

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY
AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD**

2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95833
(916) 274-5721
FAX (916) 274-5743
Website address www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb



SUMMARY
PUBLIC MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING/BUSINESS MEETING
November 15, 2012
Sacramento, California

I. PUBLIC MEETING**A. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Acting Chairman Bill Jackson called the Public Meeting of the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board (Board) to order at 10:00 a.m., November 15, 2012, in the Auditorium of the State Resources Building, Sacramento, California.

ATTENDANCE**Board Members Present**

Bill Jackson
Hank McDermott
Barbara Smisko
Laura Stock
David Harrison
Dave Thomas

Board Members Absent

John MacLeod

Board Staff

Marley Hart, Executive Officer
Mike Manieri,
Principal Safety Engineer
David Beales, Legal Counsel
David Kernazitskas,
Associate Safety Engineer
Sarah Money, Executive Assistant

Division of Occupational Safety and Health

Mike Donlon, Senior Safety Engineer

Others present

David Shiraishi, DOL-OSHA
Bruce Wick, CALPASC
Marti Fisher, CalChamber
Laura Cottrell, The Houston Group
Dave Tognetti, Raley's
Jay Weir
Charley Rea, CALCIMA

Terry Thedell, SDG&E
Bill Taylor, PASMA-South
Michael Musser, California Teachers
Association
Dan Leacox, Greenberg Traurig
Mark Stone, EPIC Ins. Brokers
Jim Rucker, Safeway Inc.

Wendy Holt, CSATF/AMPTP	Mitch Seaman, CA Labor Federation
Eric Rozance, Phylmar Regulatory Rountable	Kate Smiley, AGC
Teresa Pichay, CDA	Jeremy Smith, State Bldg. Trades
Bryan Little, Cal. Farm Bureau	Kevin Thompson, COR
Mallari Spilker, United Contractors	Dorothy Wigmore, Worksafe
Andrew Hamilton, USD Center for Public Interest Law	Steve Johnson, Assoc. Roofing Contractors of the Bay Area Counties
Michael Herges, Granite Rock Company	Nicole Rice, CA. Manuf. & Technology Assn.
Carol Barake, Bickmore	

B. OPENING COMMENTS

Mr. Jackson indicated that this portion of the Board's meeting is open to any person who is interested in addressing the Board on any matter concerning occupational safety and health or to propose new or revised standards or the repeal of standards as permitted by Labor Code Section 142.2.

C. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Jackson adjourned the public meeting at 10:04 a.m.

II. PUBLIC HEARING

A. PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

Mr. Jackson called the Public Hearing of the Board to order at 10:05 a.m., November 15, 2012, in the Auditorium of the State Resources Building, Sacramento, California.

Mr. Jackson opened the Public Hearing and introduced the item noticed for public hearing.

1. TITLE 8: **CONSTRUCTION SAFETY ORDERS**
Division 1, Subchapter 4, Article 4
Sections 1529, 1532, and 1532.1
Appendix B to Sections 1532.1, 1532.2 and 1535
GENERAL INDUSTRY SAFETY ORDERS
Division 1, Subchapter 7, Article 107, Section 5150
Article 109, Sections 5189, 5190, 5191, 5192, and 5194
Appendices A through G of Section 5194, Section 5198, and
Appendix B to Section 5198
Article 110, Sections 5200, 5201, and 5202
Appendix A to Section 5202, Sections 5206, 5207, 5208, 5209,
5210, 5211, 5212, 5213, 5214, 5217, 5218 and 5220

**SHIP BUILDING, SHIP REPAIRING AND SHIP
BREAKING SAFETY ORDERS**

**Division 1, Subchapter 18, Article 4, Sections 8358 and 8359
Globally Harmonized System Update to Hazard
Communication – Health (Horcher)**

Mr. Donlon summarized the history and purpose of the proposal and indicated that the proposal is ready for the Board's consideration and the public's comment.

Marti Fisher, California Chamber of Commerce, stated that the language in the proposal is not the same as the language in the federal GHS proposal, and therefore, should not be done through the Horcher process. She also stated that if this proposal is adopted, it will make California different from the rest of the world, which would not be good for business in California and would be contrary to the goal of global harmonization. She urged the Board to either revise the language to make it identical to the federal proposal and then continue with the Horcher process or continue through the normal rulemaking process to adopt the significant differences to the federal standard.

Dan Leacox, Greenberg Traurig, stated that the adopted federal GHS rule contains substantial differences that negatively impact the this rulemaking in three ways: it defeats the purpose of the rule regarding conformance with the United Nations GHS updates; it has a negative impact on the adoption procedure, and it lacks the rationale needed to justify the substantial differences between it and the federal standard. He also stated that this proposal affects or changes several of the classification criteria listed in the federal standard, which leads to differences in safety data sheets required by the hazard communication standard. There are also portions where substantial differences occur because the proposal omits certain language listed in the 2012 federal standard or retains existing state language that was deleted from the 1994 federal standard.

Mr. Leacox reviewed the side by side with the Board, discussing the highlighted sections in further detail. He stated that in order to achieve the purpose of rule, all substantial differences between the federal standard and this proposal must be identified and eliminated. If the Board desires to retain some of the proposed differences, he believes that they should be deferred to future rulemakings like it has been done with other federal updates.

Nicole Rice, California Manufacturers and Technology Association, concurred with Mr. Leacox regarding the inconsistencies between the federal GHS standard and the proposal. She stated that these differences could hinder California's global competitiveness in this area. She urged the Board to make this proposal more similar to the federal standard or move the inconsistencies into the full rulemaking process so that they can be fully vetted.

Bill Taylor, PASMA – South Chapter, asked to clarify some concerns regarding this proposal. He stated that there is a difference in labeling between the NFPA standard and the federal standard that needs to be addressed, because it will cause confusion regarding

what is considered to be the most hazardous and the least hazardous.

Mitch Seaman, California Labor Federation, concurred with the Division's statement regarding this proposal. He said that elements that would weaken the state standard, specifically the study requirement and the amount of time in which the safety data sheets would need to be changed, should go through the standard rulemaking process instead of the Horcher process.

Jeremy Smith, State Building Construction Trades Council, concurred with Mr. Seaman's comments and supported the Board staff's plan to carve out the areas in this proposal that need further discussion or separate rulemakings and move the rest through the Horcher process. He said that the California regulation supersedes the federal regulation in this case.

Bruce Wick, CALPASC, spoke on behalf of CALPASC and several clients of Kevin Bland. He concurred with Mr. Leacox's comments. He asked the Board to consider the small businesses in California and the difficulty that they have had in complying with the federal GHS standard since the beginning. He stated that this could be an opportunity for California to upgrade and join an international movement on this very important issue.

Charley Rea, CALCIMA, concurred with the concerns expressed by Mr. Leacox and the California Chamber of Commerce regarding the inconsistencies between the proposed state standard and the federal standard, encouraging the Board to have sufficient deliberations on this matter.

Mike Herges, Granite Rock, concurred with the coalition letter and urged the Board to adopt a GHS standard that is more in line with the federal standard. He stated that the inconsistencies between the proposed state standard and the federal standard are significant and that if California takes a different approach to GHS than that of the federal standard, it will not be in harmony with the global system and will make it difficult for safety people to comply with the federal standard.

Eric Rozance, Phylmar Regulatory Roundtable, sent in written comments to the Board along with a GHS training pamphlet that they created. He stated that he is concerned about the parts of the proposal that deviate from the federal standard, especially subsections (d)(2), (d)(3), and (d)(5) of Section 5194(D) regarding hazard classifications. He asked the Board to use the same classification language that federal OSHA uses and to replace all of Section 5194(D) with the current federal language. He also asked the Board to adopt the same 6-month timeframe that the federal standard has for revising labels instead of the 3-month timeframe listed in the proposed standard. Mr. Rozance recommended that the Board make both the existing version and the proposed version of the GHS standard readily available online to employers until the new standard becomes enforceable. He also recommended that Cal/OSHA engage in outreach with the business community and workers to explain the new requirements and compliance deadlines for GHS, as well as the areas where the new standard deviates from the federal standard and the old standard.

John Caldwell, American Chemistry Council, concurred with the concerns expressed in the coalition letter and by Ms. Fisher and Mr. Leacox.

Steven Johnson, Associated Roofing Contractors of the Bay Area Counties, concurred with the comments made in the coalition letter. He stated that manufacturers in his group struggle to comply with the California GHS standard as it is currently written and that the lack of clarity and consistency with the language in the federal standard could be harmful. He stated that he supports making this proposal clearer and more consistent with the federal standard and expressed interest in being involved with this process as it moves forward.

Kate Smiley, Association of General Contractors of California, stated that this proposal should not be a Horcher because it differs from the federal standard. She concurred with the statements made by Mr. Wick and Mr. Johnson and encouraged the Board to make it easier to understand and apply so that workers can be protected.

Terry Thedell, Sempra Energy, stated that he would like to see clarity in the training requirements portion of the proposed standard and as soon as possible so that businesses can have enough time before the December 1, 2013 deadline to get this done.

Dorothy Wigmore, Worksafe, stated that federal OSHA has changed their standard to include a version of the GHS standard, but not all of it. It only includes certain things. She also stated that the Horcher process recognizes the need to retain items that are more effective than the federal regulations and that the Board cannot adopt any part of a federal regulation that is less protective than an existing California standard. She stated that she does not understand why the federal GHS labeling requirement is 6 months instead of 3 months when it comes to informing workers about being harmed. She stated that this is not good for workers or for businesses whose workers may be getting sick because they do not know about the hazards. Ms. Wigmore also stated that there are going to be differences to deal with and that California has demonstrated where it can be more protective and that this difference should be retained.

At 11:15 a.m., Mr. Jackson called for a break. The meeting was called back to order at 11:25 a.m. and Mr. Jackson asked for questions and comments from the Board on the proposed standard.

Mr. McDermott stated that this is a complex issue as noted by the Division and Mr. Leacox. He said that if there were issues with the federal standard, then they should have been brought to federal OSHA when they were making decisions on that standard, and because the issues were not brought up at that time, Federal OSHA followed its beliefs on that part. He also cautioned the Board about laying extra requirements on labels and safety data sheets that are being prepared globally for products being sent to California. He said that it is not practical to think that both the GHS standard and California's standard will be incorporated when safety data sheets are prepared. Mr. McDermott suggested that the Board adopt the federal standard as it is written and then adopt a separate standard with requirements specific to California, and when creating the separate standard, consult the

Labor Code, Cal/OSHA standard, and other sources to decide what is needed.

Mr. Harrison stated that if the Board does what Mr. McDermott recommended and adopts the federal standard, he is concerned about the timeframe for creating and adopting the separate standard and what to do in the interim because there are some portions of the federal standard that are less stringent than the existing California standard, which conflicts with the Labor Code.

Ms. Stock pointed out that the Labor Code states that items providing less protection than the existing standard cannot be Horchered. Mr. Donlon earlier made a similar statement to the effect that the state may not adopt a federal standard that is less protective than an existing state standard.

Ms. Stock also said that it makes sense to her to pull out the sections in the proposed standard that differ from the federal standard or need further discussion and subject them to the standard public hearing procedures while moving the rest of the proposal forward and adopting it. She stated that one area of the proposed standard that she would like to see further discussion on is regarding one study versus the weight of the evidence. She stated that there will be a lot of public health implications and opinions regarding that provision. She asked whether the Division or Board staff have isolated the information somewhere for the Board to see what areas of the proposed standard will be pulled out or if that is something that needs to be discussed right now.

Mr. Donlon responded by stating that the proposed standard that is currently in front of the Board is what the Division is asking the Board to adopt at this time. He stated that if the proposed standard is adopted by the Board, portions of it can be changed through the advisory committee, rulemaking, and APA processes. He also stated that sections have been pulled out to go through the regular rulemaking process.

Ms. Stock asked Mr. Donlon if the reason why some of the items are not the same as the federal standard is because those items were not as effective in the federal standard as they are in the proposed. Mr. Donlon stated that some things in the existing California standard were left in where the Division felt that the federal standard is less effective.

Ms. Smisko asked about the timeline that is available to act on this proposed standard and asked if there are any federal deadlines that must be met. Ms. Hart stated that it will depend on the Division's response to today's comments and whether or not they decide to pull out the parts of the proposed standard that can be Horchered. She stated that the other parts will still need to be addressed, and since the Division only has until December 1, 2013 to address some of those parts, they would need to move on them quickly. The other parts have deadlines in 2014 and 2015. Mr. Donlon added that some of the things in the proposed standard that conflict with the federal standard would need to be worked out before the December 1, 2013 deadline because that is the deadline for training and some of those differences would need to be worked out before training can begin.

Mr. Thomas stated that items that are different and stronger in the proposed standard need to be identified and passed, and the other items that are argumentative or conflicting need to be worked on further. He stated that he does not want anyone to guess or not know what the standard is regarding certain chemicals.

Ms. Smisko asked for clarification as to whether or not the Board wants to adopt the federal language as it is or just the parts that are exactly the same and then further discuss the other parts. Ms. Stock stated that the Board is not able to adopt something through the Horcher process that is less effective than the current standard; so they cannot adopt the entire federal standard as it is written. She suggested that the Board adopt the parts of the federal standard that are identical to the proposed standard and then work out the other areas in an expedited fashion because of the timing. Mr. McDermott suggested that the Board adopt the whole federal standard and then add a subsection under it that lists the differences to the standard.

Mr. Thomas and Mr. Jackson asked Mr. Beales to comment on what the Board should do. He explained the two rulemaking processes that the Board has at its disposal. He stated that there are three legal concerns regarding this proposal that the Board should consider: internal consistency, the Horcher process, and retaining items. He stated that the proposal should embody clarity, and if one part of the proposal contradicts another part of the proposal, or is ambiguous, then it does not meet the clarity standard and should be addressed. He explained that the Horcher process takes the words of the federal regulation and sticks them into the state regulation, and if things are added that are not part of the federal language, that cannot be done through the Horcher process. Regarding retaining items, items can be retained, and the proposal before the Board is what is crossed out or underlined, not what stays the same.

Mr. Beales opined that the Labor Code section that underlies the argument that the state may not adopt a federal standard that is less effective than a state standard does not apply to the present rulemaking, and the status of this rulemaking as a Horcher does not alter that opinion. Also, the Horcher process does not require the state to adopt a federal standard in its entirety; parts of existing state standards that are at least as effective as federal standards may be retained, as was in the most recent crane standard Horcher.

Mr. Harrison stated that he supports adopting the Division's rulemaking and addressing the problems brought up by stakeholders through an APA rulemaking. Mr. Jackson asked the Division to respond to the comments made. Mr. Harrison and Ms. Stock agreed. Mr. Donlon responded by saying that the Division did try to follow the Labor Code and adopt the federal requirements that were more stringent than those in the California standard, but it was difficult to do so because of what they had to go through with various groups such as the coalition. He stated that comments are being reviewed and considered.

Ms. Smisko asked who is commenting on the physical hazards. Ms. Hart responded by saying that the Division will retain the lead on the proposal before the Board today and Board staff is working on a rulemaking to address the physical hazards, and that rulemaking will not be Horchered. Mr. Manieri stated that the rulemaking will be titled

GHS – Flammables and Combustibles.

Ms. Stock asked Mr. McDermott for clarification regarding the practical application of adopting the verbatim of the entire federal standard and then sorting out the conflicting areas after that. She stated that if they adopt the federal standard verbatim, and it includes parts that are weaker than the state standard, and then sort out the differences later on, then until the differences are sorted out, the federal standard supersedes the state standard in this case. She said that if the Board does not want to adopt something weaker in the interim, then they could just Horcher the parts of the standard that are the same, which would allow the parts of the California standard that are stronger to continue to remain in effect until the differences are sorted out.

Mr. McDermott stated that in the proposed standard and federal standard, there is discussion regarding one positive study. In this section, the Division added a paragraph in the hazard classification section that makes it different from the federal standard. He stated that he is concerned that differences like this that are hidden in the standard may confuse people who read the federal standard for GHS. He stated that he suggests putting in a separate standard underneath the federal standard that clarifies situations where the California standard is different.

Mr. Jackson stated that in the Informative Digest, the Division, on behalf of the Board, stated that the Board proposes to adopt regulations that are the same as the federal regulations except for editorial and format differences. He said that in the case of this proposal, there are a lot more things going on than just editorial and format differences. He stated that when the Division created this proposal, the only document that they incorporated into it was the federal register. He also stated that there are a lot of things in this proposal that were not explained to the Board or the public until today. The Division did not inform the Board or the public as to why there are differences between the California standard and the federal standard, and that this needs to be addressed. He stated that the Division did not give a rationale as to why they are proposing this. He also stated that he wants to make sure that the public knows that there are differences between the California and federal standard and that he would like to see the Division provide a rationale and explanation for the differences.

Ms. Stock concurred with Mr. Jackson and stated that she would like to see the justifications for the differences pulled out in the final statement of reasons.

B. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Jackson adjourned the Public Hearing at 12:03 p.m.

III. BUSINESS MEETING

Mr. Jackson called the Business Meeting of the Board to order at 12:04 p.m., November 15, 2012, in the Auditorium of the State Resources Building, Sacramento, California.

A. PROPOSED VARIANCE DECISIONS FOR ADOPTION

1. Consent Calendar

Mr. Beales informed the Board that a variance hearing was held prior to today's meeting and recommended that all variances on the consent calendar be granted, except for case number 12-V-007 regarding Waste Management of California, which should be removed from the consent calendar, because the applicant withdrew its application a few days ago.

MOTION

A motion was made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Ms. Stock to adopt the consent calendar as modified.

A roll call was taken, and all members present voted "aye." The motion passed.

B. OTHER

1. Legislative Update

Mr. Beales stated that there was nothing to report.

2. Division Update: Follow-up Report on Possible Rulemakings and Advisory Committee progress (i.e., Hospital Patient Lifting, Hotel Housekeeping), and status of prospective DOSH Form 9's for submittal to the Board and 2013 Division Rulemaking Proposals

Mr. Donlon provided an update to the following activities that the Division is working on (items a-g below):

- a. Elevator Safety Orders: The Division will have an advisory committee meeting on December 18, 2012 in Oakland to discuss the 2-step process to adopt Group 4. The 2013 ASME is scheduled to be released in October.
- b. Tunnel Safety Orders: The Board staff is currently reviewing the proposed changes to the Tunnel Safety Orders.
- c. Safe Patient Handling: The Division sent out a new draft of the proposal, and posted it on its website, on October 3, 2012, and comments were requested by the end of the month. However, constituents have asked for more time. The Division will bring a rulemaking to the Board on this issue early in 2013.
- d. Hotel Housekeeping: An advisory committee meeting was held on October 23, 2012 in Oakland and provided Spanish translation for many of the participants. The Division expects to hold a second meeting in the Los Angeles area in early 2013.

- e. N-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone and Hydrogen Chloride: Drafts of these rulemakings are at the Division's headquarters and will be given to the Board next month. A new round of a health expert advisory committee studying permissible exposure levels will be held on December 6, 2012. The meeting will focus on substances remaining from the previous rounds and prioritizing substances for the next round.
- f. Petition 513 - Bloodborne Pathogens Protection, Adult Film Industry: Cal/OSHA continues to conduct inspections under the current standards. The Division is working on a new draft that will be circulated to interested parties during the first quarter of next year, resources permitting. Los Angeles County voters passed Measure B, which requires the use of condoms in the adult film industry.
- g. Petition 519 – Required First Aid Supplies: The Division will be emailing a new draft to interested parties in mid-December and plans to bring a rulemaking to the Board by the end of January.
- h. Petition 524 – Respiratory Protection for Emergency Responders: The Division sent a rulemaking to the Board in September of 2012 to amend the exception to subsection 5199 (G)(3)(b) of the ATD standard regarding the use of respiratory protection for emergency responders performing high hazard procedures on airborne infectious diseases – suspected or confirmed cases.

Ms. Hart stated that the purpose for this agenda item was to identify the form 9's and rulemakings that the Division plans to bring to the Board in 2013 so that the Board's senior staff can put together their work plan for 2013. She stated that she asked Deborah Gold to submit these items to her by November 1 and that Ms. Gold asked her for an extension to November 9, which was granted. Ms. Hart stated that she has not received any further response from Ms. Gold about this and asked Mr. Donlon whether the items he mentioned (First Aid, Tunnel Safety Orders, respiratory protection, ethylbenzene, and the two chemicals) will be the only rulemakings that the Division anticipates submitting to the Board in 2013 and if the Division is planning to submit any form 9's.

Mr. Donlon stated that the information he gave is all of the information that he has at this time and that he is aware of several form 9's that have been developed over the past few months, but does not know the status of them.

3. History of Petitions and Advisory Committees Promoting Products/Devices

Ms. Hart stated that the Board staff reviewed the history of petitions and produced a list of those petitions that promoted products or devices, as Mr. McDermott had requested, and that the list was included in the Board packets. The list stated what happened for each of those petitions. Ms. Hart stated that she felt the information contained in the list is conclusive, but she also invited the Board to further discuss how they were handled.

Mr. McDermott thanked Ms. Hart and the Board staff for putting this information together

for him and stated that he counted 9 petitions on the list that the Board voted to send to advisory committee, but none of them resulted in a standard that was adopted by the Board, and in this time of limited resources, he feels that this is a misallocation of the Board's resources. He stated that if a petition is promoting a product or device, the Board needs to put more thought into it and create a higher hurdle that the petitioner has to clear before sending it to an advisory committee, such as requiring the petitioner to bring in a stakeholder to speak on how the product or device could be more helpful.

4. Diesel Shut-off Devices Rulemaking Follow-up

Ms. Hart stated that the information requested by Mr. Harrison and Ms. Stock at the previous Board Meeting was compiled and placed in the Board packets in a narrative format along with a copy of the API letter. She informed the Board that the rulemaking was approved by the Office of Administrative Law, filed with the Secretary of State, and will become effective soon.

5. Executive Officer's Report

Ms. Hart stated that the draft of the 2013 meeting schedule was placed in the Board packets and that the meetings in Costa Mesa and San Diego will be the only meetings requiring air travel. She also stated that the meeting in May will be held in Walnut Creek, which will be a new location for the Board, and if the location works out well for the May meeting, the September meeting may be held there as well instead of in Oakland.

Ms. Hart also briefed the Board on the virtual advisory committee process. She stated that the virtual advisory committee process was used for a rulemaking regarding foot protection and that 60 emails were sent out to stakeholders regarding using metatarsal guards and foot protectors, but only three comments were received. The revised proposal and comments were posted online for all to review. Ms. Hart said that she felt that this virtual advisory committee was not truly successful because there were only three comments received during the comment period. She stated that this process could help a lot of people save money on travel expenses associated with attending an advisory committee, but she is not sure that it will save time. She stated that the staff will try using the virtual advisory committee process again with another rulemaking that is coming up soon and will see how it goes.

Ms. Stock pointed out that the virtual advisory committee process limits people's ability to access and participate in the advisory committee and asked whether the virtual advisory committee process may eventually replace the current in-person advisory committee process. Ms. Hart stated that it will not replace the in-person advisory committee process and that another drawback to the virtual advisory committee is the lack of face-to-face dialogue. She stated that the staff will have to weigh carefully which topics in which the virtual advisory committee process can be used. She also stated that virtual advisory committees have worked for several other agencies, such as the Division of Worker's Compensation and the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement and that the virtual

advisory committee process will help keep the travel budget low for the state and stakeholders.

Ms. Hart stated that the staff's workload continues to proceed. She also announced that Hans Boersma is retiring in December and that paperwork has been filed to fill his position when he leaves.

Mr. Jackson notified the Board and staff that he received an email yesterday from a senior engineer in the enforcement part of the Division asking for the intent of a subpart of section 1533 regarding Other Excavations. Mr. Jackson stated that, in response to the email, he called the senior engineer and told him that the Standards Board is not in the business of interpreting what a standard means; the Appeals Board deals with that function Mr. Jackson also stated that he has heard from lots of people in the regulated community that they do not understand what is meant by "other excavations".

Mr. Manieri and Ms. Hart stated that they are aware of this issue and are in the process of further clarifying what "other excavations" means. Ms. Hart stated that it is not unusual for the Board staff to receive requests for the intent of a standard. She stated that if someone wants to know the interpretation of a standard, the staff refers them to the Division, and if they want to know the intent of a standard, the staff provides them with the Initial Statement of Reasons and the Final Statement of Reasons. She also stated that some of these documents are available to them online.

Mr. Jackson stated that it is not right when agents of an enforcement agency contact a member of the Board to understand the Board's intent. Ms. Hart stated that it is important that those people contact the Board staff for assistance when they have those kinds of questions.

C. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Jackson adjourned the Business Meeting at 12:30 p.m.