

**Theodorellys, Penny**

**From:** Nace.Charles@epamail.epa.gov  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 18, 2003 11:59 AM  
**To:** Theodorellys, Penny  
**Cc:** Radhakrishnan, Krish; Gilsenan, Michael; Maddaloni.Mark@epamail.epa.gov; Callahan.Kathy@epamail.epa.gov; LaPosta.Dore@epamail.epa.gov  
**Subject:** Re: FW: PAH results US DEP - WTC



R03030157 Cover Letter.pdf



R03030157 Report.pdf



R03030158 Cover Letter.pdf



R03030158 Report.pdf

Penny,

I am back from vacation and had a chance to take a look at the data (i.e., asbestos, lead and PAH) from 114 Liberty that you sent over last week. Overall the data that you sent looks good but there are several problems with the reporting limits (i.e., analytical sensitivity).

- 1) The PAH data indicates that the reporting limit used is 5 ug. This does not allow us to compare the results to the health-based benchmark because the reporting limit is higher than the benchmark. The reporting limit that was supposed to be used was 1 ug (as stated on page 3, item #5 in the scope of work). I hope future PAH analyses can use the appropriate reporting limit as it will result in data that can be compared to the health-based benchmark.
- 2) The asbestos data indicates that the reporting limit used is 0.0009 s/cc. This is acceptable for comparing to the health-based benchmark but the reporting limit that was supposed to be used was 0.0004 s/cc (as stated on page 4, Asbestos Collection and Analysis, item #2). Using the lower reporting limit will add confidence that the concentrations are below the health-based benchmark rather than being "at" the health-based benchmark and it is also what is being used in our residential cleaning project and it is what was used for 125 Cedar Street.
- 3) The lead data indicates that the reporting limit used is 20 ug/ft<sup>2</sup>. Again, this is acceptable for comparing to the health-based benchmark of 25 ug/ft<sup>2</sup>, but for our projects we used a reporting limit of 2.32 ug/ft<sup>2</sup> and a reporting limit of 9 ug/ft<sup>2</sup> was used for 125 Cedar Street.

A summary of the data I have received to data is presented below:

**Asbestos - TEM**

40 samples at or below the health-based benchmark of 0.0009 (28 were below the reporting limit of 0.0009), 1 above health-based benchmark @ 0.0018 s/cc

**Asbestos/Fibrous Glass - PCM**

3 samples were below the health-based benchmark of 0.01 f/cc and 2 samples were overloaded and could not be analyzed.

**Lead**

13 samples were above the health-based benchmark of 25 ug/ft2 and 17 samples were below the analytical sensitivity of 20 ug/ft2.

**PAH**

30 samples were below the reporting limit of 5ug. The resulting TEF for each sample would be 580 ug/m2 which is above the current health-based benchmark of 300 ug/m2. This is why a reporting limit of 1 ug should be used (i.e., item #1 above).

I look forward to seeing the dioxin and silica data when it is ready to be released.

Thanks,

Chuck Nace  
Environmental Toxicologist

USEPA - Region 2  
290 Broadway - 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10007-1866

212.637.3459  
212.637.4164  
212.637.4360 - fax  
[nace.charles@epa.gov](mailto:nace.charles@epa.gov)

"Theodorellys,

Penny" To: Charles Nace/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
<ptheodorellys@dep.nyc.gov> cc: "Gilsenan, Michael"  
<mgilsenan@dep.nyc.gov>, Charles Nace/R2/USEPA/US@EPA,  
p.nyc.gov "Radhakrishnan, Krish"  
<kradhakrishnan@dep.nyc.gov>

| Subject: FW: PAH results US DEP - WTC

03/17/2003 11:57  
AM

——Original Message——

| **From:** Andrew Gasparro [<mailto:agasparro@jlcenvironmental.com>]  
<[mailto:\[mailto:agasparro@jlcenvironmental.com\]](mailto:[mailto:agasparro@jlcenvironmental.com])>

**Sent:** Monday, March 17, 2003 10:53 AM  
**To:** 'Theodorellys, Penny'  
**Subject:** FW: PAH results US DEP - WTC

<<R03030157 Cover Letter.pdf>> <<R03030157 Report.pdf>> <<R03030158  
Cover  
Letter.pdf>> <<R03030158 Report.pdf>> Penny,

Top of the morning to you.

I wanted to forward to you the results of our PAH and Dioxin wipe Samples.

If you have any questions please feel free to call me at any time.

Thank you,

Andrew L. Gasparro  
Vice President  
JLC Environmental Consultants, Inc.  
200 Park Ave. S. Suite 1001  
New York, NY 10003  
212-420-8119  
212-420-6092 Fax  
917-612-4803 Cell

——Original Message——

**From:** Usbeck, Fred [<mailto:FUsbeck@contactpsc.com>]  
<[mailto:\[mailto:FUsbeck@contactpsc.com\]](mailto:[mailto:FUsbeck@contactpsc.com])>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 14, 2003 4:17 PM  
**To:** [agasparro@jlcenvironmental.com](mailto:agasparro@jlcenvironmental.com)  
<<mailto:agasparro@jlcenvironmental.com>>  
**Subject:** PAH results US DEP - WTC

Andrew -

Attached are the PAH results for the WTC project. We broke it into 2  
sample

delivery groups to make reporting/QA easier.

If you have any questions please get back to me. Original hard copy  
will

follow by mail.

thanks! Fred

<<R03030157 Cover Letter.pdf>> <<R03030157 Report.pdf>> <<R03030158  
Cover

Letter.pdf>> <<R03030158 Report.pdf>>

Fred Usbeck, CIH

**PSC Analytical Services**  
**4418 Pottsville Pike**  
**Reading, PA 19605**  
**[fusbeck@contactpsc.com](mailto:fusbeck@contactpsc.com) <<mailto:fusbeck@contactpsc.com>>**  
**(610) 921-8833 ext. 224**

**(See attached file: R03030157 Cover Letter.pdf)(See attached file:**  
**R03030157 Report.pdf)(See attached file: R03030158 Cover Letter.pdf)(See**  
**attached file: R03030158 Report.pdf)**

**Theodorellys, Penny**

**From:** Theodorellys, Penny  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 19, 2003 9:34 AM  
**To:** 'agasparro@jlcenvironmental.com'  
**Cc:** Radhakrishnan, Krish; Gilsenan, Michael;  
 'Nace.Charles@epamail.epa.gov'  
**Subject:** 114 Liberty Sampling

The following are comments received from the USEPA for the analytical data received to date. The analytical sensitivity was an issue I had addressed with you as well. We discussed the matter and you had gotten clarification from the lab. Please contact Mr. Chuck Nace of the USEPA directly and address the comments below. (Chuck Nace, Environmental Toxicologist, USEPA - Region 2 212.637.3459 /212.637.4164

Excerpts of the e-mail I received...

.....there are several problems with the reporting limits (i.e., analytical sensitivity).

- 1) The PAH data indicates that the reporting limit used is 5 ug. This does not allow us to compare the results to the health-based benchmark because the reporting limit is higher than the benchmark. The reporting limit that was supposed to be used was 1 ug (as stated on page 3, item #5 in the scope of work). I hope future PAH analyses can use the appropriate reporting limit as it will result in data that can be compared to the health-based benchmark.
- 2) The asbestos data indicates that the reporting limit used is 0.0009 s/cc. This is acceptable for comparing to the health-based benchmark but the reporting limit that was supposed to be used was 0.0004 s/cc (as stated on page 4, Asbestos Collection and Analysis, item #2). Using the lower reporting limit will add confidence that the concentrations are below the health-based benchmark rather than being "at" the health-based benchmark and it is also what is being used in our residential cleaning project and it is what was used for 125 Cedar Street.
- 3) The lead data indicates that the reporting limit used is 20 ug/ft2. Again, this is acceptable for comparing to the health-based benchmark of 25 ug/ft2, but for our projects we used a reporting limit of 2.32 ug/ft2 and a reporting limit of 9 ug/ft2 was used for 125 Cedar Street.

A summary of the data I have received to data is presented below:

**Asbestos - TEM**

40 samples at or below the health-based benchmark of 0.0009 (28 were below the reporting limit of 0.0009), 1 above health-based benchmark @ 0.0018 s/cc

**Asbestos/Fibrous Glass - PCM**

3 samples were below the health-based benchmark of 0.01 f/cc and 2 samples were overloaded and could not be analyzed.

**Lead**

13 samples were above the health-based benchmark of 25 ug/ft2 and 17 samples were below the analytical sensitivity of 20 ug/ft2.

PAH

30 samples were below the reporting limit of 5ug. The resulting TEF for each sample would be 580 ug/m2 which is above the current health-based benchmark of 300 ug/m2. This is why a reporting limit of 1 ug should be used (i.e., item #1 above).....

Please provide me with a written update as soon as possible. Thanks. Penny.