



Chair Klein and Members of the Senate Commerce Committee:

MCEA writes to oppose Article 7 of the DE amendment to SF 2216, the Senate Commerce Budget bill. Article 7 would rollback essential protections for Minnesotans from PFAS “forever chemicals” that were adopted in 2023. These provisions are unnecessary, damaging to Minnesota’s response to PFAS, and should be fully vetted by the Senate Environment, Climate and Legacy committee and not inserted into the Commerce budget bill.

Since the passage of Amara’s law in 2023, we continue to learn more about the pervasiveness of PFAS “forever chemicals” in our water, products, and bodies. These are not just “forever” chemicals, they are “everywhere” chemicals. And since they don’t break down in the environment, every new use, every new product produced that contains PFAS is adding to the problem. That’s why every delay in eliminating these chemicals and every exemption that is contemplated to Amara’s Law is a problem. The sooner we turn off the tap on continued PFAS production, the better, and the faster we can turn to addressing the existing pollution.

The other thing we are learning is how harmful even tiny amounts of PFAS are to people. Recent science continues to show that PFAS compounds, down to the smallest amount we can detect, contribute to cancer risk, and harm our immune systems, livers, and thyroids.

Since PFAS compounds are so pervasive in our products, it’s understandable that there will be challenges in unwinding our dependence on these chemicals. But there’s a reason this Legislature made the key distinction between essential and non-essential uses of these pollutants, and set a clock to eliminate their use, starting with the most direct sources of exposure to the most vulnerable people.

The MPCA rulemaking is underway to define what constitutes an essential and non-essential use, and we should let that process continue rather than legislatively preempt certain products.

Direct exposure to these chemicals is not just about where they are in products like electronics and furniture. People are also exposed to PFAS through the water they drink, years after these chemicals are discarded as waste. In just one example, the residents of the east Metro are painfully aware of this fact and dealing with the consequences today. This is why exemptions or delays on the basis of whether PFAS are used in internal components miss the point and should not be adopted.

MCEA strongly opposes Article 7 of the DE amendment to SF 2216 and recommends that it be removed from the bill and referred to the Senate Environment, Climate and Legacy Committee, which has jurisdiction over this area of law. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Sincerely,

Aaron Klemz

Chief Strategy Officer // aklemz@mncenter.org // (763) 788-0282