

To: Grevatt, Peter[Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov]; Orme-Zavaleta, Jennifer[Orme-Zavaleta.Jennifer@epa.gov]; Jackson, Ryan[jackson.ryan@epa.gov]
Cc: Flynn, Mike[Flynn.Mike@epa.gov]; Forsgren, Lee[Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov]; Ross, David P[ross.davidp@epa.gov]; Yamada, Richard (Yujiro)[yamada.richard@epa.gov]
From: Beck, Nancy
Sent: Thur 1/18/2018 8:46:28 PM
Subject: RE: PFAS mtg with ATSDR

Thanks Peter and Jennifer.

We did make significant progress in understanding on the call. Kudo's to ORD for making it happen. I have to agree with Peter here-- I think there may be significant concerns, especially considering implications for susceptible populations which came as a surprise to OCSPP staff. Seeing all the numbers ATSDR mentioned on paper will help. However, an internal discussion may be useful as well.

thanks,
Nancy

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP
P: 202-564-1273
M: 202-731-9910
beck.nancy@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Grevatt, Peter
Sent: Wednesday, January 17, 2018 5:41 PM
To: Orme-Zavaleta, Jennifer <Orme-Zavaleta.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>
Cc: Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>; Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>; Ross, David P <ross.davidp@epa.gov>; Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>; Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: PFAS mtg with ATSDR

Thanks Jennifer. I agree that the call provided the opportunity to discuss differences between the approaches used by EPA and ATSDR. I think it is important to note that we disagree with the perspective that there is not a significant difference between our drinking water values. I think it would be helpful to get the folks on this email together for a brief discussion of recommended next steps.

Thanks, P. Grevatt

-----Original Message-----

From: Orme-Zavaleta, Jennifer
Sent: Wednesday, January 17, 2018 2:50 PM
To: Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>
Cc: Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>; Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>; Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>; Ross, David P <ross.davidp@epa.gov>; Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>
Subject: PFAS mtg with ATSDR

Ryan, yesterday OCSPP, OW, OLEM, and ORD had a call with ATSDR on the risk levels they developed for PFOA and PFOS. This was an initial call with their scientists and managers to better understand the basis for their risk levels, why and how they differ from EPA's health advisory, and how we might be able to coordinate better going forward. Jim Kim (and another whose name I don't remember) from OMB also listened in.

For PFOA, ATSDR chose a different study as the basis for their risk level than EPA. A study which meets their criteria for basing a risk assessment but one in which we would typically judge as inadequate for serving as the basis for quantifying a risk level. For PFAS, ATSDR selected the same study as EPA but applied an additional uncertainty factor to address concerns for toxicity to the immune system. We did not apply an additional factor and think this uncertainty is already addressed in our assessment.

They are in the process of clearing the Toxicity Profile document for these and other PFAS compounds for release as another draft, seeking comment from other agencies and the stakeholders one more time. So these risk levels will not be considered final as yet.

While these risk numbers differ from ours, ATSDR made the point that when converted to represent a drinking water intake level (as milligrams per liter) they do not differ significantly from EPA's Health Advisory.

Going forward, ATSDR will share with us a summary of the call. We also talked about getting our scientists/risk assessors together with theirs and see if we can't better coordinated on finalizing these and other assessments. This call was helpful with informing our communications on the differences.

I invite Peter and Richard to add in anything I missed. We are happy to talk with you further.

Jennifer

Sent from my iPad