

Senator Campion— thanks so much for holding the hearing for the Comm on Natural Resources and Energy here in Bennington last night. It was very enlightening to hear from all our neighbors. All other meetings have been just listening to state agencies reporting. All those agency representatives have been extremely responsive and helpful, so far.

I'd like to put into writing my testimony as a way to highlight my major concerns related to S. 10:

I hope the language of S.10 can be strengthened or clarified so that the state mandated minimum level PFOA contamination ( currently 20ppt, but subject to further research and amendment) is used to define what contamination means.

But in addition and most importantly, I hope the language of S.10 can be revised to take into account my concerns and those of many others: that the well-test levels of PFOA can and do vary over time. So far no research has been able to explain how or why those level fluctuate. Those of us whose wells currently fall under 20ppt, but who are within the boundaries of the contamination zone and whose homes are surrounded by properties with over 20ppt need to be explicitly included in the requirement to provide potable water. We are being provided bottled water now, but we need to be assured we will be included in the extensions of the municipal water supply.

We have no assurance that our PFOA levels won't rise in the future, since we are surrounded by neighbors with high levels well over 20ppt. We have no assurance that any level of PFOA is medically safe, even if currently below 20ppt. We want to be assured we will have PFOA-free municipal water in the future. We fear our home, known to be in the contamination zone, is unmarketable unless we get municipal water. No future buyer would purchase a home with the knowledge they'd have to rely on bottled water ( or a POET system) in perpetuity.

Lora Block  
34 McIntosh Lane  
Bennington