

US District Court, District Court of Minnesota
CSA v. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

**DECLARATION OF DR. SARAH PARKER, Ph.D. IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

In summary, because definitions of PFAS can include a wide variety of substances that exhibit diverse properties and perform differently in specific applications, it is important to consider the particular substances present in a product, as well as the context of intended use, in order to evaluate the properties that are relevant to intended use and safety. In the context of nonstick cookware and bakeware, FDA has approved the use of specific fluoropolymer PFAS as nonstick coatings because the agency has evaluated and determined that these fluoropolymers are large, immobile molecules that are not expected to be absorbed by the human digestive tract and contain only negligible levels of small molecule PFAS that could migrate into food. If forced to transition away from fluoropolymer coatings, manufacturers are limited to currently available alternatives such as sol-gel based "ceramic" coatings that demonstrate inferior performance, until new technologies and manufacturing processes can be developed and approved for use.