

These on-site inspections of water systems are more effective in assuring safe water to the public than individual tests taken in the absence of sanitary surveys. The regulations provide that monitoring frequencies for coliform bacteria can be changed by the entity with primary enforcement responsibility for an individual non-community system, and in certain circumstances for an individual community system, based on the results of a sanitary survey.

MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVELS

Numerous comments were received by EPA on the substances selected for the establishment of maximum contaminant levels and on the levels chosen. Congress anticipated that the initial Interim Primary Drinking Water Regulations would be based on the Public Health Service Standards of 1962, and this Congressional intent has been followed. Comments received on the various levels did not contain new data sufficient to require the establishment of levels different from those contained in the Public Health Service Standards.

WATER CONSUMPTION

The maximum contaminant levels are based, directly or indirectly, on an assumed consumption of two liters of water per day. The same assumption was used in the 1962 Standards. This assumption has been challenged because of instances where much higher water consumption rates occur. EPA's justification for using the two-liter figure is that it already represents an above average water or water-based fluid intake. Moreover, while the factor of safety may be somewhat reduced when greater quantities of water are ingested, the maximum contaminant levels based on the two-liter figure provide substantial protection to virtually all consumers. If, as has been suggested, a water consumption rate of eight liters per day is used as the basis for maximum contaminant level, all of the proposed MCL's would have to be divided by four, greatly increasing the monitoring difficulties, and in some cases challenging the sensitivity of accepted analytical procedures. It could be expected, in such a case, that the maximum contaminant level would be exceeded to a significant degree, and that specialized treatment techniques would be required to order that the contaminant levels would be reduced. The economic impact of a move in this direction would be enormous. It is not technically or economically feasible to base maximum contaminant levels on unusually high consumption rates.

SAFETY FACTORS

A question was raised about the fact that different safety factors are contained in various maximum contaminant levels. The levels are not intended to have a uniform safety factor, at least partly because the knowledge of and the nature of the health risks of the various contaminants vary widely. The levels set are the result of experience, evaluation of the available data, and professional

judgment. They have withstood the test of time and of professional review. They are being subjected to further review by the National Academy of Sciences in connection with development of data for the Revised Primary Drinking Water Regulations.

MCL'S BASED ON TEMPERATURE

A question was also raised as to whether ranges of maximum contaminant levels should be established on the basis of the climate in the area served by the public water system, as was done with fluoride. EPA believes that the use of a temperature scale for fluoride is more appropriate than for other chemicals because of the studies available on the fluoride-temperature relationship and because there is a small margin with fluoride between beneficial levels and levels that cause adverse health effects.

MCL'S DELETED

Three proposed maximum contaminant levels have been eliminated in the final regulations because they are not justified by the available data. One of these is carbon chloroform extract (CCE), which is discussed separately below. The others are the proposed levels for the standard bacterial plate count and cyanide. In the case of the plate count, it is believed that the coliform limits contained in the regulations, combined with the turbidity maximum contaminant level, adequately deal with bacterial contamination. However, EPA continues to believe that the standard plate count is a valid indicator of bacteriological quality of drinking water, and recommends that it be used in appropriate cases in conjunction with the coliform tests as an operational tool.

The proposed maximum contaminant level for cyanide was eliminated because the possibility of cyanide contamination can be effectively addressed only by the use of emergency action, such as under Section 1431 of the Act. EPA's 1969 Community Water Supply Study did not reveal a single instance in which cyanide was present in a water system at a level greater than one-thousandth of the level at which cyanide is toxic to humans.

Available data indicate that cyanide will be present in water systems at toxic levels only in the event of an accident, such as a spill from a barge collision. Maximum contaminant levels are not the appropriate vehicle for dealing with such rare accidental contamination.

Heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide and chlordane have also been removed from the list of maximum contaminant levels at least temporarily in view of the pending cancellation and suspension proceedings under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act involving these pesticides. When the results of these proceedings are available, EPA will again consider whether maximum contaminant levels should be established for those three pesticides.

SODIUM AND SULFATES

A number of comments were received on the potential health effects of sodium

and sulfates. The National Drinking Water Advisory Council has recommended that consideration be given to the monitoring of these constituents, but has not recommended the adoption of maximum contaminant levels because available data do not support the adoption of any specific levels. EPA has requested the National Academy of Sciences to include sodium and sulfates among the contaminants to be studied by NAS, and to include information on the health effects of sodium and sulfates in the report to be made by NAS in December 1976.

Since a number of persons suffer from diseases which are influenced by dietary sodium intake and since there are others who wish to restrict their sodium intake, it is desirable that the sodium content of drinking water be known. Those affected can, by knowing the sodium concentration in their drinking water, make adjustments to their diets or, in extreme cases, seek alternative sources of water to be used for drinking and food preparation. It is recommended that the States institute programs for regular monitoring of the sodium content of drinking water served to the public, and for informing physicians and consumers of the sodium concentration in drinking water.

A relatively high concentration of sulfate in drinking water has little or no known laxative effect on regular users of the water, but transients using such water sometimes experience a laxative effect. It is recommended that the States institute monitoring programs for sulfates, and that transients be notified if the sulfate content of the water is high. Such notification should include an assessment of the possible physiological effects of consumption of the water.

PCB'S AND ASBESTOS

An interagency comment expressed concern for asbestos and PCB's in the environment and noted the need for at least a monitoring requirement, if not for MCL's, for these contaminants. EPA is also concerned, but for the moment lacks sufficient evidence regarding analytical methods, health effects, or occurrence in the environment to establish MCL's. The Agency is conducting research and cooperating in research projects to develop criteria for establishing needed limits as quickly as possible. A monitoring study on a number of organic chemical contaminants, including PCB's, for which MCL's are not being established at this time, will be contained in an organic chemical monitoring regulation that is being promulgated with these regulations. Regarding asbestos, HEW and EPA are sponsoring a number of studies this year at an approximate cost of \$16 million to establish health effects, analytical methods and occurrence.

POINT OF MEASUREMENT

Other comments on maximum contaminant levels focused on the proposed requirement that such levels be tested at the consumer's tap. Concern was expressed over the inability of the public water system to control potential sources

COMPLIANCE - GUIDELINES
Drinking Water Standards

1976 - 1981 (I.H.)

811.5.1

LAM 015951