

**Summary Report of the
World Trade Center Technical Review Panel Meeting**

February 2, 2006

Prepared for:

Office of the Science Advisor
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC

Prepared by:

Eastern Research Group, Inc.
110 Hartwell Avenue
Lexington, MA 02421

NOTICE

This report was prepared by Eastern Research Group, Inc., an EPA contractor, as a general record of discussion during the twelfth meeting of the World Trade Center Technical Review Panel held December 13, 2005, at the Alexander Hamilton U.S. Custom House. This report captures the main points and highlights of the meeting. It is not a complete record of all details discussed, nor does it embellish, interpret, or enlarge upon matters that were incomplete or unclear. Statements represent the individual view of each meeting participant, and may or may not represent the analyses or positions of EPA.

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Panel Attendees.....	2
1.2 Purpose and Agenda	2
2. WELCOME, PURPOSE, AND OPENING REMARKS	3
3. PANEL DISCUSSION	3
4. WTC COMMUNITY/LABOR COALITION PRESENTATION	6
5. PANEL DISCUSSION	7
6. PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	10
7. CLOSING REMARKS.....	11
ATTACHMENT A: AGENDA	
ATTACHMENT B: PUBLIC COMMENTS	

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CLC	Community-Labor Coalition
COPC	contaminant of potential concern
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GAO	Government Accountability Office
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
NIOSH	National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
NYC	New York City
OSHA	Occupational Health and Safety Administration
UMDNJ	University of Medicine and Dentistry, New Jersey
WTC	World Trade Center

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

After the collapse of the World Trade Center (WTC) and the subsequent release of contaminants into the environment, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), other federal agencies, New York City (NYC), and New York State public health and environmental authorities focused on numerous cleanup, dust collection, and ambient air monitoring activities to ameliorate and better understand the human health effects of the disaster. While these monitoring and assessment activities were ongoing, EPA began planning for a program to clean and monitor residential apartments. Residents impacted by WTC dust and debris were eligible to request federally funded monitoring and/or cleaning of their residences. The cleanup continued into the summer of 2003, by which time EPA had cleaned and monitored 3,400 apartments and monitored an additional 800 apartments.

Since then, EPA convened a technical panel of experts who have been involved with the WTC assessment activities to provide advice on the effectiveness of these and related programs. Tim Oppelt, Acting Assistant Administrator of EPA's Office of Research and Development, serves as the panel chairperson, and Paul Liroy, Professor of Environmental and Community Medicine at the Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Institute of the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School-UMDNJ and Rutgers University, serves as vice chair. This report summarizes the twelfth technical panel meeting in New York City, held at the Alexander Hamilton U.S. Custom House on December 13, 2005.

Mr. Oppelt facilitated the meeting. The original agenda was modified to consist of:

- Welcome, Purpose of Today's Meeting, and Opening Remarks
- Panel Discussion
- WTC Community/Labor Coalition Presentation
- Panel Discussion
- Public Comment Period
- Closing Remarks
- Adjourn

EPA representatives and individual panelists proposed the following key suggestions and conclusions during the meeting:

- Many of the panel members disagreed with EPA that their comments on the Test and Clean Program Plan were fully considered.
- Several panelists said there were serious flaws in the WTC dust screening study peer review (for example, the peer reviewers were not provided all the information they needed to make a final determination). One panelist disagreed with EPA's conclusions that the peer reviewers were very negative about the use of the WTC dust signature.
- Several panelists recommended that EPA reconsider its decision to abandon the WTC dust signature. A few encouraged EPA to analyze for slag wool, even if the signature is not included as a component in the test and clean program plan. A few panelists said that

collecting and analyzing for slag wool now could provide critical information for future responses.

- In response to panelist comments, EPA said it would discuss how the WTC dust signature could be incorporated into the sampling, even though it may not be part of the decision-making process for this program.
- Most panel members thought that the final test and clean program plan was not appropriate. Many advised EPA to reconsider the plan.
- A few panel members expressed concern over including lead as a contaminant of potential concern in the absence of a WTC signature.
- A few panelists predicted that the test and clean program would not be successful due to a lack of community support.
- Most of the panel members felt that EPA prematurely terminated the WTC panel meetings.
- All the panelists agreed to attend a future meeting, if EPA chose to have one; although some said they would only attend if additional components (such as the sampling methodologies, reservoirs, whole buildings, geographical area, and workplaces) were open for discussion.
- EPA said that its views that the program remain voluntary and that Occupational Health and Safety Administration and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health are the requisite organizations to address worker exposures would not change.

1. INTRODUCTION

After the collapse of the World Trade Center (WTC) and the subsequent release of contaminants into the environment, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), other federal agencies, New York City (NYC), and New York State public health and environmental authorities focused on numerous cleanup, dust collection, and ambient air monitoring activities to ameliorate and better understand the human health effects of the disaster. While these monitoring and assessment activities were ongoing, EPA began planning for a program to clean and monitor residential apartments. Residents impacted by WTC dust and debris were eligible to request federally funded monitoring and/or cleaning of their residences. The cleanup continued into the summer of 2003, by which time EPA had cleaned and monitored 3,400 apartments and monitored an additional 800 apartments. Since then, EPA has developed a draft sampling plan to study the contamination and recontamination of spaces in lower Manhattan that may have been contaminated by the WTC disaster.

EPA convened a technical panel of experts who have been involved with the WTC assessment activities to provide advice on the effectiveness of these and related programs. Timothy Oppelt, Acting Assistant Administrator for EPA's Office of Research and Development, serves as the panel chairperson, and Paul Liroy, Professor of Environmental and Community Medicine at the Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Institute of the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School-UMDNJ and Rutgers University, serves as vice chair. Members of the panel include representatives from the federal agencies directly involved in the air quality response and monitoring, the NYC Departments of Health and Environmental Protection, and outside experts.

EPA's goals in forming this panel and holding this series of meetings are:

- To provide for greater input on continuing efforts to monitor the situation for New York residents and workers impacted by the collapse of the WTC towers.
- To help guide EPA's use of the available exposure and health surveillance databases and registries to characterize any remaining exposures and risks, to identify any unmet public health needs, and to recommend any steps to further minimize the risks associated with the aftermath of the WTC attacks.

Twelve technical panel meetings and one conference call have been held to date:

- March 31, 2004, at the Alexander Hamilton U.S. Custom House
- April 12, 2004, at the Tribeca Performing Arts Center at the Borough of Manhattan Community College
- May 12, 2004, conference call
- May 24, 2004, at Saval Auditorium at St. John's University
- June 22, 2004, at Saval Auditorium at St. John's University
- July 26, 2004, at Saval Auditorium at St. John's University
- September 13, 2004, at Saval Auditorium at St. John's University
- October 5, 2004, at Saval Auditorium at St. John's University
- November 15, 2004, at Saval Auditorium at St. John's University
- February 23, 2005, at Saval Auditorium at St. John's University

- May 24, 2005, at the Alexander Hamilton U.S. Custom House
- July 12, 2005, at St. John's University
- December 13, 2005, at the Alexander Hamilton U.S. Custom House

This report summarizes the presentations and panel discussions at the December 13, 2005 technical panel meeting. Information on each of these meetings is provided on EPA's Web site (<http://www.epa.gov/wtc/panel>).

1.1 Panel Attendees

The following panel members were not present at this technical panel meeting:

- Patricia Clark
- Jessica Leighton
- Joseph Picciano
- Sven Rodenbeck
- Claudia Thompson

Richard Mendelson served as an alternate for Patricia Clark. Mr. Mendelson is the Acting Deputy Regional Administrator for Region 2 Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA). Christopher D'Andrea served as an alternate for Jessica Leighton. Mr. D'Andrea is an Environmental Scientist with NYC's Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Office of Environmental and Occupational Disease Epidemiology. Kathryn Humphrey served as an alternate for Joseph Picciano. Ms. Humphrey is the Response and Recovery Director for Region 2 Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). A complete list of WTC expert technical review panel members is available on EPA's panel Web site (<http://www.epa.gov/wtc/panel/members.html>).

1.2 Purpose and Agenda

The focus of this technical panel meeting was:

- EPA's plan to test dust that may remain in lower Manhattan homes and commercial spaces from the collapse of the WTC towers, including program implementation and recruitment strategy.

The original agenda for this meeting is provided in Attachment A. The agenda was modified during the meeting and covered the following topics:

- Welcome, Purpose of Today's Meeting, and Opening Remarks
- Panel Discussion
- WTC Community/Labor Coalition Presentation
- Panel Discussion
- Public Comment Period
- Closing Remarks
- Adjourn

2. WELCOME, PURPOSE, AND OPENING REMARKS

E. Timothy Oppelt, Acting Assistant Administrator for EPA's Office of Research and Development and Panel Chair

Tim Oppelt introduced himself and explained that audiovisual support was not yet operational. He apologized for the inconvenience and asked whether everyone could follow his presentation about the final test and clean program plan from the printed materials. Morton Lippmann suggested having the panel discussion first, since it does not require audiovisual support. After some discussion among the panel members, it was decided that Oppelt would continue with his opening remarks, there would be some panel discussion, followed by the WTC Community/Labor Coalition (CLC) presentation, a second round of panel discussion, and public comments.

Oppelt welcomed everyone to the twelfth meeting of the WTC Technical Review Panel. He said that the objectives of today's meeting were to (1) review and clarify the final test and clean program plan, which was posted on the Web site on November 29, 2005, and (2) discuss EPA's proposed outreach plan. He also wanted to hear from the community liaisons and finish with public comments by 12:30 p.m. He then asked the panel members to introduce themselves.

3. PANEL DISCUSSION

Oppelt asked panel members for their individual thoughts about the final test and clean program plan. He believes that it incorporates the best science available and is consistent with the legal authorities at EPA's disposal. He highlighted that the process has been open and transparent, and everything has been posted on the Web site for perusal.

EPA appreciated and gave full consideration to the comments received, even though not all comments were accepted. Oppelt reiterated that implementing the program is EPA's decision, but that the panel members' input and advice were incorporated, as appropriate. He noted the following areas as examples of where EPA made changes based on comments from the panel:

- Looking at remaining contamination versus recontamination
- Appropriateness of the asbestos surrogate
- List of contaminants of potential concern (COPCs)
- Use and development of a signature
- Dust benchmarks

Greg Meeker took exception to Oppelt's remarks and said that he sent comments to EPA to include in the peer review and that they were never passed on to the reviewers. He believes it was pertinent that the reviewers had this information. He also thought that the peer reviewers should have reviewed the signature study in light of what the panel had discussed over the last year. Further, after the peer review was finished, the panel's Signature Subgroup sent EPA a second set of comments and never received a response, nor has there been any discussion about the points raised. Meeker said there were serious flaws in the study and peer review. The data were not properly analyzed or presented to the peer reviewers.

Jeanne Stellman said that Meeker's comments were strongly endorsed by most of the panel, however, EPA decided not to pass on the comments to the peer reviewers. She also was upset because she disagrees that EPA fully considered the panel members' comments. For example, the alternate plan that David Prezant and she put together was never fully discussed. Stellman was discouraged and commented that she felt like she wasted her time being part of the panel for the last two years.

Morton Lippmann also expressed disappointment in the final plan. He believes that the results are not going to be interpretable and will not be able to guide a useful cleanup. He objects to EPA abandoning the slag wool signature. He thinks that EPA wants to spend the money and walk away from the problem. He objects as a taxpayer and suggested EPA give the \$8 million back to FEMA to see if they can find something useful to do with it.

Marc Wilkenfeld agreed with the other panelists' comments. He noted that when he got the e-mail last week that this was the final WTC panel meeting, he thought it was a spoof it was so ridiculous. As a medical doctor who lives in NYC, he is in a position to tell people whether to participate in the sampling, and he cannot in good conscience tell the community to participate. He strongly advised EPA to reconsider.

David Newman pointed out that implementing the original test and clean plan, means that the same issues that most panel members objected to 21 months ago are still present. He also pointed out that by prematurely terminating the panel, EPA is not addressing the mandate to deal with unmet public health needs. He thought that the last 21 months of collegial and technical discussion had been ignored in the final plan. The early termination is a disservice to the panelists, EPA, and the community. The final plan suffers from both scientific and technical flaws, removing any incentive for participation. He predicted that enrollment would be a failure, eliminating any hope of obtaining scientifically sound data.

David Prezant felt that the panel was working together toward a plan that they could all be proud of, even though there was some divergence in the details. He noted that some panel members only agreed on expanding the COPC list and geographical area because there was some level of confidence in the signature. For example, many panel members only agreed to add lead as a COPC when it could be related to the WTC through the signature. Without the signature, there is no ability to attribute the lead levels to the WTC. He thinks this will lead to many unanswered questions and a tough policy decision without any supporting data. Prezant commented that the peer review of the WTC signature was flawed. Some of the finest experts are on the panel, and their individual written comments were ignored in the contractor's final report on the WTC Dust Screening Study Review. Further, a compromise could have been obtained by considering the plan that Stellman and he proposed—to unlink cleaning from the signature (i.e., clean based on the level of COPCs), but continue to sample for the WTC signature. He thinks abandoning the signature worsens the problem.

Paul Liroy agreed with the comments made by his colleagues. He expressed frustration at the panel being considered "a child of lesser gods" to the peer reviewers, who did not have all the background, supporting information, and discussions that the panel members have had. The peer reviewers' work is not more important than the WTC panel members' work. He said that EPA

scientists and others in the Agency spent 15 months developing a plan that he thought was very good in July, even though there were some disagreements on the details. Lioy feels strongly that EPA has not listened to the panel members, who have been working diligently for the past 21 months. He stated that Meeker's work was ignored when the criteria for the peer reviewers were developed and when his comments were not passed on to the peer reviewers. He believes that the peer reviewers, while credible, had less than satisfactory information and therefore, could not make a final determination about the signature. He commented that sampling for lead is a complex issue if it cannot be tied to the WTC. He urged EPA to reconsider the direction of the program and to think about the consequences of sampling without a WTC signature. Lioy suggested that EPA at least continue an evaluation for slag wool.

Meeker reminded everyone that the signature study is EPA's own work and that, with proper calibration of the data, the signature can clearly distinguish site samples from background samples. He said that it made no sense to *not* take the extra step to analyze for slag wool when that step could potentially produce good, useful data.

Prezant said that, as environmental and health experts, "we" have another role—to collect information that could be used to respond to future attacks. Collecting and analyzing for slag wool now could provide critical information about ways to predict aerosolized dust patterns in urban environments during a future response.

Steven Markowitz predicted that the final plan is likely to fail. He thinks that if the plan is not based on science, it becomes an environmental benefits project based on policy. However, the plan will fail as an environmental benefits project because there is no partnership with the community. He stressed that the plan will fail both the public and the scientific community.

Frederica Perera said that, from her perspective (i.e., one not closely involved in the deliberations of the sampling plan details), it seemed as if the plan in July was almost "there." She commented that the experts on the panel have devoted a tremendous amount of time and that the peer reviewers did not have all the information. She suggested that the problem could be solved quickly with very little effort, since it seems the plan was about 95 percent completed.

Peter Gautier agreed with his colleagues' statements. He said there was universal agreement at the first panel meeting that it was not appropriate to test areas that had already been cleaned. He is disappointed that EPA seems to have regressed two years to a proposal the panel had deemed unacceptable. He urged EPA to reconsider its abandonment of the signature. He suggested EPA conduct the signature study in parallel with the testing program, and not lose the opportunity to do something worthwhile for the community.

Lioy asked the Agency to reconsider how it is finalizing the plan. He thinks that it is 90 percent complete, and that positive progress can be made. He said that, when dealing with issues of homeland security, recognizable approaches and credibility are important. EPA should consider how the information collected during this sampling could be applied to future events.

David Newman commented that abandoning the signature is not the only issue. Even if EPA were to proceed with the signature, there are other significant technical issues that should also be discussed.

Oppelt thanked the panelists for their comments. He reminded them that the test and clean plan has been out for review since June, as the second approach if the signature methodology could not be validated. He noted that there had been very little discussion of the second approach, perhaps because everyone thought the signature methodology would pass peer review. EPA was very disappointed that the peer reviewers' comments on the signature methodology were so negative. The greatest concern was that the laboratories could not differentiate between WTC dust and background. He reminded the panelists that at previous meetings, many people—especially the public—did not support use of a signature. Because of the signature study, EPA was accused of trying to avoid finding WTC contamination and delay further action.

Lippmann replied that most people did not take the second plan seriously because it was not considered a viable alternative. He also reiterated that the peer reviewers did not have all the information they needed to reach a valid conclusion.

Wilkenfeld noted that none of the panelists said they endorse EPA's alternate test and clean plan. He does not think that any community members will volunteer to participate in a plan that none of the panelists endorses. He said it is not too late for EPA to reconsider their approach.

Micki Siegel de Hernandez clarified that the public was opposed to linking the signature to cleanup because they did not think that the science and research was complete. She said that the community joins with the panelists in their feeling of being betrayed. The test and clean plan is a "sham," and will not answer the community's questions or protect families and workers. It will only forward the Bush Administration and EPA's cover-up of the WTC contamination in NYC. She noted that similar mistakes are being made in the Gulf. In response, Oppelt said that the decisions being made have nothing to do with the Bush Administration. It is not a cover-up.

4. WTC COMMUNITY/LABOR COALITION PRESENTATION

Catherine McVay Hughes, Community Liaison

Micki Siegel de Hernandez, Alternate Community Liaison (Labor)

Catherine McVay Hughes and Siegel de Hernandez presented a report reflecting the results of several WTC Community/Labor Coalition (CLC) meetings. The community believes that the final test and clean program plan is scientifically and technically flawed, designed to find as little WTC contamination as possible and clean as little as possible, and a Bush Administration cover-up of contamination from 9/11. They consider the plan to be a failure and do not think it should go forward. The plan excludes the following:

- Testing in most buildings' heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems and common areas.
- Entire neighborhoods known to have been impacted by the dust cloud, the fires that burned for months, and the barge waste transfer operations.

- Workplaces and businesses.
- Looking at the building as the unit of interest.
- The possibility of collecting accurate data about contamination by using inappropriate sampling methods.
- Testing and/or cleanup in areas most likely to be reservoirs of contamination.
- The likelihood of having a contaminated HVAC unit cleaned.
- Whole building cleanup, even if warranted.
- Discussion of the steps that EPA will take to ensure adequate sensitivity of test results.
- An independent monitor on behalf of the affected community.

Siegel de Hernandez read a statement by NYC labor organizations and listed the organizations that endorsed the statement. Craig Hall and Esther Regelson emphasized the outrage of the communities being excluded from the testing and cleaning. Jo Pollet further explained the inappropriateness of the sampling methods. For all of the reasons stated during the presentation, the CLC rejected EPA's plan and joined Senator Clinton and Congressman Nadler's call for a Government Accountability Office (GAO) investigation into EPA's actions.

5. PANEL DISCUSSION

Oppelt asked if the panelists would like to discuss EPA's outreach efforts at this time. Prezant and Newman suggested that the panel discuss the plan instead. Wilkenfeld asked whether any input from the panel would change the plan since it is final. Stellman asked for clarification about which topics are open for discussion. Oppelt said that EPA would consider all panel comments, but that the plan is a final draft. EPA's views that the program remain voluntary and that OSHA and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) are the requisite organizations to address worker exposures will not change. He did, however, say that he would talk to the scientists about how the signature can be incorporated into the sampling, even though it may not be part of the decision-making process for this program. He agreed to have a discussion with Agency scientists regarding EPA's interpretation of the peer review report on the WTC Dust Screening Study.

Lioy responded to the CLC's concerns about the sampling methods. He stated that he has 30 years experience with sampling for risk, and he is comfortable with the sampling methods EPA has chosen for surfaces. He explained that the proposed methods would capture the contamination that is posing the most risk to the occupant. The contamination at the surface is the portion available for contact. Because a rug is a reservoir for everything (e.g., wine, cotton), sampling deep down does not reflect the true risk. Lioy also commented that the sampling methods are tied to being able to differentiate between WTC-related contamination and whatever else might be in a home. For example, lead could be from paint. This is a reason why the WTC dust signature was so important to the sampling program.

Wilkenfeld suggested having additional meetings to discuss the areas for which EPA is open to receiving feedback. He questioned why this has to be the last meeting. There are additional topics to discuss, in addition to the science.

Meeker replied that there was still much to talk about concerning the signature. He implored EPA to take that extra, small step to collect and analyze for slag wool. If EPA continues to work on the signature development, they might be able to achieve positive results.

Siegel de Hernandez was skeptical that EPA would consider anything the panel members said today. She felt that the meetings had been purposely designed to limit discussion and that EPA had not incorporated panelists' comments. She also expressed frustration at the infrequency of the meetings. She alleged that Senator Clinton sent a letter to EPA, which was met with silence. Oppelt countered that EPA agreed to meet with Senator Clinton, however, she canceled the meeting.

Prezant empathized with EPA wanting to move forward without further discussion because so many issues were being brought up. However, he urged EPA to strongly resist the temptation to give in. He suggested that panel members hold a one or two-day meeting with EPA scientists and technicians to discuss the issues and arrive at a solution or compromise. Lioy asked every panel member to comment on Prezant's idea:

- Newman commented that there is a need for an effective, scientifically based cleanup program. However, he expressed skepticism that the meetings would be productive, given that much of the plan is not up for discussion. He said there are serious scientific deficiencies and issues with the plan and signature. If additional components (such as the sampling methodologies, reservoirs, HVAC units, whole buildings, geographical area, and workplaces) are included, then he would attend additional meetings.
- Kathryn Humphrey (alternate) passed, saying it was more appropriate for Joseph Picciano to speak for FEMA.
- Gautier said he would support additional meetings as a way to find something to salvage from the proposed plan.
- Perera agreed to meet.
- Markowitz agreed that several topics should be discussed, in addition to the signature. If these topics were also being discussed, he would attend the meetings.
- Meeker agreed to meet.
- Mendelson commented that he would attend additional meetings and that it would be good to reach a resolution.
- Lioy agreed to meet.
- Wilkenfeld agreed to meet, as long as the additional topics that Newman mentioned are up for discussion.
- Christopher D'Andrea thought that discussing the plan further would be worthwhile and agreed to meet.

- Krish Radhakrishnan also agreed that further discussion was warranted and said he would attend additional meetings.
- Siegel de Hernandez said she would participate in additional meetings if the fundamental problems were on the table for discussion. She emphasized that EPA does not have to give up good science and that the program can be valuable for discovering WTC contamination and developing methodologies.
- McVay Hughes agreed to meet.
- Stellman said that additional meetings would be worthwhile if the additional topics that Newman mentioned are open for discussion and change. She commented that there seems to be consensus that Plan B in its current state is not a useful way to spend money or engage the community.

Lioy summarized that the overall sense of the panel members is that there is a need for additional discussion.

Oppelt responded that, from a legal perspective, EPA will not clean ubiquitous urban contaminants. The signature was an important component to be able to differentiate background contamination from WTC-related contamination. EPA was also disappointed that the peer review was so negative about the signature. However, based on the succinct and honest comments made today, Oppelt thinks that EPA should reexamine abandoning the signature study altogether. He reiterated that EPA has been consistent about which dimensions of the program have not been open for discussion.

Markowitz pointed out that EPA's final plan does not have the ability to attribute contamination to the WTC. If other sources of the contamination are visible, the contamination will be attributed to those sources. He said that EPA will not be able to meet its own standard to attribute contamination to the WTC.

Meeker argued that the peer review was not as negative as Oppelt is suggesting. Based on the reviewers' individual pre-meeting comments, four of six reviewers agree that slag wool would work as a WTC signature. One reviewer said it might work, and only one said slag wool would not work. Therefore, it is wrong to characterize the peer review as so negative. He believes it is worthwhile to collect and analyze for slag wool.

McVay Hughes commented that it is disheartening that man can go to the moon, but cannot attribute contamination to the WTC collapse.

Siegel de Hernandez remarked that even though it is complicated to attribute contamination to the WTC collapse, there must be a method for presuming WTC origin. If the levels are higher than elsewhere (i.e., higher than background), then it should be considered contaminated. She believes that the final plan is not designed to find contamination.

Prezant suggested that EPA offer cleanup without using the WTC dust signature, but continue to validate the signature to see if testing and cleaning can proceed to a larger geographical area. He also recommended discussing a comparison to background and the statistical sampling design.

Oppelt said that EPA has made its decision. Though not everyone may agree with it, the decision was made with input from the panel and community. He agreed that it might be useful for a smaller group to have a limited discussion about the signature.

Stellman commented that the fundamental problem is not scientific; rather it is the fact that the community will not support the plan without serious modifications. McVay Hughes said that EPA would not need to spend money on public relations or community outreach if the program was good; people would gladly volunteer to participate in a good program.

Prezant noted that additional issues could be open for discussion if it was decided to include the WTC signature in the program sampling. For example, group averaging only became necessary when there was no confidence in the WTC signature. He urged EPA to keep an open mind. He also suggested that if EPA were to hold a one to two-day meeting, it should be focused on specific topics.

Siegel de Hernandez summarized that everyone seems to agree that the final test and clean program plan is bad. Fundamental elements of the plan need to be discussed, beyond the signature.

Oppelt introduced Wendy Thomi, EPA's Community Involvement Coordinator, as the person who will engage and interact with the community going forward.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

A public comment session was held from 11:39 a.m. to 1:16 p.m. (scheduled from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.) The following members of the public made comments to the panel during this period:

- Jenna Orkin
- Jo Polett
- Suzanne Mattei
- Stanley Mark
- Jeanie Chin
- Councilman Alan Gerson
- Christine Falvo (read statement from Senator Clinton)
- Linda Rosenthal (representing Councilman Nadler)
- John Feal
- Jonathan Sferazo
- Marvin Bethea
- Bonnie Giebfried
- Mike McCormack
- Caroline Martin
- Craig Hall
- Alex Sanchez

- Paul Stein
- Kelly Colangelo
- Barbara Caporale
- Joel Kupferman
- Lisa Burriss
- Maria Muentes (also read statement from Rosa Panea)
- Harriet Grimm (also read statement by Jan Fried)
- Robert Gulack
- Linda Belfer
- Kimberly Flynn
- Marjorie Clark
- Ann Arlen

7. CLOSING REMARKS

E. Timothy Oppelt, Acting Assistant Administrator for EPA's Office of Research and Development and Panel Chair

Oppelt said that EPA is prepared to move forward with the plan as proposed. He will further discuss the peer reviewers' comments on the WTC dust signature with EPA. He thanked the panel members and the community for their contributions. He noted that their input is important and appreciated. He also thanked EPA staff for the countless hours they have worked on drafting and revising the reports. He then adjourned the meeting.