

*WTC  
media*

**From:** Kelly McKinney  
**To:** D'Andrea, Christopher; Jeffery, Nancy; Leighton, Jessica; Thomas, Polly; Tucker, Andrew  
**Date:** 12/23/02 6:21PM  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: WTC dust study

Lioy published a detailed study of WTC dust in June with results that were generally consistent with what we've seen. Weaknesses in his analysis in the past have been small sample size (n=3) and no indication of background concentrations.

>>> Andrew Tucker 12/23/02 06:00PM >>>

Have you guys heard anything about the attached email/article from Environmental Science & Technology?

\*\*\*\*\*

>>> Summary:

> >>> A new study of dust samples taken from around Manhattan in the days  
 > >>> following Sept. 11, 2001, could offer some much-needed good news to  
 > >>> survivors of the World Trade Center attacks. A team of researchers tested  
 > >>> debris from the collapsed towers for toxic organic chemicals and found  
 > >>> that the potential risk of exposure from inhaling such compounds was  
 > >>> lower  
 > >>> than expected.

> >>>

> >>> Contact: Beverly Hassell

> >>>

> >>> 202-872-4065

> >>>

> >>> [b\\_hassell@acs.org](mailto:b_hassell@acs.org)

> >>>

> >>> FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

> >>>

> >>> World Trade Center dust analysis offers good news for New Yorkers

> >>>

> >>> The rubble has been cleared from the World Trade Center site, but  
 > >>> questions still loom about the long-term health effects on people who  
 > >>> survived the terrorist attacks. A new study of dust samples taken from  
 > >>> around Manhattan in the days following Sept. 11, 2001, could offer some  
 > >>> much-needed good news.

> >>>

> >>> A team of researchers tested debris from the collapsed towers for toxic  
 > >>> organic chemicals and found that the potential risk of exposure from  
 > >>> inhaling such compounds was lower than expected. The findings are  
 > >>> scheduled to appear in the Feb. 1 print edition of Environmental Science  
 > >>> &

> >>> Technology, a peer-reviewed journal of the American Chemical Society, the  
 > >>> world's largest scientific society. The article was initially published  
 > >>> Dec. 18 on the journal's Web site.

> >>>

> >>> The scientists were looking specifically for persistent organic

> >>> pollutants

> >>> - highly stable compounds that pose a special problem because they endure  
 > >>> in the environment and can be toxic to humans and wildlife. They found no  
 > >>> evidence of high levels of two particular POPs: pesticides and  
 > >>> polychlorinated biphenyls, which were used in hundreds of industrial and  
 > >>> commercial applications until their production was banned in 1977.