Rescission of Regulatory Determinations and Removal of Related Provisions for Four PFAS Substances (PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA (GenX), and the Mixture of These Three PFAS Plus PFBS)

-	DOCKET	AGENCY
-	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654	Environmental Protection Agency
RIN	CITATION	STAGE
2040-AG53	91 FR 29413	Proposed rule
COMMENT PERIOD	DATA CUTOFF	
May 20, 2026 to July 20, 2026 (61 days)	Nov. 8, 2026	

QUESTION THIS REPORT ANSWERS

Will EPA finalize the rescission of the 2024 drinking-water standards for PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA and the Hazard Index mixture as proposed, and what should water systems, states and regulated industry do while the legal basis is contested?

BOTTOM LINE UP FRONT

What changes if EPA finalizes the rescission as proposed: the federal standards, monitoring duties and compliance dates for PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA and the Hazard Index mixture disappear from 40 CFR part 141 on the final rule's effective date, while the PFOA and PFOS standards at 4 ppt stay and state PFAS standards continue to bind where they exist. Until then

the 2024 rule is in force: the D.C. Circuit twice declined to vacate the four standards at EPA's request, heard argument on the whole rule on September 18, 2026 and has not decided, and the initial monitoring deadline for all six PFAS is April 26, 2027. EPA said it would act in 2026; its agenda target of September 2026 has passed. ComtIQ judges a final rescission likely, a petition for review almost certain, and the outcome of that review close to even.

The dispute is not whether these four PFAS are hazardous; EPA says it is not reopening the science. It is whether the 2024 rule was issued in the wrong order under section 1412(b)(1)(E) of the Safe Drinking Water Act and, if it was, whether rescinding the standards is the remedy the statute allows. On the first question the record splits along institutional lines: 19 attorneys general, from 18 states and the District of Columbia (0165), the New Jersey and New Mexico environment departments (0152, 0104) and the Cape Fear Public Utility Authority (0137) say the statute permits a proposal alongside a preliminary determination; the water associations AMWA and AWWA (0061), the Association of California Water Agencies (0141), the American Chemistry Council (0094) and Chemours (0159) accept EPA's new reading. On the second question the record contains an answer EPA did not propose and will have to address: a procedural cure that keeps the standards in place. The National Congress of American Indians (0161), the goDeeper Foundation (0150), the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (0168) and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (0047) ask EPA, if it believes the sequence was wrong, to re-propose the standards in the correct order while the 2024 provisions stay on the books. The D.C. Circuit's 2023 decision in NRDC v. Regan, which held that EPA may not withdraw a final determination to regulate, is why this alternative matters.

Opposition in the record is broad and mostly individual: 1,477 of 1,555 comments oppose, 193 of them in 15 coordinated campaigns, and three petitions filed as single comments carry about 20,900 listed signature entries between the two that ComtIQ counted (0080, 0170), with a third list uncounted (0083). The organized support is concentrated in water utilities and their associations, the chemical industry and ten local governments.

KEY FINDINGS

1. **The remedy is the open question, and the record names an alternative EPA did not propose.** EPA rests the rescission on one reading of section 1412(b)(1)(E): a proposed standard may come no earlier than the final determination to regulate. Four organizations accept that reading for the sake of argument and still oppose the remedy.

The National Congress of American Indians (0161) asks EPA to evaluate and publish for comment a sequential cure, a standalone determination followed by a companion rule, that retains the 2024 MCLs; the goDeeper Foundation (0150) says EPA must explain why complete rescission is the only remedy; the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (0168) asks for the corrected sequence on an expedited schedule; the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (0047) asks EPA to retain the standards or republish them for comment. In NRDC v. Regan (D.C. Cir. 2023) the court held that once EPA makes a final determination to regulate it "shall" regulate and cannot withdraw the determination. EPA's proposal distinguishes that case on the ground that these determinations were themselves unlawfully issued. Whether a court accepts that distinction is the central question on EPA's power to withdraw the determinations; independent anti-backsliding and APA objections bear on the validity and scope of any rescission as well, and the cure the commenters describe is what EPA would be left with if the distinction fails. Confidence: high that the requests are on file and that the precedent governs withdrawal of a determination; moderate on how the court will treat EPA's distinction. Source: organization letters, NRDC v. Regan, No. 20-1335 (D.C. Cir. May 9, 2023).

2. **Local governments and state agencies lean opposite ways.** Among governments, local governments support the rescission 10 to 3 and state agencies oppose it 8 to 1. The supporting local filers are water systems and utilities, among them the City of Huntsville, Texas (0017), Fairfax Water (0177), Olivenhain Municipal Water District (0160) and the Laurens County Water and Sewer Commission (0086), and their letters argue process, cost and the stepwise statute. The opposing state agencies are environmental regulators, New Jersey (0152), New Mexico (0104), Massachusetts (0047), North Carolina (0179) and the Indiana department on the other side (0091), and the attorneys general coalition (0165) adds the enforcement view. The split is consistent with distinct institutional mandates, systems that pay for treatment against regulators that answer for public health; the groups are small and the letters named are the evidence, not a sample. It signals that a federal rescission would not end the obligations of systems in states that keep or adopt their own PFAS standards. Confidence: high for the counts; moderate for the reading of motives, which rests on the letters named. Source: ComtIQ census, organization letters.
3. **The anti-backsliding clause divides the two sides on what counts as a baseline.** 27 organizations oppose EPA's finding that section 1412(b)(9) is not triggered, 5 support it. EPA's position is that the baseline is no regulation, because no compliance deadline for the four PFAS has passed, and that an unlawful rule cannot set a protection floor.

Chemours (0159) and the National Association of Manufacturers (1021) agree. Iota Intel LLC (0107) answers that a promulgated regulation with a 2029 compliance date is protection in force and that removing it is a revision; the New Mexico Environment Department (0104) calls the zero-baseline reading wrong; the Senate letter (0162) and the attorneys general (0165) say the proposal contravenes the clause. The clause reads "shall maintain, or provide for greater, protection of the health of persons." Which baseline a court adopts decides this issue, and the proposal's own cost memorandum, which counts forgone health benefits, is the evidence opponents cite against the zero baseline. Confidence: high for the positions; low on the outcome. Source: organization letters, 91 FR 29413.

4. **Supporters want the rescission and, in several cases, more.** 32 comments support the proposal; 27 come from organizations. The American Chemistry Council (0094) asks EPA to rescind the whole 2024 PFAS regulation, not only the four standards. AMWA and AWWA (0061) and the Association of California Water Agencies (0141) support the sequential reading and ask EPA to restart any future determination under it. The Association of State Drinking Water Administrators (0090) asks for time to understand treatment needs if EPA proceeds. A second group supports or accepts the rescission but asks to keep the monitoring and data provisions: the Laurens County Water and Sewer Commission (0086) and Persistence Analytics Group (0519) ask EPA to preserve monitoring and occurrence data, and the Nantucket Tipping Point (0055) asks that data collection not end. Monitoring is the one provision where the two sides come closest. Confidence: high. Source: organization letters.
5. **Three petitions carry most of the listed public signatures and count as three comments.** Comment 0080, filed by the Natural Resources Defense Council, attaches a petition opposing the rescission with about 12,700 distinct name entries after ComtIQ removed exact duplicates within the list; comment 0170, filed by Environment America, lists 8,174 entries; comment 0083, also Environment America, carries a further list that ComtIQ did not count. ComtIQ counts each petition as one organization comment, consistent with the unit of count throughout this report, and reports the entries here because they are the largest expression of public position in the record. The two counted lists were not checked against each other, so the entries are not a count of distinct people. A listed name is not a verified signatory, and EPA weighs significant comments, not signatures. 18 comments (1.2%) do not address what the rule regulates; they concern sludge incineration, wastewater permits, local contamination disputes and general PFAS concerns, and one of them was read with a side and stays in the totals as

read. Confidence: high for the counts; the signatory figures are ComtIQ's count of the lists as filed. Source: ComtIQ census, analyst reading of 0080, 0170 and 0083.

THE RECORD IN NUMBERS

MEASURE	VALUE
Submissions received (agency)	not reported
Comments posted	1,555
Comments stored and detailed	1,555 / 1,555
Attachments with text	1,813
Attachments that are images only	5
Distinct texts read (comment fields and attachments counted separately, campaign copies once)	2,345
Coordinated campaigns / letters	15 / 193
Comments with a coded reading	1,555 (100.0%)
Read directly / inherited from campaign	1,377 / 178
Oppose among comments flagged off-topic	1 of 18 (5.6%)
Oppose among comments on the rule	1,476 of 1,537 (96.0%)
Without a readable text	0
Flagged as uncertain by the coding system	39, all read in full and resolved
Posting days	30

Position by unit of count. A comment is one count; a campaign is one text sent many times, and the record does not show whether by one person or many; one organization may file

twice. Each line counts the same record a different way. The deduplicated units are not a count of distinct people or entities: text similarity does not establish common authorship.

UNIT OF COUNT	COUNT	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	OTHER	SUPPORT SHARE	OPPOSE SHARE
Every comment with a reading	1,555	32	1,477	46	2.1%	95.0%
Campaign copies counted once	1,377	32	1,299	46	2.3%	94.3%
Deduplicated units (each campaign's text once, repeat filings of an organization once)	1,362	32	1,295	35	2.3%	95.1%
On the rule only (off-topic left out)	1,537	32	1,476	29	2.1%	96.0%

Gap recorded by the census (attachments listed without file): 2 comments, both from individuals, reported here in aggregate only.

WHO IS COMMENTING

COMMENTER TYPE	COMMENTS	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	OTHER
Individuals	1,154	3	1,127	24
Anonymous	262	1	259	2
Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	72	0	59	13
Local governments	15	10	3	2
Trade associations	15	10	3	2
Type unclear	11	1	8	2
State agencies	10	1	8	1
Businesses	6	3	3	0

COMMENTER TYPE	COMMENTS	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	OTHER
Academics and universities	3	0	3	0
Think tanks	2	2	0	0
Tribal governments	2	0	2	0
Members of Congress	1	0	1	0
Federal agencies	1	1	0	0
State attorneys general	1	0	1	0

Individuals are reported only in aggregate. The record holds 124 organization letters. All 28 that are longer than the coding system's reading limit were read in full by ComtIQ's reading assistant, a second model reading the whole letter; the analyst checked each reading against the letter and confirmed or corrected it. Organizations are named in this report where a finding or an argument rests on them; the list of all filers with their stance is in the data file organizations.csv.

Coalitions. The largest institutional coalition is the letter of 19 attorneys general, from 18 states and the District of Columbia, led by North Carolina (0165): North Carolina, California, Connecticut, New Jersey, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington and Wisconsin. Earthjustice, the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Southern Environmental Law Center filed jointly (0842), with ten further comments carrying only the references cited in that letter, and a broader Earthjustice-led coalition filed separately (0110). Thirty-four craft breweries in twenty states signed one letter (0180), led by Sierra Nevada Brewing Co., Lakefront Brewery, Half Acre Beer Company and Port City Brewing Company. AMWA and AWWA, the two national associations of water utilities, filed one joint letter in support (0061). Two tribal governments, the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (0168) and the Snoqualmie Indian Tribe (0113), and the National Congress of American Indians (0161) filed, all opposed. The letter recorded as "United States Senate" (0162) carries one signature in the docket text, Senator Adam Schiff of California; press reports describe a letter from 26 senators to the Administrator, so the docket understates the congressional position. ComtIQ did not find a letter from the House in the record.

ARGUMENTS

Themes, by number of comments carrying them (a comment can carry several).

THEME	COMMENTS	SHARE OF CODED
public-health-pfas-exposure	1,417	91.1%
vulnerable-populations	516	33.2%
anti-backsliding-principle	308	19.8%
polluter-pays-liability	248	15.9%
deregulation-policy-priorities	240	15.4%
science-and-evidence-basis	213	13.7%
regulatory-stability-and-trust	103	6.6%
statutory-authority-and-courts	96	6.2%
water-system-costs-ratepayers	70	4.5%
mixtures-cumulative-exposure	59	3.8%
private-wells-and-unregulated-sources	25	1.6%
utility-investment-already-made	24	1.5%
state-standards-patchwork	22	1.4%

Argument types, by number of comments.

ARGUMENT TYPE	COMMENTS	SHARE OF CODED
Health impact	1,341	86.2%
Values	772	49.6%
Scientific evidence	269	17.3%

ARGUMENT TYPE	COMMENTS	SHARE OF CODED
Statutory authority	136	8.7%
Costs and benefits	112	7.2%
Alternative proposed	62	4.0%
Political	57	3.7%
Environmental impact	53	3.4%
Procedure (APA)	47	3.0%
No reason given	42	2.7%
Safety risk	30	1.9%
Enforcement feasibility	21	1.4%
Comment period	7	0.5%
Federalism, state role	6	0.4%
Tribal consultation	5	0.3%
Regulatory impact analysis	4	0.3%
Constitutional	1	0.1%

Provisions, coded for organizations and law firms only. Unit: comments, so an organization that filed twice counts twice here; the section on disputes below counts each organization once. Oppose, support and modify here are a stance on the provision, not the comment's position on the proposal: a commenter can support the rule and ask to remove one safe harbor.

PROVISION	COMMENTS OPPOSING	SUPPORTING	ASKING TO MODIFY	MENTIONING ONLY
comment-period-and-hearing	2	0	1	2
legal-grounds-only-scope	13	0	1	2

PROVISION	COMMENTS OPPOSING	SUPPORTING	ASKING TO MODIFY	MENTIONING ONLY
legal-reading-1412-b-1-e	29	22	3	7
no-anti-backsliding	31	5	1	2
no-hrrca-economic-analysis	8	2	4	2
nrdc-v-regan-distinguished	7	3	0	0
remove-definitions-notice-provisions	2	1	0	0
remove-mcls-mclgs-141-61	69	12	3	3
remove-monitoring-compliance-provisions	20	6	3	2
rescind-reg-determinations	81	27	8	4
retain-pfoa-pfos-limits	2	9	2	31
rfa-certification	0	0	0	1

The strongest arguments, by side.

For the rescission. The statutory text, as EPA now reads it: section 1412(b)(1)(E) says EPA shall propose a standard "not later than 24 months after the determination to regulate," and the determination the statute refers to is the final one, published after comment on a preliminary determination. AMWA and AWWA (0061) and the Association of California Water Agencies (0141) add the practical point that collapsing the two steps denied the public a chance to comment on whether to regulate before commenting on how. Chemours (0159) supplies the anti-backsliding answer: rescinding a rule issued without authority is not a revision of a lawful standard, and the 2024 standards had no compliance date in effect. The National Association of Manufacturers (1021) argues the same and adds occurrence and hazard-index objections as confirmation. The weakness on this side is remedy: none of these letters explains why the defect, if it exists, requires withdrawing the determinations rather than re-proposing the standards.

Against the rescission. The text, read the other way: "not later than" sets a deadline, not a starting gate, and nothing in the subsection forbids an earlier proposal; the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (0152) says the provision expressly authorizes concurrent publication, and the Cape Fear Public Utility Authority (0137) says EPA has proposed standards with final determinations before. The New Mexico Environment Department (0104) argues harmless error under 5 U.S.C. 706: the public did comment on both the determination and the standards. The American Association for Justice (0088) answers EPA's reliance on Loper Bright: the end of deference does not oblige an agency to reverse its own prior actions. On remedy, NRDC v. Regan and the "shall" in section 1412(b)(1)(E) support the NCAI (0161) and Keweenaw Bay (0168) position that the determinations stand and the cure is procedural. On anti-backsliding, Iota Intel LLC (0107) makes the sharpest point: a promulgated standard with a 2029 compliance date is protection, and the proposal's own memorandum counts the health benefits that rescission forgoes. On scope, the Earthjustice coalition (0110), EDGI (0118) and the Kentucky Resources Council (0183) argue that an agency reversing a rule must consider reliance interests and the consequences of reversal, and that a notice limiting comment to legal grounds does not relieve EPA of that duty. The weakness on this side is that the D.C. Circuit has not yet said whether EPA's reading of the sequence is wrong; two denials of summary vacatur say only that the question is not simple.

What a court would weigh. The sequence question is a pure question of statutory text that the court will decide without deference (91 FR 29413; NRDC v. Regan, No. 20-1335, D.C. Cir. May 9, 2023; petitions for review under SDWA section 1448, 42 U.S.C. 300j-7). The remedy question turns on whether the 2024 determinations, which followed a preliminary determination and public comment, were themselves defective or only the standards proposed alongside them were. If the determinations stand, NRDC v. Regan binds EPA to regulate, and the cure is to re-propose. If they fall, the anti-backsliding and reliance arguments remain, and EPA's zero-baseline reading is the next contested step.

WHERE THE DISPUTES ARE

Provisions ranked by the number of organizations asking to change or remove them. Unit: organizations, each counted once per provision. Each row is one organization, what it asks as the coding system summarised it, and the comment to open; the summary is a reading, not a quotation. Read the letter before quoting it.

rescind-reg-determinations: Rescission of the final regulatory determinations to regulate PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA and the mixture of these with PFBS (Index PFAS) as unlawfully issued.

Organizations opposing it 71, asking to modify it 7, supporting it as proposed 26.

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
AbilityForge.net	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	oppose	Withdraw the proposed rescission in its entirety.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0024
Governors Public Health Alliance (PHA)	State agencies	oppose	Withdraw the proposed rescission of the 2024 regulations.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0130
Cape Fear Public Utility Authority (CFPUA)	Local governments	oppose	Do not rescind the determinations; SDWA gives no mechanism to retract a final determination to regulate.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0137
International Society for Environmental Epidemiology North America Chapter (ISEE NAC)	Academics and universities	oppose	Keep the 2024 finalized regulations; if rescission occurs, immediately draft a new regulation using the original scientific determinations.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0100
Nantucket Tipping Point	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	modify	If rescinded on legal grounds, do not end data collection.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0055
Association of State Drinking Water Administrators (ASDWA)	Trade associations	modify	If EPA moves forward, allow additional time to understand treatment needs for different compounds and weigh the implementation burden on states and PWSs.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0090

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
American Chemistry Council	Trade associations	support	Rescind the whole PFAS Regulation, not just the four PFAS.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0094
City of Huntsville, Texas	Local governments	support	Finalize the rescission of standards for PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA/GenX and PFAS mixtures.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0017

96 more organizations on this provision are in organizations.csv and the reading copy.

remove-mcls-mclgs-141-61: Removal of the MCLGs and MCLs for PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA and the hazard index from 40 CFR 141.61(c) and the associated best available technology entries in 141.61(d) and 142.62.

Organizations opposing it 62, asking to modify it 1, supporting it as proposed 12.

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
Alaska Community Action on Toxics (ACAT)	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	oppose	Keep the standards in place.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0129
Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection	State agencies	oppose	Retain the current MCLGs and NPDWR for PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA and the hazard index, or republish them for comment.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0047
City of Santa Ana Public Works Agency	Local governments	oppose	Maintain enforceable standards rather than eliminating them.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0028

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy, University of Arizona	Academics and universities	oppose	Retain the 2024 standards for GenX, PFNA, PFBS and PFHxS.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0120
34 craft breweries (including Sierra Nevada Brewing Co., Lakefront Brewery, Half Acre Beer Company, Port City Brewing Company)	Businesses	oppose	Keep the existing standards in place.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0180
Institute of Hazardous Materials Management (IHMM)	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	modify	Consider staying the affected MCLs rather than removing them.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0030
International Carwash Association	Trade associations	support	State in the final preamble that removing the MCLs undermines the basis for categorical industrial user PFAS sampling absent a facility-specific reasonable potential analysis.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0173
Laurens County Water and Sewer Commission (LCWSC)	Local governments	support	Finalize removal of the four-PFAS MCLGs and MCLs, then restart the process: finish the UCMR 5 analysis, publish new preliminary determinations for each contaminant and any mixture approach, and regulate only after final determinations.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0086

67 more organizations on this provision are in organizations.csv and the reading copy.

legal-reading-1412-b-1-e: EPA's new interpretation of SDWA section 1412(b)(1)(E) that 'determination to regulate' means

only the final determination, so a proposed NPDWR cannot be issued concurrently with a preliminary determination.

Organizations opposing it 26, asking to modify it 3, supporting it as proposed 22.

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
American Association for Justice (AAJ)	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	oppose	Reject EPA's legal justification; Loper Bright does not require agencies to reverse prior actions.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0088
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP)	State agencies	oppose	Reject EPA's new reading; 1412(b)(1)(E) expressly authorizes publishing a proposed regulation concurrently with the determination to regulate.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0152
Cape Fear Public Utility Authority (CFPUA)	Local governments	oppose	Reject EPA's reading that SDWA requires a sequential mechanism; no such requirement exists and EPA routinely proposes MCLG/MCL with the final determination.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0137
Attorneys General of North Carolina, California, Connecticut, New Jersey, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin	State attorneys general	oppose	Retain the prior interpretation allowing concurrent proposal with the preliminary determination	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0165

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
goDeeper Foundation	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	modify	Even accepting a sequencing defect, EPA must explain why complete rescission is the only remedy and should instead use an expedited, properly ordered process.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0150
National Congress of American Indians (NCAI)	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	modify	Assuming the new sequencing reading is valid, EPA should evaluate and publish for comment a sequential procedural cure (standalone determination plus companion final rule) that retains the 2024 MCLs.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0161
Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA)	Trade associations	support	Follow the stepwise SDWA process; restart rulemaking in accordance with it for any future regulatory determination, as was done for PFOA and PFOS.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0141
Fairfax Water (Fairfax County Water Authority)	Local governments	support	Reaffirm commitment to the full SDWA process (CCL, UCMR, preliminary determination, comment, final determination, then proposed NPDWR) in any future action.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0177

43 more organizations on this provision are in organizations.csv and the reading copy.

no-anti-backsliding: EPA's finding that rescission does not trigger SDWA section 1412(b)(9) anti-backsliding because the rule was unlawful, and alternatively that it maintains protection since no compliance deadlines have passed.

Organizations opposing it 27, asking to modify it 1, supporting it as proposed 5.

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	oppose	At a minimum, EPA should provide a more comprehensive analysis of consistency with SDWA 1412(b)(9) anti-backsliding.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0147
New Mexico Environment Department (NMED)	State agencies	oppose	EPA's zero-baseline reading of SDWA 1412(b)(9) is wrong; the rescission backslides on public health protection.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0104
Iota Intel LLC	Businesses	oppose	Do not rely on City of Waukesha or treat the baseline as no regulation; a promulgated but not-yet-effective regulation's removal is a revision under 1412(b)(9).	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0107
Senator Adam Schiff (United States Senate)	Members of Congress	oppose	Notes a strong case that the proposal contravenes the SDWA anti-backsliding provision, 42 U.S.C. 300g-1(b)(9).	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0162
Attorneys General of North Carolina, California, Connecticut, New Jersey, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin	State attorneys general	oppose	Withdraw the proposal; section 1412(b)(9) bars any revision less protective than the 2024 standards, so the four MCLs and the hazard index cannot be removed	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0165

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
Main Street Foundation, Center for Regulatory Analysis and Engagement (CRAE)	Think tanks	modify	Directly address the SDWA maintain-or-increase protection requirement, define the protection baseline and reconcile procedural and protective commands.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0157
Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA) and American Water Works Association (AWWA)	Trade associations	support	Agrees the rescission does not violate anti-backsliding, because MCLs and MCLGs resting on determinations made outside the statutory sequence are not legally valid.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0061
The Chemours Company FC, LLC	Businesses	support	Agrees that rescission of an unlawful rule is not a 'revision' and does not trigger SDWA 1412(b)(9); the rescission would also maintain the status quo of public health protection because the 2024 rule is not yet in effect.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0159

25 more organizations on this provision are in organizations.csv and the reading copy.

remove-monitoring-compliance-provisions: Removal or revision of monitoring, trigger-level, compliance and violation provisions for these PFAS in 40 CFR 141.902, 141.903 and 141.905, and of related analytical method and performance evaluation entries in 141.901.

Organizations opposing it 18, asking to modify it 3, supporting it as proposed 6.

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
Harpeth Conservancy	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	oppose	Retain routine monitoring, since removal would leave communities without information about PFAS in drinking water.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0172
Culligan International	Businesses	oppose	Keep testing and reporting of the four PFAS; municipal water providers should include testing in routine annual public reporting.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0696
International Society for Environmental Epidemiology North America Chapter (ISEE NAC)	Academics and universities	oppose	Keep monitoring requirements for all 6 original PFAS (PFBS, PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA, PFOA, PFOS), regardless of any rescission or compliance extension.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0100
New Mexico Environment Department (NMED)	State agencies	oppose	Do not make utilities halt monitoring without clear guidance. Systems have already spent funds to meet the April 26, 2027 initial monitoring deadline.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0104
Persistence Analytics Group LLC / United Grid	Businesses	modify	Preserve monitoring and occurrence data during rescission and track exposure, cost and treatment feasibility under an interim evidence standard.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0519
Laurens County Water and Sewer Commission (LCWSC)	Local governments	modify	Preserve appropriate monitoring and data-development activities needed to inform future decisions.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0086

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
Olivenhain Municipal Water District	Local governments	support	Supports removing the monitoring and reporting requirements for PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA and PFBS to cut compliance costs, relying on continued enforcement of the PFOA and PFOS standards.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0160
Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM)	State agencies	support	Supports removing the associated monitoring and treatment provisions pending proper reevaluation, through new regulatory determinations that follow the SDWA sequence.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0091

19 more organizations on this provision are in organizations.csv and the reading copy.

legal-grounds-only-scope: EPA's choice to propose the rescission solely on legal grounds and treat comments on health risks, costs or occurrence findings as outside the scope of the rulemaking.

Organizations opposing it 13, asking to modify it 1, supporting it as proposed 0.

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
Children's Environmental Health Network	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	oppose	Says that despite EPA not seeking comment on health risks, rescission is fundamentally a public health decision.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0143
International Society for Environmental Epidemiology North America Chapter (ISEE NAC)	Academics and universities	oppose	EPA should consider comments on the public health implications of the rescission despite its stated legal-grounds-only scope.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0100

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
Attorneys General of North Carolina, California, Connecticut, New Jersey, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin	State attorneys general	oppose	Reject the reading that the rescission rests on legal grounds alone; the 2024 health findings stand, and any procedural defect should be cured by notice and comment without revoking the standards	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0165
New Mexico Environment Department (NMED)	State agencies	oppose	Health risks cannot be treated as outside the scope. EPA should withdraw and assess health risk and incorporate new early-life exposure data into the record.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0104
Earthjustice, Natural Resources Defense Council, Southern Environmental Law Clinic and numerous other organizations and individuals	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	oppose	Barring comment on scientific basis, harms of repeal and reliance interests violates the APA.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0110
Environmental Data and Governance Initiative (EDGI)	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	oppose	EPA must consider all relevant material raised in comments, including health risk, cost and occurrence information, and add relevant materials from the 2024 docket to this docket.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0118

ORGANIZATION	TYPE	STANCE	WHAT IT ASKS	COMMENT
Environmental Protection Network	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	oppose	Notes EPA directed commenters to focus only on legal issues, but supplies public health and Superfund information anyway.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0181
Iota Intel LLC	Businesses	modify	Allow meaningful comment on the new remedial, health-protection and economic conclusions; incorporate the 2024 record.	EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0107

6 more organizations on this provision are in organizations.csv and the reading copy.

By provision.

rescind-reg-determinations. The question is whether a final determination to regulate, made in April 2024 after comment on a preliminary determination, can be rescinded because the standards were proposed alongside the preliminary one. 71 organizations oppose, 26 support, 7 ask for a change. EPA is likely to rescind as proposed; it has argued in court that the determinations are unlawful and it has not offered a middle course. The middle course is in the record, from the NCAI (0161), goDeeper (0150), Keweenaw Bay (0168) and MassDEP (0047), and EPA's response-to-comments document will have to meet it.

remove-mcls-mclgs-141-61. The standards fall with the determinations; 62 organizations oppose, 12 support. The International Carwash Association (0173) asks a narrower thing, a preamble statement that removal undercuts categorical industrial PFAS sampling, which shows how the standards reach beyond drinking water into pretreatment. The Institute of Hazardous Materials Management (0030) asks EPA to stay rather than remove. Likely rescinded with the determinations.

legal-reading-1412-b-1-e. The core legal dispute, 26 against, 22 for. EPA will keep its reading in the final rule; the court decides whether it is the best one. The letters for the reading come from the regulated water sector, the letters against from state regulators and attorneys general.

no-anti-backsliding. 27 against, 5 for. EPA will keep both findings, that the clause does not reach an unlawful rule and that the baseline is no regulation. The second is the weaker one, because it rests on the absence of a compliance deadline rather than on the text of the clause, and the proposal's own cost memorandum counts forgone benefits. Expect this to be a lead argument in any petition for review.

remove-monitoring-compliance-provisions. 18 against, 6 for, 3 ask for a change, and the asks cross sides: the Laurens County commission (0086) and Persistence Analytics (0519), which accept the rescission, join Harpeth Conservancy (0172), Culligan (0696), ISEE (0100) and New Mexico (0104) in asking to keep monitoring or data collection. The initial monitoring deadline of April 26, 2027 is already funded by many systems. This is the provision where a final rule could move without conceding the legal question; EPA's statement that it will re-evaluate the four PFAS gives it a reason to keep occurrence data flowing. ComtIQ still judges a monitoring carve-out unlikely, because the proposal removes 141.902 to 141.905 as a package and UCMR 5 already supplies national occurrence data.

legal-grounds-only-scope. 13 against, none for. EPA will keep the framing. The exposure is in the response to comments: if the final rule dismisses health, cost and reliance comments as out of scope while its own memorandum counts forgone benefits, the APA argument that the agency failed to consider an important aspect of the problem is set up for the court.

COORDINATED CAMPAIGNS

Letters with near-identical text are grouped by a similarity detector whose thresholds are fixed before any docket is read. Members take the reading of the group's representative text.

CAMPAIGN	LETTERS	POSITION	REPRESENTATIVE TYPE	SPONSOR
1	84	Oppose	Anonymous	not stated in text
2	18	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text
3	12	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text
4	10	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text
5	9	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text

CAMPAIGN	LETTERS	POSITION	REPRESENTATIVE TYPE	SPONSOR
6	8	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text
7	8	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text
8	7	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text
9	7	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text
10	5	Oppose	Advocacy and nonprofit organizations	not stated in text
11	5	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text
12	5	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text
13	5	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text
14	5	Oppose	Individuals	NC Sierra Club
15	5	Oppose	Individuals	not stated in text

Campaign 1. Its reading rests on: "As a stakeholder, I strongly oppose your proposal to rescind regulatory determinations and related provisions for four PFAS substances (PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA (GenX), and the mixture of these three PFAS plus PFBS)." Themes: anti-backsliding-principle, public-health-pfas-exposure, vulnerable-populations.

Campaign 2. Themes: polluter-pays-liability, public-health-pfas-exposure, science-and-evidence-basis.

Campaign 3. Themes: public-health-pfas-exposure.

Campaign 4. Themes: public-health-pfas-exposure.

Campaign 5. Themes: public-health-pfas-exposure, science-and-evidence-basis.

Campaign 6. Themes: anti-backsliding-principle, public-health-pfas-exposure.

Campaign 7. Themes: deregulation-policy-priorities, public-health-pfas-exposure.

Campaign 8. Themes: public-health-pfas-exposure, science-and-evidence-basis.

Campaign 9. Themes: mixtures-cumulative-exposure, public-health-pfas-exposure, vulnerable-populations.

Campaign 10. Representative text: EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0115. Its reading rests on: "The Agency should not proceed with the Proposed Rule to Rescind Regulatory Determinations and Regulations for PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA (GenX), and the mixture of these three PFAS plus PFBS (EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654)." Themes: anti-backsliding-principle, private-wells-and-unregulated-sources, public-health-pfas-exposure.

Campaign 11. Themes: public-health-pfas-exposure, regulatory-stability-and-trust, vulnerable-populations.

Campaign 12. Themes: public-health-pfas-exposure.

Campaign 13. Themes: anti-backsliding-principle, deregulation-policy-priorities, public-health-pfas-exposure.

Campaign 14. Themes: anti-backsliding-principle, public-health-pfas-exposure, statutory-authority-and-courts.

Campaign 15. Themes: public-health-pfas-exposure.

The largest campaign (84 letters, all anonymous) asks EPA not to rescind the determinations and the standards, in one template sentence, and cites public health, the anti-backsliding principle and vulnerable populations; the record names no sponsor. The only campaign with a named sponsor is the NC Sierra Club's (5 letters). The three petitions (0080, 0170, 0083) are not campaigns under ComtIQ's detector, which groups repeated texts across comments; each is one comment carrying a list of signatories, and the lists are reported in finding 5.

AGENCY RESPONSE

Not applicable at the proposed-rule stage. At the final rule, each significant issue above is matched to the preamble's response and unanswered issues are flagged.

OUTSIDE THE RECORD

What was said about the proposal outside the docket: law firm analyses, specialist press, statements and coverage that ComtIQ's analyst read and kept. These sources are not comments; nothing here is counted with the record above. A source marked 'filer' was published by an organization that also filed in the docket: it restates a party's position and is

not independent corroboration. The summaries are ComtIQ's; read each source before relying on it.

SOURCE	PUBLISHER	KIND	DATE	SUMMARY
Attorney General Jeff Jackson Leads States Opposing Rollback of PFAS Limits in Drinking Water - NCDOJ	North Carolina Department of Justice	agency	2026-07-21	North Carolina's Attorney General announced a multistate coalition filing against the rescission. The release says the rollback would end federal requirements to test for, report and treat the four PFAS. It argues the action is illegal and arbitrary because of the anti-backsliding provision and the lack of impact analysis.
Proposed PFOA and PFOS Compliance Extension Rule	U.S. EPA	agency		EPA's page on the companion PFOA/PFOS extension proposal says it is separate from the rescission rulemaking. It says the hearing and comment period ran in sequence with the extension rule. It restates EPA's May 2025 intent to reconsider the determinations so the process follows the SDWA.
AUGUST 2026 MID-YEAR ADVOCACY REPORT	Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies	filer	2026-08-11	AMWA says it supports the rescission. It argues that issuing a proposed regulation concurrently with a preliminary determination was contrary to the SDWA's stepwise process, and says EPA's proposal adopts that view. AMWA says it filed joint comments with AWWA in July backing the proposal and also supports the PFOA/PFOS extension.

SOURCE	PUBLISHER	KIND	DATE	SUMMARY
EPA Seeks to Gut PFAS Protections, Leaving Millions Exposed to Toxic Forever Chemicals in Tap Water	Natural Resources Defense Council	filer	2026-05-18	NRDC says the proposals would eliminate four standards and delay two others, and calls them unlawful under the SDWA. It describes the D.C. Circuit's refusal to vacate the four standards and says the litigation over the 2024 rule continues.
What to Expect in Key EPA Cases on PFAS and Lead in Drinking Water	Natural Resources Defense Council	filer		NRDC's explainer covers the pending D.C. Circuit challenge to the 2024 PFAS rule and EPA's change of position on four of the standards. It says the court declined EPA's request to vacate those standards and that EPA proposed rescission on May 18, 2026. It describes what to expect from the litigation, including timing of a decision.
EPA Rolls Back PFAS Regulations, States Fill the Gap	Ballard Spahr	law firm		The alert places the rescission within EPA's broader PFAS strategy. It says the rescission rests on the previous administration's failure to follow the SDWA's sequential process, that the PFOA/PFOS 4 ppt MCLs stay, and that EPA may re-regulate the four PFAS, possibly more strictly. It also gives the comment and hearing dates and describes states stepping in to regulate PFAS themselves.

SOURCE	PUBLISHER	KIND	DATE	SUMMARY
EPA Seeks Public Comment on Recently Proposed PFAS Drinking Water Rule Revisions	Best Best \& Krieger	law firm	2026-05-26	The alert for water-sector clients describes the two proposals. It says the rescission targets the 2024 rule's simultaneous issuance of determinations, MCLGs and MCLs. It also notes the public comment opportunity.
EPA Proposes to Revisit PFAS Drinking Water Rules	Foley Hoag	law firm		The blog post says EPA describes the rescission as solely correcting an unlawful process. It quotes EPA's position that it issued the standards without first completing the regulatory determination as a prerequisite. It adds that EPA may evaluate further PFAS for regulation after final action.
EPA Proposes Two New Rulemakings Set to Shape Safe Drinking Water Act Regulation of PFAS	Morgan Lewis	law firm		This client alert describes the rescission as a procedural correction and says EPA is not relying on any reassessment of health, occurrence, toxicity or cost findings. It suggests the procedural framing is meant to head off anti-backsliding challenges under SDWA 1412(b)(9). It predicts litigation, possibly in the D.C. Circuit, over whether a rescission based on procedural defects is lawful.

SOURCE	PUBLISHER	KIND	DATE	SUMMARY
EPA Proposes Changes to PFAS Federal Drinking Water Regulations	National Law Review	law firm		The article explains that the rescission is described by EPA as correcting an unlawful process, citing litigation issues and the Loper Bright decision. It adds that finalizing the rescission could remove the four PFAS standards as Superfund ARARs, while the PFOA/PFOS MCLs would stay as likely ARARs. It also notes that EPA may consider regulating more PFAS after final action.
EPA Proposes Major Changes to PFAS Drinking Water Rule	Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman	law firm		The alert covers both May 20, 2026 proposals and says they are likely to draw litigation from environmental groups and from industry. For the rescission, it repeats EPA's position that the 2024 tandem rulemaking was not authorized. It also flags a possible legal challenge to the separate PFOA/PFOS extension.
EPA Proposes Rules to Extend Time to Comply with PFOA and PFOS Drinking Water Standards and Rescind Regulatory Determinations and Regulations for Other PFAS - The Acta Group	The Acta Group	law firm		This regulatory-compliance alert summarizes both proposals. It quotes EPA's position that simultaneous action is not authorized under the best reading of the statute. It lists the issues on which EPA invites comment, including the meaning of 'determination to regulate', and notes that EPA says it will follow through on its commitment after final rescission.

SOURCE	PUBLISHER	KIND	DATE	SUMMARY
EPA Proposes to Partially Rescind PFAS Drinking Water Standards	Thompson Hine	law firm		The alert says EPA relies on Loper Bright to read the SDWA as requiring a sequential process. It reports that EPA argues anti-backsliding covers only lawfully promulgated rules, and that EPA distinguishes the NRDC perchlorate decision because this rescission addresses a procedural defect rather than new science. It also notes that environmental groups are expected to sue, that states are not preempted, and that losing the MCLs could change the evidence in PFAS tort litigation.
New data shows 176M exposed to ‘forever chemicals’ as Trump EPA rolls back drinking water limits	Environmental Working Group	advocacy	2026-03-01	This EWG release comes before the formal proposal. It argues that reversing the four MCLs likely conflicts with the SDWA anti-backsliding provision, citing new UCMR 5-based exposure estimates. It says abandoning the limits is a public health betrayal.
EPA proposes rescinding drinking-water limits for 4 PFAS	Chemical \& Engineering News	trade press	2026-05-19	C\&EN covers the announcement. EPA says the 2024 rule combined steps and denied the public a chance to comment, and that re-regulation could end up more stringent. It also reports criticism from environmental and public-health groups, including Earthjustice, and support from AWWA and AMWA.

SOURCE	PUBLISHER	KIND	DATE	SUMMARY
EPA Plans PFAS Rule Rollbacks After Court Tosses Chemours Order	Chemical Processing	trade press	2026-06-15	The article calls the rescission a rollback based on a technicality and sets out EPA's changed reading of the statute. It describes how to comment in both dockets. It also cites the American Chemistry Council's earlier support for rolling back the standards and points to West Virginia's lack of its own enforceable standards.
Dems ask EPA to reconsider ‘forever chemicals’ rollback - E\&E News by POLITICO	E\&E News by POLITICO	trade press		E\&E reports that 26 Senate Democrats asked Administrator Zeldin to withdraw the proposal. They argue it could violate the SDWA and conflicts with prior EPA findings and with the science.
EPA to formally rescind certain PFAS drinking water regulations	Waste Dive	trade press		Waste Dive reports the proposal as a likely first step toward restarting review of the four PFAS. It quotes Zeldin saying the four PFAS might warrant strict standards. It also reports the $1 billion in grant funding announced with the proposal, a July 7 hearing, and RFK Jr.'s pushback on calling the action a rollback.

SOURCE	PUBLISHER	KIND	DATE	SUMMARY
EPA's PFAS Rollback: Comments Closed July 20, No Final Rule Yet	WaterVerge	trade press	2026-08-30	This update reports that the comment period closed on schedule and no final rule had issued as of late August. EPA has said it intends to take final action in 2026. It confirms that the 2024 limits stay in effect until then and that litigation is expected either way.
EPA’s Proposal to Remove Drinking Water Standards for Four PFAS Could Slow Future SDWA Rulemakings	Harvard Environmental \& Energy Law Program	academic	2026-06-23	This quick take compares EPA's 2024 and 2026 readings of SDWA 1412(b)(1)(E) and sets out the legal and practical consequences of the proposal. It says the new reading could slow future SDWA rulemakings, because it adds a second comment round and a second judicial-review window. It also says the cost savings and forgone benefits are uncertain and that challengers will likely contest the 'best reading' claim.
PFAS in Drinking Water	Harvard Environmental \& Energy Law Program	academic		This tracker gives the litigation and rulemaking timeline. It records EPA's earlier motions to vacate or sever the four PFAS claims in AWWA v. EPA, and the D.C. Circuit's denials of them. It also gives the hearing and registration dates and the July 20 comment deadline.

SOURCE	PUBLISHER	KIND	DATE	SUMMARY
Heinrich Joins Schiff, Senate Colleagues in Demanding EPA Drop Efforts to Weaken Health Protections for Millions of Americans	Office of Sen. Martin Heinrich	congress		A Senate Democratic letter led by Sen. Schiff demands that EPA withdraw the rescission. The senators say the proposal likely violates the SDWA anti-backsliding provision and would remove federal limits on PFAS linked to serious health effects.
Dingell, Fitzpatrick Raise Bipartisan Concerns Over Administration’s Rollback of Clean Water Protections	Rep. Debbie Dingell	congress	2026-05-19	Reps. Dingell (D) and Fitzpatrick (R) raise bipartisan concerns about the rollback of PFAS drinking water standards. They encourage EPA to reconsider and note their earlier bipartisan bill to codify the standards. They also acknowledge the nearly $1 billion in new state funding.

Outside discussion matches the record on the legal frame and adds what the record lacks: timing. The law firm alerts (Morgan Lewis, Thompson Hine, Ballard Spahr, Pillsbury) read the proposal as a procedural correction designed to avoid the anti-backsliding clause and expect litigation from both sides; the Harvard Environmental and Energy Law Program adds that EPA's new reading would slow every future SDWA rulemaking by adding a second comment round. On the supporting side, AMWA's own mid-year report confirms the position in its joint letter. The comment docket does not show what was argued at the July 7 hearing, whose recording EPA posts on the rule's page. Nor does it show the meetings held at the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs while the proposal was under review; reginfo.gov lists three for RIN 2040-AG53, on March 27, April 9 and April 20, 2026, requested according to those records by the Environmental Working Group, by the American Chemistry Council with Chemours in attendance, and by the Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments. The records show that the meetings took place and who attended; they do not show what was decided. Nor does the record show the D.C. Circuit's view, which will arrive in American Water Works Association v. EPA, No. 24-1188, argued September 18, 2026.

IMPLICATIONS AND SCENARIOS

Each judgment carries a likelihood term and band (ICD 203), a confidence and the test that settles it, and goes into the forecast log. The bands are the analyst's estimates, not frequencies from the census or outputs of a validated model; they rest on the statute, the proposal, the court record and what EPA has said. The number of commenters on a side is context, not the basis.

ID	JUDGMENT	LIKELIHOOD	CONFIDENCE	BASIS	SETTLES IT
S1	EPA publishes a final rescission rule by June 30, 2027	Likely (55 to 80%)	Low	EPA said it would act in 2026 and its agenda target of September 2026 passed; its legal position is fixed, since it conceded the point in court, but no final rule has been listed for OIRA review as of November 7, 2026, and the pending D.C. Circuit decision gives EPA a reason to wait	Federal Register, RIN 2040-AG53
S2	If a final rule publishes, it rescinds the determinations and the standards for all four PFAS as proposed	Likely (55 to 80%)	Moderate	EPA told the court the determinations are unlawful and proposed no partial course; the only letters asking for a narrower result accept the legal reading EPA rejects as sufficient	Final rule text, 40 CFR 141.61

ID	JUDGMENT	LIKELIHOOD	CONFIDENCE	BASIS	SETTLES IT
S3	The final rule keeps a monitoring or occurrence-data requirement for the four PFAS	Unlikely (20 to 45%)	Low	Asked for across sides (0086, 0519, 0100, 0104, 0172); the proposal removes 141.902 to 141.905 as a package and UCMR 5 already collects occurrence data; EPA's promise to re-evaluate is the argument for keeping it	Final rule text, 40 CFR 141.902 to 141.905
S4	EPA adopts the procedural cure, keeping the determinations and re-proposing the standards, instead of rescinding	Very unlikely (5 to 20%)	Moderate	EPA's position in court is that the determinations themselves are unlawful; the cure is asked for by four organizations (0161, 0150, 0168, 0047); a court order would be the likeliest route to it	Final rule, or a remand order
S5	The D.C. Circuit decides American Water Works Association v. EPA before the final rescission publishes	Roughly even chance (45 to 55%)	Low	Argued September 18, 2026; the court refused to sever the four PFAS, so the issues remain before the court, although the scope of its eventual decision is uncertain; EPA may wait for it or publish first	D.C. Circuit opinion date against the Federal Register date
S6	A petition for review of the final rescission is filed within the 45-day window of SDWA section 1448	Almost certain (95 to 99%)	High	19 attorneys general (0165) and the Earthjustice, NRDC and SELC coalition (0842) oppose on legal grounds and have litigated the 2024 rule already	Petition docketed in the D.C. Circuit

ID	JUDGMENT	LIKELIHOOD	CONFIDENCE	BASIS	SETTLES IT
S7	If a final rescission publishes and is challenged, the court upholds it on the merits (a remand without vacatur counts as not upheld)	Roughly even chance (45 to 55%)	Low	The sequence question is open text and the court twice declined to decide it summarily; NRDC v. Regan weighs against withdrawing a determination; EPA's distinction, that these determinations were unlawful, is untested	Court of appeals judgment
S8	EPA proposes a new standard for any of the four PFAS by December 31, 2028	Unlikely (20 to 45%)	Low	EPA says it will re-evaluate the four after rescission but gives no schedule; the perchlorate re-proposal took years after NRDC v. Regan	Federal Register

What would change this view: a D.C. Circuit opinion in AWWA v. EPA that reaches the sequence question would move S2, S4 and S7 sharply in either direction; a supplemental notice from EPA on monitoring would raise S3; a final rule that answers the NCAI and goDeeper letters with a severability or re-proposal plan would raise S4.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS AND DATES

What the record means for each reader, the provision and forecast behind it, and when to act.

READER	WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS	WHAT TO DO	BY
Public water system	The 2024 rule is in force and the initial monitoring deadline covers all six PFAS; a federal rescission is likely (S2) but a monitoring carve-out is unlikely (S3), and state standards persist	Keep the April 2027 monitoring plan for all six PFAS until a final rule's effective date changes the federal duty; separate three things in the plan: federal duties in force, state duties, and voluntary risk-based sampling for the four, which state rules, consumer confidence reports and pretreatment programs may still use; budget treatment on PFOA and PFOS, which stay	Now; revisit at publication of a final rule and at its effective date
State primacy agency	EPA says states may seek an extension of the primacy revision until the scope is settled; 19 attorneys general and eight state agencies oppose	Request the primacy extension; decide whether to adopt the four standards under state law, as New Jersey, Massachusetts and others have done; prepare the record for a petition for review if the state intends to join one	At publication of a final rule, then within 45 days of it
Industrial discharger or pretreatment program	The International Carwash Association (0173) reads the standards as the basis for categorical industrial PFAS sampling	Map which local limits and sampling duties cite the four MCLs and what replaces them if they fall	At publication of a final rule
Chemical manufacturer or PFAS defendant	Rescission removes four federal MCLs that serve as cleanup benchmarks and evidence in tort cases; PFOA and PFOS at 4 ppt stay; a federal rescission does not by itself remove state standards, cleanup obligations or liability theories	If a final rule publishes, assess its effective date and any judicial stay separately; reevaluate federal obligations only when the governing text changes, and review state benchmarks and site-specific cleanup requirements provision by provision and state by state; a petition for review (S6) does not by itself suspend the final rule	At publication; at the effective date; at any stay order; at the court decision

READER	WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS	WHAT TO DO	BY
Law practice or policy team	The decisive letters are few	Read the attorneys general (0165), NCAI (0161), goDeeper (0150), Iota Intel (0107), New Jersey (0152), AMWA/AWWA (0061) and Chemours (0159) first; keep an issue matrix by provision and forecast; read the D.C. Circuit opinion in No. 24-1188 the day it issues	Now; at the court decision; at publication of a final rule
Public health or environmental organization	The procedural cure is the argument EPA has not answered	Put the re-proposal alternative at the center of any petition for review and any meeting with EPA; the remedy question, not the hazard, is where the rule is weakest	At publication of a final rule, then within 45 days of it

Dates: 2024 rule published April 26, 2024 (89 FR 32532), with initial monitoring due April 26, 2027 and MCL compliance due April 26, 2029; a separate 2026 proposal would let systems seek until 2031 for PFOA and PFOS, and it is a proposal; proposal published May 20, 2026 (91 FR 29413); hearing July 7, 2026; comments closed July 20, 2026; AWWA v. EPA argued September 18, 2026, decision pending; no final rule found as of November 7, 2026. A petition for review of a final rule must be filed within 45 days of its promulgation (SDWA section 1448, 42 U.S.C. 300j-7), and filing does not stay the rule. A final rule takes effect on the date its text sets, whatever the state of the litigation, unless a court orders otherwise. Watch the Federal Register and the Unified Agenda for RIN 2040-AG53 and the D.C. Circuit docket for No. 24-1188.

METHOD, SOURCES AND LIMITS

Collection. Every posted comment in docket EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654 was pulled through the Regulations.gov v4 API and stored with a dated snapshot, with every attachment the API listed except 2 that the API lists but does not serve (comments 1062, 1260), read from the comment field alone; attachments were read as PDF, Word or plain text, scanned PDFs through OCR, and image-only files recorded as comments without words. Census generated Nov. 8, 2026.

Processing. Exact and near duplicates grouped and coordinated campaigns detected as described above. One representative per campaign was coded; 1,377 comments were read one by one, holding 2,345 distinct texts once each attachment is counted on its own, and campaign members inherit their representative's reading.

Analysis. Each unique text was read and coded by ComtIQ's AI coding system against a fixed codebook, returning position, commenter type, themes, argument types, provisions for organizations, and the sentence each judgment rests on. 39 comments were flagged as uncertain by the coding system (unclear stance, attachment-only text or a reading it doubted); 35 are longer than the reading limit (see the limits below), and 33 are both. All 39 flagged readings were then read in full and confirmed or corrected, so none is open. The flags are reported as coverage and the reading stands unless the analyst corrected it. Campaign members inherit the reading of their representative.

Measurement. The unit is the comment read directly: 1,377 of them, campaign copies once (the 2,345 distinct texts above count comment fields and attachments separately). A simple random sample, not stratified, of 15% (207; the share is set by docket size, all of a docket up to 100 comments, half up to 500, 15% up to 2,000, 5% above) was read a second time, blind, at a stronger reading level. Agreement between the two readings, not accuracy against a human: position in three values (support, oppose, other) 99% (95% interval 96% to 99%, n=207); organizations 100% (95% interval 87% to 100%, n=24); individuals, which here include anonymous and unclear commenters, 98% (95% interval 96% to 99%, n=183); commenter group 97% (95% interval 94% to 99%, n=207). The group sizes come from the draw, not from a quota. Intervals are Wilson intervals with the finite population correction; the population is the 1,377 comments read directly, and for each group its share of them as estimated from the sample. These figures cover position and commenter type only; themes, argument types and provisions are not measured.

0 posted comments carry no readable text. 35 comments are longer than 40,000 characters; the coding system read each up to that limit, and each was then read in full, 1 by the analyst and 34 by ComtIQ's reading assistant, whose readings the analyst checked; each reading was confirmed or corrected. Themes, argument types and provisions are automated readings not yet measured against a second reading; they are reported as counts, not as findings, unless an analyst confirmed them. No comment is labeled as written by AI; nothing here speaks to authorship.

APPENDIX. CITED COMMENTS

COMMENT	LINK
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0017	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0017
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0024	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0024
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0028	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0028
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0030	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0030
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0047	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0047
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0055	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0055
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0061	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0061
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0080	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0080
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0083	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0083
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0086	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0086
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0088	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0088
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0090	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0090

COMMENT	LINK
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0091	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0091
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0094	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0094
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0100	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0100
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0104	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0104
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0107	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0107
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0110	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0110
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0113	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0113
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0115	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0115
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0118	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0118
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0120	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0120
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0129	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0129
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0130	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0130
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0137	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0137

COMMENT	LINK
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0141	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0141
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0143	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0143
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0147	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0147
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0150	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0150
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0152	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0152
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0157	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0157
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0159	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0159
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0160	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0160
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0161	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0161
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0162	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0162
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0165	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0165
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0168	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0168
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0172	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0172

COMMENT	LINK
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0173	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0173
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0177	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0177
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0179	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0179
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0180	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0180
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0181	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0181
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0183	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0183
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0519	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0519
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0696	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0696
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0842	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-0842
EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-1021	https://www.regulations.gov/comment/EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0654-1021

The data behind the tables (organizations with their stance, campaigns, position by commenter type) is published with this report as CSV files.