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SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is promulgating today’s final rule, the Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (DBPR), to provide for increased protection against the potential risks for cancer and reproductive and developmental health effects associated with disinfection byproducts (DBPs). The final Stage 2 DBPR contains maximum contaminant level goals for chloroform, monochloroacetic acid and trichloroacetic acid; National Primary Drinking Water Regulations, which consist of maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) and monitoring, reporting, and public notification requirements for total trihalomethanes (TTHM) and haloacetic acids (HAA5); and revisions to the reduced monitoring requirements for bromate. This document also specifies the best available technologies for bromate. This rule also makes minor corrections to drinking water regulations, specifically the Public Notification tables. New endnotes were added to these tables in recent rulemakings; however, the corresponding footnote numbering in the tables was not changed. In addition, this rule makes a minor correction to the Stage 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule by replacing a sentence that was inadvertently removed.

DATES: This final rule is effective on March 6, 2006. For judicial review purposes, this final rule is promulgated as January 4, 2006. The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the rule is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of March 6, 2006.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OW–2002–0043. All documents in the docket are listed on the http://www.regulations.gov Web site.

Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be regulated by this action. This table lists the types of entities that EPA is now aware could potentially be regulated by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be regulated. To determine whether your facility is regulated by this action, you should carefully examine the definition of “public water system” in §141.2 and the section entitled “coverage” (§141.3) in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations and applicability criteria in §141.600 and 141.620 of today’s proposal. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, contact the person listed in the preceding FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples of regulated entities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Community and nontransient noncommunity water systems that use a primary or residual disinfectant other than ultraviolet light or deliver water that has been treated with a primary or residual disinfectant other than ultraviolet light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Local, Tribal, or Federal Governments</td>
<td>Community and nontransient noncommunity water systems that use a primary or residual disinfectant other than ultraviolet light or deliver water that has been treated with a primary or residual disinfectant other than ultraviolet light.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rule also makes minor corrections to drinking water regulations, specifically the Public Notification tables. New endnotes were added to these tables in recent rulemakings; however, the corresponding footnote numbering in the tables was not changed. In addition, this rule makes a minor correction to the Stage 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule by replacing a sentence that was inadvertently removed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information, contact the Water Supply Section, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (MC 4607M), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 564–5262; fax number: (202) 564–3767; e-mail address: grubbs.thomas@epa.gov. For general information, contact the Safe Drinking Water Hotline, Telephone (800) 426–4791. The Safe Drinking Water Hotline is open Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Eastern Time.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does This Action Apply to Me?

Entities potentially regulated by the Stage 2 DBPR are community and nontransient noncommunity water systems that add a primary or residual disinfectant other than ultraviolet light or deliver water that has been treated with a primary or residual disinfectant other than ultraviolet light. Regulated categories and entities are identified in the following chart.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be regulated by this action. This table lists the types of entities that EPA is now aware could potentially be regulated by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be regulated. To determine whether your facility is regulated by this action, you should carefully examine the definition of “public water system” in §141.2 and the section entitled “coverage” (§141.3) in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations and applicability criteria in §141.600 and 141.620 of today’s proposal. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, contact the person listed in the preceding FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section.

B. How Can I Get Copies of This Document and Other Related Information?

See the ADDRESSES section for information on how to receive a copy of this document and related information.

Regional contacts:
I. Kevin Reilly, Water Supply Section, JFK Federal Bldg., Room 203, Boston, MA 02203, (617) 565–3616.

Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically through http://www.regulations.gov or in hard copy at the Water Docket, EPA/DC, EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The Public Reading Room is open from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the Water Docket is (202) 566–2426.

For further information, contact Tom Grubbs, Standards and Risk Management Division, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (MC 4607M), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 564–5262; fax number: (202) 564–3767; e-mail address: grubbs.thomas@epa.gov.
III. Jason Gambatese, Drinking Water Section (3WM41), 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103–2029, (215) 814–5759.

IV. Robert Burns, Drinking Water Section, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, GA 30303, (404) 562–9456.

V. Miguel Del Toral, Water Supply Section, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604, (312) 886–5253.

VI. Blake L. Atkins, Drinking Water Section, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, TX 75202, (214) 665–2297.

VII. Douglas J. Brune, Drinking Water Management Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, KS 66101, (800) 233–0425.

VIII. Bob Clement, Public Water Supply Section (8P2-W-MS), 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202–2466, (303) 312–6653.

IX. Bruce Macler, Water Supply Section, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, (415) 972–3569.

X. Wendy Marshall, Drinking Water Unit, 1200 Sixth Avenue (OW–136), Seattle, WA 98101, (206) 553–1890.

Abbreviations Used in This Document

ASDWA Association of State Drinking Water Administrators
ASTM American Society for Testing and Materials
AWWA American Water Works Association
AWwaRF American Water Works Association Research Foundation
BACH Best available technology for control of pollutants
BCAA Bromochloroacetic acid
BDCM Bromodichloromethane
CDBG Community Development Block Grant
CWS Community water system
DBAA Dibromoacetic acid
DBCM Dibromochloromethane
DBP Disinfection byproduct
DBPR Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule
DCAA Dichloroacetic acid
EA Economic analysis
EC Enhanced coagulation
EDA Ethylenediamine
EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESWTR Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
FACA Federal Advisory Committee Act
GAC Granular activated carbon
GC/ECD Gas chromatography using electron capture detection
GWR Ground Water Rule
GWUDI Ground water under the direct influence of surface water
HAA5 Haloacetic acids (five) (sum of monochloroacetic acid, dichloroacetic acid, trichloroacetic acid, monobromoacetic acid, and dibromoacetic acid)
HAN Haloacetonitriles (trichloroacetonitrile, dichloroacetonitrile, bromochloroacetonitrile, and dibromoacetonitrile)
IC Ion chromatograph
IC/MS Ion chromatograph coupled to an inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometer
IDSE Initial distribution system evaluation
ILSI International Life Sciences Institute
IESWTR Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
IPCS International Programme on Chemical Safety
IRIS Integrated Risk Information System (EPA)
LOAEL Lowest observed adverse effect level
LRAA Locational running annual average
LT1ESTWR Long Term 1 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
LT2ESTWR Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
MBAA Monobromoacetic acid
MCAA Monochloroacetic acid
MCL Maximum contaminant level
MCLG Maximum contaminant level goal
M–DBP Microbial and disinfection byproducts mg/L Milligram per liter
MRL Minimum reporting level
MRDL Maximum residual disinfectant level
MRDLG Maximum residual byproduct level goal
NDMA N-nitrosodimethylamine
NDVAC National Drinking Water Advisory Council
NF Nanofiltration
NOAEL No observed adverse effect level
NODA Notice of data availability
NPDWR National primary drinking water regulation
NRWA National Rural Water Association
NTNCWS Nontransient noncommunity water system
NTP National Toxicology Program
NTTAA National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
OMB Office of Management and Budget
PAR Population attributable risk
PE Performance evaluation
PWS Public water system
RAA Running annual average
RFA Regulatory Flexibility Act
RID Reference dose
RSC Relative source contribution
RUS Rural Utility Service
SAB Science Advisory Board
SBAR Small Business Advisory Review
SBBRA Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act
SDWA Safe Drinking Water Act, or the "Act," as amended in 1996
SER Small Entity Representative
SGA Small for gestational age
SUVA Specific ultraviolet absorbance
SWAT Surface Water Analytical Tool
SWTR Surface Water Treatment Rule
TC Total coliforms
TCAA Trichloroacetic acid
TCR Total Coliform Rule
THM Trihalomethane
TOC Total organic carbon
THM Total trihalomethanes (sum of four THMs: chloroform, bromodichloromethane, dibromochloromethane, and bromoform)
TWG Technical work group
UMRA Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
UV 254 Ultraviolet absorption at 254 nm
VSL Value of Statistical Life
WTP Willingness To Pay
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The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is finalizing the Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (DBPR) to reduce potential cancer risks and address concerns with potential reproductive and developmental risks from DBPs. The Agency is committed to ensuring that all public water systems provide clean and safe drinking water. Disinfectants are an essential element of drinking water treatment because of the barrier they provide against harmful waterborne microbial pathogens. However, disinfectants react with naturally occurring organic and inorganic matter in source water and distribution systems to form disinfection byproducts (DBPs) that may pose health risks. The Stage 2 DBPR is designed to reduce the level of exposure from DBPs without undermining the control of microbial pathogens. The Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2ESWTR) is being finalized and implemented simultaneously with the Stage 2 DBPR to ensure that drinking water is microbiologically safe at the limits set for DBPs.

Congress required EPA to promulgate the Stage 2 DBPR as part of the 1996 Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Amendments (section 1412(b)(2)(C)). The Stage 2 DBPR augments the Stage 1 DBPR that was finalized in 1998 (63 FR 69390, December 16, 1998) (USEPA...
The goal of the Stage 2 DBPR is to target the highest risk systems for changes beyond those required for Stage 1 DBPR. Today’s rule reflects consensus recommendations from the Stage 2 Microbial/Disinfection Byproducts (M–DBP) Federal Advisory Committee (the Advisory Committee) as well as public comments.

New information on health effects, occurrence, and treatment has become available since the Stage 1 DBPR that supports the need for the Stage 2 DBPR. EPA has completed a more extensive analysis of health effects, particularly reproductive and developmental endpoints, associated with DBPs since the Stage 1 DBPR. Some recent studies on both human epidemiology and animal toxicology have shown possible associations between chlorinated drinking water and reproductive and developmental endpoints such as spontaneous abortion, stillbirth, neural tube and other birth defects, intrauterine growth retardation, and low birth weight. While results of these studies have been mixed, EPA believes they support a potential hazard concern.

New epidemiology and toxicology studies evaluating bladder, colon, and rectal cancers have increased the weight of evidence linking these health effects to DBP exposure. The large number of people (more than 260 million Americans) exposed to DBPs and the potential cancer, reproductive, and developmental risks have played a significant role in EPA’s decision to move forward with regulatory changes that target lowering DBP exposures beyond the requirements of the Stage 1 DBPR.

While the Stage 1 DBPR is predicted to provide a major reduction in DBP exposure, national survey data suggest that some customers may receive drinking water with elevated, or peak, DBP concentrations even when their distribution system is in compliance with the Stage 1 DBPR. Some of these peak concentrations are substantially greater than the Stage 1 DBPR maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) and some customers receive these elevated levels of DBPs on a consistent basis. The new survey results also show that Stage 1 DBPR monitoring sites may not be representative of higher DBP concentrations that occur in distribution systems. In addition, new studies indicate that cost-effective technologies including ultraviolet light (UV) and granular activated carbon (GAC) may be very effective at lowering DBP levels.

EPA’s analysis of this new occurrence and treatment information indicates that significant public health benefits may be achieved through further, cost-effective reductions of DBPs in distribution systems.

The Stage 2 DBPR presents a risk-targeting approach to reduce risks from DBPs. The new requirements provide for more consistent, equitable protection from DBPs across the entire distribution system and the reduction of DBP peaks. New risk-targeting provisions require systems to first identify their risk level; then, only those systems with the greatest risk will need to make operational or treatment changes. The Stage 2 DBPR, in conjunction with the LT2ESWTR, will help public water systems deliver safer water to Americans with the benefits of disinfection to control pathogens and with fewer risks from DBPs.

B. What Does the Stage 2 DBPR Require?

The risk-targeting components of the Stage 2 DBPR focus the greatest amount of change where the greatest amount of risk may exist. Therefore, the provisions of the Stage 2 DBPR focus first on identifying the higher risks through the Initial Distribution System Evaluation (IDSE). The rule then addresses reducing exposure and lowering DBP peaks in distribution systems by using a new method to determine MCL compliance (locational running annual average (LRRAA)), defining operational evaluation levels, and regulating consecutive systems. This section briefly describes the requirements of this final rule. More detailed information on the regulatory requirements for this rule can be found in Section IV.

1. Initial Distribution System Evaluation

The first provision, designed to identify higher risk systems, is the Initial Distribution System Evaluation (IDSE). The purpose of the IDSE is to identify Stage 2 DBPR compliance monitoring sites that represent each system’s highest levels of DBPs. Because Stage 2 DBPR compliance will be determined at these new monitoring sites, only those systems that identify elevated concentrations of TTHM and HAAs will need to make treatment or process changes to bring the system into compliance with the Stage 2 DBPR. By identifying compliance monitoring sites with the highest concentrations of TTHM and HAAs in each system’s distribution system, the IDSE will offer increased assurance that MCLs are being met across the distribution system and that customers are receiving more equitable public health protection. Both treatment changes and awareness of TTHM and HAAs levels resulting from the IDSE will allow systems to better control for distribution system peaks.

The IDSE is designed to offer flexibility to public water systems. The IDSE requires TTHM and HAAs monitoring for one year on a regular schedule that is determined by source water type and system size. Alternatively, systems have the option of performing a site-specific study based on historical data, water distribution system models, or other data; and waivers are available under certain circumstances. The IDSE requirements are discussed in Sections IV.E, IV.F., and IV.G of this preamble and in subpart U of the rule language.

2. Compliance and Monitoring Requirements

As in Stage 1, the Stage 2 DBPR focuses on monitoring for and reducing concentrations of two classes of DBPs: total trihalomethanes (TTHM) and haloacetic acids (HAA5). These two groups of DBPs act as indicators for the various byproducts that are present in water disinfected with chlorine or chloramine. This new approach enables TTHM concentrations of TTHM and HAA5 are monitored for compliance, but their presence in drinking water is representative of many other chlorination DBPs that may also occur in the water; thus, a reduction in TTHM and HAA5 generally indicates an overall reduction of DBPs.

The second provision of the Stage 2 DBPR is designed to address spatial variations in DBP exposure through a new compliance calculation (referred to as locational running annual average) for TTHM and HAA5 MCLs. The MCL values remain the same as in the Stage 1. The Stage 1 DBPR running annual average (RAA) calculation allowed some locations within a distribution system to have higher DBP annual averages than others as long as the system-wide average was below the MCL. The Stage 2 DBPR bases compliance on a locational running annual average (LRAA) calculation, where the annual average at each sampling location in the distribution system will be used to determine compliance with the MCLs of 0.080 mg/L and 0.060 mg/L for TTHM and HAA5, respectively. The LRAA will reduce exposures to high DBP concentrations by ensuring that each monitoring site is in compliance with the MCLs as an annual average, while providing all customers drinking water that more consistently meets the MCLs.

A more detailed discussion of Stage 2 DBPR MCL requirements can be found in Sections IV.C, IV.E, and IV.G of this preamble and in §141.64(b)(2) and (3) and subpart V of the rule language. The number of compliance monitoring sites is based on the
population served and the source water type. EPA believes that population-based monitoring provides better risk-targeting and is easier to implement. Section IV.G describes population-based monitoring and how it affects systems complying with this rule.

The Stage 2 DBPR includes new MCLGs for chloroform, monochloroacetic acid, and trichloroacetic acid, but these new MCLGs do not affect the MCLs for TTHM or HAA5.

3. Operational Evaluation Levels

The IDSE and LRAA calculation will lead to lower DBP concentrations overall and reduce short term exposures to high DBP concentrations in certain areas, but this strengthened approach to regulating DBPs will still allow individual DBP samples above the MCL even when systems are in compliance with the Stage 2 DBPR. Today’s rule requires systems that exceed operational evaluation levels (referred to as significant excursions in the proposed rule) to evaluate system operational practices and identify opportunities to reduce DBP concentrations in the distribution system. This provision will curtail peaks by providing systems with a proactive approach to remain in compliance. Operational evaluation requirements are discussed in greater detail in Section IV.H.

4. Consecutive Systems

The Stage 2 DBPR also contains provisions for regulating consecutive systems, defined in the Stage 2 DBPR as public water systems that buy or otherwise receive some or all of their finished water from another public water system. Uniform regulation of consecutive systems provided by the Stage 2 DBPR will ensure that consecutive systems deliver drinking water that meets applicable DBP standards, thereby providing better, more equitable public health protection. More information on regulation of consecutive systems can be found in Sections IV.B, IV.E, and IV.G.

C. Correction of § 141.132

Section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), provides that, when an agency for good cause finds that notice and public procedure are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, the agency may issue a rule without providing prior notice and an opportunity for public comment. In addition to promulgating the Stage 2 regulations, this rule also makes a minor correction to the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations, specifically the Stage 1 Disinfection Byproducts Rule. This rule corrects a technical error made in the January 16, 2001, Federal Register Notice (66 FR 3769) (see page 3770). This rule restores the following sentence that was inadvertently removed from §141.132(b)(1)(iii).

“Systems on a reduced monitoring schedule may remain on that reduced schedule as long as the average of all samples taken in the year (for systems which must monitor quarterly) or the result of the sample (for systems which must monitor no more frequently than annually) is no more than 0.060 mg/L and 0.045 mg/L for TTHMs and HAA5, respectively.” This text had been part of the original regulation when it was codified in the CFR on December 16, 1998. However, as a result of a subsequent amendment to that regulatory text, the text discussed today was removed. EPA recognized the error only after publication of the new amendment, and is now correcting the error. EPA is merely restoring to the CFR language that EPA had promulgated on December 16, 1998. EPA is not creating any new rights or obligations by this technical correction. Thus, additional notice and public comment is not necessary. EPA finds that this constitutes “good cause” under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B).

III. Background

A combination of factors influenced the development of the Stage 2 DBPR. These include the initial 1992–1994 Microbial and Disinfection Byproduct (M–DBP) stakeholder deliberations and EPA’s Stage 1 DBPR proposal (USEPA 1994); the 1996 Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Amendments; the 1996 Information Collection Rule; the 1998 Stage 1 DBPR; new data, research, and analysis on disinfection byproduct (DBP) occurrence, treatment, and health effects since the Stage 1 DBPR; and the Stage 2 DBPR Microbial and Disinfection Byproducts Federal Advisory Committee. The following sections provide summary background information on these subjects. For additional information, see the proposed Stage 2 DBPR and supporting technical material where cited (68 FR 49548, August 18, 2003) (USEPA 2003a).

A. Statutory Requirements and Legal Authority

The SDWA, as amended in 1996, authorizes EPA to promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation (NPDWR) and publish a maximum contaminant level goal (MCLG) for any contaminant the Administrator determines “may have an adverse effect on the health of persons,” is “known to occur or there is a substantial likelihood that the contaminant will occur in public water systems with a frequency and at levels of public health concern,” and for which “in the sole judgement of the Administrator, regulation of such contaminant presents a meaningful opportunity for health risk reduction for persons served by public water systems” (SDWA section 1412(b)(1)(A)). MCLGs are non-enforceable health goals set at a level at which “no known or anticipated adverse effects on the health of persons occur and which allows an adequate margin of safety.” These health goals are published at the same time as the NPDWR (SDWA sections 1412(b)(4) and 1412(a)(3)).

SDWA also requires each NPDWR for which an MCLG is established to specify an MCL that is as close to the MCLG as is feasible (sections 1412(b)(4) and 1401(1)(C)). The Agency may also consider additional health risks from other contaminants and establish an MCL “at a level other than the feasible level, if the technology, treatment techniques, and other means used to determine the feasible level would result in an increase in the health risk from drinking water by—(i) increasing the concentration of other contaminants in drinking water; or (ii) interfering with the efficacy of drinking water treatment techniques or processes that are used to comply with other national primary drinking water regulations” (section 1412(b)(5)(A)). When establishing an MCL or treatment technique under this authority, “the level or levels or treatment techniques shall minimize the overall risk of adverse health effects by balancing the risk from the contaminant and the risk from other contaminants the concentrations of which may be affected by the use of a treatment technique or process that would be employed to attain the maximum contaminant level or levels” (section 1412(b)(5)(B)). In today’s rule, the Agency is establishing MCLGs and MCLs for certain DBPs, as described in Section IV.

Finally, section 1412(b)(2)(C) of the Act requires EPA to promulgate a Stage 2 DBPR. Consistent with statutory provisions for risk balancing (section 1412(b)(5)(B)), EPA is finalizing the LT2ESWTR concurrently with the Stage 2 DBPR to ensure simultaneous protection from microbial and DBP risks.

B. What is the Regulatory History of the Stage 2 DBPR and How Were Stakeholders Involved?

This section first summarizes the existing regulations aimed at controlling
levels of DBPs in drinking water. The Stage 2 DBPR establishes regulatory requirements beyond these rules that target high risk systems and provide for more equitable protection from DBPs across the entire distribution system. Next, this section summarizes the extensive stakeholder involvement in the development of the Stage 2 DBPR.

1. Total Trihalomethanes Rule

The first rule to regulate DBPs was promulgated on November 29, 1979. The Total Trihalomethanes Rule (44 FR 68624, November 29, 1979) (USEPA 1979) set an MCL of 0.10 mg/L for total trihalomethanes (TTHM). Compliance was based on the running annual average (RAA) of quarterly averages of all samples collected throughout the distribution system. This TTHM standard applied only to community water systems using surface water and/or ground water that served at least 10,000 people and added a disinfectant to the drinking water during any part of the treatment process.

2. Stage 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule

The Stage 1 DBPR, finalized in 1998 (USEPA 1998a), applies to all community and nontransient noncommunity water systems that add a chemical disinfectant to water. The rule established maximum residual disinfectant level goals (MRDLGs) and enforceable maximum residual disinfectant level (MRSDLs) standards for three chemical disinfectants—chlorine, chloramine, and chlorine dioxide; maximum contaminant level goals (MCLGs) for three trihalomethanes (THMs), two haloacetic acids (HAAs), bromate, and chlorite; and enforceable maximum contaminant level (MCL) standards for TTHM, five haloacetic acids (HAA5), bromate (calculated as running annual averages (RAAs)), and chlorite (based on daily and monthly sampling). The Stage 1 DBPR uses TTHM and HAA5 as indicators of the various DBPs that are present in disinfected water. Under the Stage 1 DBPR, water systems that use surface water or ground water under the direct influence of surface water and use conventional filtration treatment are required to remove specified percentages of organic materials, measured as total organic carbon (TOC), that may react with disinfectants to form DBPs. Removal is achieved through enhanced coagulation or enhanced softening, unless a system meets one or more alternative compliance criteria. This was one of the first rules to be promulgated under the 1996 SDWA Amendments (USEPA 1998a).

EPA finalized the Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (63 FR 69477, December 16, 1998) (USEPA 1998b) at the same time as the Stage 1 DBPR to ensure simultaneous compliance and address risk tradeoff issues. Both rules were products of extensive Federal Advisory Committee deliberations and final consensus recommendations in 1997.

3. Stakeholder Involvement

a. Federal Advisory Committee process

EPA reconvened the M-DBP Advisory Committee in March 1999 to develop recommendations on issues pertaining to the Stage 2 DBPR and LT2ESWTR. The Stage 2 M-DBP Advisory Committee consisted of 21 organizational members representing EPA, State and local public health and regulatory agencies, local elected officials, Native American Tribes, large and small drinking water suppliers, chemical and equipment manufacturers, environmental groups, and other stakeholders. Technical support for the Advisory Committee’s discussions was provided by a technical working group established by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee held ten meetings from September 1999 to July 2000, which were open to the public, with an opportunity for public comment at each meeting.

The Advisory Committee carefully considered extensive new data on the occurrence and health effects of DBPs, as well as costs and potential impacts on public water systems. In addition, they considered risk tradeoffs associated with treatment changes. Based upon this detailed technical evaluation, the committee concluded that a targeted protective public health approach should be taken to address exposure to DBPs beyond the requirements of the Stage 1 DBPR. While there had been substantial research to date, the Advisory Committee also concluded that significant uncertainty remained regarding the risk associated with DBPs in drinking water. After reaching these conclusions, the Advisory Committee developed an Agreement in Principle (65 FR 83015, December 29, 2000) (USEPA 2000a) that laid out their consensus recommendations on how to further control DBPs in public water systems, which are reflected in today’s final rule.

In the Agreement in Principle, the Advisory Committee recommended maintaining the MCLs for TTHM and HAA5 at 0.080 mg/L and 0.060 mg/L, respectively, but changing the compliance calculation in two phases to facilitate systems moving from the running annual average (RAA) calculation to a locational running annual average (LRAA) calculation. In the first phase, systems would continue to comply with the Stage 1 DBPR MCLs as RAAs and, at the same time, comply with MCLs of 0.120 mg/L for TTHM and 0.100 mg/L for HAA5 calculated as LRAAs. RAA calculations average all samples collected within a distribution system over a one-year period, but LRAA calculations average all samples taken at each individual sampling location in a distribution system during a one-year period. Systems would also carry out an Initial Distribution System Evaluation (IDSE) to select compliance monitoring sites that reflect higher TTHM and HAA5 levels occurring in the distribution system. The second phase of compliance would then require MCLs of 0.060 mg/L for TTHM and 0.060 mg/L for HAA5, calculated as LRAAs at individual monitoring sites identified through the IDSE. The first phase has been dropped in the final rule, as discussed in section IV.C.

The Agreement in Principle also provided recommendations for simultaneous compliance with the LT2ESWTR so that the reduction of DBPs does not compromise microbial protection. The complete text of the Agreement in Principle (USEPA 2000a) can be found online at www.regulations.gov.

b. Other outreach processes

EPA worked with stakeholders to develop the Stage 2 DBPR through various outreach activities other than the M-DBP Federal Advisory Committee process. The Agency consulted with State, local, and Tribal governments; the National Drinking Water Advisory Committee (NDWAC); the Science Advisory Board (SAB); and Small Entity Representatives (SERs) and small system operators (as part of an Agency outreach initiative under the Regulatory Flexibility Act). Section VII includes a complete description of the many stakeholder activities which contributed to the development of the Stage 2 DBPR.

Additionally, EPA posted a pre-proposal draft of the Stage 2 DBPR preamble and regulatory language on an EPA Internet site on October 17, 2001. This public review period allowed readers to comment on the Stage 2 DBPR’s consistency with the Agreement in Principle of the Stage 2 M-DBP Advisory Committee. EPA received important suggestions on this pre-proposal draft from 14 commenters, which included public water systems, State governments, laboratories, and other stakeholders.
C. Public Health Concerns to be Addressed

EPA is promulgating the Stage 2 rule to reduce the potential risks of cancer and reproductive and developmental health effects from DBPs. In addition, the provisions of the Stage 2 DBPR provide for more equitable public health protection. Sections C and D describe the general basis for this public health concern through reviewing information in the following areas: the health effects associated with DBPs, DBP occurrence, and the control of DBPs.

1. What Are DBPs?

Chlorine has been widely used to kill disease-causing microbes in drinking water. The addition of chlorine in PWSSs across the U.S. to kill microbial pathogens in the water supply has been cited as one of the greatest public health advances of the twentieth century (Okun 2003). For example, during the decade 1880–1890, American cities experienced an average mortality rate of 58 per 100,000 from typhoid, which was commonly transmitted through contaminated water. By 1938, this rate had fallen to 0.67 deaths per 100,000, largely due to improved treatment of drinking water (Blake 1956).

During the disinfection process, organic and inorganic material in source waters can combine with chlorine and certain other chemical disinfectants to form DBPs. More than 260 million people in the U.S. are exposed to disinfectated water and DBPs (USEPA 2005a). Although chlorine is the most commonly applied disinfectant, other disinfectants, including ozone, chlorine dioxide, chloramine, and ultraviolet radiation, are in use. In combination with these, all surface water systems must also use either chlorine or chloramine to maintain a disinfectant residual in their distribution system. The kind of disinfectant used can produce different types and levels of disinfectant byproducts in the drinking water.

Many factors affect the amount and kinds of DBPs in drinking water. Areas in the distribution system that have had longer contact time with chemical disinfectants tend to have higher levels of DBPs, such as sites farther from the treatment plant, dead ends in the system, and small diameter pipes. The makeup and source of the water also affect DBP formation. Different types of organic and inorganic material will form different types and levels of DBPs. Other factors, such as water temperature, season, pH, and location within the water purification process where disinfectants are added, can affect DBP formation within and between water systems.

THMs and HAAs are widely occurring classes of DBPs formed during disinfection with chlorine and chloramine. The four THMs (TTHM) and five HAAs (HAA5) measured and regulated in the Stage 2 DBPR act as indicators for DBP occurrence. There are other known DBPs in addition to a variety of unidentified DBPs present in disinfectated water. THMs and HAAs typically occur at higher levels than other known and unidentified DBPs (McGuire et al. 2002; Weinberg et al. 2002). The presence of TTHM and HAA5 is representative of the occurrence of many other chlorination DBPs; thus, a reduction in the TTHM and HAA5 generally indicates an overall reduction of DBPs.

2. DBP Health Effects

Since the mid-1980’s, epidemiological studies have supported a potential association between bladder cancer and chlorinated water and possibly also with colon and rectal cancers. In addition, more recent health studies have reported potential associations between chlorinated drinking water and reproductive and developmental health effects.

Based on a collective evaluation of both the human epidemiology and animal toxicology data on cancer and reproductive and developmental health effects discussed below and in consideration of the large number of people exposed to chlorinated byproducts in drinking water (more than 260 million), EPA concludes that (1) new cancer data since Stage 1 strengthen the evidence of a potential association of chlorinated water with bladder cancer and suggests an association for colon and rectal cancers, (2) current reproductive and developmental health effects data do not support a conclusion at this time as to whether exposure to chlorinated drinking water or disinfection byproducts causes adverse developmental or reproductive health effects, but do support a potential health concern, and (3) the combined health data indicate a need for public health protection beyond that provided by the Stage 1 DBPR.

This section summarizes the key information in the areas of cancer, reproductive, and developmental health studies that EPA used to arrive at these conclusions. Throughout this writeup, EPA uses ‘weight of evidence,’ ‘causality,’ and ‘hazard’ as follows:

- A ‘weight of evidence’ evaluation is a collective evaluation of all pertinent information. Judgement about the weight of evidence involves considerations of the quality and adequacy of data and consistency of responses. These factors are not scored mechanically by adding pluses and minuses; they are judged in combination.
- Criteria for determining ‘causality’ include consistency, strength, and specificity of association, a temporal relationship, a biological gradient (dose-response relationship), biological plausibility, coherence with multiple lines of evidence, evidence from human populations, and information on agent’s structural analogues (USEPA 2005i). Additional considerations for individual study findings include reliable exposure data, statistical power and significance, and freedom from bias and confounding.
- The term ‘hazard’ describes not a definitive conclusion, but the possibility that a health effect may be attributed to a certain exposure, in this case chlorinated water. Analysis done for the Stage 2 DBPR follow the 1999 EPA Proposed Guidelines for Carcinogenic Risk Assessment (USEPA 1999a).

In March 2005, EPA updated and finalized the Cancer Guidelines and a Supplementary Children’s Guidance, which include new considerations on mode of action for cancer risk determination and additional potential risks due to early childhood exposure (USEPA 2005j).

Conducting the cancer evaluation using the 2005 Cancer Guidelines would not result in any change from the existing analysis. With the exception of chloroform, no mode of action has been established for other specific regulated DBPs. Although some of the DBPs have given mixed mutagenicity and genotoxicity results, having a positive mutagenicity study does not necessarily mean that a chemical has a mutagenic mode of action. The extra factor of safety for children’s health protection does not apply because the new Supplementary Children’s Guidance requires application of the children’s factor only when a mutagenic mode of action has been identified.

a. Cancer health effects. The following section briefly discusses cancer epidemiology and toxicology information EPA analyzed and some conclusions of these studies and reports. Further discussion of these studies and EPA’s conclusions can be found in the proposed Stage 2 DBPR (USEPA 2003a) and the Economic Analysis for the Final Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (Economic Analysis (EA)) (USEPA 2005a).

Human epidemiology studies and animal toxicity studies have
examined associations between chlorinated drinking water or DBPs and cancer. While EPA cannot conclude there is a causal link between exposure to chlorinated surface water and cancer, EPA believes that the available research indicates a potential association between bladder cancer and exposure to chlorinated drinking water or DBPs. EPA also believes the available research suggests a possible association between rectal and colon cancers and exposure to chlorinated drinking water or DBPs. This is based on EPA’s evaluation of all available cancer studies. The next two sections focus on studies published since the Stage 1 DBPR. Conclusions are based on the research as a whole.

i. Epidemiology. A number of epidemiological studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between exposure to chlorinated drinking water and various cancers. These studies contribute to the overall evidence on potential human health hazards from exposure to chlorinated drinking water. Epidemiology studies provide useful health effects information because they reflect human exposure to a drinking water DBP mixture through multiple routes of intake such as ingestion, inhalation and dermal absorption. The greatest difficulty with conducting cancer epidemiology studies is the length of time between exposure and effect. Higher quality studies have adequately controlled for confounding and have limited the potential for exposure misclassification, for example, using DBP levels in drinking water as the exposure metric as opposed to type of source water. Study design considerations for interpreting cancer epidemiology data include sufficient follow-up time to detect disease occurrence, adequate sample size, valid ascertainment of cause of the cancer, and reduction of potential selection bias in case-control and cohort studies (by having comparable cases and controls and by limiting loss to follow-up). Epidemiology studies provide extremely useful information on human exposure to chlorinated water, which complement single chemical, high dose animal data.

In the Stage 1 DBPR, EPA concluded that the epidemiological evidence suggested a potential increased risk for bladder cancer. Some key studies EPA considered for Stage 1 include Cantor et al. (1998), Doyle et al. (1997), Freedman et al. (1997), King and Marrett (1996), McGeehin et al. (1993), Cantor et al. (1987), and Cantor et al. (1985). Several studies published since the Stage 1 DBPR continue to support an association between increased risk of bladder cancer and exposure to chlorinated surface water (Chevrier et al. 2004; Koivusalo et al. 1998; Yang et al. 1998). One study found no effects on a biomarker of genotoxicity in urinary bladder cells from TTHM exposure (Ranmuthugala et al. 2003).

Epidemiological reviews and meta-analyses generally support the possibility of an association between chlorinated water or THMs and bladder cancer (Villanueva et al. 2004; Villanueva et al. 2003; Villanueva et al. 2001; Mills et al. 1998). The World Health Organization (WHO 2000) found data inconclusive or insufficient to determine causality between chlorinated water and any health endpoint, although they concluded that the evidence is better for bladder cancer than for other cancers.

In the Stage 1 DBPR, EPA concluded that early studies suggested a small possible increase in rectal and colon cancers from exposure to chlorinated surface waters. The database of studies on colon and rectal cancers continues to support a possible association, but evidence remains mixed. For colon cancer, one newer study supports the evidence of an association (King et al. 2000a) while others showed inconsistent findings (Hildesheim et al. 1998; Yang et al. 1998). Rectal cancer studies are also mixed. Hildesheim et al. (1998) and Yang et al. (1998) support an association with rectal cancer while King et al. (2000a) did not. A review of colon and rectal cancer concluded evidence was inconclusive but that there was a stronger association for rectal cancer and chlorination DBPs than for colon cancer (Mills et al. 1998). The WHO (2000) review reported that studies showed weak to moderate associations with colon and rectal cancers and chlorinated surface water or THMs but that evidence is inadequate to evaluate these associations.

Recent studies on kidney, brain, and lung cancers and DBP exposure support a possible association (kidney: Yang et al. 1998, Koivusalo et al. 1998; brain: Cantor et al. 1999; lung: Yang et al. 1998). However, so few studies have examined these endpoints that definitive conclusions cannot be made. Studies on leukemia found little or no association with DBPs (Infante-Rivard et al. 2002; Infante-Rivard et al. 2001). A recent study did not find an association between pancreatic cancer and DBPs (Do et al. 2005). A study researching multiple cancer endpoints found an association between THM exposure and all cancers when grouped together (Vinceti et al. 2004). More details on the cancer epidemiology studies since the Stage 1 DBPR are outlined in Table II.D-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Exposure(s) studied</th>
<th>Outcome(s) measured</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do et al. 2005</td>
<td>Case-control study in Canada, 1994–1997.</td>
<td>Estimated chlorinated DBPs, chloroform, BDCM concentrations.</td>
<td>Pancreatic cancer.</td>
<td>No association was found between pancreatic cancer and exposure to chlorinated DBPs, chloroform, or BDCM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevrier et al. 2004..</td>
<td>Case-control study in France, 1985–1987.</td>
<td>Compared THM levels, duration of exposure, and 3 types of water treatment (ozonation, chlorination, ozonation/chlorination).</td>
<td>Bladder cancer.</td>
<td>A statistically significant decreased risk of bladder cancer was found as duration of exposure to ozonated water increased. This was evident with and without adjustment for other exposure measures. A small association was detected for increased bladder cancer risk and duration of exposure to chlorinated surface water and with the estimated THM content of the water, achieving statistical significance only when adjusted for duration of ozonated water exposures. Effect modification by gender was noted in the adjusted analyses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II.D–1.—SUMMARY OF CANCER EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES REVIEWED FOR STAGE 2 DBPR—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Exposure(s) studied</th>
<th>Outcome(s) measured</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vinceti et al. 2004.</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study in Italy. 1987–1999.</td>
<td>Standardized mortality ratios from all causes vs. cancer for consumers drinking water with high THMs.</td>
<td>Mortality ratio from all cancers showed a statistically significant small increase for males consuming drinking water with high THMs. For females, an increased mortality ratio for all cancers was seen but was not statistically significant. Stomach cancer in men was the only individual cancer in which a statistically significant excess in mortality was detected for consumption of drinking water with high THMs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infante-Rivard et al. 2002.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in Quebec, 1980–1993.</td>
<td>Estimated prenatal and postnatal exposure to THMs and polymorphisms in two genes.</td>
<td>Data are suggestive, but imprecise, linking DNA variants with risk of acute lymphoblastic leukemia associated with drinking water DBPs. The number of genotyped subjects for GSTT1 and CYP2E1 genes was too small to be conclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infante-Rivard et al. 2001.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in Quebec, 1980–1993.</td>
<td>Compared water chlorination (never, sometimes, always) and exposure to TTHMs, metals, and nitrates.</td>
<td>No increased risk for lymphoblastic leukemia was observed for prenatal exposure at average levels of TTHMs, metals or nitrates. However, a non-statistically significant, small increased risk was seen for postnatal cumulative exposure to TTHMs and chloroform (both at above the 95th exposure percentile of the distribution for cases and controls), for zinc, cadmium, and arsenic, but not other metals or nitrates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King et al. 2000a.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in southern Ontario, 1992–1994.</td>
<td>Compared source of drinking water and chlorination status. Estimated TTHM levels, duration of exposure, and tap water consumption.</td>
<td>Colon cancer risk was statistically associated with cumulative long term exposure to THMs, chlorinated surface water, and tap water consumption metrics among males only. Exposure-response relationships were evident for exposure measures combining duration and THM levels. Associations between the exposure measures and rectal cancer were not observed for either gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantor et al. 1999.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in Iowa, 1994–1997.</td>
<td>Compared level and duration of THM exposure (cumulative and average), source of water, chlorination, and water consumption.</td>
<td>Among males, a statistically significant increased risk of brain cancer was detected for duration of chlorinated versus non-chlorinated source water, especially among high-level consumers of tap water. An increased risk of brain cancer for high water intake level was found in men. No associations were found for women for any of the exposure metrics examined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantor et al. 1998.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in Iowa, 1986–1989.</td>
<td>Compared level and duration of THM exposure (cumulative and average), source of water, chlorination, and water consumption.</td>
<td>A statistically significant positive association between risk of bladder cancer and exposure to chlorinated groundwater or surface water reported for men and for smokers, but no association found for male/female non-smokers, or for women overall. Limited evidence was found for an association between tapwater consumption and bladder cancer risk. Suggestive evidence existed for exposure-response effects of chlorinated water and lifetime THM measures on bladder cancer risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildesheim et al. 1998.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in Iowa, 1986–1989.</td>
<td>Compared level and duration of THM exposure (cumulative and average), source of water, chlorination, and water consumption.</td>
<td>Increased risks of rectal cancer was associated with duration of exposure to chlorinated surface water and any chlorinated water, with evidence of an exposure-response relationship. Risk of rectal cancer is statistically significant increased with &gt;60 years lifetime exposure to THMs in drinking water, and risk increased for individuals with low dietary fiber intake. Risks were similar for men and women and no effects were observed for tapwater measures. No associations were detected for water exposure measures and risk of colon cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koivusalo et al. 1998.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in Finland, 1991–1992.</td>
<td>Estimated residential duration of exposure and level of drinking water mutagenicity.</td>
<td>Drinking water mutagenicity was associated with a small, statistically significant, exposure-related excess risk for kidney and bladder cancers among men; weaker associations were detected for mutagenic water and bladder or kidney cancer among women. The effect of mutagenicity on bladder cancer was modified by smoking status, with an increased risk among non-smokers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Exposure(s) studied</td>
<td>Outcome(s) measured</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang et al. 1998.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional study in Taiwan, 1982–1991.</td>
<td>Cancer of rectum, lung, bladder, kidney, colon, and 11 others.</td>
<td>Residence in chlorinating municipalities (vs. non-chlorinating) was statistically significantly associated with the following types of cancer in both males and females: rectal, lung, bladder, and kidney cancer. Liver cancer and all cancers were also statistically significantly elevated in chlorinated towns for males only. Mortality rates for cancers of the esophagus, stomach, colon, pancreas, prostate, brain, breast, cervix uteri and uterus, and ovary were comparable for chlorinated and non-chlorinated residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle et al. 1997.</td>
<td>Prospective cohort study in Iowa, 1987–1993.</td>
<td>Colon, rectum, bladder, and 8 other cancers in women.</td>
<td>Statistically significant increased risk of colon cancer, breast cancer and all cancers combined was observed for women exposed to chloroform in drinking water, with evidence of exposure-response effects. No associations were detected between chloroform and bladder, rectum, kidney, upper digestive organs, lung, ovary, endometrium, or breast cancers, or for melanomas or non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma. Surface water exposure (compared to ground water users) was also a significant predictor of colon and breast cancer risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedman et al. 1997.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in Maryland, 1975–1992.</td>
<td>Bladder cancer</td>
<td>There was a weak association between bladder cancer risk and duration of exposure to municipal water for male cigarette smokers, as well as an exposure-response relationship. No association was seen for those with no history of smoking, suggesting that smoking may modify a possible effect of chlorinated surface water on the risk of bladder cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Marrett 1996.</td>
<td>Case-control study in Ontario, Canada, 1992–1994.</td>
<td>Bladder cancer</td>
<td>Statistically significant associations were detected for bladder cancer and chlorinated surface water, duration or concentration of THM levels and tap water consumption metrics. Population attributable risks were estimated at 14 to 16 percent. An exposure-response relationship was observed for estimated duration of high THM exposures and risk of bladder cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGeehin et al. 1993.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in Colorado, 1990–1991.</td>
<td>Bladder cancer</td>
<td>Statistically significant associations were detected for bladder cancer and duration of exposure to chlorinated surface water. The risk was similar for males and females and among nonsmokers and smokers. The attributable risk was estimated at 14.9 percent. High tap water intake was associated with risk of bladder cancer in a exposure-response fashion. No associations were detected between bladder cancer and levels of THMs, nitrates, and residual chlorine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantor et al. 1987 (and Cantor et al. 1985).</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in 10 areas of the U.S., 1977–1978.</td>
<td>Bladder cancer</td>
<td>Bladder cancer was statistically associated with duration of exposure to chlorinated surface water for women and nonsmokers of both sexes. The largest risks were seen when both exposure duration and level of tap water ingestion were combined. No association was seen for total beverage consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews/Meta-analyses</td>
<td>Review and meta-analysis of 6 case-control studies.</td>
<td>Bladder cancer</td>
<td>The meta-analysis suggests that risk of bladder cancer in men increases with long-term exposure to THM. An exposure-response pattern was observed among men exposed to THM, with statistically significant risk seen at exposures higher than 50 µg/L. No association between THMs and bladder cancer was seen for women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanueva et al. 2004.</td>
<td>Review and meta-analysis of 6 case-control studies and 2 cohort studies.</td>
<td>Bladder cancer</td>
<td>The meta-analysis findings showed a moderate excess risk of bladder cancer attributable to long-term consumption of chlorinated drinking water for both genders, particularly in men. Statistically significant seen with men and combined both sexes. The risk was higher when exposure exceeded 40 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, bladder cancer data provide the strongest basis for quantifying cancer risks from DBPs. EPA has chosen this endpoint to estimate the primary benefits of the Stage 2 DBPR (see Section VI).

ii. Toxicology. Cancer toxicology studies provide additional support that chlorinated water is associated with cancer. In general, EPA uses long term toxicity studies that show a dose response to derive MCLGs and cancer potency factors. Short term studies are used for hazard identification and to design long term studies. Much of the available cancer toxicity information was available for the Stage 1 DBPR, but there have also been a number of new cancer toxicology and mode of action studies completed since the Stage 1 DBPR was finalized in December 1998. In support of this rule, EPA has developed health criteria documents which summarize the available toxicology data for brominated THMs (USEPA 2005b), brominated HAAs (USEPA 2005c), MX (USEPA 2000b), MCAA (USEPA 2005d), and TCAA (USEPA 2005e). The 2003 IRIS assessment of DCAA (USEPA 2003b) and an addendum (USEPA 2005) also provides analysis released after Stage 1. It summarizes information on exposure from drinking water and develops a slope factor for DCAA. IRIS also has toxicological reviews for chloroform (USEPA 2001a), chlorine dioxide and chlorite (USEPA 2000c), and bromate (USEPA 2001b), and is currently reassessing TCAA.

Slope factors and risk concentrations for BDCM, bromoform, DBCM and DCAA have been developed and are listed in Table II.D–2. For BDCM, bromoform, and DBCM, table values are derived from the brominated THM criteria document (USEPA 2005b), which uses IRIS numbers that have been updated using the 1999 EPA Proposed Guidelines for Carcinogenic Risk Assessment (USEPA 1999a). For DCAA, the values are derived directly from IRIS.

### Table II.D–2.—QUANTIFICATION OF CANCER RISK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disinfection byproduct</th>
<th>LED&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>10&lt;sup&gt;−6&lt;/sup&gt; Risk concentration (mg/L)</th>
<th>ED&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>10&lt;sup&gt;−6&lt;/sup&gt; Risk concentration (mg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slope factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slope factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(mg/kg/day)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(mg/kg/day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromodichloromethane</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromoform</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibromochloromethane</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichloroacetic Acid</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.015&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0023&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>LED<sub>10</sub> is the lower 95% confidence bound on the (effective dose) ED<sub>10</sub> value. ED<sub>10</sub> is the estimated dose producing effects in 10% of animals.

<sup>b</sup>The ED<sub>10</sub> risk factors for DCAA have been changed from those given in the comparable table in the proposed Stage 2 DBPR to correct for transcriptional errors.

More research on DBPs is underway at EPA and other research institutions. Summaries of on-going studies may be found on EPA’s DRINK Web site (http://www.epa.gov/safewater/drink/intro.html). Two-year bioassays by the National Toxicology Program (NTP) released in abstract form have recently been completed on BDCM and chlorate. The draft abstract on BDCM reported no evidence of carcinogenicity when BDCM was administered via drinking
water (NTP 2005a). Another recent study, a modified two-year bioassay on DBCM in the drinking water, reported little evidence of carcinogenicity (George et al. 2002). In a previous NTP study, tumors were observed, including an increased incidence of kidney, liver, and colon tumors, when DBCM was administered at higher doses by gavage in corn oil (NTP 1987). EPA will examine new information on DBCM as it becomes available. In the chlorate draft abstract, NTP found some evidence that it may be a carcinogen (NTP 2004). Chlorate is a byproduct of hypochlorite and chlorine dioxide systems. A long-term, two-year bioassay NTP study on DB is also complete but has not yet undergone peer review (NTP 2005b).

b. Reproductive and developmental health effects. Both human epidemiology studies and animal toxicology studies have examined associations between chlorinated drinking water or DBPs and reproductive and developmental health effects. Based on an evaluation of the available science, EPA believes the data suggest that exposure to DBPs is a potential reproductive and developmental health hazard.

The following section briefly discusses the reproductive and developmental epidemiology and toxicology information available to EPA. Further discussion of these studies and EPA’s conclusions can be found in the proposed Stage 2 DBPR (USEPA 2003a) and the Economic Analysis (USEPA 2005a).

1. Epidemiology. As discussed previously, epidemiology studies have the strength of relating human exposure to DBP mixtures through multiple intake routes. Although the critical exposure window for reproductive and developmental effects is much smaller than that for cancer (generally weeks versus years), exposure assessment is also a main limitation of reproductive and developmental epidemiology studies. Exposure assessment uncertainties arise from limited data on DBP concentrations and maternal water usage and source over the course of the pregnancy. However, classification errors typically push the true risk estimate towards the null value (Vineis 2004). According to Bove et al. (2002), “Difficulties in assessing exposure may result in exposure misclassification biases that would most likely produce substantial underestimates of risk as well as distorted or attenuated exposure-response trends.” Studies of rare outcomes (e.g., individual birth defects) often have limited statistical power because of the small number of cases being examined. This limits the ability to detect statistically significant associations for small to moderate relative risk estimates. Small sample sizes also result in imprecision around risk estimates reflected by wide confidence intervals. In addition to the limitations of individual studies, evaluating reproductive and developmental epidemiology studies collectively is difficult because of the methodological differences between studies and the wide variety of endpoints examined. These factors may contribute to inconsistencies in the scientific body of literature as noted below.

More recent studies tend to be of higher quality because of improved exposure assessments and other methodological advancements. For example, studies that use THM levels to estimate exposure tend to be higher quality than studies that define exposure by source or treatment. These factors were taken into account by EPA when comparing and making conclusions on the reproductive and developmental epidemiology literature. What follows is a summary of available epidemiology literature on reproductive and developmental endpoints such as spontaneous abortion, stillbirth, neural tube and other birth defects, low birth weight, and intrauterine growth retardation. Information is grouped, where appropriate, into three categories (fetal growth, viability, and malformations, and reviews are described separately afterward. Table II.D–3 provides a more detailed description of each study or review.

Fetal growth. Many studies looked for an association between fetal growth (mainly small for gestational age, low birth weight, and pre-term delivery) and chlorinated water or DBPs. The results from the collection of studies as a whole are inconsistent. A number of studies support the possibility that exposure to chlorinated water or DBPs are associated with adverse fetal growth effects (Infante-Rivard 2004; Wright et al. 2004; Wright et al. 2003; Källén and Robert 2000; Gonzalez et al. 1998; Kanitz et al. 1996; Bove et al. 1995; Kramer et al. 1992). Other studies showed mixed results (Porter et al. 2005; Savitz et al. 2005; Yang 2004) or did not provide evidence of an association (Toledano et al. 2005; Jakkola et al. 2001; Dodds et al. 1999; Savitz et al. 1995) between DBP exposure and fetal growth. EPA notes that recent, higher quality studies provide some evidence of an increased risk of small for gestational age and low birth weight.

Fetal viability. While the database of epidemiology studies for fetal loss endpoints (spontaneous abortion or stillbirth) remains inconsistent as a whole, there is suggestive evidence of an association between fetal loss and chlorinated water or DBP exposure. Various studies support the possibility that exposure to chlorinated water or DBPs is associated with decreased fetal viability (Toledano et al. 2005; Dodds et al. 2004; King et al. 2000b; Dodds et al. 1999; Waller et al. 1998; Aschengrau et al. 1993; Aschengrau et al. 1989). Other studies did not support an association (Bove et al. 1995) or reported inconclusive results (Savitz et al. 2005; Swan et al. 1998; Savitz et al. 1995) between fetal viability and exposure to THMs or tap water. A recent study by King et al. (2005) found little evidence of an association between stillbirths and haloacetic acids after controlling for trihalomethane exposures, though non-statistically significant increases in stillbirths were seen across various exposure levels.

Fetal malformations. A number of epidemiology studies have examined the relationship between exposure to chlorinated water or DBPs and various fetal malformations (such as neural tube, oral cleft, cardiac, or urinary defects, and chromosomal abnormalities) and chlorinated water or DBPs. It is difficult to assess fetal malformations in aggregate due to inconsistent findings and disparate endpoints being examined in the available studies. Some studies support the possibility that exposure to chlorinated water or DBPs is associated with various fetal malformations (Cedergren et al. 2002; Hwang et al. 2002; Dodds and King 2001; Klots and Pyrch 1999; Bove et al. 1995; Aschengrau et al. 1993). Other studies found little evidence (Shaw et al. 2003; Källén and Robert 2000; Dodds et al. 1999; Shaw et al. 1991) or inconclusive results (Magnus et al. 1999) between chlorinated water or DBP exposure and fetal malformations. Birth defects most consistently identified as being associated with DBPs include neural tube defects and urinary tract malformations. Other endpoints have also been examined in recent epidemiology studies. One study suggests an association between DBPs and decreased menstrual cycle length (Windham et al. 2003), which, if corroborated, could be linked to the biological basis of other reproductive endpoints observed. No association between THM exposure and semen quality was found (Fenster et al. 2003). More work is needed in both areas to support these results.

Reviews. An early review supported an association between measures of fetal viability and tap water (Swan et al.
1992). Three other reviews found data inadequate to support an association between reproductive and developmental health effects and THM exposure (Reif et al. 1996; Craun 1998; WHO 2000). Mills et al. (1998) examined data on and found support for an association between fetal viability and malformations and THMs. Another review presented to the Stage 2 MDBP FACA found some evidence for an association between fetal growth and exposure to DBPs but reported that the evidence was inconsistent for these endpoints as well as for fetal growth (Reif et al. 2000). Reif et al. (2000) concluded that the weight of evidence from epidemiology studies suggests that “DBPs are likely to be reproductive toxicants in humans under appropriate exposure conditions,” but from a risk assessment perspective, data are primarily at the hazard identification stage. Nieuwenhuijsen et al. (2000) found some evidence for an association between fetal growth and THM exposure and concluded evidence for associations with other fetal endpoints is weak but gaining weight. A qualitative review by Villanueva et al. (2001) found evidence generally supports a possible association between reproductive effects and drinking chlorinated water. Graves et al. (2001) supports a possible association for fetal growth but not fetal viability or malformations. More recently, Bove et al. (2002) examined and supported an association between small for gestational age, neural tube defects and spontaneous abortion endpoints and DBPs. Following a meta-analysis on five malformation studies, Hwang and Jaakkola (2003) concluded that there was evidence which supported associations between DBPs and risk of birth defects, especially neural tube defects and urinary tract defects.

### Table II.D.3. — Summary of Reproductive/Developmental Epidemiology Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Exposure(s) studied</th>
<th>Outcome(s) measured</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porter et al. 2005.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional study in Maryland, 1998–2002.</td>
<td>Estimated THM and HAA exposure during pregnancy.</td>
<td>Intrauterine growth retardation.</td>
<td>No consistent association or dose-response relationship was found between exposure to either TTHM or HAA5 and intrauterine growth retardation. Results suggest an increased risk of intrauterine growth retardation associated with TTHM and HAA5 exposure in the third trimester, although only HAA5 results were statistically significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savitz et al. 2005.</td>
<td>Population-based prospective cohort study in three communities around the U.S., 2000–2004.</td>
<td>Estimated TTHM, HAA9, and TOC exposures during pregnancy. Indices examined included concentration, ingested amount, exposure from showering and bathing, and an integration of all exposures combined.</td>
<td>Early and late pregnancy loss, preterm birth, small for gestational age, and term birth weight.</td>
<td>No association with pregnancy loss was seen when looking at high exposure of TTHM compared to low exposure of TTHM. When examining individual THMs, a statistically significant association was found between bromodichloromethane (BDCM) and pregnancy loss. A similar, non-statistically significant association was seen between dibromochloromethane (DBCM) and pregnancy loss. Some increased risk was seen for losses at greater than 12 weeks’ gestation for TTHM, BDCM, and TOX (total organic halide), but most results generally did not provide support for an association. Preterm birth showed a small inverse relationship with DBP exposure (i.e. higher exposures showed less preterm births), but this association was weak. TTHM exposure of 80 μg/L was associated with twice the risk for small for gestational age during the third trimester and was statistically significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledano et al. 2005.</td>
<td>Large cross-sectional study in England, 1992–1998.</td>
<td>Linked mother’s residence at time of delivery to modeled estimates of TTHM levels in water zones.</td>
<td>Stillbirth, low birth weight.</td>
<td>A significant association between TTHM and risk of stillbirth, low birth weight, and very low birth weight was observed in one of the three regions. When all three regions were combined, small, but non-significant, excess risks were found between all three outcomes and TTHM and chloroform. No associations were observed between reproductive risks and BDCM or total brominated THMs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodds et al. 2004 (and King et al. 2005).</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in Nova Scotia and Eastern Ontario, 1999–2001.</td>
<td>Estimated THM and HAA exposure at residence during pregnancy. Linked water consumption and showering/bathing to THM exposure.</td>
<td>Stillbirth ..................</td>
<td>A statistically significant association was observed between stillbirths and exposure to total THM, BDCM, and chloroform. Associations were also detected for metrics, which incorporated water consumption, showering and bathing habits. Elevated relative risks were observed for intermediate exposures for total HAA and DCAA measures; TCAA and brominated HAA exposures showed no association. No statistically significant associations or dose-response relationships between any HAAs and stillbirth were detected after controlling for THM exposure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II.D—3. Summary of Reproductive/Developmental Epidemiology Studies—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Exposure(s) studied</th>
<th>Outcome(s) measured</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infante-Rivard 2004.</td>
<td>Case-control study of newborns in Montreal, 1998–2000.</td>
<td>Estimated THM levels and water consumption during pregnancy. Exposure from showering and presence of two genetic polymorphisms.</td>
<td>Intrauterine growth retardation.</td>
<td>No associations were found between exposure to THMs and intrauterine growth retardation. However, a significant effect was observed between THM exposure and intrauterine growth retardation for newborns with the CYP2E1 gene variant. Findings suggest that exposure to THMs at the highest levels can affect fetal growth but only in genetically susceptible newborns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright et al. 2004.</td>
<td>Large cross-sectional study: Massachusetts, 1995–1999.</td>
<td>Estimated maternal third-trimester exposures to TTHMs, chloroform, BDCM, total HAAs, DCA, TCA, MX and mutagenicity in drinking water.</td>
<td>Birth weight, small for gestational age, preterm delivery, gestational age.</td>
<td>Statistically significant reductions in mean birth weight were observed for BDCM, chloroform, and mutagenic activity. An exposure-response relationship was found between THM exposure and reductions in mean birth weight and risk of small for gestational age. There was no association between preterm delivery and elevated levels of HAAs, MX, or mutagenicity. A reduced risk of preterm delivery was observed with high THM exposures. Gestational age was associated with exposure to THMs and mutagenicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang et al. 2004 (and Yang et al. 2000).</td>
<td>Large cross-sectional studies in Taiwan, 1994–1996.</td>
<td>Compared maternal consumption of chlorinated drinking water (yes/no).</td>
<td>Low birth weight, preterm delivery.</td>
<td>Residence in area supplied with chlorinated drinking water showed a statistically significant association with preterm delivery. No association was seen between chlorinated drinking water and low birth weight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenster et al. 2003.</td>
<td>Small prospective study in California, 1990–1991.</td>
<td>Examined TTHM levels within the 90 days preceding semen collection.</td>
<td>Sperm motility, sperm morphology.</td>
<td>No association between TTHM level and sperm mobility or morphology. BDCM was inversely associated with linearity of sperm motion. There was some suggestion that water consumption and other ingestion metrics may be associated with different indicators of semen quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw et al. 2003.</td>
<td>2 case-control maternal interview studies: CA, 1987–1991.</td>
<td>Estimated THM levels for mothers’ residences from before conception through early pregnancy.</td>
<td>Neural tube defects, oral clefts, selected heart defects.</td>
<td>No associations or exposure-response relation were observed between malformations and TTHMs in either study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windham et al. 2003.</td>
<td>Prospective study: CA, 1990–1991.</td>
<td>Estimated exposure to THMs through showering and ingestion over average of 5.6 menstrual cycles per woman.</td>
<td>Menstrual cycle, follicular phase length (in days).</td>
<td>Findings suggest that THM exposure may affect ovarian function. All brominated THM compounds were associated with significantly shorter menstrual cycles with the strongest finding for chlorodibromomethane. There was little association between TTHM exposure and luteal phase length, menses length, or cycle variability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright et al. 2003.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional study: Massachusetts, 1990.</td>
<td>Estimated TTHM exposure in women during pregnancy (average for pregnancy and during each trimester).</td>
<td>Birth weight, small for gestational age, preterm delivery, gestational age.</td>
<td>Statistically significant associations between 2nd trimester and pregnancy average TTHM exposure and small for gestational age and fetal birth weight were detected. Small, statistically significant increases in gestational duration/age were observed at increased TTHM levels, but there was little evidence of an association between TTHM and preterm delivery or low birth weight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedergren et al. 2002.</td>
<td>Retrospective case-control study: Sweden, 1982–1997.</td>
<td>Examined maternal periconceptional DBP levels and used GIS to assign water supplies.</td>
<td>Cardiac defects ...............</td>
<td>Exposure to chloroform in drinking water showed statistical significance for cardiac defects. THM concentrations of 10 mg/L and higher were significantly associated with cardiac defects. No excess risk for cardiac defect and nitrate were seen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwang et al. 2002.</td>
<td>Large cross-sectional study in Norway, 1993–1998.</td>
<td>Compared exposure to chlorination (yes/no) and water color levels for mother’s residence during pregnancy.</td>
<td>Birth defects (neural tube defects, cardiac, respiratory system, oral cleft, urinary tract).</td>
<td>Risk of any birth defect, cardiac, respiratory system, and urinary tract defects were significantly associated with water chlorination. Exposure to chlorinated drinking water was statistically significantly associated with risk of ventricular septal defects, and an exposure-response pattern was seen. No other specific defects were associated with the exposures that were examined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Exposure(s) studied</td>
<td>Outcome(s) measured</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodds and King 2001.</td>
<td>Population-based retrospective cohort in Nova Scotia, 1988–1995.</td>
<td>Estimated THM, chloroform, and bromodichloromethane (BDCM) exposure.</td>
<td>Neural tube defects, cardiovascular defects, cleft defects, chromosomal abnormalities.</td>
<td>Exposure to BDCM was associated with increased risk of neural tube defects, cardiovascular anomalies. Chloroform was not associated with neural tube defects, but was associated with chromosomal abnormalities. No association between THM and cleft defects were detected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaakkola et al. 2001.</td>
<td>Large cross-sectional study in Norway, 1993–1995.</td>
<td>Compared chlorination (yes/no) and water color (high/low) for mother during pregnancy.</td>
<td>Low birth weight, small for gestational age, preterm delivery.</td>
<td>No evidence found for association between prenatal exposure to chlorinated drinking water and low birth weight or small for gestational age. A reduced risk of preterm delivery was noted for exposure to chlorinated water with high color content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Källén and Robert 2000.</td>
<td>Large cross-sectional cohort study in Sweden, 1985–1994.</td>
<td>Linked prenatal exposure to drinking water disinfected with various methods (no chlorine, chlorine dioxide only, sodium hypochlorite only).</td>
<td>Gestational duration, birth weight, intrauterine growth, mortality, congenital malformations, and other birth outcomes.</td>
<td>A statistically significant difference was found for short gestational duration and low birth weight among infants whose mother resided in areas using sodium hypochlorite, but not for chlorine dioxide. Sodium hypochlorite was also associated with other indices of fetal development but not with congenital defects. No other effects were observed for intrauterine growth, childhood cancer, infant mortality, low Apgar score, neonatal jaundice, or neonatal hypothyroidism in relation to either disinfection method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodds et al., 1999 (and King et al., 2000b).</td>
<td>Population-based retrospective cohort study in Nova Scotia, 1988–1995.</td>
<td>Estimated TTHM level for women during pregnancy.</td>
<td>Low birth weight, preterm birth, small for gestational age, stillbirth, chromosomal abnormalities, neural tube defects, cleft defects.</td>
<td>A statistically significant increased risk for stillbirths and high total THMs and specific THMs during pregnancy was detected, with higher risks observed among asphyxia-related stillbirths. Bromodichloromethane had the strongest association and exhibited an exposure-response pattern. There was limited evidence of an association between THM level and other reproductive outcomes. No congenital anomalies were associated with THM exposure, except for a non-statistically significant association with chromosomal abnormalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klotz and Pyrch 1999 (and Klotz and Pyrch 1998).</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in New Jersey, 1993–1994.</td>
<td>Estimated exposure of pregnant mothers to TTHMs and HAAs, and compared source of water.</td>
<td>Neural tube defects ......</td>
<td>A significant association was seen between exposure to THMs and neural tube defects. No associations were observed for neural tube defects and haloacetic acids or haloacetanilides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus et al. 1999.</td>
<td>Large cross-sectional study in Norway, 1993–1995.</td>
<td>Compared chlorination (yes/no) and water color (high/low) at mothers’ residences at time of birth.</td>
<td>Birth defects (neural tube defects, major cardiac, respiratory, urinary, oral cleft).</td>
<td>Statistically significant associations were seen between urinary tract defects and chlorination and high water color (high content of organic compounds). No associations were detected for other outcomes or all birth defects combined. A non-statistically significant, overall excess risk of birth defects was seen within municipalities with chlorination and high water color compared to municipalities with no chlorination and low color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan et al. 1998.</td>
<td>Prospective study in California, 1990–1991.</td>
<td>Compared consumption of cold tap water to bottled water during early pregnancy.</td>
<td>Spontaneous abortion ...</td>
<td>Pregnant women who drank cold tap water compared to those who consumed no cold tap water showed a significant finding for spontaneous abortion at one of three sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Exposure(s) studied</td>
<td>Outcome(s) measured</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller et al. 1998 (and Waller et al. 2001).</td>
<td>Prospective cohort in California, 1989–1991.</td>
<td>Estimated TTHM levels during first trimester of pregnancy via ingestion and showering.</td>
<td>Spontaneous abortion ...</td>
<td>Statistically significant increased risk between high intake of TTHMs and spontaneous abortion compared to low intake. BDCM statistically associated with increased spontaneous abortion; other THMs not. Reanalysis of exposure yielded less exposure misclassification and relative risks similar in magnitude to earlier study. An exposure-response relationship was seen between spontaneous abortion and ingestion exposure to TTHMs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savitz et al. 1995.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study: North Carolina, 1988–1991.</td>
<td>Examined TTHM concentrations at residences and water consumption (during first and third trimesters).</td>
<td>Spontaneous abortion, preterm delivery, low birth weight.</td>
<td>There was a statistically significant increased miscarriage risk with high THM concentration, but THM intake (based on concentration times consumption level) was not related to pregnancy outcome. No associations were seen for preterm delivery or low birth weight. Water source was not related to pregnancy outcome either, with the exception of a non-significant, increased risk of spontaneous abortion for bottled water users. There was a non-statistically significant pattern of reduced risk with increased consumption of water for all three outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aschengrau et al. 1993.</td>
<td>Case-control study in Massachusetts, 1977–1980.</td>
<td>Source of water and 2 types of water treatment (chlorination, chloramination).</td>
<td>Neonatal death, stillbirth, congenital anomalies.</td>
<td>There was a non-significant, increased association between frequency of stillbirths and maternal exposure to chlorinated versus chloraminated surface water. An increased risk of urinary tract and respiratory tract defects and chlorinated water was detected. Neonatal death and other major malformations showed no association. No increased risk seen for any adverse pregnancy outcomes for surface water versus ground and mixed water use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramer et al. 1992.</td>
<td>Population-based case-control study in Iowa, 1989–1990.</td>
<td>Examined chloroform, DBCM, DBCM, and bromoform levels and compared type of water source (surface, shallow well, deep well).</td>
<td>Low birth weight, prematurity, intrauterine growth retardation.</td>
<td>Statistically significant increased risk for intrauterine growth retardation effects from chloroform exposure were observed. Non-significant increased risks were observed for low birth weight and chloroform and for intrauterine growth retardation and DBCM. No intrauterine growth retardation or low birth weight effects were seen for the other THMs, and no effects on prematurity were observed for any of the THMs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aschengrau et al. 1989.</td>
<td>Case-control study in Massachusetts, 1976–1978.</td>
<td>Source of water and exposure to metals and other contaminants.</td>
<td>Spontaneous abortion ...</td>
<td>A statistically significantly association was detected between surface water source and frequency of spontaneous abortion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Exposure(s) studied</td>
<td>Outcome(s) measured</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews/ Meta-analyses Hwang and Jakkola 2003.</td>
<td>Review and meta-analysis of 5 studies.</td>
<td>Compared DBP levels, source of water, chlorine residual, color (high/low), and 2 types of disinfection: chlorination and chloramination.</td>
<td>Birth defects (respiratory system, urinary system, neural tube defects, cardiac, oral cleft).</td>
<td>The meta-analysis supports an association between exposure to chlorination by-products and the risk of any birth defect, particularly the risk of neural tube defects and urinary system defects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bove et al. 2002.</td>
<td>Qualitative review of 14 studies.</td>
<td>Examined THM levels. Compared drinking water source and type of water treatment.</td>
<td>Birth defects, small for gestational age, low birth weight, preterm delivery, spontaneous abortion, fetal death.</td>
<td>Review found the studies of THMs and adverse birth outcomes provide moderate evidence for associations with small for gestational age, neural tube defects, and spontaneous abortions. Authors felt risks may have been underestimated and exposure-response relationships distorted due to exposure misclassification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves et al. 2001.</td>
<td>Review of toxicological and epidemiological studies using a weight of evidence approach.</td>
<td>Examined water consumption, duration of exposure, THM levels, HAA levels, and other contaminants. Compared source of water, water treatment, water color (high/low), etc.</td>
<td>Low birth weight, preterm delivery, small for gestational age, intrauterine growth retardation, specific birth defects, neonatal death, decreased fertility, fetal resorption, and other effects.</td>
<td>Weight of evidence suggested positive association with DBP exposure for growth retardation such as small for gestational age or intrauterine growth retardation and urinary tract defects. Review found no support for DBP exposure and low birth weight, preterm delivery, some specific birth defects, and neonatal death, and inconsistent findings for all birth defects, all central nervous system defects, neural tube defects, spontaneous abortion, and stillbirth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanueva et al. 2001.</td>
<td>Qualitative review of 14 reproductive and developmental health effect studies.</td>
<td>Compared exposure to TTHM levels, mutagenic drinking water, water consumption, source water, types of disinfection (chlorination and chloramination), and residence times.</td>
<td>Spontaneous abortion, low birth weight, small for gestational age, neural tube defects, other reproductive and developmental outcomes.</td>
<td>Review found positive associations between increased spontaneous abortion, low birth weight, small for gestational age, and neural tube defects and drinking chlorinated water in most studies, although not always with statistical significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieuwenhuisen et al. 2000.</td>
<td>Qualitative review of numerous toxicological and epidemiological studies.</td>
<td>Examined levels of various DBPs, water consumption, and duration of exposure. Compared water color, water treatment, source of water, etc.</td>
<td>Low birth weight, preterm delivery, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth, birth defects, etc.</td>
<td>The review supports some evidence of association between THMs and low birth weight, but inconclusive. Review found no evidence of association between THMs and preterm delivery, and that associations for other outcomes (spontaneous abortions, stillbirth, and birth defects) were weak but gaining weight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reif et al. 2000.</td>
<td>Qualitative reviews of numerous epidemiological studies.</td>
<td>Compared source of water supply and methods of disinfection. Estimated TTHM levels.</td>
<td>Birth weight, low birth weight, intrauterine growth retardation, small for gestational age, preterm delivery, somatic parameters, neonatal jaundice, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth, developmental anomalies.</td>
<td>Weight of evidence suggested DBPs are reproductive toxicants in humans under appropriate exposure conditions. The review reports findings between TTHMs and effects on fetal growth, fetal viability, and congenital anomalies as inconsistent. Reviewers felt data are at the stage of hazard identification and did not suggest a dose-response pattern of increasing risk with increasing TTHM concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO 2000</td>
<td>Qualitative reviews of various studies in Finland, U.S., and Canada.</td>
<td>Various exposures to THMs.</td>
<td>Various reproductive and developmental effects.</td>
<td>Review found some support for an association between increased risks of neural tube defects and miscarriage and THM exposure. Other associations have been observed, but the authors believed insufficient data exist to assess any of these associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craun, ed. 1998.</td>
<td>Qualitative review of 10 studies, focus on California cohort study.</td>
<td>Examined THM levels and water consumption, and compared source of water and water treatment (chlorine, chloramines, chlorine dioxide).</td>
<td>Stillbirth, neonatal death, spontaneous abortion, low birth weight, preterm delivery, intrauterine growth retardation, neonatal jaundice, birth defects.</td>
<td>Associations between DBPs and various reproductive effects were seen in some epidemiological studies, but the authors felt these results do not provide convincing evidence for a causal relationship between DBPs and reproductive effects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii. Toxicology. To date, the majority of reproductive and developmental toxicology studies have been short term and higher dose. Many of these studies are summarized in a review by Tyl (2000). A summary of this review and of additional studies is provided in the proposed Stage 2 DBPR (USEPA 2003a). Individual DBP supporting documents evaluate and assess additional studies as well (USEPA 2000b; USEPA 2000c; USEPA 2001a; USEPA 2001b; USEPA 2003b; USEPA 2005b; USEPA 2005c; USEPA 2005d; USEPA 2005e; USEPA 2005k). A number of recent studies have been published that include in vivo and in vitro assays to address mechanism of action. Overall, reproductive and developmental toxicology studies indicate a possible reproductive/developmental health hazard although they are preliminary in nature for the majority of DBPs, and the dose-response characteristics of most DBPs have not been quantified. Some of the reproductive effects of DCAA were quantified as part of the RID development process, and impacts of DCAA on testicular structure are one of the critical effects in the study that is the basis of the RID (USEPA 2003b).

A few long term, lower dose studies have been completed. Christian et al. (2002a and 2002b) looked for an association between BDCM and DBAA and reproductive and developmental endpoints. The authors identified a NOAEL and LOAEL of 50 ppm and 150 ppm, respectively, based on delayed sexual maturation for BDCM and a NOAEL and LOAEL of 50 ppm and 250 ppm based on abnormal spermatogenesis for DBAA. The authors concluded that similar effects in humans would only be seen at levels many orders of magnitude higher than that of current drinking water levels. As discussed in more detail in the proposal, EPA believes that because of key methodological differences indicated as being important in other studies (Bielmeier et al. 2001; Bielmeier et al. 2004; Kaydos et al. 2004; Klnefelter et al. 2001; Klnefelter et al. 2004), definitive conclusions regarding BDCM and DBAA cannot be drawn. Other multi-generation research underway includes a study on BCAA, but this research is not yet published.

Biological plausibility for the effects observed in reproductive and developmental epidemiological studies has been demonstrated through various toxicological studies on some individual DBPs (e.g., Bielmeier et al. 2001; Bielmeier et al. 2004; Narotsky et al. 1992; Chen et al. 2003; Chen et al. 2004). Some of these studies were conducted at high doses, but similarity of effects observed between toxicology studies and epidemiology studies strengthens the weight of evidence for a possible association between adverse reproductive and developmental health effects and exposure to chlorinated surface water.

c. Conclusions. EPA’s weight of evidence evaluation of the best available science on carcinogenicity and reproductive and developmental effects, in conjunction with the widespread exposure to DBPs, supports the incremental regulatory changes in today’s rule that target lowering DBPs and providing equitable public health protection.

EPA believes that the cancer epidemiology and toxicology literature provide important information that contributes to the weight of evidence for potential health risks from exposure to chlorinated drinking water. At this time, the cancer epidemiology studies support a potential association between exposure to chlorinated drinking water and cancer, but evidence is insufficient to establish a causal relationship. The epidemiological evidence for an association between DBP exposure and colon and rectal cancers is not as consistent as it is for bladder cancer, although similarity of effects reported in animal toxicity and human epidemiology studies strengthens the evidence for an association with colon and rectal cancers. EPA believes that the overall cancer epidemiology and toxicology data support the decision to
pursue additional DBP control measures as reflected in the Stage 2 DBPR.

Based on the weight of evidence evaluation of the reproductive and developmental epidemiology data, EPA concludes that a causal link between adverse reproductive or developmental health effects and exposure to chlorinated drinking water or DBPs has not been established, but that there is a potential association. Despite inconsistent findings across studies, some recent studies continue to suggest associations between DBP exposure and various adverse reproductive and developmental effects. In addition, data from a number of toxicology studies, although the majority of them were conducted using high doses, demonstrate biological plausibility for some of the effects observed in epidemiology studies. EPA concludes that no dose-response relationship or causal link has been established between exposure to chlorinated drinking water or disinfection byproducts and adverse developmental or reproductive health effects, but do provide an indication of a potential health concern that warrants incremental regulatory action beyond the Stage 1 DBPR.

D. DBP Occurrence and DBP Control

New information on the occurrence of DBPs in distribution systems raises issues about the protection provided by the Stage 1 DBPR. This section presents new occurrence and treatment information used to identify key issues and to support the development of the Stage 2 DBPR. For a more detailed discussion see the proposed Stage 2 DBPR (USEPA 2003a). For additional information on occurrence of regulated and nonregulated DBPs, see the Occurrence Assessment for the Final Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (USEPA 2005f).  

1. Occurrence

EPA, along with the M-DBP Advisory Committee, collected, developed, and evaluated new information that became available after the Stage 1 DBPR was published. The Information Collection Rule (ICR) (USEPA 1996) provided new field data on DBP exposure for large water systems and new study data on the effectiveness of several DBP control technologies. The unprecedented amount of information collected under the ICR was supplemented by a survey conducted by the National Rural Water Association, data provided by various States, the Water Utility Database (which contains data collected by the American Water Works Association), and ICR Supplemental Surveys for small and medium water systems.

After analyzing the DBP occurrence data, EPA and the Advisory Committee reached three significant conclusions that in part led the Advisory Committee to recommend further control of DBPs in public water systems. First, the data from the Information Collection Rule showed that the RAA compliance calculation under the Stage 1 DBPR allows elevated TTHM or HAA5 levels to regularly occur at some locations in the distribution system while the overall average of TTHM or HAA5 levels at all DBP monitoring locations is below the MCLs of the Stage 1 DBPR. Customers served at those sampling locations with DBP levels that are regularly above 0.080 mg/L TTHM and 0.060 mg/L HAA5 experience higher exposure compared to customers served at locations where these levels are consistently met.

Second, the new data demonstrated that DBP levels in single samples can be substantially above 0.080 mg/L TTHM and 0.060 mg/L HAA5. Some customers receive drinking water with concentrations of TTHM and HAA5 up to 75% above 0.080 mg/L and 0.060 mg/L, respectively, even when their water system is in compliance with the Stage 1 DBPR. Some studies support an association between exposure to DBPs and potential adverse reproductive and developmental health effects (see Section III.C for more detail).

Third, the data from the Information Collection Rule revealed that the highest TTHM and HAA5 levels can occur at any monitoring site in the distribution system. In fact, the highest concentrations did not occur at the maximum residence time locations in more than 50% of all ICR samples. The fact that the locations with the highest DBP levels vary in different public water systems indicates that the Stage 1 DBPR monitoring may not accurately represent the high DBP concentrations that actually exist in distribution systems, and that additional monitoring is needed to identify distribution system locations with elevated DBP levels. These data showed that efforts beyond the Stage 1 DBPR are needed to provide more equitable protection from DBP exposure across the entire distribution system. The incremental regulatory changes made by the Stage 2 DBPR meet this need by reevaluating the locations of DBP monitoring sites and addressing high DBP concentrations that occur at particular locations or in single samples within systems in compliance.

2. Treatment

The analysis of the new treatment study data confirmed that certain technologies are effective at reducing DBP concentrations. Bench- and pilot-scale studies for granular activated carbon (GAC) and membrane technologies required by the Information Collection Rule provided information on the effectiveness of the two technologies. Other studies found UV light to be highly effective for inactivating Cryptosporidium and Giardia at low doses without promoting the formation of DBPs (Malley et al. 1996; Zheng et al. 1999). This new treatment information adds to the treatment options available to utilities for controlling DBPs beyond the requirements of the Stage 1 DBPR.

E. Conclusions for Regulatory Action

After extensive analysis of available data and rule options considered by the Advisory Committee and review of public comments on the proposed Stage 2 DBPR (USEPA, 2003a), EPA is finalizing a Stage 2 DBPR control strategy consistent with the key elements of the Agreement in Principle signed in September 2000 by the participants in the Stage 2 M–DBP Advisory Committee. EPA believes that exposure to chlorinated drinking water may be associated with cancer, reproductive, and developmental health risks. EPA determined that the risk-targeting measures recommended in the Agreement in Principle will require only those systems with the greatest risk to make treatment and operational changes and will maintain simultaneous protection from potential health concerns from DBPs and microbial contaminants. EPA has carefully evaluated and expanded upon the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and public comments to develop today’s rule. EPA also made simplifications where possible to minimize complications for public water systems as they transition to compliance with the Stage 2 DBPR while expanding public health protection. The requirements of the Stage 2 DBPR are described in detail in Section IV of this preamble.

IV. Explanation of Today’s Action

A. MCLGs

MCLGs are set at concentration levels at which no known or anticipated adverse health effects occur, allowing for an adequate margin of safety.
Establishment of an MCLG for each specific contaminant is based on the available evidence of carcinogenicity or noncancer adverse health effects from drinking water exposure using EPA’s guidelines for risk assessment. MCLGs are developed to ensure they are protective of the entire population.

Today’s rule provides MCLGs for chloroform and two haloacetic acids, monochloroacetic acid (MCAA) and trichloroacetic acid (TCAA).

1. Chloroform MCLG
   a. Today’s rule. The final MCLG for chloroform is 0.07 mg/L. The MCLG was calculated using toxicological evidence that the carcinogenic effects of chloroform are due to sustained tissue toxicity. EPA is not changing the other THM MCLGs finalized in the Stage 1 DBPR.
   b. Background and analysis. The MCLG for chloroform is unchanged from the proposal. The MCLG is calculated using a reference dose (RfD) of 0.01 mg/kg/day and an adult tap water consumption of 2 L per day for a 70 kg adult. A relative source contribution (RSC) of 20% was used in accordance with Office of Water’s current approach for deriving RSC through consideration of data that indicate that other routes and sources of exposure may potentially contribute substantially to the overall exposure to chloroform. See the proposed Stage 2 DBPR (USEPA 2003a) for a detailed discussion of the chloroform MCLG.

\[
MCLG \text{ for Chloroform} = \frac{(0.01 \text{ mg/kg/day})(70 \text{ kg})(0.2)}{2 \text{ L/day}} = 0.07 \text{ mg/L (rounded)}
\]

Based on an analysis of the available scientific data on chloroform, EPA believes that the chloroform dose-response is nonlinear and that chloroform is likely to be carcinogenic only under high exposure conditions (USEPA 2001a). This assessment is supported by the principles of the 1999 EPA Proposed Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment (USEPA 1999a) and reconfirmed by the 2005 final Cancer Guidelines (USEPA 2005i). The science in support of a nonlinear approach for estimating the carcinogenicity of chloroform was affirmed by the Chloroform Risk Assessment Review Subcommittee of the EPA SAB Executive Committee (USEPA 2000d). Since the nonzero MCLG is based on a mode of action consideration specific to chloroform, it does not affect the MCLGs of other trihalomethanes.

c. Summary of major comments. EPA received many comments in support of the proposed MCLG calculation for chloroform, although some commenters disagreed with a non-zero MCLG.

At this time, based on an analysis of all the available scientific data on chloroform, EPA concludes that chloroform is likely to be carcinogenic to humans only under high exposure conditions that lead to cytotoxicity and regenerative hyperplasia and that chloroform is not likely to be carcinogenic to humans under conditions that do not cause cytotoxicity and cell regeneration (USEPA 2001a). Therefore, the dose-response is nonlinear, and the MCLG is set at 0.07 mg/L. This conclusion has been reviewed by the SAB (USEPA 2000d), who agree that nonlinear approach is most appropriate for the risk assessment of chloroform; it also remains consistent with the principles of the 1999 EPA Proposed Guidelines for Carcinogenic Risk Assessment (USEPA 1999a) and the final Cancer Guidelines (USEPA 2005i), which allow for nonlinear extrapolation.

EPA also received some comments requesting a combined MCLG for THMs or HAAs. This is not appropriate because these different chemicals have different health effects.

2. HAA MCLGs: TCAA and MCAA
   a. Today’s rule. Today’s rule finalizes the proposed Stage 2 MCLG for TCAA of 0.02 mg/L (USEPA 2003a) and sets an MCLG for MCAA of 0.07 mg/L. EPA is not changing the other HAA MCLGs finalized in the Stage 1 DBPR (USEPA 1998a).
   b. Background and analysis. The Stage 1 DBPR included an MCLG for TCAA of 0.02 mg/L and did not include an MCLG for MCAA (USEPA 1998a). Based on toxicological data published after the Stage 1 DBPR, EPA proposed new MCLGs for TCAA and MCAA of 0.02 mg/L and 0.03 mg/L, respectively, in the Stage 2 proposal (USEPA 2003a). The proposed TCAA MCLG and its supporting analysis is being finalized unchanged in today’s final rule. The MCLG calculation for MCAA is revised in this final rule, based on a new reference dose, as discussed later. See the proposed Stage 2 DBPR (USEPA 2003a) for a detailed discussion of the calculation of the MCLGs.

TCAA. The MCLG for TCAA was calculated based on the RfD of 0.03 mg/kg/day using a 70 kg adult body weight, a 2 L/day drinking water intake, and a relative source contribution of 20%. An additional tenfold risk management factor has been applied to account for the possible carcinogenicity of TCAA. This approach is consistent with EPA policy. TCAA induces liver tumors in mice (Ferreira-Gonzalez et al. 1995; Pereira 1996; Pereira and Phelps 1996; Tao et al. 1996; Latendresse and Pereira 1997; Pereira et al. 1997) but not in rats (DeAngelo et al. 1997). Much of the recent data on the carcinogenicity of TCAA have focused on examining the carcinogenic mode(s) of action. However, at this time, neither the bioassay nor the mechanistic data are sufficient to support the development of a slope factor from which to quantify the cancer risk.

\[
MCLG \text{ for TCAA} = \frac{(0.03 \text{ mg/kg/day})(70 \text{ kg})(0.2)}{(2 \text{ L/day})(10)} = 0.02 \text{ mg/L (rounded)}
\]

The chronic bioassay for TCAA by DeAngelo et al. (1997) was selected as the critical study for the development of the RfD. In this chronic drinking water study, a dose-response was noted for several endpoints and both a LOAEL and NOAEL were determined. The data are consistent with the findings in both the Pereira (1996) chronic drinking water study and the Mather et al. (1990) subchronic drinking water study. The RfD of 0.03 mg/kg/day is based on the NOAEL of 32.5 mg/kg/day for liver histopathological changes in rats (DeAngelo et al. 1997). A composite uncertainty factor of 1000 was applied in the RfD determination. A default uncertainty factor of 10 was applied to...
the RfD to account for extrapolation from an animal study because data to quantify rat-to-human differences in toxicokinetics or toxicodynamics are not available. The default uncertainty factor of 10 was used to account for human variability in the absence of data on differences in human susceptibility. Although subchronic and chronic studies of TCAA have been reported for multiple species, many studies have focused on liver lesions and a full evaluation of a wide range of potential target organs has not been conducted in two different species. In addition, there has been no multi-generation study of reproductive toxicity and the data from teratology studies in rats provide LOAEL values but no NOAEL for developmental toxicity. Thus, an additional uncertainty factor of 10 was used to account for database insufficiencies.

The MCLG calculation also includes a relative source contribution (RSC) of 20%. The RSC was derived consistent with Office of Water’s current approach for deriving RSC. In addition to disinfect water, foods are expected to contribute to daily exposure to TCAA (Raymer et al. 2001, 2004; Reimann et al. 1996). Some of the TCAA in foods comes from cleaning and cooking foods in chlorinated water. Additional TCAA is found in some foods because of the widespread use of chlorine as a sanitizing agent in the food industry (USFDA 1994). EPA was not able to identify any dietary surveys or duplicate diet studies of TCAA in the diet. TCAA also has been identified in rain water, suggesting some presence in the atmosphere (Reimann et al. 1996); however, due to the low volatility (0.5—0.7 mm Hg at 25 °C) of TCAA, exposure from ambient air is expected to be minimal. Dermal exposure to disinfected water is also unlikely to be significant. A study by Xu et al. (2002) reports that dermal exposure from bathing and showering is only 0.01% of that from oral exposure. In addition, the solvents trichloroethylene, tetrachloroethylene, 1,1,1-trichloroethane (often found in ambient air and drinking water), and the disinfection byproduct chloral hydrate all contribute to the body’s TCAA load since each of these compounds is metabolized to TCAA (ATSDR 2004; ATSDR 1997a; ATSDR 1997b; USEPA 2000e). Due to the limitations primarily in the dietary data and a clear indication of exposure from other sources, EPA applied a relative source contribution of 20%.

MCAA. The MCLG for MCAA uses the following calculations: An RfD of 0.01 mg/kg/day, a 70 kg adult consuming 2 L/day of tap water, and a relative source contribution of 20%. The RfD included in the proposal was based on a chronic drinking water study in rats conducted by DeAngelo et al. (1997). In the assessment presented for the proposed rule, the LOAEL from this study was identified as 3.5 mg/kg/day based on increased absolute and relative spleen weight in the absence of histopathologic changes. After reviewing comments and further analysis of the data, EPA concludes that it is more appropriate to identify this change as a NOAEL. Increased spleen weights in the absence of histopathological effects are not necessarily adverse. In addition, spleen weights were decreased, rather than increased in the mid- and high-dose groups in the DeAngelo et al. (1997) study and were accompanied by a significant decrease in body weight, decreased relative and absolute liver weights, decreased absolute kidney weight, and an increase in relative testes weight. Accordingly, the mid-dose in this same study (26.1 mg/kg/day) has been categorized as the LOAEL with the lower 3.5 mg/kg/day dose as a NOAEL. Based on a NOAEL of 3.5 mg/kg/day (DeAngelo et al. 1997), the revised RfD was calculated as shown below, with a composite uncertainty factor of 300. EPA used a default uncertainty factor of 10 to account for extrapolation from an animal study, since no data on rat-to-human differences in toxicokinetics or toxicodynamics were identified. A default uncertainty factor of 10 was used to account for human variability in the absence of data on the variability in the toxicokinetics of MCAA in humans or in human susceptibility to MCAA. An additional uncertainty factor of three was used to account for database insufficiencies. Although there is no multi-generation reproduction study, the available studies of reproductive and developmental processes suggest that developmental toxicity is unlikely to be the most sensitive endpoint. This led to the following calculation of the Reference Dose (RfD) and MCLG for MCAA:

\[
\text{RfD} = \frac{(3.5 \text{ mg/kg/day})}{300} = 0.012 \text{ mg/kg/day rounded to 0.01 mg/kg/day}
\]

Where:

- 3.5 mg/kg/day = NOAEL for decreased body weight plus decreased liver, kidney and spleen weights in rats exposed to MCA for 104 weeks in drinking water (DeAngelo et al. 1997).
- 300 = composite uncertainty factor chosen to account for inter species extrapolation, inter-individual variability in humans, and deficiencies in the database.

\[
\text{MCLG for MCAA} = \frac{(0.01 \text{ mg/kg/day})(70 \text{ kg})(0.2)}{2 \text{ L/day}} = 0.07 \text{ mg/L}
\]

The RSC for MCAA was selected using comparable data to that discussed for TCAA. MCAA, like TCAA, has been found in foods and is taken up by foods during cooking (15% in chicken to 62% in pinto beans) and cleaning (2.5% for lettuce) with water containing 500 ppb MCAA (Reimann et al. 1996; Raymer et al. 2001, 2004). Rinsing of cooked foods did not increase the MCAA content of foods to the same extent as was observed for TCAA (Raymer et al. 2004). MCAA was found to be completely stable in water boiled for 60 minutes and is likely to be found in the diet due to the use of chlorinated water in food preparation and the use of chlorine as a sanitizing agent by the food industry (USFDA 1994). As with TCAA, inhalation and dermal exposures are unlikely to be significant. Dermal exposure from bathing and showering was estimated to contribute only 0.03% of that from oral exposure (Xu et al. 2002). As with TCAA, due to the limitations in dietary data and a clear indication of exposure from other
sources, EPA applied a relative source contribution of 20%.

c. Summary of major comments. EPA received few comments on MCAA and TCDA. The majority of comments about the MCLGs for TCDA and MCAA were general MCLG questions, including RSC derivation. Some commenters questioned why MCAA, TCDA, and chloroform were calculated using an RSC of 20%. In particular, some commenters compared these calculations to that for DBCM in the Stage 1 DBPR, which uses 80%. Each of the MCLGs set for chloroform, TCDA, and MCAA under this rule is calculated using the best available science and EPA Office of Water’s current approach for deriving the RSC. EPA chose an RSC of 20%, not 80%, because of clear indications of exposure from other sources; data limitations preclude the derivation of a specific RSC.

The RSC for DBCM was 80% in the Stage 1 DBPR. The DBCM MCLG is not part of today’s rulemaking. Any possible future revision to the DBCM MCLG as a result of an RSC change would not affect the MCL for TTHM finalized in today’s rule.

In response to comments received on the RfD for MCAA, EPA has reviewed the critical study regarding the appropriateness of an increase in spleen weight in the absence of histopathology as a LOAEL. EPA has determined that the dose associated with this endpoint is more appropriately categorized as a NOAEL rather than a LOAEL and has revised the RfD and MCLG for MCAA.

B. Consecutive Systems

Today’s rule includes provisions for consecutive systems, which are public water systems that receive some or all of their finished water from another water system (a wholesale system). Consecutive systems face particular challenges in providing water that meets regulatory standards for DBPs and other contaminants whose concentration can increase in the distribution system. Moreover, previous regulation of DBP levels in consecutive systems varies widely among States. In consideration of these factors, EPA is finalizing monitoring, compliance schedule, and other requirements specifically for consecutive systems. These requirements are intended to facilitate compliance by consecutive systems with MCLs for TTHMs and HAAs under the Stage 2 DBPR and help to ensure that consumers in consecutive systems receive equivalent public health protection.

1. Today’s Rule

As public water systems, consecutive systems must provide water that meets the MCLs for TTHM and HAA5 under the Stage 2 DBPR, use specified analytical methods, and carry out associated monitoring, reporting, recordkeeping, public notification, and other requirements. The following discusses a series of definitions needed for addressing consecutive system requirements in today’s rule. Later sections of this preamble provide further details on how rule requirements (e.g., schedule and monitoring) apply to consecutive systems.

A consecutive system is a public water system that receives some or all of its finished water from one or more wholesale systems.

Finished water is water that has been introduced into the distribution system of a public water system and is intended for distribution and consumption without further treatment, except as necessary to maintain water quality in the distribution system (e.g., booster disinfection, addition of corrosion control chemicals).

A wholesale system is a public water system that treats source water as necessary to produce finished water and then delivers finished water to another public water system. Delivery may be through a direct connection or through the distribution system of one or more consecutive systems.

The combined distribution system is defined as the interconnected distribution system consisting of the distribution systems of wholesale systems and of the consecutive systems that receive finished water from those wholesale system(s).

EPA is allowing States some flexibility in defining what systems are a part of a combined distribution system. This provision determines effective dates for requirements in today’s rule; see Section IV.E (Compliance Schedules) for further discussion. EPA has consulted with States and deferred to their expertise regarding the nature of the connection in making combined distribution system determinations. In the absence of input from the State, EPA will determine that combined distribution systems include all interconnected systems for the purpose of determining compliance schedules for implementation of this rule.

2. Background and Analysis

The practice of public water systems buying and selling water to each other has been commonplace for many years. Reasons include saving money on pumping, treatment, equipment, and personnel; assuring an adequate supply during peak demand periods; acquiring emergency supplies; selling surplus supplies; and delivering a better product to consumers. EPA estimates that there are more than 10,000 consecutive systems nationally.

Consecutive systems face particular challenges in providing water that meets regulatory standards for contaminants that can increase in the distribution system. Examples of such contaminants include coliforms, which can grow if favorable conditions exist, and some DBPs, including THMs and HAAs, which can increase when a disinfectant and DBP precursors continue to react in the distribution system.

EPA included requirements specifically for consecutive systems because States have taken widely varying approaches to regulating DBPs in consecutive systems in previous rules. For example, some States have not regulated DBP levels in consecutive systems that deliver disinfected water but do not add a disinfectant. Other States have determined compliance with DBP standards based on the combined distribution system that includes both the wholesaler and consecutive systems. In this case, sites in consecutive systems are treated as monitoring sites within the combined distribution system. Neither of these approaches provide the same level of public health protection as non-consecutive systems receive under the Stage 1 DBPR. Once fully implemented, today’s rule will ensure similar protection for consumers in consecutive systems.

In developing its recommendations, the Stage 2 M-DBP Advisory Committee recognized two principles related to consecutive systems: (1) consumers in consecutive systems should be just as well protected as customers of all systems, and (2) monitoring provisions should be tailored to meet the first principle. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended that all wholesale and consecutive systems comply with provisions of the Stage 2 DBPR on the same schedule required of the wholesale or consecutive system serving the largest population in the combined distribution system. In addition, the Advisory Committee recommended that EPA solicit comments on issues related to consecutive systems that the Advisory Committee had not fully explored (USEPA 2000a). EPA agreed with these recommendations and they are reflected in today’s rule.
3. Summary of Major Comments

Commenters generally supported the proposed definitions. However, commenters did express some concerns, especially with including a time period of water delivery that defined whether a system was a consecutive system (proposed to trigger plant-based monitoring requirements) or wholesale system (proposed to allow determination that a combined distribution system existed). EPA has dropped this requirement from the final rule; population-based monitoring requirements in the final rule do not need to define how long a plant must operate in order to be considered a plant, and EPA has provided some flexibility for States to determine which systems comprise a combined distribution system (without presenting a time criterion).

Other commenters expressed concern that the proposed definition of consecutive system was inconsistent with use of the term prior to the rulemaking. EPA acknowledges that the Agency has not previously formally defined the term, but believes that the definition in today’s rule best considers all commenters’ concerns, while also providing for accountability and public health protection in as simple a manner as is possible given the many consecutive system scenarios that currently exist.

Several States requested flexibility to determine which systems comprised a combined distribution system under this rule; EPA has included that flexibility for situations in which systems have only a marginal association (such as an infrequently used emergency connection) with other systems in the combined distribution system. To prepare for the IDSE and subsequent Stage 2 implementation, EPA has worked with States in identifying all systems that are part of each combined distribution system.

Finally, several commenters requested that the wholesale system definition replace “public water system” with “water system” so that wholesale systems serving fewer than 25 people would not be considered public water systems. EPA did not change the definition in today’s rule; EPA considers any water system to be a public water system (PWS) if it serves 25 or more people either directly (retail) or indirectly (by providing finished water to a consecutive system) or through a combination of retail and consecutive system customers. If a PWS receives water from an unregulated entity, that PWS must meet all compliance requirements (including monitoring and treatment techniques) that any other public water system that uses source water of unknown quality must meet.

C. LRAA MCLs for TTHM and HAA5

1. Today’s Rule

This rule requires the use of locational running annual averages (LRAAs) to determine compliance with the Stage 2 MCLs of 0.080 mg/L TTHM and 0.060 mg/L HAA5. All systems, including consecutive systems, must comply with the MCLs for TTHM and HAA5 using sampling sites identified under the Initial Distribution System Evaluation (IDSE) or using existing Stage 1 DBPR compliance monitoring locations (as discussed in Section IV.F). EPA has dropped the proposed phased approach for LRAA implementation (Stage 2A and Stage 2B) by removing Stage 2A and redesignating Stage 2B as Stage 2.

Details of monitoring requirements and compliance schedules are discussed in preamble Sections IV.G and IV.E, respectively, and may be found in subpart V of today’s rule.

2. Background and Analysis

The MCLs for TTHM and HAA5 are the same as those proposed, 0.080 mg/L TTHM and 0.060 mg/L HAA5 as an LRAA. See the proposed rule (68 FR 49584, August 18, 2003) (USEPA 2003a) for a more detailed discussion of the analysis supporting the MCLs. The primary objective of the LRAA is to reduce exposure to high DBP levels. For an LRAA, an annual average must be computed at each monitoring location. The RAA compliance basis of the 1979 TTHM rule and the Stage 1 DBPR allows a system-wide annual average under which high DBP concentrations in one or more locations are averaged with, and dampened by, lower concentrations elsewhere in the distribution system. Figure IV.C–1 illustrates the difference in calculating compliance with the MCLs for TTHM between a Stage 1 DBPR RAA, and the Stage 2 DBPR LRAA.
Figure IV.C-1. Comparison of RAA and LRAA compliance calculations.  

Stage 1 DBPR  
First Quarter  Second Quarter  Third Quarter  Fourth Quarter  
Average of All Samples  Average of All Samples  Average of All Samples  Average of All Samples  
Running Annual Average of Quarterly Averages  MUST BE BELOW MCL  

Stage 2 DBPR  
First Quarter  Second Quarter  Third Quarter  Fourth Quarter  
First Quarter  ▲  Second Quarter  ▲  Third Quarter  ▲  Fourth Quarter  ▲  \{  LRAA 1  \}  \{  LRAA 3  \}  
First Quarter  ▲  Second Quarter  ▲  Third Quarter  ▲  Fourth Quarter  ▲  \{  LRAA 2  \}  \{  LRAA 4  \}  

\(^1\)Stage 2 DBPR sampling locations will be selected based on the results of an IDSE and may occur at locations different from Stage 1 DBPR sampling sites.  

EPA and the Stage 2 M–DBP Advisory Committee considered an array of alternative MCL strategies. The Advisory Committee discussions primarily focused on the relative magnitude of exposure reduction versus the expected impact on the water industry and its customers. Strategies considered included across the board requirements, such as significantly decreasing the MCLs (e.g., 40/30) or single hit MCLs (e.g., all samples must be below 80/60); and risk targeting requirements. In the process of evaluating alternatives, EPA and the Advisory Committee reviewed vast quantities of data and many analyses that addressed health effects, DBP occurrence, predicted reductions in DBP levels, predicted technology changes,
systems are able to comply with an RAA MCL even if they have a plant with a poor quality water source (that thus produces high concentrations of DBPs) because they have another plant that has a better quality water source (and thus lower concentrations of DBPs). Individuals served by the plant with the poor quality source will usually have higher DBP exposure than individuals served by the other plant.

In part, both the TTHM and HAA5 classes are regulated because they occur at high levels and represent chlorination byproducts that are produced from source waters with a wide range of water quality. The combination of TTHM and HAA5 represent a wide variety of compounds resulting from bromine substitution and chlorine substitution reactions (e.g., bromoform has three bromines, TCAA has three chlorines, BDCM has one bromine and two chlorines). EPA believes that the TTHM and HAA5 classes serve as an indicator for unidentified and unregulated DBPs. EPA believes that controlling the occurrence levels of TTHM and HAA5 will help control the overall levels of chlorination DBPs.

3. Summary of Major Comments

Commenters supported the proposed, risk-targeted MCL strategy over the alternative MCL strategies that were considered by the Advisory Committee as the preferred regulatory strategy. Commenters concurred with EPA’s analysis that such an approach will reduce peak and average DBP levels. Commenters supported the Stage 2 long-term MCLs of 0.080 mg/L TTHM and 0.060 mg/L HAA5 as LRAAs.

EPA received many comments on today’s MCLs specific to consecutive systems. While commenters supported consecutive system compliance with the Stage 2 DBPR in order to provide comparable levels of public health protection, they noted that it would be difficult for many consecutive systems to meet Stage 2 requirements because they have not had to meet the full scope of DBP requirements under previous rules. EPA has developed a training and outreach program to assist these systems and encourages States, wholesale systems, and professional associations to also provide assistance.

Some commenters expressed concern about holding consecutive systems responsible for water quality over which they have no control. Several commenters were concerned about the establishment of contracts between wholesale and consecutive systems, including a concern about a strain on their relationship, wholesale system reluctance to commit to keep DBPs at a level suggested by the consecutive systems, and the time and money it could take to work out differences. Although setting up a contract is a prudent business action, commenters noted that small consecutive water systems have few resources to sue for damages should the wholesaler provide water exceeding the MCL.

The purpose of DBPRs is to protect public health from exposure to high DBP levels. Not requiring violations when distributed water exceeds MCLs undermines the intent of the rule. While EPA recognizes consecutive systems do not have full control over the water they receive, agreements between wholesale and consecutive systems may specify water quality and actions required of the wholesaler if those water quality standards are not met.

Finally, commenters recommended that the Stage 2A provisions in the proposed rule be removed. These provisions (compliance with locational running average MCLs of 0.120 mg/L for TTHM and 0.100 mg/L for HAA5) required systems to comply with the Stage 1 MCLs (as running annual averages) and the Stage 2A MCLs (as LRAAs) concurrently until systems were required to comply with Stage 2B MCLs. Commenters noted that having two separate MCLs for an individual system to comply with at the same time was confusing to the system and its customers. In addition, State resources needed for compliance determinations and data management for this short-term requirement would be resource-intensive. Finally, resources spent to comply with Stage 2A would be better spent in complying with Stage 2B, especially given that some of the changes for Stage 2A compliance might not provide any benefit for Stage 2B. Since EPA agrees with commenters’ concerns, the Stage 2A requirements have been removed from the final rule.

D. BAT for TTHM and HAA5

1. Today’s Rule

Today, EPA is identifying the best available technology (BAT) for the TTHM and HAA5 MCLs (0.080 mg/L and 0.060 mg/L respectively) for systems that treat their own source water as one of the three following technologies:

(1) GAC10 (granular activated carbon filter beds with an empty-bed contact time of 10 minutes based on average daily flow and a carbon reactivation frequency of every 120 days)

(2) GAC20 (granular activated carbon filter beds with an empty-bed contact time of 20 minutes based on average daily flow and a carbon reactivation frequency of every 480 days)
daily flow and a carbon reactivation frequency of every 240 days).

3) Nanofiltration (NF) using a membrane with a molecular weight cutoff of 1000 Daltons or less.

EPA is specifying a different BAT for consecutive systems than for systems that treat their own source water to meet the TTHM and HAA5 LRAA MCLs. The consecutive system BAT is chloramination with management of hydraulic flow and storage to minimize residence time in the distribution system for systems that serve at least 10,000 people and management of hydraulic flow and storage to minimize residence time in the distribution system for systems that serve fewer than 10,000 people.

2. Background and Analysis

The BATs are the same as was proposed, except that consecutive systems serving fewer than 10,000 people do not have chloramination as part of the consecutive system BAT. See the proposal (68 FR 49588, August 18, 2003) (USEPA 2003a) for more detail on the analysis supporting these requirements. The Safe Drinking Water Act directs EPA to specify BAT for use in achieving compliance with the MCL. Systems unable to meet the MCL after application of BAT can get a variance (see Section IV.K for a discussion of variances). Systems are not required to use BAT in order to comply with the MCL. PWSs may use any State-approved technologies as long as they meet all drinking water standards.

EPA examined BAT options first by analyzing data from the Information Collection Rule treatment studies designed to evaluate the ability of GAC and NF to remove DBP precursors. Based on the treatment study results, GAC is effective for controlling DBP formation for waters with influent TOC concentrations below approximately 6 mg/L (based on the Information Collection Rule and NRWA data, over 90 percent of plants have average influent TOC levels below 6 mg/L [USEPA 2003c]). Of the plants that conducted an Information Collection Rule GAC treatment study, approximately 70 percent of the surface water plants studied could meet the 0.080 mg/L TTHM and 0.060 mg/L HAA5 MCLs, with a 20 percent safety factor (i.e., 0.064 mg/L and 0.048 mg/L, respectively) using GAC with 10 minutes of empty bed contact time and a 120 day reactivation frequency, and 78 percent of the plants could meet the MCLs with a 20 percent safety factor using GAC with 20 minutes of empty bed contact time and a 240 day reactivation frequency. Because the treatment studies were conducted at plants with much poorer water quality than the national average, EPA believes that much higher percentages of plants nationwide could meet the MCLs with the proposed GAC BATs.

Among plants using GAC, larger systems would likely realize an economic benefit from on-site reactivation, which could allow them to use smaller, 10-minute empty bed contact time reactors with more frequent reactivation (i.e., 120 days or less). Most small systems would not find it economically advantageous to install on-site carbon reactivation facilities, and thus would opt for larger, 20-minute empty bed contact time reactors, with less frequent carbon replacement (i.e., 240 days or less).

The Information Collection Rule treatment study results also demonstrated that nanofiltration was the better DBP control technology for ground water sources with high TOC concentrations (i.e., above approximately 6 mg/L). The results of the membrane treatment studies showed that all ground water plants could meet the 0.080 mg/L TTHM and 0.060 mg/L HAA5 MCLs, with a 20% safety factor (i.e., 0.064 mg/L and 0.048 mg/L, respectively) at the system average distribution system residence time using nanofiltration. Nanofiltration would be less expensive than GAC for high TOC ground waters, which generally require minimal pretreatment prior to the membrane process. Also, nanofiltration is an accepted technology for treatment of high TOC ground waters in Florida and parts of the Southwest, areas of the country with elevated TOC levels in ground waters.

The second method that EPA used to examine alternatives for BAT was the Surface Water Analytical Tool model that was developed to compare alternative regulatory strategies as part of the Stage 1 and Stage 2 M–DBP Advisory Committee deliberations. EPA modeled a number of BAT options. In the model, GAC10 was defined as granular activated carbon with an empty bed contact time of 10 minutes and a reactivation or replacement interval of 90 days or longer. GAC20 was defined as granular activated carbon with an empty bed contact time of 20 minutes and a reactivation or replacement interval of 90 days or longer.

The compliance percentages forecasted by the SWAT model are indicated in Table IV.D–1. EPA estimates that more than 97 percent of large systems will be able to achieve the Stage 2 MCLs with the GAC BAT, regardless of post-disinfection choice (Seidel Memo, 2001). Because the source water quality (e.g., DBP precursor levels) in medium and small systems is expected to be comparable to or better than that for the large system (USEPA 2005f), EPA believes it is conservative to assume that at least 90 percent of medium and small systems will be able to achieve the Stage 2 MCLs if they were to apply one of the proposed GAC BATs. EPA assumes that small systems may adopt GAC20 in a replacement mode (with replacement every 240 days) over GAC10 because it may not be economically feasible for some small systems to install and operate an on-site GAC reactivation facility. Moreover, some small systems may find nanofiltration cheaper than the GAC20 in a replacement mode if their specific geographic locations cause a relatively high cost for routine GAC shipment.

### Table IV.D–1.—SWAT Model Predictions of Percent of Large Plants in Compliance With TTHM and HAA5 Stage 2 MCLs After Application of Specified Treatment Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Residual disinfectant</th>
<th>All systems (percent)</th>
<th>Residual disinfectant</th>
<th>All systems (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chlorine (percent)</td>
<td>Chloramine (percent)</td>
<td>Chlorine (percent)</td>
<td>Chloramine (percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Coagulation (EC)</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (no pre-disinfection)</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC &amp; GAC10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See Section IV.K for a discussion of variances.) Systems are not required to use BAT in order to comply with the MCL. PWSs may use any State-approved technologies as long as they meet all drinking water standards.

The BATs are the same as was proposed, except that consecutive systems serving fewer than 10,000 people do not have chloramination as part of the consecutive system BAT. See the proposal (68 FR 49588, August 18, 2003) (USEPA 2003a) for more detail on the analysis supporting these requirements. The Safe Drinking Water Act directs EPA to specify BAT for use in achieving compliance with the MCL. Systems unable to meet the MCL after application of BAT can get a variance (see Section IV.K for a discussion of variances). Systems are not required to use BAT in order to comply with the MCL. PWSs may use any State-approved technologies as long as they meet all drinking water standards.

EPA examined BAT options first by analyzing data from the Information Collection Rule treatment studies designed to evaluate the ability of GAC and NF to remove DBP precursors. Based on the treatment study results, GAC is effective for controlling DBP formation for waters with influent TOC concentrations below approximately 6 mg/L (based on the Information Collection Rule and NRWA data, over 90 percent of plants have average influent TOC levels below 6 mg/L [USEPA 2003c]). Of the plants that conducted an Information Collection Rule GAC treatment study, approximately 70 percent of the surface water plants studied could meet the 0.080 mg/L TTHM and 0.060 mg/L HAA5 MCLs, with a 20 percent safety factor (i.e., 0.064 mg/L and 0.048 mg/L, respectively) using GAC with 10 minutes of empty bed contact time and a 120 day reactivation frequency, and 78 percent of the plants could meet the MCLs with a 20 percent safety factor using GAC with 20 minutes of empty bed contact time and a 240 day reactivation frequency. Because the treatment studies were conducted at plants with much poorer water quality than the national average, EPA believes that much higher percentages of plants nationwide could meet the MCLs with the proposed GAC BATs.

Among plants using GAC, larger systems would likely realize an economic benefit from on-site reactivation, which could allow them to use smaller, 10-minute empty bed contact time reactors with more frequent reactivation (i.e., 120 days or less). Most small systems would not find it economically advantageous to install on-site carbon reactivation facilities, and thus would opt for larger, 20-minute empty bed contact time reactors, with less frequent carbon replacement (i.e., 240 days or less).

The Information Collection Rule treatment study results also demonstrated that nanofiltration was the better DBP control technology for ground water sources with high TOC concentrations (i.e., above approximately 6 mg/L). The results of the membrane treatment studies showed that all ground water plants could meet the 0.080 mg/L TTHM and 0.060 mg/L HAA5 MCLs, with a 20% safety factor (i.e., 0.064 mg/L and 0.048 mg/L, respectively) at the system average distribution system residence time using nanofiltration. Nanofiltration would be less expensive than GAC for high TOC ground waters, which generally require minimal pretreatment prior to the membrane process. Also, nanofiltration is an accepted technology for treatment of high TOC ground waters in Florida and parts of the Southwest, areas of the country with elevated TOC levels in ground waters.

The second method that EPA used to examine alternatives for BAT was the Surface Water Analytical Tool model that was developed to compare alternative regulatory strategies as part of the Stage 1 and Stage 2 M–DBP Advisory Committee deliberations. EPA modeled a number of BAT options. In the model, GAC10 was defined as granular activated carbon with an empty bed contact time of 10 minutes and a reactivation or replacement interval of 90 days or longer. GAC20 was defined as granular activated carbon with an empty bed contact time of 20 minutes and a reactivation or replacement interval of 90 days or longer.

The compliance percentages forecasted by the SWAT model are indicated in Table IV.D–1. EPA estimates that more than 97 percent of large systems will be able to achieve the Stage 2 MCLs with the GAC BAT, regardless of post-disinfection choice (Seidel Memo, 2001). Because the source water quality (e.g., DBP precursor levels) in medium and small systems is expected to be comparable to or better than that for the large system (USEPA 2005f), EPA believes it is conservative to assume that at least 90 percent of medium and small systems will be able to achieve the Stage 2 MCLs if they were to apply one of the proposed GAC BATs. EPA assumes that small systems may adopt GAC20 in a replacement mode (with replacement every 240 days) over GAC10 because it may not be economically feasible for some small systems to install and operate an on-site GAC reactivation facility. Moreover, some small systems may find nanofiltration cheaper than the GAC20 in a replacement mode if their specific geographic locations cause a relatively high cost for routine GAC shipment.
The BAT requirements for large consecutive systems are the same as proposed, but the requirements have changed for small consecutive systems. EPA believes that the best compliance strategy for consecutive systems is to collaborate with wholesalers on the water quality they need. For consecutive systems that are having difficulty meeting the MCLs, EPA is specifying a BAT of chloramination with management of hydraulic flow and storage to minimize residence time in the distribution system for systems serving at least 10,000 and management of hydraulic flow and storage to minimize residence time in the distribution system for systems serving fewer than 10,000. EPA believes that small consecutive systems can use this BAT to comply with the Stage 2 DBPR, but if they cannot, then they can apply to the State for a variance.

Chloramination has been used for residual disinfection for many years to minimize the formation of chlorination DBPs, including TTHM and HAAs (USEPA 2003d). EPA estimates that over 50 percent of large subpart H systems serving at least 10,000 use chloramination for Stage 1. The BAT provision to manage hydraulic flow and minimize residence time in the distribution system is to facilitate the maintenance of the chloramine residual and minimize the likelihood for nitrification. EPA has not included chloramination for consecutive systems as part of the BAT for systems serving fewer than 10,000 due to concerns about their ability to properly control the process, given that many have no treatment capability or expertise and the Agency’s concern about such systems having operational difficulties such as distribution system nitrification.

EPA believes that the BATs for nonconsecutive systems are not appropriate for consecutive systems because their efficacy in controlling DBPs is based on precursor removal. Consecutive systems face the unique challenge of receiving waters in which DBPs are already present if the wholesale system has used a residual disinfectant, which the BATs for nonconsecutive systems do not effectively remove. GAC is not cost-effective for removing DBPs. Nanofiltration is only moderately effective at removing THMs or HAAs if membranes with a very low molecular weight cutoff (and very high cost of operation are employed). Therefore, GAC and nanofiltration are not appropriate BATs for consecutive systems.

3. Summary of Major Comments

Commenters concurred with EPA’s identification of BATs for nonconsecutive systems but expressed concern about the BAT for consecutive systems. Many commenters agreed that Stage 2 compliance for consecutive systems would usually best be achieved by improved treatment by the wholesale system. However, they noted that the proposed BAT may not be practical for compliance if water delivered to the consecutive system is at or near DBP MCLs. In addition, chloramination requires operator supervision and adjustment and many consecutive systems that buy water may be reluctant to operate chemical feed systems.

E. Compliance Schedules

1. Today’s Rule

This section specifies compliance dates for the IDSE and MCL compliance requirements in today’s rule. As described elsewhere in Section IV of this preamble, today’s rule requires PWSs to carry out the following activities:

- Conduct initial distribution system evaluations (IDSEs) on a required schedule. Systems may comply by using one of four approaches for which they qualify (standard monitoring, system specific study, 40/30 certification, or very small system waiver).
- Determine Stage 2 monitoring locations based on the IDSE.
- Comply with Stage 2 MCLs on a required schedule.

Compliance dates for these activities vary by PWS size. Table IV.E–1 and Figure IV.E–1 specify IDSE and Stage 2 compliance dates. Consecutive systems of any size must comply with the requirements of the Stage 2 DBPR on the same schedule as required for the largest system in the combined distribution system.
# TABLE IV.E–1.—IDSE AND STAGE 2 COMPLIANCE DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Compliance dates by PWS size (retail population served)¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit IDSE monitoring plan OR Submit IDSE system specific study plan OR.</td>
<td>October 1, 2006 ..... April 1, 2007 .......... October 1, 2007 ..... April 1, 2008 ...... Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit 40/30 certification OR ..... Receive very small system waiver from State.</td>
<td>September 30, 2008 March 31, 2009 ..... September 30, 2009 March 31, 2010 .. Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete standard monitoring or system specific study.</td>
<td>January 1, 2009 ..... July 1, 2009 .......... January 1, 2010 ..... July 1, 2010 .. Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit IDSE Report ..................</td>
<td>April 1, 2009 ..... October 1, 2012 .....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin subpart V (Stage 2) compliance monitoring²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Wholesale and consecutive systems that are part of a combined distribution system must comply based on the schedule required of the largest system in the combined distribution system.

² States may grant up to an additional 2 years for systems making capital improvements.
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**Figure IV.E-1. Final Stage 2 DBPR and LT2ESWTR Implementation Schedule.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>Year 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems serving at least 100,000 people&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypto monitoring</td>
<td>IDSE mon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDSE Plan Due</td>
<td>IDSE Report Due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems serving 50,000 to 99,999 people&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypto monitoring</td>
<td>IDSE mon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDSE Plan Due</td>
<td>IDSE Report Due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems serving 10,000 to 49,999 people&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypto monitoring</td>
<td>IDSE mon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDSE Plan Due</td>
<td>IDSE Report Due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems serving fewer than 10,000 people&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypto mon.</td>
<td>Treatment Installation&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Possible Extension&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDSE mon.</td>
<td>IDSE Report Due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes all systems that are part of a combined distribution system that has a largest system with this population.

<sup>2</sup> A State may grant up to a two year extension for systems to comply if the State determines that additional time is necessary for capital improvements needed for compliance.

<sup>3</sup> Subpart H systems serving fewer than 10,000 that must conduct Crypto monitoring have an additional 12 months to comply with Stage 2 DBPR MCLs.
2. Background and Analysis

The compliance schedule in today’s final rule stems from the risk-targeted approach of the rule, wherein PWSs conduct initial monitoring to determine locations and concentrations of high DBPs. A primary objective of this schedule is to ensure that PWSs identify locations with high DBP concentrations and provide appropriate additional treatment in a timely manner for high risk areas, while not requiring low risk systems to add additional treatment. The compliance schedule balances the objective of early risk-targeted monitoring with adequate time for PWSs and the State or primacy agency to assure full implementation and compliance. EPA is establishing concurrent compliance schedules under the Stage 2 DBPR for all systems (both wholesale systems and consecutive systems) in a particular combined distribution system because this will assure comparable risk-based targeting information being available at the same time for all PWSs that are part of a combined distribution system and thereby allow for more cost-effective compliance with TTHM and HAA5 MCLs.

SDWA section 1412(b)(10) states that a drinking water regulation shall take effect 3 years from the promulgation date unless the Administrator determines that an earlier date is practicable. Today’s rule requires PWSs to begin monitoring prior to 3 years from the promulgation date. Based on EPA’s assessment and recommendations of the Advisory Committee, as described in this section, EPA has determined that these monitoring start dates are practicable and appropriate.

Systems must submit their IDSE plans (monitoring plans for standard monitoring, study plans for system specific studies) to the primacy agency for review and approval. The State or primacy agency will then have 12 months to review, and, as necessary, consult with the system. A number of PWSs will then conduct one year of distribution system monitoring for TTHM and HAA5 at locations other than those currently used for Stage 1 DBPR compliance monitoring. At the conclusion of this monitoring, these PWSs have three months to evaluate analysis and monitoring results and submit Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations and schedules to the State or primacy agency. Where required, PWSs must provide the necessary level of treatment to comply with the Stage 2 MCLs within three years of the completion of State or primacy agency review of the IDSE report, though States may allow an additional two years for PWSs making capital improvements.

EPA has modified the proposed compliance schedule to stagger monitoring start dates for PWSs serving 10,000 to 99,999 people and to allow more time for development and review of IDSE monitoring plans prior to the start of monitoring. The following discussion addresses these changes from the proposal.

The proposed rule required all PWSs serving at least 10,000 people (plus smaller systems that are part of a combined distribution system with a PWS that serves at least 10,000 people) to complete IDSE monitoring and submit IDSE reports (including recommended Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations) two years after rule promulgation, followed by one year for review of IDSE reports, after which systems had three years to come into compliance with Stage 2B MCLs.

Under today’s final rule, PWSs serving at least 100,000 people (plus smaller systems that are part of the combined distribution system) will meet the same Stage 2 compliance deadlines as proposed. However, the timing of the IDSE has been changed to allow for a more even workload and a greater opportunity for primacy agency involvement (e.g., through monitoring plan review and approval). The IDSE plan submission dates for PWSs serving 50,000 to 99,999 people (plus smaller systems that are part of the combined distribution system) will be 12 months after the effective date; for PWSs serving 10,000 to 49,999 (plus smaller systems that are part of the combined distribution system), the IDSE plan submission dates will be 18 months after the effective date. The Stage 2 compliance schedule for systems serving fewer than 10,000 people remains the same as proposed. Stage 2 MCL compliance dates are modified accordingly.

This staggering of IDSE start dates for PWSs serving 10,000 to 99,999 people is advantageous in several respects:

- Provides PWSs greater assurance that IDSEs are properly conducted by requiring IDSE plan review prior to conducting the IDSE.
- Provides additional time to develop budgets and establish contracts with laboratories.
- Spreads out the workload for technical assistance and guidance. The staggered schedule will allow States and EPA to provide more support to individual PWSs as needed.
- Provides time for DBP analytical laboratories to build capacity as needed to accommodate the sample analysis needs of PWSs and extends and smooths the demand for laboratory services.
- Maintains simultaneous rule compliance with the LT2ESWR as recommended by the Stage 2 M-DBP Advisory Committee and as mandated by the 1996 SDWA Amendments, which require that EPA “minimize the overall risk of adverse health effects by balancing the risk from the contaminant and the risk from other contaminants the concentrations of which may be affected by the use of a treatment technique or process that would be employed to attain the maximum contaminant level” (Sec. 1412(b)(5)(B)(i)).

The Advisory Committee recommended the Initial Distribution System Evaluation, as discussed in Section IV.F, and EPA is finalizing an IDSE schedule generally consistent with the Advisory Committee timeframe recommendation, but modified to stagger the schedule for systems serving more than 10,000 but less than 100,000, and to address public comments on the IDSE requirements.

For all systems, the IDSE schedule has been revised to allow systems to submit and States or primacy agencies to review (and revise, if necessary) systems’ recommendations for IDSE and Stage 2 monitoring locations, while still allowing systems three years after completion of the State or primacy agency review of Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations to make necessary treatment and operational changes to comply with Stage 2 MCLs.

Figure IV.E–2 illustrates compliance schedules for examples of three combined distribution systems, with the schedule dictated by the retail population served by the largest system.

---

**Figure IV.E–2.—Schedule Examples.**

---

- Wholesale system (pop. 64,000) with three consecutive systems (pops. 21,000; 15,000; 5,000):
  - IDSE monitoring plan due for all systems April 1, 2007 since wholesale system serves 50,000–99,999
  - Stage 2 compliance beginning October 1, 2012 for all systems
- Wholesale system (pop. 4,000) with three consecutive systems (pops. 21,000; 5,000; 5,000):
This schedule requires wholesale systems and consecutive systems that are part of a combined distribution system with at least one system with an earlier compliance deadline to conduct their IDSE simultaneously so that the wholesale system will be aware of compliance challenges facing the consecutive systems and will be able to implement treatment plant, capital, and operational improvements as necessary to ensure compliance of both the wholesale and consecutive systems. The Advisory Committee and EPA both recognized that DBPs, once formed, are difficult to remove and are generally best addressed by treatment plant improvements, typically through precursor removal or use of alternative disinfectants. For a wholesale system to make the best decisions concerning the treatment steps necessary to meet TTHM and HAA5 LRAAs under the Stage 2 DBPR, both in its own distribution system and in the distribution systems of consecutive systems it serves, the wholesale system must know the DBP levels throughout the combined distribution system. Without this information, the wholesale system may design treatment changes that allow the wholesale system to achieve compliance, but leave the consecutive system out of compliance.

In summary, the compliance schedule for today’s rule maintains the earliest compliance dates recommended by the Advisory Committee for PWS serving at least 100,000 people (plus smaller systems that are part of the combined distribution system). These PWSs serve the majority of people. The schedule also maintains the latest compliance dates the Advisory Committee recommended, which apply to PWSs serving fewer than 10,000 people. EPA has staggered compliance schedules for PWSs between these two size categories in order to facilitate implementation of the rule. This staggered schedule is consistent with the schedule required under the LT2ESWTR promulgated elsewhere in today’s Federal Register.

3. Summary of Major Comments

EPA received significant public comment on the compliance schedule in the August 18, 2003 proposal. Major issues raised by commenters include providing more time for PWSs to prepare for monitoring, giving States or primacy agencies more time to oversee monitoring, and establishing consistent schedules for consecutive PWSs. A summary of these comments and EPA’s responses follows.

Standard monitoring plan and system-specific study plan preparation. Many commenters were concerned about the proposed requirement to develop and execute an IDSE monitoring plan without any primacy agency review. PWSs specifically expressed concern about the financial commitment without prior State approval and noted that some PWSs would need more than the time allowed under the proposed rule to develop and implement an IDSE monitoring plan, especially without an opportunity for State or primacy agency review and approval. Smaller PWSs may require substantial time and planning to budget for IDSE expenses, especially for systems that have not previously complied with DBP MCLs.

EPA recognizes these concerns and today’s final rule provides time for PWSs to submit IDSE plans (monitoring plans, study plans, or 40/30 certifications) for State or primacy agency review and more time before having to begin monitoring. Specifically, PWSs serving 50,000 to 99,999 people and those serving 10,000 to 49,999 people must submit IDSE plans about 12 months and 18 months after the effective date, respectively, and complete standard monitoring or a system-specific study within two years after submitting their IDSE plan. This is significantly more time than was specified under the proposal, where these systems would have had to conduct their IDSE and submit their IDSE report 24 months after the effective date. PWSs serving at least 100,000 people must submit IDSE plans about six months after the effective date and complete standard monitoring or a system-specific study about 30 months after the effective date, which also provides more time than was specified under the proposal. PWSs serving fewer than 10,000 people, not associated with a larger system in their combined distribution system, do not begin monitoring until more than 36 months after the effective date.

EPA believes that the final compliance schedule allows PWSs sufficient time to develop IDSE plans with these compliance dates. The schedule also allows 12 months for State or primacy agency review of IDSE plans, which allows additional time for review and for coordination with systems and provides more time to address deficiencies in IDSE plans. This is especially important for smaller PWSs, which are likely to need the most assistance from States. By staggering monitoring start dates, today’s rule also eases implementation by reducing the number of PWSs that will submit plans at any one time, when the most assistance from regulatory agencies will be required.

In summary, today’s schedule has been modified so that systems are required to submit IDSE plans for primacy agency review and approval prior to conducting their IDSE. Systems can consider that their plan has been approved if they have not heard back from the State by the end of the State review period. Systems are also required to conduct the approved monitoring and submit their IDSE report (including the system’s recommended Stage 2 compliance monitoring) for State or primacy agency review on a schedule that allows for systems to still have a minimum of full three years to comply with Stage 2 following State or primacy agency review of the system’s Stage 2 recommended monitoring. As with the review of plans, systems can consider that their IDSE report has been approved if they have not heard back from the State by the end of the State review period.

State/primacy agency oversight. EPA is preparing to support implementation of IDSE requirements that must be completed prior to States achieving primacy. Several States have expressed concern about EPA providing guidance and reviewing reports from systems that the State has permitted, inspected, and worked with for a long time. These States believe that their familiarity with
the systems enables them to make the best decisions to implement the rule and protect public health and that the rule requirement should be delayed until States receive primacy. Commenters were concerned that some States will not participate in early implementation activities and indicated that States would prefer monitoring to begin 24 months after rule promulgation. Commenters also noted that States need sufficient time to become familiar with the rule, train their staff, prepare primary packages, and train PWSs.

EPA agrees that State familiarity is an important component of the review and approval process, looks forward to working closely with the State drinking water program representatives during IDSE implementation, and welcomes proactive State involvement. However, the Agency believes that delaying implementation of risk-based IDSE targeting activities until States receive primacy is an unacceptable delay in public health protection and also inconsistent with the Advisory Committee’s recommendations. EPA remains committed to working with States to the greatest extent feasible to implement today’s rule, consistent with the schedule promulgated today. For States unable to actively participate in IDSE implementation, however, EPA believes it has an obligation to provide support and guidance to PWSs who are covered and independently responsible for complying with the IDSE requirements of today’s rule and is prepared to assist in implementation. Moreover, EPA believes that the staggered compliance schedule in today’s final rule will enhance States’ ability to help implement the rule.

Consecutive systems. Most commenters supported consecutive systems being on the same IDSE schedule as wholesale systems, recognizing the benefits of treatment plant capital and operational improvements by the wholesale system as the preferred method of DBP compliance, with the timely collection of DBP data throughout the combined distribution system a key component. Several commenters preferred that consecutive systems have a later Stage 2 compliance date to allow for evaluation of whether wholesale system treatment changes are adequate to ensure compliance and to consider changes to water delivery specifications. EPA disagrees with those commenters recommending a different Stage 2 compliance date and thus has maintained the approach in the proposal, which keeps all systems that are part of a combined distribution system (the interconnected distribution system consisting of the distribution systems of wholesale systems and of the consecutive systems that receive finished water) on the same Stage 2 compliance schedule. Extending the Stage 2 compliance dates would unnecessarily delay the public health protection afforded by this rule. Consecutive systems must be able to evaluate whether wholesale system changes are sufficient to ensure compliance and, if they are not, to make cost-effective changes to ensure compliance where wholesale system efforts address some, but not all, of the concerns with compliance. Public health protection through compliance with Stage 2 MCLs will occur on the schedule of the largest system for all systems in the combined distribution system (regardless of size). If a consecutive system must make capital improvements to comply with this rule, the State may use its existing authority to grant up to an additional 24 months to that system. In addition, implementation and data tracking will be simplified because all systems in a combined distribution system will be on the same IDSE and Stage 2 compliance schedule. EPA believes that this is a better approach from both a public health standpoint and an implementation standpoint.

EPA agrees with many commenters that a high level of coordination among wholesaler, consecutive system, and States will be necessary to ensure compliance. The schedule in today’s rule provides more time for planning, reviewing, and conducting the IDSE than the schedule in the proposed rule, which will allow more time for necessary coordination, including small consecutive systems that need help in negotiations with their wholesale system. EPA will work with ASDWA and States to develop guidance to facilitate wholesale/consecutive system cooperation. This additional time and the staggered schedule discussed in this section also lessens the laboratory burden associated with IDSE monitoring.

The staggered schedule also helps address commenter concerns about evaluating combined distribution systems. Other commenters’ concerns about time needed for developing contracts between systems and for planning, funding, and implementing treatment changes are addressed by not requiring Stage 2 compliance until at least six years following rule promulgation.

F. Initial Distribution System Evaluation (IDSE)

1. Today’s Rule

Today’s rule establishes requirements for systems to perform an Initial Distribution System Evaluation (IDSE). The IDSE is intended to identify sample locations for Stage 2 compliance monitoring that represent distribution system sites with high DBP concentrations. Systems will develop an IDSE plan, collect data on DBP levels throughout their distribution system, evaluate these data to determine which sampling locations are most representative of high DBP levels, and compile this information into a report for submission to the State or primary agency. Systems must complete one IDSE to meet the requirements of today’s rule.

a. Applicability. This requirement applies to all community water systems, and to large nontransient noncommunity water systems (those serving at least 10,000 people) that use a primary or residual disinfectant other than ultraviolet light, or that deliver water that has been treated with a primary or residual disinfectant other than ultraviolet light. Systems serving fewer than 500 people are covered by the very small system waiver provisions of today’s rule and are not required to complete an IDSE if they have TTHM and HAAs data collected under Subpart L. Consecutive systems are subject to the IDSE requirements of today’s rule. Consecutive systems must comply with IDSE requirements on the same schedule as the system serving the largest population in the combined distribution system, as described in section IV.E.

b. Data collection. For those systems not receiving a very small system waiver, there are three possible approaches by which a system can meet the IDSE requirement.

i. Standard monitoring. Standard monitoring requires one year of DBP monitoring throughout the distribution system on a specified schedule. Prior to commencing standard monitoring, systems must prepare a monitoring plan and submit it to the primary agency for review. The frequency and number of samples required under standard monitoring is determined by source water type and system size. The number of samples does not depend on the number of plants per system. Section IV.G provides a detailed discussion of the specific population-based monitoring requirements for IDSE standard monitoring. Although standard monitoring results are not to be used for determining compliance with MCLs,
systems are required to include individual sample results for the IDSE results when determining the range of TTHM and HAA5 levels to be reported in their Consumer Confidence Report (see section IV.J).

ii. System specific study. Under this approach, systems may choose to perform a system specific study based on earlier monitoring studies or distribution system hydraulic models in lieu of standard monitoring. Prior to commencing a system specific study, systems must prepare a study plan and submit it to the primacy agency for approval. The two options for system specific studies are: (1) TTHM and HAA5 monitoring data that encompass a wide range of sample sites representative of the entire distribution system, including those judged to represent high TTHM and HAA5 concentrations, and (2) extended period simulation hydraulic models that simulate water age in the distribution system, in conjunction with one round of TTHM and HAA5 sampling.

iii. 40/30 certification. Under this approach, systems must certify to their State or primacy agency that every individual compliance sample taken under subpart L during the period specified in Table IV.F–2 were less than or equal to 0.040 mg/L for TTHM and less than or equal to 0.030 mg/L for HAA5, and that there were no TTHM or HAA5 monitoring violations during the same period. The State or primacy agency may require systems to submit compliance monitoring results, distribution system schematics, or recommend subpart V compliance monitoring locations as part of the certification. This certification must be kept on file and submitted to the State or primacy agency for review. Systems that qualify for reduced monitoring for the Stage 1 DBPR during the two years prior to the start of the IDSE may use results of reduced Stage 1 DBPR monitoring to prepare the 40/30 certification. The requirements for the 40/30 certification are listed in Table IV.F–1.

### TABLE IV.F–1.—40/30 CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40/30 Certification Requirements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A certification that every individual compliance sample taken under subpart L during the period specified in Table IV.F–2 were less than or equal to 0.040 mg/L for TTHM and less than or equal to 0.030 mg/L for HAA5, and that there were no TTHM or HAA5 monitoring violations during the same period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance monitoring results, distribution system schematics, and/or recommended subpart V compliance monitoring locations as required by the State or primacy agency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IV.F–2.—40/30 ELIGIBILITY DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If your 40/30 Certification Is Due</th>
<th>Then your eligibility for 40/30 certification is based on eight consecutive calendar quarters of subpart L compliance monitoring results beginning no earlier than¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹ Unless you are on reduced monitoring under subpart L and were not required to monitor during the specified period. If you did not monitor during the specified period, you must base your eligibility on compliance samples taken during the 12 months preceding the specified period.

c. Implementation. All systems subject to the IDSE requirement under this final rule (except those covered by the very small system waiver) must prepare and submit an IDSE plan (monitoring plan for standard monitoring, study plan for system specific study) or 40/30 certification to the State or primacy agency. IDSE plans and 40/30 certifications must be submitted according to the schedule described in section IV.E and IV.M. The requirements for the IDSE plan depend on the IDSE approach that the system selects and are listed in Tables IV.F–1 and IV.F–3.

### TABLE IV.F–3.—IDSE MONITORING PLAN REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDSE data collection alternative</th>
<th>IDSE plan requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Standard Monitoring              | • Schematic of the distribution system (including distribution system entry points and their sources, and storage facilities), with notes indicating locations and dates of all projected standard monitoring, and all projected subpart L compliance monitoring.  
  • Justification for all standard monitoring locations selected and a summary of data relied on to select those locations.  
  • Population served and system type (subpart H or ground water). |
| System Specific Study:           |                                                                                                        |
| Hydraulic Model                  |                                                                                                        |
|                                  | Hydraulic models must meet the following criteria:  
  • Extended period simulation hydraulic model.  
  • Simulate 24 hour variation in demand and show a consistently repeating 24 hour pattern of residence time.  
  • Represent 75% of pipe volume; 50% of pipe length; all pressure zones; all 12-inch diameter and larger pipes; all 8-inch and larger pipes that connect pressure zones, influence zones from different sources, storage facilities, major demand areas, pumps, and control valves, or are known or expected to be significant conveyors of water; all pipes 6 inches and larger that connect remote areas of a distribution system to the main portion of the system; all storage facilities with standard operations represented in the model; all active pump stations with controls represented in the model; and all active control valves. |
TABLE IV.F–3.—IDSE MONITORING PLAN REQUIREMENTS—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDSE data collection alternative</th>
<th>IDSE plan requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The model must be calibrated, or have calibration plans, for the current configuration of the distribution system during the period of high TTHM formation potential. All storage facilities must be evaluated as part of the calibration process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All required calibration must be completed no later than 12 months after plan submission. Submission must include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tabular or spreadsheet data demonstrating percent of total pipe volume and pipe length represented in the model, broken out by pipe diameter, and all required model elements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A description of all calibration activities undertaken, and if calibration is complete, a graph of predicted tank levels versus measured tank levels for the storage facility with the highest residence time in each pressure zone, and a time series graph of the residence time at the longest residence time storage facility in the distribution system showing the predictions for the entire simulation period (i.e., from time zero until the time it takes for the model to reach a consistently repeating pattern of residence time).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Model output showing preliminary 24 hour average residence time predictions throughout the distribution system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing and number of samples planned for at least one round of TTHM and HAA5 monitoring at a number of locations no less than would be required for the system under standard monitoring in §141.601 during the historical month of high TTHM. These samples must be taken at locations other than existing subpart L compliance monitoring locations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of how all requirements will be completed no later than 12 months after submission of the system specific study plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schematic of the distribution system (including distribution system entry points and their sources, and storage facilities), with notes indicating the locations and dates of all completed system specific study monitoring (if calibration is complete) and all subpart L compliance monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Population served and system type (subpart H or ground water).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the model submitted does not fully meet the requirements, the system must correct the deficiencies and respond to State inquiries on a schedule the State approves, or conduct standard monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV.F–4.—SSS EXISTING MONITORING DATA SAMPLE REQUIREMENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System type</th>
<th>Population size category</th>
<th>Number of monitoring locations</th>
<th>Number of samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TTHM</td>
<td>HAA5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart H:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–3,300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,301–9,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–49,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000–249,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000–999,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The State or primacy agency will approve the IDSE plan or 40/30 certification, or request modifications. If the State or primacy agency has not taken action by the date specified in section IV.E or has not notified the system that review is not yet complete, systems may consider their submissions to be approved. Systems must implement the IDSE option described in the IDSE plan approved by the State or primacy agency according to the schedule described in section IV.E. All systems completing standard monitoring or a system specific study must submit a report to the State or primacy agency according to the schedule described in section IV.E. Systems that have completed their system specific study at the time of monitoring plan submission may submit a combined monitoring plan and report on the required schedule for IDSE plan submissions. The requirements for the IDSE report are listed in Table IV.F–5. Some of these reporting requirements have changed from the proposal to reduce reporting and paperwork burden on systems.

### Table IV.F–5.—IDSE Report Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDSE data collection alternative</th>
<th>IDSE report requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Standard Monitoring ................ | - All subpart L compliance monitoring and standard monitoring TTHM and HAA5 analytical results in a tabular format acceptable to the State.  
- If changed from the monitoring plan, a schematic of the distribution system, population served, and system type.  
- An explanation of any deviations from the approved monitoring plan.  
- Recommendations and justifications for subpart V compliance monitoring locations and timing.  
- All subpart L compliance monitoring and all system specific study monitoring TTHM and HAA5 analytical results conducted during the period of the system specific study in a tabular or spreadsheet form acceptable to the State.  
- If changed from the study plan, a schematic of the distribution system, population served, and system type.  
- If using the modeling provision, include final information for required plan submissions and a 24-hour time series graph of residence time for each subpart V compliance monitoring location selected.  
- An explanation of any deviations from the original study plan.  
- All analytical and modeling results used to select subpart V compliance monitoring locations that show that the system specific study characterized TTHM and HAA5 levels throughout the entire distribution system.  
- Recommendations and justifications for subpart V compliance monitoring locations and timing. |
| System Specific Study .............. | - All systems must prepare Stage 2 compliance monitoring recommendations. All IDSE reports must include recommendations for Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations and sampling schedule. Systems submitting a 40/30 certification must include their Stage 2 compliance monitoring recommendations in their Stage 2 (Subpart V) monitoring plan unless the State requests Subpart V site recommendations as part of the 40/30 certification. The number of sampling locations and the criteria for their selection are described in § 141.605 of today’s final rule, and in section IV.G. Generally, a system must recommend locations with the highest LRAAs unless it provides a rationale (such as ensuring geographical coverage of the distribution system instead of clustering all sites in a particular section of the distribution system) for selecting other locations. In evaluating possible Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations, systems must consider both Stage 1 DBPR compliance data and IDSE data. The State or primacy agency will approve the IDSE report or request modifications. If the State or primacy agency has not taken action by the date specified in section IV.E or has not notified the system that review is not yet complete, systems may consider their submission to be approved and prepare to begin Stage 2 compliance monitoring. EPA has developed the Initial Distribution System Evaluation Guidance Manual for the Final Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (USEPA 2006) to assist systems with implementing each of these requirements. This guidance may be requested from EPA’s Safe Drinking |
Water Hotline, which may be contacted as described under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT in the beginning of this notice. This guidance manual is also available on the EPA Web site at http://www.epa.gov/safewater/stage2/index.html.

2. Background and Analysis

In the Stage 2 DBPR proposal (USEPA, 2003a), EPA proposed requirements for systems to complete an IDSE. The Agency based its proposal upon the Stage 2 M–DBP Advisory Committee recommendations in the Agreement in Principle. The Advisory Committee believed and EPA concurs that maintaining Stage 1 DBPR monitoring sites for the Stage 2 DBPR would not accomplish the risk-targeting objective of minimizing high DBP levels and providing consistent and equitable protection across the distribution system. Most of these requirements have not changed from the proposed rule. The data collection requirements of the IDSE are designed to find both high TTHM and high HAA5 sites (see section IV.G for IDSE monitoring requirements). High TTHM and HAA5 concentrations often occur at different locations in the distribution system. The Stage 1 DBPR monitoring sites identified as the maximum location are selected according to residence time. HAAs can degrade in the distribution system in the absence of sufficient disinfectant residual (Baribeau et al. 2000). Consequently, residence time is not an ideal criterion for identifying high HAA5 sites. In addition, maximum residence time locations that are associated with high TTHM levels may not be constant due to daily or seasonal changes in demand. The analysis of maximum residence time completed for the selection of Stage 1 monitoring sites may not have been capable of detecting these variations. The Information Collection Rule data show that over 60 percent of the highest HAA5 LRAAs and 50 percent of the highest TTHM LRAAs were found at sampling locations in the distribution system other than the maximum residence time compliance monitoring location (USEPA 2003a). Therefore, the method and assumptions used to select the Information Collection Rule monitoring sites and the Stage 1 DBPR compliance monitoring sites may not reliably capture high DBP levels for Stage 2 DBPR compliance monitoring sites.

a. Standard monitoring. The Advisory Committee recommended that systems sample throughout the distribution system a number of locations as required under Stage 1 and, using these results in addition to Stage 1 compliance data, identify high DBP locations. Monitoring at additional sites increases the chance of finding sites with high DBP levels and targets both DBPs that degrade and DBPs that form as residence time increases in the distribution system. EPA believes that the required number of standard monitoring locations plus Stage 1 monitoring results will provide an adequate characterization of DBP levels throughout the distribution system at a reasonable cost. By revising Stage 2 compliance monitoring plans to target locations with high DBPs, systems will be required to take steps to address high DBP levels at locations that might otherwise have gone undetected.

The Advisory Committee recommended that an IDSE be performed by all community water systems, unless the system had sufficiently low DBP levels or is a very small system with a simple distribution system. EPA believes that large nontransient noncommunity water systems (NTNCWS) (those serving at least 10,000 people) also have distribution systems that require further evaluation to determine the locations most representative of high DBP levels and proposed that they be required to conduct an IDSE. Therefore, large NTNCWS and all community water systems are required to comply with IDSE requirements under today’s final rule, unless they submit a 40/30 certification or they are covered by the very small system waiver provisions.

b. Very small system waivers. Systems serving fewer people that have taken samples under the Stage 1 DBPR will receive a very small system waiver. EPA proposed and the Advisory Committee recommended a very small system waiver following a State determination that the existing Stage 1 compliance monitoring location adequately characterizes both high TTHM and high HAA5 for the distribution system because many very small systems have small or simple distribution systems. The final rule grants the very small system waiver to all systems serving fewer than 500 that have Stage 1 DBPR data. This provision was changed from the proposal to reflect that most very small systems that sample under the Stage 1 DBPR have sampling locations that are representative of both high TTHM and high HAA5 because most very small systems have small and simple distribution systems. In addition, many very small systems are ground water systems that typically have stable DBP levels that tend to be lower than surface water DBP levels. NRWA survey data show that free chlorine residual in very small systems (serving <500) at both average residence time and maximum residence time locations are lower than levels at both of those locations in larger systems, and the change in residual concentration between those two locations is smaller in very small systems compared to larger sized systems. The magnitude of the reduction in residual concentration gives an indication of how much disinfectant has reacted to form DBPs, including TTHM and HAA5. The smaller reduction in disinfectant concentration between average residence time and maximum residence time in very small systems compared to larger systems indicates that DBP formation potential is probably lower in very small systems compared to larger systems, and the likelihood for significant DBP variation within the distribution system of very small systems is low if the distribution system is small and not complex. However, there may be some small systems with extended or complex distribution systems that should be studied further to determine new sampling locations. For this reason, States or primary agencies can require any particular very small system to conduct an IDSE. Very small systems subject to the Stage 2 DBPR that do not have a Stage 1 compliance monitoring location may monitor in accordance with the Stage 1 DBPR provisions to be eligible for this waiver.

c. 40/30 certifications. Systems that certify to their State or primary agency that all compliance samples taken during eight consecutive calendar quarters prior to the start of the IDSE were ≤0.040 mg/L TTHM and ≤0.030 mg/L HAA5 are not required to collect additional DBP monitoring data under the IDSE requirements as long as the system has no TTHM or HAA5 monitoring violations. These criteria were developed because both EPA and the Advisory Committee determined that these systems most likely would not have DBP levels that exceed the MCLs. Systems must have qualifying TTHM and HAA5 data for eight consecutive calendar quarters according to the schedule in Table IV.F–2 to be eligible for this option. Systems on reduced monitoring that did not monitor during the specified time period may use data from the prior year to meet the 40/30 certification criteria. Systems that have not previously conducted Stage 1 DBPR compliance monitoring may begin such monitoring to collect the data necessary to qualify for 40/30 certification. The certification and data supporting it must be available to the public upon request.
The qualifying time period for the 40/30 certification has changed from the proposed rule. Under the proposed rule, the rule language identified a specific two year window with start and end dates. In today’s final rule, the qualifying time period has been changed to “eight consecutive calendar quarters of subpart L compliance monitoring results beginning no earlier than * * *” (see Table IV.F–2). This change was made so that systems have made a treatment change within the two years prior to rule promulgation and have collected initial data that meet the 40/30 criteria might have the opportunity to collect eight consecutive quarters of qualifying data and apply for a 40/30 certification. This schedule change also allows systems that have not previously monitored under Stage 1 an opportunity to qualify for a 40/30 certification.

Under the proposed Stage 2 DBPR, systems that missed the deadline for submitting a 40/30 certification would be required either to submit monitoring or a system specific study approach, even if the system otherwise qualified for the 40/30 certification. Under today’s final rule, systems that do not make any submission by the IDSE plan submission deadline will still receive a violation, but may submit a late 40/30 certification if their data meet the requirements. This change was made so that systems and primacy agencies do not spend time preparing and reviewing standard monitoring plans and IDSE reports for systems with a low likelihood of finding high TTHM and HAA5 levels.

The reporting requirements for this provision have been reduced from the requirements in the proposed rulemaking. In the proposal, systems qualifying for the 40/30 certification were required to submit all qualifying data and provide recommendations for Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations. The final rule requires systems to submit a certification that their data meet all the requirements of the 40/30 certification and to include their Stage 2 compliance monitoring recommendations in their Stage 2 monitoring plan. These changes were made to reduce the reporting burden on systems that qualify for the 40/30 certification and to maintain consistency with monitoring plan requirements under the Stage 1 DBPR. This approach also gives systems more time to select appropriate monitoring sites for Stage 2 compliance monitoring. The State or primacy agency may request the data, a distribution system schematic, and/or recommendations for Stage 2 compliance monitoring as part of the 40/30 certification. This provision was included to facilitate primary agency review of 40/30 certifications; the additional information is only required if requested by the primacy agency.

d. System specific studies. Advisory Committee members recognized that some systems have detailed knowledge of their distribution systems by way of ongoing hydraulic modeling and/or existing widespread monitoring plans (beyond that required for compliance monitoring) that would provide equivalent or superior monitoring site selection information compared to standard monitoring. Therefore, the Advisory Committee recommended that such systems be allowed to determine new monitoring sites using system-specific data such as hydraulic model results or existing monitoring data; this provision remains in the final rule. In the proposed rule, the only specification for SSSs was to identify monitoring sites that would be equivalent or superior to those identified under Standard Monitoring. The final rule includes more specific requirements on how these studies should be completed. The requirements in the final rule were developed to be consistent with the proposal, yet more specific to help systems better understand expectations under this provision and lessen the chances of a study plan not being approved.

The new modeling requirements were developed to reflect that hydraulic models can identify representative high TTHM monitoring locations by predicting hydraulic residence time in the distribution system. Water age has been found to correlate with TTHM formation in the distribution system. Consequently, for this system specific study approach, hydraulic residence time predicted by the model is used as a surrogate for TTHM formation to locate appropriate Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations. To predict hydraulic residence time in the distribution system, the model must represent most of the distribution system and must have been calibrated recently and appropriately to reflect water age in the distribution system. Requirements to reflect this are in today’s rule. All storage facilities must be evaluated for the calibration, and systems using this option must submit a graph of predicted tank levels versus measured tank levels for the storage facility with the highest residence time in each pressure zone. These calibration requirements are focused on storage facilities because the data is the largest controlling factor for water age in the distribution system. The calibration requirements reflect the fact that the purpose of the model is to predict water age. ICR data show that HAA5 data do not necessarily correlate well with water age (USEPA 2003a). Because the purpose of the IDSE is to locate representative high locations for both TTHM and HAA5, one round of monitoring must be completed at potential Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations to determine appropriate HAA5 monitoring locations during the historical high month of TTHM concentrations. The number of locations must be no less than would be required under standard monitoring.

Preliminary average residence time data are required as a part of the study plan for systems to demonstrate that their distribution system hydraulic model is able to produce results for water age throughout the distribution system, even though calibration may not be complete. Systems also need to describe their plans to complete the modeling requirements within 12 months of submitting the study plan. These last two requirements were developed so that States can be assured that systems have the technical capacity to complete their modeling requirements by the IDSE report deadline. If systems cannot demonstrate that they are in a position to complete the modeling requirements according to the required schedule, they will be required to complete standard monitoring.

All new modeling requirements were added to help systems demonstrate how their model will fulfill the purpose and requirements of the IDSE and to assist primacy agencies with approval determinations. The associated reporting requirements were developed to balance the needs of systems to demonstrate that they have fulfilled the requirements and the needs of primacy agency reviewers to be able to understand the work completed by the system.

EPA has specified new requirements for systems complete an SSSS using existing monitoring data to help systems understand the extent of historical data that would meet the requirements of the IDSE. The number of required sample locations and samples are consistent with sampling requirements under standard monitoring and the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee recommended that systems complete an IDSE sample at twice the number of sites required by the Stage 1 DBPR in addition to Stage 1 DBPR sampling. However, the number of required Stage 1 DBPR monitoring locations varies within each population category under
the Stage 1 plant-based monitoring approach (since systems have different numbers of plants). EPA used the number of required Standard Monitoring locations plus the number of Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations to develop minimum requirements for the use of existing monitoring data for the SSS. The number of required locations and samples are shown in Table IV.F.4.

Systems will use their Stage 1 monitoring results plus additional non-compliance or operational samples to fulfill these requirements. Small systems with many plants may have been collecting a disproportionate number of samples under the Stage 1 DBPR compared to the population based monitoring requirements presented in today’s rule and may have sufficient historical data to characterize the entire distribution system. These requirements allow those systems to submit an SSS based on existing Stage 1 monitoring results, and they also accommodate systems that have been completing additional monitoring throughout the distribution system.

The requirement to sample during the historical month of high THM, high HAA5, or warmest water temperature during each year for which data were collected was added to maintain consistency with the standard monitoring requirements where each location must be sampled one time during the peak historical month.

Samples that qualify for this SSS must have been collected within five years of the study plan submission date and must reflect the current configuration of treatment and the distribution system. Five years was selected as a cut off for eligible data so that all data submitted would be reasonably representative of current source water conditions and DBP formation within the distribution system. Data that are older may not reflect current DBP formation potential in the distribution system. Five years prior to the submission of the study plan also correlates with the signing of the Agreement in Principle where the Advisory Committee made the recommendation for this provision.

Systems interested in using this provision would have started eligible monitoring after the agreement was signed.

Systems that submit existing monitoring data must submit all Stage 1 sample results from the beginning of the SSS to the time when the SSS plan is submitted. The purpose of this requirement is to demonstrate that there have been no significant changes in source water quality since the first samples were collected, especially if all existing monitoring results were taken during the earliest eligible dates. Again, these clarifications were made so that systems could better understand the extent of data necessary for a monitoring plan to be deemed acceptable and be confident that efforts to complete an SSS would be found acceptable to the State or primacy agency.

e. Distribution System Schematics.

EPA has considered security concerns that may result from the requirement for systems to submit a distribution system schematic as part of their IDSE plan. EPA believes that the final rule strikes an appropriate balance between security concerns and the need for States and primacy agencies to be able to review IDSE plans. EPA has developed guidance for systems on how to submit a distribution system schematic that does not include sensitive information.

3. Summary of Major Comments

The Agency received significant comments on the following issues related to the proposed IDSE requirements: Waiver limitations, and State or primacy agency review of IDSE plans.

In the proposed rule, EPA requested comment on what the appropriate criteria should be for States or primacy agencies to grant very small system waivers. Commenters responded with a wide range of suggestions including support for the proposal as written, different population cut-offs, State or primacy agency discretion on what system size should qualify for the waiver, and alternative waiver criteria such as pipe length or number of booster stations. There was no consensus among the commenters on what changes should be made to the proposal for the very small system waiver requirements. EPA did not change the population cutoff for the very small system waiver because analysis of NRWA survey data also showed that systems serving fewer than 500 had different residence times and lower free chlorine residual concentrations compared to other population categories, indicating that larger systems have different DBP formation characteristics compared to very small systems. Some of the suggested changes for very small system waiver criteria may require data that are not readily available to systems (such as pipe length in service) and for which there were no specific criteria proposed or recommended by the commenters. Implementation of subjective very small system waiver criteria would result in reduced public health protection from the rule by allowing higher DBP levels to go undetected.

In addition to addressing the very small system waivers, commenters suggested that different criteria should be used for the 40/30 certification, such as higher minimum DBP levels, cut-offs of 40/30 as LRAAs or RAAs rather than single sample maximums, or State or primacy agency discretion on which systems should qualify for 40/30 certification. There was no consensus among the commenters on what changes should be made to the proposal for the 40/30 certification requirements. EPA did not change the requirements for the 40/30 certification eligibility because the recommended alternatives were not technically superior to the requirements of the proposed rule. Implementation of 40/30 criteria using an LRAA or RAA would result in reduced public health protection from the rule by allowing higher DBP levels to go undetected. EPA did change the eligibility dates and reporting requirements for the 40/30 certification to reduce the burden on the system. Under today’s final rule, States or primacy agencies can request TTHM and HAA5 data as desired for a more in-depth review of a system’s qualifications.

Many commenters expressed concern over the implementation schedule for the IDSE. Commenters were especially concerned that IDSE plans would be developed and implemented prior to State primacy, and once States receive primacy, they might not support the IDSE plan and would reject the results of the completed IDSE. To address this issue, commenters requested the opportunity for States to review the IDSE plans prior to systems completing their IDSEs. In today’s rule EPA has modified the compliance schedule for the Stage 2 DBPR so that systems have the opportunity to complete their IDSE plan and have it reviewed by the primacy agency prior to completing the IDSE to address the concern that States or primacy agencies may reject the results of the completed IDSE. The changes to the compliance schedule are discussed further in section IV.E.

g. Monitoring Requirements and Compliance Determination for TTHM and HAA5 MCLs

EPA is finalizing monitoring requirements under a population-based approach described in this section. EPA believes the population-based approach will provide more representative high DBP concentrations throughout distribution systems than would plant-based monitoring, is equitable, and will simplify implementation for both States and systems. For the very small systems, EPA believes this approach is more appropriate than the proposed plant-
based monitoring. Detailed discussion of the two approaches is presented in the preamble of the proposed rule (USEPA 2003a) and EA for today’s rule (USEPA 2005a).

1. Today’s Rule

Today’s rule establishes TTHM and HAA5 monitoring requirements for all systems based on a population-based monitoring approach instead of a plant-based approach. Under the population-based approach, monitoring requirements are based solely on the retail population served and the type of source water used and not influenced by the number of treatment plants or entry points in the distribution system as in previous rules (i.e., TTHM Rule (USEPA 1979) and Stage 1 DBPR (USEPA 1998a)).

a. IDSE Monitoring. All systems conducting IDSE standard monitoring must collect samples during the peak historical month for DBP levels or water temperature; this will determine their monitoring schedule. Table IV.G–1 contains the IDSE monitoring frequencies and locations for all source water and size category systems. Section IV.F identifies other approaches by which systems can meet IDSE requirements.

b. Routine Stage 2 Compliance Monitoring. For all systems conducting either standard monitoring or a system specific study, initial Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations are based on the system’s IDSE results, together with an analysis of a system’s Stage 1 DBPR compliance monitoring results. Systems receiving 40/30 certification or a very small system waiver, and nontransient noncommunity water systems serving <10,000 not required to conduct an IDSE, base Stage 2 initial compliance monitoring locations on the system’s Stage 1 DBPR compliance monitoring results. Some of these systems may also need an evaluation of distribution system characteristics to identify additional monitoring locations, if required by the transition from plant-based monitoring to population-based monitoring. Systems recommend Stage 2 monitoring locations generally by arraying results of IDSE standard monitoring (or system specific study results) and Stage 1 compliance monitoring by monitoring location (from highest to lowest LRAA for both TTHM and HAA5). Using the protocol in §141.605(c) of today’s rule, systems then select the required number of locations. Larger systems include existing Stage 1 monitoring locations in order to be able to have historical continuity for evaluating how changes in operations or treatment affect DBP levels. Systems may also recommend locations with lower levels of DBPs that would not be picked up by the protocol if they provide a rationale for the recommendation. Examples of rationales include ensuring better distribution system or population coverage (not having all locations in the same area) or maintaining existing locations with DBP levels that are nearly as high as those that would otherwise be selected. The State or primacy agency will review these recommendations as part of the review of the IDSE report submitted by systems that conducted standard monitoring or a system specific study.

Table IV.G–2 contains the routine Stage 2 TTHM and HAA5 compliance monitoring approach instead of a plant-based approach, which systems can meet IDSE requirements.

### Table IV.G–1.—IDSE Monitoring Frequencies and Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source water type</th>
<th>Population size category</th>
<th>Monitoring periods and frequency of sampling</th>
<th>Distribution system monitoring locations 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total per monitoring period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;500 consecutive systems.</td>
<td>one (during peak historical month) 2.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;500 non-consecutive systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500–3,300 non-consecutive systems.</td>
<td>four (every 90 days)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500–3,300 consecutive systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,301–9,999</td>
<td>six (every 60 days)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000–49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000–249,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250,000–999,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000–4,999,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water</td>
<td>&lt;500 consecutive systems.</td>
<td>one (during peak historical month) 2.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;500 non-consecutive systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500–999</td>
<td>four (every 90 days)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000–99,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000–499,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A dual sample set (i.e., a TTHM and an HAA5 sample) must be taken at each monitoring location during each monitoring period.
2. The peak historical month is the month with the highest TTHM or HAA5 levels or the warmest water temperature.
monitoring requirements for all systems (both non-consecutive and consecutive systems), as well as the protocol for Stage 2 compliance monitoring location selection in the IDSE report. Systems that do not have to submit an IDSE report (those receiving a 40/30 certification or very small system waiver and nontransient noncommunity water systems serving <10,000) must conduct Stage 2 compliance monitoring as indicated in the “Total per monitoring period” column at current Stage 1 compliance monitoring locations, unless the State or primacy agency specifically directs otherwise. All systems are then required to maintain and follow a Stage 2 compliance monitoring plan.

### Table IV.G–2. Routine Compliance Monitoring Frequencies and Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source water type</th>
<th>Population size category</th>
<th>Monitoring frequency¹</th>
<th>Distribution system monitoring location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total per monitoring period²</td>
<td>Highest TTHM locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart H:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;500</td>
<td>per year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–3,300</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,301–9,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–49,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000–249,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000–999,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000–4,999,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 5,000,000</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground water:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;500</td>
<td>per year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–9,999</td>
<td>per year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–99,999</td>
<td>per year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000–499,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 500,000</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All systems must monitor during month of highest DBP concentrations.
² Systems on quarterly monitoring must take dual sample sets every 90 days at each monitoring location, except for subpart H systems serving 500–3,300. Systems on annual monitoring and subpart H systems serving 500–3,300 are required to take individual TTHM and HAA5 samples (instead of a dual sample set) at the locations with the highest TTHM and HAA5 concentrations, respectively. Only one location with a dual sample set per monitoring period is needed if highest TTHM and HAA5 concentrations occur at the same location, and month, if monitored annually.

Today’s rule provides States the flexibility to specify alternative Stage 2 compliance monitoring requirements (but not alternative IDSE monitoring requirements) for multiple consecutive systems in a combined distribution system. As a minimum under such an approach, each consecutive system must collect at least one sample among the total number of samples required for the combined distribution system and will base compliance on samples collected within its distribution system. The consecutive system is responsible for ensuring that required monitoring is completed and the system is in compliance. It also must document its monitoring strategy as part of its subpart V monitoring plan.

Consecutive systems not already conducting disinfectant residual monitoring under the Stage 1 DBPR must comply with the monitoring requirements and MRDLs for chlorine and chloramines. States may use the provisions of § 141.134(c) to modify reporting requirements. For example, the State may require that only the consecutive system distribution system point-of-entry disinfectant concentration be reported to demonstrate MRDL compliance, although monitoring requirements may not be reduced.

### Table IV.G–3.—Reduced Monitoring Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source water type</th>
<th>Population size category</th>
<th>Monitoring frequency¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subpart H:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;500</td>
<td>per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monitoring may not be reduced.
TABLE IV.G–3.—REDUCED MONITORING FREQUENCY—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source water type</th>
<th>Population size category</th>
<th>Monitoring frequency</th>
<th>Distribution system monitoring location per monitoring period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 TTHM and 1 HAAS sample: one at the location and during the quarter with the highest TTHM single measurement, one at the location and during the quarter with the highest HAAS single measurement; 1 dual sample set per year if the highest TTHM and HAAS measurements occurred at the same location and quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–3,300</td>
<td>per year</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 dual sample sets: one at the location and during the quarter with the highest TTHM single measurement, one at the location and during the quarter with the highest HAAS single measurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,301–9,999</td>
<td>per year</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 dual sample sets—at the locations with the two highest TTHM and two highest HAAS LRAAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–49,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 dual sample sets—at the locations with the three highest TTHM and three highest HAAS LRAAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000–249,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 dual sample sets—at the locations with the four highest TTHM and four highest HAAS LRAAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000–999,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 dual sample sets—at the locations with the five highest TTHM and five highest HAAS LRAAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000–4,999,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 TTHM and 1 HAAS sample: one at the location and during the quarter with the highest TTHM single measurement, one at the location and during the quarter with the highest HAAS single measurement; 1 dual sample set per year if the highest TTHM and HAAS measurements occurred at the same location and quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥5,000,000</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 dual sample sets: one at the location and during the quarter with the highest TTHM single measurement, one at the location and during the quarter with the highest HAAS single measurement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ground Water:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population size category</th>
<th>Monitoring frequency</th>
<th>Distribution system monitoring location per monitoring period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;500</td>
<td>every third year</td>
<td>1 TTHM and 1 HAAS sample: one at the location and during the quarter with the highest TTHM single measurement, one at the location and during the quarter with the highest HAAS single measurement; 1 dual sample set per year if the highest TTHM and HAAS measurements occurred at the same location and quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–9,999</td>
<td>per year</td>
<td>1 TTHM and 1 HAAS sample: one at the location and during the quarter with the highest TTHM single measurement, one at the location and during the quarter with the highest HAAS single measurement; 1 dual sample set per year if the highest TTHM and HAAS measurements occurred at the same location and quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–99,999</td>
<td>per year</td>
<td>2 dual sample sets: one at the location and during the quarter with the highest TTHM single measurement, one at the location and during the quarter with the highest HAAS single measurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000–499,999</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>2 dual sample sets; at the locations with the highest TTHM and highest HAAS LRAAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥500,000</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td>4 dual sample sets at the locations with the two highest TTHM and two highest HAAS LRAAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Systems on quarterly monitoring must take dual sample sets every 90 days.

ii. Compliance determination. A PWS is in compliance when the annual sample or LRAA of quarterly samples is less than or equal to the MCLs. If an annual sample exceeds the MCL, the system must conduct increased monitoring which may set up an MCL under State/EPA regulations. The system is out of compliance if the consecutive system is in violation because it has the legal responsibility for monitoring under State/EPA regulations.

- If monitoring results in a consecutive system violation, the consecutive system is in violation because it has the legal responsibility for complying with the MCL under State/EPA regulations. The consecutive system may set up a contract with its wholesale system that details water quality delivery specifications.

- If a consecutive system has hired its wholesale system under contract to monitor in the consecutive system and the wholesale system fails to monitor, the consecutive system is in violation because it has the legal responsibility for monitoring under State/EPA regulations.

- If a wholesale system has a violation and provides that water to a consecutive system, the wholesale system is in violation. Whether the consecutive system is in violation will depend on the situation. Whether the consecutive system will also be in violation unless it conducted monitoring that showed that the violation was not present in the consecutive system.

2. Background and Analysis

EPA proposed the plant-based approach for all systems that produce some or all of their finished water and the population-based monitoring approach for systems purchasing all of their finished water year-round. As part of the proposal, EPA presented a monitoring cost analysis for applying this approach to all systems in the Economic Analysis to better understand the impacts of using the population-based approach.

The plant-based approach was adopted from the 1979 TTHM rule and the Stage 1 DBPR and was derived from the generally valid assumption that, as systems increase in size, they tend to have more plants and increased complexity. During the development of the Stage 2 proposal, EPA identified a number of issues associated with the use of the plant-based monitoring approach. These included: (1) Plant-based monitoring is not as effective as population-based monitoring in targeting locations with the highest risk; (2) a plant-based approach can result in disproportionate monitoring requirements for systems serving the same number of people (due to widely varying numbers of plants per system); (3) it cannot be adequately applied to plants or consecutive system entry points that are operated seasonally or intermittently if an LRAA is used for compliance due to complex implementation and a need for repeated transactions between the State and...
system to determine whether and how compliance monitoring requirements may need to be changed; (4) State determinations of monitoring requirements for consecutive systems would be complicated, especially in large combined distribution systems with many connections between systems; and (5) systems with multiple disinfecting wells would have to conduct evaluation of common aquifers in order to avoid taking unnecessary samples for compliance (if they did not conduct such evaluations under Stage 1). EPA requested comment on two approaches to address these issues: (1) keep the plant-based monitoring approach and add new provisions to address specific concerns; and (2) base monitoring requirements on source water type and population served, in lieu of plant-based monitoring.

The final rule’s requirements of population-based monitoring for all systems are based on improved public health protection, flexibility, and simplified implementation. For determining monitoring requirements, EPA’s objective was to maintain monitoring loads consistent with Stage 1 and similar to monitoring loads proposed for Stage 2 under a plant-based approach, using a population-based approach to facilitate implementation, better target high DBP levels, and protect human health. This leads to a more cost-effective characterization of where high levels occur. For the proposed rule, EPA used 1995 CWSS data to derive the number of plants per system for calculating the number of proposed monitoring sites per system. During the comment period, 2000 CWSS data became available.

Compared to the 1995 CWSS, the 2000 CWSS contained questions more relevant for determining the number of plants in each system. Based on 2000 CWSS data, EPA has modified the number of monitoring sites per system for several categories (particularly for the larger subpart H systems) to align the median population-based monitoring requirements with the median monitoring requirements under plant-based monitoring, as was proposed.

EPA also believes that more samples are necessary to characterize larger systems (as defined by population) than for smaller systems. This progressive approach is included in Table IV.G–4. As system size increases, the number of samples increases to better reflect the hydraulic complexity of these systems. While the national monitoring burden under the population-based approach is slightly less than under a plant-based approach, some larger systems with few plants relative to system population will take more samples per system than they had under plant-based monitoring. However, EPA believes that many of these large systems with few plants have traditionally been undermonitored (as noted in the proposal). Systems with more plants will see a reduction in monitoring (e.g., small ground water systems with multiple wells).

While population-based monitoring requirements for ground water systems in today’s rule remain the same as those in the proposed rule, the final rule consolidates ten population categories for subpart H systems into eight categories for ease of implementation. As indicated in Table IV.G–4, EPA has gone from four to three population size categories for smaller subpart H systems (serving fewer than 10,000 people) and the ranges have been modified to be consistent with those for other existing rules (such as the Lead and Copper Rule). This change will reduce implementation transactional costs. For medium and large subpart H systems (serving at least 10,000 people), EPA has gone from seven categories in the proposal to five categories in final rule. The population groups are sized so that the ratio of maximum population to minimum population for each of the categories is consistent. EPA believes that this will allow most systems to remain in one population size category and maintain the same monitoring requirements within a reasonable range of population variation over time. In addition, it assures that systems within a size category will not have disparate monitoring burdens as could occur if there were too few categories. Overall, EPA believes that the population-based monitoring approach allows systems to have more flexibility to designate their monitoring sites within the distribution system to better target high DBP levels and is more equitable.

To derive the number of monitoring sites for IDSE standard monitoring, EPA doubled the number of routine compliance monitoring sites per system for each size category. This is consistent with the advice and recommendations of the M-DBP Advisory Committee for the IDSE. EPA has developed the Initial Distribution System Evaluation (IDSE) Guidance Manual for the Final Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (USEPA 2006) to assist systems in choosing IDSE monitoring locations, including criteria for selecting monitoring.

### Table IV.G–4. Comparison of Monitoring Locations per System for Stage 2 Routine Compliance Monitoring with Plant-Based and Population-Based Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population category</th>
<th>Ratio of maximum population to minimum population</th>
<th>Number of sampling periods per year</th>
<th>Plant-based approach</th>
<th>Number of plants per system (Based on 2000 CWSS data)</th>
<th>Calculated number of sites per system for plant-based approach</th>
<th>Number of monitoring sites per system for population-based approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E=F=B*C</td>
<td>F=B*D</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–3,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,301–9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000–249,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000–1 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 million–&lt;5 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥5 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As in the proposal.

**System is required to take individual TTHM and HAA5 samples at the locations with the highest TTHM and HAA5 concentrations, respectively, if highest TTHM and HAA5 concentrations do not occur at the same location.
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3. Summary of Major Comments
EPA received significant support for
applying the population-based approach
to all systems. EPA also received
comments concerning the specific
requirements in a population-based
approach.

Excessive Sampling Requirements.
Several commenters believed that the
proposed sampling requirements were
excessive (especially in the larger
population categories for subpart H
systems) and that some individual
systems would be required to sample
more under the population-based
approach than the plant-based
approach. EPA recognizes that a small
fraction of systems in some categories
will have to take more samples under
the population-based approach than the
plant-based approach because their
number of plants is substantially less
than the national median or mean.
However, the number of samples
required under the Stage 1 DBPR for
these systems may not have been
sufficient to determine the
concentrations of DBPs throughout the
distribution system of these systems. On
the other hand, systems with many
plants may have taken excessive
samples under the Stage 1 DBPR that
were not necessary to appropriately
determine DBP levels throughout the
distribution system. Consequently, the
total number of samples taken
nationally will be comparable to the
Stage 1 DBPR, but will better target DBP
risks in individual distribution systems.

Consecutive systems. Some
commenters noted that a consecutive
system may need to take more samples
than its associated wholesale system.
Under today’s rule, all systems,
including consecutive systems, must
monitor based on retail population
served. Thus, large consecutive systems
will take more samples than a smaller
wholesale system. The population-based
monitoring approach will allow the
samples to better represent the DBP
concentrations consumed by the
population associated with the sampling
locations and to understand the DBP
concentrations reaching consumers.
There is also a provision that allows
States to specify alternative monitoring
requirements for a consecutive system
in a combined distribution system (40
CFR 142.16(m)(3)). This special primacy
condition allows the State to establish
monitoring requirements that account
for complicated distribution system
relationships, such as where
neighboring systems buy from and sell
to each other regularly throughout the
year. In this case, water may pass
through multiple consecutive systems
before it reaches a user. Another
example would be a large group of
interconnected systems that have a
complicated combined distribution
system. This approach also allows the
combined distribution system to
concentrate IDSE and Stage 2
monitoring sites in the system with the
highest known DBP concentrations,
while assigning fewer sample sites
to systems with low DBP concentrations.

Population Size Categories. Some
commenters recommended fewer
population categories for subpart H
systems (those using surface water or
ground water under the direct influence
of surface water as a source) than
proposed while others recommended
more. Today’s rule has fewer categories
than proposed. However, EPA believes
that further reduction of the number of
population size categories will not
reflect the fact that the number of plants
and complexity of distribution systems
(and DBP exposure) tend to increase as
the population served increases. As a
result, the population served by a large
system in one particular category would
receive much less protection from the
DBP risks than a smaller system in the
same size category. On the other hand,
too many categories with smaller
population ranges would result in
frequent category and requirement shifts
due to population fluctuations. Much greater
implementation effort would be needed
for those systems without much benefit
in DBP exposure knowledge.

Population Definition. Some
commenters supported use of the
population of a combined distribution
system (i.e., the wholesale and
consecutive systems should be
considered a single system for
monitoring purposes) while others
preferred use of the retail population
for each individual system (i.e., wholesale
systems and consecutive systems are
considered separately). Today’s final
rule uses the retail population for each
individual system. EPA chose this
approach for today’s rule because of the
complexity involved in making
implementation decisions for
consecutive systems. Using the retail
population to determine requirements
eases the complexity by specifying
minimum system-level requirements;
simplicity is essential for meeting the
implementation schedule in today’s
rule. If monitoring requirements were
determined by the combined
distribution system population, many
implementation problems would occur.
Some of these problems would have the
potential to impact public health
protection. For example, States or
primacy agencies would have to decide
how to allocate IDSE distribution
system samples (where and how much
to monitor in individual PWSs) in a
complicated combined distribution
system with many systems, multiple
sources, multiple treatment plants, and
varying water demand and with limited
understanding of DBP levels throughout
the combined distribution system. This
would have to happen shortly after rule
promulgation in order to meet the
schedule. For example, some
consecutive systems buy water
seasonally (in times of high water
demand) or buy from more than one
whole system (with the volume
purchased based on many factors). The
State or primacy agency would find it
difficult to properly assign a limited
number of IDSE monitoring locations
(especially since there are States where
many consecutive systems have no DBP
data) to adequately reflect DBP levels in
such a system, as well as throughout the
combined distribution system.

EPA believes that assigning
compliance monitoring requirements
appropriately throughout the combined
distribution system requires a case-by-
case determination based on factors
such as amount and percentage of
finished water provided; whether
finished water is provided seasonally,
intermittently, or full-time; and
improved DBP occurrence information.
Since the IDSE will provide improved
DBP occurrence information throughout
the combined distribution system,
States may consider modifications to
Stage 2 compliance monitoring
requirements for consecutive systems on
a case-by-case basis as allowed by
§ 141.29 or under the special primacy
condition at § 142.16(m)(3) by taking all
these factors into consideration. In
making these case-by-case
determinations, the State will be able to
use its system-specific knowledge, along
with the IDSE results, to develop an
appropriate monitoring plan for each

Note: To determine the number of routine compliance monitoring sites per population category, EPA took these steps: (1) Maintaining about the same sampling
loads in the nation as required under the plant-based approach, but basing on population rather than number of plants to better target high DBP levels in distribution
systems and facilitate implementation; (2) The number of monitoring sites per plant under the plant-based approach (Column B) were multiplied by the number of
plants per system (Columns C and D) to calculate the number of monitoring sites per system under the plant-based approach (Columns E and F in terms of median
and mean, respectively); and (3) The number of monitoring sites per system under the population-based approach were derived with adjustments to keep categories
consistent and to maintain an even incremental trend as the population size category increases (Column G).
system within the combined distribution system.

Changes to monitoring plans.

Commenters requested more specific language regarding how IDSE and Stage 2 monitoring plans should be updated as a result of treatment or population changes in the distribution system. Changes to IDSE plans should not be necessary since the State or primacy agency will have reviewed those plans shortly before the system must conduct the IDSE and the reviewed plan should identify such issues. EPA provided a process in the Stage 2 DBPR proposal for updating monitoring plans for systems that have significant changes to treatment or in the distribution system after they complete their IDSE. This process remains in today’s rule, with an added requirement that systems must consult with the State or primacy agency to determine whether the changes are necessary and appropriate prior to implementing changes to their Stage 2 monitoring plan.

In addition, the State or primacy agency may require a system to revise its IDSE plan, IDSE report, or Stage 2 monitoring plan at any time. This change was made so that systems could receive system-specific guidance from the State or primacy agency on the appropriate revisions to the Stage 2 monitoring plan. Regulatory language regarding changes that might occur is not appropriate because any modifications would be system-specific and a national requirement is not capable of addressing these system-specific issues.

H. Operational Evaluation Requirements Initiated by TTHM and HAA5 Levels

A system that is in full compliance with the Stage 2 DBPR LRAA MCL may still have individual DBP measurements that exceed the Stage 2 DBPR MCLs, since compliance is based on individual DBP measurements at a location averaged over a four-quarter period. EPA and the Advisory Committee were concerned about these higher levels of DBPs. This concern was clearly reflected in the Agreement in Principle, which states, “...significant excursions of DBP levels will sometimes occur, even when systems are in full compliance with the enforceable MCL...”.

Today’s final rule addresses this concern by requiring systems to conduct operational evaluations that are initiated by operational evaluation levels identified by Stage 2 DBPR compliance monitoring and to submit an operational evaluation report to the State.

1. Today’s Rule

Today’s rule defines the Stage 2 DBP operational evaluation levels that require systems to conduct operational evaluations. The Stage 2 DBP operational evaluation levels are identified using the system’s Stage 2 DBPR compliance monitoring results. The operational evaluation levels for each monitoring location are determined by the sum of the two previous quarters’ TTHM results plus twice the current quarter’s TTHM result, at that location, divided by 4 to determine an average and the sum of the two previous quarters’ HAA5 results plus twice the current quarter’s HAA5 result, at that location, divided by 4 to determine an average. If the average TTHM exceeds 0.080 mg/L at any monitoring location or the average HAA5 exceeds 0.060 mg/L at any monitoring location, the system must conduct an operational evaluation and submit a written report of the operational evaluation to the State. Operational evaluation levels (calculated at each monitoring location)

\[
\text{IF } (Q_1 + Q_2 + 2Q_3)/4 > \text{ MCL, then the system must conduct an operational evaluation where:}
\]

\[
Q_1 = \text{current quarter measurement}
Q_2 = \text{previous quarter measurement}
Q_3 = \text{quarter before previous quarter measurement}
MCL = \text{Stage 2 MCL for TTHM (0.080 mg/L) or Stage 2 MCL for HAA5 (0.060 mg/L)}
\]

The operational evaluation includes an examination of system treatment and distribution operational practices, including changes in sources or source water quality, storage tank operations, and excess storage capacity, that may contribute to high TTHM and HAA5 formation. Systems must also identify what steps could be considered to minimize future operational evaluation level exceedences. In cases where the system can identify the cause of DBP levels that resulted in the operational evaluation, based on factors such as water quality data, plant performance data, and distribution system configuration the system may request and the State may allow limiting the evaluation to the identified cause. The State must issue a written determination approving limiting the scope of the operational evaluation. The system must submit their operational evaluation report to the State for review within 90 days after being notified of the analytical result that initiates the operational evaluation. Requesting approval to limit the scope of the operational evaluation does not extend the schedule (90 days after notification of the analytical result) for submitting the operational evaluation report.

2. Background and Analysis

The Stage 2 DBP proposal outlined three components of the requirements for significant excursions (definition, system evaluation and excursion report). In response to public comments, the term “significant excursion” has been replaced by the term “operational evaluation level” in today’s rule. The evaluation and report components remain the same as those outlined in the proposed rule for significant excursions. However, the scope of the evaluation and report components of the operational evaluation has also been modified from the proposed significant excursion evaluation components based on public comments.

In the Stage 2 DBPR proposal, States were to define criteria to identify significant excursions rather than using criteria defined by EPA. Concurrent with the Stage 2 DBPR proposal, EPA issued draft guidance (USEPA 2003e) for systems and States that described how to determine whether a significant excursion has occurred, using several different options. The rule proposal specifically requested public comment on the definition of a significant excursion, whether it should be defined by the State or nationally, and the scope of the evaluation.

After reviewing comments on the Stage 2 DBPR proposal, EPA determined that DBP levels initiating an operational evaluation should be defined in the regulation to ensure national consistency. Systems were concerned with the evaluation requirements being initiated based on criteria that might not be consistent nationally. Also, many States believed the requirement for States to define criteria to initiate an evaluation would be difficult for States to implement.

Under today’s rule, EPA is defining operational evaluation levels with an algorithm based on Stage 2 DBPR compliance monitoring results. These operational evaluation levels will act as an early warning for a possible MCL violation in the following quarter. This early warning is accomplished because the operational evaluation requirement is initiated when the system assumes that the current quarter’s result is repeated and this will result in an MCL violation. This early identification allows the system to act to prevent the violation.

Today’s rule also modifies the scope of an operational evaluation. EPA has concluded that the source of DBP levels
that would initiate an operational evaluation can potentially be linked to a number of factors that extend beyond distribution system operations. Therefore, EPA believes that evaluations must include a consideration of treatment plant and other system operations rather than limiting the operational evaluation to only the distribution system, as proposed. Because the source of the problem could be associated with operations in any of these system components (or more than one), an evaluation that provides systems with valuable information to evaluate possible modifications to current operational practices (e.g. water age management, source blending) or in planning system modifications or improvements (e.g. disinfection practices, tank modifications, distribution looping) will reduce DBP levels initiating an operational evaluation. EPA also believes that State review of operational evaluation reports is valuable for both States and systems in their interactions, particularly when systems may be in discussions with or requesting approvals from the State for system improvements. Timely reviews of operational evaluation reports will be valuable for States in reviewing other compliance submittals and will be particularly valuable in reviewing and approving any proposed source, treatment or distribution system modifications for a water system. Under today’s rule, systems must submit a written report of the operational evaluation to the State no later than 90 days after being notified of the DBP analytical result initiating an operational evaluation. The written operational evaluation report must also be made available to the public upon request.

3. Summary of Major Comments
EPA received comments both in favor of and opposed to the proposed evaluation requirements. While some commenters felt that the evaluation requirements should not be a part of the Stage 2 DBPR, until there was more information regarding potential health effects correlated to specific DBP levels, other commenters felt that the existing health effects data were sufficient to warrant strengthening the proposed requirements for an evaluation. Today’s final rule requirements are consistent with the Agreement in Principle recommendations.

Some commenters noted that health effects research on DBPs is insufficient to identify a level at which health effects occur and were concerned that the proposed significant excursion requirements placed an emphasis on DBP levels that might not be warranted rather than on system operational issues and compliance with Stage 2 DBPR MCLs.

Basis. The proposed requirements for significant excursion evaluations were not based upon health effects, but rather were intended to be an indicator of operational performance. To address commenter’s concerns and to emphasize what EPA believes should initiate a comprehensive evaluation of system operations that may result in elevated DBP levels and provide a proactive procedure to address compliance with Stage 2 DBP LRAA MCLs, EPA has replaced the term “significant excursion” used in the Stage 2 DBPR proposal with the term “operational evaluation level” in today’s rule.

Definition of the operational evaluation levels. The majority of commenters stated that EPA should define the DBP levels initiating an operational evaluation (“significant excursion” in the proposal) in the regulation to ensure national consistency rather than requiring States to develop their own criteria (as was proposed). Commenters suggested several definitions, including a single numerical limit and calculations comparing previous quarterly DBP results to the current quarter’s result. Commenters that recommended a single numerical limit felt that such an approach was justified by the available health effects information, while other commenters felt available health effects information did not support a single numerical limit. EPA recommended that any definition be easy to understand and implement.

EPA agrees with commenter preference for national criteria to initiate an operational evaluation. The DBP levels initiating an operational evaluation in today’s rule consider routine operational variations in distribution systems, are simple for water systems to calculate, and minimize the implementation burden on States. They also provide an early warning to help identify possible future MCL violations and allow the system to take proactive steps to remain in compliance. EPA emphasizes, as it did in the proposal and elsewhere in this notice, that health effects research is insufficient to identify a level at which health effects occur, and thus today’s methodology for initiating operational evaluation is not based upon health effects, but rather is intended as an indicator of operational performance.

Scope of an evaluation. Some commenters agreed that the scope of an evaluation initiated by local DBP levels should be limited to the distribution systems, as in the proposal. Others felt that the treatment processes should be included in the evaluation, noting that these can be significant in the formation of DBPs.

The Agency agrees with commenters that treatment processes can be a significant factor in DBP levels initiating an operational evaluation and that a comprehensive operational evaluation should address treatment processes. In cases where the system can clearly identify the cause of the DBP levels initiating an operational evaluation (based on factors such as water quality data, plant performance data, distribution system configuration, and previous evaluations) the State may allow the system to limit the scope of the evaluation to the identified cause. In other cases, it is appropriate to evaluate the entire system, from source through treatment to distribution system configuration and operational practices.

Timing for completion and review of the evaluation report. While some commenters agreed that the evaluation report should be reviewed by the States as part of the sanitary survey process (as proposed), many commenters felt that the time between sanitary surveys (up to five years) minimized the value of the evaluation report in identifying both the causes of DBP levels initiating an operational evaluation and in possible changes to prevent recurrence. Moreover, a number of commenters felt that the evaluation report was important enough to warrant a separate submittal and State review rather than have the evaluation report considered as part of other priorities during a sanitary survey.

The Agency agrees that completion and State review of evaluation reports on a three or five year sanitary survey cycle, when the focus of the evaluation is on what may happen in the next quarter, would allow for an unreasonable period of time to pass between the event initiating the operational evaluation and completion and State review of the report. This would diminish the value of the evaluation report for both systems and States, particularly when systems may be in discussions with or requesting approval for treatment changes from States, and as noted above, the focus of the report is on what may occur in the next quarter. EPA believes that timely reviews of evaluation reports by States is important, would be essential for States in understanding system operations and reviewing other compliance submittals, and would be extremely valuable in reviewing and approving any proposed treatment or distribution system modifications for a water system.
Having the evaluation information on an ongoing basis rather than a delayed basis would also allow States to prioritize their resources in scheduling and reviewing particular water system operations and conditions as part of any on-site system review or oversight. Therefore, today’s rule requires that systems complete the operational evaluation and submit the evaluation report to the State within 90 days of the occurrence.

I. MCL, BAT, and Monitoring for Bromate

1. Today’s Rule

Today EPA is confirming that the MCL for bromate for systems using ozone remains at 0.010 mg/L as an RAA for samples taken at the entrance to the distribution system as established by the Stage 1 DBPR. Because the MCL remains the same, EPA is not modifying the existing bromate BAT. EPA is changing the criterion for a system using ozone to qualify for reduced bromate monitoring from demonstrating low levels of bromide to demonstrating low levels of bromate.

2. Background and Analysis

a. Bromate MCL. Bromate is a principal byproduct from ozonation of bromide-containing source waters. As described in more detail in the Stage 2 DBPR proposal (USEPA 2003a), more stringent bromate MCL has the potential to decrease current levels of microbial protection, impair the ability of systems to control resistant pathogens like Cryptosporidium, and increase levels of DBPs from other disinfectants that may be used instead of ozone. EPA considered reducing the bromate MCL from 0.010 mg/L to 0.005 mg/L as an annual average but concluded that many systems using ozone to inactivate microbial pathogens would have significant difficulty maintaining bromate levels at or below 0.005 mg/L. In addition, because of the high doses required, the ability of systems to use ozone to meet Cryptosporidium treatment requirements under the LT2ESWTR would be diminished if the bromate MCL was decreased from 0.010 to 0.005 mg/L; higher doses will generally lead to greater bromate formation. After evaluation under the risk-balancing provisions of section 1412(b)(5) of the SDWA, EPA concluded that the existing MCL was justified. EPA will review the bromate MCL as part of the six-year review process and determine whether the MCL should remain at 0.010 mg/L or be reduced to a lower level. As a part of that review, EPA will consider the increased utilization of alternative technologies, such as UV, and whether the risk/risk concerns reflected in today’s rule, as well as in the LT2ESWTR, remain valid.

b. Criterion for reduced bromate monitoring. Because more sensitive bromate methods are now available, EPA is requiring a new criterion for reduced bromate monitoring. In the Stage 1 DBPR, EPA required ozone systems to demonstrate that source water bromide levels, as a running annual average, did not exceed 0.05 mg/L. EPA elected to use bromide as a surrogate for bromate in determining eligibility for reduced monitoring because the available analytical method for bromate was not sensitive enough to quantify levels well below the bromate MCL of 0.010 mg/L.

EPA approved several new analytical methods for bromate that are far more sensitive than the existing method as part of today’s rule. Since these methods can measure bromate to levels of 0.001 mg/L or lower, EPA is replacing the criterion for reduced bromate monitoring (source water bromide running annual average not to exceed 0.05 mg/L) with a bromate running annual average not to exceed 0.0025 mg/L. In the past, EPA has often set the criterion for reduced monitoring eligibility at 50% of the MCL, which would be 0.005 mg/L. However, the MCL for bromate will remain at 0.010 mg/L, representing a risk level of 2×10⁻⁴, 10⁻⁴ and 10⁻⁶ (higher than EPA’s usual excess cancer risk range of 10⁻² to 10⁻⁶) because of risk tradeoff considerations (USEPA 2003a).

EPA believes that the decision for reduced monitoring is separate from these risk tradeoff considerations. Risk tradeoff considerations influence the selection of the MCL, while reduced monitoring requirements are designed to ensure that the MCL, once established, is reliably and consistently achieved. Requiring a running annual average of 0.0025 mg/L for the reduced monitoring criterion allows greater confidence that the system is achieving the MCL and thus ensuring public health protection.

3. Summary of Major Comments

Commenters supported both the retention of the existing bromate MCL and the modified reduced monitoring criterion.

II. Public Notice Requirements

1. Today’s Rule

Today’s rule does not alter existing public notification language for THMs, HAAs or TOC, which are listed under 40 CFR 141.201–141.210 (Subpart Q).
and developmental health effects is premature at this time. The Agency needs to understand how best to characterize and communicate these risks and what to do to follow up any such communication. The public deserves accurate, timely, relevant, and understandable communication. The Agency will continue to follow up on this issue with additional research, possibly including a project to work with stakeholders to assess risk communication strategies.

Some comments also suggested leaving the choice of language up to the water server. EPA believes that this strategy would cause undue confusion to both the PWS and the public.

Commenters generally agreed that both wholesale and consecutive systems that conduct monitoring be required to report their own analytical results as part of their CCRs. One commenter requested clarification of consecutive system public notification requirements when there is a violation in the wholesale system but the consecutive system data indicate that it meets DBP MCLs.

Although EPA requires consecutive systems to conduct appropriate public notification of violations (whether in the wholesale or consecutive system), there may be cases where the violation may only affect an isolated portion of the distribution system. Under the public notification rule, the State may allow systems to limit distribution of the notice to the area that is out of compliance if the system can demonstrate that the violation occurred in a part of the distribution system that is “physically or hydraulically isolated from other parts of the distribution system.” This provision remains in place. As for a consecutive system whose wholesale system is in violation, the consecutive system is not required to conduct public notification if DBP levels in the consecutive system are in compliance.

K. Variances and Exemptions

1. Today’s Rule

States may grant variances in accordance with sections 1415(a) and 1415(e) of the SDWA and EPA’s regulations. States may grant exemptions in accordance with section 1416(a) of the SDWA and EPA’s regulations.

2. Background and Analysis

a. Variances. The SDWA provides for two types of variances—general variances and small system variances. Under section 1415(a)(1)(A) of the SDWA, a State that has primary enforcement responsibility (primacy), or EPA as the primacy agency, may grant general variances from MCLs to those public water systems of any size that cannot comply with the MCLs because of characteristics of the raw water sources. The primacy agency may grant general variances to a system on condition that the system install the best technology, treatment techniques, or other means that EPA finds available and based upon an evaluation satisfactory to the State that indicates that alternative sources of water are not reasonably available to the system. At the time this type of variance is granted, the State must prescribe a compliance schedule and may require the system to implement additional control measures. Furthermore, before EPA or the State may grant a general variance, it must find that the variance will not result in an unreasonable risk to health (URTH) to the public served by the public water system. In today’s final rule, EPA is specifying BATs for general variances under section 1415(a) (see section IV.D).

Section 1415(e) authorizes the primacy agency to issue variances to small public water systems (those serving fewer than 10,000 people) where the primacy agent determines (1) that the system cannot afford to comply with an MCL or treatment technique and (2) that the terms of the variances will ensure adequate protection of human health (63 FR 43833, August 14, 1998) (USEPA 1998c). These variances may only be granted where EPA has determined that there is no affordable compliance technology and has identified a small system variance technology under section 1412(b)(15) for the contaminant, system size and source water quality in question. As discussed below, small system variances under section 1415(e) are not available because EPA has determined that affordable compliance technologies are available.

The 1996 Amendments to the SDWA identify three categories of small public water systems that need to be addressed: (1) Those serving a population of 3301–10,000; (2) those serving a population of 500–3300; and (3) those serving a population of 25–499. The SDWA requires EPA to make determinations of available compliance technologies for each size category. A compliance technology is a technology that is affordable and that achieves compliance with the MCL and/or treatment technique. Compliance technologies can include point-of-entry or point-of-use treatment units. Variance technologies are only specified for those system size/ source water quality combinations for which there are no listed affordable compliance technologies.

Using its current National Affordability Criteria, EPA has determined that multiple affordable compliance technologies are available for each of the three system sizes (USEPA 2005a), and therefore did not identify any variance treatment technologies. The analysis was consistent with the current methodology used in the document “National-Level Affordability Criteria Under the 1996 Amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act” (USEPA 1998d) and the “Variance Technology Findings for Contaminants Regulated Before 1996” (USEPA 1998e). However, EPA is currently reevaluating its national-level affordability criteria and has solicited recommendations from both the NDWAC and the SAB as part of this review. EPA intends to apply the revised criteria to the Stage 2 DBPR once they have been finalized for the purpose of determining whether to enable States to give variances. Thus, while the analysis of Stage 2 household costs will not change, EPA’s determination regarding the availability of affordable compliance technologies for the different categories of small systems may.

b. Affordable Treatment Technologies for Small Systems. The treatment trains considered and predicted to be used in EPA’s compliance forecast for systems serving under 10,000 people, are listed in Table IV.K–1.
The household costs for these technologies were compared against the EPA’s current national-level affordability criteria to determine the affordable treatment technologies. The Agency’s national level affordability criteria were published in the August 6, 1998 Federal Register (USEPA 1998d). A complete description of how this analysis was applied to Stage 2 DBPR is given in Section 8.3 of the Economic Analysis (USEPA 2005a).

Of the technologies listed in Table IV.K–1, integrated membranes with chloramines, GAC20 with advanced oxidants, and ozone are above the affordability threshold in the 0 to 500 category. No treatment technologies are above the affordability threshold in the 500 to 3,300 category or the 3,300 to 10,000 category. As shown in the Economic Analysis for systems serving fewer than 500 people, 14 systems are predicted to use GAC20 with advanced disinfectants, one system is predicted to use integrated membranes, and no systems are predicted to use ozone to comply with the Stage 2 DBPR (USEPA 2005a). However, several alternate technologies are affordable and likely available to these systems. In some cases, the compliance data for these systems under the Stage 2 DBPR will be the same as under the Stage 1 DBPR (because many systems serving fewer than 500 people will have the same single sampling site under both rules); these systems will have already installed the necessary compliance technology to comply with the Stage 1 DBPR. It is also possible that less costly technologies such as those for which percentage use caps were set in the decision tree may actually be used to achieve compliance (e.g., chloramines, UV). Thus, EPA believes that compliance by these systems will be affordable.

As shown in Table IV.K–2, the cost model predicts that some households served by very small systems will experience household cost increases greater than the available expenditure margins as a result of adding advanced technology for the Stage 2 DBPR (USEPA 2005a). This prediction may be overestimated because small systems may have other compliance alternatives available to them besides adding treatment, which were not considered in the model. For example, some of these systems currently may be operated on a part-time basis; therefore, they may be able to modify the current operational schedule or use excessive capacity to avoid installing a costly technology to comply with the Stage 2 DBPR. The system also may identify another water source that has lower TTHM and HAA5 precursor levels. Systems that can identify such an alternate water source may not have to treat that new source water as intensely as their current source, resulting in lower treatment costs. Systems may elect to connect to a neighboring water system. While connecting to another system may not be feasible for some remote systems, EPA estimates that more than 22 percent of all small water systems are located within metropolitan regions (USEPA 2000f) where distances between neighboring systems will not present a prohibitive barrier. Low-cost alternatives to reduce total trihalomethanes (TTHM) and haloacetic acid (HAA5) levels also include distribution system modifications such as flushing distribution mains more frequently, looping to prevent dead ends, and optimizing storage to minimize retention time. More discussion of household cost increases is presented in Section VI.E and the Economic Analysis (USEPA 2005a).

### Table IV.K–2.—Distribution of Household Unit Treatment Costs for Plants Adding Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems size (population served)</th>
<th>Number of households served by plants adding treatment (Percent of all households subject to the Stage 2 DBPR)</th>
<th>Mean annual household cost increase</th>
<th>Median annual household cost increase</th>
<th>90th Percentile annual household cost increase</th>
<th>95th Percentile annual household cost increase</th>
<th>Available expenditure margin ($/hh/yr)</th>
<th>Number of households with annual cost increases greater than the available expenditure margin</th>
<th>Number of surface water plants with annual cost increases greater than the available expenditure margin</th>
<th>Number of groundwater plants with annual cost increases greater than the available expenditure margin</th>
<th>Total number of plants with annual cost increases greater than the available expenditure margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–500</td>
<td>43045(3)</td>
<td>$201.55</td>
<td>$299.01</td>
<td>$299.01</td>
<td>$414.74</td>
<td>$733</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501–3,300</td>
<td>325,642(4)</td>
<td>$58.41</td>
<td>$79.96</td>
<td>$75.09</td>
<td>$366.53</td>
<td>$724</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,301–10,000</td>
<td>325,255(5)</td>
<td>$37.05</td>
<td>$56.34</td>
<td>$55.25</td>
<td>$200.05</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Household unit costs represent treatment costs only. All values in year 2003 dollars. Source: Exhibit 8.4c, USEPA 2005a.

### Table IV.K–1.—Technologies Considered and Predicted to Be Used in Compliance Forecast for Small Systems—Continued

- GAC20.
- GAC20 + Advanced disinfectants.
- Integrated Membranes.

Note: Italicized technologies are those predicted to be used in the compliance forecast. Source: Exhibits 5.11b and 5.14b, USEPA 2005a.

c. Exemptions. Under section 1416(a), EPA or a State that has primary enforcement responsibility (primacy) may exempt a public water system from any requirements related to an MCL or treatment technique of an NPDWR, if it finds that (1) due to compelling factors (which may include economic factors such as qualification of the PWS as serving a disadvantaged community), the PWS is unable to comply with the requirement or implement measures to develop an alternative source of water supply; (2) the exemption will not result in an unreasonable risk to health; and; (3) the PWS was in operation on the effective date of the NPDWR, or for a system that was not in operation by that date, only if no reasonable alternative source of drinking water is available to the new system; and (4) management or restructuring changes (or both) cannot reasonably result in compliance with the Act or improve the quality of...
to recognize and respond to problems. Subpart H systems were required to be operated by qualified personnel under the SWTR (§ 141.70). The Stage 1 DBPR added requirements for all disinfected systems to be operated by qualified personnel who meet the requirements specified by the State, which may differ based on system size and type. The rule also requires that States maintain a register of qualified operators (40 CFR 141.130(c)). While the Stage 2 DBPR requirements do not supercede or modify the requirement that disinfected systems be operated by qualified operators, such personnel play an important role in delivering drinking water that meets Stage 2 MCLs to the public. States should also review and modify, as required, their qualification standards to take into account new technologies (e.g., ultraviolet (UV) disinfection) and new compliance requirements (including simultaneous compliance and consecutive system requirements). EPA received only one comment on this topic; the commenter supported the need for a qualified operator.

M. System Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements

1. Today’s Rule

Today’s Stage 2 DBPR, consistent with the existing system reporting and recordkeeping regulations under 40 CFR 141.134 (Stage 1 DBPR), requires public water systems (including consecutive systems) to report monitoring data to States within ten days after the end of the compliance period. In addition, systems are required to submit the data required in § 141.134. These data are required to be submitted quarterly for any monitoring conducted quarterly or more frequently, and within ten days of the end of the monitoring period for less frequent monitoring. As with other chemical analysis data, the system must keep the results for 10 years and may prove valuable in identifying trends and recurring issues.

2. Summary of Major Comments

EPA requested comment on all system reporting and recordkeeping requirements. Commenters generally supported EPA’s proposed requirements, but expressed concern about two specific issues. The first issue was the data management and tracking difficulties that States would face if EPA finalized a monitoring approach which had both plant-based and population-based requirements, as was proposed. Since today’s rule contains only population-based monitoring requirements, this concern is no longer an issue. See section IV.G in today’s preamble for further discussion.

The second concern related to reporting associated with the IDSE. Commenters who supported an approach other than the IDSE for determining Stage 2 compliance monitoring locations did not support IDSE-related reporting. The IDSE remains a key component of the final rule; thus, EPA has retained IDSE-related reporting. However, the Agency has modified both the content and the timing of the reporting to reduce the burden. See sections IV.F and IV.E, respectively, of today’s preamble for further discussion.

N. Approval of Additional Analytical Methods

1. Today’s Rule

EPA is taking final action to:
(1) allow the use of alternate methods published by the Standard Methods Committee in Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater,