

Message

---

**From:** Jones, Enesta [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=65B8E6C6E5CA4A7A9AE85D98A4C8EEDB-EJONES02]  
**Sent:** 6/8/2018 2:08:23 PM  
**To:** Ex. 6  
**CC:** Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]  
**Subject:** Re: EPA's position on PFOA -- Chicago Booth Review magazine -- SEEKING COMMENT

**Alina,**

**“The National Leadership Summit on PFAS provided an unprecedented opportunity for stakeholders to share vital information and best practices regarding PFAS challenges across the nation,”** said EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. **“EPA will utilize the information discussed at the historic summit, along with upcoming visits to affected communities, to develop a National PFAS Management Plan. The Agency will also take concrete actions to ensure PFAS is thoroughly addressed and all Americans have access to clean and safe drinking water.”**

**“EPA remains committed to evaluating PFOA and PFOS during the regulatory determination process as quickly as feasible.”** – EPA Spokesperson

**On background:**

Administrator Pruitt announced four actions EPA will take following the summit:

- EPA will initiate steps to evaluate the need for a maximum contaminant level (MCL) for PFOA and PFOS. We will convene our federal partners and examine everything we know about PFOA and PFOS in drinking water.
- EPA is beginning the necessary steps to propose designating PFOA and PFOS as “hazardous substances” through one of the available statutory mechanisms, including potentially CERCLA Section 102.
- EPA is currently developing groundwater cleanup recommendations for PFOA and PFOS at contaminated sites and will complete this task by fall of this year.
- EPA is taking action in close collaboration with our federal and state partners to develop toxicity values for GenX and PFBS by this summer.

As noted by the Administrator, we are taking steps to accelerate the process prior to the timing noted in the background previously sent. EPA is currently conducting the scientific data collection and analysis called for under the Safe Drinking Water Act to evaluate PFOA and PFOS. EPA will consider occurrence data along with health effects information to determine whether or not to initiate the process to develop a National Primary Drinking Water Regulation (NPDWR) under its Regulatory Determination process 4.

The Safe Drinking Water Act requires EPA to make regulatory determinations for at least five contaminants from the most recent CCL (published in 2016) within five years after the completion of the previous round of regulatory determinations (published in 2016).

EPA included PFOA and PFOS on the fourth Contaminant Candidate List (CCL). Additionally, approximately 5,000 public water systems monitored drinking water for PFOA, PFOS, and four other PFAS between 2013-2015 as part of the third cycle of the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR 3).

EPA is currently conducting the analysis called for under the Safe Drinking Water Act to evaluate PFOA and PFOS. EPA will consider occurrence data along with health effects information to determine whether or not to make a positive preliminary regulatory determination under its Regulatory Determination 4 process, which is the first step in the SDWA process to develop a National Primary Drinking Water Regulation (NPDWR).

More information is [here](#).

**From:** Alina Dizik <Ex. 6>

**Date:** June 4, 2018 at 10:58:59 AM CDT

**To:** [Rowan.Ann@epa.gov](mailto:Rowan.Ann@epa.gov)

**Subject:** Re: EPA's position on PFOA -- Chicago Booth Review magazine -- SEEKING COMMENT

Hi Anne,

Wanted to check back on this.

Thanks,

Alina

On Wed, May 30, 2018 at 3:37 PM, Alina Dizik <Ex. 6> wrote:

Hi Anne,

I'm writing a story about this [research](#) by University of Chicago Booth School of Business professor Luigi Zingales. It's about PFOA/C8.

When I reached out to DuPont for comment, they mentioned that the EPA still has not concluded that PFOA/C8 is a proven cause of the health conditions claimed in

the C8 litigation and still does not regulate the concentrations of C8 in drinking water. Is that technically correct?

Or is there anything else I should keep in mind about that background info?

I saw this EPA fact-sheet on it and wanted to make sure there was nothing further.

Thanks,

Alina

---

Alina Dizik

**Ex. 6**

--

**Ex. 6**