U.S. EPA Webinar on the Proposed Regulation of 1-Bromopropane under the Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA)

Transcript

Wednesday, August 28, 2024

Commencing at 12:30 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)

Sheerin Shirajan (ICF): Hello, and welcome to the U.S. EPA Webinar on the proposed regulation of 1-bromopropane. We will get started shortly. If you're having trouble with Zoom and are using the desktop app, please check your settings. If you are using a browser, we recommend either restarting it or opening it with Google Chrome. For general questions on the rule, please email EPA at 1BP_TSCA@EPA.gov. If you have any technical questions, please utilize the Q&A box or email us at EPARulemaking@ICF.com. All attendees are pre-muted.

Note that the public remarks session will take place after the presentation. Attendees who requested to make public remarks, and who are present, will be taken off mute one at a time, and given five minutes to provide their remarks. More information regarding the session will be provided later in the webinar. The chat will be used for broadcast messages only. Please refer to the Q&A button on your Zoom dashboard to submit technical questions. Please also ensure your full name and affiliation are correct. If your name on Zoom does not align with your name at registration, please reach out to EPARulemaking@icf.com with your name as it currently appears in Zoom, and the email address that you registered with. This will ensure that you are still able to provide your remarks. The ASL and CLT interpreters will have their camera turned on through the entirety of the webinar and will be pinned to the top left corner of your screen. The closed captions have been turned on and should be displayed at the bottom of your screen. Click and drag the captions to move their position in the meeting window. If you wish to hide these captions, move your cursor down to the meeting controls and click the hide captions icon on the right-hand side of the Zoom dashboard.

An email before this webinar will be in your inbox from EPARulemaking@icf.com. The email includes details regarding accessing the presentation slides. If you do not see communications from this email, please check your spam. This webinar is being recorded and will be available, along with the presentation slides, after the webinar has concluded. Please use the links posted in the chat to access these materials in the future.

Please note that the comment period for the proposed rule closes on September 23. Any oral remarks presented during the webinar today will not be included as part of the docket and it is important that any substantive comments be submitted in writing by September 23 to EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0471. The link can be found in the chat. With that, I will pass it off to Dr. Eileen Murphy for the opening remarks.

Eileen Murphy (EPA): Thank you so much. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for joining us. My name's Eileen Murphy. I'm the Director of the Existing Chemicals Risk Management Division with EPA's Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics. We are so glad to be able to host this event for you. I know many of you have attended our previous events following the publication of the proposed risk management rules for perchloroethylene, carbon tetrachloride, trichloroethylene, and then n-methyl pyrrolidone, and the final risk management rule for methylene chloride. But today I'm excited to welcome you to our event for the proposed rule for 1-bromopropane, or 1-BP.

As many of you are aware, TSCA requires EPA to issue rules to address unreasonable risk to human health or the environment from chemical substances, and to apply section 6 requirements to the extent necessary so that these risks are no longer unreasonable. The unreasonable risk findings on 1-BP stem from risks of health effects resulting from inhalation or dermal exposure to this chemical. These very well-documented effects include cancers, such as skin, intestinal and lung tumors, and non-cancer effects, including kidney and liver toxicity, neurotoxicity, and reproductive and developmental toxicity. However, in many occupational

situations, these risks can be managed with robust workplace protections. For this reason, EPA is proposing that the majority of uses would continue with appropriate controls in place.

The proposal includes a combination of workplace controls, including a formal workplace chemical protection program that uses a familiar exposure management framework to protect workers in these industries. This is combined with a risk-based exposure limit and prescriptive dermal controls to prevent dermal contact in uses that don't have inhalation exposures. A key element to note here is that the proposed strict and common-sense worker protections will prevent unreasonable risk while also allowing for essential uses to continue, including in aerospace and defense applications. We've based this proposed rule on that extensive risk evaluation for 1-BP, which was first published in August of 2020, with a revised unreasonable risk determination published in December 2022. Many of you attended our webinar in September 2020 that provided an overview of that risk evaluation and our key findings. It is also available on the EPA website. We were able to develop and refine this proposed rule through consistent public engagement over the past four years, including stakeholder meetings, consultations with Tribes, small businesses, and people interested in environmental justice. I know some attendees of those meetings have joined the event today. Thank you. To those of you who have written to us, met with us, and engaged since the first stage of that risk evaluation, we thank you. We hope you see elements of your contributions to the risk management action we propose and describe today.

Our goal is to explain the rationale for our proposed action, several of the key details, and highlight specific areas where we're seeking comments from you to inform the final risk management rule. And I want to emphasize that point. We are interested in substantive comments from you to consider as we work to finalize this rulemaking. Detailed comments that provide supporting documentation will be particularly important for the final rule development, so that the agency has a solid record basis for the elements in its final rules. Please note that your continued participation is critical to helping us write and then finalize regulations that are protective of human health and the environment, while protecting critical uses. We cannot emphasize enough our appreciation for your time and the information that you provide to us. On behalf of the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, we continue to look forward to collaborating as we move ahead. It is my pleasure now to turn it to one of the professionals in my division, Bethany Masten, who is a member of the 1-BP risk management team. She is the next speaker, and she'll lead you through the start of the presentation. Beth, I'm turning it over to you.

Bethany Masten (EPA): Thank you, Eileen. I'm going to speak on this slide for a few minutes before we advance to the next slides. As Eileen said, my name is Bethany Masten, and I'm a Risk Manager with the Environmental Protection Agency in the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics. I'm on the rulemaking team for the proposed regulation of 1-bromopropane, also known as n-PB, or 1-BP under section 6 of the Toxic Substances Control Act, also known as TSCA. I'm going to be turning off my camera for the rest of the presentation to conserve bandwidth.

Before I continue, I'd like to briefly explain the picture on the slide, which is an example of a vapor degreaser, one of the most common uses of 1-BP. These devices are used to remove dirt, grease, and surface contaminants in a variety of sectors, including defense, aerospace, and other industries that require cleaning of electronics or small parts. These devices can also largely eliminate the opportunity for human exposures to 1-BP within these sectors, and the use of such devices for reducing workplace exposures is an example of the information we have considered and built into the proposal you're about to hear about.

On slide two, we have an overview of what we will talk about today, starting with the purpose of the rulemaking, followed by some background on 1-BP. We will then cover the list of regulatory tools available

under TSCA, and how the agency developed the proposed risk management actions to address unreasonable risk. We will then review the proposed rulemaking for 1-BP in closer detail, along with the alternative regulatory actions and the benefits of this proposal. Finally, we will conclude the presentation portion of the webinar with information about opportunities for comment and engagement, next steps, and additional resources. We will then move to the public remarks portion of the webinar.

On slide three, we will cover some history of TSCA. In June 2016, Congress amended TSCA with the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act. The new law requires EPA to evaluate and address unreasonable risk from chemicals currently in commerce under statutory time frames to protect the public while outlining a predictable and comprehensive path for the regulated community. In 2016, 1-BP, along with nine other chemicals, was identified for risk evaluation. These chemicals are often called the first 10, with 1-BP being the 7th chemical for which EPA published a proposed rulemaking under amended TSCA. As required by statute, EPA conducted a risk evaluation for 1-BP to determine whether the substance presents an unreasonable risk without consideration of cost or other non-risk factors. The risk evaluation underwent a scientific peer reviewed process and public comment period. After incorporating feedback from peer review and the public, EPA published the final risk evaluation in 2020 and determined that 1-BP presents unreasonable risk under its conditions of use, or COUs, and proceeded directly to the development of risk management regulation to address those risks.

Here on slide four, the purpose of this rulemaking is to address the unreasonable risk identified in the risk evaluation of 1-BP. This rule will help protect consumers and workers through strict workplace protections, prescriptive controls, and prohibitions. This proposal is based on the risk evaluation and extensive public comment engagement since 2016. We will talk more about that later in the presentation. The proposal is currently open for public comment until September 23, 2024, and we encourage stakeholders to submit comments in the docket. This comment period is an opportunity to submit information for EPA's consideration as we develop the final regulation.

Slide five presents some background information on 1-BP. 1-BP is a volatile chemical with a low global warming potential and historically it was seen as a preferred substitute for some ozone depleting substances. It is a solvent used for a range of industrial purposes and in commercial and consumer products, most commonly used in vapor decreasing, including aerospace and defense applications.1-BP has an annual production volume reported to EPA's Chemical Data Reporting Program, or CDR, in 2020 of between 1-50 million pounds. In the risk evaluation, the agency assessed these uses across the life cycle of 1-BP, including risk to workers, occupational non-users, or ONUs, consumers, and bystanders, and found that 23 of the 25 COUs significantly contribute to the unreasonable risk from 1-BP. So, to address the unreasonable risk such that it is no longer unreasonable, on August 8, 2024, EPA published the proposed rule for the regulation of 1-BP under TSCA section 6(a). The public comment period closes on September 23, 2024, and we estimate that the final rule will be published in 2025.

On slide six, we provide more information on the unreasonable risk from 1-BP and the basis for the proposed rulemaking. As noted, EPA determined that 1-BP presents an unreasonable risk to workers, owners, consumers, and bystanders. The health risks associated with 1-BP are well-established, with inhalation and dermal exposure being the main driver of unreasonable risk. The risk evaluation identified acute and chronic non-cancer adverse effects from exposure to 1-BP, including kidney and liver toxicity, neurotoxicity, reproductive and developmental toxicity, as well as cancer effects, including skin, intestinal, and lung tumors. The final risk evaluation based the unreasonable risk determination on the developmental toxicity endpoint. However, as detailed in the risk evaluation, the cancer endpoint is the basis for EPA's proposed existing

chemical exposure limit, or ECEL. Additionally, EPA did not find unreasonable risk to the environment from 1-BP.

Slide seven describes EPA's authority under TSCA. Under TSCA, EPA is required to address unreasonable risk. It has the authority to apply restrictions throughout the supply chain. EPA can regulate manufacturers, importers, processors, distributors, commercial users, and businesses or facilities that dispose of 1-BP. It's worth emphasizing that while EPA cannot directly regulate consumer use of 1-BP, we can regulate manufacturers, processors, distributors, and retailers in the supply chain to restrict the availability of 1-BP to consumers. By regulating at key points throughout the supply chain, EPA can effectively prevent 1-BP from reaching consumers, thereby addressing the unreasonable risk to this population.

On slide eight, we have what I like to think of as our TSCA toolbox for addressing unreasonable risk. EPA has the authority to restrict manufacturing, processing, distribution, and commerce for the chemical as a whole, or for a particular use. This includes prohibitions, as well as the ability to set limits on weight fraction or production volume for a chemical or particular use of a chemical. This is the authority that allows EPA to set inhalation exposure limits, prescribe engineering controls, administrative controls, personal protective equipment, or other workplace restrictions. Of course, any of these potential regulatory options would have to be supported by the findings in the risk evaluation. We can also require record keeping, monitoring, or testing, as well as regulating the commercial use or disposal of a chemical substance. Any of these regulatory options could be used alone or in combination, so that the chemical no longer presents an unreasonable risk.

Now that we've gone over EPA's authority and regulatory toolbox under TSCA, on slide nine, we are going to discuss how EPA went about ensuring that we are developing protective and practical regulations. Transparency is important to us throughout the whole TSCA risk evaluation and risk management process. Meaningful dialogue between the agency and stakeholders is the foundation of finding risk management strategies that will protect human health and the environment but also work for the regulated community. The deeper understanding we have of chemical uses, hazards, and exposures, the better we can focus our efforts and ensure outcomes that reflect the way chemicals are actually being used. To develop this proposed regulation, we engaged in one-on-one meetings, public webinars, comment periods, peer review, and consultations with state and local governments, Tribes, environmental justice communities, and small businesses. We also held consultations with other federal agencies, such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to promote a consistent and harmonized regulatory approach to facilitate compliance and to avoid duplicative requirements. EPA, with the Small Business Administration (SBA) and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) also convened a small business advocacy review panel to seek input from small businesses. Stakeholders were essential to the development of this proposal and will be essential to its finalization. For those who have already engaged with EPA on 1-BP, thank you for taking the time to provide input throughout this process and thank you to everyone in advance for any input you may provide as we move forward to develop the final rule.

As noted here on slide 10, EPA's mandate is to address the identified, unreasonable risk. Congress included some considerations in the statute to guide us, including requirements to consider and address risk to potentially exposed or susceptible subpopulations, such as workers and consumers, consideration of the chemical's particular effects, magnitude of exposure, the benefits of a chemical substance, economic impacts of the regulation, and availability of alternative substances or processes. This proposed regulation is supported by the best available science and reasonably available information.

On slide 11, you'll see that the 1-BP proposal uses the regulatory framework we just discussed to address occupational and consumer exposures and aligns with how OSHA regulates workplaces whenever possible. EPA's goal is protective and practical regulation. Specifically, the proposal prohibits most consumer uses of 1-BP, except for the commercial and consumer use of 1-BP in insulation, prohibits occupational uses where EPA determined there would likely be an inability to comply with the proposed worker protection requirements or where alternatives are relatively available. For occupational uses where strict workplace controls can be implemented, the proposal requires worker protections and self-certification. The proposal meets the TSCA requirement to address unreasonable risk to the extent necessary, so that it is no longer unreasonable, including risk to potentially exposed or susceptible subpopulations. And finally, the proposal requires record keeping to ensure the rule is enforceable. I want to emphasize that this is a proposal based on the best information we had at the time, and that we are requesting comments on all aspects of the proposal, and fully intend to consider all comments, and, if appropriate, modify the proposal so that a final rule is as protective and practical as possible. We will talk about specific requirements, requests for comment throughout, but broadly, we'd like to ask for input on the timelines in the proposal and implementation of new requirements. Public comments submitted to the docket could result in changes to elements of the proposed regulatory action. For example, EPA finalizing shorter or longer compliance timeframes.

On slide 12, we have an overview of the proposed regulatory approach to address the identified unreasonable risk for 1-BP. On the left side of the slide, you can see that, under the proposed regulation, prohibitions account for only a small amount of the end use production volume of 1-BP, approximately 3%, and that most conditions of use will be continuing. We will get into more details on the following slides, but in general, for 1-BP, EPA is proposing to prohibit the manufacture, including import, processing, and distribution and commerce for all consumer use except for the use of 1-BP in insulation, to prohibit the manufacture, including import, processing, and distribution for occupational COUs that are not continuing under our workplace chemical protection program, or WCPP, or prescriptive controls. Again, we will get into the details of what this program involves in the next slides. For those COUs not being prohibited, EPA is proposing to require worker protection measures, including a WCPP and self-certification for six COUs, a WCPP alone for one COU. For manufacturing - there is no purchaser to whom a certification could be provided. We will go into details of self-certification on the following slides. And for the remaining six COUs, with only dermal exposures driving the unreasonable risk, although inhalation exposures were still evaluated, it was only the dermal exposures that drove the unreasonable risk. EPA is proposing to require prescriptive dermal controls, namely, gloves. EPA is proposing to establish record keeping and downstream notification requirements, and this proposed rule would protect consumers and workers, while allowing for the continued use of 1-BP and uses that can comply with the proposed workplace protections. Now, let's go over these aspects of the proposal in more detail.

On slide 13, we have more details about the proposed prohibitions of consumer COUs. EPA is proposing to prohibit the manufacture, including import, processing, and distribution, for all consumer uses, except the use in insulation. Those uses are listed on this slide. I mentioned earlier that EPA has the authority to regulate upstream in the supply chain to address consumer COUs. Available information suggests there is minimal ongoing use of 1-BP in consumer products or that alternative products are available. EPA is proposing a staggered timeframe that provides time for retailers to phase out their consumer product inventory. We will go over the proposed compliance dates later in the presentation.

EPA is also proposing to prohibit the manufacture, including import, processing, distribution, and commerce and use of 1-BP for the occupational COUs that are not continuing under WCPP or prescriptive controls that are listed on this slide, including adhesives and sealants. Available information suggests alternatives are

available for most of the uses where ongoing use is minimal. EPA is uncertain regarding feasibility to implement controls to reduce exposures sufficient to address the unreasonable risk associated with 1-BP exposures for these COUs. Additional information about these uses, including about the feasibility of implementing workplace exposure controls, could reduce EPA's uncertainty and be considered in any changes in the final regulation. We encourage submission of information during the public comment period.

On slide 15, we will talk about the proposed worker protection for those COUs that are continuing under a workplace chemical protection program or WCPP. EPA is proposing strict workplace controls, including an inhalation exposure limit ECEL of 0.05 parts per million, while also providing flexibility in implementation and compatibility with existing OSHA requirements wherever possible. Please note that EPA conducted outreach to confirm that there is a fully validated OSHA method available that allows workplaces to measure to this ECEL level, namely, OSHA Method 1017. One difference between OSHA guidelines and the 1-BP WCPP is EPA's proposed regulatory approach applies to owners and operators subject to the rule which is more broad than OSHA's use of employers and employees. The WCPP also includes additional record keeping, dermal, and exposure control plan requirements. EPA received public comments indicating that some workplaces already have these controls in place. However, there is uncertainty regarding the ability to comply with WCPP in certain sectors, and that is the primary driver of differences between the proposed approaches. We have received feedback that longer compliance timeframes are needed for federal agencies and federal contractors acting for or on behalf of the federal government.

Slide 16 lists the COUs for which EPA is proposing to require a WCPP. These are the occupational COUs that are not being prohibited or subject to other prescriptive controls, including manufacturing and use in cleaning and decreasing.

Slide 17 shows the last type of worker protections included in the 1-BP proposed rule: prescriptive dermal controls or gloves. EPA is proposing gloves only for the COUs listed here, including import, recycling, and disposal, because these COUs only have dermal exposures driving the unreasonable risk. EPA is proposing to require the use of chemically resistant gloves made of supported polyvinyl alcohol or multi-layer laminated materials. EPA is also proposing workplace training requirements in accordance with OSHA's general PPE requirement standards.

Slide 18 includes more details about the additional requirements that go along with the WCPP and prescriptive controls that we just covered. EPA is proposing a point-of-sale self-certification requirement for those facilities subject to a WCPP, except for domestic manufacturing of 1-BP. Owners and operators subject to self-certification would be required to submit a signed self-certification statement to the distributor they are purchasing from in order to purchase and subsequently use 1-BP. The statement would indicate that the facility is implementing and complying with all aspects of the 1-BP WCPP including the ECEL, PPE requirements, and ancillary requirements, and would be valid for one year unless the facility changes processes or there is an indication 1-BP exposures have changed. EPA is proposing that both distributors of 1-BP and owners and operators purchasing and using 1-BP retain the self-certification statement and supporting documents for five years. Record keeping requirements, including maintenance of normal business records, as well as records relating to the WCPP, prescriptive controls and self-certification. The proposal also requires downstream notification of the restrictions by requiring the information be included on safety data sheets. This spreads awareness throughout the supply chain of the restrictions on the 1-BP under TSCA and provides information to commercial end users about time frames for allowable uses.

On slide 19, we turn to the alternative regulatory actions that TSCA requires the agency to consider in addition to the proposed regulatory action. The primary alternative action differs from the proposed regulatory action in two ways. First, it proposes the use of prescriptive controls instead of a WCPP for two COUs. Second, it includes longer compliance timeframes that would take effect six months later than the proposed regulatory action. The second alternative regulatory action differs more significantly from the proposed regulatory action. It would be prohibition in 36 months without a supply chain. stagger for all COUs. And in the next slide we will go into more detail on these compliance dates.

If the rule is finalized as proposed, slide 20 provides the compliance timeframes that would apply. Under TSCA, compliance dates must be as soon as practicable while providing for a reasonable transition period. Prohibitions related to consumer and occupational uses would become effective in six months for manufacturers, nine months for processors, 12 months for distributing to retailers, 15 months for retailers and all other distributors, and 18 months for commercial users after publication of the final rule. For the WCPP, non-federal regulated entities would have six months to conduct initial monitoring, nine months to institute a training program, establish a regulated area, ensure that no person is exposed above the ECEL, and provide PPE if needed, and 12 months to establish an exposure control plan. Federal agencies and federal contractors acting for or on behalf of the federal government would have 33 months for initial monitoring and 36 months for other components of the WCPP. Prescriptive controls, specifically, the use of gloves, would become effective six months after publication in the federal register for non-federal regulated entities and 36 months for federal agencies and federal contractors. And finally, for COUs subject to self-certification, the requirement would become effective at the time of purchase.

On slide 21, we include some of the benefits of the proposed rule, which I don't think I can overstate. The rule would address unreasonable risk for consumers and workers and provide the regulated community with confidence and a protected and healthier workforce. It would ensure the unreasonable risk identified in the risk evaluation is adequately addressed with workplace protections, while allowing for important uses of 1- BP to continue, including in vapor degreasing, aerospace, and defense applications.

As noted earlier, this proposal is based on reasonably available information at the time of the proposal, and we're seeking comment on all aspects of the proposal that EPA should consider as we finalize the rule. The proposal includes requests for comment throughout, which are listed in full in Unit 8 of the notice. Slide 22 highlights a few of the topics on which we are eager to receive information, including the WCPP and its various components, such as the ECEL, restricted areas and monitoring frequency, timeframes for implementation of the requirements, specific engineering or administrative controls that could address the unreasonable risk, feasibility of alternatives to 1-BP and their availability, timeframes for prohibitions for any uses that are currently proposed to be prohibited, the need for and associated costs of ambient air monitoring or facility emission source monitoring to prevent inadvertent releases associated with WCPP compliance, and whether to include a regulatory threshold limit. This is a concentration limit that has been referred to as de minimis in previous rules.

On slide 23, we list some potentially useful information for comments, which ideally should include relevant data from the last 20 years, descriptions of commercial worker activities and associated sources of exposure, process emission factors, product formulation information, and other relevant, unpublished data. And again, we want to stress the public comments submitted to the docket could result in changes to elements of the proposed regulatory action. We want to hear about the ability to meet workplace controls and compliance timeframes and details and robust data to support or substantiate any information. Any comment is very important.

On slide 24, we list some next steps. As noted earlier, the public comment period closes in less than a month, on September 23, 2024. Please submit comments to the docket for EPA's consideration as we develop the final rule.
On slide 25, we have links to additional resources, including EPA's risk evaluation and risk management web pages, and links to the docket.

And finally, on slide 26, please find the link to the docket where comments must be submitted for EPA's consideration. If you have any additional questions that are not answered today, please email 1BP_TSCA@EPA.gov. These slides and links to the additional information, resources, and contact information will be available on EPA's web page following the webinar.

I'll pass it back to Sheerin to facilitate the public remarks portion of the webinar. Thank you so much for joining today. Thank you for engaging with the agency on this proposed rule, and we look forward to hearing your input.

Sheerin Shirajan (ICF): Thank you, Beth. We will now begin the public remarks session.

If you requested to make public remarks, please ensure that your name is on Zoom and it's under the same name that you registered with. If you are currently signed on Zoom under a different name, and you registered to provide remarks, please email EPARulemaking@icf.com with your name as it currently appears on Zoom and the email address that you registered with. Attendees who requested to provide public remarks will be given five minutes to speak. We will call on speaker numbers to begin. Each speaker will be asked to unmute one at a time to make their remarks. As a reminder, oral remarks presented during the webinar will not be included as part of the docket, and substantive comments should be provided in writing by September 23, 2024 to EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0471. The link to the docket is provided in the chat box.

Before you begin your remarks, please state your full name and affiliation. A timer will appear in the top right corner of the screen, and a time check will be sent to the speaking attendees when they have 1 minute remaining in the chat. Those who requested to speak have been added to a public remark group. As you see your name and number in the queue to speak, please be ready to provide your remarks. When it is your turn to speak in your respective group and order in the queue you will see a pop-up message. Please hit unmute when it is your turn to speak. Your five minutes will begin when you start your oral remarks. If you do not see the pop-up message when it is your turn, go to the bottom left of the Zoom dashboard and hit the unmute button to speak. If you continue to have issues, please email EPARulemaking@icf.com.

Again, please state your full name and affiliation before providing your remarks. You will have a total of 5 minutes to provide your remarks.

Speaker number one is currently not present, and therefore will not provide their remarks.

We will now move on to our next speaker. Speaker number two, please unmute, introduce yourself and begin your remarks.

Bob Hoyt (Unknown Affiliation): I have no comments at this point.

Sheerin Shirajan (ICF): Thank you very much. This now concludes our public remarks session. Thank you.

As a final reminder, oral remarks presented during the webinar will not be included as part of the docket, and it is important that any substantive comments be provided in writing by September 23, 2024 at EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0471. The link can be found in the chat box and in your email from EPARulemaking@icf.com. I'll now pass it back to Beth Masten for closing remarks. Thank you.

Bethany Masten (EPA): Thank you, Sheerin. Once again, I am Bethany Masten, one of the risk managers at EPA, who works on the 1-BP rulemaking. On behalf of the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, we thank you again for your continued participation and engagement. It is invaluable to us as we work through the final rulemaking process. We look forward to receiving your written comments in the 1-BP rulemaking docket by September 23, 2024. Thank you again for joining us today. And this concludes the webinar. Thank you.