

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region III
POLLUTION REPORT

Date: Saturday, November 20, 2010

From: Jack Kelly

To: Art O'Connell, Maryland Dept of the
Environment
Mark Mank, MDE
Jill Dyken, ATSDR
Dave Polish, EPA III
Phil Campagna, EPA ERT

Phil Anderson, Maryland Dept of the
Environment
Karl Markiewicz, ATSDR
Brad Van Gosen, U.S. Geological Survey
Trish Taylor, EPA III
Kevin Scott, TetraTech EMI

Subject: Powhatan Mining Company
6721 Windsor Mill Road, Woodlawn, MD
Latitude: 39.3250000
Longitude: -76.7358000

POLREP No.:	12	Site #:	A3NA
Reporting Period:	11/08/2010-11/20/2010	D.O. #:	
Start Date:	8/16/2010	Response Authority:	CERCLA
Mob Date:	8/15/2010	Response Type:	Time-Critical
Demob Date:		NPL Status:	Non NPL
Completion Date:		Incident Category:	Removal Action
CERCLIS ID #:	MDN000306665	Contract #	
RCRIS ID #:			

Site Description

Site Description

The Powhatan Mining Company site is the location of a former asbestos processing facility. The mill operated from approximately 1920 to 1980 primarily processing anthophyllite asbestos. Asbestos ore for the mill was mined in Maryland until about the 1940s and later brought in from several States including California, Georgia and Alabama. The site is bordered on all sides by residential properties and the residential yards to the southwest lie within feet of the former processing facility and in the path of site runoff. In 2006, the property to the east of the former mill was subdivided into residential lots for new home construction. From 2006 to 2008, the residential lots were cleared and graded and retention ponds were installed. Development ceased after only two homes were constructed.

The former processing facility is a multi-story building with a loading area on the northeast end (cement block portion) and a processing area at the southwest end (rusted metal portion). The asbestos fiber extraction process took place inside the building complex. Asbestos ore was reportedly received and first dried in the cement block portion of the complex. Further processing of the rock ore is believed to have occurred in the metal portion of the facility, a multi-level, timber-framed structure with stone foundation and corrugated metal siding. In the milling operation believed used at this facility, the asbestos ore was first crushed to a normal, even size and then dried. Fiber extraction then occurred through a series of crushing operations, each followed by vacuum aspiration of the ore running on a vibrating screen. On the screen, the fibers were released from the ore and collected into a vacuum system. Fibers recovered from consecutive vibrating screens were brought to cyclone separators, and the air filtered to remove the finer, suspended fibers.

The property was brought to EPA's attention by the Maryland Dept of the Environment. After an initial assessment, a non-emergency Removal Action primarily intended to secure building openings was initiated by the OSC in a Special Bulletin dated August 11, 2009. More recent sampling data and conditions warranted a time-critical action. A time-critical Action Memorandum for the site, concurred on by HQ, was signed on June 8, 2010. In addition, a memorandum authorizing demolition and compensation to the property owner was approved by the Region and HQ on this date.

EPA will be conducting removal activities at the site in order to deconstruct the facility and remove/cover soil which may pose a threat to public health and/or the environment. During activities which will cause significant disturbance of interior dust or outdoor soils, air samples periodically will be collected from personal sampling devices on cleanup personnel to determine if proper levels of protection are being used

at the site. Additional air samples will be collected along the perimeter of the site to confirm that engineering controls are protective of the surrounding community.

Current Activities

Current Activities

- ERRS continues cleaning the owner's personal items for conex box storage and bagging items to be discarded as asbestos-containing waste. A wood and poly "air-lock" was constructed at the side garage door for removing the tires and bagged asbestos waste,

11/08/10 - OSC Kelly went to Westminster, MD to ask questions of Rasche Bros about the cost estimate bid and design they submitted for the new garage in light of the property owner's concerns.

11/9/10 - OSC Kelly in Cumberland, MD for a presentation to EPA RCRA

11/10/10 – OSC Kelly, START and ERRS began discussing sedimentation and erosion control plans for new building construction and post cleanup controls. S&E Engineer BMackie of Weston Inc was onsite to evaluate E&S control possibilities. He requested construction drawings for the stalled Valerie Manor Development. OSC Kelly will obtain.

11/11/10 – ERRS sends roll-off with asbestos containing waste off-site for disposal. ~40 cu yds sent to Old Dominion Landfill in Virginia via ETW, LLC.

- the developer for the stalled Valerie Manor project (Parcel 304) stopped by to drop off construction drawings per the OSC's request. He asked the OSC about EPA plans to address the lots identified for development on Parcel 304. The OSC explained that he recently completed a geoprobe, test pit and sampling investigation of the parcel and will make all information available in a report to the County, State, Mortgage holder and developer. The developer asked about innocent landowner information and the OSC indicated that he or another EPA official will get back to him. The OSC conferred with the cost recovery program and ORC.

11/12-13/10 - the OSC and owner discussed specifics of the proposed building.

11/16/10 - the OSC emailed a query to the Zoning Commission about the status of the variance decision.

11/17/10 - At 1430 a site meeting was held at the site to discuss the property owner's concerns with the proposed post frame building. The owner has reviewed the design in detail at the OSC's request. His concerns focus on the structural adequacy of the current design (footer design, spacing of support columns, size of columns), insulating properties, clear span space, and other items. Attendees were OSC Kelly, the property owner, START and a structural engineer from Weston Inc. The certified structural engineer was brought on per the OSC's need to have someone with the right credentials and knowledge to answer questions by the property owner. The meeting duration was about two+ hours. Further discussions will resume. (Note the Zoning Commission's decision will determine if the proposed building size and height is permitted).

11/18/10 - the OSC and ERRS RM agreed on the Scope of Work for the IFB for the demolition contractor.

- the property owner provided a request letter to the OSC regarding the proposed new building. The OSC indicated he needs to discuss with management.

11/19/10 - the OSC requested START for the services of a professional cost estimator to come up with cost estimates for a pre-engineered metal building and concrete block building similar in size and characteristics to the existing concrete block building.

Planned Removal Actions

Planned Removal Actions

- Continue cleaning personal items of asbestos and storing in conex boxes. Properly bag discardable items for ultimate transport and disposal.

- Continue fine tuning what will be needed for new garage construction.

Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Await to receive notice of the zoning hearing decision..

- Continue to coordinate with the site owner on the fate of interior items and the likely progression of

upcoming work.

- Issue IFB for demolition of former plant.

Key Issues

Key Issues

- The zoning hearing results will have significant consequences for future work.

Estimated Costs *

	Budgeted	Total To Date	Remaining	% Remaining
Extramural Costs				
ERRS - Cleanup Contractor	\$1,920,000.00	\$427,455.00	\$1,492,545.00	77.74%
TAT/START	\$206,000.00	\$65,537.42	\$140,462.58	68.19%
Intramural Costs				
Total Site Costs	\$2,126,000.00	\$492,992.42	\$1,633,007.58	76.81%

* The above accounting of expenditures is an estimate based on figures known to the OSC at the time this report was written. The OSC does not necessarily receive specific figures on final payments made to any contractor(s). Other financial data which the OSC must rely upon may not be entirely up-to-date. The cost accounting provided in this report does not necessarily represent an exact monetary figure which the government may include in any claim for cost recovery.

response.epa.gov/powhatan

POLREP #12 Last Updated 9/13/2011