

Washington Departments of Ecology & Health Per-and Poly-Fluorinated Alkyl Substances (PFAS) Chemical Action Plan (CAP) Advisory Committee Meeting

Ecology Headquarters Lacey WA | Thursday, October 4, 2018
9:00 am to 2:30 pm | Meeting Documents: [Ecology EZ ViewWebsite](#)

On October 4, 2018, Ecology and DOH met with the CAP advisory committee and other interested parties to discuss a brainstorm list of PFAS CAP goals and options. Ecology and DOH provided a list of goals and options for discussion. Participants included representatives from industry and business associations, local, federal and tribal government, water providers, environmental organizations, and others.

- [Meeting agenda](#)
- [Goals and Options](#) document

Advisory Committee Attendees (*webinar):

Jessica Bowman, FluoroCouncil
Joyce Dinglasan-Panlilio*, University of Washington-Tacoma
Steven Gilbert, Institute of Neurotoxicology and Neurological Disorders
Doug Kelly*, Island County Environmental Health
John Lovie, Whidbey Island Water Systems Association

Grant Nelson*, Association of Washington Business
Rory O'Rourke, King County Dept of Natural Resources
Cheri Peele, Clean Production Action
Don Robbins*, Port of Seattle
Erika Schreder, Toxic-Free Future
Heather Trim, Zero Waste Washington
Abigail Welch, Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe

Interested Parties (*webinar):

Frank Adamsky, Daikin America, Inc.*
Matt Bangcaya, King County Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP)
Evan Bruning, Serlin Haley LLP*
Hollie Burt, Step2*
Laura Cook*
Merv Coover, Western States Petroleum Association
Holly Davies, King County LWHMP
Lauren Dempsey, U.S. Air Force*
Frank Dick, City of Vancouver*
Chris Generous, U.S. Navy*
Peggy Horst, W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc*
Al Innes, Minnesota DEP*
Danielle Jorgensen, Landau Associates*

Steve Korzenowski, FluoroCouncil
Evan Laganis, AGC Chemicals Americas, Inc.*
Carolyn Logue, C. Logue Public Affairs*
Kristin Marshall, Boeing*
Bryan McCulloch, DOW Chemical
Keith Petka, Chemours*
Ron Russ, Pangborn Memorial Airport*
Tim Shestek, American Chemistry Council *
Lindsay Stovall, American Chemistry Council*
Shirlee Tan, Public Health Seattle King County
Taylor Tidwell, U.S. Air Force
Laurie Valeriano, Toxic-Free Future
Kathryn VanNatta, NW Pulp and Paper Association*
Sarah Wightman, Marten Law*

State Agency Staff (*webinar)

Maria Blackshear, WA Dept of Ecology (ECY)
Derrick Dennis, WA Dept of Health (DOH)*
Elmer Diaz, DOH
Ellie Ott, ECY
Anne Knapp, ECY
Callie Mathieu, ECY
Mike Means, DOH
Thatcher Montgomery, ECY*
Barb Morrissey, DOH
Kasia Patora, ECY

Brian Penttila, ECY
Sean Smith, ECY
Kara Steward, ECY
Kari Trumbull, ECY
Bridgette Valdez-Kogle, ECY
Saskia van Bergen, ECY*
Jim White, ECY
Sam Wilson, ECY
Ken Zarker, ECY

Agency Presentations - Slides: [Ecology](#), [Dept of Health](#), [Economics](#)

Ecology and Health presented on:

- Status of the PFAS CAP process – Kara Steward, Ecology
- Update on firefighting foam and food packaging – Ken Zarker, Brian Penttila, Ecology
- Update on drinking water rule and sampling – Barbara Morrissey, Mike Means, Health
- Update on PFAS contamination cleanup (no slides) – Jim White, Ecology
- CAP economics – Kasia Patora, Ecology

Discussion of CAP Recommendations

Meeting attendees brainstormed a list of CAP Recommendation Goals missing from the draft list shared at the meeting. ECY/DOH list of CAP [Goals and Options](#). Attendees list of goals, options, focus, other ideas:

- Add impact to orcas/wildlife.
- Reduce and eliminate the source of PFAS in products.
- Separate out fluoropolymers, not all PFAS are the same, only PFOS on the PBT list,.
- Add equity and vulnerable populations to all goals/options.
- Include historic perspective on the use of PFAS.
- Add a recommendation to identify data gaps – where is more research needed.
- Coordinate testing for PFAS – for all media, agencies (cross agency, cross program).
- Clarify where state and local governments would do the actions.
- Make the CAP a living document (adaptive management, accountability).
- Reconvene the Advisory Committee every 2 years.
- Regularly report back on status of implementation of all completed CAPs – is there a summary of implemented CAP recommendations.
- Summarize lessons learned from developing CAPs.

Discussion of Criteria

Meeting attendees brainstormed a [List of Criteria](#) to consider as recommendations are identified for the CAP:

- Equitable – who bears the cost.
- Avoid future cleanup costs.
- Costs are on responsible parties.
- Find safer alternatives using data and transparency.
- Transparency – CBI issues, more transparent about availability, goal to protect public health.
- Practicality – is the option practical to implement, is it do-able.
- Strategic – need to do things in a certain sequence; what’s going to give the biggest benefit to health.
- Meaningful.
- Prioritize the scope of options – which PFAS are most impactful (to env’t, community).
- Focus on high gain – not all PFAS are the same some are more mobile, nontoxic; tiered approach.
- Goal about remediation – there is no guidance for remediation, need more emphasis on this.
- Environmental and social justice, protect the most sensitive life stages, vulnerable populations, most sensitive ecological species.
- Will it result in the greatest possible reduction in levels of PFAS in products and biota-comprehensive/effective.
- Enforce-ability – what needs to be done to be able to ‘enforce’ an action.
- Regulatory approach including identifying the bounds of state (and local?) regulatory authorities.
- Measurable (quantifiable solutions).
- Flexible to allow for future technologies.
- Values health benefits over costs.

Goal and Option Facilitated Discussion

The list of [Goals and Options](#) were reviewed by the meeting attendees. Highlights from those comments and suggestions are provided below.

Common Themes:

- Identify the source of funding for recommended actions, include legislative recommendations to provide funding, manufacturer funding, responsible party funding.
- Identify staffing resources needed to implement actions.
- Need more actions, no more testing.
- Need to test: biosolids, landfill leachate, products, industrial discharges, house dust.
- Regroup the Goals by strategy: testing, mitigation, regulations/enforcement, financial; short, medium and long term goals for actions.
- Products, look at the mercury CAP: identified product types, known alternatives, estimated quantity, alternatives.
- All goals/actions must include public participation and environmental justice/social equity.

GOAL 1 - Reduce exposure to people through drinking water.

- None of the options say “reduce,” add reduction options (or change the goal).
- Connect to Goal 2 (remediation leads to exposure reduction) – or merge Goal 1 and Goal 2.
- Where is the funding for connecting to a new well or other local water system or bottled water?
- Regroup by strategy: testing, mitigation, enforcement, financial (in place of the goals as listed).

GOAL 2 - Identify, prioritize, and clean up sources of PFAS contamination in drinking water.

- If this applies to groundwater and wildlife, replace “drinking water” with “environmental contamination.”
- Survey AFFF use, investigate urban/nonurban watersheds.
- Focus priorities where it’s harder to find clean water.
- Connect to work in other states and federal government (EPA).

GOAL 3 - Evaluate and reduce releases of PFAS to people, homes, or the environment.

- Look at surfactants – cleaners, polishes, wax, cleaners, textiles, carpet. Look at product end of life – second hand use. What about house dust.
- Don’t recommend actions underway by others: FDA food testing; EPA PFAS in imported products; California PFAS in carpet; FAA allowed to switch to non-PFAS.
- What do we know, recommend evaluating sources we don’t understand. Model how people are exposed, prioritize the path that contributes to the highest exposure.
- Industry is reducing releases, manufacturers are phasing out PFAS use (carpet).

Goal 4 - Evaluate and identify the need to regulate or reduce releases of PFAS.

- Need disclosure in purchasing.
- Focus on non-essential uses and high exposure.
- Non-point sources are difficult to regulate.

Goal 5 - Identify actions that residents can take to reduce PFAS exposure.

- Remove Goal 5 – the public didn’t cause the pollution, focus on actions.
- Reframe as Education and Outreach.
- Engage the public, not just educate.

Goal 6 – Identify the state’s top priorities for federal agencies and industry partners.

- Collaborate with other states and organizations, like ITRC and ECOS.
- Keep an eye on actions in Europe: ECHA, REACH, Germany.
- Keep track of emerging issues.

Goal 7 – Financial Mechanism

This goal was added by the meeting attendees.

- Recommend funding from the legislature for water testing.
- Access the Hazardous Substance Tax.
- Manufacturer fund AFFF takeback.
- Chemical industry fund water testing.
- Partner with the filtration industry.

Questions:

Kara Steward

Department of Ecology | Hazardous Waste & Toxics Reduction Program

360-407-6250

kara.steward@ecy.wa.gov

Project links:

- [PFAS CAP advisory committee site](#)
- [Ecology's PFAS CAP site](#)
- [Health's PFAS website](#)