

HB 211: PFAS Receiver Shield Act

Legislative Rubric from Science for Georgia

[HB 211](#) excludes 'PFAS Receivers' (which are people who don't manufacture PFAS but use manufacturing processes with PFAS, receive or maintain goods with PFAS, or purchases goods with PFAS) from legal liability when spreading PFAS. Anyone who is not a chemical manufacturer would be excluded from liability. This differs from many PFAS receiver shield acts – where only unintentional users are shielded.

Criteria	Variables			
Impact Who is going to be impacted? Is it equitable? List stakeholders & opinions.	Negative		Positive	
	Different stakeholders have radically different opinions on this bill. Agricultural/waste stakeholders think they need to be absolved from liability because they used PFAS unintentionally and current regulations leave them open to intense lawsuits. Manufacturers that utilize PFAS are eager to prevent more liability lawsuits. Other stakeholders think that exception will incentivize the use of PFAS, putting human health at risk.			
Reach Does it reach its target audience?	0 - No impact on target audience.	1 - Impacts narrow segment.	2 - Impacts majority; exceptions.	3 - Impacts entire target audience
	This bill is meant to create a broad exemption to PFAS liability when it is used either intentionally or unintentionally.			
Scientific Merit Does it utilize scientific research accurately?	YES - this does follow scientific research accurately. Here's why....		NO - this does not present scientific research accurately.	
	There is substantial scientific evidence that PFAS has negative human health effects. There is far less research or evidence of intense economic costs from PFAS suits.			
Financial Feasibility Is it financially feasible? or does this have burdensome finances (higher taxes, future costs, etc)?	0 - Extremely high costs	1 - Expensive but can be done	2 - Slight	3 - No financial burden
	This bill will have a positive financial impact on major industries by protecting them from costly lawsuits over their usage of PFAS. But, by encouraging PFAS use, it has long-term societal costs, as taxpayers will have to foot the bill to remove PFAS from their water and soil.			
Political Feasibility Level of opposition and partisan disagreement.	0 - Majority disagreed	1 – Split along party lines	2 - Minimal Opposition	3 - Complete consensus (0-5 'Nays').
	Party lines dictate major concerns over whether health or legal liability risks should be prioritized. The bill was sponsored by 5 Republicans.			
Measurable Metrics? We recommend looking at these 3 metrics. Is the data available or being measured?	0 - no data	1 - some data / not accessible	2 - most data / somewhat accessible	3 - complete transparency
	There is data showing that PFAS is harmful to human health and the environment. There is not enough publicly available data on the amount of PFAS in water and soil to then track if this bill has an impact on PFAS contamination.			

