

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

MEETING MINUTES
Fairmont Community Liaison Panel
August 5, 1999

Attendees: Barry Bledsoe, Tammy Currey, Tom Grabb, Bruce McDaniel, Kevin McClung, Tom Vincent, John Watson, Norma Watson, Marcella Yaremchuck.

Exxon Representatives: Art Chin, John Hannig.

Agency Representatives: Melissa Whittington, Hilary Thornton, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); Thomas Bass, West Virginia Division of Environmental Protection (WVDEP).

Contractors: Frank Markert, IT Corporation.

Guests: Jackie Marhefka, Fairmont Times-West Virginian; Griff Fowler; Louis McDonald; Shana Johnson, Channel 12; Jenni Vincent, Morgantown Dominion-Post.

Facilitator: Mary Lovejoy Rebhan, Ann Green Communications, Inc.

Minutes: Dan T. Londeree, Ann Green Communications, Inc.

The August meeting of the Fairmont Community Liaison Panel (FCLP) was called to order at 5:40 p.m. by Mary Lovejoy Rebhan, facilitator. Mary said she was filling in for Roberta Fowlkes. Mary asked panel members and guests to introduce themselves. Melissa Whittington of EPA announced she will be moving to San Francisco in September and will not be attending meetings as regularly. She introduced Hilary Thornton, a project manager who will work with the panel as her liaison.

Mary reviewed the agenda, and there were no additions. She also reviewed the FCLP Ground Rules. Approval of the July meeting minutes was tabled until the September meeting.

Unfinished Business

Project Update

John reviewed the project update handout. [A copy is attached for those not present.] He described a new work item, entitled "Additional Waste Characterization," which consists of approximately 50 soil borings being done in the Waste Management Area. He said this work will provide more specific information to determine if alternatives being considered for the Waste Management Area are feasible.

John said Exxon has contracted with Federal Investigative Associates (FIA) for security at the site. He said FIA will begin providing site security after the field work is complete and IT is no longer present on a daily basis. He said signs will be put up with a contact number for use in the event someone needs access to the site.

John reviewed plans for the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) reports. He said there will be two EE/CA reports generated. The first will address the Waste Management Area and will likely be submitted to the agencies before the next panel meeting. The second will address the Process Area and will be done next year. He explained that the reports are being phased to speed up the process of starting work in the Waste Management Area. The Waste Management Area EE/CA Report will contain the sampling data from the Waste Management Area, a semi-quantitative human health and ecological risk assessment and a discussion of removal action alternatives. The review process includes an internal EPA and WVDEP review process, followed by a 30-day public comment period. Melissa added that the EE/CA report will be available for the panel to see before the 30-day comment period begins. She said a copy of the report will be placed in the repository at the Marion County Library. She plans to give a presentation at a future FCLP meeting regarding the recommended solution for the Waste Management Area.

John reviewed the status of the preliminary site assessment, which is step one of the redevelopment phase of the project. This work addresses future site use parameters, site marketability, infrastructure and the positives and negatives of the property. He said he is working with IT and McCabe-Henley to advance the redevelopment plans. John is planning to give a brief presentation at the next panel meeting on the preliminary site assessment work.

Presentation on Data Analysis of Groundwater

Art Chin presented the initial groundwater sampling data for the site. He said unlike the earlier soil presentations, an analysis of groundwater is conducted on a site-wide basis, rather than limited to separate areas of the site. He said any groundwater

contamination found is likely due to soil contamination, as confirmed by findings of similar chemicals in the soil and groundwater. Art distributed an outline of his presentation. [A copy is attached to these minutes for those not present.]

Art reviewed the procedure used to sample groundwater and the resulting data. He said wells were installed at three depths:

- a) Shallow (15-20 ft.)
- b) Intermediate (25-40 ft.)
- c) Deep (100+ ft.)

Art said the monitoring wells have been installed such that, if there are any questions about sampling results, the wells can be retested. He said the groundwater samples were tested for pesticides, in addition to the same chemicals for which the soil samples were tested.

Art said the intermediate zone is the only true aquifer on the site. He said the groundwater flows from the edges of the site to the center, moving away from residential areas. He said groundwater flow in the deep zone (bedrock) occurs in fractures in the rock. However, it appears as if these fractures are very tight, and little, if any, groundwater flow occurs in that portion of the bedrock, which has been examined. He said the data for the deep zone needs to be examined more closely.

In response to a question from Bruce McDaniel, Art said the groundwater samples were tested for any level of concentration of chemicals, regardless of how high or how low. He said technology allows for the detection of chemicals at extremely low concentrations. He said the lowest that can be detected is approximately one part per billion.

Art said several of the polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) found in the soil sampling were not found in groundwater sampling. He said this is positive, since the PAHs are of more concern than most other substances found onsite. He said most of the semi-volatile organic chemicals found in the water are methyl phenols. He said many of the metals found in the water are found naturally in soil. Art said all the chemicals detected in the groundwater also were detected in the soils. He said analysis also was done to compare the concentrations found in each level.

In response to a question from Tom Vincent, Art said at this time, he does not know if the groundwater is flowing from the site to a surface location. He said he still needs to see if there is any impact to surface water. Art said the important thing is knowing which way groundwater is flowing, which is away from residents. In response to a suggestion from Mary, Art said flow rates of the groundwater are not applicable to

the shallow or deep zones. He said he does not yet know the flow rate in the intermediate zone. Frank Markert said groundwater flow rates are typically described in feet per year instead of feet per second, much slower than surface water.

Melissa said no immediate action is planned regarding groundwater because groundwater is not flowing towards residential areas and there are no residential wells in the area of the site.

In response to a question from Bruce McDaniel, Art said sampling the Monongahela River to check for a correlation with data from the site would be of limited value. He said there would be no way to tell whether substances in the river are coming from the Fairmont Coke Works site or from the other industries located along the banks. Frank said the dilution factor would also come into play.

In response to a question, Art said that due to the nature of the materials detected onsite, migration of contaminants to offsite locations is not likely. He said the offsite migration via surface water from the light oil storage area may be a concern, and this is an area that is being studied more closely. In response to a question from Louis McDonald, Art said analysis for organic volatile compounds in groundwater was done on unfiltered samples.

In response to a question from Melissa, Frank said that monitoring well MW13S was screened in waste material, which accounts for the high levels of benzene. Frank said Well 13S is a shallow well.

Art said the objective of his presentation is to familiarize the panel with what contamination is being found on the site. He said the information will be coming out in the EE/CA report for the Waste Management Area, and this presentation may help panel members understand the information.

Melissa said the main factors in the process are the risk assessment, what standards will be set to compare the groundwater data, and whether there are any human or environmental receptors. She said more will be known in the future. Melissa said risk assessments will be done on surface water and sediment data, as well as groundwater.

Art said he will talk more about surface water and sediment issues in future panel meetings when the groundwater issue is addressed. Art said the preliminary findings indicate the shallow and intermediate zones have some contamination. He said there is no contamination in the deep zone. He said the concentrations in shallow levels are higher, which indicates the downward migration of contamination is limited. Melissa said the preliminary data has identified areas that need to be looked at. She said the

sampling was done well on the first attempt, thus eliminating any need to redrill any of the wells. Art said another positive is there was no free product (pure product, for example) found in the light oil storage area.

In response to a question from Norma Watson, Art said toluene is not a carcinogenic compound. Melissa offered to bring toxicological profiles of the compounds to the next meeting so panel members can see the characteristics of these substances. The panel agreed this information may help.

Art previewed the Waste Management Area EE/CA Report. He said this area is being dealt with now, because it has been mutually agreed upon that better management of the Waste Management Area is necessary. He said the additional waste characterization work John described earlier may move the target date of the report back, but these data are invaluable. He said that field work is expected to be finished by the end of August, and it would not be appropriate to submit the report before then. Art said this report will most likely contain three alternatives regarding the Waste Management Area:

- 1) Consolidate and cap all waste material onsite.
- 2) Complete offsite disposal of all contents onsite.
- 3) A combined approach using an onsite landfill and recycling those materials that can feasibly be recycled.

In response to a question from Bruce, Art said the breeze materials could possibly be recycled by power plants who could burn the material for energy. He said there are requirements regarding this practice, and these are being investigated. Art said if the EE/CA report on the Waste Management Area is submitted to the agencies in mid-August, a copy will also then be placed in the repository at the Marion County Library. Melissa said it may be more realistic to anticipate the report in September for the reasons Art shared. She said regardless, nothing will be finalized between now and the September meeting.

Art said when the onsite field work is complete and IT is no longer there, access to the area will be extremely limited. John added that the lock boxes will remain at each of the two gates to allow emergency responders access to the site if necessary.

Communication Update

Panel members had no new information to report. Mary said there have been no calls to the community information line.

Other Business

John said a photographer may come to the September meeting to take pictures for the article planned for Exxon's shareholder magazine, if the panel was comfortable. Panel members said they are comfortable with this.

Next Meeting

The next regular meeting will be September 2. The agenda will include a project update, a status report on the EE/CA report and a communication update. Tom Grabb will check on the status of the Offsite Subcommittee. Mary said Roberta will follow up with Tom.

There was no further business, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Next Meeting: Thursday, September 2, 1999
5 p.m. - Refreshments
5:30 p.m. - Meeting