



{In Archive} Region VI Arsenic

palmeag to: John King

04/12/2010 02:11 PM

From: palmeag@nu.com
To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

20.5 ug/l and not 0.14 ug/l... <http://www.epa.gov/region6/water/ecopro/watershd/standard/arsenic.htm>

http://www.iowadnr.gov/water/standards/files/k_arsenic.pdf...

IV. Other States Human Health Criteria

Table 1 shows the current ambient human health criteria for arsenic in several states.

Table 1. Arsenic Human Health Criteria for Other States

States	Arsenic Human Health Criterion (non water supply)	Drinking Water (ppb)
Nebraska	16.7	10
Kansas	0.14a	10
Missouri	None	50
Minnesota	53	2.0
Illinois	None	50
Iowa	50	10

a. EPA promulgated criterion

EPA had withdrawn the federal human health water quality criteria for arsenic applicable to Idaho and Alaska.

In 1992, EPA promulgated a final rule (known as the National Toxics Rule) to establish numeric water quality criteria for 12 States and 2 Territories that had failed to comply fully with section 303(c)(2)(C) of the Clean Water Act (57 FR 60848). The criteria, codified at 40 CFR 131.36, became the applicable water quality standards in those 14 jurisdictions for all purposes and programs under the Clean Water Act effective February 5, 1993. When a State adopts criteria that meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act, EPA withdraws its criteria. Idaho adopted human health criteria for arsenic (0.020 ppb for the consumption of water and organisms and 6.2 ppb for the consumption of organisms); these criteria are less stringent than the federal regulations (0.018 ppb for the consumption of water and organisms and 0.14 ppb for the consumption of organisms). Idaho's criteria for arsenic differ from the federal criteria because the State used a bioconcentration factor (BCF) to derive its criteria that is different from the BCF used by EPA. Idaho selected a BCF that the State believes more accurately reflects the species of fish present in State's surface waters. Having reviewed Idaho's submission, EPA concluded that the State's choice of a BCF to calculate the arsenic criteria was appropriate and the State's arsenic criteria met the requirements of the Clean Water Act.

A similar situation occurred in Alaska. EPA withdrew the promulgation to Alaska's on May 21, 1997. Subsequent to the promulgation of the NTR, a number of issues and uncertainties arose concerning the health effects of arsenic. EPA determined that these issues and uncertainties were sufficiently significant to necessitate a careful evaluation of the risks of arsenic exposure. Accordingly EPA has undertaken a number of activities aimed at reassessing the risks to human health from arsenic. In light of EPA's review of the health effects of arsenic, the State of Alaska has proposed that the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) maximum contaminant level (MCL) for arsenic of 50 ppb currently in the state's water quality standards be used as meeting the requirements of the Clean Water Act in lieu of the current human health criteria in the NTR. As adopted by Alaska, the MCL for arsenic applies to all fresh waters that have the public water supply designated use. EPA found that the MCL for arsenic in freshwaters designated for public water supply, in conjunction with Alaska's aquatic life criteria for arsenic, meets the requirements of the CWA, and accordingly proposes to withdraw the applicability to Alaska of the human health criteria for

arsenic promulgated in the NTR.

***** This e-mail, including any files or attachments transmitted with it, is confidential and/or proprietary and is intended for a specific purpose and for use only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any disclosure, copying or distribution of this e-mail or the taking of any action based on its contents, other than for its intended purpose, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are not necessarily those of Northeast Utilities, its subsidiaries and affiliates (NU). E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be error-free or secure or free from viruses, and NU disclaims all liability for any resulting damage, errors, or omissions.*****