

Comment 1 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Anne
Last Name: Meininger
Email Address: anne.meininger@nist.gov
Affiliation: NIST/US Dept of Commerce

Subject: ASTM comments on use of ASTM standards in the CA consumer products regulations
Comment:

Hello California,

This office at the National Institute of Standards and Technology is the USA WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Inquiry Point. We notified WTO of the CA consumer regulations and received the attached comments from a US interest, ASTM International.

Please acknowledge receipt of the attached comments if that is possible.

Thank you,
Anne Meininger

USA WTO TBT Inquiry Point
National Center for Standards and Certification Information
National Institute of Standards and Technology
100 Bureau Drive, MS-2100
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2100
Telephone: 301-975-4040 or 301-975-2921
Fax: 301-926-1559
Email: ncsci@nist.gov or anne.meininger@nist.gov

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/2-astm_comments_on_usa393.doc'

Original File Name: ASTM_comments_on_USA393.doc

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-03 09:44:11

No Duplicates.

Comment 2 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Adriana

Last Name: Franco

Email Address: christina@coalitionforcleanair.org

Affiliation:

Subject: Strengthen The Consumer Products Regulation

Comment:

Mary Nichols
Chairman
California Air Resources Board
1001 "I" Street
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, CA 95812

Dear Chairman Nichols,

I encourage you to strongly reduce the harmful toxics found in cleaning and other consumer products. By regulating and reducing these chemicals from consumer products, the State of California will set another precedent in protecting the health of families and workers.

Volatile organic compounds (VOCs), harm our families' health and contaminate our air. Everyone is vulnerable to the harmful effects of these chemicals, which are often used where we work and live and where our children study and play.

Many children in our communities suffer from asthma, and the chemicals emitted by consumer products only increase the chances that they endure more frequent attacks or develop asthma in the future. Furthermore, adults may experience an increased risk of liver and kidney damage and cancer from the daily use of consumer products.

As a consumer and concerned citizen, I urge the California Air Resources Board to adopt tougher regulations on consumer products. I also urge you to include additional VOC reductions from some of the worst culprits - multipurpose cleaners, degreasers and glass cleaners.

Please take this opportunity to protect the health of our families by significantly reducing these air pollutants that emanate from consumer products.

Thank you.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/3-comments_adriana_franco.jpg'

Original File Name: Comments_Adriana_Franco.jpg

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-10 13:51:52

125 Duplicates.

Comment 3 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Ruby

Last Name: Ghadially

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Re; Consumer Product Rulemaking; Astrigents/ Toners

Comment:

Please see attached.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/118-cp080001.pdf'

Original File Name: cp080001.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-18 10:33:30

No Duplicates.

Comment 4 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Robin

Last Name: Gentz

Email Address: robin.gentz@clorox.com

Affiliation: The Clorox Company

Subject: Board Agenda Item #08-6-5

Comment:

Please see attached letter.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/119-2008_cmts_to_arb.pdf'

Original File Name: 2008 Cmts to ARB.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-19 13:53:50

No Duplicates.

Comment 5 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Larry
Last Name: Beaver
Email Address: lbeaver@gunk.com
Affiliation: Radiator Specialty Company

Subject: Comments regarding Consumer Products VOC regulation changes
Comment:

Radiator Specialty Company produces products for the Car Care Industry. Many of our customers are DIY and commercial establishments that service automobiles.

Radiator Specialty Company appreciates the opportunity to comment on this regulation. We support the limits and effective dates for the Multi-purpose Lubricants and Penetrants category. These are technology-forcing limits.

Radiator Specialty also supports the provision to allow the continued manufacturer of penetrants that are non-flammable. Penetrants can be used in situations where energized circuits, high heat sources, or open flames exist. Non-flammable products are needed to ensure safety to the consumer in these situations.

Thank you for your consideration on this issue. Any questions or comments feel free to contact me at 704-684-1802 or by e-mail at lbeaver@gunk.com.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry Beaver
Vice President, Technology

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/121-radspeccommentstoarb62508.doc'

Original File Name: RadSpecCommentstoARB62508.doc

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-23 10:17:29

No Duplicates.

Comment 6 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: D. Douglas

Last Name: Fratz

Email Address: dfratz@cspa.org

Affiliation: Consumer Specialty Products Association

Subject: CSPA Comments on Board Agenda Item #08-6-5

Comment:

See comments attached.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/122-cspa_comments_on_arb_proposed_2008_amemdments_6-23-08.pdf'

Original File Name: CSPA Comments on ARB Proposed 2008 Amemdments 6-23-08.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-23 11:25:31

No Duplicates.

Comment 7 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Paul

Last Name: Gardner

Email Address: pgardner@blasterchemical.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Consumer Products rule

Comment:

See attachment

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/129-high_performance_creative_chemistry.doc'

Original File Name: HIGH PERFORMANCE CREATIVE CHEMISTRY.doc

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-23 12:58:19

No Duplicates.

Comment 8 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Gary
Last Name: Silvers
Email Address: gsilvers@meguiars.com
Affiliation: Meguiar's, Inc.

Subject: Proposed Amendments to Ca. Consumer Products Regulations 6/25/08; Board Agenda Item#08-6-5

Comment:

June 23, 2008

Board Members
Air Resources Board
1001 I Street, 23rd Floor
Sacramento, California 95814
Attn: Ms. Lori Andreoni, Board Secretary
<http://www.arb.ca.gov/lispub/comm/bclist.php>

Subject: Proposed Amendments to the California Consumer Products Regulations 6/25/08; Board Agenda Item # 08-6-5

Dear Board Members:

Meguiar's is a manufacturer of premier car care products. Our products are distributed through numerous retail outlets. What began a century ago as a simple furniture polish laboratory and plant now spans four generations of Meguiar family stewardship. Celebrating its 100th anniversary in 2001, Meguiar's, Inc. has become one of the world's leading surface care products companies, providing highly specialized products for almost every conceivable type of surface.

Meguiar's appreciates the opportunity to comment on this rule. Our sole comment is that the current definition of "motor vehicle wash" will ban our aerosol form of the product. The majority of the products in this category are dilutable products. After closer review of the proposed wording we realized one of our niche products would be banned. The aerosol product Quick Mist label is attached. This product was introduced after 2003 thus not subject to the 2003 survey.

Meguiar's respectfully requests the ARB to modify the existing wording of the definition to remove aerosol products from this category.

Thank you for in advance for your attention to this issue. If there are any questions or comments please feel free to contact me at (949) 752-3821.

Respectfully submitted

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/136-a3318_quikdetaileraero1.pdf'

Original File Name: A3318_QuikDetailerAero1.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-23 15:46:46

No Duplicates.

Comment 9 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jerry

Last Name: Ulrich

Email Address: julrich@fourstarchemical.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Consumer Products regulation

Comment:

See attachment

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/137-4-star-carb_6-25-08__2_.pdf'

Original File Name: 4-star-carb 6-25-08 (2).pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-24 07:45:46

No Duplicates.

Comment 10 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Steve

Last Name: Cook

Email Address: scook@techspray.com

Affiliation:

Subject: consumer products regulation

Comment:

see attachment

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/138-carb_board_agena_item___08-06-5.doc'

Original File Name: carb board agena item # 08-06-5.doc

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-24 08:00:48

No Duplicates.

Comment 11 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Sharon H.

Last Name: Kneiss

Email Address: sandra_andrade@americanchemistry.com

Affiliation: American Chemistry Council SIG

Subject: Comments on the CARB Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for Reducing VOC Emissions

Comment:

Comments on the CARB Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for Reducing VOC Emissions from Consumer Products submitted by the ACC Solvents Industry Group.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/139-final_carb_comments_on_voc_062408.pdf'

Original File Name: FINAL CARB Comments on VOC 062408.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-24 08:36:24

No Duplicates.

Comment 12 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

This comment was posted then deleted because it was unrelated to the Board item or it was a duplicate.

Comment 13 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Ray

Last Name: Cull

Email Address: ray.cull@us.henkel.com

Affiliation: Henkel Consumer and Pro Div

Subject: Comments on Sealants & caulks

Comment:

See attached letter

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/141-sealant_response_letter_june_24.doc'

Original File Name: sealant response letter June 24.doc

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-24 11:37:27

No Duplicates.

Comment 14 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Valerie

Last Name: Ramsey

Email Address: Ramseyv@cbfleet.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Proposed Amendments to the CA Consumer Product Regulations 6/25/08; Agenda Item #08-6-5

Comment:

Comments attached.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/142-carb_comments.pdf'

Original File Name: CARB Comments.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-24 12:53:10

No Duplicates.

Comment 15 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: John

Last Name: Davis

Email Address: jdavis@plaze.com

Affiliation: Plaze, Inc./Claire Sprayway

Subject: June 25th Board Hearing Comments

Comment:

Comments for June 25th Board Hearing.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/145-air_resources_board.pdf'

Original File Name: Air Resources Board.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-24 14:21:33

No Duplicates.

Comment 16 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Ruby

Last Name: Ghadially

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Re: Consumer Product Rulemaking ; Astrigents/ Toners

Comment:

Please see attached.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/146-ghadially_letter_062408.pdf'

Original File Name: Ghadially letter 062408.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-24 16:07:42

No Duplicates.

Comment 17 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Harry

Last Name: Zechman

Email Address: hzechman@stonersolutions.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Consumer Products Regulation

Comment:

See attachment

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/147-stoner_comments_arb_june_25_2008_proposal__4_.doc'

Original File Name: Stoner Comments ARB June 25 2008 proposal (4).doc

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-24 16:29:01

No Duplicates.

Comment 18 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: William

Last Name: Burke

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: South Coast Air Quality Management District

Comment:

Please see attached.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/149-scan0001.pdf'

Original File Name: scan0001.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-24 16:45:45

No Duplicates.

Comment 19 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Philip
Last Name: Lapin
Email Address: plapin@falconsafety.com
Affiliation: Falcon Safety Products

Subject: Proposed Amendments to the California Consumer Products Regulations
Comment:

June 25, 2008

Honorable Board Members
Air Resources Board
1001 I Street, 23rd Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Honorable Board Members:

I am writing in support of the proposed amendment to the Regulation for Reducing Emissions from Consumer Products. More specifically, we are in support of the new requirements for Pressurized Gas Dusters to contain a propellant compound that has a Global Warming Potential (GWP) value of 150 or less. As the leading manufacturer of compressed gas dusters, Falcon Safety Products has been aggressively promoting the use of HFC 152a as its primary choice propellant in dusters for the last 15 years. Our company chose this strategy because we believe strongly in the environmental benefit, and efficacy of this lower GWP compound. Because of our company's action, there has been an overall trend in the duster industry towards using HFC 152a in duster products.

We would like to commend the staff of the Air Resources Board for working judiciously towards finding the appropriate path forward for our industry in California. And until there is a future generation of compounds, we believe that HFC152a is a safe, effective and necessary compound for use in aerosol applications.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Philip M. Lapin
President/CEO
Falcon Safety Products

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-25 06:16:24

No Duplicates.

Comment 20 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Daniel

Last Name: Pourreau

Email Address: dan.pourreau@lyondellbasell.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Comments on Proposed Amendments to Consumer Products Rule

Comment:

Please find our comments in the attached .zip file.

Please confirm receipt of our comments and call me if you have problems opening or viewing the letter in pdf format.

Thanks,

Dan Pourreau

LyondellBasell Industries.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/151-lyondellbasell_comments.zip'

Original File Name: LyondellBasell comments.zip

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-25 07:31:13

No Duplicates.

Comment 21 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Kathleen

Last Name: Stanton

Email Address: kstanton@sdaq.org

Affiliation:

Subject: SDA comments on Proposed Consumer Products Regulations

Comment:

Please see attached comments.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/152-sda_comments_on_arb_proposal_2008_june_20.pdf'

Original File Name: SDA comments on ARB proposal 2008 June 20.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-25 09:16:00

No Duplicates.

Comment 22 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Darlene

Last Name: Coe

Email Address: darcoe@velotech.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Consumer Products Regulation on Sealants

Comment:

In the past construction companies I currently work with were able to use a sealant containing a petroleum solvent. This sealant allows them to complete their outdoor work in all 12 months of the year, whether wet or dry or damp.

Now, we are told that we can't buy this type of sealant. That California has outlawed them. Why? We all need to work in the winter. Rubber sealants with a petroleum solvent are the best all season sealants for outdoor work.

We are told you are the authority to change the rule to allow contractors to use rubber sealants containing petroleum solvents. Please help us. We all want to be proud of our work and cannot afford to have call backs due to failures. Please allow professional contractors to use these type of sealants.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-25 11:09:55

No Duplicates.

Comment 23 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: emily

Last Name: winchester

Email Address: ejworking@aol.com

Affiliation: JRW Ent. Inc.

Subject: Sealants

Comment:

My company is a construction company in the bay area. In the past we were able to use a sealant containing a petroleum solvent. This sealant allowed us to complete any outdoor work in all 12 months of the year with no call backs. Now I' m told we will be unable to purchase this product-we need to be able to work the year around and also not keep going back and trying to correct a leak problem. We have been told that you have the authority to allow construction contractors to use rubber sealants containing petroleum solvents. Please consider.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-25 11:19:18

No Duplicates.

Comment 24 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Luis

Last Name: Cabrales

Email Address: luis@coalitionforcleanair.org

Affiliation:

Subject: 2008 Consumer Products Regulation Amendments

Comment:

COALITION FOR CLEAN AIR * COMMONWEAL *
LONG BEACH ALLIANCE FOR CHILDREN WITH ASTHMA * COALITION FOR A
SAFE ENVIRONMENT *
HEALTHY CHILDREN ORGANIZING PROJECT * REGIONAL ASTHMA MANAGEMENT
AND PREVENTION (RAMP) INITIATIVE * SIERRA CLUB CALIFORNIA *
WOMEN'S VOICES FOR THE EARTH *
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL *
ENVIRONMENT CALIFORNIA * CLEAN WATER ACTION *
BAY AREA HEALTHY 880 COMMUNITIES-SL *
CENTER FOR PUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL OVERSIGHT * NATIONAL TOXIC
ENCEPHALOPATHY FOUNDATION * WORKSAFE, INC. * INSTITUTE FOR
CHILDREN'S ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH * CONSEJO DE FEDERACIONES
MEXICANAS EN NORTEAMÉRICA * CALIFORNIA RURAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE
FOUNDATION * BOYLE HEIGHTS RESIDENT HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION *
RESIDENTS OF PICO RIVERA FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE *
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COALITION FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY & HEALTH *
PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY-LOS ANGELES * GREEN SCHOOLS
INITIATIVE *
CLEAN AIR NOW * PLANNING AND CONSERVATION LEAGUE * GREENACTION FOR
HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE *
MERCED/MARIPOSA COUNTY ASTHMA COALITION * COMITE CIVICO DEL VALLE
*
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATERSHEDALLIANCE *
URBAN SEMILLAS * ASIAN HEALTH SERVICES * LABOR/COMMUNITY STRATEGY
CENTER

June 25, 2008

Mary Nichols
Chairman
California Air Resources Board
1001 "I" Street
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, CA 95812

Via e-mail

Re: 2008 Consumer Products Regulation Amendments

Dear Chairman Nichols:

We the cosigners are writing to comment on the revised proposal for categories to be considered in the 2008 Consumer Products Regulation Amendments. We applaud CARB's efforts to reduce emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in consumer products. However, we encourage you to direct staff to protect the health of California residents, consumers and workers.

According to your staff's own estimates, after SIP measures are implemented, 2010 VOC emissions from consumer products will be approximately 220 to 235 tons per day (tpd). Additionally, consumer products will be the second largest source category of VOC emissions in 2010 (tied with trucks and buses), and in 2020 these products will be the leading source of VOC emissions. Unfortunately, the current version of the Consumer Products Regulation will reduce VOCs by just 1.7 tpd in 2010, less than one percent of total expected emissions. Yielding to industry demands, staff has suggested numerous delays in deadlines associated with emission reductions for different consumer product categories, such that full benefits associated with the 2008 proposal will not be achieved until 2015.

We would like to start by highlighting staff's improvements on this proposal and commend them for their foresight in addressing the following issues:

REDEFINITION OF DILUTABLE PRODUCTS

We are very pleased that staff included language redefining dilutable products (pg. ES-13) in spray bottles. Dilutable products bottled in containers that appear to be for immediate use should be required to reduce their VOC limits.

We want to use this opportunity to encourage CARB to also pay attention to other products designed to be diluted. It is very important that we assume that not all consumers follow diluting instructions to the letter. Therefore, in an effort to continue identifying emissions reductions alternatives, CARB should account for the potential emissions of other consumer products that should be diluted.

GLOBAL WARMING EMISSIONS FROM CONSUMER PRODUCTS

We are very supportive of staff's efforts to start looking at global warming emissions from consumer products. Many consumer products and their ingredients contribute directly and indirectly to the GHG emissions. We want to encourage this agency to think about the possibility of addressing those products and or their ingredients and make California the first State that officially takes steps to reduce our Global Warming foot print.

The following is a list of concerns, which we discuss in detail bellow, we have identified on the most recent draft staff proposal, released May 9, 2008:

JANITORIAL PRODUCTS

PAINT AND LACQUER THINNER AND MULTIPURPOSE SOLVENT

PROHIBITION OF TOXICS FROM SPECIFIC CATEGORIES

- DRY-CLEANING "SPOT REMOVERS"

- PAINT STRIPPER METHYLENE CHLORIDE

INCREASED VOC LIMITS AND COMPLIANCE DATES FOR SEVERAL CATEGORIES

- ODOR REMOVER (LIQUID/NON-AEROSOL)

- ASTRINGENT/TONER

- FABRIC SOFTENER-SINGLE USE DRYER PRODUCT

- GLASS CLEANERS (AEROSOL FORM)

- MULTI-PURPOSE LUBRICANTS

- PENETRANT

- PERSONAL FRAGRANCE NON-CHEMICALLY CURING SEALANT

CATEGORIES DELETED FROM THE DRAFT LANGUAGE

- LIQUID AIR FRESHENERS

- POST-SHAVE PRODUCTS

The first three categories we list in this letter will help CARB more than triple the calculated emissions reductions expected by staff from ALL the categories in their proposal.

We encourage you to review this list and adopt our suggestions.

JANITORIAL PRODUCTS (Not in current draft)

The SCAQMD has joined us in this request that you direct staff to include janitorial cleaning products in the regulation draft staff will prepare for a vote in November. Staff has mentioned they are in the process of compiling data from previous surveys about possible VOC limits in cleaning products; we want this Board to encourage staff to look at the data available and to work closely with SCAQMD staff and advocates when setting VOC limits on cleaning products.

SCAQMD has been researching possible VOC reductions in a broad category of janitorial cleaning products. SCAQMD tested 21 "environmentally preferable" cleaning products from six different manufacturers. Of the 21 products tested, 12 were General Purpose Cleaners, General Purpose Degreasers and/or Glass Cleaners, and all met the VOC content standard. To date, 17 products have been certified under SCAQMD's Voluntary Clean Air Choices Cleaner Certification Program. When calculating the VOC content, no exemptions were made for fragrance or low vapor pressure (LVP) solvents.

SCAQMD staff calculates the state would achieve a reduction of 4.5 tons per day of VOC emissions if CARB agreed to set VOC content of institutional and industrial janitorial products to one percent by weight (10 g/l).

CARB staff has indicated that it is likely that several categories originally delayed for the November hearing will not be ready to be included in draft after all. If this is the case, we ask that you to direct staff to gather data and prepare language to regulate VOC emissions, toxics and other environmentally "unfriendly" ingredients from cleaning products. If adopted, these reductions will further benefit water quality, workers' safety and consumers' health. In addition, the extra emissions reductions will help out-of-compliance districts to fill in the void left by the 2007 SIP "Black Box."

PAINT AND LACQUER THINNER AND MULTIPURPOSE SOLVENT (Categories delayed for future consideration)

CARB staff had informed us it was going to coordinate a work group to discuss ideas to implement reductions from this category. However, staff has now indicated it is unlikely this process will take place soon enough to ensure this category is included in the November hearing. We ask CARB to commit to setting a health-focused emissions limit from those products and set a timeline to regulate this category.

A VOC limit of 3% for these products will result in a huge emissions reduction of 13.85 tpd; more than two times the emissions reduction expected by staff from the current proposal.

The Institute for Research and Technical Assistance (IRTA) conducted a project sponsored by Cal/EPA's Department of Toxic Substances Control. This project involved working with wood furniture refinishers, auto body shops, architectural contractors and various manufacturers of metal parts. Low-VOC safer alternatives were tested for cleaning up coating application equipment like spray guns, brushes and rollers and for thinning the coatings. Alternatives that performed well and were cost-effective included acetone, water-based cleaners and soy-based cleaners .

Furthermore, SCAQMD's Rule 1171 established a 2.5% VOC requirement for cleaning solvents in many applications, including general cleaning during manufacturing, maintenance and repair cleaning, and coating equipment clean-up. Every related industry has met this regulation in the South Coast Air Basin. Unfortunately, hobbyists and home-based businesses do not have to comply with SCAQMD's rule because they have access to high VOC-emitting products at their neighborhood superstores.

We urge CARB to ensure the Paint and Lacquer Thinners work group takes into account IRTA's research, which has been backed by SCAQMD and that the category is included in the November 2008 board meeting agenda. Additionally, CARB staff should work closely with the SCAQMD to create and implement statewide health protective standards with a limit of 3% or lower for Paint and Lacquer Thinner and Multipurpose Solvent, which are already in use in Southern California.

PROHIBITION OF TOXICS FROM SPECIFIC CATEGORIES

We are pleased that staff included language for the regulation of toxics in specific categories, the proposal asks for a prohibition of methylene chloride, perchloroethylene, and trichloroethylene in Carpet/Upholstery Cleaner," "Fabric Protectant," "Multi-purpose Lubricant," "Penetrants," "Sealant or Caulking Compound," and "Spot Removers." We support staff's decision to prohibit those toxics.

- DRY-CLEANING "SPOT REMOVERS":

It is very unfortunate, however, that the language staff drafted does not address "Spot Removers" used in dry-cleaners. In January 2007, CARB approved a regulation to ban PERC dry cleaners. CARB staff informed us that they are considering removing the

exemptions that prevent them from regulating spot removers used at dry cleaning facilities. However, this category is not yet on the draft and staff has not indicated if the category will be included in the November board hearing.

According to Dr. Katy Wolf, IRTA director, there are a number of cleaners—including those dry cleaning businesses that have adopted safer alternatives—that use trichloroethylene (TCE) and PERC spotting chemicals. These chemicals are carcinogens and TCE, the most commonly used, is a VOC.

IRTA conducted a project sponsored by Cal/EPA's Department of Toxic Substances Control and US EPA to identify, develop, test and demonstrate alternative spotting agents for the dry cleaning industry. This project involved working with seven textile cleaning facilities that have adopted alternatives to PERC in dry cleaning. IRTA identified safer, water-based and soy-based alternatives that performed as well as the TCE and PERC alternatives currently used by dry cleaners. The cost analysis indicates that the alternatives are less costly than the spotting agents used today .

We ask that CARB accelerate the process to remove the exemptions that prevent them from regulating spot removers so they can be regulated during the November rulemaking processes.

- PAINT STRIPPER METHYLENE CHLORIDE:

Despite our requests, staff did not include language for a prohibition of methylene chloride (METH or MECL) in Paint Strippers.

According to CARB's own survey, annual reporting of METH tonnage in Paint Strippers for 2006 was about 1.9 tpd. A known carcinogen, METH is not a VOC and, thus, the challenge is finding alternatives to this chemical that are not VOCs.

DTSC contracted with IRTA to identify, test, develop and demonstrate alternative non-METH stripping formulations in consumer product applications. The aim of the project was to find safer alternative non-METH strippers that minimized the increase in VOC emissions.

The project involved testing alternative non-METH stripping formulations in four sectors including:

- Large furniture stripping companies that use equipment to apply stripper;
 - Small furniture stripping companies that apply stripper by hand;
 - Contract stripping companies that strip on-site and apply stripper by hand; and
 - Consumer stripping where consumers apply the stripper by hand.
- This research found effective alternatives that will be classified as Low Vapor Pressure (LVP) materials, which CARB classifies as non-VOC emitting materials .

We want to encourage CARB to ban METH as a toxic and set a low VOC limit.

INCREASED VOC LIMITS AND COMPLIANCE DATES FOR SEVERAL CATEGORIES

We are very disappointed that staff increased VOC limits and compliance dates for several categories, most of which we believe could comply with more health-focused limits and shorter

deadlines. During the development of this regulation, our preliminary conversations with staff indicated it would establish more health-focused limits and shorter deadlines for the following categories.

- ODOR REMOVER (LIQUID/NON-AEROSOL): VOC limits increased from 0.1% to 6% for non-aerosol, and 25% for aerosol; compliance dates increased from 2012 to 2013.

In addition to increasing the VOC limits and compliance dates for this category, CARB staff does not want to disclose the total amount of 2008 VOC emissions created by ALL the aerosol odor removers/eliminators in the market arguing possible damage "confidentiality". It is important that CARB staff finds a way to inform the public about the amount of emissions created by this industry.

Failing to release generic statistics on releases of VOC'S or toxins into the air because of patent issues isn't really a valid argument, although it is used in the food industry as well as the various chemicals industries. (That's why foods can say "natural flavors" and have in it any ingredient with a primary purpose of only adding flavor.) Please note: any of these products can be reformulated by a laboratory in Florida which specializes in deconstructing fragrance formulae for the industry. The claim that a patent might be at risk is therefore invalid. Releasing the total pounds of emissions no more reveals the exact formula than does reformulation by gas chromatography.

- ASTRINGENT/TONER: VOC limits increased from 10% to 35%. Although we support staff's efforts to reduce the VOC limits for this category, we would like to see a standardization of this industry. Many manufacturers of non-medicinal, non-FDA regulated astringent/toners already manufacture 10% VOC limit products.

- FABRIC SOFTENER-SINGLE USE DRYER PRODUCT: VOC limits increased from .05% to .1%.

- GLASS CLEANERS (AEROSOL FORM): VOC limit increased from 8% to 10%; compliance dates increased from 2010 to 2012.

- MULTI-PURPOSE LUBRICANTS: Compliance date moved from 2012 to 2013.

We are very pleased and supportive, however, that staff added a new VOC limit of 10% to be met in 2015 - one positive improvement we support.

- PENETRANT: Compliance dates increased from 2012 to 2013. Additionally, we feel that technology allows and staff could have set this category's limit at 10%, instead of the 25% VOC limit suggested.

- PERSONAL FRAGRANCE: Compliance dates increased from 2010 to 2014. Personal fragrances are a large emitter of VOCs in the consumer products category (10.77 tpd), thus we are pleased staff will remove grandfather clauses from all products with 20% or less fragrance. However, staff should increase the scope of products whose grandfather clause will be removed and strengthen the VOC limits suggested—currently at 25%.

- NON-CHEMICALLY CURING SEALANT: VOC limit increased from 0.5% to 1.5%.

CATEGORIES DELETED FROM THE DRAFT LANGUAGE

We have informed staff that we are concerned about removing the following categories from the regulation draft. We ask CARB to commit to reduce emissions from those products and set a reasonable timeline to bring this category back.

- LIQUID AIR FRESHENERS: It is our understanding that CARB learned about a patent problem that might prevent them from demanding a lower VOC limit. In addition to setting a reasonable timeline for VOC reductions from this category, CARB staff needs to provide stakeholders more details about the stumbling blocks.

- POST-SHAVE PRODUCTS: CARB staff was having a hard time coming up with a good way to define post-shave products, such as skin conditioners, as separate from aftershave products like fragrance. CARB staff has indicated they need more time to develop this subcategory, so they have pulled it from the proposed regulation.

As CARB weighs its decision to regulate these chemicals, we urge you to work with other stakeholders and consider the health of those who are most exposed, and to protect the health of the most vulnerable among us. CARB's own Resolution No. 05-28, approved on March 17, 2005, in response to the Indoor Air Pollution in California study, "directs staff to promote 'Best Practices' for the... maintenance of school facilities...in conjunction with other State agencies and relevant private sector groups."

These protections are critical in the work and home environment, where exposure to emissions from products tends to be more than outdoors. These emissions can be significantly influenced by regulatory decisions. In this regard, spot removers and cleaning/janitorial chemicals are particularly important.

Part of Cal-EPA's mission is to ensure that environmental regulations not only protect the environment but also protect public health, water quality, and worker safety, while minimizing waste generation. The agency has recognized this fact in a variety of ways, most recently in the Green Chemistry Initiative. One of the challenges is to ensure that toxics are not in products, either by design or by accident. We encourage CARB to not only choose the most environmentally friendly VOC limit but also one that is health protective and in line with the laudable goals put forward by the Green Chemistry Initiative.

Again, thank you for your commitment to regulate VOCs in consumer products. We are very hopeful about this regulation's potential to help protect the health of California residents, consumers and workers who deal with these products on a daily basis.

We look forward to continuing working with your staff on this issue and urge you to include us in CARB's decision making process.

Sincerely,

Luis R. Cabrales

Senior Campaign and Outreach Associate
Coalition for Clean Air

Charlotte Brody, RN
Executive Director
Commonweal

Elina Green, MPH
Program Coordinator
Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma

Jesse Marquez
Executive Director
Coalition for a Safe Environment

Neil Gendel
Director
Healthy Children Organizing Project

Joel Ervice
Interim Director
Regional Asthma Management and Prevention (RAMP) Initiative

Bill Magavern
Director
Sierra Club California

Dori Gilels
Executive Director
Women's Voices for the Earth

Adrian Martinez
Project Attorney
Natural Resources Defense Council

Rachel L. Gibson
Environmental Health Advocate & Staff Attorney
Environment California

Andrea Ventura
Program Manager
Clean Water Action

Wafaa Aborashed
Executive Director
Bay Area Healthy 880 Communities-SL

Lenny Siegel
Executive Director
Center for Public Environmental Oversight

Angel De Fazio, BSAT
President
National Toxic Encephalopathy Foundation

M. Suzanne Murphy,
Executive Director
Worksafe, Inc.

Elise Miller
Executive Director
Institute for Children's Environmental Health

Arturo Carmona
Executive Director
Consejo de Federaciones Mexicanas en Norteamérica
(COFEM)

Anne Katten
Pesticide and Work Safety Specialist
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation

Teresa Marquez
Land use Committee Chair
Boyle Heights Resident Homeowners Association

James Roybal
President
Residents of Pico Rivera for Environmental Justice

Eden Flynn
Coordinator
Southern California Coalition for Occupational Safety & Health
(SoCalCOSH)

Martha Dina Arguello
Executive Director
Physicians for Social Responsibility-Los Angeles

Deborah Moore
Executive Director
Green Schools Initiative

James Provenzano
President
Clean Air Now

René L. Guerrero
Legislative Advocate
Planning and Conservation League

David Lighthall, Ph.D.
Senior Scientist for Environmental Health,
Central Valley Health Policy Institute*
(* For identification purposes only)

Bradley Angel
Executive Director
Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice

Allyson Holman
Chair
Merced/Mariposa County Asthma Coalition

Jose Luis Olmedo
Executive Director
Comite Civico Del Valle

Conner Everts
Executive Director
Southern California Watershed Alliance

Miguel A. Luna
Urban Semillas

Julia Liou
Planning and Development Manager
Asian Health Services

Manuel Criollo
Lead Organizer
Labor/Community Strategy Center

Cc (via electronic mail):

James Goldstene
EO
jgoldste@arb.ca.gov

Carla Takemoto
Manager, Technical Evaluation Section
ctakemoto@arb.ca.gov

David Mallory
Measures Development Section Manager
dmallory@arb.ca.gov

Femi Olaluwoye
Regulatory Amendments
folaluwoye@arb.ca.gov

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/155-carbcconsumerproductsletter_062608.pdf'

Original File Name: CARBCconsumerProductsLetter_062608.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-25 12:01:37

No Duplicates.

Comment 25 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Sean

Last Name: Fitzgerald

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: National Aerosol Association

Comment:

Please see attached.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/157-naa.zip'

Original File Name: NAA.zip

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-25 14:57:07

No Duplicates.

Comment 26 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 45 Day.

First Name: Rufus

Last Name: Howell

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: California Department of Public Health

Comment:

Please see attached.

Attachment: 'www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/158-ar-m355u_20080625_171647.pdf'

Original File Name: AR-M355U_20080625_171647.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-06-27 15:09:22

No Duplicates.

Comment 1 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008). (At Hearing)

First Name: Linda

Last Name: Ray

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Statement for CARB Meeting

Comment:

Please see attached.

Attachment: www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/159-cp2008.pdf

Original File Name: cp2008.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-07-01 16:05:57

No Duplicates.

Comment 2 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008). (At Hearing)

First Name: Barry

Last Name: Wallerstein

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: South Coast AQMD

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/160-cp080002.pdf

Original File Name: cp080002.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-07-01 16:27:44

No Duplicates.

Comment 3 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008). (At Hearing)

First Name: Mark

Last Name: Sorenson

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Yorkshire Guttering

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/162-mark_sorenson.pdf

Original File Name: mark_sorenson.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-07-01 16:32:01

No Duplicates.

Comment 4 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008). (At Hearing)

First Name: Rufus

Last Name: Howell

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: CDPH

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/163-cp080003.pdf

Original File Name: cp080003.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-07-01 16:39:34

No Duplicates.

Comment 1 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 15-1.

This comment was posted then deleted because it was unrelated to the Board item or it was a duplicate.

Comment 2 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 15-1.

First Name: Mike
Last Name: Flanagan
Email Address: advantagebp@aol.com
Affiliation:

Subject: CP2008
Comment:

Dear Committee Members

Roof leaks and window leaks are nasty problems. The area is usually wet and silicon sealants or latex sealants simply do not work. Only a rubber sealant with a petroleum solvent allows repairs to damp areas. I heard that California plans to ban all petroleum solvents in sealants to protect household consumers. Trained contractors need an exemption from this rule that will allow them to select a rubber sealant having a petroleum solvent that will fix the leaking problems permanently for the consumer.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mike Flanagan
President - Advantage Building Products

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-08-19 12:53:02

No Duplicates.

Comment 3 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 15-1.

First Name: Jeremy

Last Name: Owens

Email Address: jeremy@3Generationsinc.com

Affiliation: 3 Generations Improvements

Subject: CA Consumer Products Regulations

Comment:

I was told recently that the caulking that I use to seal up my customers' homes could be outlawed. We are a siding and window contractor who use Quad and NPC sealant for sealing around windows, doors, corners, etc. I use these petroleum based rubber sealant's because it adheres the best in moist weather. Its flexibility and ability to adhere during all weather conditions has been the best for our business. We have tried using other sealant's in the past and have had service claims where caulking has cracked or deteriorated within a few years.

When doing projects such as fiber cement, caulking is essential to sealing up around windows and without the best sealant in the market, we would be doing homeowners a dis-service. Please do not outlaw these sealants or at least provide a contractor's exception!
Thanks!

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-08-21 14:15:20

No Duplicates.

Comment 4 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 15-1.

First Name: D. Douglas

Last Name: Fratz

Email Address: dfratz@cspa.org

Affiliation: Consumer Specialty Products Association

Subject: 15-Day Notice of Public Availability of Modified Text

Comment:

Attached are CSPA comments on this notice.

Attachment: www.arb.ca.gov/lists/cp2008/171-cspa_comments_on_arb_15-day_modified_text.pdf

Original File Name: CSPA Comments on ARB 15-Day Modified Text.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-08-25 13:48:41

No Duplicates.

Comment 5 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 15-1.

First Name: Darlene

Last Name: Coe

Email Address: darcoe@velotech.net

Affiliation: DARCO Sales

Subject: Consumer Products Regulation on Sealants

Comment:

I have sold building products for the last 25 years. The last 4 years I have immersed myself in "Moisture Management" in construction, both new and remodel. I have seen sealant failures due to substandard sealants. I have also dealt with contractor frustration when a silicone sealant just won't stick to a damp surface, nor could they paint over it. Professional sealants, those that include petroleum solvents, have proven to be the only year-round sealant contractors can use with confidence. I have seen the destruction leaks have caused around windows, on roofs and behind siding. Many homes have become uninhabitable due to these leaks and either the new homeowner is stuck with a home they can't resell or the builder is forced to spend thousands of dollars to correct the problem. California MUST allow contractors to be exempt from this ruling. Quality construction is a must and professional sealants are insurance they are doing everything possible to prevent mold issues and serious water damage. Please consider these issues and reduce all of the litigation that will result by restricting contractors on the sealants they can use and the seasons they can work.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-08-26 11:59:53

No Duplicates.

Comment 6 for Consumer Products Regulations (cp2008) - 15-1.

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Arnett

Email Address: rarnett@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation: Vinyl Designs Inc.

Subject: CA Consumer Products Regulation cp2009

Comment:

I have heard that the caulking that most of the siding ,window and PatioCover contractors are using at this time are going to be taken off the market(California only).We currently use petroleum based rubber sealant's because it adheares best in wet weather or under damp conditions. If we are limited to Silicone based sealants, only, then the call back rate to product failure will skyrocket. We believe in giving our customers the best quality installation possiable and we can not do that with current silicone product that are on the market today.

Please DO NOT OUTLAW THESE SEALANTS BUT IF YOU DO PLEASE MAKE IT AN EXCEPTION FOR "CONTRACTORS USE ONLY"

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2008-08-26 13:11:16

No Duplicates.