March 26, 2021

Submitted via the Federal eRulemaking Portal, www.regulations.gov

Document Control Office (7407M)
Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT)
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
ATTN: Docket Number EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0493

Re: Fees for the Administration of the Toxic Substances Control Act

Dear Acting Assistant Administrator Freedhoff,

The Alliance for Automotive Innovation[1] (Auto Innovators) appreciates the opportunity to continue our engagement with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by providing comments and recommendations related to the proposed rule, "Fees for the Administration of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA)" ("proposed Fees Notice").[2] In addition to these comments, Auto Innovators supports the comments submitted by the Ad-Hoc Downstream Users Coalition of which Auto Innovators is a member.

Auto Innovators and our companies would like to recognize the significant effort that the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT) has put into drafting a proposed approach to the collection of fees. This approach will provide a sustainable source of funds to EPA to fulfill its legal obligations under TSCA. This proposal meets the intent of the Lautenberg Chemical Safety Act (LCSA), while avoiding imposing duplicative fees for the same chemical through multiple tiers of the chemical supply chain. The proposed Fees Notice reflects an approach that assigns fees to the primary chemical manufacturers and in some cases, processors. It also proposes to exempt specific downstream users that use the same chemicals as provided by the chemical manufacturers, such as importers of articles, producers of a chemical as a byproduct, impurity or non-isolated intermediate, the manufacture (including import) of small quantities of a chemical substance solely for research and development, and the manufacture (including import) of a chemical in quantities below a 2,500 lbs. annual production volume.[3] This proposed approach is wholly consistent with EPA's intended universe of fee payers, as

---

[1] Formed in 2020, the Alliance for Automotive Innovation is the singular, authoritative and respected voice of the automotive industry. Focused on creating a safe and transformative path for sustainable industry growth, the Alliance for Automotive Innovation represents the manufacturers producing nearly 99 percent of cars and light trucks sold in the U.S. The organization, a combination of the Association of Global Automakers and the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, is directly involved in regulatory and policy matters impacting the light-duty vehicle market across the country. Members include motor vehicle manufacturers, original equipment suppliers, technology and other automotive-related companies and trade associations. The Alliance for Automotive Innovation is headquartered in Washington, DC, with offices in Detroit, MI and Sacramento, CA. For more information, visit our website http://www.autosinnovate.org.

[2] 86 FR 1890 (January 11, 2021). Found at https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2021/01/11/2020-28585/fees-for-the-administration-of-the-toxic-substances-control-act-tsca.

[3] "Manufacturers of a chemical substance subject to risk evaluation under section 6(b) of the Act are exempted from fee payment requirements in this section if they meet one or more of the exemptions under paragraphs (a)(3)(i) through (v) of this

reflected in the economic analysis developed for the 2018 Fees Rule. That analysis estimated that no more than 60 entities would be subject to fees for risk evaluations under TSCA§6(a).[4] This current proposal aligns with that analysis and assigns fees by applying a consistent methodology that avoids double and triple imposition of fees through the supply chain. As a result, it also ensures a sustainable resource base for implementation of TSCA.

We recognize that some stakeholders have raised concerns about these exemptions, and we would like to take this opportunity to reiterate why we believe EPA's proposed Fees Notice reflects a sustainable approach and will provide EPA with the resources it needs to implement TSCA §6. In addition, this approach will also avoid the unintended consequences of imposing duplicative costs on importers of chemicals, of requiring prohibitively expensive testing of thousands of articles, and of overwhelming EPA with thousands of fees invoices. In addition to providing the rationale for our support of these proposed exemptions, we would like to raise several issues where additional clarification of the proposed certification criteria and self-identification requirements associated with eligibility to meet the proposed exemptions is needed.

I. Exemption for Importers of Articles

Auto Innovators strongly supports EPA's proposed exemption for importers of articles:

> Consequently, EPA proposes to exempt these three categories of manufacturers from EPA-initiated Risk Evaluation fees and associated regulatory requirements: (1) Importers of articles containing a chemical substance subject to an EPA-initiated risk evaluation; (2) manufacturers of a substance subject to an EPA-initiated risk evaluation that is produced as a byproduct; and (3) manufacturers (including importers) of a substance subject to an EPA-initiated risk evaluation that is produced or imported as an impurity.[5]

Articles have traditionally been exempted from data collection requirements, because EPA has recognized that articles generally pose a low potential for exposure and consequently result in no- to low-risk scenarios. As a result, importers have not been required to track or collect information on the chemicals in the articles that they import:

---

section for the five-year period preceding publication of the preliminary list and will meet one of more of the exemptions in paragraph (a)(3)(i) through (v) in the successive five years. Those manufacturers are excluded from fee payment requirements in this section, if they exclusively:

(i) Import articles containing that chemical substance;
(ii) Produce that chemical substance as a byproduct;
(iii) Manufacture (including import) that chemical substance as an impurity;
(iv) Manufacture that chemical substance as a non-isolated intermediate as defined in § § 704.3
(v) Manufacture (including import) small quantities of that chemical substance solely for research and development, as defined in § 700.43; and/or
(vi) Manufacture (including import) that chemical substance in quantities below a 2,500 lbs. annual production volume as described in § 700.43, unless all manufacturers of that chemical substance manufacture that chemical in quantities below a 2,500 lbs. annual production volume as described in § 700.43, in which case this exemption is not applicable."

[4] EPA, "Fees for the Administration of the Toxic Substances Control Act; Final Economic Analysis," (November 5, 2018). Table 5-4. Found at: https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPPT-2016-0401-0084.

[5] 86 FR at 1899 (January 11, 2021).

> …extremely burdensome for importers to identify the chemical substances contained in the articles they import… [estimated] total direct cost would range from $187 million to about $437 million…health and environmental risk posed by a chemical substance in an imported article may be less than the risk posed by a chemical substance imported in bulk" (in 1977 dollars)[6]

Further, EPA has also recognized that the process of trying to collect this type of information across a global supply chain would not only be unduly burdensome but would be prohibitively costly and time consuming. EPA has long recognized that the costs associated with trying to collect this type of information for purposes of self-reporting far outweigh any benefit that would result from the exercise, going back to the PMN regulations from 1985:

> Because it would be enormously difficult for an importer to determine the identity and Inventory status of each chemical substance in imported articles (e.g., automobiles), the rule does not require persons to submit notices on new substances imported as part of articles.[7]

As EPA recognized in the 2018 Fees Rule,[8] fees imposed on primary chemical manufacturers will ultimately be passed through the supply chain with equitable share being borne not only by processors but also by those manufacturers and importers that meet any of the proposed exemption criteria:

> EPA believes the allocation primarily to manufacturers, and, in limited circumstances, to processors, is an appropriate balance as required in TSCA. As noted in the proposal, the effort of trying to identify relevant processors for all fee-triggering actions would be overly burdensome and EPA expected many processors would be missed. Generally limiting fee obligations to manufacturers is the simplest and most straightforward way to assess fees for conducting risk evaluations under TSCA section 6 and most TSCA section 4 testing activities. Furthermore, EPA expects that manufacturers required to pay fees will have a better sense of the universe of processors and will pass some of the costs on to them.[9]

For the reasons appropriately cited by EPA in its 2020 "No Action Assurance" letter, requiring importers of articles to self-identify for the presence of high-priority chemicals in the thousands of articles that move through the global supply chain is impractical, cost-prohibitive and without significant benefit to EPA:

> …the broad scope of the current TSCA Fees Rule unintentionally imposes potentially significant burdens on importers of chemical substances in articles, and manufacturers of byproducts and impurities. Determining whether they may be subject to the TSCA Fee Rule and thus need to self-identify could be difficult or impossible for certain manufactures across the country. Your request [request from Alexandra Dunn] indicates that the inherent uncertainties and difficulties associated with identifying the presence (or not) of one or more of the 20 high-priority chemicals by these stakeholders, especially those that have not previously been subject to a TSCA regulatory requirement, creates a compliance problem and adversely impacts the agency's implementation of the TSCA Fees Rule.[10]

---

[6] 42 FR 39185 (October 3, 1977).
[7] 48 FR at 21722 and 21726 (May 13, 1983).
[8] 83 FR 52694 (Oct. 17, 2018). Found at: https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/10/17/2018-22252/fees-for-the-administration-of-the-toxic-substances-control-act.
[9] 83 FR 52694 at 52696 (Oct. 17, 2018).
[10] No Action Assurance letter from Susan Bodine to Alexandra Dapolito Dunn, March 24, 2020.

These same points of view are still applicable and provide the appropriate justifications for EPA's exemption of importers of articles from TSCA fees. As a result, EPA will have a streamlined approach to collecting fees at the source of generation, as opposed to duplicating fees throughout the supply chain. More importantly, this approach still ensures that EPA can collect the necessary fees to conduct robust and thorough risk assessments, and nothing related to the collection point of fees would or should prevent the agency from evaluating all conditions of use throughout the supply chain as part of its risk assessment process.

II. Byproducts, Impurities, and Non-Isolated Intermediates

Auto Innovators strongly supports EPA's proposed exemptions for byproducts, impurities, and non-Isolated intermediates. Similar to the concerns with unnecessary burden, cost duplication and complex and time-consuming data collection for importers of articles, EPA recognizes these issues for byproducts, impurities, and non-Isolated intermediates, as follows:

> As stated in EPA's memorandum issued on March 18, 2020, concerns were raised regarding fee payment obligations for "importers of articles containing any one of the twenty listed chemicals . . ." and that these entities "could potentially be required to test thousands of imported articles and [it]would be difficult if not impossible to complete in the time allotted for self-identification under the TSCA Fee Rule." EPA recognizes that manufacturers of chemicals as byproducts or impurities may face similar challenges to pinpointing and tracking when impurities and byproducts are produced, particularly because the 'manufacture' of even very small amounts of a high-priority chemical triggers the TSCA Fee Rule requirement to self-identify.[11]

And,

> EPA is also proposing to exempt manufacturers of a substance subject to an EPA-initiated risk evaluation that is produced as a non-isolated intermediate. A non-isolated intermediate, as defined in 40 CFR part 704.3, referenced by 40 CFR part 711.3., is "any intermediate that is not intentionally removed from the equipment in which it is manufactured, including the reaction vessel in which it is manufactured, equipment which is ancillary to the reaction vessel, and any equipment through which the substance passes during a continuous flow process, but not including tanks or other vessels in which the substance is stored after its manufacture.[12]

Requiring companies to gather information on impurities, byproducts or non-isolated intermediates in order to self-identify would take substantial resources and a significant amount of time on the part of producers, importers, and suppliers. Companies that manufacture and import chemicals solely as impurities, byproducts or non-isolated intermediates face the same challenges as importers of articles. The effort needed to ascertain enough information on impurities, byproducts and non-isolated intermediates greatly outweighs the value derived. As recognized by EPA's No Action Assurance letter, many companies do not have supply systems set up to monitor impurity and byproduct levels in their products, and chemicals in these categories are generally exempt from other regulatory schemes. For example, impurities, byproducts and non-isolated intermediates are exempt from PMN reporting under

[11] 86 FR at 1899 (January 11, 2021).
[12] 86 FR at 1900 (January 11, 2021).

40 C.F.R. § 720.30(h). In addition, a byproduct that is not used for a commercial purpose after it is manufactured was not required to be listed on the TSCA Inventory (40 C.F.R. § 710.4(d)(2)).

The time and cost to EPA to process thousands of additional self-identification responses would overwhelm EPA's staff and needlessly increase implementation costs, likely with little to no additional benefit to the overall risk assessment process. These costs would also be duplicated in that they would be passed down company-to-company through the supply chain. The value added by requiring companies that manufacture and import high-priority substances solely as impurities, byproducts or non-isolated intermediates would be negligible compared to the associated costs that would be borne by EPA and the regulated community. As acknowledged by EPA:

> EPA recognizes that manufacturers of chemicals as byproducts or impurities may face similar challenges to pinpointing and tracking when impurities and byproducts are produced, particularly because the `manufacture' of even very small amounts of a high-priority chemical triggers the TSCA Fee Rule requirement to self-identify.[13]

III. Research and Development Exemption

Auto Innovators strongly supports EPA's proposed exemption from TSCA fees for chemicals used for research and development (R&D).

> EPA is proposing an exemption from EPA-initiated risk evaluation fees and associated regulatory requirements for manufacturers (including importers) of small quantities of a chemical solely for research and development, as to be defined in 40 CFR 700.43. Small quantities solely for research and development is defined to mean quantities of a chemical substance manufactured, imported, or processed or proposed to be manufactured, imported, or processed solely for research and development that are not greater than reasonably necessary for such purposes.[14]

Our members support state of the art R&D programs to identify opportunities to use green chemistry options where possible, to replace or reduce chemicals of potential concern in our applications, and ultimately to produce cleaner and safer automobiles. As stated in this proposed Fees Notice:

> This exemption will avoid imposing burdensome costs to those manufacturers of small quantities of a chemical solely for research and development, given the critical importance of this activity to the detection, quantification and control of chemical substances.[15]

This proposed exemption would relieve R&D programs from self-identification and payment of fees and continue to encourage investment in safer substitutes and greener alternatives. An exemption from the requirements of the Fees Notice would allow our R&D programs to continue their essential work without the time and financial burden imposed by regulation.

---

[13] 86 FR at 1899 (January 11, 2021).
[14] 86 FR at 1990 (January 11, 2021).
[15] 86 FR at 1900 (January 11, 2021).

IV. Small Volume Exemption

While Auto Innovators and our members support an exemption for small volumes of chemicals, we strongly encourage EPA to continue to assess the need and practicality of a *de minimis* exemption in addition to a small volume exemption. We believe this "low volume" exemption will provide significant relief to those that manufacture, including import of very small volumes of a chemical; these volumes are negligible compared to primary chemical manufacturers.

> EPA is proposing an exemption from EPA-initiated risk evaluation fees and associated regulatory requirements for entities that manufacture (including import) a chemical substance in quantities not to exceed 2,500 lbs. This limit is consistent with requirements in the CDR described in 40 CFR 711.8(b) and 40 CFR 711.15, where the reporting threshold is 2,500 lbs. (1,134 kg) for any person who manufactured a chemical substance that is the subject of certain rules, orders, or relief under TSCA section 5, 6, and 7. This exception does not apply if all manufacturers of a chemical substance manufacture that chemical in quantities below a 2,500 lbs. annual production volume. EPA is proposing this exemption to reduce the burden on entities producing small amounts of the chemical substance undergoing an EPA-initiated risk evaluation.[16]

However, we continue to see the need for a *de minimis* exemption of 0.1% for mixtures, especially for non-dimensional chemical use such as service chemicals. This type of exemption would be consistent with other federal and international regulatory agencies and would allow our members to rely more heavily on the International Material Data System (IMDS), a chemical tracking system developed to assist our members in compliance with international and federal regulations. IMDS is populated by input from our supply chain partners, identifying regulated chemicals that may be present or used in the components and articles used in the manufacture of automobiles. However, the IMDS has a *de minimis* threshold of 0.1% and any chemical present or used in the manufacture of any articles we may use in our production process, would not be reported to the database.

EPA has itself recognized the practicality of a *de minimis* threshold. Most recently, in the EPA's "Long-Chain Perfluoroalkyl Carboxylate and Perfluoroalkyl Sulfonate Chemical Substances; Significant New Use Rule; Supplemental Proposal," EPA put forward sound arguments for establishing a *de minimis* threshold:

> Establishment of a threshold could be based on one or more of the following rationales: (1) below the selected threshold level, there is no "reasonable potential for exposure" within the meaning of § 5(a)(5) (i.e., the risk of exposure is very low); and (2) below the selected threshold level, there is a "reasonable potential for exposure" (or, alternatively, there may be such a potential), but the potential does not "justify[y] notification" (i.e., potential for risk is very low in light of the low level of LCPFAC present in the surface coating).[17]

We support EPA's rationale for establishing a *de minimis* reporting level as articulated in the LCPFAC supplemental proposal. It is an approach consistent with other EPA reporting requirements, as well as other federal and international chemical regulatory schemes.

---

[16] 86 FR at 1900 (January 11, 2021).
[17] 85 FR 45109 (July 27, 2020). Found at: https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPPT-2013-0225-0232.

V. Certification Requirements as Applicable to Exemptions

We have several concerns about this certification requirement proposed by EPA:

> (iv) Certification of meeting exemption. If a manufacturer is identified on the preliminary list and meets one or more of the exemptions in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) through (vi) of this section for the five-year period preceding publication of the preliminary list and will meet one of more of the exemptions in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) through (vi) in the successive five years, the manufacturer must submit a certification statement attesting to these facts in order to not be included in the final list of manufacturers described in paragraph (b)(7) of this section and to not be obligated to pay the fee under this section.[18]

There appears to be inconsistency between the preamble language about the applicability of this requirement and the related language in the regulatory text.

In the preamble, EPA proposes to require manufacturers of small quantities solely for research and development and those that manufacture in quantities not to exceed 2,500 lbs., and manufacturers of chemical substances produced as a non-isolated intermediate to certify that they meet those exemption requirements:

> Additionally, EPA is proposing to require manufacturers of small quantities solely for research and development and those that manufacture in quantities not to exceed 2,500 lbs., and manufacturers of chemical substances produced as a non-isolated intermediate to certify that they meet those exemption criteria.[19]

In this preamble language, such language, however, is included relative to articles, byproducts and impurities.

However, in the regulatory text EPA states:

> (iv) Certification of meeting exemption. **If a manufacturer is identified on the preliminary list and meets one or more of the exemptions in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) through (vi)** of this section for the five-year period preceding publication of the preliminary list and will meet one of more of the exemptions in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) through (vi) in the successive five years, **the manufacturer must submit a certification statement attesting to these facts in order to not be included in the final list of manufacturers described in paragraph (b)(7) of this section** and to not be obligated to pay the fee under this section. If a manufacturer is not on a preliminary list and meets one or more of the exemptions in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) through (vi) for the five-year period preceding publication of the preliminary list and will meet one of more of the exemptions in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) through (vi) in the successive five years, the manufacturer may submit a certification statement attesting to these facts. If EPA receives such a certification statement from a manufacturer, the manufacturer will not be included in the final list of manufacturers described in paragraph (b)(7) and will not be obligated to pay the fee under this section.[20] (**emphasis added**)

---

[18] 86 FR at 1907 (January 11, 2021).
[19] 86 FR at 1901 (January 11, 2021).
[20] 86 FR at 1907 (January 11, 2021).

This regulatory text language would appear to require that a company, that has been erroneously included on the initial list of fee payers, must file a certification statement even if they qualify for an exemption for either: (i) import of articles containing that chemical substance; (ii) production of that chemical substance as a byproduct; or (iii) manufacture (including import) that chemical substance as an impurity. We believe this was not EPA's intent, since such certification requirements would require even more resources and time to identify uses throughout the supply chain – the very reason EPA is providing such exemptions.

In Small Business Roundtable webinar hosted on February 5, 2021, EPA clarified the applicability of this language and stated that an importer of an article would not need to certify that they had imported an article, for five previous years or would continue to import for five successive years thereafter. Requiring such a certification would undo much of the administrative relief provided by the exemption. This same argument is equally relevant to byproducts and impurities. If this criterion is not clarified in the regulatory text, meeting the exemption certification requirement would necessitate an exhaustive review of business records for thousands of articles for every automotive manufacturer over a five-year period.

We request that EPA make it clear that this criterion does not apply to the exemptions for articles, byproducts, or impurities. Failing to do so, would undo the relief provided by the exemptions themselves.

In addition, we have serious concerns about the application of this certification requirement to R&D chemical use and to manufacture (including import) of non-isolated intermediates. As EPA states:

> EPA is proposing to require manufacturers of small quantities solely for research and development and those that manufacture in quantities not to exceed 2,500 lbs., and manufacturers of chemical substances produced as a non-isolated intermediate to certify that they meet those exemption criteria.[21]

And,

> Manufacturers that meet the research and development exemption must meet it for the five-year period preceding publication of the preliminary list and meet it in the successive five years.[22]

EPA has not included any rationale for why the R&D exemption should require a five-year previous / five-year forward certification. Is EPA asking that a company certify they have used a chemical for R&D purposes for at least five years prior to the publication of the preliminary list and commit to using that R&D chemical for five years into the future? It is not clear what purpose this type of information would serve. We request that EPA remove the certification requirements for R&D chemical use. If there is some compelling reason that EPA needs this information, then we request that EPA provide for a simple R&D notification for current use.

Similarly, with the identification of non-isolated intermediates, we are concerned that EPA has offered no logical reason for requiring a five-year previous / five-year forward certification. Given that these chemicals are never intentionally removed from the parent chemical or mixture or process, requiring

[21] 86 FR at 1901 (January 11, 2021).
[22] 86 FR at 1900 (January 11, 2021).

companies to submit a certification essentially undoes the relief provided by not having to trace and track these chemicals that never enter commerce.

We request that EPA remove the certification requirements for non-isolated intermediates.

VI. Self-Identification

It is not clear why EPA is requesting that manufacturers that qualify for the (a)(3)(iv) trough (v) exemptions need to self-identify for the purposes of fee payment:

> (5) Self-identification. All manufacturers other than those listed in paragraph (a)(3)(i) through (iii) of this section who have manufactured or imported the chemical substance in the previous five years must submit notice to EPA, irrespective of whether they are included in the preliminary list specified in paragraph (b)(3) of this section. The notice must be submitted electronically via EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX), the Agency's electronic reporting portal, using the Chemical Information Submission System (CISS) reporting tool, and must contain the following information.[23]

If these manufacturers are exempt and meet recordkeeping requirements as imposed by the proposed rule,[24] EPA can at any time request to see these records. As with the initial 2018 Fees Rule, there appears to be a disconnect between what was intended in the preamble and regulatory text requirements and the costs estimated in the associated economic analyses.

Based on EPA's economic analysis accompanying this proposal, EPA projects the following burden for submitting self-identification.

> Similarly, 100 firms are expected to report this information to EPA as a result of approximately seven EPA initiated Risk Evaluations per year. EPA estimates this burden to occur once per respondent over a three-year period. Thus, the average annual burden is calculated as 2.5/3 = 0.833 hours/year.[25]

If manufacturers that qualify for the exemptions for manufacture of a chemical substance as a non-isolated intermediate, and the manufacture (including import) of small quantities solely for R&D are required to self-identify then the number of respondents will be exponentially greater than 100 per seven risk evaluation per year, and the economic cost of the proposal will be significantly higher than that assessed.

We request that EPA remove the self-identification requirements for exemptions (a)(3)(iv) through (v).

---

[23] 86 FR at 1907 (January 11, 2021).
[24] "(A) All manufacturers other than those listed in paragraphs (a)(3)(i) through (vi) of this section must maintain production volume records related to compliance with paragraph (vi) of this section. These records must be maintained for a period of five years from the date notice is submitted pursuant to paragraph (b)(5) of this section." 86 FR at 1907 (January 11, 2021).
[25] EPA. "Economic Analysis of the Proposed Rule for Fees for the Administration of the Toxic Substances Control Act," (January 11, 2021), pp. 7-13. Found at: https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0493-0025.

VII. In Conclusion

Auto Innovators and its members support the exemptions that EPA has proposed in this Fees Notice. We believe they provide a balanced approach to collecting fees to support TSCA risk evaluation and risk management activities that will provide a reliable and sustainable source of funding to EPA to fulfill its legal obligations under TSCA. This proposal meets the intent of the LCSA, while avoiding imposing duplicative fees for the same chemical through multiple tiers of the chemical supply chain.

In addition to the proposed exemptions, we request that EPA add a *de minimis* exemption for mixtures, especially for non-dimensional chemical use such as service chemicals. This would allow more effective use of our IMDS system and assist us in providing more reliable conditions of use information to EPA.

We also urge EPA to streamline and clarify its certification and self-identification requirements. There appear to be inconsistencies between the regulatory text and preamble language that need to be reconciled. Additionally, certification for a company that has been erroneously listed should not be as cumbersome as proposed. A simple notice to EPA should suffice and requirements to inform EPA of their error should not involve the cumbersome requirements of EPA's CDX. Similarly, it is not clear why EPA is requesting that manufacturers that qualify for the (a)(3)(iv) trough (v) exemptions need to self-identify for the purposes of fee payment. EPA can at any time request to see company records that support the exemption.

We believe our comments and recommendations on the Fees Notice provide the opportunity to EPA to finalize a workable and equitable mechanism to support TSCA implementation while removing unnecessary burden from the regulated community. If there are any questions, or if additional information is needed related to these comments, I can be reached at (202) 326-5500 or jrege@autosinnovate.org.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Julia M. Rege
Vice President, Energy & Environment