5 trying and Mr. Morby over here is beating on me all the
6 time to do better.
7 MR. ROTH: I happen to be Mr. Roth. You heard my
8 wife. I happen to be the second guy hired out at that
9 Weldon Spring Plant. I worked in every building but one.
10 What gets me -- what's out there is fine. What's
11 going to happen, I hope it don't happen, but I'm afraid
12 it's going to, bring some more uranium from other places
13 and bring it in there. Handford National Lead, all the way
14 down the line.
15 I'm one of the guys that helped pump that raffinate
16 out there in that pits. I'm the one that took the PH's on
17 there. Some of them are high and some low. If they go in
18 and drain those pits, all you engineers know as well as I
19 do, when they stir that stuff up, they're going to run into
20 problems. There is going to be more and more problems.
21 I say what's out there, load it up and take it back to
22 Utah, Homestead Act, Mining, Beldon Congo, all them places
23 where that uranium came from.
24 I live out there. I lived out there thirty-one
25 years. I'm like my wife. I pass there five o'clock in the

1 morning, it's just like a hotel. Everything's lit up.
2 What's them people doing down there in that pumping station
3 ten after five? Surely nobody can watch a pump? I watched
4 pumps for seven years out there.
5 There is something going wrong out there. They're
6 spending the taxpayers' money. We want that place cleaned
7 up and cleaned up right.
8 Steve, I think you're doing a good job but there is
9 too much money being spent and the whole problem is not
10 getting the work done, that's the whole problem. Thank
11 you.
12 MS. SCHNEIDER: Anyone else?
13 Going once. If you would like to make a question or
14 comment, please, this is your last chance to do it because
15 we want to wind this up.
16 Okay. Hearing no other -- no interest in that, what
17 I'd like to do is thank you all and thank you all
18 particularly for observing the time limit so we can get out
19 of here and get home at a reasonable hour.
20 The exhibits will still be available there for at
21 least a little while, I guess, so you might want to go get
22 some information. And again, public comment period with
23 written information goes through January 20th, so please
24 feel free to get that information in.
25 Thank you.

1 THE STATE OF MISSOURI)
)
2 COUNTY OF ST. CHARLES)

3

4 I, Sandra McGraw, a stenotype reporter and notary
5 public in and for the State of Missouri, do hereby certify
6 that I was present and reported all of the proceedings had
7 and entered of record in this cause, and I further certify
8 that the foregoing pages contain an accurate reproduction
9 of my shorthand notes of said proceedings.
10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
11 affixed my notarial seal on this 4th day of January, 1993.
12
13 My commission expires July 19, 1993.
14
15 Sandra McGraw
Sandra McGraw,
16 Notary Public.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25