

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region III
POLLUTION REPORT**

Date: Saturday, January 15, 2011

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.: | 15 | Site #: | A3NA |
| Reporting Period: | 1/3/2011 to 1/15/2011 | 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

1/3/2011 - ERRS crew returned from holiday demobe. Re-commenced cleaning of building interior, primarily working in Bay 2
(OSC not present this day due to leave for family issue.)

1/4/11 - OSC arrived onsite 1330 (after GSA vehicle maintenance). Discussed status and adequacy of demolition bids with the ERRS RM and OSC co-worker. Asked owner to stop by trailer tomorrow to discuss future activities including fate of scrap steel after demolition. OSC asked EPA Asbestos Program and MDE Asbestos Program about the regulatory standing of three bidders. MDE stated all ok.

1/5/11 - START working to redact personal identifiers in Administrative Record documents. The Admin Record will be placed at the Woodlawn Public Library for public review. CIC to place notice in local newspaper.

RM and I discussed the fate of scrap steel and how best to present to the owner (i.e. steel cannot remain onsite after removal action is complete, payment for steel recycling to owner?, selected bidder profits from steel recycling?). Continued to discuss demolition bids and need to obtain some missing information from bidders.

1/6/11 - OSC and RM met with the property owner to discuss:

- fate of scrap steel - agreed that owner will not be seeking more than a specific dollar amount for the steel in light of requirements for his disability payments. Steel will be hauled offsite by the chosen subcontractor.
- compensation for personal items discarded - OSC will prepare a second EPA/owner agreement for EPA management approval whereby the owner to receive compensation for items at a specific dollar amount that will not adversely affect his disability payments.
- final building design will be attached to the Agreement for Compensation of Property (owner has reviewed a draft Agreement).
- a larger opening to the new building ceiling will be provided (larger than in current design)

- The RM and I agreed on the demolition bidder based on price and bid submittal. Company must first submit all required, completed FAR flow-down forms in order to be considered further.

- The RM and I agree, for both cost and expediency reasons, that the provision of electrical service to the new building and owner's home should be performed by the electrician doing all new building interior work. A sole source justification will be prepared.

- The START E&S engineer is to submit fill/compaction details for the new building footprint, crush size of cement block for basement fill and two preliminary designs for the new building exterior grading.

1/7/11 - Photos taken of Bay 2 work showing plastic "ceiling" removed. The top side of this ceiling was covered with settled asbestos-laden dust and required careful vacuuming and removal.

- The demolition bidder submitted a brief, generic work plan and H&S plan. The OSC submitted both to MDE Asbestos Program and co-workers for comment.

- Rasche Bros submitted an updated new building design incorporating what the OSC recently agreed with the owner. The OSC emailed this to the owner.

- The owner emailed back stating "As far as I could tell everything was there".

1/8/11 - ERRS continued work in Bay 2. The OSC worked on documentation and administrative matters.

1/10/11 to 1/13/11 - OSC at the regional office for the quarterly, mandatory Program and Safety meetings. The following activities occurred during this period:

- ERRS continued interior cleaning.
- START completed redacting documents in the Admin Record.
- Per OSC approval, ERRS moved three conex boxes away from the old factory and moved to the cul de sac.
- ORC recommended minor changes to the Agreement for Compensation of Property (OSC will inform the owner and provide him with this new version).
- START E&S engineer obtained services of a CAD drawing operator to complete grading designs.

1/15/11 - OSC at site and went over status with RM. The bidder we identified for demo work is not willing to complete and send in FAR-required submittals. This company wants to know if they are getting the work before they are willing to complete and send in the forms. The RM will call and explain contract requirements (until ERRS evaluates the completed forms for FAR compliance, they cannot say the company will definitely get the work.)

- Continued to evaluate bids in case this company cannot be selected. ERRS asked other bidders to reconsider bid amounts and accurately state difference in bid cost estimate between a one phase and two phase demolition.
- The electrician for the new building is having difficulties coordinating with BG&E and the County inspector.
- ERRS placed cleaned, black Isuzu Trooper into Bay 2 at owner's insistence to keep out of weather. Car was covered with plastic sheeting.
- Awaiting MDE Asbestos Program's position on our plan to place cleaned, crushed cement block into the basement of the old factory after demolition.

Planned Removal Actions

- Endeavor to get subcontract consent package for the new building to the CO for approval.
- Resolve issues with demolition company bids, select a company and proceed. Need for submission of a subcontract package to the CO will depend on whether or not the \$100,000 level requiring CO concurrence is exceeded.
- Proceed to Bay 1 and begin cleaning items. Coordinate with owner first.

Next Steps

- Obtain owner's signature on the Property Compensation Agreement and his cooperation for work in Bay 1.

Key Issues

- Obtaining coordination among electrician, BG&E and County on how to connect owner's home and new building to electrical service.

Estimated Costs *

| | Budgeted | Total To Date | Remaining | % Remaining |
|---------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|
| Extramural Costs | | | | |
| ERRS - Cleanup Contractor | \$1,920,000.00 | \$596,000.00 | \$1,324,000.00 | 68.96% |
| TAT/START | \$206,000.00 | \$71,000.00 | \$135,000.00 | 65.53% |
| Intramural Costs | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Total Site Costs | \$2,126,000.00 | \$667,000.00 | \$1,459,000.00 | 68.63% |

* 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.

Disposition of Wastes

| Waste Stream | Quantity | Manifest # | Disposal Facility |
|--------------|-----------|------------|--|
| Asbestos | 40 cu yds | 057176 | Old Dominion Landfill, Richmond, VA 10/16/10 |
| Asbestos | 40 cu yds | 057177 | Old Dominion Landfill, Richmond, VA 11/11/10 |
| Asbestos | 40 cu yds | 057178 | Old Dominion Landfill, Richmond, VA 12/17/10 |

response.epa.gov/powhatan