ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115

Majority (202) 225-2927 Minority (202) 225-3641

October 16, 2018

Dr. Peter Grevatt
Director
Office of Groundwater and Drinking Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Dr. Grevatt:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Environment on September 6, 2018, to testify at the hearing entitled "Perfluorinated Chemicals in the Environment: An Update on the Response to Contamination and Challenges Presented."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. Also attached are Member requests made during the hearing. To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions and requests with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Tuesday, October 30, 2018. Your responses should be mailed to Kelly Collins, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to kelly.collins@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

John Shimkus

Chairman

Subcommittee on Environment

cc: The Honorable Paul Tonko, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Environment

Attachments

Attachment—Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable John Shimkus

- 1. Your testimony states that there are "many PFAS chemicals."
 - a. What is the correct number?
 - b. Of the chemicals in the PFAS class
 - i. How many of them are well-understood?
 - ii. For how many is the Agency missing health effects data?
- 2. EPA has very robust authority under the reforms made to title I of the Toxic Substances Control Act to require the production of new information on a chemical substance. If there is so little known about PFAS health effects data, why isn't EPA using this authority to quickly fill these information gaps?
- 3. How similar are the chemicals in the PFAS class to each other in other words, do they all act the same in the environment, do they all have the same effect on the human body?
- 4. Your testimony mentions that "there is evidence that exposure to certain PFAS may lead to adverse health effects." This sounds scary, but you just mentioned that the majority of PFAS chemicals are not well understood.
 - a. Is there a difference in certainty between "there is evidence" and "science demonstrates"?
 - b. What are the "certain PFAS" that "may"?
 - c. Are all PFAS toxic?
- 5. Your testimony talked about the health advisory level of 70 parts per trillion, individually or combined, for PFOA and PFOS. How low of a reading can existing monitors detect these contaminants?
- 6. Today's hearing has raised questions about EPA being able to protect vulnerable subpopulations from adverse health effects.
 - a. To do that, wouldn't the Agency necessarily have to do aggregate and cumulative exposure analyses?
 - b. Does the Agency have an agreed upon protocol for doing aggregate exposure assessments?

- c. Does the Agency have an agreed upon protocol for doing cumulative exposure assessments?
- 7. For site remediation of PFAS,
 - a. What are the available methods that may be deployed?
 - b. What is the Federal government doing to ensure communities have sufficient information to assess the public health benefits against the cost for deploying these systems?
- 8. For drinking water systems,
 - a. What are the available remediation methods that communities may deploy to address PFAS contamination?
 - b. How affective are these?
 - c. Are there other technologies being examined to address potential drinking water contamination?
- 9. Please explain how EPA is addressing emerging contaminants, such as PFAS, with respect to environmental cleanups?
- 10. When does EPA intend to have resolution on whether PFOA and PFOS are hazardous substances under Superfund?

The Honorable Paul Tonko

- 1. National Management Plan
 - a. What specific EPA actions are being considered as part of the National Management Plan?
 - b. Will the Plan include a decision on whether or not to designate PFOA and/or PFOS as a hazardous substance under CERCLA?
- 2. Dr. Grevatt, you mentioned building out capacity for labs to test for PFAS.
 - a. How many labs in the United States are now capable of using Method 537 (or an EPA-approved method for testing for PFAS)?
 - b. What is the approximate cost of testing for PFAS at one of these labs?
 - c. While EPA is considering whether a regulatory determination should be made for PFOA and PFOS, are you also considering what financial or technical assistance

options may be available for testing and treating the water of citizens relying upon private wells, which would not be bound by a MCL?

Attachment 2—Member Requests for the Record

During the hearing, Members asked you to provide additional information for the record, and you indicated that you would provide that information. For your convenience, descriptions of the requested information are provided below.

The Honorable Scott H. Peters

1. Studies tracking PFOS in marine organisms and ocean waters, PFOS was added to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in 2009, and we are not party to that Convention but is EPA doing anything to monitor coastal waters for these compounds and are you working with other countries to control the spread of these contaminants?