

**David B. McKinley Opening Statement (6/23/21)**  
**Energy and Commerce Committee Markup**  
**Drinking Water & PFAS Legislation**  
*As prepared for delivery*

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The AQUA Act is a well-intentioned bill but I still have serious concerns with it. It removes the cost-benefit requirement and small systems variance from the Safe Drinking Water Act. I will again offer an amendment to ensure these existing provisions remain in law.

The committee will also examine the “water assistance programs act of 2021” This bill will create at EPA, for the first time, a permanent government social program. And lastly the committee will markup a bill on PFAS. As I pointed out last week nearly a quarter of our members are new to the committee. Yet we haven’t had a hearing on pfas in two years despite my request for one at last week’s markup.

Remember PFAS is a class of over 9,000 different chemicals with varying properties and characteristics. And the science on pfas has evolved since this committee last had a hearing. Yet this bill takes a non-scientific, one-size-fits-

all approach to addressing this problem. And curiously it includes a unique exemption from superfund liability for airports. Airports have been one of the biggest users of firefighting foam containing PFOA and PFOS. Sure, the FAA has required airports to use it. Others, like water utilities, are also required by the federal government to filter water containing PFAS. But they don't receive an exemption.

Obviously, you're trying to do airports a favor but why not water systems? Mr. Chairman, I'm interested to learn your explanation for favoring one group over another. And let's not forget that EPA has made significant progress in addressing PFAS since this bill passed the house last year, and congress has already passed key bipartisan laws to address it.

Mr. Chairman let's take the time to address this issue in a more thoughtful manner before this bill goes to the floor. Thank you and I yield back.