

Alan Roberson Email Summary

EPA PFAS Leadership Summit on May 22-23

Good Afternoon State Administrators, I wanted to send out a summary and my take-aways from EPA's PFAS Leadership Summit on May 22-23 before my memory fogged up over the Memorial Day weekend. First off, the summit was well attended - approximately 210 people on the first day so the room was full - if you look closely you can find Lisa Daniels from PA and Doug Kinard from SC on the left of the picture below, as well as Daniel Czecholinski from AZ at the bottom. There were a few less on the second day when it was only federal and state staff - but it was still a full room as the format shifted to small discussion groups.

Second, considering the number of people in attendance and the diverse perspectives, some good discussions percolated through the Summit. EPA's facilitators used PollEverywhere the first day to solicit input and then developed word maps to show commonalities of the responses. On the second day, the small groups reported out on each of the three topics, and again, there were lots of commonalities.

At the start of the summit, EPA Administrator Pruitt announced EPA's Four-Step Action Plan:

1. EPA is starting the process to evaluate the need for an MCL for PFOA and PFOS, i.e., whether a regulatory determination is needed.
2. EPA is starting the process to propose designating PFOA and PFOS as "hazardous substances" under its existing statutory authority such as CERCLA Section 102.
3. EPA is currently developing groundwater cleanup recommendations for PFOA and PFOS at contaminated sites that should be released this fall.
4. EPA is developing toxicity values for GenX and PFBS.

At the start of Day 2, Peter Grevatt provided his summary seven points from Day 1:

1. We need to focus on risk communication and community involvement;
2. We need to prioritize our efforts;
3. There is a big universe of PFAS - should we focus on individual PFAS versus a group?
4. There are cross-media, cross-program sources, so we need to think about source control;
5. What does transparency mean for PFAS (in the context of PFAS complexity & uncertainty)?
6. There is a tremendous wealth of experience at the state and local levels; and
7. How do we get monitoring data (outside of UCMR3) without regulations that require monitoring?

EPA has posted the presentations from the Summit on its website. I would recommend taking a look at Brandon Kernen's presentation as he makes 11 excellent recommendations.

My own personal takeaway from this Summit is that there are many more potential sources of PFAS than I knew about or had thought about before and that I have a new tagline: "UCMR3 Data Does Not Equal the Potential PFAS Problems".

We will be coordinating with ECOS and ACWA and the other state environmental associations so that we are leveraging each others' efforts. One effort I am considering starting is collecting and analyzing monitoring data beyond UCMR3 that states have collected, so if you have such monitoring data, can you send me an email and let me know what you have so that I have some idea of the potential scope of this effort??

ASDWA's PFAS Workgroup will be holding a conference call in the near future to determine our next steps. ASDWA had excellent representation at this Summit, so many thanks to all of the state folks that made the trip to D.C. for this Summit! Alan

J. Alan Roberson, P.E.
Executive Director

Association of State Drinking Water Administrators (ASDWA)

1401 Wilson Blvd - Suite 1225
Arlington, VA 22209

Office (703) 812-9507