

Oregon Toxic-Free Cosmetics Act Rulemaking - RAC Meeting _1-20260730_091034-Meeting Transcript

July 30, 2026, 4:10PM

2h 2m 12s

● **Sherry Brett W** started transcription –

Transcript of [Teams Chat](#) for 7.30.26 RAC meeting

CR **Christina Ross** 0:05

My background is in toxicology and chemical risk assessment as well as microbiology. I've sat in on a couple of these for a few states.

I'm glad to be here for Oregon.

I started my career. I have to say as a receptionist at a hair salon. I was not a cosmetologist or a hair stylist.

Way back in high school and after grad school worked in consulting for about 10 years in product stewardship, focused on first industrial chemicals and then quickly moved into consumer products and personal care, which is much more interesting. And I'm thrilled to be here.

Our companies, headquartered in San Francisco, but I'm calling in from Boulder, Co.

SW **Sherry Brett W** 0:45

Nice. It's very interesting mix.

It's a great, you know, skill set to bring to this virtual table.

Both like cosmetics background and the toxicology.

So happy to have you. Thanks.

Lane boger.

LB **Lane Bogar** 1:02

Hi. Yeah, I'm laying Bogar with manager of regulatory science at Fragrance Creators Association, representing essentially the entire North American fragrance industry from in the entirety of the supply chain.

Background and toxicology specifically.

So excited to to be a part of this and have some have some Intel as well.

Thanks for having me.

I'll be off camera.

Also, I'm eating my lunch currently a salad which seems a little risky at the moment, but.

Thanks.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:35

Thanks for being here and it's absolutely fine if you need to go on and off camera.

I mean, it's always nice to see faces, but if you need to eat or whatever, you need to do, I realized that, you know, with the time differences.

Here it's 9:00 in the morning on the West Coast.

But it's lunchtime in other parts of the country.

So do what you need to do.

Sammy pet node.

PS Patnode Samie 2:01

Good morning.

My name is Sammy Patnode.

I am policy analyst for the Health Licensing Office. Specifically, six of the boards that we oversee, including the Board of Cosmetology.

So I'm here in that capacity to listen and learn and and help help if I can.

SW Sherry Brett W 2:20

Sounds great.

Thanks Sammy.

Derek sang strum.

WJ WALTZ Justin 2:32

I believe he has a colleague.

SW Sherry Brett W 2:34

Oh, a backup. Is this Scott winkles?

SW Scott Winkels 2:38

Yeah. Hi, this is Scott Winkles.

I'm representing standing in for Derek, representing Oregon business and industry

and the Oregon Retail Alliance.

I am a dance dad and a theater dad, so I'm not completely ignorant of these matters.

SW Sherry Brett W 2:59

Glad to have you, Scott. Thank you.

Lisa Cox.

CD COX Lisa * DEQ 3:07

Hi everyone.

My name is Lisa Cox.

I work for the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality in Portland, OR.

I'm a senior policy toxics reduction analyst and I'm also here to listen and learn and support.

The group and bring information back to DQ and get resources as needed.

SW Sherry Brett W 3:30

Thanks Lisa.

Crystal Weston.

CW Crystal Weston 3:36

Hey everyone.

Crystal Weston she her pronouns here with Oregon Environmental Council, where I focus on environmental health and great to see you all here today.

SW Sherry Brett W 3:49

Thanks for being with us. Crystal actually used to work with our environmental Public health section.

So I I actually know crystal.

So personal Care Products Council, I think this sub is Kathy Stanton.

KS Kathy Stanton 4:04

Hi everyone.

Kathy Stanton from the Personal Care Products Council.

I'm also on the East Coast and enjoying my lunch, as is lane.

I'm the senior director of Science and regulatory affairs for over 600 member

association. I've been a human and environmental science expert for the last 25 years in all types of consumer products used to be soaps and detergents. Now I'm. Looking at more of the personal care products and have been at the Council for the last couple of years, so thank you for this invite and looking forward to the conversation.

SW Sherry Brett W 4:46

Yeah, thanks for joining.

It's definitely a great skill set for this conversation.

Mira Irizarry.

So looks like professional beauty association is there, Amira.

OK.

Moving on, we have the Beatrice van or B.

B Beatrice 5:20

Hi everyone.

Good morning or good afternoon too.

My name is Beatrice van.

I also go by B. Either way works for me.

I am the owner of Beauty by B as a petitioner and also I own a skin care line here in Portland OR.

I also am currently on the Board of Cosmetology and also work at an aesthetic school here in Portland OR in Tigard. OR I've been an esthetician for 20, almost 25 years.

And I am really excited to be a part of this group and listen and learn and see if I can provide any feedback and help support this bill.

Thank you.

SW Sherry Brett W 5:54

It's definitely great to have that hands on experience for this conversation, so thanks for joining.

I think I saw Mira just pop in.

Is Mira irizari here?

MI Myra Irizarry 6:05

Hi. Yes, sorry about that.

My name's Myra and we can get us go by ready. Because I was very so. I was one of those that a really long name. I apologize for being late. So I'm Maya ready.

I'm the vice president of Government affairs for the Professional Beauty Association and super excited to be included.

Thank you so much for this opportunity and really anxious just to learn more about this process and all the details.

So hopefully we can provide some great feedback and work together.

Thank you.

SW Sherry Brett W 6:37

Thanks for joining us.

I will put out the little disclaimer.

I grew up in New Jersey, so names are pronounced very differently out there.

So if I slaughter things, it's it's. It's where I'm from.

It's not my. It's not my fault.

MI Myra Irizarry 6:48

I was actually born in New Jersey, so completely understand.

SW Sherry Brett W 6:50

See that?

Then you know.

MI Myra Irizarry 6:53

Yes.

SW Sherry Brett W 6:55

Alright, so Sherry franzovic.

Sherry here today.

Or Eleanor fanning.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 7:12

Yeah, hi. Good morning and thank you, Eleanor Fanning.

I'm a board certified toxicologist at the Washington Department of Public Health and I work in our Office of Environmental Public Health Science.

Actually, we have a lot of programs at DoH that kind of parallel with what Brett described at Oregon Health Authority.

And I work in multiple project areas in toxic chemicals.

Work, but a chunk of my time now is on implementation of Washington's toxic Free Cosmetic Act.

That work is led by our sister agency, the Department of Ecology, and Sherry Franjevic leads that work, and she can't be here today.

So you'll meet her next time, but Sherry and I work very, very closely on implementation of our.

Law in Washington state.

Thank you.

SW Sherry Brett W 8:11

Thank you.

Thanks for that context too.

That helps kind of tie things together.

So that's most of the list.

There's just a couple of folks.

So when there's actually a new law in here in Oregon that the representatives and senators that actually introduce legislation.

Are invited to these Rule advisory committee meetings and that invites were sent out. But I don't think I've seen anything back, but just to check is Senator Janine Solman or Senator Niran Mislin with us?

OK, I didn't think so, but just wanted to double check what I'm trying to take the attendance here and share a screen and do all of these things at the same time. It can get a little hard to see what's on the screen so thanks for bearing with.

Me there.

All right, so moving right along.

Just a couple housekeeping issues.

It's really helpful if folks can raise their hand during this process.

We can make sure everybody's heard.

One thing you'll probably see that this message this meeting is being transcribed.

We don't record the actual video, but the transcriptions really helpful if we need to go back and see exactly what somebody said. In case there's any, you know, you know, if our notes don't align, we.

Can actually go back and see the words that when folks are on camera and it's being recorded, they tend to not speak up as much.

But the transcriptions kind of happen in the background, so it's not. It's not something that you're seeing.

There is a chat feature, but we do ask that you use it sparingly.

It can be very distracting for someone who's presenting.

It's a great tool for sharing resources or links, or you know information that's, you know, pertinent to the conversation.

But if you have questions or comments, it's always helpful to just raise your hand and and bring them to everybody.

Not everyone's gonna be checking the chat the whole time, so things can go missed, so it's always helpful if it's part of the discussion.

I think we were saying this earlier, but I think we've all experienced the the awkward hot mic moment.

So it's always great if you have your microphone muted when you're not speaking.

That's always helpful.

We do ask that you try to stay on camera if possible. If you're eating your lunch, please, you can go off camera.

Or if you're just not comfortable being on camera today, you're just not feeling the camera day.

That's absolutely fine, but sometimes it's helpful just to see who's talking and kind of have that that back and forth.

So we do ask.

We do allow interested parties or other folks from organizations to attend these meetings, but if your name was not called as part of that roster, you're not an official RAC member. So you can listen in, but it's not time for you to comment if you have questions you.

Can always send an e-mail to us.

We'll have that on a future slide here.

We can actually drop that in the chat as well.

We can put a link if Justin, maybe you can help with that.

A link to the website and.

Our.

E-mail address.

So you can send stuff to us.

We're always happy to communicate outside of the rack meetings as well.

That's absolutely fine.

So if there's questions or comments or something that's burning, you need to share.

Feel free to do that.

So when it comes to the if you have a substitute. If you can't make it to a future meeting, it's OK to send somebody else from your organization.

And if you wanna have them listen in to these calls, that's great as well.

But again, just one person from each organization is is gonna be serving as the actual rack member.

And next slide.

So why are we here?

Just kind of a quick overview about what we're doing. Some folks may be more familiar with this whole process than others, but what brings us here was Senate Bill 546. That was from the 2023 legislative session.

This bill established our toxic Free cosmetics program and it directed the Oregon Health Authority to develop rules to implement that program.

So the Rule advisory committee process is what we use to basically develop.

Up these rules. So we wanna get a good representation of folks who these rules will impact. And that goes from, you know, folks who are involved in the industry, manufacturers, you have all the governmental entities that kind of work on this type of of regulation, you know, either.

Statewide or nationally.

And there's also the advocate side. You have folks who are really looking at and, you know, either environmental health or the environmental impacts.

Of of this legislation.

So it's a pretty good smattering of of folks that are involved in that. This may impact directly, so.

We try to get a pretty broad perspective at these meetings.

I think it's really helpful to craft rules that are effective in that you know, everybody can hopefully live with.

Timeline, you might notice an interesting gap here.

This bill was passed in 2023 and it doesn't take effect until 2027.

There were some budget constraints at the time when this was passed and it was in order for them to get it through.

It was a much easier thing to do to push this out a few years, which helped.

Then there's the other obvious piece of like, why are we doing this now when this is gonna take effect in six months, essentially?

We actually didn't get any funding for that, the Oregon Health Authority to do this work until the beginning of this year, and there were quite a few hang ups on our end about getting position authority and and getting getting staff hired.

So Justin just came on about a month ago to help really kick this into gear. So I'm still confident we can make this happen.

We can have these rules.

In place by January 1st.

Go to the next slide here and kind of talk about the Charter. So Justin shared a charter about kind of how this process works.

I mentioned this before like each rack member, you know each rack, each group that's participating as a rack member can have a backup.

I understand. You know, it's summer.

There's gonna be vacations. People get sick, things happen.

So if you can't make it, that's fine.

Let us know we can add somebody else's name to the roster.

We know who's gonna be joining us, and it's absolutely fine.

Just have somebody else sit in.

We just can't have two folks from the same organization at the table at the same time at our virtual table. Interested parties can listen in.

Like I said before, we just don't want them commenting.

This isn't the time there's going to be a public comment period where anyone could submit comments.

Questions, whatever it might be, concerns.

We'll share that with the group obviously and and we'll send this out to our list of interested parties.

These as well about anybody who might be interested in in commenting on this whole process.

This is our general e-mail inbox.

This toxic tree cosmetics link you can see here on the screen.

But the big crux here is the decision-making piece.

There, there are obviously gonna be differing opinions at this virtual table. Typically, if you can imagine like a manufacturer doing their thing, not convinced that maybe a chemical is actually.

Hazardous to folks.

And then there's the opposite side of the health advocates who are really pushing to have all of that chemical removed from everything possible.

So there are going to be some competing opinions here, which is, you know, part of this process. But what we really want to do is make sure that everybody is heard and we really want to come to a consensus when possible.

So again, like the the the Oregon Health Authority, we're kind of sitting here in the middle of this whole process trying to create rules that will work for everyone.

That are protective of health but not overly burdensome.

So we kind of walk this line in this in this middle spot, this middle ground in a way, but obviously we want to have agreement. We would love to be able to have rules that everybody's happy with, but that doesn't always happen.

So just so you know, at the very end of the day, the Oregon Health Authority makes the final call. If we can't reach consensus, we're going to have to pick a direction, so. Again, we do want to have all of the feedback.

All the reasons why and we we will consider all of that, but at the end of the day, OHA does get to make that call.

So quick overview of the agenda.

We did intros already.

We talked about the housekeeping piece.

We're gonna try to get through a bunch of rules today.

These so oars, Oregon administrative rule. These numbers are basically placeholders.

We worked with our Rules coordinator to come up with some numbers that are eventually gonna be holding all the rules that we create through this process.

So if you ever try to look these up right now and like Google them, you're not gonna find it.

They don't. They're not.

They're not official.

All of these rules are currently in draft, so, but these are the numbers that are likely going to align with with the new rules.

So today we're going to try to get through this bucket of rule writing.

We'll take a break in the middle.

At a time that actually feels good.

We'll wrap up at the end and just talk about next steps about what the next rack meeting will look like so.

The one of the hardest things in putting these rule advisory committee meetings together.

Is tiny.

So we've had with our toxic Free Kids program the not the last time, but the time before we scheduled three rack meetings and we thought, oh, that should be plenty of time.

It took nine.

It was a lot more controversial.

It was a lot more discussion happening and we had to do a lot of homework in between, but it just took a very long time and learning from that the last, the most recent toxic free Kids rule writing we did we we built in a lot of extra.

Time.

And we zipped through it faster than we could have possibly imagined.

We had it.

You know, cancel that.

The meetings at the end 'cause we just didn't need them.

So it's really hard to gauge how long this will all take.

So we have 3 hour blocks. We we wanna make sure there's enough time to get through and have a good conversation about it all, but we might.

We might not need it all, and if we get through this early, we'll give back the gift of time. We're not gonna waste anybody's time.

Totally respect everybody being here and appreciate your time. So we don't wanna to waste it.

We're not gonna go off on frivolous conversations.

So we'll chat about the the timeline for the next piece at the end of of today's session.

And just last slide, before we kind of pop into the the nuts and bolts of this.

There's essentially like 6.

I mean this can expand, but there's about 6 buckets of work that we need to get through.

We have to write definitions for the rules. We have to come up with a list of high priority chemicals of concerns and cosmetics.

There's a process for modifying that list over time.

There's many factoring.

So there's a notice required for manufacturers.

Is that we're gonna be talking about?

We have to come up with a list of prohibited chemicals, classes and subclasses of chemicals that that list already exists. But there's work that we have to build around that.

And then we have the enforcement process. Basically how enforcement is gonna be, how we handle enforcement, it spells out the process.

We don't just automatically send out civil penalties. We have to go through a process before we do something like that.

So we we work with manufacturers to make sure they can comply.

It's really like a compliance assistance approach, but the last step is enforcement. If folks aren't complying, then we have to go down that route.

The the bullets here that are in blue are what we'll tackle today and you can see it's a little bit out of order.

Like, why wouldn't you just start from the top?

Sometimes it's a little back and forth, but we don't necessarily know all the terms we'll need to define until we get most of the rules drafted.

So the the definitions we can talk about kind of some ideas about definitions as we go through this, but we'll we'll finalize those definitions later on at A at a future rack.

One of the biggest.

Chunks of work in this process is going to be creating that list of high priority chemicals. Concerned that doesn't exist.

And there are a lot of different lists out there from different states, different countries, different organizations.

So coming up with that list will probably be the the biggest. You know, the crux of this work. It's gonna be a a big chunk of it.

So that's not happening today.

The rules we're looking at today again.

And blue.

So with that, are there any questions before we dive into the actual rule piece?

Anything I said unclear or confusing or just needs clarification.

All right.

My my work is done here. I can pass this over to Justin.

So Justin's going to share his screen.

I'll stop.

I'll stop sharing on my end.

Justin's going to pull up the draft rules. Hopefully folks have all had a chance to take a look at those rules.

Of course it's rural language.

It's not exactly.

You know, like a summer novel, it's not something you're going to remember, but it's it's helpful to, you know, have that out ahead of time and just see what we're looking at.

We're going to go through this and.

Basically, ask for feedback about anything that's in there that might be concerning and kind of you know where the obviously you're representing your organization like. Think about how these rules would impact your organization if that's something that is absolutely impossible for you to do, or if it's somet.

That's gonna be very burdensome.

Like we need to know that, or if it's just if it just doesn't make sense, we need to know that as well. As I said before.

We are certainly not the experts in all of this.

So that's that's why we have everybody here at the virtual table.

So with that, I will pass this over to Justin and stop talking.

WJ WALTZ Justin 22:13

Thank you, Brett. Appreciate that.

OK, before I dive in, I'll read a point that Brett made.

We have 10 years of experience with chemicals and children's products.

Cosmetics is new to us.

So if you have ideas for these rules, either OHA should consider doing this, or you know that's really not gonna work.

Please voice them during these rec meetings.

The point of these meetings is to discuss how OHA is implement this law.

I would say the two action points that will result from this law is a restriction on certain chemicals and cosmetic problems from being sold in Oregon. That restriction and the chemicals are in statute.

But how we do it is?

What we put out in Rule and the second piece is the requirement that manufacturers publicly disclose in websites a second group of chemicals known as hypertrigemicals, if a concern used in cosmetic products.

To wiely name.

But that's we have.

That's where I have to go with.

So yeah, all of you have experience we don't have.

So we'd really like to hear from you second before I get going.

We don't have additional staff to implement, talks, free kids.

I'm sorry, T.O.K free cosmetics.

Some do this in rulemaking, in addition to implementing the talks, every kids act.

As I'm doing this kind of real time, these draft rules may change midway.

To this rack, but whenever we send these back out to you, it changes in black font that are made either because of your input or because I've been talking with colleagues and and decided to change them.

Always be in red. That way the current changes are clear for everybody.

The rules will always be titled, but the date of the REC meeting are gonna be discussed.

The date that they're posted or sent out will be at the bottom of the page.

Looks like this one is right here.

And for for version control, which can be really frustrating, I always keep the most current version on of the docs on our website and I gave you the rules implementation page in the.

In the chat.

OK.

So starting along.

In the version I sent out on Monday, I gave you a table of contents. I just realized I'll make that clickable on future iterations of this.

But let's get right to the first part. We're going to do, which is kind of like.

A hopefully everyone can see this on their screen.

Please let me know if you can't.

This is kind of like.

The formal part of of all rules.

It just talks about what the program is and the effective date. You could see there.

I've already noticed errors that it made in trying to turn this over from toxic free kids.

11 point that I'm real realizing is that the information will be required to be reported.

Well, it doesn't have to be reported to us.

It has to be noticed on a website and so my question mark out there to you is what's

a good noun or what's a good word.

That replace reported and please let me know if.

You could think of one and we can do that in the in the chat if you'd like.

The second part to this is Brett talked about all these will be effective as well as the statute itself on January 1st, 2027. So in in less than six months.

And so that's just what we have to do.

I just talked with earlier or as Brett did, the definitions are often we do have some of the definitions in statute, which always take precedence over those that are made in Rule, but.

There may be words that are needed that we use in these rules that need to be defined and so we'll kind of do those as we get going as we go forward on this, OK.

Next one is the Hyperion cosmetic products.

These are the ones that manufacturers must put on their website.

Or they noticed on the website if they contain in cosmetic products or sold in Oregon.

And So what I'd like to do.

Which is take an aside here. If you have particular ideas on on chemicals that should be included, please let us know.

I mean, we would.

We would be very interested to know what your opinions are on what we should we should do.

If you take a moment now or or let me know if you if you have any ideas.

OK, let's keep on going.

PQL's practical quantification limits.

I think I'm gonna ask Dave Ferrar, our toxicologist to kind of explain a little bit about what those are just so everybody's clear on what we're talking about, Dave.

DF **David Farrer** 27:24

Sure. So practical quantitation limit.

PQL it it's a quasi technical term.

It's it's not something that is actually used in analytical laboratories very much, so the the issue is that.

Like the analytical equipment used to detect chemicals have has limits like below, which they can't.

They can't detect just like a scale at the grocery store. Like if you put like 1 grape on

the scale, it will still show 0 even though you know there's a grape there. There's a limit to what the machine can actually tell.

There's some minimum number of grapes you have to add to the scale before the scale can tell that there's something.

So that's it's the same with analytical chemistry, so.

So that's so that part is technical, that that's the like the detection limit like the detection limit of the machine is is technical and you can figure that out what that limit is.

But.

Different methods and but that that limit can change depending on what kind of substance you're trying to test, like a powder or a cream or a liquid or an oil or a solid.

Or plastic like all these different kinds of matrices, those we call those a matrix like depending on what the matrix is, it will change what the detection limit is, because it's hard to like extract the chemical from whatever the.

The way you try to extract the chemical depends on what that matrix is, and so there's different methods that you would use for different kinds of products.

And so it's pretty.

It's very, very complicated actually to. There's not just one absolute number that is the limit of detection for a chemical because it depends on so many things like what method you're using, what kind of instruments you have, like what.

Kind of matrix and.

So the what we what the kind of the intention behind the word practical quantification limit is a number that most labs would be able to achieve like like a detection like kind of a a limit of quantification that that most labs would be able to get.

And it's it's usually some amount above the detection limit, so there's the technical detection limit of the machine.

And then a little bit above that is the level that like most labs can probably get and and quantify with with confidence?

But it's very complicated because of the things I said. It's not like there's just one. It's very dependent on the method on the type of substance you're testing on, which chemical you're looking for.

Is that what you were looking for, Justin?

Like the the kind of explanation.

WJ WALTZ Justin 30:22

Yes, thank you very much, Dave. And I believe Kathy has a question.

KS Kathy Stanton 30:26

Yeah. Thank you, David. And Justin, the question is about you have.

A. Basically you have a PQL of contaminants at 100 PPM.

I mean, that's according to David.

What you were saying, that's not going to be always.

A concentration that you can hit here, so if these.

Concentrations of contaminants.

Are put into the. You know the HP triple CPI.

What do we do in those cases?

And I guess that's that's kind of a that's an analytical question. And then it's also a question on the regulatory side of things, I think.

DF David Farrer 31:16

Right. And and we're and we're actually I I don't.

We haven't figured that out yet.

KS Kathy Stanton 31:22

OK.

DF David Farrer 31:22

Exactly like the that's. That's where in the middle.

So if you have ideas about it, but I mean the statute, the statute says that we have to have a PQL for these and also it feels technically impossible to have to have to have PQLS for all of these.

KS Kathy Stanton 31:25

Mm-hmm.

DF David Farrer 31:37

So that's exactly what we're struggling with right now.

KS Kathy Stanton 31:40
Gotcha. All right.

DF David Farrer 31:41
So if so, if you have ideas that that would be great.

KS Kathy Stanton 31:44
Yeah, I'll, I'll. I'll continue to muddle this over and I can get back to you.

DF David Farrer 31:50
OK.
Yeah, because one thing I think that Brett, Brett or Justin said this earlier on, but.
One of the tricky things about writing rule the way right the way that bill that laws work is that the legislature writes the statute and then the agencies write the rules to kind of make it practical.

KS Kathy Stanton 32:04
Mm-hmm.

DF David Farrer 32:10
There's not enough detail. Usually in the statute to actually make the program work, so the rules flush it out.

KS Kathy Stanton 32:10
Right.

DF David Farrer 32:15
But the the rules cannot contradict the statute.
So that's kind of that's the trick, yeah.

KS Kathy Stanton 32:20
Exactly, yeah.
Thank you.

WJ WALTZ Justin 32:26

Thank you very much Kathy for that really insightful question.

Does anybody else have any questions or comments for questions of Dave or comments on this PQL matter at the moment?

And again, you may want to want to Mull it over and we could always bring it up later.

Eleanor, please.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 32:49

Just quick question, can you remind me, I I didn't review the law the statute.

Do you need PQLS also for the chemicals that are prohibited by statute?

I can't remember how that works or the PQL part of your statute, just for the noticeable.

Chemical list.

WJ WALTZ Justin 33:15

Yes, I believe you.

Them at the moment I believe at the moment you need them for both.

That's and it said we'll have to define figure that out later, but it will will do that.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 33:27

OK. Thanks.

WJ WALTZ Justin 33:28

Yeah. OK.

All right, let's see. Moving right along.

OK.

So this next one this is you know we've not still work on those chemicals.

For both both chemical for the chemicals to put on the to notice on the website, but what it is I went ahead and.

Wrote up the section for deciding future chemicals for this list.

So.

The law states that every three years.

Oregon OHA needs to have a rule making.

Committee, A rack meeting or subtle meetings, a session to decide to add chemicals or remove chemicals from this list.

And so that's in statute.

We have to do that every three years.

But what we what we've done is we've put a bunch of.

Sources.

Under rule that will.

In the fall of what it be 2029 to decide for January 1st and 27, No 30. Excuse me.

To so I wanted to know should be pretty straightforward with written, but I'm happy to take questions on any of the items here.

You'll notice at 1A and this is kind of directly from statute that you know.

Washington has their.

Talk to your kids. Act. Sorry. Talk to your cosmetics act.

Which is similar, but it has some differences, but we're directed to use their guidance in helping us come up with our list and then we have a few others that are on this draft rule.

So if you have any questions on it or.

You can see I made a few errors but but I'll clean those up for next time.

I think you all have this in front of you, so I'm just kind of.

Going through, but if you have any questions on on the technical terms, be happy to answer them. Put them up for discussion.

SW Sherry Brett W 35:52

Hey Justin, it is this the list that has the EPA site that's slowly being dismantled. I forget the acronym for.

WJ WALTZ Justin 36:01

Yes it does.

And that is right up here.

SW Sherry Brett W 36:07

I think it might just be helpful to explain what what is up with that.

WJ WALTZ Justin 36:12

I'm gonna turn to Dave once again. Thank you, Dave.

DF **David Farrer** 36:13

I I can do that, yeah.

Yeah. So the, the and I think is so the integrated risk information system.

Was a program with EPA that was.

I think very valuable.

That is, is doesn't exist anymore.

And so do you know, Justin, whether is Iris mentioned in the statute or was that something we added in, in Rule for toxic for kids?

But you are mute, Justin.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 36:49

I'll tell you that real quick.

Just keep on talking. Then I can have an answer for you. One second, please.

DF **David Farrer** 36:54

Oh, OK, OK.

But so the issue with the issue with having it listed here is that in the moving forward there is not likely to be.

New anything coming out of Iris, so at least not for several years, so.

That's so that's like long term, that's could be an issue having iris as like a.

KS **Kathy Stanton** 37:18

Mm-hmm.

DF **David Farrer** 37:19

Source, yeah.

KS **Kathy Stanton** 37:24

The issue would also be that if Iris is there, nothing new will be added, but if there is issues with the data that are available on iris, those won't be corrected as well.

SW **Sherry Brett W** 37:24

Kathy, go ahead.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 37:24

Umm.

KS **Kathy Stanton** 37:38

So I'm not sure if this is going to be.

Well, we have to check with Justin to see if this is gonna if this is actually part of the statute or not.

But like this may be a question that you know needs to be reviewed by the rack.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 37:54

Sure. And so I I'm just looked at the statute and it was taken from tox free kids.

So we will see about removing that and we'll figure out we'll see what we're gonna do.

As I understand Dave, the values up there are still valid, but.

DF **David Farrer** 38:15

Yeah, I I would say there's still right like and and the information that Iris produced is still available online.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 38:17

May not be changed, OK.

DF **David Farrer** 38:25

It's just that the program that generated the numbers is doesn't exist anymore.

So there's not going to be updates or.

Anything over time.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 38:37

Thank you, Eleanor.

DF **David Farrer** 38:38

And no new values.

WJ WALTZ Justin 38:40

Thank you, Eleanor, please.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 38:44

Yeah, I kind of agree with some of the issues around the iris program.

It it isn't being maintained, which for me is a very sad point.

I think there was some excellent science that supported that program.

What I see in your statute is.

Lists maintained by another state agency, a federal agency that.

The authority has identified by rule so it it looks to me like you.

Have you have latitude to kind of designate state and federal authority authoritative lists that you can consider drawing from and you're not required?

You can consider.

So that's good.

That gives some leeway in the legal language, right?

But I just would comment that.

We've had.

Trouble. There really aren't excellent authoritative lists for neurotoxicants.

And that's what this particular D is getting at trying to find an authoritative source for neurotoxicity.

And that can be a little difficult.

I think one of the things we considered and I can look back at it and maybe we we talk next time.

Was also whether.

The state of California has within a week they they have their designated.

I'm sorry, I'm really sick this week, so I'm not thinking very clearly, but the chronic and acute.

WJ WALTZ Justin 40:28

Oh.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 40:33

Health protective numbers for a variety of for their hotspots program, which is a site specific contaminant program.

And in that they they might designate a risk based on a neurotoxic endpoint.
We that is one thing that we looked at was.
Whether there's an acute or chronic relations, that's it.
Reference exposure level in the state of California for neurotoxicity.
Something we might toss out because that program is still alive as far as I know.

WJ WALTZ Justin 41:10

OK, great. I really appreciate you.
You bring that to our and so.
We ha is in office at the Department of Toxic.
Safety control socks acceptance, toxic substance of control.
Excuse me.
And let's say we don't really have anything like this in Oregon, but it's a bonafide agency in in of California.
Does anybody else have any points on these these lists or this?
The rules that are written up.

SW Sherry Brett W 41:43

Just one comment about what this actually touches on. What Eleanor was saying in one all all these letters here are underneath one and it says Oregon Health Authority shall consider adding a chemical to the list.

WJ WALTZ Justin 41:44

Yeah.

SW Sherry Brett W 41:55

So it's not saying that all of these lists will be part of our list. It's just a consideration. So by leaving it there, it doesn't mean we have to adopt something on it. And if if something does change in the future.
We can consider removing it because it's it's not well.
It wouldn't be coming off of that list, but it would be coming off of other people's lists, so it gives us a little bit of latitude to to make changes.

WJ WALTZ Justin 42:20

Yeah. Thank you.

I think I just make the point that consider is in a lot of several of the statutory provisions.

The word that we really need to do something is shall.

So just for a bitty to understand the difference in this two, OK, please elinar you know. So, Christa, go ahead.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 42:37

Sir. Yeah. One one more.

SW Sherry Brett W 42:39

Crystal was first.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 42:41

Oh, you go ahead please.

WJ WALTZ Justin 42:42

Sorry my bad.

CW Crystal Weston 42:44

That's all right.

I'm just struggling back to this iris situation.

Was that resource particularly being used to identify or avoid regrettable substitutions?

WJ WALTZ Justin 43:01

Dave.

DF David Farrer 43:02

Well, I would say, I mean if.

Like iris.

So tools like green screen that I think that you might be thinking about, which is really designed to do, avoid regrettable substitutions.

I think they used information from Iris.

You know, like if something was on an iris list, then green screen would have directed steered people away from from chemicals that Iris had assessed. But.

They're not, but is that what you're to answer your question like? Like I like. Iris wasn't so much like working.

For green screen but green screen used resources from Iris I think is the way to say it.

CW Crystal Weston 43:45

OK.

Yeah, I'm just trying to understand like.

What what we might or need to do?

As a state or region, if this tool no longer exists, like what it would look like.

Like what? We can no longer do, so just trying to wrap my head around the implications of some of these ongoing rollbacks. So I I should have let others speak first because it's a little bit.

Outside, but just trying to see like what we're missing for this rule making and other things.

Thank you.

WJ WALTZ Justin 44:18

Before Eleanor jumps in, I just wanted to give definition to a a word that Crystal talked about.

Regrettable substitutions.

That is something where.

A manufacturer could be anybody.

Or an agency decides that some chemical is is hazardous to people or the environment, and they so opt in a new another chemical.

But it turns out that the second chemical.

Is is also hazardous, and so it's regrettable.

And so it's not a good thing to do. I will say the toxic for Kids Act does have the provision in statute and in Rule.

Where manufacturers must ask the Oregon Health Authority must submit their substitutions to us for us to check on that, and we put in Rule that they must use green screen to the method.

To do that, I don't get deep into the details there, but just to put that out there.

However, the Taxpayers Act or Washington Oregons does not have that.

So just so we're clear on that.

CW Crystal Weston 45:39

Thank you both.

SW Sherry Brett W 45:44

Eleanor, I think Justin froze there for a minute.

WJ WALTZ Justin 45:45

Sonar. Oh, thank you. Go ahead.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 45:48

Sure.

Quick, quick word on iris. That program was essentially.

The in the science branch of EPA and the purpose of the program was to create was to conduct risk assessments that were externally peer reviewed that would identify.

Exposure levels that could be used across.

EPA regulatory programs and they were because of the sort of authoritative process a lot of states use those numbers.

Green screens they were.

Those numbers were very, very useful, but there is no longer a science office at the United States EPA, so.

That's kind of changed.

What I was gonna say here is I realized as I was kind of scanning this list.

One thing we could think about is.

Going to the globally harmonized system of Classification of chemicals, you could say something that is that.

That would be is currently classified as.

Such and then list the classifications that kind of fit with your law under the globally harmonized system.

So that also is gonna be, you know, authoritative and peer reviewed source that that might be helpful here. Just a thought.

WJ WALTZ Justin 47:29

OK.

Thank you very much, Kathy, please.

KS Kathy Stanton 47:33

Yeah. Yeah. Just a word about the GHS that's applied differently across all the geographies that have.

Accepted the globally harmonized system of classification and labeling the United States. Currently, I think the only federal agency that is currently using.

GHS and the pictograms that go along with it is Department of Transportation.

So I'd I'd caution on using that because it's not equally applied across all jurisdictions across the world. And I know that at least in the European Union and some of those jurisdictions within the European Union, they're looking to apply.

Different classifications, so I just. I'm very interested in it.

I've I've been GHS for a very long time so I just wanna make sure.

That it's it's known as a little bit of a caution because it's not applied equally across all jurisdictions.

WJ WALTZ Justin 48:39

Thank you very much for that, Kathy.

Please crystal, go ahead.

CW Crystal Weston 48:45

Yeah, I believe I might have opened up a can of worms and this might be something to discuss as some kind of.

Maybe get some kind of a summary of of our options, how to proceed without this tool, but there is like the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants for example.

Maybe it makes sense to start referring to some of these international orgs. And of course, we're not going to have full global consensus.

But I think a global organization.

Better than nothing.

And it's certainly more vetted than what we might be able to achieve at a state or regional level.

So I think to the extent that that would help.

Harmonize manufacturing recommendations, for example in Europe and the United States and other countries that might some of these international resources might be a good place to look as we seek to replace those references.

WJ WALTZ Justin 49:46

Thank you very much, crystal. OK.

Unless there are any other questions on this, I think we can just move on, I will.

SW Sherry Brett W 49:56

No, we gotta hit. Oh, Crystal's hands down. Never mind.

WJ WALTZ Justin 50:00

Oh, OK.

Let's see the thing else. Thank you very much for that. Crystal. Put it in the chat.

What I would just point out is that we put in the European Chemicals Agency a list which is right here in C.

Which is these are the chemical chemicals that are currently prohibited from being used in in.

Cosmetics sold in Europe. So there's just that C.

OK.

Unless there's anything else.

Let's keep on going here.

OK.

Let's see.

Yeah. So I talked about earlier. We got to do this again in fall of 2029.

We can also remove the chemical if it's longer used in cosmetics. If we've determined that.

And then the other part that is very important is that the agency can only add or subtract chemicals from its list and rule during rulemaking.

1.

What's we're talking about?

SW Sherry Brett W 51:28

Justin, for some reason you're you're freezing.

WJ WALTZ Justin 51:29

That's a, that's a term used in.

SW Sherry Brett W 51:31

I'm not sure if that's happening for everyone, but you kind of froze there for a minute.

WJ WALTZ Justin 51:36

How do you everybody hear me now?

SW Sherry Brett W 51:41

Can hear you now.

DF David Farrer 51:41

Yeah, just I I might maybe mute your camera.

WJ WALTZ Justin 51:42

OK.

Thank you.

DF David Farrer 51:45

That'll help with bandwidth, maybe. So just keep your sound on, but mute your camera then sometimes that helps with bandwidth.

WJ WALTZ Justin 51:52

OK.

I don't.

I don't use my camera, I use a different camera so.

What I could do? I could possibly go off, turn off, turn off my camera. Just do that and see if that's helping things.

Let's do that, OK?

Everybody hear me.

That's all it really matters at the moment.

OK, what I wanted to do here is talk about this rule right here. 4040 knows requirements.

Again, these. This is the mechanism by which manufacturers are.

To.

Show on their websites which the the products that they use that use the hyperinose of concern used in cosmetic products.

OK. Which is the 4020 list?

So.

Basically this concept here is the way it's working and what I'm gonna say is that I will have a schematic like a cartoon for next rule making to kind of illustrate this little better.

But the idea I have is that.

The manufacturer would put where are the chemical or sorry, where are the cosmetic products that contains one of these chemicals as anat's website?

You would put next to that product, Oregon intoxicate Free Cosmetics Act warning that'd be hyperlinked.

And the link would go to. This part could be to a different part of the manufacturer website to a text block and so little B be a big B.

Big C or examples?

And so I've not fully.

Worked out with upper management. If we can do this, but I wanted to get your feedback.

Back on it now, just as an idea.

But then I should go on to say that I got these from Prop 65, which everybody knows about.

These are the these are the.

Flags that are required for Internet sales for Pop 65.

These these three blocks, basically this product can expose you to X wires.

SW **Sherry Brett W** 54:09

You're cutting out again, Justin.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 54:12

All right and.

CW **Crystal Weston** 54:15

You're back.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 54:16

I'm back.

Let me start over again.

So if you didn't hear me again, the idea is that next to the product on the Internet display page where the products where the where the customer first potential customer first sees the product, the words organ, toxic Free Cosmetics Act warning will be there and be hyperlinked and.

Then it would go to a different.

Location on the manufacturer's website where it have these blocks of text.

This product can expose you to.

AB or C, whatever.

It's gonna be all three of em if you only have one. You just do one.

We can recognize the state of Oregon and cause cancer.

More information you go to this be our hyperlink.

The statute requires.

State of Oregon.

Us to put in a list of chronic and or.

Acute.

Health effects from the high purity chemicals of concern.

Using cosmetic roducts and so it'd be on our website and so the link in this would go right to here and then that's what we would go.

That's how it satisfy the the.

The.

The law of the Statute statute provision.

Moving right, right along.

The Little C and little D These are directly from statute.

These two things are required of us and and the four of manufacturers that they have to have information.

On this this little notice that satisfies all the labeling requirements for the food Product Cosmetics Act as well as the federal Fair Package Labeling Act. We don't have those details enrolled because it's not our it's not our rule.

And so we what we don't wanna do is have the feds. If they changed it.

Then we have to go back and change things as well, which is just kinda.

We have to do a Rule 4 where we can and it's kind of a waste of.

Oregon's time.

So those two things C&D are in there.

The last thing is.

This must be the proc display page and we can talk about that exactly.

And then for the the section of 1A, you know basically the notice is not prominently displayed, which is what the statute calls for. If the if the customer has to search for it deep into the manufacturer's website.

But again, you can put that block of text 1B in a different section than 1A.

And then finally, our rule does not apply to the packaging of a cosmetic product that is intended to be thrown out after before first use.

There's a lot here and so I'll open it up for questions or comments and we'd love to hear from all of you.

Eleanor, please.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 57:26

One quick thought, not so much on the whole noticing, but I just had a thought about your very first question to us about reported or noticed or declared at the beginning.

WJ WALTZ Justin 57:27

Yeah.

OK.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 57:39

Could because you're gonna. You could say something like publicly available as. As specified in section blah blah blah.

And then it points to some of the noticing here.

In other words, you know I'm describing all 'cause you're 'cause some of the noticing detail is down in this section.

Does that make am I making sense?

I'm sorry. I'm just like you said.

WJ WALTZ Justin 58:04

Well, you are, but maybe you could repeat it, report it or repeat it for me again.

LNR because I wanna make sure I get that straight.

You just tell me what you're talking about again.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 58:10

How about if I let if I let the next person go and I'll try to write it in the chat in more convenient fashion?

WJ WALTZ Justin 58:15

Thank you.

Perfect. Perfect.

Go ahead, crystal.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 58:18

Sorry.

WJ WALTZ Justin 58:18

Thank you.

I appreciate that, Eleanor.

CW Crystal Weston 58:21

Well, I'm not sure my question is gonna be very much more decipherable, but what I'm wondering is if it's a contaminant. I believe that's the practical quantification for that would be 100 parts per million of any chemical.

If that's a contaminant, then it seems like it wouldn't be reported.

But would it be?

But would there be any documentation that it exists as a contaminant that would go to the health authority or just nothing happens if it's a contaminant?

And I do think that the prop 65 language makes sense, so that it's kind of more standardized the that language.

WJ WALTZ Justin 59:03

OK.

Thank you, crystal.

Let me answer your contaminant question in part.

We are still working on the contaminant issue, but I can tell you this at no point does the manufacturer have to report anything to the state of Oregon.

That's that is a clear difference between.

Cosmetics act and toxic.

Kids act where manufacturers do need to send us or to send.

A multi state data system.

Reports every two years, so I can tell you that much and we're still working on the whole contaminants situation, OK.

DF **David Farrer** 59:44

But let me can I just say something about that?

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 59:46

Please, Dave.

DF **David Farrer** 59:48

But it does.

It's interesting the the contaminants is there's a definition for it in the statute for the cosmetics, for the toggles, free cosmetics, but everywhere all it's not mentioned anywhere else in the statute.

So like like everywhere else, when it talks about like a like a list of high priority, the HP CCCPS.

Like it doesn't.

It doesn't say.

It only talks about intentionally added.

Substances, not not contaminants.

So I want.

So I wonder if it's, you know, they they modeled a lot of the statute after the Toxicity Kids Act. So I think they might have just left the definition in from toxicity kids, even though it doesn't seem like they intend for anything to really happen with contaminants in.

In this law.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:00:42

Yeah, it's. I don't know.

And you may be right about how this was the sausage was made, right?

But we will need to figure out that one point Dave and pour back to the group at a later date.

So thank you.

Go ahead, please, Kathy.

KS Kathy Stanton 1:00:56

Yeah. So there's there's a couple things here.

We know that within.

FDA that there are limits that are set for certain contaminants.

A lot of the heavy metals and so on, so.

Reporting if there's going to be lead, but it's under that 10 PPM limit that's in.

Over FDA or what's reportable in Washington state? Is that something that's going to have to be reported and anything that?

Has like an earth like an earth mine mineral in it.

So that's that's a question specifically on lead, but also because you have those limits that are set at FDA for some of these contaminants.

Is that going to be something that everyone's going to have to report? Like this can contain cadmium and lead and you know all those other ones, so.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:01:50

Yeah.

KS Kathy Stanton 1:01:52

It's something that we're really, I think going to have to be very careful around.

Because there's already that preemption from FDA.

So there may be a little bit of room there because you're obviously not going to be like it's at 100 parts per million for some of these because you know, they're they're down to the, you know, 10s and below part per million, just want to bring that.

Up and then.

What I guess we haven't yet gone into.

What are the maybe lists or lists of lists for?

The contaminants, because we keep talking about the intentionally added ingredients.

So just wanna put that out there for all of us to think about. So thanks.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:02:38

No, thank you.

I really appreciate that.

Let me just.

Address one thing he said with respect to lead. OK, that is something that.

The manufacturer under this law is not gonna be putting on their website.

It's simply that.

They can't have.

A. So a product in Oregon with containing lead with 10% million or above.

Or above in it.

And so it's it's it's part.

KS **Kathy Stanton** 1:03:12

Excellent. OK.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:03:13

It's a part that's a different.

That's the restricted list, as opposed to the Hyper V chemicals list. And I know it's terrible to have two lists, but that's that's what we were given.

KS **Kathy Stanton** 1:03:18

Perfect.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:03:22

So I tried to do my best to differentiate that, but thank you for bringing that up.

KS **Kathy Stanton** 1:03:23

Understood this this isn't your doing.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:03:26

No, thank you very much and and.

Please, you know, at a future time, Kathy, for sure to bring up kind of your second point on on the contaminants, if you can remember, but but thank you.

OK.

Does anybody else have any questions on on this? What we've done right here?

SW Sherry Brett W 1:03:45

I've got a just a quick comment, Justin.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:03:46

Yeah. Yep.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:03:47

Well, maybe a comment and a question. When it comes down to the, we hadn't really thought through that right. The the list of banned chemicals I was not thinking we would be adding them to our list because they're already addressed in the ban. So, but there really isn't anything that would stop us from doing that.

I wouldn't want to touch lead.

That's a complicated one because it can just be in, you know, the.

The mind minerals coming in.

It's not intentionally added like it. It gets a little messy. If that were to happen, but it's just one area I hadn't really thought of, so we can probably discuss that a little further, but.

I do have one question for the group about the the FCA requirements like labeling requirements.

This is an area that I'm not overly familiar with, but like, what exactly are they listing on their websites?

Like, is there a full list of all the different ingredients that are in contained in the product, or is it just like I just don't really know what that actually entails?

We we took that straight from the statute and put it here in the rule, but I'm wondering if anybody can provide some feedback on what is currently required with the FDA requirements.

Alright, so maybe it's not something that's everyone's aware of, Kathy.

KS Kathy Stanton 1:05:07

Yeah. Brad, are you are you just asking the question like what?

Does the FDA labeling entail for personal care products in cosmetics?

SW Sherry Brett W 1:05:19

Yeah, yeah.

KS **Kathy Stanton** 1:05:20
OK.

SW **Sherry Brett W** 1:05:20
So like, again, we're we're putting that right into our rule like they have to follow the FDA labeling requirements.

KS **Kathy Stanton** 1:05:22
Mm-hmm.

SW **Sherry Brett W** 1:05:24
But frankly, I don't know what they are like.

KS **Kathy Stanton** 1:05:27
Yeah.

SW **Sherry Brett W** 1:05:27
How? How involved are they?

KS **Kathy Stanton** 1:05:29
So I think that, you know, lane can also weigh in when it comes to fragrances, cause those are labeled a little bit differently, but.
Everything that goes into a product that's intentionally added that is under FDA jurisdiction needs to have all the ingredients in inkey the.
The.
International nomenclature.
Cosmetic ingredient system that's put in place. So every ingredient is named by Inky and it's in.
Predominance. So you start with the most, you know, whatever has, you know, the highest percentage and then that moves its way down in a product.
So that's how and it's down to. I think it is .1% and then fragrances are labeled a little bit differently.
Because of the CBI with fragrances.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:06:30
OK.

KS Kathy Stanton 1:06:32
So I'll stop there.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:06:33
So almost similar to like a, you know, a package of ice cream or something. The biggest ingredient is 1st and it works its way down.

KS Kathy Stanton 1:06:38
Exactly. Yeah, it's very. It's very close to food and it's very different from like like cleaning products, so.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:06:48
And the one thing I did hear you say though, is that this is all intentionally added. So anything that was not intentionally added would not be included in FDA labeling requirements.

KS Kathy Stanton 1:06:57
Correct.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:06:58
Thank you.
That's super helpful.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:07:01
Yeah. Thank you, Kathy.
And I'll just Ruby's information.
CBI stands for confidential business information.

KS Kathy Stanton 1:07:06
Sorry.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:07:08

No, no, no, no.

Or trade secrets.

The two essentially mean the same, but go ahead.

Thank you very much. And Christina please.

CR Christina Ross 1:07:19

Yeah, I Kathy, Kathy got it.

Inky isn't specifically mentioned in the law, but it's the accepted standard and and yeah, fragrances is typically mentioned just as fragrance or perfume.

So an important caveat there and and color and also are listed by their colorant name. But I think in general it's it's safe to to assume that would be OK.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:07:41

Great. Thank you.

OK.

I appreciate that very much.

Does anybody else have any comments or questions on this particular section?

And again, we are.

Right in this in real time. And so, you know, anything you can do to let us know.

Go ahead, crystal.

Sure.

CW Crystal Weston 1:08:00

Just thinking about how this will mesh with other regulations. Does the prop 65?

Does anyone know cover if it's either intentionally or not intentionally added?

Is it just like it's there?

We don't care how it got there or is prop 65 only cover intentionally added.

It's OK if no one knows 'cause. That's not even what we're talking about.

I'm just thinking about.

How to harmonize?

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:08:32

I did not look into that.

I just wanted their mechanism, which is used obviously for hundreds of millions of products, to go ahead. Kathy, if you know or hey, go ahead.

KS Kathy Stanton 1:08:42

Yeah, there there's some litigation going on along those lines as well. So I'm going to just say that that is going to be debated.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:08:53

Great. Alright, well.

CR Christina Ross 1:08:55

And I think generally it's about exposure instead of intentionally or in intentionally added.

But I'm not an expert on Prop 65.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:09:03

Ah, that's a very, very good point, Kristina.

I think you're, I think I'm not not taking this as the legal truth, but I think you're right that that's what the verbiage says is state of cons.

Cious blah blah blah can cause X to Z.

So you're right, but go ahead.

CW Crystal Weston 1:09:20

Thanks. Thanks everyone.

LB Lane Bogar 1:09:20

That's what.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:09:22

Go ahead.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 1:09:22

Right. And so I think just the presence in a product.

They have I I think that's where the litigation kind of comes in is that I think it's just we know this is a bad chemical.

You can't have it in your product.

You have to disclose and I don't think the state has.

Maybe always been clear about whether that's intentional or contaminant as source.

But I'm not sure, yeah.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:09:49

OK.

OK.

All right. Well, good. Yeah, please.

FW **Fanning, Elinor W (DOH)** 1:09:53

I will, can I say one other thing about Prop 65, Justin?

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:09:58

Yeah.

FW **Fanning, Elinor W (DOH)** 1:09:59

When the state of California says this chemical is recognized by the state of California to cause cancer or cause birth defects or reproductive harm, right, they have a whole big process to kinda create that classification with a big external peer review committee to kinda define what is known.

Into the state of California.

And I guess I mean here you say recognized so.

I think these, I think these statements are OK.

I just don't want you to get get yourselves into the business of reviewing.

Large quantities of data on a toxicant to determine whether Oregon recognizes it as.

A chemical.

I see David kind of nodding like you don't wanna.

I don't think you have.

Well, it's up to you.

Do you wanna be in the business of defining or do you wanna be in the business of saying we recognize that this has?

Hazard, based on such authority or something like that.

That's just something for you all to think about.

DF David Farrer 1:11:19

I appreciate that because California has like a whole like department of people to do that determining and we have me and I also already have a job, so.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:11:32

Of the Department of Dave.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:11:34

Honestly, this this change was kind of at a last minute thing that at my recommendation to Justin, he did have known and I was concerned that if this statement says known by the state of Oregon that someone will come back to us and say, how do you know?

That, and we're relying on a lot of other sources of information. We haven't done those studies. We we are not as flush as the state of California.

So if there are other recommendations here.

Here all ears because, you know, recognized to me was kind of the a lighter version of that saying that we you know we understand that this is a concern.

But if there's a better word, please let us know crystal.

CW Crystal Weston 1:12:20

Yeah, that's interesting.

So maybe we need to define known by the state of Oregon in the rules, and that could mean.

We reference California or one of the international standards because.

Maybe.

Maybe, maybe David doesn't have time to be in a whole department for identifying these things.

So in a time of budget hits like maybe we do need to lean on.

Someone with more capacity, and I think California's already done a lot of this work, so it might make sense to just refer to them as making it so that we know if they know, then we know and then we can say known by the state of O.

But like, just define it that way potentially I see Scott might have thoughts.

I'll let Scott share his thoughts next.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:13:14

Thank you very much crystal.
Go ahead, Scott.

SW Scott Winkels 1:13:18

I mean I I think it's it would be a little it'd be concerning to to Obi in the retail council if we were saying that a product or some substance was recognized by the state of Oregon.

As having being hazardous or causing cancer without the peer review rigorous peer review.

That what I'm here in California does.

I think what we would recommend.

Simply you know the the statute I think does allow us simply to mimic what's being done in Washington.

And that would certainly make it easier for the.

Compliance. More practical for.

For members of our members of the industry.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:14:07

OK.

Thank you for that.

One thing.

To your, to your point, Scott.

The statute, and I'm gonna switch to statute right here, this is.

Has this right here and hopefully I'm gonna highlight this in a second.

Let me pull it up.

OK, so manufacturer, this is anything say that we can't change.

This is what it is.

Manufacturers, anybody that produces a cosmetic product.

Fine manufacturers does not mean a retailer wholesaler.

So this is in statute. So I guess, Scott, that, that kind of keeps.

The folks that you represent maybe holds holds them harmless.

No. What do you think?

SW Scott Winkels 1:15:03

Well, I think it impacts their supply chain.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:15:06

Well, OK, that. But that's but the manufacturer right here, that is the that is the that is the the manufacturers of cosmetic products so.

All right, I'm just putting this, this this important differentiation out, which is not in talks for kids. So but this was a it was a legal matter that was put into the statute.

SW Scott Winkels 1:15:38

Thank you.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:15:39

You're welcome. Thank you for bringing that crystal. Go ahead again.

CW Crystal Weston 1:15:43

Yeah. I think ultimately like the goal here is to impact the supply chain. If we can remove harmful products from cosmetics.

So hopefully we remove this, remove that and have a new supply chain that's cleaner.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:15:58

Thank you, crystal.

OK.

Any other questions or comments on this this section not this section, this section.

Not Eleanor, please.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 1:16:12

Yeah, just a quick clarification on the. There was a discussion of kind of where the Washington law may or may not be helpful. And I just want to be really clear here that the Washington Toxic Free Cosmetic Act does not require.

Us to develop a list of HPCC how many CS do we have in our organ list?

So.

Our.

Work within our voluntary initiatives can be useful and can provide some information

that is helpful to Oregon as you navigate developing that list, but we do not have. Really a parallel list that you could directly.

Adopt and I think that's where you know this development of your list is actually a pretty complex.

Exercise to figure out what you want there, and you know, of course we provide some input, but I just want to be clear for this group who's trying to bring everyone's best advice to you that we don't have to make such a list under our law.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:17:35

Thank you very much for that and that that is an important differentiation between the two laws, even though they have the exact same name. Unfortunately, they're quite different.

The with the exception of the restricted chemicals in terms of the rest of the provisions of each law.

OK.

Thank you.

Audrey, please.

Thank you.

AA **Arjorie Arberry-Baribeault** 1:18:01

I I wanted to comment on the recognized that we were talking about a little bit there before.

And you know.

I I appreciate it because you know, when I was I when I was buying products before, because I I didn't clarify that I don't.

I don't practice.

Still, I keep my licenses active because I don't want to have to go through the whole going through school again if I ever want to do it again.

And so I keep my licenses active. I don't.

I'm not a hair stylist or aesthetician anymore, but when I was and I was buying these products.

They're, you know, they're there's nothing on these products to say what is harmful on them.

So had I had something like this that said the state of Oregon recognized that it could cause yada yada yada.

I would have.

I would have appreciated that.

So I just wanna say that, you know, having something at all is better than having nothing in my opinion.

So I just wanted to put that out there.

Just as a former stylist, I'm I don't practice anymore.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:19:14

Thank you very much for sharing that with us, Audrey.

AA **Arjorie Arberry-Baribeault** 1:19:15

But.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:19:16

Thank you. OK, do we have anybody else who would like to comment on this section?

AA **Arjorie Arberry-Baribeault** 1:19:17

Yeah, yeah.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:19:23

Thank you again.

OK.

SW **Sherry Brett W** 1:19:30

So Justin, looking at time we this is this is a perfect opportunity to take a quick break.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:19:30

We can.

SW **Sherry Brett W** 1:19:36

We're kind of right at the midway point. Does this work?

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:19:39

Yeah.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:19:40

Look at that.

So let's take a quick break.

We'll come back at 10:45.

You have 15 minutes to to do what you need to do, and we'll pick it up from there.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:19:49

All right.

Thank you.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:19:51

Nice timing.

All right, we're at the less than one minute warning.

It's amazing how fast 15 minutes can go.

As soon as you open up that e-mail inbox, it's gone.

Right. We are at 10:45.

Hopefully folks are finding their way back to their computers.

Looks like Justin is having some connectivity issues, so hopefully our our leader here is not disconnected.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:35:14

All right.

Can you hear me?

I'm back, I think.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:35:17

I can hear you and see you.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:35:18

Great. OK.

OK.

Thank you. OK, let's see.

So we let me show my screen again please.

OK.

Here we are again.

So let's say we have just gone through. There's a notice requirements that we're just last talking about.

Before we move on, does anybody have any last comments on the notice requirements for hyper income concern used in cosmetic products?

And manufacturers will need to.

In some way, put in their website.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:36:10

And just one thing to add here.

I mean, it's always helpful to have the the conversation here as a group to kind of hear all sides.

But if something comes to you after the fact, feel free to to shoot us an e-mail.

Uh, that's something we can consider and bring up at a future meeting.

So everybody kind of, you know, processes things differently in different time frames.

So if that's an easier method for you, just just let us know.

Feel free to reach out.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:36:37

OK.

Great. Thank you.

Moving along, the next one is a super easy one.

It's just we when we do.

Discussions, or certainly compliance measures and and our our go to is always to start off with kind of stuff compliance.

We would do that from this e-mail address as opposed to another e-mail address.

And so I was putting that in Rule because it is one we use, we put into rule.

For talks for kids so that manufacturers know.

Who they're speaking with or what entity they're speaking with, and so that's clear.

OK.

Moving along, I have a double here of this which I which I apologize.

Now let's move on to our very last.

It's our last, our second to last piece here.

These are the list of prohibited chemicals, subclasses, or classes of chemicals that manufacturers may not have in their cosmetic products sold in Oregon on January

1st, 2027.

And after.

This is taken directly from statute, so please let me know if there are any questions on this.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:38:05

Justin, just for clarification, these are all taken directly from statute, right?

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:38:09

Mm-hmm.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:38:09

So that there's no, I mean we can't change any of these.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:38:15

That is, that is correct.

So there's no swapping in of formaldehyde.

No, sorry. Cadmium for ortho phalids.

So go ahead, Crystal please.

CW Crystal Weston 1:38:27

So.

So looking closely at this language.

And I'm not a lawyer, but the way I'm reading this because it says.

Or.

May not manufacture, sell, offer for sale, distribute for sale or distribute for use in this state. Any cosmetic product that contains any of the following intentionally added chemicals.

Or classes of chemicals above the practical quantification limit.

Umm.

That would seem to mean that the PQL matters more than whether or not it's intentionally added.

Might be something to really look closely at because my read of this is that for example, if the PQL is like 50 parts per million.

Then that would be.

The limit as opposed to the 100 parts per million if it wasn't intentionally added.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:39:41

OK so.

I'm subt.

Can you maybe restate your question?

I don't know if I understand quite please.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:39:51

I'm trying to capture this one too. Is it?

Is this the? Is it really hanging on the OR you know sometimes or can can really mess with a statute or a rule?

Is it?

Are you saying it's only applying to one or the other?

CW Crystal Weston 1:40:02

Because it's saying.

It can't have intentionally added chemicals, and it can't have chemicals above the practical quantification limit.

So that means.

Don't intentionally add them, but also they can't be above the practical quantification limit, which means if the practical quantification limit is 50.

Then it doesn't matter if it's intentionally added or not.

Don't have it above 50.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:40:32

OK, so as.

CW Crystal Weston 1:40:33

That's entirely, I think that needs to be double checked by someone else.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:40:37

OK. Crystal, I think that.

And again, I took this one straight from actually the whole thing from statute. I think

we're still working on the whole, whether contaminants are covered by either this restricted list or by the list.

Of chemicals that must be placed on the website, right?

So we're still working on those that the whole point of contaminants.

I don't know if I'd.

Good, Dave.

DF **David Farrer** 1:41:17

Crystal is the OR that you're talking about. The one that's between the word chemicals or classes is that the OR.

That you're talking about?

CW **Crystal Weston** 1:41:26

Yes, yes, that's the OR chemicals or classes of chemicals above the PQL.

So that means if you have a class of chemicals above that are above the PQL.

DF **David Farrer** 1:41:38

Right. But I think that still that's still related to this intentionally added piece about the chemicals.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:41:44

Hmm.

Yep.

DF **David Farrer** 1:41:47

Like it's like it's a chemical or class of chemicals that are intentionally added above the practical quantification limit.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:41:47

It's if. Go ahead. Sorry if.

In other words, if you have methylene glycol, which is a single chemical.

That can't be in the product.

Versus and whether you have one of the.

Prefast chemical class members.

Which is this.

The whole class right here, right?
So does that's. This is a class.
It's a single chemical, but they.
The section seems to apply to both.

DF **David Farrer** 1:42:27

Right. So either a single chemical or the class is about being about like intentionally added above the practical quantification limit.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:42:29

Right.

CW **Crystal Weston** 1:42:37

It's almost like if it had a comma, it would mean one thing and without a comma it might mean something else.
Well, not to derail it, yeah.

DF **David Farrer** 1:42:44

Like it's not adding a new.
Like it's not adding like a whole. Anything outside of this list like like I don't that or is like adding chemicals that aren't on this list if that's what you were thinking about.

CW **Crystal Weston** 1:42:57

Yeah, I guess I'm thinking about like when the PQL matters and when the 100 parts per million.
Applies.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:43:05

Well, I can tell you that.
The PQL matters when it's intentionally added.
And the hundred parts per million matters if we decide that it covers when it's a contaminant.
OK.
And that's that's in. We can read that in statute.

CW Crystal Weston 1:43:20

OK.

All right. Thanks.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:43:25

Yeah.

Does anybody else have any points on this?

Section right here.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:43:49

Just one comment, Justin, in two at the bottom.

I know that's cut and pasted probably from the statute, but it's talking about as determined by Oregon Health Authority.

By rule, I mean and that's what this is.

I'm not sure we would actually include that language here.

Because this is, this is the rule, right?

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:44:06

OK.

What you're saying is that next time around I might Nix this right here because this is statutory.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:44:17

Yeah, it's kind of bit.

I mean, that's just cut and paste.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:44:18

OK.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:44:19

I realized what happened was probably was cut and pasted, but we wouldn't talk about writing the rule in the rule. We would just write the rule right.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:44:21

Yeah.

Yeah, and here Section 4 is what we're talking about.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:44:32

Yep.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:44:33

So I will just Nix take out that section.

Thank you for that, Bret.

OK.

OK.

Let's see.

Let's unless there's anything else.

Brett.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:44:58

You know that is one point.

Sorry to jump in again, Justin, but that's one point I'm I'm getting really just more on like the language piece of what you know, how we could alter it because this is a rule, but that is a really good point to to point out here.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:45:01

No.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:45:14

Everything else is basically a set. You know, it's gonna be a set number, but this one allows us to to set something specific for lead, right?

And that's the only that one's very unique.

Compared to the rest of these chemicals.

And I think it's just important to give a little context as to what that number means in, in adjusting. You're probably better able to explain this, but we mentioned this earlier on that there are some, you know, cosmetic products that use different naturally occurring elements or materials like.

Clay or different types of of like mind material that could have led in it and.

It's not intentionally.

Added it could be, you know, 10 parts per million, that number as well kind of comes up as well.

What is? What does that actually correlate to?

What does that mean?

But we have heard that it can be very challenging to get certain types of materials with lead below 10 parts per million.

So this piece does give us the ability to change that number, but it doesn't seem like it's a very good idea at this point.

Because of the the challenges of finding source materials that are below that 10 part per million.

So just wanted that to be kind of clear that we do have the ability to to when you look at lead you know lead is one of those. You know elements there is no safe exposure like 0 is the ideal, but in reality lead is a part of.

The environment and it's it's kind of all around us.

So as low as possible is always great, but if we were to say something like 0.

So I mean that that would basically eliminate certain types of cosmetics from being produced 'cause it. It may not be possible to get down to 0.

So I'm not sure if I if I could Justin, if I slaughtered any of that, please correct me.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:47:13

Well.

I do know that.

This.

These lists the lead is in Washington's law, and Washington has whole policy temporary.

On.

Accepting that certain certain types of products can have certain levels of lead at certain amounts like below 10 like 2:00 and 5:00.

Eleanor, is this something that you have knowledge of or?

Would you like to let us know about that? Take care.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 1:47:49

Sure, I can speak.

I I can speak briefly to what's happening with. So our our statute where yours says 10

parts per million, which as somebody mentioned earlier, maybe Kathy is a federal that's the FDA limit.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:47:53

Thank you.

Thank you.

FW **Fanning, Elinor W (DOH)** 1:48:11

But our statute our legislature gave US1 PPM and as as you just mentioned.

That that 'cause angst in industry for products that use these natural earth minerals.

And so we are in Washington state in a state in a situation right now where we've given some regulatory relief for certain cosmetic product categories and we.

Are working toward defining what? What is a reasonable?

Way to regulate lead in cosmetics, given that blanket one PPM may not work across the board at this moment in time.

I think my recommendation to you is probably this is good that you have statutory authority to change.

Change by rule at some time doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

That both our states kind of struggle with this at the same time, it might be that.

That we kind of see through where we are and you know we can kind of collaborate on landing in the same place.

It's never helpful to our regulated entities if two states land in two different places with two different regulatory processes.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 1:49:42

Thank you very much for that, Eleanor, I appreciate that.

So does anybody else have any comments on this this one point?

This is a tricky point which currently olariska outlined.

I also wanna chime in on it.

OK, we can always revisit it in a future meeting. But but thank you, Eleanor, for giving us the background on what Washington's doing, OK.

Let's move on to this last piece.

Which is enforcement and civil penalties. This is taken pretty close from statute and then also from talks free kids enforcement provision. These numbers are straight out of statute.

So I would also state I may have reiterated this. I said this earlier that our go to is to kind of work on the the cost, the soft compliance end of things really is what we do. We talk for kids to explain, to notify the manufacturers. Hey, you.

Are.

We notice you're out of compliance with X or Y and so please please change that and we're gonna give you X amount of time to do that before we start start up on the enforcement piece.

And that's worked out very well in the for that. And so we expect that to go well for this time around as well.

But if we need B, these are the tools we have to work with.

These let me know and I should also back up by saying.

The enforcement provision of rules requires that we use the statutory authority, not the rule authority, and so that's why these things, but these are.

Actually, on the state's website, I'm happy to.

Provide that right now in in the chat.

But.

Does anybody have any question on these?

These enforcement rules and mayor visit this in the future, but just for right now.

Right.

SW

Sherry Brett W 1:52:10

Just for a little more context to like this is this is actually kind of one of the nice parts of having both a toxic free kids and toxic free cosmetics programs in the same, you know, in the same unit.

Here we actually took from the toxic free kids.

Scaffolding, so to speak, and plunked in the different rule.

Sorry, different statute and and penalty amounts, so a lot of this language is very similar to what we have in in toxic free kids.

And so far this works pretty well.

As Justin said, we're we're really, we're really about compliance.

It's really more compliance assistance, but when you have organizations that are just unwilling or just will not cooperate, I mean that's that's when we wind up going down the simple penalty path.

So we we try to be the kinder, gentler government.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:53:02
OK.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:53:05
I will say though, these penalties are actually higher.
Within TFK, right?

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:53:09
They're twice as much, so that the TFK was 2016.
So I guess inflation.
But again, we didn't make these.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:53:17
Civil penalty inflation? Interesting.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:53:19
So yeah, who knows? Yeah.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:53:22
Lisa.

CD COX Lisa * DEQ 1:53:24
Yeah. Hey, I was wondering if you had levied any fines or had any enforcement
actions against others in the Toxics Free Kids Act?

SW Sherry Brett W 1:53:38
We are.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:53:38
At this time, good.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:53:39
Go ahead, Justin.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:53:41

At this time, we have not.

We have found that doing the the soft compliance part is been effective.

So we've gotten what we needed to get done so far using that and not going towards the to the more formal part. Unfortunate part.

CD COX Lisa * DEQ 1:53:50

Mm.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:54:02

There's a there's a piece to this, right?

Like you're you're creating toys for children and you're not in compliance with laws that are protecting the Children's Health.

It's it's kind of APR nightmare for an organization to to have a public fight like that.

So in the majority of cases, there's a lot of of you know.

They're they're coming into compliance relatively quickly and they they understand that the reason for it.

Not to say that it won't happen. We were.

We're we're starting.

We were in the process of working with at least one organization that has not been agreeable.

So we're starting down that path, but we haven't actually given any civil penalties at this point. I'm hoping we have a very similar setup with the cosmetic industry.

Again, let's let's you know when you're selling a product and something like that hits the news. It's not necessarily good for for sale.

Else, so to speak. So.

LB Lane Bogar 1:55:10

I think for subsection 5I mean I my understanding is that it would only apply once.

Once there's been like subsection 4, there's been a requested statement of compliance, and I think that's how it's meant to be read.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:55:25

Mm-hmm.

LB Lane Bogar 1:55:26

I think to make sure that there's not really any ambiguity. Maybe there could be like in response to request for statement of compliance. Just because I I don't know if someone I don't know who, but if they're quickly reading through it. They could take that as just needing to demonstrate compliance. Constantly or at some level, so just to ensure there's less ambiguity in that in that language.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:55:52

Lane, I really appreciate that, even if it's unlikely, it's a good point to to work and I will look to see with kind of upper management if that's something we need to do legally.

But I appreciate that very much.

Because what we don't want to do is have manufacturers prepare statements in compliance.

All the time.

That's a waste of everyday's time, so thank you.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:56:17

I'm trying to capture this in my notes here and I'm I'm which exact part was the ambiguity.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:56:24

So what?

Well, maybe plain can tell us again, but.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:56:29

Sorry Lee, I was trying to trying to capture it.

LB Lane Bogar 1:56:30

No, no, you're good. You're good.

Yeah, I think Justin understood that, that, that whole subsection 5, it just says to prove there.

I think just having some level of starting clause that says, you know, in response to a

request.

For for a statement of compliance under subsection four or something along those lines.

So that someone doesn't read it and automatically assume that compliance needs to be proved on a.

On a regular cadence.

WJ

WALTZ Justin 1:57:01

Yep. Thank you very much.

Brett, do you get that roughly? OK, great. Thank you.

SW

Sherry Brett W 1:57:07

Yes, thank you.

This is honestly this is always one of the pieces that's really helpful to have a lot of eyes on this 'cause there's one sentence you can write and you think it's super clear, and then other people read it and they're like that says this. And you're like, wait.

What it's really helpful to have different eyes on things like that.

So I really appreciate that.

Thank you.

WJ

WALTZ Justin 1:57:28

Are there any other comments on this enforcement piece?

OK.

I think that is our very last piece to go over that we have prepared.

So unless we are there anything else that people would like to bring up, I think we can kind of move to the including part of this session.

Brett, do you wanna go there?

SW

Sherry Brett W 1:58:02

Can let me share my screen again. Just kind of talk about the next meeting.

I have a probably not the right slide show presentation part, but that's fine.

Can you see my screen?

WJ

WALTZ Justin 1:58:20

Yeah you can.

You can turn it to a slideshow at the top. I think with this thing right here.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:58:25

It's it's for some reason it's it's shaded out, so I can't do it so, but it's OK. We saw those other slides before. So there's nothing there.

WJ WALTZ Justin 1:58:27

Oh, it's grayed out OK.

All right, well.

SW Sherry Brett W 1:58:33

There's nothing to worry about.

So First off, thank you.

This is super helpful.

It's always great getting feedback from folks and it's it's been a good conversation today.

Upcoming meetings are probably gonna be a little bit more involved coming up with this list of of chemicals is gonna be pretty complicated and and more of a deeper dive.

We did get through things.

Pretty quickly today, so hopefully folks can enjoy the gift of time.

So the next meeting is coming up August 13th.

It's on a Thursday from 9:00 till noon as well.

That's Pacific Standard Time. Justin's gonna work on making some edits to the draft rules that we were looking at today. So you'll be able to see the the track changes from today's discussion in that document as well.

Well, just so everybody's aware, like a full transparency, we we send rules to our Department of Justice as well.

They help us to kind of look to make sure things are are in line with with the law, so there may be some other edits that are happening that we may not have talked about, 'cause, if DOJ tells us we can't do something, then we have to go.

Back to the drawing board.

So if anything of those types of changes happen, we'll obviously let you know about that as well. We can talk about that in a future meeting and explain the the rationale

behind it.

So again, just trying to be, as you know, transparent as possible through this process.

If you have folks who'd like to be added to our interested parties list, let us know.

Feel free to shoot us an e-mail or e-mail and website.

All that information is in the thread here, so it's in the chat.

And if any other thoughts or concerns pop up or come to you in the middle of the night, feel free to send us that information as well and we'll take that into consideration for the rules and possibly bring that up into a future RAC meeting.

As well.

So anybody have any last minute thoughts, comments, questions?

All right, hearing none. Sorry, Justin.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 2:00:36

I would just say we want to just, we're going to meet at Pacific Daylight Time, not Standard Time.

SW **Sherry Brett W** 2:00:38

Go ahead.

This is like Daylight Time is at PDS.

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 2:00:44

It's OK.

SW **Sherry Brett W** 2:00:47

But isn't it called Pacific Standard Time PST?

WJ **WALTZ Justin** 2:00:47

Well PD.

I.

I don't know but.

DF **David Farrer** 2:00:53

We're we're on Daylight Time, though not standard.

SW Sherry Brett W 2:00:53

West Coast time.

WJ WALTZ Justin 2:00:54

We're in Daylight Time, but OK.

DF David Farrer 2:00:55

Yeah, PDT PDT, not PST.

SW Sherry Brett W 2:00:56

West Coast time, whatever that means.

Thank you.

CW Crystal Weston 2:01:01

Well, and I will add, I'm happy that we've commenced our our rulemaking for this program.

I know it took some time to get it moving, so it's really great to get this program up and running hopefully.

This year.

SW Sherry Brett W 2:01:18

Yeah, hopefully by the end of the year.

CW Crystal Weston 2:01:19

Yeah.

SW Sherry Brett W 2:01:22

OK.

Well, thanks a lot.

Thanks everybody for your time and and all the conversation here.

Really appreciate it and enjoy the rest of your day.

WJ WALTZ Justin 2:01:30

All right.

Thank you everybody.

KS Kathy Stanton 2:01:30

Thank you.

MI Myra Irizarry 2:01:32

Thank you so much.

CA Catherine APOLINARIO 2:01:32

Thank you. Bye.

FW Fanning, Elinor W (DOH) 2:01:32

You very much.

WJ WALTZ Justin 2:01:35

You're gonna talk.

You're putting something in there.

Purchase off.

OK.

SW Sherry Brett W 2:01:45

So if you go to the the more for the transcript.

WJ WALTZ Justin 2:01:49

Yes, thank you, Brett.

Get that right now get more.

Thank you.

I go to record and transcribe.

SW Sherry Brett W 2:02:03

You can stop it.

WJ WALTZ Justin 2:02:04

Stop transcription.

Stop. Yes.

- **WALTZ Justin** stopped transcription