

FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN
CHAIRMAN

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115

Majority (202) 225-2927
Minority (202) 225-3641

October 29, 2013

Mr. Mark A. Greenwood
Principal
Greenwood Environmental Counsel PLLC
888 16th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Greenwood:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy on Wednesday, September 18, 2013, to testify at the hearing entitled "Regulation of Existing Chemicals and the Role of Pre-Emption under Sections 6 and 18 of the Toxic Substances Control Act."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions by the close of business on Tuesday, November 12, 2013. Your responses should be e-mailed to the Legislative Clerk in Word format at Nick.Abraham@mail.house.gov and mailed to Nick Abraham, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



John Shimkus
Chairman

Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy

cc: The Honorable Paul Tonko, Ranking Member,
Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy

Attachment

The Honorable John Shimkus

1. Some think that the Corrosion Proof Fittings case reflects failure of TSCA, others assert parts of TSCA, such as Section 5 dealing with new chemicals) have been a success. What is your view?
2. You suggested that the Corrosion Proof Fittings case chilled EPA's enthusiasm for using section 6. Is your concern with how the Court interpreted the least burdensome requirement or with its inclusion in the statute?