

Gilsenan, Michael

From: Jeanine Prudhomme [jprudhom@health.nyc.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2002 12:05 PM
To: michaelgi@dep.nyc.gov
Subject: Fwd: Re: Next conference call for the Indoor Taskforce COC/BenchmarksCommittee

Mike: Please forward to Penny

Jeanine Prud'homme
Assistant Commissioner
Office of Environmental Sciences & Engineering
Ph: (212) 295-5386
Fax: (212) 295-5428

PII

e-mail: jprudhom@health.nyc.gov

Re: Next
onference call for t..

Gilsenan, Michael

From: Maddaloni.Mark@epamail.epa.gov
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2002 9:56 AM
To: grevatt.peter@epamail.epa.gov; smith.terry@epamail.epa.gov; svr1@cdc.gov; rlc07@health.state.ny.us; kcarlino@health.nyc.gov; dld7@cdc.gov; laposta.dore@epamail.epa.gov; david.ippolito@osha.gov; dan.crane@osha.gov; njeffery@health.nyc.gov; girman.john@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Callahan.Kathy@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: Next conference call for the Indoor Taskforce COC/Benchmarks Committee

Let's discuss on the 2pm call today.

----- Forwarded by Mark Maddaloni/R2/USEPA/US on 04/01/02 09:55 AM -----

Paul Giardina

04/01/02 08:33 AM

njeffery@health.nyc.gov,

John

Indoor Taskforce

Mark Maddaloni)

To: Mark Maddaloni/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
cc: jleight@health.nyc.gov,

cdandrea@health.nyc.gov, Michael DeBonis,

Girman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject: Re: Next conference call for the

COC/Benchmarks Committee (Document link:

I guess you didn't realize I was gone from March 16- April 1.

I am getting a polling of our IAQ contractors who have been dealing with post-WTC clean up. The word I got before I left is most of them were dealing with mold issues either due to water intrusion, humidity issues, or internal building leaks caused by the sudden loss of power.

Unofficially I know the following companies [see list below] have dealt with mold issues and all of these companies saw this as a human health issue as employees apparently reacted unfavorably to the mold conditions, or the mold was so bad that the building wasn't fit for occupancy.

Verizon
 Con Edison
 Standard and Poors
 CMS [?].

I might add, these are the only four companies that I talked to about post WTC recovery, as I did this in the time period immediately thereafter, and before we were back in our office. Subsequent to that, I forwarded all inquiries to the city.

I have also had contact with a couple of MDs who were treating patients with upper respiratory distress in the months immediately after the incident and they reported a possible cause was mold and moisture problems in the work place.

In the case of one of the companies mentioned above, they had to remove the entire contents of the building including walls, right down to the structural steel, to get rid of the mold problems. In short, I know there are mold problems associated with the WTC attack and there is reason to suggest that some of these problems are related to some of the health situations being reported. Without actually polling our IAQ consultants, I cannot tell you what the percentage is, however.

It is for this reason that I had previously suggested that no matter what is done in the way of sampling, somebody who is part of the sampling team should do a visual inspection for water damage and mold, and a check should be made of the overall building to see if water leakage or intrusion, or climate control systems problems could have occurred. The later is necessary in case there are moisture problems behind walls that aren't readily visible.

I'll give you a reading on how many of our consultants handled mold problems if and when I get that info from the staff.

Indoor Taskforce

Mark Maddaloni
03/21/02 09:52
AM

To: Paul Giardina/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
cc:
Subject: Re: Next conference call for the
COC/Benchmarks Committee

FYI - Comments?
----- Forwarded by Mark Maddaloni/R2/USEPA/US on 03/21/02 09:51 AM -----

Indoor Taskforce

Christopher
D'Andrea
<cdandrea@health
<jleight@health.nyc.gov>, Nancy
.nyc.gov>

To: Mark Maddaloni/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
cc: Jessica Leighton
Jeffery <njeffery@health.nyc.gov>
Subject: Re: Next conference call for the
COC/Benchmarks Committee

03/20/02 01:10
PM

sure Mark I can take a crack at mold but I'm not sure why mold would be tested. Mold was not a component of the towers; if there was water infiltration into buildings then it may be an issue but we have not come across a single case of mold problems in any of the apartments we have inspected or a single mold complaint related to the disaster. The CUES sub-committee on mold has brought this up but no one on the panel, which includes a mold consultant working downtown, has found this to be an issue.

>>> <Maddaloni.Mark@epamail.epa.gov> 03/14/02 04:53PM >>>
The next conference call of the COC/Benchmarks Committee is scheduled for Monday March 18, from 2 - 4 pm (I extended the time to 4 pm because I'm hearing that we need to move with all due expediency). The call in number is (202) 260-1015 Access Code 4603#

Summary and Action Items from 3/11 Conference Call

Progress was made on consolidating the COC list. PCBs and TSP are likely out, but we need to add mold to the list (Chris D. I know you're

a mold man, so could use take a crack at putting together a tiered benchmark paradigm for our green friends consistent with the approach that's detailed below.)

There was some discussion about linking the COC list to geographic zones (i.e., proximity to Ground Zero).

NYCHOH will collect and review NYCDEP indoor sampling data to further delineate the COC list.

A strawman benchmark table (see below) will be presented demonstrating the tiered approach for indoor assessment.

Proposed Approach for Establishing Health-Based Benchmark Values

Tier	Screening Value	Action
I	> E-04 (1 yr) or HQ = 10	aggressive cleaning (professional?) - if readings persist take additional action to reduce exposure
II	background or E-04 (30 yr)/HQ = 1 to E-04 (1 yr)/HQ = 10	maintain recommended (i.e., diligent wet/HEPA) cleaning methods - consider additional monitoring
III	< background or E-04 (30 yr)/HQ = 1	no further action

* Example (dioxin in air)

Tier	Screening Value	Action
I	> .162 ng/m ³ (E-04 x 1 yr)	aggressive cleaning (professional?) - if readings persist take additional action to reduce

		exposure
II	.0054 - .162 ng/m3	maintain recommended (i.e.,
		diligent wet/HEPA) cleaning
		methods - consider
		additional monitoring
III	< .0054 ng/m3 (E-04 x 30 yr)	no further action

* For illustration purposes only. With combustion by-products no longer being formed, Dioxin is unlikely to represent an inhalation hazard in the indoor environment. Dioxin in settled dust may represent a more significant hazard from incidental ingestion/dermal contact. The same approach would be used for dust substituting dioxin load/concentration (I prefer load) for airborne values.

For Monday's call we'll need to get consensus on the tiered approach and get down to the business of identifying exposure media (air,dust - load vs conc) and filling in numbers for COCs.

Finally, I've been having some side bar discussions with members regarding the use of "sentinel substances" as a means for guiding our efforts relating to additional sampling, level of cleanup, and need for follow-up monitoring. Bob Chinery has observed that fiberglass seems to be in high concentration wherever there are readily clearly impacted areas. The question is: can it serve as a reliable indicator for the handful of COCs we'll be dealing with? After speaking with a physician today about the persistently alkaline characteristic of WTC dust, I was thinking if pH might also be able to serve as type of sentinel for identifying significantly impacted dwellings. Anyway, consider this food for thought and we'll discuss all of the above in more detail on Monday. Have a nice weekend.