MEETING MINUTES
Fairmont Community Liaison Panel
February 10, 2000

Attendees:	Michael Cummings, Nick Fantasia, Georgeann Grewe, Karen Gribben, Bea Hunter, Bruce McDaniel, Barbara Metcalfe, Kevin McClung, John Parks, Robert Sapp, Robert Starnor and Gregg Freme (attending for Ronnie Vangilder), Ron Swope, Mark Thompson, Marcella Yaremchuk.
ExxonMobil Representatives:	Art Chin, John Hannig.
Agency Representatives:	Melissa Pennington, Hilary Thornton, Rich Kuhn, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); Tom Bass, West Virginia Division of Environmental Protection (WVDEP).
Contractor:	Frank Markert, IT Corporation.
Guests:	Michael Buege, Wanda Bower, Griff Fowler, Jim Martin, Cynthia Ray, Wayne Stutler.
Facilitator:	Roberta Fowlkes, Ann Green Communications, Inc.
Minutes:	Dan T. Londeree, Ann Green Communications, Inc.

The regular meeting of the Fairmont Community Liaison Panel (FCLP) was called to order by facilitator Roberta Fowlkes at 5:30 p.m. Guests introduced themselves.

Griff Fowler thanked ExxonMobil for the company's donation of $5,000 to East Fairmont High School. He said the money will be used to enhance an existing nature trail at the school. John Hannig said the nature trail at the school needs some work, and the school plans to create some wetlands along the trail, including a pond. John thanked

Griff and said this would not have been possible if Griff had not approached ExxonMobil about the project.

Roberta reviewed the agenda and there were no additions. The minutes of the January meeting were approved as distributed.

New Business

Feedback on Waste Management Area EE/CA Report

There was no initial feedback from the panel regarding the Waste Management EE/CA Report.

Presentation: Details of the Removal Action Alternatives

Art Chin presented the details of removal action alternatives contained in the Waste Management Area EE/CA Report. He presented what he believes to be the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative. [Art's slides are attached to these minutes.] He asked panel members to think about what they believe are the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative. He said that instead of comparing the alternatives to each other, these should be looked at individually to see if they meet the expectations of the panel. He said the purpose of the panel is not to be in a "review and comment mode." He said instead, the panel should be as much involved in the decision making process as possible.

Art reviewed Alternative One, known as "Consolidation and Landfill Capping." He said this alternative consists of the excavation of waste from three areas: 1) north landfill, 2) waste sludge/breeze storage area, and 3) the oxidation impoundment. He said this alternative would consolidate 60,000 cubic yards of waste into the south landfill, resulting in an area of five acres that would be capped. Art referenced Frank Markert's discussion several months ago regarding what a landfill cap consists of. He said this alternative also consists of the regrading of the Waste Management Area, a surface water management and a program to monitor landfill cap integrity and performance.

Art reviewed what he believes are the advantages and disadvantages of Alternative One. [This information is included in the slides, which are attached to these minutes]. Art said the technology exists to properly manage the consolidated waste in Alternative One. In response to a question, Art said a properly designed parking lot could be built on the area. Frank Markert said a parking lot could be built on it, but a large structure could not. He said there are weight limits regarding the capped area.

In response to a question, Frank said the capped area would have about a 20 percent slope on the sides. Approximately three acres of flat area would be present when the cap is finished. He said building a parking lot on top of the capped area can be safe if done properly. Frank said landfill designs are able to support 3,000 pounds per square foot, which includes most methods of road transportation.

Art reviewed the air monitoring program involved with Alternative One. He said the purpose of this program is to protect workers onsite and residents who live near the site. Art said once the cap is in place, there will be no more air monitoring because a physical barrier will be present. He said the only reason air monitoring would be done after the cap is in place is if the cap has been compromised. Frank Markert explained that while work is being done onsite, there are three levels of air monitoring: 1) in the hole where workers are working, 2) at the edge of the hole and 3) at the fence line. Art said in all areas that are excavated, the soil left behind will be sampled to make sure there are no contaminants present above screening levels.

In response to a question, Art said Alternative One is the most restrictive in terms of redevelopment of the site, but there is not a large difference in this area among the three alternatives.

In response to a question, Art said this is only site in the area owned by Green Bluff Development Inc., a subsidiary of ExxonMobil. He said Hazmat Environmental Contractors filed a mechanics lien against part of the Fairmont Coke Works site. Frank said Hazmat was contracted by ICF Kaiser (now IT Group), and the mechanics lien issue was resolved. He said he believed the lien had been released. Art also said the Fairmont Coke Works site is completely separate from the Marion Docks site, and Green Bluff has no ownership in the Marion Docks site.

Art reviewed Alternative Two, known as "Excavation and Off-site Disposal." He said this alternative consists of the excavation of waste from three areas: 1) north landfill, 2) waste sludge/breeze storage area, and 3) the oxidation impoundment. He said this alternative would result in the transportation offsite of approximately 135,000 cubic yards of waste. He said the waste would be transported to a facility where the waste will be disposed of properly. He said after the material has been removed, the Waste Management Area would be regraded and a surface water management program would be implemented.

In response to a question, Frank said if Alternative Two is used, clean fill material would be used in regrading the area. He said the area would not be brought back up to its existing elevation, but the area would not collect water because it would be tiered. Art said the future use of the site will be industrial, regardless of what

alternative is used. He said based upon what ExxonMobil heard from the community, the intent has always been to clean the property in such a manner that it can be used for industrial purposes in the future. He said ExxonMobil will not redevelop the site, but will clean the site to prepare it for industrial redevelopment.

Art reviewed what he believes are the advantages and disadvantages of Alternative Two. [See attachment].

In response to a question, Art said if the air monitoring picks up nothing at the point where workers are working, then no airborne contaminants are getting into the air. He said the reason for having monitoring right at the point of work is to catch anything before it leaves the site. He said if airborne contaminants are detected, work will immediately stop and efforts will be made to contain the contaminants. In response to a question, Art also said Green Bluff acquired the timbering rights to the property to prevent any timbering onsite.

Art reviewed Alternative Three, known as "On-site Landfill and Off-site Recycling." He said this alternative consists of the excavation of waste from three areas: 1) north landfill, 2) waste sludge/breeze storage area, and 3) the oxidation impoundment. He said this alternative would recycle high quality coke matrix material collected from the waste, and the rest of the waste would be consolidated into the south landfill. He said this would result in an area of 4 1/2 acres that will be capped. He said Alternative Three also consists of the regrading of the Waste Management Area, surface water management and a monitoring program which monitors landfill cap integrity and performance.

Art reviewed what he believes are the advantages and disadvantages of Alternative Three [included in the attached]. Art said the sludge from the oxidation pond consists of sediments deposited from the surface water network onsite and the materials contained in the sediments. Frank said the oxidation impoundment sediments do not have a recycling value. He said most likely any recyclable material will come from the landfill. He said the monetary value of the recyclable material is not comparable to the cost of removing the material and sending it to be recycled.

In response to a question, Frank said the landfill will not be landscaped all the way to the hillside onsite. He said there will be a channel at the foot of the hill that will continue to capture the surface water runoff from the hillside. He said the runoff will not be able to affect the landfill. Melissa Pennington said there are very specific standards for landfill caps, and EPA is very sensitive to the surface water flow on the site.

In response to a question, Art said there is flexibility built into the plan to deal with possible additional waste from the Process Area. He said if additional waste is found in this area, the option exists to consolidate it into the south landfill. He said there will be no new landfills created onsite.

Oxidation Impoundment Closure

Frank presented information about the oxidation impoundment closure. Frank said the impoundment was one of two onsite created by Sharon Steel in the 1960s. He said one was removed by EPA in 1994. He said the impoundment that still exists was dredged and re-graded by EPA in 1994 and the sediment material was taken out at that time. He said the sediment material that now exists in the impoundment has been there for six years.

Frank said in December 1998, surface water, seep and sediment samples were taken from and around the impoundment. He said more samples were taken in December 1999 to determine what work needed to be done to neutralize the impoundment. Frank reviewed the statistics of the impoundment: it covers 0.4 acres, contains 600,000 gallons of water, is five to eight feet deep and contains 18 inches (or approximately 1,600 tons) of sediment.

Frank said Sharon Steel operated under a set of limits known as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System limits. He said these limits had to be met for the plant to legally discharge into the unnamed tributary. Frank said these limits were applied to the current impoundment, and the substances over the limits were as follows:

- iron
- manganese
- benzene
- pH levels

Frank said it takes one pound of calcium carbonate per 100 gallons of water to neutralize the water in the impoundment. He said the sediments at the bottom will be solidified by adding cement to it. When the water is neutralized, the two metals that were found to be over the limits (iron and manganese) will be precipitated out through changing the condition of the water. He said the calcium carbonate will be added over the course of a few days, and the metals will drop into the sediments during this period of time. He said when the water is completely neutralized, it will be pumped from the surface and will pass through granular activated carbon to absorb any organic materials present. He said the water will be pumped into the tributary at 100 gallons per minute over the course of a few days.

Frank said after the water is pumped off the impoundment, 80 tons of cement will be mixed with the remaining sediment material. He said the material will then be transported to a temporary stockpile adjacent to the south landfill. He said the stabilized material will be dealt with at a later time and will remain stable until such time. He said the sediment material will be excavated until native soil is reached, so no material will be left behind in the impoundment.

Frank said the low-lying area left after the impoundment is drained will still have water draining into it. He said the water still draining into the area from the site will be treated, the area will be regraded, and vegetation will be planted to prevent erosion. He said once the landfill has a cap in place, the water will stop flowing from the Waste Management Area. He said limestone cobbles on top of a liner will be used to treat the water until the landfill cap is in place.

In response to a question, Frank said the benzene in the water now flowing into the unnamed tributary is sterile, due to the pH level of the water. He said once the tributary reaches the Monongahela River, it is diluted several thousand-fold; for this reason, the benzene has no environmental impact once it reaches the river.

In response to a question, Frank said the surface water flowing from the site does not contain levels of benzene that exceed limits. He said the benzene has settled into the sediment. Also, he said there will be no liner below the waste located in the landfill, because the groundwater table onsite will not rise to the level of the waste.

Tom Bass said regulatory personnel will revisit the site yearly to ensure there are no problems. He said at closed sites where this technology was used, he has not found any problems upon revisiting.

Wetlands

Tom presented information regarding the issue of wetlands onsite. He said the issue has been a point of discussion since October 1999. He said since then, the West Virginia Office of Water Resources and the West Virginia Division of Natural Resources visited the site and examined the areas under discussion.

Tom showed photographs of the area being discussed and said it is in the former coal and coke storage area. He said this area contains a draining channel that has not been draining properly and has been retaining water. He said the area meets two of the three criteria for wetlands. He said the EPA Biological Technical Assistance Group (BTAG) has taken the stance that this is a wetlands area. He said WVDEP has been in discussions with EPA regarding this area, because WVDEP disagrees with the

assessment that it is a wetlands area. Tom said he hopes the issue will be resolved in the near future. Tom said the criteria for wetlands are as follows:

- vegetation
- hydrology (standing water)
- hydric soils

Tom said the area being discussed does not meet the criteria of hydric soils. In response to a question, Melissa said the only reason the area has been retaining water is because, during the prior EPA removal action, the grading of the soil was not done properly. Melissa said a reasonable solution to the issue has not yet been achieved.

Art said completion of the work plan for the Process Area of the site is essential to moving forward with the work in that area. He said the issues of wetlands and terrestrial habitats are the two issues that need to be dealt with before the work plan can be completed. He said if there are wetlands and/or terrestrial habitats, an ecological risk assessment must be part of the work plan. He said if neither are present, the ecological risk assessment will not be part of the work plan for the Process Area.

Michael Cummings said he and Nick Fantasia participated in a conference call when this was discussed, and he believes there should be no wetlands issue. Melissa said she made it clear in her last meeting regarding this issue that the community response indicated this issue is not one of concern. Michael said he is an environmentally conscious person and does not want to see a true wetland removed just so more jobs can be brought into the area. He said although he is concerned about the environment, he does not see the reason for this issue to put a hold on the work onsite.

Art said, from ExxonMobil's point of view, this is not an insignificant issue. He said the company regards this as an important issue and, like all other parties involved, is searching for the proper solution.

A discussion followed regarding the wetlands issue. In response to a question, Tom said if the area onsite is determined to be wetlands, ExxonMobil must create another wetlands area onsite. Art presented a picture of the area when the site was in industrial use.

In response to a question, Tom said the area has been estimated at three acres, but he believes it is less than an acre.

Unfinished Business

Project Update

John reviewed the Project Update. [A copy of the update is included with these minutes for those not present.] John said efforts are being made to conduct different aspects of work at the same time to ensure a quicker site cleanup. He said field activities and redevelopment activities are happening simultaneously to move this process forward. He said a typical Superfund site takes 10-12 years to complete, and the objective of Project XL is to do this in five to six years. He said he would like for the project to keep up the pace it has maintained over the past year.

Communication Update

Roberta referenced the letter sent by John Hannig to the community. She apologized for not sending the letter to panel members and said it would be sent the following day. John said there were only minor changes to the version the panel saw at the last meeting.

EPA Teleconference

Melissa explained that EPA hired a contractor to evaluate the process of Project XL. She said the contractor was involved in the conference call, along with herself, Tom, Art, Michael and Nick. She said the contractor led those involved through a list of questions. Nick said he believes the teleconference took a day that could have been used to work on the project itself. Michael said he and Nick, as community members, could not comment on many of the questions asked by the contractor. Melissa said the contractor will use the conference call and other information gathered to create a report to be submitted to EPA management. Melissa said she will give the minutes of the call to anyone interested.

Next Meeting

A discussion followed regarding the next meeting. The panel decided the next meeting will be March 30, due to the need to have a meeting during the public comment period for the Waste Management Area EE/CA Report. Melissa explained the next meeting will double as a panel meeting and public meeting for the EE/CA public comment period. She said there is no specific requirement for having a public meeting, but this method is preferred. Art encouraged community members to send comments regarding the EE/CA Report before the next meeting. He said residents can e-mail them or call the Community Information Line [(800) 250-3868].

There was no further business, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Next Meeting: **March 30, 2000**
Circle W Building
5 p.m. – Refreshments
5:30 p.m. – Meeting