Message

From: Baptist, Erik [Baptist.Erik@epa.gov]
Sent: 10/25/2018 2:22:40 PM
To: Bertrand, Charlotte [Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov]; Beck, Nancy [Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW // Response to Politico on PFAS

Looks good to me.

Erik Baptist
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1201 Constitution Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20460
Personal Phone / Ex. 6
baptist.erik@epa.gov

From: Bertrand, Charlotte
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 10:12 AM
To: Baptist, Erik <Baptist.Erik@epa.gov>; Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: FOR REVIEW // Response to Politico on PFAS

Suggest to move a couple of sentences.

From: Konkus, John
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 8:14 AM
To: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Baptist, Erik <Baptist.Erik@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>
Cc: Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>; Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>
Subject: FOR REVIEW // Response to Politico on PFAS

Charlotte, Nancy and Erik: Good morning. Ryan asked that you all please review and edit this draft response to Politico's question below. The reporter's deadline is later today. Thank you.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Annie Snider [mailto:asnider@politico.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2018 4:37 PM

To: Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>
Cc: Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>; Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>
Subject: Responsible Science Policy Coalition & PFOA/PFOS

Ryan, I am looking into a group called the Responsible Science Policy Coalition that has been lobbying on PFOA/PFOS regulation, questioning the science around the chemicals causing harm to humans. I understand the group, and its primary backer, 3M, came into EPA for at least two meetings with Richard Yamada over the late summer/early fall, and possibly others with the water office, and that this is a matter that's on your radar. My sense is that there is a divide within industry about how to approach this issue; obviously ACC is on the record backing the current EPA approach to evaluating and possibly regulating the two legacy chemicals.

I'm hoping you can comment on a few things for me:

1 – confirm that EPA officials have met with the group
2 – comment on their line of argument – that PFOA and PFOS aren't proven to be harmful to humans at current exposure levels
3 – comment on what influence industry will have in the EPA process of evaluating the chemicals and potentially proceeding with regulations. Industry sources tell me that part of the reason much of the chemicals industry is on board with the EPA efforts is because they think the Trump administration will produce industry-friendly standards.

I'm shooting to wrap up reporting by COB tomorrow. I'm on my cell if you want to discuss.

Best,
Annie