

January 22, 2026

Brett Guthrie
Chair
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Frank Pallone
Ranking Member
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Gary Palmer
Chair
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Paul Tonko
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Representatives Guthrie, Pallone, Palmer and Tonko:

The undersigned 225+ organizations write to strongly oppose the [draft bill](#) released last week by House Energy & Commerce Committee Republican leadership that would dismantle key health protections of the 2016 bipartisan reforms to the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), our nation's bedrock chemical safety law.

Since 2016, TSCA has protected workers, consumers, and the public from known human carcinogens like asbestos and trichloroethylene whose harmful health impacts at low levels of exposure have been recognized by scientists and authoritative bodies for decades. Dismantling TSCA – as this bill does – would be a historic step backward on chemical safety, a goal overwhelmingly supported by the public.

The draft bill would roll back much of the progress our nation has made over the last decade by making it much harder – and in many instances impossible – for the EPA to take action on dangerous chemicals that threaten the health of millions of Americans. These are the very chemicals that Congress resolved to address in 2016 after decades of inaction. It would also hamper the ability of states to protect their own residents from harmful chemicals like PFAS. As a result, the public, especially children, workers and fenceline communities, would suffer from more cancer, infertility, cardiovascular disease, Parkinson's disease, birth defects, and other harms.

The following are some of the most significant rollbacks in the Discussion Draft:

1. **The bill would leave the public, including workers and vulnerable populations, exposed to known risks of serious harm.**
 - a. **The bill would eliminate EPA’s current requirement to regulate chemicals to eliminate unreasonable risk.** Instead, EPA could regulate only those risks and only to the degree that it deems “reasonably feasible.” This would prioritize lowering costs to industry over EPA’s duty to protect the public from formaldehyde, phthalates, vinyl chloride, and other known health threats. Congress rightly rejected that trade off in 2016. The resulting weak or non-existent chemical regulations would also preempt states’ ability to protect against those uses of those chemicals (pp. 14, 19).
 - b. **The bill would prevent EPA from protecting workers** by prohibiting any regulation that is “inconsistent with any requirement” imposed by OSHA and other federal agencies (p. 29). OSHA readily admits that its workplace exposure limits “[are outdated and inadequate for ensuring protection of worker health](#),” which is why Congress reinforced in the 2016 amendments the longstanding TSCA requirement that EPA evaluate and address occupational risks. As just one example, the OSHA limit for trichloroethylene (TCE) was set in 1971 and is 500 times higher than the level that EPA found necessary to protect workers, leaving up to hundreds of thousands of workers exposed to serious risks of cancer, immunotoxicity and other serious harms.
 - c. **The bill would direct EPA to conduct incomplete and under-protective risk evaluations.** For example, EPA would be required to prejudge chemicals’ risks by limiting its evaluation to only those hazards and exposures that it deems – before it has done any evaluation – “more likely than not to result in an unreasonable risk” (pp. 14-15).
 - d. **The bill would stop EPA from considering aggregate exposures and risks.** People are routinely exposed to a chemical from multiple sources - the air they breathe, the water they drink, and the products in their home. But the bill would make it much harder for EPA to examine the combined exposure from all the exposure pathways and all the sources that put people at risk, resulting in inadequate protection from real-world exposures and their health consequences (p. 15).
 - e. **The bill would delay public health protection for months or years** by authorizing industry to file premature lawsuits challenging EPA risk evaluations and postponing EPA’s issuance of rules until the lawsuits are resolved (pp. 17, 22).
2. **The bill would make it harder for EPA to collect information for data-poor chemicals...**
 - a. **The bill would tie the hands of EPA scientists** and prevent them from determining which test methods and data sources will be most informative in understanding the risks of a given chemical (pp. 5-6, 36-37).
 - b. **The bill would make it harder for EPA to require chemical testing and to fill data gaps.** The bill would create new obstacles to assuring that industry conducts needed studies on the health effects of its chemicals by requiring EPA to show both substantial environmental releases and substantial human exposure. This would block testing where only workers or users of consumer products are exposed, testing for chemicals that may be highly toxic but not yet produced in very large quantities and would make it impossible to collect information on chemicals that harm the environment (pp. 2-3).

3. **...And then limit EPA's ability to regulate chemicals because of a lack of data**
 - a. **The bill would limit EPA's ability to address "reasonably foreseen" exposures and risks.** As a result, it would limit EPA's current obligation to examine and address a chemical's known, intended, and reasonably foreseen uses. Instead, these reviews will be limited to "conditions of use" identified by companies. This is unjustified given the possibility that new chemicals will have future uses (e.g., in a consumer product) that present increased risks which EPA would have limited ability to address and reduce. By weakening the current law, the bill would allow chemical manufacturers to produce new PFAS and other toxic chemicals for uses that EPA would be powerless to assess or control (pp. 1-2).
 - b. **The bill would create new hurdles that keep EPA from taking action on potentially dangerous new chemicals.** The law currently requires EPA action where a new chemical may or will present unreasonable risk. The bill would instead require EPA to establish that the unreasonable risk is "more likely than not to occur." Since most new chemicals have little or no test data, EPA could not take action where it has evidence that a new chemical may present severe health risks but lacks the information needed to determine the likelihood of harm (pp. 7, 11-12). This is less protective of health than both the 2016 amendments and the original 1976 law.
 - c. **The bill would prevent EPA from regulating new chemicals with known data gaps or serious hazards.** In contrast to current law, the bill would allow EPA to regulate new chemicals only if the Agency finds that there is insufficient data *and* that the chemical may present unreasonable risk. There is typically a paucity of data on chemicals that have not yet been commercially produced. Thus, this Catch-22 would paralyze EPA where the absence of information prevents it from making the risk finding needed to require chemical testing. In cases where there is information that the chemical may present an unreasonable risk, EPA will be hamstrung because it must also find that there is insufficient information to make the determination. In both cases this will severely limit EPA's ability to regulate the new chemical. (pp. 11-12).

4. **Under the guise of simplicity, the bill would cut even more corners, harming the public.**
 - a. **The bill would outsource EPA's obligation to review new chemicals and weaken our government's ability to protect the American public by allowing EPA to grant exemptions for new chemicals** if they have been approved in another Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) country. Given the wide range of regulatory competence among the 32 OECD members, this would encourage a dangerous race to the bottom (pp. 13-14).
 - b. **The bill would allow companies to avoid the review and regulation of toxic chemicals made from the burning of plastic waste and tires** by asserting that such chemicals are "equivalent" to other substances made from entirely different feedstocks. EPA has previously found that fuels derived from the burning of plastic present [astronomical](#) cancer risks (pp. 27-29).

- c. **The bill would grant an automatic, 10-year exemption to manufacturers and distributors of replacement parts, such as asbestos in brake linings.** This would leave the public at risk even after EPA has found that the replacement part “contributes significantly” to unreasonable risk (p. 20-21).

These drastic changes to TSCA would not promote innovation in safer chemistry or improve the efficiency of chemical reviews, as industry claims. They come at a time when key decisions in the chemicals office at EPA are being made by former chemical industry lobbyists. The Administration has already taken action to recklessly rush reviews of many chemicals, including PFAS. EPA has also drastically reduced the workforce of the Office of Research and Development (ORD), severely limiting invaluable research on PFAS contamination, chemical exposures due to natural disasters, and so much more. Legislative weakening of TSCA, in conjunction with administrative actions to rush scientific reviews and weaken existing chemical safety protections, will result in policies that place the profit of corporations over the safety, well-being and health of Americans.

We urge Congress to reject this bill.

Sincerely,

350 Bay Area Action	American Sustainable Business Network	Cape Fear River Watch
5 Gyres Institute	Barron Park	Caring for our children
A Community Voice	Bend the Curve	Center for Environmental Health
A Voice for Choice Advocacy	Between the Waters	Center for Justice & Democracy
Able Differently	Beyond Plastics	Center for Progressive Reform
AFGE Local 704	Beyond Plastics Louisville	Center for Public Environmental Oversight
Afghan Health Initiative	Beyond Plastics NJ	Center for Science in the Public Interest
Air Alliance Houston	Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Inc.	Cherokee Concerned Citizens
Alaska Community Action on Toxics	Breast Cancer Prevention Partners	Children Now
Alianza Nacional de Campesinas	Brighton Honey	Children Run Better Unleaded
Alliance for Mission-Based Recycling	California Communities Against Toxics	Citizens for Safe Water Around Badger (CSWAB)
Alphabet Alliance of Color	California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice (CNEHJ)	
American Bird Conservancy		

Clean Air Action Network (CAAN)	Delaware Riverkeeper Network	Eureka Recycling
Clean Air Council	Don't Waste Arizona	Fenceline Watch
Clean Air for All Now!	Earth Care Team of St. Andrews Covenant Presbyterian Church	Flow Water Advocates
Clean Cape Fear	Earthjustice Action	FoCo Trash Mob
Clean Production Action	Eco-Cycle	Food and Water Watch
Clean Production Action	Ecology Center	Form, LLC
Clean Water Action	ECOS	FORT ORD COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP
Clean Water Action Council of Northeast Wisconsin	EDF Action	Forward Together East Point
Clean+Healthy	El Valle De La Cieneguilla Land Grant Association	FreshWater Accountability Project
Climate Conversation Brazoria County	Elder Climate Action TAKE CARE	Friends of the Earth
Climate Justice Alliance	Elders Climate Action	Georgia WAND
Climate Reality Project - Northern Colorado Chapter	Elders Coalition for Climate Justice	Georgia WAND Education Fund Inc.
Climate Reality Project Greater New Orleans Chapter	Endangered Habitats League	Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives (GAIA)
Coastal Watch Association	Energy Alabama	GMOScience
Coming Clean	Environmental & Public Health Consulting	Good Neighbor Steering Committee of Benicia
Commission Shift	Environmental Advocates NY	Great Lakes PFAS Action Network
Comunidades Aliadas Tomando Accion (CATA)	Environmental Law & Policy Center	Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance
Concerned Citizens of Lake Twp./Uniontown IEL Superfund Site	Environmental Protection Network	Greater New Orleans Interfaith Climate Coalition
Concerned Citizens of St. John	Environmental Working Group	Green Science Policy Institute
Concerned Health Professionals of Pennsylvania	Ethical And Respectful Treatment of Humans (EARTH)	GreenFaith
Conservation Law Foundation		GreenLatinos

Greenpeace USA	Learning Disabilities Association of Arkansas	Learning Disabilities Association of Texas
Habitable		
Habitat Recovery Project	Learning Disabilities Association of California	Learning Disabilities Association of Utah
Healthy Air and Water Colorado	Learning Disabilities Association of Florida	Learning Disabilities Association of Virginia
Healthy Babies Bright Futures	Learning Disabilities Association of Georgia	Learning Disabilities Association of Wisconsin
Healthy Ocean Coalition	Learning Disabilities Association of Illinois	Living River
Healthy Work Campaign		Locust Point Community Garden
Heritage Works, Inc.	Learning Disabilities Association of Iowa	
Hip Hop Caucus	Learning Disabilities Association of Maine	Maryland Children's Environmental Health Coalition [MD CEHC]
Huntington Breast Cancer Action Coalition		Maryland Pesticide Education Network
Illinois Environmental Council	Learning Disabilities Association of Maryland	
Inclusive Louisiana	Learning Disabilities Association of Michigan	MassCOSH
Indivisible HoCoMD Environmental Action	Learning Disabilities Association of Minnesota	Media Alliance
Inland Ocean Coalition	Learning Disabilities Association of New Hampshire	Merrimack Citizens for Clean Water
International Marine Mammal Project of Earth Island Institute	Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey	Micah Six Eight Mission
Kentucky Environmental Foundation	Learning Disabilities Association of New York	Michigan Clinicians for Climate Action
Labor of Love Safety Training	Learning Disabilities Association of Ohio	Michigan Environmental Council
League of Conservation Voters	Learning Disabilities Association of Oklahoma	Mid-Ohio Valley Climate Action
Learning Disabilities Association of Alabama	Learning Disabilities Association of Pennsylvania	Milwaukee Riverkeeper
Learning Disabilities Association of America	Learning Disabilities Association of South Carolina	Moms Clean Air Force
		Moms for a Nontoxic New York (MNNY)
		Montana Environmental Information Center

Mossville Environmental Action Now MEAN	Physician and Scientist Network Addressing Plastics and Health (P-SNAP)	SanDiego350
Move Past Plastic		Save Our Water SOH2O
National Employment Law Project	Physicians for Social Responsibility	Science and Environmental Health Network
National PFAS Contamination Coalition	Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles	Self & Soul
National Stewardship Action Council	Physicians for Social Responsibility Pennsylvania	Sierra Club
Natural Resources Defense Council	Pittsburghers Against Single Use Plastic (PASUP)	Silver Valley Community Resource Center
Naturepedic Organic Mattresses	Plastic Pollution Coalition	Social Justice Alliance of the Florida Suncoast
Neighborhood Assistant Org.	Plastic Pollution Coalition	Society of Native Nations
New York Public Interest Research Group (NYPIRG)	Preserve our Hill Country Environment (PHCE) Foundation	Stop Sacrificing Our Beautiful Environment
New York Sustainable Business Council	Protect Our Water, Heritage, Rights (POWHR)	Stop Waste Tucson
Newburgh Clean Water Project	Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility	Sunflower Alliance
Next 100 Coalition	Puget Soundkeeper	Sustain our River
Northeastern Minnesotans for Wilderness	Pursue PFAS Free	Sustainable Finger Lakes
Ohio Valley Environmental Advocates	Putnam Progressives	Testing for Pease
Orca Network	Rachel Carson Council	Texas Band of Yaqui Indians
Pacifica Social Justice	Raging Grannies	Texas Environmental Justice Advocacy Services
Partnership for Policy Integrity	Resource Renewal Institute	The Last Plastic Straw
People Over Pollution	RESTORE: The North Woods	The Ocean Project
PfoaProject NY	RiSE4EJ	Toxic Free North Carolina
	River Alliance of Wisconsin	Toxic-Free Future
	RootsAction	Union of Concerned Scientists
	Sanctuary Woods	Unitarian Universalists for a Just Economic Community
		Vadnais Heights Green Team

Vermont Conservation
Voters

Vermont Natural Resources
Council

Vermont PFAS Coalition

Vermont Public Interest
Research Group

Waterkeeper Alliance

WE ACT for Environmental
Justice

West Berkeley Alliance for
Clean Air and Safe Jobs

Wind and Solar Denver

Wiscosh

WisCOSH, Inc.

Young, Gifted & Green

Your Turnout Gear and
PFOA

Zero Waste Ithaca