WICKENS, KOCHES & CALE

WASHINGTON SQUARE

SUITE 1111

1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-5303

(202) 775-2400

September 21, 1987

Federal Express

Mr. John Moran
Director, Division of Safety Research
National Institute for Occupational
Safety and Health
944 Chestnut Ridge Road
Morgantown, West Virginia 26505

Re: Request for Recall of Proposed 42 C.F.R. Part 84

Received 9-22-87 0915

Dear Mr. Moran:

On behalf of the members of the Respiratory Protection Group of the Industrial Safety Equipment Association, Inc. ("ISEA")* we hereby request the recall of 42 C.F.R. Part 84 as proposed on August 27, 1987 (52 Fed. Reg. 32402) for the following reasons:

*/ The members of ISEA's Respiratory Protection Group are:

Airolife Safety Inc. American Optical Corporation Biosystems, Inc. E. D. Bullard Company Glendale Protective Technologies, Inc. Mine Safety Appliances Company Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co., Inc. (3M) Moldex-Metric, Inc. National Draeger, Inc. Parmelee Industries Pro-Tech Respirators, Inc. Racal Airstream Scott Aviation Sellstrom Manufacturing Company Siebe North, Inc. Survivair - U.S. Divers Company WGM/ Willson Safety Products

Mr. John Moran September 21, 1987 Page 2

Under the Administrative Procedure Act, notice of a proposed rule must include "either the terms or substance of the proposed rule or a description of the subjects and issues involved." 5 U.S.C. §553(b)(3)(1982). This requirement exists to assure that interested parties are afforded the opportunity to offer informed criticism or comments on agency proposals. See, Ethyl Corp. v. Environmental Protection Agency, 541 F.2d 1, 48 (D.C. Cir. 1976). In the instant proposal NIOSH has failed to give the detailed notice required by the APA, thereby denying an opportunity for informed comment and full participation by interested parties in the rulemaking process.

As set forth at 42 C.F.R. §84.31 through §84.34, the proposed rule requires workplace or simulated workplace testing prior to certification. The preamble to the proposed rule states that NIOSH will provide applicants detailed model protocols to perform these tests upon request. The preamble further states that NIOSH "has begun to develop model protocols for performing such tests in a proven and reliable manner."

NIOSH notes that these protocols when and if developed would be too voluminous to be included in the Federal Register notice. The preamble states NIOSH's intention, however, to make the protocols available at the time of final rulemaking. NIOSH thereafter solicits comments on these unidentified model tests that will supposedly "assure reliability and reproducibility of mandatory workplace and simulated workplace test results."

The foregoing proposal for workplace testing protocols is insufficient and should be recalled for further development. The proposal as it currently exists fails to identify sufficiently the substance of the workplace testing and simulated workplace testing that will be required for certification. Without further specificity regarding the details of such testing, it is impossible for ISEA, or NIOSH for that matter, to evaluate and comment on the technical accuracy and feasibility of the proposed protocols.

While ISEA and its members generally support workplace testing, such testing can only assure reliability of the equipment when reliability of the test method itself has been established. Mandatory undefined workplace testing, as NIOSH now proposes, certainly does not advance reliability and it is thus premature to require such testing before reliable protocols have

Mr. John Moran September 21, 1987 Page 3

been established. Accordingly, the proposed rule denies the opportunity for informed comment and criticism and the notice is therefore defective.

ISEA thus requests that NIOSH recall proposed Part 84 until it has developed protocols for workplace testing in sufficient detail to afford interested persons the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Paul A. Koches

PAK:mlr

cc: J. Donald Millar

Number: 84-003 Date Rec'd.: 225	optember 1987 Pages: 3		
From: Paul A. Kaches			
		☐ Firefighter ☐ Re ☐ Government ☐ Tr ☐ Independent lab ☐ Ur	rofessional Association espirator Manufacturer rade Association nion niversity
		Comments on:	
□ Extension of time for comments □ Public meeting □ Preamble Subparts: □ A General provisions □ B Application procedures □ C Quality Assurance □ D Testing by applicant □ Lab testing □ Workplace testing □ E Certification label □ F Operation & Maintenance □ G Modification of respirator □ H Withdrawal of certification □ I Appeals □ J Fees □ K Mine rescue and emergency Other □ COLUME 12 CFC Part 84	□ O Technical definitions □ P Respirator classification □ Q General requirements □ R Face seal leakage □ S SCBA □ T SAR □ U APR general requirements □ V Particulate APR □ W Gas and vapor APR cartridge □ X Gas and vapor APR canister □ Y Organic gas and vapor □ Z Unlisted gas and vapor □ Appendix A unfl proficels for workplace		
Jesting are developed in s	officient detail to afford		
interested persons the	opportunity to comment		