

THE JOURNAL OF FEDERAL AGENCY ACTION

Editor's Note: The Winds of Change Keep Blowing

Victoria Prussen Spears

Securities and Exchange Commission Expands Accommodations for Confidential Draft Registration Statements

Ryan J. Adams, Scott Lesmes, Justin R. Salon, and Carolina Bernal

Parties Seeking to Overturn Superfund PFAS Rule Explain Bases of Their Challenge

Greg A. Christianson, Hillary Sanborn, Megan Ault, and Frankie Brown

Reshaped Priorities: Navigating Changes to Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and Foreign Agents Registration Act Enforcement

Adam Goldberg, William M. Sullivan Jr., Carolina A. Fornos, Kimberly D. Jaimez, and Christopher C. Caffarone

Loper Bright Strikes Again: U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit Hangs Up on Federal Communications Commission's One-to-One Consent Rule, Calling the Validity of Other Telephone Consumer Protection Act Rules Into Question

Andrew C. Glass and Gregory N. Blase

Commodity Futures Trading Commission Announces New System to Incentivize Self-Reporting, Cooperation, and Remediation

Michelle N. Tanney, Isabelle Corbett Sterling, and Shelleah M. Jackson

Commodity Futures Trading Commission Permits Separate Account Treatment

Rita M. Molesworth, Tamika P. Bent, and Imani Martinez

U.S. Supreme Court Invalidates Certain "Narrative" Water Quality Limitations in NPDES Permits

Martin T. Booher, Thomas E. Hogan, and Cory N. Barnes

The Latest on Pharmaceutical Company-Sponsored Diagnostic Testing Programs

Jesse A. Witten and Kennedy Ferry

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Moves to Eliminate Self-Affirmed GRAS Pathway for Food Ingredients

Samuel D. Jockel and Angela M. Spivey

White House Policy Aims to Reshape Foreign Investment in the United States

Eric R. Markus and Sevren R. Gourley

Trump Administration Rescinds Certain Actions by Previous Administration to Ease Cuba Sanctions

Andres Fernandez, Gabriel Caballero Jr., Aymee D. Valdivia, Ronald A. Oleynik, Jonathan M. Epstein, Robert A. Friedman, Antonia I. Tzinova, Andrew K. McAllister, Daniel A. Noste, and Kristen Jimenez

The Journal of Federal Agency Action

Volume 3, No. 4 | July–August 2025

- 237 Editor's Note: The Winds of Change Keep Blowing**
Victoria Prussen Spears
- 241 Securities and Exchange Commission Expands Accommodations for Confidential Draft Registration Statements**
Ryan J. Adams, Scott Lesmes, Justin R. Salon, and Carolina Bernal
- 247 Parties Seeking to Overturn Superfund PFAS Rule Explain Bases of Their Challenge**
Greg A. Christianson, Hillary Sanborn, Megan Ault, and Frankie Brown
- 251 Reshaped Priorities: Navigating Changes to Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and Foreign Agents Registration Act Enforcement**
Adam Goldberg, William M. Sullivan Jr., Carolina A. Fornos, Kimberly D. Jaimez, and Christopher C. Caffarone
- 257 *Loper Bright* Strikes Again: U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit Hangs Up on Federal Communications Commission's One-to-One Consent Rule, Calling the Validity of Other Telephone Consumer Protection Act Rules Into Question**
Andrew C. Glass and Gregory N. Blase
- 261 Commodity Futures Trading Commission Announces New System to Incentivize Self-Reporting, Cooperation, and Remediation**
Michelle N. Tanney, Isabelle Corbett Sterling, and Shelleah M. Jackson
- 271 Commodity Futures Trading Commission Permits Separate Account Treatment**
Rita M. Molesworth, Tamika P. Bent, and Imani Martinez
- 277 U.S. Supreme Court Invalidates Certain "Narrative" Water Quality Limitations in NPDES Permits**
Martin T. Booher, Thomas E. Hogan, and Cory N. Barnes
- 283 The Latest on Pharmaceutical Company-Sponsored Diagnostic Testing Programs**
Jesse A. Witten and Kennedy Ferry
- 289 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Moves to Eliminate Self-Affirmed GRAS Pathway for Food Ingredients**
Samuel D. Jockel and Angela M. Spivey

293 White House Policy Aims to Reshape Foreign Investment in the United States

Eric R. Markus and Seuren R. Gourley

303 Trump Administration Rescinds Certain Actions by Previous Administration to Ease Cuba Sanctions

Andres Fernandez, Gabriel Caballero Jr., Aymee D. Valdivia,
Ronald A. Oleynik, Jonathan M. Epstein, Robert A. Friedman,
Antonia I. Tzinova, Andrew K. McAllister, Daniel A. Noste, and
Kristen Jimenez

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Steven A. Meyerowitz

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

Victoria Prussen Spears

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Lynn E. Calkins

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

Washington, D.C.

Helaine I. Fingold

Member, Epstein Becker & Green, P.C.

Baltimore

Nancy A. Fischer

Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

Washington, D.C.

Bethany J. Hills

Partner, DLA Piper LLP (US)

New York

Phil Lookadoo

Partner, Haynes and Boone, LLP

Washington, D.C.

Michelle A. Mantine

Partner, Reed Smith LLP

Pittsburgh

Ryan J. Strasser

Partner, Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP

Richmond & Washington, D.C.

THE JOURNAL OF FEDERAL AGENCY ACTION (ISSN 2834-8818 (online)) at \$495.00 annually is published six times per year by Full Court Press, a Fastcase, Inc., imprint. Copyright 2025 Fastcase, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner.

For customer support, please contact Fastcase, Inc., 729 15th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005, 202.999.4777 (phone), or email customer service at support@fastcase.com.

Publishing Staff

Publisher: Leanne Battle

Production Editor: Sharon D. Ray

Cover Art Design: Morgan Morrisette Wright and Sharon D. Ray

This journal's cover includes a photo of Washington D.C.'s Metro Center underground station. The Metro's distinctive coffered and vaulted ceilings were designed by Harry Weese in 1969. They are one of the United States' most iconic examples of the brutalist design style often associated with federal administrative buildings. The photographer is by XH_S on Unsplash, used with permission.

Cite this publication as:

The Journal of Federal Agency Action (Fastcase)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Copyright © 2025 Full Court Press, an imprint of Fastcase, Inc.

All Rights Reserved.

A Full Court Press, Fastcase, Inc., Publication

Editorial Office

729 15th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005

<https://www.fastcase.com/>

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE JOURNAL OF FEDERAL AGENCY ACTION, 729 15th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005.

Articles and Submissions

Direct editorial inquiries and send material for publication to:

Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.,
26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@
meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541.

Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, corporate compliance officers, government agencies and their counsel, senior business executives, and anyone interested in federal agency actions.

This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact:

Leanne Battle, Publisher, Full Court Press at leanne.battle@vlex.com or at
866.773.2782

For questions or Sales and Customer Service:

Customer Service
Available 8 a.m.–8 p.m. Eastern Time
866.773.2782 (phone)
support@fastcase.com (email)

Sales
202.999.4777 (phone)
sales@fastcase.com (email)

ISSN 2834-8796 (print)
ISSN 2834-8818 (online)

Parties Seeking to Overturn Superfund PFAS Rule Explain Bases of Their Challenge

Greg A. Christianson, Hillary Sanborn, Megan Ault, and Frankie Brown*

In this article, the authors discuss a court challenge to the Environmental Protection Agency's rule placing PFOS and PFOA on the Superfund "hazardous substances" list.

In April 2024, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a new rule designating perfluorooctanoic acid, or PFOA, and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid, or PFOS, and their salts and structural isomers as "hazardous substances" under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other parties have sought to reverse the designation by challenging the rule in a case pending before the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. In a November 2024 filing, the Chamber and co-petitioners explained the basis of their challenge as summarized below.

The EPA's Alleged Misinterpretation of the Standard for Designation

In designating a substance as hazardous under CERCLA, the EPA must first determine that, "when released into the environment[, it] . . . may present substantial danger to the public health or welfare or the environment."¹ In applying this standard to PFOA and PFOS, the EPA, the petitioners alleged, construed the phrase "may present substantial danger" as granting it authority to designate a substance as hazardous if it created any possibility of substantial danger. The petitioners argue that this interpretation is far too broad, asserting that it essentially gives the EPA unlimited power to declare almost anything, even substances like salt, as hazardous.

Instead, the petitioners argue, the EPA's interpretation must have "fixed boundaries" to comport with Congress's intent. Furthermore, the petitioners argue that the EPA erred by listing several factors they "may consider" when evaluating a substance without explaining how those factors are weighed or prioritized.

The petitioners also argue that the EPA's broad interpretation of the substantial danger criterion clashes with how CERCLA defines "pollutants or contaminants," a separate category of substances the EPA can address under the statute under certain circumstances. The petitioners argue that, under the EPA's current interpretation, the requirements for "pollutants or contaminants" are actually stricter than for "hazardous substances," which, they posit, makes no sense. The petitioners further argue that the EPA's proposed approach contradicts the agency's own earlier practices and proposals, which included clear, measurable standards for what constitutes a "substantial danger."

Purported Flaws in the EPA's Cost Analyses

The petitioners also argue that the EPA's cost analysis, assessing the implications of its rule, is deeply flawed. The EPA initially took the position they were not allowed to consider costs when making the proposed rule. After reviewing public comments, the EPA added a cost analysis in the final rule. However, because the cost analysis was not provided in the public comment version, the petitioners argue that they had been prevented from providing feedback, which, they asserted, constituted a violation of standard administrative procedure.

The petitioners also identified several other alleged problems with the EPA's cost analysis. The petitioners argue the EPA improperly treated cleanup costs paid by companies as a benefit of the rule on the rationale that these costs otherwise would have fallen to the government. The petitioners argue that this is illogical and assumes the EPA would have otherwise incurred these costs by cleaning up these chemicals, which they contend is not supported by evidence. Further, the petitioners asserted that the EPA significantly underestimated the number of sites that would require cleanup, potentially by thousands, dramatically understating the true cost of the rule.

The petitioners argue that the EPA also ignored several important elements of the cost analysis.

First, they contend that the EPA completely ignored the cleanup costs at federal facilities, which are expected to be substantial, and violated the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which requires agencies to consider the impact of their rules on small businesses.

Second, they contend that the EPA failed to address comments from various industries, including waste management, construction, and recycling, about the significant costs they would face and improperly classified major costs as “indirect,” excluding them from their analysis of impacts on small businesses.

And finally, the petitioners argue that the EPA’s actual calculation of the rule’s benefits was flawed and overstated.

The EPA’s Alleged Failure to Consider Far-Reaching Implications

The petitioners argue that the EPA failed to adequately assess the broad implications of their decision, including the impact on real estate transactions, given the widespread presence of PFOA and PFOS. The EPA admits uncertainty about where these chemicals are located, how much cleanup will cost, and the best way to clean them up. Property owners, the petitioners argue, could face unexpected cleanup liabilities, and buyers would need to conduct extensive environmental assessments before purchasing property. While the EPA suggests using “enforcement discretion” to mitigate these issues, the petitioners argue this potential constraint is insufficient because it is not legally binding and does not prevent lawsuits from states or private parties. And the petitioners argue that this uncertainty, combined with the strict liability imposed by CERCLA, makes the rule arbitrary and capricious.

The petitioners conclude that the appropriate action is for the court to vacate the rule entirely. They contend that the alleged problems with the rule are too serious to be fixed through revisions. They further argue that vacating the rule would not cause significant disruption because other regulatory tools are available to address PFOA/PFOS contamination.

The case presents a compelling test of the DC Circuit’s approach to reviewing agency rules following the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*.² In *Loper*, the Supreme Court overruled the long-standing practice of affording *Chevron* deference to agencies’ interpretations of ambiguous statutory terms

if those interpretations were reasonable. The petitioners here specifically invoke the Supreme Court’s decision in *Loper* to argue that the EPA’s interpretation of when a substance may present substantial danger “is entitled to no deference” and to instead urge the court to apply the “best reading” of the statutory language.

Some reports indicate that the Trump administration might consider reversing the EPA’s position on PFOA and PFAS. In particular, the Project 2025 “blueprint” for a second Trump administration compiled by the Heritage Foundation calls on the EPA to “revisit” the designation decision. While the Trump administration has recently clarified its position on certain PFAS issues, it remains to be seen whether it will seek to continue to defend the CERCLA rule, particularly in light of the petitioner’s arguments.

Notes

* The authors, attorneys with Alston & Bird LLP, may be contacted at greg.christianson@alston.com, hillary.sanborn@alston.com, megan.ault@alston.com, and frankie.brown@alston.com, respectively.

1. CERCLA § 102(a).
2. *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369 (2024).