



October 10, 2019

The Honorable Alexandra Dapolito Dunn  
Assistant Administrator  
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention  
Environmental Protection Agency  
1201 Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20460

Re: Docket ID: EPA-HQ-OPPT-2019-0495, *Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (19-5.B)*

Dear Assistant Administrator Dunn,

The Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA) is an organization representing the largest publicly owned drinking water utilities in the United States. Pollution prevention is paramount in protecting water sources for public water supply. For this reason, AMWA feels it is imperative to emphasize the importance of protecting drinking water sources through programs like the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). These programs are the first line of defense against the growing number of contaminants that could pose a risk to drinking water supplies and the public.

Our ability to test for chemicals in our environment has grown exponentially, and we are now aware of the persistent, bioaccumulative, and possible toxic characteristics of chemicals we once thought inert or non-problematic. The most recent and dramatic examples of this are the complex issues surrounding per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). These chemicals have been used for decades, but as our knowledge of these substances has grown, PFAS have been shown to be increasingly problematic. PFAS have highlighted the overwhelming need to better evaluate chemicals before allowing them to be used in commerce in order to prevent chemicals that may pose health risks from entering the environment and contaminating source waters.

Preventing pollutants from entering drinking water supply sources is a complex task. It is easier, more effective and more equitable to control pollutants at the source, where they are highly concentrated, than it is to remove them at the consumer's expense after they have entered a water body or supply source. Controlling pollutants at the source – in this case at the point of manufacture, import or process – also helps ensure that those who pollute our natural resources are not allowed to pass the cost of correcting the problem onto others.

AMWA has concerns with one of the substances listed in the latest Significant New Use Rule (SNUR) (84 FR 47923) and had expanded on these concerns below.

#### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

##### **PRESIDENT**

Steve Schneider  
Saint Paul Regional Water  
Services

Jerry Brown  
Contra Costa Water District

Shane Chapman  
Metropolitan Water District of  
Southern California

Rudolph Chow  
Baltimore City Department of  
Public Works

##### **VICE PRESIDENT**

Angela Licata  
New York City Department of  
Environmental Protection

Robert L. Davis  
Cleveland Department of Public  
Utilities

Yvonne Forrest  
Houston Public Utilities  
Division

Kevin Gertig  
Fort Collins Utilities

##### **TREASURER**

John Entsminger  
Las Vegas Valley Water  
District

Richard Harasick  
Los Angeles Department of  
Water and Power

Robert Hunter  
Municipal Water District of  
Orange County

##### **SECRETARY**

Kathryn Sorensen  
Phoenix Water Services

Carrie Lewis  
Portland Water District

James S. Lochhead  
Denver Water

Ron Lovan  
Northern Kentucky Water  
District

##### **CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**OFFICER**  
Diane VanDe Hei

Sue McCormick  
Great Lakes Water Authority

John P. Sullivan, Jr.  
Boston Water and Sewer  
Commission

Jeffrey Szabo  
Suffolk County Water Authority

Douglas Yoder  
Miami-Dade Water and Sewer  
Department

*PMN Number(s): P-17-0324*

*Chemical Name(s): 2,4-Hexadien-1-ol, 1-acetate, (2E,4E)-*

Within the notice EPA identified concerns for “specific target organ toxicity, skin and eye irritation, neurotoxicity, and aquatic toxicity” based on data from analogous chemicals. The notice goes on to require that there be no releases to surface waters that would exceed 5 ppb. After reviewing the information included within the docket, AMWA is concerned with EPA’s intent to permit the release of this chemical into surface waters.

In particular, AMWA is concerned with information stating that migration of this chemical to groundwater is moderate. As groundwater may be used as a source for drinking water, EPA should be especially cautious with chemicals that have this particular attribute. Furthermore, documents within the docket state that risks to the environment were not identified because the submitter is not expecting any releases to water. However, if EPA is allowing releases under this SNUR, more data should be collected regarding these risks. AMWA cautions against allowing for releases of this chemical into surface waters due to possible unforeseen risks in the future. Surface waters are often the source waters for drinking water utilities. Therefore, any allowance of chemical discharges to these waters should be made with this in mind, using scientifically sound data that is made readily available to the public for review and comment.

#### *Comments Related to the Process as a Whole*

For future SNURs, AMWA recommends that EPA reconsider approvals for chemicals that are known to have an acute toxicity to human health and have been identified as a potential contaminant of concern in drinking water supplies. The Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT) should coordinate with the EPA Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (OGWDW), which not only oversees the Safe Drinking Water Act implementation but also may have on its radar many of the chemicals being considered in this and future SNURs as potential drinking water contaminants. Furthermore, AMWA strongly encourages OPPT to utilize the knowledge base of the drinking water program at EPA’s OGWDW to better inform decision making for future SNURs.

AMWA also recommends that EPA include the agency’s PMN determination for each chemical included in future SNURs. It is necessary for the public to have access to these decision documents so that they might better understand the reasoning for EPA’s decision and provide the most useful and appropriate information. AMWA also requests that EPA clearly mark these documents within the docket. Currently, these documents are either not included or are not clearly marked forcing the public to parse through dozens, if not hundreds, of supporting documents included within the docket in order to find them. Dealing with this volume of documents is a cumbersome task and undermines the intent of the comment period by impeding the public’s access to information necessary to provide the agency with meaningful comments.

AMWA appreciates the agency’s application of searchable tables for both PMNs and Significant New Use Notices, as well as for chemicals determined not likely to present an unreasonable risk following PMN review. However, AMWA would like to note that it seems not all chemicals included in this most recent SNUR are found within these tables. If this is inaccurate, AMWA requests that EPA make this more apparent and easily accessible. Otherwise, AMWA suggests EPA complete this for each chemical before including them in any SNURs. AMWA also requests

Assistant Administrator Dunn

October 10, 2019

Page 3

that the location of these tables be made more apparent and easily accessible off the main SNURs webpage. Currently they are very difficult to locate without knowing the direct link.

AMWA is also concerned with EPA's method of obtaining "Potentially Useful Information". The agency states that the orders do not require testing to help determine potential health and/or environmental effects. The only incentive for manufacturers or users of these chemicals to obtain and submit this information is so that a modification or revoking of the PMN would be allowed. This approach provides a disincentive for additional study that could reveal more harmful health effects since disclosure of new information to the agency could prompt further study by EPA. Additional study would likely not remove the PMN and could possibly result in more federal restrictions on the chemical.

TSCA provides significant tools to help prevent harmful pollution. In addition to TSCA, the agency should consider how our current system of environmental regulation can be leveraged to protect human health and the environment across multiple media. Preventing pollution at the source is a more cost-effective option for protecting public health rather than relying solely on end-of-pipe treatment to ensure safe drinking water. Additional loadings into the environment of minimally studied chemicals, such as the ones identified in this letter, could result in future problems for source water protection and ultimately necessitate additional drinking water treatment at a high cost to the public.

It is crucial to strive towards the prevention of pollutants entering drinking water sources. TSCA provides us with a unique opportunity to protect the environment and public health. AMWA thanks EPA for the opportunity to comment and looks forward to working with the agency to protect drinking water sources in the future.

If you would like to further discuss our concerns, please call Stephanie Hayes Schlea, Regulatory and Scientific Affairs Manager, at 202-331-2820.

Sincerely,



Diane VanDe Hei  
Chief Executive Officer

cc: David Ross, Assistant Administrator, OW  
Eric Burneson, OGWDW  
Jennifer McLain, OGWDW  
Kenneth Moss, OPPT