



Henry L. Ingwersen
Senator, District 32

THE MAINE SENATE
132nd Legislature

3 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333

Testimony of Senator Henry Ingwersen in opposition to *LD 827, "An Act to Allow the Sale of Polymer-coated Cookware That is Authorized for Food Contact by the United States Food and Drug Administration,"* and *LD 987, "An Act Clarifying Exemptions from the Notification Requirements for Products Containing PFAS,"*

Before the Joint Standing Committee on Environment and Natural Resources
March 17, 2025

Senator Tepler, Representative Doudera, and esteemed members of the Environment and Natural Resources Committee. I am State Senator Henry Ingwersen, representing District 32 which includes the City of Biddeford and the Towns of Arundel, Dayton, Hollis, and Lyman. I'm before you today to testify in opposition to LD 827 "An Act to Allow the Sale of Polymer-coated Cookware That Is Authorized for Food Contact by the United States Food and Drug Administration" and LD 987 "An Act Clarifying Exemptions from the Notification Requirements for Products Containing PFAS".

In our last session I introduced LD 1537, "An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to the Prevention of Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances Pollution and to Provide Additional Funding," which amended the original PFAS Products Act to allow for some exemptions from the products act. This committee worked on that bill for two years. During that time, we heard from a whole host of industries asking for exemptions from the law. Some were granted; some were not. None of the exemptions given were to products that consumers come into contact with directly on a daily basis.

Exempting products that come into contact with the food that we eat makes little sense. Ingestion is one of the main ways people are exposed to PFAS.¹ We should be limiting that exposure, not expanding it. Teflon coated pans are not a necessity. We have many other ways to cook our food including stainless steel, cast iron, and non-stick cookware such as the PFAS-free Green Pan line. Alternatives are readily available.

I would also point out that not once during that two-year process did we hear from the Sustainable Cookware Alliance, and manufacturers in the farm equipment industry only showed up on the last day at the last work session, after two years of discussion. Both are asking for exemptions under LD 827 and LD 987. It was well-reported that Maine was making some adjustments to the PFAS products law. The time to come forward would have been during that process. LD 987 wants to do away with requirements that motorized vehicles make sure there is no PFAS in the textiles or in refrigerants, both items that consumers come into contact with

¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024, November 12). *Human exposure: PFAS information for clinicians - 2024*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/pfas/hcp/clinical-overview/humanexposure.html#:~:text=Ingestion%20of%20food%20and%20water,of%20exposure%20sources%20can%20vary.&text=swallowing%20contaminated%20soil>.



Henry L. Ingwersen
Senator, District 32

THE MAINE SENATE
132nd Legislature

3 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333

during the normal course of usage of those types of products. This committee had long conversations about those issues and decided to move the original legislation forward with that language intact.

The Department of Environmental Protection is currently in the middle of rulemaking on this law. To amend it will interrupt that process, delaying the implementation of the law. And for any products in LD 987 that aren't specifically named in the law, manufacturers will have the opportunity to ask for currently unavoidable use designations under the rulemaking process. They should be required like everyone else to utilize the process laid out by the Legislature in conjunction with the Department.

The state of Maine has spent millions of dollars on the PFAS contamination crisis. We should be reducing our sources of PFAS, not expanding them. Fluoropolymers used in PFAS-coated cookware are dangers in the entire life cycle of the product. They release harmful chemicals in the air and water during production. They can flake off or off gas during use, impacting consumers.² During disposal they can break down and flake off the product, turning into microplastics and entering the environment. F-gases used in refrigerants are a huge contaminant of PFAS in emissions. According to the European Union, they are responsible for 52% of PFAS emissions.³ These products will end up in our landfills, adding more toxic chemicals and microplastics to our environment.

Maine is not an outlier when it comes to banning PFAS in these products. Our New England neighbors in Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island have also banned PFAS in cookware. There are at least 5 other states looking to do the same thing. Minnesota has banned the products that are listed in LD 987.

I'm very proud of the work we've done in Maine to protect people from further PFAS exposure and contamination. This bill is a step in the wrong direction when it comes to protecting public health and the environment from toxic PFAS chemicals. I urge the committee to vote ought not to pass on LD 827 and 987.

Thank you.

² Lohmann, R., & Ian T. Cousins. (2020, October 12). *Are Fluoropolymers Really of Low Concern for Human and Environmental Health and Separate from Other PFAS*. ACS Publications
<https://pubs.acs.org/doi/full/10.1021/acs.est.5b04681>

³ European Chemicals Agency. Annex XV Restriction Report. Proposal for a Restriction: Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs), Version Number 2. March 23, 2023.