

Managing PFAS in Maine

Final Report from the Maine PFAS Task Force
December 2019



Commented [SFE1]: We would recommend changing the picture as it only speaks to one source of PFAS.

Table of Contents

Task Force Members

Task Force Principles

PFAS Background

PFAS in Maine

Recommendations

Appendices

A. Executive Order

B. Definitions and Acronyms

C. Charts and Tables

D. AFFF Workgroup Report

E. References

PFAS Task Force Members

Dr. Meredith Tipton
Chair

Amanda Beal, Commissioner
Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry

Michael Belliveau
Environmental Health Strategy Center

Andre Brousseau
Certified Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator

Major General Doug Farnham
Department of Defense, Veterans and Emergency Management

Dr. Lani Graham
Maine Public Health Association

Charles Kraske
Pulp and Paper Industry

Norm Labbe
Public Drinking Water Professionals

Jeanne Lambrew, Commissioner
Department of Health and Human Services

Jeff McBurnie
Biosolids Management Professionals

Jerry Reid, Commissioner
Department of Environmental Protection

DRAFT

Guiding Principles

Governor Janet Mills created the Maine PFAS Task Force in March 2019 to review the extent of PFAS contamination in Maine and provide recommendations about how we can protect Maine residents from exposure.

The Maine PFAS Task Force reviewed information from a variety of sources, including results of sampling by State of Maine agencies and various health studies, and solicited input from stakeholders and other members of the public.

The varied viewpoints of Task Force members strengthened discussions about priorities for State action. These diverse perspectives helped us deliver more comprehensive recommendations that center around a shared set of priorities.

Summary of Recommendations

To be most protective of Maine citizens, now and in the future, we believe the following are of greatest importance:

- 1. Identifying and reducing sources of PFAS;**
- 2. Providing safe drinking water;**
- 3. Protecting our food supply;**
- 4. Responsible waste disposal and management;**
- 5. Improving public education about PFAS;**
- 6. Demanding federal action; and**
- 7. Funding for state agencies to investigate, respond to and reduce exposure of Maine citizens to PFAS.**

PFAS is a health concern for Maine citizens and requires our attention. Nearly everyone is exposed to these chemicals from numerous sources. Our recommendations reflect a commitment to determine where PFAS contaminants exist in Maine and put in place strategic responses to protect people from exposure. The following report details recommendations the Task Force has identified as action items State of Maine agencies should implement.

Commented [SFE2]: These recommendations do not line up with the duties the Task Force was supposed to accomplish and should reflect them.

DRAFT

PFAS Background

What is PFAS?

"PFAS" (per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances) are a large group of manmade fluorinated chemicals. There are over 4,000 compounds that have been identified as PFAS to-date.

Commented [SFE3]: Should be replaced with synthetic

The two most commonly used PFAS were PFOA (perfluorooctanoic acid) and PFOS (perfluorooctane sulfonate). These two compounds were used in households across the country in the non-stick, grease resistant convenience items of the 20th century. PFOA and PFOS are still required components in a class of firefighting foam (Class B Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF)) used to quickly extinguish petroleum-based fires. Some of the highest levels of PFOA and PFOS in Maine have been found at current or former military bases where Class B AFFF had been repeatedly discharged.

Commented [SFE4]: We recommend removing this comment as it is only talking about one area and not the other PFAS sources.

Chemical manufacturers in the U.S. phased out production of PFOA and PFOS in the early 2000's, but they were replaced with a wide variety of other PFAS. PFOA and PFOS are also still present in imported products, and many other PFAS break down in the environment into the more stable PFOA and PFOS compounds.

A wide variety of PFAS, many still unidentified as manufacturers claim their formulations to be proprietary information, are now used in consumer products that are stain, oil, heat, and water resistant, such as clothing, furniture fabric, food packaging, carpets, cookware, outdoor recreational items, and electronics. Because these chemicals are used so widely in consumer products, they are also present in our wastewater in septic tanks and at treatment plants.

The scientific understanding of how PFAS impacts people and the environment is still developing, and for thousands of PFAS compounds much remains unknown. Laboratories can still only accurately analyze for a small subset of PFAS.

State governments typically rely on the federal government to certify analytical methods for environmental contaminants. At this time, the U.S. EPA has only formally certified one method for analysis of 18 PFAS in drinking water (Method 537.1, Document #EPA/600/R-18/352 (2018)), although other methods for groundwater, wastewater and soils have been accepted by the U.S. EPA and Department of Defense for remediation site cleanup decisions. Other states have wide-ranging levels of industrial activity and methods for managing wastes, which have resulted in varying levels of PFAS contaminants within their borders. These differences among states are reflected in the variety of standards and screening levels for PFAS that other states have established in the absence of federal action to respond to their own unique circumstances.

DRAFT

Human exposure to PFAS continues to be widespread because this chemistry is used in hundreds of products for a variety of applications. Manufacturers do not report their uses of PFAS so it is difficult to limit exposures. International studies have been supported by Maine-specific sampling to indicate that PFAS are present in our environment, and that the highest concentrations of PFAS exist in environmental media such as soil and groundwater in areas where materials containing PFAS were disposed. In 2019, Maine is similar to other states trying to manage a shifting landscape while keeping pace with changes in our knowledge of this emerging contaminant and protecting human health with limited resources and authority.

Health Concerns

Scientists are still learning about the possible health effects from exposure to PFAS chemicals. Four specific PFAS chemicals - PFOA, PFOS, PFHxS and PFNA - have been studied more extensively than other PFAS. According to the U.S. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), studies of people who have higher PFOA or PFOS levels in their blood have shown that these chemicals may:¹

- increase cholesterol levels;
- decrease how well the body responds to vaccines;
- increase the risk of thyroid disease;
- increase the risk of high blood pressure or pre-eclampsia in pregnant women;
- lower infant birth weights; however, the decrease in birth weight is small and may not affect the infant's health;
- increase risk of kidney cancer or testicular cancer.

Studies with laboratory animals exposed to high doses of one or more of these PFAS have shown changes in liver, thyroid, pancreatic function, and hormone levels, and increases in testicular, liver and pancreatic tumors.

Nearly everyone is exposed to PFAS chemicals. By measuring PFAS in blood serum it is possible to estimate the amount of PFAS that have entered people's bodies. Because some PFAS persist in our bodies for years, the levels in our blood serum at any time reflects exposure to these chemicals over the preceding several years. U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC) scientists have measured at least 12 PFAS in the blood serum of participants who have taken part in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) since 1999.² Four PFAS (PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS and PFNA) have been found in the

¹ <https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/pfas/PFAS-health-effects.html>

² National Report on Human Exposure to Environmental Chemicals – US CDC:
<https://www.cdc.gov/exposurereport/index.html>

Commented [SF5]: We recommend it be changed to Human Exposure Concerns

DRAFT

blood serum of nearly all the people tested, indicating widespread exposure to these PFAS in the U.S. population. Notably, since 1999 the measured levels of PFOS and PFOA in the blood serum of NHANES participants have decreased by about 80 percent. The exposure pathway or pathways responsible for this decline remains unclear, though the timing does coincide with the declining use of these chemicals in the U.S.

For most people, diet is thought to be the primary source of exposure to PFAS.^[1] The major types of dietary exposure for PFAS include either ingesting food contaminated with PFAS and eating food packaged in materials containing PFAS. Hand-to-mouth transfer from dust in households containing products treated with PFAS-containing stain protectants, such as carpets, is thought to be an important exposure pathway for infants and toddlers. Dermal exposure from water is thought to be a minor exposure pathway, and therefore bathing is not considered of concern.

For individuals drinking water with even relatively low level PFAS contamination (e.g., as low as 20 ppt), water consumption is likely their dominant exposure pathway.^[2] Much of the early attention to PFAS nationally has been in response to contaminated drinking water supplies. Both community drinking water supplies, and residential wells have been contaminated through past use of AFFF at military bases, as well as releases at chemical manufacturing facilities. Sizable population exposures to contaminated water have been reported in Colorado, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.

More recent testing has shown drinking water may be contaminated by many different sources, such as landfills, residuals and septage spreading sites, air emissions from manufacturing facilities, and the discharge of AFFF for firefighting.

In 2016, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final Lifetime Health Advisory (LHA) informing state health agencies with regulatory authority over public water systems that, due to its adverse health effects, members of the public should not drink water where PFOA and PFOS individually or combined are measured above 70 parts per trillion (ppt). EPA Health Advisories are intended as informational resources for administrators of public water systems and agencies responsible for their oversight. Health Advisories are not regulations and do not represent legally enforceable standards. (EPA HA, 2016)

^[1] Egeghy & Lorber. Journal of Exposure Science and Environmental Epidemiology (2011) 21, 150–168

^[2] Need to check calculations on this, but latest NHANES blood serum levels and pharmacokinetic modeling suggests a typical daily intake for PFOS of around 28 ng/day. A typical adult person consumes a bit less than a liter per day of tap water. So at water levels above 20 ng/L, water is clearly the dominant exposure pathway.

Commented [SFE6]: We recommend moving this to PFAS in Maine section and removing military bases as its not just at military bases.

Commented [SFE7]: In our research we didn't see a reference to this on the EPA site. However, we did find EPA's health advisories are non-enforceable and non-regulatory and provide technical information to states agencies and other public health officials on health effects, analytical methodologies, and treatment technologies associated with drinking water contamination."

Source: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-06/documents/drinkingwaterhealthadvisories_pfoa_pfos_updated_5.31.16.pdf

DRAFT

Since the release of the 2016 PFOA/PFOS health advisory, the ATSDR and several states have reviewed the toxicity information available for PFOA, PFOS (and some agencies have also reviewed information on PFHxS and PFNA) and proposed or developed their own toxicity values. Despite looking at the same toxicity information as EPA, nearly all of these agencies have adopted toxicity values as much as 10-fold lower (including ATSDR's – another federal agency - proposed values), with differences largely a consequence of divergent views on which animal studies and which toxic effects to rely on, as well as divergent views on the appropriate application of uncertainty factors.

Absent a federal drinking water standard (called a Maximum Contaminant Level or MCL), some states confronting significant community water contamination problems have proposed or adopted their own drinking water standards. These state specific standards are lower than EPA's Health Advisory, a consequence of both the aforementioned lower toxicity values but also differences in the modeling of exposure. EPA's Health Advisory is based on water consumption by a lactating woman, to be consistent with a toxicity value based on developmental toxicity resulting from in utero exposure. Some states have instead modeled water consumption by the formula-fed infant, conservatively assuming the infant has similar sensitivity to PFAS as the developing fetus. Recently a few states have modeled transgenerational exposure to PFAS in water that considers both exposure in utero from water consumption during pregnancy followed by exposure to the infant from breast feeding. While most states continue to rely on EPA's Health Advisory for making risk management decisions on water contamination (including Maine), a national consensus regarding appropriate guidelines for PFAS in water has not been achieved. Moreover, toxicity data is lacking for most PFAS.

Across the country, as well as here in Maine, PFOA, PFOS, and other PFAS are also being detected in soils, sediment, surface water, air, biosolids, septage, compost, fish, and some foods. With these discoveries, new exposure pathways become apparent, such as soil-to-groundwater and soil-to-plant. Yet models and data for some of these exposure pathways are limited, posing challenges for developing guidelines for these media. It is also becoming apparent that trace levels of PFAS can be found in soils and freshwater fish in locations with no known release of PFAS, indicating a possible role for atmospheric transport and deposition.³

³ Reference VT background soil study.

DRAFT

PFAS in Maine

PFAS was first discovered in groundwater in Maine at former military installations. Those sites were already known to contain other contaminants and surrounding areas are served by public water supplies. The potential for more widespread PFAS impacts in Maine was not realized until PFAS was discovered in the Kennebunk, Kennebunkport, Wells Water District supply well, which led to the discovery of PFAS in a nearby dairy farm well, milk, hay and soil. This one incident raised a series of questions about the soil-to-groundwater pathway, agronomic exposure pathways, and whether this was an isolated or more common occurrence. Since that time, many State of Maine agencies have become involved in efforts to investigate, respond to, and reduce exposure of Maine citizens to PFAS.

Maine DEP, the Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry (DACF), and the Maine Drinking Water Program, in cooperation with the Maine Center for Disease Control (Maine CDC) continue to investigate sites and materials for possible PFAS compounds, including:

- Public water supplies near potential sources of PFAS
- Groundwater, surface water, and private water supplies around Maine DEP cleanup sites, landfills, sludge land application sites, and Superfund sites
- Retail milk supply
- Vegetation (corn and hay) associated with agricultural feed for the dairy industry
- Sludge and other residuals
- Fish tissue

Commented [SFE8]: Systems instead of supplies

Commented [SFE9]: Systems instead of supplies

Commented [SFE10]: Biosolids instead of sludge

Maine Department of Environmental Protection

As of October 2019, the Maine DEP has more than 30,000 records for PFAS at 244 locations across the State. The DEP follows a step-out approach to site investigation – if contaminants are found above screening levels at a sampling point, DEP evaluates environmental pathways for those contaminants and conducts testing at nearby locations where impacts may also be predicted. For example, DEP may investigate contamination along a bedrock fracture where groundwater is predicted to travel to drinking water wells. DEP's Remedial Action Guidelines, developed in collaboration with Maine CDC, recommend treatment or replacement of drinking water supplies where PFOA and PFOS exceed 70 ppt, or where all PFAS exceed 400 ppt. As a result of this approach, carbon filtration drinking water treatment systems for PFAS have been installed on several private supplies near closed, unlined municipal landfills.

DRAFT

Maine DEP, DACF, and Maine CDC are continuing efforts to refine modeling assumptions to ensure that decisions are made based on the best available science. Work is on-going or underway to:

- Assess historic records to determine extent of **sludge** spreading activities on farmland and determine appropriate next steps;
- Sample corn stalks growing on farm fields with extensive land spreading history that will be harvested for silage feedstock;
- Further evaluate the extent to which PFAS compounds transfer from soil to silage corn to animals and ultimately into the food chain;
- Communicate with other states and agencies to evaluate toxicological data that is the foundation of our modeling work.

Commented [SFE11]: Biosolids instead of sludge

All data is publicly available through Maine DEP's website in several formats, including:

- An interactive mapping tool that includes a visual map, the ability to search for sites, and all supporting data in a downloadable format
- For **sludge** land application sites, a table that includes information for all licensed sites as well as all available records of land application
- A copy of all PFAS test results for all site types included in Maine DEP's database

Commented [SFE12]: Biosolids instead of sludge

Recognizing the financial burden PFAS has placed on some of Maine's wastewater treatment facilities, in 2019 Maine DEP:

- Offered emergency dewatering grants to certain facilities that did not have a way to dispose of low-solids content wastewater **sludge** that cannot be land applied due to high PFAS levels
- Offered planning grants to assist these same facilities in planning for future wastewater **sludge disposal**.

Commented [SFE13]: Biosolids instead of sludge

Commented [SFE14]: Biosolids instead of sludge

Commented [SFE15]: should have some charts as attachments to show this.

Maine Drinking Water Program

Just over half (51 %) of Maine citizens obtain their drinking water from private wells, which are not subject to federal or state regulation or testing requirements. The remaining 49% of Maine's population is served water by Community Water Systems, which are regulated under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act administered through Maine CDC's Drinking Water Program. Maine has approximately 378 regulated Community Water Systems (water systems that serve people in their homes on a year-round basis). Community Water Systems must test for approximately 87 **manmade** and natural contaminants on a regular basis and take necessary steps to reduce detected contaminant levels to below

Commented [SFE16]: Synthetic instead of manmade

DRAFT

drinking water standards established by EPA, known as Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs). Maine also has 375 Non-Transient Non-Community systems (these include schools and businesses); 1,151 Transient systems (these include restaurants and campgrounds); and 54 regulated bottled water sources. These systems are also subject to regulation, albeit less rigorous than the requirements for Community Water Systems.

Public water supplies are not required to monitor for or treat PFAS in drinking water. However, several public water supplies have been sampled for PFAS in Maine through an EPA-coordinated sampling program from 2013-2015 and two sampling rounds coordinated by the Maine CDC Drinking Water Program in 2017 and 2019. These programs were part of a data gathering effort to help evaluate the presence of PFAS in Maine's public water systems to inform future decisions on possible regulation of these chemicals as drinking water contaminants. The combined sampling efforts have resulted in analysis of drinking water samples for PFAS concentration in a total of 53 public water systems in Maine, mostly Community Water Systems. These systems represent more than 65% of the population served by Community Water Systems.

Maine CDC has advised public water systems testing for PFAS to use EPA's Health Advisory to guide decisions on whether to install filtration to reduce PFAS levels. The current Health Advisory for drinking water is a combined concentration of 70 ppt for two PFAS compounds, perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluoro octane sulfonate (PFOS). To date, only one public water supply was found to have combined PFOA and PFOS above the health advisory of 70 ppt. This is a small community system in Houlton, Maine (Houlton Mobile Home Park) serving approximately 140 people. This system is currently providing bottled water to their customers while considering installation of a treatment system and/or replacement of the water source. In addition, one public water supply in southern Maine (Kennebunk, Kennebunkport & Wells Water District) serving a population of approximately 34,250 elected to install a treatment system for PFAS in one of their well sources, although PFAS levels in the well did not exceed 70 ppt.

Based on PFAS sampling in Maine's public water systems to-date, PFAS does not appear to be present in most public drinking water. Where detected, PFAS levels tend to be very low (i.e., well below EPA's Health Advisory), with a couple of exceptions as noted above. Considering that all the systems included in the State-coordinated sampling programs were selected due to their proximity to potential sources of PFAS contamination, these results indicate that Maine does not have widespread PFAS contamination of public drinking water. However, since PFAS is present in many consumer products, waste streams and industrial processes, a thorough assessment of potential risk to consumers served by Community Water Systems would need to include sampling of all 378 systems.

Commented [SFE17]: Systems instead of supplies

Commented [SFE18]: Systems instead of supplies

Commented [SFE19]: Should add table of Maine data results

Commented [SFE20]: Should remove "very" as a statement it sounds better to say PFAS levels tend to be low.

Commented [SFE21]: Should remove "well" as it sounds better with just below EPA's Health Advisory

DRAFT

In Maine's most recent PFAS sampling round conducted in 2019, seventeen (17) of the thirty-six (36) public water systems included in the program declined to participate, in several cases stating that they wished to wait until testing was required rather than participating in the voluntary sampling program. Based on this result, it may be necessary to create a requirement for Community Water Systems to sample for PFAS to assess potential risks to all of Maine's citizens that receive their water from Community Water Systems. This would require action by the State Legislature to enact new laws requiring Community Water Systems to test for PFAS at specified intervals in addition to their regular monitoring requirements under the Safe Drinking Water Act. The Maine CDC recommends that public water systems continue to use EPA's Health Advisory to guide decision making on treatment and public notification when PFAS is detected until EPA's Health Advisory may be superseded by new MCLs established at the federal level.

Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry

DACF is responsible for ensuring the safety of Maine's food supply while providing support to farmers and food producers through a host of programs and resources. To date, DACF has concentrated its efforts on investigating potential contamination of PFAS in retail milk; however, it anticipates this scope to expand upon further data collection and assessment, additional scientific study, and the establishment of recognized PFAS standards for food.

In late 2016, PFAS chemicals were found to be present at levels up to 1420 ppt in the milk of a Maine dairy farm that had historically applied biosolids and papermill residuals to its fields. These results exceeded the Action Threshold of 210 ppt for milk that was developed by the Maine Center for Disease Control & Prevention to determine when milk is considered adulterated.

To determine the safety of Maine's current overall milk supply, DACF completed a state-wide retail milk survey in June 2019. The survey focused on Maine-produced, fluid pasteurized milk that was: 1) bottled in-state; or 2) was bottled out of state but sold in Maine. Twenty-six samples were taken throughout the state to ensure broad geographic representation. All results were below the laboratory reporting level of 50 ppt.

At the same time DACF tested milk from three commercial dairy farms, two with an extensive history of biosolid and/or paper mill residual applications and whose soil samples exceeded DEP's screening levels for PFOA and/or PFOS. The third farm was near the farm that had tested high for PFOS in 2016. The results from all three farms were also below the lab's reporting level of 50 ppt.

DRAFT

Future testing of milk and other agricultural products will occur based on additional factors, including the careful review of historic records, assessment of emerging science (including improved testing methods), and with the establishment of PFAS thresholds for other foods. DACF is in the process of assessing historical records of where licensed residuals may have been applied on Maine farmland. These records must be vetted to fully understand past spreading activities (residual type(s), location(s), amount(s), and date(s)), the crops or livestock produced, soil characteristics, and other relevant data to assess potential risk and next steps.

DACF will work closely with any farmer whose products may be found to be adulterated by PFAS, with the goal of identifying mitigation strategies that could allow them to continue farming and producing safe agricultural products. DACF, in collaboration with DEP and DHHS, is prepared to help identify on-farm sources of PFAS contamination, design elimination strategies, and conduct ongoing testing and monitoring. It will further advocate for additional sources of funding to assist farmers who face financial hardship from lost production caused by PFAS contamination.

Maine Emergency Management Agency

The Maine Emergency Management Agency implements the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) reports for the State. At the current time PFAS is not a TRI chemical but recommendations to the US EPA have been sent on behalf of Maine to include PFAS on the chemical list.

The AFFF working group was formed to establish a comprehensive inventory of Class B AFFF firefighting foam throughout Maine and to make recommendations to the Governors PFAS Task Force regarding the future use of Class B AFFF. The AFFF workgroup included the State Fire Marshal and representation from Maine DEP, MEMA, Maine Fire Chief's Association, **Maine Professional Firefighters Association**, Maine Department of Labor, Maine Fire Service Institute, Bangor International Jetport, Portland International Jetport, Sappi Fine Paper, Maine State Police, Irving Oil, Citgo Oil, Global Partners LP, Gulf Oil, State Emergency Response Commission, and the Maine Air National Guard. A formal letter of request from the State Fire Marshall along with a survey was developed and sent to all Maine fire departments and industry partners to collect Class B AFFF information on behalf of the Task Force. Additionally, working group members developed and emailed a Class B AFFF infographic to all fire service organizations and industry partners in the state. Out of 305 fire departments in the State only 60 responses were received and out of 20 industry partners only 8 were received. Response to these surveys has been

Commented [SFE22]: Should be replaced with Professional Firefighters Association of Maine

DRAFT

disappointing, even after multiple requests. We are unaware of any mechanism that obligates response to these surveys. Maine DEP, MEMA and the State Fire Marshal's office will continue to encourage organizations to respond to these surveys and manage survey data for future use to ensure accurate information is available once an appropriate takeback and replacement program is established.

The AFFF workgroup submitted their recommendations to the Maine PFAS Task Force at their October 29, 2019 meeting. Those recommendations are included in Appendix D.

Commented [SFE23]: Should be Appendix C

Recommendations

1. **Identifying and reducing sources of PFAS;**
2. **Providing safe drinking water;**
3. **Protecting our food supply;**
4. **Responsible waste management;**
5. **Improving public education about PFAS;**
6. **Demanding federal action; and**
7. **Funding for state agencies to investigate, respond to and reduce exposure of Maine citizens to PFAS.**

Commented [SFE24]: These should reflect the duties assigned by the Governor for the task force to complete and have actionable items that address data gaps.

1. Identifying and Reducing Sources of PFAS

The Task Force recommends that the State of Maine require manufacturers to report the intentional use of all PFAS in manufacturing processes and in consumer products, and to require the use of safer alternatives when they are available. Legislation would be necessary to require this.

The Task Force supports the recommendations of the Firefighting Foam workgroup, included in Appendix D. This includes reporting discharges of Class B AFFF to the DEP and establishing a Class B AFFF take back and replacement program.

Commented [SFE25]: Should be Appendix C

Commented [SFE26]: Add: once a suitable replacement is found.

The Task Force recommends that State of Maine procurement guidelines should discourage the purchase of PFAS-containing products.

2. Providing Safe Drinking Water

The Task Force recommends that all public water systems should be required to test for PFAS and to notify their customers if PFAS are detected. This is similar to the approach taken by the State of California.

Commented [SFE27]: We recommend adding a level here to show what it should be.

Commented [SFE28]: We would recommend striking this from the paragraph as it calls out one State and not others that may have done similar things.

Task Force members disagreed about the level at which customers should be notified; Maine DWP recommended 10 ppt while some other members recommended notification at any level of detection. Maine has not, to-date, taken this approach with any other contaminants. For all other drinking water contaminants, Maine public water systems are only required to provide notice if concentrations exceed a maximum contaminant level

Commented [SFE29]: Where did this come from, is it an EPA standard? Should list what it is quoting. It should also state what wells you are talking about, private and or public.

DRAFT

(MCL). Legislation would be required to establish a testing and notification requirement for PFAS.

The Task Force also recommends that private drinking water should be tested for PFAS in areas where groundwater is likely to have been impacted by PFAS at unsafe levels, such as: 1) manufacturing locations that utilized PFAS chemistry; 2) unlined landfills; 3) areas where Class B AFFF has been discharged or stored; and 4) residuals land spreading sites. Some members recommended that the State should require PFAS testing of private wells at the time of real estate transfers.

3. Protecting our Food Supply

Foods may contain PFAS in unsafe quantities due to contact with PFAS-containing materials (such as packaging or processing equipment), due to vegetative uptake into produce, due to livestock consumption of PFAS-containing feed, or due to other environmental exposures. Regulation of contaminants in food is controlled almost exclusively by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (See Recommendation #6 for further discussion of federal actions.)

The Task Force recommends that the State protect foods produced in Maine from PFAS adulteration through restrictions on PFAS uses, restrictions on the agronomic utilization and land application of PFAS-containing residuals, and through the investigation and remediation of PFAS contamination.

4. Responsible Waste Management

The State of Maine must take actions to prevent PFAS from entering Maine's environment, food supply, and drinking water. The Task Force supports legislation to amend Maine's Uncontrolled Sites law to include pollutants and contaminants, which would give the State authority to require the removal and treatment of PFAS when they are a danger to public health.

The Task Force recommends that DEP require regular testing of residuals for PFAS prior to land spreading or commercial distribution in Maine. The Task Force also recommends expanding existing requirements to include septage that is agronomically utilized or land applied. The Task Force supports legislation that would authorize the Board of Environmental Protection to update DEP's screening levels for individual PFAS and other constituents through routine technical rulemaking so those levels can be kept up to date.

DRAFT

The Task Force also recommends the State continue efforts to sample for PFAS in prioritized locations, analyze sampling results for patterns, and refine models of PFAS fate and transport.

Maine DEP should investigate the availability of treatment and disposal technologies that minimize the potential for environmental PFAS contamination. Preference should be given to technologies with the demonstrated capacity to safely destroy PFAS. Additionally, the State of Maine should promote the development of infrastructure, on the scale necessary to meet the needs of the State, to manage PFAS-contaminated wastes safely and in a cost-effective manner.

5. Public Education

Maine citizens, physicians, government officials and other professionals must have access to information regarding PFAS to guide their own decision making. The Task Force recommends that the State develop educational materials at the appropriate literacy level for their intended audience, to be provided through a variety of forums such as webpages, training events, and fairs. Those audiences should include healthcare providers, farmers, drinking water and wastewater utility customers, fire fighters and students.

Commented [SFE30]: We recommend also adding in education and referring to social media as that is what is used mostly to get information.

6. Demand for Federal Action

The Maine PFAS Task Force demands that federal government agencies take prompt action to reduce harmful exposures of citizens to PFAS due to the widespread nature of PFAS uses and potential exposures. These actions should include:

a) Source reduction

The federal government should require manufacturers to reduce and eliminate the use of PFAS chemistry in non-essential applications, with particular focus on those uses with the highest potential for human exposure. Manufacturers (domestic and foreign) of consumer products should be required to report their use of PFAS compounds in products sold in the United States.

The Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Defense should identify effective foams that do not contain PFAS and should eliminate requirements for firefighting foams to contain PFAS.

Commented [SFE31]: We recommend wording this differently or taking it out as most of the DOD and FAA sites are already trying to do this.

DRAFT

OSHA and NIOSH should adopt exposure limits for workers exposed to PFAS. These limits should also apply to firefighters and other emergency personnel supporting emergency response activities.

The U.S. EPA should add PFAS to the hazardous substance list under CERCLA authority.

b) Drinking Water

The U.S. EPA should establish a Maximum Contaminant Level for PFAS in drinking water, which should also apply to bottled water.

c) Food supply

The U.S. FDA should establish PFAS adulteration levels for foods in order to minimize dietary exposures to all PFAS.

Commented [SFE32]: We recommend adding in foods and food packaging

The U.S. Department of Agriculture should establish additional sources of funding support for farmers impacted by PFAS contamination, similar to the Farm Service Agency's Dairy Indemnity Payment Program.

d) Waste Management

ATSDR should finalize toxicity values for PFAS commonly found in environmental samples. The U.S. EPA should then update Regional Screening Levels to include additional screening level guidelines. The U.S. EPA should also certify additional laboratory methods to measure PFAS in various media (groundwater, wastewater, soils and other solids, ambient air).

7. Funding for State Actions

The State of Maine is expending significant funds to investigate and control PFAS exposures for Maine citizens, and substantial additional funding will be needed to continue this work. Municipalities, drinking water and wastewater utility districts, farmers, businesses, property owners and other Maine citizens are also bearing direct and indirect costs from PFAS contamination.

State funding

The Task Force recommends that funding from appropriate State of Maine accounts should be utilized, to the extent it is available, to fund sampling and treatment of drinking water supplies, and to fund the investigation of PFAS contamination that threatens Maine's citizens. State of Maine agencies must also be adequately staffed to

DRAFT

conduct the work necessary to implement any and all of the Task Force’s recommendations, which will cost **many** millions of dollars in the coming years.

Commented [SFE33]: We recommend removing “many” and just leaving it as millions of dollars since we don’t have a guaranteed figure.

Bond Initiative

The Task Force recommends that the State of Maine introduce a bond initiative to raise money for the State’s costs for PFAS sampling, remediation, and drinking water treatment.

Damage Claims

Many municipalities and states across the country are engaged in litigation against companies that manufactured PFOA and PFOS products, including claims for financial compensation. The Task Force recommends that the State of Maine fully consider **available legal avenues to apply the costs of PFAS contamination in Maine to appropriate** responsible parties who knowingly supplied products that are harmful to human health and the environment.

Commented [SFE34]: We recommend getting some language from the AG as they are already taking care of some of this now.

Conclusion

These recommendations reflect a commitment to determine where contamination exists in Maine and to put in place strategic responses to protect people from exposure. Through our deliberations and review of data, we concluded that PFAS is a **health concern** for Maine citizens and requires our attention. We believe that these recommendations exemplify the sincerity of our work and the seriousness of this contamination issue.

Commented [SFE35]: We recommend saying it’s a health advisory instead of concern. Studies are still being done on this so we should also be looking at those.