



MEMO: Industry concerns regarding Michigan Senate Bill 816

TO: Senate Natural Resources and Agriculture Committee

FROM: Mike Alaimo, Michigan Chamber of Commerce

On behalf of the Michigan Chamber of Commerce, I would like to voice our concerns with Senate Bill 816. While the goals of protecting consumers and the environment are important, the current approach risks creating significant compliance costs, supply-chain disruption, and economic uncertainty for businesses operating in Michigan. The bill would create practical challenges for Michigan employers, manufacturers, retailers, and supply-chain partners around tracking, reporting, and physically labeling products that contain intentionally added PFAS. A more workable solution should be developed through stronger collaboration among lawmakers, regulators, environmental stakeholders, and affected industries that more accurately addresses real and solvable problems.

Key concerns and areas where collaboration could improve the legislation include:

- **Overly broad classification:** The bill uses a sweeping definition of PFAS that could capture thousands of different compounds, including materials that differ widely in risk profiles, uses, and exposure pathways. For Michigan businesses, this creates uncertainty across sectors such as manufacturing, automotive supply, outdoor gear, cookware, textiles, and consumer goods.
 - For example, the cookware definition includes pots, pans, skillets, etc, and other items. The phrase “including, but not limited to” creates uncertainty about how far the definition extends and whether related kitchen appliances or accessories could be swept in without clear guidance.
- **Testing and identification challenges:** Because many products include components, coatings, adhesives, or additives sourced from multiple suppliers, businesses may need costly testing and documentation systems simply to determine whether a product falls within the bill’s scope. This is especially challenging for small and mid-sized Michigan companies that do not have large compliance departments.
- **Limited access to upstream chemical data:** Michigan retailers, distributors, and final-product manufacturers rely on multi-tier supply chains. Lack of access to proprietary



formulations held by upstream suppliers make it difficult to verify whether PFAS were 'intentionally added'. Building systems to track substances through complex supply chains could require new software, supplier audits, testing protocols, and legal review. Those costs would be felt by Michigan suppliers, retailers, and consumers at a time when affordability is a real concern.

- **Insufficient transition time:** Michigan businesses need realistic lead times to identify covered products, work with suppliers, reformulate where feasible, update materials and packaging, train staff, and manage existing inventory. Unachievable deadlines will create avoidable costs without improving environmental outcomes. Businesses will need guidance on reporting format, label placement, testing thresholds, exemptions, and enforcement expectations well before deadlines arrive. A collaborative rulemaking process would help avoid confusion and uneven enforcement.
- **A patchwork of state-based regulation:** Without a unified federal framework, Michigan-specific requirements could force companies to create separate inventory, packaging, labeling, and distribution systems for this market. That added complexity can make Michigan less competitive for investment, product availability, and job growth.
- **Risk of oversimplified labeling:** A mandatory label stating "Made with PFAS chemicals" does not provide consumers with meaningful context, level of exposure, or knowledge about whether there is actual risk. Michigan businesses face consumer backlash even when the substance is used in a regulated, low-exposure, or performance-critical application.

Rather than relying primarily on penalties and litigation risk, Michigan should bring together business leaders, environmental experts, regulators, and legislators to develop a solution that protects public health while preserving economic growth, supply-chain reliability, and the ability of Michigan companies to compete. A better approach would pair transparency with scientifically grounded consumer information.

Thanks so much for your consideration, please let me know if you have any questions.

Mike Alaimo
Vice President, Legislative and External Affairs
Michigan Chamber of Commerce