
From: Mark Rossi <mark@cleanproduction.org>

Sent: Monday, February 10, 2020 6:34 AM

To: Zarker, Ken (ECY) <kzar461@ECY.WA.GOV>

Cc: shari@cleanproduction.org; Manahan, Craig (ECY) <CRMA461@ECY.WA.GOV>; VanBergen, Saskia (ECY) <sava461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Davies, Holly G (DOH) <holly.davies@doh.wa.gov>; Smith, Marissa (ECY) <MASM461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Cheri Peele <cheri@cleanproduction.org>

Subject: thoughts to share on food packaging AA

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE THE WASHINGTON STATE EMAIL SYSTEM - Take caution not to open attachments or links unless you know the sender AND were expecting the attachment or the link

Hi Ken -

Following our call on Monday 2/3, the CPA team had a chance to reflect on the current proposed approach for hazard assessment in the PFAS AA for food packaging. We believe the best path forward is two-fold: first, use GreenScreen for Safer Chemicals hazard assessment method to create a baseline hazard assessment; then second, add additional requirements as your team sees fit. This way you build on top of GreenScreen, creating content that can be readily used in other contexts, and not creating a revised hazard assessment method that you can no longer call GreenScreen.

In short, our proposal is: PFAS AA Hazard Assessment = GreenScreen + extra requirements

Some advantages of this strategy include:

- You are following the IC2 AA Guidance more closely
- You are leveraging a widely adopted and accepted, 3rd party, peer-reviewed method
- You are using GreenScreen as designed and can communicate about results as well as compare results to other GreenScreen assessments
- You are adding on to your process beyond GreenScreen to address specific endpoints of concern and you can provide a rationale for doing that

Of course, we'd be glad to discuss further.

All the best,

Mark Shari, and Cheri

On Mon, Feb 3, 2020 at 5:01 PM Zarker, Ken (ECY) <kzar461@ecy.wa.gov> wrote:

Hi Mark and Shari –

I'd also like to update you on the PFAS AA hazard assessment. We have been working on better alignment with the IC2 guide to support our AA. Holly and Marissa may join if they have time.

Thanks,

Ken

-----Original Appointment-----

From: shari@cleanproduction.org <shari@cleanproduction.org>

Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 3:59 PM

To: shari@cleanproduction.org; mark@cleanproduction.org; Zarker, Ken (ECY); Manahan, Craig (ECY); VanBergen, Saskia (ECY)

Subject: Updated invitation: CPA & Ecology @ Mon Feb 3, 2020 2:15pm - 3pm (PST)
(kzar461@ecy.wa.gov)

When: Monday, February 03, 2020 2:15 PM-3:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).

Where: <https://zoom.us/j/619127904>

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE THE WASHINGTON STATE EMAIL SYSTEM - Take caution not to open attachments or links unless you know the sender AND were expecting the attachment or the link

From: Mark Rossi <mark@cleanproduction.org>

Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 3:40 PM

To: Zarker, Ken (ECY) <kzar461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Davies, Holly G (DOH) <holly.davies@doh.wa.gov>

Subject: PFAS Food Packaging AA: the case for no base case assessment of a PFAS

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE THE WASHINGTON STATE EMAIL SYSTEM - Take caution not to open attachments or links unless you know the sender AND were expecting the attachment or the link

Dear Ken and Holly,

We at Clean Production Action reviewed the most recent proposal related to the AA for PFAS in Food Service Ware. We are very supportive of your choice to use a standardized hazard assessment methodology and in particular GreenScreen.

We also strongly urge reconsideration of spending time and money on assessing a "base case" PFAS chemical or polymer. As you know, the legislature has already declared the entire PFAS class as essentially equivalent to a chemical of high concern by restricting the entire class (pending finding safer alternatives). Thus we recommend defining all PFAS as equivalent to GreenScreen Benchmark-1, and a safer alternative as a GreenScreen Benchmark-2 or higher.

Note that this approach is consistent with the approaches taken by the Oregon Health Authority in its proposed rulemaking for the Oregon Toxic Free Kids Act and by TCO Certified for flame retardants:

- The Oregon Health Authority in its proposed rule for Hazard Assessment (HA), on our suggestion, has proposed the following:
 - o “For a HA submitted with an assessment from a Licensed GreenScreen Profiler:
 - (a) A HPCCH [High Priority Chemical of Concern for Children's Health] is considered by the Authority to be comparable to a chemical that has a GreenScreen Benchmark score of 1.
 - (b) A substitute chemical is considered to be inherently less hazardous if it is assigned a GreenScreen Benchmark score of 2, 3 or 4, and is in compliance with section (3) of this rule.”
 - o WA State could do something similar and state that all PFAS are equivalent to GreenScreen Benchmark-1.
- Similarly, TCO Certified, a sustainability standard for electronics products, bans all organohalogen flame retardants (FRs) and requires the use of safer FRs. TCO did not evaluate any organohalogen FR as part of its decision to ban all organohalogens. Instead TCO considers all organohalogens FRs as the equivalent of a GreenScreen Benchmark-1, and

requires alternative FRs to be assessed using GreenScreen and be Benchmark-2 or higher.

By taking this proposed approach the Departments of Ecology and Health would create a clear process for assigning chemicals of high concern (GreenScreen Benchmark-1) as well as safer alternatives (Benchmark-2 or higher). Eliminating base case assessment has the additional benefit of saving funds that could be used to evaluate additional chemicals.

We'd be glad to discuss this approach further. And we recommend discussing this approach with Justin Waltz at the Oregon Health Authority.

Thank you for your considering eliminating the base case analysis of a PFAS.

Best regards,

Mark

--

Mark S. Rossi, PhD
Executive Director, Clean Production Action
1310 Broadway, Suite 101
Somerville, MA 02144 USA
t) +1 781.391.6743 x101