

**Vela, Monet@OEHHA**

---

**From:** Lauren Ayers <lauren.sonoma@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2016 3:05 PM  
**To:** Vela, Monet@OEHHA  
**Subject:** Comment on proposed revision of Article 6 of Prop 65

Hello Monet Vela,

I recently contacted the CA EPA regarding bromine used as a ‘dough conditioner’ in bread, because I’d heard that Prop 65 protects Californians but I didn’t see any labels on bread so didn’t have any confidence the bakers use safe dough conditioners. (But when I read all the loopholes in Prop 65, I realized that it must have been written by corporate lawyers.)

While looking into the issue, I came across the proposed new Article 6. I URGE YOU TO INCLUDE ALL FIVE CHANGES. This will get us an inch closer to the type of protection from potassium bromate that exists in Europe.

In a nation with half the population being overweight, where one in three people are predicted to have diabetes, why do we tolerate any endocrine disrupters in food and the environment?

Surely you realize that weak regulations are worse than none at all. Not just because feeble regs give the impression that the problem is handled when it’s not, but also because any future class action suit can be shot down in court when the offending corporation says, “We followed the law!”

In other words, poisoned, sickened consumers have a feeble chance to win against for-profit corporations, but no judge would make state or federal government agencies pay for the lost income and lives, because that would set off an avalanche of suits.

Discouraged,

Lauren

Lauren Ayers  
Resident of Oakland  
cell: 707 230-9255