Message

From: Cook, Steven [cook.steven@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/26/2019 12:30:47 PM
To: Drinkard, Andrea [Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov]; Gray, David [gray.david@epa.gov]; Forsgren, Lee [Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov]; Dunn, Alexandra [dunn.alexandra@epa.gov]; Orme-Zavaleta, Jennifer [Orme-Zavaleta.Jennifer@epa.gov]; Konkus, John [konkus.john@epa.gov]; Schiermeyer, Corry [schiermeyer.corry@epa.gov]
CC: Idsal, Anne [idsal.anne@epa.gov]; Chancellor, Erin [chancellor.erin@epa.gov]; Grantham, Nancy [Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov]; Rodrick, Christian [rodrick.christian@epa.gov]; Wadlington, Christina [Wadlington.Christina@epa.gov]; Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]; Kramer, Jessica L. [kramer.jessical@epa.gov]; Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Mattas-Curry, Lahne [Mattas-Curry.Lahne@epa.gov]; Thomas, Latosha [Thomas.Latosha@epa.gov]; Perovich, Gina [Perovich.Gina@epa.gov]; Gillespie, Andrew [Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov]; Cheatham, Reggie [cheatham.reggie@epa.gov]; Clark, Becki [Clark.Becki@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW: ITC Response Assistance PFAS Fact Sheet/Statement

Andrea –

OLEM has no further edits at this time.

Thanks

From: Drinkard, Andrea
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2019 3:59 PM
To: Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov>; Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>; Dunn, Alexandra <dunn.alexandra@epa.gov>; Cook, Steven <cook.steven@epa.gov>; Orme-Zavaleta, Jennifer <Orme-Zavaleta.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Schiermeyer, Corry <schiermeyer.corry@epa.gov>
Cc: Idsal, Anne <idsal.anne@epa.gov>; Chancellor, Erin <chancellor.erin@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>; Wadlington, Christina <Wadlington.Christina@epa.gov>; Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; Kramer, Jessica L. <kramer.jessical@epa.gov>; Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Mattas-Curry, Lahne <Mattas-Curry.Lahne@epa.gov>; Thomas, Latosha <Thomas.Latosha@epa.gov>; Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>; Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>; Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>; Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>
Subject: FOR REVIEW: ITC Response Assistance PFAS Fact Sheet/Statement

Hi all—

In response to David's request for communications support, I worked with ORD, OW, Region 6 and OEM staff to develop the attached fact sheet. David plans to post the fact sheet on the EPA response website for the ITC fire and share it with his stakeholder group. Any input that I have received from your staff has been incorporated into the attached draft. Please provide any additional feedback that you may have by **tomorrow, Tuesday, March 26 by 1:00PM EDT.**

I am also including two INTERNAL ONLY Q&As below for your review as well.

Thanks and please let me or David know if you have any questions.

-Andrea-

QUESTION 1: Why does it take so long to get sampling results on PFAS when Benzene are posted within 24 hours?

EPA is working with laboratories to process samples and provide the public with the results of the sampling as quickly as possibles. The time it takes for laboratories to analyze specific chemicals varies. The analytical methodology for PFAS is more complex and takes more time than the methodology for benzene. On average it should take approximately five

days for the laboratory to process the samples. EPA will make the data available to the public immediately following receipt of the data from the laboratory.

QUESTION 2: EPA is sampling water and so is TCEQ and others. Why are the sampling results different?

The differences in reported concentrations are due to several factors. The location and time samples are collected, the sampling procedures followed, the analytical methods all contribute to the differences we see in concentration. For example, water samples taken a few feet away from each other may experience very different physical and chemical conditions depending on river or bayou bottom contours, currents, gradient and other factors.

From: Gray, David
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2019 6:33 PM
To: Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>; Dunn, Alexandra <dunn.alexandra@epa.gov>; Cook, Steven <cook.steven@epa.gov>; Orme-Zavaleta, Jennifer <Orme-Zavaleta.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Cc: Idsal, Anne <idsal.anne@epa.gov>; Chancellor, Erin <chancellor.erin@epa.gov>; Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>; Wadlington, Christina <Wadlington.Christina@epa.gov>; Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; Kramer, Jessica L. <kramer.jessical@epa.gov>; Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Subject: ITC Response Assistance

Good afternoon,

We need your assistance. We are continuing to make good strides in our response efforts at ITC in Deer Park, Texas. Attention is turning to the use of AFFF materials to extinguish the fire and their possible environmental impacts. While the fire is out, AFFF is being used vapor suppression. We will need some assistance with the related PFAS questions and guidance. OCIR is already hearing questions from hill and committee staff about the AFFF use. I expect more questions will be raised at upcoming hearings as well as an increase in media attention within a few days.

Here are a few of my initial thoughts -

- Region 6 is working to determine which foams have been used. So far, we have received two product sheets in response to our requests (attached). We could use help determining whether PFAS is in each of the foams that have been used.
- Suggestions on what questions need to be asked of responders or what information would be helpful to have on hand as we gather information about other foams.
- AFFF is suspected to have entered into Tucker Bayou as there have been reports of foam in the water. ITC, TCEQ and EPA are collecting water samples. Any advice from HQ on that sampling to help ensure we get the data we need using the appropriate methods.
- We could use communications support both to develop a holding statement and rapid-response to questions from the hill/press/public.
- Advice on cleanup considerations that we need ITC to conduct post emergency response. We are already being asked if the site could become a Superfund site due to AFFF use.

Thanks everyone.

David