

ARTICLE I: POETS

PRINCETON SPECIAL TOWN MEETING

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINORITY OPINION

NOVEMBER 17, 2021

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Significant harm from PFAS was clearly established through litigation evidence long ago
- However, Federal/State governments are still grappling with how much PFAS is too much
- States balance evolving medical research against financial considerations in setting maximum contaminant limits (MCLs)
- Because of this uncertainty, Princeton should not strictly rely on the current MA MCL to guarantee its citizens safety
- These Princeton residents have the right to fully use/ enjoy their property, especially water and soil, in same unfettered, safe manner as everyone else

TO VOTE YES,
WE MUST FIRST
UNDERSTAND THE
HISTORY OF PFAS AND
THE HEALTH RISK
ESTABLISHED
THROUGH
LITIGATION

- 1950s-1970s
 - Dupont buys PFOA from 3M ignoring warnings about safe disposal
 - Dupont conducted secret animal studies showing liver damage
 - Dupont discovers PFOA in employee blood
- 1980s-2010s
 - 3M animal research showed birth defects
 - Dupont found birth defects in babies of employees
 - Dupont begins dumping toxic sludge at landfill
 - 100+ cows die on adjacent farm; farmer brings lawsuit but settles
 - Attorney sends letter to EPA; Dupont reaches \$16.5m settlement with EPA
 - Attorney brings class action, settled for \$70m
 - Studies on people, exposed for 10 years+, showed linkage to kidney cancer, testicular cancer, thyroid disease, high cholesterol, pre-eclampsia

NO ONE KNOWS DEFINITELY HOW MUCH PFAS IS TOO MUCH IN WATER OR SOIL

- Federal government still has no PFAS limit, just guidance; states vary widely
- Maximum Contaminant Limits (MCLs) are derived based on exposure of average adult and factor in not only health but financial considerations
- MA rolls up total exposure to 6 PFAS in MCL of 20 ppt
- Other states put individual limits on different types of PFAS, some higher, some lower than MA; research demonstrated lower limits are needed to protect against certain PFAS
- MN health scientists have developed model showing babies whose mothers are exposed will have 4-6 times higher PFAS in blood than mothers
- If there is no risk under 20ppt, why does MA require bottled water be provided?

PRINCETON
RESIDENTS CHOOSE
TO LIVE HERE DUE
TO UNIQUE
TOWN CHARACTER
YET THESE
RESIDENTS ARE
LIMITED IN FULLY
ENJOYING THAT
LIFESTYLE

- Town has long history of preserving rural , natural lifestyle of residents with "green" emphasis
- Examples include zoning that limits commercial business, putting land in trust, developing trails, etc.
- But these residents with PFAS under 20 ppt are uniquely limited in enjoying the Princeton lifestyle. Beyond inconvenience of using bottled water, their well water with PFAS still drains into their septic systems and soil polluting their yards and groundwater. Any livestock or pets must still ingest PFAS from their faucets. Children can't drink from the garden hose. Research studies demonstrate PFAS absorption from soil into garden vegetables.
- Again, if it's safe below 20 ppt, why does MA DEP require Town to give bottled water?