

Problems in Current TSCA, and How the Lautenberg Act (S. 697) and the TSCA Modernization Act (H.R. 2576) Address Them

Problem in TSCA	Senate Bill S. 697	House Bill H.R. 2576
Paralyzing Regulatory Hurdle, Failure to Protect Most Vulnerable	Health-Only Safety Standard that Protects Vulnerable Populations	Health-only Safety Standard that Protects Vulnerable Populations
Requires onerous cost-benefit analysis that has left dangerous chemicals unregulated. No requirement to consider elevated risks to children, pregnant women, the elderly.	Prohibits EPA from considering costs in safety determinations. Expressly requires the protection of those most susceptible to harm from chemicals.	Prohibits EPA from considering costs in risk evaluations. Precludes finding a chemical does not present unreasonable risk if any potentially exposed populations face such risk.
Chemicals are Presumed Innocent	Mandate to Review All Chemicals	Limited Mandate to Review Chemicals
No requirement to review the safety of existing chemicals.	Requires prioritization of all chemicals, safety determinations on all those not deemed low-priority.	Limited process, evidentiary burden, to identify chemicals for reviews.
	Limited pathway for industry-requested reviews.	Unlimited pathway for industry-requested reviews.
New Chemicals Lack Adequate Safety Check	Safety Finding for New Chemicals Before Use	No Change Is Made to Status Quo
New chemicals are allowed onto market without affirmative EPA safety decision.	New chemicals can enter the market only after an affirmative safety finding standard by EPA.	Makes no changes to TSCA Section 5.
Weak Testing Powers	New Testing Authority	Some New Testing Authority
Test rules take years. EPA must first show potential risk/high exposure, a Catch-22.	EPA can order testing, with justification. Catch-22 is eliminated.	EPA can order testing. Catch-22 NOT eliminated except for tests needed to do risk evaluations.

Insufficient Funding	Broad Dedicated Fees	Limited Fees
Fees only for new chems, \$2,500/co cap. Don't go to EPA.	Fees cover all parts of program. Go directly to EPA.	Fees only for industry- requested chemicals. Go directly to EPA.
Excessive CBI Claims	Greater Transparency	Partial Transparency
Companies can claim virtually any info CBI. Rare EPA reviews.	Upfront justification for most claims. EPA review of most claims, past and future. State must be given access, no	Upfront justification for all new claims. No EPA review of past or future claims mandated. State may be given access, prior
Can't share with public, states, health providers.	prior notification.	notification required.
	Health providers are given access, prior notification except in emergencies.	Health providers are given access, no prior notification required.
CBI Kept Indefinitely	Time Limits, Reviews for Past	Time Limits Only for New
Claims have no time limits, and remain in place unless the EPA challenges them.	and New Claims Claims expire after 10 years if not re-justified.	Claims, No EPA Reviews Past claims don't expire, no EPA review.
	EPA to review most past and new claims.	New claims subject to 10 years, but no EPA review.
Limited preemption	More preemption	More preemption
EPA requirements on new or existing chemicals generally preempt states' existing or new requirements.	Preemption after EPA final action limited to state restrictions (e.g., not disclosure).	Preemption after EPA final actions extends to any requirement "designed to protect against exposure."
EPA may grant waivers.	Preemption applies only to existing chemicals.	Preemption applies to new and existing chemicals.
	No <u>new</u> state restrictions on a chemical under EPA review except via a waiver.	No early preemption of new requirements.
	Higher bar for final waiver; state can challenge denial.	Lower bar for final waiver; but state can't challenge denial.