

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

84-177

JAN 25 1988

The Honorable Mark O. Hatfield  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Hatfield:

Thank you for your letter of January 7 on behalf of Mr. Robert N. Griffith regarding the proposed regulations governing the certification of respirators. Please excuse the delay in responding.

The current regulations under which the Mine Health and Safety Administration and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health test and certify respirators (30 CFR Part 11) were originally promulgated in 1972. During the last several years, there has been a growing consensus among the respirator manufacturers and user community that these requirements need revision to reflect the technical advances in the field and the increased knowledge regarding environmental factors in the workplace. Some of the steps taken to develop the proposed rule are outlined in the enclosed preamble (52 FR 32402).

We are, of course, anxious to receive comments on both the technical and policy elements of this proposed rule. Toward that end, in October we extended our original comment period and announced two public hearings (52 FR 37639). The first took place in San Francisco on January 20, 1988, and the second is scheduled for January 27-28, 1988, in Washington, D.C. We look forward to hearing from all parties concerned, and I assure you that all comments received will be placed into the record and will be carefully considered in any final rulemaking decision.

Sincerely,  
**Otis R. Bowen, M.D.**

Otis R. Bowen, M.D.  
Secretary

Enclosure

FILE

OFFICE	SURNAME	DATE	OFFICE	SURNAME	DATE	OFFICE	SURNAME	DATE

CDC

Page 2 - The Honorable Mark O Hatfield

cc:

OD

NIOSH

FMO

CDCW

ES/PHS

ASL/OS

CLO/OS

H Official File

CDC Official File (Return to CDC, Atlanta)

OS No. 8801130039

PHS Tracer No. T90949

CDC ID #D41013; NIOSH #3125; Doc 3470B

Prepared by Larry Sparks, CDC, FTS 236-3061, 12/29/87

Contact Karen Lindauer, CDC, FTS 236-3322

United States Senate  
WASHINGTON DC

January 7, 1988

Dr. Otis Bowen  
Secretary  
Department of Health and Human Services  
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Dr. Bowen:

Please find enclosed a copy of a letter I have received from Mr. Robert N. Griffith of Lake Oswego, Oregon, concerning the National Institute for Occupational Health and Safety's proposed regulations with regard to the certification of respirators for use in general industry, mining and construction. Mr. Griffith feels these regulations would have a disastrous impact on worker safety and on his industry.

So that I may furnish this individual with an appropriate response, I would very much appreciate your reviewing his correspondence and providing me with your comments. Please reply to my Portland field office address, as indicated above.

Thank you for your kind attention to this inquiry.

With best regards.

Sincerely,



Mark O. Hatfield  
United States Senator

MOH/mh  
Enclosure

CDC ID: D 41073  
DATE: JAN 15 1988  
Correspondence Unit, OD  
Ext. 3322

T90949

ENCLOSURE

H

Dear Senator Hatfield:

The National Institute for Occupational 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 Industrial Safety Equipment Association, of which 3M Company of St. Paul, Minnesota is a part, feels strongly that this proposal must be withdrawn.

The proposal provides no prototype, 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 ninety 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 3M Company trust that we can count on your support in this matter of critical interest to 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. Enclosed is a fact sheet which outlines the proposal, our objections and recommendations.

I look forward to hearing from you once you have contacted Secretary Bowen, as we are very anxious about the resolution of this problem.

Thank you for your assistance on this matter.

Sincerely,  
*Robert M. Gifford*  
*17 Trench Street*  
*Seaside, OR 97134*

7

**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 recertified under the new process and manufacturers will be required to retest any respirators which are modified in the most minor ways.

**III. Concerns about Proposed Changes:**

(1) Testing in and for the Wrong Environment:

Ninety percent 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, recertification 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:

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 affect 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. 4

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 test results, reserve the right to retest 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 annually, 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 its 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 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.