[Date]

**[Your Name]**[Your Address]  
[City, State, ZIP Code]  
[Your Email]  
[Your Phone Number]

**The Honorable [Congressman’s Name]**[Office Address]  
United States House of Representatives/Senate  
Washington, D.C. [ZIP Code]

**Subject: Urgent Opposition to EPA’s Proposed Adjustments to the Endangerment Finding & EPCRA Reporting**

Dear [Congressman’s Last Name],

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) proposed review and potential rollback of the 2009 Endangerment Finding and Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) reporting requirements.

These changes threaten public safety, emergency preparedness, interstate commerce, and the integrity of U.S. environmental policy enforcement.

On March 11, 2025, the EPA announced 38 regulatory updates under Administrator Lee Zeldin, framed within a newly branded approach called Cooperative Federalism.

While this term implies a balance of federal and state authority, the reality is a contradiction—the federal government is attempting to shift climate and chemical safety regulations to states, despite the Supreme Court ruling in Massachusetts v. EPA (2007), which established that states lack the ability to regulate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from sources beyond their borders.

This move directly undermines the legal precedent set by the Supreme Court, which ruled that:  
✔ GHGs qualify as pollutants under the Clean Air Act.  
✔ The EPA has an obligation to regulate them if they pose a danger to public health.  
✔ States alone lack the authority to regulate cross-border emissions, making federal oversight necessary.

If these proposed changes proceed, they will create a fragmented, unpredictable regulatory landscape. Individual states will be left to determine their own emissions policies, creating trade disparities and regulatory confusion across industries.

**How These Changes Threaten Public Safety, Business Stability, and Trade**

1. Undermining Emergency Response & Community Right-to-Know Protections

* The EPCRA program provides vital chemical safety information to first responders, local governments, and businesses.
* By weakening Tier II reporting requirements, the EPA risks leaving communities in the dark about hazardous chemicals stored and released in their areas.
* Fluorinated gases (HFCs, HFOs, methane, CO₂-based industrial emissions) may be removed or downgraded from the EPA’s "List of Lists," meaning fewer chemicals will be subject to mandatory disclosure.

2. Weakening State & Federal Cooperation in Emissions Oversight

* States sued in Massachusetts v. EPA precisely because they could not regulate emissions beyond their borders.
* Now, the EPA is contradicting that ruling by abandoning federal oversight, leaving states without enforcement mechanisms to protect their economies and public health.
* This approach creates a regulatory free-for-all, where some states may tighten restrictions while others allow unchecked emissions, disrupting interstate commerce and undermining environmental accountability.

3. Creating Uncertainty for U.S. Businesses & Trade Agreements

* Companies that rely on consistent regulatory policies for investment decisions will face uncertainty and increased compliance risks.
* The global market is moving toward HFC phasedown schedules, and the U.S. risks falling behind if federal agencies fail to provide a stable regulatory framework.
* Trade partners like the EU, Canada, and China are enforcing strict HFC restrictions, and if the U.S. weakens its policies, American businesses could face barriers to export markets.

**Congress Must Take Action**

The EPA’s proposed adjustments represent a serious regression in environmental oversight and violate the Supreme Court’s established precedent in *Massachusetts v. EPA*. These changes must be subject to full Congressional review to prevent regulatory chaos. I urge you to:

✔ Oppose any EPA actions that weaken EPCRA reporting requirements or alter the Endangerment Finding without scientific consensus and legislative oversight.  
✔ Support Congressional Review Act (CRA) measures to block these unnecessary deregulations before they take effect.  
✔ Ensure that businesses, state governments, and emergency responders continue to have access to critical emissions data necessary for safety, compliance, and economic stability.

Congress must reject the false premise that states alone can handle emissions regulation. Before Massachusetts v. EPA, it was a federal responsibility, and the Supreme Court ruled it must remain one. The EPA’s latest actions contradict legal precedent and economic common sense, putting public safety and trade competitiveness at risk.

I appreciate your leadership in protecting our communities, businesses, and the integrity of state and federal cooperation.

I look forward to your response and hope you will take a strong stand against these reckless policy rollbacks.

Sincerely,

**[Your Name]**