Number: P-18-0270

TSCA Section 5(a)(3) Determination: The new chemical substance is not likely to present an unreasonable risk (5(a)(3)(C))

Chemical Name:

Generic: Ethanol, 2-butoxy-, 1,1'-ester

Conditions of Use (intended, known, or reasonably foreseen)¹:

Intended conditions of use (specific): Manufacture for use as an active co-solvent for solvent-based coatings, coalescent for industrial water-based coatings, coupling agent and solvent in industrial cleaners, rust removers, hard surface cleaners, and disinfectants, primary solvent in solvent-based silk screen printing inks, coupling agent for resins and dyes in water-based printing inks, and other uses including as a co-solvent for agricultural pesticides and in the production of a wide variety of products and commodities such as polyester resins, engine coolants, latex paints, heat transfer fluids and deicing compounds, lubricants, plasticizers and cement grinding additives, consistent with the manufacturing, processing, use, distribution, and disposal information described in the PMN

Known conditions of use: Applying such factors as described in footnote 1, EPA evaluated whether there are known conditions of use and found none.

Reasonably foreseen conditions of use: Applying such factors as described in footnote 1, EPA evaluated whether there are reasonably foreseen conditions of use and found consumer use to be reasonably foreseen conditions of use based on information in the original PMN submission. EPA also found use as an emulsion stabilizer and solubilizing agent for [claimed CBI], and use as a chemical intermediate to be reasonably foreseen based on patent searches and information available in other TSCA submissions.

¹ Under TSCA § 3(4), the term "conditions of use" means "the circumstances, as determined by the Administrator, under which a chemical substance is intended, known, or reasonably foreseen to be manufactured, processed, distributed in commerce, used, or disposed of." In general, EPA considers the intended conditions of use of a new chemical substance to be those identified in the section 5(a) notification. Known conditions of use include activities within the United States that result from manufacture that is exempt from PMN submission requirements. Reasonably foreseen conditions of use are future circumstances, distinct from known or intended conditions of use, under which the Administrator expects the chemical substance to be manufactured, processed, distributed, used, or disposed of. The identification of "reasonably foreseen" conditions of use will necessarily be a case-by-case determination and will be highly fact-specific. Reasonably foreseen conditions of use will not be based on hypotheticals or conjecture. EPA's identification of conditions of use includes the expectation of compliance with federal and state laws, such as worker protection standards or disposal restrictions, unless case-specific facts indicate otherwise. Accordingly, EPA will apply its professional judgment, experience, and discretion when considering such factors as evidence of current use of the new chemical substance outside the United States, evidence that the PMN substance is sufficiently likely to be used for the same purposes as existing chemical substances that are structurally analogous to the new chemical substance, and conditions of use identified in an initial PMN submission that the submitter omits in a revised PMN. The sources EPA uses to identify reasonably foreseen conditions of use include searches of internal confidential EPA PMN databases (containing use information on analogue chemicals), other U.S. government public sources, the National Library of Medicine's Hazardous Substances Data Bank (HSDB), the Chemical Abstract Service STN Platform, REACH Dossiers, technical encyclopedias (e.g., Kirk-Othmer and Ullmann), and Internet searches, Chemical Abstract Service STN Platform, REACH Dossiers, technical encyclopedias (e.g., Kirk-Othmer and Ullmann), and Internet searches.

Summary: The new chemical substance is not likely to present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment, without consideration of costs or other nonrisk factors, including an unreasonable risk to a potentially exposed or susceptible subpopulation identified as relevant by the Administrator under the conditions of use, based on the risk assessment presented below and the terms of the proposed Significant New Use Rule (SNUR) signed by EPA.² EPA estimated that the new chemical substance could have limited persistence and a low potential for bioaccumulation, such that repeated exposures are not expected to be cumulative. Based on EPA's TSCA New Chemicals Program Chemical Categories for Esters, Neutral Organics, and Ethylene Glycol Ethers³ and data for analogous chemical substances, EPA estimates that the new chemical substance has moderate environmental hazard and potential for the following human health hazards: irritation, solvent neurotoxicity, immunotoxicity, developmental, reproductive, liver and blood toxicity. The PMN describes conditions of use that mitigate human health risks. Therefore, EPA concludes that the new chemical substance is not likely to present an unreasonable risk under the intended conditions of use.

As set forth below, the information available to EPA is sufficient to permit the Agency to conduct a reasoned evaluation of the health and environmental effects of the chemical substance under the conditions of use that are not subject to the proposed SNUR, in order to determine that the chemical substance is not likely to present an unreasonable risk under those conditions of use. As such, EPA does not need to impose test requirements to conduct this evaluation. Whether testing is needed to evaluate the effects of the intended, known, or reasonably foreseen conditions of use of a chemical substance subject to a PMN is determined on a case-by-case basis. To the extent that testing may be necessary to conduct a reasoned evaluation of the health or environmental effects of the reasonably foreseen conditions of use that are subject to the proposed SNUR, EPA will make the appropriate determination if a SNUN is submitted following finalization of the SNUR.

EPA found no known conditions of use, assessed the intended conditions of use, and addressed reasonably foreseen conditions of use by proposing a SNUR. Therefore, EPA determines the new chemical substance is not likely to present an unreasonable risk to human health or the environment.

² Reasonably foreseen conditions of use subject to a proposed SNUR are not likely to present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. Based on EPA's experience, it is the Agency's judgment that a new use would not commence during the pendency of a proposed SNUR because web posting of a proposed SNUR serves as the cut-off date for a significant new use. Therefore, manufacturers and processors would not commence a prohibited new use that would be legally required to cease upon the finalization of the SNUR. Once a SNUR is final and effective, no manufacturer or processor – including the PMN submitter – may undertake the conditions of use identified as a significant new use of the PMN substance in the SNUR. EPA must first evaluate the new use in accordance with the requirements of TSCA Section 5 and (a) either conclude that the new use is not likely to present an unreasonable risk under the conditions of use; or (b) take appropriate action under section 5(e) or 5(f). If EPA were not to finalize the proposed SNUR, then that decision would be based on information and data provided to the Agency during the comment period demonstrating that the reasonably foreseen conditions of use subject to the proposed SNUR are not likely to present an unreasonable risk. Under either scenario, the reasonably foreseen condition of use is not likely present an unreasonable risk.

Fate: Environmental fate is the determination of which environmental compartment(s) a chemical moves to, the expected residence time in the environmental compartment(s) and removal and degradation processes. Environmental fate is an important factor in determining exposure and thus in determining whether a chemical may present an unreasonable risk. EPA estimated physical/chemical and fate properties of the new chemical substance using data for analogues (Ethanol, 2-(2-butyoxethoxy)-, acetate (CASRN 124-17-4)), and EPI (Estimation Program Interface) SuiteTM (http://www.epa.gov/tsca-screening-tools/epi-suitetm-estimationprogram-interface). In wastewater treatment, the new chemical substance is expected to be removed with an efficiency of 90% via biodegradation. Removal of the new chemical substance by biodegradation is high. Sorption of the new chemical substance to sludge is low and to soil and sediment is low to moderate. Migration of the new chemical substance to groundwater is expected to be moderate to rapid due to low to moderate sorption to soil and sediment. Due to low estimated vapor pressure and Henry's law constant, the new chemical substance is expected to undergo negligible volatilization to air. Overall, these estimates indicate that the new chemical substance has low potential to volatilize to air, has moderate to high potential to migrate to groundwater, and is likely to be removed in wastewater treatment.

Persistence⁴: Persistence is relevant to whether a new chemical substance is likely to present an unreasonable risk because chemicals that are not degraded in the environment at rates that prevent substantial buildup in the environment, and thus increase potential for exposure, may present a risk if the substance presents a hazard to human health or the environment. EPA estimated degradation half-lives of the new chemical substance using data for an analogue (Ethanol, 2-(2-butyoxethoxy)-, acetate (CASRN 124-17-4)). EPA estimated that aerobic and anaerobic biodegradation half-lives of the new chemical substance are < 2 months. These estimates indicate that the new chemical substance will have limited persistence in aerobic environments (e.g., surface water) and anaerobic environments (e.g., sediment).

Bioaccumulation⁵: Bioaccumulation is relevant to whether a new chemical substance is likely to present an unreasonable risk because substances that bioaccumulate in aquatic and/or terrestrial species pose the potential for elevated exposures to humans and other organisms via food chains. EPA estimated the potential for the new chemical substance to bioaccumulate using EPI SuiteTM. EPA estimated that the new chemical substance has low bioaccumulation potential based on BCFBAF model result < 1000 (bioconcentration factor = 25 (estimated) and bioaccumulation factor = 30 (estimated)). EPA estimated that the new chemical substance could have limited

_

⁴ Persistence: A chemical substance is considered to have limited persistence if it has a half-life in water, soil or sediment of less than 2 months or there are equivalent or analogous data. A chemical substance is considered to be persistent if it has a half-life in water, soil or sediments of greater than 2 months but less than or equal to 6 months or if there are equivalent or analogous data. A chemical substance is considered to be very persistent if it has a half-life in water, soil or sediments of greater than 6 months or there are equivalent or analogous data. (64 FR 60194; November 4, 1999)

⁵ Bioaccumulation: A chemical substance is considered to have a low potential for bioaccumulation if there are bioconcentration factors (BCF) or bioaccumulation factors (BAF) of less than 1,000 or there are equivalent or analogous data. A chemical substance is considered to be bioaccumulative if there are BCFs or BAFs of 1,000 or greater and less than or equal to 5,000 or there are equivalent or analogous data. A chemical substance is considered to be very bioaccumulative if there are BCFs or BAFs of 5,000 or greater or there are equivalent or analogous data. (64 FR 60194; November 4 1999)

persistence and a low potential for bioaccumulation, such that repeated exposures are not expected to cause food-chain effects via accumulation in exposed organisms.

Human Health Hazard⁶: Human health hazard is relevant to whether a new chemical substance is likely to present an unreasonable risk because the significance of the risk is dependent upon both the hazard (or toxicity) of the chemical substance and the extent of exposure to the substance. EPA estimated the human health hazard of this new chemical substance based on its estimated physical/chemical properties and by comparing it to structurally analogous chemical substances for which there is information on human health hazard. Absorption of the new chemical substance is expected to be poor through the lungs and moderate for the skin and GI tract based on physical/chemical properties. For the new chemical substance, EPA identified irritation, solvent neurotoxicity, immunotoxicity, developmental, reproductive, liver and blood toxicity as hazards based on the US EPA Chemical Categories for Ethylene Glycol Ethers and analogues. EPA identified an oral BMDL of 1.4 mg/kg/day and an inhalation BMCL of 16 mg/m³ for liver effects based on a 2-year inhalation study (non guideline) on a metabolite, which was used to derive exposure route- and population-specific points of departure for quantitative risk assessment, described below.

Environmental Hazard: Environmental hazard is relevant to whether a new chemical substance is likely to present unreasonable risk because the significance of the risk is dependent upon both the hazard (or toxicity) of the chemical substance and the extent of exposure to the substance. EPA estimated environmental hazard of this new chemical substance using the Ecological Structure Activity Relationships (ECOSAR) Predictive Model (https://www.epa.gov/tsca-screening-tools/ecological-structure-activity-relationships-ecosar-predictive-model); specifically the QSAR for esters and neutral organics. Acute toxicity values estimated for fish, aquatic invertebrates, and algae are 13 mg/L, and 13 mg/L, respectively. Chronic toxicity values estimated for fish, aquatic invertebrates, and algae are 0.92 mg/L, 4.0 mg/L, and 4.2 mg/L, respectively. These toxicity values indicate that the new chemical substance is expected to have moderate environmental hazard. Application of assessment factors of 5 and 10 to acute and

⁶ A chemical substance is considered to have low human health hazard if effects are observed in animal studies with

characterizations of hazard (low, medium, high) would also apply to BMDLs. In the absence of animal data on a

 $(\underline{http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=env/jm/mono(2014)4\&doclanguage=en)}), structure-activity relationships, and/or structural alerts to support characterizing human health hazards.$

a No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) equal to or greater than 1,000 mg/kg/day or if there are equivalent data on analogous chemical substances; a chemical substance is considered to have moderate human health hazard if effects are observed in animal studies with a NOAEL less than 1,000 mg/kg/day or if there are equivalent data on analogous chemical substances; a chemical substance is considered to have high human health hazard if there is evidence of adverse effects in humans or conclusive evidence of severe effects in animal studies with a NOAEL of less than or equal to 10 mg/kg/day or if there are equivalent data on analogous chemical substances. EPA may also use Benchmark Dose Levels (BMDL) derived from benchmark dose (BMD) modeling as points of departure for toxic effects. See https://www.epa.gov/bmds/what-benchmark-dose-software-bmds. Using this approach, a BMDL is associated with a benchmark response, for example a 5 or 10 % incidence of effect. The aforementioned

chemical or analogous chemical substance, EPA may use other data or information such as from in vitro assays, chemical categories (e.g., Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2014 Guidance on Grouping of Chemicals, Second Edition. ENV/JM/MONO(2014)4. Series on Testing & Assessment No. 194. Environment Directorate, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, France.

chronic toxicity values, respectively, results in acute and chronic concentrations of concern of 2.6 mg/L (2,600 ppb) and 0.092 mg/L (92 ppb), respectively.

Exposure: The exposure to a new chemical substance is potentially relevant to whether a new chemical substance is likely to present unreasonable risks because the significance of the risk is dependent upon both the hazard (or toxicity) of the chemical substance and the extent of exposure to the substance.

EPA estimates occupational exposure and environmental release of the new chemical substance under the intended conditions of use described in the PMN using ChemSTEER (Chemical Screening Tool for Exposures and Environmental Releases; https://www.epa.gov/tsca-screening-tools/chemsteer-chemical-screening-tool-exposures-and-environmental-releases). EPA uses EFAST (the Exposure and Fate Assessment Screening Tool; https://www.epa.gov/tsca-screening-tools/e-fast-exposure-and-fate-assessment-screening-tool-version-2014) to estimate general population, consumer, and environmental exposures.

EPA considers workers to be a potentially exposed or susceptible subpopulation (PESS) on the basis of greater exposure potential compared to the general population. EPA also considers PESS in conducting general population drinking water exposures by evaluating risks associated with water intake rates for multiple age groups, ranging from infants to adults. EPA considers consumers of specific products to be a potentially exposed or susceptible subpopulation on the basis of greater exposure potential compared to the general population who do not use specific products.

For this new chemical assessment, EPA assessed exposure to workers via the dermal and inhalation routes. Releases to water, air and landfill were estimated. Exposure to the general population was assessed via drinking water, fish ingestion, landfill, and fugitive air. Exposures to consumers were assessed as reasonably foreseen conditions of use.

Risk Characterization: EPA applies a margin of exposure approach to calculate potential human health risks of new chemicals. A benchmark (acceptable) margin of exposure is derived by applying uncertainty factors for the following types of extrapolations: intra-species extrapolation ($UF_H = 10$ to account for variation in sensitivity among the human population), inter-species extrapolation ($UF_A = 10$ to account for extrapolating from experimental animals to humans) and LOAEL-to-NOAEL extrapolation (UF_L = 10 to account for using a LOAEL when a NOAEL is not available). Hence, in the New Chemicals Program, a benchmark MOE is typically 100 and 1000 when NOAELs and LOAELs, respectively, are used to identify hazard. When allometric scaling or pharmacokinetic modeling is used to derive an effect level, the UF_H may be reduced to 3, for a benchmark MOE of 30. The benchmark MOE is used to compare to the MOE calculated by comparing the toxicity NOAEL or LOAEL to the estimated exposure concentrations. When the calculated MOE is equal to or exceeds the benchmark MOE, the new chemical substance is not likely to present an unreasonable risk. EPA assesses risks to workers considering engineering controls described in the PMN but in the absence of personal protective equipment (PPE) such as gloves and respirators. If risks are preliminarily identified, EPA then considers whether the risks would be mitigated by the use of PPE (e.g., impervious gloves, respirator).

Risks to human health for the new chemical substance were evaluated using the route-specific effect levels (i.e., BDML and BMCL) described above. Risks were identified for workers for blood toxicity via dermal contact based on quantitative hazard data for a metabolite of the new chemical (MOE= 0.1; benchmark MOE = 10). Risks were identified for workers for blood toxicity via inhalation exposures based on quantitative hazard data for a metabolite of the new chemical (MOE=0.7; benchmark MOE = 10; Inhalation fold factor = 14). Irritation hazards to workers via inhalation and dermal contact were identified based ethylene glycol ethers. Risks for these endpoints were not quantified due to a lack of dose-response for these hazards. However, exposures can be mitigated by the use of appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE), including impervious gloves, eye protection, and respiratory protection with assigned protection factors (APFs) of 25. EPA expects that employers will require and that workers will use appropriate PPE consistent with the Safety Data Sheet prepared by the new chemical submitter, in a manner adequate to protect them.

Risks were not identified for the general population for blood toxicity via oral exposure (drinking water and fish ingestion), based on quantitative hazard data for a metabolite of the new chemical ($MOE_{Adult} = 556$; $MOE_{Infant} = 132$; $MOE_{Fish} = 570$; $MOE_{Landfill} = 1,272$; benchmark MOE = 10). Risks were not identified for the general population for blood toxicity via inhalation exposure based on quantitative hazard data for a metabolite of the new chemical (MOE = 15; benchmark MOE = 10). Risks were not identified for the general population for irritation via drinking water or fugitive air releases since these concerns are expected to be mitigated by dilution in the media.

Risks to consumers were not evaluated under the intended conditions of use because consumer uses were only identified as reasonably foreseen conditions of use.

Risks to the environment were evaluated by comparing estimated surface water concentrations with the acute and chronic concentrations of concern. Acute and chronic risks to the environment were not identified due to releases to water (surface water concentration as high as 90 ppb for processing) that did not exceed the acute or the chronic COC.

It is reasonably foreseen that the new chemical substance could be used by consumers based on information provided in the original PMN submission, other TSCA submissions, and patent searches. Based on other TSCA submissions and patent searches, it is also reasonably foreseen that the new chemical substance could be used as an emulsion stabilizer and solubilizing agent for fragrances used in fabric care and cleaning products or as a chemical intermediate. The SNUR that has been proposed for this chemical substance defines certain conditions of use as significant new uses. The proposed significant new uses include any use by consumers or use other than described in the PMN. Conditions of use that fall under the restrictions of the proposed SNUR are not likely to present unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment because (1) those conditions of use are not likely to be commenced during the pendency of the proposed SNUR, and (2) upon finalization of the SNUR, those conditions of use would be prohibited unless and until EPA makes an affirmative determination that the significant new use is not likely to present an unreasonable risk or takes appropriate action under section 5(e) or 5(f).

5/31/2019	/s/
Date:	Tala R. Henry, Ph.D.
	Deputy Director for Programs
	Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics