

COPY

LOG OF MEETING

SUBJECT: NPCA LABELING SUBCOMMITTEE

DATE: May 9, 1995

JUL 18 1995

PLACE: 1500 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, DC

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Mary F. Toro *Mary F. Toro*

COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVES:

Lauren Burton, Division of Health Effects
Jacqueline Elder, Office of Hazard Reduction
Mary F. Toro, Division of Regulatory Management

NON-COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVES:

Rob Roy	Morton International	Janet Ryan	L&F Products
LeeAnne Briggs	Kop-Coat, Inc.	Kevin Settles	Tnemec Co., Inc.
Christopher Balsat	RPM, Inc.	Robert Siladie	The Flood Co.
Rosa Carreon	Dow Chemical Company	Gary Wemmert	S.C. Johnson & Co
Lee Davidson	Parks Corporation		
Harry Finkbone	The Glidden Company		
Bonnie Jo Gambino	Miles, Inc.		
Brian Heath	The Valspar Corporation		
Jim Helms	Oak Printing Company		
Thomas Henry	Berkeley Products Co.		
Sue Hignet	PPG Industries, Inc.		
Jeff Hollister	Vanguard Paints		
Tina Hunt	Courtaulds Coatings		
Robert Jurczynsyn	Akzo Coatings, Inc.		
Mike Kunke	Surface Research Corp.		
Marilyn Lindquist	Devoe Coatings Company		
Thomas Louer	E.I. duPont deNemours		
Michael Manning	Monsey Products Company		
Terri Marcus	Marcus Paint Company		
Pat Gieske	Seymour of Sycamore		
Paula McGovern	Benjamin Moore & Co.		
Barry Harbaugh	Lord Corporation		
Lynn Morsch	Atlas Products, Inc.		
H. Everett Myer	Bayer Corporation		
Jennifer Nellis	Okon Inc.		
Helene R. Johnson	Lenmar, Incorporated		
Robert Ripley	Guardsman Products		
Jay Robey	Pratt & Lambert, Inc.		

CPSA 6 (b)(1) Cleared

No Mfrs/PrvtLblrs or
Products Identified
Excepted by _____
Firms Notified.

7-1995 ✓

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

The National Paint and Coatings Association (NCPA) requested that the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) staff present information regarding the labeling of paint strippers, spray paint and other products containing methylene chloride that are the subject of a current project at the CPSC.

Ms. Burton, methylene chloride project manager, gave a brief synopsis of the project from its inception to the present, a span of approximately 10 years. At this time, the Commission is considering its options regarding changing the statement of enforcement policy and interpretation. After her review she entertained questions from the industry trade association members.

The industry commented on the difficulty of incorporating symbols into the label that is currently used on methylene chloride containing products. They currently use a litho machine that does not print the ANSI triangle. The triangle would have to be offset printed.

They also had a question about the rationale that went into dropping the reference to use of a fan to aid ventilation. Ms. Burton explained the danger of using a fan with products that are flammable. The labeling for the use of a fan is an optional statement that a manufacturer can use if they determine that based on the properties of their individual product, the use of a fan would aid ventilation without additional hazard.

They questioned whether we had any incidents of fire with the aided use of a fan for ventilation. Ms. Burton said that there were no incidents with products containing DCM and a fan relating to starting a fire during the painting or stripping process. One industry person also felt that the reference to respirators and to not using the products in the basement should not be deleted.

The aerosol manufacturers noted that they felt they could not squeeze anything else onto their label. The proposed boxes and borders would require additional spacing on the label.

Ms. Burton reviewed the ANSI color requirement and many of the manufacturers were bothered by the ANSI color conventions. They were not convinced that the addition of color really enhanced the understanding of the hazard associated with a product. They also noted that there are serious problems with what we are proposing and available label space. They propose a minimal label change because there are many states with their own requirements and it is very difficult for the manufacturer to comply with everything.

The Prop 65 statement is very rigid. There currently is potential for front panel statements (FHSA) to contradict back panel statements. The state of California forbids language that deviates from what they require. The DCM label which we are proposing differs from and is in violation of the state of California Prop 65. They would like federal intervention on the

labeling requirements of Prop 65. NPCA forwarded some information on this issue to the Office of General Counsel. The 9th Circuit is currently looking at a FIFRA case and the preemption issue.