

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. Maureen Sullivan
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Defense, Environment, Safety and Occupational Health
U.S. Department of Defense
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Ms. Sullivan:

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 Members 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. Your written testimony states that the Department of Defense's (DoD's) use of Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF), one of the PFAS compounds is "limited" – could you estimate for us what percentage of AFFF's usage was by DoD?
2. Your written testimony indicates that DoD began testing drinking water in drinking water systems on military installations in June 2016 to determine whether there were exceedances of EPA's Lifetime Health Advisory. Your testimony provides some facts regarding the number of installations that had exceedances of EPA's Lifetime Health Advisory, but the numbers are a bit confusing. Your testimony states that there were 24 installations that exceeded EPA's Lifetime Health Advisory and that DoD was providing bottled water or "additional water treatment" –
 - a. What is the "additional water treatment"?
 - b. Your written testimony also states that there were 12 drinking water systems where the results were above EPA's Lifetime Health Advisory – is it 12 or 24? Or what is the difference between the 24 identified that are receiving bottled water and the 12 where DoD is "working with the drinking water supplier(s) to encourage appropriate actions"?
3. Your testimony is that DoD is prioritizing sites that have PFAS releases to drinking water according to "worse first." Can you walk us through what that means and what is included in the analysis?
 - a. Would you also walk us through how PFAS contamination in other media is incorporated into that analysis?
4. Your testimony states that DoD uses EPA's Lifetime Health Advisory to determine site-specific, risk-based cleanup levels and that sometimes the levels may be higher than EPA's Lifetime Health Advisory.
 - a. I understand that EPA's Lifetime Health Advisory is not an enforceable limit, but it would justify a higher cleanup level?
5. Your written testimony makes note of the fact that DoD included PFAS cleanup in the President's Budget in FY2018 and that now that DoD has created an initial inventory, the Agency can begin determining potential cleanup costs.
 - a. Does this inventory only contain sites that have drinking water impacts?
 - b. Does DoD plan to do a similar inventory for sites that may have contaminated soil, sediment, or groundwater?

6. Can you walk through how the process of Cooperative Agreements with States work and why Cooperative Agreements are important to the cleanup process?
 - a. Does DoD feel like the necessary legal authority is in place regarding Cooperative Agreements?
 - b. What is the States' role in the process under a Cooperative Agreement?
7. How does the Defense and State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) program fit into DoD's process with respect to addressing PFAS contamination?
 - a. Does DoD feel that there are any legal impediments for reimbursing States for their work on PFAS under the DSMOA program?
8. What has DOD done to coordinate the Department's efforts with EPA and local governments regarding the issues associated with the PFAS chemicals?
9. How does the Department ensure it is using the most appropriate assessment technologies?
 - a. Given the increased sensitivity of detection methods, what is your experience with increased detection at military bases?
 - b. How does DOD communicate risk to the families and area communities?
10. Please explain how the Department is addressing emerging contaminants, such as PFAS, with respect to environmental cleanups?

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 Frank Pallone Jr.

1. Can you provide the committee with any and all studies that the Department of Defense has regarding the safety of these substitute chemicals?

The Honorable Gene Green

1. Has there been a partnership with the military bases in Texas and Department of Defense?