

Gilsenan, Michael

From: Kelly McKinney [kmckinne@health.nyc.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 07, 2003 9:44 AM
To: michaelgi@dep.nyc.gov
Subject: Fwd: RE: EPA Draft Report

Mike, We talked briefly last week about this report:

http://oaspub.epa.gov/eims/eimscomm.getfile?p_download_id=36387

"Exposure and Human Health Evaluation of Airborne Pollution from the World Trade Center Disaster"

National Center for Environmental Assessment
 Office of Research and Development
 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 October, 2002

The Law Department has asked us to comment. They asked me today about comments raised on page 134 about DEP sampling. Can you take a look at it and tell me what you think? The issue is time-sensitive since comments are due tomorrow.

>>> "Cohen, Jay" <jcohen@law.nyc.gov> 04/07/03 09:30AM >>>
 Kelly:

Thanks. From my layman's perspective, I think that your comments were very valuable, especially the comment about outliers. I do have a very modest background in statistics and understand what you are saying. I think that it is important that we raise the uncertainties where EPA makes statements that can hurt us in the future. If OEM does not submit comments quickly concerning the access issue, can you do it? The issue is raised again on page 122 of the report alleging difficulty of access for both EPA and NYSDEC. I think that it is very important that the City responds to this. Also, do you know anything about EPA's comment on page 134 that the City's DEP used varying sampling and analytical methods concerning indoor sampling of WTC dust? Do you know if this is true and was it acceptable procedure? I provided the report to DEP, but have heard nothing from them.

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

From: Kelly McKinney [mailto:kmckinne@health.nyc.gov]
 Sent: Monday, April 07, 2003 9:20 AM
 To: jcohen@law.nyc.gov
 Cc: Jessica Leighton
 Subject: Re: EPA Draft Report

Several of us have reviewed the document and we have had some internal discussion about it. We can't agree on the nature of our comments however. I disagree with the discussion about impacts to indoor air. I believe EPA makes strong statements with little data to support them. These include the following:

page 4 bottom "The issue of alkalinity of WTC dust and its potential as a possible health concern...After late September, indoor exposures to such dust probably warrant more concern than outdoor exposures for possible acute irritative effects or more chronic health effects, not only because of the basic nature of some constituent particles but also because of other unusual features, such as slender microscopic glass fibers with toxic materials

attached to them or very fine particles composed of unusual combinations of silica coalesced with lead or other toxic materials."

My questions to EPA would include: What is the relationship between particle configuration and location of exposure (indoor vs outdoor)? What about the issue of source strength (amount of material that would have been entrained in a typical indoor apartment)?

page 8 bottom "Limited available evidence suggest the incursion of asbestos to the indoor environment. A small study which sampled the indoor environment of two apartments on September 18 showed very high indoor levels of asbestos"

There is evidence (including the DOH/ATSDR indoor study) that would indicate that the two apartments mentioned above are outliers and do not represent the vast majority of indoor spaces in Lower Manhattan. In any event, a sample size of two would not be large enough to justify EPA's conclusion.

page 11 top "Difficulties associated with site access and security, power supply sources, equipment availability and analytical capacity hindered efforts by EPA and the NYSDEC to put air monitors in place immediately after the attack...other contaminants were not sampled until September 23, such as dioxin."

My experience with EPA is that the reasons given are inadequate for an extraordinarily long delay (given events). However, I think it would be more appropriate for OEM to respond. I have sent it to OEM and will followup with them today.

page 33 top "They (Liroy et al) also noted that penetration of substantial quantities of WTC-derived dust into indoor office or residential spaces likely notably increased the potential for indoor exposures (via ingestion or by inhalation of re-entrained particles) to high levels of constituent elements and compounds."

What is the basis for this statement?

The document is technically rigorous and well written when documenting outdoor exposures but includes many such statements on indoor exposures with limited data to support them. I'm not sure we gain anything by pointing out the uncertainty contained within them.

>>> "Cohen, Jay" <jcohen@law.nyc.gov> 04/06/03 01:36PM >>>
Kelly:

Have you submitted comments on behalf of DoH concerning the EPA draft report that we talked about? If you have, can I get a copy of them? If you have not, are you going to submit and is there anything that I can help with. Please e-mail or call me at (212) 676-9219 as the deadline is April 7, 2003. Thanks.