Environmental Consulting and Management Services

Tel: 845-638-0640
Cell: 914-523-1523

info@ecmsny.com
www.ecmsny.com

February 13, 2020

Vesa Naka
Manager
SILVERSTONE PROPERTY GROUP
235 East 5th Street, New York, NY
New York, NY

Re: Lead-based paint inspection
@ 235 East 5th Street, New York, NY

Executive Summary of Inspection Results: Lead-based paints at or above current regulatory standards were detected by the XRF field measurements in hallways and stairwells of 235 East 5th Street, New York, NY. Lead in ambient dust samples was <5 micrograms/cm^2, less than one-half the present US EPA allowable level following a lead abatement action.

Dear Ms. Naka,

You requested that we conduct a field inspection and assessment of localized interior building painted surfaces to ascertain lead-in-paint levels.

We retained and coordinated AAA Lead Professionals to perform the site works. The testing results are attached for the field lead-in paint X-ray Fluorescence (XRF) tests. Here, I opine on the significance and meaning of the results that they obtained.

LEAD-BASED-PAINT TESTING METHODS:

XRF testing is the preferred field methodology for evaluating the lead concentration in a painted surface. It is non-destructive and can be performed swiftly and with acceptable accuracy. For inconclusive results, if warranted, paint chips can be extracted for laboratory analysis.

Mr. Yaakov M. Beer (NY Inspector Certificate No. NY-R-1210101-1 and E.P.A. Certificate No. LBP-R-1210101-1) utilized a Niton XLP 300A X-ray Fluorescence (XRF) instrument (serial # 25065). I am familiar with this instrument and the general categories of XRF devices used for field and laboratory analysis.

One XRF reading was performed for each testing combination except for walls.

The components that were tested were representative surfaces and building materials present in hallways and stairwells of the building.

Prior to and following testing of targeted surfaces, the XRF instrument was checked for precision and accuracy in accordance with manufacturer's guidelines. The instrument was deemed to be operating properly for normal operation prior to and after the site testing. In addition, the analytical data do not suggest any instrumental bias.

Wall/Side A is the wall adjacent to the main entry door to the building. The remaining walls are labeled B, C, and D in a clockwise fashion. Calibration XRF readings were conducted at the beginning and the end of the inspection using the manufacturer's calibration block

"Lead-based paint" (LBP) is defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as a dried paint film containing equal to or greater than 1.0 milligrams of lead per square centimeter (mg/cm^2).

XRF TEST RESULTS:

The testing was done on February 6, 2020.

A total of seventy-nine (79) XRF readings were made. Three (3) pre- and post calibration readings were made and seventy-three (73) measurements were made on painted surfaces in hallways and stairwells.

Only the surfaces listed on the attached XRF Results Forms were sampled. This testing was done to assess representative locations and should not be considered to be a comprehensive lead-based paint inspection.

Negative XRF readings or readings of 0.0 and 0.1 mg/cm^2 are statistically insignificant and are considered zero for lead. Readings of 1.0 mg/cm^2 or greater are considered Positive for the presence of regulated levels of lead in painted surfaces. The "Action Level" for this inspection was 1.0 mg/cm^2.

Three (3) positive lead readings are listed in the "Summary Report" section of the XRF results. Readings are reported as mg/cm^2. ***Pbc*** is the XRF instrument reading; ***Pbc Errr*** is the instrument's statistical analytic error of the Pbc reading. The "true" reading could be plus or minus the analytical error.

The Positive readings are highlighted in yellow on the attached XRF summary tabulation.

The Inspector assessed the condition of each of the three Positive surfaces as "Fair". This is a subjective interpretation of the condition and usually anything less than Good-Excellent and Intact are cause for concern to prevent exposures to lead-containing particulates.

LEAD IN DUST WIPE SAMPLES

The Inspector took eleven (11) dust "wipe samples" to ascertain if there was lead in ambient dusts in the tested areas. Every one of the samples had lead level of <5 micrograms/ft^2. I opine that this was the detection limit of the analytical laboratory.

The US EPS revised allowable lead in dust levels for post-abatement works last year and the new standards went into effect January 6, 2020. The present allowable levels for lead-in-dust following an abatement action are 10 micrograms/ft^2. Hence, the exploratory samples had lead levels less than half the amount that would be allowed had lead abatement had been done.

SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS:

The XRF results demonstrate that three (3) of the tested surfaces contained lead above regulatory levels set by New York State and New York City. Therefore, I conclude with a reasonable degree of scientific and environmental engineering certainty that lead-based paint, as defined by applicable regulatory standards, was present in the building located at 235 East 5th Street, New York, NY.

The lead-in-dust wipe samples contained lead at levels less than one-half the allowable amount had a lead abatement action been done.

LIMITATIONS**:**

The testing results are applicable only to the time that testing was conducted and cannot be considered applicable to future conditions and I cannot offer a judgment on whether lead is or is not present on surfaces that were not tested.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,
Martin S. Rutstein *(electronic signature)*

Martin S. Rutstein, Ph.D.
Professor (retired) & Consultant

Attach.: XRF Data
Lead in Dust Wipes