Message

From: Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]
Sent: 11/23/2020 12:53:31 PM
To: Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]
CC: Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]; Leifer, Kerry [Leifer.Kerry@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Globe PFAS story
Attachments: Summary of PFAS in Anvil test results fnl DA.docx; State use of Anvil 10+10 (updated 11.9.20) DA.docx; PFAS Fact Sheet for Anvil release FINAL for Review DA.docx; PFAS Anvil letter to DEP DA.docx; EPA letter -- PFAS DA.docx; 11_20_Aerially Sprayed Pesticide Contains PFAS DA (1).docx

FYI

From: Leifer, Kerry <Leifer.Kerry@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 7:25 AM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Press <Press@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Han, Kaythi <Han.Kaythi@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Globe PFAS story

I received the following press inquiry yesterday evening—see email below.

Kerry

Kerry Leifer, Chief
Chemistry, Inerts and Toxicology Assessment Branch
Registration Division (7505P)
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20460
tel: (703) 308-8811
fax: (703) 605-0781

e-mail: leifer.kerry@epa.gov

From: Abel, David [mailto:dabel@globe.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 22, 2020 6:12 PM
To: Leifer, Kerry <Leifer.Kerry@epa.gov>; Deegan, Dave <Deegan.Dave@epa.gov>
Subject: Globe PFAS story

Hi Kerry and Dave,

I hope all's well. I'm working on a potential story about elevated levels of PFAS found in Anvil, the insecticide Massachusetts and other states use to spray for EEE. Below is a table of findings from DEP, as well as a press release and other documents from PEER, urging the state to ban the use of the chemicals.

Just wondering if you could respond to these questions:

-- Are these findings of PFAS in Anvil from the DEP concerning, and if so, why or why not?

-- Should we be as concerned about forever chemicals (which don't degrade) being sprayed by air and truck entering drinking water and other water systems, and if so, why?

-- Based on these findings, should the EPA or states ban the use of these chemicals, and if so, why or why not?

Thanks!

Best, David

Summary Table of PFAS Concentrations from MassDEP Anvil 10 + 10 Sampling:

Sample collection date	9/22	9/22	9/22	9/22	9/22	10/21	10/21	10/21	10/21	10/22
Sample type	55 gal. drum 1	55 gal. drum 2	CONTROL: sampling device rinse cntrl. for 55 gal. drum 1 and 2	2.5 gal. jug 1 (SAMPLE 3)	sampling device rinse cntrl. 2.5 gal. jug 1	55 gal. drum 1	55 gal. drum 2	55 gal. drum 3 and dupli-cate sample	Sampling device rinse cntrl. for 55 gal. drum 1 and 2	2.5 gal. jug 2 and Dupli-cate sample
PFAS Compound	Concentration in nanograms per liter (ng/L) or part per trillion (ppt)									
Perfluorobutanoic Acid (PFBA)	**692**	171	ND ND	52.8 J	ND	**716**	174	**230** 216	ND ND	59.2 J 62.9 J
Perfluoro-3-Methoxypropanoic Acid (PFMPA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluoropentanoic Acid (PFPeA)	296	76.6 J	0.370 J ND	35.2 J	ND	290	55.4 J	88.7 J 84.7 J	ND ND	41.5 J 41.2 J
Perfluorobutanesulfonic Acid (PFBS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluoro-4-Methoxybutanoic Acid (PFMBA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluoro(2-Ethoxyethane)Sulfonic Acid (PFEESA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Nonafluoro-3,6-Dioxaheptanoic Acid (NFDHA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
1H,1H,2H,2H-Perfluorohexanesulfonic Acid (4:2FTS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorohexanoic Acid (PFHxA)	132	41.2 J	0.407 J ND	17.6 J	0.461 J	105	23.7 J	37.4 J 42.3 J	ND ND	19.7 J ND
Perfluoropentanesulfonic Acid (PFPeS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
2,3,3,3-Tetrafluoro-2-[1,1,2,2,3,3,3-Heptafluoropropoxy]-Propanoic Acid (HFPO-DA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluoroheptanoic Acid (PFHpA)	53.4 J	23.6 J	ND ND	ND	ND	47.6 J	ND	ND 19.2 J	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorohexanesulfonic Acid (PFHxS)	**ND**	**ND**	**ND ND**	**52.8 J**	**ND**	**ND**	**ND**	**ND ND**	**ND ND**	**59.2 J 57 J**
4,8-Dioxa-3h-Perfluorononanoic Acid (ADONA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
1H,1H,2H,2H-Perfluorooctanesulfonic Acid (6:2FTS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	29.8 J	31.6 J	27.6 J 28.9 J	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)	**25.7 J**	**ND**	**ND ND**	**ND**	**ND**	**21.8 J**	**ND**	**ND ND**	**ND ND**	**ND ND**
Perfluoroheptanesulfonic Acid (PFHpS)	107	100	ND ND	125	ND	ND	98.9	63.0 J 52.0 J	ND ND	138 108
Perfluorononanoic Acid (PFNA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorooctanesulfonic Acid (PFOS)	**73.1 J**	**ND**	**ND ND**	**76.2 J**	**2.73**	**ND**	**ND**	**ND ND**	**3.31 ND**	**132 141**

9-Chlorohexadecafluoro-3-Oxanone-1-Sulfonic Acid (9Cl-PF3ONS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
1H,1H,2H,2H-Perfluorodecanesulfonic Acid (8:2FTS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorodecanoic Acid (PFDA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluoroundecanoic Acid (PFUnA)	13.8 J	ND	ND ND	21.5 J	ND	184	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
11-Chloroeicosafluoro-3-Oxaundecane-1-Sulfonic Acid (11Cl-PF3OUdS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorododecanoic Acid (PFDoA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND

Table notes: ND = not detected; J = estimated value; Tube rinse cntrl. = sampling device rinsates performed at sampling site prior to sample collection to assess any sampling device contamination. All field and trip blanks were generally non-detect and are not presented. In one, PFOS was detected at 3.3 ppt.

All samples were analyzed by Alpha Analytical, Mansfield, MA. using a modified version of EPA Method 533. Stated reporting limits for product samples were below 100 ng/L with detection limits ranging from approximately 5-50 ng/L depending on the analyte. QA/QC issues were appropriately noted by Alpha Analytical in the lab reports but all QA/QC elements have not been fully reviewed by MassDEP at this time.

The September and October samples were collected by two different contractors using new sampling devices. The October 2.5 gallon jug samples were directly poured into the sample collection tubes.

Initial samples that were collected on 9/2 are not presented. These were invalidated because appropriate field controls were not collected by the contractor and results were consistent with samples being contaminated during collection. In that round, five to thirteen PFAS were detected in duplicate analyses of the single drum 1 sample collected, with a maximum concentration of 25 ug/L (25,000 ppt) for PFBA.

David Abel
Reporter
The Boston Globe
dabel@globe.com
Follow on Twitter @davabel
See my bio here, films here, and recent stories here