Message

From: Kraft, Andrew [Kraft.Andrew@epa.gov]
Sent: 5/17/2021 9:15:21 PM
To: Barone, Stan [Barone.Stan@epa.gov]; Thayer, Kris [thayer.kris@epa.gov]; Glenn, Barbara [Glenn.Barbara@epa.gov]
CC: Lavoie, Emma [Lavoie.Emma@epa.gov]; Bateson, Thomas [Bateson.Thomas@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Formaldehyde meta-analyses review (by ECRAD)

Hi Stan,

Thank you for sharing. We missed this letter at the team level (it looks like it was sent to OPPT, so maybe it didn't make its way to ORD or got lost in the recent shuffle). Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

e

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

We haven't looked at these in detail, but hopefully this is helpful to your discussions.

Best Regards,
Barbara, Tom, and Andrew

From: Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 10:05 AM
To: Thayer, Kris <thayer.kris@epa.gov>; Kraft, Andrew <Kraft.Andrew@epa.gov>; Glenn, Barbara <Glenn.Barbara@epa.gov>
Cc: Lavoie, Emma <Lavoie.Emma@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Formaldehyde meta-analyses review (by ECRAD)

Mark Hartman is asking what we are doing to consider ACC inputs.

I want to make sure we do not get crosswise with IRIS update.
How are you all planning to consider ACC "new metatanyalsis"

From: Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 9:57 AM
To: Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>; Benson, Amy <Benson.Amy@epa.gov>
Subject: Formaldehyde meta-analyses review (by ECRAD)

FYI

From: Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 9:38 AM
To: Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>; Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>; Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>
Cc: Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OCSPP News for April 21, 2021

Here is the staff evaluation of the studies, they will walk through this today.

Andrew J. R. Gillespie, Ph. D.
Division Director (Acting), US EPA/OCSPP/OPPT/ECRAD

Office 919 541 3655 Mobile Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

From: Gillespie, Andrew
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2021 1:07 PM
To: Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>; Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>; Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OCSPP News for April 21, 2021

We (ECRAD) are ready. Our HH staff have reviewed and digested. Do you want to carve our 20 mins at Monday's 10 am meeting?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Andrew J. R. Gillespie, Ph. D.
Division Director (Acting), US EPA/OCSPP/OPPT/ECRAD

Office 919 541 3655 Mobile Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

From: Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 22, 2021 1:19 PM
To: Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>; Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>; Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: OCSPP News for April 21, 2021

Let's discuss the formaldehyde studies when you are ready.

From: OCSPPNews Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 5:13 PM
To: Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>; Carlisle, Sharon <Carlisle.Sharon@epa.gov>; Collazo Reyes, Yvette <CollazoReyes.Yvette@epa.gov>; Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; Diaz, Catherine <Diaz.Catherine@epa.gov>; Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal <Freedhoff.Michal@epa.gov>; Garcia, Beth <garcia.beth@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>; Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>; Harwood, Laura <Harwood.Laura@epa.gov>; Hauff, Amanda <Hauff.Amanda@epa.gov>; Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>; Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Kochis, Daniel <Kochis.daniel@epa.gov>; Kramer, George <Kramer.George@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Nguyen, Khanh <Nguyen.Khanh@epa.gov>; OPP Branch Chiefs Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP); OPP Deputy & Associate Directors Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP); OPP Division Directors Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP); OPP IO Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP); OPPT Managers Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP); OPS CSID CB Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP); Picone, Karim <Picone.Karim@epa.gov>; Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>; Pinto, Ana <Pinto.Ana@epa.gov>; Richmond, Jonah <Richmond.Jonah@epa.gov>; Romanovsky, Anna <Romanovsky.Anna@epa.gov>; Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>; Siciliano, CarolAnn <Siciliano.CarolAnn@epa.gov>; Smith, Carolyn <smith.carolyn@epa.gov>; Sullivan, Melissa <sullivan.melissa@epa.gov>; Tyler, Tom <Tyler.Tom@epa.gov>; Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>; Vernon, Jennifer <Vernon.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: OCSPP News for April 21, 2021

OCSPP Daily News Round-Up

General EPA

- Bloomberg Law 04/21; House Appropriators Go Easy on Regan Over Big EPA Budget Request
- Chemistry World 04/21; Physical chemist tapped to head chemical safety at US environment agency
- E&E News 04/21; Regan looks to sell lawmakers on big spending hike
- E&E News 04/21; Appropriators grill Regan on climate, regulations

Toxics

- E&E News 04/21; Report: 'Forever chemicals' widespread in buildings
- Inside TSCA 04/20; Environmentalists See Substitution Hurdles To PFAS Phase-Out Push
- Inside TSCA 04/20; 9th Circuit unifies challenges to decaBDE rule
- Inside TSCA 04/20; As EPA Ramps Up Evaluations, Industry Downplays Formaldehyde's Risks

Pesticides

- E&E News 04/21; Fla. officials reject Trump EPA approval of citrus treatment
- E&E News 04/21; Widely used pesticide threatens 78 animals, plants — study
- Indiana Environmental Reporter 04/20; New study finds undisclosed inert ingredients in popular herbicide killing bumble bees

Blog/OpEd/Other

- Beyond Pesticides Blog 04/21; Study Finds Eagle Populations Experiencing Widespread Rodenticide Exposure
- Center for Biological Diversity 04/20; Federal Analysis Finds Insecticide Malathion Imperils Continued Existence of 78 Endangered Plants, Animals
- Chemical Watch 04/20; Comment: Why a pesticide contamination case in the US should concern all of us

++

House Appropriators Go Easy on Regan Over Big EPA Budget Request

Stephen Lee, Bloomberg Law

https://news.bloomberglaw.com/environment-and-energy/house-appropriators-go-easy-on-regan-over-big-epa-budget-request

EPA Administrator Michael Regan escaped grilling Wednesday from House Republicans on the 21.3% budget increase that the Biden administration seeks for his agency in fiscal 2022.

But the convivial tone of the 90-minute hearing doesn't necessarily signal congressional support for the Biden budget, because Hill appropriators routinely ignore presidential budget plans. The administration is hoping its proposal at least sets an ambitious starting point for negotiations.

The Environmental Protection Agency needs a $2 billion increase to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, learn more about the impacts of climate change on human health and the environment, fortify the agency's depleted ranks, deliver environmental justice to low-income communities of color, and create new jobs, Regan told the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

No members objected to those goals. Instead, they mostly asked Regan for help with issues in their districts and clarity on water and air rules for their communities, ranging from the Great Lakes to Puget Sound.

Regan consistently said his approach will be to work with states, tribes, industry groups, farmers, ranchers, and local communities to hash out compromises, while simultaneously creating jobs.

'Not in a Ping Pong Way'

For example, he told Rep. Mike Simpson (R-Idaho) that his approach to the contentious rule governing federal jurisdiction over waters of the U.S., or WOTUS, will be to start a stakeholder input process and look at the approaches taken by both the Obama and Trump administrations.

Ultimately, the EPA will chart a path forward "not in a ping pong way, but a way that we can provide some certainty to the ag industry, where we don't overburden the small farmer, but we also balance the protection of our wetlands," Regan said.

"You have made my day," Rep. Chris Stewart (R-Utah) told Regan in response to a subsequent question about WOTUS, to which Regan said that both the Obama and Trump approaches "did not necessarily listen to the will of the people."

In 2020, the Trump administration issued a rule that lifted federal protections for many small waterways across the country.

Regan also told Rep. Josh Harder (D-Calif.) that the requested $100 million in air quality grants is meant to give states and tribes flexibility in compliance.

"A lot of times we spend a lot of resources on enforcement, and the reality is, that enforcement mechanism is only as good as the rule," he said. "Many of our rules may or may not be as transparent as possible, and/or may be harder from an administrative burden standpoint. So we're not achieving the environmental goals we're looking for."

The only significant pushback to the size of the Biden budget request came in ranking member Rep. David Joyce's (R-Ohio) opening statement, in which he said the federal government must be careful to live within its means.

Climate Crisis, Staffing
Biden's $11.2 billion EPA budget proposal earmarks $1.8 billion for investments to tackle the climate crisis, such as $100 million for air quality grants to states and tribes and $30 million to do more research on the impacts of climate change.

It also includes $110 million to bulk up EPA staffing levels, $48 million of which would be deployed at the Office of Air and Radiation so it can implement climate change programs under the Clean Air Act.

Other parts of the proposal feature $1.4 billion to help environmental justice communities deal with historic pollution and $882 million for the EPA's Superfund program. It also includes $75 million to speed up studies and research that would feed into a regulation on per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, a family of persistent chemicals known as PFAS.

In his prepared remarks, Regan also touted Biden's infrastructure plan, which he said would "reduce pollution and help create good quality jobs." It would provide $111 billion to improve the nation's water infrastructure, $56 billion in grants...

Physical chemist tapped to head chemical safety at US environment agency

Rebecca Trager, Chemistry World

https://www.chemistryworld.com/news/physical-chemist-tapped-to-head-chemical-safety-at-us-environment-agency/4013568.article

President Biden has announced his nomination of physical chemist Michal Freedhoff to lead the chemical safety and pollution prevention office at the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). She currently serves as acting head of that office, which implements the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), evaluating new as well as existing chemicals and their risks. The Senate must confirm Freedhoff's nomination before she can assume the post.

After earning a PhD in physical chemistry from the University of Rochester in 1995, Freedhoff began her political career working for Democratic congressman Ed Markey as a congressional science and engineering fellow in 1996. She has spent over two decades working in government. Her most recent position on Capitol Hill was minority director of oversight for the Senate environment and public works (EPW) committee in early 2017. Previously, Freedhoff served as a staffer on the House of Representative's science committee, select committee on energy independence and global warming, energy and commerce committee, and natural resources committee.

The major legislative issues with which she has been involved include helping to lead the charge to reauthorise TSCA during former President Obama's administration in 2016, which overhauled that major US chemicals law that had been around for more than 40 years. Freedhoff also helped champion a bill that sought to regulate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in 2019.

Freedhoff's nomination won praise from environmental groups and Democratic members of Congress whom she served. Scott Faber, senior vice president of government affairs for the non-profit Environmental Working

Group, said Freedhoff is 'well-versed in chemicals policy nuances, with a deep understanding of chemical safety law and chemistry'.

'It's hard to imagine a better person for this role – Michal has a relentless spirit and tenacious work ethic that is rivalled by few,' added senator Tom Carpenter, who chairs the Senate EPW committee. Freedhoff 'worked tirelessly' for bipartisan solutions to protect the environment and public health during her time working for Congress, he said.

Beyond her focus on revamping TSCA and regulating PFAS, Freedhoff has also publicly spoken out against political interference in policymaking at science agencies such as the EPA, encouraging employees to report them.

Regan looks to sell lawmakers on big spending hike

Kevin Bogardus, E&E News

https://www.eenews.net/eedaily/2021/04/21/stories/1063730505?utm_campaign=edition&utm_medium=email&utm_source=eenews%3Aeedaily

EPA Administrator Michael Regan will be on Capitol Hill today to sway lawmakers on President Biden's proposal to boost his agency's budget.

Regan is set to appear before the House Interior and Environment Appropriations Subcommittee this morning for his first solo hearing as administrator.

The administration's fiscal 2022 budget request for EPA is $11.2 billion — $2 billion more or about a 21% increase from the agency's current funding of $9.2 billion.

That greater spending, if approved by Congress, would support Biden priorities like fighting climate change and promoting environmental justice.

Lawmakers typically ignore presidents' budget requests. They did with President Trump's proposals to slash EPA's budget by a quarter or more, instead keeping agency funding level or raising it even slightly higher over the past four years.

But Regan will still have a tough sell in convincing appropriators to raise funding for EPA, a frequent Republican target.

In written testimony for today's hearing, Regan says the White House budget plan "advances key EPA priorities" and rebuilds the agency's "core functions."

Within the budget request for EPA is $1.8 billion for addressing "the climate crisis," with more than half of that sum for environmental justice work.

Regan also says the agency has lost nearly 1,000 employees over the past four years when EPA was roiled by the Trump administration's proposed deep budget cuts and rollbacks of environmental protections. That's why

the budget request includes $110 million "to restore EPA's staff capacity," the administrator says.

"It has affected the Agency's ability to carry out its core duties and functions to protect public health and the environment," Regan says. "Restoring capacity across the Agency will strengthen our ability to tackle multiple priorities, from clean air and water, to cutting edge research at the Agency."

In addition, Regan wants to restore the voice of EPA employees and support their science in advancing the agency's environmental and public health mission.

The budget hearing will also be a chance to grill Regan on a number of hot topics from his first days as EPA administrator, including his decision to fire all members of two agency science advisory boards that were meddled with by the Trump administration as well as his plans for regulations on climate change; fuel economy standards for vehicles; and per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, also known as "forever chemicals."

Biden infrastructure plan
Today's hearing will not be Regan's first appearance on Capitol Hill since his confirmation as EPA administrator.

That occurred yesterday, when he testified alongside other Cabinet-level officials at a Senate Appropriations Committee hearing in pushing for Biden's $2 trillion infrastructure plan (Greenwire, April 20).

Regan touches upon the proposal in his written testimony for today's hearing. He received some skeptical questions about the package from Republicans yesterday and could face similar queries today.

Sen. John Kennedy (R-La.) repeatedly pressed the EPA administrator at yesterday's hearing on whether the agency had done any modeling on how much the world temperature would be lowered if the infrastructure plan, touted as an effort to fight climate change, became law. Regan did not provide a figure to the senator.

"So we're just going to spend $2.3 trillion and find out on a wing and prayer?" Kennedy asked.

Regan responded, "I think the American Jobs Plan looks at more than just a prayer and a whim. I think it looks at some really good metrics that show that we can create millions of jobs."

Later in the hearing, Sen. Martin Heinrich (D-N.M.) sought to highlight climate aspects of the proposal. He asked the EPA administrator how the plan would stop methane emissions, and Regan replied that it would help EPA measure and "significantly reduce those emissions."

"I know my colleague from Louisiana said how important it is to model these things...

Appropriators grill Regan on climate, regulations

Kevin Bogardus, E&E News

https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2021/04/21/stories/1063730573

EPA Administrator Michael Regan plugged his agency's request for more funding at his first budget hearing this morning.

Appearing at a virtual hearing by the House Interior and Environment Appropriations Subcommittee, he discussed President Biden's initial budget proposal for fiscal 2022.

The proposal offers EPA $11.2 billion, an increase of $2 billion, or 21%, over its current funds. It's a dramatic change from the Trump administration, which often sought to cut the agency's budget by roughly a quarter or more each year.

"From my perspective, compared to what we have seen these past several years, this is a breath of fresh air," said Rep. Chellie Pingree (D-Maine), who chairs the subcommittee that oversees EPA funding. She added that the agency now has senior leaders who believe in its mission, use science appropriately and serve in the public interest, not to benefit political allies.

Rep. Betty McCollum (D-Minn.), who chaired the subcommittee in the last Congress, called the budget request "a welcomed change." She added that she was thrilled Pingree would be working with Regan to get EPA "a hefty increase" in funds.

A big chunk of EPA's budget request, about $1.8 billion, would go toward fighting climate change, with more than half that sum focused on environmental justice work. Pingree asked Regan how he sees EPA's role in the climate battle.

The EPA administrator noted that the budget request has money to enhance air quality grants as well as for climate research.

"This will double our ability to look at research and development on the topic of climate change," Regan said.

A budget boost for EPA is likely to run into Republican resistance. Rep. David Joyce (R-Ohio), the subcommittee's ranking member, noted the greater spending coming from or proposed by the Biden administration, including the $1.9 trillion relief package for the COVID-19 pandemic and the $2 trillion infrastructure plan, as well as a $2 billion funding increase for EPA.

"I have some concerns about the debt we may leave to the next generation," Joyce said, calling that spending "unsustainable and unaffordable."

Biden's initial budget plan is light on details, with more information expected to be shared later with Congress. Consequentially, lawmakers asked Regan if he supports specific cleanup projects that affect their congressional districts.

Joyce, expressing worries over rising water levels in Lake Erie, asked Regan about the agency's Great Lakes cleanup, which was often slated for budget cuts during the prior administration. The EPA administrator assured him he is supportive of the program.

"The Great Lakes are a national treasure," Regan said. "We have prioritized that. We're aligned there."

Regan was also questioned over plans for a number of EPA regulations, including an expected drinking water standard for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). The "forever chemicals" have contaminated water sources across the country.

Regan, who formerly led the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, noted that he has personal experience with the issue. He said EPA hopes to use its budget funds to research and quantify PFAS, help states

with cleanup, and move forward on regulations.

"It's a top priority for this administration," Regan said about a federal drinking water standard for PFAS, adding that the prior administration did not move fast enough.

"We are moving in an expedited fashion because the states need some certainty," Regan said, adding so do the military and private companies.

McCollum said lawmakers want a tough standard.

"We want to have one great standard, and we don't want [the Department of Defense] to have a weakened standard," McCollum said.

Regan said he and Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin have agreed to meet to discuss PFAS as EPA works on its regulations. The chemicals have been found widespread around military sites.

Republican appropriators asked Regan about his plans for the Waters of the U.S. (WOTUS)...

Report: 'Forever chemicals' widespread in buildings

E.A. Crunden, E&E News

https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2021/04/21/stories/1063730553?utm_campaign=edition&utm_medium=email&utm_source=eenews%3Agreenwire

Controversial "forever chemicals" are wall to wall all around us due to their persistent presence in building materials, according to research out today.

Findings from the Green Science Policy Institute show per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are used for a "wide variety of applications" across the building sector. Those uses have exposed workers and the public to the chemicals, per the report, even though alternatives are often available.

"What stands out here is the sheer magnitude of their use," said Tom Bruton, a report author and senior scientist with the Green Science Policy Institute. "It's just a very large amount of PFAS."

Those chemicals have long been used for their nonstick properties and appear in a wide array of items. Those include common household products, like cookware and dental floss, but also building items — including roofing materials, paint, sealants, adhesives, glass and more.

The new report takes a closer look at which PFAS are prevalent in those materials and the risks they may pose despite the useful properties the chemicals provide. Of the thousands of PFAS that exist, only a few have been closely studied — with several repeatedly linked to cancer, kidney disease, reproductive issues and other health risks.

"Given these risks, it is urgent that the building industry finds and adopts safer alternatives to the many products on the market that contain harmful PFAS," the authors argued in the analysis.

In their report, Bruton and his colleagues noted that PFAS are used as an exterior layer in metal roofing, as well as in asphalt and tensile roofing, among other related materials. In coatings, fluorinated additives also appear in paints, as well as wood lacquers and both metal exterior and plastic finishes.

Flooring is also a common source of PFAS, with the chemicals used extensively in carpets and rugs for their stain-resistant and water-repelling properties. They similarly appear on resilient and hard flooring. Caulks used to fill gaps in a structure are yet another PFAS source, as is glass, which becomes more durable with the help of the chemicals. Wires, cables, tapes and many other items are also included in the report.

The authors additionally noted the presence of PFAS in solar panels, where the chemicals can help boost areas like UV resistance. Bruton said those findings caught his eye, and cited the example as another motivating factor for industry members to explore PFAS alternatives as the country pivots to renewable energy.

"We all want more solar energy. More solar coming online doesn't lock us into increased use of PFAS necessarily," said Bruton. "But we do want to draw attention to this."

The authors also probed who might be most at risk, as all people to some extent have likely been exposed to PFAS. But building construction and maintenance workers using items like spray-on waterproofing products might be more exposed, they concluded.

Divisions over regulatory approach
Parts of the report have already drawn pushback from industry. The authors in their analysis included fluoropolymers, which groups like the American Chemistry Council have argued should be evaluated separately from other PFAS. Fluoropolymers have a higher molecular weight and appear to be less likely to migrate into bodies and cause health problems.

Tom Flanagin, an ACC spokesperson, said new PFAS are subject to strict controls under the Toxic Substances Control Act. The chemicals used in building and construction, he said, "enable high performance, stability and durability" — leading to resource conservation and waste reduction. Flanagin emphasized that notable distinctions exist among different PFAS.

Bruton acknowledged nuances around fluoropolymers but said the life cycle of those chemicals still contributes harm to the environment, including through their production and the potential for PFAS to escape via emissions. Some of the fluoropolymers in buildings include PTFE, which is used in Teflon...

Environmentalists See Substitution Hurdles To PFAS Phase-Out Push

Diana DiGangi, Inside TSCA

https://insideepa.com/tsca-news/environmentalists-see-substitution-hurdles-pfas-phase-out-push

Environmental groups say industry efforts to voluntarily phase out per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are leaving firms at risk of "regrettable substitution" if they select another perfluorinated substance as a replacement, arguing that only top-down regulation will ensure they use of safe alternatives.

“This is something we've seen time and time again with this issue,” Mike Schade, director of the “Mind the Store” campaign organized by several environmental groups to push retailers to stop using or selling products made with PFAS, said during an April 20 Northeast Waste Management Officials' Association (NEWMOA) webinar on PFAS uses and substitutions.

“Industry has said for years, we're going to phase out the long-chain chemicals, but the short-chain ones are safe. And the more that independent scientists and academia and government have studied these replacement chemicals, we learn that in a number of cases, they may be just as toxic in some cases or even more toxic in other cases, but generally just as persistent in the environment,” Schade said.

He and the event’s other speaker, Liz Harriman, deputy director of the Massachusetts-based Toxics Use Reduction Institute (TURI), said those challenges bolster the case for stringent regulatory limits on PFAS, either through state law or the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).

“We really need strict limits [on all PFAS], especially given their widespread persistence and mobility in the environment,” Schade said.

Both speakers said that includes not only state or federal limits on PFAS uses, such as restrictions on food packaging under consideration in several states, but also adoption of the “class-based” model of regulating the chemicals that would apply any restrictions to the entire category rather than only certain substances -- such as the distinction between “long-chain” and “short-chain” varieties Schade referenced.

For instance, Schade said, research by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) helped prove that many short-chain PFAS that companies adopted as alternatives to existing, long-chain chemicals were in some cases as toxic and bioaccumulative as their predecessors.

The FDA has now entered agreements with some of those firms to phase out the short-chain PFAS as well, he added.

The potential for regrettable substitutions is “one of the reasons why we're really concerned about the use of food packaging,” Schade said, “because the packaging is used once and then the chemicals can then last forever in the environment. So that's why we think it's really critical for policymakers and businesses to take a class-based approach to avoid regrettable substitution.”

And Harriman said her group is pushing businesses to phase out nonessential uses of PFAS by dropping those uses entirely rather than finding new chemicals that produce similar effects -- such as adopting alternate methods of weaving carpet that avoids the need for coatings that have historically contained PFAS or making skis without waterproofing wax that contain the chemicals.

And he noted in response to an audience question that even though Mind the Store has had success in encouraging large national or multi-national companies to phase out PFAS from food packaging, smaller firms often lack the resources needed to identify problem chemicals or select safer replacements on their own initiative.

Supply-Chain Transparency

Both Schade and Harriman said that while they see strict regulation as crucial to avoid more instances of regrettable substitution, greater transparency is also a key part of the agenda and would again be a particular boon to smaller companies that might not have the capacity for a full supply-chain analysis.

“A lot of the issues that our manufacturers have is that that information doesn't come through the supply chain,”

Harriman said. "So if there is better transparency, then the guy at the corner store might be able to find out what the grease-proof treatment is on the paper...

9th Circuit unifies challenges to decaBDE rule

N/A, Inside TSCA

https://insideepa.com/tsca-takes/9th-circuit-unifies-challenges-decabde-rule

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit has joined two cases brought by environmentalists, public health and consumer groups and a California tribe against the Trump EPA's TSCA rule on the persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic (PBT) flame retardant decabromodiphenyl ether (decaBDE) at the request of all sides in both suits.

In an April 19 order, the 9th Circuit announced it is consolidating the two pending decaBDE cases, Alaska Community Action on Toxics (ACAT) v. EPA and Yurok Tribe et al. v. EPA.

Both suits target EPA's final Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) rule restricting uses of decaBDE, which is one of five substances the agency designated as PBT shortly after the 2016 reforms to the law. While neither of the cases has reached substantive briefing, both sets of petitioners have argued in public statements that EPA's rule was too lenient.

For instance, the Yurok tribe and its co-plaintiffs issued public statements alongside their March 19 petition arguing that several exclusions and deferred deadlines in the rule for the common flame retardant are unlawfully lax. They said they plan to argue that the agency created "dangerous loopholes" by excluding disposal and recycling from regulation in addition to several use-specific exemptions and implementation delays.

"Congress directed EPA to act fast and act aggressively to protect Americans from DecaBDE and similar chemicals that are highly toxic and long lasting. . . . But in the final days of the Trump administration, EPA signed a rule that allows this dangerous chemical to be used in our children's toys and dumped in our communities without establishing any safeguards to protect our health," reads a statement from Katherine O'Brien, an attorney at the environmental law firm Earthjustice, which is representing petitioners in both cases.

The Yurok petition followed ACAT's Jan. 27 filing of its own petition for review of the decaBDE rule, also in the 9th Circuit in January. Earthjustice's March 19 statement quoted Vi Waghiyi, ACAT's environmental health and justice director, as saying that research shows widespread DecaBDE contamination in her community, the Native Village of Savoonga on Sivuqaq in Alaska.

"We found Deca-BDE in 100% of household dust samples and human blood serum samples and it was present in significant levels in fish samples from freshwater lakes and streams of our Island. Our Yupik communities are located on an Island in the northern Bering Sea in the Alaskan Arctic, far from manufacturing sources. If communities such as mine are exposed to this dangerous chemical, it threatens the health of people everywhere," the statement says.

The decaBDE rule is one of five governing PBTs that EPA finalized in December, almost all of which drew immediate criticism from environmentalists over several exclusions that will allow continued use of the

chemicals in certain industries or consumer products.

Industry groups have sued separately in the District of Columbia Circuit over the rule governing another flame retardant, phenol, isopropylated phosphate (3:1) (PIP), which they say was impossible to eliminate from supply chains by EPA's compliance deadline of March 8.

The rules followed a one-time expedited process that Congress created in the 2016 overhaul of TSCA specifically for chemicals the agency has designated as PBT. It allows EPA to craft risk-management rules without the risk evaluation phase TSCA normally requires for regulating existing chemicals.

Former Obama toxics chief Steve Owens told Inside TSCA in January that the PBT rules, and court challenges to them, could set an important precedent for all future risk-management rules under the reformed toxics law, in the form of an upper limit on how strict the agency is willing to be in its restrictions on chemical uses.

Since the law considers PBT chemicals to be the most dangerous to health and the environment, Owens said, establishing broad exemptions to restrictions on them implies that...

As EPA Ramps Up Evaluations, Industry Downplays Formaldehyde's Risks

David LaRoss, Inside TSCA

https://insideepa.com/tsca-news/epa-ramps-evaluations-industry-downplays-formaldehyde-s-risks

Formaldehyde manufacturers and users are touting recent studies they say show the link between inhalation of the common chemical and leukemia is weaker than environmental groups and some EPA findings have claimed, extending the long-running clash over the substance as the agency gears up to evaluate its risks under TSCA.

In a March 31 letter, the American Chemistry Council's (ACC) formaldehyde consortium writes that the new research should "inform" EPA's ongoing Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) evaluation of the chemical, which is expected to focus in large part on cancer risks.

Specifically, the ACC consortium used the letter to highlight two studies released in 2021 and two from 2020, charging that they find that either evidence for formaldehyde's cancer-causing properties is scant, or that EPA should adopt new or updated methodologies for its review.

"We encourage the agency to consider this latest scientific information to inform the ongoing formaldehyde risk evaluation," the letter says.

Sarah Jane Scruggs, ACC's senior director for communications, adds in a statement to Inside TSCA that by law, "EPA is required to use the best available science and weight of scientific evidence when it comes to evaluating risk. Science is ever-evolving and the consortium has supported the development of new science to provide updated information on formaldehyde. These recently completed, peer-reviewed studies have meaningfully advanced the body of scientific evidence related to understanding formaldehyde."

EPA is currently working on two reviews of formaldehyde -- its TSCA risk evaluation under the existing-chemicals program and the long-delayed Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) hazard assessment, which

agency officials recently revived after it had been shelved under the Trump administration.

The last draft IRIS assessment for the chemical, published in 2010, concluded formaldehyde exposure could cause myeloid leukemia -- a finding significantly stricter than the existing 1987 evaluation that was based instead on nasal cancer risk.

EPA based that conclusion in large part on an epidemiological study of blood cell changes in Chinese workers exposed to high levels of formaldehyde.

Industry, however, argued that the leukemia study was flawed and subsequent research has shown no definitive link to formaldehyde exposure.

The new ACC letter advances that claim, saying that recent studies undercut the findings IRIS relied on in its 2010 draft.

But debate over the resumed IRIS assessment and EPA's TSCA evaluation might not be limited to its cancer risks, based on a March 31 systematic review conducted by the University of California San Francisco's Program on Reproductive Health and the Environment (PRHE) that found "sufficient evidence" that formaldehyde exposures can both cause and exacerbate asthma.

EPA included possible asthma risks in its draft IRIS assessment, but peer-reviewers criticized its treatment of the subject as inadequate at the time, and the PRHE study could help elevate it.

Leukemia Research

The first study ACC cites in its letter is titled "The importance of evaluating specific myeloid malignancies in epidemiological studies of environmental carcinogens," and concludes that epidemiological study of the relationship between formaldehyde and three other chemicals and "myeloid malignancies" -- a category that includes leukemia -- is fundamentally limited and thus a poor basis for regulatory action.

"The evaluation found that few epidemiological studies present results for specific myeloid malignancies, and those identified were inconsistent across studies of the same exposure, as well as across chemical agents. The authors' review illustrates that even for agents classified as having sufficient evidence of causing 'myeloid malignancies,' the epidemiological evidence for specific myeloid malignancies is generally limited and inconsistent."

ACC's other three studies focus on the best methodology for...

Fla. officials reject Trump EPA approval of citrus treatment

Marc Heller, E&E News

https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2021/04/21/stories/1063730561?utm_campaign=edition&utm_medium=email&utm_source=eenews%3Agreenwire

Agriculture officials in Florida put a halt to the use of the pesticide aldicarb on citrus groves in the state, allowing time for EPA to reevaluate its potential effects on endangered wildlife.

The decision in Florida followed EPA's acknowledgement in a lawsuit that it hadn't conducted such a review under the Endangered Species Act before allowing expanded use of the farm chemical in the waning days of the Trump administration.

Growers in Florida wanted to use aldicarb to fight insects that spread citrus greening disease, which has decimated the citrus industry there. A company called AgLogic Chemical, of Chapel Hill, N.C., had requested the expanded use.

Environmental groups say aldicarb poses threats to children and farmworkers, including contributing to brain damage in children. But in approving the expanded use in January, EPA said it had found "no risks of concern."

The agency approved the use until 2023 and put in place several restrictions, including limiting application to 100,000 acres in Florida only and capping sales at 2.5 million pounds (Greenwire, Jan. 13).

In a filing in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on Monday, EPA said it hadn't done the review under the Endangered Species Act and asked the court to return the matter to the agency for further action. The Center for Biological Diversity, Environmental Working Group and Farmworker Association of Florida had sued to block the Trump administration's approval.

A senior scientist at the Center for Biological Diversity, Nathan Donley, praised the action by the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and said in a statement, "The science is clear: there is simply no way aldicarb can be used without putting small children, farmworkers or imperiled wildlife at risk." Even very low amounts in water or food, he said, "can have dangerous impacts on brain development in young children."

Widely used pesticide threatens 78 animals, plants — study

Marc Heller, E&E News

https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2021/04/21/stories/1063730567?utm_campaign=edition&utm_medium=email&utm_source=eenews%3Agreenwire

The pesticide malathion poses a grave threat to 78 endangered plants and animals, the Biden administration said in a revised report that puts a new spotlight on the widely used farm chemical.

While the 78 species identified by the Fish and Wildlife Service represent a significant threat, the estimate is a fraction of findings made by the Obama administration, which the Trump administration discarded at the direction of then-Interior Secretary David Bernhardt.

FWS prepared the analysis as part of EPA's draft biological opinion for malathion — a step in the periodic review of pesticides required by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act. The report will play into EPA's recommendations on how to minimize risks to wildlife, should the agency maintain the insecticide's registration.

EPA posted the opinion and related documents on its website, opening them to public comment until June 19.

Farmers use malathion on cotton, corn and other crops, and home gardeners use it on vegetables and ornamental plants. Pest control companies spray malathion, which first appeared in the U.S. in the 1950s as part of a class of pesticides called organophosphates, for mosquito control.

In preparing the analysis, FWS said it evaluated 1,600 threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as 760 designated and proposed critical habitats.

It found that maintaining malathion's registration would be "likely to jeopardize the continued existence" of 78 species, a dramatic reduction from the 1,284 endangered plants and animals identified by the Obama administration.

Bernhardt in 2017 directed FWS to change its method for such evaluations after complaints from the pesticide industry. The Interior Department's inspector general said he didn't violate any ethics rules in doing so (E&E News PM, Dec. 10, 2019).

The Center for Biological Diversity, which has pressed for a ban on malathion, called the analysis "one of the most extreme findings of harm ever published" by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The CBD's environmental health director, Lori Ann Burd, criticized the Biden administration for adopting Bernhardt's approach to evaluating risk to endangered species.

"The Fish and Wildlife Service's disappointing decision to embrace the junk science policies of the previous administration risks the extinction of animals like rusty patched bumblebees, Indiana bats and whooping cranes to prop up pesticide company profits," Burd said in a news release.

Burd said restrictions on pesticides to avoid mass extinctions "won't happen unless the Biden administration grows a spine and stands up to the powerful pesticide industry."

Burd told E&E News today that her group hopes the Biden administration will change course and adopt methods more in line with the practice when President Biden was President Obama's vice president — and consult the report that administration prepared.

"All they have to do is dust it off," she said.

The manufacturer of malathion, FMC Corp., complained to the Trump administration in 2017 through a lobbyist that biological evaluations prepared by the previous administration were flawed.

An FMC spokeswoman told E&E News today in a statement, "FMC has begun the review of the most recent draft biological opinion on malathion that was posted to the EPA website this week. It would be premature to comment further at this time."

Among other complaints, the firm representing FMC and Dow AgroSciences, Wiley Rein LLP, said in 2017 that the evaluations for malathion and two other organophosphates — chlorpyrifos and diazinon — lacked transparency, overlooked studies submitted by the companies and were in part based on "unrealistically high and sometimes physically impossible estimates."

The companies also complained that the earlier evaluation including species not listed as endangered. In its latest report, FWS said it removed species that had been delisted, while adding others that had obtained new designations...

New study finds undisclosed inert ingredients in popular herbicide killing bumble bees

Enrique Saenz, Indiana Environmental Reporter

https://www.indianaenvironmentalreporter.org/posts/new-study-finds-undisclosed-inert-ingredients-in-popular-herbicide-killing-bumble-bees

A study by British researchers found that undisclosed inert ingredients in certain Roundup weedkiller products are highly toxic to bumblebees.

The study by Royal Holloway, University of London researchers looked at co-formulants found in several Roundup products.

Co-formulants are inert additives that increase the efficiency of the active ingredient in a chemical product.

Inert ingredients are not tested by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to the same degree as active ingredients.

The study involved three Roundup products available in the United Kingdom, only two of which contained glyphosate as the active ingredient. They also tested a glyphosate-based weedkiller from a different brand.

Glyphosate has been previously found to destroy the gut bacteria in honeybees and has been linked to a higher risk of certain type of cancer in humans called Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma.

The researchers directly sprayed the products onto bumblebees and saw what happened over 24 hours.

They found that all the Roundup products, including those without glyphosate, had a high toxicity rate for bumblebees.

The bees had a 94% mortality rate with Roundup Ready-to-use, a 30% mortality rate with Roundup ProActive and a 96% mortality with Roundup No Glyphosate, a product not available in the U.S.

Weedol "did not cause significant mortality," according to the researchers.

The Center for Biological Diversity, an American environmental advocacy group, said there are 1,102 registered formulations for glyphosate, each with a proprietary mixture of inert ingredients that do not have to be disclosed.

"EPA must begin requiring tests of every pesticide formulation for bee toxicity, divulge the identity of 'secret' formulation additives so scientists can study them, and prohibit application of Roundup herbicides to flowering plants when bees might be present and killed," said Bill Freese, science director at the Center for Food Safety.

The EPA in November found that glyphosate-based products were likely to "adversely affect" 93% of all plants and animals protected under the Endangered Species Act.

Study Finds Eagle Populations Experiencing Widespread Rodenticide Exposure

N/A, Beyond Pesticides Blog

https://beyondpesticides.org/dailynewsblog/2021/04/study-finds-eagle-populations-experiencing-widespread-rodenticide-exposure/

The vast majority of bald and golden eagles in the United States are contaminated with toxic anticoagulant rodenticides, according to research published in the journal PLOS One earlier this month. Although eagle populations have largely recovered from their lows in the 1960s and 70s, the study is a stark reminder that human activity continues to threaten these iconic species. "Although the exact pathways of exposure remain unclear, eagles are likely exposed through their predatory and scavenging activities," said study author Mark Ruder, PhD, assistant professor at the University of Georgia to CNN.

Eagle carcasses were retrieved from the University of Georgia's ongoing Southeastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study. Eighteen state wildlife agencies and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service all sent in specimens from a period spanning 2014 to 2018. In total, 116 bald eagle and 17 golden eagle carcasses had their livers tested for the presence of anticoagulant rodenticides.

Out of the 116 bald eagles tested, 96, or 83% had were exposed to toxic rodenticides. Forty of the eagles (35%) were exposed to more than one rodenticide compound. Thirteen out of 17 golden eagles were contaminated was rodenticides, with four exposed to a single rodenticide and nine exposed to more than one. The second-generation anticoagulant rodenticide brodifacoum was the most detected compound in sampled eagles. In sum, researchers identified 12 eagles (4%) that had died specifically from toxicosis caused by rodenticide exposure.

The recovery of eagle populations over the last 50 years is a major wildlife success story, showing the power and impact of science, advocacy, and a meaningful regulatory response. DDT and other organochlorines pesticides were eliminated, and the Endangered Species Act was successful at protecting eagles' critical habitat.

The spot eagles hold at the top of their respective food chains were challenged by human activity, effectively acting as predaceous downward pressure on their population numbers. The current study reveals that similar threats remain that warrant further reforms. Prior studies have deemed anticoagulant rodenticides "super-predators" in ecosystems for the widespread damage that can result from their use. This is because rodents that eat these chemicals, often contained in toxic baits, do not die immediately. The anticoagulant nature of these rodenticides means that they stop an animal's blood from clotting, resulting in a slow, painful death. The animal becomes confused and slow, blood vessels are ruptured, hair and skin loss begin to occur, and nosebleeds and bleeding gums will present prior to succumbing to the poison.

While a rodent is likely to die from this poison, ingesting it also turns it into a sort of poison trojan horse for any predator that may take advantage of its slow decline. An eagle that eats a poisoned rodent at the edge of death will be the next to succumb to the anticoagulant effects of the chemical. If not killed outright, a poisoning event can weaken a predator's immune system and make the animal more susceptible to disease. "Humans need to understand that when those compounds get into the environment, they cause horrible damage to many species, including our national symbol, the bald eagle," Dr. Ruder told CNN.

Over a decade ago EPA issued rules intended to reduce non-target poisonings from rodenticide use. However, the study notes that ongoing poisonings must continue to be investigated. "The prevalence of exposure is concerning, and the documentation of SGAR toxicosis in eagles in this study suggests that exposure and

mortality due to SGAR exposure remains a problem in eagles, despite recent risk mitigation efforts," the authors write.

Fifty years ago, EPA met the challenge of protecting the nation's iconic birds of prey from collapse. With fair warning of future problems, we need not wait until another crisis to stop the use of toxic pesticides. The state of California is...

Federal Analysis Finds Insecticide Malathion Imperils Continued Existence of 78 Endangered Plants, Animals

N/A, Center for Biological Diversity

https://biologicaldiversity.org/w/news/press-releases/federal-analysis-finds-insecticide-malathion-imperils-continued-existence-of-78-endangered-plants-animals-2021-04-20/

Using Trump-era Guidelines, 'Jeopardy' Calls Reduced from 1,284 to 78 Species

WASHINGTON— A U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service analysis released today has found that the commonly used insecticide malathion jeopardizes the continued existence of 78 endangered plants and animals.

The analysis is one of most extreme findings of harm ever published by the Service. Yet it represents a dramatic departure from the findings of an Obama administration analysis scrapped by the Trump administration that found malathion jeopardized 1,284 endangered plants and animals.

Today's analysis deploys former Interior Secretary David Bernhardt's methods to discount the harms of the pesticide by unlawfully relying on incomplete, unreliable estimates of its use rather than looking more broadly at the overall effects of its registration by the Environmental Protection Agency, as required by the Endangered Species Act.

Malathion is used on a wide variety of crops, including corn, wheat, vegetables and fruits and is sprayed for mosquito control.

"This deep bow to the Trump administration's reckless disregard for science imperils the survival of over a thousand of our most endangered plants and animals," said Lori Ann Burd, environmental health director at the Center for Biological Diversity. "The Fish and Wildlife Service's disappointing decision to embrace the junk science policies of the previous administration risks the extinction of animals like rusty patched bumblebees, Indiana bats and whooping cranes to prop up pesticide company profits."

Around 1 million pounds of malathion are used in the United States each year. The insecticide is a neurotoxin that is part of the dangerous class of old pesticides called organophosphates. Organophosphates were used as nerve agents in chemical warfare and have been linked to Gulf War syndrome, which causes fatigue, headaches, skin problems and breathing disorders in people.

The analysis raises questions about the pesticide's potential harm to pollinators and of the consequences to endangered plants. Plants make up more than half of all endangered species, and the overwhelming majority of endangered plants are dependent on insect pollinators to reproduce.

Because the EPA allows the use of malathion virtually anywhere, the harm to plants and animals is widespread.

"We need to impose commonsense restrictions on pesticide use if we want to dodge mass extinctions in this country, and this is our moment to do just that for malathion," said Burd. "But that won't happen unless the Biden administration grows a spine and stands up to the powerful pesticide industry. And this analysis suggests that they'd rather not."

BACKGROUND

As part of a legal settlement, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was supposed to issue a biological opinion by the end of 2017 identifying ways to safeguard endangered species from malathion, as well as two other organophosphate insecticides, chlorpyrifos and diazinon, as required by the Endangered Species Act.

In January 2017 the EPA completed its part of that process when it issued its biological evaluation determining that 97 percent of federally protected species are likely harmed by malathion, which also has been found by the World Health Organization to be "probably carcinogenic to humans."

Following the EPA's announcement, officials at Dow AgroSciences, which produces malathion, asked the Trump administration to suspend the assessments.

In May 2017 the Fish and Wildlife Service announced that after nearly four years of work its draft biological opinion assessing the pesticide's harms was nearly complete and would be ready for public comment within months. As Fish and Wildlife Service career staffers were preparing to make the biological opinion available for public comment, they briefed Trump's political appointees, including then-acting Interior Secretary Bernhardt, on the results of the agency's rigorous scientific review.

Following this briefing, top officials at the...

Comment: Why a pesticide contamination case in the US should concern all of us

Geraint Roberts, Chemical Watch

https://chemicalwatch.com/251664/comment-why-a-pesticide-contamination-case-in-the-us-should-concern-all-of-us

Last year Kyla Bennet, a scientist working for a civic society group in Massachusetts, began to ponder why there was an area with drinking water contaminated with per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFASs) that lacked obvious sources of contamination, such as defence facilities, chemical plants or firefighting training sites. Where was the contamination coming from? Could there be a connection to the aerial spraying of mosquito insecticide that occurred every year?

To test the theory, the Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER) group examined the insecticide, Anvil 10+10, which is stored and transported in high-density polyethylene (HDPE) containers. Tests found PFAS compounds in the pesticide.

Alerted to the results, the US EPA decided to do its own tests, not only to see if PEER's findings would be

confirmed, but also to work out where the PFAS compounds were coming from. The agency discovered that none were approved for use as active or inert ingredients in Anvil 10+10, so it decided to test product samples from different steps in the production/distribution process – and to rinse both the inside and the outside of the HDPE containers, and analyse the rinsates. Testing on a limited number of containers used by one Anvil 10+10 supplier found eight PFAS compounds, including perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA).

The EPA thinks it has found the source. As a final stage in their production process, the HDPE containers used to store and transport the pesticide were treated inside and outside with fluorine gas, in a reactor. This was done to create a chemical barrier that makes them tough enough to contain liquid chemicals and solvents that would otherwise react with the container and cause it to buckle, or the product inside to become damaged. The PFAS compounds in the pesticide, says the agency, were formed by fluorine atoms reacting with the plastic, either during the fluorination process or afterwards, and then leaching into the containers' contents.

If this is correct, and fluorinated containers are widely used, mosquito pesticides could be the tip of the iceberg. The PFAS levels connected to the pesticide containers are very low, but we don't know how many containers are leaching PFASs. Millions of acres could be sprayed with pesticides containing PFASs. The EPA says many companies use fluorinated containers to store and distribute pesticides and that "fluorinated polyethylene and HDPE are used for numerous applications such as food packaging". Companies offering fluorinated plastic containers say that as well as pesticides, the range of products that can benefit from them includes petroleum products, solvents, as well as household and beauty products containing enzymes. According to a post on the website of US firm Berlin Packaging, dated October 2019,"new trending uses" for fluorinated containers include food and beverage containers. The American Chemistry Council says fluorinated packaging is manufactured by numerous companies worldwide and that the US Food and Drug Administration has authorised fluorinated HDPE packaging and several specific fluorinated substances for food contact materials.

Six months on from PEER's test results and we are none the wiser about the scale of the problem. The EPA is testing different brands of fluorinated containers but it is yet to provide evidence that pins down the potential scale of the issue. The chemical, pesticide and agricultural container trade bodies working with the EPA have also not yet provided evidence. Most say that until the local press ran stories about PEER's testing, they were unaware that fluorinated containers might leach PFASs.

The issue has also caught authorities on the hop in Europe, where five countries are preparing a wide-ranging EU restriction on PFAS compounds. The restriction is likely to encompass the whole lifecycle of...

++

For more news, visit:

- Inside EPA: https://insideepa.com/
- Inside TSCA: https://insideepa.com/inside-tsca-home
- Bloomberg Environment and Energy: https://news.bloombergenvironment.com/environment-and-energy/

If you'd like to be removed or would like to add someone to the listserv please contact Bailey Rosen at Rosen.Bailey@epa.gov. Feedback and interesting articles are welcomed. Thanks and enjoy!

And while you're reading.... Remember to shoot your coworkers a shooting star!