

3334

Kathy Cooper

From: ecomment@pa.gov
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2022 8:57 AM
To: Environment-Committee@pasenate.com; environmentalcommittee@pahouse.net; regcomments@pa.gov; Troutman, Nick; Glendon King; Franzese, Evan B.; Eyster, Emily; IRRC
Cc: c-jflanaga@pa.gov
Subject: Comment received - Proposed Rulemaking: Safe Drinking Water PFAS MCL Rule (#7-569)

CAUTION: **EXTERNAL SENDER** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



Re: eComment System

The Department of Environmental Protection has received the following comments on Proposed Rulemaking: Safe Drinking Water PFAS MCL Rule (#7-569).

Commenter Information:

Shane Pepe
Borough of Emmaus (spepe@borough.emmaus.pa.us)
28 S. 4th Street
Emmaus, PA 18049 US

RECEIVED

MAR 29 2022

**Independent Regulatory
Review Commission**

Comments entered:

Make no mistake, there are health concerns with PFOS and PFOA. I certainly support regulating PFAS chemicals in drinking water, as all chemicals should be regulated. HOWEVER, my deep concern is that PA DEP has created an arbitrary number with these level with no scientific research at all to justify the numbers. The Borough of Emmaus is already going to incur over \$1 million in costs to address two wells in the community. However, if you lower the levels to these levels, the Borough will have a 3rd well that is contaminated. This will cost no less than an additional \$500,000, another DEP unfunded mandate, and \$30,000 per year forever to maintain. The Borough's entire water budget is \$1 million.

Furthermore, PA DEP has only tested less than 10% of all of the public drinking wells across the Commonwealth. What is the true percentage of "polluted" drinking water, and how much is it going to cost the citizens of the communities to address the water, without financial assistance from PA DEP?

We would not be as concerned with the proposed numbers if PA DEP could actually scientifically back up the reason for the proposed numbers. However, we all know that EPA can't even justify where they came up with the number of 70 ppt, let alone DEP arbitrarily decreasing the numbers down to the new proposed numbers. Rather than playing politics, we encourage you to practice

science before changing the numbers. Unfortunately, we are all aware that that scientific research hasn't been adequately completed.

Again, we do not oppose setting a regulated number to ensure safe drinking water. However, we do oppose another unfunded mandate that does not include adequate scientific research to back up the change.

No attachments were included as part of this comment.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Jessica Shirley

Jessica Shirley
Director, Office of Policy
PA Department of Environmental Protection
Rachel Carson State Office Building
P.O. Box 2063
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063
Office: 717-783-8727
Fax: 717-783-8926
ecomment@pa.gov