

Congress of the United States

Washington, DC 20515

March 27, 2026

The Honorable Amy Karpel
Chair
U.S. International Trade Commission
500 E Street, SW
Washington, DC 20436

Dear Chair Karpel:

I write to you regarding the current Section 201 (Safeguards) investigation into Quartz Surface Products. Serious harm may follow from an affirmative determination, including putting thousands of Americans with good paying fabricator manufacturing jobs out of work. Fabricators are members of the very industry that the Safeguards statute is designed to protect. Following the hearing on this matter, I believe that affirmative determination is not warranted. Accordingly, I respectfully request that the International Trade Commission (ITC)—in accordance with the law—vote negative in this case. Finally, I request that you keep in mind the following aspects of the standard of review and the relevant evidence.

With respect to the standard of review, Sections 201-202 of the Trade Act of 1974 sets forth a very high burden for an affirmative finding in a Safeguards case—precisely because the foreign producers are not accused of engaging in any unfair trading practice. To make an affirmative finding in a Safeguards case, the ITC must find that imports are the “substantial cause” of “serious injury” to the domestic industry.¹ The Safeguard statute requires establishing that imports are, in and of themselves, sufficient to have caused serious harm to the domestic industry through significant impairment such as the closure, idling of facilities, or loss of employment for workers.

It is not clear that the evidence presented in this case demonstrates the existence of such harms, let alone that imports are the cause of them. The petitioning companies also import quartz, are seeking an exemption for at least one of the countries from which they import, and do not represent the views of the bulk of domestic manufacturing of quartz surface products. The record demonstrates that these multinational companies’ share of the surface products market has remained consistent for years and that they have expanded production. They remain profitable and have made major recent investments in their U.S. manufacturing facilities.² This is not the picture of an industry going through the type of “serious injury” for which the Safeguards statute is intended to apply.

The quartz industry is not only comprised of the few large firms representing the petitioning group. The industry is made up of approximately 10,000 small domestic businesses that employ 100,000 workers fabricating quartz. That is 10 times as many workers as employed by the Petitioners. More than 1,000 of these laborers have written to you opposing this petition because it risks hurting the profitability and growth of the industry.³ The purpose of the Safeguards statute is to protect American workers, not pick winners and losers among them. The domestic industry overwhelmingly opposes this petition.

¹ 19 U.S.C. § 2251.

² *Quartz Surface Products*, Inv. No. TA-201-79, USITC Prehearing Report (Feb. 9, 2026) (“Prehearing Staff Report”) at Tbl. C.2

³ See Prehearing Staff Report at pp. 1.1, FN2 (reporting receipt of declarations from more than 700 independent fabricators opposing the petition prior to institution); *Quartz Surface Products*, Inv. No. TA-201-79, Respondents’ Prehearing Brief, Exh. 1-A (Fabricator Declarations) (containing more than 340 new fabricator declarations opposing the petition).

Even though the evidence for “serious injury” is lacking, it is equally the case that whatever complaints the multinational companies have, the “substantial cause” of them does not flow from imports. Several other conditions are more impactful than imports in the housing and countertop market, most prominently the broader affordability problems that have slowed homebuilding in the past couple years. Homebuilders are finding it more difficult to economically build homes, and regular Americans are finding it increasingly to afford a home—much less the high-end premium countertops sold by the Petitioners which often cost over \$100 an installed square foot. In fact, single-family housing starts fell in almost every month of 2025, ending the year approximately 10 percent below 2024 levels and nearly 20 percent below their 2021 peak, reflecting the strain that ongoing affordability pressures place on the housing market. The ITC should not add to the cost of home ownership.

Importantly, the Petitioners proposed tariffs and rigid quotas, which would result in imports of previously affordable quartz being replaced with other materials such as imported granite. Economic modelling submitted in this investigation finds that the 50 percent tariff on quartz surface products (QSP) requested by the Petitioners would result in a 36 percent decline in the quantity of U.S. QSP consumption and a \$2.6 billion reduction in revenue U.S. QSP producers. The proposed remedy would cause a \$634 million loss for the domestic industry, largely harming small, family-owned American fabricators.⁴

To be clear, this is a loss that hurts our domestic industry; the estimate does not include the significant increased costs that Americans buying quartz or renovating their homes would experience. At a time with increased prices in every sector, the ITC must protect consumers and American businesses. As you prepare to vote; it is critical that you prioritize American workers and businesses and apply the Safeguards statute faithfully.

Sincerely,



Raja Krishnamoorthi
Member of Congress

⁴ Travis Pope and Bhargav Parapati, Economic Modeling of the Effects of Petitioner’s Proposed Remedy (Feb. 17, 2025), submitted in Quartz Surface Products, U.S. Int’l Trade Commission, inv. No. TA-201-79 (Injury Phase).