LOWER MANHATTAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

----------x

PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION :

on :

DRAFT PHASE I DECONSTRUCTION PLAN :

FOR 130 LIBERTY STREET :

----------x

Savol Auditorium
St. John's University
Murray Street
New York, New York

January 24, 2005
6:10 p.m.

B e f o r e:

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:

Amy Peterson

Kate Mellia

Jennifer Brown

David Ridley

For TRC:

Marc Wilkenfeld
Columbia University

Edward Gerdts

Jennifer Guido

For Gilbane:

Bill Gilbane, III

Steve Moriarty

Mark Winslow

Bruce Messina

For Ecology & Environment, Inc.:

Christina Hynes

Julie Chang

JoAnne Raab

L I S T O F S P E A K E R S

L I S T O F S P E A K E R S

* * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. PETERSON: Hello, everyone.

Thank you very much for coming here tonight. We are here to discuss the Phase I Draft Deconstruction Plan for 130 Liberty Street.

We will do a brief, probably about a half-an-hour - if that's a brief presentation - on the plan. The plan has been available at our website since December 13th.

The presentation that we will do tonight is very similar to the one we did at Community Board #1 on December 13th and have done for other groups in the interim.

After that period of time we will have the opportunity for people to come and provide comment, and then we will have some closing remarks at the end.

So I thank you all for coming out on a very cold, snowy night.

My name is Amy Peterson. I'm the Senior Vice President for Memorial, Cultural and Civic Development at the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation and I have primary responsibility for the deconstruction of 130 Liberty Street.

I'm joined on the stage by Ed Gerdts and Steve Moriarty. Ed Gerdts is with TRC and Steve Moriarty is with Gilbane Building Company.

And I will let them introduce themselves briefly right now.

MR. GERDTS: Yes. I'm Ed Gerdts with TRC Environmental Consultants and we are a national engineering company. I'm a vice president. And we are a consultant to the LMDC on environmental matters.

MR. MORIARTY: Good evening. My name is Steve Moriarty. I'm a Project Executive for Gilbane Building Company. My role will be to oversee the actual dismantling of the building.

MS. PETERSON: We have a sign language interpreter to your right who is available for sign language interpretation tonight and will make himself available throughout the evening.

First, I just want to go briefly over the history of our purchase and the plan for 130 Liberty Street. And then I'll talk a little bit about the people involved and our plans for moving forward.

We purchased the building on August 31st of last year. The building had been the subject

of a dispute between Deutsche Bank, its prior owner, and the insurance companies who insured the building on September 11th. And as a result of that protracted dispute about whether or not the building could be reoccupied or needed to be torn down, Governor Pataki asked Senator George Mitchell to get involved and to mediate that dispute.

The result of the mediation was that we would come in and tear down the building through an involved cleaning and deconstruction process which we are here tonight to discuss with you.

Our involvement stems from both the need to remove this blight from the Lower Manhattan area and also the need to increase the space for the memorial. And by purchasing this property we were able to increase the area available for the World Trade Center Memorial and the other buildings in the World Trade Center Memorial and Redevelopment Plan.

The consultants and contractors who are involved in this project include Gilbane Building Company who we have hired as the contractor to deconstruct the building. They have been maintaining the building since we purchased it on August 31st.

They have a number of different subcontractors who were instrumental in drafting the deconstruction plan for Phase I that you have that will be talked about tonight.

They include:

LVI, an asbestos cleaning subcontractor;

Weston, which is their environmental monitoring contractor and drafted the portions of the plan dealing with asbestos abatement; and

CDI, their main deconstruction subcontractor.

TRC is our environmental consultant and is doing exterior air monitoring for us in addition to environmental consulting.

URS Corporation is our owner's representative on the site.

Ecology & Environment, who will be -- who was instrumental in putting this evening together and will be managing the public comment portion of the evening -- is our outreach and community outreach consultant.

And Kroll Associates is our

1

integrity monitor. Our Vice President for Investigations is managing an effort separate from my effort to manage the deconstruction of the building to ensure that all of the work that we do, all of the work that our contractors and consultants do is done with the utmost integrity. And they've hired a contractor, Kroll Associates, as their integrity monitor.

We have put together a Draft Deconstruction Plan and submitted it to the regulators for review. We are going to be talking about that plan today. That plan was submitted to the regulators on December 13th.

There are a number of different regulators who are involved in this project, including the environmental regulators, including the EPA, State Department of Labor and the City Department of Environmental Protection, in addition the State and City Department of Health, and then the Department of Buildings and OSHA, and a number of other regulators. Some of them are listed on the screen, but there are a number of other ones who are involved in this project.

In September of this year we

released an Initial Characterization of the building. Basically the first thing we did when we knew we were going to purchase the building and prior to purchasing the building was to do some testing of the materials in the building, specifically the World Trade Center dust and the dust that is throughout the building.

We looked at four things in the Initial Characterization.

We looked to determine if there were asbestos-containing building materials, meaning nothing to do with September 11th, but was the building put together without any asbestos-containing building materials.

We looked at the dust itself and the materials that the dust affected to see if they were contaminated with any of the contaminants of essential concern that have been identified by EPA as a part of the study of the World Trade Center dust and its impacts.

And we looked for particular contaminants, including asbestos, silica, PAHs, dioxin, PCBs and heavy metals, including mercury.

We also looked at mold in the

1

building.

We published the results of that Initial Characterization in September and we drafted our deconstruction plan based on that.

In preparation for the deconstruction we are doing supplemental testing which TRC is managing and we'll discuss in some detail later.

We've been developing the deconstruction plan and we have the first phase of that deconstruction plan available for you this evening. And we have been working with the regulatory agencies to start the permitting and notification process because there are a number of permits that we need to obtain to do this work.

I'm going to turn it over now to Ed Gerdts to talk about the supplemental testing.

MR. GERDTS: Thank you, Amy.

As Amy mentioned, there was -- the Initial Building Characterization was performed and the report was issued September 14th of this year -- of last year.

In that report there were a number

of items that were requested to be addressed, recommendations were made, essentially looking at spaces that were inaccessible during the Initial Building Characterization.

There are seven spaces that were identified. They're on the first bullet here.

The curtail wall, which is the curtain wall cavity, which is essentially the cavity between the exterior of the building and the interior sheetrock of the building. There's a cavity wall there, the cavity within that curtain wall.

The interior wall interstitial spaces of the interior walls, the spaces essentially between the two pieces of sheetrock on the interior of the building.

The exterior of the building. In the Initial Characterization Report there was not any ability -- there wasn't any ability to do sampling of the exterior of the building at elevation. We have done that now and actually accessed the exterior building with swing scaffolding.

The interior of the HVAC ductwork, the distribution ductwork on the various floors, the

1

interior of that HVAC ductwork.

Vertical shafts including the elevator shafts and pipe shafts.

Cell systems, raceways within the concrete slabs is another area. The cell systems within the concrete slabs were essentially conduits that are encased in concrete that run within the building in the floor slab and allow the running of telecommunication cables and electrical cables from the electrical closets to the various areas of the floor. So it's essentially conduit that's buried within the concrete of the floor slabs during the construction.

And, finally, fireproofing.

For these locations essentially we were looking for the chemicals of potential concern addressed in the Initial Characterization Study and I'm here today to present those results.

In addition, visual inspection of the building, Asbestos-Containing Building Materials, ACBM. There are a number of locations I mentioned where there was no access. TRC performed inspections for Asbestos-Containing Building Materials in those

areas, as well as for mold.

Finally, preliminary waste characterization was performed and I'm here to present the results, essentially the preliminary determination of what the waste characterization will be of the waste generated during this project.

The results of this supplemental investigation is designed to inform the Phase I Deconstruction and provide a basis as well for the Phase II Deconstruction Plan.

Essentially what we have done is we have collected samples for the COPCs in those areas, those seven areas I identified previously and we are comparing those to the Initial Building Characterization Report as well as the EPA World Trade Center Health-Risk Based Benchmarks. There are benchmarks that the EPA has developed relative to interior residential space, surface concentrations. And we've compared those results and will present those results today.

Although these residential health-based benchmarks are not directly applicable to this deconstruction project, they do provide some relative

1

context for the results.

These results will be posted upon finalization on the LMDC website and they are very close to being published.

So the results.

The first area that I would like to talk about is the exterior surface sampling results. And essentially what I've done is I've taken the six COPCs and presented the average concentration of the COPC contaminant as well as the range. And if it's highlighted, it's above the health-risk based benchmark as the result.

So if you look at the first slide:

Asbestos average concentration of 105,000 structures per square centimeter;

Lead at 92 micrograms per square foot.

Again, these are all surface concentrations.

Dioxin's average surface concentration of 1.46 nanograms per square meter;

PAHs for the exterior we had non-detect, less than 57 micrograms per square meter.

Silica average is 18.30 milligrams per square foot;

And MMVF, fibrous glass concentration of 38 structures per centimeter square.

What does that mean? Essentially, compared to the Initial Characterization Reports, we found that these concentrations would be generally lower than the Initial Building Characterization Report. The Initial Building Characterization Report again was for the area inside the building that was easily accessible prior to ownership by LMDC of the building, so generally accessible areas.

The average asbestos, lead and silica concentrations in the exterior surface sampling program were found to be above the Tier I residential health-based benchmarks.

HVAC distribution ductwork, surface sampling, the average asbestos concentration was found to be almost 1.2 million structures per square centimeter, and the lead concentration of almost 500 micrograms per square foot.

Again, these concentrations are very consistent with the results found within the interior

space as identified in the Initial Building Characterization Report. These are inside the HVAC ductwork within the building, within the space. So it's understandable that they are similar in concentrations and they are, in fact, above the benchmark criteria.

The vertical shafts, surface sampling results, the average asbestos concentration was over 37,000 structures per square centimeter, and lead average concentration of 109 micrograms per square foot.

Again, these are above the benchmark criteria, however generally lower than what we found in the Initial Building Characterization Report.

The building cell system - that's the cell system of the ductwork the conduits that are embedded in the concrete, in the concrete slab of each floor:

Average asbestos concentration of almost 63,000 structures per square centimeter;

Lead concentration of almost 3200 micrograms per square foot;

Dioxin a little over 2 nanograms;

1

All PAH concentrations were less than or equal to 40 micrograms per square meter;

Silica was not sampled. In order to access the cell system, you will need to break up the concrete, which itself contains silica. So it was not sampled.

MMVF concentration of 1100, almost 1200 structures per square centimeter.

These average concentrations are generally lower than we found in the Initial Building Characterization, which makes sense. It's very difficult to access these areas -- located underneath rugs, embedded in the concrete -- through access ports.

Average concentrations of asbestos and lead, however, were found above the residential health-based benchmarks.

The one result for asbestos really drove the asbestos concentration. There was one result of over 500,000 structure per square centimeter. That just drove the average concentration for the asbestos for the cell system.

Curtail wall cavity surface

1

sampling; again, this is the area between the exterior of the building and the interior of the building, the cavity wall within the curtain wall.

Average asbestos concentration, approximately 14,000. Note that that's lower than the health-based benchmark, the Tier I benchmark not on the overhead;

Lead average concentration of 60 micrograms;

Dioxin average concentration of 7, 7 nanograms;

PAH concentration of 74 micrograms per square meter;

Silica average concentration of 7400 milligrams per square foot; and

MMVF was located, you'll notice, was identified at approximately ten percent of the sample. In the curtain wall cavity there is fireproofing that contains man-made fibeous fibers inherent to the fireproofing. So it's understandable that we found a very high concentration of MMVF in the samples of the ten percent, which is consistent with the actual analysis of the fireproofing itself.

Again, the average concentrations are lower -- generally found to be lower than the Initial Building Characterization Report. However, lead and silica were found to be above the residential health-based benchmark.

Interior wall, interstitial space sampling; so the interior walls, essentially the space between the two pieces of sheetrock within the interior walls, these are the results: non-detected for all of the asbestos surface samples that we collected on the interior walls.

Lead, low concentrations, 8 micrograms per square foot.

Dioxins, 1.1 nanograms per square meter.

All the PAHs were non-detect.

Silica, average concentration of .55 milligrams per square foot. That's only because the benchmark concentration is essentially background. And if you look at the EPA background study, this concentration is higher than that. The background concentration was samples taken in a residential setting, so obviously different than the interstitial

spaces of an interior wall.

MR. BENNETT: How is it possible that the lead average is below the lowest part of the range?

MS. PETERSON: We're not taking --

MR. BENNETT: Well, I mean you got a chart up there that has something that is meaningless.

MS. PETERSON: We will look into that and publish it for you. We are going to publish these results.

MR. GERDTS: When you read the report, you will notice that when there is a non-detect, the average -- the detection, half of the detection limit was used in calculating the average. So that's why, to answer your question.

Interior wall interstitial summary results: obviously lower than the Initial Building Characterization Report and only silica was found to be above the residential health-based benchmark.

Fireproofing; fireproofing is located within the building. It's located on the structural steel as well as the underside of the decking, the metal decking on each floor.

Surface sample concentrations range from less than 2900 to 2.75 million with an average of seventy-five -- approximately 75,000 structures per square centimeter.

Lead average concentration is 24 micrograms per square foot;

Dioxin average concentration of 64 nanograms per square meter;

PAH average concentration of 90 micrograms per square meter;

Silica, high silica concentration not unexpected in fireproofing;

And MMVF average concentration, approximately ten percent.

So consistent with what was found in the curtain wall cavity where there was a significant amount of fireproofing present.

Again, generally lower than the concentrations in the Initial Building Characterization Report. Asbestos and silica were found above the health-based benchmarks.

In addition to these interstitial or these previously inaccessible area sampling efforts

1

that were conducted, TRC performed initial waste characterization sampling. The initial waste characterization sampling, the intent of it was to give us an idea of what type of waste will be generated during the deconstruction process. And it focused on the dust and the debris as a specific waste stream, as well some of the common waste streams that we anticipated to be generated, such as the sheetrock and the carpet that's impacted by the World Trade Center dust.

Full TCLP analysis was performed on these materials. So -- TCLP is Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure. Essentially it's a procedure where you -- the sample is analyzed to mimic its conditions within a landfill to see what might leach out of it. And it's for disposal purposes.

Full TCLP analysis was performed so VOCs, SVOCs, metals as well as characteristics of ignitability, crossivity and reactivity. So a full TCLP analysis was performed on the sample.

What we found was one of the dust samples -- most of the analysis was non-detected. Some of the metals were detected at low concentrations. But

1

one of the samples of the dust itself found an exceeding of cadmium, which was over the 5 milligrams per liter standard at 6.2 milligrams per liter.

In addition, I mentioned that TRC performed Asbestos-Containing Building Material inspection in the areas that were previously inaccessible. And what we found was additional Asbestos-Containing Building Materials in these locations as listed here.

A little over 10,600 additional square feet of floor tile, non-fryable floor tile, 6000 square feet of brown caulking sealant inside each of the perimeter induction units on floors 7 through 34. So around the perimeter of the building you've got high pressure induction units that provide heat and air conditioning to the spaces.

The high pressure duct as it enters the induction unit, there's a seal, a brown seal caulking that's used to seal that, you know, material or that component. And that material is found to be Asbestos-Containing Building Material.

In addition, 200 linear feet of pipe insulation was also found within the vertical shafts.

1

So additional materials found in -- additional quantities of pipe insulation that will be dealt with during the deconstruction were found within the vertical shaft.

MS. PETERSON: Thank you, Ed.

I want to talk briefly about how this all fits into our deconstruction plan that you will be hearing about tonight.

The deconstruction plan for Phase I that we are going to present this evening and that the regulators have in front of them does not take into account these pieces of the puzzle.

Basically what we are going to need to do is adjust the plan, work with the regulators to determine what these results mean.

We're also reviewing the other results that have been published by other groups including Deutsche Bank and the insurers for each of these areas and determining which parts of the deconstruction plan these different things need to be put into.

So, for example, if the HVAC ductwork, it appears that the interior of the ductwork

has very similar results to the other World Trade Center dust throughout the building, then the cleaning of the interior of the ductwork would be put into Phase IA.

That work will be going on. We expect to get comments from the regulators on our initial plan and to work with them to incorporate the results of this testing.

So I just wanted to make sure that everyone understands how that will work in terms of the incorporation of these results.

So if you heard results about something and it appears that it's not in the right place in our phased deconstruction plan, that's because these results have not yet been taken into account. These results were produced after December 13th when the draft plan was put in place, was published.

So with that I'll introduce Steve Moriarty from Gilbane who will go through the deconstruction plan.

MR. MORIARTY: Thank you.

Gilbane put together the

deconstruction plan and will be doing any modifications to it with these principles in mind.

The first and foremost is the safety and health of the workers involved along with that of the community.

We also want to be compliant with all applicable rules and consistent with the Initial Characterization Study Report and also with any current industry standards that we have to follow.

The deconstruction plan is broken into three parts. There's a Phase I and II and Phase II is broken into two parts, A and B.

Phase IA is the abatement of any identified interior ACBM and cleaning and removal of the dust of the World Trade Center.

Phase IB is considered softstrip where we would be going in and doing the interior of most of, if not all, of the interior non-structural elements of the building. So this section of the work, you know, won't be visible to the outside.

We'll also be installing our tower frames and our personnel hoist that we will talk about.

A little greater detail on Phase IA, it will be undertaken from the top down inside of the building. We will be abating the interior Asbestos-Containing Material, cleaning of the dust and removal of the building components necessary to expose any of the dust that otherwise may be trapped. In this instance we may be taking down a portion of, the bottom of partitions so that we can get at material underneath the partitions.

Using the methods for Phase IA with engineer controls to develop our barriers. We are going to be exposing all of the work in establishing a negative air pressure to ensure that the potential contaminants stay in the building. This means essentially we are going to be sealing off an area by mechanical means drawing the air in, creating a negative pressure inside of the space so that in the event that seal gets broken, not only would it be repaired, but the air would be coming into the building and not going outside of the building.

All of the work will be done by licensed abatement subcontractors to do this work, fully trained and well-practiced in the skill.

There will be a thorough cleaning of any fibers that may have been released through the abatement. Prior to the work all the vertical connections between the floors will be sealed and our connections will be cleaned one last time when they're ready to do the Phase II of the building.

Phase IB is considered the softstrip. Again, the interior demolition of any non-structural elements. We'll be removing the interior gypsum wall, any sprayed-on fireproofing, bathroom fixtures, anything that is integral to the building itself, and removing any smaller electrical and mechanical components of the job.

In Phase IB also we are looking to -- starting at the top of the building and proceeding downward for the safety involved, we are looking to provide a minimum buffer zone of one floor between the IA and IB work at all times.

We will be working on two floors at the same time. It will be a productive piece of work and all in compliance with safety regulations and standards and including the work as designated in the Coordinated Construction Act.

Water will be used as a misting agent to keep the dust down. There will be a volume of water used for the dusting, the misting to keep the dust down.

Now, all of this work is going to be essentially happening behind the building relatively invisible except for what you see going down at about the street level for people going in and out.

At the same time we are going to be installing the tower frame on the north side of the building and a manpower and material hoist on the south side of the building. That's going to be necessary for personnel and material movement during our phases.

You'll see during the installation of this work a small cutout, so to speak, on the building to provide clean areas, alcoves, if you will, to provide structural connections for both of these elements. In some cases they will be relatively small; in some cases they will be essentially a carving going down into the building.

But, again, it's going to be conducted with a smaller crew dedicated to that

operation so that we can maintain an integrity of all of the work activities.

Once we are well underway with our Phase I, Phase II, which is associated with the actual deconstruction and dismantling of the structure, will start taking place. That deconstruction plan hasn't been outlined yet. We are in the throes of developing that now as we modify Decon I and then get into the Decon or Phase II rather.

But it will essentially entail the disassembly of the building and removal of all the rooftop equipment and the deconstruction itself. So all of that will be developed shortly.

The protective measures in place are composed of the waste sampling and the waste stream that will be generated. We want to be able to know where the waste started from inside the building, how it was handled, how it was bagged, how it was cleaned, how it left the building, how it was then trucked offsite and where it went.

So everything will be labelled very clearly and go to the right places in accordance with all of our regulations.

We are also going to be conducting air monitoring on at least four levels: the first one on the person, second within the building, and just immediately outside of the building, and also the immediate perimeter of the building surrounding the site.

We will be utilizing meteorological instruments to detect and record, document wind velocity, wind direction and wind speed so that we can conduct real time monitoring for any potential issues that may happen, off-site migration of any material.

We're also going to be conducting continuous integrated air sampling of the elements listed.

I'll throw this back over to Ed.

MR. GERDTS: In addition to Gilbane and the subcontractors we will be performing ambient air monitoring as described by Steven.

LMDC has developed an enhanced exterior monitoring approach which I've described and it was described previously. That is essentially going to be -- it's in development. On the website there is a current plan that was prepared prior to the receipt

of the Gilbane program. So LMDC asked TRC and TRC prepared this enhanced air monitoring plan. That was prepared prior to receipt of the Gilbane plan. Essentially there's an overlap to the plans. A lot of the same thought processes went into developing these plans.

Our intent is to, with the final plan, eliminate any of the redundancies that are inherent in the two plans and make those plans complimentary where Gilbane does some of the work and LMDC through its consultants performs additional work.

Some of the components of the enhanced exterior air monitoring program approach include sampling at elevations, not just at the ground level, but at rooftops and setbacks in the perimeter -- around the perimeter of the building because it is a forty-story building.

Co-located sampling with the Gilbane sampling for QAQC purposes to ensure that we are getting consistent results.

There's a daily real time monitoring component so as the data is generated, it can be evaluated and we can react on a real time basis to the

monitoring that is being conducted. So there's a real time component to it.

And it will include an enhanced analyte list, greater than the list that is currently going on now. Currently there's 24-hour a day/7-day a week air sampling around the perimeter of the building, which LMDC has been, through their consultants, implementing since day one of their ownership of the building. So our approach is an enhanced analyte list as compared to this current monitoring in its current state where there's not much activity.

In addition, there will be a public and project notification protocol continued. Currently all the results on a daily basis are being submitted to all the regulators, not only the DEP as indicated here, but to all the regulators - EPA, DOL, DEC and the DOH - that have shown interest in reviewing the results.

And, again, public access is a component of this exterior air monitoring program.

Part of the development will be trigger levels that will be developed with the

regulators. These trigger levels will be identified in the air monitoring program and the intent is to have a specific level at which if an excedance of that level occurs, there's an immediate reaction and a definite reaction that's spelled out in the plan.

So the plan will incorporate these trigger levels which will, in fact, incorporate safety factors protective of the public and the sensitive population receptors, such as people with emphysema and asthma and children and whathaveyou.

Excedances of the trigger level will require immediate contractor evaluation and response. Regulators will be informed and notified of all excedances as well as the public will be and there will be posting on the website, renewnyc.org.

In addition, Dr. Wilkenfeld is with us today. Dr. Wilkenfeld is an occupational physician. He's part of the TRC team evaluating the information that is being generated as part of this project and he would like to say a few words about and elaborate on the health risks.

DR. WILKENFELD: I've been working with TRC since September 11th on environmental medical

issues, cleaning, re-entry, health questions.

And I think -- you know, I'm a physician at Columbia in the Department of Medicine and Environmental Sciences.

And I think -- this actually, all these numbers are nice for everyone to see, but for the community and for the community that's been through so much down there, it really boils down to one question, and that's whether the work that is going to go down, that's going to go on, is going to have adverse health effects on anybody.

And when I say "anybody," I mean the workers and the community.

And the plan right now -- because we all agree that there are substances in that building which have the potential to harm people. Right? That's something that we can all agree about.

And that the plan -- by using these trigger levels, there will be a safety factor built in because I think there's been some confusion. People have talked to me. If there's an excedance, it doesn't mean that there's a toxic cloud that's released into the community and the people get immediately sick. We

are concerned about the chronic adverse health effects and causing disease due to chronic exposures. That's what we want to avoid.

And the trigger levels, as I understand it and as I work with Ed on it and as we wait for the regulators to get back to us on it, the trigger levels are going to have a built-in safety factor to make sure that we are notified as health professionals and environmental engineers, we are notified before there is any increase in risk of disease to the population, whether it be workers or the community.

So it may be -- an excedance may be a personal monitoring device that one of the workers is wearing, might show an elevated exposure to a substance. But when that happens, things will be changed so that there can be no further exposures and the community should not be affected at all.

So that is the plan.

If you have any questions, by the way -- I think I'm the only physician here today. But if you have any questions, feel free to grab me afterwards. Okay? Great.

MR. MORIARTY: In addition to our deconstruction plan, Gilbane has also put together an emergency action plan.

What this does is designate the appropriate personnel, who is responsible to implement and monitor emergency procedures. And this will be applicable to all our contractors and visitors alike.

Gilbane has on-site John Graves, our Superintendent, a licensed New York City Site Safety Manager. He'll act as the liaison and the person who will respond to the agencies throughout the duration of the project. He has already been dealing directly with the local police department and fire department to develop protocols for this action plan.

Each of the prime subcontractors will have a designated OSHA identified, certified emergency coordinator.

And this plan will be revised as the project continues as the need demands.

We will turn this over to Kate and she's going to walk us through a few more items of the emergency action plan.

MS. MELLIA: Good evening. I'm Kate

Mellia, the community liaison on the project.

In addition to the emergency action plan for the workers, we've also identified some protocols for community notification and some outreach to the community.

The LMDC has met with the Office of Emergency Management and is going to be working with them to develop a coordinated plan in the event of an emergency.

The Gilbane emergency coordinator will continue to meet with the emergency response agencies, and as appropriate we will be extending that to the community as well for input.

You can see that the emergency action plan includes the communication chart for the flow of communication at the site, all the emergency contact numbers, the assembly area for the different contractors on-site.

And we will also be publishing the community notification plan. We've been working on it and received a lot of feedback and will continue to develop that throughout the project as the need arises.

As I mentioned, we have met with OEM and we are working on the coordinated response plan. We have notified the surrounding building owners and will continue to meet with the surrounding building neighbors to make sure they understand what is occurring within the building and how the emergency action plan can be implemented once it is in place with the coordination of OEM.

And as I mentioned before, we will allow the community to meet with the emergency coordinator, Gilbane's emergency coordinator.

In the event of an emergency, in the risk coordinated planning that we're working on, we will turn to the emergency response agency to implement their protocol.

For events that don't require emergency response agencies, that we feel that we would like to inform the community about, we have set up the protocol where various volunteers from the neighboring building would receive a phone call from me when I find out what's going on. And then beyond that, those volunteers are committed to sharing with their neighbors the information that's necessary at

1

that time.

Following that, implementation of the phone tree and send a notification to the people who have signed up for our e-mail list on our website. If you haven't already checked out that, I urge you to do so.

Beyond the e-mail notification, we would post flyers that discuss what the LMDC did in response to the event.

And then be committed to hold forums where we would discuss it, get feedback from the community and let everybody know what we plan to do about whatever had occurred.

We also met with the Battery Park City CERT team. As many of you may know or may not know, the CERT team in Battery Park City is comprised of a hundred and twenty-one FEMA trained individuals who reside near Liberty Street or in Battery Park City. And they are going to work with us to respond in a coordinated way with the other emergency response agencies in the event of an emergency.

Their role, their primary role and their response will be assisting the LMDC in community

notification, aiding people in directions once -- if there needs to be an evacuation, they would be on-site. They're trained in many different response tactics and they will be there to assist us in the event of an emergency.

We will be working with CERT throughout the entirety of the project and look forward to their feedback, as well as the community feedback on the protocols that are put in place.

And just as another point of interest, with the CERT team they will be looking to recruit more members from the Liberty Street, 130 Liberty Street area. So people who are interested in participating, becoming trained and being part of that group, we do have representatives here tonight. There's information out in the lobby. If you could take a look at that information and you could start a dialogue for members who would like to become certified.

MR. MORIARTY: Thanks.

In addition, we will also develop a health and a safety plan which is site specific and it's designed to protect anyone coming onto the site.

1

It describes the engineering controls we will have, put up the barriers. It will describe all of the personal protection equipment that's used and the decontamination requirements associated with them, along with identifying the potential physical hazards and chemical hazards if they exist.

Along with LMDC, we also are going to be in full compliance with regulations dictated by the Coordinated Construction Act, which includes, but certainly not limited to, dictating the use of ultra-low sulphur diesel fuel, designating the hours of operation on-site and the development and following the pre-planned truck routes that will be on the site and from the site.

MS. PETERSON: Thank you.

The proposed truck routes, LMDC is developing a plan with City and State DOT and the Port Authority and we'll be sharing that with the public in detail.

The loading docks for the building are all on Washington Street and the proposal is to use the loading docks on Washington Street.

The hoist is planned to be installed on Albany Street and there will be some material moving on Albany Street as a result of that.

We will be working with those agencies to prepare the truck route and we will be providing it to the public and sharing it with you for comment.

Our next steps.

We put this plan together. It is, and I want to stress very much, a draft plan. It is LMDC's main goal to ensure the safety of the public, both the community and the workers and to comply with all legal requirements.

We've shared it with the regulatory agencies and we anticipate receiving comments.

We will work with the regulatory agencies to both incorporate those comments, to incorporate any public comments that we receive tonight, that we've received to date or that we receive in the future.

And also to incorporate the results of the interstitial testing and any other additional testing that we do.

We will be publishing the results of the interstitial testing on our website and providing those results to the regulators also.

There is some interim work that we will be doing that we will be submitting a plan to the regulators. There is some equipment in the building, some remaining -- the majority of the furnishings were removed by Deutsche Bank prior to us taking possession of the building. There are some items that are still in the building.

We will be working with Deutsche Bank and a contractor that they are putting in place to remove that material. That may happen prior to the start of Phase I. It will happen with the same protocols that Deutsche Bank used prior to us purchasing the building and we will share all of that information with you and the regulatory agencies as it becomes available.

It's a very minimal amount of work.

We will be submitting a final plan to the regulators for approval and we will be coming back before the public to share that plan and any other interim changes or other items that need to be

shared with the public.

We are also going through the process of submitting permit applications to all of the State, City and Federal agencies that require applications to do this work.

In addition to submitting the plan for approval, there are also a number of permit processes that we need to go through as result of the regulations.

Once we have approval of the plan, we will be mobilizing at the site. We don't have an estimated time for that at this point in time. We hope to receive the regulator comments shortly. And based on that and the revisions to the plan, we will be able to share with you our estimated time for mobilization at the site and then the schedule for actually moving forward with this project and completing the Phase I work.

We are also, as Steve mentioned, in the process of developing a plan for Phase II. As we've said often, this is going to be a process of actually taking the building down piece-by-piece. And that plan will be developed and will be shared with

all the regulatory agencies and also with the public.

I also just wanted to briefly talk about all the opportunities for public involvement.

We have all of the information that we've made available to the public on our website. It's fairly extensive. Kate Mellia, who just spoke, is our community liaison. Her phone number is available on all of the information that we have that is available out front.

In addition, if you get on our website, you can sign up to be part of an e-update, which means whenever we have events like this or publish additional information or provide any information on this project, you will receive that information via e-update.

We will continue to have public information sessions. We will continue to go to Community Board #1 and provide information on a regular basis.

And we welcome and we will be receiving tonight public comment, and we will also be receiving public comment throughout the length of this project on our website.

1

So I'm going to turn it over to JoAnne Raab from Ecology & Environment. But before I do that, I just again want to thank everyone for coming here tonight and look forward to hearing your comments.

MS. RAAB: Thank you, Amy.

I'm JoAnne Raab, Ecology & Environment, and we are assisting LMDC with the public outreach of the project.

If you wish to speak and you haven't signed up yet, there are speaker cards out front, put your name in and they will be bringing them in and I can call you forward.

We currently have fourteen speakers. I will call you in groups of three.

Just a quick note. There are also comment boxes out in the hallway and comment forms. So there's a couple of opportunities to be heard tonight.

There are two microphones located at either column. Feel free to use either one.

And with that, we will go ahead and get started.

The first three speakers:

1

Number one, Jennifer Hensley with Alliance for Downtown;

Number two, Tal Barzilai;

And number three, Dave Newman, New York COSH and EPA World Trade Center Expert Panel.

Jennifer.

MS. JENNIFER HENSLEY: Good evening.

I'm Jen Hensley, Assistant Vice President of Corporate and Intergovernmental Affairs for the Downtown Alliance, Lower Manhattan's Business Improvement District.

We represent the thousands of businesses and hundreds of thousands of workers in the area south of Chambers Street.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak here today in support of the expeditious deconstruction of 130 Liberty Street.

Severely damaged in the September 11th attacks, 130 Liberty Street has remained an eyesore that detracts from vibrancy of the neighborhood and hinders Downtown's revitalization.

We are pleased that the LMDC has issued a comprehensive deconstruction plan for the

building and believe this represents significant progress in the redevelopment of the World Trade Center site.

However, the Downtown Alliance remains concerned about many of the logistics of the deconstruction. We believe that this project, like all other construction projects in Lower Manhattan, must be coordinated through the Lower Manhattan Construction Command Center, and we again urge the Mayor and the Governor to appoint an Executive Director for the Center as soon as possible.

It is important that transportation of on-site workers, movement of materials, truck traffic, street closures and the like be coordinated through a single agency so that impacts to the community from this myriad of projects can be mitigated to the fullest extent possible. Without the timely appointment of an Executive Director, the Command Center is at risk of becoming obsolete before it is even operational.

We eagerly anticipate the safe and efficient deconstruction of 130 Liberty Street. With a master plan for development on the World Trade Center

site selected, ground broken on the Freedom Tower, and Seven World Trade nearly completed, it is time that 130 Liberty Street is deconstructed and Lower Manhattan's revitalization proceeds.

Thank you.

MS. RAAB: Thank you, Jen.

Before the next speaker, I just want to remind everybody we also do have a three-minute time limit. We'll use cue cards.

The next speaker.

MR. TAL BARZILAI: Hi!

My name is Tal Barzilai, resident of Pleasantville, New York, Downtown College in Downtown New York.

I honestly feel that although the asbestos issue is big at the Deutsche Bank, I do not feel that it really needs to be demolished.

The other buildings that surrounded the World Trade Center site were not demolished despite the fact that they also had some of the debris. If this was the case, then we should demolish every other building that surrounded it which includes the World Financial Center, 101 Vesey Building, 1

Liberty Plaza and anything else that surrounded it.

But I do not feel that just -- I feel that, although I do support the idea of containing the stuff that it has, I do not feel that demolition is the answer. It can actually be reoccupied just like all the other buildings were.

Demolition is really an extensive process. And I feel that it will cost less if it's just repaired and reopened like the other surrounding buildings. And, therefore, I do not feel that it was right to purchase this from Deutsche Bank.

MS. RAAB: Thank you.

Mr. Newman.

MR. DAVE NEWMAN: Good evening.

My name Dave Newman. I'm an industrial hygienist with NYCOSH, the New York Committee for Occupational Safety and Health. I also have the honor of serving on the EPA WTC Expert Technical Review Panel.

I've comments in three areas this evening.

First, and this is addressed to LMDC - I don't see LMDC represented up here, but I think

it's absolutely despicable and inappropriate for LMDC to accept comments and not allow questions and answers. And I think that's --

(Applause.)

MR. DAVE NEWMAN: I just think that's absolutely inappropriate. We appreciate your presentations. We appreciate the information and we also appreciate and deserve the opportunity to get answers to questions.

Secondly, I've had the opportunity to follow the evolution or the devolution of the plans over the last couple of years. And in particular I want to address tonight the changes that have evolved in the health and safety plans as they've moved forward.

I've reviewed the health and safety plan prepared by the RJ Lee Group, Inc., dated March 18, 2003.

I've reviewed the draft specifications for tear-out and tear-down put together by Kominsky, Morse and RJ Lee Group, dated December 13, 2003.

And I've reviewed the health and

safety plan dated December 10, 2004 prepared for Gilbane by Weston.

And I'm sad to say, I'm disheartened to say, I'm concerned to say that there has been significant deterioration in the level of protection and level of expertise that's been required on the site. As you review these three plans, you'll find that the current plan is seriously deficient in a number of areas, in particular by comparison to the prior two plans.

I just want to address two of those, two components of those plans.

One is the area of respiratory protection for the workers. There's a much higher level of respiratory protection called for in the first two plans. The current plan downgrades the level, seriously downgrades the level of respiratory protection called for for the workers.

Secondly, with regard to the levels of qualification, levels of training and the acknowledgment of the building as an uncontrolled hazardous waste site, the first two plans acknowledge these things, the second -- the most current plan does

not.

The first two plans call for the application of the OSHA Hazardous Waste Operation and Emergency Response Standard, requires workers to receive forty hours of HAZWOPER training to be properly certified and trained.

Those elements, which are key elements, are absent from the current plan. These are serious omissions.

And I would remind people, first of all, of the justice and appropriateness of having workers protected, and second of all, for community residents, that workers are essentially unfortunately the canaries for the community. So it's absolutely essential to have workers protected and monitored appropriately.

Third of all, I would like to bring our attention to the findings of both --one of the RJ Lee reports, which indicates serious structural compromises -- serious compromises of the structural stability of the building in terms of foundation.

MS. RAAB: Mr. Newman, I'm sorry. The three minutes are up.

A VOICE: Let him talk.

(Audience participation.)

A VOICE: We yield our three minutes.

A VOICE: I yield my minutes.

MR. DAVE NEWMAN: I'm almost done.

I see no addressing of the issue of structural stability, which was found in question earlier on, in the current plan.

Thank you.

MS. RAAB: Thank you.

The next three speakers:

Michael McCann for the Center to Protect Workers' Rights;

Kelly Colangelo, Resident, World Trade Center Community/Labor Coalition; and

Louis Epstein, World Trade Center Restoration Movement.

MR. MICHAEL McCANN: My name is Michael McCann. I'm the Director of Safety for the Center to Protect Workers' Rights, which is the research arm for the construction unions in the United States.

I've been reading over the plan. I have a number of concerns following up even on what Dave Newman said about the workers' safety.

There seems to be there's been a lot of attention to environmental monitoring, but in terms of monitoring for the workers as to what they are being exposed to, except for asbestos, it seems to be entirely left up to the different subcontractors as to what sampling goes on and what precautions they take.

I don't think this is an adequate response and that for something of this size you need an overall coordinated response where the GC, Gilbane, should be responsible for the health and safety throughout all of the subcontractors to make sure that their workers are absolutely protected.

In addition, the question of the reporting of -- I didn't see any instance in the health and safety plan about how reporting of injuries and illnesses in workers are done. Under OSHA normally the individual employer/subcontractor reports to their employer and that's it. It doesn't have to be reported to the general contractor.

I think this should be done now in

an overall coordinated effort as to what is going on in the deconstruction of this building.

I think these are important issues and I would definitely agree with the need to have the hazardous waste, HAZWOPER, or OSHA's HAZWOPER standards to be used in this situation.

Thank you.

MS. RAAB: Kelly Colangelo.

MS. KELLY COLANGELO: Hi!

My name is Kelly Colangelo. I'm a resident of Battery Park City and a member of the World Trade Center Residential and Community/Labor Organization.

One of the things that strikes me in all the documentation that I've read is the lack of accountability.

Accountability is an obligation or willingness to accept responsibility.

Now we know there's multiple agencies, contractors, subcontractors involved with the deconstruction and environmental monitoring. But the December 10th emergency action plan -- and the December 10th emergency action plan names these ten.

1

But the most critical piece of information is missing. It is not clear who is accepting responsibility for the activities at 130 Liberty Street.

There is much written about coordination, but nothing about ultimate accountability. In the event of a release of COPCs, a further collapse of the structure or an explosion at 130 Liberty Street, the community surrounding the building needs to know who will be responsible for notifying us about the situation and possible danger, who will be responsible for determining how to handle the situation and who will be responsible for ensuring a proper cleanup is conducted.

When I use the word "community," I'm including every person in any public or private building in the immediate area as well as the areas up and downwind of the site.

A sentence in the EAP reads: In the event of an emergency requiring implementation of this EAP, the Gilbane Emergency Coordinator shall immediately notify LMDC. LMDC at its discretion will be responsible for any community notification.

While this statement implies that

1

the LMDC is accountable to the community, the phrase "at its discretion" is unacceptable.

In an emergency the LMDC should not have the freedom to choose if and when they want to notify the community. They must notify us.

The COPCs that we know are in the building - asbestos, cadmium, dioxins, lead, mercury, manganese and so on and so forth - put us at risk for exposure. And we want this risk minimized and so should all the parties involved in this project.

It is apparent from this EAP that the LMDC has not performed a thorough risk analysis in regards to community response.

It is clear from the EAP that a risk planning exercise was conducted for a response to on-site emergencies only, which is praiseworthy, but it's also standard operating procedure.

But this is not standard operating procedure. This is not a typical work site. To properly respond to an emergency in the community, LMDC must perform a risk analysis for community response. It is a standard project manager protocol.

A thorough risk management plan will

demonstrate to the community that the LMDC is being proactive in protecting us and not planning to be reactive should anything happen.

The LMDC must identify all possible risks regardless of the probability of occurrence and then must analyze each risk for the severity of impact and identify and document the planned response for each risk.

I have a few suggestions, just in closing, for enhancing the existing EAP, which is dated December 10th still.

Make a clear statement to identify the agency accountable to the community should an emergency occur.

Add a new section to the EAP titled community emergency response containing a detailed risk analysis, determining the risk responses, containing a decision tree showing a clear chain of command that includes all relevant agencies, contractors, community representatives and residential-based volunteers, detailed community emergency response procedures, including the tactics to be used to alert anyone, an emergency response

communications chart to outline the phone and e-mail chain for notification and follow-up, and a neighborhood evacuation plan including plans should the streets need closure.

The new section should be available as a stand-alone document as well as continue to be included in the EAP, but it should be downloadable from the LMDC website and it should be publicized in the local newspapers to tell us that it's available so we know what's going on.

Not everybody in the community could obviously make it to this meeting. Please don't put our health at risk anymore than it already has been, and help us to help you.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. RAAB: Louis Epstein.

MR. LOUIS EPSTEIN: Hi! I'm Louis Epstein of the World Trade Center Restoration Movement.

It was famously said of a dancing bear that the issue is not that it dances well but that it dances at all.

Now, however well or badly the proposal of demolishing the former Deutsche Bank Building is undertaken, the problem is that it shouldn't be in front of us at all.

And it says in the background information this is necessary for implementation of the World Trade Center Memorial and Site Redevelopment Plan. And that in itself is reason to oppose it.

When the dust cleared in September, 2001 and people were tasked with the rebuilding plan, they should have seen their task as strictly limited to restoring the 16-acre World Trade Center site fully in the spirit of what was destroyed, of making sure that on undiminished scale we show our determination to rise again after a murderous attack.

Instead, those who wish to reimagine things allowed themselves to run riot and they brought out guidelines that ensured that only bad plans would be considered for the site, that the 19th century cramped little blocks that people were moving away to escape then would be restored, that the largest part of the superblock would be spent on a memorial calculated to celebrate the triumph of the murderers

of thousands, to scream to the world that we never rose again, we were humbled, to, in fact, disgrace those who died that we purport to honor by literally setting in stone the triumph of killers.

Now, after this specification that only bad site plans would be accepted for consideration, nine plans from architects willing to accept unacceptable limitations on intellectual property were brought forward.

Two of the less distinguished ones were determined to be finalists.

And then in a public poll, the official public poll of the process, being won by the choice, neither of those two choices, the planning committee selected the plan to finish second and Governor Pataki imposed the Daniel Libeskind site plan which finished dead last of the three.

130 Liberty Street was roped into this in order to try to remedy the problem caused entirely by the unacceptable guidelines.

And it should not be treated this way. It should be returned to the private sector after careful declassification with a due apology for

wasting time and taxpayer money insisting on the implementation of absolutely indefensible plans and policies.

We should rebuild more in the spirit of what was destroyed because nothing else truly honors those who died.

MS. RAAB: Thank you very much.

The next three speakers:

Paul Stein, New York State Public Employees Federation;

Jenna Orkin with the World Trade Center Environmental Organization; and

Catherine McVay Hughes.

MR. PAUL STEIN: Good evening.

My name is Paul Stein. I'm the Health and Safety Chairman of Division 199 of the Public Employees Federation.

My union represents several hundred workers who just today began to move to 90 Church Street, two blocks from 130 Liberty Street. And there are several hundred workers there altogether from both the Public Employees Federation and the Civil Service Employees Association.

Our members are still very scared about living, working I should say in the neighborhood and we are particularly concerned about the demolition of not just the Deutsche Bank or 130 Liberty, but Fitterman Hall as well, and we are concerned about the apparent lack of coordination between all of the different demolitions that are taking place.

But I would like to make three points in particular.

One, we're very concerned not just for ourselves and the residents. We are very concerned for the health and safety of the workers who participate in the demolition.

As we know from before, that there were many minority group members who were enlisted to do this very dangerous cleanup, decontamination work after the original 9/11 event, and many of them became sick and were seriously injured and disabled because they did not receive proper training and they did not receive proper personal protective equipment.

So I want to stress it's essential that there be extensive training, equipping and supervision of the use of the personal protective

equipment.

We all know that personal protective equipment lowers productivity. But we're not concerned here about productivity. We're concerned about protecting the health of all of the workers who are involved in the demolition itself.

Second of all, notifications. The notification plan, it's very nice to have telephone trees. It's nice to have e-mail lists and they look nice on paper. But if you're not at your phone and if you're not at your computer, you may not get the notification.

I understand that your major concern is the cumulative effect and elevated exposures rather than a massive sudden release of a cloud. But if there is some sort of massive sudden release, there should be a mechanism in place to notify people, such as a klaxon or a siren or in addition to that loud speakers all around the neighborhood.

(Applause.)

MR. PAUL STEIN: And this can be used, once given immediate notification, to say clear the area and tell people go to your telephones, go to

1

your computers, we'll give you more information that way.

Last and certainly not least, the LMDC has millions of dollars left in their coffers that hasn't been used up to this point. We would highly recommend that you take the millions of dollars and use it to contact, train and educate the residents and the workers and the landlords and the employers who are in the neighborhood who will face the possibility of being exposed to some sort of toxic release from 130 Liberty Street.

Although there are laws in place that require emergency evacuation plans, and probably most of the buildings down there have emergency evacuation plans, there are next to none that have sheltering-in-place plans. And there's next to none of the people who work there, probably even the building superintendents who are aware of the need if there's a toxic release in some instances to shelter-in-place rather than to evacuate.

And after 9/11 people have a tendency just to want to flee the scene and that might not be the best thing for people to do.

1

There are fire safety teams, tenant safety teams in the buildings. How many of them have walkie-talkies to coordinate with each other? How many of them even have bullhorns? How many of them have all of the equipment they need both in the residences and perhaps in the schools also and in the office buildings?

I think it's incumbent, since this is an unprecedented demolition event, and we hope it will go well, but we have great concerns and there are great risks with what is taking place there. It's incumbent upon LMDC to undertake with the funds they have a massive community education campaign and a monitoring campaign of all the local buildings to make sure that they have emergency evacuation plans in place, that they have trained teams, that they have sheltering-in-place plans in place. Again, there is next to none of those at the present time. And that they have the proper equipment to communicate with their residents, with their students and with their workers so in the event of the unthinkable, that people are able to respond appropriately to this emergency and respond much better than we were able to

1

respond on 9/11.

Thank you.

MS. RAAB: Jenna.

MS. JENNA ORKIN: Jenna, J-e-n-n-a, Orkin, O-r-k-i-n, World Trade Center Environmental Organization.

The same subjects keep coming up at these meetings and it's beginning to look as though they are being held in order to allow us to vent in the hope that that will be enough and LMDC will say they did community outreach.

But, you know, it's as though there is a wall between here and there. We keep saying the same things and they keep returning with the same plan or worse.

And so I will repeat again that AHERA is not a health-based standard for asbestos. I believe it started out as a detection method. They are treating AHERA as though if it's under 70 structures, you're home free. That is not the case.

I'm also alarmed that the man in the middle quoted the EPA health-based benchmarks. I believe you're quoting a document by EPA that did not

pass peer review and their science is under great dispute. I'm surprised that LMDC would want to be guilty by association with EPA whose record on this disaster is horrendous, possibly criminal.

Now you are not allowing questions so I don't know where we can go with this. I was going to ask you if in the air monitoring you were going to measure asbestos particles that were less than 5 micrograms. Can you say whether you are?

MR. GERDTS: Yes, that will be part of our --

MS. JENNA ORKIN: Less than five micrograms down to what level?

MR. GERDTS: There's going to be a category of less 5 microns, five and greater. So the intent right now - it's not fully developed, it's under review - but there will be a differentiation between less than 5 microns and greater than 5 microns.

MS. JENNA ORKIN: Because there's a great deal of science to indicate that, in fact, the smaller particles may be more dangerous which EPA has been disputing.

1

And also the lead levels have on several occasions exceeded OSHA action limits. I understand that on one occasion you shut down the site. What happened on the other occasions? There was more than double the OSHA action limits.

When you shut down the site, it was not immediate. It was several days later I'm told.

MS. PETERSON: That was not our project. We have not shut down the site since we purchased the building.

MS. JENNA ORKIN: Okay. It's on your website.

And, finally, since this is an unprecedented deconstruction or demolition or whatever you are going to call it, it may be not appropriate to say we are just going to adhere to the, you know, standard regulations, we are going adhere to the letter of the law.

The letter of the law doesn't apply here. This is unprecedented and should be treated as such.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. RAAB: Catherine McVay Hughes.

MS. CATHERINE McVAY HUGHES: Hi! Good evening.

My name is Catherine McVay Hughes. I live two blocks away from the Deutsche Bank Building and I'm a resident down here.

I would like to reiterate what David Newman said earlier and told the panelists that it's disappointing that we're only allowed to ask questions today and that we are not allowed to have any of our questions to be answered. So that this is really not a dialogue tonight.

So I just wanted to make sure of the following five points.

One, will your presentation tonight be on your website and when will it be available on your website?

Two, the sampling results, I haven't seen any of that on your website. When will that be available on your website?

And I also understand when you do sampling that there is a time delay of several days between when the actual sample is taken and the

1

results are taken back.

My next question is, on 4 Albany they actually did stop a project. And that was part of their emergency plan because there was a lead excedance. They determined it was from road construction.

I have not seen in your plan today that there was any intention ever to stop a job if there was an excedance of anything that was monitored.

The Battery Park City CERT having to get involved is really good, but what happens to the people east of 9 West? A huge group of people live and work to the east of the West Side Highway including a lot of families in our building.

And what happens -- my last question refers to a Downtown Express article that was written January 14th to the 20th. There's a small little article about LMDC switching air quality firms.

I guess you are no longer going to be using Ambient Group, but that you are considering one of five or six groups that are written down here:

AKRF;

BEM Systems;

GZA GeoEnvironmental;

LiRo Engineers; and

TRC Engineers,

to get the $.5 million job contract for the air monitoring for Deutsche Bank.

I was wondering why Ambient is no longer in the loop because I'm not sure that any of these groups, these consulting firms, actually can do the testing, that they have the labs to test for World Trade Center contaminants.

So I guess I want a clarification on, so the samples are going to be taken by subcontractors of these environmental firms and then sent out so there's a middle man in the process.

And so, for example, when RJ Lee, which was referred to, that did the original testing for Deutsche Bank, they are certified by the American Industrial Association and they are also certified by the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program.

So I don't think, but I don't know for sure, if any of these firms are certified to do the testing for the World Trade Center contaminants.

1

So if you could clarify, that would be great.

Thank you very much.

MS. RAAB: Thank you.

The next three speakers Kimberly Flynn, 9/11 Environmental Action;

Kathleen Moore from 125 Cedar Street; and

Mary Perillo from 125 Cedar Street.

Is Kimberly Flynn still here?

MS. KIMBERLY FLYNN: Yes, I am.

Could I be the third in that group?

MS. RAAB: Sure.

Kathleen Moore, 125 Cedar Street.

MS. KATHLEEN MOORE: I'm Kathleen Moore. And for those of you who don't know where 125 Cedar Street is, it's as close to Deutsche Bank as the wall of the auditorium approximately.

I'll be the first one I guess to be a very close resident to speak.

I don't understand why we still don't have neighborhood drills, why there's no plan that I know of that shows where people live, how many

people live in the building and what the plans are to evacuate those buildings.

We are not talking about buildings with evacuation plans. We are talking about buildings with forty residents, sixteen residents, twenty-five residents.

We evacuated ourselves on 9/11. We are prepared to do it again in case of an emergency.

But we would like to be prepared a little bit better than that in case of an emergency this time.

I'd also like to say that for those of us very close the possibility of structural instability is a very large fear. It may be ungrounded, but we've already had a couple of incidents in which pieces have fallen off. And we want to make sure that that doesn't happen. We want to make sure -- for instance, I have one exit from my building. If that exit is blocked, what do I do, where do I go?

These are questions that I'm not capable of answering and I hope you will figure it out.

1

I do hope that as the plans continue to evolve that these questions will be considered.

(Applause.)

MS. MARY PERILLO: Hi!

I'm Mary Perillo, also 125 Cedar Street.

There's kind of -- I'm not noticing a big change with the LMDC and their subcontractors in terms of who is going to pull the plug and how quickly.

I know that the EPA has decided that they are not going to be like the big oversight on the project. To me it feels a little bit still like the fox guarding the hen house. I had hoped there would be some change in this direction, but I don't really see it yet.

The next thing is the monitoring. There is a category of human being which is not a worker or a resident, but unfortunately both. There are about nine in my building. I'm one of them.

We need to be monitored too. We have 24/7 exposure levels. It would be great if we would have whatever devices humans were wearing who are

exposed to it. And being that close I mean it makes perfect sense.

The third thing is the emergency action plan. When the firemen and the FBI were still in the our building looking out the north side of the pile when they were taking out bodies, there were two huge loudspeakers on the front of our building. If there was an instability in the pile, they would go off and everybody would start running. You clear.

With the structural issues on a forty-story building that is out all of my windows, right there, with nothing in between me and air, it would be really nice for there to be a siren system in place in case there were something that looked unstable.

And there could be -- you know, and this is better than the phone trees and the e-mails. We've all learned what the signals mean. this means it's a little "iffy," this mean "get the hell out of there." We need that desperately.

Okay. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. RAAB: Kimberly Flynn.

MS. KIMBERLY FLYNN: Thank you for the opportunity to address this forum.

I think I speak for many people here when I say that a precious opportunity has been lost when LMDC refuses to answer questions and have genuine dialogue.

I want to briefly address a number of topics.

First, emergency action planning. Anyone who lived through September 11th knows that ordinary folks became de facto the first responders. Experts in public health and preparedness acknowledge that after September 11th the definition of a first responder is necessarily evolving. The public must be treated as a capable ally and planning must incorporate the on-ground knowledge of the community.

The only way to develop sufficiently detailed plans that will work in an actual emergency is to directly involve the people those plans are supposed to protect in the design phase.

Then I want to address the Phase I Deconstruction Plan.

It was said that Phase I would be

consistent with the findings of the Louis Berger study. But, you know, when I look over the health and safety plan and the asbestos abatement plan, I find a disconnect between those findings and what is being proposed.

The Louis Berger study found dust throughout the building. It was found to contain silica, PAHs, dioxins, PCBs, heavy metals in addition to asbestos. So the building, as we've all known all along and has been confirmed by both RJ Lee and Louis Berger is contaminated with World Trade Center dust.

We also know from the Louis Berger study that the level of these hazards, which taken together are known to cause cancer, birth defects, kidney disease, liver disease, brain and nerve disease, blood disorders, heart disease, in addition to lung and respiratory disease, are extraordinarily high, to an order of ten to one hundred thousand times acceptable levels.

Yet the Phase I plan goes on to describe the job as an asbestos abatement with work being carried out under protocols for asbestos.

On what evidence is the LMDC basing

the notion that asbestos removal will safely remove all other contaminants and contain all those contaminants during removal?

How is it that a building whose entire structure is permeated with a combination of contaminants known to be hazardous to human health, unparalleled in any building designed for office use, is going to be handled as an asbestos abatement?

And how is this possible when a number of the residents here in this room can attest that their own buildings bordering the site, cleaned by EPA and DEP under asbestos abatement protocols, had to be recleaned several times?

Lead, a highly prevalent Contaminant Of Potential Concern in World Trade Center dust will be dealt with only as an in-place contaminant. The only discussion of safe handling of lead speaks of the applicability of OSHA, the OSHA lead standard, referring only to the kind of surfaces coated by lead paint, not to the very fine, very available lead dust released in the World Trade Center collapse.

And, finally, I think probably the most important question of all, who is in charge.

LMDC is in over their heads. The demolition is staggeringly complex and risk ridden. Responsibility and accountability are currently diffuse, distributed across the patchwork of contractors and subcontractors and a list of regulators.

Everyone is in charge and no one is no charge.

Remember, rebuild, renew, the three R's of LMDC, to these we should add remediate, proper remediation of what clearly remains a vertical Superfund site is critical to the rebuilding effort at Ground Zero.

Preventing another respiratory pit to area residents and workers, as well as the kind of recontamination that imposes a risk of chronic exposures are critical.

Can anyone doubt that the revitalization of the area depends on the safe demolitions of all buildings known to be contaminated, and we have a list of four currently?

Where is Governor Pataki at whose pleasure most on the LMDC serve?

Does anyone here really believe that Governor Pataki couldn't successfully approach the Bush Administration or EPA to take on its all important lead role in oversight and enforcement for this most dangerous LMDC project?

We call upon Kevin Rampe to pick up the phone and ask Governor Pataki to do everything in his power to ensure the health and safety of workers and the surrounding community during the Deutsche Bank demolition and the demolitions of all contaminated buildings.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. RAAB: The next speakers:

Craig Hall of the World Trade Center Residents Coalition;

Caroline Martin with Family Association Tribeca East, and

Jonathan Bennett.

MR. CRAIG HALL: Hi!

I'm Craig Hall, President of the World Trade Center Residents Coalition.

We are a residents organization

representing 30,000 downtown residents through building tenants associations, co-ops and others.

I'm a downtown Battery Park City resident and a parent of three young children.

I have a couple of questions.

On September 11th a sixteen-story gash was produced in the building plus many windows were blown in.

I believe that the building has remained basically unsealed since that date.

My question is: what assurances can you give to us today that no contamination has or continues to escape the building and contaminate our local communities and especially our vulnerable children?

Why hasn't the building been encased in plastic under negative pressure?

$15 million was spent by Deutsche in assessing over ten months that the building was highly contaminated.

LMDC has done the same. How much does it cost to encase the building in plastic and put it under negative pressure to protect us all?

I raised this point at the Community Board meeting last month and was promised an answer. I'm still waiting.

My next point, I'm still having a very hard time understanding why the EPA isn't the lead agency here. We need accountability.

Under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the EPA has jurisdiction over (unintelligible) and have contributed to past and present HAZWOPER storage, transportation and disposal of solid waste that may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to the health or the environment.

Surely Deutsche Bank falls under that criteria.

I would like to understand what the LMDC has done to engage the EPA. Surely we should have them as the lead agency to protect everyone.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. RAAB: Thank you.

Caroline Martin.

MS. CAROLINE MARTIN: Hi! I'm

1

Caroline Martin, Family Association Tribeca East.

I'm not here to say very much because I left my notes at home.

However, I should point out that it is extremely scary as a resident to sit here with people bringing up all kinds of problems with your plan and you are not addressing any of them in real time.

You make a presentation. We say, oh, well, perhaps they're really working on it. And then comes a whole bunch of experts from the floor saying you missed this, you haven't done that, this isn't the right thing to be doing and you don't answer those questions. So we go away terrified that you haven't addressed any of them and that you are not going to address them even.

For instance, one of the newspaper articles that I left at home talked about subway openings close to the Deutsche Bank building which is the intake to the subway system. And I want to know what you have done to make sure that the contaminations from the building don't get into the subway system and, you know, to hell with residents

1

and whatnot, but that would be the whole of New York.

And I still have questions about who is going to be ultimately accountable for people getting sick and or have property damaged, et cetera.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: My name is Jonathan Bennett of Update on Safety and Health, a newsletter. I'm a reporter and editor. I'm not going to make a statement. I have some very simple questions.

If you choose not to answer them, that is your business.

Mr. Gerdts, in your presentation of the seven areas that you did sampling that you hadn't been able to do sampling before, two of the areas you did not list all of the contaminants of concern. You only listed lead and asbestos for the HVAC system and I believe the other one was for the vertical shafts.

Could you explain why you didn't sample for those other contaminants or tell us what the results of those were?

MS. PETERSON: We are going to be

providing the actual report on our website and that will provide that information to you.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: When?

MS. PETERSON: We're just proofreading them right now. We hope to get them up shortly, in a few days.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: All right.

Since we're on the subject, Ms., how many e-updates have you sent out? You solicited us to sign up for them I believe.

MS. PETERSON: I think Kate Mellia has left the room who is in charge of sending out the e-updates.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: How many e-updates have you sent out?

MS. MELLIA: We've sent out e-updates regarding the public information session. At the time there hasn't been activity at the site to warrant e-updates. As work progresses throughout the project, we will be sending them out regularly discussing what's going on at the site.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: So you are going to send out an e-update about this meeting.

1

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: I did send out an e-update.

MS. RAAB: No, you -- well, if you did, I didn't get it and I know every -- one other person here who has signed up for them who hasn't received it.

I have never received any update and I think I signed up on the first day.

MS. MELLIA: Please give me a call and we will look into what the potential problem might be.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: Thank you.

Getting back to this sampling of the seven areas, you said you sampled for mold. You didn't tell us the results of any of those tests. Why didn't you tell us the results and could you tell us what the results were?

MR. GERDTS: We haven't finalized our report yet so it's not available yet. That's why you don't have them. That's why I didn't present it because it's not finalized. The other ones are much closer to finalization.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: Okay.

1

A VOICE: Tell us an approximation.

MR. GERDTS: There was -- in the Initial Building Characterization there was a section on mold and what Louis Berger had identified as the quantity, --

MS. PETERSON: In the Initial Characterization.

MR. GERDTS: -- in the Initial Characterization. It was 105 square feet.

MS. PETERSON: Approximately.

MR. GERDTS: A number of locations. Very minimum.

MS. PETERSON: We're going to publish that result when we have it. The initial result and the characterization of the mold was published in the Initial Characterization Report and it was 105 square feet.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: Last question.

Mr. Gerdts, you spoke of some people have daily real-time air monitoring. Could you please explain to me what daily real-time air monitoring is?

MS. PETERSON: I want to -- I know

people are disturbed by the fact that we're not answering questions. So I just wanted to speak to that and I know we've been a little selective in answering some of the questions and not all of the questions.

We want to give you fair, honest and detailed answers on the questions.

What we've been trying to do is get questions, solicit comments, solicit information from all of the public and we will provide answers to those questions either in additional forums that we'll have and/or on our website through a process called Frequently Asked Questions.

What I don't want to do is try to give some kind of extemporaneously up here and give you incorrect information.

So I appreciate the questions. We are taking them all down. As everybody can see, we are getting a full transcript of this evening and we will be providing answers to all of the questions that have been asked at a later date.

A VOICE: My question was just a request for a definition.

MS. PETERSON: As I said, we are

1

going to be providing that information.

A VOICE: Do you publish the transcript on your website?

MS. PETERSON: We'll answer that question at a later date.

A VOICE: Publish the answer at a later date.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: Could you tell me why you don't have any information on the website about the failing foundation of the building?

MS. PETERSON: We will answer that -- I don't know what you're referring to.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: The RJ Lee Report says very clearly that the foundation was built to last indefinitely and it's only going to last twenty years at the most because of the fact that a huge diesel oil tank collapsed and burned in the basement and that did a tremendous amount of damage to the foundation.

And RJ Lee said the building is structurally unsound.

Now why don't you have anything about that on your website? Are you aware of it?

MS. PETERSON: Is that the end of your questions?

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: Is that your answer?

I'd like to know why it is -- you don't have copies of this presentation to give to people.

MS. PETERSON: We actually will put this presentation on our website.

Thank you.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: When?

MS. PETERSON: Every presentation that we've done to date has been posted on our website within days of the presentation. This will be posted on our website within days of this presentation.

MR. JONATHAN BENNETT: Thank you.

MS. PETERSON: Thank you.

MS. RAAB: The last registered speaker is Joel Kupferman with the UFA-New York Environmental Law Justice Project.

MR. JOEL KUPFERMAN: I just want to say that I'm here representing Phil McConnell and Rudy Sanfilippo of the UFA. Unfortunately, they can't be

here tonight because of a few fatalities the Fire Department faced a few days ago.

And it's our concern over the firefighters and the community that brings us here today.

One of the things that concerns us is your quick response to people asking how soon LMDC is going to respond.

I just want to read a FOIA response letter that's dated January 14th.

"This letter is to inform you that the records of the LMDC inspected at our offices about consultant's Louis Berger Group and the requested information are available."

We requested these documents on June 8, 2004. The quick response time is January 14, 2005. So much for instant FOIA response.

Some of our concerns are, LMDC is not using the most stringent health and safety plans. OSHA has not been invited to even come to the site to inspect or even to give a remedial plan. No tests have taken by OSHA. We learned this two/three days ago.

The same as the New York State

Department of Labor.

A diligent employer can invite the State in and say tell us which plan we should do, what we can do, how we can improve. You haven't spoken to the New York State Department of Labor.

And as Dave Newman and others pointed out, this is definitely a HAZWOPER site if there ever was one, especially for emergency responders, the first responders.

The same day that LMDC came to the firehouse to tell us why the glass fell or try to explain why the glass fell, there was a fatality in World Trade Seven 7, one of the construction workers.

It's the firefighters and the ambulance people that have to go in and pull people out if there are accidents.

The firefighters at 1010, the same firehouse that's right across the street from the Deutsche Bank building, whose vents face the building, whose ventilation system pulls in the air from the Deutsche Bank building, these are the guys that we depend on to go into this building if there is any problem.

They have not been told specifically what's in that building.

Also, your chief counsel, in response to a letter we asked what communications have you had with the Fire Department, and they said they've had many, many communications with the firehouse.

As of today, I spoke to three lieutenants, all the firefighters, there's been no meaningful dialogue with the people in that firehouse.

I spoke to the person who's in HAZMAT - that's the branch of the Fire Department that responds to the hazardous conditions - they have not been informed of what's in that building.

Your air monitoring results are too little too late. You've only posted asbestos and heavy metal results leaving out that whole list of all the other materials that were found and listed here today, and especially with the key period that was missing on your website. And that was the weeks surrounding the period when that glass fell.

The reason why these people are suspicious today is wondering where those results are

1

and why are those results missing.

Also your monitor replacement is definitely insufficient. You have monitors on the ground. You have a building that's more than forty-one stories tall. And we can't even get a monitor on top of the firehouse. We learned at that firehouse that the LMDC has a movie camera that is filming the World Trade Center site. Why did you put a camera up there and pay for a camera and not pay for monitoring equipment for the firefighters and the neighborhood?

And there's no mention of the subway. Okay?

One of the -- Caroline mentioned about the subways. You have the Albany Street fan plant that has 200 horsepower motors that pull in the air - okay? - into that subway in case there's an emergency.

Not only that, you have the 1/9 line that's running along the subway. Every time that subway passes by, it is pulling in air.

With limited research on the web, it took me about five minutes, to find an article done by the national government called "Model for the

1

Dispersion of Contaminants in the Subway Environment." Although subway ventilation has been studied extensively, dispersion of contaminants in the subway environment, this paper presents a model of dispersion of contaminants in a complex subway system. Exchange occurs between the subway and exterior atmosphere through vents and entrances, portals, also between the train as, and subway tunnels and stations.

In some subways, including the New York City subway, trains may reach speeds approaching 105 miles per hour thus generating the most powerful piston action.

Today I spoke to the Transit Authority, their chief environmental manager. They have not been contacted or given any reports by LMDC.

How could you spend this much money, how could you spend this many meetings with the people that are sitting here and just totally disregard any subway rider that goes by?

Not only be concerned about the air, we had glass that fell down, not once, but two times, and LMDC still can't explain where that -- why that glass fell.

1

A little more -- a little more poundage, whatever, is going to go right into that subway. We all know what happens, you know, when the floodgate opens up.

That's just -- and I think the subway issue is definitely a sign that you been in a most negligent manner.

And one thing that came up today also is mold. Okay? The only site -- visual site inspection by the Health Department took place on two floors and they didn't look behind any interior wall spaces.

And you said there's only 150 square feet.

The RJ Lee Report, mold - I'll send this to you in case you don't have it in your possession, at one time you actually said you did have this in your possession - large areas of microbiological contamination occurred in certain parts of the building that resulted in elevated airborne microbiological concentrations.

Building materials inevitably became visibly contaminated with this (unintelligible) and in

response large-scale mediation of building materials and contents has to be performed.

It is noteworthy that contamination was observed on some of the materials on locations not easily accessible, easily cleaned, such as mechanical shafts.

So much for your 150 square feet of mold.

I have just one more point because there's many points to go.

As to the use of the volunteers, VPC volunteers, put these people out, it's a little shocking because three weeks ago the New York State courts rejected all the claims by most of the volunteers that were down at the World Trade Center site, said that there's a little obscure Civil Defense Law that says that the State is not responsible for compensation for any of these workers.

So all of the volunteers that were down there were basically told goodbye.

And now you're telling us it's great that, you know, that you're enlisting the local militia. Are you going to compensate these people, you

1

know, if something happens to them, or are you going to be like many other State agencies and say we don't know where you were, who you worked, you can't prove who you worked for and we're not going to pay you a dime?

So I think these are a few of the facts that are going to just raise many, many more questions. And especially, besides the public here, I'm representing all those firefighters at 1010 that are actually really, really scared not only to enter that building, not knowing what's going to come down, and they are not even sure that if the plywood that's on top of their roof is going to protect them.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. RAAB: We don't have any more registered speakers. Are there any additional speakers?

(No response.)

MS. RAAB: If not, I'll close up the floor and hand it over to Amy.

MS. PETERSON: I really want to thank all of you for coming here tonight.

1

I know that you are frustrated by us not answering questions and I'm going to try to go through some of the issues that were raised that I took some notes on to give you some answers.

But I want to stress again that where we are at this stage is that we have a draft deconstruction plan, it was issued by LMDC on December 13th. We have it in front of the regulators and we are getting public comment from all of you here, from all of the people we've heard from at the other public meeting that we had and the other meetings we've had with local schools and local businesses and local residents and we will be incorporating that comment and answering those questions and addressing that. We will be coming back to you and providing the final plan.

So I wanted to just take a brief minute to go through a couple of issues that we hadn't addressed in our previous presentation or maybe we had but it didn't seem like people understood that.

So, first of all, I want to state again that LMDC is the owner of this building and is fully accountable for this project. I know there are

1

some questions about that. But I think we have been in front of you a number of times. We are going to continue to come in front of you. We are available to you 24/7 through our emergency number and certainly during regular working hours and we are here to answer your questions and we are here to ensure that this building comes down safely and that you and the workers are protected.

I also wanted to speak briefly about the regulators. The regulators are all actively involved in this project. EPA, the State Department of Labor, we have worked very closely with Chris Gallant and other workers of the State Department of Labor. We have submitted this plan to the State Department of Labor and they are working with DEP and EPA to provide comments.

So I think there was some confusion as to whether the State Department of Labor was involved.

Department of Buildings, OSHA, amongst a lot of different regulatory agencies.

We're also meeting with OEM, and we have had local meetings with the local fire station.

1

And I would like to put you directly in touch with John Graves, our site safety person, to make sure that wherever the communication seems to be missing that we can stop that.

I said this earlier. Our presentation will be available on our website and the supplemental investigation that Ed went through today will be available on our website. We are going through a proofreading process, but we did want to get you those results today.

I think there was some question, and Kate had mentioned, the Battery Park City CERT is very interested in incorporating the group of people who surround 130 Liberty Street and that are east of 9A.

So if people are interested in that, they should definitely talk to Battery Park City CERT.

I wanted to briefly talk about the fact that we have switched - and I apologize for not mentioning it earlier - Ambient Group was the contractor that was doing the air monitoring, after September 11th and prior to us taking ownership of the building, for Deutsche Bank.

We had continued their contract for

1

a short period of time and at the same time did a competitive procurement. We hired five firms to do air monitoring and environmental consulting. And we'll provide information on the qualifications of those firms on our website.

But we went through a competitive process to choose those firms and will be continuing to review their qualifications.

Regarding the glass and the structural stability related to the glass, we've actually been, and I'm sure you have seen it, surveying and repairing glass on the exterior of the building from the hanging scaffolding. And that work was actually completed about a week ago.

And so we have gone basically through all the faces of the building that were impacted by September 11th to ensure that there is not additional glass on those areas and have secured or removed any of the glass. And we will continue to monitor the exterior of the building.

We've had many discussions with the MTA and we have a meeting scheduled and we've talked specifically to their environmental counsel and the

head of Lower Manhattan. And again we can talk to who you are talking to to make sure that we are in agreement.

We also talked to OSHA and are putting a partnering agreement in place for this project.

Regarding mold and the structural stability in the RJ Lee, we'll make sure that it's clear on our website what has happened with both of those issues.

But Deutsche Bank did address those structural stability issues and mold issues during the period of time that they owned the building. So we'll ensure that the issues that RJ Lee has in their report, referring to issues that occurred prior, and if not, we'll respond to those issues on our website.

I know this does not begin to answer all of the questions you asked and we will be providing answers to all of the questions you asked today.

I just want to say that we are here. We feel very strongly about ensuring that this is a safe project for the community and the workers. And we

hope that you'll come again to forums and we hope that you'll continue to provide us with comments because every comment you provide us is very helpful for all of us.

So thank you.

MS. CATHERINE McVAY HUGHES: Amy, when does the actual work begin? Has the timetable been revised?

MS. PETERSON: We've submitted the plan to the regulators and we are still waiting to get comments from the regulators.

So once we receive those comments, we will be able to, one, assess how much we need to modify the plan to address those comments, and we will be able to give an estimate of when the work will start.

Thank you very much.

(At 8:20 o'clock p.m. the proceedings were concluded.)