

LOWER MANHATTAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

-----X
MEETING :
of :
130 LIBERTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE :
-----X

Conference Room
Offices of Lower Manhattan
Development Corporation
One Liberty Plaza
20th Floor
New York, New York

September 14, 2004
3:40 p.m.

B e f o r e:

PAUL CROTTY
LMDC Board of Directors

ED MALLOY
LMDC Board of Directors

AMY PETERSON
Vice President, Memorial, Cultural
and Civic Development

A P P E A R A N C E S:

For the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation:

Paul Crotty
Ed Malloy
Amy Peterson
Kate Mellia
Dyana Lee
David Ridley
Philip Salmon
Jennifer Lump
William Kelly

For The Louis Berger Group, Inc.:

Stephen Pharai
Manager
Niek Veraart
Jim Stamatis

For Ecology and Environment, Inc.:

Aarty Joshi

For TRC:

Marc Wilkenfeld
Columbia University
Ed Gerds

A P P E A R A N C E S:

For Carter Ledyard & Milburn:

Steven Kass, Esq.

Michael C. Davis, Esq.

A T T E N D E E S:

Terry LaFrance
NYS DOT

Angelina Foster
NYS DOT

Bonnie Bellow
EPA

David Carlson
US EPA

Mary Perillo
125 Cedar Street

Glenn Guzi
Port Authority of NY/NJ

Caesar Johnson
Senior Construction Management
Consultant, Port Authority of
NY/NJ

Allan Sperling
Cleary, Gottlieb

Linda Rosenthal
Representing Congressman Nadler

Robin Forst
Representing New York City
Councilman Alan Gerson

Michael Gilsenan
New York City DEP

A T T E N D E E S: (Continued)

Bernard P. Orlan
New York City DOE

Catherine M. Hughes
Community Board #1

Julie Menin
Wall Street Rising

Jen Hensley
Downtown Alliance

Steve Lemson
American Express

John Boritza
Verizon

Judy Duffy
Community Board #1

Richard Rosen
NYC Department of Buildings

Erik Lutzker
New York State Department of
Labor

Dave Newman
New York City OSH

Pat Moore
Community Board #1

Chris D'Andrea
New York City DOHMH

Peter Levenson

Joel R. Kupferman, Esq.

Kate Kerrigan
Downtown Alliance

A T T E N D E E S: (Continued)

Helene Seeman
BPC United

Dave Stanke
BPC United

Rich Bachia
Brookfield Properties

Michael McMahon
Marriott Financial Center

Roy A. Selenske, CSR, RPR
Reporter

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. PETERSON: Hello, everybody.
Thank you very much for coming
today.

My name is Amy Peterson and I am the
Vice President for Memorial, Cultural and Civic
Development and the manager responsible for the
Deutsche Bank Project at the LMDC.

I thought it would probably be a
good idea for us to go around the room and introduce
ourselves.

The purpose of today's meeting is --
we will be releasing the results and giving you an
update on the Initial Building Characterization Study
for the Deutsche Bank Building. And I believe we will
have copies for you when you leave the room.

MS. MELLIA: Yes.

MS. PETERSON: Excellent.

So with that, I would like to go
around the room and have everybody introduce
themselves.

MR. CROTTY: Okay. I'm Paul Crotty,
a member of the Lower Manhattan Development
Corporation and I sit on the Advisory Committee.

MR. MALLOY: I'm Ed Malloy. I do the same.

MS. MELLIA: I'm Kate Mellia with the LMDC, the Community Outreach Department.

MR. KASS: I'm Steve Kass with Carter, Ledyard & Milburn, environmental counsel to LMDC.

MR. DAVIS: Mike Davis, also with Carter, Ledyard, counsel to LMDC.

MR. GILSENAN: Michael Gilsenan, New York City DEP.

MR. ORLAN: Bernie Orlan, New York City Department of Education.

MS. HUGHES: Catherine McVey Hughes. I'm a resident. I live across the street. I'm also on Community Board #1 on the World Trade Center Redevelopment Committee. I'm co-chair of the Financial District. I'm also the community liaison to the EPA World Trade Center Expert Technical Panel.

MS. MENIN: Hi! I'm Julie Menin with Wall Street Rising and Community Board #1.

MS. HENSLEY: Jen Hensley with the Downtown Alliance.

MR. LEMSON: Steve Lemson with
American Express.

MR. BORITZA: John Boritza, Verizon.

MS. DUFFY: Judy Duffy, Community
Board #1.

MS. FORST: Robin Forst, Councilman
Gerson.

MR. ROSEN: Richard Rosen,
Department of Buildings.

MR. SPERLING: Allan Sperling,
Cleary, Gottlieb.

MR. LEVENSON: Peter Levenson, 90
West Street.

MR. SALMON: Phil Salmon, LMDC.

MR. BACHIA: Rich Bachia,
Brookfield.

MR. McMAHON: Michael McMahon,
Marriott.

MS. LUMPP: Jennifer Lumpp, LMDC,
Business Relations and Government Relations.

MR. LaFRANCE: Terry LaFrance, New
York State Department of Transportation, Route 9A
Office.

MS. FOSTER: Angelina Foster, New York State Department of Transportation, Route 9A Group.

MR. GUZI: Glenn Guzi, Port Authority, Government Relations.

MR. JOHNSON: Caesar Johnson, Port Authority.

MR. RIDLEY: David Ridley, Lower Manhattan Development Corporation.

MR. VERAART: Niek Veraart, Louis Berger Group, Environment & Ecology.

MR. STAMATIS: Jim Stamatis, The Louis Berger Group.

MR. GERDTS: Ed Gerdts with TRC Environmental.

MR. WILKENFELD: Marc Wilkenfeld from Columbia University Medical Center.

MS. JOSHI: Aarty Joshi from Ecology and Environment.

MS. LEE: Dyana Lee, Director of Investigations here at LMDC.

MR. PHARAI: Stephen Pharai, The Louis Berger Group.

MS. BELLOW: Bonnie Bellow, EPA.

MS. PETERSON: And I think there are a few other people in the back of the room.

MS. MOORE: Pat Moore, 125 Cedar Street, resident, and also a member of the Community Board #1.

MR. NEWMAN: I'm Dave Newman. I'm an industrial hygienist with NYCOSH, New York Committee for Occupational Safety and Health.

MR. LUTZKER: Erik Lutzker, New York State Department of Labor.

MS. PETERSON: Thank you.

Before Louis Berger presents the characterization, I wanted to give you an update on the building itself.

As expected, on August 31st LMDC took ownership of the building and we are currently working on the environmental characterization which we will release the initial study today.

We have signed a contract with Gilbane Building Company who currently has site control for the building and is maintaining security for the building.

I think we'll start to go through who some of the players are involved on our side and then I'll turn it over to Louis Berger.

Louis Berger, who is here today, is the consultant that LMDC hired to do a building characterization to determine the hazards and the contaminants that exist in 130 Liberty Street.

In addition, we hired TRC Consulting, who is here, as a second environmental consultant to basically provide a second opinion and to help in the determination of what to do for the characterization, to review the results and help us to make our plans for the deconstruction.

Ecology and Environment is here and they are our outreach consultant who is helping us to work out a plan to share information with the public about both the environmental hazards and the plans for deconstruction.

Ambient Group is doing air monitoring at the site and they are currently monitoring at exterior locations and we are reviewing and enhancing that plan.

Gilbane Building Company, as I

mentioned, is the general contractor that's been hired for the deconstruction project. They have a number of subcontractors. Three of the major ones are:

LDI, which is an asbestos abatement contractor;

CDI, which is control demolition, which is a company that does major demolition and deconstruction projects; and

Western Solutions, who will be doing air monitoring for Gilbane themselves.

And, in addition - and I'm going to ask Dyana Lee to speak briefly about Kroll Associates.

MS. LEE: Great.

We've determined that we are going to enter into a contract with Kroll Associates. Kroll Associates is a company that has been around for over thirty years, a risk consulting company. And we intend to retain them as an integrity monitor.

The purpose of the integrity monitor is going to be, first, to prevent waste, fraud, abuse or corruption, and second, to detect it if it's there, and thirdly, to work with us aggressively to root out any corruption working with government, with law

enforcement.

We intend to take a kind of risk-based approach where we are going to assess the risks that might be prevalent in a project of this kind, then put policies and procedures in place to make sure that those risks are minimized, and then going forward to monitor, to have our consultant monitor to make sure that those procedures and policies are, in fact, being used.

And, for example, you know, we'll go into details as time goes on, but one of the things that we probably will put in place will be a fraud prevention hotline phone number, for example, where people can call.

And so I say to members of the community now, until that is in place, you can always feel free to call me. I'm Dyana Lee. I'm the Director of Investigations here and my number is 212-587-9325.

MS. PETERSON: In addition to the contractors and consultants that we've hired, there are a number of regulating agencies who are involved in this project. Many of them are in this room and at the table.

And they include the EPA, New York State DEC, New York State Department of Labor, New York City Department of Environmental Protection, both New York State and New York City Department of Health, OSHA, the Department of Buildings, City and State DOT.

We are working with these groups and looking to these groups to determine the most effective and safe way to proceed with this project minimizing the impact to the community.

So with that I will turn the presentation over to Steve Pharai who will present the Building Characterization Study.

MR. PHARAI: Thanks, Amy.

The Louis Berger Group was hired by LMDC in May of 2004 to conduct an Initial Characterization Study to determine what hazardous substances are present in the building, if any.

I serve the role as Project Manager on this project.

There were existing data available regarding 130 Liberty Street building. There was the bank's database, bank's data, and there was data from the insurance company. Both had different opinions and

recommendations and conclusions of what is present in the building.

LMDC asked us to make an objective, independent -- conduct an independent, objective investigation of what is in the building and make recommendations.

In the next couple of slides I would like to take you through our characterization study and give you an overview of what we conducted, what we found and the recommendations that we are making to LMDC.

MR. CROTTY: Before you do that, could you tell us a little bit about yourself and who The Louis Berger Group is, what your background and experience is.

MR. PHARAI: Sure.

The Louis Berger Group was founded in 1953. We celebrated our fiftieth anniversary last year. We are a full service environmental, engineering and natural hygiene company. We are a national company, an international company in seventy to eighty countries.

I have been involved in natural

hygiene for the last fifteen years in New York City. I was extensively involved in the testing of various buildings downtown after September 11th, starting on September 18th with the DEP doing ambient air monitoring.

That's an overview of what I've been doing. I've worked on several buildings, commercial, industrial, residential facilities.

I am very familiar with this building because for the past maybe ten years I've worked in this building with Deutsche Bank. Deutsche Bank was a client of mine, my previous company. So I'm very familiar with the layout of the building, the architectural components, what is in the building. I've been doing testing in this building for several years now.

As part of the study, we wanted to identify what hazards are in the building and make recommendations to LMDC for implementing a deconstruction plan.

The study included tests necessary to make determinations regarding:

Appropriate precautions for worker

and public health and safety;

Appropriate cleaning and disposal procedures; and

Compliance with applicable federal, state and local agencies.

The study included sampling and analysis of suspected asbestos-containing building materials - those are considered pre-9/11 existing conditions.

It also included sampling and analysis of the dust for asbestos and key WTC contaminants of potential concern. COPCs is a term defined by the EPA as having certain contaminants.

We tested for those as well as other suspected contaminants which we will get into a bit later.

We also did a visual observation for the presence of mold on exposed surfaces - walls, ceilings, floors, et cetera.

Subsequent to LMDC acquiring the building on September 1st, Berger conducted a preliminary screening for mercury vapor in the indoor environment on random floors.

The various tasks involved in this Characterization Study are as follows.

Task number one was preparing a Sampling and Analysis Plan, a Quality Assurance Project Plan and a Health and Safety Plan specific to this project and the study.

The Sampling Analysis Plan would show that -- was prepared to show where the samples were going to be collected, what protocols were going to be used in the field, how -- the quality of samples to be collected to determine whether material is positive or negative.

The Quality Assurance Plan dictated to us the laboratory procedures, the protocols for analysis, and help us in the interpretation of the laboratory data.

The Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan dealt with worker safety, decontamination processes during the Characterization Study, and general precautions being on site of the building.

Task number two involved the asbestos building inspection and material survey.

We followed the EPA AHERA protocol

floor-by-floor, space-by-space, identifying all materials suspected of containing asbestos, that is, of building materials.

We tested floors, walls, ceilings, roofing materials, caulking, anything that was considered a suspect building material.

Over two thousand samples were selected on various floors, in fact, on all of the floors.

Task number three was a characterization of the dust in the building for asbestos, above the ceiling, under the ceiling.

We identified -- we collected over 815 samples throughout the building for the dust.

Task number four, we collected samples of the dust for analytes such as silica, poly aromatic hydrocarbons, dioxins, PCBs, heavy metals, which includes mercury. We also, as I indicated, said before, conducted preliminary screening for mercury vapor.

Task number five included a visual inspection for mold of all the accessible surfaces. We didn't include destructive sampling or intrusive

sampling for the mold.

The asbestos containing building materials, that's task number two, the majority of the samples we tested were negative. And these were basically the spray-on fire-proofing, the wallboards, the roofing materials and most of the thermal systems.

We identified 155,000 square feet of flooring and wall materials that were identified -- I mean that were considered as asbestos containing materials, that is, these materials had within them one percent asbestos.

We also found 95,000 linear feet of materials, just caulking, insulation, sealants throughout the building. Again, these materials were identified as having greater than one percent asbestos.

Of the 155,000 square feet of floor tiles -- I'm sorry, of the 155,000 square feet of material identified, over 120,000 were floor tiles and mastic. And we're talking on various floors scattered throughout the building.

Over half of the total linear footage was exterior caulking material. The building

was constructed using -- has a curtain wall, exterior curtain wall, and the seams come together, there's caulking in the seams and throughout all of the power plants.

The dust samples were analyzed using the Polarized Light Microscopy method, which is the regulatory standard established by the EPA and the DEP in New York State.

In addition, the PLM results --as I mentioned before, over 815 samples were collected. Although we identified trace amounts of asbestos in the dust using the PLM method, none of these materials, none of these samples were greater than one percent.

But we know for a fact that there's data out there by Deutsche Bank stating that this dust in the building has asbestos.

We then proceeded to collect an additional forty random samples from the building and analyzed these samples by surface area for asbestos using the Transmission Electron Microscopy.

We identified asbestos structures in the dust greater than the EPA-established background

levels. These range from 4,000,000 to less than 891. That's the range of findings.

The results for the COPCs, which is the analytes other than asbestos, were as follows.

We took 125 samples of dioxin. 123 of them either exceeded the residential background level or the EPA residential benchmark.

Of the lead -- okay.

The EPA conducted a background study that indicated -- produced results or levels that said these were concentrations, these are the concentrations in Manhattan.

And they also did a study, a residential cleanup study, for apartment buildings and established thresholds where the buildings were considered suitable for reoccupancy when they met -- when they were under these thresholds.

The lead results were exceeded in 121 of the 125 samples.

Quartz, which is a type of silica, there were exceedances in 111 of the 118 samples collected.

Poly Aromatic Hydrocarbons, 100 of

125 samples.

Chromium, 38 out of 125.

Manganese --

MR. ROSEN: Excuse me. Did you characterize the chromium as to what type?

MR. PHARAI: No, we did not.

Manganese, 26 out of 125.

Other analytes such as cristobalite, which is a type of silica, barium, cadmium, copper, zinc and mercury, will show some detectible levels but were less than five percent of the samples collected.

Nickel and beryllium did not exceed available residential criteria in any of the samples we tested.

The PCB levels, there were no established criteria for the PCB levels. So what we did was we used the EPA spill cleanup criteria and we compared the PCBs identified in the building to this threshold and they did not exceed. So there were no exceedances of the PCBs.

For the visual mold we conducted a floor-by-floor, space-by-space evaluation from the top to the bottom, down to the basement levels A and B.

We went through every space looking at wallboard, looking at locations where mold may be present or there's moisture present. We knew for a fact, based on previous published reports that there was mold in the building in the basement levels. So we paid particular attention to the basement levels.

We identified some mold in this building but a small quantity. In the entire building we identified five areas - the 11th floor, the 7th floor, the 3rd floor, basement level A and basement level B - a total of 105 square feet of visual mold.

The inspection was conducted in accessible areas. There were certain areas that were not sampled, were not inspected. Those included non-exposed surfaces such as concealed interstitial spaces, inside -- such as inside curtain walls, inside wall partitions. And these will be performed as part of a supplemental investigation in conjunction with a deconstruction plan.

Upon LMDC taking ownership of the building on September 1st, there were occupants from Gilbane who were going to secure the building and control access to the site. LMDC staff and other

consultants who are currently doing testing in the building needed access to the space.

What we did was we conducted a preliminary screening using a direct reading instrument for mercury vapor, to identify what the levels were, if any, so the appropriate respiratory protection can be used.

We did not identify any other levels, detectible levels, of mercury vapor.

The results that we found were consistent with the high variable nature of the WTC dust. When you look at studies done by the EPA, the contaminants we identified in the dust were consistent with WTC dust.

Conclusions.

We believe that the sampling and testing conducted provides a basis -- is a good start for LMDC as part of this Initial Characterization Study to include as part of their deconstruction plan for the building.

Asbestos containing materials were positively identified throughout.

There were detectible levels of

asbestos, silica, PAHs, heavy metals, et cetera throughout the dust in the building, whether it's above the panel or under the panel.

The results indicated varying contaminant levels and are consistent again with WTC dust.

Further testing.

LMDC proposes to implement a supplemental investigation program for previously inaccessible spaces such as curtain walls, interior walls, the exterior facade of the building and the cell systems and raceways on the floor.

We are proposing also to test for all of the constituents addressed in this characterization study, asbestos and the other analytes as well as mold.

We also propose to perform additional testing to characterize the waste during the deconstruction process prior to leaving the site.

Berger's recommendations to LMDC.

We recommend that LMDC continue and maintain a health and safety plan and continue external air monitoring.

Should review the existing health and safety plan for the project site and take appropriate measures to address all of the conditions identified in the study.

LMDC should continue to review and address the potential for release of contaminants from the inside of this building to the outside.

It should also develop and implement an emergency action plan for the building.

It should also conduct further testing as recommended in this study.

It should further develop its plan for cleaning and deconstruction and address the contaminants identified in this study and in the further testing.

It should also consult with regulatory agencies - Department of Labor, Department of Environmental Protection, the EPA, various New York State and New York City agencies.

LMDC should also develop an appropriate, site-specific health and safety plan which includes establishing organizational and procedural safeguards to ensure worker protection and

community, public health and safety.

This can include setting up the regulations controlling access to the site. Various measures can take place to restrict access to this building.

In connection with the deconstruction plan, LMDC should further develop appropriate work and site operations plan documents to cover such items as work area controls/limitations, decontamination units, engineered controls, negative air filtration system sampling, waste management plans, emergency contingency plans. Those are part of the recommendations.

It should also file appropriate notifications with and obtain necessary permits from the regulatory agencies, such as the Department of Buildings, the New York State Department of Labor, the New York City Department of Environmental Protection, the EPA.

LMDC should engage a contractor with a New York State Department of Labor Asbestos Handling License to perform the cleanup activities.

And LMDC should also conduct

appropriate monitoring and quality assurance and quality control inspection throughout the cleaning and deconstruction process.

Timeline.

MS. PETERSON: Okay. Thank you, Stephen.

Our timeline right now is, we are releasing the Characterization today.

Kate Mellia is -- right there -- is going to go through with you our public outreach plan concerning the Characterization and what we are going to do over the next month regarding that.

MS. MELLIA: Good evening, everyone.

I just want to give you a brief outline of everything that we have planned for the next few weeks.

Today we are opening a public comment period for the next thirty days to solicit questions and concerns about this Characterization Report as well as the cleaning and deconstruction in general.

We are holding this meeting to give you this information. We are also meeting with the

Community Board this evening.

Next Thursday, September 23rd, we'll be holding a public information session at Tribeca Performing Arts Center. And that will be from 5:00 to 9:00 p.m.

The first hour, from 5:00 to 6:00, will be a meet-and-greet session where it will allow the public to interact one-on-one with many of the different key people involved in this and get some answers to some questions. Then it will be followed by a presentation similar to this, but we hope to answer some more of the community's questions at that time, the questions that are raised in the next week or so.

And then there will be the opportunity for the public to also voice their questions and concerns at that meeting.

Just as some other points of information.

I will personally be the community liaison on this project from the LMDC. So everybody is welcome to contact me at any time with any issues or direct questions that you need an answer to.

We also want to let everybody know

that we are making the information available, the data that produced this report, available to the public here in our offices along with the data from the Deutsche Bank study and the insurance study.

It will be here in our office and people are encouraged to call our front desk to make an appointment to come and view that data. It's on two work stations, computer work stations. So we just encourage an appointment as to not have an overlap in people trying to get on and view that data.

Today we will be uploading all of this information on our website. I believe it is live as we speak now. We will be sending out electronic distribution with the links to that information on our site. And we would appreciate it, any of you who are on our distribution - and those of you who aren't, if we could get you on our distribution - and those of you who are if you could forward the information on to your lists. We would definitely appreciate your getting this information out to as many people as possible in the community.

We also will be sending out -- doing a flyer distribution about the public information

session that we are holding next week. We definitely would like as many people throughout the community to attend that as are interested to.

We will be doing a mailing to area businesses to inform them of the information session and the comment period and make sure that business leaders and their staffs are aware of everything that we are implementing to make sure people understand what's going on.

And, finally, I just want to review a little bit about the information that is on the website.

We, as I mentioned, will put this Characterization Report online. The fact sheet, which I handed out to most of you - if you didn't receive it, I have additional copies - that's also online.

We have background information on all of the consultants and contractors that are working with us on this project so people can become familiar with their past experience and their role in working with us on this project.

We currently have some answers to some frequently asked questions, but our hope is to

have that grow as time goes on with the questions that we receive from you.

We also have an online comment forum so people can pose their questions directly on the website.

There will be a contact information - right now it is my contact information - and another 24-hour number that people can call if there is a problem or a concern outside of business hours.

And, finally, there is a registration form for people to sign up for a 130 Liberty Street Update list.

So that is what we have planned currently.

MS. PETERSON: So we are starting a number of efforts, or continuing a number of efforts today.

It is our intention to release this Initial Characterization. And as Steven mentioned, we do intend, now that we own the building, to do some additional testing that we weren't able to do previously with space, interior testing in the interstitial spaces both for World Trade Center dust

and asbestos and the other contaminants in that dust and for mold and for asbestos containing building materials, which might be between the wall partitions.

We are providing the information from the Characterization to the regulators and we are asking them to guide us in providing information on what is legally required to deconstruct this -- particularly to deconstruct this building.

And we are really trying to open up this public comment period and have this public information session, go to the Community Board today. We intend to go to the Community Board again before the public comment period is over to really also hear from the public and understand what their -- what everyone's concerns and questions are.

And our intention is to take those three things - the Characterization and the feedback from the regulators and the feedback from the public - and put together a cleaning and deconstruction plan for the building.

We've completed this first stage of the Initial Characterization and I think that we tried to in the report show the dust that's in the building

and compare it to some of the studies that have been done previously. Those studies were done for residential reoccupancy. We were just trying to show, so the layperson could read and understand, what does it mean if there are levels of these contaminants.

I think, based on the results of our report, it's very clear that in the spaces where we've surveyed so far, which is the exposed areas below the ceiling and above the ceiling throughout the building there is World Trade Center dust. It has the contaminants of concern in it.

And we really want to work to put together a plan to begin to go in and start to clean out that dust, strip down -- strip down the carpets and other parts of the building, put together a plan that we can submit to the regulators and they can approve to continue to do this additional testing and really be able to move forward and remove this contaminated building from the neighborhood.

So that is our plan.

And I guess I'll open it up to questions now.

MR. NEWMAN: I have three questions.

The first is - maybe you could share with us what current measures are underway to contain the contaminants that have been identified pending the demolition process, and also what current provisions are in place for external monitoring prior to the demolition.

Second, I'm wondering whether there are any plans, in addition to allowing members of the community to come in and view the data, whether the data could be made accessible via the Internet.

And the third, whether there are any plans -- whether you anticipate formalizing a process, institutionalizing a process for community input similar to what's been done or what is being done at the EPAWTC Panel.

MS. PETERSON: Ed, do you want to answer the question about the air monitoring.

MR. GERDTS: Sure.

Relative to what's going on now, ever since August 31st when LMDC closed on the property, there has been air monitoring that's been ongoing. It goes on twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

There are four locations around the perimeter of the building. And at those four locations samples are collected for asbestos and analyzed via TEM, metals, and SEM analysis for World Trade Center dust.

So each of those four locations has those sampling stations, and those samples run twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. The sampling program started, was initiated when LMDC took ownership.

There was prior sampling, but as far as, you know, LMDC is concerned, it's, you know, the data that we are generating.

In addition, there are -- there's discussions about enhancing that program. So currently there are recommendations under review relative to enhancing that program both now in its, the current static state of the building as well as during the deconstruction activities, so when there's a lot more activity, an enhanced program to ensure that it's representative of the conditions during that process.

So --

MS. HUGHES: Where are those four

locations?

MR. GERDTS: The four locations are on the -- they're almost on the four corners. They're on Cedar and Greenwich, Greenwich and Albany, Albany and Washington and Washington and Cedar.

So those are the four locations.

MS. PETERSON: We're adding a fifth location right now and we've asked both TRC and Louis Berger and Ambient Group to look and make recommendations for additional locations.

Concerning the question about the containment, one of the first things we've asked Gilbane to do is ensure that the building is contained, that there's plywood or Tyvak or other means to ensure that the contaminants that are in the building are not escaping from the building.

I'm just going to go through the three questions he had, although I'm not completely sure if I recall them now.

The second question had to do with the data on the web. We are putting our report on the web and we are putting our tallied data on the web. But the amount of raw data that we have available and

the Deutsche Bank data and insurance data is of such size that, one, you would have to get additional web capacity, and two, it's very hard to download to even be able to use.

So we are making it available at our office for people to come in and review it. We think that that's the best way to make that available.

And the third question, one of the purposes of having this Advisory Council is to get feedback from you on what are the best ways to communicate with the public and to move forward with this project.

So we welcome suggestions either at this meeting or through our public comment period about ideas for creating -- expanding this group or creating other advisory councils.

I think that answers the three questions.

MS. FORST: Can somebody summarize these results as compared with Deutsche Bank's results?

MS. PETERSON: I think I can talk a little bit to that.

One of the things that we did and people -- I think a big question is, you know, Deutsche Bank did all of this work, the insurers did all of this work, now we are doing this work, how does it all compare.

We looked at the -- our consultants looked at the Deutsche Bank data and the insurers data in coming up with their sampling plan originally and determining what sampling we needed to do, what contaminants we should test for. It wasn't the only thing they looked at, but they looked at that.

I think you will remember that we had originally anticipated publishing our report earlier than this.

When we did get our initial data back, we actually set up meetings with the insurers' consultants and the Deutsche Bank's consultants and shared with them our results.

And one of the things that came up in those discussions was the fact that Deutsche Bank feels that there is a tremendous amount of asbestos in the dust and yet our readings were coming back, using the standard PLM method, at less than one percent.

So we initiated additional testing for that, which is the TEM testing, which showed that there is certainly a health hazard associated with the fact that there is asbestos in this dust.

The other questions in terms of the Deutsche Bank data that I would be concerned about right now are what's in the interstitial spaces, and we have not tested for that.

And it's our intention to continue that dialogue with Deutsche Bank and the insurers moving forward.

However, there's a couple of things to keep in mind.

One is the studies and the data and all of the extensive data that they were doing were to prove whether or not you could reoccupy this building. We're not trying to prove that. We don't need to prove that. We want to determine what contaminants are in the building and how you safely remove those contaminants and deconstruct this building.

One of the things that we want to do is do all of the testing that we need to do to determine that, but not to get caught up in some of

the more theoretical and scientific discussions about that. We want to be able to say that there are contaminants, what those contaminants are, work with the regulators to determine how to remove those contaminants and start to remove those contaminants from the building, which I think is the best result for anyone after three years.

MS. MOORE: Pat Moore.

Steve mentioned that among the other plans that you had come up with was the emergency action plan.

Does that also include -- I -- there are many buildings that are in close proximity, residential buildings, to the Deutsche Bank. So does that plan include evacuation of residents if there's an accident, say something falls off the building?

And -- well, does it include an emergency action for the residents or is it just for workers in the building?

MR. GERDTS: No.

I think that the intent is to address many types of emergencies. And that would be one sort of emergencies that are generated based on

work which hopefully -- I mean God forbid, you know, there better not be any accidents of that magnitude on this job.

MS. MOORE: But if there are.

MR. GERDTS: But if there are.

Right.

And, in addition, if there is a fire or any of those kind of, you know, emergencies, the action plan would include -- and it is to be developed frankly so it's good to get your input --

MS. MOORE: Absolutely. If you're going to develop that, you have to have a way of getting --

MR. GERDTS: Absolutely.

MS. MOORE: -- to the immediate residents.

MS. PETERSON: Yes.

And I think we will work through Kate to work with the buildings directly in the area concerning that.

And we are going to publish -- and I don't have it in front of me, but there is a 24-hour number for people to call and you can reach someone at

the Gilbane Building Company who can reach me immediately if there is any issue with the building.

Obviously, you can call here during the day.

But there is a -- and major emergencies are 911. But there is an emergency number. It will be on our website and we can give it to you at the end of the meeting.

MR. ROSEN: Just to follow up on that question.

Has any kind of formalized site safety plan been agreed upon or even submitted either to VESSQUAD or to us, meaning the Department of Buildings, so that we have some kind of timeframe on this so we know when exactly you are going to walk in the door and start this process?

Just as a headsup so I can come back to my people and give them a headsup that this is going to be walking in the door.

MS. PETERSON: Yes.

We have had preliminary discussions with the VESSQUAD and Department of Buildings about ways to deconstruct the building.

But one of the things that we really needed to do was to determine how you characterize the contaminants and how you, not as much structurally but with the risk of contaminants within the structure, how you take that down.

Our timeframe right now, we are looking at coming up with a deconstruction plan in the next six to eight weeks to deal specifically with removing the dust. And what our thoughts are right now is trying to get in and deal with the kind of floor to deck dust cleaning removal process and at the same time prepare for -- do additional testing and start to think about the more complicated things, which is how to take down the curtain wall and the steel and all of those.

So --

MS. SEEMAN: Hi! Helene Seeman.

From a community point of view, I recognize that you've done a lot of work so far, but I think there is a sense of urgency that we all feel about this project.

And I hope that when you make your public presentation, you have more information between

Fall 2004 and 2005 deconstruction complete.

I think there is a sense of urgency. So I would hope that this report has already gone to regulator X and Y for them to review and you have deadlines for everyone so that we don't go into 2006 and 2007 before the building comes down.

And my -- two other questions.

One, has anyone tested the outside of the building, which I know it's been three years, but it's never been cleaned and we don't like to walk around it and nobody talks about the outside.

And the other thing is, I imagine that there is a tremendous difference in all of the reports and all of the studies because the building isn't sealed now and when will it be sealed.

MS. PETERSON: To do some -- I'm trying to figure out in my mind -- sorry. So I'll go backwards.

In terms of sealing the building and the exterior testing, when we talk about what we had access to test, it was very difficult to test the exterior of the building prior to us owning it because of the steps that needed to be taken above the ground

level.

So part of our supplemental testing is to test higher levels of the exterior of the building.

But we did do some preliminary results -- we do have some results at the ground level.

Our intention right now is to go through the building and determine if there are places where it is not sealed and take care of containing the building to ensure that contaminants are not released from the building.

We agree with you completely in terms of wanting to start this project and take this building down. And we feel very strongly that we need to do it in this methodical way and we need to take the steps to do the testing and to move forward with the regulators.

We did not share -- although we've have discussions with the regulators, we did not share this report. Today is the day that it was shared with the regulators and with you. We felt that to be as transparent as possible that you should -- the public

should receive it at the same time as the regulators.

So we're sharing it with everyone at the same time.

We do think that there is a way to go in and handle -- to begin the deconstruction, which is basically to start cleaning out the floors, to start removing the dust, to start removing the carpet and the ceiling tiles, and that we can move forward rather quickly with the regulators in creating a plan, sending it to them for their review and approval, and starting with that work.

And some of the more complicated discussions can take a little bit longer and we will be ready to do that work when we get to that point.

So we -- the building has been there for three years. It's not going to be there much longer. We need to take the steps to get it down.

MR. MALLOY: Can I ask Louis Berger, has there ever been a building that has been deconstructed that has been in this condition?

MR. VERAART: Not of this magnitude that we can think of.

MR. MALLOY: Magnitude of the size

of the building or magnitude of the contamination of the building?

MR. VERAART: The size of the building -- I guess both the size of the building and the contamination that's dispersed throughout every floor. You usually find contamination in maybe a few floors, but not in almost, you know, universally distributed as we have here.

MR. RIDLEY: What we can do when the web component of this is available on our website, which may be right now, you'll see the experience of the contractors who are going to do the deconstruction and control demolition and a number of other firms that have significant experience in deconstructing nuclear reactors, control demolition.

So perhaps it's not specific to asbestos and things like this building in terms of magnitude and, as Louis Berger said, not necessarily come up with a similar project, but certainly the firms involved in this have a range of experience that's probably like --

MR. VERAART: Let me put --

MR. RIDLEY: -- this but not --

MR. VERAART: Let me put it in perspective.

MR. RIDLEY: With a number of them.

MR. VERAART: Let me put it in perspective.

In an urban environment with residents nearby we are not aware of any buildings that have been or any that have had this level of both the size as well as the contaminant distribution.

If we are talking Department of Energy out in the middle of nowhere where we have a substantial building that has been contaminated with various types of radioactive waste, et cetera, yes, we do have some magnitude. But they're away from sensitive receptors, the public, et cetera.

MR. CROTTY: On the other hand, you should point out that the level of contamination of this building is no different than the general level of contamination throughout the number of buildings that have been exposed to the World Trade Center.

And a number of the buildings down here have already been decontaminated without this kind of public review process.

One building is 140 West Street, 90 Church Street, the hotel, this building, perhaps 90 West Street and all the buildings fronting on West Street that are part of the World Financial Center have all have been through this process.

MS. VERAART: Absolutely.

I was purely --

MR. CROTTY: I understand.

But I think it's important to keep all of this stuff in context.

MR. PHARAI: To add to that, Berger was contracted by the Postal Services at the Morgan Facility when there was an anthrax -- and anthrax was identified in the postal facility, the post office in midtown Manhattan.

We've also completed remediation oversight at the Trenton post office again at the same time where a remediation plan was developed, was scrutinized and engineering controls were implemented and the building was secured, restricted access and was decontaminated by process by process.

Can that same methodology apply to this building process by process remediation? We think

so.

MR. GERDTS: Again, and relative -- I mean it is a large project. It is within obviously a center, an urban, densely populated urban environment.

But it is a manageable job.

There will be a process that will be developed - it will be a step-wise fashion - to ensure that it's done in an appropriate manner.

And we're -- this is part of the process, is to get people's input to make sure that we hear the concerns and we address those concerns.

But it is -- frankly, it is a manageable project. And there are projects that go on all the time of this magnitude in hazardous materials, hazardous material removal.

MR. STANKE: Hi! David Stanke.

What were the results of the exterior testing at the lower levels? Can somebody characterize the results of the testing, the exterior testing at lower levels and what those results are? And would it be possible to implement a plan to clean the outside fairly quickly?

MR. PHARAI: Yes. We did some

preliminary wipe samples on the outside ground floor level.

The concentrations were detectible in some samples, none detected in a lot of samples.

Because we're taking it off a surface that had been exposed to the air for three years. Accumulations of dust were not present. So, you know, you destroy actually by wiping the square foot area.

As opposed to inside the building where you had settled dust.

So the results varied. We found that the dust that we -- the sample that we collected, we identified some dust. And was it from the normal street activity, dust blowing up from the street onto the building at the ground level?

That's why using the data from the ground floor cannot be representative of the upper floors.

MR. STANKE: So more testing would have to be done before a cleaning plan --

MR. PHARAI: Yes.

MR. STANKE: -- can be devised.

MR. PHARAI: As proposed, yes.

MS. PETERSON: Yes?

MS. ROSENTHAL: Linda Rosenthal from
Congressman Nadler's Office.

Two things.

One, you said you were going to be
doing mailings to local businesses.

In terms of the residents, how would
you identify all of them?

MS. MELLIA: We are doing
advertising in the area through flyers for the public
information sessions.

We're also going to be flyering the
different buildings throughout here, the residential
buildings and hope that you all take some flyers with
you today and put them in your buildings, those of you
who are residents.

Those are the attempts.

And eventually we do plan to do a
more widespread mailing with a more formalized
timeline that does reach more residents.

Right now we just want to publicize
the fact that we are having this information session

next week and then do the full scale mailing with more details.

MS. ROSENTHAL: My other question, did Deutsche Bank do any cleaning inside?

MS. PETERSON: Deutsche Bank remediated the gashed area and they also remediated the basement level area which is where the workers go down and suit up to go up into the building.

In addition, they removed all of the furniture, fixtures and equipment. So I mean there was a tremendous, I would assume actually, I didn't see the building before that, but I assume in the removal of that furniture they did take out some of the dust that was probably on that furniture.

MR. DAVIS: And they also did mold abatement.

MS. PETERSON: And they also did a mold abatement.

MS. ROSENTHAL: What's physically in there now?

MS. PETERSON: There's really not much. I mean mechanical equipment is still in there, basically things that are affixed to the building. So

the ceiling is still there and the walls and doors are still in there and the mechanical equipment.

MR. KASS: Carpeting.

MS. PETERSON: And carpeting.

And duct work and electrical wiring, basically the shell.

Yes?

MS. PERILLO: Hi! Mary Perillo, 125 Cedar.

I'm wondering, having been through the abatement of my apartment which we couldn't live through, we had to live elsewhere, and my particular apartment failed three times, the way that was done was, it was negative -- there were filters out to the street. The building was really very well sealed. The apartments were cleaned from the top down, one at a time.

And I'm not hearing the broad strokes of what I would love to be hearing today. Am I wrong in assuming that you will first seal the building, second, clean the building top to bottom, third, take the building down, demolish it top to bottom? Is that your general plan or am I getting this

wrong?

MS. PETERSON: We need to create that plan. And part of what we are going to be doing over the next few weeks/month is going to be creating that plan.

In terms of the last step, which is taking the building down, I think that we need to have some additional testing before we can go to the regulators and say this is how we are proposing to take that down.

MS. PERILLO: But you are preparing to seal it and then clean it and --

MS. PETERSON: Our initial plan that we are going to be presenting to the regulators will involve sealing each of the floors and cleaning each of the floors and removing that debris.

MS. PERILLO: Oh! So you're talking piecemeal. You're talking seal the floor, clean the floor and demolish it - seal, clean, demolish? That's what I'm trying to find out.

MS. PETERSON: We are still looking at that and determining what we need to do and what is the best way to do this.

MR. KUPFERMAN: I'm Joel Kupferman. I'm an environmental attorney for the UFA. I want to point out that Firehouse 1010 is right next door. And as of ten minutes ago as I spoke to the captain of Fire Engine 10, the firehouse has not been apprised of basically any of the materials in that place.

Their intake to their building has been blocked several -- many times in the last few months and they had to replace the filters.

We want to know if you're working on a special liaison with the firehouse and the fire department in terms of emergency evacuation plans. These are the guys that have to go into the building if there is any problem.

And I have a second question.

MR. RIDLEY: I had -- I've actually stopped at the 1010 house obviously before we got this. One of the things I had done working on this project was just go around and introduce myself to the business owners and anyone else.

The 1010 house happens to be out most of the time you come by.

We absolutely by the end of this

week will have spoken with them and share this with them and try to work --

MS. PETERSON: And let me --

MR. SALMON: I had officially notified the fire department.

MR. KUPFERMAN: Okay.

MS. PETERSON: And --

MR. KUPFERMAN: The firefighters in that house have not been apprised.

MR. SALMON: But their bosses have.

MR. KUPFERMAN: Okay.

But if there is a problem, it's not their bosses who are going into the building.

MS. MELLIA: I've personally spoken with the engine boss of Engine 10 and I delivered him materials.

MR. KUPFERMAN: Okay.

So they're concerned about the disparity between the data that you just delivered and the Deutsche Bank material such as, (a) this legionelle bacteria that's been found in the Deutsche Bank Report but not in yours. Okay?

And (b) the Deutsche Bank Report

said that mercury vapor was consistently found in that building much beyond your -- you know, everyone else's expectations.

So there is a little disparity that they are very, very concerned about. Until you reconcile your findings and the Deutsche Bank findings, I think it's really important to keep the people that protect -- you know, everyone in that area apprised of your methods and also how you explain the disparity.

MS. PETERSON: Well, one, I mean in terms of informing, I think that we feel very strongly about -- we want to make sure that we involve everyone in creating the plans and that we reach out to these people.

And I think you just heard from three LMDC individuals who have been working and trying to work with the Fire Department.

And I think -- we invited them to be on this panel in addition. And we will be continuing to work with them. I think Ed can talk a little bit about --

MR. GERDTS: Yes.

I think -- you mention the Deutsche Bank Reports. And those have been -- to an extent we looked -- those all have been reviewed and where we felt that they should be incorporated, such as you, you know, we talk about microbiological and we talk about mold.

The legionelle that they found was in the actual water system. It wasn't -- you know, it's not in the air, It wasn't in the -- it wasn't like in the walls like mold is or whathaveyou. It's actually in the water system itself.

And that was something that we didn't have access to as part of this survey.

In addition, because of the mercury issues that you're bringing up, mercury was sampled at least for screening purposes, initial screening purpose. We did wipe samples for mercury but we also took air samples for mercury and we did a screening to determine what are the concentrations right now because we wanted to know because we took into consideration the Deutsche Bank issues with mercury in their documentation relative to mercury.

So we have incorporated that

information and we will continue to. It's not -- we're not done evaluating the issue with mercury frankly.

MR. KUPFERMAN: We're also concerned with your methodology because you said you used PLM and you didn't find any asbestos. Then you used PEM.

MR. GERDTS: Right. Absolutely.

MR. KUPFERMAN: I think the public and the firefighters are concerned that you are using the right methodology, state-of-the-art --

MR. GERDTS: Right.

MR. KUPFERMAN: We were a little surprised that you used PLM when for the last two or three years the PLM is not state-of-the-art. The PLM interestingly found no detects when TEM has shown, you know, detects even when EPA -- EPA has used split samples.

You know, we are a little chagrin that why are you using low-level testing methods when high-level testing methods are available and produce more truthful results.

MS. PETERSON: I want to speak a little bit to how we are doing what we're doing and why we are doing what we're doing.

Deutsche Bank, and again I think I've mentioned this before, Deutsche Bank and the insurers both have done an extensive amount of testing and they have done that testing in preparation for litigation and they've done that testing over a three-year period while nothing has happened to the building except that it sat in your neighborhood.

We have bought the building to prevent that, to basically start to take the steps necessary to take down the building.

We're not interested in reoccupying the building. We are interested in taking down the building.

So while there is this tremendous amount of data that has been taken and looked at in terms of litigation, we are trying to take the data that we need to take to meet with the -- to inform the regulators and to inform us and to let us understand what are the contaminants in that building, how do we treat those contaminants now and during the cleaning and deconstruction plan.

Regarding the PLM versus the TEM testing, you need to do PLM testing because that's

what the regulators require for you to do to determine if something is an asbestos containing material.

We agree completely. We got the results of the PLM testing. We were surprised that it was less than one percent. We think like everybody in this room thinks that there is asbestos in that dust, there are all of these contaminants in that dust.

We also believe that we are going to need to treat that dust as if it has asbestos in it, and DEP can speak up, regardless of whether or not the TEM/PLM/SEM tests come out and say there is asbestos in that dust.

But we did think that it was important to do additional testing with TEM to show that what I think everybody believes is true is right, that there is asbestos in that dust, that it is a safety hazard and that we need to handle it.

MR. GILSENAN: And that's how it's going to be treated. And that's been our understanding. It will be treated as an asbestos project and we will follow all those guidelines as we did during the World Trade Center residential cleanup.

So it's going to be an asbestos --

it's going to be an asbestos project.

MR. KUPFERMAN: And if there is a violation, DEP, since you opened up your treatment of downtown, I believe it's your own data that shows -- DEP issued a --

MR. GILSENAN: I feel like I'm on the presidential campaign.

MR. CROTTY: We ought to address questions. We're not going to try to turn this into a forum for litigation.

MR. KUPFERMAN: -- DEP is people we can trust.

MR. CROTTY: Listen. We're not talking about that. We're going to say what our plan is, you can comment on the plan, and to the extent you don't like the plan, we appreciate your comments. To the extent that you do like the plan, we appreciate those comments.

But I don't think it's appropriate to turn this into a forum for litigation.

MR. KASS: Or trust and distrust of the regulatory agencies.

MS. PETERSON: Okay.

Next question.

MS. PERILLO: A very simple one to anybody that's involved with cleanup or EPA, DEC.

Living next door with the Deutsche Bank out the kitchen window, I've been back there a year-and-a-half or so now, can I open my windows?

MS. PETERSON: Well, what we would like to do, and I'll answer that honestly, what we would like to do is have you talk to David Ridley after this meeting and actually the man who is sitting next to you, Bill Kelly, and let's set up an air monitoring station so that we can give you the exact answer to that question.

MS. ROSENTHAL: I know this wasn't your responsibility, but if the Deutsche Bank really didn't do cleaning of everything that was in there, how did they take it out and where did they put it?

MS. PETERSON: I --

MR. GILSENAN: No. They filed it as an asbestos job. They filed it as an asbestos job with DEP. They had all the proper filings. They had all the proper decontaminations. They came to a decontamination and they discarded it as asbestos

containing material.

So we have the filings on record and we did do inspections.

MS. ROSENTHAL: And did someone monitor this?

MR. GILSENAN: We did do inspections, yes.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Inspections, but not monitoring.

MR. GILSENAN: Inspections, not a constant monitoring, no.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Okay.

A VOICE: If you didn't inspect the PCBs --

MR. GILSENAN: No, no.

We were responsible --

MS. ROSENTHAL: I just want to make a point that that kind of information, which was extremely difficult to get -- you know, we and other offices, we called OEM or other City agencies and they said, look, it's a private matter, we can't -- we don't know.

So, you know, that -- and I think,

you know, that's not what --

MS. PETERSON: And that's the difference. And I can't stress enough, we're a public agency. We are a public agency that is committed and has been committed to Lower Manhattan. And we are sitting here with other public agencies. We're going to do this process in as transparent a method as possible.

And we want to hear from the public as much as possible and we want to give you information back.

So it is our intention to take the steps that we need to take as a public agency that it's actually -- you know, it's both, we receive our funding from the Federal government and our board is equally appointed by the Governor and the Mayor, and do what we need to do to ensure that we can start to demolish this building and get it -- I'm being redundant -- but get it out of the way.

MS. HUGHES: Hi!

I just have a couple of questions. Catherine McVey Hughes. I'm a resident living across the street.

Have you developed standards so if there are exceedances in the air monitoring program, that it would -- if there are exceedances, the job would stop?

MR. GERDTS: Well, right now the job hasn't started.

MS. HUGHES: Right. But I'm just saying --

MR. GERDTS: But as part of the program, yes. You know, we have briefly described the enhanced program. And part of that would be the notification process where -- you know, it would be a tiered approach where, you know, at certain levels we talk to the contractor and say you've got an issue or you don't have an issue. And then, you know, --

MS. HUGHES: Yes. I hope you only have to go to that level.

MR. GERDTS: Right. Yes.

But ultimately, you know, potentially stopping the job. I mean the intent is to monitor the air and to have actually a potentially real time response to the contractor, to work with them to make sure that there aren't releases.

I mean the engineering controls are a primary defense against releases and we've got to make sure that the engineering controls are appropriate, in place, monitored, inspected and continue to be effective.

And then the monitoring is sort of a fail/safe in a sense because we want to make sure that those contaminants are up there. But the monitoring program will have -- the current monitoring program does have -- we are comparing it to the EPA AHERA standard and the OSHA standards at this moment.

MS. HUGHES: I guess I'm somewhat confused because I don't think if there is dust that might be created -- actually maybe further along the process when they are actually cutting the steel beams -- I don't think the dust will necessarily fall exactly down in your perimeter of where your four monitors are now.

MR. GERDTS: You are absolutely correct.

MS. HUGHES: The wind will blow.

So I think what will probably make sense, that you'll have monitors at one block away or

two blocks away or four blocks away.

MR. GERDTS: And at that elevation.

MS. HUGHES: And a different elevation because --

MR. GERDTS: That's absolutely part of the, you know, this enhanced program that we're describing which we haven't flushed out yet because it's part of -- you know, when we get to the deconstruction program, it's going to monitor that program. So it has to be done in concert with that.

But that will certainly be part of that enhanced program.

MS. HUGHES: Okay. Great.

MS. PETERSON: Additional questions?

Sorry.

MR. NEWMAN: I'm hoping that I misheard what I think I heard you just say, and that is, that you are going to use the AHERA and the OSHA standards for your monitoring purposes.

And I would strongly encourage you to revisit that notion and to look at more protective environmental standards.

MR. GERDTS: Right. And that is part of the evaluation as well.

This is what's going on right now in its static state. The building is not under active deconstruction and there's not a lot of work going on right there right now.

I think we are intending -- you know, the work right now is to increase the seals and button down the building. And that's the work that's going on now.

But that comment is absolutely, you know, part of the evaluation for the enhanced program.

MS. PETERSON: Yes.

MS. MOORE: I know you have a lot of work left to do. But any idea, a two-month process, a three-month process? Are we looking at it coming down next year?

MS. PETERSON: I think that it's important for us to be able to get in there this fall and to start to clean this building.

And so what we really want to work out is a way that we continue to do some of the testing on the areas where I think it's going to be

more complicated to figure out what it's going to look like, how you take the curtain wall out and be able to get a plan immediately, very soon, immediately very soon to start going in and cleaning out the floors. And that's our intention.

Any other questions?

Yes.

MR. D'ANDREA: I was wondering if the deconstruction plan will have a period of review also for open comments.

THE REPORTER: Could I have your name, sir?

MR. D'ANDREA: Chris D'Andrea, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.

MS. PETERSON: Our intention is to have a public information session and make the deconstruction plan available for everyone.

MS. HUGHES: So that will be before September 23rd or after --

MS. PETERSON: No, no, no. After.

So we are going to have a public information session to share the Characterization with you and to share -- for you to share your concerns

both about the contaminants in the building and plan of deconstruction.

And then we will have another public information session to share information about the deconstruction plan.

Any other questions?

MR. SPERLING: The interior demolition, I guess because you said the furniture was gone, it's really all been sealed, the duct work and the conduit, do you have any idea as far as the breakdown for 2005? Are we talking about the end of '05 or the middle?

MS. PETERSON: The schedule -- prior to having done the Characterization, the schedule for deconstruction of the building was approximately fourteen months. So depending on how complicated it gets based on what we might need to do with the exterior of the building - because I think the interior schedule won't change that much - we would like to get that building down by the end of 2005.

And I keep saying any other questions. This isn't your only obviously opportunity

to question us.

We didn't anticipate that you would have been able to read the report. You didn't have it.

So we will be setting up an additional meeting and we will have the session next week.

And you should feel free to call Kate in the interim with any questions.

It's very helpful to us to hear all of these questions. And I think that the report was shaped somewhat by the questions that you've asked at previous community board meetings and at this meeting previously.

So we want to continue to hear from you. We want to get asked the questions and then we want to figure out a way to answer them.

So --

MS. MELLIA: A few last points.

I'm just going to check to see if the reports are available for you to take with you.

And I'm going to get the 24-hour number, which is also posted on our website.

And I would also ask that if you

haven't signed the signin sheet, to please do that.

So I'll be right back.

MS. PETERSON: Thank you everyone.

(At 4:55 o'clock p.m. the
proceedings were concluded.)

* * *