

Assignment Workpaper

Prepared by: Dawn Griffin 08/16/2005

Assignment Number: E-EV-MOA-0009-2005
Assignment: DOI MIB Modernization Project

Section: H-07c Subsection:
Program Name: Issue Follow-Up
Subject: Follow-up Interview to EPA Memorandum with GSA Program Manager

Origination Doclink: 

Purpose:

To determine GSA's response to the issues identified in the EPA Memorandum.

Scope:

Phone interview with GSA Program Manager on 8/8.

Source:

Anne Marie Sweet-Abshire, GSA Program Manager (202) 208-2784.

Conclusion:

The panel cited in the EPA memo has been fixed. Negative air pressure is only required during asbestos abatement; Ms. Sweet-Abshire will do further research to determine if asbestos abatement was occurring when EPA noted the negative air pressure wasn't functioning. She hopes to have the answer to us by the end of the week. She believes that the 10' code does not apply to relief air from offices, and so does not apply to the exhaust/intake vents cited in the EPA memo; a formal response to this affect will be ready by the end of next week, but in the meantime, the GSA Industrial Hygienist can give us support for that opinion.

Details:

Has the buckled panel indicated by EPA been fixed?

Ms. Sweet-Abshire stated that the panel has been sealed and that the other panels were checked for the same problem.

Is negative air pressure required by the contract?

The requirement in the contract for negative air pressure is only during asbestos abatement. The requirement can be found in the specs either in 0-1000 or 0-2085, which outlines the asbestos abatement requirements. She did note that the temporary heating and cooling units have helped restore negative air pressure, even though they can't achieve total negative air pressure because of the open windows. The buttoning-up has been completed as far down as the 5th floor, and will be completed (thus, enabling negative air pressure) before the painting and sanding begin.

Was asbestos abatement occurring when the EPA visited?

Ms. Sweet-Abshire gave a conflicted answer, noting both that hazardous material work was done before EPA came in and that a small tent for asbestos abatement work is still in place. She does not know where in the asbestos abatement process Grunley was when the EPA visited in March or April; she will find out and have the answer to us possibly by the end of the week.

What about EPA's contention with the M floor exhaust and intake being less than 10' apart?

Ms. Sweet-Abshire believes that the code only addresses restroom exhaust, and as the exhaust indicated by EPA is only the relief air from offices, it is not addressed by the code. She will have a formal response prepared for the DOI Modernization Coordinator by the end of next week; in the meantime, she

01282

referred me to the GSA Industrial Hygienist, James Hodges, at (202) 708-5253, who should be able to cite the relevant passages of the code.

Methodology:

Phone interview on 8/8/05.

Submission:	Submitted	Dawn Citrin	08/16/2005 05:10:56 PM
Level 1 Approval:			
Level 2 Approval:	Approved	Suzanna Park	08/23/2005 04:46:08 PM

Linkage Information

History

Status:	Approved	Request Review:
In Progress Edit:	Dawn Citrin/ARL/OIG/DOI	
Confidentiality:	Standard	

Add Document Readers:

Read Authorization: [Management], [E MGT], [E Reader], Curtis Crider/WDC/OIG/DOI, Patti Boyd/ARL/OIG/DOI, Suzanna Park/ARL/OIG/DOI, Lisa Vonder Haar/ARL/OIG/DOI, Dawn Citrin/ARL/OIG/DOI, Shahara Morgan/ARL/OIG/DOI, Lynda Kyte/ARL/OIG/DOI, Chris Krasowski/ARL/OIG/DOI

Current Editor List: [E MGT], Curtis Crider/WDC/OIG/DOI, Patti Boyd/ARL/OIG/DOI, Suzanna Park/ARL/OIG/DOI, Lisa Vonder Haar/ARL/OIG/DOI, Dawn Citrin/ARL/OIG/DOI, Shahara Morgan/ARL/OIG/DOI