

Thoughts on PFAS initiatives

With the little I've seen about your work here, I think this is good. From what I understand, the chemists who develop these chemicals have a library of many other analogs that are functionally the same but have slightly different makeups; so when one of the chemicals gets banned, they just go down the list to the next analog. I hope any legislation or initiatives developed here are careful to target the general class of chemicals and not any single one.

Thoughts on the Climate Pollution Reduction Grants Program

The Climate Action Plan for PA has nothing about encouraging plant-based eating as of today. Considering the most conservative estimates for global GHG emissions have animal agriculture at around 15% total emissions, this is an enormous oversight. And when we factor in that 80% of all agricultural land is used by animal agriculture to produce <20% of total calories consumed by people, it becomes a no-brainer to start rewilding the 32 million km² of "rangeland" used by animal agriculture to turn it into an active carbon sink. And when we take the negative emissions of that potential carbon sink into account, the true share of global GHG emissions contributed by animal agriculture balloons much higher than 15%.

I think the entire conception of this grant-funding approach is off. We don't need the biggest winners in our economy to be doing *more*, we need everyone in our society to be doing *more with less*. We've all become very habitually wasteful and take our ever-more-finite resources for granted. These grants are going to get sucked up by the biggest companies who have the funds to hire lawyers and consultants to draw up convincing applications to receive the maximum amount from these grants. Regular people aren't going to be able to do that. And so small business owners now have to compete not just with big, well-established businesses, but with big, well-established businesses that are also subsidized by huge government welfare programs like this one.

I get that giving grants and throwing money at problems to try to fix them is kind of just the way our government (and culture) functions at this point. In my opinion it's very wasteful and mostly just distorts the market (often in favor of the worst actors). But I could almost forgive it if there was anything significant in that plan to allow normal people to participate in reducing GHG emissions. If the centerpiece was plant-based eating, that would be something everyone could participate in and it would have an enormous effect on emissions reductions.

I also think there's a missed opportunity in none of the funding going to litigation to keep the biggest emitters and polluters accountable. We need more people enforcing the laws otherwise why even have them? Unfortunately, with how our court system functions today, regular people of modest means can't really use the legal system to do this on their own; it's far too time consuming, expensive and risky. The DEP on the other hand has plenty of resources to prepare strategic cases that could both hold violators accountable and reduce emissions. Again, we need more talk about *doing less*, and there are a lot of people in power who literally don't even believe in climate change and/or don't care about it. For those people litigation will likely be the only avenue and motivator for change. It sucks we can't always just discuss facts and science like adults but this is reality unfortunately. A great example of this is a recent lawsuit filed by Letitia James, the attorney general of New York, against JBS, the world's largest beef producer, on their fallacious claims about their emissions reductions. Does anyone really believe that asking JBS nicely to stop would do anything? Or do you think we should bribe them with grants? We need more litigation.