

From: [Michael Fisher](#)
To: [P65Public Comments](#)
Subject: Clear and Reasonable Warning Regulations
Date: Thursday, January 22, 2015 10:31:30 AM

I read the information on your website for Proposition 65, "NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING - TITLE 27, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS PROPOSED REPEAL OF ARTICLE 6 AND ADOPTION OF NEW ARTICLE 6 PROPOSITION 65 CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNINGS."

I disagree with your assessment of no economic impact on companies. They currently have to know whether or not the chemical exists in their product. If this passes, they will have to use human and laboratory resources to determine how much of the chemical is present. I know some companies include the Safe Harbor wording if just a trace of a chemical exists. For example, anything with an electrical cord attached has very small traces of toxic chemicals, so they already know they must warn. This does not require more employees, nor does it require testing.

My concern is some major manufacturers may evaluate their revenue from products sold in CA, compare it to the added cost to comply with the revised Prop 65, and then opt to sell only to the rest of the USA, except CA.