

Minutes of Chevron Burnaby Refinery Community Advisory Panel Meeting (Revised)

Thursday June 24, 2010

7 – 9 pm at the Confederation Seniors Centre

Present:

Dianne Alsop, Kathryn Curran, Guenther Krueger, Steve Lower, David McLellan, Judi Marshall, Kathy Mezei, Art Quan

Chevron representatives:

Andrew Brewer, Refinery Manager; Ray Lord, Public & Govt. Affairs Manager; Jill Donnelly, Health Environment & Safety Manager; Chris Boys, Environmental Specialist

Metro Vancouver Representatives:

Darrell Wakelin, Officer, Regulation and Enforcement Division, Policy and Planning

Facilitator:

Kim Barbero, Carah Worldwide Consulting, Inc.

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

- Kim Barbero welcomed CAP members and observers in attendance. Observers, several of whom are interested in becoming CAP members, had pre-registered because they wanted a better understanding of the meeting process or because they have a particular interest in the seepage issue. Kim also noted that Dipak Dattani of the City of Burnaby had accepted CAP's request to attend meetings as an observer and thanked him for his attendance.
- Ray Lord introduced Chris Boys, Burnaby Refinery Environmental Specialist, Joanne Jamieson, Refinery Community Affairs Representative, and Jocelyn Fraser, Communications Consultant.
- Andrew Brewer announced that he will be returning to Australia for his new assignment at the end of June after two and a half years here as Burnaby Refinery Mgr. Andrew took the opportunity to thank CAP and to introduce his successor, Mr. Jim Gable, who comes to Burnaby from Chevron Oronite Company's Oak Point Plant in Louisiana.

CAP BUSINESS

1. Refinery Perimeter Monitoring – Area 2 seepage

- Prior to discussing the Area 2 seepage, Kim Barbero requested that CAP set some structure and objectives around this subject so as to reach agreement on the purpose of the discussion and to define how CAP will know it has reached the end of the dialogue. It was agreed that following the initial presentation, time check-ins would be every 25 minutes.
- CAP members agreed that a successful outcome would be that:
 - answers are received to the questions (addendum #2) submitted prior the meeting and any additional questions raised during the discussion
 - they are heard
 - all members have an opportunity to share information and concerns
 - action items are identified to address unresolved issues
- Andrew Brewer acknowledged the importance of this issue to Chevron and expressed regret for the situation and the impact it has had, including to refinery employees. Andrew said that the business expects better and Chevron has allocated the necessary resources and funding to understand what happened and why, to resolve the situation and to identify improvements that can be made.
- Jill Donnelly opened the session with a presentation (addendum #1) that took CAP members through the time and activity sequence since the seepage was first realized on April 21st during a routine perimeter inspection. The presentation provided further background and detail to the overview provided the day before when Chevron hosted a tour of the site for CAP members.
- A question and answer sheet (addendum #2) was circulated to all CAP members for review. Numerous other questions were posed to Chris Boys and Jill Donnelly. Those questions (some of which have been combined) included, but were not limited to the following:
 - **Q: What is the total volume being extracted from the beach on a daily basis?**
A: 50 – 100 ml (3-7 tbsps per day). We are also recovering material from an interception trench next to the railway tracks.
 - **Q: How many holes/wells have been drilled and what is their depth?**
A: 10 extraction wells have been installed to date; 6 geological wells; and prior that, 13 monitoring wells. The monitoring wells are up to 65 feet in depth and the extraction wells are at 45 feet.

- **Q: The seepage was a surprise despite the presence of the monitoring wells. Did the monitoring wells not alert Chevron to the seep? Are the wells not working? Have any lessons been learned regarding more effective placement?**
A: The monitoring wells did not directly alert us to the issue. However the seep was realized through routine perimeter monitoring including increased levels of dissolved hydrocarbons in some monitoring wells. We need to look closely at the effectiveness of the perimeter monitoring system and understand what more needs to be done.
- **Q: When pressure testing a pipe would small cracks show?**
A: Yes, even a pinhole leak would result in a loss of pressure.
- **Q: When did signs go up on the beach?**
A: Signs were posted on the beach May 15.
- **Q: Chevron has noticed hydrocarbons offsite before – is this the first time you noticed contamination seeping near the tracks?**
A: This material beyond our property was noticed as a result of a routine inspection of the existing monitoring wells in that area. Previous experience near a different area of the refinery perimeter involved subsurface MTBE contamination of groundwater. That issue has been effectively addressed using onsite recovery and remediation.
- **Q: Are there inspections beyond the refinery perimeter?**
A: Yes. There are regular inspections around the onsite perimeter monitoring system which is adjacent to the refinery perimeter and along the Confederation Park pipeline right of way.
- **Q: For how long and how much material seeped?**
A: We are unsure as to how long the material was seeping and made initial estimates of the amount being less than 50 liters and the amount being recovered at the beach to approximately 50-100 mls/day.
- **Q: Will you not be digging on the beach?**
A: We will be investigating under the sand. We will dig up to three feet down and take soil samples. Preliminary observations suggest that it's within inches of the surface but if the results indicate we need to dig further, we will and that is part of our investigation plan.
- **Q: What is the depth of the groundwater?**
A: It depends where you measure. At the wells by the East Impounding Basin, the groundwater is approximately 18 feet deep and at the beach it's close to or at the surface.

- **Q: Could the material be moving with the tide?**
A: Possible but unlikely.
- **Q: Would it be prudent to drill down hill of the tanks to locate the specific product and match it to the suspect tank?**
A: The product in tanks does change occasionally but because the suspect product is a mix of material, it seems unlikely that it came from the tanks but more likely from something like the refinery's effluent treatment sewer line.
- **Q: The MTBE tank was a problem previously, could the leak be from there?**
A: No we don't think it is. From a previous tank issue, we believe the flow path is different and would be expressed further west.
- **Q: Will there be monitoring and testing of seawater for contamination?**
A: The initial results of the beach digging will determine how much further we need to test. There is no evidence of impact to the seawater at this time.
- **Q: A member of CAP shared the historical perspective with a representative of the David Suzuki Foundation who indicates that the problem is more extensive than is being presented, that there has been soil contamination on the north slope since 2003, that groundwater contamination with hydrocarbon is leaving the site perimeter at the wharf and that drastic measures are required. Is Chevron doing enough?**
A: For several years Chevron has been reporting to CAP on progress with the refinery's perimeter monitoring program. Testing is underway to determine the scope of this on-site seepage, both laterally and vertically. The wharf is located about 1300 m to the west and the issue associated with that area underwent significant remedial excavation in 2008, which has been previously reported CAP.
- **Q: Will the result be a quick stop gap measure or will Chevron take steps to understand the full extent of the problem and how to improve its operations going forward?**
A: The priority at this time is to investigate and contain this seepage, understand how this happened and put steps in place to prevent a recurrence.
- **Q: What if you don't find the source? What if the seepage is historical and not the result of a current issue? Will the refinery shut down?**
A: We are exhausting all efforts to find the source. If it's determined to be historical, we would put steps in place to contain it within the Refinery's property. It is not necessary to shut down the refinery to complete the required work.

- The question and answer period was followed by CAP members expressing their concern about Chevron's decision to not notify them of the situation for 29 days following notification to the regulators (see response to question 4 in Addendum #2). Members requested that, in future, Chevron notify CAP of issues that could have a negative impact to the neighbourhood concurrently with notification to regulatory bodies.
- Chevron advised that it will not adopt the requested concurrent approach to CAP notification in every case. The company said that it works with all required regulatory agencies and chose to notify CAP, in this instance, in advance of the regularly scheduled CAP meeting. Chevron also engaged with media who provided extensive coverage of the situation for the broader public audience.
- It was felt that Chevron failed the public disclosure test and that CAP members felt obliged to advise the media directly of the situation. Chevron, in turn, expressed its disappointment that it did not receive any enquiries from CAP members directly following the issuance of the information briefing to CAP on May 18. Chevron was only made aware of concerns from some CAP members via third parties and media reports.
- A lengthy discussion ensued about the sharing of information and whether or not it should be confidential. While Chevron and other CAP members agree that issues of this kind are not meant to be private there is a desire on Chevron's part to initially discuss refinery issues directly with CAP members whether or not the media are involved. Concern was expressed with the communications process and the issue remained unresolved. Chevron concluded by reiterating its commitment to the CAP process.

OTHER BUSINESS

With only 10 minutes remaining, CAP agreed to focus on only three additional items of business on the agenda.

a. CAP Web site

ACTION: It was agreed that the Beta CAP website that was previously circulated to CAP for review should be activated. Chevron will proceed with site activation.

b. Criteria for Observers

Several CAP members requested that elected officials and interested individuals who live outside of CAP's residential boundaries be permitted to observe CAP meetings.

ACTION: Chevron agreed to consider this recommendation as part of its overall review of practices exercised by existing CAPs in other jurisdictions and industries.

c. Next Scheduled Meeting: September 23rd, 2010 at Confederation Seniors Centre.