

PFAS Subcommittee Meeting Notes

11/16/2024, 2:00 PM EST

Logsdon, Jackie (EEC)

Jacobs, Alicia (EEC)

Arnold, Melanie (EEC)

Thompson, Josh

Gaddis, Sarah J (EEC)

Cooper, Ashley

Powers, Brandon

Peter Goodmann

Roberts, Kevin

Bates, Robert

Castlen, Holly

Preher, Todd

Caywood, Sarah (EEC)

Ward, Tim

Arianna Lageman (Guest)

Osterman, Stefanie C (EEC)

Jason Petersen

Carissa Garland

Heather Davis

Doug Kimbler

Traylor, Madeline E (EEC)

Smith, Theodore

Eric Zhu

Herbert Woike

Bevins, James (EEC)

Kelley Dearing-Smith

Heather R King (Unverified)

Mills, Todd W

Dowling, Elizabeth F (EEC)

Stoffer, Amy (Unverified)

Catalfo, Carole (EEC)

Carwell, Michael M (EEC)

Logsdon, Jackie (EEC): 2 minutes 9 seconds

On the agenda. Really didn't have a big update this time. I did want to share an update on the initial monitoring progress and one of the things that I wanted to point out too is we've been in discussion with the labs as far as how they are reporting the UCMR5 data. So, under the rule they are just required to report the data to that minimum reporting level. That's in the UCMR5 five rule, and we've been talking about this, and I think I've presented on it at the last meeting. But with all the labs that Sarah Caywood has been able to get in contact with there's still a few that she's waiting to hear back from, it does look like the labs are going to be able to reprocess data, so not reprocess samples. But reprocess data to be able to report to the water system below that minimum reporting level of four for the PFOA and PFOS, so that's good.

We do know that Pace has already from the beginning, the reports that they've sent to their water systems have been in that original format that has the results what they actually were, and then as they submit the data to EPA, then it's submitted according to the UCMR5 rule, so we have found that out and but we're still working to get a hold of a few of the other ones. That's going to be the biggest piece because that UCMR5 data is going to be important as far as meeting the initial monitoring requirements without requiring systems to do a bunch of resampling.

So, as I go through these numbers, I just want to point out that this is not anything that's been submitted to us. We're still working with the labs on how they're going to be able to submit the data so that it can be uploaded into our database with these numbers.

Are assuming that water systems are going to be able to use the UCMR5 data to meet the minimum reporting requirements, but as of today and the data that we have available to us, we're at 34% complete of the water systems that have essentially completed the initial monitoring using UCMR5 and DOW data. So that's a total of 70 systems out of 205. So that's pretty good progress there considering we're still new on this. We're expecting another 35 percent of systems to be completed with UCMR5 be completed with what they need for the initial monitoring requirements through completing their UCMR5 sampling. And that runs through the end of 2025, so by the end of next year, another 35% should be complete. Let's say 20% of systems will be completed using the DOW sampling and that includes sampling that's ongoing now continuing into 2025. But really, like I said, the key is just making sure that that UCMR5 data is going to be able to be used. We have had some systems that have had some issues with the UCMR 5 sampling. Whether it was a sampling error or an issue at a lab where it knocked one of their samples out of being able to account for a quarterly sample for UCMR 5 and that information is being communicated directly with the water systems. So, Sarah Caywood is doing that outreach to make sure that systems know that they have a missing quarter that needs to be picked up as we're coming up in 2025.

And then the next thing on the agenda was to go through the subgroup report outs. Russell Neal is unavailable and he's the chair of the funding subgroup, but we really don't have an update on that anyway, so there won't be a report out on that. Amy, are you on here? Would you want to go through the bench and pilot study subgroup report out?

Amy Stoffer: 8 minutes 17 seconds

I am. I'm having computer issues, so I apologize. I'm not on teams, but I am here, at least on the phone. So, we did have a meeting October 21st and Jackie, if you want to expand on anything, I'll go over to high level, but feel free to add any details. So, DOW staff is working with USEPA on a study with seven utilities in Kentucky participating in this study. So, there have been site visits with EPA and utilities either completed or soon to be completed the samples will be collected on site for water quality data and the bulk water that will be used to do the testing will be sampled at the utility and the actual Jar testing will be done in the USEPA lab in Cincinnati, so we look forward to hopefully having some of those results shared down the road, hopefully not too distant down the road.

So, we've been looking at some resources that are available to States and utilities on PFAS. So, there's a couple things going on there that participants on the subgroup are involved in. So, I am working on a project with American Water Works Association and association state drinking water. Is it agencies or administrators? I might have the last day wrong, but there's a project that that is being completed as part of AWWA PFAS tool kit where guidance is being developed to help and the systems understand what'll be required for demonstration, testing and permits. So, there's a workshop coming up in Chicago at the tail end of the water Quality technology Conference for that group. And then AWWA, in addition to developing some new material is also working on updating the existing PFAS toolkit materials. So, it might be end of December or early next year till any of those that those documents either updated or new becomes available. But certainly, I will be relaying to this group once the schedules are a little bit firmer, when some of that new information is available. Certainly, there is existing information out there in a AWWA PFAS toolkit, so you know, feel free to look at that. But there are some new materials coming, it's just not ready right now.

We had found in Arizona Department of Environmental Quality document that is a decision tree I guess make matrices on kind of walking through the process that a system might need to go through and helping to understand how one might comply with the PFAS rule. Just wanted to let you know that that document is out there, and we can share that link for anybody that might be interested in looking at that document.

Logsdon, Jackie (EEC): 12 minutes 49 seconds

And also, I will say Amy too on these decision trees there was a small EPA small system webinar on October the 29th and the person that was the lead on developing these decision trees gave a presentation and goes into more details about how they were developed and the resources and the peer review and everything that went through. So if you look at this resource and you want more information on it, I encourage you to go back and if the recording's not up on EPA's website yet, it will be soon, but it'll be under the small system Webinar series is where you'll be able to find that.

Amy Stoffer: 13 minutes 32 seconds

Great. Yeah, I was not able to participate in the live version, so hopefully they'll post that out there where we can access it. And then the only other thing we did, scheduled December 9th, 2024, would be our next subgroup meeting, 2:00 to 3:00.

Logsdon, Jackie (EEC): 14 minutes 21 seconds

OK. And then Kelly, would you like to give us an update on the communication subgroup?

Kelley Dearing-Smith: 14 minutes 28 seconds

Sure. Hello everyone. I'm also like Amy not having issues, but at a place where I can't get my camera on, so I'll just verbally give the update. So, our communication subgroup held its first meeting on Friday, October the 11th. We had a nice diverse group of water utility folks and people from the state was a good conversation. So, at that meeting, the first thing we did is solidified amongst our group what we believe our expectations to be and the outcomes that we're producing. And so, as we see it, our role is to help give context to this topic of PFAS in terms of the testing, interpreting the data, what is it? We also want to give utilities tools, resources to talk about PFAS, talk about the testing.

How do you explain the data and the utilities response? We want to develop risk communication guidance, and this may not be so much developed as it is repackaging. There's a lot of good material that's already out there and so we can garner the best of what we can find. And then ultimately want to make sure that we help our utilities use this EPA regulation to strengthen the public's trust.

We spent a lot of time talking about the current situation, several of us shared, you know, how perhaps we've been targeted by the environmental working group.

Perhaps had to educate a constituent or a reporter about the difference between UCMR5 and the Reg running annual average. There's just a lot of confusing technical language that. Makes it really tough for a consumer to understand this topic. So, then we got into how we prioritize what we're doing and what is it that we can deliver to utilities knowing that we do have some time on the reporting stands from the regulation, but we didn't feel like we would wait, you know a year or two before we produced anything. So, I guess for today, if I could get any feedback from this group would be helpful.

What I'd like to do is share with you some of the ideas we talked about and if these are things that resonate with you, especially those of you who are at a utility or work with utilities, through what role water or the state. So we said one of our first to Do's would be to review the drinking water website, the state's website on PFAS, look at the language, look at our existing utility resources.

So, you know, what do we have at Louisville Water at Northern Kentucky perhaps? What does the state develop? Do we have risk communication? Examples. Templates that we could give to the state to repackage for all utilities.

We talked about this idea of a tool kit for PFAS. Think of it as PFAS 101, written at a fifth-grade level. How would you explain PFAS to someone who works at a utility? The media, your grandma, a politician? Just basic information. We suggested a story map. I think the state has some ability to do that for us. Perhaps a guide on how to make sense of the scary language.

Explain UCMR5, maybe even an infographic on what does it mean when we say running annual average? That seems to be causing a lot of confusion. UCMR5 data is being interpreted as The

Reg when it's really just trying to inform The Reg, but running annual average is hard to get your arms around.

And then the last idea we had was, would it be helpful for utilities to have just a virtual webinar teams meeting where you could ask questions about PFAS communication share? Best practices, really thinking of it as a safe place where you could feel like you could ask a peer, and someone could contribute with what they've what they've done. So, to summarize all of this, I was really happy with our first meeting. I felt like we solidified our goals. We started to brainstorm what we want to deliver.

We do have another meeting set in December where we're going to put a regular cadence on the calendar. But I would be curious for those of you, Jackie, if we can, on the call today, what do you need from a communication standpoint? Is it risk communication? Basic information? Do you want to be able to share with peers? Does any of this that I've said resonate with what those of you on the call would like to see? I know we love your thoughts though.

Amy Stoffer: 19 minutes 16 seconds

On the PFAS 101, the basic information in the story map, I guess that one maybe piqued my interest the most. You know, I live and breathe PFAS for the last couple years, so it's hard for me to kind of step back and you know, what would my mother understand about it? And do you think anything like that exists now? Or would this be completely brand new, potentially to do something like this?

Kelley Dearing-Smith: 19 minutes 55 seconds

I think I think we would pull from a few resources that I'm aware of. I know AWWA has some materials. I'm not sure about national water. I really need to look through the state's website again.

We have a few things at Louisville Water, but I do think it would be a matter of creating some things to working in conjunction with the state.

Amy Stoffer: 20 minutes 21 seconds

You know it, it might be. The easiest place to start in terms of maybe not the easiest to actually do it from a, put it together but in terms of the concept of where do we start to try to put it in a layperson's words as to what it is because I don't know that I that I've seen anything like that, but I haven't looked for it either. And most of the things I'm looking at are EPA documents and they're pretty technical.

Kelly Dearing-Smith: 20 minutes 55 seconds

Yes, so an example of what we might put into something like that at Louisville Water, we have a one-page document that we worked in conjunction with our water quality team on that gets as granular as how we're going to write copy for our website or put something in the CCR. So, for example, you will never see Louisville water use forever chemicals. That's a Hollywood term. We're not going to put that in our copy. We made that decision ourselves.

We also decided that in the first sentence or the headline of something in our CCR on our website, we're not going to use PFAS because most people don't understand what we're talking about when we say that to begin with. So, let's lead with some language that's more approachable.

So those are two very small examples of what we might do with this. You know, kind of this 101-learning opportunity is put yourself in the consumer's position to try to understand how they're receiving that information. I guess the last thing, Amy, we talked a lot about, and I just put the ideas in the chat too. We talked a lot about, you know, we all are visual learners, whether we realize it or not. And a lot of the materials that come from the EPA think they've gotten a lot better, but even on the utility side, they're very heavy on copy. So, thinking about how we describe this complicated topic with images and infographic and not necessarily a lot of text.

Amy Stoffer: 22 minutes 30 seconds

Yeah, I think that's where I would vote to start. If you're asking for feedback, it's just, you know, my opinion, I don't know how others feel, but just because I don't feel like I've seen that and it feels like it could be very helpful as we eventually we're going to have to explain a whole lot more other stuff about test results and whatnot, but that, you know, I think that's Step 2 step one is actually very understandable. What is the stuff? Why should I care?

Kelley Dearing-Smith: 23 minutes 7 seconds

Yep. So, I put the ideas in the chat. I mean, feel free to comment there or if you'd like to reach out to me directly. I would love to hear from those of you who have ideas or like Amy, something that resonated with her. Thanks Jackie. That's all I have.

Logsdon, Jackie (EEC): 23 minutes 30 seconds

Thank you, Kelly. That was really helpful. And we do want to make sure, like Kelly was saying, we do want to make sure that you know what we're developing is meeting the need. And so, we really encourage you. You may not have any ideas right now. But please, if you think of something, feel free to share that with me. Does anybody have any questions about what Kelly went over or want to add anything else? Are there any other topics? That need to be discussed. In the chat.

There was the question from Robert Bates about demonstration testing and we don't have a requirement for requiring pilot testing. And if systems are going to be installing the best available technologies that are listed in the PFAS rule, we aren't going to be requiring pilot testing, but we do encourage the testing recommend and encourage it because that pilot testing can let the system know how long the media will last, how often change out would have to happen and help them have a better understanding of how much the O&M is going to cost for their system, because that's going to vary from system to system. But getting some clarification and Robert, we can talk about this. Probably need to talk to our engineers and get back with you. But in my mind, demonstration pilot testing would be a type of demonstration testing where I think there are other demonstration methods that could be used as well. One question I think you had had in the past was about blending. If there's a water system that wants to blend to meet compliance. And I don't think that we've really made a decision on what we would do in that

scenario, but there may be some type of demonstration we would need to see whether you know, and it may just be sampling, I don't know. I think there are still, some details in that arena that we need to work out. We really haven't had some of those conversations, but I think these are really good questions. And Robert, if you want to expand on that.

Bates, Robert: 26 minutes 50 seconds

Well, I think you know we use the term demonstration test, pilot testing, rapid small scale column testing. You know, we've got all these different tests, and we just need to make sure that they may or may not be the same. Especially you know for the utility. So, they know what they may or may not have to do. You know, based on one their sampling results and you know their initial monitoring results, there's a lot of terms that are going back and forth and if we're going to say pilot test and let's say pilot test, if we're going to say demonstration, let's say demonstration, you know. I think we just need to rein in some of the terms that we're trying to use interchangeably.

Logsdon, Jackie (EEC): 27 minutes 46 seconds

I think that's a really good point and I appreciate that perspective and that's something that we can and that may even be something that we need to put together for water systems, but that's definitely something we can add to the list of things that we need to discuss.

Bates, Robert: 28 minutes 2 seconds

And it might be something Kelly that you could, you know, somehow incorporate into, you know, what you're doing as well.

Arianna Lageman: 28 minutes 20 seconds

I just want to pipe up and say that I think Robert Scott, a really great point. You know, we've talked a lot about the timeline and how it feels like we've got plenty of time, but we really don't. By the time we actually try to do some testing and get some treatment changes, maybe tweaks and what not in place, I'm going through the approval process and the financial process for the few systems that are going to need this. So, I think something that maybe we should ask DOW is for you all to attempt to work with your engineering and your plan's approval folks to maybe fast track a general guidance of minimum requirements that you're going to ask for utilities to submit in asking for treatment changes at their plant in order to cope with this sooner, we know exactly what we need to submit the I think the better off we're going to be.

Logsdon, Jackie (EEC): 29 minutes 29 seconds

Thank you, Ariana. So that's all we had on the agenda. I know that's a really short meeting.

Doug Kimbler: 30 minutes 14 seconds

Now this is a little on and off topic, but has anybody seen some ads on television or streaming for an eye drop product called my EBO MIEB 0? And, if you haven't, you really need to check it out.

It is 100%, per Floro Hexyl octane. So, FDA is approved putting pure PFAS into your eyes, but obviously four parts per trillion is too much in drinking water. And I will jump off the soapbox here because I'm getting ready to have a coffee fit anyway, but it's like, jeez, people please. MIEBO look it up. It's hilarious.

Logsdon, Jackie (EEC): 30 minutes 58 seconds

That's a new one for me.

Doug Kimbler: 31 minutes 3 seconds

Well, just thinking that something like that might go in with Kelly's stuff as well that you know, it's in more places than you think. Folks, don't worry about your drinking water, worry about your glide floss or your eyeballs.

Logsdon, Jackie (EEC): 31 minutes 31 seconds

OK. So maybe mid to late January, if anybody, feels differently about that? But, if that time frame sounds reasonable, I can send out a doodle poll later.

Does anyone on the call have anything? Alright, I'll give you some of your afternoon back. I really appreciate everyone's attendance today and we'll see you next time, and if you have any ideas for the communication subgroup, just send them our way.