

David S. Wall  
P.O. Box 756 Newberg, Oregon 97132; [(408)-287-6878]

February 23, 2021

To: House Committee on Energy and Environment; others

**Re: I OPPOSE [HB 2495]...defect is noted in language.**

**Products from China and other countries with poor product safety records should receive enhanced scrutiny.**

[HB 2495] Vague and ambiguous reliance issues are not acceptable.

The "Text: [Page 4 at 17-44]" states, " (3)(a) The authority may enter into reciprocal data sharing agreements with other states in which manufacturers of children's products are required to disclose information related to high priority chemicals of concern for children's health used in children's products. The authority must use the **GS1 Global Product Classification system** to identify and specify product categories subject to the data sharing agreements. If the authority has entered into a data sharing agreement with another state, and a manufacturer has reported the information required in the notice described in subsection (2) of this section to that state, **the manufacturer may request that the other state provide the authority with the information in lieu of the manufacturer's direct reporting of the information to the authority.** (b) A manufacturer fulfills the notice requirement of subsection (1) of this section when the authority receives the information from the other state and the authority determines that the information received satisfies the requirements for the notice specified in subsection (2) of this section. (4) In lieu of the manufacturer's providing notice to the authority under subsection (1) or (3) of this section, the authority may require that the notice described in subsection (2) of this section be submitted to the Interstate Chemicals Clearinghouse. The authority by rule shall specify procedures for the provision of such notice by manufacturers to **the Interstate Chemicals Clearinghouse.** (5)(a) The authority shall grant an exemption to a manufacturer of children's products that applies for an exemption from the notice requirements of this section if the application demonstrates that: (A) The high priority chemical of concern for children's health used in children's products is present in the children's product otherwise subject to the notice requirements of this section only as a contaminant; (B) The manufacturer conducts a manufacturing control program for the contaminant; and (C) The manufacturing control program meets minimum standards for a manufacturing control program as set forth by the authority by rule. (b) The authority shall approve or disapprove an exemption application within 180 days after its submittal. **If the authority fails to act within 180 days, the exemption application is deemed approved.**"

The "Text: [Page 5 at 24-29]" states, "(b) **If the authority fails to act within 180 days, the hazard assessment is deemed approved, and the manufacturer may continue to sell or offer for sale in this state the children's product for which the manufacturer submitted a hazard assessment[.]** for a period of three years after the date of submission of the hazard assessment. A manufacturer whose hazard assessment is approved under this paragraph must resubmit the hazard assessment at the end of the three-year period."

Oregon should have its' own Material Testing Laboratories and not rely on outside government studies.

Reliance on other State's testing of products may incorporate "negligent acts" causing harm.

Oregon deserves better and you can make this happen.

Make Oregon our National Standard for chemical safety in children's products.

*Respectfully submitted,*

/s/ David S. Wall