

# Newspapers Across the Country Oppose EPA's Plan to Cut Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) Chemical Reporting

**No one wants to be kept in the dark about toxic releases in their district or state. However, EPA's plan would do just that and take away decision-making power from citizens and public officials. Take a look at what the newspapers are saying:**

- ▶ "[F]irst responders like those in New Orleans used the TRI to find out what chemicals were in the water that flooded the city. Congress should demand that the inventory be improved by requiring that more comparative data be included in the TRI."  
-- *Bangor Daily News* [Bangor, ME]. April 24, 2006.
- ▶ "It's absurd for the federal government to be thinking about relaxing the standards for when industry has to report toxic releases. Yet that is precisely what the EPA is considering. This proposed change should be scuttled."  
-- *Poughkeepsie Journal* [Poughkeepsie, NY]. March 15, 2006.
- ▶ "Investors should be particularly concerned about the effects of the agency's proposal... Washington should be working to expand corporate disclosure and accountability, rather than moving to allow polluters to conceal their toxic releases."  
-- *New York Times*. March 10, 2006.
- ▶ "Cutting paperwork is a worthy goal. But the cost to the public in this rollback outweighs the benefit to industry."  
-- *Star-Ledger* [Newark, NJ]. February 15, 2006.
- ▶ "Providing such valuable data should not be considered an undue burden on polluters. The EPA should abandon its unnecessary rule change."  
-- *Roanoke Times* [Roanoke, VA]. January 29, 2006.
- ▶ "Much information would be lost with weakened rules, with little economic gain. Paperwork is always a burden, but in this case industry has failed to show it is excessive."  
-- *Los Angeles Times*. January 28, 2006.
- ▶ "Requiring industries to report emissions puts the costs of data-gathering on the sources rather than the taxpayers,' the [California Attorney General Bill Lockyer] said in a prepared statement. The attorney general is right. Our community's right to know trumps paperwork."  
-- *San Francisco Chronicle*. January 23, 2006.
- ▶ "Environmental Protection Agency will hardly be living up to its name."  
-- *Appleton Post-Crescent* [Appleton, WI]. January 24, 2006.
- ▶ "There's little to be gained by cutting back on the TRI requirement. The government should be making it easier, not harder, for the public to keep tabs on potentially harmful substances."  
-- *Poughkeepsie Journal* [Poughkeepsie, NY]. January 20, 2006.
- ▶ "When it comes to easing rules on reporting legal toxin releases, our feeling is: Been there ... done that ... and don't need to go there again."  
-- *Daily Nonpareil* [Council Bluffs, IA]. January 20, 2006.
- ▶ "Congress adopted the inventory reporting program so the public would know about toxic releases. Congress should reject the attempt to muzzle it."  
-- *The Journal News* [Westchester, Rockland and Putnam Counties, NY]. January 17, 2006.
- ▶ "[T]he changes would deprive citizens of important and timely information about the chemicals released into the air they breathe, the water they drink and the land they live on."  
-- *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. [St. Louis, MO] January 17, 2006.
- ▶ "There is no valid reason for the public not to know what is being pumped into the air or the ground in communities across the country... Pennsylvania should be in the forefront of the effort to preserve the current rule."  
-- *The Times-Tribune* [Scranton, PA]. January 17, 2006.
- ▶ "The last thing the EPA should do is relax its oversight of toxic substances industries are spewing into communities."  
-- *The Journal Gazette* [Fort Wayne, IN]. January 12, 2006.

# Congress Can Save the TRI Program

## Vote to Protect Right-to-Know

- ▶ "The changes could have potentially serious effects on many North Jersey towns... Citizens would no longer have information about what chemicals - and in what amounts - are being used in many nearby factories."  
-- *New Jersey Record*. January 11, 2006
- ▶ "[T]he sniff test for overhauling the Toxics Release Inventory should be the benefits or risks to public health, not the financial gains for polluters."  
-- *USA Today*. January 10, 2006.
- ▶ "The agency is on the verge of making drastic, unwelcome changes to the database."  
-- *Herald Tribune* [Sarasota, FL]. January 9, 2006.
- ▶ "Congress should put a stop to a plan by the Bush Administration to substantially weaken this important public information law."  
-- *The Toledo Blade* [Toledo, OH]. December 10, 2005.
- ▶ "In Greene County, we would lose detailed reporting of about 10,733 pounds of toxic chemicals released into the environment ... Polk County would lose details on 14,216 pounds. That may be insignificant to a bureaucrat sitting in Washington, D.C., but it has an effect on the health of people in the Ozarks. It matters here."  
-- *Springfield News-Leader* [Springfield, MO]. December 5, 2005.
- ▶ "The administration's recommendation is dangerous and cavalier and should be withdrawn or blocked by Congress."  
-- *Columbian* [Vancouver, WA]. October 30, 2005.
- ▶ "The Bush administration already expects Americans to live with more pollution. It seems the administration doesn't want the public to know as much about it either."  
-- *Charleston Gazette* [Charleston, WV]. November 18, 2005.
- ▶ "The EPA should be more concerned with protecting the public from pollutants rather than trimming a few hours off the time a company spends filling out reports."  
-- *The Daily Herald* [Provo, UT]. November 15, 2005.
- ▶ "Communities will lose -- to borrow a phrase from the EPA Web site -- 'power to hold companies accountable and make informed decisions about how toxic chemicals are to be managed.'"  
-- *Herald Tribune* [Sarasota, FL]. November 7, 2005.
- ▶ "Clearly, the proposed changes to the TRI program would...needlessly put the health and safety of every citizen at greater risk."  
-- *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*. November 1, 2005.
- ▶ "It's ironic that an agency with 'environmental protection' in its name would be seriously considering weakening just that by permitting less frequent emissions reports. The EPA should scrap the idea faster than you can say 'dirty air.'"  
-- *Fort Worth Star-Telegram* [Fort Worth, TX]. October 28, 2005.
- ▶ "But watering down the TRI won't make it better. America doesn't need a 'right to guess' law."  
-- *The Times Leader* [Wilkes-Barre, PA]. October 15, 2005.
- ▶ "[The EPA] wants to collect less data, less frequently. That would set back the clock, just when the public needs that information the most - in a time of increasing natural disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina, and the threat of terrorist attack."  
-- *Philadelphia Inquirer*. October 11, 2005.
- ▶ "Congress should demand is that this program be improved, not weakened."  
-- *Bangor Daily News*. October 10, 2005.
- ▶ "This change is unnecessary and insensitive, a bad idea at the wrong time."  
-- *Newsday*. December 2, 2005.
- ▶ "TRI empowers anyone who wants to use it. That, presumably, is what worries an administration that believes it always knows best."  
-- *The Courier-Journal* [Louisville, KY]. September 25, 2005

***The House Passed the Toxic Right-to-Know Amendment to Save TRI  
Support Efforts to Pass Similar Right-to-Know Protections in the Senate***

**TRI: 20 Years of Progress Cleaning Up Our Environment**