



March 13, 2025

**TO:** Members of the House Committee on Climate, Energy, and Environment

**FR:** Derek Sangston, Oregon Business & Industry

**RE:** Opposition to HB 3512

---

Oregon Business & Industry (OBI) is a statewide association representing businesses from a wide variety of industries. Through the Oregon Retail Council, it is also the state affiliate for the National Retail Federation. The Oregon Retail Council represents the unique interests of retailers throughout the state on both legislative and regulatory issues. Retail trade is Oregon's largest private sector employer and drives the state's economy.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to HB 3512, which seeks to impose strict and far-reaching regulations on the sale of products containing perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). While we recognize the importance of addressing the environmental and public health concerns posed by PFAS chemicals, we believe that HB 3512 is an overreach that will place an extreme burden on businesses, create an administrative nightmare for the state, and unnecessarily exceed the approaches adopted in other states.

### **Burden on Businesses**

HB 3512 would impose an extraordinarily strict prohibition on the sale of products containing even trace amounts of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances. This blanket approach would significantly disrupt entire industries and businesses in Oregon, from manufacturing to retail, without offering a reasonable pathway for compliance.

As businesses work to meet consumer demand for everyday products—from clothing to food packaging and electronics—many of these products may contain small, incidental levels of PFAS, often a result of complex manufacturing processes or trace contamination from raw materials. The threshold for acceptable PFAS levels in this bill is so low that it would be nearly impossible for businesses to comply without drastically altering their production methods or eliminating large swaths of products from the market entirely.

The proposed restrictions would result in significant new compliance costs for businesses, especially small and medium-sized enterprises, as they would need to engage in expensive, time-consuming testing to ensure their products comply with the requirements imposed by HB 3512.

### **Administrative Burden and Enforcement Challenges**

In addition to the burdens placed on businesses, HB 3512 would create an overwhelming administrative nightmare for the state in its efforts to enforce such stringent and far-reaching regulations. The bill's broad language would require the state to conduct widespread testing of

thousands of consumer products across numerous industries, placing a significant strain on already stretched resources.

Enforcing a blanket ban on PFAS in all consumer products, regardless of concentration, would require the state to establish robust testing protocols for various product categories, identify acceptable limits, and continuously monitor products for compliance. This type of oversight is not only impractical, but it would also likely result in a wave of uncertainty and confusion for both consumers and businesses alike.

In addition to huge new regulatory burdens on businesses, standing up a major new regulatory program would be extremely resource intensive. Given the complexities involved in identifying and measuring trace amounts of PFAS in products, implementation of such a regulatory program is likely to require massive state resources.

### **Successful Models from Other States**

While the Oregon Retail Council acknowledges the use of PFAS is something many states have regulated. We urge this committee to consider the more measured and thoughtful approaches taken by those states. A growing number of states have passed legislation that addresses PFAS in consumer products with practical and reasonable standards with a phased approach. For example, California and Washington have enacted laws that limit PFAS in certain products but provide clear thresholds and timeframes for businesses to comply.

Other states, such as Maine and New York, have focused their efforts on specific product categories where the presence of PFAS is most concerning due to exposure pathways. By targeting high-risk products and providing businesses with a reasonable period for compliance, these states have successfully mitigated the risks associated with PFAS without creating an undue burden on their economies.

For those reasons, OBI urges this committee to reject HB 3512. Thank you for your consideration.

Contact: [dereksangston@oregonbusinessindustry.com](mailto:dereksangston@oregonbusinessindustry.com)