



August 11, 2023

The Honorable Michael S. Regan
Administrator
US Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20460

Via electronic submission

Re: Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OLEM–2022–0922; Addressing Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances in the Environment

Dear Administrator Regan,

The Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA) welcomes the opportunity to provide comment on EPA’s request for public input on its consideration to designate additional PFAS as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). AMWA is an organization of the largest publicly owned drinking water systems in the United States. Our member utilities collectively provide clean drinking water to over 160 million people. The association has voiced serious concerns that this proposal, and others like it, will have significant financial implications on drinking water utilities and, by extension, their ratepayers. While the association is generally supportive of efforts to reduce burdens of PFAS contamination, AMWA cautions EPA of future additions before Congress have provided liability protections to passive receivers.

AMWA supports the “polluter pays” principle

AMWA strongly supports CERCLA’s core principle of “polluter pays,” which is intended to hold entities financially responsible for the cleanup of sites they contaminated. EPA must do more to hold chemical producers and manufacturers financially accountable for their actions, consequently incentivizing them to adopt safer practices, invest in pollution prevention measures, and develop alternative substances that are less harmful to public health and the environment.

Drinking water utilities played no role in generating, using, or profiting from PFAS that were placed into commerce. However, water systems across the county will be required, at significant

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT John Entsminger Las Vegas Valley Water Dist.	VICE PRESIDENT Yvonne Forrest Houston Water	TREASURER Jeffrey Szabo Suffolk County Water Authority	SECRETARY vacant	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER Tom Dobbins	
Mike Armstrong WaterOne	Tad Bohannon Central Arkansas Water	Edward Campbell Portland Water Bureau	Shane Chapman Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Andrea Cheng Chicago Department of Water Management	Scott Dewhirst Tacoma Water
Calvin Farr Prince William County Service Authority	Randy E. Hayman Philadelphia Water Department	Ghassan Korban Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans	Yann Le Gouellec Newport News Waterworks	Angela Licata New York City Department of Environmental Protection	Lindsey Rehtin Northern Kentucky Water District
Holly Rosenthal Phoenix Water Services Department	John P. Sullivan, Jr. Boston Water and Sewer Commission	Todd Swingle Toho Water	Timothy Thomure Tucson Water	Paul Vojtek Erie Water Works	

cost, to remove certain PFAS from drinking water sources when the national primary drinking water regulation is finalized. These costs will ultimately fall on ratepayers, so it would be patently unfair for these same ratepayers to incur additional cost liability related to the cleanup of the ultimate disposal site of these substances. These environmental cleanup costs should be borne by the polluters who allowed them to enter the environment in the first place.

AMWA would like to reiterate concerns it communicated to EPA previously when the agency proposed designating PFOA and PFOS as hazardous substances under CERCLA. These comments are attached here for the agency's review, as the concerns will apply to any future designations of additional PFAS until the water sector is exempt from liabilities pertaining to PFAS disposal and cleanup. The letter was submitted on November 7, 2022, and EPA has not yet finalized this rulemaking or fully addressed those comments. Therefore, it is unclear what issues remain, what additional issues will rise after the rule goes in effect, and what information AMWA needs to provide EPA to address them. EPA should hold off on any further designations until the concerns AMWA and other water sector organizations have expressed are thoroughly resolved.

EPA's plans for "enforcement discretion" are incomplete and insufficient

EPA has indicated it would use "enforcement discretion" when considering potential CERCLA liability for drinking water systems in relation to environmental cleanups of PFAS. While AMWA appreciates the acknowledgement from EPA that any potential designation would require additional measures by EPA to avoid putting unwarranted burdens on the water sector, this step does little to reassure water utilities that they will not incur large costs associated with CERCLA liability. These enforcement discretions are not legally binding, can be rescinded at any time during any administration, and cannot guarantee that third parties will not pursue lawsuits against public water systems to spread out the financial burdens of cleanups.

EPA has not completed drafting this enforcement discretion policy and has explicitly stated it will not seek public comment on the document. AMWA would like to request EPA provide the document for comment before implementation. AMWA would also ask EPA to hold off on any additional designations until that policy is finalized, and for EPA to make the policy publicly available.

EPA should allow AMWA and others time to achieve a legislative fix

AMWA has reiterated multiple times that unless Congress first enacts a clear, narrowly tailored exemption for drinking water systems, members and their ratepayers will permanently face a "community pays" outcome that unfairly shifts the clean-up and liability costs onto municipalities and the public they serve. AMWA and other members of the Water Coalition Against PFAS strongly supported introduction of the "Water Systems PFAS Liability Protection Act" (S. 1430), a bill that would provide such liability protections.

AMWA asks EPA to hold off on proposed designations of any additional PFAS as CERCLA hazardous substances until Congress has time to consider this legislative solution. The bill was just introduced in May, and we understand that the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee is in the process of developing a bipartisan PFAS package. EPA should allow the committee the time to complete this important work, and for Congress to consider comprehensive PFAS legislation that includes these necessary liability protections, before designating additional PFAS as hazardous substances under CERCLA.

AMWA appreciates the opportunity to comment on this advanced notice of proposed rulemaking. If you have any additional questions on this topic, please contact Brian Redder (Redder@AMWA.net), AMWA's Manager of Regulatory and Scientific Affairs.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Dobbins". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Tom Dobbins
Chief Executive Officer

cc: Jennifer McLain, OGWDW
Michelle Schutz, OLEM
Barry Breen, OLEM

Attachment



**ASSOCIATION OF
METROPOLITAN
WATER AGENCIES**

LEADERS IN WATER

1620 I Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006

P 202.331.2820
amwa.net

November 07, 2022

Michael S. Regan
Administrator
US Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20460

Via electronic submission

Re: EPA-HQ-OLEM-2019-0341-0001; Designation of PFOA and PFOS as CERCLA hazardous substances

Dear Administrator Regan,

The Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA) appreciates the opportunity to provide comment on EPA’s proposal to designate perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS) as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). AMWA is an organization of the largest publicly owned drinking water systems in the United States. Our member utilities collectively provide clean drinking water to over 160 million people. The association has serious concerns that this proposal will have significant financial implications on drinking water utilities and, by extension, their ratepayers, and urges EPA to consider these costs and be transparent in its efforts to alleviate them.

AMWA strongly supports CERCLA’s core principle of “polluter pays,” which is intended to hold entities financially responsible for the cleanup of sites they contaminated. AMWA has also expressed support for EPA’s regulatory determination to establish a National Primary Drinking Water Regulation (NPDWR) for PFOA and PFOS, due to the significant risks of severe health effects associated with high levels of both substances in drinking water. However, given that drinking water utilities have played no role in generating, using, or profiting from PFAS that were placed into commerce, but will be required, at significant cost, to remove these substances from drinking water sources when the NPDWR is finalized, it would be patently unfair for water systems and their customers to face additional cost liability related to the cleanup of the ultimate disposal site of these substances.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT

John Entsminger
Las Vegas Valley Water Dist.

Mike Armstrong
WaterOne

Calvin Farr
Prince William County Service Authority

Joe Mantua
Beaufort Jasper Water & Sewer Authority

Paul Vojtek
Erie Water Works

VICE PRESIDENT

Yvonne Forrest
Houston Water

Tad Bohannon
Central Arkansas Water

Randy E. Hayman
Philadelphia Water Department

Lindsey Rehtin
Northern Kentucky Water District

TREASURER

Jeffrey Szabo
Suffolk County Water Authority

Edward Campbell
Portland Water Bureau

Robert Hunter
Municipal Water District of Orange County

Holly Rosenthal
Phoenix Water Services Department

SECRETARY

James S. Lochhead
Denver Water

Shane Chapman
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

Ghassan Korban
Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans

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

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Tom Dobbins

Scott Dewhirst
Tacoma Water

Angela Licata
New York City Department of Environmental Protection

Timothy Thomure
Tucson Water

Andrea Cheng
Chicago Department of Water Management

Yann Le Gouellec
Newport News Waterworks

Todd Swingle
Toho Water

Unfortunately, if PFOA and PFOS are designated as hazardous substances under CERCLA, then our members and their ratepayers will permanently face a “community pays” outcome that unfairly shifts the clean-up and liability costs onto municipalities and the public they serve—people who are already facing affordability challenges. This will be a very problematic outcome unless Congress first enacts a clear, narrowly tailored exemption for drinking water systems that legally dispose of PFOA and PFOS removed pursuant to compliance with any future NPDWR. When acting in accordance with all applicable laws, drinking water systems should not be held liable for the cost of cleaning up PFAS contamination that escaped into the environment after it was properly disposed of following its removal during the water treatment process.

In its current form, EPA’s proposed designation of PFOA and PFOS as hazardous substances allows for drinking water utilities to face unwarranted liability and legal defense costs at Superfund sites, such as landfills or agricultural sites, which would divert vital resources from their primary responsibilities of protecting public health and the environment. Under CERCLA, any party who has contributed in any part to disposing of hazardous substances, even trace amounts, may be held liable for remediation. Therefore, a drinking water system that disposes of water treatment byproducts containing PFAS could be held liable under CERCLA years or decades later if the disposal location becomes a Superfund site due to PFAS contamination.

EPA recently indicated it would use “enforcement discretion” when considering potential CERCLA liability for drinking water systems in relation to PFOA and PFOS. While AMWA appreciates the acknowledgement from EPA that this designation, if finalized, would require additional measures by EPA to avoid putting unwarranted burdens on the water sector, this step does little to reassure water utilities that they will not incur large costs associated with CERCLA liability. Drinking water utilities are not even cited in any of the five broad categories EPA has listed as potentially affected parties, so it is important EPA acknowledge the potential burdens it will be imposing on drinking water systems and their customers.

EPA should quickly release its plan for enforcement discretion for the water sector, one which guarantees that the legal disposal of water treatment byproducts containing PFOA or PFOS by a drinking water system cannot trigger a CERCLA enforcement action by EPA or any other party. The agency should also establish a mechanism to ensure that this guarantee will be honored by different administrations in the future. If such a step is beyond EPA’s ability or authority, then the proposed hazardous substance designation should not be finalized.

AMWA has significant concerns that other potentially responsible parties will continue the common practice of bringing other parties into legal actions to try and reduce their overall share of the cost of clean-up. In this situation, we again see the shift of burdens from the entity responsible for the pollution to the community affected by the pollution. EPA has recognized this as an issue and must do more to support the water sector in its efforts to avoid cleanup liability and reduce burdens on ratepayers.

Many states have already implemented their own regulations to limit the amount of PFAS in drinking water, meaning some utilities are already required to remove it from source waters, and subsequently dispose of it. As EPA prepares to propose its own NPDWR for PFOA and PFOS, EPA should recognize the difficult situation this will put drinking water utilities in. The water sector will be legally required to remove PFAS from drinking water and dispose of media in a hazardous waste site - thereby forcing local ratepayers to cover the cleanup bill after they already paid to remove the PFAS from their source water. EPA should consider how these two rulemakings affect each other and work to prevent costs of removal, disposal, and potential liabilities, from falling to ratepayers.

The proposed designation of PFOA and PFOS as hazardous substances also runs in direct opposition to the agency's commitment to environmental justice, as the impacts of the proposed rule could require vulnerable communities to bear the brunt of remediation costs for environmental contamination they did not create. For example, in the case of a community adjacent to a facility producing PFOS and PFOA released into the environment, the most vulnerable community members would be most susceptible to the negative health effects of the contamination. Requiring this community's water utility – and by extension, its ratepayers – to then pay for costs of the PFOS and PFOA removed from drinking water would cause further strain to vulnerable households and individuals struggling to pay their water bills. EPA should quickly release its plans for preventing this “double jeopardy” like situation.

While the association is gravely concerned with the potential outcomes of this rulemaking, it is generally supportive of efforts to reduce the burdens of PFAS contamination. AMWA strongly supports further scientific research into disposal and destruction of PFAS to find better solutions to this complex problem. AMWA recommends EPA focus its efforts on finding sustainable and reliable methods for destruction to prevent build up in hazardous landfills.

AMWA appreciates the opportunity to provide this feedback to EPA on its proposal to designate PFOA and PFOS as hazardous substances under CERCLA. The association is also in agreement with and supportive of comments submitted by the Water Coalition Against PFAS expressing concerns with this proposal. If you have any questions about these comments, please contact Brian Redder, AMWA's Manager of Regulatory and Scientific Affairs, at Redder@amwa.net.

Sincerely,



Thomas Dobbins
Chief Executive Officer

cc: Jennifer McLain, OGWDW
Michelle Schutz, OLEM
Barry Breen, OLEM