Message

From: Strauss, Linda [Strauss.Linda@epa.gov]
Sent: 10/3/2018 12:51:02 AM
To: Ortiz, Julia [Ortiz.Julia@epa.gov]
CC: Beck, Nancy [Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]; Bertrand, Charlotte [Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov]; Baptist, Erik [Baptist.Erik@epa.gov]; Parsons, Doug [Parsons.Douglas@epa.gov]; Dunton, Cheryl [Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov]; Pierce, Alison [Pierce.Alison@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: ACTION: The Intercept re follow-up on PFAS

The reporter has been pinging on this.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 2, 2018, at 7:03 PM, Ortiz, Julia <Ortiz.Julia@epa.gov> wrote:

> The non-CBI numbers would have to be pulled by a contractor, which would involve time and expense. The reporter had asked for a quick turnaround originally and we were trying to get her whatever we could on short notice. It now appears that her timeline is more flexible. Would you like us to obtain that set of numbers?
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Oct 1, 2018, at 5:40 PM, Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov> wrote:
>
>> Why can we provide year by year for CBI but not the non-CBI?
>>
>> Thanks.
>>
>> _____
>> Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
>> Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP
>> P: 202-564-1273
>> M: 202-731-9910
>> beck.nancy@epa.gov
>>
>> **From:** Strauss, Linda
>> **Sent:** Monday, October 1, 2018 1:22 PM
>> **To:** Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>; Baptist, Erik <Baptist.Erik@epa.gov>; Parsons, Doug <Parsons.Douglas@epa.gov>; Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>; Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>; Ortiz, Julia <Ortiz.Julia@epa.gov>
>> **Subject:** RE: ACTION: The Intercept re follow-up on PFAS
>>
>> Nancy/Charlotte/Erik, sorry if Doug already passed on to you on Friday. Let us know if you have edits about the below response. Thanks.
>>
>> 1) I know that the chemical inventory has been in the process of being updated. Do these numbers reflect the fully updated inventory? Or is that process still underway and thus could these numbers soon be bigger once the inventory is completed?

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

2) During what period of time were the 907 PFAS you mention received and reviewed by the New Chemicals Program? Can you please break them down by year?

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

3) If I'm understanding you correctly, there are 672 PFAS on the inventory that did not come through the PMN process. Am I right to assume that that means that they entered the inventory through low volume exemptions or some other exemptions? If not, how did they get on the inventory? And can I get a breakdown by year of when those PFAS entered the inventory?

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

4) For the PFAS that aren't active, what does that mean exactly? Were they never active? Or were they active and then subsequently withdrawn?

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

5) According to the information you provided below, there are 43 CBI PFAS that didn't go through new chemicals program. How did those PFAS get on inventory? Did they predate TSCA because they've been in commerce since 1976? If so, why would their names still be CBI? Or did they get on the inventory some other way? And, if so, how did they get get on the inventory?

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

6) I had asked whether some of the 672 PFAS on the inventory that did not come through the PMN process might have entered the inventory through low volume exemptions or some other exemptions. And then I asked to get a breakdown by year. I want to be clear that, if some of the PFAS did in fact get LVE or other exemptions, I'd like to know HOW MANY may have gotten those exemptions as part of the breakdown by year they entered the inventory.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Jones, Enesta
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2018 9:40 AM
To: Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>; Ortiz, Julia <Ortiz.Julia@epa.gov>; Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>
Cc: Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ACTION: The Intercept re follow-up on PFAS

EOD is fine, she says.

She added this one:
I had asked whether some of the 672 PFAS on the inventory that did not come through the PMN process might have entered the inventory through low volume exemptions or some other exemptions. And then I asked to get a breakdown by year. I want to be clear that, if some of the PFAS did in fact get LVE or other exemptions, I'd like to know HOW MANY may have gotten those exemptions as part of the breakdown by year they entered the inventory.

From: Jones, Enesta
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2018 9:02 AM
To: Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>; Ortiz, Julia <Ortiz.Julia@epa.gov>; Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>
Cc: Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ACTION: The Intercept re follow-up on PFAS

All, she added two questions.

For the PFAS that aren't active, what does that mean exactly? Were they never active? Or were they active and then subsequently withdrawn?

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Jones, Enesta
Sent: Monday, September 17, 2018 5:38 PM
To: Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>; Ortiz, Julia <Ortiz.Julia@epa.gov>; Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>
Cc: Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: ACTION: The Intercept re follow-up on PFAS

Hi All, the reporter — Sharon Lerner — has returned with follow-up that is due at noon on Sept. 21.

DDL is noon on 9/21.

1) I know that the chemical inventory has been in the process of being updated. Do these numbers reflect the fully updated inventory? Or is that process still underway and thus could these numbers soon be bigger once the inventory is completed?

2) During what period of time were the 907 PFAS you mention received and reviewed by the New Chemicals Program? Can you please break them down by year?

3) If I'm understanding you correctly, there are 672 PFAS on the inventory that did not

come through the PMN process. Am I right to assume that that means that they entered the inventory through low volume exemptions or some other exemptions? If not, how did they get on the inventory? And can I get a breakdown by year of when those PFAS entered the inventory?

From: "Strauss, Linda" <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>
Date: August 14, 2018 at 8:05:52 AM EDT
To: "Daguillard, Robert" <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>, "Jones, Enesta" <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Cc: "Ortiz, Julia" <Ortiz.Julia@epa.gov>, "Pierce, Alison" <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>, "Dunton, Cheryl" <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>, "Parsons, Doug" <Parsons.Douglas@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: ACTION: The Intercept re PFAS

And this one.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Jones, Enesta
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2018 11:15 AM
To: Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>; Ortiz, Julia <Ortiz.Julia@epa.gov>; Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>
Cc: Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: ACTION: The Intercept re PFAS

All,

Reporter: Sharon Lerner
DDL: 8/10, noon

On EPA's website --https://www.epa.gov/pfas/pfas-laws-and-regulations -- it says that there are 478 PFAS on the TSCA Inventory

(though the inventory is still "interim" due to inventory reset), 294 of which have been added to the inventory since 2006.

> In particular, it says: **330** non-CBI PFAS are listed on the Interim Updated TSCA Inventory. In addition, **148** CBI PFAS are reported.

But at the recent PFAS Summit, Jeff Morris, director of OPPT, reported that "[n]early 900 new PFAS chemicals have come through EPA's TSCA program since 2006." https://www.epa.gov/pfas/pfas-national-leadership-summit-materials

Can you please help me understand this discrepancy? In particular, he says that 900 new PFAS "came through" the TSCA program. Yet the website indicates that only 294 PFAS have been added to the inventory since 2006. What happened to the other 606 PFAS that "came through" the program if they weren't added to the TSCA inventory? Were they exempted for some reason? Did EPA refuse to approve them for distribution in commerce?