

DATE

Sent via email to: Chris Gorud; Colin.Timmerman@mail.house.gov;
Shane.Trimmer@mail.house.gov; Jacob.Marx@mail.house.gov;
Jonathan.Kuperman@mail.house.gov

The Honorable Congressman Correa
2301 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
(email: Ngoc.Nguyen@mail.house.gov)

The Honorable Congresswoman Kim
1306 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
(email: Colin.Timmerman@mail.house.gov)

The Honorable Congressman Lowenthal
108 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
(email: Shane.Trimmer@mail.house.gov)

The Honorable Congresswoman Porter
1117 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
(email: Jacob.Marx@mail.house.gov)

The Honorable Congresswoman Steel
1113 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
(email: Jonathan.Kuperman@mail.house.gov)

Dear Representatives Correa, Kim, Lowenthal, Porter, and Steel:

PFAS are a group of manmade chemicals created by chemical manufacturers and despite playing no role in releasing PFAS into the environment, cities and water agencies must find ways to remove them from local water supplies, find alternative water supply, and conduct expensive monitoring. PFAS have been detected in the Orange County Groundwater Basin, managed by Orange County Water District (OCWD), and are estimated to cost Orange County communities more than \$1 billion, over 30 years—a cost that could increase. Complicating this cleanup burden, ratepayers are at additional risk from pending PFAS legislation that would effectively abandon the “polluter pays” principle and create a new separate drinking water standard setting process for PFAS chemicals.

I ask as you consider legislation to address PFAS and other contaminants of emerging concern, that you ensure any legislation or rulemaking provides an explicit exemption from liability for water and wastewater agencies related to PFAS cleanup costs. A water utility that complies with applicable and appropriate federal management and treatment standards must not be responsible for current and future costs associated with a PFAS cleanup. Water agencies have no responsibility for the presence of PFAS and the concept of imposing CERCLA liability is bad public policy. We also advocate that USEPA rely upon the Safe Drinking Water Act’s current methodology, which includes a cost-benefit analysis as a component in the development of drinking water standards for PFOA and PFOS. This current methodology ensures that public health benefits of new drinking water standards are reasonably balanced with the compliance costs.

I call upon California’s House of Representatives to cast votes implementing these public policy positions. If I can provide any further information or assistance, please contact me at **(insert your contact information)**.

Sincerely,

(insert your name)
(insert position, name of city or agency)

cc: Board President Steve Sheldon (ssheldon@ocwd.com)