Message

From: Lindstrom, Andrew [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=04BF7CF26AA44CE29763FBC1C1B2338E-LINDSTROM, ANDREW]
Sent: 3/14/2016 1:28:32 PM
To: Laurel Schaider [schaider@silentspring.org]
Subject: RE: PFAS manufacturing plants

Laurel,

I've been told to stop working on the PFAS many times over the past 4 years.

And while I have been allowed to participate at Fluoros and various GSPI meetings, but I wouldn't call it support.

I've kept working with the PFAS because I keep getting requests for information and involvement from outside groups.

Our research planning process is designed to place emphasis on topics that sound good but have little practical impact in the near term. Instead of packing up and moving our mobile lab to Flint, we are working on high throughput screening of important exposure-related matrices. I don't understand how that is ever going to help people who are being poisoned right now.

You don't have to go far to find environmental problems that are affecting people's lives. It seems like we'd rather work on things that have little immediate impact.

Thank you very much,

Andy

From: Laurel Schaider [mailto:schaider@silentspring.org]
Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 11:34 PM
To: Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: PFAS manufacturing plants

Hi Andy,

Wow, that is so disheartening that you're not allowed to speak openly. It's not like you're working for the CIA. Do they try to stop you from going to FLUOROS or GSPI meetings?

I guess one article doesn't change things amidst the sheer volume of information that comes at us daily, but right now there is a lot of momentum on PFASs and this article contributes a really important perspective.

Thanks,
Laurel

--
Laurel Schaider, PhD
Research Scientist

Silent Spring Institute
Leading environmental health research to identify opportunities for prevention
320 Nevada Street, Suite 302
Newton, MA 02460
(617) 332-4288 ext 224
www.silentspring.org

On Fri, Mar 11, 2016 at 3:04 PM, Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov> wrote:

Laurel,

Thank you very much.

I have a lot of respect for Sharon Lerner. She's a great journalist and she wants to publish the truth.

For me, getting something on The Intercept means a lot. Everybody there is trying to get the truth out into the open air. Lots of good company on that site.

We've had a few close colleagues comment on the story, so I'm happy about that.

The "interview" process with Sharon has made very difficult by the EPA's press policy. We couldn't have a regular speaking interview – this topic is considered too sensitive. We could only respond in writing to Sharon's previously submitted questions. It took about a month to get everything straight. EPA censors what we say and who we speak with. There is no excuse for this. They are afraid of what we might say.

Finally, I don't think this story is going to change anything. The issue of chemical safety and appropriate regulation is just too complicated for the average person to care. We are all so distracted with continuous media exposure and pop culture that we can't think anymore.

Anyway, I'm pretty happy with the article and I'm glad you found it interesting too.

Thank you,

Andy

From: Laurel Schaider [mailto:schaider@silentspring.org]
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 2:33 PM
To: Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov>

Subject: Re: PFAS manufacturing plants

Hi Andy,

Nice article in the Intercept. Hopefully will raise awareness of how much the system is stacked in favor of industry and that instead of proposing to cut the EPA, politicians should actually support EPA to do its job (though maybe the followers of those politicians don't read the Intercept). Have you gotten much reaction to the article?

-Laurel

--

Laurel Schaider, PhD
Research Scientist
Silent Spring Institute
Leading environmental health research to identify opportunities for prevention
320 Nevada Street, Suite 302

Newton, MA 02460
(617) 332-4288 ext 224

www.silentspring.org

On Thu, Mar 3, 2016 at 11:54 AM, Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov> wrote:

Cindy,

I've taken a look at the ten facilities that you've been using as inputs and I've plotted them using Google Maps. I think some of the following observations could help sharpen the model a bit.

1. 3M1, Decatur, AL, 1400 State Docks Rd Decatur, AL 35601, 34.641782, -87.044871

This looks good, but it may be worth noting there are other fluorochemical facilities nearby – Toray and Daikin America. It is very common to have collocated production facilities.

2. 3M2, Cottage Grove, MN, PO Box 33427 St Paul, MN 55133, 44.958597, -92.995353

The Cottage Grove plant which is responsible for most (?) of the emissions in this area is actually at 44.788908, -92.911710. Given the scale of the modeling, I don't know if this is relevant.

3. 3M3, Cordova, IL, 3M 22614 Route 84 N, Cordova, IL 61242, 41.751568, -90.289291

Looks fine.

4. 3M4, Pensacola, FL, 3000 Old Chemstrand Rd, Cantonment, FL 32533, 30.631464, -87.254791

The GPS looks to be about 2 km north of the actual plant – it may be the official outfall point for the plant, I don't know how to tell.

5. 3M5, Columbus, GA, 3M Co 3700 Atlanta Industrial Pkwy NW Atlanta, GA 30331, 33.799707, -84.496028

The GSP tracks to a warehouse looking structure called "Med Supply Partners". There is 3M facility just to the north, but it looks like a warehouse, not a production facility. I am not aware of any 3M fluorochemical production in the Atlanta area or the state of Georgia. I doubt that this site is a major source.

6. 3M6, Guin, AL, 3M Co 6675 US-43 Guin, AL 35563, 33.966864, -87.9024

This looks like a very small production facility and it may not be a major source.

7. DuPont1, Chambers Works in Deepwater, NJ, 603 Heron Dr #1 Bridgeport, NJ 08014, 39.770261, -75.35608

The GPS tracks to the general vicinity but does not appear to correspond to the Chambers Works site.

I think it actually this: 39.691381, -75.503249

8. DuPont2, Washington Works in Parkersburg, WV, 8480 DuPont Rd Washington, WV 26101, 39.266469, -81.665904

Looks fine.

9. DuPont3, Fayetteville, NC, 22828 NC-87 Fayetteville, NC 28306, 34.840297, -78.842319

Looks fine.

10. DuPont4, Little Hocking, OH, E I Dupont De Nemours & Co RR 50 Little Hocking, OH 45742, 39.285488, -81.724003

GSP location is in the woods about 3 km northwest of the DuPont Washington Works plant in Parkersburg, WV. This may be a dump site or some other DuPont holding. It does not look like a major production facility and it is probably redundant given the nearby Washington Works plant.

Points to consider adding:

Solvay Specialty Polymers, 10 Leonard Ln, West Deptford, NJ 08086, 39.844013, -75.209851

This is a known source of PFNA contamination that is apparent in the UCMR3 database.

Arkema America, 4350 Camp Ground Rd, Louisville, KY 40216, 38.211586, -85.844380

There are probably other sites to consider, but we should think about how to do this.

As I said before, I think it would be good to somehow add all of the major sites for the companies participating in the Stewardship Agreement, but I don't think there is a way to do it.

Try plotting BASF on google maps and see how many sites they have across the US. Which of these is important? Probably more than a few, but I don't know how to identify them.

In the end I'm afraid we're going to be stuck with a somewhat arbitrary way of choosing sites to include as potential industrial sources. And I think the companies that actually use these bulk products (like carpet and

textile manufacturers or polymer operations) are going to be at least as significant and these primary producers. There may not be anything we can do about this, but we need to be aware that these biases are part of the process.

Thank you,

Andy

From: Xindi Hu [mailto: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 6:23 PM
To: Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov>
Cc: Elsie M Sunderland <ems@seas.harvard.edu>; Laurel Schaider <schaider@silentspring.org>; rlohmann@uri.edu
Subject: Re: PFAS manufacturing plants

Hi Andy,

Thanks a lot for your detailed reply.

I agree with you that major sites will be compound specific, and thanks for providing the PFNA example.

The current 10 sites are attached as a csv file to this email.

I will let you know after I hear back from my colleague at Harvard.

Thanks again for your contribution to this work.

Best,

Cindy