

Virtual Testimony on the Rescission of Regulatory Determinations and Removal of Related Provisions for Four PFAS Substances (PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA (GenX), and the Mixture of These Three PFAS Plus PFBS)

July 7, 2026

Good afternoon. My name is Marc Boom, and I am the Senior Director of Public Affairs with the Environmental Protection Network, a nonprofit organization made up of more than 750 former EPA staff.

We urge the agency to withdraw the proposed rescission rule.

EPA should be moving faster to protect people from PFAS in drinking water, not reopening and weakening standards before communities ever receive the benefits. Families across the country have already waited years for enforceable protections against these forever chemicals. This proposal would make them wait even longer.

The central problem with this proposal is that EPA is not following the science. EPA is not saying these PFAS are safe. EPA is not showing that the health risks have gone away. The research links these PFAS to serious health harms, including effects on thyroid hormone levels, lipid metabolism, infant development, the immune system, and liver function. The research also shows that people are exposed to PFAS as mixtures, not one chemical at a time. How can EPA justify rescinding protections when the science is telling us people need more protection, not less?

EPA frames this as a legal-process issue. But the Safe Drinking Water Act does not require EPA to separate every step into a different action. Pairing the determination to regulate with the proposed drinking water standards helped the public understand what was at stake for health, costs, and protection. And EPA's concern for legal footing appears selective. This EPA has shown no hesitation to use novel legal theories when rolling back other safeguards. It should not be bold with the law when weakening protections and timid with the law when protecting families' health.

Rescission is not a neutral act. It delays treatment for toxic chemicals that are persistent, harmful, and already present in drinking water. It benefits companies that do not want to pay the full cost of cleaning up PFAS contamination, while families are left buying filters and wondering whether the water they use to cook dinner or bathe their children is safe.

Once again, we have to remind the agency that EPA's mission is to protect human health and the environment. That means following the science, keeping enforceable protections in place, and moving urgently to reduce exposure, not searching for legal arguments to delay safeguards families need. EPA should not treat the safety of families' drinking water as a legal technicality.