

**U.S. House Committee on Energy and Commerce**  
**Subcommittee on Environment**  
**“Chemicals in Commerce: Legislative Proposal to Modernize America’s Chemical Safety**  
**Law, Strengthen Critical Supply Chains, and Grow Domestic Manufacturing.”**  
**Documents for the Record**  
**January 22, 2026**

Majority

1. A letter from Downstream Users Coalition to Senator Capito, Senator Whitehouse, Chairman Guthrie, and Ranking Member Pallone urging legislation for downstream users.
2. A letter from AAI to Senator Capito, Senator Whitehouse, Chairman Guthrie, and Ranking Member Pallone in support of improvements to TSCA.
3. A letter from ACI to Chairman Palmer, Chairman Guthrie, Ranking Member Tonko, and Ranking Member Pallone in support of improvements to TSCA.
4. A letter from API to Chairman Guthrie in support of improving TSCA.
5. A letter from CASA to Chairman Palmer and Ranking Member Tonko to underscore the critical role of TSCA.
6. A letter from Environmental Technology Council to Chairman Guthrie, Chairman Palmer, Ranking Member Pallone, and Ranking Member Tonko to show appreciation for holding hearings on TSCA issues.
7. A letter from Physicians Committee to Chairman Palmer and Ranking Member Tonko to show appreciation for moving legislation for TSCA.

Minority

1. A letter signed by 217 advocacy organizations addressed to Chair Guthrie, Chair Palmer, Ranking Member Pallone, and Ranking Member Tonko, submitted by Rep. Ruiz of California
2. A letter from public health and medical organizations addressed to Chair Guthrie and Ranking Member Pallone, submitted by Rep. Ruiz of California
3. A letter from Bluegreen Alliance addressed to Chair Guthrie and Ranking Member Pallone, submitted by Rep. Carter of Louisiana
4. A letter from the AFL-CIO addressed to Chair Palmer, Ranking Member Tonko, and members of the subcommittee, submitted by Rep. Carter of Louisiana
5. A letter from the California Association of Sanitation Agencies addressed to Chair Palmer, and Ranking Member Tonko, submitted by the minority
6. A letter from the Mom’s Clean Air Force addressed to Chair Guthrie and Ranking Member Pallone, submitted by Ranking Member Tonko of New York

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 217 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)	Clean Air Council
American Bird Conservancy		

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

Heritage Works, Inc.	Learning Disabilities Association of Maryland	Maryland Pesticide Education Network
Hip Hop Caucus		
Illinois Environmental Council	Learning Disabilities Association of Michigan	MassCOSH
Inclusive Louisiana	Learning Disabilities Association of Minnesota	Media Alliance
Indivisible HoCoMD Environmental Action	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
Learning Disabilities Association of Arkansas	Learning Disabilities Association of Texas	Moms for a Nontoxic New York (MNNY)
Learning Disabilities Association of California	Learning Disabilities Association of Utah	Montana Environmental Information Center
Learning Disabilities Association of Florida	Learning Disabilities Association of Virginia	Mossville Environmental Action Now MEAN
Learning Disabilities Association of Georgia	Learning Disabilities Association of Wisconsin	Move Past Plastic
Learning Disabilities Association of Illinois	Living River	National Employment Law Project
Learning Disabilities Association of Iowa	Locust Point Community Garden	National PFAS Contamination Coalition
Learning Disabilities Association of Maine	Maryland Children's Environmental Health Coalition [MD CEHC]	National Stewardship Action Council
		Natural Resources Defense Council
		Naturepedic Organic Mattresses
		Neighborhood Assistant Org.

New York Sustainable Business Council	Putnam Progressives	Texas Band of Yaqui Indians
Newburgh Clean Water Project	Rachel Carson Council	Texas Environmental Justice Advocacy Services
Next 100 Coalition	Raging Grannies	The Last Plastic Straw
Northeastern Minnesotans for Wilderness	Resource Renewal Institute	The Ocean Project
Ohio Valley Environmental Advocates	RESTORE: The North Woods	Toxic Free North Carolina
Partnership for Policy Integrity	RiSE4EJ	Toxic-Free Future
People Over Pollution	River Alliance of Wisconsin	Union of Concerned Scientists
PfoaProject NY	RootsAction	Vadnais Heights Green Team
Physician and Scientist Network Addressing Plastics and Health (P-SNAP)	Sanctuary Woods	Vermont Conservation Voters
Physicians for Social Responsibility	SanDiego350	Vermont Natural Resources Council
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles	Save Our Water SOH2O	Vermont PFAS Coalition
Physicians for Social Responsibility Pennsylvania	Science and Environmental Health Network	Vermont Public Interest Research Group
Pittsburghers Against Single Use Plastic (PASUP)	Self & Soul	Waterkeeper Alliance
Plastic Pollution Coalition	Sierra Club	WE ACT for Environmental Justice
Preserve our Hill Country Environment (PHCE) Foundation	Silver Valley Community Resource Center	West Berkeley Alliance for Clean Air and Safe Jobs
Protect Our Water, Heritage, Rights (POWHR)	Social Justice Alliance of the Florida Suncoast	Wind and Solar Denver
Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility	Society of Native Nations	Young, Gifted & Green
Puget Soundkeeper	Stop Sacrificing Our Beautiful Environment	Your Turnout Gear and PFOA
Pursue PFAS Free	Stop Waste Tucson	Zero Waste Ithaca
	Stuart Day Guitars	
	Sunflower Alliance	
	Sustain our River	
	Sustainable Finger Lakes	
	Testing for Pease	

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

Dear Representative Guthrie and Representative Pallone,

The undersigned national public health and medical organizations strongly oppose any effort to weaken the nation's main chemical safety law, the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), as amended by the 2016 bipartisan Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act.

The House is currently engaged in discussions about potential changes to TSCA. We write to urge you to act in the best interest of the American people by preserving TSCA's mission to protect the public's health. TSCA is essential to safeguarding public health through comprehensive exposure reduction from harmful chemicals both already on the market and proposed to enter the market as well as testing chemicals for safety.

Widespread exposure to harmful industrial, commercial, and consumer chemicals poses significant risks to human health, with particularly serious implications for susceptible populations, including infants, children, pregnant women, and workers. Commonly used substances – such as volatile organic compounds, flame retardants, plasticizers, and PFAS – are pervasive in homes, schools, and communities and can negatively affect nearly every organ system. Robust independent, peer reviewed science demonstrates that chemical exposures are linked to a host of chronic diseases and poor health outcomes, including respiratory diseases like asthma, cardiovascular problems, infertility, diabetes, low birth weight, developmental disorders like autism and ADHD, and increased cancer risk across the U.S. population. Many of these conditions are on the rise in the United States.

Prior to 2016, in TSCA's first 40 years, EPA struggled to address harmful chemicals, including asbestos, a known human carcinogen that has caused hundreds of thousands of deaths, and allowed hundreds of new PFAS "forever" chemicals to be introduced into the environment.

TSCA's struggles led to a bipartisan effort in Congress to update the law in 2016 to ensure EPA could better protect people from harmful chemicals. At the time, a broad coalition of lawmakers and stakeholders, including many of the undersigned organizations, came together to modernize

the law. One of the goals of the TSCA amendments was to provide stronger protections for highly exposed and susceptible populations like pregnant women, children, workers, and people who live in areas where polluting facilities have been sited.

Today, TSCA is working far better than it ever did in the previous 40 years before it was amended in 2016. A key provision of the 2016 amendments includes the requirement that EPA must make an affirmative determination that a chemical does not pose an “unreasonable risk to human health or the environment” before marketplace entry. New chemicals and chemicals long present in the marketplace that have been known for decades to cause cancer and other adverse health effects are finally being evaluated, regulated, and in some instances banned – including the cancer-causing chemicals trichloroethylene, methylene chloride, and asbestos. While much remains to be accomplished, the public’s health is better protected from unsafe chemicals now than 10 years ago. This is exactly what Congress and our organizations hoped to achieve by strengthening TSCA in 2016.

Today’s push to undermine the law – so soon after it was strengthened with broad bipartisan and outside stakeholder support and careful negotiation – appears to be motivated solely by efforts to weaken regulatory efforts instead of improving science-based public health protections. Regulated entities claim that chemical regulation is too slow and expensive, and that rapidly approving more chemicals will drive innovation and lead to safer chemicals. However, the safety of chemicals can only be verified through robust regulatory assessment and opening TSCA for reform now will only open the door for weakening regulations – that water down incentives for industry to design truly safer chemicals – in order to approve more chemicals without a proper assessment of their harms. We believe that approaches to more quickly and effectively assess chemicals (e.g., grouping) can already be implemented under the current law and do not require additional action by Congress. We are deeply concerned that legislation to change TSCA by this Congress would likely undermine, not strengthen, the public health protections that were carefully negotiated in 2016.

Prevention is the primary tenet of public health. Health-based regulations have been proven to be enormously effective at improving health, reducing health care costs, and increasing life expectancy. EPA estimates that the [2024 TSCA rule](#) that reduced the risks from methylene chloride has a monetized benefit of \$25 million annualized over 20 years (3% discount rate) from avoided fatalities and cancer – putting aside unquantified benefits related to nervous system effects, kidney toxicity, and other health impacts. Weakening TSCA would likely repeat past mistakes by allowing new, potentially harmful chemicals to enter the market – much like the unchecked introduction of PFAS, which has burdened communities with [expensive](#) local clean up and [billions](#) in health costs, including medical care and reduced lifetime earnings.

EPA’s core mission is “to protect human health and the environment” – not to endanger public health by allowing new, untested chemicals into the market. We urge you to protect the public and environment by upholding strong public health protections in TSCA and

rejecting any efforts to weaken this important public health law. We welcome the opportunity to meet with you to further discuss this important public health issue.

Sincerely,

Able Differently

Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments

American Academy of Pediatrics

American College of Nurse-Midwives

American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists

American Lung Association

American Public Health Association

American Society for Reproductive Medicine

Association of Community Health Nursing Educators

Association of periOperative Registered Nurses

Association of Public Health Nurses

Breast Cancer Prevention Partners

California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice

California Safe Schools

Carolina Advocates for Climate, Health and Equity

Children's Environmental Health Network

Clinicians for Climate Action of New Jersey

DNPs of Color

Endocrine Society

Health Care Without Harm

Healthy Climate Wisconsin

Learning Disabilities Association of America

Learning Disabilities Association of Alabama

Learning Disabilities Association of Arkansas

Learning Disabilities Association of California  
Learning Disabilities Association of Florida  
Learning Disabilities Association of Georgia  
Learning Disabilities Association of Illinois  
Learning Disabilities Association of Iowa  
Learning Disabilities Association of Maine  
Learning Disabilities Association of Maryland  
Learning Disabilities Association of Michigan  
Learning Disabilities Association of Minnesota  
Learning Disabilities Association of New Hampshire  
Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey  
Learning Disabilities Association of New York  
Learning Disabilities Association of Ohio  
Learning Disabilities Association of Oklahoma  
Learning Disabilities Association of Pennsylvania  
Learning Disabilities Association of South Carolina  
Learning Disabilities Association of Texas  
Learning Disabilities Association of Utah  
Learning Disabilities Association of Virginia  
Learning Disabilities Association of Wisconsin  
Medical Students for a Sustainable Future  
Michigan Nurses Association  
Mid Atlantic Alliance on Climate and Health  
National Association of Hispanic Nurses  
National Association of Neonatal Nurses  
National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health  
National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners

National Association of School Nurses  
National Black Nurses Association, Inc  
National Environmental Health Association  
National League for Nursing  
National Medical Association  
National Student Nurses' Association  
Network of Black Male Nurse Leaders  
New Jersey State Nurses Association  
Oncology Advocates United for Climate and Health - International  
Philippine Nurses Association of America  
Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Rural Nurse Organization  
Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine  
Society of Latinx Nurses  
The National Coalition of Ethnic Minority Nurse Associations



CREATING GOOD JOBS, A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT, AND A FAIR AND THRIVING ECONOMY

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

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

January 22, 2026

Dear Chair Guthrie and Ranking Member Pallone:

BGA unifies labor unions and environmental organizations into a powerful force to fight climate change, protect the health of people and the environment, stand against economic and racial inequality, and create and maintain good-paying, union jobs in communities across the country. We write today in opposition to the draft legislation being considered in today's hearing that would modify the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).

A bipartisan Congress passed the 1976 Toxics Substances Control Act (TSCA) and strengthened its provisions in 2016 to review that "large body of science" and address the human health impacts of phthalates and other hazardous chemicals. The 2016 Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act (LCSA) allowed the EPA to initiate a long overdue effort to review the scientific evidence and restrict the chemicals that were doing the most harm to the health of the American people.

LCSA included workers in its definition of a "potentially exposed or susceptible subpopulation" that should be protected by new restrictions. The proposed legislation would forbid EPA from providing that protection by amending Section 9(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2608(c):

(7) PROHIBITION.—The Administrator may not apply a requirement with respect to a chemical substance under section 6(a) that is inconsistent with another requirement applied with respect to the chemical substance under any Federal law not administered by the Administrator."

[On its website OSHA warns](#) that almost all of the agency's restrictions on chemicals are more than 50 years old and are "outdated and inadequate." How can requiring the use of 50-year-old limits be considered "modernization?"

We urge you to withdraw this proposed legislation that will weaken EPA's authority to restrict dangerous chemicals, fast-track new substances without full safety reviews, roll back protections established in the bipartisan 2016 reforms, and effectively prioritize chemical industry interests over the health of workers and communities.



## LEGISLATIVE ALERT

January 21, 2026

Dear Chairman Palmer, Ranking Member Tonko, and members of the Subcommittee,

On behalf of the AFL-CIO, a federation of 64 affiliate unions representing 15 million working people across our economy, in light of the upcoming January 22, 2026 subcommittee hearing on chemical safety, I urge you to wholly reject the draft discussion bill that would weaken the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). Simply put, this proposal would put American workers, their children, spouses and neighbors in danger.

This proposal is not only dangerous, it is unnecessary. It allows the chemical industry to erode the bipartisan agreement to modernize TSCA made only nine years ago. The 2016 amendments aimed to strengthen chemical protections for American workers and their families, pregnant women, children, elderly and other vulnerable groups named in the law. Thanks to TSCA, the U.S. has finally been able to start phasing out asbestos and other dangerous chemicals on the market that have safer substitutes.

The new draft legislation puts profit over people. It would shield the chemical industry from obligations to submit adequate safety data to the government; to undergo adequate review of toxicity data for chemicals—both existing and new chemicals to the market—; and to install engineering technologies that reduce chemicals in the air and on surfaces to levels protective of worker health. Preventing workplace health and safety hazards requires adequate planning; yet, this proposal removes responsibility from chemical companies to address “reasonably foreseen” exposures and risks, and allows them to prematurely find no “unreasonable risk” before EPA has performed any evaluation whatsoever.

Importantly for workers, this proposal would allow EPA to rely on faulty assumptions about existing chemical protections from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and erase the gap-filling measures TSCA was specifically amended in 2016 to address. OSHA has acknowledged its limits are unprotective, has not issued a chemical regulation since 2017, and prohibits the total reliance on PPE. Additionally, the chemical industry has not historically looked to invigorate OSHA’s standard setting process or increase its resources.

The health and safety of entire working families is at stake. Occupational chemical exposures cause medically incurable and costly disease. Workplace exposures affect family members. For example, children are especially susceptible to take-home exposures from toxic

dusts and other chemicals, and many workers and their families live near the same facilities that can pollute their lungs both inside and outside the workplace.

This draft legislation would make work less safe. We urge Congress to wholly reject this attempt to ease the safety obligations of giant corporations at the expense of working families and their long-term health.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jody Calemine". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jody Calemine  
Director, Government Affairs



January 21, 2026

The Honorable Gary Palmer  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Environment  
Committee on Energy and Commerce  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

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

Dear Chairman Palmer and Ranking Member Tonko:

The California Association of Sanitation Agencies (CASA) writes to underscore the critical role the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) plays as a proactive source control tool to protect public health and the environment from harmful chemical exposures. CASA respectfully requests that this letter be included in the January 22, 2026, Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment hearing record entitled, *Chemicals in Commerce: Legislative Proposal to Modernize America's Chemical Safety Law, Strengthen Critical Supply Chains, and Grow Domestic Manufacturing*. TSCA provides essential upstream safeguards to ensure that toxic substances do not pollute our water resources or ecosystems. As the subcommittee considers proposals to modernize TSCA, it is vital that TSCA remains a strong and effective source control mechanism, implemented both efficiently and with scientific rigor.

CASA represents more than 150 local public agencies engaged in the collection, treatment and recycling of wastewater and biosolids to protect public health and the environment. Our mission is to provide trusted information and advocacy on behalf of California clean water agencies, and to be a leader in sustainability and utilization of renewable resources.

TSCA provides the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency with essential tools to evaluate and manage risks from chemicals already in commerce and to require safety protocols for new substances before they enter the market. In the context of PFAS contamination, TSCA embodies the principle of preventing pollution at its source rather than responding only after contamination occurs. Without TSCA's protections, wastewater agencies, which are passive receivers of these chemicals, could be held responsible for the financial burdens and treatment of these chemicals. These are costs that are ultimately passed down to their ratepayers, and strain utilities' ability to address other pressing issues such as aging infrastructure.

Any weakening of TSCA's authorities, implementation capacity, or funding would compromise the nation's ability to safeguard communities. Strong risk evaluation standards, transparent chemical data reporting, and enforceable chemical usage restrictions are essential not only to protect public health but also to spur innovation among manufacturers to develop safer, sustainable alternatives.

CASA urges Congress to continue supporting TSCA with a robust statutory framework. Preserving the law's scientific integrity and ensuring adequate resources for its implementation will uphold the nation's commitment to evidence-based chemical safety regulation and pollution prevention at the source.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments for the record and your leadership in protecting public health and the environment. If CASA can be a resource to you, please do not hesitate to contact me at [alink@casaweb.org](mailto:alink@casaweb.org) or (916) 446-0388.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Adam D. Link".

Adam D. Link  
Executive Director



January 21, 2026

The Honorable Brett Guthrie  
Chair  
House Committee on Energy & Commerce  
2125 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Frank Pallone  
Ranking Member  
House Committee on Energy & Commerce  
2125 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

**Dear Chairman Guthrie and Ranking Member Pallone:**

On behalf of Moms Clean Air Force, a community of over 1.6 million moms, dads, and caregivers fighting to protect children’s health, I am writing to express serious concerns with the recently released draft bill to revise the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).

Chemical safety is deeply personal for parents. Our children are exposed to chemicals every day through toys, cleaning supplies, and household products—not to mention dust, air, and water. Because their brains and bodies are still developing, our infants and children are uniquely vulnerable to harm from toxic exposures. As parents, we want our children to be safe, but we lack the time and resources to turn every purchase into a chemistry project, and in any case there is no transparency: plastic toys and other products do not come with ingredient lists. We can’t control what’s used in schools or childcare settings, and we can’t opt out of exposure in our communities. We rely on the government to ensure that the chemicals we—and our children—encounter in our homes, schools, and neighborhoods are safe.

The Toxic Substances Control Act was meant to fill that void. Updated by Congress in 2016, the bipartisan Lautenberg Amendments require EPA to evaluate chemicals for unreasonable risks of injury to human health or the environment, make an affirmative determination of safety before new chemicals are put on the market, and consider impacts to potentially exposed or susceptible populations like workers, children, and pregnant mothers. While implementation hasn’t been perfect, these changes signaled an important shift towards protecting public health.

Unfortunately, the new discussion draft represents a dangerous step backwards. For example, this bill:

- narrows the scope of what EPA can include when evaluating chemical safety,
- makes it extraordinarily difficult to declare chemicals unsafe despite the scientific evidence,
- allows EPA to make health and safety decisions based on polluters' costs and profits,
- fails to consider the actual risks we face, by all-but-eliminating any consideration of aggregate exposures,
- gives the chemical industry a prominent seat at the decision-making table, and
- imposes draconian procedures for EPA staff who don't approve new chemicals within 90 days—even when the delays are due to industry foot-dragging and when the health and safety repercussions are significant, involving toxic and persistent chemicals that poison the planet for decades or centuries.

EPA would allow chemicals approved for use in industrial settings—with proper safety precautions in place—to be used across the board, including in our homes and schools. The bill prioritizes industry profits over sound science and public health.

We urge the committee to protect American children and families from toxic chemicals and to leave the Lautenberg Act intact.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. A. Browning". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "D" and a long horizontal stroke.

**Dominique Browning**

Co-Founder and Director, Moms Clean Air Force

On behalf of 1.6 million members