MEETING MINUTES
Fairmont Community Liaison Panel
July 1, 1999

Attendees:	Bob Ashcraft (representing Bruce McDaniel), Barry Bledsoe, Tammy Currey, Nick Fantasia, Tom Grabb (representing Mark Thompson), Karen Gribben, Bea Hunter, Barbara Metcalfe, Kevin McClung, John Parks, Robert F. Sapp, Ron Swope, Tom Vincent, Chief Dave Wimer.
Exxon Representatives:	Art Chin, John Hannig.
Agency Representatives:	Richard Kuhn, Melissa Whittington, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); Thomas Bass, West Virginia Division of Environmental Protection (WVDEP).
Contractors:	Frank Markert, Stephen Spoull, George Werkman, IT Corporation.
Guests:	Bill Byrd, Fairmont Times-West Virginian; Griff Fowler; Salley Shannon; Wayne Stutler; Doug Taylor.
Facilitator:	Roberta P. Fowlkes, Ann Green Communications, Inc.
Minutes:	Dan T. Londeree, Ann Green Communications, Inc.

The July meeting of the Fairmont Community Liaison Panel was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by Roberta Fowlkes, facilitator. Guests introduced themselves, and John Hannig introduced Salley Shannon, who is a writer for the Exxon stockholder magazine. He said she would like to talk with panel members to gather information about the process of the panel.

Art Chin informed the panel George Werkman of IT will be moving to another site and will be back to the Fairmont Coke Works site periodically. Art thanked George for the job he has done on the site.

Roberta reviewed the agenda and there were no additions. Minutes for the May and June meetings were approved as distributed.

Unfinished Business

Project Update

John reviewed the project update handout [attached for those not present]. He said the piles of brick and concrete left from demolition of buildings will be crushed to three inches or less in diameter, and this material will be kept onsite for use as fill material. John said by the end of August there will be no demolition or crushing operations onsite, and there will be one or two mounds of crushed brick and concrete left to be used for redevelopment.

John said Exxon has contracted with Federal Investigative Associates (FIA) for security at the site. He said signs will be put up with a contact number if someone needs access to the site. He said an individual from FIA will stop by periodically and walk the site to ensure everything is secure.

He said the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) work plan includes an expanded site investigation work plan, a risk assessment work plan and a removal action alternatives work plan. He said the risk assessment work plan is being revised and will be resubmitted to the agencies. He said this includes the human health risk assessment and the ecological risk assessment. He said the EE/CA report will be complete in the fall/winter timeframe.

John called attention to a new item on the project update entitled "redevelopment." He said he has met with McCabe/Henley consultants and with an individual from Exxon who deals with land management issues to begin the initial phase of redevelopment, which is called a "preliminary site assessment." He said this stage deals with issues such as what is left on the site that can be used and what type of infrastructure is available to the site.

John Parks asked why Exxon is resubmitting the risk assessment to the agencies. Art said Exxon is simply revising the work plans in response to comments made by EPA. He said WVDEP also is part of the review process, and representatives from the Division offer revisions as well. Melissa said it is not uncommon for a work plan to be revised, and said it is rare for one to be approved upon the initial submission.

Art said most of the comments received dealt with clarification of Exxon's intentions. He said the basic concepts have been agreed upon during the Final Project Agreement (FPA) process and will be carried through until the end of the project.

Melissa said there is no designated time period for responses. She said the human health portion of the work plan has been revised and the ecological portion is undergoing revisions. Art said the three work plans still to be finalized are the human health risk assessment work plan, the ecological risk assessment work plan and the removal action alternative work plan. He said none of these work plans will delay the progress of the project. He said the focus has been on areas that need to be completed to do work at present.

Tom Bass said that, during an EPA Region 3 meeting, it was indicated the risk assessment work plan did not need to be complete to start work on the waste management area. He said in dealing with the landfills and the oxidation pond, there is a potential risk and further risk analysis is not needed to indicate this.

Presentation on Data Analysis of Process Area

Art presented the initial soil sampling data for the process area on the site. He said this area includes Potential Source Areas (PSAs) 1, 2 and 3. He said these PSAs include (1) the light oil storage area, (2) the coal and coke handling area and (3) the byproducts area. He said this area is the southern part of the site where the buildings were located.

Art showed a slide illustrating the 22 soil boring locations and pointed out the locations in each part of the process area. He presented sampling data for chemicals detected in soil samples. He provided summaries of data from the waste management area and the process area. [Copies of these summaries are attached for those not present.] Art said unlike the waste management area, where soil borings and trenching were done, the process area sampling included only soil borings.

Frank Markert said the ground water wells reach as far as the bedrock, and the soil borings went as deep as the water table (as deep as 20 feet). Art said soil samples are not taken underneath the water table because if something is detected, there is no way to determine if it is in the water or the soil. Frank said the water table varied from 8-10 feet to 20 feet.

Ron Swope asked if the water table measurements included seasonal variations. Frank said the water table was measured just after a period of drought, meaning the level of the table at that time was likely the lowest point throughout the year. Frank said

the ground water monitoring well construction would permit measurements through seasonal variations.

Art presented charts for each of 60 compounds that were detected onsite. He explained to panel members how to read the charts and pointed out the 14 compounds that exceeded the conservative preliminary screening criteria. [A summary of these findings is attached to these minutes.] Ron Swope asked if a sample contained 100,000 parts per million of a chemical, does this indicate 10 percent of the sample is made up of that chemical. Art affirmed 100,000 parts per million would be 10 percent. Art said every location was checked for all 121 chemicals.

Bea Hunter asked how panel members could tell how much of a chemical is present onsite and how much of a risk it is. For illustration, Art reviewed the chart for benzene. He said any sample exceeding the preliminary screening criterion, which is 20 parts per million for benzene, represents a potential risk and requires further evaluation. He said there were two samples out of 200 that exceeded the criteria for benzene. Art explained benzene was not detected in area 3, but was detected in areas 1 and 2. He said whether it is found in the groundwater still remains to be seen.

In response to a question, Art explained semi-volatile compounds are not as likely to vaporize as volatile compounds. He said these chemicals are not likely to be found in water because they are not very water-soluble. He said this group includes polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). He said these are of particular interest because some of them have been found to be carcinogenic.

Art said he is not surprised most of the exceedances are PAHs, but said he is somewhat surprised the levels in general are not higher. He noted this site did not treat or store hazardous chemicals, but instead was a production facility which manufactured a product to sell. He said it was good business for the company to minimize the loss of materials, and this probably contributed to the low levels of chemicals found in the soil.

Art reviewed the 14 chemicals that exceeded the criteria and their locations, whether surface or subsurface. He said anything between zero and two feet is considered surface soil. He said it is important to be careful with initial interpretations of these data because some compounds occur naturally. He said subsurface soil contamination is the potential source of groundwater contamination.

Art said these data form a screening analysis, and no determination about whether action will be required in different areas of the site can yet be made. He said the next step is to examine the exceedances through a more comprehensive risk assessment to determine what, if anything, needs to be done to eliminate risk. In

response to a question, Art said it is possible no action will be needed in some areas of the site.

Art said it has already been recognized that action needs to be taken in the waste management area, and a more permanent solution will be applied to this area. He said action can be taken in this area without a formal risk assessment because there is a potential risk has been recognized. Asked whether a decision has been made to consolidate the waste management area into one new area, Melissa said that decision has not been made. Bill asked if the issue of onsite waste management has been decided. Art said this is one alternative out of several now being considered.

In response to a question, Art confirmed the process area is the area most likely to have buildings on it in the future. Karen asked if the amount of chemicals located in this area that are below the EPA criteria will cause problems when mixed together. Art said these chemicals are mostly mixed together now. Art said deed restrictions placed on the property will prevent digging onsite where chemicals are located below the soil so no exposure to these contaminants will occur. He said these restrictions will protect those doing excavation work. He said there may be a restriction that there be no excavation below a certain level. Art said a one-time exposure to these chemicals will likely not cause a problem. Melissa said the risk assessment will be done based on an industrial worker and how often and how long a worker may come into contact with the soil. She said if a cleanup standard needs to be set, it will be at a level safe for industrial activity. She said this standard will be regarding all contaminants together, not just one. Art said this is part of the comprehensive risk assessment. He said if every chemical is below a risk but the combined level is above a risk, an unacceptable risk may exist.

Art said the findings are consistent with what has been found on similar sites. Melissa said the list of chemicals present is almost the same as the list from a similar site in Morgantown.

Communication Update

Panel members had no new information to report.

Offsite Subcommittee

Robert Sapp said the subcommittee is at a point of coming up with a method of surveying the community, but without causing unnecessary concern or fears.

Melissa said she has been in contact with the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry (ATSDR) which is a branch of the Center for Disease Control (CDC). She said Tom Bass also has been in contact with the State Bureau of Health. She said

the Bureau has a study that reported on cancer incidents in West Virginia from 1993-96 and the Bureau is willing to do a follow-up to focus on the Fairmont area. She said another possibility is to work through the ATSDR to complete an epidemiological study of the area, which is a study of how groups are affected, if at all, by exposure to chemicals or diseases. She said a contractor from the ATSDR would come to Fairmont and gather data from areas near the site, as well as comparison data from areas distant from the site. She said she and Art are available to meet with the subcommittee to plan a course of action.

Robert said he is interested in seeing the completion of the data before moving forward. Robert said he has seen other reports mentioning high levels of phenols, where the recent sampling detects low levels. Robert asked if phenols are water-soluble and whether they could migrate. Art said this is not likely to happen; a driver such as large amounts of liquid would be needed for it to migrate. Robert said he has seen a report from before the first removal action by EPA and he also has seen some private studies. Tom Grabb said the report done before the removal action was the CDC public health assessment, which was done in 1986. Roberta asked if it can be said that the recent samplings supercede the 1986 study, and this was confirmed. Tom Bass said these differences are a confirmation EPA eliminated immediate threats.

Robert said he is interested in seeing offsite sampling data from previous reports as compared to new data. He said he believes if people see contaminants no longer exist in an area where they once did, it puts the public at ease. Art said the strategy is to first understand what is located onsite without excluding offsite. He said understanding what is onsite will offer a way to better understand what could be located offsite. Tom Bass said he is familiar with the offsite area Robert is referring to, and said there will be an action taken in that area to eliminate possible risk. Robert said he believes it also is important to investigate other areas around the site and ask neighbors if there are concerns. He said even if no other areas of concern are found, Exxon and the agencies will be able to determine where they stand regarding possible offsite concerns.

Roberta reviewed the next course of action. She confirmed with the panel the next meeting will finish the sampling result presentations. She said the panel should consider someone from ATSDR coming to a fall meeting to discuss offsite research options.

Next Meeting

The next regular meeting will be August 5. The agenda will include a project update, a presentation of groundwater, surface water and sediment sampling results and a communication update.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Next regular meeting: Thursday, August 5, 1999
Circle W Building
5 p.m. refreshments
5:30 p.m. meeting