MEETING MINUTES
Fairmont Community Liaison Panel
January 6, 2000

Attendees:	Amy Casto, Michael Cummings, Tom Grabb (attending for Mark Thompson), Georgeann Grewe, Karen Gribben, Bruce McDaniel, Barbara Metcalfe, Kevin McClung, Ronnie Vangilder (attending for Chief Wimer), Norma Watson, 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:	Griff Fowler; Jackie Marhefka, Fairmont Times-West Virginian; Wayne Stutler; Doug Taylor.
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 at 5:30 p.m. by Roberta Fowlkes, facilitator. Roberta introduced Amy Casto, a new member of the panel. Roberta said Amy is replacing Tammy Currey from Congressman Mollohan's office. She said Tammy accepted a job in Charleston. Roberta also introduced Ronnie Vangilder of the Fairmont Fire Department. She said Chief Wimer retired and Ronnie will represent the department until a new chief is named. Roberta welcomed all guests and asked them to introduce themselves.

Roberta asked John Hannig to deliver his news regarding the Exxon-Mobil merger before continuing with the scheduled agenda. John said that, since the November 1999 panel meeting, the Exxon-Mobil merger has been completed. He said the name of the company is now ExxonMobil.

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

Presentation: EE/CA Report for Waste Management Area

Melissa Pennington gave a presentation regarding the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) Report for the Waste Management Area. [Melissa's slides are included with these minutes. A map used by Melissa is also included.] Melissa reviewed how and why the site has been divided into two areas: the Waste Management Area and the Process Area. She said many of the wastes produced in the Process Area were disposed of in the Waste Management Area. She said the decision was made to deal with the Waste Management Area first because more is known about this area of the site.

Melissa said the EE/CA is the investigation and evaluation done for non-time critical removal actions. She said these actions allow for quicker cleanups than the typical Superfund remedial actions used at many other sites. She reviewed the course of action after the Waste Management Area and the Process Area are complete, which includes reinstating the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) order which has been suspended during the EE/CA phase. She said this order already has been negotiated with ExxonMobil. She said the RI/FS is the typical investigation that is done at Superfund sites. She said the RI/FS will address groundwater and any other items which may be discovered during the course of the work.

Melissa reviewed the different parts of the Waste Management Area. She said these include the sludge impoundment (referred to in the EE/CA report as the existing sludge and breeze storage impoundment), north landfill, south landfill and breeze washout area. Melissa identified each area on the map as follows:

4A- north landfill
4B- south landfill
5- low-lying area above the north landfill
6- existing oxidation pond
7- sludge impoundment

8A- at one time thought to be separate from south landfill, but is actually part of it

8B- one of the two oxidation ponds that existed before EPA removal actions; it is no longer present

Melissa said the exact boundaries of the landfills are now known, and the materials that are in the landfills are known as well. She said the materials in the landfills are consistent with the operations at the Fairmont Coke Works site, including coal and coke. She said there also is construction debris, such as clay, steel, pipes, wood chips and railroad ties. She said these landfills were used to dispose of waste from the production areas as well as other miscellaneous items that were no longer needed. She said it is also now known that the sludge impoundment contains coal and coke, ash-like material, glass, metal, gravel and clay. She said no buried drums were found onsite.

Melissa said the contaminants present onsite also are known. She reviewed these contaminants and the levels at which they were found. She said her slides show the maximum contaminant level for each chemical. This means the substance was found at that maximum level in at least one location. She said this does not mean the contaminant was found at that level at each location.

She said it has been learned that contamination is at higher levels in the subsurface than it is on the surface. She said this is a positive because there is less potential for direct exposure to contaminated material. She said there also is less opportunity for contaminants in the soil to migrate offsite. She said for the most part, the subsurface contamination is not traveling into the groundwater. She said the types of contamination found are not very mobile, and the levels detected in the groundwater are not as high as expected.

Melissa explained why a specific risk assessment has not been done for the Waste Management Area. She said although this area is not a risk to the surrounding community, it is already known that it could be a risk for someone working onsite in the future. She said a risk assessment is typically done to document there is a risk that requires action. She said ExxonMobil has already committed to taking action in this area, negating the need for the assessment.

Melissa said EPA, WVDEP and ExxonMobil have used EPA's presumptive remedies to decide what needs to be done with the Waste Management Area. [A handout regarding presumptive remedies is included with these minutes for those not present.] She said relying on these remedies does not mean no investigations are done, it just means the investigations are done in a more streamlined manner. She said using presumptive remedies is a method that calls on EPA's Superfund experience. She said

this allows for speeding up the selection of a cleanup action, because the choice is narrowed to alternatives that have been proven to work at similar sites.

Melissa presented the contaminants of concern that are above screening levels. [This information is included in the slides, which are attached to these minutes.] Melissa asked Art Chin to explain which screening levels were used. Art explained EPA Region III created generic industrial exposure levels. He said this was done by determining the average time an industrial worker could be exposed to contaminants onsite if the site was again active as an industrial site. He said it does not take into account exposure through drinking the groundwater, because the source of drinking water for the site would not come from under the site. He said EPA has taken the industrial exposure and the toxicity of each contaminant to create a level for each contaminant onsite. He said this screening level is designed to be a very conservative benchmark. In addition for non-carcinogens, this level is further divided by a factor of ten for additional conservatism.

Melissa said she brought toxicological profiles for arsenic, benzene and the polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), so panel members could read about the characteristics of these contaminants. She said they are available for anyone to take, and she can have more copies made if needed. Art said PAHs were first found when a link was made between chimney sweeps in England and a certain type of cancer. He said these substances are found in soot, and it is expected they would be found on this site due to the burning of coal.

Melissa presented what action will be taken to clean up the oxidation pond. She said this action will be taken before the rest of the Waste Management Area is dealt with. She said the pond was used for water treatment by Sharon Steel and has not been maintained since the plant was shut down in 1979. Melissa said the main problem with the pond is that the water has a very low pH, meaning it is acidic. She said the water in the oxidation pond is trickling out the back of the pond into an unnamed tributary. She said this is not an immediate contamination problem because of the small amount of water leaving the pond, but it needs to be taken care of soon. Melissa said ExxonMobil is still working on the details, but the preliminary plan is to have a concrete chamber built between the back of the pond and the unnamed tributary. She said the pH of the water in the oxidation pond will be adjusted to bring the water back to a more neutral state. She said following this adjustment, the water will be drained out of the pond through the concrete chamber. She said this will not be a sudden massive flow of water, but rather will be a controlled flow, and the concrete chamber will contain a mechanism to sample the water as it flows through.

Melissa said after the pond is drained, the remaining material will be tested for contaminants. She said if there is contamination, the material will be removed; if there

is no contamination, the soil will be left as is and the pond will be engineered to prevent it from filling up again. In response to a question, Art said the results from the analysis of the existing water in the pond should be returned within a week. He said the work regarding the pond could be completed one month after receiving the results. He said the engineering of the pond will be looked at more closely when investigating the surface water management of the site.

Melissa presented the three alternatives being evaluated to deal with the Waste Management Area. They are as follows:

1. **Consolidation and capping**
   Involves excavation of materials from the north landfill, breeze washout area and sludge impoundment and movement of that material to the south landfill. Also involves capping of the south landfill and groundwater monitoring and cap maintenance program.

2. **Excavation of materials and offsite disposal**
   Involves excavation of materials from the north and south landfills, breeze washout area and sludge impoundment and transportation of materials to a proper offsite disposal facility.

3. **Recycling and capping**
   Involves excavation of materials from the north landfill, breeze washout area and sludge impoundment and analysis for possible recycling of materials. Also involves movement of materials not recycled to the south landfill. Also involves capping of the south landfill and groundwater monitoring and cap maintenance program.

Melissa reviewed how each alternative will be evaluated against three criteria: 1) risk reduction, 2) feasibility and 3) cost. She said all reduce risk and all are easily implemented, and the biggest difference between these three alternatives is cost. She said although none of the alternatives offer a low cost, numbers one and three are significantly less than number two. She said ExxonMobil will be committing a substantial amount of money to the future stages of the project, regardless of which alternative is chosen. She said the company already has shown its commitment in the work done to date. She said EPA and WVDEP have evaluated whether a high-cost alternative will give results worth that higher cost. She said in this case, alternative number three provides just as much risk reduction as the other alternatives for a more reasonable cost than alternative number two.

In response to a question, Melissa said ExxonMobil and IT are currently analyzing the feasibility of excavating the south landfill to remove recyclable material if alternative three is chosen. Frank Markert said the material that potentially could be recycled is the coal and coke. He said this material may have an energy value.

Melissa said the next step regarding EE/CA is to have a complete report approved by EPA and submitted to the repository. In response to a question, Melissa said she will check into posting the EE/CA report on the EPA website during the public comment period. She said after the public comment period is closed, EPA will evaluate comments. She said EPA will document the comments and responses. She said EPA will then issue an action memorandum that identifies the selected action. Following this, ExxonMobil would submit a work plan to be reviewed and approved by EPA. She said the goal is to begin work during the 2000 construction season.

Melissa said work is continuing on the work plan for the Process Area EE/CA. She said this plan includes the cleanup alternatives for this area, as well as the human health and ecological risk assessments for the entire site. She said as soon as the work plan is complete, ExxonMobil can begin work on the EE/CA report for the Process Area. She said the process then follows the same steps as for the Waste Management Area.

In response to a question, Melissa said the groundwater monitoring work done for the Waste Management Area will work consistently with long-term monitoring for the entire site. She said the long-term monitoring initially will include quarterly sampling of groundwater monitoring wells. In response to a question, Melissa said EPA guidance describes "long-term" as 30 years. She said the goal is to eventually reduce the frequency of sampling, depending on what is found. She said the 30-year timeframe is used for cost estimation, but in reality the sampling will be done in perpetuity. In response to a question, Melissa said ExxonMobil will be responsible for monitoring regardless of who purchases the property in the future.

Unfinished Business

Project Update

John Hannig reviewed the project update handout. [A copy is attached for those not present.] He said fence repairs and sub-basement closure are complete. He reviewed the oxidation pond closure and referenced Melissa's explanation of that activity.

John reviewed plans for the EE/CA reports and referenced Melissa's presentation regarding future steps involved in the process. He said the site redevelopment target marketing plan is undergoing broker selection. John also noted an item entitled "Purchase of Remaining Landfill Parcel," and said he is happy to report ExxonMobil has purchased four additional acres of property adjacent to the site, including a two-acre parcel, which is part of the north landfill. He said the property was owned by a local family and was needed to move forward with plans for the Waste Management Area.

Communication Update

Norma Watson said she has been asked about yellow posts, which are a recent addition to the site. Frank Markert said they are monitoring wells. Bruce McDaniel said he received results from drinking water sampling done in response to community concerns. He said no contamination was found in any samples taken, which is what he expected to find. He said this should show that drinking water in the area is not being impacted by the site.

John reviewed a letter he has drafted for eventual mailing to approximately 600 residents living near the site. He said the purpose of the letter is to let residents know what has been happening on the site and to keep them informed about future work. He said the letter has undergone revisions after feedback from the panel in November. He said he has added the names of panel members at the end of the letter and he asked for final feedback from panel members by Thursday, January 13. A suggestion was made to use thicker paper and John agreed.

Karen Gribben said she wrote an article regarding the site and the panel for the West Virginia League of Women Voters newsletter. She said she hopes to get the article into the national newsletter.

New Business

Project XL Teleconference

Melissa said EPA headquarters has hired a contractor to do an evaluation of all Project XL sites. She said the contractor is doing quarterly reports on the progress of the sites, and has asked if one or two panel members would volunteer to be involved in a teleconference regarding the site. Melissa said agency and company representatives will be involved in the teleconference and will be answering questions regarding the project. She said the purpose of having panel representatives is to receive community

feedback about the site. Melissa said all that is asked of panel volunteers is to answer general questions regarding how well they believe the process is working.

Michael Cummings volunteered to be involved, and the panel suggested Nick Fantasia also be involved. Roberta said Nick will be contacted. Melissa said she will work with the volunteers to schedule a time and date for the teleconference. She said anyone else interested in being involved should call Roberta at 1-800-784-4343.

Next Meeting

After a discussion, it was agreed the next meeting will be Thursday, February 10. The EE/CA report will be mailed to panel members before this meeting to allow members to review the document. Panel members agreed they would be ready with comments regarding the report at the February meeting.

The February agenda will include a presentation of the Waste Management Area EE/CA report, panel feedback regarding the report, a project update and a communication update.

There was no further business, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: **Thursday, February 10, 2000**
Circle W Building
5 p.m. - Refreshments
5:30 p.m. - Meeting