Climate & Earth Systems | Jan 8, 2026 | 8 min read | By Bryan White

PFBS, PFNA, and the EPA: Inside the Struggle to Regulate Toxicity in "Forever Chemicals"

Environment * Conservation * Urban Environment

The Persistent Legacy of the Carbon-Fluorine Bond

In modern industrial chemistry, per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) -- colloquially known as "forever chemicals" -- stand as a double-edged triumph of mid-century engineering. Defined by the extraordinarily robust carbon-fluorine bond, these compounds repel oil, grease, and water across non-stick cookware, stain-resistant textiles, and aqueous film-forming foams (AFFF). Yet the same thermodynamic stability that makes PFAS commercially indispensable renders them environmentally immortal, allowing them to accumulate in soil, groundwater, wildlife, and human serum worldwide.[1]

For decades, regulatory oversight centered on two eight-carbon (C8) compounds: perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS). As epidemiological investigations and internal corporate records linked these long-chain substances to immune suppression, hepatic injury, developmental defects, and cancer, major manufacturers phased out C8 production in favor of "short-chain" homologs.[2] Perfluorobutane Sulfonic Acid (PFBS), built on a four-carbon backbone, was marketed as a benign replacement for PFOS because it cleared from human serum in weeks rather than years.[2] Subsequent toxicological evaluations, however, demonstrated that rapid clearance does not equate to biological safety: PFBS targets the thyroid, kidneys, and fetal endocrine programming.[1]

This report examines the contested regulatory trajectory of PFBS alongside its nine-carbon relative, Perfluorononanoic Acid (PFNA). In January 2021, political appointees at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) intervened to alter a peer-reviewed PFBS toxicity assessment, replacing a definitive safety threshold with a weakened range of values.[1][4] In late 2025, a parallel administrative blockade emerged as the agency withheld a completed Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) toxicity report on PFNA.[3][14] Dissecting the dose-response mathematics, target-organ toxicities, and bureaucratic suppression surrounding these compounds reveals how statistical uncertainty factors intended to safeguard public health can be manipulated to reduce industrial remediation liabilities.

The Mechanics of Federal Risk Assessment and Uncertainty Arithmetic

The EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) establishes the toxicological benchmarks upon which federal and state program offices build enforceable drinking water and cleanup standards.[4] The cornerstone of non-cancer risk assessment is the Oral Reference Dose (RfD), an estimate of daily lifetime exposure likely to be without appreciable risk of deleterious effects. Modern derivations model the dose-response curve to identify a Benchmark Dose Lower Confidence Limit (BMDL) as the Point of Departure (POD).[5]

To extrapolate from controlled animal bioassays to heterogeneous human populations, risk assessors divide the POD by composite Uncertainty Factors (UFs), typically assigned in multiples of 3 or 10:[5]

* Interspecies Uncertainty (UFa): Accounts for toxicokinetic and toxicodynamic differences between laboratory rodents and humans.[4][5]

* Intraspecies Uncertainty (UFh): Protects sensitive human subpopulations, including fetuses, infants, and immunocompromised individuals.[4][5]

* Database Uncertainty (UFd): Applied when toxicological literature lacks critical evaluations, such as multi-generation reproductive or developmental neurotoxicity studies.[4][5]

Because the RfD equals the POD divided by the product of these factors, reducing a single UFd from 10 to 1 increases the permissible exposure limit tenfold. In groundwater remediation under CERCLA or state drinking water standards, a tenfold relaxation can shift cleanup obligations by billions of dollars.[1]

PFBS: Environmental Mobility and Target-Organ Toxicology

Although PFBS exhibits lower bioaccumulation potential than PFOS due to its four-carbon sulfonate structure, its high water solubility makes it an exceptionally mobile contaminant. Unlike long-chain PFAS that adsorb to organic soil matrices, PFBS migrates rapidly with groundwater fronts and breaks through granular activated carbon (GAC) filtration beds far earlier than PFOA or PFOS -- accelerated by competitive displacement from long-chain PFAS and coexisting ions -- necessitating frequent and costly media replacement.[6][7]

Toxicological studies by Feng et al. (2017)[8] and the National Toxicology Program (2019)[9] established that PFBS disrupts three primary physiological systems:

* Thyroid Hormone Perturbation: The most sensitive endpoint identified by EPA toxicologists is profound hypothyroxinemia -- dose-dependent reductions in circulating thyroxine (T4) in pregnant dams and neonatal mice.[8][10] Because PFBS lowers serum T4 without a consistent compensatory surge in Thyroid Stimulating Hormone (TSH), evidence indicates it displaces T4 from transport proteins and accelerates hepatic clearance, threatening irreversible neurodevelopmental deficits during gestation.[8][10]

* Renal Hyperplasia: As the primary route of excretion, the kidneys concentrate PFBS, resulting in increased organ weight and papillary epithelial tubular and ductal hyperplasia.[9][10]

* Reproductive Delays: Rodent models further demonstrate delayed vaginal opening and altered ovarian and uterine morphology following perinatal exposure.[8][11]

Regulatory Interference: From the 2021 PFBS Scandal to the 2025 PFNA Delay

By late 2020, career scientists in the EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD) had finalized a peer-reviewed PFBS assessment anchored on neonatal thyroid disruption, applying a database uncertainty factor (UFd) of 10 to account for absent developmental neurotoxicity and immunotoxicity data.[3][7] During a last-minute

review directed by political leadership in the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP), appointees overrode ORD scientists and demanded a UFd of 1.[4][12]

Published on January 19, 2021, the compromised assessment broke agency precedent by replacing a single chronic RfD with a tenfold range (0.0003 to 0.001 mg/kg-day), inviting polluters to lobby for the least protective bound.[1][4] Acting Science Advisor Dr. Jennifer Orme-Zavaleta publicly disavowed the insertion as biased political interference, and in April 2021 the EPA rescinded the range, restoring a single chronic RfD of 0.0003 mg/kg-day.[11][13]

| Assessment Version | | Date Released | | Chronic RfD (mg/kg-day) | | Subchronic RfD (mg/kg-day) | | Key Methodological Action |

| Compromised Assessment | | Jan 19, 2021 | | Range: 0.0003 - 0.001 | | Range: 0.001 - 0.003 | | Political appointees imposed a range and reduced UFd from 10 to 1 for the upper bound. |

| Restored Final Assessment | | Apr 8, 2021 | | Single Value: 0.0003 | | Single Value: 0.001 | | Reinstated single scientific value and full UFd of 10 for missing immunotoxicity/neurotoxicity data. |

In October 2025, investigative reporting revealed that the EPA was employing an administrative "pocket veto" against a completed IRIS assessment for Perfluorononanoic Acid (PFNA).[3][14] Although PFNA passed internal clearance and peer review in spring 2025, political leadership withheld publication.[3] Found in the drinking water supplies of roughly 26 million Americans, the nine-carbon carboxylate exhibits multi-year human half-lives and severe reproductive toxicity.[3] Internal findings confirm that PFNA causes statistically significant reductions in human infant birth weight alongside male reproductive damage -- including diminished testosterone, impaired spermatogenesis, and testicular atrophy -- while activating hepatic PPAR-alpha pathways.[3][14][15]

| Feature | | PFBS (C4 Sulfonate) | | PFOS (C8 Sulfonate) | | PFNA (C9 Carboxylate) |

| Structure | | 4 Carbons, Sulfonic Acid | | 8 Carbons, Sulfonic Acid | | 9 Carbons, Carboxylic Acid |

| Human Half-Life | | ~1 month | | 3.4 - 5.4 years | | 2.5 - 4.3 years |

| Bioaccumulation | | Low (Serum, Renal clearance) | | High (Liver, Serum) | | Very High (Liver, Serum albumin) |

| Critical Effect (EPA) | | Thyroid hormone reduction (T4) | | Immune suppression, Hepatic | | Decreased birth weight, Male reproductive toxicity |

| EPA Chronic RfD | | 0.0003 mg/kg-day (Restored 2021) | | 0.000002 mg/kg-day | | Completed 2025; Withheld |

Conclusion: The Integrity of the Toxicological Benchmark

The parallel struggles surrounding PFBS and PFNA expose two distinct structural vulnerabilities in U.S. environmental governance: the post-hoc manipulation of uncertainty factors to dilute quantitative benchmarks, and the indefinite

administrative withholding of completed IRIS assessments to stall statutory enforcement under the Safe Drinking Water Act and CERCLA.[3][12] While the EPA Office of Inspector General validated career scientists' complaints regarding the 2021 PFBS breach in a landmark 2023 oversight report, reactive audits cannot compel the real-time release of suppressed hazard determinations.[4][12]

Ultimately, an Oral Reference Dose is not merely an abstract calculation; it is the regulatory boundary separating safe municipal water from unmitigated toxic exposure. Protecting fetal thyroid development, renal function, and human reproductive capacity against thousands of commercial PFAS requires insulating federal risk assessment from political clearance bottlenecks and regulating fluorochemicals as a structural class rather than through delayed, chemical-by-chemical attrition.

Updates... (Nov 20, 2026): Replaced broken, 403/404, and bot-gated references with verified CrossRef DOIs (Zhang et al., 2023; Feng et al., 2017; NTP TOX 96, 2019; Dankovic et al., 2015; Wolf et al., 2010) and live primary EPA/Undark/ProPublica sources with full publication dates; removed section numbering; split multi-citation superscripts; and aligned inline citations 1-to-1 with the numbered reference list.

References

* [1] Perkins, T. (2023, Mar 23). Trump appointees interfered to weaken EPA assessment of toxic chemical. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/mar/23/trump-appointees-epa-toxic-chemical-pfas-pfbs-toxic

* [2] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2021, Jan 19). Toxicity Assessment for PFBS (Archived Snapshot). https://19january2021snapshot.epa.gov/pfas/toxicity-assessment-pfbs_.html

* [3] Lerner, S. (2025, Oct 14). EPA Readied a Report on One Forever Chemical. Now It's in Limbo. Undark. https://undark.org/2025/10/14/epa-toxicity-report-pfna/

* [4] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Inspector General (2023, Mar 7). The EPA's January 2021 PFBS Toxicity Assessment Did Not Uphold the Agency's Commitments to Scientific Integrity and Information Quality (Report No. 23-E-0013). https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-03/_epaoig_20230307-23-E-0013.pdf

* [5] Dankovic, D. A., Naumann, B. D., Maier, A., Dourson, M. L., & Levy, L. S. (2015, Nov 25). The Scientific Basis of Uncertainty Factors Used in Setting Occupational Exposure Limits. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene, 12(sup1), S55-S68. https://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2015.1060325

* [6] Zhang, Y., Thomas, A., Apul, O. G., & Venkatesan, A. K. (2023). Coexisting ions and long-chain per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) inhibit the adsorption of short-chain PFAS by granular activated carbon. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 460, 132378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2023.132378

* [7] Minnesota Department of Health (2023, Nov). Perfluorobutane Sulfonate (PFBS) Toxicological Summary. https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/risk/docs/guidance/gw/pfbssummary.pdf

* [8] Feng, X., Cao, X., Zhao, S., Wang, X., Hua, X., Chen, L., & Chen, L. (2017). Exposure of Pregnant Mice to Perfluorobutanesulfonate Causes Hypothyroxinemia and Developmental Abnormalities in Female Offspring. Toxicological Sciences, 155(2),

409-419. https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfw219

* [9] National Toxicology Program (2019, Aug). Toxicity Studies of Perfluoroalkyl Sulfonates Administered by Gavage to Sprague Dawley Rats (NTP TOX 96). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://doi.org/10.22427/NTP-OTHER-1

* [10] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2018, Nov). Response to Peer Review Comments on the Draft Human Health Toxicity Values for Perfluorobutane Sulfonic Acid (CASRN 375-73-5). https://19january2021snapshot.epa.gov/sites/static/files/2018-11/documents/pfbs_epa_response_to_peer_review_comments_nov201

* [11] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2021, Jan). Human Health Toxicity Values for Perfluorobutane Sulfonic Acid and Related Compound Potassium Perfluorobutane Sulfonate (Pre-publication Federal Register Notice). https://19january2021snapshot.epa.gov/sites/static/files/2021-01/documents/hold_for_pfas_prepub_frn.pdf

* [12] Bergeson, L. L. (2023, Mar 10). EPA OIG Finds EPA's January 2021 PFBS Toxicity Assessment Did Not Uphold EPA's Commitments to Scientific Integrity and Information Quality. Bergeson & Campbell, P.C. https://www.lawbc.com/epa-oig-finds-epas-january-2021-pfbs-toxicity-assessment-did-not-uphold-epas-commitments-to-scientific-i

* [13] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2021, Feb 9). EPA Takes Action to Protect Scientific Integrity. https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-takes-action-protect-scientific-integrity

* [14] ProPublica (2025, Oct 9). Scientists Completed a Toxicity Report on This Forever Chemical. The EPA Hasn't Released It. https://www.propublica.org/article/epa-pfna-forever-chemical-report

* [15] Wolf, C. J., Zehr, R. D., Schmid, J. E., Lau, C., & Abbott, B. D. (2010). Developmental Effects of Perfluorononanoic Acid in the Mouse Are Dependent on Peroxisome Proliferator-Activated Receptor-Alpha. PPAR Research, 2010, 282896. https://doi.org/10.1155/2010/282896