

Fort Worth Asbestos Demonstration Project
 Facilitated Team Meeting
 12 May 2004
 Outstanding Internal Issues

No.	Issue	Recommended Action
1	<p>Has asbestos at Cowtown Inn been adequately characterized—including vermiculite? Have cavities and interstitial spaces been adequately explored?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use assessment method that can detect vermiculite; there is a potential that vermiculite exists given methods used for site characterization • Expand exclusion to include all vermiculite products • Include discussion of mineral speciation in sample analysis • Air sample analysis must be able to detect presence of vermiculite 	<p>Fort Worth (FW) will provide copies of all assessments performed and the methods used.</p>
2	<p>No exposure-based plan for monitoring workers and the public</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FW will conduct negative exposure assessments in accordance with OSHA regulations. • FW reiterated that the Fort Worth Method is a work practice-based approach, not a health/risk-based approach.
3	<p>No acceptable level of exposure to asbestos (pertains to equivalency to NESHAP)</p>	<p>No action required by FW.</p>
4	<p>Potential policy shift from work practice to risk-based standard</p>	<p>No action required by FW.</p>
5	<p>Friable asbestos concentrations below 1% present a risk to workers and residents</p>	<p>No action required by FW.</p>
6	<p>Current method does not require removal of all external transite; we believe all external transite should be removed by NESHAP method</p>	<p>FW will consider removing external transite.</p>
7	<p>Monitoring will not identify a potential exposure until a release has already occurred</p>	<p>No action required by FW.</p>
8	<p>What are household exposures to deposition now (background or baseline)</p>	<p>FW will consider trying to define background asbestos signature in the community via a sampling plan, depending on what it involves.</p>

No.	Issue	Recommended Action
9	<p>Effectiveness of ambient air monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of nighttime air sampling • Lack of sampling during high and low wind speed conditions • Timing of wind change; what makes a change that affects monitoring and what is the impact on uncertainty • No consideration in the QAPP for transient exposures due to changing environmental conditions (e.g., wind speed) or the associated uncertainty • Number and placement of samplers • Rationale for multimedia sampling • Will emissions be captured if they occur? • Ambient monitoring will not provide information about personal exposure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FW will consider additional sampling if it can be justified. • FW would like to hear OECA's and ORD's specific recommendations for sampling. ("No blank check")
10	<p>Visual determination is not a true indicator of asbestos release and no guidance is provided for optimizing observations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FW will review existing guidance and include appropriate language. • OECA/OAR can provide guidance.
11	<p>No data on effectiveness of NESHAP method</p>	<p>No action required by FW.</p>
12	<p>Potentially exposing public to known carcinogen leaves agency vulnerable to criticism of not getting appropriate review; recommend Institutional Review Board (IRB) or at least official OGC determination</p>	<p>EPA Region 6 is pursuing OGC determination.</p>
13	<p>Allowable levels of asbestos left in soil are extremely high and may result in future exposures (possible solution: clean up to levels used, approved, or applied elsewhere—e.g., CA, NY)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowable soil level should reflect future use • Methods should include signs, institutional controls, and notice to developers • Must be consistent with standards and practices used by other Regional offices 	<p>FW will review the authorities and allowable actions of an <i>Owner in Trust</i> as dictated by Texas law, as well as the practices commonly employed under NESHAP.</p>

No.	Issue	Recommended Action
14	What is the process and who has the authority to stop work? (possible solution: maintain EPA presence on site for duration of project and designate each party with authority to stop project, if deemed appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FW will describe who within the city has the authority to stop work, as well as under what conditions he or she will stop work. Region 6 and the Texas Department of Health will have on-site decision-making authority. FW will make this explicit in method documentation, and EPA will include in enforcement discretion letter. EPA will dictate stop work action levels.
15	What are the criteria for "adequately wet" and can they be met for all materials?	FW will adopt NESHAP definition.
16	25% wet criterion may not mitigate release and is inconsistent with NESHAP definition	FW will delete 25% wet criterion and use NESHAP definition.
17	How does the Fort Worth Method satisfy OSHA requirements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FW will conduct negative exposure assessment. FW will include in documents a point-by-point comparison of OSHA requirements and how FW will satisfy them during the Cowtown Inn demolition. FW will seek OSHA review and feedback on the proposed approach.
18	Do water leaks during transportation of debris cause a release and, if so, how will leaks be minimized? (possible solution: cover truck and place absorbent material in truck bed)	FW will consider in the context of what NESHAP allows.
19	Want to see QA audit of any lab used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FW will get National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NAVLAP) certifications from each of the proposed labs. ORD will have its audit contractor audit the proposed labs. Include specifications for data deliverable.

No.	Issue	Recommended Action
20	Are statistical analysis methods adequate and appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action required by FW. ORD, in coordination with other offices and Bertram Price, will identify requirements for statistical analysis.
21	No logical order is presented for building destruction	FW will clarify rationale for the order presented.
22	Details of demolition and handling of debris not articulated fully or clearly; provide these details. Make explicit that disassembly of the building is not typical and is central to method	FW will rewrite and explain further.
23	Potential proliferation of method use is a concern if used improperly or not as intended	No action required by FW.
24	Restrictions/limitation on application of method are based on building height only; explain and expand	FW will insert placeholder for other restrictions.
25	Removals conducted under method must be consistent with NESHAP definition of <i>facility</i> . Explain why deviating from method as described for this test at Cowtown Inn	FW will explain why it is acceptable to use a different definition in this case.
26	Several agency policies (e.g., Information Quality Guidelines (IQG)) may not be complied with	No action required by FW.
27	Assumption that the likelihood of a "significant air release is extremely remote" is unfounded; support the assumption or delete it and clarify prior expectations and revise method (remediation plan) appropriately	FW will evaluate the context in which that statement was made.
28	All applicable laws must be complied with and remediation plan must have procedures to do it	See issue 27.
29	Lack of storm water run-on/run-off and soil infiltration controls	FW will address this issue in the next draft.
30	If proposing Ft. Worth method on basis of cost, EPA has no data to verify cost savings. Explain how cost savings estimate was developed, including disposal costs.	FW will provide additional details.
31	Potential support to civil and criminal defendants in NESHAP enforcement.	No action required by FW.

No.	Issue	Recommended Action
32	<p>Community must be fully informed, and there must be meaningful public involvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should have access to information • Should have ability to participate • Should have informed consent 	<p>FW believes it is doing all it can, given the current state of the project, the documents, and EPA and peer reviews and issues.</p>