Message

From: Beck, Nancy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=168ECB5184AC44DE95A913297F353745-BECK, NANCY]
Sent: 6/29/2018 1:29:32 AM
To: Scott, Gregory [Scott.Gregory@epa.gov]; Bertrand, Charlotte [Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov]; Wise, Louise [Wise.Louise@epa.gov]
CC: Morales, Oscar [Morales.Oscar@epa.gov]; Berkley, Bruce [Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov]; Keller, Kaitlin [keller.kaitlin@epa.gov]; Hanley, Mary [Hanley.Mary@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: For DAA Review: SAC Questions for the Record
Attachments: TES-001 JM CB.2.DOCX; UDA- 016 PFAS and PFOA_v2 JM NB_v2.2.docx

Some comments attached. thanks

****

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
P: 202-564-1273
M: Ex. 6 PP – personal phone
beck.nancy@epa.gov

From: Scott, Gregory
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2018 2:06 PM
To: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>; Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>
Cc: Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>; Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>; Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>; Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For DAA Review: SAC Questions for the Record

Attached are the remaining two QFRs for clearance. The Tester/Asbestos response has not changed since yesterday but the Udall/PFAS response has been updated with the remaining response we were waiting for. OCFO is looking for these as soon as possible.

From: Scott, Gregory
Sent: Wednesday, June 27, 2018 9:38 AM
To: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>; Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>
Cc: Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>; Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>; Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>; Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For DAA Review: SAC Questions for the Record

Good morning,

I have edited QFRs from OPPT and a response to your comments from OPP. We are still waiting for the estimated time required to complete to review the PFAS in commerce for animal tests, OPPT is hoping to resolve that today. OPPT did not provide their edits in track changes but made all changes as requested, I have summarized the edits below. I have also attached scanned copies of your edits for your reference.

- **Rubio Citrus Greening** – No edits, response to DAA comments
- **Alexander Methylene Chloride** – No further edits from DAA edits
- **Tester Asbestos** – Shortened response and added discussion of SNUR
- **Udall PFAS** – DAA edits made, waiting on time estimates for last question.

Can you please review and let me know if I can send forward everything but the Udall PFAS QFR and I will get the final PFAS response to you ASAP.

Thanks,
Greg

From: Scott, Gregory
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2018 8:07 AM
To: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>; Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>
Cc: Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>; Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>; Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>; Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: For DAA Review: SAC Questions for the Record

This is what I received from Rick in response to your comments on Rubio/Citrus Greening -

"I checked with the team. We are not currently able to refine the 1 million comment number. It'll take us a few more weeks to get a better handle on how many of the million comments received are substantive. Yes, our current timeline for issuing the proposed interim decisions for the neonics is the end of 2018. This is public information, posted on the registration review website (https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-reevaluation/registration-review-schedules)."

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Beck, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2018 8:19:08 AM
To: Scott, Gregory; Bertrand, Charlotte; Wise, Louise
Cc: Morales, Oscar; Berkley, Bruce; Keller, Kaitlin; Hanley, Mary
Subject: RE: For DAA Review: SAC Questions for the Record

Ok. I will leave the edits in the box outside my office for Deon (who's email I cant seem to find)

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP
P: 202-564-1273
M: Ex. 6 PP – personal phone
beck.nancy@epa.gov

From: Scott, Gregory
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2018 8:15 AM
To: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>; Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>
Cc: Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>; Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>; Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>; Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For DAA Review: SAC Questions for the Record

Thanks Nancy,

Deon will be picking the hard copy up from you if he hasn't already. I'd say the responses going beyond the immediate question are par for the course. Often if we provide a very direct answer then OCFO or OMB will ask us for additional context to frame the response. That being said, if you would like I can work with the programs to make the responses more succinct or cut out any sections you feel are unnecessary.

Greg

From: Beck, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2018 7:34 AM
To: Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>; Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>
Cc: Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>; Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>; Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>; Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For DAA Review: SAC Questions for the Record

Greg,
I've marked up my hard copy if you want to swing by and grab it. I have some comments and edits. An overarching comment is that these responses seem to go way beyond what is asked. Is this appropriate here?
Thanks.

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP
P: 202-564-1273
M: Ex. 6 PP – personal phone
beck.nancy@epa.gov

From: Scott, Gregory
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 10:13 AM
To: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>; Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>
Cc: Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>; Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>; Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>; Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: For DAA Review: SAC Questions for the Record

Good morning,

Attached for your review are responses to Questions for the Record from the Senate Appropriations Committee. The questions are also below for your reference. OCFO did not issue their deadline for these QFRs until yesterday, and they are asking for our responses by COB tomorrow. I have informed OCFO that we will need additional time as I know that your focus is on TSCA this week. Can I get your edits or clearance on these QFRs by Friday?

Thank you,
Greg

Alexander Question #1:
I have heard from Tennesseans who are concerned about the federal regulation of methylene chloride. I have also heard from manufactures in Tennessee about the impact of a ban on methylene chloride. In 2016, Congress passed the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act, which requires the Environmental Protection Agency to perform risk evaluations on the uses of ten specific chemicals, including methylene chloride. Last week, you announced that the

Environmental Protection Agency will finalize the methylene chloride rulemaking first proposed in January 2017. As the Environmental Protection Agency considers the regulation of methylene chloride, I encourage you to work with both advocates and manufacturers to achieve a result. What is the timeline for finalizing the rule? Will you keep me updated on the process as you work to finalize the rule?

Tester Question #1:
You know that the community of Libby has struggled with the direct health impacts of asbestos, with the highest rate of asbestos-related diseases in the country. This matter is deadly serious. Your asbestos evaluation scoping document cited evidence from the National Toxicology Program, the International Agency for Research on Cancer, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, as well as past work from the EPA. These reports lay out the truth: asbestos causes mesothelioma, and a whole variety of cardiovascular, pulmonary, immunodeficiency diseases. People are losing their lives. If the agency is still on track to finalize its evaluation in December of 2019, what is the absolute soonest asbestos could be pulled from the market? Do you believe that taking asbestos of the market before then would save lives?

Udall Question #16:
PFAS AND PFOA

f. We need to learn the lesson from the 1970s about PCBs that when highly persistent toxic pollutants are widely spread into the environment, they cause widespread harm and are extremely expensive and difficult to clean up. PFAS chemicals could be entering our homes and our environment via imported products and neither EPA nor the public has any way of knowing about those uses and exposures. Will you agree to issue a Significant New Use Rule to ensure EPA is aware of all new uses of PFAs, including use in articles containing them?
g. How many PFAS are currently on the TSCA Inventory or in use in commerce within the United States and in what amounts?
h. How many PFAS have been cleared through the New Chemicals Program under TSCA?
i. Will you commit to not allowing new PFASs on the market under the TSCA New Chemicals Program?
j. Of the PFAS in commerce, for how many does EPA have animal studies examining reproductive toxicity, immunotoxicity, or carcinogenicity?

Rubio Question #5:
Florida citrus has been battling citrus greening for more than a decade. I want to thank you on behalf of Florida's citrus growers for the emergency exemptions you issued to help suppress the continued spread and impacts of the disease. As far as I know, these expired at the end of last year, as did a separate exemption for dealing with Laurel Wilt, a disease killing avocados and several related species of native trees throughout the southeast. Was there any consideration made to extending these exemptions?

Rubio Question #6:
Citrus greening is spread by the Asian Citrus Psyllid, an invasive insect that has proven difficult to manage. In December, EPA released new citrus benefits assessments identifying foliar applications of four neonicotinoids, as being critical for psyllid control. What is the status of the final pollinator risk assessments and proposed interim decisions for these chemicals?