

**Stephen Hoffman**



**From:** ecomment@pa.gov  
**Sent:** Monday, April 25, 2022 5:41 PM  
**To:** Environment-Committee@pasenate.com; environmentalcommittee@pahouse.net;  
regcomments@pa.gov; Troutman, Nick; Glendon King; Franzese, Evan B.; Eyster, Emily;  
IRRC  
**Cc:** c-jflanagan@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:

Thomas Simonet  
(simonet@rider.edu)  
59 E. College Ave  
Yardley, PA 19067 US

Comments entered:

Dear PA Environmental Quality Board,

I applaud the Board for proposing statewide PFAS standards and encourage Board members to further strengthen the specific requirements of these important protections of Pennsylvanians' Constitutional "right to ... pure water."

I live a block from the Delaware River and have been watching water quality for decades, but I first learned about this issue from a cover story in Consumer Reports magazine highlighting how much PFAS have become a mainstream concern. I infer from CR's article that the science has concluded PFAS regulation has moved from "abundance of caution" advisories to dire "red alert" warnings of toxins. Thank you for heeding them!

I urge you to fortify the proposed standards by including:

- maximum allowed levels in the single digits ppt;
- implementation ASAP, not in two or three years;
- inclusion of more PFAS compounds, including all PFAS compounds that DEP has sampled and

found in our state;  
-- application of the rulemaking to private water systems.

I admire the Board's painstaking attention to the complex details of this important issue. I would like to remind you to evaluate the inevitable arguments that will oppose strict regulation because of the high costs of implementation and enforcement, by weighing those costs against the costs of doing nothing. My layman's guess is that every cancer carries an average price tag of tens of thousands of dollars to the individual and society. Plus, the quality-of-life costs are immeasurable.

Sincerely,

---

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](mailto:ecomment@pa.gov)