



New Mexico to use PRISM platform for PFAS reporting

System is the same as that used in Minnesota

CHEMICAL WATCH NEWS | 12 June 2026

New Mexico regulators have confirmed they will use the same reporting platform as Minnesota for upcoming PFAS disclosures, aligning the state's requirements with an existing system.

The New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) told Chemical Watch News & Insight this week that it will use the PFAS Reporting Information System for Manufacturers (PRISM) portal to collect reports on products containing intentionally added PFAS.

According to David Quigley, a partner at law firm Akin Gump, the decision to use the same system already [in place in Minnesota](#) could ease reporting compliance for companies, while also allowing New Mexico to avoid building a new platform from scratch.

New Mexico's rule [implementing](#) its PFAS law ([HB 212](#)) requires manufacturers to submit reports on PFAS-containing products sold in the state by 1 January 2027. The reporting requirements are part of a broader framework that phases in PFAS restrictions for certain products starting in 2027, with a wider ban on the persistent chemical class expanding to most goods by 2032.

NMED had not previously specified how companies would submit the required PFAS disclosures, even as the rulemaking process established the underlying reporting and data requirements.

But now, its decision to use the same reporting system used in Minnesota may support broader efforts to align reporting requirements across states, Quigley said.

Good for industry and regulators

New Mexico's plan to use PRISM is "certainly good for industry, because once they get familiar with one system, they only have to get familiar with that system", Quigley told attendees at Chemical Watch Events & Training's PFAS Global 2026 virtual conference on 11 June.

"But from New Mexico's perspective, it's also good for them," he said. "This is a way to have a reporting programme without having to invest the time and resources into developing the reporting framework."

Other states have found PFAS reporting regimes difficult and resource-intensive to administer, according to Quigley.

by **enhesa.**

“What we’ve seen in the reporting realm generally is that each state that has dipped their toe into the reporting pool has found out it’s a very extensive pool,” he said.

In Maine, lawmakers [initially required](#) reporting on [all products](#) containing intentionally added PFAS, but later scaled it back to cover only those applications designated as currently unavoidable uses (CUUs). The reporting changes in Maine came amid [broader amendments](#) that delayed elements of the state’s phase-out law.

“Maine had their reporting programme first, and almost immediately took it down because they realised it required a tremendous amount of resources - not just to collect the reports, but someone has to review them,” Quigley said.

And in Minnesota, the implementation of its PFAS reporting system has proceeded in stages as regulators work through practical challenges. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has [already extended](#) its reporting deadline multiple times - most recently to [15 September](#) - to give manufacturers more time to collect supply chain data and navigate PRISM.

Against that backdrop, Quigley said NMED’s decision to use the PRISM reporting system could ultimately reduce burdens for both regulators and industry.

NMED is “trying to piggyback very smartly on what another state has done, in an effort to keep their own costs down, while also having this side benefit to industry of really only having to complete one system”, he said.

Bobby DeMuro

North America deputy editor
Chemical Watch News & Insight

FURTHER INFORMATION

[PRISM portal →](#)

[NMED PFAS webpage →](#)

Disclaimer: Content on Chemical Watch News & Insight (including any of its websites) shall not be regarded as professional advice and is not intended as such. Enhesa does not accept liability for inaccuracies in published material. Customers are advised to take appropriate professional advice to inform business decisions.

Copyright: Documents and web pages downloaded from Chemical Watch News & Insight (including any of its websites) are for the use of registered users only. Such documents and web pages must not be distributed or republished without consent from Enhesa (email enquiries@chemicalwatch.com). Copyright in original legal texts and guidance remains with the respective government authorities.