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Trump Administration Regulatory Pace

Regulatory Actions Reviewed by OIRA

Chart 1: Year 1

Chart 2: First 6 Months, Year 2

Chart 3: First 18 Months

Source: GWU Regulatory Studies Department
Trump Deregulatory Agenda

- President Trump Promised Deep Cuts to Regulation
  - Takes a new rule to undo an old rule (need to pick up pace?)
  - The deep reductions in regulatory activity suggest that the Trump Administration has staunched the flow of new regulations.
  - Has it taken all necessary steps to remove old regulations?
- Recent EPA Proposals to Improve Rulemaking Process
- My Observations
  - Trump Administration’s dramatic first-year slowdown in regulatory activity has continued into year 2.
  - The most significant policy actions have seen the steepest declines compared to Obama and Bush II
  - Permanent changes in the regulatory landscape come from congressional disapprovals under the Congressional Review Act.
Trump Deregulatory Agenda

Recent Court Roadblocks

- Primarily EPA
- WOTUS of US rule
  - South Carolina case - lifts injunction in 22 states.
  - Two injunctions remain in other 28 states.
  - Expect further appeals by industry and agricultural groups

- Chemical Risk Management Plans
- Risk Tolerances for Chlorpyrifos
Trump Effect?

- Trump’s Initiatives and Regulatory Pronouncements Have Generally Been Positive for Business, Instilling Confidence to Invest and Hire
  - Logistics issues (both trucking and rail)
    - FMCSA pilot program to determine whether drivers between 18-21 with military experience can operate commercial motor vehicles in interstate commerce.
  - Other supply chain issues
  - Chinese trade dispute
    - Double-tax for lubricants industry?
  - IRS implementation of tax reform law (primarily for pass-through entities)
  - Marpol 2020
OSHA Tracking Injuries & Illnesses

- **2017**
  - OSHA is currently collecting 2017 Form 300A data
  - This year’s submissions are due July 1, 2018
  - The Injury Tracking Application (ITA) is not collecting Form 300/301 data at this time

- **2016 Data**
  - 60,000 accounts created on the ITA
  - Data from over 214,000 300A Forms were submitted
  - Users can no longer submit or edit their 2016 data through the ITA
OSHA Tracking Injuries & Illnesses

- 2018 Proposed Rule
  - Reiterates OSHA’s intent to reconsider, revise, or remove provisions of the 2016 final rule
  - OSHA proposes amending the Rule to remove the requirement to electronically submit OSHA Forms 300 and 301 for establishments with 250 or more employees which are required to routinely submit injury and illness records
  - OSHA asks for comment on adding the Employee Identification Number (EIN) to OSHA Form 301A to increase BLS’ use of the OSHA data
OSHA Tracking Injuries & Illnesses

- ILMA’s Comments (9/18)
  - Support elimination of electronic reporting of OSHA Forms 300 and 301
    - OSHA properly uses FOIA privacy concerns
    - OSHA should add independent bases from 1974 Privacy Act and OMB privacy circular
  - Support inclusion of EIN, provided no SSNs disclosed
    - Can eliminate double reporting
DOL Overtime Rule

- DOL Conducted Five “Listening Sessions” in Sept. 2018
  - Address salary/job duties applicable to Executive, Administrative & Professional Exemptions from FLSA Overtime Rule
- Trump Administration Request for Information - Summer 2017
- New Overtime Proposed Rule - Spring 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obama</th>
<th>Reinstated</th>
<th>Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Week</td>
<td>$913</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>$615-$673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$47,476</td>
<td>$23,660</td>
<td>$32,000-$35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WOTUS Rule

- Federal Court Blocks Implementation of WOTUS in TX, MS & LA (09/12/18)
  - Texas judge stops short of issuing nationwide injunction
- Trump Administration Asks South Carolina Federal Judge to Delay Effect of Court’s Decision to Vacate EPA’s Stay of WOTUS Rule Implementation
  - EPA & Army Corps failed to comply with Administrative Procedure Act
  - Reinstates Rule in 22 States
  - Two other court decisions stay rule in 28 States (AL, AK, AZ, AR, CO, FL, GA, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NM, NC, ND, SC, SD, TX, UT, WV, Wi & WY)
- EPA & Army Corps’ WOTUS Replacement Rule at OMB for Review
EPA Proposed in June 2018 to Establish NO Additional Regulatory Requirements under its SPCC Program for “Hazardous Substances”

- EPA based proposal on a review of existing regulations and an analysis of the frequency and impacts of reported hazardous substance discharges
- ILMA Supported Proposal in Written Comments
SPCC Plan Deficiencies

- Inaccurate Facility Diagrams & Descriptions
- State & Local Requirements Not Included
- Brittle Fracture Inspection Process Not Followed
- Prior Spills Not Recorded
- No Written Statement Estimating Flow Rate/Amount of Lost Product
- Failure to Monitor Internal Heating Coils
Transportation & Logistics

- Capacity Crunch
  - Driver Retirements
  - Hours of Service (HOS)/Electronic Logging Device Mandate (ELD)
  - Average Driver Pay
  - OTR - Work/Life Balance
- Rising Freight Rates - Contract & Spot
- Technology
  - Electric Vehicles
  - On-Demand Freight Apps
Transportation & Logistics

- Fuel Costs
- Taxes
  - Replacement of Aging Trucks
  - New Effective Tax Rates
  - Renewing Fleets
- Trucking Industry Consolidation
  - LTL Sector
- Rail Service Issues - Precision Railroading
- Marpol 2020
TSCA User Fee Rule

- EPA finalized TSCA User Fees Rule on 9/27/18
  - Mandated by 2016 TSCA Amendments
  - Affected manufacturers and processors will begin incurring fees on October 1, 2018
  - Small businesses are eligible to receive a substantial discount of approximately 80%
  - EPA calculated fees by estimating the total annual costs of administering TSCA Sections 4, 5, and 6 (excluding the costs of manufacturer-requested risk evaluations)

- PMN/SNUN (Section 5) - $16,000
- EPA-initiated risk evaluation (Section 6) - $1,350,000
- Manufacturer-requested risk evaluation (Section 6)
  - On EPA Work Plan - Initial payment of $1.25 million, with final invoice to recover 50% of actual costs
  - Not on EPA Work Plan - Initial payment of $2.5 million, with final invoice to recover 100% of actual costs
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Chemical Management/Inventories

K-REACH 2018

James Eggenschwiler
(Pre)Registration of Existing Chemicals

All KECI listed substances ≥1t/y must be (pre)registered.

1. Exception: PEC’s registered in 2018.
3. No Preregistration = No Market ≥1t/y until registered.
   (No “late” preregistration” and no “3-year rolling avg”.)
4. Tonnage band sequencing = If in doubt, preregister!
   - ≥1,000t/y and CMR substances ≥1t/y: 31 Dec 2021;
   - 100-1000t/y: 31 Dec 2024;
   - 1-100t/y: 31 Dec 2030
5. OR Appointment Letter required - pre-May 1st submittal is recommended.
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Chemical Management/Inventories

REACH 2018

John Howell, Stephan Baumgärtel
Registration Update

REACH 2018

Substances

Registration type

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Registration</td>
<td>15,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>8,340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23,462

(ECHA expected 30,000 registrations)

Registration Update

REACH 2018

- Full registration vs. intermediates
- CoRAP/PACT: all high volume / PBT CMR substances to be put on Annex XIV / XVII (app. 150 on Annex XIV)
- BREXIT (3000 UK Registrations)
Product Notifications – Duty Holders

► Who is required to submit the notification?
  • Importers (Definition acc. To REACH and CLP)
  • Downstream Users (e.g. Formulators) – Definition acc. To REACH and CLP)

► When and where is he required to submit the notification?
  • Before placing the product on the market
  • Within the 28 EU-Member States plus Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway

► Deadlines
  • Consumer Use: 1. January 2020
  • Professional use: 1. January 2021
  • Industrial Use: 1. January 2024
Information Requirements (Standard submission)

- **Identification of the product and the submitter**
  - Product Identifier (Name), Details of the submitter – must be consistent with label information!
  - Unique Formula Identifier (UFI)

- **Hazard Identification and additional information**
  - Classification of the mixture
  - Toxicological information (as in section 11 of SDS)
  - Types and sizes of-packagings placed on the market for consumer / professional use
  - Colour / physical state
  - Product category according to EU PCS code
  - Use (industrial, professional, consumer or combination)
Information Requirements (Standard submission)

- Information on Mixture Components
  - Substance Identifier (CAS#, EC#, Index#, INCI#, IUPAC-Name..)
  - Concentration or concentration range (defined limits) in descending order
    - Hazardous Component classified for human health or physical hazards >=0.1%
    - Other Hazardous components or components not classified as hazardous (>= 1%)
  - Mixture in Mixture (MIM) Components with UFI (or product name and SDS)
  - MIM Concentration & classification
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Chemical Management/Inventories

TSCA – Inventory Reset & User Fee Rules

John Howell, Jeff Leiter
Inventory Reset

Due dates:

- Manufacturers: February 7, 2018
- Processors (optional): October 5, 2018

https://www.epa.gov/tsca-inventory/tsca-inventory-notification-active-inactive-rule
More on Who Reports - Retrospective

If you manufactured, imported, or processed 1) a TSCA Inventory listed chemical substance 2) for non-exempt commercial purpose 3) at any time during the 10-year reporting period (June 21, 2006 - June 21, 2016):

- **manufactured**
  - report as a manufacturer
  - 180 days, required

- **imported**
  - report as a manufacturer
  - 180 days, required

- **processed**
  - Did you directly obtain a substance that you processed from a foreign source?
    - report as a manufacturer (importer)
    - 180 days, required
  - Did you directly obtain a substance that you processed from a domestic source?
    - report as a processor
    - 420 days, voluntary

Timeline - Retrospective Reporting (Form A)

- Manufacturer (& processor) submission period: 8/12/2017 to 2/7/2018 (180 days)
- Processor submission period: 3/2018 to 10/5/2018 (240 days)

EPA publishes draft inventory with substances reported by 2/7/2018 designated as “active”

Timeline - Future Reporting (Form B)

EPA publishes initial Inventory with substances reported by 10/5/2018 designated as either “active” or “inactive”

11/2018

Manufacturer & processor reporting

90 days

2/2019

date when substances designated as “inactive” become effectively “inactive”
User Fees

- Draft rule published 02/26/2018
- ILMA submitted comments
- Final rule, 09/27/2018

## User Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEE CATEGORY</th>
<th>FEE AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TSCA Section 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test order</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test rule</td>
<td>$29,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>$22,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TSCA Section 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premanufacture notice (PMN) and consolidated PMN</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNUN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbial commercial activity notice (MCAN) and consolidated MCAN</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low exposure/low release exemption (LoREX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-volume exemption (LVE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TME*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier II exemption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCA experimental release application (TERA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TSCA Section 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-initiated risk evaluation</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer-requested risk evaluation on a chemical included in the TSCA Work Plan</td>
<td>Initial payment of $1.25 million, with final invoice to recover 50% of actual costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer-requested risk evaluation on a chemical not included in the TSCA Work Plan</td>
<td>Initial payment of $2.5 million, with final invoice to recover 100% of actual costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## User Fees - Small Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEE CATEGORY</th>
<th>SMALL BUSINESS FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test order</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test rule</td>
<td>$5,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMN and consolidated PMN</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNUN</td>
<td>$940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAN and consolidated MCAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoREX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier II exemption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-initiated risk evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer-requested risk evaluation on a chemical included in the Work Plan</td>
<td>$1,250,000 initial payment + 50% of total actual costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer-requested risk evaluation on a chemical not included in the Work Plan</td>
<td>$2,500,000 initial payment + 100% of total actual costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=6a4e1ef9-d035-4634-bff8-9f9a2506d76e
Updating HCS 2012 - Purposes

- Maintain alignment with GHS
- Address issues identified during implementation of HCS 2012
- Identify issues of concern for those complying with WHMIS 2015

From a presentation given by M. Ruskin to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Principles & Assumptions

- As with HCS 2012, OSHA plans to modify only the provisions of the HCS that must be changed to align with the GHS
  - Basic framework of HCS will remain the same
- OSHA will maintain or enhance the overall current level of protection of the HCS

From a presentation given by M. Ruskin to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Maintaining Alignment with GHS

- **Align with Revision 7**
  - Appendix A (health hazards): mostly editorial
  - Appendix B (physical hazards):
    - Flammable gases, Desensitized explosives
    - Aerosols - align with GHS Rev 6/7, include Category 3

From a presentation given by M. Ruskin to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Maintaining Alignment with GHS

Appendix C (label elements)
- New or updated hazards, updated guidance, and precautionary statements

Appendix D (SDS)
- Updates to SDS Sections 2, 5, 7, 9

From a presentation given by M. Ruskin to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Possible Implementation Issues

- Hazard classification Issues
  - Health Hazards; Physical Hazards; Hazards not otherwise classified or Mixtures/cut-off values

- Safety Data Sheet

From a presentation given by M. Ruskin to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Possible Implementation Issues

- OSHA has provided guidance on labeling
  - Small packages; Kits; OSHA versus other Jurisdictions and Timing of updating labels
  - Example: How would a change to the (f)(11) provision requiring labels to be updated within six months affect your industry/company?

From a presentation given by M. Ruskin to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
UN Subcommittee on GHS

Considerable activity underway

- As an example: proposed change to P201/202:
  - P201, “Obtain special instructions before use” and P202, “Do not handle until all safety precautions have been read and understood”, both aim to draw attention to the particular importance of safety precautions where high hazard chemicals are handled and used.
  - Proposal: Add new P203 to read: “Read and follow all safety instructions before use.”

From a presentation given by M. Ruskin to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
On June 4, 2018, the U.S. Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA), within the White House Office of Management and Budget, and the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat signed a Memorandum of Understanding on regulatory cooperation between the United States and Canada. The MOU reaffirms the principles and commitments of the U.S.-Canada Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC). Through the elimination of unnecessary regulatory differences, this MOU promotes economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.
RCC Workplan

- Develop guidance for stakeholders
  - joint guidance on label variances and alignment, descriptions of respective regulatory frameworks, HNOC guidance
- Coordinate common positions and participate in UNSCEGHS
- Maintain alignment on the implementation of the GHS

From a presentation given by M. Ruskin to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Enforcement Update: Concentration Ranges/Trade Secrets

- A concentration range may be used when:
  - A trade secret claim is made (for the exact percentage);
  - There is batch-to-batch variability in the production of a mixture; or
  - for a group of substantially similar mixtures with similar chemical composition.

- Trade secret status may be claimed for exact percentage composition but not for concentration ranges.

From a presentation given by S. Rundman III to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Enforcement Update
Concentration Ranges/Trade Secrets

- When classifier uses a range of concentrations:
  - must be sufficiently narrow to meet the intent of disclosing the actual concentration;
  - Accurate representation of the variation.
- The hazard classification must reflect the highest degree of hazard that the mixture could present.

From a presentation given by S. Rundman III to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Top 5 HCS Violations (cited serious)
12/1/2013-7/30/18 (federal only)

1910.1200(e)(1) – Written program
Develop, implement and maintain at each workplace, a written hazard communication program

1910.1200(h)(1) – Information and training program
Effective information & training at initial assignments & new chemicals introduced

1910.1200(g)(8) – Safety Data Sheets
Maintain SDS for each hazardous chemical and readily accessible during each work shift

1910.1200(g)(1) – Safety Data Sheets
Mfg/Imp obtain or develop a safety data sheet for each hazardous chemical they produce or import. Employers shall have a safety data sheet for each hazardous chemical which they use.

1910.1200(h)(3)(iv) – Training
Training on shipped labels, workplace labeling & SDS and how employees can obtain and use the appropriate hazard information.
## Canada HPR April 18, 2018

### Prescribed concentration ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration Range</th>
<th>Concentration Range</th>
<th>Concentration Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1 - 1.0%</td>
<td>0.5 - 1.5%</td>
<td>1.0 - 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 - 7.0%</td>
<td>5.0 - 10.0%</td>
<td>7.0 - 13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 - 30.0%</td>
<td>15.0 - 40.0%</td>
<td>30.0 - 60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0 - 70.0%</td>
<td>60.0 - 80.0%</td>
<td>65.0 - 85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0 - 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SHERA Opportunities

▶ Create Task Force to solicit comments from Manufacturing Members re current or anticipated issues with Feb 2019 rulemaking

▶ Helping customers with HCS 2012
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Globally Harmonized System (GHS)

WHMIS 2015

John Howell
Key Developments

- HPR Amendments, April, 2018
- Remaining due date
- Compliance & Enforcement: SDS Audit
- Regulatory initiatives: updating WHMIS 2015
HPR Amendments, April, 2018

Amendments make it easier for hazardous product suppliers to protect confidential business information (CBI)

HPR Amendments April, 2018

- Prescribed concentration ranges

- 0.1 - 1.0% 0.5 - 1.5% 1.0 - 3.5%
- 3.0 - 7.0% 5.0 - 10.0% 7.0 - 13.0%
- 10.0 - 30.0% 15.0 - 40.0% 30.0 - 60.0%
- 45.0 - 70.0% 60.0 - 80.0% 65.0 - 85.0%
- 80.0 - 100.0%

- Note: classification must reflect actual concentration (most hazardous) in product

SDS must note that exact concentration is being withheld as a trade secret
Remaining Due Date

December 1, 2018: everyone (manufacturers, importers, distributors, employers) must be in compliance with all aspects of WHMIS 2015

From a presentation given by K. Godard to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Safety Data Sheet Audit

- Assess compliance of 188 publicly available SDS
- Identify areas of non-compliance to target compliance promotion initiatives, assist inspectors
- Objective: obtain baseline information

From a presentation given by K. Godard to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Safety Data Sheet Audit Project

How were the SDS reviewed?

- Each section of the SDS was reviewed to assess compliance with the HPA and HPR.
  - For the purpose of this review, it was assumed that the hazard classifications were correct
- Non-compliance under the HPA:
  - False/Misleading information (Subsections 14.2(1), (2) and (3))
- Non-compliances under the HPR:
  - Regulatory requirements required under Section 4 – Safety Data Sheet
    - Outlines the requirements for elements that need to be included on the SDS
  - Information elements required under Schedule 1 – Information Elements on Safety Data Sheet
    - Outlines specific information elements that are required for each section of the SDS
Safety Data Sheet Audit Project

*How were non-compliances categorized?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the non-compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information required not on the SDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some information provided but incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording on the SDS was different than required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information not clear or confusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False/Misleading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information that creates an erroneous impression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety Data Sheet Audit Project

What were the results?

SDS Analysis Results

HPR Non-Compliance by Sections of SDS*

*Sections 12-15 excluded

From a presentation given by K. Godard to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Safety Data Sheet Audit Project

*What were the results?*

The top 3 sections of non-compliances were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDS Section</th>
<th>% of Non-Compliant SDSs</th>
<th>Examples of Non-Compliances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 9: Physical and Chemical Properties</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>• Relative density – ex. Specifying specific gravity instead (variation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Boiling range – ex. Not providing the range (not provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2: Hazard Identification</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>• Procedural statement ex. P260 statement outline cyc “or” face protection was specified when it should be “and” (ambiguous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other Hazards – ex. not providing other hazards or stating “not available” / “not applicable”  as appropriate (not provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3: Composition/Information on ingredients</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>• Common name – ex. Not providing the common name (not provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Concentration with unit of measurement – ex. SDSs specifying % by weight” or “% by volume”, which do not sufficiently identify the unit of concentration (incomplete)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a presentation given by K. Godard to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
Updating WHMIS 2015

- Health Canada’s HPR currently aligned with GHS, revision 5
- Looking at updating the HPR to align with GHS, revision 7
- Will propose other amendments to address issues identified both by the Department and by stakeholders

From a presentation given by K. Godard to the Society for Chemical Hazard Communication, September 25, 2018
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Regulatory Activity, State: CA Prop 65

REACH 2018

John Howell, Mike Pearce
Clear & Reasonable Warnings

- ILMA request for clarification, May 17th
  - OEHHA responded, July 16th
- New regulations in effect August 28th
- Enforcement actions up

https://oehha.ca.gov/proposition-65/about-proposition-65
Clear & Reasonable Warnings

Actions

Source: https://oag.ca.gov/prop65
Clear & Reasonable Warnings