State Legislature and Environmental Agencies PFAS Response Scorecard

Prepared by Aiden Meyer

Intern at Northeast-Midwest Institute

Student at Nazareth University

May 20, 2024

Introduction:

Per- and poly-fluoroakyl substances (PFAS) are a large group of synthetically manufactured chemicals that include a chain of linked carbon and fluorine atoms. PFAS have been utilized in many forms, including a variety of consumer products, everything from cookware and clothing to food packaging and firefighting foam.

Unfortunately, PFAS have also been linked to many different health problems, including decreased fertility, a reduced immune system, and increased risk of high cholesterol, obesity, and cancer.[1] Depending on which strand of PFAS enters the bloodstream, it could take between four to seven years to expel half of the contaminant from the body, due to their long half-life.[2] PFAS have a chain of carbon-fluorine bonds that make them difficult to break down, meaning that they linger in our soil, air, and even drinking water.

Over the past decade, PFAS have received increased attention from Congress. Recently, the House of Representatives introduced both the PFAS Action Act and the PFAS Accountability Act, which would set federal, enforceable legal standards for PFAS contamination.[3] [4] Unfortunately, these bills have made little traction at the federal level. States, especially in the Northeast and Midwest, have now had to shoulder this burden, and have chosen different strategies to do so. This report will focus on the actions of state legislatures and state environmental agencies, including spending, legislation that has been passed or introduced, future legislation, action plans, drinking water limits, and enforcement against PFAS manufacturers.

Lawsuits

One of the biggest pushes in the fight against PFAS has been in the courts, where some states have taken legal action against manufacturers who have continued to include PFAS in their products. As of February 5th, 2024, 29 state attorneys general have sued manufacturers -- most notably 3M and DuPont -- for their use of PFAS. Four states have already reached settlements in those lawsuits: Minnesota, Michigan, Delaware, New Jersey, and Ohio.[5] Recently, 3M obtained preliminary approval from a federal court in South Carolina to settle a class action lawsuit, agreeing to pay out $10.3 billion over the next 13 years. Petitioners in the case get their water

---

[1] "Our Current Understanding of the Human Health and Environmental Risks of PFAS," EPA, last updated June 7, 2023, https://www.epa.gov/pfas/our-current-understanding-human-health-and-environmental-risks-pfas

[2] Morgan McFall-Johnsen and Taylor Tyson, "How Long Hazardous 'Forever chemicals' stay in the body," *Business Insider*, March 16, 2023, https://www.businessinsider.com/chart-how-long-hazardous-forever-chemicals-pfas-stay-in-blood-2023-3

[3] "PFAS Action Act," H.R.2467, 117th Congress, 2021

[4] "PFAS Accountability Act," S.3275, 118th Congress, 2024

[5] Stephanie Stohler, "More than half of US State Attorney General have taken action against PFAS manufacturers and key users," *Safer States*, August 24, 2023, https://www.saferstates.org/press-room/more-than-half-of-us-state-attorneys-general-have-taken-action-against-pfas-manufacturers-and-key-users/

from a system that either tested positive for PFAS contamination, or are in the process of testing for contamination. 3M Chairman and Chief Executive Mike Roman has announced that the manufacturer will end its use of PFAS in manufacturing by the end of 2025.[6]

The other major class-action settlement involved the manufacturers DuPont, Chemours, and Corteva, who settled for $1.19 billion nationwide.[7] As in the 3M settlement, recipients of the money will be divided up into two groups. The first group are public water systems that draw or collect from a water source that has tested positive for PFAS contamination. The second group includes public water systems that are subject to the EPA's monitoring rules or are required under applicable federal or state law to test or otherwise analyze any of their water sources. Members of the class action have the option of opting out of the settlement and pursuing their own legal action against 3M or DuPont. Some attorneys general cited frustration with the settlement amount, believing that the manufacturers caused too much in damages and were not held responsible enough. POLITICO has estimated that it could cost up to $400 billion to eliminate PFAS contamination nationwide.[8]

IIJA

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, passed on November 15th, 2021, appropriated $55 billion to the EPA to improve drinking water and water infrastructure. Of this, $10 billion will be directed at combating PFAS contamination in drinking water, being dispersed into three separate funds. The Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) will receive $4 billion, helping direct states to fight PFAS contamination. All funds will be given in the form of grants or as loan forgiveness to communities over five years. Grants will be awarded based on results of the most recent Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey Assessment (DWINSA). Next, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) will receive $1 billion over five years. This will be used for eligible activities under the Clean Water Act (CWA), all given as grants or loan forgiveness. Lastly, another $5 billion will go to the PFAS - Emerging Contaminants (EC) in Small or Disadvantaged Communities Grant (SDC).[9] The EPA is authorized to distribute this money in the form of grants to underserved, small, or disadvantaged communities to finance projects that

---

[6] Lisa Friedman and Vivian Giang, "3M Reaches $10.3 Billion Settlement in 'Forever Chemicals' Suits," *New York Times*, June 22, 2023, https://www.nytimes.com/2023/06/22/business/3m-settlement-forever-chemicals-lawsuit.html#:~:text=The%20chemical%20and%20manufacturing%20giant,firefighting%20foam%20to%20nonstick%20coatings

[7] Sharon Udasin, "Federal court finalizes $1.2B 'forever chemicals' settlement involving major firms. *TheHill*, February 8, 2024, https://thehill.com/policy/equilibrium-sustainability/4456932-federal-court-finalizes-1-2b-forever-chemicals-settlement-involving-major-firms/

[8] Ry Rivard and Jordan Wolman, "'Forever Chemicals' are everywhere. The battle over who pays to clean them up is just getting started," *Politico,* September 9, 2022, https://www.politico.com/news/2022/09/13/the-battle-over-who-pays-to-clean-up-chemicals-00056136

[9] "FACT SHEET: EPA & The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law," EPA, November 6, 2021https://www.epa.gov/infrastructure/fact-sheet-epa-bipartisan-infrastructure-law

comply with the Safe Drinking Water Act and respond to contaminants such as PFAS. All of the $10 billion will be allocated to privately-owned community water systems, publicly-owned community water systems, non-profit non-community water systems, municipal, intermunicipal, interstate or state agencies.[10]

Methodology:

In the scorecard, each state is graded on a score of 0-10, with ten being the highest. Scores are determined by nine different criteria, each of which contributed a maximum of one point to a state's score.

Legislature Appropriations

For the legislature appropriations criteria, states earned a point if their legislature has passed any appropriations for PFAS, whether in its own bill or a part of an omnibus. Data was gathered from "nonsticknightmare", and a comprehensive list of all state legislature spending/appropriations for PFAS can be found in Appendix B.[11]

Drinking Water Testing

The extensive testing criterion came from information from the PFAS Project Lab, a group of faculty, postdoctoral scholars, graduate and undergraduate students affiliated with the Social Science Environmental Health Institute at Northeastern University.[12] If the project lab had a record of a statewide drinking water testing program, they earned a point.

Drinking Water Limit

The Drinking Water Limit information was gathered from Safer States' PFAS website.[13] If a state has implemented an enforceable drinking water limit, meaning that water sources that do not meet the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) are legally required to make an effort to reduce that level, the state earned a point. MCLs are defined by the EPA as: "The highest level of a contaminant that is allowed in drinking water. MCLs are set as close to MCLGs [Maximum Contaminant Level Goal] as feasible using the best available treatment technology and taking cost into consideration. MCLs are enforceable standards."[14] If a state had a guidance level,

---

[10] EPA, "FACT SHEET,"

[11] "NIGHTMARE COSTS," Nonsticknightmare, last updated 1/19/2024, https://nonsticknightmare.org/nightmare-costs/

[12] "PFAS Sites and Community Resources," PFAS Project Lab, https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/12412ab41b3141598e0bb48523a7c940/page/Page-1/?views=State-Action#data_s=id%3AdataSource_21-18203d2ab1c-layer-8%3A26

[13] "Our Priorities - PFAS 'Forever Chemicals,'" SaferStates, https://www.saferstates.org/priorities/pfas/

[14] "How EPA Regulates Drinking Water Contaminants,'" EPA, Last updated November 2, 2023, https://www.epa.gov/sdwa/how-epa-regulates-drinking-water-contaminants#:~:text=In%20most%20cases%2C%20the%20standard,of%20a%20public%20water%20system.

meaning that states have goals for PFAS levels in water sources, but are not legally enforcing these levels, the state earned half a point. If the state had no standard, they earned no points.

Filing Suits
States were graded on whether they took legal action against manufacturers who utilized PFAS in their products. If the state's attorney general took action against manufacturers, they earned a point (more information on this can be found here).

Action Plan
States that developed a PFAS action plan earned a point over those that did not.

Phasing Out the Bad, Addressing Harmful Plastics and Packaging, and Policies on Drinking Water
The next three listed criteria come from Safer State's 2024 "Analysis of State Legislation Addressing Toxic Chemicals and Plastics" report released on February 8th, 2024.[15] Page 4 of the report has a map of states that are looking to introduce/pass legislation against PFAS use in 2024. Secondly, states that are anticipated to introduce legislation against use of PFAS in plastics and packaging on page 7 earn a point. Finally, if a state is anticipated to take action on PFAS in drinking water, which is listed on page 10, the state earned a point.

Previous Legislative Action
This criterion focuses on the legislation that has already been introduced or passed as of April 2024. States were graded on both the quality of the legislation (how much does it cover?), and the quantity (how much have they introduced and passed?) to create a snapshot of what the legislature has already done. Partial credit was awarded for this category.

Landing Page
Every state in the Northeast-Midwest region has a PFAS "landing page" controlled by the state's environmental agency. A "good" landing page scored 1 point, an "okay" landing page scored .5 points, and a "lackluster" landing page earned 0. Landing pages were scored on how much information they provided, how up to date they were, whether or not they clearly laid out the state's actions, providing resources for private remediation, and more.

States by Region:

New England States
(Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, Connecticut, and Rhode Island)

[15] "2024 Analysis of State Legislation Addressing Toxic Chemicals and Plastics," SaferStates, published February 8, 2024, https://www.saferstates.org/wp-content/uploads/Safer-States-2024-Multistate-Analysis.pdf

As of right now, Vermont is the clear gold standard for PFAS policies among not just the New England states, but all states in the Northeast-Midwest region. Vermont has excelled in the policy category. They have already passed 10 policies, and have introduced 12 more in 2023-24. One of these bills, S.261, would hold anyone who releases any PFAS substances from a large facility strictly liable for the damages resulting in that release.[16] The Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation also provides a great resource online that allows citizens to find PFAS-free bottled water, get health information, and see the Vermont PFAS road map.

Maine has taken strides in combatting PFAS, but they lack an action plan or roadmap that gives the state's environmental agencies a clearer path to fighting PFAS contamination. Maine does have a plan to help farmers which have been devastated recently by PFAS contamination, but a more comprehensive plan that includes plans for water systems would be beneficial. The Maine state legislature has been one of the best in the northeast-midwest at passing legislation, with 20 bills being implemented to fight against PFAS contamination. They are also one of the only states in the region to pass a statewide ban on PFAS by 2030.

Due to its extensive testing, New Hampshire has uncovered one of the highest numbers of known contamination sites among all states. In response, the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services has implemented a state rebate program for private well users who have had their drinking sources contaminated with PFAS. People can request a rebate for PFAS treatment for their private wells on the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services website. The New Hampshire state legislature has been introducing and passing legislation since 2018, but they have recently made a push to pass even more. So far in 2024, the state legislature has already introduced 8 new bills. These bills include restricting use of PFAS in certain products, removing the statute of limitations for civil actions for damages from PFAS exposure, and holding facilities that release PFAS into groundwater strictly liable.

Although the Massachusetts legislature has not passed any PFAS legislation yet, they have introduced 28 bills in 2023 and 2024, some of which appear likely to pass soon. One of these bills, H.4486, is one of the most comprehensive pieces of legislation circulating around state legislatures at this moment. If enacted, the bill will ban PFAS from being intentionally added in all products (unless it is determined that the use of PFAS in a product is "unavoidable"), ban all use and sale of PFAS in a plethora of products by January 7th, 2027, create a remediation trust fund, establish an education program centered around PFAS, and more. In addition, Massachusetts also has a great website for informing their citizens about PFAS, and the actions the state is taking. If Massachusetts passes some of the legislation they have introduced, they can easily earn a "good" score in the "Previous Legislation Action" category.

[16] "An act relating to liability relating to the use of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances," Vermont S.261, 2024, https://legislature.vermont.gov/bill/status/2024/S.261

Rhode Island and Connecticut have the most room for improvement compared with the rest of the New England states. The Rhode Island legislature has not yet appropriated any funds to combat PFAS contamination, and also lacks an action plan. Compared to states in other regions, the Rhode Island legislature has been among the most active recently, introducing eight policies in 2024 alone. These policies include an extension of a timeline to conduct testing in drinking water until June 2025, appropriations for PFAS remediation, and prohibitions on selling of certain products that have intentionally added PFAS. Two of these are appropriations bills that total just under $35 million in water remediation and treatment plants. The Rhode Island Department of Health website provides information answering frequently asked questions about PFAS, but more information about specific actions the state is taking would be beneficial.

The Connecticut legislature has passed 5 bills, although a few of them were small grant bills that were passed in 2020 and 2021. Connecticut does have a detailed action plan that was released in 2019, which lays out their 4 strategic focuses and legislation that they may consider introducing in the upcoming year. Their website does provide valuable information on PFAS, and outlines their drinking water levels. The next action Connecticut should take is to release enforceable drinking water standards statewide, as well as introduce and pass more legislation outlawing the use of PFAS in certain products.

The New England states are collectively the strongest region among the three in the report. Two thirds of these states still lack an action plan, but the legislatures have been successful in introducing and implementing legislation, including appropriations bills and PFAS bans in certain products. Since most of the states still lack an action plan, the next actions should involve development of a plan for remediating PFAS contaminated drinking water sites.

Mid-Atlantic States
(New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware)

Since the start of the year, the New Jersey state legislature has already introduced 13 different bills, some of which aim to outlaw the sale and manufacture of products that knowingly contain PFAS. However, the state legislature had not taken any action before this year, and only two bills have passed this year. New Jersey has been one of the states struggling the most with PFAS, having found at least 34 drinking water sources contaminated, so their next focus should be on remediation projects to reduce the amount of PFAS currently in community drinking water sources.[17] Perhaps a similar program to New Hampshire's private well rebate would be beneficial.

[17] Scott Fallon, "High levels of PFAS chemicals found in 34 NJ drinking systems affecting 500K+ people," *NorthJersey.com* January 25, 2022, https://www.northjersey.com/story/news/environment/2022/01/25/nj-drinking-water-contaminated-chemicals-pfas-pfoa-pfos/9209219002/

Maryland's situation is similar to New Jersey's, as they have been struggling with contamination in the state, but they have made more progress towards fixing these ailments. The Maryland state legislature has passed seven bills, and introduced another four at the beginning of 2024. Many of the bills that have already been passed mainly focus on trying to prevent the manufacture of PFAS in certain products, such as cosmetics and firefighter gear. Where Maryland needs to improve, however, is in their spending. Due to their high contamination levels in their community drinking water sources, banning the use of PFAS helps, but more needs to be done to appropriate money to remediation projects.

New York is ranked the highest among the Mid-Atlantic states. The New York legislature has already spent significant capital on state grants for remediation projects in specific areas, one of them being a $27 million grant focused on Long Island communities.[18] The New York state legislature has also been busy when it comes to introducing new legislation, having introduced 28 new bills in 2023 and 2024, with a range of purposes such as further appropriations projects, the creation of a Department of Environmental Conservation program to provide grants for remediation projects and phasing out PFAS in certain manufactured products.[19] The New York Department of Environmental Conservation's landing page regarding PFAS lacks some basic information, and seems outdated. The next step for New York is to create an action plan that lays out plans to cut out all uses of PFAS in the state.

Pennsylvania ranks just behind New York and 4th in the Mid-Atlantic. The Pennsylvania state legislature passed a bill in 2019 creating a PFAS remediation fund, and has introduced more bills in 2023 and to start 2024, many of which would focus on outlawing manufactures use of PFAS in certain products, such as firefighting equipment. Although the introduction of these bills is a great step, Pennsylvania needs to take more legislative action. The legislature has already appropriated funds towards PFAS, but $1.6 million is not nearly sufficient for dealing with the problem. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's PFAS landing page lacks a lot of information, so they drop a point in this category.

Last among the Mid-Atlantic states, Delaware comes up short in many areas. The state legislature has been relatively inactive, having only passed one policy and introduced only one bill (an appropriations bill), both in 2024. Most of their shortfalls on the scorecard result from this lack of previous legislation, and little indication to introduce legislation in the future. Delaware does have a drinking water limit that will soon be enforceable. The Delaware state legislature needs to take more action in passing bills to control the use of PFAS.

---

[18] "Governor Cuomo Announces Availability of $350M For Water System Upgrades Statewide And Directs Health Department To Begin Adopting Maximum Contaminant Levels For PFOA, PFOS, and 1,4-Dioxane," *Wateronline,* July 8, 2019, https://www.wateronline.com/doc/governor-cuomo-adopting-maximum-contaminant-levels-for-pfoa-pfos-and-dioxane-0001

[19] "Safer States: Bill Tracker," Bill Tracker, Safer States, https://www.saferstates.org/bill-tracker/?toxic_chemicals=PFAS&states=New%20York

The Mid-Atlantic states have taken good preliminary steps to combat PFAS. Legislatures have been actively passing legislation, every state besides Maryland has enforceable drinking water limits, and all have held manufacturers accountable for the use of PFAS. Where this region struggles, however, is a lack of appropriated funds. New York has spent high amounts, Pennsylvania has appropriated $1.6 million, and New Jersey and Delaware have introduced appropriations bills, but considering many states in this region are struggling with contamination in their drinking water sources, providing more funding for remediation and research would be the best course of action.

Midwest States
(Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Ohio)

Wisconsin comes in first in the Midwest region. The state has been in an interesting position lately, as a divided government has brought much of their PFAS policy implementation to a halt. In 2023 the Wisconsin state legislature passed an appropriations bill to add $125 million into their PFAS fund, but debate is still raging concerning how the money is to be spent.[20] The Wisconsin legislature has introduced more policies recently, one of which is a bill that would give the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources the ability to set enforceable standards for PFAS in air emissions. Besides the appropriations bill, the legislature has not taken nearly enough action limiting the use of PFAS.

The Minnesota state legislature has been one of the best in the nation at introducing PFAS legislation throughout the past few years. Although not all have been implemented, policies that have been introduced include large amounts of appropriations, banning PFAS in broad categories like firefighting equipment and in smaller categories like ski wax, and requiring testing of biosolids for PFAS contamination. Most notably, Minnesota has passed a bill that bans all unnecessary uses of PFAS for 13 categories of product specific uses by the year 2032.[21] Minnesota's next course of action should be the development of an action plan to lay out their next steps.

Michigan's legislature, similar to Wisconsin's, has appropriated significant capital to PFAS remediation funds. In the last three years, Michigan has appropriated a total of $97 million in PFAS remediation efforts and contamination response. Michigan's legislature has also introduced a bill, S.B.327, which would ban any PFAS from being intentionally added into food

[20] Todd Richmond, "Evers signals he won't sign bill to fight PFAS as legislative session nears end," *Associated Press*, February 21, 2024, https://apnews.com/article/pfas-pollution-wisconsin-evers-bill-republicans-99cc2d53caeb411ad10620376f8ecbad
[21] Minnesota HF 2310, 93rd legislature, 2023, https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bills/bill.php?b=House&f=HF2310&ssn=0&y=2023

packaging.[22] Although the appropriations bills are beneficial, Michigan's legislature has not taken much action outlawing the use of PFAS in a few products. Michigan's PFAS landing page does not provide much information, but does provide citizens with contact information to the Michigan PFAS Response Team (MPART).

Compared to the rest of the Midwest states, Illinois is right in the middle, and separates the top three that have done well from the bottom three that are struggling. Illinois introduced a similar bill to Minnesota's widespread ban, H.B. 5042, which includes a statewide ban on PFAS in 2032.[23] If this bill were to pass, it would easily put Illinois in the "good" category for enacted legislation. The Illinois legislature has been active, introducing new bills since the start of 2024, including establishing primary drinking water standards. Illinois's next actions should be to introduce appropriations bills for remediation projects.

Iowa and Indiana's actions have been lackluster. Iowa has not filed lawsuits against PFAS manufacturers and their previous legislative actions have been lackluster. Iowa does have an action plan and may introduce some new legislation in the upcoming year, so they are showing improvement. Indiana looks like they will introduce some bills, and they have already passed 3 policies and their PFAS landing page has valuable information on their process of extensive testing. Neither state has introduced any drinking water regulations.

Ohio is dead last among all states. They have done extensive testing, but have not taken any actions to fund remediation projects, or introduce/pass any legislation that could be used to ban PFAS from certain manufactured products. Although the Ohio EPA does have a PFAS landing page, compared to other states' it lacks information and is not up to date.

The Midwest states collectively are the furthest behind of the three northeast-midwest regions. Many states' legislatures have taken little to no action, passing or introducing legislation to combat the use of PFAS in manufacturing products, and little money has been appropriated in remediation projects or research. Aside from Michigan and Wisconsin that have appropriated funds, this should be the focus for the near future.

Conclusion

The federal government has been inactive at passing policy to combat the use of PFAS, which has led to state legislatures taking actions themselves. Each state has taken a different approach to combating PFAS because the issue lacks one singular solution. Combatting PFAS contamination requires outlawing the manufactured use, conducting remediation projects for

[22] Michigan S.B.327, 2023, https://legislature.mi.gov/Bills/Bill?ObjectName=2023-SB-0327
[23] Illinois H.B.5042, 103rd Legislature, 2024, https://legiscan.com/IL/text/HB5042/id/2918921#:~:text=Illinois%20House%20Bill%205042&text=Bill%20Title%3A%20Amends%20the%20PFAS,Environmental%20Protection%20Agency%20specified%20information.

water sources that have PFAS contamination, and researching possible replacements for PFAS. Currently, the biggest hurdle standing in the way involves finding the most efficient and cost-effective way to remediate drinking water sources that have been contaminated by PFAS. State environmental agencies and the federal EPA have both put resources towards research in this area.

PFAS contamination has become a crucial issue, especially considering that the United States is currently experiencing a clean water crisis.[24] The CDC has estimated that 97% of the United States population currently have PFAS in their bodies.[25] With the many health risks that are associated with PFAS, this is alarming information, and it makes state action all the more imperative. In the northeast-midwest region, some states are on the right track to eliminating PFAS, while others need to step up and accomplish more for their citizens.

Appendix A:

[24] Ruth O'Neil, "Addressing a Growing Water Crisis in the U.S.," *CDCFoundation*, March 22, 2023, https://www.cdcfoundation.org/blog/addressing-growing-water-crisis-us#:~:text=In%20the%20United%20States%2C%20many,running%20water%20or%20basic%20plumbing.
[25] Jessica Knoblach, "Breaking Down Toxic PFAS," *Earthjustice*, March 19, 2023, https://earthjustice.org/feature/breaking-down-toxic-pfas#:~:text=PFAS%20don't%20easily%20break,Control%20and%20Prevention%20(CDC).

State	Legislature Appropriations	Drinking Water Testing	Drinking Water Limit	Filed Suits	Action Plan	Phasing out the Bad	Plastics and Packaging	Drinking Water Policies	Previous Legislation	Landing Page	Total /10:
Vermont	Yes	Yes	Enforceable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Good	10
Maine	Yes	Yes	Enforceable	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Good	9
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Enforceable	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Good	9
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Enforceable	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Okay	Good	8.5
Rhode Island	No	Yes	Enforceable	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Okay	7.5
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	Guidance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Okay	Okay	7.5
New Jersey	No	Yes	Enforceable	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Okay	Good	8.5
Maryland	No	Yes	Guidance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Okay	8.5
New York	Yes	Yes	Enforceable	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Lackluster	8
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	Enforceable	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Lackluster	Lackluster	7
Delaware	No	Yes	Enforceable*	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Lackluster	Good	6
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	Enforceable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Okay	Good	9.5
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	Guidance	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Good	8.5
Michigan	Yes	Yes	Enforceable	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Okay	Lackluster	7.5
Illinois	No	Yes	Guidance	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Okay	Good	7
Iowa	No	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Lackluster	Good	6
Indiana	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Lackluster	Okay	5.5
Ohio	No	Yes	Guidance	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Lackluster	Lackluster	3.5
	New England	Atlantic	Mid-West	*Status Pending							

Appendix B:

Massachusetts:

- $28 Million set aside https://www.bostonglobe.com/2021/05/23/science/more-communities-are-finding-toxic-chemicals-their-drinking-water/
- **https://news.bloomberglaw.com/environment-and-energy/pfas-cleanup-money-rules-on-the-way-in-massachusetts**

Vermont:

- In 2023 Vermont appropriated $3M (and passed) to their DEC for PFAS Remediation (https://legislature.vermont.gov/bill/status/2024/H.145)
- In 2022 $420,000 appropriated (and passed) for the purchase of equipment to test for PFAS (https://legislature.vermont.gov/bill/status/2022/H.740)
- State agreed to spend $ 4.7 million in Bennington

Maine:

- In 2021 Maine appropriated $26.5 million for PFAS (https://legislature.maine.gov/LawMakerWeb/summary.asp?ID=280078272)
- In 2023 Maine appropriated $115,000 for new firefighter equipment without PFAS (http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/getPDF.asp?paper=HP0127&item=6&snum=131)
- In 2022 Maine passed an appropriations bill appropriating $60 million focused on PFAS remediation in farms (https://www.maine.gov/dacf/ag/pfas/docs/pfasfund/dacf-report-to-legislature-pfasfund.pdf)

Rhode Island:

- No State legislature spending found, however 2 appropriations in the FY budget bill have been introduced
    - 20 mil water plant http://webserver.rilegislature.gov/BillText/BillText24/HouseText24/H7224.pdf
    - 14 mil removal plant http://webserver.rilegislature.gov/BillText/BillText24/HouseText24/H7225.pdf

New Hampshire:

- In 2019 $6 Million in appropriations for PFAS testing and research (https://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/legislation/2019/HB0004.html)
- $50 Million loan program - ? (https://www.des.nh.gov/blog/pfas-remediation-loan-fund-program)
- $15 Million in state legislature funds for Bedford and Merrimack rebate program (https://newhampshirebulletin.com/briefs/bedford-merrimack-establishing-municipal-pfas-rebate-programs/)

Connecticut:

- In 2019 $2 million in appropriations for testing (https://www.cga.ct.gov/2020/ACT/pa/pdf/2020PA-00001-R00HB-05518-PA.pdf)

New Jersey:

- None
    - $5 Million appropriation bill introduced (https://pub.njleg.state.nj.us/Bills/2024/A1500/1421_I1.PDF)

Maryland:

- None

New York:

- $10 Million invested in water filtration systems (https://www.health.ny.gov/press/releases/2016/2016-03-30_hoosick_falls.htm)
- $27 Million in PFAS Water Infrastructure Improvement Act (https://www.wateronline.com/doc/governor-cuomo-adopting-maximum-contaminant-levels-for-pfoa-pfos-and-dioxane-0001)
- $500,000 Appropriations bill introduced to Stony Brook (not passed yet)

Pennsylvania:

- $1.6 Million Temple University PFAS cancer study earmark (https://www.phillyburbs.com/story/news/2021/07/05/pennsylvania-earmarks-1-6-million-pfas-cancer-study-temple-university-unwell-water-pfas-horsham/7826350002/)

Delaware:

- None
    - $1 Million appropriation bill introduced for a PFAS foam project

Wisconsin:

- $125 Million appropriated from general and environmental management fund

Michigan:

- $39 Million appropriations bill (https://www.legislature.mi.gov/(S(yp553qnntvhhpsnrshu2mji0))/mileg.aspx?page=GetObject&objectname=2023-HB-4437)

References

"An act relating to liability relating to the use of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances," Vermont S.261, 2024.

"FACT SHEET: EPA & The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law," *EPA*, November 6, 2021.

Fallon, Scott. "High levels of PFAS chemicals found in 34 NJ drinking systems affecting 500K+ people," *NorthJersey.com* January 25, 2022.

Friedman, Lisa & Giang, Vivian. "3M Reaches $10.3 Billion Settlement in 'Forever Chemicals' Suits," *New York Times*, June 22, 2023.

"Governor Cuomo Announces Availability of $350M For Water System Upgrades Statewide And Directs Health Department To Begin Adopting Maximum Contaminant Levels For PFOA, PFOS, and 1,4-Dioxane," *Wateronline*, July 8, 2019.

"How EPA Regulates Drinking Water Contaminants,'" *EPA*, Last updated November 2, 2023.

Illinois H.B.5042, 103rd Legislature, 2024.

Knoblach, Jessica. "Breaking Down Toxic PFAS," *Earthjustice*, March 19, 2023.

McFall-Johnsen, Morgan & Tyson, Taylor."How Long Hazardous 'Forever chemicals' stay in the body," *Business Insider*, March 16, 2023.

Michigan S.B.327, 102nd Legislature, 2023.

Minnesota HF 2310, 93rd legislature, 2023.

"NIGHTMARE COSTS," *Nonsticknightmare*, Last Updated 1/19/2024.

O'Neil, Ruth. "Addressing a Growing Water Crisis in the U.S," *CDCFoundation*, March 22, 2023.

"Our Current Understanding of the Human Health and Environmental Risks of PFAS," *EPA*, last updated June 7, 2023.

"Our Priorities - PFAS 'Forever Chemicals,'" *SaferStates.* https://www.saferstates.org/priorities/pfas/

"PFAS Accountability Act," S.3275, 118th Congress, 2024.

"PFAS Action Act," H.R.2467, 117th Congress, 2021.

"PFAS Sites and Community Resources," *PFAS Project Lab.* https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/12412ab41b3141598e0bb48523a7c940/page/Page-1/?views=State-Action

Richmond, Todd. "Evers signals he won't sign bill to fight PFAS as legislative session nears end," *Associated Press,* February 21, 2024.

Rivard, Ry & Wolman, Jordan. "'Forever Chemicals' are everywhere. The battle over who pays to clean them up is just getting started," *Politico,* September 9, 2022.

"Safer States: Bill Tracker," *Safer States,* https://www.saferstates.org/bill-tracker/?toxic_chemicals=PFAS&states=New%20York.

Stohler, Stephanie. "More than half of US State Attorney General have taken action against PFAS manufacturers and key users," *Safer States,* August 24, 2023.

Udasin, Sharon. "Federal court finalizes $1.2B 'forever chemicals' settlement involving major firms." *TheHill,* February 8, 2024.

"2024 Analysis of State Legislation Addressing Toxic Chemicals and Plastics," *SaferStates,* published February 8, 2024.