

MINUTES  
ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DECEMBER 5, 2019

A meeting of the Environmental Policy Advisory Committee (EPAC) was convened on Thursday, December 5, 2019, at 5:15 p.m., in the Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development Conference Room, 229 West 12th Street. Chair Lopez called the meeting to order at 5:20 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Those members present were:

Sherie Caffey  
Becky Cortese  
Nancy Keller

Ted Lopez  
Alicia Solis (arrived at 5:30 p.m.)  
Ryan Tessman

Members absent: Andrea Crockenberg (last day of employment as Environmental Coordinator with the Pueblo Department of Public Health and Environment (PDPHE) was November 6, 2019), Gail Conners (\*excused), and Jim Sharp (\*excused).

Staff present: Sandra M. Smith, EPAC Recording Secretary.

Guest present: Gail L. Wallingford-Ingo, Interim Director, Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development and the Acting Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG) Manager.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 3, 2019 MEETING

Ms. Keller moved to approve the minutes from the October 3, 2019 meeting as mailed. Ms. Caffey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Lopez asked the members to introduce themselves for the benefit of Ms. Wallingford-Ingo.

APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2019 EPAC AGENDA

Chair Lopez stated he would like to move the Chair's Report to the end of the meeting. He asked Mr. Tessman to fill in for Ms. Crockenberg to the best of his abilities. Mr. Tessman replied that he knew nothing about the Environmental Coordinator's duties.

Ms. Caffey moved to approve the agenda of the December 5, 2019 meeting as amended. Ms. Cortese seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR REPORT - RYAN TESSMAN

Chair Lopez asked Mr. Tessman to expand on his duties with PDPHE and program involvements. Mr. Tessman replied that his duties were with Solid Waste and Housing. On January 1, 2020, he was more involved with the Trash Task Force. He helps with the enforcement of illegal dumping sites, noting that more cameras were on order to affix to telephone poles. He finds those doing the illegal dumping and requires them to clean up the sites. Chair Lopez questioned if the Trash Task Force has identified certain illegal dumping sites. Mr. Tessman replied there is a list of the top identified sites, which he will be visiting over the next couple of months. He will determine the scope of the dumping and look for areas that will accommodate a camera. He stated they were working on analyzing six in the City of Pueblo and six in Pueblo County. Chair Lopez asked if he could recall some of the sites that would

receive cameras. Mr. Tessman replied that he has not had time to look through the site list. Ms. Cortese stated that she was not sure what sites were being looked at to install cameras, noting there was a list of known illegal dump sites that was created by the Trash Task Force. Some of the examples would be around Nature Center Road and Spaulding Avenue that connects to Pueblo West, noting that Pueblo West Metropolitan District has taken measures to block off the road so cars cannot pass through. Ms. Keller stated there was a known site off of Troy Avenue. Ms. Cortese concurred, noting off Troy on both highways. She indicated that the Trash Task Force conducted a clean-up for that area a couple of months ago. There were some areas downtown on West 10<sup>th</sup> Street, and some alleys in the area before the Midtown area. She stated that mattresses have been lit on fire continuously. She could not remember what all of the areas were but noted the PDPHE had a good list in progress.

Chair Lopez noted that Ms. Solis joined the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Chair Lopez questioned how the surveillance cameras would be powered. Mr. Tessman replied he did not bring the specifications with him, noting they had a battery that would be solar powered. Chair Lopez questioned if they were confident the cameras would not be damaged or vandalized. Mr. Tessman replied that the camera specifications indicated the camera has a half-inch steel plate on the outside, noting that other counties have used this type of camera.

Chair Lopez stated the Environmental Coordinator (EC) reported on projects such as Earth Day in April, a twice a year reduced fee dump day at the Southside Landfill in early May, recycling material collection events, household hazardous collection events, and neighborhood cleanups. He stated he was unsure about the future of the neighborhood cleanups, noting they were conducted in Pueblo West, Avondale, Salt Creek, and the City of Pueblo within the Bessemer and Eastside areas. He stated that this was the type of information the EC reported to EPAC. The EC also attended the yearly recycling conference. Ms. Cortese stated the recycling conference was for Recycle Colorado. Chair Lopez stated this was the type of information he wanted Mr. Tessman to bring to EPAC. Mr. Tessman replied that the PDPHE would be hiring soon to fill the EC position, noting that he did not have access to the information he was requesting; it was beyond his purview. Chair Lopez asked Mr. Tessman to bring any information he may have or deals with relative to environmental issues to EPAC.

#### WW NO. 2019-001, SITE PLAN REVIEW, PUEBLO WEST - GAIL WALLINGFORD-INGO

Ms. Wallingford-Ingo stated that she was the Interim Director for the Department of Planning and Development. She gave a presentation of the Wastewater Treatment Site Plan Review for the Pueblo West Metropolitan District (PWMD) at the December 5, 2019, Pueblo Area Council of Governments' (PACOG) meeting held at 12:15 p.m. A copy of the staff review was e-mailed to the EPAC members for informational purposes only. She noted that Mr. Lopez was in attendance at the December 5, 2019 PACOG meeting. The Pueblo West Metropolitan District has submitted a site plan amendment for the wastewater treatment facility in Pueblo West. The intent is to add an additional process to mitigate the solids and process them accordingly. There will not be any additional effluent, and nothing would be increasing. Because EPAC is a policy advisory committee, this type of application is presented to EPAC for informational purposes only. She stated that Mr. George Reichert, Pueblo West Wastewater Department Manager, gave a good presentation to PACOG and will give another presentation at the Board of County Commissioners' (BOCC) meeting scheduled for December 12, 2019. She stated that PACOG and the BOCC were required to give their recommendations to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) within 60 days of submittal. PACOG forwarded a recommendation of approval, which was passed by a 7 to 2 vote.

Ms. Keller questioned if EPAC was required to give a recommendation. Ms. Wallingford-Ingo replied that in some instances it is. In other instances, only an overview is required. She noted that it was the Pueblo County Attorney's determination that because this particular submittal was an amendment to an existing wastewater treatment facility, only an overview presentation was required for EPAC.

Ms. Keller stated it appeared that PWMD would be installing a reuse system so they can use non-potable water to use in their treatment. Ms. Wallingford-Ingo concurred. Chair Lopez felt that was the most important part, to save treated water to remove solids and/or other things in the process of treating effluent. Ms. Keller presumed that the water would come out before chlorination. Ms. Wallingford-Ingo replied yes.

Chair Lopez stated that there were two PACOG members that voted against the amendment, Mr. Ray Aguilera and Mr. Mike Cafasso, who is on the board of directors of the Pueblo Board of Water Works. Mr. Cafasso voted against it because he wanted to make sure that the level of treatment of the discharge was such that it would not pollute, contaminate, or negatively affect the Arkansas River. He stated that Mr. Reichert said that depending on where the water will be discharged, that it may not have to meet the level for potable water. Ms. Keller stated that it does not. Ms. Wallingford-Ingo replied there were different standards that apply to the area the water is being released. Ms. Keller stated that each Arkansas River segment has different standards. She stated that Pueblo West was not discharging the reuse, they were putting the reuse back into the system, which would go back through the process, which would then go through the same disinfection to meet the same permit requirements as it does other areas. There would not be a potential of it being of poor quality. Chair Lopez stated that Mr. Reichert mentioned that the segment standards were for aquatic life. Ms. Keller stated Pueblo West would have to meet the typical stream standard. Chair Lopez stated that this goes along with some of the other presentations made by Ms. Keller to EPAC, noting the different segments on the St. Charles River leading into the Arkansas River. Ms. Keller concurred.

#### WATER QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE - NANCY KELLER

Ms. Keller stated she wanted to update the members on the Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS). She stated that members may remember the presentation from the members of the Sierra Club a few months ago discussing the issue of PFAS that were being found around Widefield and how they were going to address it. She stated there have been some major advances relative to standards. The EPA has still not adopted criteria to develop standards for any of the PFAS compounds. They are in the process of doing that. The states are moving ahead of the EPA on this and are gathering data. There is a health advisory of 70 ug/L, which is a very low amount. Some of the PFAS long-chain compounds are very toxic at very low levels. There are some short-chain ones that are being used more commonly now, noting that most of the long-chains have been banned in the United States. However, they still come in on products from outside of the United States. Many items have PFAS chemicals in them, like Teflon pans, clothing treated for rain repellent, Scotch Guard on furniture and rugs, the fast-food paper wrappers that do not absorb the grease, noting the PFAS compound repels water and oil and is very effective. The old fire-fighting foams were loaded with PFAS, which made it very good for putting out petroleum-based fires. There are a lot of areas on military bases and airports that have PFAS contamination, which is infiltrating the aquifers in those areas. In Colorado, the legislature has mandated that the State has to develop a policy and get monitoring and requirements for those holding permits. She stated the State was moving very fast and will go to hearing in May 2020. Work groups with stakeholders have met and, at the last meeting, there were 160 in attendance in person and on the phone. The work groups include environmentalists, impacted citizens in the Widefield area, and other facilities that will be impacted like the wastewater plants because

they will be the ones doing the cleanup. The PFAS compounds do not break down in the environment and will have to be incinerated. This is going to be an extremely expensive process, noting she was concerned because it will not be an easily handled and needs to happen at the source and not at the wastewater plant. She handed out a Colorado PFAS Summary, entered into the record as Exhibit A, which was an overview of what was going on, where the chemicals were coming from, the State's fast track process, and the health advisory limits for twenty-five different PFAS compounds that are being sampled. She stated there were very few labs in the United States that test for these types of compounds, noting there are none in Colorado. Many of them cannot test for all twenty-five compounds, noting there are two screening methods that were not ideal to use. There was a drinking water method, not made for wastewater. It has never been proven in wastewater, there were a lot of inference that it would be a large problem. If this method is to work, it would have to be modified. The EPA was against the modified method and posted its concerns on its website. She stated that every lab modifies differently to get a certain compound to give them data that they can quantify. To find a lab that would be able to do all twenty-five and to do it accurately was going to be very debatable. There are a lot of concerns of how fast the State was progressing and the direction it was taking, noting there was no scientific research to be used as a backup. The EPA was working rapidly to get some of the risk assessments done and get them out by the end of the year as well as developing additional methods, noting they were not available yet. She stated it costs \$200-\$300 per sample to analyze. If money was spent analyzing these compounds and then that method was not approved, that money spent has been thrown away. However, it appears that there was no other choice. Monitoring was being put in place for discharge permit limits. Colorado Springs has problems because the compounds are in its aquifer. If there was construction going on like replacing a sewer line or a contractor digging a hole to put in a basement and you run into groundwater, that groundwater needs to be treated before it can be discharged if it exceeds the PFAS limits. This going to be a huge impact on construction. Colorado Springs was in the target area that needs to start on this PFAS cleanup. Any activity that touches the groundwater will be impacted and will require monitoring for all of the permits as well as treatment of wastewater.

Ms. Keller stated the next issue that needed to be addressed was the PFAS contaminated bio-solids and how it should be handled if it goes to a landfill.

Chair Lopez questioned which wastewater treatment plants would be affected. Ms. Keller replied all of them, noting that the contamination was everywhere. She stated that the testing needs to be done everywhere to determine how widespread the contamination was. She stated that the State of Michigan was further ahead on this type of testing because that is where the DuPont and 3M manufacturing plants that manufacture the PFAS compounds are located. She stated that the sampling guidance has a list of do's and don'ts that includes no sunscreen, perfumes, makeup, and no clothing with fabric softener. There are not a lot of types of clothing that can be worn when testing. It can be cotton, but it has to be washed several times without fabric softener and without certain soaps with surfactants. Surfactants are what helps get the clothes clean, and it contains PFOA compounds. The tubing used for testing has to be a certain type of tubing because you can't use plastic or glass. She stated that there are so many items that have these compounds and the chance of contamination was huge. Chair Lopez questioned the non-point sources of contamination because it is all over the place. Ms. Keller concurred, noting that PFAS are not natural; they are manmade and used in many different products. Chair Lopez stated that it was the everyday activities like washing clothes, cars, and dishes. Ms. Keller stated that most any soap has a surfactant in it because it is needed to help the water to be able to compound the hydrogen to combine with the dirt to remove it. Chair Lopez had heard that approximately 70,000 new chemicals are produced every year. Ms. Keller stated that she thought there were approximately 600 PFAS or PFOS compounds, noting that

they think that most of the newer ones are far less toxic. Several long-chain compounds are extremely toxic. Chair Lopez stated that other parts of the world, for instance, Europe, have been ahead in banning the use of certain chemicals; way ahead of the United States. Ms. Keller replied that the United States was working on it, noting it takes some time for certain compounds to meet our standards, to go through the risk assessments, developed criteria documents, have peer reviews, and get scientific background data. She stated it has been known for a long time that the PFAS were very toxic, noting they have been banned from being used in the United States. They have been banned in most of the European countries, but there was still a lot coming into the United States from other countries through the production processes. There were still a significant number of items in the United States that were using those compounds, i.e., plastics of any source.

#### SOLID WASTE SUBCOMMITTEE - BECKY CORTESE

Ms. Cortese stated there would be a presentation to the Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG) in February 2020 for the Materials Management portion for the Sustainable Plan Action Team (SPAT). This was a follow-up to ask PACOG to fund a marketing campaign for the Pueblo community for reduction of materials that cannot be processed because of lost markets like single-use plastics and a reuse campaign. Over the last several months, the term “reduce, reuse, recycle” has been used, and she feels there has been a shift in the term. The first two have been ignored and discussions have been about what it takes to recycle. She noted that markets have been lost making it necessary to concentrate on reducing rather than recycling. She stated that people were living in the single-use throwaway age. It’s imperative to change the mindset of the community. She stated that recycling can be promoted for items there were markets for like metals, newspapers, and cardboard.

Chair Lopez stated they discussed the campaign and how to get the word out to the media. They discussed using campaigns from other localities that were successful and funding to get the information out in different forms. He stated the Materials Management meeting was held on the fourth Wednesday of the month at 3:00 p.m. The next scheduled meeting is on January 22, 2020.

#### CHAIR’S REPORT – TED LOPEZ

Chair Lopez stated that one thing he forgot to mention at the last meeting was a program he watched on the PBS channel called “The Plastic Problem”. He was amazed and overwhelmed at the broad contamination of PFAS chemicals, noting that many people were not aware of it. He stated there was a cartoon in the local newspaper a few days ago about a frog in a pot. Several of the members indicated that they had seen it. He stated that with chemicals and plastics, people have slowly become used to it and don’t pay attention to them anymore. He stated we cannot get away from plastic in terms of packaging, containers, etc. He mentioned nano-particles in facial products was another culprit. Ms. Keller stated they are known as micro-beads. Chair Lopez stated that he had heard about a sperm whale from the Atlantic Ocean that was found dead. It was determined that the cause of death was due to the 200 or so pounds of plastic material that was found in its stomach. They found fishing nets and a lot of other items. After watching the documentary about the plastic problem, he searched the Internet and found a lot of information about plastics. He stated that the United States, Canada, and developed nations were not necessarily the source of plastics in the environment especially in the waterways and the ocean. There were pictures of India and Africa that showed rivers of plastics. He was amazed by the amount. He stated that all plastics could not be recycled because it was not economical. He stated he started a practice at his parent’s home. The caregivers were using napkins to serve toast or sandwiches. The napkins would then end up in

the trash. He told the caregivers to use plates; no more paper. They were using plastic baggies for leftovers. He told them to use reusable plastic or glass containers. Canned or bottled beverages should be poured into a reusable glass jar. The beverage container could then be rinsed and recycled. He stated that he had picked up some containers at the ARC Thrift Store to use for storing leftovers. He stated that plastic water bottles were bad because they leach chemicals into the water. Ms. Keller stated that there were so many things being produced with harmful chemicals that we could not get away from it all. She stated that leaving diet soda in the sun or where it can get hot changes the ingredients and makes it a carcinogen. Chair Lopez stated much education needed to be done. He felt that a media campaign could address these concerns. Ms. Cortese questioned if he was speaking of the toxicity of plastics. Chair Lopez replied yes or just the presence of plastic in the waterways that end up in the oceans and affect sea life and birds. He stated people were part of the problem and part of the solution. People need to be educated to change their ways.

Chair Lopez stated that Denver's city council was considering implementing a price of \$0.10 on plastic bags. He cut out an article from a New Jersey newspaper that stated it was time to revive the bottle law. He stated there was a lot of information available regarding the problems created with plastic packaging.

Ms. Keller stated there were more chemicals in food packaged in bulk because they have to protect it from losing moisture in the open air. You get chemicals no matter what. Chair Lopez stated it came down to the source. Rather than shipping long distances that require more plastic packaging, more could be sourced locally. Ms. Keller stated that reading about the number of chemicals in things was astonishing.

#### AGENDA FOR FEBRUARY 6, 2020 MEETING

The next regularly scheduled EPAC meeting is Thursday, February 6, 2020, at 229 West 12th Street, from 5:15 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before EPAC, the meeting was adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

  
Sandra M. Smith  
EPAC Recording Secretary

SMS

# Colorado PFAS Summary

Preparing for May 11, 2020 Commission Hearing

EPAC Meeting  
12-5-2019

Exhibit A



## Division Proposes an Accelerated Path Forward for PFAS

In response to Governor's office requests, the Colorado Water Quality Control Division (Division) has developed a statewide action plan that includes a series of proposed efforts to "break the chain" of exposure for Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS):

- Expand monitoring for PFAS
- Identify impacted drinking water sources
- Develop an inventory of contaminated sites
- Establish regulatory authority to apply limits to surface and groundwater discharge permits

This summary focuses mainly on efforts related to the last bullet – establishing regulatory authority to apply limits to surface and groundwater discharge permits.

## Why Now? Exploring the Drivers

PFAS is a group of over 5,000 man-made chemicals that have been introduced into the environment after decades of use in household goods (carpets, non-stick pans), clothing (fire retardant pajamas, ski coats), food packaging (fast-food wrappers, microwave popcorn bags), and fire-fighting foams, among other products. Because of their chemical structure, PFAS compounds are used in products to resist heat, oil, stains, grease, and water. However, studies of a handful of specific forms of PFAS have shown impacts to human health, including developmental effects, endocrine impacts, and renal toxicity. Because of these compounds' resilience, they do not easily break down in the environment and are expected to be found most anywhere at very low levels, including in our bodies.

Media attention to PFAS has skyrocketed, likely driven by the release of "The Devil We Know" and "Dark Waters," both films based on the true story of an attorney's battle against DuPont for release of PFAS into the environment. Since 2014, states have begun to take action to understand the levels of PFAS in the environment and set maximum levels in drinking water and source water that they believe are protective. However, all of these states, and now Colorado, are moving forward without the benefit of federal drinking water standards or water quality criteria for these chemicals in surface or groundwater.

## What's the Plan? Following a Fast Track

In order to move quickly to "break the chain" of PFAS exposure, the Division is working outside of the typical procedures for developing and setting water quality standards. They are proposing to implement the narrative standard (included in both the surface water regulations, Reg 31, and groundwater regulations, Reg 41), which basically says that these waters shall be free from toxins in toxic amounts. Through **Policy 20-1: Policy for Interpreting the Narrative Water Quality Standards for Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)**, the Division will document how the narrative standard was translated into named constituents with associated limits. The policy will further explain how these "translation levels" will be implemented in permits and used to address contamination. Specific to permitted dischargers, Policy 20-1 outlines a plan to:

- 1) Through a mandatory survey, require dischargers and firefighting districts to **report known or suspected PFAS-containing chemicals** processed or stored at the facility.
- 2) Require **sampling for PFAS and report the results** upon request through the permits' duty to provide information clause (this could occur outside of the permit renewal process).
- 3) Require **ongoing PFAS monitoring** as part of the normal discharge permit renewal process.
- 4) Require **investigation and evaluation of control strategies** for possible PFAS sources.
- 5) **Implement effluent limits**, using the "translation levels," in discharge permits (e.g., domestic, industrial, dewatering).

The "translation values" that the Division is proposing are listed in Table 1. Since there are no federal regulatory standards for PFAS, these values are based on various draft health advisory levels or screening levels. Some constituents have the same health impact (i.e., impact to human development) and, to be conservative, the Division has binned these compounds together and set a **combined or additive translation level** in addition to the individual level. As the science of PFAS continues to evolve, it is conceivable that more constituents could be added to this list and binned in the same way.

Policy 20-1 **does not include any standards for drinking water** or for implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) with regard to PFAS compounds.

**Table 1. Draft Policy 20-1 Translation Levels**

PFAS Constituent	Translation Level (ng/L)	Combined Translation Level (ng/L)
PFOA	70	
PFOA Parent Compounds	70	
PFOS	70	70
PFOS Parent Compounds	70	
PFNA	70	
PFHxS	700	Not Applicable
PFBS	400,000	Not Applicable

Notes:

1. Translation level of 70 ng/L is based on the EPA 2016 health advisory. The critical effect for this constituent is development (gestation and lactation).
2. Translation level of 700 ng/L is based on the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) minimal risk levels calculated for PFOS, PFOA and PFNA relative to PFHxS. The critical effect for this constituent is endocrine impacts.
3. Translation level of 400,000 ng/L is based on the EPA Regional Screening Level in tap water for PFBS. The critical effect for this constituent is renal toxicity.

## What's the Issue? Food for Thought

Dischargers; entities that use, handle, or store PFAS-containing materials; and communities with source waters impacted by PFAS are all stakeholders in this process. All have found themselves in the middle, faced with a potentially ubiquitous constituent that is both used to protect and enhance human life but may also have long-term impacts on human health. Without clear science and time to explore and understand the path forward, stakeholders are faced with many unanswered questions and general concerns as the Division moves forward. Below is a list of general issues that have been identified . . . some food for thought:

- There are **no federal standards** for any PFAS compound for drinking water or any other media.
- There are **no approved laboratory analytical methods** for analyzing PFAS constituents in Clean Water Act monitoring (wastewater, stormwater, groundwater, surface water).
- There are **few labs** across the country (and none in Colorado) that can properly handle and analyze for PFAS compounds and the **cost per sample can be significant** (at least \$200 per sample).
- At this point, PFAS compounds have been identified in significant quantities in 5 locations in Colorado. However, **PFAS is ubiquitous** and is expected to be found in trace amounts almost everywhere.
- **PFAS does not readily break down**, so removing PFAS from water merely moves it into residuals and does not destroy the compound. Although the science is evolving on PFAS treatment, the only current technology that is known to destroy the strong bonds of these long-chain compounds is high temperature incineration.
- There is a **general lack of data** on the magnitude and extent of PFAS in Colorado's waters (ground and surface), soils, wastewater, and drinking water. Without this information, stakeholders cannot predict the impact Draft Policy 20-1 may have on their operations.
- Because of the uncertainty regarding future regulation of PFAS, **landfills are no longer accepting PFAS waste**. Currently, the ultimate fate of PFAS from Colorado is incineration at sites out of state.
- Once PFAS contamination is identified, there is **not a process for identifying the responsible parties and holding them accountable**. In the case of utilities or locations with diffuse groundwater contamination, the party responsible for removing the PFAS was not the source.
- With these unanswered questions and fast pace, it is **unclear if we're using our limited resources in the most effective and impactful way**, while balancing the increased cost to rate payers and the regulated community.

## PFAS Policy 20-1 Schedule

### 2019

- **December 3** –Comments due on Policy 20-1 draft, version 1.

### 2020

- **January 21** –Policy 20-1 draft, version 2 out for PFAS Stakeholder Workgroup review.
- ★ **February 4** –Comments due on draft version 2.
- ★ **February 11** – Last PFAS Stakeholder Workgroup meeting to discuss comments on draft version 2.
- **March 2** – Policy 20-1, final draft out for general stakeholder review.
- **March 30** – Comments due on Policy 20-1, final draft.
- **April 29** – Proposed Policy 20-1 submitted to Commission
- **May 11** – Commission Administrative Action hearing to adopt Policy 20-1

### Future Actions

- **Require discharge sampling**
- **Implement PFAS limits in wastewater, dewatering, and other discharge permits**
- **Develop and adopt water quality standards for PFAS in Colorado**

For more information, contact:  
 Colorado Monitoring Framework  
 Sarah Reeves, Coordinator  
 (303) 239-5411  
 sreeves@brwncaid.com

