

## ECOS PFAS Coordinating Committee Call

July 11, 2018, 2 p.m. Eastern

**State Partners** - Aubrey White (AL, filling in for Lance Lefleur), Marty Suuberg (MA), Heidi Grether (MI), John Stine (MN), Jim Macy (NE), Catherine McCabe (NJ), Amy Klei (OH, filling in for Craig Butler), Scott Thompson (OK), Peter Walke (VT, filling in for Julie Moore)

**Federal Partners**- Maureen Sullivan (DoD), Donna Knutson (CDC/ATSDR, filling in for Pat Breyse), Peter Grevatt (EPA OGWDW), Ellen Manges (EPA OLEM), Andy Gillespie (EPA ORD), Randall Lovell (FDA, filling in for Suzanne Fitzpatrick), Paul South (FDA). NIEHS was not on the call.

**ECOS** - Sam Sankar, Sarah Grace Longsworth, Tadbir Singh

### Federal Updates

#### 1. DoD

- a. DoD is in the process of moving \$10 million to ATSDR through an interagency agreement to conduct exposure assessments. ATSDR is in the process of deciding the criteria for selecting a minimum of 8 current or former military sites for studies. They will announce the final selection by September 30 (end of Fiscal Year).
- b. Multiple DoD facilities are in the remedial investigation and feasibility study (RI/FS) phase of the CERCLA process and are looking forward to EPA OLEM's study.
- c. DoD is responding to various requests from Congress as they move thru "conference" on both the FY19 Authorization and Appropriations bills. The Department expects more in defense appropriations for PFOS/PFOA in FY19.

#### 2. CDC/ATSDR

- a. Since its release of its draft tox profile, ATSDR has received less than 20 comments. 3 of the requests were for 60-day extensions. The agency plans to offer a 30-day extension, as 80 percent of the profile has already been extensively reviewed.

#### 3. EPA

- a. EPA emphasized that the recent change in Administration leadership will not impact PFAS as one of the agency's top priorities.
- b. [OW] On the last call, EPA discussed its development of draft toxicity values for GenX and PFBS. These tox profiles are currently undergoing peer review and are expected to be returned by early August. After obtaining comments from states and federal partners, EPA plans to post the draft values on its website in September for public comment.
- c. [OLEM] EPA is continuing work on developing groundwater cleanup goals, as well as exploring the possibility of listing PFOA and PFOS as hazardous substances under CERCLA and/or another statute.

- d. [OW] EPA held its first public engagement event on PFAS in Exeter, NH on June 25-26. There was robust community participation. Upcoming public engagements include:
  - i. Horsham, PA (July 25)
  - ii. Near Fountain, CO (August)
  - iii. Fayetteville, NC (August)
  - iv. Spokane, WA (Tribal) (September)
  - v. Fort Leavenworth, KS (September)EPA noted that the agency is receiving many congressional requests from states interested in hosting a community engagement event in one of their impacted communities. At some point, the agency will draw the line to focus on writing its national PFAS management plan.
- e. [ORD] recently updated its [drinking water treatability database](#) to identify successful strategies for remediating drinking water contaminated with PFNA, PFHxA, PFHxS, and PFBS. PFOA and PFOS were already in the database.
- f. [OW] EPA is exploring the issue of PFAS contamination through land application of wastewater biosolids.

#### **4. FDA**

- a. Building on discussion from the last call, FDA is moving ahead with developing methods for estimating dietary exposure for PFAS through the “total dietary sample” method, wherein they collect and prepare table-ready food samples, analyze the samples for dietary exposures (in this case PFAS), and compare them to a survey data map.
- b. FDA is continuing its pharmacokinetic studies for PFAS grease-proofing agents in food packaging.

### **State Updates**

#### **1. Michigan**

- a. MI is testing 1380 public water systems and 460 schools with their own wells. This effort was launched in May, and will be completed by the end of the calendar year. DEQ will post a spreadsheet of the results on its website.
- b. MI is continuing to investigate foam (reconstituted from groundwater) on several surface water bodies throughout the state (for example, one river near Grand Rapids has foam with PFOA/PFOS measuring at concentrations greater than 260,000 ppt). The agency is working on a pilot project near Grayling Oscoda to study the removal of foam. They will use a vac truck to see if they can take foam off of the lake and neutralize the contamination.
- c. MI is continuing to add sites (i.e. airports) where PFAS is over 70 ppt.

- d. MPART put together multi-agency subgroups/workgroups to focus on certain areas (e.g. lab standards, biosolids, air quality, pollution prevention, surface water, groundwater, drinking water, wastewater, and treatment technologies. etc.)
  - e. MI staff are visiting MN this week to exchange best practices and lessons learned.
2. **Massachusetts**
- a. MA is working closely with 3 communities impacted by PFAS contamination (Westfield, Devens, and Ayer). They are attempting to save wells, but need treatments. MA is encouraged by the letter EPA sent to DoD.
3. **Vermont**
- a. VT ANR [announced](#) on July 10 that the VT Department of Health updated its health advisory for drinking water of 20 ppt to include 3 additional PFAS (PFHxS, PFHpA, and PFNA) for a cumulative total of 5 compounds. The 20 ppt was previously just the sum of PFOA and PFOS concentrations.
  - b. VT is testing schools for PFAS in onsite supplies.
4. **Ohio**
- a. OH is compiling a PFAS team. The first task is to survey certified fire training facilities with known use of PFAS foam.
  - b. OH is talking with various departments to determine if they will stick with their current standards.
5. **Alabama**
- a. AL is in the process of installing GAC systems in 2 of its water systems. They have noticed a recent increase in PFOA and PFOS concentrations in that water.
6. **New Jersey**
- a. By August 7, NJ must decide if it will finalize its rule for the proposed MCL for PFNA of 13 ppt.
  - b. In the Fall, NJ will turn its decision-making attention to the possibility of rules for MCLs for PFOA (14 ppt) and PFOS (13 ppt).
7. **Oklahoma**
- a. OK put in a request for the Region 6 laboratory in Houston to obtain the capacity to do its own PFAS testing, as that is lacking in the region.
  - b. OK is seeking a compository of state sampling protocols. An example of one state's guidance is below. **If you have state sampling protocols to share, please email them to Sarah Grace Longworth ([slongsworth@ecos.org](mailto:slongsworth@ecos.org)).**
    - i. New Hampshire:  
<https://www.des.nh.gov/organization/commissioner/documents/pfas-sample-guidance-201611.pdf>
- Furthermore, ITRC has a [Fact Sheet](#) on Site Characterization Considerations, Sampling Precautions, and Laboratory Analytical Methods for PFAS.

8. **Minnesota**

- a. MN is looking forward to hosting MI staff this week. EPA leadership will call into the meetings.
- b. MN is hosting its first round of stakeholder meetings to conduct a natural resources damages assessment for PFAS.
- c. MN has ongoing response actions for drinking water systems throughout the state. More information can be found on the [MN Department of Health website](#).