In WTC files

114 Liberty

## Gilsenan, Michael

**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/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).

## Gilsenan, Michael

**From:** Gilsenan, Michael
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 19, 2003 1:29 PM
**To:** 'evangelista.pat@epamail.epa.gov'
**Subject:** FW: Meeting with contractrors

FYI

-----Original Message-----
**From:** Maldonado, Jane
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 19, 2003 12:15 PM
**To:** 'walter.melnick@fema.gov'
**Cc:** Gilsenan, Michael
**Subject:** Meeting with contractrors

FYI - Mike is in the process of scheduling the following status/update meetings for Friday, 3/21 at EPA.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Quad C | 10:00 | Confirmed |
| Quad D | 11:00 | Out/Left/Message |
| Quad B | 1:30 | Confirmed |
| Quad A | 2:30 | ? Awaiting confirmation |

I'll forward the finalized version when I receive all confirmations.

Jane

See: 114 Liberty

**Gilsenan, Michael**

**From:** Theodorellys, Penny
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 19, 2003 9:03 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).....

See: 114 Liberty

## Gilsenan, Michael

**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/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).

See: 114 Liberty

## Gilsenan, Michael

**From:** Nace.Charles@epamail.epa.gov
**Sent:** Thursday, March 20, 2003 1:42 PM
**To:** Theodorellys, Penny
**Cc:** Radhakrishnan, Krish; Gilsenan, Michael; Callahan.Kathy@epamail.epa.gov
**Subject:** Re: FW: Dioxin Wipe results


R03030259 Cover Letter.pdf


R03030259 excel Report.xls

Penny,

I looked at the dioxin data that you forwarded to me and I have a few questions. The first is that I do not see the TEQ calculations that were detailed in Attachment 2 of the workplan (see below). The second is that the TEQs, when presented, should be reported in the units of ng/m2 (alternatively, the TEQs could be reported in pg as long as someone provides the template area that was sampled so that I could add a row to the spreadsheet and calculate it myself). Without the TEQ calculations, it is not possible to compare the results to the health-based benchmark.

7 of 7

2/7/03

Attachment 2: Reporting Dioxin Sampling Results

1. The laboratory shall submit sample results in tabular format on the laboratory's letterhead. The date of sample collection, the matrix (e.g. wipe), and date analyzed must be printed on each page of the report. The table must contain, at a minimum, columns with the following headings and information.

§ Sample Identification Number
§ Analytical Method
§ Analyte
§ Result (including units)
§ Detection Limit
§ EMPC
§ Laboratory Flags
§ Standard Type
§ Dilution Factor
§ Recovery Limits
§ TEF, max TEF
§ # Isomers

2. Analytical results shall be reported using a 2,3,7,8 -TCDD toxicity equivalence (TEQ). The TEQs shall be reported four ways. A TEQ which sets non-detects to zero (i.e., TEQ (ND=0), a TEQ which sets non-detects at 1/2 the detection limit (i.e., TEQ (ND=1/2), a TEQ Estimated Maximum Potential Concentration with non-detects set to zero (i.e., TEQ EMPC (ND=0), and a TEQ Estimated Maximum Potential Concentration with non-detects set to 1/2 the detection limit (i.e., TEQ EMPC (ND=1/2).

Thanks,

Chuck Nace
Environmental Toxicologist

USEPA - Region 2

## Gilsenan, Michael

**From:** Radhakrishnan, Krish
**Sent:** Monday, March 24, 2003 1:24 PM
**To:** Gilsenan, Michael
**Subject:** Contact for COSH

Mike,

Contact person for
Citywide Office of Safety & Health
Sylvia Pryce 212 669-8828

See 114 Liberty

**Gilsenan, Michael**

**From:** Theodorellys, Penny
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 25, 2003 3:36 PM
**To:** Nace.Charles@epamail.epa.gov
**Cc:** Radhakrishnan, Krish; Gilsenan, Michael
**Subject:** FW: Revised PAH results

Revised PAH results.

-----Original Message-----

**From: Andrew Gasparro [mailto:agasparro@jlcenvironmental.com] <mailto:**
**[mailto:agasparro@jlcenvironmental.com]>**
**Sent:** Monday, March 24, 2003 4:28 PM
**To:** 'Theodorellys, Penny'
**Subject:** FW: Revised PAH results

R03030157 revised Report.pdf R03030158 revised Report.pdf

Penny,

I hope this reporting method is correct. Please let me know if we need to make any additional changes on this.

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]>**
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 3:50 PM
To: agasparro@jlcenvironmental.com
Subject: Revised PAH results

Andrew -

Attached are revised reports showing detection limits for PAH wipes at 1 ug per parameter.

If you need anything else please get back to me (dioxin reports are being worked on).

Thanks! Fred