

Industry Lobbying

Current and former EPA officials have reported that Trump appointees have required that career officials receive their permission before beginning the required internal review of the formaldehyde study and have canceled key briefings that would have advanced it. That interference came after EPA career scientists revised the study once already last year to insulate it from political controversy: [See <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/07/06/epa-formaldehyde-warnings-blocked-696628>]

Scott Pruitt replaced academic scientists with industry advocates on the agency's influential science advisory boards and sought to limit the types of human health research the EPA can rely on in rulemakings: [See <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/04/24/pruitt-unveils-controversial-new-science-policy-501612>]

The industry officials appointed to run EPA consider any attempt to report on the chemical industry as "elitist clickbait" and refuse to take questions: [See <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/21/us/trump-epa-chemicals-regulations.html>]

Chemical Industry PAC donation overview: [See <https://www.opensecrets.org/pacs/industry.php?txt=N13&cycle=2018>]

American Chemistry Council individual contributions: [See <https://www.opensecrets.org/pacs/pacgot.php?cycle=2018&cmte=C00252338>]

Bill introduced by Rep. Andy Biggs (R-Ariz.) to eliminate the IRIS system entirely: [See <https://chemicalwatch.com/68776/bill-to-eliminate-epa-iris-programme-introduced-in-congress>]

Letter from Senator Ed Markey, Sheldon Whitehouse, and Thomas Carper regarding the American Chemistry Council and ExxonMobil's pressuring of EPA not to allow the IRIS update to go forward as drafted until references to leukemia are deleted: <https://www.markey.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Pruitt%20Letter%20formaldehyde%20assessment.pdf>