

March 24, 2026

RE: Opposing HF 4257

Dear Chairs Heintzeman and Fischer and members of the committee.

We are the Coalition for Plastic Reduction (CPR), and we are writing to you today to ask that you vote "No" on HF 4257.

CPR works to address plastic pollution and prevent chemical exposure from plastics through community organizing, education, and supporting state policy changes. We are particularly concerned that HF 4257 is unnecessary and risks undermining Minnesota's progress in addressing harmful chemicals, especially fluorinated plastics such as PTFE.

Minnesota has been a leader in addressing PFAS and protecting public health through Amara's Law. This bill introduces unnecessary ambiguity at a time when urgency is needed. PRISM is being continually worked on by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) and partners; we must stick to the current timeline to ensure that this section of Amara's Law can be implemented. We feel that this is nothing but an attempt to dismantle the law via continual delays and extensions.

We understand that there are concerns over "complex products" and the availability of supply chains. Determining what is in a component of a larger product might be difficult, but these manufacturers shouldn't get a free pass to pollute just because protecting Minnesotans might be "difficult." It can and should still be done; our communities deserve to know what they are purchasing and consuming. We urge manufacturers to take responsibility for the products they create and ultimately sell to our families.

At a time when Minnesota is taking nationally recognized steps to address PFAS and reduce pollutants, HF 4257 moves in the opposite direction. By pushing off the reporting timeline for a year, Minnesota consumers are left in the dark regarding the items they are purchasing, and manufacturers are able to kick the can of responsibility down the road even further. Markets are already shifting. Manufacturers and retailers are exploring safer alternatives in cookware, textiles, and other products, and consumers are responding.

For these reasons, we urge the committee to oppose HF 4257. Instead, we encourage continued support for policies that reduce reliance on persistent PFAS chemicals, protect public health, and increase transparency for the health and safety of Minnesotans and their environment.

Thank you for your time and consideration.