

This document does not substitute for EPA regulations; nor is it a regulation itself. Thus, it does not and cannot impose legally binding requirements on the EPA, the states, tribes or the regulated community, and may not apply to a particular situation based on the circumstances. If there are any differences between this web document and the statute or regulations related to this document, the statute and/or regulations govern. The EPA may change this guidance in the future.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON D C 20460

FEB 6 1995

OFFICE OF  
WATER

**MEMORANDUM**

**SUBJECT:** Arsenic Decision  
**FROM:** Robert Perciasepe  
Assistant Administrator  
*Robert Perciasepe*  
**TO:** Addressees

I appreciate the time and helpful input from you and your staffs as I made the difficult decision on how to proceed with the drinking water standard for arsenic.

As became apparent during our deliberations, there are many issues and uncertainties involved in the regulation of arsenic. Given the potentially very high cost of this rule, I believe it most prudent for the Agency to get as much information as reasonably possible to accurately quantify the health effects and to assess the possible technologies which could be applied to implement the rule. The level of uncertainty in the current risk assessment justifies additional research before we impose the substantial costs from an MCL lower than the current standard of 50  $\mu\text{g}/\text{l}$ . The standard to which the Agency is being held for the adequacy of both risk and cost assessments is higher now than in the past. Therefore, I have decided to request a deferral in the November 1995 court-ordered proposal date in order to provide time for additional information to be developed.

In drinking water, the principle health effects of arsenic, at levels we are likely to see, are long-term chronic effects. Thus, the risk increases as exposure accrues. I believe the incremental risk resulting from a delay of a couple of years is offset by the benefit of research to reduce the uncertainty of our risk assessments and provide further data on treatment technologies. If insufficient progress has been made on the research front in that timeframe, it would be appropriate to proceed with rulemaking rather than wait for open-ended research results.



Recycled/Recyclable  
Printed with Soy/Canola Ink on paper that  
meets or exceeds EPA requirements

My staff will be working with key Agency staff to develop a plan to obtain the information and to develop a new schedule for the rule. Without question, most of the funding for the additional research will need to come from outside the Agency since our own funding limitations preclude substantial Agency investment. I have been assured that outside parties will help fund the necessary work. We will be formalizing those commitments of support.

In the interim, it is important that we recognize that some people have been exposed to high arsenic levels for a long time. I believe it is important that the current standard be enforced to assure that these people are protected from high arsenic levels. I encourage all of you to help communicate the importance of compliance with the existing arsenic standard.

**Addressees:**

Mary D. Nichols, OAR  
Steven A. Herman, OECA  
Jean C. Nelson, OGC  
David M. Gardiner, OPPE  
Lynn R. Goldman, OPPTS  
Robert J. Huggett, ORD  
Elliott P. Laws, OSWER  
John P. DeVillars, Region 1  
Jeanne M. Fox, Region 2  
Peter H. Kostmayer, Region 3  
John Hankinson, Jr., Region 4  
Valdas V. Adamkus, Region 5  
Jane N. Saginaw, Region 6  
Dennis D. Grams, Region 7  
William P. Yellowtail, Region 8  
Felicia Marcus, Region 9  
Charles C. Clarke, Region 10

cc: Regional Water Division Directors  
Regional GW and DW Branch Chiefs  
Phil Metzger  
Mark Luttner  
Mahesh Podar  
Cynthia Puskar  
Cynthia Dougherty  
Tudor Davies  
Margaret Stasikowski  
Peter Cook  
Bill Diamond