



Senator Christine Cohen & Representative Joseph P. Gresko
Co-Chairs, Connecticut Joint Environment Committee
Honorable Members of the Connecticut Joint Environment Committee
State Capitol
Hartford, CT 06106

Subject: OPPOSE CT S 926

Dear Co-Chairs Cohen & Gresko
and Honorable Members of the Joint Environment Committee:

The undersigned organizations would like to express concerns with S. 926, legislation that would ban consumer packaging containing PFAS. The breadth of the materials covered and the lack of any thresholds, the proposed changes would have significant implications for a very broad range of packaging materials. This proposal disregards sound science, and could potentially have major unintended socioeconomic and environmental consequences.

Packaging plays a critical role in the U.S. from environmental, quality of life, and economic perspectives. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. Census Bureau, the packaging industry is an estimated \$200 billion industry, or roughly 2% of U.S. GDP, and employs over 750,000 hardworking Americans across the country. Packaging is essential in almost every aspect of the economy: whether it's providing safe, sanitary products in the medical sector, or food packaging that helps American families save money by keeping their groceries fresher for longer.

¹ National Resources Defense Council (2017). "Wasted: How America is Losing up to 40 Percent of Its Food From Farm to Fork to Landfill".

² National Resources Defense Council (2017). "Wasted: How America is Losing up to 40 Percent of Its Food From Farm to Fork to Landfill".

³ Oregon DEQ (2017). "Strategy for Preventing the Wasting of Food".

Packaging is a crucial component in minimizing a growing problem in America: food waste. According to a study by the Natural Resources Defense Council, up to 40% of food in America goes to waste every year with the average American wasting more than 400 pounds of food annually¹. Effective food packaging can help reduce these numbers by extending longevity of food; however, this legislation would not only undermine effective packaging design and cause these numbers to balloon, but would also lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions. Food waste accounts for 2.6% of all U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, which is equal to 37 million passenger vehicles worth of emissions². For every ton of food waste prevented, an estimated average gain of 6 to 7 times in greenhouse gas benefits can be reaped compared to alternatives like composting³.

In addition to the potential loss of the previously mentioned economic and environmental factors, we have serious concerns over the general regulatory framework, which is not only redundant due to existing federal regulations, but is also ripe with fundamental flaws. The U.S. already has a robust regulatory system in place for managing chemicals and packaging which is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA). This legislation would sidestep an already rigorous FDA review process where manufacturers are required to prove the safety of their products. Consumer protection and product safety are of paramount concern to the FDA. Failing to meet the very high standards set by the FDA results in the products being blocked from entering the market.

Additionally, these federal agencies have the resources and personnel required to effectively administer such meticulous testing whereas many state agencies do not. This bill would also result in fundamentally flawed regulation that fails to meet critical benchmarks of objectivity, transparency, and scientific accuracy. More specifically, the exposure level requirements are inappropriate as they do not account for “risk” and are based solely on “hazard.” Such an approach is not only scientifically inaccurate, but can also have negative consequences such as causing public confusion, generating unwarranted alarm, or even result in the deselection of products from the market that are actually safe.

One of the most concerning aspects of this bill is that it threatens to upend benefits provided by quality packaging by banning entire classes of chemistry that contribute to the unique properties of packaging materials that make them so effective.

¹ National Resources Defense Council (2017). “Wasted: How America is Losing up to 40 Percent of Its Food From Farm to Fork to Landfill”.

² National Resources Defense Council (2017). “Wasted: How America is Losing up to 40 Percent of Its Food From Farm to Fork to Landfill”.

³ Oregon DEQ (2017). “Strategy for Preventing the Wasting of Food”.

The legislation ignores a broad consensus between the scientific community and leading government authoritative bodies: individual compounds within the respective PFAS family are not the same. PFAS chemical compounds have varying properties, uses, and environmental and health profiles.

For the reasons outlined above, we respectfully request that you oppose the legislation and take into consideration the points set forth in this letter. Thank you.

Sincerely,
American Chemistry Council
American Forest and Paper Association
Alliance for Telomer Chemistry Stewardship
Ameripen
AdvaMed
Flexible Packaging Association
Foodservice Packaging Institute
Performance Fluoropolymer Partnership