

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

MEETING MINUTES
Fairmont Community Liaison Panel
April 13, 2000

Attendees: Georgeann Grewe, Karen Gribben, Bea Hunter, John Parks, Ron Swope, Mark Thompson, Tom Vincent, Norma Watson, Rick Starn.

ExxonMobil
Representative: 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: Wanda Bower; Margie Davis; Griff Fowler; Donna Hartley; Jackie Marhefka, Fairmont Times-West Virginian; Jim Martin; Chris Matta, EPA; Lisa Quinones, ExxonMobil contract photographer; Cynthia Ray; William Tarleton; 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 5:35 p.m. Guests introduced themselves.

John introduced Lisa Quinones, a contract photographer for ExxonMobil. He said she is taking photographs of the panel during the meeting for the corporation's

annual report on safety, health and the environment. He said these three aspects of the business have been grouped together because they are the most important parts of the business. John said he will bring copies of the annual report to a future FCLP meeting when the publication is printed. John added he has brought with him copies of the ExxonMobil Lamp, the quarterly shareholder magazine, which contains an article on the Fairmont project and references to the panel. Copies were distributed to panel members and made available to guests.

Roberta reviewed the agenda and there were no additions. She explained the process for the meeting, including separate times for FCLP input and guest input. The minutes of the February meeting were approved as distributed.

Unfinished Business

Project Update

John presented a project update. He said the one area of work soon to be done is the oxidation impoundment closure. He said information regarding this work was presented during the January and February meetings. He said the water in the impoundment will be neutralized and then drained slowly into the Monongahela River. John said the sediment material at the bottom of the impoundment will be solidified with cement and later added to the consolidated landfill. Frank Markert added that, after the water is drained and the sediment solidified, a drainage ditch lined with limestone rocks will be created, and this will help further neutralize any runoff water before it exits the site.

John said the second area of work to be done is fence work. He said now that ExxonMobil has purchased the former Fischer property on the backside of the south landfill, the fence needs to be moved to encompass this property. He said there is another area where a gate needs to be repaired, as well as a section of fence, which was damaged when a tree limb fell on it.

John said there is an issue that needs to be clarified. He said the local newspaper listed three recent property transfers in Marion County involving ExxonMobil and Darden Properties in February. Having read the article, several panel members and other members of the community asked him if these property transfers were related to the Coke Works site. John said the answer is no, these property transfers are not related to the site. Rather, these property transfers involved three service stations owned by ExxonMobil that were bought by PPI. He said Darden Properties is handling the transfer for PPI. John asked those present to share this information with their neighbors.

New Business

Resolution of Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) Issues

Tom Bass reported on the finalizing of the Phase I (Waste Management Area) EE/CA report. He reviewed the handout with the summary of text changes to the EE/CA report. [A copy of this handout is included with these minutes for those not present.] Tom said the wetlands issue was resolved because the area in question was determined to be a drainage channel for the site, which is not draining properly. He said because this area is a drainage area, no wetlands mitigation is needed if the area needs to be removed. Tom said other issues resolved include the oxidation impoundment, the combination of the breeze washout area and north landfill and the Verification Sampling Program.

Melissa Pennington said the presentation of the resolution of the Verification Sampling Program was very detailed. She said this program determines how deep the excavation needs to be to remove material that will go to the consolidated landfill.

EE/CA, Action Memorandum Status Update

Hilary Thornton said the final draft version of the Phase I EE/CA report is now available for review in the Marion County Library. He said an ad in the newspaper on Tuesday, April 4, informed the community that the document is available for review. He said the public comment period will last until May 5. Hilary said by approving the Phase I EE/CA report, the EPA is supporting Alternative Three for cleanup, which includes the combination of consolidating waste into a single onsite landfill and recycling material that has high enough energy content. He said the decision is not final until the comment period is over and EPA has reviewed comments from the public. He said another document will be released after the comment period that summarizes and responds to public comments. He said this document is called an action memorandum. He said the purpose of this document is to provide a written record of the decision to select the appropriate remedial action.

Melissa said there are two locations in the library where information regarding the site is kept. She said there has been a running copy of meeting materials since the project began, and there also is a copy of materials specifically placed in the library for this public comment period.

Next Steps

Hilary presented information regarding what will happen next concerning the site. [A copy of these slides is included with these minutes.]

In response to a question, Hilary said Phase II of the project deals with the Process Area. He said once Phase II work is complete, the site will shift from Project XL back to the more traditional Superfund process, and groundwater will be addressed. Hilary said the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS), which began dealing with groundwater, was suspended when the site became a Project XL site. He said once Phase II is complete, groundwater work will resume.

In response to a question, Hilary said, hopefully, work will start during the summer, and the best outcome would see work completed before the end of the year. He said the timeline depends on the weather, and especially on when colder weather comes to Fairmont. As an example, he said the landfill cap will include a liner of plastic sheets that need to be welded together. He said this can only be done in certain temperature conditions. Frank added this work cannot be done any lower temperatures than 40 degrees.

In response to a question, Hilary said work on the Phase II EE/CA report will begin while fieldwork on Phase I is being done. John said he hopes that by the time the fieldwork on Phase I is being demobilized, the fieldwork on Phase II can begin. He said he is not sure whether this will happen, but this is the goal. Melissa said the investigation work for the entire site is complete, and all the initial data have been collected and analyzed. She said the goal is to complete Phase I work this construction season and begin Phase II work the following construction season. John said ExxonMobil has been working on the Phase I detailed engineering work plan, while agency reviews of the Phase I report are in progress. John said he hopes that soon after the action memorandum is complete, ExxonMobil will be able to have the Phase I detailed engineering work plan ready to submit to the agencies.

FCLP Comments on EE/CA, Proposed Cleanup Plan

A discussion followed in which panel members asked general questions regarding the cleanup alternatives. Representatives of the EPA, WVDEP, ExxonMobil and IT Corporation answered questions and offered clarification of issues. Melissa said these questions would not be included in the public record unless requested by panel members. Melissa asked if any of these questions need to be included, and the panel agreed these questions were for clarification purposes only. After this session concluded, panel members offered their official public comments.

Tom Vincent said he believes separating material for recycling will be very difficult and very costly, and could be unnecessary. He said when he worked at the site, materials such as railroad ties, bricks and breeze were dumped at different places onsite. He said it will be difficult to locate materials suitable for recycling. He said he believes the breeze found onsite will not be enough to pay for the process of finding it. He said the company hauled most of the breeze offsite when the plant closed, and he doesn't believe there is much breeze left onsite.

John Parks said he prefers Alternative Two, which includes excavation and offsite disposal, although he realizes that the cost for this alternative would be very high. He said he worries about the yearly cost of maintaining the landfill cap included in Alternative Three, because the cap will have to be maintained forever.

Ron Swope said he agrees the cost of Alternative Two has removed it from consideration, and he believes Alternative Three, which includes the consolidation of the landfills and the recycling of materials, is the best alternative.

Bea Hunter said she agrees Alternative Three is the best course of action.

She said the purpose of the FCLP was to try to get something done onsite faster and in an efficient manner. She asked whether the work is progressing as quickly as it should. Melissa and John stated the accelerated schedule is proceeding well so far.

Karen Gribben said she agrees with Alternative Three. She said ideally she would rather see no waste left onsite, but she believes Alternative Three is the most cost-effective, while still protecting human health and the environment. She said the trucks that do leave the site need to be covered, and air monitoring needs to be done while work is in progress.

Mark Thompson said he would rather see the waste taken offsite, and does not believe the cost should play such a large part in the decision. He said he believes the waste could be hauled offsite in a safe way. He said he is concerned about maintenance of the site for the future, but said he can live with the alternative that has been chosen.

Norma Watson said she would rather see all waste removed, because she lives very near the site. However, she said she lived through the time when Sharon Steel operated, and the waste currently onsite is not at all comparable to the pollution that was present when the plant was in operation. She said she is

happy that the site is much cleaner now, and she realizes removing all waste is not cost-effective.

Georgeann Grewe said she agrees with Alternative Three, and she is pleased that only 4.5 acres will be taken up by the landfill cap.

Rick Starn said he believes Alternative Three sounds like the most reasonable option.

In response to a question, Tom Bass said ExxonMobil is responsible for the maintenance of the site, regardless of who owns the site. Also, in response to a question, Tom said even if ExxonMobil goes bankrupt, Superfund itself will provide funds for the completion of the work, and then the operation and maintenance falls to the State of West Virginia. Frank said the yearly cost of maintaining the cap is approximately \$20,000. Hilary noted this is an estimate, and ExxonMobil will be required to spend whatever amount is needed from year to year. He said some years maintenance may be more and some years less.

The panel agreed it supports Alternative Three as the cleanup action. Rich explained any additional comments may be submitted by May 5.

Next Meeting

After discussion, the panel decided the next meeting will be June 1.

There was no further business, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Next Meeting: **June 1, 2000**
 Circle W Building
 5 p.m. – Refreshments
 5:30 p.m. – Meeting