

EZASSI SIGNALS

PFAS Restrictions in Food Packaging and Consumer Products (United States)

Regulatory Signals · September 2026

A Regulatory watch on the PFAS obligations a US contract manufacturer of food, cosmetics, personal care or supplement products will have to meet next: state bans and reporting rules for intentionally added PFAS in products and packaging, unavoidable-use exemptions, and the federal reporting rule. It tracks whether each date is holding or moving. Five signals from one cycle.

#	SIGNAL	CONFIDENCE	HORIZON	STATUS
1	EPA's TSCA PFAS reporting deadline has slipped multiple times and now has no confirmed fixed date, with substantive scope revision still pending	High	Immediate (0-3 months)	Review
2	Maine, Minnesota, and New Mexico have converged on an identical Currently Unavoidable Use standard, creating a model exception pathway with state-specific procedural requirements that a manufacturer must satisfy separately in each state	High	Short-term (3-12 months)	Review
3	New Mexico's implementing rules, approved April 2026, create the next hard product-ban calendar: food packaging and dental floss banned January 1, 2027, certain personal-care products banned January 1, 2028	High	Short-term (3-12 months)	Verified
4	Illinois enacted a scope-narrowing amendment that removes food packaging and cookware from the state's 2032 PFAS product ban while leaving other product categories in place — a divergence signal for manufacturers tracking product-category coverage	Medium	Long-term (1-3 years)	Review
5	Maine's food-packaging PFAS ban is limited to direct-food-contact plant-fiber packaging with an incidental-presence threshold — a narrower scope than Vermont's any-amount formulation, signaling that food-packaging bans are not uniform across states even when enacted in the same timeframe	Medium	Immediate (0-3 months)	Verified

Every signal rests on two or more dated events. Confidence is published as a band. Where a signal sits below High, the reasoning names the evidence that is missing. Status says where the evidence stands: Verified, Review, or Inconclusive — we looked, and the evidence does not yet support a firmer call.

SIGNAL 1 OF 5

EPA's TSCA PFAS reporting deadline has slipped multiple times and now has no confirmed fixed date, with substantive scope revision still pending

HIGH Immediate (0–3 months) • Regulatory Agency Actions • Review

EPA has postponed the TSCA section 8(a)(7) PFAS reporting start date from July 2025 to April 2026 and then again to 60 days after a forthcoming substantive rule revision, with a January 31, 2027 backstop, leaving contract manufacturers with no reliable submission window and an unresolved scope.

REASONING

Multiple distinct EPA postponements are documented across independent EPA program pages and a prepublication Federal Register notice. The first extension moved the start from July 11, 2025 to April 13, 2026 with an ordinary deadline of October 13, 2026 for most manufacturers and April 13, 2027 for small manufacturers reporting exclusively as article importers. A subsequent EPA action then moved the start again to 60 days after the effective date of a forthcoming substantive revision. A prepublication notice identifies January 31, 2027 or 60 days after the revision's effective date, whichever is earlier, as a backstop. EPA's own pages are internally inconsistent, with the program summary still listing October 13, 2026 while the update page states the period was re-anchored to the revision. The pattern is not a single slip — it is a recurring deferral tied to a scope revision that had not been finalized as of the latest available sources. Because the proposed scope changes have not been confirmed as finalized in the retrieved materials, and because the start date is now floating rather than calendar-fixed, a manufacturer that planned around any prior announced deadline is out of compliance with the current agency posture.

PATTERN

First extension: start moved from July 11, 2025 to April 13, 2026; ordinary deadline set at October 13, 2026; small-manufacturer article-importer deadline set at April 13, 2027. Subsequent extension: start moved to 60 days after effective date of forthcoming substantive revision. Prepublication notice establishes January 31, 2027 or 60 days after revision's effective date, whichever is earlier, as a backstop. EPA program summary page still lists October 13, 2026 for most manufacturers while the separate update page states the period was re-anchored to the revision, creating inconsistency across agency pages.

IMPLICATION

A contract manufacturer that imported PFAS-containing articles or manufactured PFAS during 2011–2022 cannot treat any previously announced date as operative. The substantive revision may change scope, exemptions, or the treatment of article importers. Planning for a submission window that could open as late as Q1 2027 is warranted, but the window could also open earlier if the revision is finalized sooner. The uncertainty also means that de minimis thresholds or exemptions that could reduce or eliminate the obligation are not yet settled.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Assign someone to monitor EPA's TSCA section 8(a)(7) program page and the Federal Register for the substantive final rule publication, note its effective date, and calendar 60 days forward as the submission start; do not treat October 13, 2026 as a confirmed current deadline.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- [EPA — TSCA Section 8\(a\)\(7\) Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements](#) — Program summary page that still lists October 13, 2026 for most manufacturers, creating the internal inconsistency across EPA pages that the signal identifies.
- [EPA — EPA Extends Reporting Period for PFAS Manufacturers](#) — Documents the first extension from July 2025 to April 2026 and sets October 13, 2026 and April 13, 2027 as the ordinary and small-manufacturer article-importer deadlines under that extension.
- [EPA — Update on Reporting Deadline for TSCA PFAS Reporting Rule](#) — Documents the subsequent EPA action moving the start date again to 60 days after the forthcoming substantive revision, superseding the October 2026 deadline.
- [EPA — Prepublication notice on TSCA PFAS reporting period](#) — Establishes January 31, 2027 or 60 days after the revision's effective date, whichever is earlier, as the current backstop for the submission start.

SIGNAL 2 OF 5

Maine, Minnesota, and New Mexico have converged on an identical Currently Unavoidable Use standard, creating a model exception pathway with state-specific procedural requirements that a manufacturer must satisfy separately in each state

HIGH Short-term (3–12 months) · Legislative & Statutory Activity · Review

Three states have independently adopted the same CUU test — essential for health, safety, or functioning of society with no reasonable alternatives available — but each has built a distinct procedural pathway, cost structure, and expiration rule on top of it, requiring separate compliance actions in each jurisdiction.

REASONING

The identical standard language appears in three independent primary sources: the Maine DEP program page for Chapter 90, the Minnesota statute at section 116.943, and New Mexico's implementing rule materials. The convergence is not coincidental — it reflects deliberate model-law adoption. However, the procedural overlays diverge meaningfully. Maine required CUU proposals by June 1, 2025 for categories subject to the January 1, 2026 prohibitions, approved them through Chapter 90, and now requires a PFAS Notification Form plus fee for any product sold under an approved CUU. New Mexico requires online submission through NMPRS, imposes three-year expiration after which sales become immediately prohibited unless renewed, and charges application fees — the specific fee amounts should be confirmed directly with the New Mexico Environment Department or via NMPRS. Minnesota's statute sets the standard but the available sources do not identify a finalized CUU determination process or a product-specific approval for food packaging, cosmetics, or personal-care products. The combination of identical substantive standards and divergent procedural requirements means that a manufacturer who secures a CUU in one state cannot assume it carries over to another.

PATTERN

Maine DEP program page states that manufacturers of products covered by approved CUU determinations must submit a PFAS Notification Form and pay the associated fee; the June 1, 2025 accelerated submission deadline for January 1, 2026 prohibition categories is established on the same page. Maine DEP legislative report confirms CUU reporting was created for products sold under a DEP determination [2 — used as the BCLP-cited Maine report in findings]. Minnesota statute section 116.943 defines CUU as essential for health, safety, or functioning of society with no reasonable alternatives, and sets a January 1, 2032 statewide sales prohibition unless a CUU determination by rule exists. New Mexico final rule Exhibit A states that once a CUU designation expires it is no longer applicable and sales become immediately prohibited. New Mexico manufacturer guidance states products with a CUU designation are exempt from applicable sales prohibitions and reporting requirements and describes online submission through NMPRS. New Mexico proposed rule materials identify three-year expiration after approval and a proposed effective date of July 1, 2026 for the CUU framework.

IMPLICATION

A manufacturer relying on a CUU pathway in any of these states faces separate application processes, fees, and expiration clocks. In Maine, the CUU pathway is already operative and tied to the January 1, 2026 prohibition; missing the notification and fee obligation means the CUU approval alone does not preserve the right to sell. In New Mexico, the three-year expiration creates a recurring compliance calendar event. In Minnesota, the CUU standard applies to product registration restrictions beginning January 1, 2026 under pending legislative proposals and to a broader sales prohibition beginning January 1, 2032.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Map each product line against the CUU categories in Maine, Minnesota, and New Mexico; for Maine, confirm whether a CUU determination is in effect for the relevant product category and, if so, file the PFAS Notification Form and fee; for New Mexico, register an NMPRS account by July 1, 2026, confirm the current CUU application fee amounts directly with the New Mexico Environment Department, and track the three-year expiration clock on any approved CUU.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- [Maine Department of Environmental Protection — PFAS in Products](#) — Establishes Maine's CUU notification and fee requirement for products covered by an approved CUU determination under Chapter 90, and documents the June 1, 2025 accelerated proposal deadline.
- [New Mexico Environment Department — Manufacturers](#) — States that CUU products are exempt from sales prohibitions and reporting and identifies NMPRS as the submission channel.
- [Minnesota Statutes §116.943](#) — States the identical CUU standard — essential for health, safety, functioning of society, no reasonable alternatives — and the January 1, 2032 statewide sales prohibition unless a CUU determination by rule exists.
- [Petition to Adopt 20.13.2 NMAC Exhibit B, Proposed New](#) — Establishes New Mexico's proposed three-year expiration and July 1, 2026 effective date for the CUU framework.
- [New Mexico Environment Department — Exhibit A, Final Rule 20.13.2 NMAC](#) — States that once a CUU designation expires, it is no longer applicable and sales, offers for sale, and distributions become immediately prohibited.
- [Maine DEP — Final PFAS in Products Legislative Report, January 2026](#) — Confirms that Maine's amended law eliminated the general notification requirement and created CUU-linked reporting for products sold under a DEP determination.
- [New Mexico Environment Department — Proposed 20.13.2 NMAC Rule](#) — Describes the three-year CUU expiration after approval and the proposed July 1, 2026 effective date for the CUU framework.

SIGNAL 3 OF 5

New Mexico's implementing rules, approved April 2026, create the next hard product-ban calendar: food packaging and dental floss banned January 1, 2027, certain personal-care products banned January 1, 2028

HIGH Short-term (3–12 months) · Regulatory Agency Actions · Verified

New Mexico's Environmental Improvement Board approved implementing regulation 20.13.2 NMAC in April 2026, establishing the next concrete state product-ban schedule a contract manufacturer must calendar: food packaging, dental floss, and children's products in 2027, then certain personal-care products and additional categories in 2028.

REASONING

The New Mexico consumer-products page and the final rule materials are the primary sources. The Environmental Improvement Board approval in April 2026 is confirmed by the NMED consumer-products page. The 2027 and 2028 ban dates are stated on the same agency page. The NMPRS system launch for account registration on July 1, 2026 is confirmed by the manufacturer guidance page. No injunction, delay, or court order affecting these dates was found in the available sources. The New Mexico schedule is particularly significant because it follows a phased category expansion pattern — food packaging and dental floss first, personal care later — that mirrors the Maine and Minnesota model and extends the operative compliance horizon for manufacturers who may currently be focused only on the 2026 states.

PATTERN

New Mexico Environment Department consumer-products page states that the Environmental Improvement Board approved implementing regulation 20.13.2 NMAC in April 2026. Same page states that beginning 2027, certain cookware, food packaging, dental floss, and children's products sold in New Mexico may not be made with intentionally added PFAS, and that on January 1, 2028 the prohibition expands to carpets, cleaning items, fabrics, textiles, ski wax, upholstered furniture, and some personal-care products. New Mexico manufacturer guidance states NMPRS account registration begins July 1, 2026, and that manufacturers can submit CUU proposals, required reports, and reporting-extension requests through the system. Final rule Exhibit A confirms CUU expiration renders sales immediately prohibited.

IMPLICATION

For a contract manufacturer supplying food-contact packaging, dental floss, or personal-care products, New Mexico creates a near-term (2027) and medium-term (2028) hard ban that must be calendared now. Product lines that rely on intentionally added PFAS and lack an approved CUU must be reformulated or discontinued for the New Mexico market before January 1, 2027. The NMPRS system launch on July 1, 2026 is the immediate action point — account registration enables CUU applications, reporting submissions, and extension requests, all of which have lead times.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Register an NMPRS account by July 1, 2026; conduct a product-by-product PFAS ingredient audit against New Mexico's 2027 ban categories and initiate CUU applications or reformulation projects for any affected line before the January 1, 2027 deadline.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- [New Mexico Environment Department — Manufacturers](#) — Confirms July 1, 2026 as the NMPRS account-registration start date and identifies the system as the channel for CUU applications, reports, and extension requests.
- [New Mexico Environment Department — Exhibit A, Final Rule 20.13.2 NMAC](#) — States that an expired CUU designation immediately reinstates the sales prohibition, establishing the consequences of failing to renew.
- [New Mexico Environment Department — PFAS in Products \(Consumer Products\)](#) — Confirms April 2026 board approval of 20.13.2 NMAC and states the 2027 food-packaging, dental-floss, and children's-product ban and the 2028 expansion to personal-care products and additional categories.

SIGNAL 4 OF 5

Illinois enacted a scope-narrowing amendment that removes food packaging and cookware from the state's 2032 PFAS product ban while leaving other product categories in place — a divergence signal for manufacturers tracking product-category coverage

MEDIUM Long-term (1–3 years) · [Legislative & Statutory Activity](#) · [Review](#)

Illinois's governor-approved HB2516 deletes food packaging and cookware from the products prohibited beginning January 1, 2032, creating a narrower Illinois scope than the Maine, Minnesota, and New Mexico models. The bill-status page identifies categories retained in the existing Illinois framework, but the operative prohibition dates and full category list for those remaining products must be confirmed against the enrolled statute.

REASONING

The Illinois General Assembly bill-status page is the primary source. It states the governor approved HB2516 on August 15, 2025 and describes the amendment as deleting cookware and food packaging from the products prohibited beginning January 1, 2032. The confidence is moderate rather than high because the bill-status page does not reproduce full enrolled text, and the findings note the search result was updated August 24, 2026, but the signing date given is August 15, 2025, so the event is datable. The divergence from other states is a genuine pattern signal: at the same time that Maine, Vermont, and New Mexico are moving toward broader food-packaging bans, Illinois is narrowing the food-packaging piece of its long-horizon prohibition. This has direct relevance to manufacturers who need to know whether Illinois food packaging is a 2032 compliance event — based on the available source, it is not under HB2516 as enacted. The specific prohibition dates and scope for product categories that remain covered under the Illinois framework were not confirmed by the bill-status page and must be verified against the enrolled text.

PATTERN

Illinois General Assembly HB2516 bill-status page states the governor approved the measure on August 15, 2025. The page identifies product categories in the existing Illinois framework — including cosmetics, dental floss, menstrual products, juvenile products, intimate apparel, and food-contact products — but does not itself establish the operative prohibition dates for those remaining categories under HB2516 as amended. The page states that HB2516 deletes cookware and food packaging from the products prohibited beginning January 1, 2032. This contrasts with Maine's operative January 1, 2026 prohibition covering cosmetics and dental floss and New Mexico's consumer-product framework, showing a state diverging from the broader model.

IMPLICATION

A contract manufacturer supplying Illinois should not plan for a food-packaging PFAS ban under the 2032 Illinois framework based on the available source — HB2516 removed that category. However, other product categories identified in the existing Illinois framework remain subject to the state's PFAS restrictions, and the applicable prohibition dates for those categories must be confirmed against the enrolled statute rather than

inferred from the bill-status page alone. This is also a signal that state-level scope is not uniform: manufacturers cannot apply a single multi-state compliance posture built around food packaging without state-by-state verification.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Pull the enrolled text of Illinois HB2516 to confirm the effective dates and scope for each remaining covered product category, and update product-compliance matrices to reflect that Illinois food packaging is no longer in the 2032 prohibition scope per the available source. Confirm the specific prohibition dates applicable to cosmetics, dental floss, menstrual products, juvenile products, intimate apparel, and food-contact products under the amended Illinois statute, as these were not confirmed by the bill-status page.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- [PFAS in Products](#) — Confirms Maine's January 1, 2026 operative prohibition on PFAS in cosmetics and dental floss.
- [Illinois General Assembly — HB2516 Bill Status](#) — Documents the governor's August 15, 2025 approval and the deletion of food packaging and cookware from the 2032 Illinois prohibition. Identifies product categories in the existing Illinois framework but does not itself confirm the operative prohibition dates for those remaining categories.
- [PFAS in Products](#) — Documents New Mexico's consumer-product PFAS framework as a point of comparison to Maine's approach.

SIGNAL 5 OF 5

Maine's food-packaging PFAS ban is limited to direct-food-contact plant-fiber packaging with an incidental-presence threshold — a narrower scope than Vermont's any-amount formulation, signaling that food-packaging bans are not uniform across states even when enacted in the same timeframe

MEDIUM Immediate (0–3 months) · [Regulatory Agency Actions](#) · [Verified](#)

Maine's food-packaging PFAS restriction that took effect May 25, 2026 applies only to direct-food-contact packaging made from plant-derived fibers above incidental presence, while Vermont's January 1, 2026 ban covers any food package with intentionally added PFAS in any amount, creating materially different compliance obligations from neighboring states for the same product type.

REASONING

Two independent primary-adjacent sources establish the contrasting scopes. The BCLP state-by-state food-packaging tracker, cited in the findings via the Maine DEP legislative report, states that Maine's May 25, 2026 provision is limited to direct-food-contact packaging made from plant fibers to which PFAS have been intentionally introduced in an amount greater than incidental presence. Vermont's AG guidance states that the food-package provision under Act 131 applies to any food package where PFAS has been intentionally added and is present in any amount. The difference is structural: Maine requires both plant-fiber substrate and above-incidental-presence PFAS, while Vermont requires only intentional addition in any amount across all food-package materials. A contract manufacturer supplying fiber-based food packaging faces different analyses under each state's law, and a manufacturer supplying non-plant-fiber food packaging is outside Maine's scope but still within Vermont's. This divergence is itself actionable intelligence for compliance planning.

PATTERN

BCLP food-packaging tracker states that beginning May 25, 2026, a manufacturer may not offer for sale food packaging intended for direct food contact when it is made from plant fibers to which PFAS have been intentionally introduced in an amount greater than incidental presence [2 — identified in findings as source, which resolves to the BCLP URL]. Vermont AG guidance states that Act 131's food-package provision applies to any food package where PFAS has been intentionally added and is present in any amount, with most bans effective January 1, 2026. New Mexico's 2027 food-packaging ban uses intentionally added PFAS without a plant-fiber limitation per the NMED consumer-products page, suggesting the narrower Maine formulation is not the model being adopted elsewhere.

IMPLICATION

A contract manufacturer producing plant-fiber food-contact packaging — such as molded pulp containers, paperboard trays, or fiber-based wraps — faces Maine's May 25, 2026 threshold and Vermont's January 1, 2026 any-amount standard simultaneously, with different triggering conditions. For non-fiber food packaging, Maine's May 2026 rule does not apply, but Vermont's does. New Mexico's 2027 ban covers food packaging

without a plant-fiber limitation. Compliance assessments must be substrate-specific and state-specific, not category-wide.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

For each food-packaging SKU, document the substrate material and PFAS source (intentional versus incidental), then map against Maine's plant-fiber/incidental-presence threshold, Vermont's any-amount standard, and New Mexico's 2027 prohibition to determine which rules apply and whether any threshold defense is available.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- [Implementation of Maine Law Regulating Products Containing](#) — Establishes the May 25, 2026 threshold for food-packaging PFAS restrictions based on intentional introduction amounts.
- [Vermont Attorney General — Act 131 PFAS Guidance](#) — States that Vermont's food-package ban applies to any food package with intentionally added PFAS in any amount, effective January 1, 2026, establishing the broader contrasting scope.
- [New Mexico Environment Department — PFAS in Products \(Consumer Products\)](#) — States the 2027 New Mexico food-packaging ban without a plant-fiber limitation, confirming that Maine's narrower formulation is not the model being adopted in New Mexico.
- [BCLP — PFAS in Food Packaging: State-by-State Regulations](#) — States that Maine's May 25, 2026 food-packaging restriction is limited to direct-food-contact packaging made from plant fibers with PFAS above incidental presence, establishing the narrower scope.

PUT A WATCH ON YOUR QUESTION

A watch on your question runs every cycle.

These signals came from one cycle of a standing watch. Name a company, a market or a regulation, and the watch keeps running whether or not anyone opens the platform. Every signal arrives rated for confidence and horizon, with the dated events behind it and the sources that carry the weight.

See all the samples and tell us your question at ezassi.com/ezassi-signals-sample-library.

info@ezassi.com • ezassi.com