UNITED STATES

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

* *

DISASTER DEBRIS REDUCTION PROJECT FOR

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING DEBRIS FROM

HURRICANE KATRINA

CHALMETTE, LOUISIANA

* * * * * *

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PUBLIC MEETING

Wednesday

JUNE 11, 2008

7:10 P.M.

* *

BEFORE:

Angie Henning, CCR, CVR

Certified Court Reporter

In and for the State of Louisiana

A P P E A R A N C E S

Sam Coleman, EPA
Superfund Division Director

Jeff Frithsen, EPA
Office of Research and Development

Roger Wilmoth, EPA
Office of Research and Development

Fran Kremer, EPA
Office of Research and Development

Pam Travis, EPA
Deputy Regional Counsel Officer

Nancy Jones, EPA
Superfund OSC, Region 6

Lacy Smith
Tulane Environmental Law Clinic

Leo Demaris
St. Bernard Resident

Linda Swanner
St. Bernard Resident

Mike Swanner
Tulane Environmental Law Clinic

Mike Murphy
St. Bernard Resident

EPA PUBLIC MEETING

DISASTER DEBRIS REDUCTION PROJECT

Chalmette, Louisiana

Wednesday, June 11, 2008

7:10 p.m.

* * * * * * * * * *

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Good evening, my name is Sam Coleman. I have a team of people here. The very brief and basic agenda is that we have some fairly short presentations to explain what the test is all about. We actually have a short video. And then we're going to be available to answer questions that folks may have.

First, I will start with my team from Dallas. I have Nancy Jones who -- hold your hand up.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

(Complies.)

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Everybody knows Nancy. Nancy is my on-the-scene coordinator. Her current job is to manage all of my Louisiana hurricane recovery-related activities. And just as

a footnote, we still have activities ongoing relative to recovery from the hurricane even today. So we are still active in doing things.

Pam Travis works in our Office of Regional Counsel. She is the acting Deputy Regional Counsel for EPA in Dallas.

Fran Kremer -- Fran is with the Office of Research and Development. And as you thumb through the Facts Sheet, you will see she is the ORD principal technical contact for our project.

Jeff -- I think it is Frithsen.

MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:

That will work.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Frithsen?

MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:

Yes, Frithsen.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Frithsen, okay. Jeff also works with Fran in ORD. And then finally, I say, last but not least is Roger Wilmoth who is -- I don't know, do you introduce yourself as the world's foremost expert?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

No, hell, no.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

But Roger is a well-respected expert in the area of asbestos monitoring and abatement and has worked for the Agency for quite some time, and is very much engaged in this project as a technical consultant and helps us all out with a whole host of issues. So with that, I am going to turn to Nancy who is going to brief you on the very basics of the project.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, we are planning on conducting a burn in an air curtain destructor type unit of vegetative material and construction and demolition material. When I say construction and demolition material, I mean houses that are construction and demolition houses that have been demolished as a result of the Hurricane Katrina damage and will be brought to our test site and loaded into the Air Burner that we will use for the

purpose of the test.

We plan to start the test at this point the week of June 23rd, probably starting with the vegetative material on the 24th. And then once we have completed the vegetative portion of the test, the one C&D house which we plan to test, we have elected at this time to only have our test be composed of those two aspects of the test right now.

Previously, we were planning on doing a RACM portion, but we have decided that we would like to just do the vegetative and C&D burn so that we can gather data in an effort to be prepared in the future to do the next component of the test. But we do feel at this time that it is important for us to gather the data from the vegetative and C&D portion before we move forward.

We do have a video we would like to show on how the Air Burner works. It is a video of vegetative material being burned.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

And we'll show the location.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes. And we also have a map showing where the test site is in relation to the closest businesses and residences. This is the site where currently the Parish brings all of the vegetative material to be chipped and the C&D material to be chipped.

It was a location that we coordinated with the Parish, that the Parish suggested and felt like it would be the most appropriate location. That's why they chose it for their staging area because they felt like it was in a remote area and that it would be appropriate for these types of staging and treatment activities.

Over here (indicating) we have a close-up of the burner. The burner has vegetative material burning in that particular photo. In the handouts we provided, the burner company provided us with a brochure about the actual unit that we will be using. So it has some details about the actual piece of equipment.

I think at this time it will probably

be good to go ahead and show a little clip of the actual burner in operation.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

(Playing video clip of burner in operation.)

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Would you turn the volume up?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

(Adjusting volume on video.)

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Would you like us to run it again?

LINDA SWANNER:

Did they say something about the temperature? I couldn't hear that part.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

It is just up to 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit is what we've been told. And the reason why we are interested in this technology is because at the beginning of, you know, our Hurricane Katrina response, you know, there was a concern, you know, of all the homes that needed to be demolished and whether or not there was enough landfill capacity.

And so we're really interested in

looking at innovative technology that can be utilized to reduce the amount of waste that goes into landfills. And so we're not doing this test in an effort to advocate these particular technologies, we just feel like it is important to evaluate them to ensure that they are really appropriate to use in these types of settings.

And so without actually conducting the test and getting the data, then we wouldn't be able to make that assessment. So this is one technology that we have decided that we want to assess at this time.

Again, out of concern for conserving landfill space in the future so that additional landfills wouldn't have to be created just for disasters of the Katrina nature.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. As I said, very simple and straight forward. So do you guys have any questions or comments that anybody wants to make?

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

(Raising hand.)

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes, sir?

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

I'll just wait.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. Go ahead, he has deferred to you.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

I've got two questions right off the bat. What is vegetative and C&D? Does that mean trees and construction and demolition stuff?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

And what parameters are you going to use to evaluate that box?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, we are circling the box with two rings of air monitors, so we will be collecting samples with these units and sending them off to a lab and evaluating the data to determine the emission rate

and what is being emitted and that type of thing.

And during the entire test, we will have a meteorological station at our test site and we will be looking at the wind speed and wind direction. And you know, if the wind speed is too high or the wind direction is looking like it -- you know, if the emissions would impact the residents or the businesses across the street, then we will discontinue the test.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Well, let me ask -- maybe ask Fran one. I am not sure if it is Fran for this. But could you talk a little bit more about the monitoring that takes place or the burning itself as well as the ring?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

We are going to be doing monitoring of the gases coming off the unit, which will be a variety of gases.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Which will be what kind of gases? I'm sorry.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

A variety of gases. We are going to be looking at, obviously, combustion effectiveness. We will be looking at the VOCs.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Acronyms don't --

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

Okay. I apologize, and I shouldn't say them.

THE COURT REPORTER:

Do you-all mind maybe moving up? There is no way -- we need to be able to hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

You can't hear us?

THE COURT REPORTER:

You-all are being recorded and there is no way --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

We can -- we all like each other so we can just come in closer.

THE COURT REPORTER:

I'm very sorry. Usually, if it's a bigger crowd, I would make each individual come up before you ask questions.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

I'll repeat my comment. And it goes back to -- when you were presenting as well, you said RACM, VOCs, C&D, just do your best to dispense with the acronyms.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

We will, and I apologize for that and thank you for reminding me of that as well. We put a different --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

It is, in fact, very difficult for us to do that.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

I know. That's why I made a point of it.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

Thank you. So then we'll be looking at a range of different chemicals coming off of from the gas, and as well we will be looking at the ash, the residuals in the ash in the box to determine what is the composition of that ash. So that is going to include various metals.

We will be looking for things also such as dioxins, PCBs, a range of

materials that in general would be considered that as a source of materials, but also could be what we consider called "combustion byproducts," that would be part of that process.

So we are doing a full array of analysis on the ash material and we will be doing the monitoring of the gas that is coming off the box as well.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

And just for the record, VOCs are volatile organic compounds.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

All right.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

And C&D is construction and demolition as Nancy explained. RACM is regulated asbestos containing materials.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And PCBs are polychlorinated byphenyls.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

The primary data is going to be taken right at the top of the box where the off gases are going to emitted. If they are

off, in fact, they are emitted. The perimeter monitoring is really just there as a backup.

If anything happens and the data is not adequate from, you know, the monitoring from the actual discharge of the plume, why then, the perimeter monitors are going to pick that up.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

So what you're saying is that when the duct tape melts that holds that little gizmo to the top and falls into the thing, you have the outside one?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Right.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Okay. Just checking.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

It’s welded.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

There won't be any duct tape.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Just checking.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes, sir, you have a question.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

It was basically -- we've covered it, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

So, Nancy, how does the box work? You know, I am kind of getting the idea that the air curtain -- this air curtain technology is what the box is about.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

And you're using the stuff that is actually the trash to fuel the fire, is that the idea?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

And you're just blowing a whole lot of air around?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes. You start with the vegetative feed material as a feed stock.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Oh, okay. Yes, vegetative, right, before we put the C&D in there.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Even when we're burning the construction and demolition house, there will be a certain amount of vegetative material that will have to go in to keep the fire hot.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Okay. So just for the sake of all of us, let's just presume that maybe one of us has been through the massive regulations made by the communist EPA in Washington, DC, and so, you know, we see a lot of stuff. This looks like a pretty good deal.

I mean, in terms of when I ask a question about evaluation, do you-all actually evaluate the cost and see if it just works?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes. Now, let me -- part of the test --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Wait. But hang on, you said evaluate the cost?

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Right, uh-huh.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

No. We are not evaluating the cost of the technology versus another technology, per se.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

I see.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

We're evaluating the technical efficacy of --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

The technology?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

-- the technology, not the cost.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, what aspect --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

The environmental effectiveness of that?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Okay.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

We will look at the cost effectiveness

of doing this versus just everything going to a landfill, that is one aspect that we talked about doing, so that is one component.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

Well, I think it is going to be fairly straight forward in terms of looking at, well, what is it going to cost for the unit and what is it going to cost for an operator to do this. And then looking at this aspect of -- of course, with the price of fuel these days the transport fees is going to be a variable that is going to be included if they are to consider to moving that to the landfill. But at the end of the day the cost for this unit and the operation is pretty straight forward.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

But we are not focused on --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

But we also want make an estimate of the productivity.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

Right. We are -- on this particular one, we are not interested -- I mean, our ultimate goal is not what the highest return we can get for this.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

What we wanted -- our key goal on this test is to get the best data available.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

So how did you-all come about picking us for this project? Is the far-sighted grand scheme that maybe St. Bernard Parish would wind up with one, or is this a portable kind of device that you're using just for emergency response and that kind of thing?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right, exactly. It is a portable device. Again, you know, this is kind of a spin-off from the Hurricane recovery effort that we were looking at, you know.

Now that things have calmed down -- it was during the height of the Katrina

response there was no way we would have been able to, you know, gather all the data and time to be able to utilize this technology for Katrina. But because Katrina did highlight the fact that, you know, landfill capacities can be an issue during large national disasters.

And you know in the last several years there have been a lot of natural disasters whether it's hurricanes, tornados, or when some parts of the country floods, and so as a result we saw a need to look at alternatives and expanding our toolbox to have other possibilities of ways to address the amount of debris that is generated in a disaster.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. I want you to answer one other question though, which is the, why St. Bernard Parish?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right. And, again, we looked specifically at the parishes that still, you know, were continuing to recover from the storm and St. Bernard had a lot of the

housing stock that was appropriate for this type of test. And the Parish, you know, expressed an interest and a willingness to participate with us.

And so, therefore, we worked with them. We made sure of any questions that they that had, that we addressed and we proceeded forward. So another aspect that, you know, we looked at when we considered Orleans Parish is there really weren't spots that were remote and became appropriate like there was here. You know, this site because they were using it as a staging area for C&D and doing chipping here, this really seems like an ideal location.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. The gentleman in the back. You have to stand up.

LEO DEMARIS:

Yes, sir. I have a couple of questions. I didn't know if you wanted us to identify ourselves for your record or not. You didn't say that earlier.

THE COURT REPORTER:

That's what I would have liked.

LEO DEMARIS:

Would you like for me to start it?

THE COURT REPORTER:

If you would like to, that's fine.

LEO DEMARIS:

Okay. My name is Leo Demaris. I represent the insulators and asbestos workers in New Orleans and Baton Rouge and I also represent quite a few residents of St. Bernard Parish. There are a couple of questions I have. Nancy or Sam can answer them, either one of them. It doesn't matter to me.

You mentioned earlier that you were not going to have any testing regulating asbestos containing materials.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes.

LEO DEMARIS:

And can you tell me why?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, we decided at this time that it was more important for us to gather data on doing the construction and demolition

material so that we were more prepared in the future, you know, should there be another disaster of this kind, that this technology might be appropriate to use.

If we have enough data, then we would feel more comfortable going forward. But we thought it was a good time to take this into a step-by-step approach, and, you know, look at the vegetative material that is commonly burned during disasters.

Oftentimes, it is burned openly. And so we thought, you know, with this type of technology would be good to evaluate the vegetative material and then the next, you know, small step is the C&D material that we thought would be a good idea to go ahead and evaluate.

Many, many years ago, C&D material was burned in Florida during Hurricane Andrew, but there is not a lot of data on that. And so while, you know, burning vegetative and just burning C&D there is not a regulation against that, it can be done already. There is just not a lot of data on it.

And so we felt like this is a good opportunity. You know, a key time basically to be able to do the research, scan the data before we go forward with burning regulated asbestos containing material.

LEO DEMARIS:

All right. Now, let me ask you this, excluding C&D material, what do you -- or what do you-all consider regulated asbestos containing material that would have been burned here or will be burned here at some point down the road.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

This is Roger Wilmoth. It would be those amounts that are regulated under the NESHAP.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

You can explain NESHAP, Roger.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Oh, I'm sorry, yeah. The National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for asbestos. Thank you, Fran.

And those limits are, you know, really well-defined, you know, quantity limits,

for your wall board, for your joint compound, for your roofing, for any other insulation that you have in the house, any of the thermal insulation that you have on your pipes, although that is kind of unusual for houses. So those would be the ones that would come under the RACM, regulated asbestos containing materials.

LEO DEMARIS:

Now, who certifies that the C&D material that you are about to burn doesn't have that regulated material in it now?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

We have already evaluated those houses, and we had a complete survey by a licensed asbestos consultant from this area.

LEO DEMARIS:

Can you give me the name?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

EEG.

LEO DEMARIS:

EEG is --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Environmental Enterprise Group, I think; is that right? (Inaudible.)

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And also the Parish --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Bob Smith is the contact there.

LEO DEMARIS:

Local folks?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Bob is licensed here. I don't know where his main office is. It might be in Arkansas.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And he also -- he got some data from the Parish demolition contractors that they offered because they told him they were going to demolish anyway through FEMA. So they also do their own asbestos inspection. And so he compared our results to their results to make sure we both agreed that it was a C&D house.

And my understanding on this particular house is that it was less than 1 percent in the joint compound and it was located in 80 square feet of the house, so

it was a large house. It is one and a half stories.

I don't know how many square feet the total house is. But, again, it was a very, very small amount that was identified in a small portion of the house.

LEO DEMARIS:

Well, you know, the material that you described that would be considered as regulated asbestos containing material is everything that you would see in a demolished house, wall board, insulation, roofing material, siding material, all those things that you described a moment ago when I asked you what would be burned that you-all would consider regulated material, is that what is going to be scooped with these houses?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

No, no, no. That's the --

LEO DEMARIS:

That's what he said though, Sam, didn't he?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

That's not exactly what he said. What -- the process works this way for any material depending on how it's made, where it was made, and the contents. Certain types of material, we know have a potential of containing asbestos. Floor tiles, wall boards, joint compounds, shingles, all types of things. They don't necessarily contain asbestos.

It depends on where they were made, the specific materials, there are a whole series of things, and we have been tracking these issues from where they originate in the mines, the minerals themselves and we track what likely contains asbestos and what does not.

So the reason we sample and test the houses is that -- and we know where to look -- because of that experience and the base of knowledge that exists. You take that and you transfer it into a house that is actually sampled, then we know that the asbestos containing materials in that house do exist in the roofing materials or the floor tile, etc., etc., because they

were sampled.

LEO DEMARIS:

All right.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

We know it does exist in this small amount of the joint compound because that was also sampled. So whereas in one house that is sampled, you may find some regulated asbestos meaning that it is greater than a certain percentage, another house is sampled and it does not contain those materials. Just because there are shingles on both houses doesn't necessarily mean there is asbestos in all shingles.

It is only in certain shingles. And that can be determined from our samples. And that's what we're trying to say is we sampled this house and the only thing that we found was this small amount of joint compound which is a very small percentage of a house, 80 square feet out of a one and a half story house.

I don't -- there is an inspection report that says how big the house is.

Actually, I've seen the house myself. It's got to be 1,500 square feet or something. So it's a small amount.

LEO DEMARIS:

One more question. I've got a couple more if you don't mind. Is that house -- do you know when it was built? For example, because it could depend on when the house was built.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Absolutely.

LEO DEMARIS:

That can have a big difference on how much regulated asbestos containing material it might have in it.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

That becomes a job of the inspector. I have -- the inspection report contains that type of material. I haven't reviewed it at this stage.

LEO DEMARIS:

A lot of this parish and a lot of the other areas around here -- I live here. I mean, I understand the problem that we have. But a lot of these homes that we're

talking about are old homes. And I would be interested to know if the samples that the EPA took, are they going to used for this --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

It's not an older home.

LEO DEMARIS:

See, now, I think that really skews the report then. You know, you need -- there needs to be some testing of some older homes to see how much asbestos containing material are in those homes before this thing moves on. Don't you think that would be a good measure?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, we are certainly going to be looking for a home that --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Did not contain asbestos.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

-- did not contain. Yes, we are looking for --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

We are not looking for a house with asbestos.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

-- a construction and demolition home that is -- yeah, that has no regulated asbestos. That was the point, to not look for -- I mean, that would be the next phase of test -- after we collect this data, then, you know, that would be another test altogether.

LEO DEMARIS:

Okay. Then one other thing I wanted to asked, you started off, Nancy, by talking about what gave rise to this whole thing was the volume of material that needed to be disposed of and the fact that there needed to be some focus on reducing that volume.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Uh-huh.

LEO DEMARIS:

Has anybody certified the fact that we don't have a place to put it as-is? Are there no other landfill opportunities for us? Is there certification to that just so --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Oh, no, no, no. Sir, there is no one saying that there is not landfill capacity. We are just saying that, you know, as there seems to be a rise in the number of natural disasters that have been happening in the recent years, we see a need to be proactive. And, you know, try to look at reducing volume so that there is not a problem in the future. So this is just a proactive measure because there are alternatives to everything going directly to a landfill.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

I have a comment that might shed some light on that question.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

You know, right after this disaster during the cleanup over on Peters Road in Harvey the answer to the vegetative material was to stack it all up in a big lot between the Westbank Expressway and Lapalco about right on the edge. Did you know --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I know about that.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Right on the edge of the Harvey Canal. And their air box was a blow torch and some diesel fuel to light some trees off. And their environmental study considered of sticking their finger in the wind and hoping the wind blew toward the canal instead of toward the houses in the back, because if they didn't do that, they didn't have no where to go with the debris. So I am figuring that all they are trying to do is try this box out just this one time to see if it works; right?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I think you said it as well as we said it.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

To secure that problem because of --

LEO DEMARIS:

My issue isn't -- my concern is not of burning vegetative material. My concern is simply, when you start moving into construction and demolition material in

areas that are old and you say that the only thing in these houses that contain asbestos material is a little bit of your drywall compound on the house.

I know for sure that St. Bernard Parish other than a few neighborhoods was a mature parish. A lot of homes have been around here.

I have a lot of retirees in my union that were wiped out out here that have been living in them same homes since in the '60s before asbestos was even regulated at all.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And that's why we have tried to be very selective, and we went through a long process to make sure that we chose an appropriate house, because we didn't want to choose a house that contains regulated asbestos material.

LEO DEMARIS:

What house and address was chosen?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, we are not really allowed to give out site addresses. So I am not

prepared to give that to you at this time. You would have to actually go through our FOIA process go through our counsel and make a determination of whether or not that information can be released. But at this time, I am not able to give out that information because it is private information.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

This young lady has a question.

LACY SMITH:

I was just wondering if it is possible to release those evaluations, perhaps, with the private information redacted onto the website that already has a variety of other materials, that way people like Mr. Demaris --

LEO DEMARIS:

That's correct.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes.

LACY SMITH:

For people who are concerned, a place for them to look and see for themselves and for those questions.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Right. There is a point in time that information can be released. The house has not been demolished.

And our understanding is we can't release information about houses that have not been demolished because there is a whole process and people have their own interests relative to what information they may want to release and their expectation of privacy. But we have to deal with the process. Once the house has gone through the entire process and it has been demolished, then that information can be released.

LEO DEMARIS:

And then, obviously, there are opportunities in the event that there was a brand new 2005 model where an objection can be raised and maybe the testing should be done on some 1960 model homes.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Well, I understand your point that I think the basic message that we have is substantially different from what you're

saying. And that is, we are not trying to test what it is like to burn a house that contains regulated asbestos. We are doing just the opposite.

We simply want to know what it is like to burn a house that we think contains no asbestos, very little or none. And so we're specifically looking for a house that does not contain asbestos. There is no dispute about some of the houses that contain asbestos.

We know that there are many houses in the Parish that contain asbestos. That's not -- that is an important issue, but that's not the issue that involves this test.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

And to go back and answer your question, I think, yes, it is possible to actually redact the information that identifies the house. (Inaudible.)

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right. And when I get back to Dallas I can work with our office on getting that redacted.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I am a little bit more cautious because I have to release it. So I have to make sure that I actually can. So I am not going tell you that I can release something until I know I can. And I know that there is a process in which we have to do that.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

But it is likely.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes. Another question? Yes, ma'am?

LINDA SWANNER:

One of questions was, why not test it in a deserted area? This is not a deserted area where you are planning on testing.

It looks like it is. But as a resident of the Parish for ten years, we have lived on Urquhart Street which is only two blocks from Judge Perez. Are you-all familiar with where Judge Perez is?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Uh-huh.

LINDA SWANNER:

It is quite a ways from the dump area. And for years we had problems with the fires underneath the dump with the garbage. And people with allergies and different things suffered because that wind blew it that way.

So even though you're saying it's deserted and it's not going to affect residential, in fact, it will if it is damaging because the wind will carry it that far. And even more so now because there is less to obstruct the wind from reaching that area depending on which way the wind goes. That is a very big concern for me.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Well, let me just say one thing on that and I'll ask Nancy to weigh in, and maybe we can really study the map over here and you'll get a better sense as to how this works. First, I don't know that we intended to conduct the test in a

deserted area simply because the logistics required to conduct the test is not conducive to be done in a deserted area.

LINDA SWANNER:

I meant non-residential.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Right. So what we try to find is an area that has certain characteristics. One, you have to have relatively controlled access.

Second, you have to have an area that you can actually monitor wind direction and have some sense of where things are going so that you actually have a place where the test can be conducted.

Third, you have to have something that you have some control over so that you actually can deal with the houses or the vegetative material that you want to burn.

You can stage it, you know where it's going to be so when you start it up, you can bring it directly in and then you can take the ash and take it back. And that all that can be done in a location that it can be all be managed and controlled.

There are lots of different factors.

Part of what we are doing is -- you heard us talk about the rings of monitors and the monitors that are on the unit itself.

The goal is that for us, we will be able to determine both wind direction and if there are, in fact, any type of emissions, particulates, gases, or other things that are going to proceed on site, that information is going to be known during the test.

And our commitment and what we do during the test is we don't continue the test once we see the wind direction is not blowing in a favorable manner.

LINDA SWANNER:

Define favorable for me.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

That means blowing towards the population.

LINDA SWANNER:

Okay. So favorable is blowing toward the population?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

No.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

That's what you don't want to do.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

That's what we don't want to do.

LINDA SWANNER:

Exactly.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

That's what we don't want to do.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes. So if you look at the map actually --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And there are copies of the map in the folders.

LINDA SWANNER:

Yes. I saw it. I glanced at it. Thank you.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

We have a map, test location here (indicating).

LINDA SWANNER:

Uh-huh.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

We see the populated areas. And as we

study the time of the year, prevailing winds, etc., then this is what we are looking for is the wind blowing in this direction (indicating).

LINDA SWANNER:

So blowing out toward the swamp?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Right.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

That's right.

LINDA SWANNER:

Okay. So then I have another concern. If there are toxic things that are going to be in the air that will fall into the water, which is a natural resource, which I believe affects Bayou Bienvenue which is a useable resource by the public. That is a concern to me as well.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Fair point. And obviously everything is based on worst-case scenario if there are toxic compounds.

Our issue is we're going to conduct a

test starting with the assumption that we monitor for those compounds and when the conditions either the combustion or other things are not favorable which we're going to know because we're doing monitoring, then that's not a favorable test.

It is not our idea to burn whatever we find, collect a lot of data that says this is really ugly, and therefore it can't proceed. That's not good for us. It's not good for anybody. And that's not really -- that doesn't serve any purpose.

The only thing that serves a purpose for us is that as we test this we find that there are favorable conditions for both conducting the test and we are getting data to show specifically what is being emitted. But if it is being emitted at levels that are harmful, then that's not good for anybody and the test is not going to continue.

LACY SMITH:

From what I understand, I thought these monitors aren't real time monitors. And so it's going to be --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Those actually weren't the ones that dealt this with this asbestos.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. So there are other --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

There is no real time monitor for asbestos.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. But so for other toxic --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes.

LACY SMITH:

-- chemicals?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Right.

LINDA SWANNER:

Okay. So I have another question regarding that, if I heard correctly, the way you figure whether it's harmful or not, if it has harmful materials in it, you rely on EEG Company and the Parish demolition.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

No.

LINDA SWANNER:

No, okay. That's what I wanted to see. Who do you rely on for your --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Maybe -- maybe -- I am not sure. Fran can explain the monitoring and what we're looking for.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

No. She was talking about --

LINDA SWANNER:

I am talking about how did you determine what -- the samples, whether they were okay to burn or not. And I thought that it was EEG --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Well, they actually went in --

LINDA SWANNER:

-- EEG and the Parish demolition and you used those two things. Okay. The Parish demolition as a resident, I don't really trust. I am not trying to just really throw things at them. But I really want to know. I mean, as a resident we have a vested interest in it.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

The only reason why I mentioned that is we wanted to compare our results to theirs to make sure we both agreed that it was a C&D house.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Well, let her --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

So it's primarily our own results.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Let her finish her question. I want to hear the whole question because I'm not sure what your question is.

LINDA SWANNER:

Okay. No -- I was just -- I wanted to see what you used as your criteria for burning, and you said you depended on EEG and the Parish demolition.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. Now, let me just clarify what you're saying --

LINDA SWANNER:

Okay.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

-- to make sure we answer exactly what you're looking for because the criteria

for burning in and of itself is based on a lack of asbestos in the house. So what you're really asking us is how do we determine if there was this minute amount of asbestos in the house. I want to make sure that we're talking about the same thing.

LINDA SWANNER:

Right. And who determines? Is it just you or are you actually using your own people to test it and see or are you just depending on EEG and the Parish demolition?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. I think that's clear. All right. Roger --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Okay. The results are the ones, you know -- the contractor, you know, EEG that went into this house and a number of other houses that were on the -- that were going to be demolished. And they actually analyzed the materials out of the walls, out of the floors that were likely to be asbestos containing. And that analysis

then gives us the confidence of whether or not those are asbestos containing materials. And there were a number of, you know -- after your comment -- there are a number of houses that had asbestos.

This house did not have the asbestos, you know, in any regulated amounts. And the only positive asbestos was, in fact, in the joint compounds but that was the concentration of that was, in fact, less than the actual regulated threshold which is 1 percent.

So the analysis came back on just the joint compound, as I understand it, Nancy, that it was just trace amounts. Which, basically, means it was probably well below 1 percent. So it's not regulated. But there was, in fact, a minute amount of asbestos that was, in fact, found.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And I wanted to clarify that EEG is an EPA contractor.

LINDA SWANNER:

It's an EPA contractor --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Right.

LINDA SWANNER:

-- that you use regularly?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes.

LEO DEMARIS:

Is there a contractor, a particular contractor that handles the burning that you guys at the EPA are doing? Who is doing the testing itself when it happens?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

We have our own combustion engineers now with Research and Development who have developed the statistical design and sampling and monitoring strategy for that. But we also wanted to emulate real conditions so that we are working with a company who has one of the air curtain destructors and using that in particular to conduct the actual work.

LEO DEMARIS:

And the name of that company?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

Air Burners.

LEO DEMARIS:

Air Burners?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

Yes.

LINDA SWANNER:

I have another question. Let me get back to it. Let me see. (Viewing documents.) There are not other technologies available currently to deal with C&D besides this burn curtain destructor?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Well, there are lots of technologies.

LINDA SWANNER:

That are not harmful to human population?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Well, we don't think this one is necessarily harmful to population either. But you will see some of the C&D waste being grinded with the big -- there are several different types of grinders. The annihilator --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

In fact, there is --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

There is a grinder right out there at Parish Road.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes, exactly. And we did extensive air monitoring of that activity, and that's why we didn't feel like that activity for C&D material needed to be part of our test because we already have a lot of data on it.

This -- we're not advocating this technology. We are not saying that there is not other technology out there.

This is just a particular type of technology that we do not have data on that we thought needed to be evaluated.

LINDA SWANNER:

Okay. This is probably my last question.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

We've got plenty of time.

LINDA SWANNER:

Given that you are going to go ahead with the vegetative burning of C&D, do you anticipate the ability to test for asbestos here at this location?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. Again, I need to clarify what that means.

LINDA SWANNER:

Does that mean, do you plan on trying to test for asbestos --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Regulated asbestos containing material?

LINDA SWANNER:

-- at this location?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Do you mean during our testing?

LINDA SWANNER:

No, not during this test that you have scheduled for the 23rd and the 24th.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Do you mean at some point --

LINDA SWANNER:

In the future, in the near future --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Later on.

LINDA SWANNER:

-- while this air curtain destructor is here.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

What you're asking is later on?

LINDA SWANNER:

Right.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

So in the foreseeable future?

LINDA SWANNER:

Correct.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I would say it is not likely because there are a couple of reasons. Reason number one is the process and the progress of demolition within the parish. Most of the houses that we may have wanted to test are going to be done. So you really cannot operate the test if you don't have a house to test.

And secondly, I think, we -- it's going to take some time to evaluate all of this data. And we just need to figure out where we go after we get the data in hand and know exactly what we're going to do next.

LINDA SWANNER:

Thank you.

LEO DEMARIS:

The data on the C&D material that is being chipped up, is that available, the monitoring that is being done on what is being chipped at the site now on the C&D? Is that --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

It can be made available.

LEO DEMARIS:

And what do I have to do to get access to that?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Contact me after this.

LEO DEMARIS:

Okay.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

I will exchange my contact information.

LEO DEMARIS:

All right. And guaranteed the last question that I'm going to ask you.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I noticed you said ask her.

LEO DEMARIS:

I always reserve my right to ask

another question. You said on the 24th you're to do the vegetative thing and then shortly thereafter that house, that C&D test will happen, do you anticipate like the 25th or the 26th, or do you know?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

We are anticipating the vegetative test will take two days, so the 24th and the 25th and the C&D the next probably two days.

LEO DEMARIS:

Could we, through Lawanda Thomas or somebody, get some more specific information regarding that?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes. We will work with you and make that available. If you wanted to come and observe, we will have a visitor area like we had planned previously for you to come and observe. And I take it you are more interested in the C&D burn than the vegetative burn.

LEO DEMARIS:

Sure.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Okay. I'll make sure that Lawanda gets with you specifically on that.

LEO DEMARIS:

Okay. Great. Thank you.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And anybody else who has an interest, you know, please, let me know and I can make sure that information gets to you on when we are starting specifically. You are welcome to be there. Again, we will have to restrict you to the visitor area because we will have the monitors all set up and everything.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Now, let me ask a question. Do you know if the tower camera is going to be available on the 23rd? Have you-all decided or are you still negotiating?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, I'll find out -- well, no, it would have been available but the local command post went to (inaudible) -- so I just don't know whether it will be back in time.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

When are we getting the other one back from the shop?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

I don't know. I will have to find out.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. The reason I ask that question, even though the safe observation distance is -- I don't know how many feet.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Like a football field.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes, close to 300.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. 300 or 400 feet away. Our plan actually was to bring -- we have a command post with a tower camera that has a high resolution zoom so we would have been able to essentially bring the camera up close and personal so you would be able to see it on a video monitor up close. But that was like everything else, everything has a schedule.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, that was actually an emergency

response that happened.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yeah.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And so -- the command post was needed at the emergency response.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

And I'm not sure if we're going to be able to get that. We'll get it if we can, and if we can't then it's because it is being used somewhere else. But if it's available then it will be here. So folks will be able to see fairly close -- I am not sure how big a monitor we are going to get.

We've got to get something larger than 9 inches. But it is taxpayer money so we are going to be conservative. We'll have something. I won't guarantee how big it is going to be but it will be able to be seen.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, we hope to, again, unless the mobile command posts are not all out on responses.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yeah, yeah, if it's not available, it's not available.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

We can always bring the one from your house, the flat screen you have there.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I'll keep that one. Was there any other questions? One gentleman came in a little bit late.

MIKE SWANNER:

I was a little late. (Inaudible.)

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. You have to come up closer.

MIKE SWANNER:

Okay. All right.

THE COURT REPORTER:

I've got to have you closer.

MIKE SWANNER:

The monitoring after you get finished burning, when you-all are doing your monitoring -- I saw the map. I guess you're going to have monitors within that area. In the residential areas or elsewhere are you going to have air

sampling monitors for the asbestos after the burn?

LINDA SWANNER:

They're not going to burn asbestos just vegetative.

MIKE SWANNER:

Well, they said they had asbestos in the drywall compound. There's asbestos. I have done asbestos abatement. I have worked on them. I know that they monitor the systems.

And you know after they've done the abatements and stuff, they monitor it before, after -- I mean, during and after for a period of time.

After the burn, will there be monitoring for air samplings to see if there is anything that got up there and is coming down.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

We've only -- in fact, we're only going to monitor -- well, okay, we've already done the monitoring prior.

MIKE SWANNER:

Right.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

So that's already done.

MIKE SWANNER:

Right.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

So we know what the baseline is. We are going to do a baseline monitoring during the burn and that's going to be at a location that's not impacted by the burn which is going to be upwind wind situation.

And I don't know exactly where that is yet, but we're going to pick one that is upwind and that will be the background level. Those will be done at the time of the burns.

Therefore, you can compare the results of the perimeter monitoring with the results in the background to find out if there is an evaluation. But as far as like a day later or something like that, no.

MIKE SWANNER:

Well, like I said --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Let me ask this question because -- all right, I think I understand your question. I am going to ask it a different way. Relative to as the burning takes place, how long after the fire is extinguished are we going to monitor it? That's really your question.

MIKE SWANNER:

Right. How long --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Is it one hour --

MIKE SWANNER:

I mean, you (inaudible) --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

-- or one minute?

MIKE SWANNER:

If any gets out, it can be up there swirling around and one day it decides to come down.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Is it going to be one hour or one minute?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

It's typically the time it takes us to make the round after the burn is over. So

once it is determined that there is no more asbestos containing material or whatever --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Nothing is being burned.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

That, in fact, nothing is being burned. Then we'll discontinue the monitoring, but that process to go around and take all those filters off, as you well know, takes a while.

MIKE SWANNER:

Yeah, takes a while.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Because you have to make the measurements.

MIKE SWANNER:

Right.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

You know, the --

MIKE SWANNER:

What I am saying is there won't be a measuring system, just one or two left spot distances just as in case to see if anything comes down. So it's possible --

because like I said, I've worked with systems where -- asbestos where we are in totally contained systems where we're doing things with asbestos, totally contained, where we are doing all the procedures as bagged, tagged, and all that good stuff. And for several days afterward, it was monitored.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

That's with regulated asbestos.

MIKE SWANNER:

Well, I am talking about minute amounts. Okay. We're not talking about taking off where it's asbestos insulation -- I am talking about minute amounts.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

What you probably have is that that is an active landfill site.

MIKE SWANNER:

Sure.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

And if you did monitor the next day and you did -- you did find levels of asbestos, you don't know where they came from.

MIKE SWANNER:

This is true. But if you have been at baseline already, you know what is --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

(Inaudible.)

MIKE SWANNER:

(Inaudible.)

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

(Inaudible.)

MIKE SWANNER:

But if you get --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

But if we know what it was on the following day --

MIKE SWANNER:

But if you get an elevated (inaudible) -- and they're monitoring and I'm assuming when they're doing their work with this crushing stuff, they're monitoring that. You are going to know if you get a spike but they are supposedly monitoring the stuff they are doing now, aren't they?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Of the --

MIKE SWANNER:

That crushing thing. Whatever you are talking about. They are supposed to be monitoring that; right?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, we don't require that they monitor it, but I feel (inaudible) --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

No. It's not currently regulated.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

I mean, I know that when we monitored the grinder activity for some time --

MIKE SWANNER:

Right.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

-- and I know that they continued to monitor after we did.

MIKE SWANNER:

Uh-huh.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

But I never asked them to continue to do it.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

That's my question. Do we know actually if the Parish is actually monitoring on a daily basis now?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

I don't know that answer to that right now.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

All right. I am going to ask my question again because we may not -- we may not actually know the specific answer, but what I'm understanding -- you're asking -- is this -- is the monitoring going to take place for a day or two after the burning stops?

MIKE SWANNER:

Right, right. Because --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

The answer to this is no.

MIKE SWANNER:

No.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

But is it going to take place an hour after the burning stops?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Typically, yes, because that's about how long it takes to make the rounds, you know, to be able to take all those filters off and make all the flow measurements,

log them into your log, log them into your chain of custody. So it will be about an hour later by the time all the monitors are off.

LINDA SWANNER:

Well, then that seems like it is not a complete test because you're picking up and leaving before you know the final results of it. If there is asbestos in the air that going to affect the area, shouldn't you know that?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Right.

LINDA SWANNER:

I mean, isn't that the point of having the test?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I know, but, again, we are making an assumption that I am not sure is a correct assumption. Maybe Roger can really talk about how the particles, if there is a particle or fiber, how long is it going to be suspended in the air?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Well, if they're little fibers -- if

they're very, very little fibers, it will be a long while. But you know, the air is not going to remain over there because typically you have a -- basically, you have a wind direction.

MIKE SWANNER:

Yeah. This area has some swirling winds. It doesn't just, you know, blow over this way. It will blow this way and then come back the other way. It swirls.

We have some strange wind patterns down here. And if you've been around here long enough you can see -- you know, you can see the weather go this way and just turn around and come right back. And this time of year it does that.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Roger, I think this is something that we can take into consideration, because, you know, we will still have our demob and site restoration activities going on. So I think this is an area that we could talk about and take your comment into consideration about continuing to do the asbestos air monitoring.

MIKE SWANNER:

I am not really against this, okay.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Uh-huh.

MIKE SWANNER:

I think it needs to be done. (Inaudible.) But I am also -- by taking the asbestos abatement -- and minute amounts can kill you, okay. That is what is drummed into our heads big time. And so it is just something that -- while it's done --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, the reason why we wanted to have this meeting is so that we can, you know, listen to your questions and consider your comments. So I think that is a valid comment that we can take into consideration and evaluate.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And we don't necessarily need to do a full sweep for the next day or two but we can look into --

MIKE SWANNER:

I am not talking about a full sweep. I am just talking about one or two here and there and just let them run.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right, exactly.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

And we could do a couple upwind and a couple, you know, straight downwind of the location.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Uh-huh.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

That's probably not that scientific, but it might be able to meet your needs.

MIKE SWANNER:

Well, it's not a controlled environment so it's not going to be real scientific, but if it's getting out it has a good chance of picking it up.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

I would be willing to do that.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Let me just summarize, because I think we should take it into consideration, but

I will tell you I will always have a little bit of a problem about that we're having something that is totally scientific. So we may need to think about what truly is a statistically valid approach in collecting data. Because if you collect data in a way that is not valid, it actually has no meaning.

MIKE SWANNER:

Right.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

It's a number or it's a statement.

MIKE SWANNER:

Well, I was thinking more of a safety --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

(Inaudible.)

THE COURT REPORTER:

One at a time.

MIKE SWANNER:

I'm sorry. I was thinking more of a safety factor, it could get out and -- you know, two days after the burn, it could be up there. It may not be but it could be.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Right. I guess what I'm saying is there is a way to collect data that is going to be valid that actually is going to tell you something.

MIKE SWANNER:

Sure.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

And we need to figure exactly how to do that because it is not in the plan right now. The way we do sampling is we have to have something called a quality assurance --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Plan, right.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

-- tracking plan which defines exactly what we're looking for, how we're going to look for it, all of the methods, and all of those things have to go through peer review and they have to be analyzed. So for us to say we can do something, we need to think about how we do it.

MIKE SWANNER:

Well, you know, I kind of -- I see what you're saying, but in the same token,

I live here, too, you know. And I know --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

We will consider that.

MIKE SWANNER:

I know the hoops EPA made us jump through. So I think it's just fair to make you jump through the same hoops.

LINDA SWANNER:

Well, not only that, I appreciate you saying you will consider it.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes.

LINDA SWANNER:

But "you will consider it," doesn't give me any confidence. EPA is an organization that is supposed to be responsible for protecting the public, if I understand it correctly.

And I understand that you're trying to gather scientific data, but as a vested resident and someone who worries about my health and the health of the people who live around here, I really don't care about your statistics toward the end.

I think that it should be measured in

all aspects so that we feel safe.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Well, let me just make sure you understand what I am saying. If I collect data that is truly not valid, then there are three things that are likely to happen.

Thing number one -- I am going to tell you something that is not likely to be true. It can't be verified. So if I say there is no asbestos, there is no way for you to know that is accurate. If I say there is, there is no way for you to know that is accurate.

So it really doesn't do me any good to say I am protecting you just to collect a sample and then say here's the result if it is not valid.

The second thing, that information can very critically cause other decisions to be made that are bad decisions. So we are very concerned about that, and we're not -- and they are decisions that you have to make. So our issue is we want to give you good information that is verifiable, that

is true and accurate.

I mean, that is very important. It is important to you and it's important to us. And the final thing is, it really damages everyone's credibility that is involved. So you really have no credibility in the entire process.

So what I am saying is -- and we have the scientists here and they do this everyday for a living, we will consider it, is probably as good an answer as you could get from us.

LINDA SWANNER:

Right. I understand that.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

So --

LINDA SWANNER:

And I understand that you're scientists and you know a lot, but you're not residents. You are not going to deal with the effects of this. So we want to be assured that it is safe. Whether it goes into your statistics or not, I want to know.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

That is exactly right.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Sam is being very cautious so that we're not promising something, but we will seriously look at it and make sure before we make a decision to implement it that it is something that we think that will be valuable data. And I think actually there is a chance it will be.

I think that we can, you know, evaluate it and think carefully about where we are going to place -- which monitors we would do this, you know, kind of post-test data collection in a way that we can do it.

And so it's just something that we haven't thought of it, but I think it is actually a really good suggestion. And I think it is something that we can probably work into our plan.

It's just that right now we need to evaluate it and make sure that we do it in the right way so we are collecting good data is all that Sam means.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Just know that we will seriously -- if there is anyway possibly to implement it, we will.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Okay. Let me make one more point that is going to re-enforce what you're concerned with, is that we are going to monitor all the workers that are involved in there. So there will be continual monitors on the workers.

And if there is any -- those individuals are the ones that are the closest to the actual operations. So if there is a release, they are the ones that their monitors are really going to be getting it.

LINDA SWANNER:

Right. I understand that part, but I'm talking about -- that doesn't help me with after it's finished because they're not going to be there, and that's my concern. And then I really --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And since we're still going to there demobbing, you know, the rest of the equipment and doing site restoration. It wouldn't really be that much effort to do some additional monitoring during --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes. But, Nancy, I think the important thing is, my point is exactly your point.

LINDA SWANNER:

That being --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I'm not going to -- you have to have good data, accurate, and it has to have -- it has to tell it proper, accurate, and truthfully.

LINDA SWANNER:

That was your point though. That wasn't mine. Mine was safety.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

That's the only way you're going to guarantee safety.

LINDA SWANNER:

Your point is the data. Okay. Right. So mine is what happens after -- what

happens when you shut down? And I want to be taken seriously for that point. And I would like you to get in touch with me to let me know what the result is of my request before the burn happens. I would truly appreciate that.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Please provide your contact information.

LINDA SWANNER:

I sure will.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Again, we will regroup and see what we can implement and let you know.

LINDA SWANNER:

Great. Thank you.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes. And I am the one that designs the monitors.

LINDA SWANNER:

Okay.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay.

LACY SMITH:

I think (inaudible). Sorry. But you

had mentioned -- Lacy Smith here. You had mentioned that you-all had been testing the grinder that is on the Parish Road landfill site.

Does that mean that the total grinder portion of this test is also cut?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

That is correct.

LACY SMITH:

Okay.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

There will be no grind portion of this test. And previously when we were monitoring the grinder -- we are not continuing to monitor it.

It wasn't part of the test. It was a part of, again, the Katrina Recovery Response.

You know, the Parish announced that they were going to be grinding C&D, construction and demolition material and so we spoke with them and got permission to monitor because we thought, one, we could collect the data on it; and, two, make sure that was being conducted in a

safe manner.

And we also did the same type of monitoring in Plaquemines Parish where they also ground construction and demolition material, and so we have a lot of data on that as well.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. And then are the project plans going to be updated now to reflect the changes?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Oh, yes.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Which is a major job by the way.

LACY SMITH:

I can imagine. (Inaudible.)

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yeah.

LACY SMITH:

And they will be posted online?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

On the web, yes.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Do you know about when?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Well, Dave Ferguson called earlier, you know, as we were coming out here.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yeah.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

So he is going to be starting on it tomorrow. You know, to redo those is not going to be as big of a job as one might would imagine because -- they are basically monitoring that we were going to do -- if, in fact, we would have burned RACM houses is now going to be monitoring what we were going to do on the scene of the houses. So all we need to do is kind of move all that area (inaudible) --

LACY SMITH:

Okay.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

But that takes time to do that and get it all cross checked.

LACY SMITH:

And those are going to be available before --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Before the tests.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Well, it has to be before the tests.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes, before the tests.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes. And that's why I asked, do you know when because there is a timing issue.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

The test is going to be what, the 23rd?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

We're hoping to start the 24th.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

This is what?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

This is the 11th.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

The 11th.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

The 11th?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

What is going to be the end of next week?

LEO DEMARIS:

The 19th is Thursday. The 20th is Friday.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

It will be done by the end of next week.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. And then are you going to allow a comments period or even for this meeting? I know that initially in the announcement, I had heard that there was going to be, like, a deadline for the community just to make comments on paper. Is that still applicable?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, we are actually hoping to get those comments here so we can address them.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Ma'am, if you would like to submit comments, then they have to be, I think, by next Monday.

LACY SMITH:

Okay.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

That we would have to receive those.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. Just because I know a lot of members of the community didn't learn about this meeting until today. And that --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

We are going to have more meetings.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

There's another meeting on Saturday and then next --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

That's fine, but where is the public notice for tonight's meeting and Saturday's meeting.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

It actually was in the paper this morning for both meetings.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

So the notice was this morning for the same day's evening meeting?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And it also announced the Saturday

meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

That's fine.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

There will be another --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

I am just making a point.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

-- announcement coming out Friday for the Saturday meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

I mean, if someone was putting a notice in the paper for something that was important to you, and you are a busy person, would you be able to read the morning paper and make your plans for that evening to attend that meeting.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Well, the plan that we have is to have more than one meeting and to have folks available to answer questions and make presentations available, so people actually have more than one opportunity.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

I am seeing they have one valid

opportunity on Saturday.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. Do you have another question?

LACY SMITH:

Yes. Let me see --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Seven pages of notes there.

LACY SMITH:

I guess along the same kind of notice comment thing, when -- if and when you do the RACM portion of this test, regardless of whether it's here or not, is there going to be an opportunity for notes and comments to comment on those project plans and even maybe a posting (inaudible) -- just so that nationwide -- I mean, the implications of burning RACM are pretty --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I will ask Pam to address that.

MS. PAM TRAVIS, EPA:

I don't think that is something that we have decided on it at this point. There is some question about the extent of public participation, you know, strictly required under the statute.

We generally attempt, as an agency, to try to go above and beyond the basics. So I think that is going to be something that if we get the opportunity to do the third phase of the test, that we will be looking at that, but that may very well be in another time and place than where we are today.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. I guess, with that being said, that was kind of why -- something to go so far as, like, a federal registry notice where nationwide people may have comments to make about this sort of test because who knows when it's going to happen in their neighborhood.

That is kind of why I think it would be important to really let everyone that could potentially be impacted and not just the people that are next door or across the street.

I mean, I know you-all don't have a plan now, but I was just wondering if that could be in perhaps consideration.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I think she wanted you to say something, Pam.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yeah.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Another question?

LACY SMITH:

Yes. For this particular C&D burn, how many operators are there going to be operating the burn, because I know -- sorry, Sam said -- you had said that you are trying to replicate conditions that may occur in real life application, and on this little pamphlet that the Burner people provided, it says, you know, one person can operate a burner or even two.

And to me, I would -- well, either, A, want more people or at least want this test to reflect what might be a (inaudible) -- if the company is saying one person can (inaudible) -- is that what is going to happen here?

So that if, you know, the data you are collecting is reflective of what actually is going to happen?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

Our situation is probably a bit different. And one is because of the monitoring -- the monitoring structure we have and kind of the area around the burner and taking caution, protecting our sampling equipment and then also getting the right material loaded.

So we are going to have operators, basically, moving the material closer to the burn, and then an operator who is actually going to take that and load it into a unit. And that in and of itself may not represent what happens in the field but for purposes of our evaluation, that is just the way we need to structure that.

Again, to really collect the data that needs to be collected. And also for the safety of our people here because we have so many people and we've got a lot of instrumentation and we've got a lot that's going to be going on.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yeah. And we don't want to run over

our monitors, you know. That's a problem.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. I am not sure if the RACM demos which are like -- you know, RACM houses being burnt, have those already occurred and have they been brought to site, and if so, what's going to happen to them?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

They have -- none of the homes whether it was construction and demolition material or the regulated asbestos containing material homes that we had considered using in the tests have been demolished at this time.

Now, they will be treated just like the rest of the demolitions that are occurring in the Parish. They were regularly scheduled. They were not being demolished just for the purpose of our test.

FEMA presented us with a list of 1,200 houses. We looked at all 1,200 houses. So I understand that -- you know, the client you are working with had asked me a number of times, you know, what houses.

We had 1,200 houses we were looking at. It took us a long time to narrow it down. We didn't know until last week which houses we actually were going to use. It really took us that long.

I know that she probably didn't believe that, but it really took us that long because we sampled -- we didn't sample all 1,200 but we looked at them all whether we looked at them in person or we looked at them online or we looked at the information that the Parish had provided us about the house.

LACY SMITH:

Okay.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

But we looked at them all and then we sampled a lot. I don't know off the top of my head how many, but it was quite a number that we sampled. And it really -- even after we had all the results, we didn't just make a snap decision.

It really was scrutinized and evaluated very carefully of what houses specifically. And so we narrowed it down

to just one. Out of all the houses that were approved by FEMA to be demolished during this period of time, we came down to one. We liked one house.

And at one point, there was a question of whether it was going to be demolished in time. And so we, like, actually didn't have a backup. So that -- we were going to have to postpone the test because we didn't have our house.

I mean, it was that -- we were that specific. And any house wouldn't do. Any C&D house wouldn't do. We specifically wanted, you know, a house that met the criteria that we were looking at.

And for this purpose, it was a house that had a little to no asbestos. So just being C&D wasn't enough for us.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. I just wanted to -- I guess -- that concern was expressed to me of getting any asbestos RACM, you know, that was on landfill property or dump property off the property.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes. It is not there, yes.

LACY SMITH:

Okay.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And again, it will be just handled as if the test had never even been considered. It will just go on its own process.

LACY SMITH:

And then -- Sam, you were talking about validity being very important and not doing studies that if the data is not going to be valid -- and I guess in my research I've come across, you know, criticisms of the monitoring method. Particularly, like asbestos in that of the, I guess, opinions I've read and come across, there has never been a test for the validity of the method of the air monitors as far as just testing to make sure the air monitors are doing what they're supposed to do.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes. That's makes perfect sense. I am waiting on you to finish.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. So is that data available for people because -- for people to review and then comment on and, you know, give their comments to you because I think right now a lot of the public is under the impression that you are using a method that is untested and, I guess, in theory unreliable to test to see if something else is happening.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I understand. I can't remember but Roger --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

I think I am the one that is best --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Okay. This method was initially developed by the Agency to deal with the demolition of buildings and evaluate how effective the demolitions were.

It was -- it was developed by a panel of Agency experts and a group of industry experts. It was then publicly and

formally peer reviewed.

We took the comments that, in fact, we got from the public and other interested parties at that time and we modified it to try to adapt to whatever concerns that were valid and we incorporated that in our monitoring strategy, okay.

That monitoring strategy has now been used in the three agency -- the Alternative Asbestos Control Method (AACM)tests or evaluations that were also and, in fact, are going to be also peer reviewed -- one has already been peer reviewed.

The next two are going to be available probably about the first of July, that used virtually the identical monitoring technology.

There are a number of comments that have been, in fact, made about this, mostly by lawyers. But those didn't look at the fact that the actual filters did detect fibers, and those fibers in these instances, you know, may or may not have been asbestos.

So, basically, if the technology wouldn't have worked, we wouldn't have captured anything. So as a result of the fact that we are capturing fibers on them, you know, is an indicator that the technology is working and the fact that we have a ring around 18 monitors, which is a lot of monitors, it gives us a great confidence.

Now, also in addition to that, we are also going to be monitoring the dust. So we are not only monitoring the actual air, but we're monitoring the dust that falls right next to the monitor. And so that gives us a lot of additional information. Now, if you would like the names of the members of the group that developed the technique, I have that with me.

LACY SMITH:

Okay.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

If you would like the names of the individuals that peer reviewed this, I have that with me and the comment was, that we had developed a team of experts

that was the -- basically, the who's who, you know, of asbestos research. So comments that the methods are not valid are just -- are just not appropriate.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. But I guess there has never been a controlled study to test whether these filters are picking up. Did we purposely throw asbestos into the air to see if we can measure it?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Purposely you think it's asbestos.

LACY SMITH:

Well, no, I mean --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

No, we didn't do that.

LACY SMITH:

I know that but I guess --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Well, that would be the only way that we would really, really be able to evaluate the technique.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Are you concerned about the capture efficiency?

LACY SMITH:

Exactly. I mean, I guess an analogy for her before is, I can stand in an outfield with a glove and if you hit enough balls, one is going to fall in. That doesn't make me a good outfielder.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Okay. Let me -- maybe it's time to use another analogy. You know, if somebody asked you to go down and characterize the water quality in the Mississippi River, I mean how many samples would you take? Would you have to sample the whole river?

LACY SMITH:

No. But I would want it to be significant.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

It is significant. If you look at the probability that we're going to do that, the probability is very high. These asbestos fibers are not particularly bright. And so they don't -- in fact, don't basically know where the monitor is and so they don't dodge around it. So

whereas, you know, the other fibers are being collected.

In fact, one of our problems is that we have to be careful that we don't overload the filters, because of the fact we are not able to read the asbestos. So the filters are effective in being able to do what they need, you know, and designed to do.

The problem is that it costs a lot of money to do the analysis because you have to count all those number of grids. If you have a low air -- a lower rate to guarantee that you're not going to overload them, then you have to count extra grids in order to get the analytical sensitivity that you want.

It costs much more money. So you are trying to balance the both of those. And for those of you who have, in fact, worked with asbestos you know what I mean.

LINDA SWANNER:

Yes.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

So we have great confidence that the

combination of the air filters and the dust data are going to provide us a very accurate comfort zone, that if there is an asbestos release we are going to be able to detect it.

Plus, on top of that as I mentioned, you know, usually we are, in fact, going to be monitoring all the workers. So in addition to the perimeter monitors, then, in fact, the worker levels are the ones that we would expect to be high if there was a release. You know, much higher than, you know, you or me.

The perimeter monitors are -- and the farther away that you go -- you know, obviously, the less the concentration is going to be because you are going to get pollution.

So the -- you know, the closer the reading is to the actual operation, the better your probability is that you will be able to capture any releases.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And again, keep in mind we are talking about a C&D house that, you know, had

virtually, you know, no asbestos in it. I am not going to say it had none. But, I mean, it had the least amount that we could find.

LACY SMITH:

Oh, I guess I was thinking more of, you know, if and when RACM is burnt and it would be -- I guess applicability -- holistically, it's very safe in being done.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, actually that is part of the reason, you know, why we are actually wanting this test to serve as looking at the future of whether or not this type of methodology is appropriate.

And so that's one of the things that we're looking at. And so that's why we are going to do the asbestos monitoring as part of this test even though it is a C&D house, because, again, we're looking at the methodology.

So we're doing this in baby steps to make sure that if in the future we decide that we want to do that next phase of the

test, what tweaks do we need to make, is it even appropriate, that type of thing.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. Yeah, I guess -- (inaudible) -- is why I just felt it would appropriate to have an official notice and comment on any kind of test in the future that would involve RACM.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right. And it may not be the exact same test. I mean, this test may effect how a future test would look, because we thought, you know, it was appropriate to take a step back, and again evaluate this approach.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. That's all my questions.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

You didn't cover seven pages.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

He was making a joke.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Okay. Does anybody have any other questions whatsoever?

LEO DEMARIS:

Whatsoever?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Whatsoever?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

There's always the next meeting.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I do not want anybody to leave and say, you know, I had a question and I didn't get them to answer it.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And let me go ahead and give out my e-mail address if you have questions. And you know Sam said you have until, you know, close of business Monday. It's jones.nancy@epa.gov.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

You don't have a card by any chance, do you?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Did you get one of mine?

LEO DEMARIS:

You handed out a couple of them.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I was hoping to collect some money for these but nobody was paying.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

You actually (inaudible) --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I just want to make sure -- are there any other questions? Are there anymore questions?

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:

Are there anymore nominations?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Anymore nominations? I don't want anybody to leave in want of an answer.

LACY SMITH:

Is everyone here going to be here Saturday?

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I will not be here Saturday. I am not actually sure who is going to be here Saturday. I have to -- I will be helping my daughter move on Saturday.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. So --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Who is going to be here Saturday? Fran is going to be here. Nancy is going to be here. Pam is going to be here.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

I don't know if I'm going to be here or not. I have to leave the next day to go to Baltimore to make a presentation.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

Well, you can fly back with me.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yeah.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I will be moving boxes. Okay. I will not hold you. I want to make sure you folks have had a chance to ask any question.

I want to thank everybody for coming. Monday we need to get any comments that folks have. You can submit them to me or you can submit them to Nancy. I think you can submit it to Lawanda. Anybody at EPA whose e-mail address you have, we'll be able to get it all together and be able to respond.

LINDA SWANNER:

Do you think you could postpone it until Tuesday since the meeting is not until Saturday? It would give people a

chance to comment since the notice was put in the paper today, and it didn't really give many people a chance to come and see the meeting.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I don't think I can.

LINDA SWANNER:

I would appreciate it if you could.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

She's good. Now, she's good.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I know. That is very good. I will have to consider that. The problem that we have, of course, is to respond to everything by a certain date. It is important that you have the comments, so if we extend the dates then that just puts us and discombobulates us.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes. And see, my guys have to -- if we're going to revise it, you know, we have to have it --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

You've got to have timing.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

-- finished by next week, so we can't be getting something Tuesday. And if it involves any type of --

LINDA SWANNER:

Right. I know, but we got late notice. And I don't know about you-all, but I work overtime. We're going to have to --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

They are working overtime.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

We've been working 60 hours a week for the past two months and only getting paid for 40.

LINDA SWANNER:

Yeah. This is pretty important though. It is important to the residents. So I really would like to see Tuesday, if we could, if at all possible.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Well --

LINDA SWANNER:

It would be very much appreciated. It would also demonstrate good faith on the part of --

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

That's even better.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

That's right. She is good, isn't she?

LINDA SWANNER:

I'm just asking.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

I know. I know. We will see what can be done.

LINDA SWANNER:

Thank you.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Yes. We will try and make that accomplished.

LINDA SWANNER:

Thanks. I appreciate it.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Any other issues? Okay. Thanks. Good night everyone.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Thanks for coming.

MR. SAM COLEMAN, EPA:

Drive safe.

(Off the record at 8:55 p.m., whereupon, the taking of the EPA Hearing

on Wednesday, the 11th of June, 2008, is concluded.)

R E P O R T E R ' S P A G E

I, Angie Henning, Certified Court Reporter, in and for the State of Louisiana, the officer, as defined in Rule 28 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or Article 1434(b) of the Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure, before whom this hearing was taken, do hereby state on the record:

That due to the interaction in the spontaneous discourse of this proceeding, dashes (--) have been used to indicate pauses, changes in thought, and/or talkovers; that same is the proper method for a court reporter's transcription of a proceeding; that the dashes (--) do not indicate that words or phrases have been left out of this transcript; and that any words and/or names which could not be verified through reference material have been denoted with the phrase "(phonetic)."

STATE OF LOUISIANA:

I, Angie Henning, Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Louisiana, as the officer before whom this hearing was taken, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, constitute a true and correct transcription of the evidence adduced on the taking of the

EPA PUBLIC MEETING,

on Wednesday, the 11th day of June, 2008, at the St. Bernard Parish Council Trailer, 8201 West Judge Perez, Chalmette, Louisiana, after the public meeting was commenced; that the hearing was reported by me in the voicewriting reporting method and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me; that I am not related the parties herein, nor am I otherwise interested in the outcome of this matter.

_____

ANGIE HENNING, CVR, CCR #23023