Government and Regulatory Affairs Committee Update

By Phil Mahoney

Since our last update, the committee met in March and May, with PFAS continuing to represent the primary area of activity as regulatory developments remain active at both the state and international levels. The committee remains engaged in the PFAS issue through coordination with coalition partners and ongoing tracking of regulatory developments.

Continued coordination with industry groups (VMA, HI and ESA) remains a priority, particularly where new reporting or compliance obligations could have significant operational impacts. The committee continues to monitor and engage on these developments through coalition efforts and information sharing with membership. These activities are intended to ensure that member companies remain informed and positioned to respond to evolving requirements in a timely and effective manner. A couple of updates from the U.S. state and federal level as well as the EU side.

- Minnesota's PFAS reporting requirement was due to start July 1, but it has been pushed out to September 15, 2026.
- New Mexico has a PFAS labeling requirement that goes into effect on January 1, 2027 (even though fluoropolymers are considered exempt from reporting requirements in the state).
- The US EPA TSCA reporting start date has been pushed out to January 31, 2027 OR 60 days after a forthcoming final "revision" rule — whichever is earlier. While the reporting period appears to be unchanged at 6 months for most manufacturers, inclusion of proposed exclusions such as imported articles is still under review.
- Engagement with the European Sealing Association (ESA) was quite busy particularly as their ESG committee prepared their response to the REACH SEAC public consultation which was due by May 25, 2026. The FSA's Government and Regulatory Affairs Committee reviewed ESA's analysis and response, as well as inputs provided by our PFAS working group of Denise Lee, Kathy Johnson and myself. Together, we prepared a response for submission to the SEAC consultation which was submitted on May 24 (thanks to Pete Lance for submitting on a Sunday over a long weekend!).
    - Some interesting data was reported on this SEAC public consultation. 3,511 comments were received from 3,200 organizations, 250 individuals from 44 countries. The number of responses was less than the last request for public consultation, but that is likely due to a narrower scope for the response, and the fact that after 3+ years of this discussion, companies are not replying individually but via trade associations like ours.
    - SEAC is still on-track to complete their opinion for submittal by the end of 2026.

The committee continues to monitor various other topics raised by members, including Methane Emissions and NSF/ANSI/CAN 61. No significant developments were reported in these areas during this period; however, they remain standing agenda items due to their potential long-term impact on member companies and the broader industry.

As discussed during the March meeting, Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) continues to gain traction at the state level and is expected to remain an area of focus. EPR shifts responsibility for end-of-life management of packaging and related materials from municipalities to producers, creating a patchwork of state-specific requirements. States including California, Colorado, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Oregon, and Washington are at various stages of implementing programs, each with unique reporting, fee, and material definitions.

From a business perspective, these developments will require companies to adapt packaging strategies, enhance reporting capabilities, and improve data management systems to meet evolving obligations. At the same time, the EPR framework presents opportunities for companies to improve sustainability performance, evaluate material selection, and identify efficiencies through more proactive compliance strategies. Further discussion on EPR was deferred during the May meeting due to time constraints and will be revisited in a future session.

Overall, the committee's activities during this period reflect a continued focus on balancing near-term regulatory advocacy with longer-term planning. PFAS remains the most significant driver of activity, supported by increased coordination across trade associations and international partners. At the same time, emerging frameworks such as EPR are beginning to shape future compliance considerations. The committee will continue to monitor these developments closely and provide updates as additional information becomes available.

Fluid Sealing Association® • 994 Old Eagle School Rd., Suite 1019, Wayne, PA 19087-1866
1-610-971-4850 • info@fluidsealing.com • www.fluidsealing.com