SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Senator Blakespear, Chair
2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	SB 730		
Author:	Hurtado		
Version:	3/26/2025	**Hearing Date:**	4/23/2025
Urgency:	No	**Fiscal:**	Yes
Consultant:	Taylor McKie		

SUBJECT: Product safety: consumer products: perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances

DIGEST: This bill prohibits a person from distributing, selling, or offering for sale in the state consumer products that contain intentionally added PFAS in specified product categories.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Prohibits, on and after July 1, 2023, a person, including, but not limited to, a manufacturer, from selling or distributing in commerce in this state any new, not previously owned, juvenile product, as defined, that contains intentionally added PFAS or PFAS at or above 100 parts per million (ppm), as measured in total organic fluorine. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 108946)

2) Prohibits, on and after January 1, 2025, a person from manufacturing, distributing, selling, or offering for sale in the state any new, not previously used, textile articles that contain intentionally added PFAS, or PFAS at or above 100 ppm, and on or after January 1, 2027, 50 ppm, as measured in total organic fluorine. (HSC § 108971)

3) Prohibits, commencing January 1, 2025, a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale, in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any specified intentionally added ingredients, including some PFAS chemicals. (HSC § 108980 (a))

4) Prohibits, commencing on January 1, 2023, a person from distributing, selling, or offering for sale in the state any food packaging that contains intentionally added PFAS or PFAS at or above 100 ppm, as measured in total organic fluorine. (HSC § 109000)

5) Prohibits a manufacturer of class B firefighting foam from manufacturing, or knowingly selling, offering for sale, distributing for sale, or distributing for use in this state, and prohibits a person from using in this state, class B firefighting foam containing intentionally added PFAS chemicals. (HSC § 13061 et seq.)

6) Requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to adopt regulations for the enforcement of those prohibitions on the use of PFAS and enforce and ensure compliance with those provisions. (HSC § 108075)

7) Under the Safer Consumer Products (Green Chemistry) statutes (HSC § 25252 et seq.):
   a) Requires the 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.
   b) Requires DTSC to adopt regulations to establish a process to 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.
   c) 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.

This bill:

1) Defines the specified product categories and other terms, most notably: "Consumer Product", "Cleaning Product", "Intentionally added PFAS chemicals", "Fabric treatment", "Product", and "Safer alternative". The definition of "Product" excludes:
   a) Drugs and medical devices approved or authorized by the federal Food and Drug Administration;
   b) Pesticides approved by the federal Environmental Protection Agency or Department of Pesticide Regulation; and
   c) Products containing fluoropolymers.

2) Prohibits a person from distributing, selling, or offering for sale in the state consumer products that contain intentionally added PFAS in specified consumer product categories.

3) Authorizes DTSC to adopt regulations to prohibit the distribution, sale, or offering for sale of a consumer product containing intentionally added PFAS within the product category if a safer alternative that performs at least as well as PFAS is available at a comparable cost.

4) Prohibits DTSC from adopting regulations that ban a consumer product containing intentionally added PFAS on or before 18 months after the regulation is adopted.

5) Makes related findings and declarations.

Background

1) *A PFAS zoo*. Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are a broad class of man-made chemicals consisting of chains with bonded carbon and fluorine atoms. Because of their physical and chemical nature, PFAS are very durable and resistant to heat, water and oil, making them extremely useful in many industrial, commercial, and medical applications. As a consequence of their durability, they are persistent, meaning that they do not degrade easily in the environment and can bioaccumulate in living things.[1,2,3] According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), there are nearly 15,000 PFAS compounds and they can be categorized into non-polymeric PFAS and polymeric PFAS.

   Non-polymeric PFAS are smaller and lighter, which allows them to disperse and exist in air, water and soils.[3] This type of PFAS is typically used for surface protection, as an additive in various products, and as a processing aid for polymeric PFAS.[3] Since non-polymeric PFAS is used in various products, including common household products, it can contaminate the environment through domestic wastewater or disposal into landfills.[4] When used as an industrial processing aid or in the manufacturing process, non-polymeric PFAS is emitted or disposed of in effluent wastewater or waste or is leached from products.[3]

   Polymeric PFAS, on the other hand, is heavier and consists of longer chains of fluorine and carbon. These chemicals are not soluble in water and it has been claimed that PFAS in this category are too large to penetrate cell membranes, which would prevent bioaccumulation.[2,5,6] Some subsets of polymeric PFAS

[1] National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. (2025). Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkly Substances.
[2] Henry, B. J., et. al. (2018). A critical review of the application of polymer of low concern.
[3] Jacobs, S. A., et. al. (2024). Assessment of Fluoropolymer Production and Use With Analysis of Alternative Replacement Materials.
[4] Kibuye, F. (2023). Understanding PFAS – What they are, their impact, and what we can do.
[5] Lohmann, R., et. al. (2020). Are fluoropolymers really of low concern for human and environmental health and separate from other PFAS?
[6] Améduri, B. (2023). Fluoropolymers as unique and irreplaceable materials: challenges and future trends in these specific per or poly-fluoroalkyl substances.

can degrade into non-polymeric PFAS, but others, namely fluoropolymers are more stable. Fluoropolymers are plastics that are used in a wide range of sectors, including but not limited to aerospace, automotive, building construction, chemical processing, electronics, and green energy technology.[3] Fluoropolymers have been shown to satisfy the criteria for polymers of low concern (PLC) developed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in which PLC are considered to have insignificant environmental and health impacts.[2,7] However, these evaluations do not consider life-cycle assessments of these products, as fluoropolymers may involve the release of non-polymeric PFAS during their production or manufacturing, leach non-polymeric PFAS if insufficiently treated, and degrade into microplastics during disposal.[3,5,8]

2) *Everything everywhere all at once: Exposure pathways & public health*. The PFAS on or in products find many different ways into the environment throughout a product's life cycle. PFAS compounds have been detected globally in soil, groundwater, and surface water. Plants can uptake PFAS and bioaccumulation can occur within their tissues and the animals that eat them. Primarily, human exposure occurs through consuming food and drinking water.[4] The drinking water of at least 70 million Americans contains PFAS at levels high enough to require reporting under federal law. California has multiple water systems with PFAS levels that are at least double the reporting concentration level.[9] Inhalation of PFAS-contaminated dust particles can also contribute to exposure, a risk especially posed to those working in or proximal to industrial or chemical processing and manufacturing facilities.[10] PFAS was found in the blood of workers in various occupations, ranging from firefighters to fishery workers, with chemical production plant workers and the public in proximity to those plants having the highest concentrations.[11] Exposure to certain PFAS may lead to adverse health outcomes, including reproductive and developmental effects, increased risk of cancer, suppressed immune systems, and endocrine disruption.[10] It has been estimated that the cost associated with the contribution of PFAS exposure to disease and disability in the United States is at least $5.5 billion and upwards of $62 billion.[12]

---

[7] OECD Task Force on New Chemicals Notification and Assessment. (2007). Data Analysis of the Identification of Correlations between Polymer Characteristics and Potential for Health or Ecotoxicological Concern.
[8] Lohmann, R., & Letcher, R. J. (2023). The universe of fluorinated polymers and polymeric substances and potential environmental impacts and concerns.
[9] Fast, A. et. al. (2024). 70 million Americans drink water from systems reporting PFAS to EPA.
[10] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2024). Our Current Understanding of the Human Health and Environmental Risks of PFAS.
[11] Christensen, B. T., & Calkins, M. M. (2023). Occupational exposure to per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances: a scope review of the literature from 1980–2021.
[12] Obsekov, V., et. al. (2023). Leveraging systematic reviews to explore disease burden and costs of per-and polyfluoroalkyl substance exposures in the United States.

3) *Piecemeal approaches vs. umbrella bans.* When it comes to products containing PFAS, California has taken a piecemeal approach through bans. The Legislature has enacted several PFAS prohibitions in the last several years. These include PFAS prohibitions at different levels across many product categories: a ban on PFAS in textiles (AB 1817, Ting, Chapter 762, Statutes of 2022); cosmetic products (AB 2771, Friedman, Chapter 804, Statutes of 2022); food packaging (AB 1200, Ting, Chapter 503, Statutes of 2021); new juvenile products (AB 652, Friedman, Chapter 500, Statutes of 2021); and, firefighting foam (SB 1044, Allen, Chapter 308, Statutes of 2020). Perhaps these piecemeal approaches were meant to address the products that come into physical contact with our bodies, rid of the PFAS unnecessary for the function of the product, or address prohibitions in a less cumbersome way.

   Two recent bills have taken a different approach to address PFAS contamination at large. SB 903 (Skinner, 2024) broadened the prohibition to all products in an umbrella ban, but it died in Senate Appropriations Committee. SB 903 lacked flexibility that would allow time for administrative procedures and industry innovation, especially for products in which PFAS is considered to be an essential use. SB 682 (Allen, 2025), another umbrella ban, built off of SB 903 and addressed its constraints with a tiered timeline and categorical approach for a more efficient review of petitions and an opportunity for industries to adjust.

   Whether the approach to PFAS prohibition is piecemeal or an umbrella, outright bans can be risky. There may not be enough time to find alternatives that are suitable for the product or public health, and in many cases, bans can result in the use of regrettable substitutions. Finding suitable alternatives for the product function and public health takes time for in-depth, comprehensive research and thorough evaluations, ideally involving government agencies, industry, research institutions, and the public.

4) *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. Under the SCP Program, all PFAS compounds are “Candidate Chemicals” because they exhibit specified hazardous traits.

DTSC has designated two product categories that contain PFAS as "Priority Products": carpets/rugs and treatments for textiles or leathers. A Priority Product is a consumer product identified by DTSC that contains one or more Candidate Chemicals and that has 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.

Comments

1) *Purpose of Bill.* According to the author, "PFAS contamination poses a growing threat to public health, drinking water, and California's agricultural lands. As we work to ensure the long-term vitality of our communities and economy, we must take a targeted and science-based approach to reduce unnecessary sources of PFAS in everyday products. SB 730 advances this goal by phasing out consumer goods that are known contributors to PFAS pollution while providing clear exemptions for products of low concern that are critical to electronics, electric vehicles, renewable energy systems, medical devices and thousands of other applications important to Californians.

   It draws a clear line between harmful PFAS compounds found in consumer products and essential fluoropolymers that are not a significant source of environmental contamination. SB 730 protects public health without compromising the tools that farmers, businesses, and communities rely on every day. California must lead with smart and balanced policy. SB 730 is a pragmatic step forward to safeguard water resources, protect our most vulnerable populations, and maintain economic resilience in both rural and urban areas."

2) *This looks familiar?* Committee members may recall a different bill addressing a similar problem from the previous Senate Environmental Quality hearing. The umbrella ban SB 682 (Allen, 2025), sponsored by environmental and public health organizations and wastewater agencies, encompassed fluoropolymers, to which industries and opposition requested an exemption. This bill, sponsored by industries and manufacturers, grants that exemption.

The exemption was not granted while SB 682 moved through the Senate Environmental Quality committee and SB 682 passed in the committee 5-3 on April 2, 2025, with the author of this bill voting no. This bill became a later proposal that took a clear exemption on fluoropolymers among other exemptions, while prohibiting the use of PFAS in specified products. The sponsors of this bill have indicated that this approach would still address some PFAS concerns while acting as a tool to continue negotiations with the author and sponsors of SB 682. *The author and sponsors may wish to engage with the author and sponsors of SB 682 and related bills to find solutions that address the concerns of industry, while effectively addressing PFAS source reduction.*

3) *How the costs of contamination trickles down*. PFAS contamination is ubiquitous in the environment globally, and while the major producers of PFAS can be identified, the original source of PFAS within any contaminated site can be hard to nail down. Part of the burden and responsibility to address PFAS contamination often falls on municipal drinking water and wastewater systems. The U.S. EPA requires these public systems to test and monitor their drinking water or wastewater effluents and take action if the contamination exceeds the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). With new developments in the research of exposure and health impacts of PFAS, the U.S. EPA can establish more stringent MCLs, which can increase the number of public drinking water systems that exceed the MCL and are considered in a health-based violation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. If a public water system does not resolve the contamination through treatment and comply with the required standards within a period of time, then state agencies can take enforcement actions, including administrative orders, legal actions, or issue fines.[13,14] The costs of enforcement could then further inhibit the ability to comply.

   Treatment is expensive, and addressing these contamination levels could cost on the order of tens of millions of dollars. Some water agencies, such as Orange County Water District and Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency, have joined class action lawsuits against manufacturers of PFAS with hopes to supplement the costs of treatment with the settlements.[15] However, not all water agencies may have the capacity to litigate and it's not guaranteed that a settlement will cover the full costs. Sweetwater Authority, a municipal water agency in San Diego County, found that the concentration of PFOA, a non-polymeric PFAS compound, exceeded the recently established MCL for PFOA

[13] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2024). Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Resources and FAQs.
[14] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2004). Understanding the Safe Drinking Water Act.
[15] Withrow, K. (2024). The PFAS Challenge: How Two California Water Agencies are Responding.

that is set to take effect in 2029.[16] This gives the water agency time to treat the drinking water supply, but the costs to address this issue is upwards of $40 million and source funds have yet to be identified. This financial burden can be shifted to ratepayers, impacting affordability through increases in utility rates where possible or with state and federal funds from taxes. But in some cases, if sources of drinking water supply cannot meet MCLs and have no ability to treat the contamination, those systems can be shut down, eliminating access to water supplies.

4) *People over products*. Because of the durability and cost-effectiveness of PFAS, industry has made clear its preferences to utilize it in what they consider essential uses. Finding similar chemicals that could act as alternatives is an innovative challenge, one that has been accomplished for some applications, but ongoing in many others.[17] Many existing alternatives may not have the same performance or may be more expensive, but it will be important to consider the trade-offs of how prioritizing product cost and performance may come at the expense of public health. Furthermore, if the costs of alternatives to manufacturers should have more consideration than the additional costs that will fall on ratepayers that may already struggle to pay their water bills. The provisions in this bill that consider costs and performance of alternatives to PFAS only come into effect if a safer alternative has been identified. As written, if that alternative is more expensive or lacks the same performance of PFAS, then that safer alternative cannot be used. While costs and performance should be considered with the availability of an alternative, perhaps it shouldn't prevail or hold equal weight in statute. ***The author and committee may wish to consider removing the conditions regarding performance and cost in which safer alternatives are required and allow DTSC to have discretion on the extent these factors are considered and engage with relevant entities to make determinations surrounding the use of safer alternatives.***

5) *Should fluoropolymers be exempted?* Because of its physical and chemical properties, fluoropolymers are ideal for the design of products to meet regulatory requirements. This is why, for many cases, various industries are advocating for a risk-based approach in determining whether fluoropolymers and their uses in certain products should be prohibited. A risk-based approach considers the potential hazards and exposure pathways, primarily for human impacts. Industries argue that fluoropolymers should be excluded from broad PFAS bans because they have been shown to satisfy criteria for polymers of low concern (PLC). In particular, there are fluoropolymers used in applications

[16] Hinch, J. (2024). South County Report: 'Forever' Chemicals Discovered in South County Water.
[17] Figuière, R., et. al. (2025). An Overview of Potential Alternatives for the Multiple Uses of Per-and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances.

that may not come in physical contact with humans or the environment during the use phase of a product's life, in which they are considered low risk. And in the case that they do come into physical contact with humans, they are claimed to not bioaccumulate in cells and are not soluble in water.[2] Examples of these fluoropolymer uses include the wiring and fuel hoses in aircraft and components within electronics. The heat and chemically-resistant properties of fluoropolymers also allow for many of these industries to comply with other relevant regulations regarding safety.[18]

However, the full life cycle of fluoropolymers, including manufacturing and disposal, is not considered in the evaluations for PLC.[5] Processing aids associated with fluoropolymer manufacturing still contribute to unsafe non-polymeric PFAS in the environment. The use of some harmful non-polymeric PFAS, such as PFOA and PFNA, in processing aids have been phased out globally by fluoropolymer manufacturers, however, the alternatives used are similar in structure and lack available data on their impacts on human health and the environment.[19] One such alternative includes perfluorocarboxylates (PFCAs), which have been reported to be bioaccumulative and associated numerous occupational health impacts.[20] Research has also shown that 80% of PFCAs have been released into the environment from fluoropolymer production.[21] There have been claims that non-polymeric PFAS is captured after processing and any residuals on the final products are low, but widespread, publicly available evidence of this may be lacking.[2,8]

It may be necessary to temporarily continue the use of fluoropolymers in some cases, as the regulatory constraints and lack of alternatives are restrictive. Though this is the reality of a technological world, fluoropolymers should not be exempt from some form of regulation as we continue to find contamination in our drinking water, wastewater, and environment. A blanket exemption with no regulation surrounding its areas of concern, namely the manufacturing processes, restricts any progress toward source reduction. *The author and committee may wish to consider policy solutions to address the concerns surrounding the production and disposal of fluoropolymers.* ***The author and committee may also wish to revise or remove the findings and declarations regarding fluoropolymers, as the current statements are partial.***

6) *Should hydrofluoroolefins be exempted?* Hydrofluoroolefins (HFOs) are typically used as refrigerants that act as alternatives to chlorofluorocarbons

[18] American Chemistry Council, Inc. (2025). Fluoropolymers.
[19] Bucaletti, E., et. al. (2024). Chloroperfluoropolyether carboxylate compounds: a review.
[20] Post, G. et. al. (2021). Technical support document: interim specific ground water quality criterion for chloroperfluoropolyether carboxylates.
[21] Prevedouros, K., et. al. (2006). Sources, fate and transport of perfluorocarboxylates.

(CFCs) and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) that have a high global warming potential.[22] HFOs have also been used as propellants and solvents in consumer products, and are excluded in the definitions of "Cleaning product" and "Fabric treatment" of this bill. As a refrigerant, HFOs can be released in into the atmosphere through leakage and degrade into trifluoroacetic acid, which is a reproductive toxicant and harmful if inhaled. There are some sectors that have transitioned to non-fluorinated refrigerants while conforming to the relevant standards and regulatory requirements. Experts have suggested that there are only slight barriers to overcome replacing HFOs with other non-fluorinated substances in all sectors.[23] HFOs may not be necessary in consumer products, such as cleaning products and fabric treatments, and if safer alternatives are available for refrigerants in some sectors, it is likely that they may be available for products in which the use of this chemical is non-essential. The definitions in this bill would bar these chemicals in these specified uses from regulation if DTSC was able to identify a safer alternative, therefore, ***the author and committee may wish to consider adding a provision for safer alternatives to be used for HFOs in cleaning products and fabric treatments if identified by DTSC.***

7) *Safeguarding people or products?* As demonstrated in the above two sections, this bill attempts to protect PFAS from regulation, rather than regulate it. This applies to more than just fluoropolymers and HFOs. This bill does not mention the use of PFAS in the manufacturing process in the definition of "Intentionally added PFAS chemicals". Many times, manufacturing processes are the culprit of PFAS contamination, as processing aids containing PFAS are used on products and can be disposed into the environment through air pollution and wastewater discharge. This bill appears to ban artificial turf, which seems like a step in the right direction of source control, but in reality, PFAS is only added to artificial turf in the manufacturing process as a processing aid. Since the definition of "intentionally-added PFAS chemicals" does not cover PFAS used as processing aids, then it would still be permitted to use PFAS-containing processing aids on artificial turf. What appears to be a prohibition would actually maintain the status quo on how artificial turf is regulated today.

Additionally, this bill appears to ban carpets and rugs containing intentionally-added PFAS. Carpets and rugs were identified as Priority Products by SCP in 2021. This required manufacturers to submit an alternatives analysis to DTSC. No manufacturers submitted alternative analyses to comply with the 2021 regulation. To check for compliance, DTSC tested 201 products for PFAS and found that only four products contained PFAS. They also determined that those

[22] Evich, M. G., et. al. (2022). Per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances in the environment.
[23] Glüge, J., et. al. (2024). Finding non-fluorinated alternatives to fluorinated gases used as refrigerants.

products were manufactured before the regulation was adopted and that the respective manufacturers no longer use PFAS. This implies that manufacturers of carpets and rugs preferred to remove PFAS from their products rather than submit an alternatives analysis.[24] This also means that all manufacturers within California no longer use intentionally-added PFAS in their products. So while a ban on carpets and rugs containing intentionally-added PFAS does not exist in statute, PFAS was already indirectly regulated out of carpets and rugs through SCP. This is another example of a seemingly laudable prohibition likely having little to no effect on how it is currently regulated.

Furthermore, it appears that cookware containing intentionally-added PFAS is banned in this proposed statute. Surfactants and processing aids containing intentionally-added PFAS are no longer used in cookware, however, fluoropolymers are used for non-stick cookware. This bill exempts fluoropolymers, thus cookware containing fluoropolymers would still be permitted. This still presents a risk, as fluoropolymers subjected to high heat can breakdown into smaller PFAS and microplastics, leading to contamination in both food and wastewater.[25,26] The prohibition on cookware would be exempted by a built-in exemption.

By excluding manufacturing processes as well as fluoropolymers as a whole, this bill does very little for the source reduction of PFAS. It will have an impact on cleaning products that currently contain PFAS, but will allow for those used in manufacturing or industrial operations to remain on the market. The bill does authorize DTSC to continue or pursue evaluations of PFAS in product categories through SCP, but this is nearly impossible to do in a timely manner to address the public health crisis at hand. SCP is very thorough, and may progress at an undesirable pace, thus evaluating the hundreds of thousands of product-chemical combinations involving PFAS would be infeasible. Even with this authorization, the provisions of this bill require an 18-month delay in the prohibition after a regulation is adopted, buying more time for industries to adjust.

Nonetheless, and with the environment and public health in mind, the use of PFAS in manufacturing processes should be included in the prohibition to encompass the processes that contribute to the release of PFAS into the environment. At the very least, it will be important to consider whether the use of PFAS-containing processing aids are necessary and discourage the use of

[24] Department of Toxic Substances Control. (2024). Testing Carpets and Rugs in California for PFASs: Summary of Findings.
[25] Cole, M., et. al. (2024). Microplastic and PTFE contamination of food from cookware.
[26] Wang, J., et. al. (2022). Critical review of thermal decomposition of per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances: mechanisms and implications for thermal treatment processes.

them where appropriate. ***The author and committee may wish to consider revising the definition of "intentionally-added PFAS chemicals" to include PFAS added during manufacturing processes.***

8) *Committee amendments.* ***Staff recommends the committee adopt the bolded amendments contained in comments 3, 5, & 6.*** *Due to timing constraints, these changes must be amended into the bill as part of the actions taken by the next committee. Should the author commit to taking these amendments, the motion in this committee will be "do pass" with that understanding.*

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.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 682 (Allen, 2025) would prohibit a person from distributing, selling, or offering for sale covered products that contain intentionally added PFAS beginning January 1, 2027. Further prohibits certain specified products that contain intentionally added PFAS by January 1, 2035, and January 1, 2040, DTSC made a determination that the use of PFAS in the product is a currently unavoidable use. This concurrent bill is currently being heard in the Senate Committee on Health.

AB 872 (Blanca Rubio, 2025) would prohibit a person from distributing, selling, or offering for sale a covered product that contains intentionally-added PFAS commencing January 1, 2028, unless DTSC issues a regulatory response for the covered product through SCP. This concurrent bill is currently being heard in the Assembly Environmental Safety & Toxic Materials Committee.

SB 903 (Skinner, 2024) prohibited the distribution, sale, or offering for sale a product that contains intentionally added PFAS unless the use of PFAS is currently unavoidable and authorized DTSC to establish regulations to administer the prohibition.

AB 347 (Ting, Chapter 932, Statutes of 2024) required DTSC to adopt regulations for the enforcement of prohibitions on the use of PFAS and enforce and ensure compliance with those regulations.

AB 2515 (Papan, Chapter 1008, Statutes of 2024) prohibited the manufacture, distribution, sale, or offer for sale any menstrual products that contain regulated

PFAS and required DTSC to adopt regulations for the purposes of implementing interpreting, and enforcing these provisions.

AB 1817 (Ting, Chapter 762, Statutes of 2022) prohibited the manufacture, sale, delivery, hold or offer for sale any new, not previously owned, textile articles that contain regulated PFAS and required manufacturers to use the least toxic alternative.

AB 2771 (Friedman, Chapter 804, Statutes of 2022) prohibited the manufacture, sale, delivery, hold or offer for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains intentionally added PFAS.

AB 652 (Friedman, Chapter 500, Statutes of 2021) prohibited the sale or distribution in commerce any new, not previously owned, juvenile product that contains regulated PFAS and required manufacturers to use the least toxic alternative.

AB 1200 (Ting, Chapter 503, Statutes of 2021) prohibited the sale, distribution, or offer for sale any food packaging that contains PFAS and required manufacturers to use the least toxic alternative.

SB 1044 (Allen, Chapter 308, Statutes of 2020) required any person that sells firefighter PPE to any person to provide a written notice to the purchaser if the PPE contains intentionally added PFAS and prohibited the sale, distribution, or offering for sale class B firefighting foam containing intentionally added PFAS.

SOURCE: AGC Chemicals Americas Inc.

SUPPORT:

A Voice for Choice Advocacy
Agc America INC. and Subsidiaries
Gladfelty Government Relations LLC

OPPOSITION:

Breast Cancer Prevention Partners
California Association of Sanitation Agencies
Californians Against Waste
Center for Environmental Health
Clean Water Action

Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Natural Resources Defense Council

-- END --