https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-clean-air-act

Clean Air Act

42 U.S.C. §7401 et seq. (1970)

Quick Links

- The official text of the CAA is available in the *United States Code*, from the US Government Printing Office

42 U.S.C.
United States Code, 2013 Edition
Title 42 - THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE
CHAPTER 85 - AIR POLLUTION PREVENTION AND CONTROL
SUBCHAPTER I - PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES
Part C - Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality
subpart i - clean air
Sec. 7470 - Congressional declaration of purpose
From the U.S. Government Publishing Office, www.gpo.gov

§7470. Congressional declaration of purpose

The purposes of this part are as follows:

(1) to protect public health and welfare from any actual or potential adverse effect which in the Administrator's judgment may reasonably be anticipate [1] to occur from air pollution or from exposures to pollutants in other media, which pollutants originate as emissions to the ambient air) [2], notwithstanding attainment and maintenance of all national ambient air quality standards;

(2) to preserve, protect, and enhance the air quality in national parks, national wilderness areas, national monuments, national seashores, and other areas of special national or regional natural, recreational, scenic, or historic value;

(3) to insure that economic growth will occur in a manner consistent with the preservation of existing clean air resources;

(4) to assure that emissions from any source in any State will not interfere with any portion of the applicable implementation plan to prevent significant deterioration of air quality for any other State; and

(5) to assure that any decision to permit increased air pollution in any area to which this section applies is made only after careful evaluation of all the consequences of such a

decision and after adequate procedural opportunities for informed public participation in the decisionmaking process.

(July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title I, §160, as added Pub. L. 95–95, title I, §127(a), Aug. 7, 1977, 91 Stat. 731.)

Effective Date

Subpart effective Aug. 7, 1977, except as otherwise expressly provided, see section 406(d) of Pub. L. 95–95, set out as an Effective Date of 1977 Amendment note under section 7401 of this title.

Guidance Document

Pub. L. 95–95, title I, §127(c), Aug. 7, 1977, 91 Stat. 741, required Administrator, not later than 1 year after Aug. 7, 1977, to publish a guidance document to assist States in carrying out their functions under part C of title I of the Clean Air Act (this part) with respect to pollutants for which national ambient air quality standards are promulgated.

Study and Report on Progress Made in Program Relating to Significant Deterioration of Air Quality

Pub. L. 95–95, title I, §127(d), Aug. 7, 1977, 91 Stat. 742, directed Administrator, not later than 2 years after Aug. 7, 1977, to complete a study and report to Congress on progress made in carrying out part C of title I of the Clean Air Act (this part) and the problems associated in carrying out such section.

[1] So in original. Probably should be "anticipated".

[2] So in original. Section was enacted without an opening parenthesis.

suspected to cause cancer, genetic mutation, reproductive harm **or** birth defects.

https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/28/well/eat/food-additives-banned-europe-united-states.html

https://www.iflscience.com/health-and-medicine/banned-europe-safe-us/

A key element of the European Union's chemicals management and environmental protection policies — and one that clearly distinguishes the EU's approach from that of the U.S. federal government — is what's called the precautionary principle.

This principle, in the words of the European Commission, "aims at ensuring a higher level of environmental protection through preventative" decision-making. In other words, it says that when there is substantial, credible evidence of danger to human or environmental health, protective action should be taken despite continuing scientific uncertainty.

In contrast, the U.S. federal government's approach to chemicals management sets a very high bar for the proof of harm that must be demonstrated before regulatory action is taken.

This is true of the U.S. Toxic Substances Control Act, the federal law that regulates chemicals used commercially in the U.S. The European law regulating chemicals in commerce, known as REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals), requires manufacturers to submit a full set of toxicity data to the European Chemical Agency before a chemical can be approved for use. U.S. federal law requires such information to be submitted for new chemicals, but leaves a huge gap in terms of what's known about the environmental and health effects for chemicals already in use. Chemicals used in cosmetics or as food additives or pesticides are covered by other U.S. laws — but these laws, too, have high burdens for proof of harm and, like TSCA, do not incorporate a precautionary approach.

Central to current U.S. policy are cost-benefit analyses with very high bars for proof of harm rather than a proof of safety for entry onto the market.

Here's an example of the decision making in our government agencies that needs to change:

If a government says that their people should eat a certain amount of yogurt because that is part of our standard healthy diet then why would they allow a toxin or chemical that they could easily ban to be added to that yogurt?

Here's another thing, in the manufacturing process to create that yogurt, the company creates more toxic waste than the supposedly healthy yogurt and they let that company dump the toxic waste in our water systems which then adds to the toxicity of our entire planet.

They could easily change the laws to forbid dumping toxic waste, forbid even the creation of toxic waste at certain levels and the United States of America has to change the laws about what chemicals need to be banned. We need change for the amounts of toxic levels to preserve health standards. Our standards must change.

Just putting a warning lable on a product is not good enough. We feed our children certain chemicals in foods, foods that are part of our standard healthy diet, those foods contain certain chemicals that have been proven to cause hyper activity among other things.

Then we have hyper active children and we have a world where children are on medication when there is just no reason this should be happening.

Is it more profitable to have to create medication to fight the effects of our toxic environment instead of fixing the root cause of the issue in the first place?

Who is actually profiting from this type of decision making?

We need more decision making that says, All for One and One for All!

Researcher: Elisabeth Revel