Date of Hearing: March 10, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY AND TOXIC MATERIALS
Damon Connolly, Chair
AB 1604 (Stefani) – As Amended March 3, 2026

SUBJECT: Product safety: proofs of purchase: intentionally added bisphenols

SUMMARY: Prohibits, on and after January 1, 2027, the provision or manufacture of a paper proof of purchase (receipt) containing intentionally added bisphenol A (BPA) and prohibits, on and after January 1, 2028, the provision or manufacture of a paper receipt containing any intentionally added bisphenols. Authorizes the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to enforce the prohibitions of the bill. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Makes legislative findings and declarations about paper receipts and bisphenols.

2) Defines "bisphenol" as a chemical with two phenol rings connected by a single linker atom. Specifies that the linker atom and phenol rings may have additional substituents.

3) Defines "business" as a person that accepts payment through cash, credit, or debit transactions. Exempts from the definition of business the following:
   a) A health care provider, as defined in Health and Safety Code (HSC); and,
   b) An entity organized as a nonprofit institution that has annual gross sales receipts of less than $2,000,000.

4) Defines "consumer" as a person who purchases, and does not offer for resale, food, alcohol, other tangible personal property, or services.

5) Defines "intentionally added bisphenol A" as BPA (CAS no. 80-05-7) that a manufacturer has intentionally added to a product and that has a functional or technical effect in the product, including BPA that is an intentional breakdown product of an added chemical that also has a functional or technical effect in the product.

6) Defines "intentionally added bisphenols" as bisphenols that a manufacturer has intentionally added to a product and that have a functional or technical effect in the product, including bisphenols that are intentional breakdown products of an added chemical that also have a functional or technical effect in the product.

7) Defines "manufacturer" as the person that makes the paper for the paper receipt using raw materials, machinery, or both.

8) Defines "proof of purchase" as a receipt for the retail sale of food, alcohol, or other tangible personal property, or for the provision of services, provided at the point of sale.

9) Prohibits, on and after January 1, 2027, a paper receipt provided to a consumer by a business or created by a manufacturer from containing intentionally added BPA.

10) Prohibits, on and after January 1, 2028, a paper receipt provided to a consumer by a business or created by a manufacturer from containing any intentionally added bisphenols.

11) Authorizes DTSC to adopt regulations to implement, interpret, or make specific the provisions of this bill.

12) Requires DTSC to post any violation or enforcement action of the provisions of this bill on its internet website.

13) Requires DTSC to deposit all penalties collected pursuant to the provisions of this bill into the Toxic Substances Control Account for use to enforce the provisions of this bill.

14) Authorizes DTSC, the Attorney General, a district attorney, a county counsel, or a city attorney to enforce the provisions of this bill.

15) Provides that a violation of the provisions of this bill shall be punishable by a civil penalty not to exceed $5,000 for a first violation and not to exceed $10,000 for each subsequent violation.

16) Provides that a prevailing plaintiff who establishes a violation of the provisions of this bill shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

17) Provides that the duties and obligations imposed by this bill are cumulative with any other duties or obligations imposed under other law and shall not be construed to relieve any party from any duties or obligations imposed under other law and do not limit any rights or remedies under existing law.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Defines "bisphenol," as it relates to a juvenile's feeding product or juvenile's sucking or teething product, as a chemical with two phenol rings connected by a single linker atom. Specifies that the linker atom and phenol rings may have additional substituents. (HSC § 108942(a))

2) Prohibits, on or after January 1, 2026, the manufacture or sale of any juvenile's feeding, sucking, or teething product that contains any form of bisphenol above the practical quantitation limit determined by DTSC (HSC § 108940 (a)); authorizes DTSC or the Attorney General to enforce this prohibition (HSC § 108940 (f)(1)); and authorizes DTSC to adopt regulations to implement, enforce, interpret, or make specific this prohibition. (HSC § 108940 (g))

3) Requires a manufacturer to use the least toxic alternative when replacing any form of bisphenol in a juvenile's feeding product or juvenile's sucking or teething product. Prohibits a manufacturer from replacing any form of bisphenol pursuant to these provisions with chemicals known to cause cancer or reproductive harm, or with any chemical identified by DTSC as a Candidate Chemical through its Safer Consumer Products Program. (HSC § 108941)

Under the California Environmental Contaminant Biomonitoring Program:

1) Requires the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), in collaboration with the California Environmental Protection Agency, to establish the California Environmental Contaminant Biomonitoring Program. Requires CDPH to utilize biological specimens, as appropriate, to identify designated chemicals that are present in the bodies of Californians. (HSC § 105441)

2) Defines "designated chemicals" as those chemicals that are known to, or strongly suspected of, adversely impacting human health or development, based upon scientific, peer-reviewed animal, human, or in vitro studies, and according to certain parameters. (HSC § 105440 (b)(6)) (Note: The California Environmental Contaminant Biomonitoring Program includes the bisphenol chemical group on its list of designated chemicals).

Under the Safer Consumer Products Program:

1) Requires DTSC to adopt regulations to establish a process to identify and prioritize chemicals or chemical ingredients in consumer products that may be considered chemicals of concern, as specified. (HSC § 25252) (Note: The Safer Consumer Product's Candidate Chemicals List includes the bisphenol chemical group).

2) Specifies, but does not limit, regulatory responses that DTSC can take on chemicals in consumer products ranging from no action to a prohibition of the chemical in the product. (HSC § 25253)

Under the California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65):

1) Prohibits a person, in the course of doing business, from knowingly and intentionally exposing any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual. (HSC § 25249.6)

2) Requires the Governor to publish a list of chemicals known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity and to revise and republish the list in light of additional knowledge at least once per year. (HSC § 25249.8) (Note: Under Proposition 65, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) has listed the bisphenols BPA, bisphenol S (BPS), and tetrabromobisphenol A as chemicals known to the state to cause cancer, birth defects, and/ or other reproductive harm.)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill: According to the author, "AB 1604 will better protect public health and the environment in California by eliminating harmful bisphenol chemicals from paper receipts. Beginning January 1, 2027, manufacturers and businesses will no longer be allowed to use BPA in receipts, with a full phase-out of all bisphenol chemicals by January 1, 2028. These chemicals have been linked to detrimental health issues for women and children, which are known to cause reproductive, developmental, and behavioral harm. By removing bisphenols from receipts, this legislation helps reduce daily exposure to toxic substances and prevents contamination in

recycling and composting systems – prioritizing health, safety, and environmental responsibility for all Californians."

Bisphenols: Bisphenols are a group of synthetic, high-volume chemicals that are used in the manufacturing of polycarbonate plastics and epoxy resins. The most widely used and well-studied chemical in the group is BPA, but the use of other bisphenols, such as BPS and bisphenol F (BPF), is increasing as manufacturers use these chemicals to replace BPA, especially following restrictions on the use of BPA.

The Human Biomonitoring for Europe program (HBM4EU), a joint European human biomonitoring initiative, explains in its "Bisphenols: What You Need to Know" factsheet that BPA is used as a building block in the production of polycarbonate plastics. The resulting plastic is clear and tough and used to manufacture a wide range of consumer goods, including sports equipment, impact-resistant safety equipment, automobile parts, and food containers, such as reusable beverage bottles and reusable plastic tableware. Another primary use of BPA is in the production of epoxy resins used to line food and beverage cans to avoid corrosion of the metal and to avoid migration of metals into the can's contents. Epoxy resins are also used to line water pipes and in the manufacture of thermal papers used for shop sales receipts, ATM receipts, public transport tickets, parking tickets, and airline boarding passes. Finally, BPA is used in dental sealants. In terms of other bisphenols, both BPS and BPF are also used in the manufacture of plastics. Also, BPS is increasingly used in the production of thermal papers.

Concerns with bisphenols: The 2019, article, "The adverse health effects of bisphenol A and related toxicity mechanisms," published in *Environmental Research,* summarizes concerns about BPA as follows: "Due to its mass productions and widespread applications, the presence of BPA is ubiquitous in the environment. BPA can enter the body via different ways such as [the] digestive tract, respiratory tract and dermal tract. As an endocrine disruptor, BPA has estrogen-like and anti-androgen effects causing damages to different tissues and organs, including [the] reproductive system, immune system and neuroendocrine system, etc. Recently, it has been shown that BPA could induce carcinogenesis and mutagenesis in animal models."

Further describing the concerns with BPA, HBM4EU says, "There is a large amount of literature on the toxicity of bisphenol A including at low doses… Studies have indicated that it could be associated with increased risk for:

- Fetal development: miscarriages, decreased birth weight at term,
- Reproductive and sexual dysfunctions,
- Breast and prostate cancer or at least significant breast tissue remodeling. Studies have indicated that those effects were associated with gestational and neonatal exposure…
- Altered immune system activity,
- Obesity and metabolic dysfunctions and diabetes in adults,
- Cardiovascular disease in adults,
- Cognitive and behavioural development in young children."

As concerns have mounted over the health and environmental impacts of exposure to BPA, manufacturers have replaced BPA with other, less-studied bisphenols. Unfortunately, studies indicate that these bisphenols display hazard traits similar to, and sometimes worse than, BPA. These studies include "Bisphenol S in Food Causes Hormonal and Obesogenic Effects Comparable to or Worse than Bisphenol A: A Literature Review," published in 2020 in *Nature*, which states,

> "In recent years, bisphenol analogues such as bisphenol S (BPS) have come to replace bisphenol A in food packaging and food containers, since bisphenol A (BPA) has been shown to leach into food and water, causing numerous negative health effects. Unfortunately, little or no research was done to determine the safety of these BPA-free products before they were marketed to the public as a healthier alternative. The latest studies have shown that some of these bisphenol analogues may be even more harmful than the original BPA in some situations... It was found that BPS works via different pathways than does BPA while causing equivalent obesogenic [i.e., obesity-promoting] effects, such as activating preadipocytes, and that BPS was correlated with metabolic disorders, such as gestational diabetes, that BPA was not correlated with. BPS was also shown to be more toxic to the reproductive system than BPA and was shown to hormonally promote certain breast cancers at the same rate as BPA. Therefore, a strong argument may be made to regulate BPS in exactly the same manner as BPA."

Another study, "Bisphenol Analogues Other Than BPA: Environmental Occurrence, Human Exposure, and Toxicity: A Review," published in *Environmental Science and Technology* in 2016, states,

> "Numerous studies have investigated the environmental occurrence, human exposure, and toxicity of bisphenol A (BPA). Following stringent regulations on the production and usage of BPA, several bisphenol analogues have been produced as a replacement for BPA in various applications… Whereas BPA was still the major bisphenol analogue found in most environmental monitoring studies, BPF and BPS were also frequently detected. Elevated concentrations of BPAF, BPF, and BPS (i.e., similar to or greater than that of BPA) have been reported in the abiotic environment and human urine from some regions. Many analogues exhibit endocrine disrupting effects, cytotoxicity, genotoxicity, reproductive toxicity, dioxin-like effects, and neurotoxicity in laboratory studies. BPAF, BPB, BPF, and BPS have been shown to exhibit estrogenic and/or antiandrogenic activities similar to or even greater than that of BPA."

Under Proposition 65, OEHHA listed BPA for effects on the female reproductive system in 2015 and for developmental effects in 2020. According to OEHHA, "BPA is on the Proposition 65 list because it may harm the developing baby, and it may harm the female reproductive system, including the ovaries and eggs." On December 29, 2023, OEHHA placed BPS on the Proposition 65 list for reproductive toxicity based on the female reproductive endpoint, and on January 3, 2025, it added the male reproductive toxicity endpoint. On October 27, 2017, OEHHA listed tetrabromobisphenol A as causing cancer.

Exposure to bisphenols: HBM4EU's factsheet states that most human exposure to BPA is through the consumption of food and beverages that have been in contact with epoxy resin linings or polycarbonate plastic containers. Food or drinks may contain very low levels of BPA that have migrated from containers and linings. Small children have an increased risk of becoming exposed to BPA due to their higher food consumption compared to their size. People may also be exposed to BPA through the skin by handling thermal papers, such as register receipts. Limited exposure to BPA may also occur through breathing in contaminated air and dust.

Bisphenols in receipts: According to the 2023 article, "Bisphenols and alternative developers in thermal paper receipts from the U.S. market assessed by Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy," published in *Environmental Pollution*, "Cash register receipts made of thermal paper expose workers and shoppers to endocrine-disrupting chemicals and contaminate paper recycling streams." The article explains that cash register receipts are an underrecognized source of exposure to hormonally active chemicals, especially for workers who frequently handle receipts. It says that most receipts are made of thermal paper, which is coated with layers of chemicals that allow for rapid image formation under a thermal print head. Thermal paper receipts became common in the late 20th century, initially with BPA commonly used as the color developer. More recently, in response to concerns about BPA's health hazards, manufacturers replaced BPA in thermal receipts with alternative developers, typically BPS. The article states that, "Bisphenols and other developer chemicals may continue to expose people even after disposal; they have been found in recycled paper products."

OEHHA, on its "Bisphenol A (BPA)" factsheet, states that, "Sources of exposure to BPA include… Some thermal paper that has a glossy surface and is often used for receipts from cash registers, gas pumps, and automated teller machines (ATMs)."

Alternatives to bisphenols in receipts: The authors of the 2023 study published in *Environmental Pollution* state, "The results of this study suggest the [United States] retail market has shifted substantially to BPS-based receipts as replacements for BPA-based receipts. At the same time, a shift toward non-bisphenol receipts has begun. Bisphenol-based receipts (those with BPS or BPA as developer) decreased from about 93% of collected receipts in 2017 to 86% in 2022, while non-bisphenols increased from 5% to 14% of receipts." However, the study cautions, "While BPS and BPA present greater known hazards, the nonbisphenol developers detected in this study encompass various unknowns and potential hazards. Using them to replace bisphenol receipts should be considered an interim solution, and each should be subjected to a comprehensive chemical hazard evaluation. Certain other thermal papers such as Blue4est™, not detected in this study, might offer preferable alternatives due to the use of a polymer coating rather than migratable developer chemicals. A better strategy for businesses to protect workers, customers, and natural resources, however, is to eliminate or minimize printing thermal paper receipts. This can be accomplished by offering a choice to the customer to skip the receipt or to receive a digital receipt. Non-thermal paper receipts are another option."

This bill: This bill prohibits, on and after January 1, 2027, the provision or manufacture of a paper receipt containing intentionally added BPA and prohibits, on and after January 1, 2028, the provision or manufacture of a paper receipt containing any intentionally added bisphenols. This bill also authorizes DTSC to adopt regulations to implement the prohibitions delineated in the bill, and authorizes DTSC, the Attorney General, a district attorney, a county counsel, or a city attorney to enforce these prohibitions, including by levying a civil penalty not to exceed $5,000 for a first violation, and not to exceed $10,000 for each subsequent violation.

Regulating chemicals as a class: In 2016, OEHHA scientists published the article, "Identifying Chemical Groups for Biomonitoring," in the journal *Environmental Health Perspectives*, which states "Regulatory agencies face daunting challenges identifying emerging chemical hazards because of the large number of chemicals in commerce and limited data on exposure and toxicology. Evaluating one chemical at a time is inefficient and can lead to replacement with uncharacterized chemicals or chemicals with structural features already linked to toxicity... Evaluating chemical groups, rather than individual chemicals, is an efficient way to respond to

shifts in chemical use and the emergence of new chemicals. This strategy can enable earlier identification of important chemicals for monitoring and intervention."

A January 2023 article, "Advancing the science on chemical classes," published in *Environmental Health* supports this argument, stating,

> "With tens of thousands of chemicals already in use and ongoing demand for new chemicals and uses, an approach to hazard assessment, risk assessment, and risk management including bans and restrictions, based on groups or classes of compounds is needed. Furthermore, there are many advantages to assessing chemicals as classes including:
>
> 1) Reducing the tendency to assume that chemicals with no data pose no risk;
> 2) Reducing regrettable substitutions by extrapolating information from data-rich chemicals to data-poor chemicals within the same class;
> 3) Improving risk assessment by considering the cumulative health impacts of exposure to multiple chemicals, thus correcting the underestimation of risk that results from the single-chemical approach;
> 4) Improving public health by reducing exposure to many chemicals of concern at once;
> 5) Increasing efficiency and reducing the use of financial and human resources, resulting in shorter decision-making times;
> 6) Facilitating monitoring of environmental exposures, including biomonitoring; and,
> 7) Better-informed decision-making throughout the supply chain, including among consumers."

Regulating chemicals as a class in California: California has taken regulatory and legislative action on several classes of chemicals. For example, DTSC scientists, in the 2021, *Environmental Health Perspectives* article, "Regulating PFAS as a Chemical Class under the California Safer Consumer Products Program," described a rationale for regulating per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) chemicals as a class, concluding, "it is both ineffective and impractical to regulate this complex class of chemicals with a piecemeal approach." The authors of the article state, "The widespread use, large number, and diverse chemical structures of PFAS pose challenges to any sufficiently protective regulation, emissions reduction, and remediation at contaminated sites. Regulating only a subset of PFAS has led to their replacement with other members of the class with similar hazards, that is, regrettable substitutions."

Following the rationale for regulating chemicals as a class in the above mentioned article, DTSC has taken action on the chemical class of PFAS substances under its Safer Consumer Products Program, including in 2020, when it proposed listing plant fiber-based food packaging containing any chemicals from the chemical class PFAS as Priority Products (this was no longer pursued once Governor Newsom signed AB 1200 (Ting, Chapter 503, Statutes of 2021) into law); in 2021, when it adopted as a Priority Product carpets and rugs containing PFAS; and, in 2022, when it adopted as a Priority Product any new treatments containing PFAS for use on converted textiles or leathers such as carpets, upholstery, clothing, and shoes. DTSC also listed as a Priority Product laundry detergents containing chemicals from the chemical class nonylphenol ethoxylates (NPEs) in 2024. Listing a Priority Product through rulemaking subjects those products to regulation under the Safer Consumer Products Program.

The California legislature has also taken action on prohibiting or restricting the use of classes of chemicals, including passing a slew of bills over the last 6 or so years prohibiting PFAS as a

class at different levels across many product categories, including a ban on menstrual products containing PFAS (AB 2515, Papan, Chapter 1008, Statutes of 2024); a ban on textiles that contain PFAS (AB 1817, Ting, Chapter 762, Statutes of 2022); a ban on new juvenile products that contain PFAS (AB 652, Freidman, Chapter 500, Statutes of 2021); and, a ban on firefighting foam containing PFAS (SB 1044, Allen, Chapter 308, Statutes of 2020), among others.

The legislature additionally enacted a prohibition on the chemical class of bisphenols in juvenile's feeding, sucking, or teething products under SB 1266 (Limon, Chapter 790, Statutes of 2024).

Chemical bans and the Safer Consumer Products Program: In 2008, California enacted AB 1879 (Feuer and Huffman, Chapter 559, Statutes of 2008) to establish a science-based regulatory process for identifying and prioritizing chemicals of concern in consumer products, to create methods for analyzing alternatives to existing hazardous chemicals, and to ultimately take regulatory action to reduce the level of harm from the chemicals in those products. DTSC did this by promulgating the Safer Consumer Products regulations (sometimes referred to as the Green Chemistry regulations), which took effect in October 2013.

While the intent of AB 1879 is to establish a robust and thorough regulatory process for chemicals in consumer products, it has long been recognized that DTSC does not have the resources to evaluate and take action on all, or even a significant portion of, chemicals in every consumer product application. The permutations of product and chemical combinations are virtually limitless. To that end, the Safer Consumer Products statute does not preclude the Legislature from taking action on the use of chemicals in consumer products, which, when there is credible scientific evidence to support a change in state policy to protect public health or the environment, the Legislature can do more expeditiously than can DTSC. Since AB 1879 was enacted, the Legislature has enacted legislation on various chemical-product applications, in addition to those prohibiting PFAS and bisphenols, including a ban on intravenous solution containers made with the phthalate DEHP (AB 2300, Wilson, Chapter 562, Statutes of 2024); a ban on flame retardants in children's products, mattresses, and upholstered furniture (AB 2998, Bloom, Chapter 924, Statutes of 2018); and, a ban on BPA in toddler sippy cups and bottles (AB 1319, Butler, Chapter 467, Statutes of 2011); among others.

DTSC, in fact, wrote in support of AB 1319 (Butler) stating: "DTSC does not believe that the [Safer Consumer Products] regulations should ever be viewed as excluding action that the Legislature might take to address specific product related concerns that are brought to its attention. Not only have the regulations taken longer to adopt than originally anticipated, DTSC also expects that the process to be represented in the regulations will be subject to time and resource constraints. There may be circumstances that warrant more timely action than DTSC can accommodate through its process."

Pressure for legislative action on chemical bans: Since AB 1879 was passed in 2008, DTSC has adopted nine Priority Products through their Safer Consumer Products rulemaking process, and currently has proposed seven more. A "Priority Product" is a consumer product that (1) contains one or more "candidate chemicals," which are chemicals that exhibit a hazard trait and/or an environmental or toxicological endpoint; that are found on one or more specified authoritative lists; and, that have the potential to harm people or the environment when used in the product; and, (2) has been formally listed in the California Code of Regulations through rulemaking. This

means that, during more than 15 years since the enactment of AB 1879, only nine chemical/ product combinations are being regulated through the Safer Consumer Products Program.

In 2022, DTSC requested 37.0 permanent positions and $7.2 million from the Toxic Substances Control Account in 2022-23 and ongoing to provide the resources needed to fully implement the Safer Consumer Products Program. In its budget proposal, DTSC states,

> "With the additional resources, DTSC will be able to completely implement the four steps of the [Safer Consumer Products] regulations... Based on the current [Safer Consumer Products] regulations implementation status and the resources requested here, the outcomes will be: …Accelerate the identification of Priority Products and the rate of regulation adoption to list new Priority Products. Previous resource increases have enabled more efficient research on the product categories in the Work Plan. In calendar year 2022, [Safer Consumer Products] expects to identify at least five possible Priority Products. With additional resources this number will increase to 12 products per year over the subsequent two years with enhanced exposure considerations. In calendar year 2022, [Safer Consumer Products] expects to initiate one to three Priority Product listing regulations and with additional resources. Beginning in calendar year 2023, [Safer Consumer Products] will increase rulemaking capacity to five Priority Product listings per year…"

DTSC's funding request was approved; however, even with increased resources, since 2023, DTSC has adopted four Priority Products, instead of the at least fifteen that it suggested was possible.

While the Safer Consumer Products Program is meant to be a rigorous program, the pace at which the rulemaking process has progressed has frustrated stakeholders and increased pressure on legislators to protect public health and the environment by taking rapid action on concerning chemicals in products. Often, this action has taken the form of legislation that prohibits or restricts the use of these chemicals. This work often requires consideration of large, complex bodies of scientific research, and/or decision-making based on emerging scientific research that reveals concerns without providing clarity on evidence-based actions that decision makers can or should take to mitigate those concerns.

Regrettable substitutions: In order to prevent regrettable substitutions, which is when a known hazardous chemical is replaced with an alternative that presents similar or greater risks to human health or the environment, often due to insufficient safety data or assessments, AB 1604 prohibits the use of all bisphenol chemicals in paper receipts. Therefore, under the provisions of this bill, manufacturers are prohibited from replacing bisphenols in their receipts with other bisphenols. However, the bill currently does not include provisions limiting regrettable substitutions of chemicals outside the bisphenol class.

Proposed amendments: To limit regrettable substitutions across chemicals, the author may wish to amend the bill to include provisions that require a manufacturer to use the least toxic alternative when replacing any form of bisphenol in a paper receipt and to prohibit a manufacturer from replacing any form of bisphenol in paper receipt with a chemical known to cause cancer or reproductive harm, or with any chemical identified by DTSC, through its Safer Consumer Products Program, as a Candidate Chemical. These provisions would be substantially similar to those in HSC § 108941, as enacted by SB 1266 (Limon, Chapter 790, Statutes of

2024), which limit regrettable substitutions for bisphenols in juvenile feeding products and juvenile sucking or teething products.

Arguments in support: A coalition of more than 40 environmental and public health organizations writes in support,

> "Exposure to bisphenols is widespread and continuous. Center for Disease Control data show that roughly 90% of Americans carry bisphenol A (BPA) and bisphenol S (BPS) in their bodies. These chemicals disrupt hormonal systems that regulate growth, fertility, and development, even at very low levels. Because BPA and BPS closely resemble estrogen, they are often described as "estrogen mimickers," with early-life exposures posing the greatest risk.
>
> Thermal receipt paper is a major and preventable source of exposure, as bisphenols are readily absorbed through the skin. While everyone who shops is affected, cashiers face the highest risk. Occupational studies show that cashiers have significantly higher BPA and BPS levels. According to 2024 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics data, nearly 70% of cashiers are women and over 75% are of childbearing age, a population especially vulnerable to endocrine-disrupting chemicals.
>
> Bisphenols are linked to serious health harms, including low birth weight, infertility, obesity, and increased cancer risk, and both BPA and BPS are listed under California's Proposition 65 for reproductive harm. The shift from BPA to BPS in receipt paper represents a regrettable substitution. The 2023 Ecology Center report Receipt Deceit found that nearly 80% of receipts tested contained BPS, even as BPA declined to about 1%, underscoring the need to regulate bisphenols as a class. Encouragingly, the same study found that non-bisphenol alternatives increased from 2% of receipts in 2017 to 20% in 2023, demonstrating that safer options are feasible.
>
> Not only are intentionally added bisphenols incredibly toxic, but they also render the receipt paper unrecyclable and a persistent, hazardous contaminant in paper bales... Peer-reviewed evidence has shown that paper recycling can carry bisphenols into recycled paper products (e.g., detectable BPA in recycled tissue/napkins), demonstrating how receipt paper acts as a contaminant in recycled fiber systems and imperils broader recycled feedstock."

Arguments in opposition: None received.

Double referral: Should this bill pass the Assembly Committee on Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials, it will be re-referred to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary.

Related legislation:

1) AB 1148 (Sharp-Collins, 2025). Would have prohibited, on and after January 1, 2027, a person from manufacturing, distributing, selling, or offering for sale food packaging that contains intentionally added bisphenols or ortho-phthalates, as specified, and would have prohibited a person from manufacturing, distributing, selling, or offering for sale food packaging that contains bisphenols or ortho-phthalates at a later date, as specified. The hearing for this bill in the Senate Environmental Quality Committee was canceled at the request of the author.

2) SB 1266 (Limon, Chapter 790, Statutes of 2024). Revises the existing prohibition on BPA in a juvenile bottle or cup established by AB 1319 (Butler, Chapter 467, Statutes of 2011) to instead prohibit the manufacture or sale of any juvenile's feeding, sucking, or teething product that contains any form of bisphenol above the practical quantitation limit to be determined by DTSC. Authorizes DTSC to enforce the bisphenol prohibition and to adopt regulations to implement, enforce, interpret, or make specific the bisphenol prohibition.

3) AB 2244 (Ting, 2024). Would have prohibited a receipt provided to a consumer by a business or created by a manufacturer from containing, beginning on January 1, 2025, internationally added BPA followed by, beginning January 1, 2026, any bisphenols. AB 2244 is substantially similar to AB 1604. This bill was held on the suspense file in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

4) AB 347 (Ting, Chapter 932, Statutes of 2024). Requires DTSC to enforce and ensure compliance with three existing laws that set limits for PFAS in food packaging, textiles, and juvenile products.

5) AB 1347 (Ting, 2023). Would have prohibited, on and after January 1, 2024, a paper receipt provided to a consumer by a business from containing BPA and, on and after January 1, 2025, a paper receipt provided to a consumer by a business from containing any bisphenols. This bill was held on the suspense file in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

6) AB 161 (Ting, 2019). Would have prohibited a paper receipt provided to a consumer by a business from containing BPA or BPS. This bill was held on the suspense file in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

7) AB 1319 (Butler, Chapter 467, Statutes of 2011). Prohibits the sale, manufacture or distribution of a bottle or cup or a liquid, food or beverage in a can, jar or plastic bottle that contains BPA if the item is primarily intended for children three years of age or younger.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

350 Bay Area Action
350 Contra Costa Action
American Sustainable Business Network
Ban SUP
Between the Waters
Beyond Plastics
Blue Ocean Warriors
Breast Cancer Prevention Partners
California Climate Action
California Communities Against Toxics
California Health Coalition Advocacy
California Product Stewardship Council
Californians Against Waste
Clean Earth 4 Kids

Clean Water Action
Community Environmental Council
Courage California
Earthday.org
Endangered Habitats League
Environmental Action Committee of West Marin
Environmental Working Group
Families Advocating for Chemical & Toxics Safety
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Glendale Environmental Coalition
I'm Hoi Strategies
Natural Resources Defense Council
Northern California Recycling Association
Pacific Environment
Physicians for Social Responsibility - San Francisco Bay
Plastic Pollution Coalition
San Francisco Baykeeper
Santa Cruz Climate Action Network
The Climate Reality Project Los Angeles Chapter
The Last Beach Cleanup
The Last Plastic Straw
The Story of Stuff Project
Yosemite Rivers Alliance
Zero Waste Ithaca
Zero Waste San Diego

Opposition

None received.

Analysis Prepared by: Shannon McKinney / E.S. & T.M. / (916) 319-3965