

DIRECTORS

DENIS R. BILODEAU, P.E.  
CATHY GREEN  
NELIDA MENDOZA  
DINA L. NGUYEN, ESQ.  
KELLY E. ROWE, C.E.G., C.H.  
STEPHEN R. SHELDON  
HARRY SIDHU, P.E.  
TRI TA  
BRUCE WHITAKER  
ROGER C. YOH, P.E.



**ORANGE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT**  
ORANGE COUNTY'S GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

OFFICERS

**President**  
STEPHEN R. SHELDON  
  
**First Vice President**  
CATHY GREEN  
  
**Second Vice President**  
TRI TA  
  
**General Manager**  
MICHAEL R. MARKUS, P.E., D.WRE

September 20, 2021

The Honorable Young Kim  
United States House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

**RE: Fitzpatrick PFAS Standard Setting Amendment Number 860 to National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA)**

Dear Representative Kim:

On behalf of the Orange County Water District (OCWD; the District), we write to seek your active support on a matter we have communicated with your office about over the past few months. OCWD has worked to advance PFAS legislation that would preserve the polluter pays principal for PFAS cleanups and provide for a PFAS National Drinking Water Standard grounded in the Safe Drinking Water Act's provisions balancing economics and health benefits of any such standard. Your continued support of these priorities is vital. To this end, we request that you work with your colleagues and oppose Representative Brian Fitzpatrick's amendment to the NDAA when the Committee on Rules consider the submitted amendment and, if made in order, work during floor debate to oppose its adoption.

As submitted to the Committee on Rules, the Fitzpatrick amendment simply uses the PFAS standard setting provision passed by the House as part of the PFAS Action Act (H.R. 2467). We communicated our opposition to the removal of the economic cost analysis within existing law when the House voted and passed H.R. 2467. The decision to seek amendment of NDAA with a provision that has already received House floor debate and passage is duplicative and unnecessary. Second, we are deeply concerned that the action to amend a defense authorization bill with a public health provision within the scope of another congressional committee establishes an undesirable precedent for the orderly consideration of public health mandates that public water agencies must ultimately comply with and dedicate strained resources.

For these reasons, we urgently request that you oppose Amendment 860.

Sincerely,

Stephen R. Sheldon  
Board President