

---

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

**Senator Blakespear, Chair**

**2025 - 2026 Regular**

---

**Bill No:** AB 1148  
**Author:** Sharp-Collins  
**Version:** 6/17/2025  
**Urgency:** No  
**Consultant:** Taylor McKie

**Hearing Date:** 6/17/2026  
**Fiscal:** Yes

**SUBJECT:** Food packaging: hazardous chemicals

**DIGEST:** This bill prohibits a person from manufacturing, distributing, selling, or offering for sale food packaging that contains intentionally added bisphenols or ortho-phthalates and outlines further regulation, as specified.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing federal law:

- 1) Establishes the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) and requires the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to oversee the safety of food, drugs, and cosmetics. (21 United States Code (U.S.C.) §§ 301 et seq.)
- 2) Defines “food contact substance” (FCS) to mean any substance that is intended for use as a component of materials used in manufacturing, packing, packaging, transporting, or holding food if such use of the substance is not intended to have any technical effect in such food. (21 U.S.C. § 348(h)(6))
- 3) Allows for a manufacturer or supplier of an FCS to notify the FDA of the identity, intended use, and basis of determination that the FCS is safe under a specified standard. (21 U.S.C § 348(h)(1); 21 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 170.100)
- 4) Requires the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) to create a regulatory framework to collect data on chemicals in order to evaluate, assess, mitigate, and control risks that may be posed by their manufacture, processing, and use. (15 U.S.C §§ 2601 et seq.)

Existing state law:

- 1) Prohibits, a person, in the course of doing business, from knowingly and intentionally exposing any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause

cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 25249.6)

- 2) Requires, under Proposition 65, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) to publish a list of chemicals known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity. (HSC § 25249.8)
- 3) Requires DTSC to adopt regulations to establish a process to identify and prioritize chemicals or chemical ingredients in consumer products that may be considered chemicals of concern, as specified. (HSC § 25252)
- 4) Requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to adopt regulations to establish a process to identify and evaluate chemicals of concern in consumer products, and their potential alternatives, to determine how to best limit exposure or to reduce the level of hazard posed by a chemical of concern. (HSC §§ 25251 et seq.)
- 5) Specifies, but does not limit, regulatory responses that DTSC can take following the completion of an alternatives analysis, ranging from no action, to a prohibition of the chemical in the product. (HSC § 25253)
- 6) Authorizes DTSC to issue a formal request for information from product manufacturers, including, but not limited to, information on ingredient chemical identity, concentration, and functional use. (HSC § 25253.7)
- 7) Prohibits, beginning January 1, 2023, the sale of any food packaging that contains regulated per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). (HSC § 109000)
- 8) Prohibits, on or after January 1, 2026, the manufacture or sale of any juvenile's feeding, sucking, or teething product that contains any form of bisphenol above the practical quantitation limit determined by DTSC (HSC § 108940(a)). (HSC § 108940(g))
- 9) Defines "bisphenol," as a chemical with two phenol rings connected by a single linker atom. Specifies that the linker atom and phenol rings may have additional substituents. (HSC § 108942)
- 10) Defines "ortho-phthalates" as a class of chemicals that are esters of ortho-phthalic acid, including specified chemicals including, but not limited to, DEHP, DBP, BBP, DINP, DIDP, and DNOP. (HSC § 109051)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits, on and after January 1, 2027, a person from manufacturing, distributing, selling, or offering for sale in the state any food packaging that contains intentionally added bisphenols or ortho-phthalates.
- 2) Defines “bisphenol” to mean “a chemical with two phenol rings connected by a single linker atom. The linker atom and phenol rings may have additional substituents” and excludes tetramethyl bisphenol F (TMBPF) from the definition.
- 3) Defines “ortho-phthalates” to mean a class of specified chemicals as listed in Section 109051 of HSC.
- 4) Defines “food packaging” to mean a nondurable package, packaging component, or food service ware that is intended to contain, serve, store, handle, protect, or market food, foodstuffs, or beverages.
- 5) Specifies that “food packaging” includes food or beverage containers, take-out food containers, unit product boxes, liners, wrappers, serving vessels, eating utensils, straws, food boxes, and disposable plates, bowls, or trays.
- 6) Defines “intentionally added bisphenols or ortho-phthalates” to mean any bisphenol or ortho-phthalate that a manufacturer has added to a product and that has a functional or technical effect in the product, including if the bisphenol or ortho-phthalate is a component of an intentionally-added chemical or is the intentional breakdown product of an added chemical that also have a functional effect in the product.
- 7) Requires DTSC, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to establish in regulation a threshold for bisphenols and ortho-phthalates in food packaging that are not intentionally added; and prohibits a person from manufacturing, distributing, selling, or offering for sale any food packaging that contains bisphenols or ortho-phthalates at or above the established threshold one year after DTSC adopts this regulation.
- 8) Authorizes DTSC to establish standards for use of bisphenols or ortho-phthalates in food packaging by regulation that are more protective of public health, sensitive populations, or the environment than the standards originally established by DTSC.

- 9) Authorizes DTSC to limit or prohibit the distribution, sale, or offer for sale in the state any food packaging that contains TMBPF by regulation if DTSC determines that TMBPF poses a significant risk to human health.
- 10) Provides that if DTSC adopts a regulatory response under its Safer Consumer Products program regarding the use of any form of bisphenol or ortho-phthalate, then the provisions of this bill shall not apply to that product.
- 11) Provides that the provisions of this bill shall not be construed to prohibit or restrict the authority of DTSC to prioritize or take action on a product containing any form of bisphenol or ortho-phthalate.
- 12) Authorizes DTSC or the Attorney General to enforce the provisions of this bill.
- 13) Requires a person in violation of the provisions of this bill to be liable for an administrative or civil penalty not to exceed \$5,000 for the first violation and not to exceed \$10,000 for each subsequent violation and authorizes penalties to be assessed for each day that a violation continues.
- 14) Authorizes DTSC to adopt regulations to implement, enforce, interpret, or make specific the provisions of this bill.
- 15) Authorizes, upon appropriation by the Legislature, funds in the Toxic Substances Control Account to be used by DTSC to implement the provisions of this bill.

## Background

- 1) *The problem with phthalates.* Ortho-phthalates, often referred to as phthalates, are ubiquitous, high-volume, synthetic chemicals used in plastic products, most often polyvinyl chloride (PVC or vinyl), to make the material soft, pliable, and less brittle. Historically, certain phthalates have been used in food packaging or other minor food contact uses, such as components of adhesives, lubricants, and sealants. Phthalates have been shown to leach into food from plastic equipment used in dairy operations, lid gaskets, conveyor belts, and food packaging materials.<sup>1</sup>

Phthalates are known endocrine disruptors and chronic exposure to these chemicals are associated with adverse impacts to the reproductive system.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Engel, S. M., et al. (2021). [Neurotoxicity of Ortho-Phthalates: Recommendations for Critical Policy Reforms to Protect Brain Development in Children.](#)

<sup>2</sup> Wang, Y. and Qian, H. (2021). [Phthalates and Their Impacts on Human Health.](#)

Studies have also indicated that exposure to phthalates can impair brain development and increase risks for learning, attention, and behavioral disorders.<sup>1</sup> OEHHA lists six phthalates under Proposition 65 for its association with birth defects, reproductive harm, and cancer.

This bill would ban food packaging that contains intentionally-added phthalates. The bill also requires DTSC to establish a threshold for non-intentionally-added phthalates, subject to an appropriation by the Legislature.

- 2) *The problem with bisphenols.* Bisphenols are a group of synthetic, high-volume chemicals that are used in the manufacturing of polycarbonate plastics and epoxy resins. The most widely used and well-studied chemical in the group is bisphenol A (BPA), but the use of other bisphenols, such as bisphenol S (BPS) and bisphenol F (BPF), is increasing as manufacturers use these chemicals to replace BPA following restrictions on its use. The most human exposure to BPA and its substitutions is through the consumption of food and beverages that have been in contact with epoxy resin linings or polycarbonate plastic containers such as jar lids, drink cans, water bottles, food storage containers, plastic wrap, dishes and utensils.<sup>3</sup> Some of these linings are intended to extend the storage time and shelf life of food and protect against food contact with corroded metal.<sup>4</sup>

BPA has been shown to have adverse effects on the endocrine, reproductive, and immune systems.<sup>5</sup> Even at low doses, studies have indicated that BPA may be associated with an increased risk of fetal development, cardiovascular disease, breast and prostate cancer, and issues with cognitive and behavioral development. While the substitutions for BPA are less studied, research has still indicated that other chemicals within the bisphenol class display hazard traits similar to BPA, and some with worse effects.<sup>6,7</sup> OEHHA has listed BPA under Proposition 65 for adverse effects on the female reproductive system in 2015 and for developmental effects in 2020. Similarly, OEHHA listed BPS under Proposition 65 for reproductive toxicity in 2023.

This bill would ban food packaging that contains intentionally-added bisphenols, with the exception of tetramethyl-bisphenol F (TMBPF). The bill

---

<sup>3</sup> HBM4EU. (2021). [Bisphenols: What You Need to Know.](#)

<sup>4</sup> Geueke, B. (2025). [Can coatings.](#)

<sup>5</sup> Ma, Y., et. al. (2019). [The adverse health effects of bisphenol A and related toxicity mechanisms.](#)

<sup>6</sup> Thoene, M., et. al. (2020). [Bisphenol S in Food Causes Hormonal and Obesogenic Effects Comparable to or Worse than Bisphenol A: A Literature Review.](#)

<sup>7</sup> Chen, D., et. al. (2016). [Bisphenol analogues Other Than BPA: Environmental Occurrence, Human Exposure, and Toxicity—A Review.](#)

also requires DTSC to establish a threshold for non-intentionally-added bisphenols, excluding TMBPF, subject to an appropriation by the Legislature.

- 3) *On the frontiers of TMBPF.* TMBPF is a bisphenol derivative that was identified by Sherwin-Williams as part of their efforts to develop a bisphenol-based compound without endocrine-disrupting properties. Unlike BPA and other derivatives of bisphenols, TMBPF has been found to lack the characteristics that would lead to adverse reproductive effects.<sup>8,9,10</sup> Additionally, coatings that use TMBPF are manufactured in a way that allows for less use of the substance and complete chemical reactions that minimize residuals, and thus reduces the migration of the substances into food and beverages and lowers human exposure.<sup>10,11</sup>

There are, however, more recent studies that have raised concerns for TMBPF, despite its promising characteristics. Contrary to the findings of earlier studies, some studies still indicate the potential of TMBPF to lead to endocrine disruption and adverse reproductive effects.<sup>8,12,13</sup> Research has also suggested that TMBPF has the potential to produce adverse skeletal, developmental, and neurological effects.<sup>8,14,15,16,17</sup> TMBPF has even been found to exhibit greater toxicity compared to BPA when considering cytotoxic effects.<sup>18</sup>

A particular concern of TMBPF is that it is persistent, which gives it the potential to accumulate in both humans and the environment. Though exposure levels may be low, repeated exposure over long periods of time may produce similar effects to that of higher exposures.<sup>8</sup> Experts suggest that caution be

---

<sup>8</sup> Hwang, I., et. al. (2025). Tetramethyl Bisphenol F: Organ- and System-Specific Toxicity, Current Status, and Perspectives.

<sup>9</sup> Maffini, M. and Canatsey, R. (2020). An expanded toxicological profile of tetramethyl bisphenol F (TMBPF), a precursor for a new food-contact metal packaging coating.

<sup>10</sup> Soto, A., et. al. (2017). Evidence of Absence: Estrogenicity Assessment of a New Food-Contact Coating and the Bisphenol Used in Its Synthesis.

<sup>11</sup> Mallen, T., et. al. (2023). Characterization of a new polymeric food contact coating with emphasis on the chemical analysis and safety assessment of non-intentionally added substances (NIAS).

<sup>12</sup> Fan, H., et. al. (2025). Tetramethyl bisphenol F exposure induces human ovarian granulosa cell senescence and mouse ovarian damage by regulating ESRRB signaling.

<sup>13</sup> Park, C.G., et. al. (2024). A combined in vitro-in silico method for assessing the androgenic activities of bisphenol A and its analogues.

<sup>14</sup> Kim, H.M., et. al. (2021). Effects of Bisphenol A and Its Alternatives, Bisphenol F and Tetramethyl Bisphenol F on Osteoclast Differentiation.

<sup>15</sup> Harnett, K.G., et. al. (2021). Teratogenicity and toxicity of the new BPA alternative TMBPF, and BPA, BPS, and BPAF in chick embryonic development.

<sup>16</sup> Liang, M., et. al. (2023). TMBPF-induced neurotoxicity and oxidative stress in zebrafish larvae: Impacts on central nervous system development and dopamine neurons.

<sup>17</sup> Hwang, I., et. al. (2026). Effects of Maternal Tetramethyl Bisphenol F Exposure on Neurodevelopment and Behavior in Mouse Offspring.

<sup>18</sup> Harnett, K.G., et. al. (2021). Cytotoxic and apoptotic data of BPA and BPA alternatives TMBPF, BPAF, and BPS in female adult rat and human stem cells.

taken with TMBPF as regulatory environments restrict other bisphenol-based materials in food packaging.<sup>8</sup>

Although this bill excludes TMBPF from the ban or further regulation on food packaging, it does acknowledge the potential hazards associated with the chemical compound by authorizing DTSC to limit or prohibit TMBPF in food packaging if DTSC determines that it poses a significant risk to human health.

- 4) *Regulating chemicals in food packaging.* The California Legislature has previously taken action when concerns were raised about chemicals in food packaging. In 2021, the Legislature passed AB 1200 (Ting, Chapter 503, Statutes of 2021) which prohibited the sale of plant fiber-based food packaging containing per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) beginning January 1, 2023. To regulate the use of bisphenols, AB 1319 (Butler, Chapter 467, Statutes of 2011) banned BPA above a specified threshold from bottles or cups intended for children that are three years of age or younger. SB 1266 (Limón, Chapter 790, Statutes of 2024) amended the provisions of AB 1319 to broaden the prohibition to the class of bisphenols above a specified threshold determined by DTSC. DTSC has yet to establish this threshold for all bisphenols, however, BPA had a previously established threshold of 0.1 parts per billion (ppb).<sup>19</sup>

There are other states that have passed legislation restricting phthalates and bisphenols in food packaging. Maine banned food packaging with intentionally added phthalates in 2022. Washington banned bisphenol-based epoxy liners specifically in drink cans beginning in 2025 and required annual reporting for food cans that contain bisphenol-based epoxy liners. TMBPF-based liners are excluded from both sets of regulations. In Washington's regulatory decision, TMBPF met the minimum criteria to be considered a safer alternative. In their evaluation, TMBPF still scored moderate for endocrine activity and developmental toxicity, and high for persistence, so use of TMBPF was considered acceptable, as long as the residual monomers are at concentrations below 100 parts per million (ppm).<sup>20</sup>

Under federal laws and regulations, information on food contact substances (FCS) may be collected and reviewed by the FDA under certain conditions. Manufacturers or suppliers of FCS may submit a premarket notification with information that indicates that the FCS is safe. The notification is recommended to include a basis for the determination that the FCS is safe; the

---

<sup>19</sup> Department of Toxic Substances Control. (2026). *Product Safety: Bisphenol of 2024 (SB 1266)*.

<sup>20</sup> Washington State Department of Ecology. (2022). *Regulatory Determinations Report to the Legislature: Safer Products for Washington Cycle 1 Implementation Phase 3*.

chemical identity of the FCS, impurities, and residual reactants; conditions of use; intended technical effect; estimates of daily intake and data on the levels of residual reactants and impurities; comprehensive toxicological profiles and studies; and environmental assessments, if applicable.<sup>21</sup>

- 5) *DTSC Safer Consumer Products Program.* DTSC administers the Safer Consumer Products (SCP, previously known as Green Chemistry) Program, which aims to advance the design, development, and use of products that are chemically safer for people and the environment. DTSC's approach provides science-based criteria and procedures for identifying and evaluating alternatives with the objective of replacing chemicals of concern with safer chemicals and avoiding the use of substitute chemicals that pose equal or greater harm. A consumer product will be designated as a Priority Product if it contains one or more Candidate Chemicals, which are chemicals that exhibit specified hazardous traits, and have the potential to contribute to significant or widespread adverse impacts on humans or the environment. Manufacturers of a Priority Product must submit an alternatives analysis which determines whether there are any safer alternatives to the Candidate Chemical in the product or if there are other ways to make a safer version of the product. The alternatives analysis takes a life cycle approach, evaluating certain factors and the safety of the product from raw material extraction to disposal/recycling. The outcomes of the alternatives analysis could lead to alternative ingredients or product design or regulatory responses including but not limited to: requiring the display of product information, chemical restrictions, product prohibitions, or end-of-life management requirements.

Under the SCP Program, bisphenols and ortho-phthalates are listed as Candidate Chemicals. DTSC evaluated several Candidate Chemicals in food packaging, including BPA and phthalates. Due to the presence and circulation of alternatives, decreased human exposure, and the lack of information that identified the use of these chemicals in food packaging, DTSC decided not to designate food packaging as a Priority Product.

DTSC may narrowly focus and only designate Priority Products to address the most significant impacts as their resources can be limited. Where there is ample scientific evidence to support a change in state policy to protect public health and the environment, the Legislature can fill in the gaps to restrict or eliminate the use of a chemical in certain products. While the market has largely moved away from the use of bisphenols and phthalates in food packaging, this bill would prohibit their use in any remaining products.

---

<sup>21</sup> U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2021). [Preparation of Food Contact Substance Notifications \(Administrative\): Guidance for Industry.](#)

## Comments

- 1) *Purpose of Bill.* According to the author, “Thousands of chemicals are used to make the materials that come into contact with our food and beverages. Chemicals from these materials can migrate into the food and our bodies, and some of these chemicals have been linked to negative health impacts ranging from allergic reactions to asthma, obesity, diabetes, male and female reproductive problems including infertility and decreased testosterone, learning disabilities, cardiovascular disease and increased risk of breast cancer. AB 1148 will allow California to act to reduce exposures through food to the same harmful chemicals that our state has already banned in other product categories: Phthalates and Bisphenols.”
- 2) *What’s intentional and what’s not?* When coating materials are manufactured, intentionally added chemicals may be synthesized to create the final product. During synthesis, byproducts can be created during the reactions which are known as non-intentionally added substances (NIAS). Both NIAS and unreacted intentionally added chemicals have the potential to migrate into food.

While NIAS should still fall under a regulatory framework, if it is perceived by manufacturers that the law inadvertently loops NIAS into the definition of intentionally added bisphenols or phthalates with this particular ban framework, it could create concerns around liability, thus impacting the market for these products and the food supply chain. Carefully clarifying this technical definition may relieve liability concerns, while maintaining the intent of the bill. ***The author and committee may wish to consider clarifying the definition of intentionally added bisphenols and phthalates to exclude reaction byproducts or intermediates, understood to be NIAS.***

- 3) *What’s durable and what’s not?* The bill in print defines food packaging, in part, as a nondurable package that is intended to contain, serve, store, handle, protect, or market food. Opponents of the bill have raised that the language in print is may not sufficiently exclude “durable” polycarbonate materials. These materials intentionally add BPA, and opponents note that there is no currently available alternative. These materials are also subject to extraction limitations under federal regulations. It is important to note that BPA from these materials may still pose a risk if the materials are improperly used or washed. Thus, the author, sponsors, and relevant stakeholders have come to an agreement to narrowly exempt these materials for commercial kitchen applications. ***The author and committee may wish to consider clarifying the definition of food packaging to exclude durable materials, including polycarbonate resins.***

- 4) *Kicking the can down the road.* Bisphenols are currently used in coatings on both inside and outside of metal cans and other products. The class of chemicals have functional properties that protect the migration of metals into food on the inside and protect the can itself from moisture, abrasion, or other environmental conditions on the outside, preserving its appearance. Even though industry notes that any exposures to these substances from external coatings are well below established thresholds, the European Union has prohibited the use of BPA specifically for this application by 2028. There has been a global shift away from bisphenols used in external can coatings to polyester and acrylic materials, however not all domestic manufacturers have worked towards this shift, and making this shift can take years. Previous shifts towards safer alternatives have taken some chemical suppliers and manufacturers over a decade. The author, sponsors, and relevant stakeholders have come to an agreement to extend the deadline for the prohibition of bisphenols and ortho-phthalates in external coatings on metal products that do not come in contact with food. Because a shift towards non-bisphenol alternatives is possible for external coatings and manufacturers will require additional time to comply, ***the author and committee may wish to consider extending the deadline for the prohibition of bisphenols and ortho-phthalates in external coatings on metal food packaging until 2037.***
- 5) *A threshold for TMBPF.* While TMBPF has some promising characteristics, there are outstanding concerns that warrant further consideration. The residual unreacted intentionally added TMBPF and associated byproducts from coatings that may migrate into food may be at very low levels, however, these chemicals have the potential to bioaccumulate in the human body with repeated exposure over longer periods of time because of their persistent nature. Long-term repeated exposure is likely, as consumers may routinely purchase similar food items with packaging containing the chemical. It is an open question whether long-term, repeated exposure to smaller doses of TMBPF lead to its associated adverse impacts.

Experts have suggested that regulatory frameworks could exercise caution by incorporating early hazard profiling and establishing regulatory thresholds in response to emerging scientific data, especially for long-term and subtle toxicities.<sup>8</sup> Even Washington regulators have established a threshold of 100 ppm for residual TMBPF, though the chemical is exempt from other regulations.<sup>20</sup> This bill does reflect some caution, as it authorizes DTSC to limit or ban TMBPF using their discretion. The bill could further specify for DTSC to establish a threshold for non-intentionally added TMBPF, as it does for other bisphenols and phthalates, upon appropriation by the Legislature. In

acknowledging the persistent nature of TMBPF and its potential for harm, *the author and committee may wish to consider requiring DTSC to establish a threshold for non-intentionally added TMBPF upon appropriation by the Legislature.*

- 6) *Promoting transparency.* Apart from TMBPF, many industries have transitioned away from the bisphenol class to other chemistries. In some cases, alternatives used may still generate bisphenols as byproducts in the manufacturing process. With TMBPF, concerns about its persistence and potential adverse effects prompt a closer look and continued research. For any transition to a new chemistry, it is important to avoid what is known as a “regrettable substitution”, or an alternative used that has the potential to cause harm.

To understand the risk that is associated with the chemicals used in these products, industries and the scientific community conduct toxicological and migration studies based on known properties of the chemicals. As industries, regulators, and the scientific community work to evaluate the safety and efficacy of existing chemical ingredients and potential alternatives, information gaps can persist for certain parties, stifling progress. The best way to prevent the use of a regrettable substitution is to have better data available to all interested parties. Increasing transparency around any bisphenol, phthalate, or alternative that is permitted as an intentionally added substance or results as a byproduct during the manufacturing process could advance research towards safer alternatives, encourage competition, optimize resource efficiency, and inform regulatory decisions.

DTSC does have the authority to request information from manufacturers and chemical suppliers, but it may not be readily available or provided with ease. Further, this information is not always public, which hinders the scientific community from making progress and supporting the advancement of safer chemistries. As mentioned above, caution could be exercised in regulatory frameworks with early hazard profiling, and the more regulators and independent scientists are equipped with information, the more efficient these profiles will be performed.

As this bill maintains the pathway for the use of intentionally-added and non-intentionally-added bisphenols and phthalates, it could provide insight into the types of chemistries used in products, migration characteristics, and toxicological endpoints by creating transparency mechanisms. This information is typically provided to the FDA under the food contact notification process.<sup>21</sup> Some companies champion transparency by publicly posting toxicological and

migration studies on their website.<sup>22</sup> Both approaches respect the need for proprietary information as documents submitted to the FDA may be regarded as confidential and publicly available documents contain redactions. A balance could be struck, encouraging scientific advancement while maintaining confidentiality for competition. AB 1148 could represent an opportunity to ban a class of known harmful chemicals while simultaneously creating essential transparency mechanisms to prevent regrettable substitutions. *The author and committee may wish to consider:*

- a) *Explicitly requiring manufacturers and chemical suppliers to maintain information pursuant to SB 502 and information on non-intentionally added bisphenols and phthalates in food packaging, toxicological and migration studies, and other relevant information and submit this information to DTSC upon their request; and*
  - b) *Encouraging manufacturers and/or chemical suppliers to voluntarily and publicly post available scientific studies, while maintaining the right to exclude proprietary information, for food packaging products that contain intentionally and non-intentionally added bisphenols and phthalates.*
- 7) *A two-year bill.* This bill was originally introduced in February 2025, with dates that correspond to an enactment date of 2026. Because this bill was parked in this committee in June 2025, and will be heard and potentially signed in 2026, the article title and the prohibition deadline should reflect this change. *The author and committee may wish to consider amending the article title to “Safer Food Packaging Act of 2026” and the prohibition deadline for intentionally added bisphenols and ortho-phthalates in food packaging to January 1, 2028.*
- 8) *Committee amendments. Staff recommends the committee adopt the bolded amendments contained in comments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7 above.*

#### **DOUBLE REFERRAL:**

If this measure is approved by the Senate Environmental Quality Committee, the do pass motion must include the action to re-refer the bill to the Senate Committee on Health.

---

<sup>22</sup> Sherwin-Williams. (2026). [valPure® NBPA Epoxy Studies and Research](#).

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SB 1266 (Limon, Chapter 790, Statutes of 2024) revised the existing prohibition on BPA in a juvenile bottle or cup established by AB 1319 (Butler, Chapter 467, Statutes of 2011) to instead prohibit the manufacture or sale of any juvenile's feeding, sucking, or teething product that contains any form of bisphenol above the practical quantitation limit to be determined by DTSC.

AB 2300 (Wilson, Chapter 562, Statutes of 2024) prohibited the manufacture or sale of IV solution containers made with intentionally added DEHP beginning January 1, 2030, and additionally prohibited the manufacture or sale of IV tubing made with intentionally added DEHP beginning January 1, 2035.

AB 2244 (Ting, 2024) would have prohibited a receipt provided to a consumer by a business or created by a manufacturer from containing, beginning on January 1, 2025, intentionally added BPA beginning January 1, 2025, followed by any bisphenols January 1, 2026. This bill was held on the suspense file in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 347 (Ting, Chapter 932, Statutes of 2024) required DTSC to enforce and ensure compliance with three existing laws that set limits for PFAS in food packaging, textiles, and juvenile products.

SB 502 (Allen, Chapter 701, Statutes of 2022) authorized DTSC to issue information requests to product manufacturers and chemical suppliers for specified information regarding a product-chemical combination.

AB 1200 (Ting, Chapter 503, Statutes of 2021) prohibited the sale of any food packaging that contains regulated PFAS beginning January 1, 2023.

AB 2762 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 314, Statutes of 2020) prohibited the manufacturing or sale of a cosmetic product containing specified intentionally added ingredients, including several phthalates beginning January 1, 2025.

AB 1319 (Butler, Chapter 467, Statutes of 2011) prohibited the sale, manufacture, or distribution of a bottle or cup or a liquid, food, or beverage in a can, jar, or plastic bottle that contains BPA if the item is primarily intended for children three years of age or younger.

AB 1108 (Ma, Chapter 672, Statutes of 2007) prohibited the sale, manufacture, or distribution of specified phthalates in toys and childcare products designed for babies and children under three years of age.

**SOURCE:** Breast Cancer Prevention Partners  
Environmental Working Group  
California Public Interest Research Group

**SUPPORT:**

350 Southland Legislative Alliance  
7th Generation Advisors  
A Voice for Choice Advocacy  
Active San Gabriel Valley  
Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments  
American Academy of Pediatrics, California  
American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists District IX  
Black Women for Wellness Action Project  
Breast Cancer Over Time  
Breast Cancer Prevention Partners  
CA League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)  
California Black Health Network  
California Nurses for Environmental Health and Justice  
Californians Against Waste  
Calpirg, California Public Interest Research Group  
Center for Environmental Health  
Clean Water Action  
Cleaneearth4kids.org  
Climate Action California  
Consumer Reports  
Defend Our Health  
Environmental Working Group  
Facts Families Advocating for Chemical and Toxics Safety  
Friends Committee on Legislation of California  
Friends of the Earth  
Green Science Policy Institute  
Immaculate Heart Community Environmental Commission  
Indivisible Alta Pasadena  
Indivisible California Green Team  
Indivisible Marin  
Just Transition Alliance  
Latino Coalition for a Healthy California  
Long Beach Alliance for Clean Energy  
Long Beach Gray Panthers  
National Stewardship Action Council

Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)  
Non Toxic Communities  
Non-toxic Neighborhoods  
Recolte Energy  
Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority  
San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility  
San Francisco Baykeeper  
Save the Bay  
Sierra Club California  
So Cal 350 Climate Action  
Stopwaste  
Story of Stuff  
Sustainable Rossmoor  
The Last Beach Cleanup  
The Salvador E. Alvarez Institute for Non-violence  
Www.gmoscience.org  
1 Individual

**OPPOSITION:**

American Chemistry Council  
American Institute for Packaging and Environment (AMERIPEN)  
California Chamber of Commerce  
California Food Producers  
California Manufacturers & Technology Association  
Can Manufacturers Institute  
Chemical Industry Council of California  
Consumer Brands Association  
Flexible Packaging Association  
Foodservice Packaging Institute  
International Bottled Water Association  
National Association of Printing Ink Manufacturers  
Printing United Alliance  
The Vinyl Institute  
Vinyl Institute  
Western Plastics Association

-- END --