March 31, 2015

Senator David Vitter

Member, Environment & Public Works Committee

456 Dirksen Senate Office Building

Washington, D.C. 20510

Senator Barbara Boxer

Ranking Member, Environment & Public Works Committee

410 Dirksen Senate Office Building

Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Vitter and Ranking Member Boxer:

We the 57 undersigned environmental and occupational health, environmental justice, and public interest organizations and businesses have worked for many years to reform chemical laws, including the federal Toxic Substance Control Act, and protect the public from the hazards of chemical exposure.

We respect and appreciate the current effort to identify areas of bipartisan compromise and consensus on chemical safety legislation. However, we believe that the Udall-Vitter bill (S. 697), has serious limitations and would fall far short of our shared goal of safeguarding human health from the risks posed by exposure to toxic chemicals. As a result, we respectfully oppose this bill.

S. 697 would fail to provide a framework essential to securing much needed health protections that have been lacking for nearly 40 years under current law. At the same time, the measure would undermine a number of vital state protections. S. 697 could have a crippling effect on every state’s longstanding duty to regulate toxic chemicals to protect its own residents.

Many of the undersigned organizations have fought for and helped enact state laws restricting the use of hazardous chemicals in consumer products. Most other major federal environmental laws allow states to take more robust action to protect citizens from very real environmental threats. S. 697, in contrast, preempts states from taking action on chemicals that are undergoing EPA review — even before EPA makes a final assessment on the safety of those chemicals — denies states co-enforcement authority, and may even preempt states from taking actions on chemicals under clean air and water laws.

We also are troubled by the fact that S. 697 would not explicitly protect communities affected by legacy chemical contamination, or by chemical disasters such as that which contaminated the Elk River in West Virginia in 2014. Although S. 697 requires consideration of “reasonably foreseeable” chemical exposures, there is no requirement to assess the exposures and risks that might result from decades-old contamination or from an unintended incident. Additionally, S. 697 would not explicitly require EPA to consider the cumulative burden of chemical pollution for residents of highly polluted communities, which is essential for people residents living near contaminated industrial and military sites all over the country. Consideration of cumulative impacts is also important for people disproportionately exposed to chemicals through the food chain and from the migration of chemicals through the environment even if they do not live near polluted sites.

Although modified, the safety standard in S. 697 still retains a core element of TSCA’s current weak safety standard, “unreasonable risk of harm,” rather than using more health-protective “reasonable certainty of no harm” language. This gives us great pause given the way courts have interpreted “unreasonable risk.” S. 697 is, at best, ambiguous about whether EPA must consider costs and benefits when determining if a chemical poses “no unreasonable risk of harm.” Even if the standard purports to exclude consideration of costs, EPA would likely be required to take them into account costs when developing risk management rules to reduce exposures to chemicals that fail the safety standard. For example, S. 697 *explicitly* requires a cost-benefit analysis upon industry request for any chemical ban or phase-out.

S. 697 lacks strict deadlines that can ensure that EPA can in fact make meaningful progress reviewing and regulating, if necessary, hundreds of chemicals of concern. It would require only that EPA *start* reviews of 25 chemicals within five years and would allow the agency at least seven years to review each substance. There is no clear deadline for implementing restrictions, phase-outs, or bans of even the most toxic chemicals. S. 697 would allow manufacturers to receive expedited review of their favored chemicals if they are willing to pay a fee, but it would not require expedited review for asbestos or persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic chemicals.

S. 697 adds troubling hurdles to regulating chemicals in products. Under S. 697 EPA would have to show that the public has “significant exposure” to a chemical in order to regulate a product that contains it, such as foam furniture laced with toxic flame retardants. If we are committed to protecting the public from harmful chemical exposures, EPA must have ready tools to regulate them as the public can be expected to come in contact with them.

S. 697 does nothing to address the problematic standard of judicial review under the current TSCA.  EPA decisions on chemical safety would still be required to meet the “substantial evidence” standard rather than the more common “arbitrary and capricious” standard. In practice, this can be expected to add further delays to regulating hazardous chemicals, or thwart EPA’s efforts to do so altogether.

Finally, S. 697 does not ensure that EPA’s chemical safety review program is adequately funded. Instead, S. 697 requires that industry generate only 25 percent of the total cost to EPA, with a cap of $18 million per year. That amount is clearly insufficient .  S. 725, by contrast would require that chemical companies pay their fair share, which is necessary for ensuring EPA assess the 1,000 chemicals it has determined may pose a risk to human health.

For these and other reasons the S. 697 is not acceptable in its current form. We look forward to working with you to pass legislation that makes public health a priority.

Sincerely,

Pamela Miller

Executive Director, Alaska Community Action on Toxics

Robyn O'Brien

Founder

AllergyKids Foundation

Katie Huffling

Program Director

Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments

Andrew Behar

CEO

As You Sow

Linda Reinstein

President

Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization

Heather Cantino

Steering Committee Chair

Athens County (OH) Fracking Action Network

Karuna Jagger

Director

Breast Cancer Action

Rebecca Roter

Chairperson

Breathe Easy Susquehanna County

Deborah Cowden

Board Chair

Buckeye Forest Council

Catherine Porter

Policy Director

California Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative

Wes Gillingham

Program Director

Catskill Mountainkeeper

Ronald White

Director of Regulatory Policy

Center for Effective Government

Colin O’Neil

Executive Director

Center for Food Safety

Sharyle Patton

Director

Commonweal Biomonitoring Resource Center

Lois Gibbs

Executive Director

Center for Health, Environment & Justice

Barbara Warren

Executive Director

Citizens’ Environmental Coalition

Kathleen A. Curtis

Executive Director

Clean and Healthy New York

Mark S. Rossi

Co-Director

Clean Production Action

Jennifer Krill

Executive Director

Earthworks

Judy Braiman

President

Empire State Consumer Project

Ken Cook

President

Environmental Working Group

Jeanne Economos

Pesticide Safety and Environmental Health Project Coordinator

Farmworker Association of Florida

Julia DeGraw

Northwest Organizer

Food & Water Watch

Dave Murphy

Executive Director

Food Democracy Now!

Lisa Archer

Director, Food and Technology Program

Friends of the Earth U.S.

Denny Larson

Executive Director

Global Community Monitor

Daniel Parshley

Project Manager

Glynn Environmental Coalition

Laura Weinberg

President

Great Neck Breast Cancer Coalition

Fran Teplitz

Executive Co-Director; Business, Investing & Policy

Green America

Rick Hind

Legislative Director

Greenpeace

Eric Uram

Executive Director

Headwaters

Claire L. Barnett

Founder and Executive Director

Healthy Schools Network, Inc.

Karen Joy Miller

President

Huntington Breast Cancer Action Coalition, Inc.

Jamie Harvie

Executive Director

Institute for a Sustainable Future

Steven G. Gilbert

Director

Institute of Neurotoxicology and Neurological Disorders

Jaydee Hansen

Senior Policy Analyst

International Center for Technology Assessment

Tracy Gregoire

Coordinator Maine Healthy Children's Project

Learning Disabilities Association of Maine

Anne Rolfes

Founding Director

Louisiana Bucket Brigade

Ruth Berlin

Executive Director

Maryland Pesticide Education Network

Michael T. Bender

Director

Mercury Policy Project

Ronnie Cummins

International Director

Organic Consumers Association

Maya Nye

Executive Director

People Concerned About Chemical Safety

Judy Hatcher

Executive Director

Pesticide Action Network

Catherine Thomasson

Executive Director

Physicians for Social Responsibility

Ted Schettler, Science Director

Rebecca Gasior Altman, PhD, Director

Science and Environmental Health Network

Kathleen Burns

Director

Sciencecorps

Deborah Thomas

Executive Director

ShaleTest

Ashley Orgain

Corporate Consciousness Manager

Seventh Generation

Judi Shils

Executive Director

Teens Turning Green

Robin Schneider

Executive Director

Texas Campaign for the Environment

Juan Parras

Executive Director

Texas Environmental Health and Justice Advocacy Services

Carol F. Kwiatkowski

Executive Director

The Endocrine Disruptions Exchange

Gary Ruskin

Executive Director

U.S. Right to Know

Cecil D. Corbin-Mark

Deputy Director/Director of Policy Initiatives

WE ACT for Environmental Justice

Henry Clark

Director

West County Toxics Coalition

Erin Switalski

Executive Director

Women's Voices for the Earth

Gail Bateson

Executive Director

Worksafe Inc.