

Message

From: Jones, Enesta [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=65B8E6C6E5CA4A7A9AE85D98A4C8EEDB-EJONES02]
Sent: 1/5/2018 9:43:16 PM
To: BuschN@cbsnews.com
CC: Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]
Subject: RE: CBS News Inquiry

Hi Nicole, attributable to an EPA spokesperson:

I'd like to know what factors went into the determination in the latest health advisory that 70 ppt (combined) is the new safe exposure limit?

The 70ppt for PFOA and/or PFOS was based on a calculation that incorporated toxicity and exposure factors. The factors include body weight, drinking water intake, and level of exposure from non-drinking water sources. EPA's health advisories are non-regulatory and reflect EPA's assessment of the best available peer-reviewed science.

Why, at this point is it considered a health advisory as opposed to a contaminant regulated?

EPA has not yet made a determination to regulate PFAS under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA). SDWA requires that to regulate a contaminant, the Agency must first make a determination (considering public comment) that the contaminant may have adverse health effects, occurs in public water systems frequently at levels of health concern and presents a meaningful opportunity for health risk reduction. See <https://www.epa.gov/ccl/basic-information-ccl-and-regulatory-determination> for more information about regulatory determinations. EPA will consider available PFAS occurrence data along with health effects information as part of the agency's regulatory determinations process to further evaluate the need for a National Primary Drinking Water Regulation (NPDWR).

Is there a limit established for the shorter chain PFCs in use now?

EPA does not currently have a health advisories or drinking water regulations for shorter chain PFCs. The agency's water and research offices are leading a cross-agency work group to:

- Identify a set of near-term actions that EPA will take to help support local communities.
- Enhance coordination with states, tribes and federal partners to provide communities with critical information and tools to address PFAS.
- Increase ongoing research efforts to identify new methods for measuring PFAS and filling data gaps.
- Expand proactive communications efforts with states, tribes, partners and the American public about PFAS and their health effects.

Confirm the EPA In 2000 called for a phaseout of PFCs (is this specific to PFOS) and later declared they were "likely to be carcinogenic to humans"

In May of 2000, the Agency announced that "EPA will be contacting foreign governments and other chemical manufacturers, both domestically and internationally, to seek their support for a voluntary phaseout of PFOS and related chemicals." See this [May 2000 Press Release](#).

Since then, EPA has taken a range of voluntary and regulatory actions to address concerns with PFOA, another PFAS, including a PFOA Stewardship Program that was launched in 2006 with the eight major companies in the industry committing to work toward eliminating emissions and product content of PFOA by 2015. Learn more at <https://www.epa.gov/assessing-and-managing-chemicals-under-tsca/risk-management-and-polyfluoroalkyl-substances-pfass>.

The Agency has not declared they are likely to be carcinogenic to humans; the risk for cancer is characterized as *suggestive* for both PFOA and PFOS based on the animal data. More information on the health effects of PFAS can be found at <https://www.epa.gov/pfas/basic-information-about-and-polyfluoroalkyl-substances-pfass#tab-3>.

Are there any plans to do continued monitoring of PFC contamination in drinking water sources going forward?

EPA required water systems to monitor for six PFAs under the third Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR 3). See <https://www.epa.gov/dwucmr> for more information about UCMR. A primary purpose of the UCMR is to gather nationally representative data on the frequency and level of occurrence of contaminants to inform the Agency's regulatory determinations under the Safe Drinking Water Act. We believe that the occurrence data collected under UCMR 3 provides a robust data set to support the Agency's future decision making. If the agency decides to regulate a contaminant then the Agency would propose and issue requirements, including any monitoring requirements, at that time.

From: "Busch, Nicole" <BuschN@cbsnews.com>

Date: January 4, 2018 at 2:26:16 PM EST

To: "'Jones, Enesta'" <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: CBS News Inquiry

Thanks Enesta.

Yes, I am with the national news.

I'd like to know what factors went into the determination in the latest health advisory that 70 ppt (combined) is the new safe exposure limit?

Why, at this point is it considered a health advisory as opposed to a contaminant regulated?

Is there a limit established for the shorter chain PFCs in use now?

Confirm the EPA In 2000 called for a phaseout of PFCs (is this specific to PFOS) and later declared they were "likely to be carcinogenic to humans"

Are there any plans to do continued monitoring of PFC contamination in drinking water sources going forward?

We plan to air the piece on Monday. Tomorrow 5pm would be our deadline.

Thank you,

Nicole

From: Jones, Enesta [<mailto:Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2018 2:15 PM

To: Busch, Nicole <BuschN@cbsnews.com>

Subject: Re: CBS News Inquiry

Hi Nicole, are you with the National News? Can you please send your specific questions and hard deadline?

On Jan 4, 2018, at 2:13 PM, Busch, Nicole <BuschN@cbsnews.com> wrote:

Hello,

I am a producer for CBS This Morning. We are working on a story about PFC contamination in the Fountain- Widefield community south of Colorado Springs.

I would like to speak to someone from the EPA regarding the Unregulated Contaminants in Drinking Water program – and the recent health advisory concerning PFCs.

Please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Thank you,

Nicole

Ex. 6