MEETING MINUTES
Fairmont Community Liaison Panel
September 2, 1999

Attendees:	Bob Ashcraft, Lawrence Cianfrocca (attending for Chief Wimer), Michael Cummings, Nick Fantasia, Georgeann Grewe, Karen Gribben, Bea Hunter, Barbara Metcalfe, Kevin McClung, John Parks, Robert Sapp, Ron Swope, Mark Thompson, Kimberly Watkins, John Watson, Norma Watson, Marcella Yaremchuk.
Exxon Representatives:	Art Chin, John Hannig.
Agency Representatives:	Rich Kuhn, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); Thomas Bass, West Virginia Division of Environmental Protection (WVDEP).
Guests:	David Choiniere; Terry Clark, Terry Clark Photography; Griff Fowler; Jackie Marhefka, Fairmont Times-West Virginian; Jim Martin; Wayne Stutler.
Facilitator:	Mary Lovejoy Rebhan, Ann Green Communications, Inc.
Minutes:	Dan T. Londeree, Ann Green Communications, Inc.

The September meeting of the Fairmont Community Liaison Panel (FCLP) was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Mary Lovejoy Rebhan, facilitator. Mary said she was filling in for Roberta Fowlkes, who was called away to another meeting. Mary asked panel members and guests to introduce themselves. John Hannig introduced Terry Clark, a photographer who would take photographs of the meeting for an article to appear in the Exxon shareholder magazine.

Mary reviewed the agenda, and there were no additions. Approval of the July meeting minutes was tabled until the October meeting. The minutes from the August meeting were approved as distributed.

Unfinished Business

Project Update

John reviewed the project update handout. [A copy is attached for those not present.] He said the brick and concrete crushing, which was originally scheduled to be completed in August, will be complete by the end of September. He said the

completion date has slid due to equipment trouble early in the process, which has since been resolved. He reviewed the 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 there was a safety incident at the site on August 13 when a driller with Geo Environmental, a subcontractor on the site, was hit by the drive head of the drill rig while making an adjustment to the rig. He said the drive head hit the driller on his hard hat and glanced off of the man's back. John said the driller was immobilized and was flown to a hospital in Morgantown. He was released the next day with no restrictions, but he was wearing a brace. He said the hospital found the driller had two compressed disks in his back. It was unclear whether this was caused by the incident or if it was a pre-existing condition that had been aggravated by the incident.

John said the drilling work was immediately stopped, and this is why the additional waste characterization work will not be completed until September. He said a thorough investigation was done to ensure Exxon understood how it happened and how to prevent it from happening again. John said Exxon places safety as the top priority. John said the investigation revealed the driller did not follow proper procedures. He said Exxon released Geo Environmental and has since hired a new subcontractor, Hardin Huber from Baltimore, Maryland, to complete the drilling work.

John reminded the panel Exxon had 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. John said field work is not expected to begin again until Spring of 2000.

John reviewed plans for the two Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) reports. John said the safety incident delayed the Waste Management Area report. He said this report will be submitted to the agencies and made available in the Marion County Library repository by the October meeting. John said the second report will address the Process Area and will be done next year. He explained the reports are being phased to speed up the process of starting work in the Waste Management Area.

John said the preliminary site assessment, the first step of the redevelopment phase of the project, is essentially complete. He pointed to maps hung about the room, showing existing infrastructure around the site and areas onsite where concrete remains in the ground. He said maps like these provide preliminary information about the site and form the basis for subsequent steps in the redevelopment process.

In response to a question from Robert Sapp, Art Chin reviewed the additional waste characterization work and possible future sampling onsite.

In response to a question from John Parks, John said the EE/CA Report for the Waste Management Area will contain soil and groundwater sampling results for that area. He said the report will also contain semi-quantitative human health and ecological risk assessments, as well as the alternatives for remedial action at the Waste Management Area.

In response to a question from John Parks, Art said the report will likely be made available to the panel at the next meeting, before the public comment period begins.

In response to a question from Ron Swope, Tom Bass said the public meeting associated with the public comment process will be a separate meeting from the monthly panel meeting, and it will include a presentation on the Waste Management Area report.

Art shared additional information regarding the Project Update. He said Exxon is in the process of closing a cave on the hillside at the site to prevent anyone from entering it. He said people may notice machinery on the hillside and a breach in the fence line to allow access to the hillside.

Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) Work Plan Status

Art said the ecological risk assessment portion of the EE/CA work plan is delaying the finalization of the work plan. He said this does not impact the progress of the work onsite. Art said he has toxicology profiles produced by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) for arsenic, benzene, toluene and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. He said he will bring copies of these to the next meeting.

Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis Report Status

Art said Exxon hopes to get the EE/CA Report to the agencies and the repository sometime in September. He said the report is a summary of all the environmental data collected to date in regard to the Waste Management Area. He said the purpose of the report is to summarize the data, the geology of the site, the hydrology of the site (groundwater) and the level and extent of contamination. He said this information is then applied to a risk evaluation.

Art said the risk evaluation for this area is not like a typical Superfund risk evaluation. He said it has become obvious that action needs to be taken in the Waste Management Area, because there are no caps on the landfills, and the cover, which consists mainly of dirt, has started to erode in places. Art said there is a need to correct stability issues with the landfills and a typical extensive risk evaluation is not needed in

this case. He said this led to the creation of a section of the report called "Streamlined Risk Evaluation."

Art reviewed the other sections of the report and gave a brief overview of what each section will contain. Nick Fantasia asked if the report can be posted on the internet. Art said the figures and drawings included in the report would be hard to post on the internet, however, the text will be made available on the Project XL website. Art asked those interested in having their own copy of the report to see him or call him to obtain one.

Ron said the report is lengthy and he doubts many people will take the time to read it. He asked if Art can write a summary for each section so people can read the summaries and have an idea what is contained within the report without actually reading the full report. Art said he can write a summary for each section, but he felt that people should read the report in order to be able to assess for themselves the appropriateness of the conclusions reached by Exxon, EPA and/or WVDEP.

A discussion followed regarding the toxicology profiles for chemicals relevant to the site. Rich Kuhn said he will gather a list of chemicals pertaining to the site. In the meantime, Dan Londeree agreed to check the ATSDR internet site and give an overview in the minutes of how to find toxicology profiles. That overview follows:

> Type the following internet address into your browser:
>
> http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxfaq.html
>
> This site contains an alphabetical list of toxic substances. Click on the letter the substance begins with (example: benzene = 'B') and this will take you to a list of substances starting with that letter. Click on the name of the substance, and this will give you the toxicology profile.

Communication Update

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

Offsite Subcommittee Discussion

Art said as the process of Project XL moves forward, decisions will be made that may preclude Exxon and the agencies from moving backwards. Art said the issue of whether offsite migration of contaminants has occurred was raised very early by the panel, and a subcommittee was formed to deal with this. There is now a need to understand what, if any, offsite migration concerns exist in order to avoid having to

change any removal action plan(s) that would soon be finalized. He said this would not be an efficient way to operate and, therefore, the best way to handle the issue is to deal with it now, before decisions are made.

John Hannig showed the panel a graph representing the progress of a typical Superfund site compared to how this project is moving along. He said the typical Superfund site operates one step at a time, while this project has several steps happening at once. As an example, he noted at the Fairmont site, demolition was happening the same time as the site investigation. John said since work in the Waste Management Area is expected to begin soon, it is important to take care of offsite issues now, rather than have an issue arise three years in the future.

John reviewed the overall site investigation approach, which was discussed in more detail at an earlier panel meeting. He explained that the investigation of the site would be completed first, and then the data would be analyzed to determine if there are any areas along the property boundaries where there is the potential for offsite migration. John said the onsite investigation has now been completed and one area has been identified as having the potential for offsite migration, the Light Oil Storage (LOS) area. He said this area will be addressed to ensure that situation is resolved. Art reviewed the findings to date and said the data confirm the LOS area is the only area with potential for offsite migration. He noted the data collected over the past year cannot address what has happened in the past; it can only refer to what is now onsite. He asked panel members to identify concerns regarding the site that have not been addressed.

Robert Sapp apologized for not being able to attend the last few meetings. Robert reviewed issues already addressed by the Offsite Subcommittee and referred to the handout given to the panel by the subcommittee several months ago regarding offsite concerns. He asked if the site boundary has been walked to check for potential offsite impact areas. Tom Bass said the site boundary has been walked by both Melissa Whittington and him, and there is no indication of other areas of potential offsite impact.

In discussion, the following concerns were identified:

- What are the effects of opening the landfills?
- Is a study or survey needed? If so, is the panel willing to help in conducting the study/survey?
- Are we certain there is only one area that could cause potential offsite impact?
- Is there a potential for offsite contamination?
- Did past migration of offsite contamination happen?
- What does the data show regarding offsite contamination?
- What will be done regarding redevelopment?

- How do we deal with the lack of interest from the community?
- Was there any airborne contamination from the plant when it was in operation?

In discussion about a possible survey, Art said a potential problem is asking people about something and receiving responses about issues or concerns that cannot be addressed. He said if a survey is planned, it would be helpful to have someone (such as ATSDR) help identify possible pitfalls beforehand.

Mary asked panel members to think about these questions and be prepared to discuss them during the next meeting. She said the goal of the discussion will be to decide how to move forward to address any offsite issues or other areas of concern.

Other Comments

Wayne Stutler asked if there has been any sampling done in the area of the cave. Tom Bass said there has been no sampling there, because there is no way to get into the area to take samples. Wayne asked whether there is evidence of a pipeline running into that area. Tom said there is no evidence of a pipeline other than a line 40 yards below the opening owned by Consolidated Gas Supply.

Ron asked whether Melissa Whittington will continue to be EPA's representative at the panel meetings. Tom Bass said that issue is still not decided, and Hillary Thornton will be the contact in the interim period. Tom said the decision will be made by the next panel meeting.

Next Meeting

The next regular meeting will be October 7. The agenda will include the offsite issues discussion, a project update, a status report on the EE/CA reports and a communication update.

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

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