



**Comparing the Toxic Substances Control Act,
the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act (S. 697),
and the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015 (H.R. 2576)**

December 21, 2015

This table compares the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) of 1976 to [S. 697](#) as passed by the full Senate on December 17, 2015, and [H.R. 2576](#) as passed by the House of Representatives on June 23, 2015. Our analysis focuses on 12 major issues that fall within the scope of the legislation.

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
1. Safety standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Unreasonable risk” requires cost-benefit analysis and balancing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicitly precludes EPA from considering costs and other non-risk factors in making safety determinations. • Clarification is made throughout TSCA where “unreasonable risk” is used that it excludes consideration of costs, either by striking “unreasonable” or adding “without taking into account cost or other non-risk factors.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibits EPA from considering costs in risk evaluations (though it does not clearly state that the unreasonable risk determination is to exclude costs or other non-risk factors). • Does not address other instances of the term “unreasonable risk” in TSCA.
2. Protection of vulnerable populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No special consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defines “potentially exposed or susceptible population” to include vulnerability due either to elevated chemical exposures or to heightened susceptibility to their effects. • Specifies such populations include (but are not limited to) infants, children, pregnant women, workers, the elderly. • Expressly requires that restrictions imposed be sufficient to ensure protection of such populations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defines “potentially exposed population” to include vulnerability due either to elevated chemical exposures or to heightened susceptibility to their effects. • Definition does not specify which populations can be included. • EPA cannot conclude a chemical will not present an unreasonable risk if one or more potentially exposed populations are subject to such a risk.
3. Adequacy of restrictions for chemicals that do not meet safety	<p><u>RESTRICTIONS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authority but no mandate to restrict chemicals found to 	<p><u>RESTRICTIONS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions must be imposed that either phase out or ban the chemical, or are sufficient to ensure the chemical meets the 	<p><u>RESTRICTIONS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions must be imposed “to the extent necessary so that the chemical substance no longer presents or will present an

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
standard; articles; compliance deadlines	<p>present an unreasonable risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No provision to ensure the sufficiency of restrictions. 	<p>safety standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For PBTs that do not meet the safety standard, EPA is to impose restrictions that reduce exposure to the maximum extent practicable. <p><u>ARTICLES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA is to restrict articles “only to the extent necessary to address the identified risks from exposure to the chemical substance from the article or category of articles, in order to determine that the chemical substance meets the safety standard.” • EPA “shall exempt replacement parts <u>manufactured</u> prior to the effective date of the rule for articles that are first manufactured prior to the effective date of the rule” unless EPA finds they “contribute significantly to the identified risk.” <p><u>COMPLIANCE DEADLINES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance deadlines can be no longer than 4 years, subject to an 18-month extension where EPA finds compliance within 4 years is technologically or economically infeasible. • Compliance deadlines for bans or phase-outs are to be “as short as practicable.” 	<p>unreasonable risk, including an identified unreasonable risk to a potentially exposed subpopulation.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA is to identify PBTs – <i>excluding any metal or metal compound</i> – to which there is likely exposure and, without first having to conduct a risk evaluation, promulgate rules “to reduce likely exposure to the extent practicable” – but “subject to the availability of appropriations.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ But if EPA initiates a risk evaluation or a company requests one, this expedited action does not apply. <p><u>ARTICLES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA is to restrict articles “only to the extent necessary to protect against the identified risk.” • EPA “shall exempt replacement parts <u>designed</u> prior to the date of promulgation of the rule” unless EPA finds they contribute significantly to the risk, “including identified risk to identified potentially exposed subpopulations.” <p><u>COMPLIANCE DEADLINES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any restriction imposed “shall provide for a reasonable transition period.” No maximum compliance deadline is provided.

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
<p>4. Regulation and consideration of costs and other nonrisk factors; other Federal laws</p>	<p><u>LEAST BURDENSOME:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictions must be “least burdensome” among those able to address identified risks. <p><u>COSTS, ALTERNATIVES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA must conduct a formal analysis and show benefits of any proposed restriction outweigh costs. EPA must consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> benefits of the substance; availability of substitutes for each use; and reasonably ascertainable economic consequences of the rule, including on the national economy, small business and innovation. <p><u>OTHER LAWS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires EPA to refer risks where another federal agency could address the concern, but does not require 	<p><u>LEAST BURDENSOME:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strikes “least burdensome” requirement. <p><u>COSTS, ALTERNATIVES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes clear that cost considerations cannot override requirement for restrictions to ensure chemical safety. Balancing of costs and benefits is not required, is to be considered only “to the extent practicable based on reasonably available information.” Bans and phase-outs must be based on consideration of costs and benefits of relevant alternatives to the chemical. Only alternatives deemed relevant and technically and economically feasible by EPA need to be considered. <p><u>OTHER LAWS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires EPA to address risks it refers to another federal agency if that agency fails to act. 	<p><u>LEAST BURDENSOME:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strikes “least burdensome” requirement. <p><u>COSTS, ALTERNATIVES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains TSCA requirements that, in issuing a rule, EPA must consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> benefits of the substance; and reasonably ascertainable economic consequences of the rule, including on the national economy, small business and innovation. EPA must show any requirements are “cost-effective, except where the Administrator determines that “additional or different requirements ... are necessary.” For a ban or effective ban, and in setting compliance dates, EPA must determine whether viable and safer alternatives are available. <p><u>OTHER LAWS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires EPA to refer risks where another federal agency could address the concern, but does not require EPA to act if that agency fails to act. Before acting under TSCA to address a risk,

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
	EPA to act if that agency fails to act.		EPA must compare the relative risks, costs and efficiencies of acting under TSCA vs. acting under another law administered by EPA. This new requirement is in addition to TSCA's existing requirement that EPA show that acting under TSCA is "in the public interest" (determined wholly at the Administrator's discretion).
5. Deadlines; mandates and pace of chemical reviews	<p><u>DEADLINES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No deadline for completing initiated assessments or imposing restrictions. <p><u>REVIEW MANDATES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mandate to review the safety of existing 	<p><u>DEADLINES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets a 3-year deadline for all safety assessments and determinations. • Allows up to a 1-year extension of the deadline for EPA to complete safety determinations, where required information has not yet been received or was submitted late in time period allotted for the safety determination. • Sets a 2-year deadline for any needed regulations. • Allows deadlines for safety determinations and any required regulations to be extended in the aggregate by up to 2 years, with cause. • Deadlines for chemicals on EPA's work plan cannot be extended unless EPA demonstrates that additional information is needed to complete the safety determination or regulation. • EPA must also specify a deadline for submission of any information it requests. <p><u>REVIEW MANDATES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA must include at least 10 chemicals on the initial high-priority list, as well as at least 	<p><u>DEADLINES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets a 3-year deadline for EPA-initiated risk evaluations and a 2-year deadline for industry-requested ones. • Allows up to a 2-year extension if additional information is needed. • Sets a 2-year deadline for any needed regulations. <p><u>REVIEW MANDATES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifies EPA is to initiate at least 10 risk evaluations each year for chemicals it

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
	chemicals.	<p>10 on the low-priority list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ By 3 years after enactment, at least 20 high-priority and 20-low-priority chemicals must have been listed. ○ By 5 years after enactment, at least 25 high-priority and 25-low-priority chemicals must have been listed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Storage near significant sources of drinking water is a prioritization criterion. ● At least 50% of chemicals are to be work plan chemicals until all of them have been listed, with preference given to chemicals that are persistent and bioaccumulative and those that are carcinogens and have high acute and chronic toxicity. <p><u>COMPANY-REQUESTED REVIEWS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Companies can request EPA to assess a chemical; at EPA’s discretion, using criteria it must develop by rule, EPA can grant such requests. If sufficient requests meeting the criteria are made, EPA must grant requests totaling not less than 25% and not more 	<p>selects – “subject to the availability of appropriations.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● EPA is to conduct risk evaluations for any chemicals it determines “may present unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment because of potential hazard and a potential route of exposure under the intended conditions of use,” but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ there is no prioritization or other process for identifying such chemicals, and ○ EPA needs to make a potential risk finding in order to initiate a risk evaluation, a potential <i>Catch-22</i>. ● For chemicals with insufficient information to determine whether they may present an unreasonable risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ there is no mechanism provided to spur their review; and ○ as noted below, EPA could not require testing without first showing potential risk or substantial production and release or exposure. ● EPA may initiate a risk evaluation on any chemical listed on its work plan without having to make a risk finding. <p><u>COMPANY-REQUESTED REVIEWS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● EPA <u>must</u> conduct a risk evaluation of any chemical that any manufacturer requests it conduct. EPA can modulate the number of industry-requested risk evaluations it conducts if it is unable to meet the deadlines for <i>those</i> risk evaluations – but

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
		<p>than 30% of the number of high-priority assessments, but cannot give them preference over high-priority chemicals, and initiation of such assessments does not trigger preemption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Companies can request EPA to assess a work plan chemical it has not yet designated high-priority (and if EPA starts such an assessment, it triggers preemption of new state restrictions). • Companies must pay 100% of the costs of safety assessments they request (50% for chemicals already on EPA’s work plan). 	<p>not because it is unable to meet the deadlines for EPA-initiated risk evaluations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Companies must pay 100% of the costs of risk evaluations they request.
6. Procedural and scientific requirements; transition	<p><u>REQUIREMENTS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Virtually no procedures or criteria specified to assess information quality, identify chemicals warranting further scrutiny, or determine risk. 	<p><u>REQUIREMENTS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires EPA to establish policies, procedures and guidance addressing: use of science; information sources; testing; prioritization screening; and safety assessments and safety determinations. • Requires EPA to base decisions on best available science and on the weight of the scientific evidence, and consider recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences. • Sets a two-year deadline for EPA to establish all policies, procedures and guidance. • Safety assessments and determinations must identify relevant vulnerable populations and the basis for considering either aggregate exposure or significant subsets of exposures. 	<p><u>REQUIREMENTS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires EPA, in making science-based decisions, to consider: whether procedures and methods to generate information are reasonable and consistent with purpose, the relevance of the information for its intended use, the extent of documentation of data, assumptions and methods and their associated variability and uncertainty; and the extent of independent verification or peer review. • Sets a two-year deadline for EPA to establish all policies, procedures and guidance. • Risk evaluations are to integrate hazard and exposure information for all intended conditions of use of a chemical; consider information on vulnerable populations; be based on and describe the weight of the scientific evidence; and consider whether

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
		<p><u>TRANSITION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eases transition to new system by, for example, allowing EPA to continue or initiate assessments on Work Plan chemicals, and adapt current procedures, as new procedures are put in place. 	<p>threshold doses exist below which no adverse effects are expected.</p> <p><u>TRANSITION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA may subject chemicals identified in its Work Plan to risk evaluations. No other specific provisions are included to indicate how EPA is to transition from its current processes and activities to the new ones called for under the bill.
7. Testing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA must go through notice-and-comment rulemaking (typically a multiyear process) to require testing. EPA must also show evidence of potential risk or high exposure, a <i>Catch-22</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides authority for EPA to use orders to require testing (with justification). EPA must first request submission of the needed information before requiring testing; and it cannot require testing as a means to establish minimum information sets for chemicals generally. Eliminates TSCA's requirement to first show risk or high exposure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides order authority to require testing; no specific justification for using an order is required. Retains TSCA's requirement for EPA to first show potential risk or high production and release or exposure before requiring testing, <i>unless</i> the testing is "necessary to conduct a risk evaluation." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Making the risk finding necessary to <i>initiate</i> a risk evaluation may be difficult or impossible absent the information testing would yield.
8. Low-priority designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA has no mandate to prioritize chemicals, the result being that a chemical unexamined by EPA is effectively a low priority, with a lack of data presumed to indicate lack of risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States explicitly that a chemical cannot be designated as low-priority unless EPA concludes that there is "information sufficient to establish it is likely to meet the safety standard." Requires EPA to identify the basis for a low-priority designation, including the information on which it is based. Criteria and process for designating low- (and high-) priority chemicals must be developed by notice-and-comment rulemaking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable: no prioritization process is included. As under current TSCA, chemicals for which EPA does not or cannot make the risk finding needed to initiate a risk evaluation are effectively set aside and not subject to any review.

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of data can be a sufficient basis in itself (not just a factor) for designating a chemical as high-priority. • EPA has authority to require testing to inform prioritization decisions where data are lacking. • Anyone can judicially challenge an EPA designation of a chemical as low-priority. • States can impose restrictions on low-priority chemicals (see item 12a below). 	
9. New chemicals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A company is generally free to start making and selling a new chemical at the end of a 90-day review period, unless EPA finds the chemical “may present an unreasonable risk”. • No affirmative safety decision is required, and the burden is on EPA to find a concern even when safety data are wholly lacking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifies that manufacture of a new chemical can only start if EPA affirmatively finds it is likely to meet the safety standard. • Where EPA determines the chemical is <i>not</i> likely to meet the safety standard, it must preclude manufacture or impose restrictions sufficient for EPA then to make the likely-safe finding. • For PBTs that are found not likely to meet the safety standard, EPA is to impose restrictions that reduce exposure to the maximum extent practicable. • If EPA has insufficient information to make a determination, it can suspend the review pending receipt of the information, or impose restrictions sufficient for it to make the likely-safe determination even in the absence of the information. • To require notification of articles as a significant new use, EPA needs to make an affirmative regulatory finding of “reasonable potential for exposure.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes no changes to TSCA’s new chemicals provisions.

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
10. Confidential business information (CBI)			
10a. CBI claims – Chemical identity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The identities of about 17,000 chemicals (out of the 85,000) on the TSCA Inventory are hidden from public view, having been claimed by their makers to be CBI. EPA can challenge such CBI claims on a case-by-case basis, but it has no mandate to review them and rarely mounts challenges because of the resources required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any presumption of protection from disclosure of chemical identities to the period before they enter the market; and any such claim for a chemical after market entry has to be substantiated and reviewed by EPA. EPA is also required to review and require substantiation of past chemical identity claims for all active chemicals now on the confidential portion of the TSCA Inventory within five years of enactment (extendable by up to 2 years if EPA can show cause), and for any inactive chemical at the time it is moved to active status. Chemical identities not already on the confidential portion of the inventory or added to it per prescribed procedures cannot be claimed confidential. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBI claims made before enactment are not subject to any review, do not expire and are not subject to justification requirements, so confidential chemicals on the TSCA Inventory will remain so. No requirement for EPA to review any past chemical identity CBI claims (17,000 of the 85,000 chemicals on the TSCA Inventory), but retains EPA authority to challenge claims on a case-by-case basis.
10b. CBI claims – Health and safety information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Companies are free to claim virtually any information they submit to EPA is CBI. Health and safety studies and their underlying data are generally not eligible for CBI protection under TSCA, but, until recently EPA routinely allowed those studies, or the identities of the studied chemicals, to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains current TSCA's exclusion of health and safety studies and their underlying data from being claimed CBI. Does <i>not</i> affect current EPA policy that disallows masking of the identities of chemicals in health and safety studies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains TSCA's two exceptions to the general allowance for disclosing health and safety information: data that would disclose processes used in manufacturing or processing of a chemical mixture, and in the case of a mixture, data that would disclose the portion of the mixture comprised by a chemical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains current TSCA's exclusion of health and safety studies and their underlying data from being claimed CBI. Current TSCA's allowance for EPA to identify chemicals that are the subject of health and safety information it is making public is effectively eliminated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains TSCA's two exceptions to the general allowance for disclosing health and safety information: data that would disclose processes used in manufacturing or processing of a chemical mixture, and in the case of a mixture, data that would disclose the portion of the mixture

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
	be hidden from public view.		comprised by a chemical. o But it adds a third exception: “data that disclose formulas (including molecular structures) of a chemical substance or mixture.” This inclusion goes beyond data relating to a chemical formulation and would expressly preclude EPA from identifying a chemical that is the subject of health and safety data it is making public, if claimed CBI.
10c. CBI claims – Substantiation and EPA review requirements, time limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No statutory requirement for CBI claims to be substantiated, though EPA has done so in certain cases. • CBI claims are not subject to time limits and remain in place until and unless challenged by EPA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most CBI claims are required to be substantiated at the time they are asserted, promptly reviewed by EPA, and either approved or denied. • Approved claims expire after 10 years unless resubstantiated and reapproved. • Even between 10-year intervals, EPA can review and require resubstantiation of certain CBI claims, including for high-priority chemicals or those lacking sufficient information. • EPA is mandated to review and require resubstantiation of certain CBI claims, including where EPA has reason to believe the claim is not valid; or for chemicals found not to meet the safety standard. • Most CBI claims for a chemical that EPA bans or phases out automatically expire, and CBI disclosure in such cases is presumed to be in the public interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBI claims are to be substantiated at the time they are asserted (though no requirements are specified). • No mandate for EPA review of CBI claims. • CBI claims made after enactment expire after 10 years unless the claim is reasserted. • Retains EPA authority to challenge claims on a case-by-case basis.
10d. CBI claims – Access to information,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TSCA provides few requirements for EPA to make public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit requirements are included throughout the bill for EPA to make public information it receives, and decisions it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific requirements for EPA to make information public are added by the bill to current TSCA.

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
including CBI	<p>information it receives or decisions it makes and the basis for them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA cannot disclose information claimed CBI to the public, to state and local agencies, health or environmental professionals, or even to first responders. 	<p>makes and the basis for them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA <u>shall</u> disclose CBI upon request to a state or local government. EPA shall disclose CBI upon request to health or environmental professionals employed by federal or state agencies or treating physicians or other health care professionals in response to an environmental release or to assist in diagnosis or treatment. EPA shall also disclose CBI upon request to poison control centers or first responders in emergency situations. Disclosures require statement of need and a confidentiality agreement with EPA to keep the information confidential. No advance notification is required prior to CBI disclosure to state or local governments. Advance notification is required prior to disclosure to health or environmental professionals or health care professionals, except in emergency situations. EPA is to institute a system to expedite and facilitate access to confidential information allowed to be disclosed to health and environmental professionals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA <u>may</u> disclose CBI upon request to a state, local or tribal government. EPA shall disclose CBI upon request to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> health or environmental professionals employed by federal or state agencies in response to an environmental release; or treating physicians or other health care professionals to assist in diagnosis or treatment. No recipient of CBI may use the information for any other purpose or disclose the information to any non-authorized person. Advance notification is required prior to CBI disclosure to state or local governments. No advance notification is required prior to disclosure to health or environmental professionals or health care professionals.
11. User fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA can only charge fees to cover testing requirements or new chemicals. No fees can be charged to defray the typically much higher costs of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA <u>shall</u> collect fees for both new and existing chemicals, as well as those designated as high-priority. Fees can be used to defray the costs of: new chemical reviews; prioritization screening; safety assessments, safety determinations and any needed regulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA <u>may</u> collect fees for new chemicals and for industry-requested risk evaluations – but <u>not</u> for EPA-initiated risk evaluations. Fees can only be used to administer the provisions for which they are collected. Fees go into a “TSCA Service Fee Fund” directly to EPA, not the general treasury.

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
	<p>EPA reviews of existing chemicals or the collection, management or evaluation of information on existing chemicals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fees are capped at \$2,500 per company (\$100 per small company). • Any fees collected go to the general treasury and are not available to directly cover EPA’s costs. 	<p>of new and existing chemicals; and the collection, review, and provision of public access to information, as well as protection of information found to warrant it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fees go into a “TSCA Implementation Fund” and directly to EPA, not the general treasury. • Fees are contingent on Congress providing sufficient funds through normal appropriations, to seek to ensure collection of fees does not lead to a reduction in EPA’s budget. • The level of fees is to be set to cover approximately 25% of relevant EPA program costs, initially capped at \$25 million/year but subject to adjustment over time to ensure 25% of costs are defrayed. • Companies must pay 100% of the costs of safety assessments they request (50% for chemicals already on EPA’s work plan). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specification as to the level of fees is provided. • Companies must pay 100% of the costs of risk evaluations they request.
12. State preemption			
12a. State preemption – general	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preemption has rarely if ever been applied because, in practice, EPA has imposed so few restrictions on chemicals under the current law. • EPA actions to protect against risks of new or existing chemicals generally preempt states’ existing or new 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bill’s preemption applies to state <u>restrictions</u> on a chemical, not to requirements for reporting, monitoring or disclosure. • Preemption is explicitly limited to restrictions relating to the hazards, exposures and risks and uses or conditions of use that are included in the scope of EPA’s safety assessment and determination, which EPA must set within 6 months of designating a chemical as high-priority. • States can still act on a chemical to address 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bill’s preemption applies to any state <u>requirement</u> “designed to protect against exposure” to a chemical, not just to restrictions, which could preempt state requirements for reporting or disclosure. • Preemption is explicitly limited to requirements relating to the intended conditions of use considered by the Administrator in the risk evaluation. • States cannot act on a chemical to address a different health or environmental concern than EPA considered.

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
	<p>actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptions are provided for a state requirement that is identical to the federal requirement (providing for co-enforcement), is adopted under authority of a Federal law, or prohibits all use of the chemical in the state. 	<p>a different health or environmental concern than EPA considers under TSCA (e.g., VOC restrictions to address ozone formation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States can continue to impose restrictions that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ identical to a Federal requirement; ○ adopted under the authority of a federal law; or ○ adopted under a state air or water quality or waste treatment or disposal law, unless they conflict with federal requirements. • A state cannot prohibit all use of the chemical in the state, except via co-enforcement or getting a waiver. • Preemption is not triggered by a low-priority designation, so states can continue to act on such a chemical; however: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ States are to notify EPA of actions they take on such a chemical and if requested by EPA provide the basis for the action; and EPA is to prioritize the chemical if it has national impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States can continue to impose requirements that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ identical to a Federal requirement; ○ adopted under the authority of a federal law; or ○ adopted under a state air or water quality or waste treatment or disposal law, unless they conflict with federal requirements. • A state cannot prohibit all use of the chemical in the state, except via co-enforcement or getting a waiver.
12b. State preemption – grandfathering; savings clauses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable 	<p><u>GRANDFATHERING:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any state action taken on a chemical prior to August 1, 2015, or taken under a law in effect on August 31, 2003, remains in place regardless of EPA action. • California’s Proposition 65 and Massachusetts’ Toxics Use Reduction Act are excluded from the scope of preemption. 	<p><u>GRANDFATHERING:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any state action taken or requirement that has taken effect on a chemical prior to August 1, 2015, or under a state law in effect on August 31, 2003, remains in place regardless of EPA action. • The wording of the bill’s grandfathering provision, including the addition of the phrase “requirement that has taken effect”

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
		<p><u>SAVINGS CLAUSE:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A savings clause preserves rights of action under common law or statutory causes of action for civil relief or penalties for criminal conduct. • Actions taken under the bill are precluded from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ being interpreted as influencing, in either a plaintiff's or defendant's favor, the disposition of any civil action; or ○ affecting the authority of any court to make a determination with respect to the admissibility of evidence in an adjudicatory proceeding. 	<p>(which is not in the Senate bill), creates ambiguity as to whether future actions taken under California's Proposition 65 and Massachusetts' Toxics Use Reduction Act are excluded from the scope of preemption.</p> <p><u>SAVINGS CLAUSE:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited savings clause preserves rights of action only under tort or contract law. • Actions taken under the bill are precluded from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ being interpreted as influencing, in either a plaintiff's or defendant's favor, the disposition of any civil action; or ○ affecting the authority of any court to make a determination with respect to the admissibility of evidence in an adjudicatory proceeding.
12c. State preemption – before final EPA action; waivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States are not barred from imposing a new requirement on a chemical EPA is reviewing until EPA takes final action on the chemical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States are generally barred from imposing a new restriction on a chemical once EPA designates it as high-priority and starts a review, ending when EPA publishes a final safety determination or the deadline for completion of the safety determination expires, whichever is earlier; states can impose new restrictions during any required rulemaking. • If a state initiates action after the deadline for completion of the safety determination but before EPA publishes the safety determination, the state must notify EPA and provide the scientific and legal basis for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States are not barred from imposing a new requirement on a chemical EPA is reviewing until EPA takes final action on the chemical.

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
	<p><u>WAIVERS:</u> Not applicable.</p>	<p>the action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA’s initiation of assessments on chemicals that industry requested it to conduct does not trigger preemption, except that initiation of industry-requested assessments of EPA work plan chemicals does trigger preemption of new state restrictions. <p><u>WAIVERS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA <u>shall</u> grant a waiver for a state to act before a final safety determination if it meets conditions similar to those under current TSCA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If EPA fails to meet its deadline for deciding on a state waiver application, the state waiver is automatically approved. ○ Such automatic approvals are not subject to judicial review but EPA’s failure to decide on a waiver is subject to a citizen’s civil action under section 20 of TSCA, because it is a failure of EPA to perform a mandatory duty. ○ Automatically approved waivers stay in effect until EPA completes or misses its deadline for completing its safety determination, whichever is earlier, unless: a) EPA subsequently denies the waiver, or b) EPA grants it, judicial review of that decision is sought, and EPA denies the waiver in response to a court’s ruling. • If EPA fails to decide on a state waiver application, any person may sue EPA to compel a decision. 	<p><u>WAIVERS:</u> Not applicable.</p>

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If EPA grants or denies a state waiver, the decision can be challenged in court. 	
12d. State preemption – after final EPA action; waivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA actions taken to protect against risks of new or existing chemicals generally preempt states’ existing or new actions. <p><u>WAIVERS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States can obtain waivers from Federal preemption for a requirement that is significantly more protective and does not unduly burden interstate commerce. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State restrictions on a chemical imposed after August 1, 2015, are preempted if EPA determines the chemical meets the safety standard; if EPA determines a chemical does not meet the standard, preemption applies when EPA issues a final rule restricting the chemical. <p><u>WAIVERS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA <u>may</u> grant a state a waiver to act after a final safety determination or risk management rule if certain conditions are met, two of which are in addition to those under current TSCA or the House bill: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ compelling conditions warrant granting the waiver to protect health or the environment; ○ in EPA’s judgment, the state’s proposed requirement is designed to address a risk of a chemical substance, under the conditions of use, that was identified— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ consistent with the best available science; ▪ using supporting studies conducted in accordance with sound and objective scientific practices; and ▪ based on the weight of the scientific evidence. • If EPA fails to decide on a state waiver application, any person may sue EPA to compel a decision. • If EPA grants or denies a state waiver, the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requirements on a chemical imposed after August 1, 2015 are preempted if EPA determines the chemical does not present an unreasonable risk; if EPA determines a chemical does present an unreasonable risk, preemption applies when EPA issues a final rule restricting the chemical. <p><u>WAIVERS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA <u>may</u> grant a state a waiver to act after a final safety determination or risk management rule, if certain conditions are met, which are the same as those under current TSCA. • If EPA fails to decide on a state waiver application, because it is done at EPA’s discretion, no recourse is available to compel a decision. • If EPA grants a state waiver, the decision can be challenged in court. • If EPA denies a state waiver, the decision cannot be challenged in court under TSCA, although a challenge may be possible under the Administrative Procedures Act if the decision is deemed a final agency action. • A waiver granted by EPA stays in effect unless a court directs EPA to deny the waiver in response to a judicial challenge.

	Current TSCA	Chemical Safety for 21st Century Act (S 697)	TSCA Modernization Act (HR 2576)
		<p>decision can be challenged in court.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waiver granted by EPA stays in effect unless a court directs EPA to deny the waiver in response to a judicial challenge. 	
12e. State preemption – new chemicals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If EPA imposes any requirement on a new chemical designed to protect against risk, no state could impose a requirement on the chemical designed to protect against the risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA reviews of new chemicals would have no preemptive effect (unlike under TSCA and the House bill). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If EPA imposes any requirement on a new chemical designed to protect against a risk, no state could impose a requirement on the chemical designed to protect against exposure from the use(s) identified by the company, even if designed to address a different risk than that addressed by EPA's requirement.