Massachusetts Toxics Use Reduction

TURA List of Toxic or Hazardous Substances

TURA Program Strengthening Ad Hoc Committee

April 29, 2021















Please contact <u>caredwen.foley@state.ma.us</u> if you have technical difficulties during the meeting

Today's Agenda





Note: Public comments/questions will be held until opened for general discussion

Vote on Minutes





Approval of March 30, 2021 meeting minutes

List of Toxic or Hazardous Substances

- Original list created from TRI & CERCLA
- 1600 substances, including 60 categories
 - 308 ever reported
- Designed to be updated over time
 - Federal updates
 - TURA program updates
- 2006 Amendments
 - HHS & LHS designations
 - Changes to threshold requirements

Massachusetts

Toxics llse Re

Updates to List



• Federal – TRI

- 1996-2019: fewer than 30 substances (individual chem & categories) added to TRI
- NDAA, 2019: 172 PFAS added to TRI in 2020; more in 2021

• TURA listings

- Crystalline silica, nPB, C1-C4 Halogenated Hydrocarbons and Halocarbons NOL
- PFAS listing recommended by SAB & TURI, currently under discussion
- Petition received for listing of single-walled carbon nanotubes, multi-walled carbon nanotubes, and carbon nanofibers

• TURA delistings

- 18 delisting petitions; 14 granted (part or all)
- Several additional delistings resulted from CERCLA list review

Substances Not Reportable to MassDEP

- 1993 reporting guidance: certain CERCLA categories not reportable (22 total)
- Examples include:
 - Phthalate esters
 - Haloethers

Massachusetts

Toxics Use Reduct

Updating the TURA List: Opportunities & Challenges



- Slow pace of updates to federal lists
- Evolving science
 - Additional knowledge on many endpoints, such as reproductive toxicity
- TURA list not up to date with current science
- Many states and federal entities use authoritative lists as basis for updates

Comparing TURA List with Other Authoritative Lists



- Contracted with Healthy Building Network to compare with multiple lists
 - Included analysis of categories
- Included federal, international, and state lists

List comparisons (excerpt from Table 3, p. 7)



Massachusetts

Toxics Use Redu

List comparisons: results (Examples - see p. 7)



- Known carcinogen: 25
- Vermont:
 - Chem of High Concern for Children: 47 (e.g. Bisphenol S, several phthalate esters)
- Maine:
 - Chem of High Concern & Priority Chem: 16 (e.g. nonylphenols not in TRI categories)
- CA Prop 65:
 - Cancer: 302 (e.g. TCEP, benzidine salts)
 - Reproductive toxicity: 192 (e.g. DIDP)

Massachusetts

Toxics Use Redi

Examples (excerpt from Table 4, p. 9)

Massachusetts Toxics Use Reduction

Substance	Lists	Notes
DIDP	State – Prop 65, VT, WA EU – ED, REACH restrictions Federal – NTP (clear evidence dev)	Not reported per 1993 guidance
Bisphenol S	State – VT, WA EU - REACH restrictions Other – GS1	Alternative to Bisphenol A
Benzidine salts & dyes	State: Prop 65, ME EU: REACH restrictions Federal: NTP	Well-established chemicals of concern

Options for Updating the TURA List

Draw from authoritative lists

Require reporting of CERCLA categories already listed

Create informational list of lists

Massachusetts

Toxics Use Reduc

Discussion Logistics



Use Zoom function to raise your hand for comments or questions

- To access the "Raise Hand" function, click "Participants" at the bottom of your screen, and then click the "Raise Hand" button that appears under the list of participants
- This will notify the host that you have a question
- Participants will be unmuted and invited to ask questions one at a time



Please contact <u>Caroline.Higley2@mass.gov</u> if you have technical difficulties during the discussion

Discussion Ground Rules





Be open to other perspectives



Build on suggestions



Allow space for all to participate

Focus on issues and opportunities



Stay present (both mentally and physically)

Discussion Goals





Gather creative, innovative ideas



Focus on opportunities to increase benefits of the TURA Program for both companies and the Commonwealth

Discussion topics

Massachusetts Toxics Use Reduction





- Do you make use of the TURA list in your work?
 - Describe examples of how and why you use the list
 - If you work with TURA filers, what process do you use for checking which substances are reportable at a facility?
- Do you make use of other chemical lists in your work?
 - Which ones?
 - How do those lists compare in breadth and in utility (including format and ease of use)?



- What feedback to you have on the usability of the information?
 - -Have you encountered any challenges with interpreting information on the list?
 - –Do you have suggestions on ways to make the TURA list easier to use?



- Do you have suggestions for how best to approach updates to the TURA list?
 - What would be the pros and cons of options including:
 - Draw from authoritative lists;
 - Require reporting of CERCLA categories already listed;
 - Create informational list of lists
 - Other options?



- Building on the information presented in the background document, as well as your own experience:
 - Are there particular substances that should be considered a high priority for addition to the TURA list?
 - Are there particular substances that should be considered a high priority for HHS or LHS designation?



- Do you have input related to current TURA thresholds?
 - For example, how should the TURA program consider thresholds with regard to nanoparticles?
- Do you have other questions about the TURA List that we have not covered?

TURA Program Strengthening Ad Hoc Committee





Please direct any questions or comments to:

Tiffany Skogstrom, Director MA OTA tiffany.skogstrom@mass.gov

Adjourn





Final topic:

• TURA Fees