## **Summary Comparison of Existing Chemical Policy Laws**

|  | TSCA  | REACH   | the States   |
|--|---|---|--|
| The Statutes<br>(Government,<br>Year Passed)         | Toxic Substances<br>Control Act<br>(United States, 1976)                          | Registration, Evaluation,<br>Authorisation, and<br>Restriction of Chemicals<br>(European Union, 2006) | New state laws create a<br>chemical policy frame-<br>work (California, Maine,<br>and Washington, 2008)     |
| Addresses many EXISTING CHEMICALS                    | NO – 62,000<br>chemicals grand-<br>fathered in without<br>testing or restrictions | YES – more than<br>30,000 chemicals must<br>be registered, potentially<br>subject to further action   | <b>NO</b> – <i>but</i> focuses on<br>priority hazardous<br>chemicals in products<br>(ME, WA, CA authority) |
| PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE in play                      | NO  | YES   | YES (all 3 states)   |
| BURDEN of PROOF                                      | on government   | on industry   | on government (all 3)<br>and industry (ME, WA)   |
| HAZARD DATA required for most chemicals              | NO – first requires<br>substantial evidence<br>re: potential risk                 | YES – industry must<br>submit information on<br>> 30,000 chemicals                                    | <b>NO</b> – <i>but</i> California<br>law requires a database<br>on chemical hazards                        |
| USE DATA and EXPOSURE DATA on chemicals              | <b>LIMITED</b> information reported for some every 5 years                        | EXTENSIVE information must flow up & down supply chain  | <b>DISCLOSURE</b> of priority chemicals in products (ME, WA)   |
| PUBLIC ACCESS & CONFIDENTIALITY                      | Very restrictive - poor public right to know                                      | Good public access to data <i>and</i> protection  | Public access to data, but could be improved   |
| Identification of priority chemicals: HAZARD-BASED & | <b>NO</b><br>not applicable   | <b>YES</b> – substances of very high concern, i.e. CMRs, PBTs, vPvBs & EDCs                           | <b>YES</b> – based on hazard traits similar to REACH (ME, WA, CA authority)                                |
| EXPOSURE-BASED factors applied                       |   | Wide dispersive use and/or high volume use  | In people, products,<br>high volume use (all 3)  |
| ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT & Substitution Plan          | NO  | <b>YES</b> – may be required for priority substances of very high concern                             | <b>YES</b> – may be required for priority chemicals (CA, ME, WA for PBTs)                                  |

by Mike Belliveau, Environmental Health Strategy Center, www.preventharm.org, Feb. 2009

## **Summary Comparison of Existing Chemical Policy Laws – page 2**

| Risk Management<br>Pathways   | TSCA  | REACH  | the States  |
|---|---|--|---|
| 1. Prohibit use of chemicals <u>unless</u> industry shows SUBSTITUTION is not feasible                    | <b>NO</b> – <i>but</i> the<br>production of highly<br>hazardous PCBs was<br>banned by statute and<br>uses were restricted       | YES – for priority<br>substances of very high<br>concern that are PBTs,<br>vPvBs or have no safe<br>exposure threshold   | YES – for same<br>priority chemicals of<br>high concern in<br>products (ME, WA for<br>PBTs)   |
| What has to be<br>shown to avoid or<br>trigger prohibition  | not applicable  | To continue chemical use, industry must show socio-economic benefits outweigh risks <i>and</i> there are no suitable alternative substances or technologies              | To trigger restriction,<br>state must show there's<br>exposure <i>and</i> safer<br>alternatives available at<br>comparable cost (ME,<br>WA through PBTs rule) |
| 2. Prohibit use of chemicals <u>unless</u> industry controls RISKs <i>or</i> substitution is not feasible | NO  | YES – for <i>other</i> priority<br>substances of very high<br>concern, e.g. CMRs,<br>where a safe threshold<br>can be determined   | YES - for same priority<br>chemicals of high<br>concern in products<br>(without regard to risk)<br>(ME)   |
| What has to be<br>shown to avoid or<br>trigger prohibition  | not applicable  | Industry shows risks are adequately controlled, <b>or</b> socio-economic benefits outweigh risks <i>and</i> there are no suitable alternative substances or technologies | To trigger restriction,<br>state must show there's<br>exposure <i>and</i> safer<br>alternatives available at<br>comparable cost (ME)                          |
| 3. Restrict specific uses of chemicals  | YES – may restrict<br>chemical production,<br>use or disposal by rule   | <b>YES</b> – for <i>other</i> toxic chemicals not subject to authorization above   | YES – broad authority<br>to restrict or prohibit<br>chemical use (CA)   |
| What has to be<br>shown to restrict<br>chemical uses  | Agency must show unreasonable risk <i>and</i> restrictions are least burdensome after cost-benefit analyses of all alternatives | Agency must show unacceptable risk to health or environment considering socioeconomic impact and available alternatives  | Not yet specified in rules<br>under development, <i>but</i><br>must consider hazards,<br>exposure pathways and<br>alternatives (CA)                           |

<u>NOTES</u>: **CMRs** = Carcinogens, Mutagens, Reproductive toxicants; **PBTs** = Persistent, Bioaccumulative and Toxic chemicals; **vPvBs** = very Persistent, very Bioaccumulative chemicals; **EDCs** = Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals