1	UNITED STATES
2	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
3	
4	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
5	
6	DISASTER DEBRIS REDUCTION PROJECT FOR
7	RESIDENTIAL BUILDING DEBRIS FROM
8	HURRICANE KATRINA
9	CHALMETTE, LOUISIANA
10	
11	* * * * *
12	
13	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
14	PUBLIC MEETING
15	Saturday
16	JUNE 14, 2008
17	3:10 P.M.
18	
19	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
20	
21	
22	BEFORE:
23	Angie Henning, CCR, CVR
24	Certified Court Reporter
25	In and for the State of Louisiana

Γ

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	Janetta Coates, EPA
4	EPA Community Involvement Coordinator
5	Jeff Frithsen, EPA
6	Office of Research and Development
7	Roger Wilmoth, EPA
8	Office of Research and Development
9	Fran Kremer, EPA
10	Office of Research and Development
11	Pam Travis, EPA
12	Deputy Regional Counsel Officer
13	Nancy Jones, EPA
14	Superfund OSC, Region 6
15	David Passey
16	St. Bernard Parish Government
17	Christina Bigelow
18	St. Bernard Resident
19	Lacy Smith
20	Tulane Environmental Law Clinic
21	Alberta Lewis
22	St. Bernard Resident
23	Jim Lewis
24	St. Bernard Resident
25	

EPA PUBLIC MEETING 1 2 DISASTER DEBRIS REDUCTION PROJECT 3 Chalmette, Louisiana 4 Saturday, June 14, 2008 5 3:10 p.m. 6 7 MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA: 8 Good evening. 9 DAVID PASSEY: 10 Good evening. 11 MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA: 12 I would like to get the meeting 13 started if that is okay with everyone. 14 DAVID PASSEY: 15 Yes, yes. 16 MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA: 17 My name is Janetta Coats. I am the 18 facilitator for this meeting tonight. 19 am responsible for ensuring that the 20 meeting is handled in an according manner, 2.1 and to make sure that the court reporter receives all of the comments and answers 22 23 to each question that is asked. 24 So if it is all possible, if you 25 desire to make a comment tonight, I would

ew Orieans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

2.1

like for you fill out one of the cards that looks like this (indicating), one of these yellow cards. And I will call your name and you will come up to the front, make your comment, receive an answer, and then you can be seated after you make your comment.

When you do that, please state your name. If you have any unusual spellings with your name, spell that so the court reporter can get that on the record.

Okay. Our court reporter is Ms. Angie
Henning sitting here to my right. I would
like to turn this over now to Ms. Nancy
Jones. She will show you a brief
presentation on what the purpose of the
meeting is for tonight.

Nancy?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Hi, I'm Nancy Jones and I'm the EPA on-the-scene coordinator that has been coordinating with our Office of Research and Development on the project that we will be talking about. I have a number of EPA folks with me.

2.1

Pam Travis is our regional counsel
officer or deputy regional counsel. Fran
Kremer is with EPA's Office of Research
and Development. Roger Wilmoth, again,
with EPA's Office of Research and
Development. And Jeff is the same, again,
Office of Research and Development.

So just a little brief background about the project in case you are not aware or familiar with it. This came about because of all the damage from Hurricane Katrina rendered thousands of homes uninhabitable, and there was a large need for a large number of demolitions. And it has resulted in a huge debris management issue. The largest debris management situation in our country that we've had to deal with.

In an effort to better deal with these types of situations, EPA is working to develop a debris management options that can expedite debris removal in a cost-effective and environmentally sound manner.

As a result, we have been working with

2.1

the State, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality and St. Bernard Parish on evaluating some options to reduce the amount of waste that is generated and goes into landfills.

So, specifically, we have developed a pilot project involving thermal treatment and grinding of the debris. Our original plan was to burn and grind construction and demolition debris; that is houses that are demolished that do not contain regulated asbestos containing material, as well as houses that contain regulated asbestos containing materials.

However, due in part to community concerns, and in preparation for public release of information, we took a look at our risk assessment that we had previously prepared and we found an error in our risk calculations.

So as a result, we decided that we needed to do a further study before we proceed with the regulated asbestos portion of the project. But we would like to go ahead and do the vegetative debris

2.1

and construction and demolition portion of the project, because we think there is valuable data that we can collect from that portion of the project that will help us in the future to be able to proceed in the future with the regulated asbestos containing material portion of the project.

So even though we are deferring that portion right now, it is something that we would still like to continue to pursue sometime in the future. Not next month, you know, it would be some time.

We need to look at all the data from the portion of the project which we are wanting to pursue right now and evaluate what next steps can be taken before we proceed with that portion. But I do want to emphasize that safety is EPA's number one concern.

This includes the workers on-site,
EPA's contractors and EPA personnel, as
well as the public. That is our first
primary concern. And that is the reason
why we decided to step back.

2.1

Once we found the error, we thought, you know, safety is way more important than the research, and we want to make sure that we can conduct this research in a safe manner.

We do believe that the testing that we are wanting to do -- we are taking every precaution possible, and we do think that we can conduct the vegetative and the construction demolition portion of the test in a safe manner.

And we think that this will help provide data to come up with effective alternatives to landfilling waste in the future that large natural disasters generate. And we would like to proceed with the test and look at any comments that you have and implement the comments that you have so that this test will help in the future with making sure that waste is reduced and we don't have to build as many landfills to address this type of situation in the future.

So that is what we are here to talk about. We do have a brief video clip. It

2.1

is very short, showing the actual piece of equipment, what the air curtain destructor looks like when it's in operation when it is burning the vegetative debris.

And so we wanted to show that to you, so you will have an idea of what to expect.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

(Playing video clip of the air curtain destructor.)

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

We also have a poster of an up-close photo of the air burner. And we have a map blown up showing the location of the test site.

(Indicating to poster.)

It is the Parish Road landfill staging area, and it shows in proximity of the closest residents and business for your review.

So, I would like at this point to go ahead and turn it over to Janetta, so she can tell how we are going to proceed from here.

MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA:

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

2.1

Okay. Thank you, Ms. Nancy. Again, this is not a debate. We are here to receive comments on the study that is being conducted.

When you signed in, you were again given a yellow card. So if there is anyone that would like to make a comment, let me know and you can come up to the front.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

So at this time if you have questions, then if you will just --

MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA:

Any comments? Any comments from the audience. Since we have a small group, we won't necessarily go through all the ground rules that we normally do because we have a small group.

There are some ground rules that we have in place when we have a large crowd to address comments and concerns. But since we do have a small group, we will just go to you guys individually and let you make your comments, okay.

So who would like to be first?

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

2.1

LACY SMITH:

Without filling it out first?

MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA:

No, you don't have to fill it out.

Just stand up and come up to the podium and state your name so that the court reporter can get your name properly on the record.

LACY SMITH:

Lacy Smith, L-A-C-Y. I have a question about -- with the assessments I know there were some asbestos assessments, but is there any sort of assessment of other things like lead paint or toxic kind of chemicals that are in these houses, so that you have an idea of what is going in versus what is going out in the event that you have a reading of the toxins.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Well, we have an evaluation -- this is Roger Wilmoth. We have an evaluation of the lead that is in the house because that was part of the asbestos, the evaluation. As well we looked for, you know, any asbestos-containing materials and also for

2.1

any lead-based paint materials.

That is probably -- that is probably all we have on just what was in the house, because that is what we were looking for in those individual surveys.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. I have a follow-up question.

Are there other chemicals and stuff that the community should be concerned about, because, I mean, as far as the kinds of hazardous things that are in a house?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, I can tell you as far as the procedure for doing the demolitions, is that the demolition contractor before they do the demolitions are supposed to remove household hazardous wastes and placed them curbside, as well as the white goods.

And when I mean white goods, I mean refrigerators, washers, dryers, stoves, ovens, that type of thing. So the Freon is handled separately and the household hazardous waste is picked up prior to the demolition occurring.

So those types of toxic hazardous

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

Saturday, June 14, 2008 1 materials are not part of the demolished 2 house. Those are handled separately. 3 MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA: 4 And "E" waste, too. 5 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 6 Yeah, and "E" waste, too. "E" waste 7 meaning computers, television, those types 8 of things. 9 LACY SMITH: 10 Okay. 11 MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA: 12 Anymore comments? JIM LEWIS: 13 14 My name is Jim Lewis. I would like to 15 know if this is sort of a lead up that we 16 will be able to burn our trash in the 17 front of the house or something without 18 the fire department coming over there 19 harassing us? MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 20 2.1 No, absolutely not. 22 DAVID PASSEY:

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

No, sir.

No.

23

24

25

2.1

DAVID PASSEY:

David Passey with the Parish,

St. Bernard Parish. That is two different animals.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes. This is totally different.

JIM LEWIS:

All right. I thought maybe this would help us out there, you know.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

This is specifically related to handling waste generated from natural disasters when it is a vast amount that is just an incredible amount that you have to deal with landfilling. And we are looking for alternatives so that in the future more landfills don't have to be constructed. So, it is not just regular day-to-day trash.

It would only be implemented -- and, again, I went to emphasize that we are not advocating this technology. This is a technology that we are wanting to evaluate to see if it is appropriate for waste reduction purposes. So, we are not trying

1	to test this so then necessarily a rule
2	will be promulgated.
3	We are just trying to evaluate the
4	effectiveness of this technology and
5	whether it is something that, you know,
6	EPA should allow to occur during
7	extraordinary circumstances.
8	JIM LEWIS:
9	Thank you.
10	MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA:
11	Anymore comments?
12	ALBERTA LEWIS:
13	(Raises hand.)
14	MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA:
15	Yes, ma'am, could you step up to the
16	podium and state your name, please.
17	ALBERTA LEWIS:
18	My name is Alberta Lewis. And, I
19	guess, you may have answered one of the
20	questions that I would have had, but I
21	would still like to come forth.
22	If this test were acceptable by EPA
23	standards, this fire box is what size?
24	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
25	It comes in different sizes actually.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

We are going to use a smaller unit for the purpose of the test, but they can build larger ones as well. This one has kind of been custom-built.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

I don't really know the dimensions of it. Do you, Fran?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

I don't right off the top of my head.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

But, you know, the one that we looked at was probably going be two-thirds as long as the room here.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Well, more than the size, but the capacity of it. How is this -- I imagine you have researched that this is an efficient -- would this be an efficient way to do this?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, that is part of the purpose of the test to see if it is efficient. So that is something that we want to evaluate. You know, the vendors wanted to utilize this technology during Katrina,

2.1

and we had to tell them it couldn't be used, because we didn't have data to support whether or not it was effective and whether it was safe.

And so the purpose of this test is to really determine whether or not this is a good idea or not. And so without doing the test, we won't know.

Now, that is -- when I say "we don't know," what I'm really specifically talking about is the burning of regulated asbestos containing material which we are actually not going to do in the test right now.

We have decided that burning the construction demolition material will provide us data that could be used towards looking at whether or not it is safe to conduct the test portion of burning regulated asbestos. So we are taking baby steps.

We want to do this first, gather this data, and then evaluate the data and then decide whether or not it's prudent to move onto the next phase of the testing.

2.1

After this phase of the test, we may decide we don't want to move on. But we really need to gather the data, evaluate it, and think about whether or not it is a good idea to proceed forward.

But right now, you know, all of our information is hypothetical and very conservative. And so we didn't feel comfortable allowing this technology to be utilized during Katrina without data to back it up.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

So, we all know -- those of us that are old-timers in St. Bernard. We all know about the effectiveness in eliminating waste by the dump that used to be there. But we know also today that household waste has changed. Electronics, hazardous materials that come out for the public usage for cleaning, and of course the asbestos issue.

When you do this test, are you going to get -- wait, let me say this -- and that's why dump -- the dump burning was not that appealing to us, not only because

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

of the toxic substance of airborne fumes, but also the odors because of the burning of garbage, etc., etc., etc.

So when you burn this -- are you -the data that you are collecting, is it going to record perhaps what was in that? Because those houses that were demolished, we don't really know that they didn't have asbestos.

Because I, myself, for one stood in the lower nine at the emptying of a house and saw people sneaking in the asbestos tiles. So we don't -- in paper bags -- I mean, in plastic bags that couldn't be recognized.

So that would concern me that you are going to burn a house -- now, maybe you have selected it very carefully.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

But at the same time, are you collecting data that might indicate some of the -- what and the degree of that are toxic substances and possible and

1	potential I see you are shaking your
2	heads.
3	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
4	Yes, we are.
5	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
6	Yes. In fact, it has been evaluated
7	twice. First by the Parish, because in
8	order to do a demolition, the Parish
9	contractors have to go through and do an
10	asbestos inspection.
11	ALBERTA LEWIS:
12	That is the household debris that you
13	are
14	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
15	No, ma'am.
16	ALBERTA LEWIS:
17	What is it then?
18	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
19	They did an asbestos inspection. So
20	they did a full asbestos inspection. They
21	went in the house.
22	ALBERTA LEWIS:
23	Of the house?
24	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
25	Yes.

2.1

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes, of the house.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

The one house we are using.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes, there is only one house that we want to burn. We looked at a number of houses. And we have whittled it down to one house that we want to test. And so the Parish contractors, demolition contractors, did their complete survey.

I mean, they go through every room of the house and they look at every aspect. They look at the roofing material. They look at the ceilings. They look at the drywall joint compounds. They look at the flooring material. And they make a determination of whether or not the house contains regulated asbestos containing material.

And then when we decided -- we thought that this particular house had a potential for use in our test, we did the same thing. We hired our own contractor and we went through and did a complete thorough

ew Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

2.1

inspection.

And then we compared our results to the Parish contractor results to make sure that we both agreed, because we didn't want to use a house that we thought was non-regulated asbestos, but the Parish contractor thought that it was.

So we narrowed it down to one house that we both agreed upon, and it does not contain regulated asbestos containing material. And both the Parish contractors and EPA contractors have been through the house, through the entire house.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

And would you say that is true of the toxic materials to be hazardous waste?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Now, that will be removed prior to the demolition. It is part of the decommissioning process. So when the house is scheduled for demolition, a couple days before the decommissioning crew comes in and they remove the household hazardous waste, they remove the white goods, and they remove the

2.1

electronic waste.

And then actually they call the EPA hotline, and EPA contractors come pick it up curbside and then the house is demolished.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Okay. So this has been given the pristine data on material that is checked and double checked. What is your -- I know depending upon the test, but surely you are doing this with the possibility of it resolving some of the problems, because we know what accumulated waste is not such safe waste in the parish, the old-timers do, with the type of mound that is over there which can lead to leaching, etc., etc., etc.

So how do we know that this test -what am I trying to say? That once this
test is conducted and you are satisfied
that that is the thing to do from the data
that you receive in the test, then what?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, that will be up to the State and locals. Basically, what we will do is we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

will publish our results and then we will take a step back. Construction and demolition material, there is not anything that prohibits that material being burned in this type of device, so it is something that --

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Within that chamber?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right, exactly. So that is something that, you know, the state government, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality or the St. Bernard Parish wanted to go to the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality and talk about utilizing that technology, and is that something that can be permanent. But EPA wouldn't have anything to do with it. would be totally out of the loop, that would be a state issue.

Now, if we proceeded in the future and did the regulated asbestos test, and if the state wanted to utilize this technology to burn regulated asbestos containing material, the state would have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

to request a no action assurance from the EPA headquarters in Washington, DC. And EPA headquarters in Washington, DC would make a determination whether or not they were going to allow that. But for burning construction and demolition material, EPA headquarters doesn't need to be involved and neither does the EPA regional office. ALBERTA LEWIS: So that -- what did you call it? What kind of construction material? MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: Construction and demolition. ALBERTA LEWIS: Okay. MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: Which did not contain regulated asbestos material. ALBERTA LEWIS: Okay. So but -- are you going to -is it your plan to try to attempt that with what has already been collected, the mounds that we already have now? MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Again, we are --

1	ALBERTA LEWIS:
2	What is going to happen?
3	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
4	We are only conducting a test.
5	DAVID PASSEY:
6	This is a project.
7	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
8	Yes. This is just this is just the
9	test.
10	ALBERTA LEWIS:
11	Just this one test.
12	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
13	And then after we complete the test,
14	it is really up to the state on what they
15	want to do with that information.
16	ALBERTA LEWIS:
17	Okay. I understand.
18	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
19	But we are not proposing that the
20	State take the mounds and do this with
21	this. We are just conducting an
22	evaluation. We are not making policy
23	decisions or policy suggestions.
24	ALBERTA LEWIS:
25	Okay. I understand. I asked

DAVID PASSEY: 1 2 Hi, I'm David Passey with the 3 St. Bernard Parish Government. Alberta, 4 maybe this will help a little bit. The 5 focus of this pilot program is as I 6 understand it -- and correct me guys if I am wrong -- is waste reduction. 7 ALBERTA LEWIS: 8 9 Okay. 10 DAVID PASSEY: 11 For catastrophes in our demolition 12 projects on that stuff, the contractors 13 are paid on the base of a cubic yard. 14 ALBERTA LEWIS: 15 Uh-huh. 16 DAVID PASSEY: 17 On a volume-type basis. So it 18 behooves -- if there is a way or method to 19 reduce the size, the cubic measurements of this place itself, then we'll get off with 20 2.1 a cheaper price. ALBERTA LEWIS: 22 23 So we're following the dollar there, 24 too. 25 DAVID PASSEY:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

That's part of the stuff for this program, too. And that's good. That's good for this parish and it's good for everybody else that is out there that it can be done safely.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

And for the -- and for the ground and the water table that is going to result -- the damage that can result to that if those mounds are just swept back.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And also so that there is not, you know, additional landfills that have to be constructed.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

That is the big thing, yes, so.

DAVID PASSEY:

And we haven't -- when I say we, the government hasn't taken the position yet.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

The Parish? The Parish; right?

DAVID PASSEY:

The Parish, yes. And it is a good thing to do. Whether or not the Parish is going to do it in a non-emergency

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

situation, I don't know. You know, to try to get to buy one of these burn units and try to reduce it ourselves, I'm not sure. That is not really what we are having an issue here with.

Right now, I think, what we have an issue with is catastrophes, try to reduce the waste as much as possible at a safe and reasonable cost and get it safely disposed of and then moved on.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

So you are saying that this is a test for a national situation?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

That is absolutely correct.

DAVID PASSEY:

And that is as well for the Tulane Environmental Law Clinic, too.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

This is Christina Bigelow. I think, you know, this fundamental -- even if this was to turn out okay and this was implemented at some point in the future and a natural disaster maybe was out in the Midwest, I don't know. I think it

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

1	fundamentally differs from the situation
2	at Kaiser because those ponds, pits, and
3	lagoons were closed at a point in time
4	when the state government was sort of
5	offering a free pass.
6	ALBERTA LEWIS:
7	Not as much regulation.
8	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
9	To close those prior to requiring
10	ALBERTA LEWIS:
11	(Inaudible.)
12	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
13	Exactly however, the one good thing
14	with the mounds and dump is, that landfill
15	is capped. And so the potential
16	permeation from the mounds that are there
17	now is greatly reduced. But, I mean, I
18	think this situation is kind of
19	fundamentally different. I just wanted to
20	point that out.
21	ALBERTA LEWIS:
22	It is.
23	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
24	Kaiser is another situation.
25	ALBERTA LEWIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

But we know what happens.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

Exactly, we do. And, in fact, you know, a contractor came and wanted to put a landfill on top of the Kaiser landfill, but because the pits, ponds, and lagoons are so unstable they were built prior to regulation.

Here we are after regulation and we're in a place where there is no possible way that this waste is going to go to an unregulated landfill even after it is reduced. I mean, it is going to be disposed to 100 percent compliant.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And one concern I would have about taking material that has already been piled up and then trying to do this with it is, you don't know what is in it.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

That is my -- that's been the concern.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

You know, it's better to utilize this technology when you know what you're putting in it rather than to address piles

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

that were generated some time ago and you don't have any information about what is in that pile.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

You didn't have controls, right. No controls on what went in it?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

So the ash from this burn off, what happens to that?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, then we would test it and depending on what was in the material -- it would depend on how it was disposed of. If the ash ends up, you know, failing and becoming a bit -- indicating that it is a hazardous waste, if it fails the toxic characteristic leaching procedures test, then we would have to handle it as hazardous waste.

But if it does not fail and is not hazardous, then it would go off to a nonhazardous landfill. And, again, since this is not -- does not contain regulated

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

1	
1	asbestos-containing material, it could go
2	to just a regular C&D landfill,
3	construction and demolition landfill.
4	ALBERTA LEWIS:
5	Uh-huh.
6	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
7	So it is all going to depend on
8	What the test results are.
9	ALBERTA LEWIS:
10	So at what temperature is the what
11	is the maximum temperature of heat on
12	this.
13	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
14	My understanding is 2,000 degree
15	Fahrenheit.
16	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
17	That is pretty warm.
18	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
19	Just a little.
20	ALBERTA LEWIS:
21	Now, I'm familiar with high
22	temperatures. I do porcelain work.
23	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
24	Oh, okay, yeah.
25	ALBERTA LEWIS:

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

2.1

So I understand that porcelains go to 2,500 and 2,600 degrees and sanitary commercial goes even higher than that. So I am not that steady on, for examples, selenium, cadmium, those heavy metals, I don't know what their maximum heat range is to deteriorate or if they do in heat at all.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And that's an excellent point. That is the reason why, you know, the ash may fail for metals. And if that is the case, then we would have to dispose of it as hazardous waste.

So that is -- and that is actually part of the test, to determine if this type of technology creates waste that is hazardous waste, then maybe this technology is not efficient. And we won't know unless we actually do the test.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Now, if this goes through, the non-asbestos burning, it would be then your intention to try to do an asbestos test burning; right?

ew Orieans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 2 Yes. 3 ALBERTA LEWIS: 4 And then would that then indicate that more of the existing debris could be 5 6 burned in a chamber as Mr. Passey mentioned just then. 7 8 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 9 Well, we probably won't have the test results in time and be able to do the next 10 11 phase of the test before you-all are 12 finished with your demolition, honestly, 13 because it is going to take us that long 14 to evaluate the data and prepare for the 15 next phase of the test. 16 So we do not -- we do not expect to be 17 able to do a regulated asbestos-containing 18 burn while you still have houses that need 19 to be demolished. So it would not happen 20 here. 2.1 ALBERTA LEWIS: 22 I see. The timeline isn't possible. 23 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 24 Right. 25 ALBERTA LEWIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

I have one more question. What is the atmosphere of what is been burned off in the burning process? Is it all contained within this fire chamber or is it filtered? The air --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

What is the material that will be released in the air?

ALBERTA LEWIS:

I am not saying it too well. The airborne particles that might be in a burnout like this?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

And that's exactly what we'll be testing.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Right.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

We have a series of parameters that we will be monitoring, some continuously, which will include different types of gases and what we call "total hydrocarbons," and as well, we'll be monitoring the temperature.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1	So this is all going to be contained
2	within that fire chamber?
3	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
4	We need to evaluate that, how
5	effective it is.
6	ALBERTA LEWIS:
7	So there could be a leakage from that
8	fire chamber?
9	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
10	Well
11	DAVID PASSEY:
12	They have sensors. They are going to
13	have sensors strategically placed around
14	the burn unit to sensor for that, okay.
15	To sensor for what is going to be up in
16	the air; is that right; am I correct?
17	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
18	Right.
19	DAVID PASSEY:
20	There are different yardages, 300
21	yards, 30 yards, 50 yards, and stuff like
22	that. So that's what they
23	ALBERTA LEWIS:
24	Much like we get of the refineries.
25	DAVID PASSEY:

1	Well, I think this is a lot better
2	than the refineries.
3	ALBERTA LEWIS:
4	But I I know that, but on that I
5	meant
6	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
7	Air quality monitor.
8	ALBERTA LEWIS:
9	As an analogy.
10	DAVID PASSEY:
11	Yes.
12	ALBERTA LEWIS:
13	I had another question but it lost me
14	for the moment.
15	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
16	But I am just asking also we read
17	in the work plan that not only are there
18	going to be the monitors that are going to
19	be within the concentric circle that you
20	will see, but there will also be five
21	perimeter sites that are sort of bias
22	towards population that are beyond those.
23	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
24	I think is right. That's right, yes.
25	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

I believe I am correct in that. That is -- and I think, you know, it was one of the things that when the Parish reviewed that, you know, we, specifically, were happy to see that additional --

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Right. (Inaudible.)

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And then additionally, there are also some monitors that are mounted onto the box itself, so we can monitor, you know, what is immediately --

ALBERTA LEWIS:

That was my next question.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

-- is coming out of the box. And then what's in the perimeter. We've got two different concentric circles of monitors, and then we have a second one stepping back and then there is the five that are closer to where the residents are. So we have --

ALBERTA LEWIS:

And how many in the two concentric circles?

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

1	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
2	Well, there are eight there are
3	going to 18 monitors in the first ring,
4	and then I'll have to go back in my plan
5	to look at what, you know, is in the outer
6	ring. There are going to be 18 of the
7	asbestos monitors because we are going to
8	monitor for asbestos.
9	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
10	Right.
11	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
12	There are going to be
13	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
14	We have 15
15	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
16	Total particulate monitors
17	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
18	Fifteen of those.
19	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
20	There is going to be the dioxin furan
21	monitors.
22	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
23	Fifteen of those.
24	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
25	Plus the ones that are going to be

Saturday, June 14, 2008

along the roa

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

along the road. There are five of those.

And then we're going to do some background monitoring; that, in fact, we are able to compare those results to.

The primary monitors though are the ones that are right on top of the box.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

And those are how many? How large is this fire chamber?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

It is, you know, from there (indicating) to the wall. However long that is?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

Maybe 8' feet, approximately.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yeah.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

By?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

About this long and about 8' feet wide.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

About maybe -- about maybe 30' or 40' feet long, something like that.

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

1	DAVID PASSEY:
2	You know, those big SPT containers,
3	those garbage
4	ALBERTA LEWIS:
5	Yeah.
6	DAVID PASSEY:
7	It is something like that.
8	ALBERTA LEWIS:
9	Uh-huh.
10	DAVID PASSEY:
11	Maybe a little longer, but not much
12	longer than that.
13	ALBERTA LEWIS:
14	So that's about 40' by what did you
15	say, eight?
16	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
17	It's less than 30.
18	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
19	By 8' by probably 8' feet tall or
20	something like that.
21	ALBERTA LEWIS:
22	So that's about 3,000 better than
23	3,000 square foot; right, not counting
24	cubic feet>?
25	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1	Right.
2	ALBERTA LEWIS:
3	Okay. So what happens and how many
4	monitors on that equipment the fire
5	burner on the exterior?
6	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
7	Well, that one has well, I don't
8	know how many.
9	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
10	We have continuous emissions
11	monitoring that is set up on that, that
12	will monitor the gases and will monitor
13	what we call total hydrocarbons.
14	MS. PAM TRAVIS, EPA:
15	That's inside of it.
16	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
17	It is right on
18	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
19	It's right on the edge.
20	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
21	It is mounted on it.
22	ALBERTA LEWIS:
23	If there is a substance emitted that
24	would be not as safe or at least have some
25	concern about, what happens then? Suppose

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

that -- just suppose -- I mean, the worst-case scenario would be if it did release something that shouldn't have released, so then what happens?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

We have for those perimeters, for the gases, the total hydrocarbons and also for the temperature, we have continuous monitoring.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Real time data.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

Real time, and that data is being averaged over every minute. And we will have all those data points. And we've got a data acquisition system that is set up, and so we will be monitoring that at the exact time that the -- you know, for the whole time that it is operating and two hours after the last bushel is fed into the unit.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

The nature of this container, is it all metal or does it have fire brick in it?

ew Orieans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
2	It has it is lined with
3	ALBERTA LEWIS:
4	Does it have the one that is on the
5	shuttle?
6	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
7	(Demonstrating diagram.) Does that
8	better explain to you here?
9	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
10	Yeah. That thing is lined with is
11	it fire brick or some porcelain, I
12	think.
13	ALBERTA LEWIS:
14	Is it the composition of material that
15	I think is used on the shuttle. Isn't it
16	(inaudible)
17	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
18	I wouldn't
19	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
20	I'm not sure.
21	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
22	I wouldn't quite say this is the same
23	stuff.
24	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
25	They would probably have some better

1	stuff, I would hope.
2	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
3	I would hope.
4	ALBERTA LEWIS:
5	Because I know there is something
6	there is something that
7	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
8	This doesn't fall off as easily as it
9	does on the shuttle.
10	ALBERTA LEWIS:
11	Well, this is the
12	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
13	This is the box itself and this is the
14	inside here that you are seeing.
15	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
16	One end opens up.
17	ALBERTA LEWIS:
18	Oh.
19	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
20	And you load it.
21	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
22	Yeah. Well, that enables you to get
23	in and unload it.
24	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
25	Here, we can run the video again if

1	that will help you.
2	ALBERTA LEWIS:
3	No, that's okay. This is one end and
4	this is the other end (indicating)?
5	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
6	Right.
7	ALBERTA LEWIS:
8	Okay.
9	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
10	And these this (indicating) goes
11	this way.
12	ALBERTA LEWIS:
13	Okay.
14	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
15	And another safety precaution, we will
16	have a meteorological station at the test
17	site, and if the wind shifts in the
18	direction if the wind is blowing
19	towards the residents, we will stop the
20	test.
21	ALBERTA LEWIS:
22	How can you do that?
23	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
24	We will stop feeding the box. And if
25	we need to under emergency circumstances

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

24

25

we can put the fire out. We will have a 1 2 water truck on site, and we will also have 3 a pile of soil that we can use to quench 4 the fire. But, you know, immediately we 5 will stop. As the wind direction starts 6 to shift, we will stop feeding the box. 7 ALBERTA LEWIS: 8 So what is the energy source of this 9 box? 10 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 11 That is going to be the vegetative 12 debris. It's the fuel. ALBERTA LEWIS: 13 14 So it generates its own heat then? 15 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 16 Uh-huh. 17 ALBERTA LEWIS: 18 And it goes to 2,000? 19 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 20 Uh-huh. So even when we are loading 2.1 the box for the construction and 22 demolition material, we will have to keep 23 putting in the vegetative material to keep

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

the box hot.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

So how do you prevent the escape of anything that might not be considered safe when you are doing that?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

When we are loading it -- well, again, we will --

ALBERTA LEWIS:

You will continually be loading it as you would stoke a fire in a fireplace box; right?

DAVID PASSEY:

You have sensors all around that is going to catch that.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right. We have sensors then also --

ALBERTA LEWIS:

When you open it to put the fuel in?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

When you actually open it, there is a -- at the top of the box there is an air ventum that points down and so you have a fairly high velocity air curtain that goes over that, and that feeds the fire with a lot of oxygen.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1	That's the convection of the air that
2	is feeding it and generating it.
3	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
4	That is that is exactly why it gets
5	as warm as it does. You have lots of
6	oxygen there.
7	ALBERTA LEWIS:
8	Uh-huh. And it feeds the oxygen.
9	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
10	So that acts an air curtain.
11	ALBERTA LEWIS:
12	And it feeds the oxygen not just from
13	the environment.
14	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
15	Right.
16	ALBERTA LEWIS:
17	You have an additional
18	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
19	No, none.
20	ALBERTA LEWIS:
21	It's coming
22	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
23	No, it only uses air.
24	ALBERTA LEWIS:
25	Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

This is the source of air on this one side of this box, and so with this just coming down it serves as a principle being a curtain but it is also stoking the fire with excess, you know.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Now, does it agitate to keep that debris turning?

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

No.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Not that much.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

No, no, that is not going to be that important. The main thing is just the excess air to really crank up the temperature.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

How will you know when you have reached the point at which it is all deteriorated sufficiently at 2,000 degrees.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

There's not going to be much left in

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

Saturday, June 14, 2008 1 the box. 2 ALBERTA LEWIS: 3 Okay. Now, you -- how do you observe 4 that though as it is going on? 5 MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA: 6 Well, they can look in the --7 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: We will be there. 8 9 MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA: 10 -- burner box as they load it. ALBERTA LEWIS: 11 12 Well, I know that heat is coming out of the peep holes, so don't --13 14 MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA: 15 Yeah. 16 ALBERTA LEWIS: 17 I know what 2,600 degrees is when it's 18 coming out of peep holes, you know. quite intense heat. 19 20 MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA: 2.1 So as they load it, they are able to 22 tell how much is in there.

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

Okay. All right. I think that covers

it. I want you to know that my interest

ALBERTA LEWIS:

23

24

25

1	is not just personal, but the Eastern
2	St. Bernard Community Development Group
3	from Violet on down is intensely
4	interested in what is going on at both
5	that end and this end of the parish.
6	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
7	Okay. Well, and this test is going to
8	last for like a day and a half and then
9	it's done.
10	ALBERTA LEWIS:
11	Is that from coals to coals?
12	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
13	Well, no
14	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
15	We are going to do C&D.
16	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
17	Well
18	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
19	Construction and demolition, we're
20	going to do two days of vegetative burning
21	and then a day and a half of construction
22	and demolition.
23	ALBERTA LEWIS:
24	So you're doing 48 hours of actual
25	burn inside the vessel?

1	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
2	Well, it will not be straight 48
3	hours.
4	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
5	No.
6	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
7	You know, we will work probably 10 or
8	12 hour days.
9	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
10	Yes.
11	ALBERTA LEWIS:
12	And what is the tonnage of what you
13	expect to put in there?
14	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
15	Well, for vegetative debris
16	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
17	One house.
18	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
19	Yeah, for vegetative debris, we are
20	looking at
21	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
22	One house.
23	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
24	1,000 cubic yards of vegetative
25	debris and then one house for the

1	construction and demolition debris. And
2	the house is, you know, a two-story or a
3	one and a half story house. I don't know
4	how many square feet it is. But you know
5	that
6	ALBERTA LEWIS:
7	And it would have been it would
8	have been out of wood construction and not
9	brick?
10	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
11	Correct.
12	ALBERTA LEWIS:
13	Okay. All right. Thank you.
14	DAVID PASSEY:
15	Alberta, this is David Passey.
16	ALBERTA LEWIS:
17	I know who you are.
18	DAVID PASSEY:
19	Have you met Christina Bigelow?
20	ALBERTA LEWIS:
21	I have. I have seen her at many of
22	the meetings, yes.
23	DAVID PASSEY:
24	She is a resident of St. Bernard. She
25	has been she has helped us in

1	environmental issues after the hurricane.
2	ALBERTA LEWIS:
3	Uh-huh.
4	DAVID PASSEY:
5	She has a Master's in Environmental
6	Toxicology.
7	ALBERTA LEWIS:
8	I recall that, yeah.
9	DAVID PASSEY:
10	And she is representing the government
11	or helping us graciously, I might add, in
12	this matter.
13	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
14	Pro bono.
15	DAVID PASSEY:
16	I want to assure you pro bono so
17	far. I want to let you know that
18	everything they have done plan-wise,
19	safety plan-wise and everything else,
20	Christina has reviewed, all right. And as
21	I am not going to comment on how she
22	said it but it is she said it was very
23	conservative in a way of what they're
24	doing, super safety. So she's comfortable
25	with it, and if she is, the Parish is. I

24

25

want you to be comfortable with it. 1 2 CHRISTINA BIGELOW: 3 And T feel --DAVID PASSEY: 4 5 She is our representative. 6 ALBERTA LEWIS: 7 We need all our residents to feel 8 comfortable with it though. 9 CHRISTINA BIGELOW: I think, too, that, you know, one of 10 the things that, you know, isn't mentioned 11 12 here is that -- obviously, the EPA is going to be there and their contractors 13 14 are going to be there. 15 And, I mean, we not only -- I not only looked at -- the EPA very strongly 16 17 considered worker safety, the safety of 18 the URG workers who are working in the 19 other parts of the landfill. And a lot of 20 the risk assessment data was sort of based 2.1 on those closer contact scenarios. And 22 the workers will be being monitored at --23 actually, at the project site.

And so that will provide invaluable

information in the event that they do do

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

the asbestos containing material burn at a later date because you really can't get much closer than that, than to be the guy driving the forklift.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

That's right.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

That's exactly true. In fact, you know, I mean, we are -- well, if we need to do that, then we will. But, you know, definitely want to conduct this in a safe manner because we are going to be the first exposed. We are going to be the --

ALBERTA LEWIS:

So you are going to be there, all five of you?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

We're going to be there.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

We don't know about Pam.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Pam is shaking (inaudible) --

MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:

She's a lawyer.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1	That's above and beyond the call of
2	duty.
3	MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA:
4	Okay, guys. All right, guys. We're
5	getting out of order.
б	MS. PAM TRAVIS, EPA:
7	You wouldn't want me on that site.
8	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
9	Pam, we have to get you to HAZWOPER.
10	I have my HAZWOPER.
11	MS. PAM TRAVIS, EPA:
12	I know.
13	ALBERTA LEWIS:
14	I have one more if I may take your
15	time. Glass, of course, is a big item in
16	debris, bottles, windows, etc., etc. I
17	don't remember
18	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
19	Louder so she can hear you.
20	ALBERTA LEWIS:
21	I don't remember the melting point
22	range of glass.
23	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
24	I don't know.
25	MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:

1	I don't know either.
2	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
3	I don't recall it offhand either.
4	ALBERTA LEWIS:
5	I know I can set it around 1,500
6	degrees, and I have just never gone on to
7	I know that it will. And I am
8	wondering if that's below the 2,000, if
9	that's the melting point. You're going to
10	have residue. Are you having glass in
11	there windows?
12	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
13	Yes.
14	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
15	Probably will be.
16	MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:
17	Yes.
18	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
19	Yes.
20	ALBERTA LEWIS:
21	So you would have a substance
22	collected from this?
23	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
24	But are the windows actually glass in
25	this house or are they one of the plastic

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

or composite that you see in a lot of more recently constructed homes. And I think that is something that --

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Really. You would have that in trailers, I think. But I don't think -- even a trailer I have had glass.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

I just had new windows put in and they are not glass.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Wow.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

I mean, they are some kind of -- but they are not -- and I can say this because, you know, we had really old windows in the house we live in now, like, original.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Uh-huh.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

And, literally, you could take the pane and knock it out and it was a pane of glass, a single pane. That is not the type of glass that I have in my new

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1	windows.
2	ALBERTA LEWIS:
3	Really.
4	MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:
5	Yes. You're getting man-made glass.
6	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
7	So I think that yeah, I think that
8	that's probably
9	MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:
10	It's still glass.
11	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
12	It's still glass, but it's not that
13	it's not that same composition, so
14	definitely
15	ALBERTA LEWIS:
16	It's laminated more like automobile
17	windshields are; right, but that has a
18	sandwich that has
19	MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:
20	That's more of a safety glass with a
21	coating on it to make it crack in an
22	accident.
23	ALBERTA LEWIS:
24	Uh-huh.
25	MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1	Most of the energy glasses that are
2	coming through now are laminate glass,
3	pieces sandwiched together. Usually with
4	a
5	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
6	There is something in between.
7	ALBERTA LEWIS:
8	Uh-huh.
9	MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:
10	And sometimes they are even exotic.
11	They fill it with a rare gas like argon.
12	ALBERTA LEWIS:
13	Uh-huh.
14	MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:
15	My bet is that all of this glass is
16	going to end up as ash material.
17	ALBERTA LEWIS:
18	You think so? So you are going that
19	high? That's what I wondered. I couldn't
20	recall. So if I can step aside for just a
21	minute.
22	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
23	We're not rushing you.
24	ALBERTA LEWIS:
25	There is I have a great concern

about many things that we dispose of, but glass because of my experience and long history of working with high ranges of heat and glass, I would like to see it be investigated for a glass crushing machine that would crush it to sand. And this wouldn't just be the glass in the household.

There is no place, absolutely no place in New Orleans to recycle glass. And I meant to bring it, but if you will reference the handbook that is online about recycling references, I think Tulane had a part in that or funded that. And it is put out by the Green Project in New Orleans and some other things.

There are a lot of bottles. And I'm saying this for St. Bernard Parish. There is a lot of glass, and that would give us a lot of sand. I think it's going to reduce down but it's going to give us waste, and it will give us bulk that we can use in swimming pools that have to be filled, and since there is nobody else doing it in this whole wide area.

2.1

And that's not something that you would be concerned with at EPA. So I am really not -- I shouldn't be taking your time, but I had an opportunity to say this with two of our environmental persons here.

And I think you-all had done a study on that. So that's all. Thank you very much. And if there is anything -- any material that you would like me to take, there is a meeting of the Eastern St.

Bernard Community Group tomorrow night, and so I'll be taking the information back to them.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Certainly, you can take some of those folders and pass them out.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Is there a CD?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

No.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

We can give you the websites and you can get it off the website. It's just on the video. I'll write it down for you

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1	after we're done.
2	ALBERTA LEWIS:
3	Okay. Can that be shown if we have a
4	meeting?
5	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
6	Yes, most definitely, of course.
7	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
8	Sure, of course. And please let them
9	know at the meeting that if they have any
10	questions or comments that they would like
11	for us to address, then they can e-mail
12	after they look at the material.
13	ALBERTA LEWIS:
14	And your e-mail would be in there,
15	too?
16	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
17	It's actually not, but I can I'll
18	give that to you as well when you get the
19	web address for the video. And if I can
20	get comments by close of business on
21	Tuesday
22	ALBERTA LEWIS:
23	I know you're rushed. I know that.
24	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
25	(Inaudible.)

1	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
2	(Inaudible.)
3	ALBERTA LEWIS:
4	It was Monday. It was Monday; right?
5	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
6	Yes. But we received a request to
7	extend until Tuesday, so we're heading
8	into Tuesday.
9	DAVID PASSEY:
10	This is David Passey again. Let's for
11	the record, if we can, if we're closing
12	down, when do you plan to do the C&D?
13	ALBERTA LEWIS:
14	Thank you, David, I had that as a
15	question.
16	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
17	Well, that was actually our original
18	plan. And when we met last Wednesday, we
19	wanted to start the burn of the vegetative
20	material on the 23rd.
21	DAVID PASSEY:
22	Of June.
23	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
24	Of June. However, it looks like there
25	is potential that our contractors have a

1	scheduling conflict, so we don't know.
2	We're going to talk to the contractors on
3	Monday and see if we can work it out, and
4	we'll get back with you and let you know.
5	DAVID PASSEY:
6	We will let you know. We will put it
7	on the website if it is convenient,
8	whenever it is going to be.
9	ALBERTA LEWIS:
10	Okay. Thank you, David. We are
11	creating history, aren't we?
12	DAVID PASSEY:
13	Oh, yeah.
14	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
15	Uh-huh.
16	DAVID PASSEY:
17	And, also, I assume that after we do
18	the HWW and C&D and stuff and you have you
19	data in and you put it through your
20	computer and for risk assessment purposes
21	or whatever, you're going to publish that
22	if you want to go forward with the
23	asbestos.
24	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
25	Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

DAVID PASSEY:

And if you want to go further with the asbestos, we can have another public meeting just so you can go in more detail as to the safety issues dealing with that issue as far as the burn process.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Right. My concern though is that the amount of time it is going to take to review the data --

DAVID PASSEY:

Yeah.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Because, you know, to generate the reports and to review the -- do the data validation and the QA/QC, I expect that you guys will have completed your demolition by the time we're ready.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Honestly. I mean, I would like to say that we would be able to expedite it.

But, you know, we're going to have to regroup and make sure that we conduct the

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

test in the safest manner possible,
because that is our primary concern is
safety. And, you know, this project is
important to us, you know, for future
events, but safety is the most important
thing. And we don't want to do anything
that we don't think is safe. And until we
can gain -- look at this data, evaluate
the data, we're not prepared to move
forward, and so we're going to move
slowly.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

You're talking about the timeline to get the data -- to do the burn, get the data back in relation to the possibility of moving forward with the asbestos burn?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Uh-huh.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

Did you say that -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- that could be past -- beyond the point of which the demolition is to occur?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

We believe that it will be past the

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

1	time because St. Bernard is very proactive
2	and they have a lot crews doing
3	demolitions and you guys are trying to get
4	it done before August 29th. And so we are
5	not going to be ready by August 29th.
6	DAVID PASSEY:
7	We will never be finished by August
8	29th.
9	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
10	Well, we have the Midwest.
11	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
12	No.
13	DAVID PASSEY:
14	There will be a lot of opportunity
15	there, won't it?
16	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
17	A lot of opportunity there,
18	unfortunately.
19	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
20	And, you know, there is stuff
21	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
22	Floods out in the Midwest that are
23	ongoing now.
24	ALBERTA LEWIS:
25	Okay.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW: 1 2 There may be some opportunity for them 3 to use the additional portions in those 4 areas. 5 ALBERTA LEWIS: 6 Yes, that's true. 7 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 8 And, unfortunately, the reality is 9 that every year there has been an increasing number of natural disasters 10 whether it's hurricanes or tornados or 11 12 floods. So, I mean, we won't lack 13 opportunity, unfortunately. 14 CHRISTINA BIGELOW: 15 Yes. But you almost wish you would. 16 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 17 Right. So the opportunity just may 18 not be here. It might be somewhere else. 19 But there does not seem to be a lack of 20 opportunity. 2.1 MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA: 22 Unfortunately. 23 MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 24 And the last thing that I would like 25 to say unless there are anymore comments,

w Orieans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

2.1

but I do want to point -- I didn't point out last time -- there actually is a Louisiana State Law, Act 662, which was passed within the past year, is my understanding, which requires debris reduction in weight and volume.

And the Act specifies that the test -that the last option is putting material
into a landfill. And it is actually -the law encourages the use of burning in
an air curtain destructor. And so we
think this test will provide data to help
us meet the requirements that are in the
law. And the LDEQ actually developed a
debris management plan which involves
encouraging the use of this technology.

So, again, there is a lot of interest in utilizing this technology. And what EPA wants to do is to actually generate data to evaluate the effectiveness and viability of this technology.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

That Act was 662?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes.

1	LACY SMITH:
2	Do you have a site for that?
3	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
4	I actually have a copy if you would
5	like to have it.
6	LACY SMITH:
7	Oh, I would love to.
8	DAVID PASSEY:
9	You have it in your you don't have
10	the actual citation.
11	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
12	It shouldn't be hard to find.
13	DAVID PASSEY:
14	Regular Session 2006.
15	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
16	30:2413.1
17	DAVID PASSEY:
18	Oh, yeah, Revised Statute 30:2413.1.
19	I've got to tell you, she's also a lawyer.
20	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
21	I think though I know one thing we
22	probably, you know, just want to point out
23	is that especially where we are so land
24	constrained, we are so resource
25	constrained in terms of where we can put

new landfills to put this debris. They actually considered reopening Carson Acres. The LDQ was very strongly behind that because they were running out space in several of the landfills that were currently open.

I mean, obviously, you can see Old

Gentilly is functioning again. There are

-- there were, at one time at least three

proposals to do landfills on this side of

the Green Bridge in the Orleans portion -
in the portion of Orleans Parish that

actually applied to St. Bernard Parish.

So, now, there is an interest.

There is money to be made by landfill operators. And I don't think that is the best use of our land at this point in time.

I mean, I don't think we want to be landfilling everything. And, hopefully, with projects that the EPA are doing like this, we can come up with some options that we won't have leaching -- I mean, our water table -- God knows, we shouldn't be putting anything in the ground, you know.

25

So, you know, I just wanted to make 1 2 that comment that I think that there are 3 other options in landfilling full volume 4 and mass (inaudible). ALBERTA LEWIS: 5 6 Shouldn't the question be 7 (inaudible) --DAVID PASSEY: 8 9 I do, too. 10 ALBERTA LEWIS: 11 (Inaudible.) I would like to see a 12 separation of the waste so that some of it 13 can be recycled. MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: 14 15 Well -- and just so you will know --16 related to Hurricane Katrina, when EPA got 17 asked to do the household hazardous waste 18 management portion, Louisiana Department 19 of Environmental Quality asked EPA to 20 recycle as much as possible. And I can 2.1 say because I tasked our contractors, and 22 we have recycled 80 percent of the household hazardous waste that we 23 24 collected.

DAVID PASSEY:

1	Is that right?
2	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
3	Yes.
4	DAVID PASSEY:
5	Wow.
6	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
7	And it was over 25 million pounds of
8	material that we collected and 80 percent
9	of it was successfully recycled.
10	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
11	That is amazing.
12	MR. JEFF FRITHSEN, EPA:
13	That is amazing. I didn't know that.
14	MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:
15	I didn't now that.
16	ALBERTA LEWIS:
17	Well, I guess it's very involved in
18	(inaudible)
19	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
20	Well, we evaluated every waste stream
21	and, you know, our contractors looked for
22	recycling opportunities for each of those
23	waste streams. And so
24	ALBERTA LEWIS:
25	At least it was separated?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Uh-huh, yeah. And that was my job during most of Hurricane Katrina, was coordinating with all the Corps of Engineers and parish contractors to make sure that the segregated. And I talked to them daily. And then when things changed then it became weekly.

ALBERTA LEWIS:

I'm sure that's a lot of work.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

But, yes, that was a very involved process. I nagged URG a lot. I am surprised they are even being nice to me now.

DAVID PASSEY:

They are the general contractor.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes. So I worked with all the demolition contractors very closely to make sure that everything was segregated that I could possibly recycle as far as household hazardous waste.

Now, there are other aspects of a house that could be recycled, that there

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1	are recycling opportunities for. But my
2	task was the household hazardous waste, so
3	that is what I focused on.
4	ALBERTA LEWIS:
5	Okay. It didn't happen with the trees
6	though, did it?
7	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
8	The trees were chipped.
9	ALBERTA LEWIS:
10	They were chipped?
11	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
12	Yes. And most of the chipped material
13	was recycled. It was either used as cover
14	for the landfills or it was used in
15	Wetland's Recovery or it was used in a
16	number of ways, but the chipped trees were
17	recycled.
18	ALBERTA LEWIS:
19	That's a very interesting statistic.
20	(Inaudible.)
21	THE COURT REPORTER:
22	You are going to have to speak up.
23	ALBERTA LEWIS:
24	I'm sorry.
25	THE COURT REPORTER:

504-525-1979

1 You are going to have to speak a 2 little bit louder for me to get what you 3 are saying. 4 ALBERTA LEWIS: 5 It's not important. I was just saying 6 that it was a very interesting aspect of 7 (inaudible) -- how the waste becomes 8 recycled. 9 MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA: 10 Thank you, guys. Are there any other 11 additional comments? 12 LACY SMITH: 13 Okay. Lacy Smith. What kind of 14 monitors are the workers wearing? 15 for what would they be testing? 16 MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA: 17 We are going to be looking for lead, 18 and we are going to be looking for 19 asbestos. 20 ALBERTA LEWIS: 2.1 Just lead? 22 MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA: 23 Lead and asbestos, those are the 24 regulated items for OSHA. 25 LACY SMITH:

2.1

And can you make -- I guess -- as far as the RACM burn goes, you were talking about other population, is there a way to make that a part of the public record just so it is out there for people that are concerned about these kinds of projects?

Simply for a general understanding. I mean, it acts as kind of a positive reflection on the EPA. It's sort of, hey, look, we could sit back -- and just think, we're learning from it.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

We will be correcting documents that have the risk assessment in it and having a correction, so it won't just be replaced. There will be an explanation and correction and all that will be, you know, available through the Freedom of Information Act.

MS. PAM TRAVIS, EPA:

I think as a practical matter, most, if not all our documents have gone out under FOIA already in whatever condition they were in when the FOIA request came in.

1	LACY SMITH:
2	I mean, I am not just speaking
3	personally, but generally. I mean, as far
4	as making another FOIA request.
5	DAVID PASSEY:
6	Have you-all made a FOIA request to
7	the EPA?
8	LACY SMITH:
9	Uh
10	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
11	Yes.
12	LACY SMITH:
13	(Inaudible.)
14	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
15	She has all of my e-mails.
16	DAVID PASSEY:
17	My God, you have a lot.
18	LACY SMITH:
19	Also, I guess, when it comes to
20	shutting the box off in the event there is
21	a problem or reducing the burn, I am just
22	I am wondering how long is the material
23	inside going to still be burning and
24	emitting whatever is hazardous and
25	whatever is causing you to want to shut it

off.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

From what I read, you know, I mean, obviously there is not an off switch. And so, I guess, what kind of risk is there? MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, for one, I would like to -- I am going to let them answer your question, but I will just say, for one, we are going to be controlling how much we put in. So we are not going to just load the whole thing up and sit back.

You know, we are going to be watching the meteorological station, watching the wind and slowly adding the material in, so that we don't come up with a situation where the wind suddenly shifts, and, oh, we can't do anything because the box is totally full.

So we are going to be very mindful of how we load it and how much we are putting in with taking into consideration the meteorological conditions.

As far as how long it takes, it is all going to depend on how much material is in the box at the time and on how long it is

504-525-1979

going to take the fire to be out.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

I think, too, just following up with Nancy's comment, if we are not charging or loading new material, that air curtain is going to be doing its job in really containing that. So we would definitely back off from adding any additional waste to ensure that the air curtain can keep a good seal and cover, basically, on the process and the combustion itself.

LACY SMITH:

So, I guess, I'm just wondering -- you are saying relatively small amounts of debris and not loading it all at one time, but if you got to -- you know, if the heat from this is having to sustain 2,000 degree Fahrenheit temperatures, I imagine that you are going to need a lot of material in there to keep that temperature up.

And so regardless if its vegetative debris that is helping to sustain the fire or not, I just think you're going to have a lot of debris. And if there is a

1	problem, it is going to take a long time
2	to drop from 2,000 to no longer burning.
3	ALBERTA LEWIS:
4	(Inaudible.)
5	LACY SMITH:
6	I mean, I don't really know if
7	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
8	I don't the answer to how long it
9	takes
10	LACY SMITH:
11	(Inaudible.)
12	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
13	Yeah.
14	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
15	I don't think there is an answer to
16	that. That is something that we I
17	don't even think the Air Burner folks
18	would be able to answer that question.
19	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
20	That is probably right.
21	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
22	Because it is very dependant on what
23	is in the box and how much is in that box
24	and what temperature it is actually at
25	when the wind direction shifts. So,

2.1

again, it's going to be something that, you know, again, we have to closely watch the MET station and look at the wind and the direction and the speed as we load the box. So it's --

LACY SMITH:

I just wanted to (inaudible) -CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

I think though also -- I mean, you have to look at the positive pressure gradient that the air curtain is creating. I mean, if you think about it -- and I hate to bring this up in St. Bernard Parish -- in terms of what oil refineries do to provide shelters for their workers, they will provide a building with a positive pressure gradient.

And in the event there is a toxic release, the workers who are outside of the building, which the building is usually generally on a positive pressure as well -- if they are anywhere within a plume gradient, they go in those buildings and, basically, the entire reliance on that worker's safety is that positive

504-525-1979

2.1

pressure gradient that is created inside of those shelters.

And so I think it is the same -- I am making that analogy because that air curtain is the same reliance there that -- essentially, when you have the worker in the building, the plume can't get in because of the positive pressure gradient. What's in the box, can't get out because of the positive pressure gradient inside the box.

And I think there is a reliance. And, also, I thought I heard you-all say you-all were going to keep a load of soil -MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yes.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

-- to dump on site. And once you dump all that particulate matter onto the actual burn -- I mean, granted, we all know about soil pour and, you know, air makes its way up through soil, you know.

Otherwise, we wouldn't have soil gas.

And that we measure it when you do site remediation and things like that or when

2.1

you're testing a site for assessment.

But, I mean, I think that is an additional level of safety in the event that they have to shut it down.

I think the first reliance is obviously the positive pressure, and the second reliance would be if it was really an emergency that something emerged that was completely not -- you know, that it was more than what they anticipated.

They also have the soil on site which should put a barrier in place. And that soil in the soil pour should capture some of that vapor as soil gas. And that will also help prevent the escape of that. So I think that is sort of a double safety net there from what I understand.

LACY SMITH:

Okay.

LACY SMITH:

(Inaudible.) When you're saying you want to evaluate the effectiveness of the technology, at Wednesday's meeting I kind of was picking up mixed messages about the cost considerations on the safety -- you

2.1

know, whatever else is involved in effectiveness.

I am just wondering if cost is going to be something that EPA is going to be considering or mentioning within the project report?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Well, as we talked about on Wednesday, you know, it is one aspect, but it is not as important of an aspect to us. But, you know, one of the things that we will come out and report is how much is disposal per cubic yard for landfill versus the amount that we're able to achieve in waste reduction, so that we are able to reduce the cost. And, you know, the cost of the actual box itself, that type of thing.

We will be able to have a little calculation to show that this type of technology, you know, is going to or may generate some sort of cost savings per cubic yard, that type of thing.

But the way that we are going to operate, it is going to take us longer because of all the monitoring that we are

new Orieans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

doing. So, you know, if this was actually used in reality during a disaster, you know, they would be going much faster than us. So the cost savings for them would be much greater than it will be for us.

There are going to be some factors in

There are going to be some factors in there for us that we're not going to be able to achieve because of the fact that it is a test. And that we are going to be taking a lot of time and being very specific related to all of our air monitoring, in making sure all of the monitors are ready for us to start and stop and that type of thing.

LACY SMITH:

Okay.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

For example, we have to wage, load, and re-add. They wouldn't be accurate.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

In doing that --

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

They wouldn't have (inaudible) --

LACY SMITH:

Okay.

2.1

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Because we're really trying to determine how much volume is really reduced, that is the most -- one of the most important things for us, because if it doesn't reduce it very much, then there is not going to be that great cost savings and the technology is not going to be very effective. So it is really important to us to know the amount, volume, and reduction that actually is achieved.

But, again, the primary thing is safety. You know, we want to operate in a very safe manner. And so, as a result we are going to be slow and methodical, because we are going to be trying to take every precaution.

And, you know, again, any wind shift we are going to stop. That may not happen in real life, you know, when there is a disaster. I mean, they're not going to be as safety conscious as we are, I would imagine.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

I believe that will be supported by

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1	the test.
2	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
3	Right.
4	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
5	Because they will have data with which
6	they are feeding.
7	MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:
8	So they won't have to have a zillion
9	air monitors circling them.
10	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
11	Well, I mean, what we're really
12	talking about is that if we don't do the
13	test we are not going to know if this
14	thing works well or not.
15	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
16	Will, I think
17	MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:
18	We don't know that it works well.
19	We're going to find out.
20	CHRISTINA BIGELOW:
21	The ultimate product is also
22	important, because I know when I read the
23	work plan I mean, they are doing
24	significant samplings of the ash material.
25	Material that will ultimately be disposed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

And so, I mean, it is not just safety during the burn, it is looking after the burn at what is left, and is that per chance worse than what we started with. MS. NANCY JONES, EPA: Right. And this type of technology was actually used in Florida during

> There is some data but not enough that, you know, the State felt comfortable supporting it during Katrina. So, I mean, we really need this data to be able to feel good about whether or not this is the right way to do things.

Hurricane Andrew, but there wasn't a lot

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Exactly.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

of data about it.

And we're not having less disasters unfortunately.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

I know.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

I mean, this could be something very applicable to them.

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES New Orleans, Louisiana

504-525-1979

2.1

LACY SMITH:

And, I guess, I have -- I'm curious -- or maybe this isn't something you might fairly strongly consider. I don't know. But the sample size right now is just one house, and to me that kind of -- I analogize that as a case study where that doesn't really give you too much information as far as generalizing it to other situations.

And so, I am curious, is EPA planning on doing other tests either with more samples in the future just as C&D or just more case studies?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Why don't we wait and find out how this one turns out?

LACY SMITH:

Well, okay, I guess that on the assumption of this one as well. You know, I guess -- are you planning on doing more is the question?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

We don't know.

LACY SMITH:

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If it does -- if you like the findings, are you going to do more?

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

It is all going to depend on what the data tells us. If, you know, there is one aspect that we don't think we have enough data on, then we might want to test that.

You know, so it's really kind of going to be very dependent on what we actually find. It is not going to be just a yes or no, this is good and this is bad.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. Well, I guess, I'm interpreting that to mean that there is a chance that you will be satisfied with it entirely and just be happy with one sample -- one house and one sample, and then move onto RACM.

MS. FRAN KREMER, EPA:

It is right now premature. It has taken us three years to get to this point.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

And look at the trouble we've made.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

There may be -- we've talked about a component of maybe doing a small control

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

test of asbestos but within the laboratory setting. So, I mean, we really need to collect our data first before we make any decisions about what happens next.

We're not prepared to say what is going to happen next at this time.

MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA:

And just remember the comments that we are receiving tonight basically focus on the study that is being conducted.

LACY SMITH:

I guess -- well, I'm doing this as a holistic project. Initially, it was a project that involved asbestos. And what Ms. Jones said is that it was going to go further into a greater project. So I think the sole concern about this test is that, is this it? I mean, that was my rationale.

I guess, well, with that being said -I guess, regardless of the outcome, is
there a way that within your project
before you could put a statement to the
effect of, like, hey, this is just one
time. You know, like, basically, consider

New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

2.1

that if you're going to implement this procedure; if you want to start using this procedure, C&D burn based on this one study -- I don't know.

To me, it just seems like it's not representative of what data could potentially be out there. And if this data is basing the decision on -- or it's heavily basing your decision on this one study that they may be making an uninformed choice.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

You know, as Nancy mentioned, the idea that we were going to do a test and we don't know how it is going to turn out is the -- the test that we are really after is, does this get us anywhere close to being comfortable with, you know, the technology.

If we are not comfortable with it, then that's flat out going to be the end of it. But there are all kinds of gradients along the way, so until we have the data, we just don't know what is going to happen.

2.1

There are also other considerations. Funding for research, I mean, these are all -- changing agency priorities, those are all part of the mix.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

Yeah.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. Well, then, I guess, with this test the result specifically then -- that kind of (inaudible) -- that there be some sort of caveat that this is, you know, one piece of data.

The state government, if you're considering really looking into this type of technology, you keep that in mind. I mean, obviously, you would do -- word it a little better.

MS. PAM TRAVIS, EPA:

Let me speak to that for a minute, because, you know, there are an awful lot of agency actions that are what they are, and they are used when they leave our hands for all sorts of things for which they were never intended, okay.

And while we don't have a lot of

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

2.1

control over what other people do with our data, we would hope that by adding to the scientific base of knowledge on this, I don't think our reports will overrepresent or underrepresent the significance of the data that we have collected on this.

I would hope that people don't use our stuff for purposes for which it wasn't intended, but I have seen an awful lot of that in recent years. So I think that we will do what we can when we report out, to try to give the proper significance, the proper proportion to whatever data is published.

But once it leaves our hands --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And keep in mind, the purpose of this test is not to advocate that technology.

And the report, you know, even if the test results end up being positive, the report is not going to be written in a manner that it is going to be advocating anything. It is just going to be reporting facts.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

2.1

Right.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And reporting the data. It is not going to be pro Air Burners. It is just going to be facts.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

And that I think Pam's point -- having worked on both sides of the fence -- it is true. And no matter how many caveats you put in a report, no matter how many times you -- no matter how absolutely neutral and just -- just the facts, the tone is -- if someone is intending to use that report for their own purposes, that is not going to dissuade them in the least.

And I think you know for states that have primacy from EPA, they are going to make decisions within their own agency based on, hopefully, not just this one report.

And the citizens of those states, be it Louisiana or be it another state have to have confidence that their agencies are doing the right analysis and have the right expertise, because you --

sw Orieans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

2.1

unfortunately, and believe me there are times I wish I could, you can't control other people's actions. You can just put what is out. Put out what you have out there.

And believe me, I have a 16 month old, and I would love to be able to control somebody else's actions. But, I mean, it's just not possible.

And I think, you know, like Nancy said, the tone -- the fact that it's not going to advocate. And at that point, that's all you can really do, because if somebody is going to use it for their own purposes, they are going to use it regardless of what is said.

MS. PAM TRAVIS, EPA:

And your question points to a really federal government problem in the whole dialogue and process.

LACY SMITH:

And then finally -- I guess this is more for the record, asbestos -- I mean, there is a chance that asbestos, not regulated asbestos containing material,

ew Orieans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

but some that don't fall under a legal requirement, those could be burnt still in this C&D test?

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

Yes. Those are going to be in there.

LACY SMITH:

Uh-huh.

MR. ROGER WILMOTH, EPA:

We have already analyzed it. We know how much is going to in there. That is less than the regulated amount. But there is -- and I don't remember the exact number, but there is a little bit of asbestos that is in the actual joint compounds, but it does not meet the concentration nor the amount that would come under the regulated clause, so it's non-regulated as of right now.

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

And that's the reason why we're doing the asbestos monitoring.

LACY SMITH:

Okay. I just wanted that on the record.

CHRISTINA BIGELOW:

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES New Orleans, Louisiana 504-525-1979

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

I think it's important to point out that a lot of the C&D debris that has already been segregated is going to a C&D landfill already with that same type of material, because that is the state regulation. And so you can either have it potentially in the ground or we can see if we can do something better with it.

MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA:

Okay. Well, I thank you-all for your comments. And, again, if you would like to submit additional comments, EPA will accept those up until Tuesday of next week which is June 17, 2008.

You can either send those, fax those, or send an e-mail. And if you prefer to fax, you can fax those to my attention, and I will ensure that Nancy gets those comments. And the fax number is area code (214)665-6660. And then, of course, Nancy's e-mail address if you prefer to send your comments via e-mail -- Nancy's e-mail address is --

MS. NANCY JONES, EPA:

jones.nancy@epa.gov

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES New Orleans, Louisiana

504-525-1979

1	MS. JANETTA COATS, EPA:
2	Okay. And, again, thank you for your
3	comments. If there are no additional
4	comments, I would like to close the record
5	for your comments being received tonight.
6	The record can be closed.
7	(Off the record at 4:35 p.m.,
8	whereupon, the taking of the EPA Hearing
9	on Saturday, the 14th of June, 2008, is
10	concluded.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	REPORTER'S PAGE

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 Saturday, the 14th 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.

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ANGIE HENNING, CVR, CCR #23023