GREG WALDEN, OREGON
CHAIRMAN

FRANK PALLONE, JR., NEW JERSEY
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515–6115
Majority (202) 225–2927
Minority (202) 225–3641

October 16, 2018

Ms. Carol Isaacs
Director
Michigan PFAS Action Response Team
111 South Capitol Ave
Lansing, MI 48933

Dear Ms. Isaacs:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Environment on September 6, 2018, to testify at the hearing entitled "Perfluorinated Chemicals in the Environment: An Update on the Response to Contamination and Challenges Presented."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. Also attached are Member requests made during the hearing. To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions and requests with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Tuesday, October 30, 2018. Your responses should be mailed to Kelly Collins, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to kelly.collins@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

John Shimkus
Chairman
Subcommittee on Environment

cc: The Honorable Paul Tonko, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Environment

Attachments

Attachment—Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable John Shimkus

1. What are some of the steps MPART has taken to deal with PFAS contamination?
    a. Does MPART have regulatory and/or enforcement authority?
    b. Does that impact the ability of MPART to be effective?
2. How does MPART work with local governments within the State of Michigan?
3. One of the issues we focused on with this hearing is what are the technical and economic barriers that States face with respect to responding to PFAS contamination?
    a. Do you feel like MPART is better suited to deal with technical and economic barriers that face State governments than states without such an organization?
    b. Why?
4. What do you think the Department of Defense should be doing to address PFAS contamination?
    a. Are they doing it willingly in Michigan?
5. I count in your testimony about 60 local, state and federal level organizations that engaged with Michigan DEQ and your program.
    a. Are other states paying attention to your leadership?
    b. How do you work with other states that are attempting to address PFAS issues?
    c. What lessons at this stage can you share for other states and localities to consider?
6. You mention in your testimony that we have significant knowledge about only a few of the PFAS chemicals. In your water quality surveys, are you able to delineate the specific PFAS chemicals?
    a. Are most of the sites you found PFAS contaminated with chemicals for which the risk is well characterized?
    b. What do you tell the public if the PFAS risks are not well characterized?
7. Some of the sites you identify were contaminated by private industry, and some by military, is that correct?

a. What has been your experience with DOD when it comes to addressing PFAS contamination, and is there more action you would you like to see?

b. What has been your experience with EPA?

Attachment 2—Member Requests for the Record

During the hearing, Members asked you to provide additional information for the record, and you indicated that you would provide that information. For your convenience, descriptions of the requested information are provided below.

The Honorable John Shimkus

1. Do you find that your team is better able to coordinate with EPA because you are working on behalf of ten Michigan state agencies?