

Page 2 - The Honorable Sam M. Gibbons

cc:

OD

NIOSH

FMO

CLCW

ES/PHS

CCU/OS

ASL/OS

CLO/OS

H Official File

CDC Official File (Return to CDC, Atlanta)

OS No. 8801280050

CDC:JOMason;FL 02/02/88 FTS 236-3291 (M/02/02)

Tracer 91373; CDC ID D41255; Doc 3509E

WAYS AND MEANS
COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES

TRADE,
CHAIRMAN
SOCIAL SECURITY

JOINT COMMITTEE
ON TAXATION

SAM M. GIBBONS
7th DISTRICT, FLORIDA

Congress of the United States

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

January 26, 1988

PLEASE RESPOND TO:

- HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
TELEPHONE: (202) 225-3378
- 101 E. KENNEDY, #1425
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33602
TELEPHONE: (813) 228-2102
- 201 S. KINGS AVE. #6
BRANDON, FLORIDA 33511
TELEPHONE: (813) 689-2847

JANICE STOORZA
WASHINGTON OFFICE MANAGER

MARGO O'CONNOR
FLORIDA OFFICE MANAGER

The Honorable Otis R. Bowen, Secretary
Dept. of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201


Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am writing on behalf of my constituent, Mr. David J. Crannell, president of Safety Equipment Company, of Tampa, Florida. Attached is a copy of Mr. Crannell's letter to me outlining his concerns with regard to proposed changes by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) concerning respirators.

I would appreciate your taking into consideration my constituent's concerns in formulating regulations with regard to this matter. I look forward to receiving your comments that I can share with Mr. Crannell.

Thanking you in advance, I am

Sincerely,



Sam M. Gibbons
United States Congressman

SMG:t

Enclosure

CDC ID: D <u>41255</u>
DATE: <u>FEB 02 1988</u>
Correspondence Unit, OD
Ext. 3322

791373
TRACK

8801280050



6507 N. Harney Road
Tampa, FL 33610

SALES OFFICES LOCATED IN
TAMPA/ORLANDO/JACKSONVILLE/TALLAHASSEE/MIAMI/PUERTO RICO

813/621-4921

January 13, 1988

Honorable Sam Gibbons
U.S. Representative
1106 Rayburn Blvd.
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Gibbons,

The National Institute for Occupation Health and Safety (NIOSH) currently certifies respirators for use in general industry, mining and construction. On August 27, 1987, NIOSH proposed (42 CFR 84, Federal Register) regulations which will have a disastrous impact on worker safety and on our industry.

The Safety Equipment Distributors Association, of which Safety Equipment Company of Tampa, FL is a part, feels strongly that this proposal must be withdrawn.

The proposal provides no protocols, nor specific requirements, so it is impossible for us to exercise our right to comment on it in a meaningful way. This denies us due process.

While our industry recognizes the value of regulation and, by and large, has little problem with the concept of workplace testing, the fact of the matter is that the technology is not available to conform to the proposed change. This is not the way to improve a process; it will, in fact, destroy a process which works but needs tuning.

Even though 90 percent of the respirators in use today are used for non-mining (industrial and construction) purposes, the proposal requires that we test all respirators under mining conditions thereby ignoring the safety interest of the majority of workers who use respirators.

Finally, the proposed changes will cost our industry up to \$700,000,000 which will threaten the very viability of the industry as well as worker safety.

The management and employees of Safety Equipment Company trust that we can count on your support in this matter of critical interest to Florida/Hillsborough labor and industry. We urge you to immediately contact Health and Human Services Secretary, Dr. Otis Bowen, to request that the proposed ruling be withdrawn.

JAN 23 1988



SALES OFFICES LOCATED IN
TAMPA/ORLANDO/JACKSONVILLE/TALLAHASSEE/MIAMI/PUERTO RICO

Enclosed is a fact sheet which outlines the proposal, our objections and recommendations.

Thank you in advance for your assistance on this matter and I look forward to hearing from you once you have contacted Secretary Bowen as we are very anxious about the resolution of this problem.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "David J. Crannell".

David J. Crannell
President

Enclosure: Fact Sheet

DJC:kee
SEDAPOLTCL/DJCTEXT

ISEA Fact Sheet

(NIOSH proposal to change certification process for respirators.)

I. Current Situation:

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) currently certifies respirators for use in general industry, mining and construction.

II. Proposed Changes:

On August 27, 1987, NIOSH proposed (42 CFR part 84, Federal Register) to limit its certification activities to respirators used in mining, thereby requiring manufacturers of respirators used in general industry and construction to "self-certify" their products.

Manufacturers will be required to test their own respirators in the workplace or a simulated environment. However, the proposed "workplace" stipulation requires that all testing be conducted in mining operations.

All respirators currently in use will have to be re-certified under the new process and manufacturers will be required to re-test any respirators which are modified in the most minor ways.

III. Concerns about Proposed Changes:

(1) Testing in and for the Wrong Environment:

Ninety per-cent of respirators used in the United States are for non-mining use. By limiting respirator testing to mining, NIOSH is ignoring the safety and health needs of the vast majority of respirator users.

(2) Economic Impact:

The costs of developing new standards, re-certification of existing respirators and workplace testing (with no proven protocols) would create an unbearable burden on manufacturers and end users. The net effect would be a major set-back to worker safety.

(3) Effects on Industries which provide respirator protection for workers:

17

It is likely that modifications required to make general industry respirators meet mine standards as well as the increased costs of the end product will adversely effect worker safety. Employers who have workers in marginal need areas, may no longer provide respirators. Moreover workers may not be willing to use respirators which are potentially too large, too unwieldy and uncomfortable.

(4) Requirement for Workplace Testing:

While the Industrial Safety Equipment Association (representing every major respirator manufacturer in the United States) is not in principal opposed to workplace testing, consensus standards and procedures must first be developed.

For example, it is presently impossible to test the broad array of different respirators in the workplace because the technology is not yet developed.

Even if the technology for workplace testing existed, there are not enough mines in the United States in which the tests can be performed without threatening the safety of workers.

(5) "Self-Certification" is a misnomer:

Given the fact that NIOSH will review tests results, reserve the right to re-test at its discretion and continue to have the ultimate say, manufacturers will, in effect, not be certifying. Instead, they will be testing their products for NIOSH.

(6). Proposed Rule is Major Ruling and not a Minor Ruling.

Implementation of the proposed rule would cost manufacturers up to \$700,000,000 ~~making~~ making the proposed rule a "major ruling" and not a "minor ruling" as portrayed by NIOSH. This would cause hardship on manufacturers and end users and be in conflict with Executive Order 12291.

(7). No Protocol issued with proposed regulation:

While NIOSH has issued it's proposed standards for certification, it has not released a protocol outlining the requirements, rules, details and procedures for the required workplace testing. This omission denies respirator manufacturers due process and, furthermore, makes it impossible

18
for them to respond to the proposal in a meaningful way because it is not complete.

IV. Recommendations:

1. The Proposed 42 CFR 84 must be withdrawn.
2. If NIOSH is to no longer certify respirators for general industry and construction, resources must be committed to developing a consensus standard for all respirator certification for use in all industrial applications.
3. This consensus standard must then be certified through a non-governmental third party.