



Solutions for a  
Toxic-Free Tomorrow

Testimony of Sarah Woodbury, Vice President of Policy and Advocacy, Defend Our Health  
Neither for Nor Against LD 935, “Resolve, Directing the Department of Environmental Protection  
to Report on Air and Soil Chemical and Metal Levels and on Soil Testing on Solar Panel Farm  
Sites”

Before the Environment and Natural Resources Committee

March 31, 2025

Senator Tepler, Representative Doudera, and members of the Environment and Natural Resources Committee. My name is Sarah Woodbury. I am the Vice President of Policy and Advocacy for Defend Our Health. Defend Our Health’s mission is to make sure that everyone has equal access to safe food and drinking water, healthy homes, and products that are toxic-free and climate friendly. I am here to testify Neither for Nor Against LD 935, “Resolve, Directing the Department of Environmental Protection to Report on Air and Soil Chemical and Metal Levels and on Soil Testing on Solar Panel Farm Sites”.

We appreciate Representative Quint bringing forward this resolve. Defend is generally in favor of making sure that toxic chemicals and metals are not ending up in our soil and water and are also generally supportive of testing required to make sure that we know what is ending up in our soil and water. However, we don’t believe that this legislation is specific enough to be helpful. The bill calls for the Department to provide information, by Dec 3, 2025, on any testing they have on metals and chemicals in soil. To what end? There are no requirements to do anything with that information. Additionally, A lot of this information is publicly available on the Department’s website and pulling that information together by the end of this year would put a huge burden on Department staff. We would hazard this would lead to a rather large fiscal note.

The second part of this bill requires the Department submit a report to the legislature on any testing around solar. It is our understanding that there is no such program currently in place so it would be difficult for the Department to gather information that isn’t available, which would not be useful to the legislature. If the sponsor wanted to amend to require that testing be done, we would suggest that the bill be much more specific as to what chemicals and metals should be tested for as that may make testing easier. It would also be a huge cost for the state to do this testing. You only need to look to the PFAS testing done on farmland to realize how expensive it. The DEP has spent over \$10M on testing for soil and water for PFAS and that is one chemical. Once again, you’d end up with a huge fiscal note on this legislation in a year when the state is experiencing budget issues. While PFAS isn’t specifically stated in the bill, that is a concern that has been raised several times, we would point out that PFAS needs to be phased out from solar panels by 2032 and is not exempted under that law so it is being phased out of solar panels.

Thank you.