- 1 {York Stenographic Services, Inc.}
- 2 RPTS EDWARDS
- 3 HIF139.170
- 4 OVERSIGHT OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION
- 5 TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2015
- 6 House of Representatives,
- 7 Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade
- 8 Committee on Energy and Commerce
- 9 Washington, D.C.

- The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:18 a.m.,
- 11 in Room 2322 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon.
- 12 Michael C. Burgess [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.
- 13 Members present: Representatives Burgess, Lance,
- 14 Blackburn, Harper, Guthrie, Olson, Pompeo, Kinzinger,
- 15 Bilirakis, Brooks, Mullin, Schakowsky, Clarke, Kennedy,
- 16 Butterfield, Welch, and Pallone (ex officio).

```
17
         Staff present: Leighton Brown, Press Assistant; James
    Decker, Policy Coordinator, Commerce, Manufacturing, and
18
19
    Trade; Graham Dufault, Counsel, Commerce, Manufacturing, and
20
    Trade; Melissa Froelich, Counsel, Commerce, Manufacturing,
21
    and Trade; Kirby Howard, Legislative Clerk; Paul Nagle, Chief
22
    Counsel, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Olivia Trusty,
23
    Professional Staff, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade;
24
    Michelle Ash, Democratic Chief Counsel, Commerce,
25
    Manufacturing, and Trade; Christine Brennan, Democratic Press
26
    Secretary; Jeff Carroll, Democratic Staff Director; Lisa
27
    Goldman, Democratic Counsel; Tiffany Guarascio, Democratic
28
    Deputy Staff Director and Chief Health Advisor; Brendan
29
    Hennessey, Democratic Policy and Research Advisor; and Adam
30
    Lowenstein, Democratic Policy Analyst.
```

31 Mr. {Burgess.} Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, 32 and Trade will now come to order. The Chair will recognize 33 himself 5 minutes for the purpose of an opening statement. 34 The Consumer Product Safety Commission was established 35 in 1972 by Congress to protect consumers against unreasonable 36 risks of injuries associated with consumer products. This 37 statutory mission is a serious responsibility for the 38 Commission, and it is critically important that Congress 39 conduct oversight to ensure that public confidence in the Commission's adherence to its responsibilities and 40 41 stewardship of the taxpayer's dollar. I would like to thank 42 Chairman Kaye and Commissioners Adler, Buerkle, and Mohorovic 43 for their testimony today. 44 We will also hear from a second panel of witnesses about Representative's -- Pompeo's bipartisan legislation, H.R. 999, 45 46 the ROV In-Depth Examination Act, and the open ROV rulemaking 47 that has garnered substantial bipartisan concern from members 48 on both sides of the dais, and both sides of the Capital. 49 Consumer safety is a top priority for this Subcommittee, and 50 at a time where difficult budget decisions are being made

51 across the government, it is critical that all agencies are 52 held accountable for their prioritization decisions, 53 particular concern about the role of sound scientific 54 principles at the Commission, the interaction between the 55 Commission and its regulated industries, the rulemaking 56 agenda, and the execution of Congressional mandates for third 57 part test burden reduction, and the Commission's continued 58 request for new authority to impose user fees. There is a 59 fundamental Constitutional issue with moving the power of the 60 purse from Congress to a regulatory agency with no experience 61 in disbursing fees. 62 A wide range of open agenda items at the Commission require significant scientific evaluation and testing, from 63 64 thiolates, to nanotechnology, to window coverings, and recreational off-highway vehicles. Consumer confidence is 65 66 rooted in the belief that the Commission has the capacity to 67 base its decision on supportable scientific findings. It is 68 dangerous and short sighted for a safety agency to move away 69 from science and scientific principles, as may have happened 70 with the Chronic Hazard Advisory Panel report regarding 71 thiolates, where even the Office of Management of the Budget

```
72
    quidelines for peer review were ignored.
73
         The Commission's authorizing statute is based around the
74
    presumption that voluntary industry standards and cooperative
75
    relationships with the regulated industry are the preferred
76
    method of regulation for product safety. Safety is a strong
77
    incentive for both parties. There are a number of open
78
    rulemakings that fundamentally change the relationship
79
    between the Commission and the regulated industry. In an
80
    area where it is said that 90 percent of the threats to
81
    consumer safety are created by 10 percent of the
82
    participants, it seems counterintuitive to put additional
83
    barriers between the Commission and the regulated industry
84
    when the common ground is consumer safety.
85
         This is especially so where resources are always going
    to dictate the Commission will need help from industry in
86
87
    identifying problems. One open rulemaking fundamentally
88
    changes the fast track voluntary recall process, an award
89
    winning program established 20 years ago to address long
90
    recall processes, which has produced tremendous results.
91
    Under this program last year, 100 percent of fast track
92
    recalls were initiated within 20 days. The positive impact
```

93 for consumers is real when potentially dangerous products can 94 be taken off the shelves in days, instead of weeks or months. 95 Finally, there has been a bipartisan--there has been bipartisan support to reduce third party testing burdens for 96 small businesses around the United States. In 2011 Congress 97 98 passed H.R. 2715, with explicit instructions to the 99 Commission to evaluate the testing burden relief in good 100 faith, but the Commission has struggled to carry out the 101 statutory requirement, even with additional funding. 3-1/2 102 years later small businesses are reporting they still have not seen any real burden reductions, and are facing seemingly 103 104 endless comment rounds, but no real solutions. 105 We are here to make certain that we are doing what we 106 can to prevent tragic and unfortunate injuries from consumer 107 products. However, additional funds for the Commission are 108 difficult to justify when there are so many questions about 109 the scientific methodology used by the Commission to support 110 its regulatory agenda, and how the Administrative Procedure 111 Act solicited comments are incorporated through the rulemaking process, and how the Commission operates without 112 113 bipartisan support from any initiative.

114 The Consumer Products Safety Commission's mission must 115 remain a touchstone for its important work, and not a 116 launching pad for an active estate driven by headlines, 117 rather than science and economics. Such an approach 118 compromises the trust in an agency that has successfully removed thousands of unsafe consumer products from the 119 120 economy, from product--from consumer shelves, as well as the 121 voluntary safety standards that build safety into the 122 products on the front end. 123 [The prepared statement of Mr. Burgess follows:] \*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* 124

125 Mr. {Burgess.} The Chair will recognize the Ranking 126 Member of the Subcommittee, Ms. Schakowsky, for the purposes 127 of an opening statement. 128 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding 129 this important hearing about Consumer Product Safety 130 Commission. The Commission, and its mission of protecting 131 consumers from unsafe products, is very near and dear to my 132 heart. I began work as a consumer advocate many moons ago, as a young mother working to get freshness dates on food. So 133 when you go and look at the date on food, moi. And I know 134 135 how important it is that consumers have access to health and 136 safety information about the products that they purchase and use, and that they are protected against harmful products. 137 138 In 2008 the landmark Consumer Product Safety Improvement 139 Act was signed into law by President Bush. The bill was the 140 product of broad bipartisan negotiation, and it marked the 141 most significant reform of the CPSC and its responsibilities 142 in decades. I also want to thank some of the advocates that are here in this room, and appreciate their work. The bill 143 passed the Committee 51 to 0, and the House by a vote of 424 144

145 to one. I was--it was slightly amended, again, on a bipartisan basis, in 2011, and the legislation gave the CPSC 146 147 additional authority and resources so it could become the 148 consumer watchdog that Americans deserve, and, frankly, 149 expect. 150 I am proud to have authored several provisions to the 151 bill, including a provision requiring mandatory standards and 152 testing for infant and toddler products, such as cribs and 153 high chairs. I also successfully added to the reform bill a 154 requirement for postage-paid recall registration cards to be attached to products so that customers can be quickly 155 156 notified their products are dangers. 157 The CPSC has been incredibly successful in its efforts to improve consumer protection over the last few years. 158 159 There was a 34 percent reduction in children's product recalls, just from 2013 to 2014. The 75 children's product 160 161 recalls in 2014 was the lowest number in more than a decade. 162 Thank you very much. We have seen enhanced proactive 163 outreach to provide consumers with information about the 164 dangers and best practices associated with everything from 165 window blinds, to electric generators, to lawnmowers. And we

166 have seen rulemaking to reduce the likelihood of preventable 167 tragedies. I applaud the Commission on its important work. 168 While I am disappointed that we move forward with this 169 hearing on a day that Commissioner Robinson was unable to 170 appear, I look forward to hearing the perspectives of the 171 other commissioners about the CPSC's work, and its next 172 steps. 173 The second panel today will provide analysis of H.R. 174 999, the Ride Act. I am strongly opposed to this bill, which 175 would suspend CPSC's statutory authority to complete a rulemaking affecting recreational off-highway vehicles, or 176 ROVs, until after a study is completed at the National 177 178 Academy of Science. It is not clear to me why this study is 179 needed. After all, the CPSC has gone through its regular 180 rulemaking process on this issue, taking into account the 181 input of technical experts, the private sector, and the 182 public. 183 I am also not sure why the National Academy of Sciences 184 would analyze the feasibility of, among other things, providing consumers with safety information at the point of 185 sale. While the NAS has a highly skilled staff, market and 186

187 consumer analysis is not its strong suit. It also makes no 188 sense that NAS would be required to consider the impact of a 189 rulemaking on ROVs used in the military. The CPSC is 190 responsible for consumer products, not military vehicles. 191 The proposed rule is irrelevant to military ROVs. I believe 192 this legislation is a delay tactic, pure and simple. It 193 would delay the implementation of the CPSC's common sense, 194 consumer-focused rule to reduce ROV rollovers, enhance 195 safety, and increase consumer information. 196 It is not as if this rulemaking is moving too fast. The risk of ROV death is not a new one, and the public comment 197 period for the ROV rulemaking is currently open. There is 198 199 nothing preventing the supporters of this legislation from making their concerns, and their suggestions, known. That is 200 201 the way the process is supposed to work. What we cannot do 202 is usher in a long delay for the sake of delay. The 335 ROV related deaths, and 506 injuries, from 2003 to 2013, I think 203 204 it is time to act to enhance ROV safeguards, not tie the 205 hands of the CPSC. Again, I look forward to hearing from our witnesses, 206 thank them for coming today, and I yield back. 207

Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentlelady. Gentlelady 210 211 yields back. The Chair recognizes the Vice-Chair of the full 212 Committee, Ms. Blackburn. 5 minutes for an opening 213 statement, please. 214 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want 215 to say thank you to our witnesses. We appreciate that you 216 are here. You know, 2008 was really the year of the recall, 217 and since that point in time we have been very interested in 218 the work that you are doing, and have looked at your deliverables, and your outcomes. 219 220 Now, one of the things that is of tremendous concern to 221 us--and I have got to tell you, I heard a lot about this during small business week, which was just a couple of weeks 222 223 ago. And I was out and about in my district, visiting with 224 small businesses, visiting with some retailers, and there are 225 a lot of complaints that are coming about the way you all are 226 going about your task, and some of the unnecessary burdens 227 that are being put on retailers, and on businesses, and changes in reporting requirements. And I have got to tell 228 you, I think there is a lot of unhappiness with the American 229

230 public in how you are doing your job. I would say too there 231 is probably some confusion as to what your mission statement 232 is, and you are meeting that. 233 Now, I think it is fair to say that, as we look at the 234 cost to business, and the cost to consumers, and a cost-235 benefit analysis, what we want to do is drill down with you a 236 little bit. We share the same goal, being certain that the 237 supply chain is safe, that products are safe when consumers 238 get those products. There are different ways to go about 239 this, and we want to make certain that there is an 240 accountability issue, a transparency issue, and a fairness 241 issue, or standards, that are being met. So we will have 242 questions, and will move forward with those -- so want to take a moment and welcome our former colleague. Commissioner 243 244 Buerkle, it is wonderful to see you back in these halls, and 245 it is wonderful to see you back in a hearing room, and we appreciate the work that you are doing. 246 247 Again--with that, Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield the 248 balance of my time to Mr. Pompeo for a statement. 249 [The prepared statement of Mrs. Blackburn follows:]

250 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

251 Mr. {Pompeo.} Thank you, Madam Vice-Chairman. Look, we 252 have a--thank you all for being here, Chairman Kaye, and your 253 colleagues, for coming today. We have this obligation, just as you do, to make sure that the CPSC statutes are 254 255 implemented in a way that is both legal, and appropriate, and 256 useful, and gets the economics and the safety balance just 257 right. I think with respect to the ROV rules that you all 258 have put forward, there is a lot of work that could be done. I think industry is prepared to try and get to a really good 259 outcome that is a better place than the rulemaking that is 260 261 proceeding will end up. 262 I was out last week too. I was actually on an ROV vehicle, out in Kansas in the woods. Wore my helmet, did all 263 264 the things right, and I am here today to tell about it, which 265 is good. I hope we can get this right, and the legislation 266 that I have proposed isn't aimed at delaying. It is aimed at 267 getting to a good outcome. It may cause a little more time, 268 and a little more thoughtfulness, and a little more work to be done, but I hope we can get that right, that we can get 269 270 the best science, and the best engineering associated with

```
getting these rules in the right place, and get a voluntary
standard put that industry can do the right thing, and get
these vehicles in a safe place, to the right people. And I
hope--and look forward to working with you to see if we can't
achieve that. With that, I will yield back my time.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pompeo follows:]
```

```
278
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} I thank the gentleman, and does any
     other member seek the balance of my time? None so doing, I
279
     yield back, Mr. Chairman.
280
281
          Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentlelady. Gentlelady
282
     yields back. Chair recognizes Democratic side for an opening
283
     statement.
284
          Ms. {Schakowsky.} If I--Mr. Chairman, if I could just
285
     submit for the record Mr. Pallone's opening statement? And
286
    also--no.
          Mr. {Burgess.} Without objection, so ordered. That
287
288
     concludes member opening statements. The Chair would like to
289
     remind members that, pursuant to Committee rules, opening
     statements will be made a part of the record.
290
291
          We will now hear from our witnesses. I want to welcome
     all of our witnesses, and thank you for taking time to
292
293
     testify before the Subcommittee. Today's hearing will
294
     consist of two panels. Each panel of witnesses will have the
     opportunity to give an opening statement, followed by a round
295
     of questions from members. Once we conclude questions with
296
297
     the first panel, we will take a brief, underscore brief,
```

298 recess to set up for the second panel. 299 Our first panel today, we have the following witnesses, 300 testifying on behalf of the Consumer Product Safety 301 Commission. Chairman Elliot F. Kaye, Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, thank you for your 302 303 attendance. Commissioner Robert Adler, and we welcome you, 304 sir, to the Subcommittee. Commissioner Ann Marie Buerkle--305 Buerkle, thank you for--it is good to see you again. You 306 give me confidence that there is an afterlife. And 307 Commissioner Joseph P. Mohorovic, thank you so much for your attendance today. We are honored to have all of you today. 308 Chairman Kaye, we will begin--you will begin the first panel, 309 310 and you are recognized for 5 minutes for the purposes of an opening statement, please. 311

```
^STATEMENTS OF ELLIOT F. KAY, CHAIRMAN, U.S. CONSUMER PRODUCT
312
313
     SAFETY COMMISSION; ANN MARIE BUERKLE, COMMISSIONER, U.S.
314
     CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION; ROBERT S. ADLER,
     COMMISSIONER, U.S. CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION; AND
315
316
     JOSEPH MOHOROVIC, COMMISSIONER, U.S. CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY
317
    COMMISSION
318
     ^STATEMENT OF ELLIOT F. KAYE
319
         Mr. {Kaye.} Good morning, Chairman and Dr. Burgess,
    Ranking Member Schakowsky, and the members of the
320
321
     Subcommittee. Thank you for the invitation to come speak
322
     about the work of the United States Consumer Product Safety
323
     Commission, and our proposed budget for fiscal year 2016. I
324
     am pleased to be joined by my friends and colleagues from the
     Commission, Commissioners Adler, Buerkle, and Mohorovic, and
325
326
     I bring regrets from Commissioner Robinson.
327
          CPSC's vital health and safety mission touches us all in
     some way every day. From the parents of the baby, who gently
328
    moves his or her child throughout the day from crib, to baby
329
```

330 bouncer, to stroller, and back again to the crib, or the 331 self-employed millennial who, on a warm spring day, relies on 332 a room fan to stay cool, and an extension cord to power a 333 computer, to the baby boomer who purchased adult bed rails to help care for an aging parent, the products in CPSC's 334 335 jurisdiction are inseparable from our lives. 336 We believe we provide an excellent return on investment 337 for the American people. We run a lean operation, and we 338 cover thousands of different kinds of consumer products, with a budget in the millions, not the billions. We are very 339 340 appreciative of the continued bipartisan support for the 341 Commission and our work. We saw this support in the 342 overwhelming, nearly unanimous vote to pass the Consumer 343 Products Safety Improvement Act of 2008, and the near 344 unanimous passage of an update to CPSIA in 2011. Your 345 support has allowed our dedicated staff to drive standards 346 development, to make children's products safer, to increase 347 our enforcement effectiveness, and to better educate 348 consumers about product related hazards. Our staff has also been hard at work trying to reduce 349 350 costs associated with third party testing, while also

assuring compliance with the law. Congress's inclusion of 351 the \$1 million as part of our funding for the current fiscal 352 353 year has enhanced those efforts. I have emphasized priority-354 -prioritizing those actions most likely to provide the greatest amount of relief, especially to small businesses. 355 356 We are set to consider at least three different regulatory 357 changes to provide relief this fiscal year, with more in the 358 works. 359 While the burden reduction, assure compliance work proceeds, our continuing efforts to carry out and enforce 360 CPSIA driven enhancements to consumer product safety are 361 362 reflected in our proposed budget. Unfortunately, not all of 363 those priorities and requirements are achievable at our current levels. For that reason, we were pleased to see the 364 365 President include in his budget two important consumer 366 product safety initiatives. Both initiatives, if funded, 367 will advance consumer safety and provide real value to those 368 in industry making or importing safe products. 369 First, we are seeking a permanent funding mechanism to allow the agency to comply with the Congressional charge in 370 Section 222 of the CPSIA. Section 222 called on the 371

372 Commission to work with Customs and Border Protection and develop a risk assessment methodology to identify the 373 374 consumer products likely to violate any of the Acts we 375 enforce out of all the consumer products imported into the 376 United States. 377 To meet our mandate, in 2011 we created a small scale 378 pilot that has been a success. However, a pilot alone does 379 not fulfill the direction of Congress, and without full 380 implementation, we will not be able to integrate CPSC into 381 the much larger U.S. Government-wide effort to create a single window for import and export filing of all products. 382 383 If CPSC can be fully integrated into the single window, we 384 can transform Congress's vision of a national scope, risk 385 based, data driven screening at the ports into a reality, a 386 reality that would mean faster entry for importers of 387 compliant products, and safer products in the hands of 388 American consumers. 389 Our proposed budget also seeks to address critical 390 emerging and safety--emerging health and safety questions 391 associated with the rapidly growing use of nanomaterials in 392 consumer products. In light of the questions raised in the

393 scientific community about the effects inhalation of certain 394 nanoparticles might have on human lungs, concerns that center 395 on identified similarities to asbestos exposure, we are 396 proposing to significantly advance the state of the science as it relates to human exposure, especially to children, from 397 398 consumer products. 399 Finally, I would like to discuss an additional priority 400 of mine, one that is not reflected in dollars, but to me, at 401 least, makes a lot of sense. How we at the CPSC do what we 402 do is often just as important as what we do. Since day one in this position, I have worked daily to try to establish a 403 404 certain culture among the five of us at the Commission level. 405 The Commission, and more importantly the American public, are far better served by an agency where we operate at the 406 407 Commission level in a culture of civility, collaboration, and 408 constructive dialogue. 409 Thank you again for the invitation to speak to you about 410 the CPSC and the life-saving work undertaken by our staff. I 411 look forward to answering questions you may have. 412 [The prepared statement of Mr. Kaye follows:]

413 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT A \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

```
414 Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentleman. The
415 gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes the gentlelady,
416 Ms. Buerkle, for her question--her statement, please.
```

417 ^STATEMENT OF ANN MARIE BUERKLE Ms. {Buerkle.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good 418 419 morning, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Schakowsky, and 420 distinguished members of this Committee. Thank you for 421 holding today's hearing with regard to the Consumer Product 422 Safety Commission. I had the honor of serving alongside many 423 of the Subcommittee members in the 112th Congress, and I am 424 delighted to be back here on Capitol Hill in my capacity as a Commissioner at the CPSC. And I do hope that today's hearing 425 426 strengthens our partnership to keep consumers safe from 427 unreasonable risks of injury. I have been a Commissioner at the agency since July of 428 429 2013, and throughout this time what has continued to impress me is the dedication of the CPSC staff. The mission of 430 safety is taken very seriously. The regulated community has 431 432 also impressed me, not only with their eagerness to 433 understand and comply with our regulations, but also with 434 their entrepreneurial drive to innovate and advance safety. 435 I am thankful too for the tone set by our Chairman, and

436 joined by my colleagues. We offer--we often differ significantly on policy issues, but those differences are 437 438 discussed in a mutually respective manner. 439 As a Commissioner I have stressed three general priorities, collaboration, education, and balance. Number 440 441 one, it is crucial to--that CPSC builds strong relationships with all stakeholders. If the lines of communications are 442 443 open, we can tap the knowledge, insight, and expertise of 444 many outside experts. This is especially important in the 445 case of the regulated community. If we inspire cooperation, rather than hostility, we will see quicker introduction of 446 447 safer designs, as well as timely removal of defective 448 products, all to the benefit of the consumer. That is why I 449 am deeply troubled regarding the discussion of high--higher 450 civil penalties, changes to important programs known as 451 retailer reporting, and the proposals known as voluntary recall in 6(b). Without question, I believe these undermine 452 453 engagement and collaborative efforts. 454 Number two, education. It is crucial to our mission. We need to make the regulated community aware of best 455 practices and be honest regarding what we are intending to 456

457 achieve. More importantly, we also need to engage the consumer, helping them to avoid hidden hazards and take 458 459 advantage of safer products that are already available to them. A prime candidate for a comprehensive educational 460 campaign is the issue of window coverings. Increased 461 462 awareness and education will prevent many unfortunate 463 injuries and death. 464 And number three, while consumer safety is our top 465 priority, I believe that that safety can be achieved in a balanced, reasonable way that does not unnecessarily burden 466 the regulated community, deprive consumers of products they 467 468 prefer, or insert government into the market where it does 469 not belong. Our statutes express a strong preference for 470 voluntary standards rather than mandatory standards. Where 471 mandatory standards are unavoidable, the CPSA instructs us to 472 find the least burdensome solution that adequately addresses 473 the risk. 474 Mandatory standards have unintended consequences. Thev 475 tend to stagnate, while the world of consumer products evolves rapidly. It makes then -- sense, therefore, to revisit 476 477 our rules periodically and make sure they are effective

478 without stifling innovation. I am pleased that the 479 Commission voted unanimously last week for a retrospective review of our rules, and I do hope it will become a more 480 481 regular activity of the Commission. 482 Regulation is a necessary function of the government, 483 and the Consumer Products Safety Improvement Act strengthened 484 our authority. It is clear, however, the CPSIA went too far 485 in some respects, forcing regulation without regard to risk, 486 let alone cost. This Subcommittee led the way in moderating some of the untoward consequences of CPSIA through its work 487 on H.R. 2715, which passed into Public Law 112-28 while I was 488 489 a member of the House. Some objectives of that law remain 490 unfulfilled. Last year the House included \$1 million in our 491 2015 appropriations, thanks to Representative Blackburn, to 492 kick start our efforts on test burden reduction. There is 493 still much more we can do to remove unnecessary regulatory 494 burdens in this arena, and I do look forward to working with 495 this Committee on those unresolved CPSIA issues. 496 The common goal among all of us, Congress, CPSC, industry, and consumers, is safety. We are all people who 497 498 have families for whom we want safe products. I have six

```
499
    children and 16 grandchildren. I do now want dangerous
    products hurting them, or anyone, however, the United States
500
501
    Government cannot, and should not, try to create a zero risk
502
    society. The solutions we seek should be balanced, and
    address actual problems. Consumers should be protected from
503
504
    unreasonable risks, while the regulated community is
505
    protected from an arbitrary government. Thank you for this
506
    time today, and I do look forward to taking any questions you
507
    might have. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
508
          [The prepared statement of Ms. Buerkle follows:]
    ********** TNSERT B ********
509
```

```
510 Mr. {Burgess.} The Chair thanks the gentlelady. The
511 Chair recognizes Commissioner Adler, 5 minutes, please, for
512 an opening statement, sir.
```

513 ^STATEMENT OF ROBERT S. ADLER 514 Mr. {Adler.} Good morning, Chairman Burgess, Ranking Member Schakowsky, and the distinguished members of the 515 516 Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear along 517 with my fellow CPSC Commissioners today. I am pleased to be 518 able to testify about an agency that I have been associated 519 with in some fashion since its establishment 40 years ago. 520 At the outset, I would point out that we are far and away the 521 smallest of the Federal Health and Safety agencies, with a 522 current funding level of 123 million, and a staff of roughly 523 560 FTEs. I want to put that in perspective. For fiscal year 2016 we have asked for an appropriation of \$129 million, 524 525 which is an increase of roughly \$6 million. By way of 526 comparison, our sister agency, FDA, has asked for roughly 527 \$4.9 billion in fiscal year 2016, which is an increase of roughly \$148 million. Or, to put it more succinctly, FDA has 528 529 asked for an increase that is larger than CPSC's entire 530 budget. 531 Notwithstanding our modest budget, our jurisdictional

532 scope is extremely wide, encompassing roughly 15,000 categories of consumer products found in homes, stores, 533 534 school, and recreational settings. Given this broad 535 jurisdiction, the agency has adopted a thoughtful, data-based approach, using its highly skilled technical staff to figure 536 537 out which products present the greatest risk, and we address 538 them using our regulatory and educational tools in a way 539 designed to minimize market disruption, while always making 540 consumer safety our top priority. We don't operate alone. 541 We have always sought to include our various stakeholder partners in a quest to reduce or eliminate unreasonable 542 543 risks. Included in this group are our friends in the 544 business and the consumer communities, as well as the various 545 standards development bodies that work closely with the 546 agency. 547 And I want to note, looking from the perspective of 40 548 years, just how much good work has been done. There has been 549 an estimated 30 percent decline in the rate of deaths and 550 injuries associated with consumer products over this 40 551 years. And let me just cite a few statistics, particularly pertaining to children. Over this period of time we have 552

553 seen an 83 percent drop in childhood poisoning, a 73 percent drop in crib death, an 86 percent reduction in baby walker 554 555 injuries, and almost complete elimination of childhood 556 suffocation in refrigerators. I would also like to mention the tremendous strides the 557 558 agency has taken to implement the Consumer Products Safety 559 Improvement Act, which has been noted was approved by the 560 House by a vote of 424-1, signed by President Bush on August 561 4--14, 2008. And among the things we have done to implement the law, we have enforced stringent limits on lead and 562 thiolates in children's products. We have promulgated the 563 564 strongest safety standard for cribs in the world. We have made mandatory a comprehensive voluntary toy standard. 565 have written, and continue to write, a series of standards 566 for durable infant products, like play yards and strollers, 567 568 and we have developed new approaches to catching dangerous 569 imported products, which we hope to expand. 570 Since I last appeared before this Committee, the 571 Commission has experienced a significant turnover in members. In fact, I am the last one standing. Although I miss my 572 former colleagues, I am pleased to welcome as new colleagues 573

574 Chairman Elliot Kaye and Commissioners Robinson, Buerkle, and Mohorovic. Simply put, they are a joy to work with. 575 576 have brought new perspectives and insights that have 577 freshened and sharpened my thinking on a host of issues, and they have done so in a way that has brought a new era of 578 579 civility to the agency. We certainly disagree, vigorously 580 sometimes, on issues, but we listen to and we trust one 581 another in ways I have not seen at this agency in many, many 582 years. 583 A final point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate my concern about a set of issues that surrounds a critical 584 585 demographic that I don't think has received enough attention 586 of the past number of years, and that is senior citizens, a group of which I am a proud member. CPSC data show that the 587 588 second most vulnerable population after kids is adults over 589 65, and I note this is a rapidly growing group doing to--due to the aging of baby boomers, and the greater longevity of 590 591 our citizens. An interesting statistic, there are more of us 592 in the over 65 age group in this country than there are people in Canada. 593 594

But what is particularly troubling to me is that

```
595
     seniors, while comprising only 13 percent of the population,
596
     account for 65 percent of our consumer product related
597
     deaths, and by 2020 they, we, will be 20 percent of the U.S.
598
    population. So, given my concerns while I was acting Chair,
599
     I worked with staff to create a senior safety initiative,
600
    which is ongoing, and which I hope to have the Congress
601
     include, and hope to work with you.
602
          Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your
603
    questions.
604
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Adler follows:]
     ********** TNSERT C ********
605
```

```
606 Mr. {Burgess.} Gentleman yields back. Chair thanks the 607 gentleman. The Chair recognizes Commissioner Mohorovic. 5 608 minutes for your opening statement, please.
```

^STATEMENT OF JOSEPH MOHOROVIC 609 610 Mr. {Mohorovic.} Thank you, Chairman Burgess, Ranking 611 Member Schakowsky, members of the Committee. I very much 612 appreciate the opportunity to be here today. I will keep my 613 opening remarks very, very brief, and focus on one--only one 614 element of evolving CPSC policy, and that is our import 615 surveillance. This is one area that I think we can dramatically improve both our efficiencies and--as well as 616 617 our effectiveness. And while we are developing our strategies to better 618 619 target illegitimate inbound consumer products, I believe CPSC 620 can and should do more to facilitate legitimate trade through 621 public/private partnerships with those importers voluntarily willing, identified, and carried down the stream of commerce 622 623 without disruption. This concept, a trusted trader program 624 and model, moves beyond incremental increases in targeting to 625 more evolved, account-based understanding of importers' demonstrated commitment to making safe products. 626 627 But to earn CPSC's trust, traders would undergo intense

628 scrutiny, including thorough reviews of their supply chain competencies. They would have to empirically demonstrate a 629 630 culture of compliance reflecting the highest standards, and 631 membership would have its privileges. To attract applicants, trusted trader status would offer fewer inspections and 632 633 faster, more predictable time to market. But should a trader 634 violate the trust we have placed in them, the government's 635 response would be swift and sure. 636 No discussion of CPSC import surveillance is complete without addressing the \$36 million annual funding level we 637 638 outlined in our most recent budget request, and the user fees 639 we hope will pay for it. I am not entirely convinced of the 640 legality of the user fee mechanism. Moreover, while I am 641 generally supportive of what we want to spend that money on, 642 I look forward to further discussions with our staff to 643 develop a more nuanced understanding of that expenditure. 644 However, my potential support for that spending, whether 645 from user fees or from appropriations, is predicated on 646 implementation of a properly resourced trusted trader program that is capable of attracting robust participation. If we 647 are going to ask for more money, particularly if it comes 648

649 from the very importers whose shipments we are rooting around 650 in, we need to spend some of that money making life easier 651 for the good actors who voluntarily subject themselves to 652 intense scrutiny. If we can develop the confidence necessary to take those good actors' shipments out of our haystack, 653 654 finding the needles will be that much easier. Thank you, Mr. 655 Chairman. 656 [The prepared statement of Mr. Mohorovic follows:] \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT D \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* 657

Mr. {Burgess.} The Chair thanks the gentleman. The 658 659 Chair would note that it appears that the era of good feelings is now settled upon the Consumer Products Safety 660 Commission. You all referenced how well you work together, 661 662 so that is -- the Chair takes that as a good sign as we move 663 forward. And, again, I want to thank you all for being in 664 our hearing. We will now move into the question portion of 665 the hearing. You--each member will have 5 minutes for questions. 666 And, Chairman Kaye, let me begin, and again, thank you 667 for your willingness to be here, and apologize about us 668 having to reschedule during the snow day. It--kind of an 669 unexpected snowfall in March that caught a lot of us by 670 671 surprise. But thank you for your flexibility in rescheduling. The budget for Fiscal Year 2016 requests--the 672 673 Commission requests new Commission authority to impose 674 undefined user fees on importers. 675 I will just--I think I have already shared with you I have some misgivings about that, and would really welcome 676 further discussion from the Commission as to how these user 677

678 fees, not just how they are collected, but how they are 679 disbursed. Are these fees that are paid into the Treasury, 680 and then subject to appropriations by the Appropriations 681 Committee, or are they fees that are retained within the 682 agency for use within the agency? So I would like some 683 clarification about that. And I would just remind the 684 members the appropriation -- we are in appropriations season. 685 The appropriations for the Consumer Products Safety 686 Commission I believes comes through the Financial Services Appropriation bill, so we all will want to be vigilant about 687 688 that, and make certain that we do pay attention to the agency 689 during the appropriations. 690 But there is the risk assessment methodology, which is a pilot program to assess hazardous imports in the Commission's 691 692 performance, budget requests to Congress to target a 693 percentage of empty--entries sampled is identified through 694 the pilot system for Fiscal Year 2015, but is only labeled 695 baseline, and Fiscal Year 2016 the target is to be decided. 696 So are we on the brink of nationalizing a pilot program where we don't know the metrics for inspection and evaluation? 697 Mr. {Kaye.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No, we are 698

699 definitely not on the brink of nationalizing the program, 700 even though the government is on the brink of nationalizing 701 the single window requiring electronic filing, which is a big 702 reason why the CPSC is trying to do it--part. We want to 703 make sure that, as close as possible, by December of 2016, 704 when the system that Customs and Border Protection runs to 705 receive electronic filing is up and running, and there is 706 truly one single window, that we are not creating an 707 unnecessary disruption to the market by not being a part of 708 that. But, as we envision in our appropriations request, we--709 710 if a permanent funding mechanism one way or another would 711 allow the agency to collect and retain the funds solely for 712 the purpose of funding this program--it wouldn't be used for 713 any other reason. There is a long history of agencies with 714 border authorities doing this. We took the time to study 715 those other agencies and work with the Office of Management 716 and Budget to come up with what was the preferred method, 717 the--to not reinvent the wheel so that CPSC could do its part 718 with the single window. 719 Mr. {Burgess.} Yeah, it is actually some of the

720 activities of those other agencies and departments that has 721 been the genesis for my concern about this. And, again, I--722 we are coming into the appropriations time. I want us to be 723 careful about how we approach things. But on the single window issue, and, Commissioner Mohorovic perhaps you can 724 725 address this as well, I was on the Committee in the 110<sup>th</sup> 726 Congress. That was the committee that actually did the 727 reauthorization of the CPSC, and the toy safety bill. 728 And I became very concerned -- we did hearings -- Chairman 729 Rush was sitting in this chair at the time, but the -- that was the year that so many things were imported into the country, 730 731 and then found to be problematic. So there didn't seem to be 732 a way to stop things before they came in, and then the 733 concern became what happens to all this stuff in warehouses 734 that is offloaded by longshoremen in Long Beach, California, 735 and then where is it going to end up? Nobody seemed to talk 736 about shipping it back to the point of origin and saying, you 737 deal with it, other country that shouldn't have sent this 738 stuff to us in the first place, because your attention was 739 lax. So are we any better off today than we were in 2007 and 740 2008, as far as containing things that come into the country

741 that may be hazardous? 742 Mr. {Mohorovic.} Thank you, Dr. Burgess. In short, I 743 do think we are in a much better position today than we were 744 before. And one of the points that I remind folks of is the fact that I am the only non-lawyer on this Commission. So I 745 746 think in terms of metrics for my formal education, being the 747 only MBA, so I think of things in terms of risk--on return on 748 investment. And so in applying that to the -- to public 749 service, I think about safety return on investment. And I am 750 committed to the fact that the investment and the evolution of our import targeting activities, and the sophistication of 751 752 those strategies, is the greatest safety return on investment 753 that we can apply, in terms of our resources and our budget. 754 It completely bypasses the difficulties that you mentioned, 755 Mr. Chairman, with regards to recall effectiveness, et 756 cetera, and it will ensure that we don't have to learn from 757 that experience. 758 Of course, before us we have the potential to scale up 759 into a nationalized program a very significant program. believe that we have a proof of concept, and do we have 760 reason to move forward, based on the success of our pilot 761

- 762 project, the RAM? And the question for--the answer for me is
- 763 absolutely. But, again, I think we do have to look at more
- 764 closely the significant IT spend so it will be able to yield
- 765 the kind of targets, and the targeting effectiveness, that we
- 766 hope to achieve, as well as the operationalization.
- Prior to joining the agency, I was in the conformity
- 768 assessment business, as part of the testing community, for 8
- 769 years, so I have had to scale up a massive supply chain,
- 770 testing operations, and with that you expect to see
- 771 significant economies of scale. That is something that I
- 772 have yet to see in terms of some of the operational scope
- 773 that we have identified, but I am sure further communication
- 774 will identify that.
- 775 Mr. {Burgess.} And I am certain that it will. It may
- 776 even in this hearing. I will yield back my time, recognize
- 777 the gentlelady from Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky. 5 minutes for
- 778 questions, please.
- 779 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 780 Commissioner Adler, like you, I identify as a senior citizen,
- 781 and wonder what you anticipate will be, or what already is
- 782 part of this Commission's senior safety initiative?

783 Mr. {Adler.} Well, thank you very much for the question. First thing I would like to announce is that we 784 785 are participating in a 2015 healthy aging summit which is 786 sponsored by HHS, which will be held on July 27 and July 28, and the Commission will be there in a listening mode. So the 787 788 agency is committed to the senior safety initiative. 789 One of the things that I asked the staff to do was to 790 look at mechanical hazards, because that seems to be the area 791 where seniors suffer the most. And one of the issues that we 792 addressed was what can you do with respect to senior citizens 793 when there are other citizens who are not senior citizens 794 using the same products? 795 Ms. {Schakowsky.} What do you mean by mechanical 796 hazards? 797 Mr. {Adler.} Falls, sawings, cuts, lacerations, things 798 along those lines. 799 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Um-hum. 800 Mr. {Adler.} And so what the staff has done I think is 801 a very smart thing. They first look to see products that 802 present unique hazards, and they are intended for senior citizens, such as bed rails, and these panic buttons that 803

804 seniors wear if they fall. The next thing they have looked 805 at is products that present disproportionate risks to 806 seniors, but that also present unreasonable risks to the public at large, and a product there I would say would be 807 808 table saws. 809 And then even with respect to products where the 810 Commission might find that there is disproportionate injury 811 to seniors, the staff is looking into areas where we can at 812 least alert seniors that they are at particular risk of harm, 813 and their caregivers as well. So I think it is a fairly 814 comprehensive program--815 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Um-hum. 816 Mr. {Adler.} --that we are doing, and I am delighted that the staff has taken to this with such enthusiasm. 817 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Well, as the co-Chair of the Senior 818 Citizens Task Force, let us stay in touch on that. I am 819 820 really interested. 821 I wanted to get to the issue of flammability standards. 822 The--I know the Consumer Products Safety Commission has the 823 authority, under the Flammable Fabrics Act, to issue 824 standards. And I know there are some promulgated

825 flammability standards, and as a -- including some children's products that it is possible, and it looks likely, have 826 827 contributed to significant use of flame retardant chemicals that pose health risks. 828 829 The Chicago Tribune, which was an early reporter about 830 this, said the average American baby is born with the highest 831 recorded levels of flame retardants among infants in the 832 world. And I know recent studies have linked flammable--833 flame retardant chemicals to a wide variety of adverse health effects, endocrine disruption, immunotoxicity, reproductive 834 toxicity, developmental effects, impaired thyroid, 835 836 neurological function and cancer, et cetera. 837 So I--my question really is if we, one, have any studies 838 or information demonstrating that flammability standards 839 promulgated by CPSC reduce instances of fire related 840 injuries, and, looking -- and if you have any plans to revisit-841 -to find out if the issue of the flame retardants themselves 842 is a danger? 843 Mr. {Kaye.} Thank you, Congresswoman. So, I don't know if I can do justice to this topic in a minute 23, but I will 844 845 do my--

846 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Yeah. 847 Mr. {Kaye.} --best. The--certainly the--Commissioner 848 Adler's point in the beginning, thanks in large part to the fire community, and the CPSC staff, over time, and I believe 849 850 this is attributable to some of the flammability standards, 851 especially with clothing and children's pajamas, there has 852 been a reduction of fire related incidents. The issue you 853 are getting at, though, is flame retardants, and to what 854 extent those have had any impact on it. 855 I am not aware that flame retardants have been proven to 856 be effective, and I am certainly aware of the studies that 857 you are talking about, or at least some of the studies, that go to the potential health concern. And I can say to you 858 859 that it bothers me even more than as a regulator, it bothers 860 me as a parent of two young children that there has to be 861 this uncertainty about products that we interact with, and 862 the chemicals that might be in them. And a perfect example 863 of that is a couch. 864 Most people don't view a couch as a potential hazardous product, but if it is true that the flame retardants that the 865 866 Trib pointed out, that have doused the foam in an attempt to

```
867
     deal with cigarette fires, have ended up getting in the dust,
     and children, as we know, go under couches, they put their
868
869
     hands in their mouth, if it is true that that has had a very
870
     negative impact on the health of children, that is a
871
     significant concern of ours.
872
          Ms. {Schakowsky.} And uncertain usefulness in reducing-
873
874
          Mr. {Kaye.} Correct.
875
          Ms. {Schakowsky.} --flame--flammability.
876
          Mr. {Kaye.} Correct. So one of the things that I have
     tried to do at my level is talk to our sister agencies, who
877
878
     have overlapping jurisdictions and similar interests in this
879
     area, to try to get the government working more cohesively to
     address this uncertainty. I think consumers deserve to know
880
881
     answers to these questions as quickly as possible.
882
          Ms. {Schakowsky.} What are the other agencies?
          Mr. {Kaye.} The EPA, the FDA, ATSDR with CDC, and the
883
884
     National Toxicology Program as part of the National
885
     Institutes of Health, and the National Institute of
     Environmental Health Sciences.
886
887
          Ms. {Schakowsky.} Thank you. I yield back.
```

```
888
          Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentlelady, gentlelady
     yields back. The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from
889
890
     Tennessee. 5 minutes for questions, please.
891
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman
    Kaye, let me come to you first. Commissioner Buerkle
892
893
    mentioned and referenced the million dollars that my
894
     amendment put in to advancing the Consumer Products Safety
895
     Improvement Act, and I just want to ask you what you all have
896
     done to reduce that third party testing requirement, where
897
     you are in that process? How are you putting that million
     dollars to work?
898
          Mr. {Kaye.} So thank you for the $1 million,
899
900
     Congresswoman. It has certainly made a big difference. As
901
     soon as the $1 million was appropriated, we moved, at the
902
     Commission level, via an amendment to our operating plan, to
903
     allocate that $1 million to seven different projects that we
904
    had identified, primarily based on stakeholder feedback, but
905
     also with discussions at the Commission level, to try to get
906
     to this issue. And so--
907
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} Um-hum.
908
         Mr. {Kaye.} --where we are now is there are three
```

909 projects that staff is very close to sending up to the 910 Commission for us to vote on to try to provide some of that 911 relief. And as I mentioned in my opening statement, my 912 direction to staff has been to prioritize those actions that will have the widest potential benefit to small businesses. 913 914 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. Let me ask you this. In your 915 letter to Senator Thune you identified three areas for--the 916 determinations of lead content, finding international toy 917 standards, and then guidance allowing for third party testing 918 exemptions. So those are the three areas that you are--Mr. {Kaye.} No, those are actually three separate areas 919 920 that my staff and I continue to work on, and have discussions with Commissioner Mohorovic. So, in total, you are talking 921 922 about 10 different projects. 923 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. Commissioner Mohorovic, you 924 want to respond? 925 Mr. {Mohorovic.} I would love to, thank you. It is 926 perfectly logical to wonder why, with the full commitment of 927 the entire Commission behind reducing third party test burden, why we have achieved very little in terms of results. 928 929 And that is because we are replying to these proposals an

```
930
    unreasonable interpretation of our statute, this language,
931
    consistent with assuring compliance. And the problem is,
932
    very quickly, it is inconsistent with established CPSC
933
    policy. If you looked at the component part testing rule,
934
     which was non-controversial--
935
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} So you are in a bureaucratic--
936
          Mr. {Mohorovic.} We are--
937
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} --quagmire?
938
          Mr. {Mohorovic.} Absolutely, yeah.
939
         Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay.
940
         Mr. {Mohorovic.} Absolutely, Congresswoman.
941
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} So you can't get to the outcome, the
942
     deliverable, because you are still talking among yourselves?
943
          Mr. {Mohorovic.} Not until we change that standard. I
    wouldn't recommend--
944
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. What is the timeline for
945
946
     getting it finished? We want this finished, so when are you
947
     going to have it finished by?
948
          Mr. {Mohorovic.} So we will have three in the next few
949
    months to vote on, and then there is more to come after that.
950
         Mrs. {Blackburn.} Give me few months.
```

```
951
          Mr. {Mohorovic.} I--
952
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} I mean, a month, 2 months, 3 months?
953
    What do you mean by that?
          Mr. {Mohorovic.} I think that within June we will have
954
955
     the first up, and then two more by September.
956
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. All right. So that is going
957
     to be your deliverable. Let me ask you something else. I
958
    mentioned being out, and a lot of dissatisfaction, and the
959
     way you are going about the 11/10 rule, all the public
960
     comment, except one, was against that. But I think what I am
    hearing is you moved forward with a little bit more of a
961
962
    heavy hand than what you would represent to us.
963
          And you say you want to be engaging the industry, and
     you want to be collaborative, but what I--the feedback I am
964
965
     getting, it is those are your words, but your actions are
966
    much more heavy handed, that you have determined what you
967
    want as the outcome, thereby--you are going to let people
968
     think they are participating, but in the end, you are the
     rulemaker, and you are going to get your way. So do you feel
969
970
     like that is a collaborative atmosphere, and trying to work
    with the industry? And how would you respond to those type
971
```

```
972
     of comments that are made about the way you all are
973
     approaching rulemaking?
974
          Mr. {Kaye.} Is that for me? I am happy to--
975
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} Yes, sir.
976
          Mr. {Kaye.} --answer that. And--
977
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} You are the Chairman.
978
          Mr. {Kaye.} And is that question specifically to 11/10
979
     rule, or more general?
980
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} It is specifically to 11/10, but in
981
     general, when it comes to dealing with industry.
982
          Mr. {Kaye.} Sure, so I will address both. The 11/10
983
     rule is in a definite pause at this point. I was not the
984
     Chairman when that came up, and that was not part of what I
985
     worked on, but as soon as I became Chairman I engaged our
986
     staff, and I worked with them to make sure that they were
987
     doing much more collaborative engagement with the -- with our --
988
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} Are you still advancing that?
989
          Mr. {Kaye.} No. It is not moving right now. It is in
990
     a--
991
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay.
992
          Mr. {Kaye.} --pause mode.
```

```
993
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} You are going to put it completely in
994
     pause?
995
          Mr. {Kaye.} It is in pause mode. It is already--
996
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay.
997
          Mr. {Kaye.} --completely paused, and what we have--
998
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay.
999
          Mr. {Kaye.} --been doing is working with our
1000
      stakeholder community, through an advisory panel, on the
1001
     issue of the single window in our imports. We are running a
1002
     pilot that is going to be coming out, the FR notice, in a few
1003
     months, and we are trying to get it right. And so we are
1004
     having--
1005
          Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay.
1006
          Mr. {Kaye.} --those exact collaborations that you are
1007
     talking about.
1008
           Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. My time is out, and I will--I
     have got one other question, but I will submit that question
1009
1010
      to you in writing. And I thank you all, and I yield back.
1011
          Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentlelady. The Chair
1012
     now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Olson. 5
1013
     minutes for questions, please.
```

1014 Mr. {Olson.} I thank the Chair, and welcome to our 1015 witnesses. A special welcome to a former House colleague, Ann Marie Buerkle. Good to see you again, Ann Marie. 1016 1017 I want to talk about nanotechnology. As a 1985 graduate 1018 of Rice University in Houston, Texas, we are proud that two of our professors, Robert Curl and Richard Smalley, won the 1019 Nobel Prize for nanotechnology. In fact, Dr. Smalley taught 1020 1021 me Chemistry 102, so it is very special to me about 1022 nanotechnology. 1023 Chairman Kaye, I wrote you a letter on February 25 about this issue. The fact that your budget requests for five 1024 1025 million more for nanotechnology--the research center is 1026 almost 85 percent of the proposed budget increase. That 1027 caught my eye. I appreciate your response by letter, and, 1028 Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter my letter, and 1029 Chairman Kaye's response, in the record. 1030 Mr. {Burgess.} Without objection, so ordered. 1031 Mr. {Olson.} Thank you. I only have a few questions to clarify issues from your letter. You stated that the reason 1032 1033 that CPSC needs five million is -- for a new research center is 1034 because your work has ``identified significant data gaps

1035 regarding exposure to nanomaterials present in consumer 1036 products.'' Can you elaborate on what these data gaps are, 1037 more details on the data gaps, sir? 1038 Mr. {Kaye.} Absolutely, and it is not only that we have 1039 identified, Congressman, those data gaps, it is that the 1040 larger nanotechnology initiative, the NNI, that is the 1041 collaboration that I think that everyone would want to see 1042 from the Federal Government, where all the agencies that have 1043 a present on nano are working together, actually, the NNI 1044 working groups have identified this data gap. And it really 1045 goes to understanding the exposure from consumer products 1046 that have nanomaterials in them. 1047 And so there are plenty--there is a billion dollars-more than a billion dollars that have been--billions of 1048 1049 dollars that has been spent by the Federal Government on advancing nanotechnology, but none of that, or very little of 1050 1051 that money has gone to understanding the specifics of 1052 consumer product exposure, which is a unique exposure 1053 pathway. 1054 If you have a child that is out swinging a tennis racket, and every time that child hits that -- hits a ball, 1055

some nanoparticles fly off, and the child is breathing those

1056

```
1057
     nanoparticles in, and those nanoparticles in, and those
1058
     nanoparticles supposedly mirror asbestos, these are the types
1059
     of critical health and safety questions that we want to get
1060
     at, and are behind our request.
1061
           Mr. {Olson.} Also in your letter you listed four
1062
     categories as criteria for success. The first one was to
1063
     develop, and this is a quote, ``robust test methods to
1064
     determine and characterize human exposure to nanomaterials.''
1065
     What defines a robust testing method?
1066
           Mr. {Kaye.} That is what I leave to our toxicologists.
1067
     Certainly I think that is what this working group has been
1068
     working on, with the money that Congress has been giving us,
1069
      and that we, in conjunction with the National Science
1070
     Foundation, as well as a number of manufacturers in other
1071
     agencies, would hope to get to those answers.
1072
           I can't--I am not a technical expert. I can't decide
1073
     what reaches that threshold of robustness, but I think we
1074
     have got the technical expertise at our staff level to be
1075
      able to make that determination.
1076
           Mr. {Olson.} In your letter you expect to staff this
```

```
research center with 12 senior scientists, 15 technicians, 10
1077
1078
     post-doctoral students, and 12 graduate students. These
1079
     positions come from your current staff, or come from outside?
1080
          Mr. {Kaye.} I think they would come from outside.
1081
     would be part of the funding.
1082
           Mr. {Olson.} How much expertise does your current staff
1083
     have on these nano-issues? Because they have been working
1084
     this since 2011, I do believe.
1085
          Mr. {Kaye.} We have some expertise. I think we--it is
1086
      thin, though. We have a thin bench. We have a phenomenal
1087
     toxicologist, who is our representative in this space with
1088
      the other agencies on the NNI, but, admittedly, it is not a
1089
     deep bench, and I think that is one of the reasons why we are
1090
     not trying to go in the more costly way, and try to just hire
1091
      internally and procure a bunch of expensive test materials
1092
      that we might not end up needing. We are trying to do the
     more cost efficient way of building off a successful model,
1093
1094
      and pursue it through the NSF.
1095
          Mr. {Olson.} How about stakeholders in nanospace? What
1096
     kinds of interaction do you have with these stakeholders?
1097
          Mr. {Kaye.} Through the NNI working groups, there is a
```

```
1098
     good amount of interaction our staff reports back.
1099
          Mr. {Olson.} Anybody else--the NNI mean other agencies
1100
     working on nano with yourselves, or just--that is pretty much
1101
     the primary agency?
1102
          Mr. {Kaye.} So there is--
1103
          Mr. {Olson.} The EPA? Who else is working--what other
1104
     agencies are--
1105
          Mr. {Kaye.} Department of Defense, Homeland Security.
1106
     There is -- there are many, many agencies as part of NNI.
1107
          Mr. {Olson.} Okay, that is my questions. Yield back by
1108
      saying go Rockets.
1109
          Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentleman, the
1110
      gentleman yields back. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Guthrie
1111
      from Kentucky. 5 minutes for your questions, please.
1112
          Mr. {Guthrie.} Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I was
1113
     preparing for the hearing today, and I talked about
1114
     Commissioner Buerkle, and showed up, and it is you. I am
1115
      glad to have you back. I didn't realize that you are in this
1116
      row, and always -- and really enjoyed serving with you, as Mr.
1117
      Pompeo and I spent 4 years of our life in the State of New
     York. It was always fun to talk about what was going on with
1118
```

1119 you back there. 1120 So I do have a question, it is -- in table saws. Back--I 1121 quess when we were serving together, I had table saw 1122 manufacturers in my district, and I understand that the CPSC 1123 has begun a special study of National Electronic Injury 1124 Surveillance System data to obtain information about the type 1125 of table saws involved in incidents, along with other 1126 information about incidents. 1127 And this study began on July 2014, and it concerns me, 1128 because it seems to me, and I am not sure, but it seems to me 1129 that no outreach has--to members of the industry by the CPSC 1130 was--for this study. And for years the industry has tried to work cooperatively with CPSC, and the industry's input could 1131 1132 have been of value. So, Commissioner Buerkle, was there any outreach to the industry representatives or manufacturers 1133 1134 regarding this special study? 1135 Ms. {Buerkle.} Thank you, and it is good to be back 1136 here on Capitol Hill. To--in fact, a specific request was 1137 made that would--we would reach out to industry and allow 1138 them to participate and be a part of that survey, and it did not happen. So, you know, I think that is -- goes to the point 1139

1140 I made earlier about collaboration and outreach. I think it 1141 is--1142 Mr. {Guthrie.} Um-hum. 1143 Ms. {Buerkle.} --incumbent upon the agency to make sure 1144 we have these conversations with industry beforehand. 1145 Whether it is before a survey, or before it is a proposed 1146 rule, that we engage with them so that we go forward, and we 1147 get the right information. 1148 I will say that NICE is one of the--it is a data 1149 collection system that we use, and it avails us of a lot of 1150 very helpful information. And--so, to that end, that is an 1151 important project. But having stakeholder engagement before 1152 the survey goes out, I think, is crucial. 1153 Mr. {Guthrie.} You know, a lot of them are concerned 1154 about mandating certain technologies, particularly patent 1155 questions that are mandating a specific technology in a 1156 Federal standard. And there are patent concerns that have 1157 been raised throughout the table saw petition discussions 1158 over the years. And is the Commission aware that there are 1159 140 patents related to the proposed technology held by the petitioner to mandate this technology on all table saws? 1160

```
1161
           Ms. {Buerkle.} Are you referring that guestion to me?
1162
          Mr. {Guthrie.} Yes, ma'am.
1163
          Ms. {Buerkle.} Well, let me say this. Quite frankly,
      and quite honestly, my colleague, Commissioner Adler, this is
1164
1165
     his pet project.
1166
          Mr. {Guthrie.} Um-hum.
1167
          Ms. {Buerkle.} And I don't mean to pass the buck,
1168
     because this is not a priority of mine, nor do I think it
1169
     should be a priority of the agency. But to your point about
1170
     the patents, and the concerns about that, I have tremendous
1171
     concerns about that. But it is not a project, quite frankly,
1172
     that I think should be a priority of the agency right now.
1173
          Mr. {Guthrie.} Okay. I have one more question for you
1174
     before we--
1175
          Ms. {Buerkle.} Thank you. Okay.
1176
           Mr. {Guthrie.} --you recently stated--I am sorry, I
1177
     couldn't see you through Mr. Pompeo there. You recently
1178
      stated that the sole basis for CHAP's recommendation to the
1179
     ban of most widely used chemicals was a cumulative risk
1180
     assessment which found that the majority--I guess Citizens'
1181
     Health Advisory Panel's what--recommendation, which found
```

1182 that the majority of the risk associated with these chemicals 1183 was from another chemical, DEHP. Can you explain your 1184 concerns for using cumulative risk assessment as a basis for 1185 such regulatory determination? 1186 Ms. {Buerkle.} Thank you. The CHAP, of course, is a--1187 and then thiolate proposed rule is of great concern to me. 1188 It has been of concern to me since the CHAP issued its 1189 report, because I believe the CHAP report should have been a 1190 public--should have been subject to a public peer review at 1191 that point. So from that point on, to me, the system, and 1192 the whole process, has been flawed. 1193 The cumulative risk assessment that you are talking 1194 about is one of my concerns, and that -- it -- the process that 1195 is used, that is not well accepted in the scientific 1196 community, cumulative risk assessment. So I think that goes to the process, and the validity, and the integrity of the 1197 CHAP report. More importantly, though, I think--and 1198 1199 certainly another grave concern I have is when the CHAP did 1200 their review, they used very old data, that was--data that 1201 was before CPSIA, and before the ban of those thiolates. So that study, to me, and the CHAP report, is almost--it is, it 1202

1203 is irrelevant because it doesn't use timely data. 1204 So the Commission has taken on analyzing the more recent 1205 data, and I have constantly and consistently said, and 1206 advocated that we put that, the findings and the analysis of 1207 the staff on the more current data out for public comment. 1208 It should be put out for at least 60 days, and the staff 1209 should comment on how they are going to use that analysis 1210 relative to the proposed rule. Because, in order to get 1211 comments from the public, we have to include that information 1212 in the proposed -- in that opportunity for them to comment. 1213 Mr. {Guthrie.} Okay. Chairman Kaye, are you concerned about cumulative data, and do you believe it should be out 1214 1215 for public comment? 1216 Mr. {Kaye.} I agree with Commissioner Buerkle that the 1217 staff's analysis should go out for public comment, and I was the one who directed staff, at the beginning of the process, 1218 to even undertake that analysis. And my hope is that we will 1219 1220 reach an agreement in the coming days, when the staff is 1221 ready to put that out for analysis, for it to go out. 1222 As far as the cumulative risk assessment, I have to respect the work of the CHAP, because that is the statutory 1223

1224 regimen that was set up by Congress in Section 108 of the 1225 Consumer Products Safety Improvement Act. That was the 1226 scientific direction, or the policy direction, to the CHAP 1227 members, which, by the way, were picked through the National 1228 Academy of Sciences as the leading experts around the world 1229 on this issue. And so, considering that that is what the 1230 statute told them to look at, and that is what they looked 1231 at, I respect that decision on their part. 1232 Mr. {Guthrie.} Thank you, my time has expired. 1233 Mr. {Burgess.} Gentleman yields back. The Chair thanks 1234 the gentleman. Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Pompeo. 5 minutes for your questions, please. 1235 1236 Mr. {Pompeo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kaye, I want to talk about the ROV rulemaking. You testified before 1237 1238 the Appropriations Committee. You described the hearing as 1239 the longest in--the hearing that was held as the longest in the CPSC's history. Went late into the night, many panels, 1240 1241 many witnesses. I appreciate you all taking the time to do 1242 that. Now I want to make sure that we don't cut short this 1243 process, that we get the data right, the science, and the engineering, and technology right. That is why I have 1244

```
1245
      introduced a piece of legislation. Have you had a chance to
1246
     take a look at that--
1247
          Mr. {Kaye.} I have.
          Mr. {Pompeo.} --99?
1248
1249
          Mr. {Kaye.} I have.
1250
          Mr. {Kaye.} And I didn't see your name as a co-
1251
      endorser, but I am looking forward to hearing you today say
1252
      that you think it is something that wouldn't make sense to
1253
     make sure that industry can work alongside you, and get a
1254
     chance to get a set of voluntary standards that make sense.
1255
          Mr. {Kaye.} So, thank you, Congressman, and I know that
      you have been particularly interested, and I appreciate that,
1256
1257
      since the time you have been in office in the work of the
1258
      CPSC, and I think that is a good thing. I think it is
1259
      important to have this continued dialogue.
1260
           The ROV issue is one of great significance to the
1261
     Commission. We are taking it very seriously. Similar to the
1262
     work on directing staff to do an analysis on the thiolates
1263
      issue, I directed staff to redouble their efforts to engage
1264
     with the voluntary standards effort to try to reach a
      solution. I think that that is the preferred solution many
1265
```

of us would like to see, if they can adequately address the 1266 1267 hazard, and it can be substantially complied with. 1268 As far as the bill is concerned, unfortunately, I am not 1269 going to be able to tell you what you want to hear. I don't 1270 have the ability to co-endorse, even if I wanted to. 1271 Mr. {Pompeo.} You can just say it here this--1272 Mr. {Kaye.} Yeah. I--sounds like I could say it, but 1273 on--based on where we are, and our discussions, I think it is 1274 well intended, but, unfortunately, it would have a negative 1275 impact for three reasons. One, I don't want to call it a delay, but it looks like a delay, even if it is not intended 1276 1277 to be, and those delays cost lives. Every year we are 1278 looking at getting close to now 80 dates per year, many of 1279 them children, associated with ROVs. So every year that this issue is not addressed, whether it is through a robust 1280 1281 voluntary standard, or a mandatory standard, is more deaths, 1282 and I think that that is something we should all be concerned 1283 about. 1284 Second of all, there are real costs. Every time that there is a death, you are talking about, from an impact the 1285 community and society, about \$8 million, as our staff 1286

```
1287
      estimates it, from an economic standpoint. So with 100 and--
1288
      if it is a 2 year study, and you are talking about 150
1289
      deaths, that is upward near a billion dollars in cost to
1290
      society that would result from this.
1291
          And probably in the area, from a timing perspective, and
1292
      I just had a conversation with Mr. Pritchard, who you will
1293
     hear on the second panel, before we came here, the staff and
1294
     the voluntary standards body, meaning industry, are really at
1295
     a position that I don't think they have been at for many,
1296
     many years, where they are finally engaging in a substantive
     technical discussion to try to resolve these issues. If this
1297
1298
     bill were to pass, it puts out for question for 2 years one
1299
     of the key areas that both industry and the staff are driving
1300
     to try to solve now. I just don't think that is going
1301
     to help the timing of it.
1302
          Mr. {Pompeo.} I appreciate that. No one wants more
1303
      deaths. I mean, no one is advocating for delay in order to
1304
      achieve that result. I know I am not, no one on this
1305
     Committee would either. Party--it is a bipartisan piece of
1306
      legislation. I know industry would want that either. I
1307
     don't think it--because of that, I think it is required.
```

1308 think you have to get the data. 1309 I am not going to go through it, but there--but I have 1310 seen testimony from staff that says that we don't have the 1311 engineering and technology, right? The--Bob Franklin on your 1312 staff said we would have to look at the data, looking at 1313 exposure over time to the different ROVs. It might be 1314 possible to do something like that, but we have not done it. 1315 I am thrilled to hear that you are having these 1316 discussions with industry, and that you are making progress. 1317 That is absolutely a preferred solution, I think, for the 1318 CPSC, and from my perspective as well, it would be a great outcome. But I would hope that you would be prepared to at 1319 1320 least suspend the rulemaking for a period of time. Put it on 1321 hold, keep it out there as something that might happen in the event that the discussions don't move forward in the way 1322 1323 that--sounds like you have at least some optimism, as do I. 1324 I would love to see you at least consider suspending the 1325 rulemaking, or put it on hold while those discussions were 1326 happening. If they fall apart, industry and you can't get 1327 together, then so be it, you can continue to proceed. Would you at least consider that? 1328

1329 Mr. {Kaye.} Well, one, I can't--I don't have the power unilaterally to suspend the rulemaking, so that would have to 1330 1331 be a Commission decision. And I would say that, from my 1332 perspective, I do think, whether industry likes it or not, 1333 one of the reasons that we have reached this situation, where 1334 we are at a position where everybody is trying to finally 1335 reach a solution, I think that everyone has proper 1336 incentives. And, from my perspective, the fact that the CPSC 1337 has taken it seriously to this point, and is prepared to move 1338 toward a mandatory standard, has provided the types of conditions that have created this environment. And I so I 1339 1340 think that it is incumbent upon us to keep moving forward. 1341 As I mentioned, the deaths, they do certainly weigh on me, 1342 and so that is not something, at this point, that I think 1343 would be a positive. 1344 Mr. {Pompeo.} Well, I hope you will reconsider that. I 1345 may or may not be the incentive structure that has been 1346 achieved, but we have a June 19 deadline now for comments to 1347 come in. Those comments, I know, will be critical of the 1348 rule from many in the industry. I hope that doesn't put--I want to keep it in a constructive way, and I hope that this 1349

deadline won't artificially create animosity where I think 1350 1351 there is a chance to really get it right, save lives, and get 1352 the rule right. So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1353 Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentlemen, gentleman 1354 yields back. The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from 1355 Indiana. 5 minutes for questions, please. 1356 Mrs. {Brooks.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Indiana has a 1357 large presence of juvenile product manufacturers in the state 1358 that make everything from strollers to car seats, and I have 1359 heard firsthand about the challenges that they face with regards to redundant testing requirements that might do 1360 1361 nothing to advance safety, while siphoning away money that 1362 could have been spent on R and D in these companies, 1363 innovation and resources like additional employment. 1364 And one Hoosier manufacturer told me recently the 1365 Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act was passed -- since it 1366 is passed, they have spent \$12-1/2 million in testing costs 1367 alone. And that is not -- that is because they not only have 1368 to test every platform that the products are on, but every 1369 SKU as well. So not only do they spend an average of \$8,900 to test every new stroller or cradle design, but they have to 1370

1371 spend an extra \$1,000 to test every paint, every new paint 1372 color as well. 1373 And so I think we all agree that the safety of our 1374 children is of utmost importance, and shouldn't be 1375 compromised, however, I think we have to draw the right 1376 balance, and--to ensure that the companies have the needed 1377 resources to do further R and D to ensure their products are 1378 safer. And so, Mr. Chairman, I have a question to you that--1379 with this in mind, what actions have you taken in the past 1380 year to provide relief to companies with respect to these--1381 cost of these third party testing requirements? Mr. {Kaye.} Thank you, Congresswoman. One of the areas 1382 1383 that we found really interesting, and this has been 1384 discovered by our small business ombudsman, and I don't want 1385 to get Commissioner Mohorovic upset, since it involves his 1386 prior occupation, but we have found that a lot of the third 1387 party labs are testing for services that are not required. 1388 And so our small business ombudsman and his office 1389 provide phenomenal support and assistance working with small 1390 businesses, and I would encourage any of the members who have small businesses in particular that have issues to reach out 1391

1392 to Neal Cohen of the CPSC because he can work with companies 1393 to go through their testing reports and to find out whether 1394 or not they really need certain testing. 1395 Now, he doesn't actually go line by line, but what he says is, here are some general guidances, and here are some 1396 1397 questions that you should be asked. He really does a 1398 phenomenal job of empowering a lot of companies, and I think 1399 that has gone a huge way to addressing some of these issues. 1400 Mrs. {Brooks.} Thank you. Commissioner Mohorovic? 1401 Mr. {Mohorovic.} Thank you, Congresswoman. I think 1402 what you will get is a lot of the dodging tactics from the agency to try to explain why we haven't achieved much in 1403 1404 terms of measurable outcomes in reducing the cost and burden 1405 of third party testing. We have all of the resources we 1406 need. We have the legal authority. We just lack the will to be able to enact very many of the policies and suggestions 1407 1408 that have come before the agency. 1409 So we can blame the testing labs, we can blame retailers 1410 for retail protocols, we can dodge and weave on this as long 1411 as we want, but, as I said earlier, it is frustrating for me 1412 particularly because it is so--it lacks alignment. It is so

inconsistent with established CPSC policy. If we applied the 1413 1414 same appreciation for risk tolerance that we did in the 1415 promulgation of the Component Part Testing Rule, we would 1416 have all of the emphasis, and staff would be able to 1417 recommend countless means to reduce the cost and burden 1418 without any adverse health or safety impact. 1419 Mrs. {Brooks.} Thank you. I--Chairman Kaye, it is my 1420 understanding that a million dollars of your 2015 budget was 1421 to be allocated to reducing the needless and duplicative 1422 testing burdens. Can you explain what actions you have 1423 actually taken in leading the Commission to fulfill that role? What--how have you reached out, what do companies 1424 1425 expect to see from this relief if we have, you know, mandated 1426 that in your budget? 1427 Mr. {Kaye.} Sure. And one of the limitations in--on--I agree with Commissioner Mohorovic that we do have a lot of 1428 1429 what we need, but we don't have everything that we need. But 1430 one of the areas is that it is a one-time appropriation, 1431 which means we cannot staff up from it. We can't count on--1432 it is not prudent to hire a bunch of people without knowing how you are going to pay for them in the following fiscal 1433

1434 year, so most of this money has gone through contracting. So 1435 we contract out with organizations who can do a lot of the 1436 technical work to figure out if there is possibility for 1437 relief. But ultimately our staff has to take that work. 1438 There has to be resources internally to be able to turn that 1439 work around, and to try to make it something actionable. 1440 And so the three areas that I mentioned in response to 1441 Congresswoman Blackburn's questions have to do with providing 1442 this exact type of relief. Looking, for instance, at natural 1443 wood, and whether or not, if you use natural wood alone, you 1444 have to test for certain heavy metals that are required by 1445 law. We keep trying to check off lists of materials and 1446 types of products that you don't actually have to test to to 1447 avoid these costs. And that has been the theme, both in 1448 terms of stakeholder engagement and internal deliberations, 1449 that we are trying to pursue to provide -- to make it worth the 1450 while. 1451 Mrs. {Brooks.} Thank you. My time is up. I yield 1452 back. 1453 Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentlelady. The Chair recognizes the Ranking Member of the full Committee, Mr. 1454

1455 Pallone. 5 minutes for your questions, please. 1456 Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is 1457 of Chairman Kaye. There have been concerning reports of 1458 young athletes that have non-Hodgkin lymphoma and other blood 1459 cancers, and who also have been playing sports on athletic 1460 fields that are filled with crumb rubber coming from tires, 1461 which often contains cancer causing chemicals. This past 1462 October I wrote to the Agency for Toxic Substances and 1463 Disease Registry explaining that I believe additional 1464 research is needed into whether synthetic turf athletic fields increase the risk of lymphoma, leukemia, and other 1465 1466 blood cancers. In the agency's reply, they stated that they 1467 are supporting efforts by the Commission in this area. 1468 Yet in 2008 the Commission released a statement saying that field filled with crumb rubber are ``okay to install, 1469 1470 okay to play on'', and I was pleased to hear more recently 1471 that a spokesperson explained that the 2008 statement does 1472 not reflect your current views. So I just wanted to ask, is 1473 it correct that your views are not reflected in that 2008 1474 report, and do you agree that additional research and study is necessary to determine whether crumb rubber used in 1475

1476 synthetic turf athletic fields presents any public health 1477 dangers? And also, is the Commission committed to working 1478 with other Federal agencies to obtain this information, and 1479 to ensure young athletes playing on these fields are 1480 protected? Just ask you, Mr. Chairman. 1481 Mr. {Kaye.} Thank you, Congressman, and thank you for 1482 your leadership on this area. I think you have three 1483 questions embedded in there, so I am going to try to address 1484 all three-1485 Mr. {Pallone.} Sure. Mr. {Kaye.} --in turn. The first is you are absolutely 1486 correct that that 2008 release does not reflect my views of 1487 1488 the state of play, and I think it is important to note that 1489 that 2008 didn't--release didn't even reflect, as far as I 1490 understand it, the technical staff's views at the time, that 1491 there was a political effort at the time at the Commission to 1492 say something in the headline of the release that may not 1493 actually reflect the state of play, which is basically that 1494 those products are safe. 1495 I think there is a big difference in looking at the lead exposure that might exist from the blades of the grass and 1496

determining that, based on a small sample size, the staff was 1497 1498 not able to say that there are--were disconcerting levels of 1499 lead in those fields in that particular aspect. That is very 1500 different from saying these things are safe to play on. 1501 to play on means something to parents that I don't think we 1502 intended to convey, and I don't think we should have 1503 conveyed. So that is the answer to the first question. 1504 The answer to the second question is, absolutely we are 1505 working with our Federal partners to try to figure out a 1506 better and faster way, working together, to see if an issue 1507 such as crumb rubber can be resolved more quickly. As I mentioned to the Ranking Member earlier, we are working with 1508 EPA, we are working with NIH, through their center down in 1509 1510 Research Trial Park, North Carolina, the National Institute 1511 of Environmental Health Sciences and the National Toxicology Program, CDC, ATSDR, and then also the FDA. We are trying to 1512 1513 figure out a way for the government to come together, use our 1514 existing resources and authorities to address these issues. 1515 Parents don't care which acronym name government agency is 1516 supposed to do what. They just want answers, and they want 1517 this uncertainty resolved.

1518 And the third question--I apologize, I can't even 1519 remember what the third one was. If you could--if you 1520 wouldn't mind asking me again? 1521 Mr. {Pallone.} Well, I am just--I think you are, you 1522 know, just really basically trying to find out what your view 1523 is, and what the Commission is doing, and whether you are 1524 working with other Federal agencies --1525 Mr. {Kaye.} Absolutely. 1526 Mr. {Pallone.} --on the issue. 1527 Mr. {Kaye.} Absolutely. 1528 Mr. {Pallone.} All right. Thank you very much. 1529 Mr. {Kaye.} Thank you. 1530 Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you. 1531 Mr. {Burgess.} Gentleman yields back. The Chair thanks 1532 the gentleman. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Kinzinger, 1533 recognized 5 minutes for your questions. Mr. {Kinzinger.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you 1534 1535 all for being here today, and it is nice to have you in front 1536 of the Committee. 1537 Mr. Chairman--Chairman Kaye, it seems that banning a chemical that has been deemed safe by other government 1538

agencies opens the door to the use of substitutes that have 1539 1540 been far less studied, and with far fewer scientific and 1541 performance data available. Is the agency prepared to deal 1542 with the market and potential safety repercussions of 1543 transitioning from well tested thiolates to the uncertainty 1544 associated with any potential substitutes? 1545 Mr. {Kaye.} Well, this gets into, Congressman, some of 1546 the answers to Congressman Pallone. There is a larger issue 1547 going on from a public policy matter, where, unfortunately--1548 and the concept that you are getting to is regrettable 1549 substitution, where one chemical is banned, and we don't really have a full sense, from a scientific and safety 1550 1551 perspective, what the substituting chemical will be. I think 1552 that is a failed public policy, I have to admit. I think the better approach, and this can be done 1553 1554 working with industry, and this would be something that I would like to see happen, is for the government and industry 1555 1556 to come together to not only focus on which chemicals 1557 shouldn't be used, but to try to get to a faster way to 1558 figure out which chemicals should be used. So, as a public policy matter, that is my preference. Unfortunately, neither 1559

1560 the resources or the authorities and the directions that 1561 agencies have been going in for a long time are moving in 1562 that direction. 1563 But, again, as part of these collaborative efforts that I am trying to undertake, and that we are trying to undertake 1564 1565 from CPSC with these other agencies, that is one of the key 1566 goals that we are looking at. 1567 Mr. {Kinzinger.} Yeah, and I think, you know, until we 1568 get to that point, where we can have that perfect system, we-1569 -I think we ought to be very careful when we look at banning 1570 substances. Because if we don't have a situation in place 1571 where we can do all the studying of alternatives, I think, 1572 you know, we ought to be very careful. 1573 Let me--following the thiolate rulemaking, Commissioner 1574 Buerkle noted in--her concern on banning chemicals that have 1575 been in use for many years, and there is risk even studying 1576 what little is known about the substitutes. So you said you 1577 agree with that. I want to see--Commissioner Buerkle, what are your thoughts on the idea of banning something with 1578 1579 unknown substitutes to follow? 1580 Ms. {Buerkle.} Thank you for your question. As you

1581 note, that was one of my concerns when the MPR came out, that 1582 we are not proposing substitutes be used that we know little-1583 -less about than we know about the chemicals that are already 1584 banned. My more general concern, with regards to the CHAP, 1585 and I have, both in comment and-here today, and also in 1586 statements--previous statements was the whole process for how 1587 the CHAP report was done, and now this proposed rule. And I 1588 think we really need to take a step back. 1589 Whether it is regarding chemicals, or whether it is 1590 regarding any of the things we do, we are a data driven 1591 agency. And so to make sure that we have the data correct, 1592 and to make sure that the processes we follow are correct, 1593 and that the CHAP followed a process that the entire 1594 scientific community can accept as credible is very key to 1595 our agency, and the credibility of our agency. It has been 1596 noted the American people rely on information coming from us, 1597 so it is important that we get it right. And so if it takes 1598 a little more time, if it requires a request to Congress that 1599 we can't promulgate that rule within 180 days after the CHAP 1600 report was issued, so be it. We have to make that request, 1601 because it is incumbent upon our agency to get it right, to

Mr. {Kinzinger.} Yeah, and, you know, I want to add to

take the time that we need to do.

1602

1603

```
1604
      that especially--I guess maybe to reiterate what you said.
1605
     You know, I understand that there is, in many cases, a need
1606
      for 180 days. Going past deadlines isn't fun, it is nothing
1607
      that any of us like to do. But I think at the risk of maybe
1608
     getting something wrong, versus getting something right, even
1609
      if we have to go past a little bit of a deadline, I think,
1610
      frankly, Republicans, Democrats, Americans, Independents, far
1611
      right, far left would all agree that that is probably a
1612
     preferable way to go. And so that is, you know, some of the
1613
     concerns we have there.
1614
           Chairman Kaye, I want to go to a bit of a different
      subject just real quick. In the preamble for the proposed
1615
1616
      rule on voluntary recalls, the CPSC indicated that it has
1617
      encountered firms that have deliberately and unnecessarily
1618
     delayed the timely implementation of the provisions of their
1619
      correction action plans. How many firms have deliberately
1620
     and unnecessarily delayed the implementation of provisions of
1621
      their corrective action plans?
1622
          Mr. {Kaye.} Congressman, I will have to follow up and
```

```
1623
      give you an answer to that. I don't know the answer to that
1624
      question. The voluntary recall rule, as my colleagues know
1625
     very well, at this point, from our continued reiterations of
1626
      our positions on it, is not something that has been a high
     priority for me. I have had higher priorities that go to
1627
1628
      saving lives. I am not saying the rule is without merit. I
1629
     think it has some value, but it has not been something that I
1630
     have spent a lot of time on. I thought that early--
1631
          Mr. {Kinzinger.} Well, can you give me, like, an
1632
      example maybe of--
1633
          Mr. {Kaye.} I can certainly give you anecdotal examples
1634
     of where we have reached a situation -- the agreements are
1635
     voluntary. So we have reached a voluntary corrective action
1636
     plan with a company, and we notice, when they file their
1637
     quarterly reports, that they are not doing what they said
      they were going to do. They are either not engaging on
1638
1639
      social media, or they are not attempting to reach out and put
1640
      forth the amount of resources and effort that they said they
     would. I--one, I wouldn't name a company, even if I could--
1641
1642
          Mr. {Kinzinger.} I understand.
1643
          Mr. {Kaye.} --but I can't name a company at this point.
```

But I thought Commissioner Adler, last week, during a public 1644 1645 meeting that we had, when this topic came up, had a 1646 phenomenal suggestion, where he asked our staff to spend a 1647 few months collecting this data, and reporting back to the 1648 Commission to see whether or not this is a real issue. And, 1649 to Commissioner Buerkle's point, we are data driven, and I 1650 think that will be a useful exercise, and we will all be 1651 curious to see that. 1652 Mr. {Kinzinger.} Good. Well, yeah, I would be 1653 interested too, and I just want to point out, let us make sure, if you are going to throw out the entire system, that 1654 it is very data driven. So, with that, thank you all for 1655 1656 being here, and I will yield back. 1657 Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentleman, gentleman 1658 yields back. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from 1659 Oklahoma, Mr. Mullin. 5 minutes for questions, please. Mr. {Mullin.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to 1660 1661 the Commissioners for taking the time to be here. I know you 1662 guys have a very busy schedule too, and anytime you've got to come to the Hill, you have got to be thrilled about that, 1663 1664 right?

```
1665
           But, you know, we are all held accountable for
1666
      statements that are made, and sometimes, when you are sitting
1667
      in a position, Chairman, that you sit in, your agency carries
1668
      a pretty big stick, and your statements can be devastating to
     people that are producing a product that depend on retail
1669
1670
      sales. Would you agree with that?
1671
          Mr. {Kaye.} Absolutely, and I think about that all the
1672
     time. There is a lot of thought that goes into what I say,
1673
     whether I end up saying something like that or not.
1674
          Mr. {Mullin.} Well, I am holding in my hand right here
     a story that was published by an Indianapolis news agency,
1675
1676
     and it says, ``If a consumer was to see a gas can at a retail
1677
     that contained a flame arrester, we would encourage them to
1678
      select such a model, as it provides a vital layer of fire
     protection.'' That was made by your agency. Are you
1679
1680
      familiar with that news story?
1681
          Mr. {Kaye.} I am.
1682
          Mr. {Mullin.} Do you agree with that statement?
1683
          Mr. {Kaye.} I don't understand enough about the
      technical aspects of flame arresters, I am sorry. That is
1684
      just not -- on gas cans. I can't comment one way or another.
1685
```

```
1686
          Mr. {Mullin.} Well--but your statements have an impact,
1687
      and a -- the flame arresters that we are talking about, they
      are only sold on commercial cans. They are not in retail
1688
1689
      stores. Are you familiar with that?
1690
           Mr. {Kaye.} No, I am not familiar with that. I don't
1691
     have any familiarity with gas cans, other than talking to our
1692
      staff, and knowing that the issue that you are talking
1693
     about--
1694
          Mr. {Mullin.} But someone on your staff made this
1695
      statement. And the reason why I say this is because, in my
1696
     district, I had a manufacturer that produced retail gas cans,
1697
     and your agency came out and made a statement referring to
1698
      retail gas cans, and--has nothing to do with retail gas cans.
1699
      They are only regulated by OSHA and the EPA with the flame
1700
      arresters. Once again, we are held accountable for what we
1701
      said, and your agency made a statement that could have
1702
     possibly cost real people their jobs. So does the CPSC
1703
      regulate commercial safety cans?
          Mr. {Kaye.} We do not, but the statement that you are
1704
1705
      talking about, I am not sure that it is inconsistent with the
1706
     position that our staff has taken in the voluntary standards
```

```
1707
     capacity.
1708
          Mr. {Mullin.} Well--okay. Well, then let us talk about
1709
      that. Are you aware that the commercial safety--a commercial
1710
      safety can with the flame arrester failed an ASTM protocol?
1711
          Mr. {Kaye.} I am not.
1712
          Mr. {Mullin.} But you made the statement. Your agency
1713
     made the statement encouraging people to go out and buy a gas
1714
     can from a retail store that doesn't even exist, and the
1715
     purpose of it is to keep children from being burned. But you
1716
     guys made a statement that failed that exact test, but yet
1717
     the consumer can does. It met those ASTM standards. You
1718
     don't see a problem with this?
1719
          Mr. {Kaye.} I see a problem with it if what you are
1720
      saying is 100 percent accurate, and I am not--
1721
          Mr. {Mullin.} Well, I am holding the news story.
           Mr. {Kaye.} No, I understand--
1722
1723
          Mr. {Mullin.} You guys sent the press release.
          Mr. {Kaye.} I am not doubting--
1724
1725
          Mr. {Mullin.} And this is coming from ASTM, their
1726
      testing protocol, that said it failed.
1727
          Mr. {Kaye.} I understand that, but what I am--my point
```

```
1728
     is that I am not familiar enough with the area that you are
1729
     talking about where I can give you the type of answer you are
1730
     looking for.
1731
          Mr. {Mullin.} Then how about we do this? Why don't you
1732
     get back with my office--
1733
          Mr. {Kaye.} Absolutely.
1734
          Mr. {Mullin.} --since you guys are making those
1735
      statements, and since they affect real jobs in my district?
1736
     Why don't you get back with me and give me that information
1737
     so you can be spun up to it, so the next time that your
1738
     agency opens its mouth and gives a statement like that, maybe
1739
      they are informed about what they are saying.
1740
          Mr. {Kaye.} Would you be willing to have a meeting with
1741
     my staff and me on it?
1742
          Mr. {Mullin.} Without question. We would--
1743
          Mr. {Kaye.} Okay.
          Mr. {Mullin.} --love to, because we would--
1744
1745
          Mr. {Kaye.} Okay.
1746
          Mr. {Mullin.} --like to get to the problem of this too,
1747
     because statements like that hurt real people.
```

Mr. {Kaye.} Excellent. So my hope is that you would be

1748

```
1749
     willing to come out to our testing center, where we have the
1750
     technical expertise, and we can walk through the gas cans,
1751
     and we can look at the issue together. Would you be willing
1752
     to do that?
1753
          Mr. {Mullin.} Absolutely I would.
1754
          Mr. {Kaye.} That would be great.
1755
          Mr. {Mullin.} But then we have got to come back and--if
1756
      I am going to be willing to do that--
1757
          Mr. {Kaye.} Yeah.
1758
          Mr. {Mullin.} --if what I am saying is accurate, I
     would like you guys to make another statement publicly--
1759
1760
          Mr. {Kaye.} You got it.
1761
          Mr. {Mullin.} --backing that up.
1762
          Mr. {Kaye.} Yeah. Let us get to the answers together,
1763
     and then we will figure out where we go from there. And you
     have my commitment that if it turns out that we said
1764
1765
      something that we both believe--
1766
           Mr. {Mullin.} Well, it is not if. I--the statement
1767
      says it, and you guys--
1768
           Mr. {Kaye.} No, the rest of it--
          Mr. {Mullin.} We checked it.
1769
```

1770 Mr. {Kaye.} If we said something that is not accurate, 1771 you have my commitment that I will say something that is 1772 accurate. I am not going to leave it to anybody else. I 1773 will say it. 1774 Mr. {Mullin.} Good enough. Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1775 Thank you. 1776 Mr. {Kaye.} You are welcome. 1777 Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentleman. The 1778 gentleman brings up an excellent point. Several years ago I 1779 actually took a field trip up to the CPSC testing facility, 1780 and it was a very illuminating day. My understanding is you are in new headquarters now, and I think the gentleman is 1781 quite right. A field trip of the Subcommittee out to the 1782 1783 CPSC would be both informative and instructive, and probably 1784 help the Commission, as well as the Subcommittee members, and 1785 we will see about putting that in the process. 1786 I would just also observe that I am, in addition to 1787 being Chairman of this Subcommittee, I am the Chairman of the 1788 House Motorcycle Caucus. I know that is kind of a 1789 disconnect, but I am. And going over to talk to that group 1790 one day after we passed the CPSIA here in the Subcommittee in

```
1791
     2007 or 2008, there was a young man, very young man, probably
1792
      12 or 13 years old, who stood up in front of the group and
1793
      said, Mr. Congressman, if you promise to give me my
1794
     motorcycle back, I promise I won't eat the battery anymore.
1795
     Apparently youth motorcycles had been--the sale had been
1796
     prohibited during the bill that we passed, and until those
1797
     technical corrections were enacted, it made it very, very
1798
     difficult for the people who sold youth motorcycles and their
1799
     parts. So we do have to be careful about the unintended
1800
     consequences.
           Seeing no other members--did you have a follow up
1801
1802
      question, Ms.--
1803
           Ms. {Schakowsky.} No.
1804
           Mr. {Burgess.} --Schakowsky? Seeing no further members
1805
     wishing to ask questions for this panel, I do want to thank
1806
     you all for being here today. This will conclude our first
1807
     panel, and we will take an underscore brief recess to set up
      for the second panel. And thank you all very much for your
1808
1809
     time today.
1810
           [Recess]
1811
          Mr. {Burgess.} The Subcommittee will come back to
```

1812 order, and I will thank everyone for their patience and 1813 taking time to be here today. We are ready to move into our 1814 second panel for today's hearing, and we will follow the same 1815 format as during the first panel. Each witness will be given 1816 5 minutes for an opening statement, followed by a round of 1817 questions from members. 1818 For our second panel, we have the following witnesses. 1819 Mr. Ronald Warfield--I have here Buck, is that correct? CEO 1820 of ATV/ROV/UTV Safety Consulting. Ms. Heidi Crow-Michael 1821 from Winnsboro, Texas. Thank you for being here today. Ms. 1822 Cheryl Falvey? Did I--Falvey, beg your pardon--co-Chair of 1823 the Advertising and Product Risk Management Group at Crowell, 1824 Moring, and Mr. Erik Pritchard, Executive Vice President and 1825 General Counsel for the Recreational Off Vehicle--Off-Highway 1826 Vehicle Association. We will begin our second panel with Mr. Warfield. You 1827 1828 are recognized for 5 minutes for the purpose of an opening 1829 statement, please.

```
1830
      ^STATEMENTS OF RONALD WARFIELD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
1831
     ATV/ROV/UTV SAFETY CONSULTING; HEIDI CROW-MICHAEL, WINNSBORO,
1832
     TEXAS; CHERYL FALVEY, CO-CHAIR, ADVERTISING AND PRODUCT RISK
1833
     MANAGEMENT, CROWELL & MORING, LLP; AND ERIK PRITCHARD,
1834
     EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL, RECREATIONAL
1835
     OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ASSOCIATION
1836
      ^STATEMENT OF RONALD WARFIELD
1837
          Mr. {Warfield.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking
     Members, and members of the Committee. Thank you for this
1838
     opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 999, the ROV In-
1839
1840
     Depth Examination, or the RIDE Act. My name is Buck
1841
     Warfield, and I have extensive experience in dealing with
1842
      safe and appropriate use of off-highway vehicles. First a
     bit of background. I was employed by the Maryland State
1843
1844
      Police as a police officer, or a trooper, for over 23 years,
1845
     and I retired in 1993. With regard to off-highway vehicle
1846
      experience, in 1985 I was trained and certified by the
1847
      Specialty Vehicle Institute of America, SVIA, as an ATV
```

1848 instructor. In 1989 I became an ATV Safety Institute, or 1849 ASI, licensed chief instructor, and I continued to be contracted by ASI to train, license, and monitor other ATV 1850 1851 instructor staff. 1852 With respect to recreational off-highway vehicles, known 1853 as ROVs, or side by sides, I have assisted several agencies, 1854 including military and government groups, in developing 1855 primary ROV training programs, and combining the Recreational 1856 Off-Highway Vehicle Association, or ROHVA, approved training 1857 program in December of 2010. I currently serve as chief ROV driver coach/trainer, and I have a training facility at my 1858 farm in Sikesville, Maryland which has been designated by 1859 1860 ROHVA as a driver/coach training center, and that is one of 1861 only three in the entire United States. On a personal note, 1862 I have logged over 900 hours as an operator of my personal ROV since 2006. I currently own two ROVs, utilized primarily 1863 1864 for ROV training, and two more utilized for daily facility 1865 maintenance at my training center and farm. 1866 I participated in the development of the ROV basic driver course curriculum, which is designated for current and 1867 prospective recreational off-highway vehicle drivers. 1868

1869 basic driver course is a training opportunity that provides 1870 current and experienced ROV drivers the chance to learn and 1871 practice basic skills and techniques. It addresses basic 1872 operation, and emphasizes safety awareness related to 1873 specific -- related specifically to ROV operation. The overall 1874 aim of the driver/coach course is to provide for drivers' 1875 development in the area of skill and risk management 1876 strategies. This includes learning to foster driver gains in 1877 basic knowledge, skill, attitude, values, and habits. 1878 I am here to support H.R. 999. The legislation would only pause the Consumer Product Safety Commissions ongoing 1879 1880 ROV rulemaking until the National Academy of Science, in 1881 cooperation with the Department of Defense, and the National 1882 Highway Traffic Safety Administration, perform a study of the 1883 vehicle handling and requirements proposed by CPSC. I do not claim to be an engineer, or to fully understand the complex 1884 1885 engineering issues, but I do understand that these are some 1886 basic disagreements on a select few issues between engineers 1887 at CPSC and the engineers who work for major manufacturers. 1888 I appreciate the CPSC is well intended. I also know that the manufacturers develop safe, capable vehicles for me, my 1889

1890 family, my friends, and the students that I train to use--1891 with power sport vehicles, including training countless people who have no prior experience with ATVs or ROVs show me 1892 1893 that these vehicles are safe, with amazing capabilities when 1894 operated as intended. 1895 H.R. 999 is a narrowly tarrowed--tailored--is narrowly 1896 tailored to examine, first of all, the technical validity of 1897 CPSC's proposed lateral stability and vehicle handling 1898 requirements. Also, the number of ROV rollovers that would 1899 be prevented if the rule were adopted, and whether there is a 1900 technical basis for the proposal to provide information on a 1901 point of sale hang tag about a vehicle's rollover resistance 1902 on a progressive scale. And, lastly, the effects on the 1903 utility of ROVs used by the U.S. military if the rule were 1904 adopted. 1905 So, in conclusion, I think the best way to--forward 1906 would be for the industry and CPSC to work together to find a 1907 voluntary solution that works for all the parties, and 1908 protects the safety of ROV drivers and passengers. Barring a 1909 cooperative solution, the best and safest way forward is for 1910 independent third party experts to make sure that we get it

1914 Mr. {Burgess.} Gentleman yields back, the Chair thanks
1915 the gentleman. Ms. Crow-Michael, you are recognized for 5
1916 minutes for the purpose of an opening statement, please.

```
1917
     ^STATEMENT OF HEIDI CROW-MICHAEL
1918
          Ms. {Crow-Michael.} Thank you. My name is Heidi Crow-
1919
     Michael, and I would like to thank you all for allowing me to
1920
      speak today on behalf of my son, J.T. Crow.
1921
           I play many roles in life. I am a homemaker, and an
1922
      advocate, but most importantly a mother to five children.
1923
     J.T. Crow is my second child, and firstborn son. He was a
1924
     happy and extraordinary 9-year-old boy. At school he was a
1925
     straight A student with perfect attendance. He loved
      science, and learning about birds and butterflies. J.T. also
1926
1927
      loved being outside and playing sports like soccer and
1928
      football.
1929
           J.T.'s life was cut short when he went for a ride in a
1930
      2007 Yamaha Rhino 450. While riding at a slow speed around a
1931
      slight curve, the ROV suddenly and inexplicably rolled over.
1932
      Through J.T. was wearing a safety belt, he was thrown from
1933
      the Rhino ROV, and then crushed by the half ton vehicle as it
1934
      rolled over. Paramedics rushed J.T. to the emergency room,
     but he had sustained more injuries than his young body could
1935
```

handle. My son died that day, when he was 9 years old, and 1936 1937 my life was forever changed. On a daily basis I live with 1938 the pain of the tragedy that struck my family, and the fear 1939 of knowing that it could happen to other families. This fear 1940 has led me to become an advocate for ROV safety and industry 1941 reform. I have been given the opportunity to use my son's 1942 life to make a difference, a difference that can save lives. 1943 As we sit here this morning, the ROV industry is one 1944 that sets its own safety standards and makes its own rules, 1945 and innocent people are paying the price. I am not against 1946 ROVs. I just want safe ROVs. Many consumers buy ROVs because they have four wheels, and sometimes seat belts, roll 1947 1948 bars and roofs, and they look safer than ATVs, but ROVs are 1949 not safe. And it has been many years, and every year, every 1950 day that there is not a better solution implemented for ROV 1951 safety is a day that more people, more children, our 1952 children, are put at risk. When we wrote the Citizens' Report on Utility Trained 1953 1954 Vehicle Hazards and Urgent Need to Improve Safety and 1955 Performance Standards in February of 2009, asking for safety and performance standards, including minimum occupant 1956

1957 containment stability and seat belt standards, we were 1958 hopeful our recommendations for safer ROVs would become 1959 standard. We asked for action. Nothing happened. An 1960 already unacceptably high casualty rate will continue unless 1961 action is taken. 1962 In 2014 ROV use resulted in at least 61 deaths, and 1963 eight more in 2015. While less stringent than the 1964 recommended safety measures in the Citizens' Report, the CPSC 1965 has proposed standards that would significantly improve ROV 1966 safety. If the ROV industry really wants to protect their consumers, why wouldn't they want to make the safest product 1967 1968 possible? Why wouldn't they want to do all they could do to 1969 protect the people who purchase their vehicles? I have been 1970 given the opportunity to speak to many families, and we all 1971 share a common bond. We have lost someone we love in an ROV 1972 rollover accident. Perhaps the most painful part of my role 1973 as an advocate for this cause is hearing the heart wrenching 1974 stories from those families. 1975 I know I am not alone in asking this Committee to allow 1976 the CPSC to move forward with its rulemaking to issue ROV 1977 safety standards and stop the senseless death of our loved

ones. In my journey over the last 8 years, I have collected 1978 the names and stories of those who shared a fate similar to 1979 J.T.'s, and it is for them that I speak today. For Ellie 1980 1981 Sand, age 10, Kristin Lake, 11, Dusty Lockabey, 14, Ashlyn 1982 Vargas, 12, Dani Bernard, 18, Stephanie Katin, 26, Whitney 1983 Bland, 13, Sydney Anderson, 10, and Abbey West, age 13. 1984 Our stories do not begin and end on the day our loved 1985 ones were killed or injured. The battle is ongoing for all 1986 of us. We will miss soccer games, dance recitals, 1987 graduations, birthdays, weddings, and holiday celebrations. 1988 We will live with the consequences forever. Today you have 1989 the opportunity, and I think the obligation, to help me honor 1990 these young lives, their families, and the life of my son, 1991 J.T. Crow, but it is more than that. You have an opportunity 1992 to become a part of their story, the part that offers hope 1993 for the future by bringing about change. Our request is simply common sense. It is unimaginable that anyone would 1994 1995 feel differently. If you don't do something about it, can 1996 you live with yourself? 1997 Delay is a problem. Delay puts our children at risk. It has been too many years and too many tragedies already. 1998

2003 Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentlelady, gentlelady
2004 yields back. Ms. Falvey, you are recognized. 5 minutes for
2005 opening statement, please.

Ms. {Falvey.} Thank you, Chairman Burgess, Ranking

STATEMENT OF CHERYL FALVEY

2006

2007

Member Schakowsky, distinguished members. Thank you for 2008 2009 providing the opportunity to discuss the statutory framework 2010 that the Consumer Product Safety Commission will use to 2011 address the kind of risk we have just heard about. I have 2012 served as the General Counsel of the Consumer Products Safety 2013 Commission from 2008 to 2012, during the implementation of 2014 both the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act, as 2015 well as the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act. Both of 2016 those statutes made voluntary standards mandatory. I have 2017 been asked to discuss the way the CPSC statutes interrelate 2018 to the voluntary standards process to inform the Committee's 2019 consideration of H.R. 999. 2020 My oral remarks will focus on three important aspects of 2021 the interrelationship between the voluntary standards process 2022 and mandatory law. First, safety standards developed by the 2023 CPSC require time and effort to develop in order to meet the statutory requirements. It is not easy. Section 7 of the 2024

CPSA provides the CPSC with the authority to promulgate rules

2025

2026 that set forth performance standards and require warnings and 2027 instructions, but only when the CPSC finds such a standard 2028 reasonably necessary to prevent or reduce an unreasonable 2029 risk of injury, and that the benefits of such regulation bear 2030 reasonable relationship to the costs of the regulation. The 2031 Commission must consider and make appropriate findings on a 2032 variety of issues, including the degree and nature of the 2033 risk, along with the utility of the product, and the costs 2034 and means to achieve the objective. 2035 To issue a final rule, the Commission must find that the 2036 rule is necessary to reasonably eliminate or reduce the 2037 unreasonable risk of injury, and that issuing that rule is in 2038 the public interest. Must also find that the rule imposes the least burdensome requirement that would adequately reduce 2039 the risk of injury. Congress recognized just how difficult 2040 it is for CPSC to do that when it enacted the CPSIA, and made 2041 2042 it easier to make voluntary standards mandatory law in the 2043 Danny Keysar Child Safety Notification Act, due in part to 2044 resolute efforts by Ranking Member Schakowsky, which streamlined the process of making voluntary standards 2045

2046 mandatory law.

2047 Second, the CPSC statute favors voluntary standards when they eliminate the risk of injury, and are complied with by 2048 2049 manufacturers. If a voluntary standard addressing the same 2050 risk of injury is adopted and implemented, the Commission cannot proceed with a final rule unless it finds that the 2051 2052 voluntary standard is not likely to eliminate the risk of 2053 injury, and that -- and/or that it is unlikely that there will 2054 be substantial compliance with the voluntary standard. These 2055 can be very difficult findings for the Commission to make. As a data driven agency, the CPSC staff has to look for hard 2056 2057 science to demonstrate the intended safety benefits of both 2058 its standards and consensus driven voluntary standards, but 2059 the CPSC must still attempt to extrapolate from current data 2060 the likely future effects of its proposed rulemaking. 2061 The legislative history of the CPSA sets a high bar, 2062 directing the CPSC to consider whether the voluntary standard 2063 will reduce to a sufficient extent, such that there will no 2064 longer exist an unreasonable risk of injury. Predicting that 2065 there is an unreasonable risk in certain circumstances is easy. It can be extremely difficult when you are dealing 2066

2067 with the highly technical issues of vehicle rollover. And 2068 that is why it takes staff time to develop the rulemaking 2069 packages, and why it is over 500 pages long. Determining 2070 whether there is substantial compliance is also a challenge 2071 when so many products come into the country now from 2072 overseas. The legislative history of the CPSC--CPSA directs 2073 that the Commission look at the number of complying products, 2074 rather than the number of complying manufacturers, and those 2075 products are coming in from all over the world. 2076 Third, and finally, the challenges of making voluntary standards mandatory law is one of the most important lessons 2077 2078 we learned in both CPSIA and the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool 2079 and Spa Safety Act. These voluntary standards are iterative. 2080 They evolved over years. And unless we know that the test 2081 methods can be replicated and are reliable, making them law 2082 prematurely can be very dangerous. 2083 [The prepared statement of Ms. Falvey follows:] 2084 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT G \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

```
2085 Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentlelady. Chair 2086 recognizes Mr. Pritchard. Five minutes for an opening 2087 statement, please.
```

2088 ^STATEMENT OF ERIK PRITCHARD 2089 Mr. {Pritchard.} Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, and members of the Committee. Thank you for this 2090 2091 opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 999, the ROV In-2092 Depth Examination, or RIDE Act. My name is Erik Pritchard. 2093 I am the Executive Vice President and General Counsel of the 2094 Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Association, known as ROHVA. 2095 ROHVA is a not-for-profit trade association sponsored by Arctic Cat, BRP, Honda, John Deere, Kawasaki, Polaris, 2096 2097 Textron, and Yamaha. ROHVA was formed to promote the safe 2098 and responsible use of recreational off-highway vehicles, 2099 called ROVs, or side-by-sides, in North America. 2100 Between 2011 and 2014 alone, ROV sales are 2101 conservatively estimated to total more than 750,000 in the 2102 U.S. These popular off-highway vehicles are used safely by 2103 families, emergency personnel, and the U.S. military in a 2104 variety of environments ranging from mud, to sand, to forest, 2105 to trails. This is a high growth industry, and a bright spot

in the U.S. manufacturing economy. ROHVA is accredited by

2106

2107 the American National Standards Institute to develop 2108 standards for ROVs, and has worked with numerous stakeholders 2109 for years to develop those standards, commencing in 2008, and 2110 culminating in voluntary standards approved in 2010, 2011, 2111 and most recently in September 2014. The CPSC has been 2112 involved throughout that process. 2113 The newest ROV voluntary standard includes a new dynamic 2114 stability and handling test and requirement, as well as new 2115 alternative seat belt reminders that were proposed by the 2116 CPSC staff, and driver side speed limiting seat belt 2117 interlocks found in over 60 percent of the 2015 model year ROVs. Nonetheless, and essentially simultaneously with the 2118 2119 approval of the new voluntary standard, the CPSC voted out 2120 the pending notice of proposed rulemaking regarding ROVs. 2121 The NPR largely ignores the new voluntary standard. Instead, the CPSC staff analyzed the prior 2011 version of the 2122 voluntary standard, and based it on testing of vehicles from 2123 2124 model year 2010. 2125 In a supplemental briefing submitted 3 weeks after the voluntary standard was approved, the CPSC staff summarily 2126 rejected the new standard because it did not match the 2127

2128 rulemaking. The CPSC's proposals are not supported by 2129 science or real world application. One area of concern is 2130 the CPSC's application of on road vehicle dynamics to 2131 vehicles used in rugged off-highway environments. Meanwhile, 2132 the CPSC actually continues to conduct testing in support of 2133 the NPR it has already voted out. 2134 While our review of the CPSC's data underlying the 2135 rulemaking is not yet complete, I can share a couple initial 2136 observations with you. According to the CPSC's data, where 2137 seat belt use is known, approximately 90 percent of riders 2138 suffering fatalities did not wear the seat belts that are provided in every ROV. Next, approximately 60 percent of the 2139 2140 severe injury rolled sideways incidents in the data were 2141 reported by a Plaintiff's law firm. This is a representative 2142 example of the reporting relied on by the CPSC. A 46-yearold man was injured by the tip over of an ROV, whose unpadded 2143 2144 roll cage crushed his foot on June 16, 2006. While it has 2145 been a year since his accident, foot is still swollen, he 2146 finds it extremely difficult to walk, and is in considerable 2147 pain, end.

117

Putting aside the bias of a Plaintiff's lawyers

2148

2149 reporting, this is not a scientifically sound approach to 2150 gathering data. It tells us nothing about how or why the 2151 alleged tip over occurred, and it is not possible to draw any 2152 statistical conclusions based on this limited information. 2153 These vehicles are significantly more complex than other 2154 products under the CPSC's jurisdiction. The ROV 2155 manufacturers and engineers have serious safety concerns 2156 about the effects of the CPSC's proposals. The RIDE Act will 2157 help resolve these matters by having these proposals examined 2158 by an independent agency, such as the National Academy of 2159 Sciences. This common sense approach, resolving technical issues 2160 2161 before considering implementation, should be supported by 2162 everyone. Some, however, have attempted to characterize the 2163 RIDE Act as further delay in a long process. The record, 2164 however, does not support that criticism. The voluntary 2165 standard has been updated as technology has evolved. The 2166 fact that the CPSC spent years drafting a proposed rule based 2167 on vehicles from 2010 cannot be evidence that the rule should 2168 be pursued, nor is the quantity of pages in the briefing package relevant to their quality. And the NPR comment 2169

```
2170
     period has been extended only because the CPSC failed, until
2171
      recently, to turn over the documents and data underlying the
2172
      rulemaking.
2173
           This morning an ROV industry group is meeting with CPSC
2174
      staff to discuss voluntary standards. ROHVA members went
2175
     with--met with the CPSC on May 5. The effort to establish a
2176
     mutually agreeable voluntary standard is the best approach, a
2177
     view, that I understand, is shared by the CPSC in light of
2178
      this morning. But in the meantime, the NPR remains pending.
2179
      It would be a mistake to proceed to a mandatory rule without
2180
      first conducting the testing contemplated by the RIDE Act.
2181
      It is imperative that we get this right for the families,
2182
      emergency personnel, and the military who use these vehicles
2183
      in a variety of off-highway terrains and conditions. Thank
2184
      you for your time.
2185
           [The prepared statement of Mr. Pritchard follows:]
2186
      ********** INSERT H ********
```

2187 Mr. {Burgess.} The Chair thanks the gentleman, 2188 gentleman yields back. The Chair is prepared to recognize 2189 Ms. Schakowsky. Five minutes for your questions, please. 2190 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have 2191 to begin by saying, as a consumer advocate pretty much all of 2192 my adult life, I have been around these conversations for a 2193 very long time, and, frankly, I think this panel is 2194 reflective of what happens to consumers, three to one, on not 2195 doing these kinds of mandatory standards. 2196 You know, one example -- I have been working on this rear 2197 visibility, and the number of children who are killed in--2198 when--often their parent or grandparent drives their car over 2199 backwards on them. We had one in Chicago recently. And now we are going to have, by 2018, mandatory in every car there 2200 is going to be a camera. That bill was passed in 2008, and 2201 2202 an average of two children die every week. Well, heck, that 2203 is not that many kids. 355 deaths from these vehicles since-2204 -between 2003 and 2013. And thank you, Ms. Crow-Michael, for 2205 reading some of those names, and bringing it home to us. And thank you for your courageous testimony today. 2206

2207 I would like to hear from the industry, instead of why it all ought to be voluntary--because you said 15--I quess 2208 2209 that is under the voluntary standards. 15 people have died 2210 this year, is that right, already? Isn't that--200 and--2211 2015? 2212 Ms. {Crow-Michael.} Yes, correct. 2213 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Yeah. So that is under voluntary 2214 standards, I take it. Well, maybe cost/benefit doesn't make 2215 that worthwhile to have mandatory standards. I disagree. 2216 And I think that, while you want to get it right, absolutely, 2217 I am sick of hearing, the fault is the trial lawyers, the fault is the user who doesn't put on the seat belt. And if 2218 2219 we can do something to save another life, and I am with you, 2220 then we need to have mandatory standards. 2221 So I am wondering if you had any feeling that you had 2222 any reason not to trust the vehicle that your son was using 2223 when you looked at that. 2224 Ms. {Crow-Michael.} In the beginning, I really feel 2225 like the vehicles give a perception of safety, but ROVs are 2226 not safe. And the fact that so many children have lost their 2227 lives has proven that, time and time again.

```
2228
          Ms. {Schakowsky.} And when your son was bucked into the
2229
     vehicle, did you trust that the seat belt would keep him from
2230
     being thrown from the vehicle, just like it would in a car?
2231
          Ms. {Crow-Michael.} Of course. We think the products
2232
      that we buy are safe.
2233
          Ms. {Schakowsky.} Did the vehicle your son was riding
2234
      look like the kind of vehicle that would lead to more than
2235
      300 deaths? Or I guess you already said the vehicle--
2236
          Ms. {Crow-Michael.} Absolutely not.
2237
          Ms. {Schakowsky.} Proponents of the CPSC rule, an
     activist like yourself, had said that the type of everyday
2238
2239
     use of the ROVs that lead to rollover deaths is not
2240
     necessarily obvious to riders, particularly children. Do you
2241
     agree?
2242
          Ms. {Crow-Michael.} I agree.
2243
           Ms. {Schakowsky.} And based on your work advocating on
     behalf of other victims of ROV accidents, do you believe that
2244
2245
      children are particularly vulnerable?
          Ms. {Crow-Michael.} I do, and I believe waiting for
2246
2247
     more data is waiting for more deaths.
```

Ms. {Schakowsky.} So what I would like to see is,

2248

2249 rather than saying we have to have perhaps years more of 2250 study, and years more of death, that the industry work with 2251 the advocates, and with the CPSC, and with their 2252 investigators, to--if you don't think the rule--the mandatory 2253 rule is proper, then figure out what a mandatory rule ought 2254 to look like. Didn't you say, Ms. Falvey, that there are 2255 imports, et cetera, and that, you know, we need to look at 2256 all of those? 2257 Ms. {Falvey.} The way the statute would work, the 2258 Commission would need to know that there is substantial compliance before they relied upon a voluntary standard. Or 2259 they could just decide, we don't have confidence in these 2260 2261 foreign manufacturers, and that they will be compliant, and 2262 move forward with their final rule. 2263 Ms. {Schakowsky.} So why don't we have a mandatory standard that would apply to all, including imports? I mean, 2264 2265 I just feel so strongly that when we have an opportunity to 2266 do something that is going to save a life, and I know that 2267 there are complicated mathematics that figures out money 2268 spent, is it worth a life? I don't really abide by that, and 2269 it seems to me that 335 is enough, I think your son is

- 2270 enough, that we ought to move ahead. I support moving ahead 2271 as quickly as possible with the mandatory standards, and I 2272 yield back. 2273 Mr. (Burgess.) The Chair thanks the gentlelady, gentlelady yields back. I will recognize myself, 5 minutes 2274 2275 for questions. 2276 Ms. Falvey, let me just, first off, say thank you for 2277 your work on the Virginia Graeme Baker pool standards. I was 2278 on the Subcommittee when that bill went through, and actually 2279 added the language for ornamental pools because, as you may recall, we lost a number of people at a Fort Worth water 2280 2281 garden just shortly before that came through, which 2282 underscored to me the necessity of including ornamental pools, as well as backyard pools. But when you were doing 2283 2284 the drain cover recall, did you go from a voluntary standard 2285 to a mandatory standard during that process? 2286 Ms. {Falvey.} Yes, we did. 2287 Mr. {Burgess.} And what were the advantages, or perhaps 2288 the disadvantages, in moving from the voluntary to the 2289 mandatory standard?
  - 124

Ms. {Falvey.} The advantage is always safety and

2290

- 2291 stopping death. You are always tempted to move as quickly as 2292 possible in order to address an addressable risk. 2293 disadvantage in that circumstance is--2294 Mr. {Burgess.} Let me just interrupt you there for a second, if I could, because -- which is the more expeditious 2295 2296 path, the voluntary or the mandatory? 2297 Ms. {Falvey.} It depends, but it can be more 2298 expeditious to rely on the voluntary standard. You get 2299 industry and the CPSC staff working together on a standard 2300 that everyone can agree on. 2301 The problem with doing it too quickly, and mandating it 2302 as law when it is not quite ready to be law is that, in that 2303 case, we didn't make things safer fast enough, in that the 2304 drain covers were tested by different labs in different ways. 2305 We didn't know that the test results--exactly how to do the tests at the lab level, and there were different labs passing 2306 different drain covers, and we ended up with pools with brand 2307 2308 new drain covers installed that weren't compliant. And we 2309 had to recall those, pull them out, and put them in, properly 2310 tested.
- 2311 That works well in the voluntary world, where things can

2312 be iterative and change over time. When you make it 2313 mandatory law, it changes the equation. And so while it is 2314 helpful, from a safety perspective, to move as quickly as 2315 possible, and that is always the CPSC's goal, if you don't do 2316 it right, it can cost an enormous amount of money, and it 2317 doesn't save lives. And that is what we want to try to 2318 avoid. 2319 Mr. {Burgess.} Very well. Now, we--Mr. Pritchard, I 2320 quess I should ask this question of you. The list that Ms. 2321 Crow-Michael read is impressive, but it is also impressive because of the young age of so many of the people who were--2322 2323 who met their demise. Is there--do you placard these 2324 machines with an age restriction, or a recommendation for 2325 training under certain ages? 2326 Mr. {Pritchard.} We do. The industry's recommendation is that, in order to drive an ROV, you need to be at least 16 2327 2328 years of age, and have a valid driver's license. These are 2329 not toys. These are not meant to be driven by children. 2330 This is on the machines, it is part of the free online 2331 training that is available to everyone. It is certainly part of the hands-on training that is available. Children don't 2332

```
2333
     belong behind the wheel of these vehicles.
2334
           We have covered a lot of ground here in sort of very
2335
      short form. One thing I do want to clarify is that, when we
2336
     talk about a voluntary standard, and the requirements under
2337
      the voluntary standard, that is enforceable. That is
2338
      enforceable by the CPSC. It is not voluntary in the sense of
2339
     an opt-in and opt-out. It is the standard. And that is how
2340
      the approximately 14 to 15,000 other products that are under
2341
      the jurisdiction of the CPSC are handled. I mean, you could-
2342
      -you can imagine the CPSC trying to write 15,000 different
2343
      standards for every product out there. So the voluntary
2344
      standard is enforceable.
2345
          Mr. {Burgess.} Yeah. Let me just interrupt you for a
     minute, because I am going to run out of time, and I want to
2346
2347
     be respectful of the other members.
2348
           Now, Ms. Crow-Michael, on your--I think it is a Facebook
2349
     page that is set up to the memory of your son, there is a
2350
      list of I quess safety measures, for want of a better term.
2351
     One mentions the age, another mentions a helmet. I mean,
2352
      these are things that your organization recommends?
          Ms. {Crow-Michael.} First off, I don't have an
2353
```

2354 organization, per se. But if we are talking about the fact 2355 that children shouldn't be on them, then we would have to--I 2356 would have to say, what about Karen Harwood, 46, or Andrea 2357 Jones, who is 34? 2358 Mr. {Burgess.} And that is an excellent point, and I 2359 was going to ask Mr. Warfield, is there--you have studied 2360 this for a long time. 2361 Mr. {Warfield.} Yes. 2362 Mr. {Burgess.} Does, you know, the age placarding may 2363 be one thing, but does there--I want to say this as nicely as I can, but does body mass make a difference? That is, the 2364 2365 lighter the driver--because most of the people older the--2366 than age 16 that are--that Ms. Crow-Michael mentioned on her 2367 list, most of those were women, so presumably of lighter body 2368 weight. Does that make a difference? Is that something that 2369 you have studied? 2370 Mr. {Warfield.} Not the weight itself, sir. What I see 2371 time and time again with these machines, it is operator 2372 error. It has almost nothing to do with the design of the 2373 vehicle. Please let me carry it one step further here. I have been operating these machines since 1985. I currently 2374

have 13 ATVs. I have four ROVs. I have a brand new one 2375 2376 coming in today. I am on those ROVs every day, either 2377 maintenance or through training. I have never rolled an ROV 2378 over. I have never rolled an ATV over. I have operated 2379 these machines in every state in the United States, including 2380 Alaska and Hawaii, except for North Dakota. I don't know why 2381 I missed that on North Dakota. 2382 But what I am getting at is I put these machines through 2383 their paces, through training, through an advocate of riding. 2384 I wear a helmet, I make sure the proper age person is operating the machine. I follow the guidelines. So what I 2385 2386 am saying is, I have trusted this industry. I have trusted 2387 this industry that they have shown me--they have given me and my family a vehicle that is safe to operate. I am really 2388 2389 concerned that now CPSC is saying, wait a minute, there is 2390 something wrong here. 2391 And to answer your question, what--why wait? I have 2392 been operating a machine that was perfectly capable of doing everything I wanted. If we are going to make a change, let 2393 2394 us make sure that change is not a negative change. Mr. {Burgess.} All right. I am going to ask you to 2395

2396 hold that thought, and the Chair will recognize Ms. Clarke. 2397 Five minutes for questions, please. 2398 Ms. {Clarke.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the 2399 Ranking Member, and I thank our witnesses for their testimony 2400 here today. It has been more than a half a decade since the 2401 Consumer Product Safety Commission issued the advance notice 2402 of proposed rulemaking in 2009. Since then, CPSC has 2403 conducted thorough research to determine the appropriate mandatory standards for ROVs. CPSC staff reviewed more than 2404 2405 550 ROV related incidents, 335 of which resulted in the death of the driver, or passenger, or both. Each incident was 2406 reviewed by a multi-disciplinary team, included--including an 2407 2408 economist, human factors engineer, a health scientist, and a 2409 statistician. The Commission also worked with FEA Limited, a 2410 CPSC contractor, to create a ROV rollover simulator from 2411 scratch. In addition to the agency's own data collection, 2412 this year the CPSC also held a 7 hour public meeting, in 2413 which the Commission heard testimony from, and asked questions of witnesses both for and against the proposal. By 2414 2415 any traditional measure, internal research, hypothetical simulation, incident review, and public input, the Commission 2416

2417 has conducted a thorough investigation and has more than 2418 enough information to issue appropriate standards. 2419 Ms. Crow-Michael, your son was not the only person 2420 affected by weak safety standards that allowed Yamaha to 2421 continue selling defective versions of the Rhino ROV. In 2422 2009 the Consumer Product Safety Commission estimated that 59 2423 people were killed riding the Rhino. In fact, the Rhino 2424 incident--accident epidemic was one of the primary drivers of 2425 the Commission's original rulemaking. But H.R. 999 would 2426 force the CPSC to contract with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct further research before implementing 2427 2428 these reasonable and thoroughly tested standards. So my 2429 question to you, Ms. Crow-Michael, is do you think more data 2430 is needed to determine the ROVs that are currently on the 2431 market are unsafe? Ms. {Crow-Michael.} CPSC, I think they have worked hard 2432 to get the data that they have. They have spent money to 2433 2434 gather and understand that data. More delay puts and all people at serious risk of injurly [sic] -- injury or death, I 2435 2436 am sorry. But I don't think more data is needed. I think it has been enough time, and I--and, like I said before, waiting 2437

2438 for more data is waiting for more death. 2439 Ms. {Clarke.} Then let me just follow up with that 2440 question. You have suffered an unspeakable loss because of 2441 an unsafe ROV. Do you think that the CPSC is rushing to 2442 judgment in proposing standards for a recreational activity responsible for more than 330 deaths in the last decade? 2443 2444 Ms. {Crow-Michael.} No. 2445 Ms. {Clarke.} I thank you. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 2446 the balance of my time. 2447 Mr. {Burgess.} Chair thanks the gentlelady, gentlelady yields back. Chair recognize the gentleman from Kentucky. 5 2448 2449 minutes for questions, please. 2450 Mr. {Guthrie.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for being here to testify today. I have a question for 2451 2452 Mr. Pritchard. I notice in your testimony you mention that the ROHVA is accredited by the American National Standards 2453 2454 Institute to develop standards for the equipment, 2455 configuration, and performance of ROVs. Can you tell us more 2456 about this process, and how voluntary safety standards have 2457 been developed over the last few years, and does this process involve the CPC? I know you touched on it a little bit, but 2458

2459 how that process of voluntary standards that are mandated, 2460 and is the CPSC involved? Mr. {Pritchard.} Absolutely, and cut me off when you 2461 get tired of listening, because I could talk about this all 2462 day. ROHVA was formed in 2007. The work on a voluntary 2463 2464 standard began in 2008, so essentially almost immediately. 2465 In 2010 a voluntary standard was developed and published, 2466 then another version in 2011, and another version in 2014 2467 reflecting the evolving technology. 2468 The way the process works is you get the process started through a procedure mandated by--it is ANSI [ph], that is the 2469 2470 acronym, for this process. You put out a proposed draft 2471 standard to the canvas, and the canvas is made of a variety 2472 of stakeholders, and the stakeholders include -- in every 2473 iteration has included the CPSC. It has included consumer 2474 groups. It has included industry. It has included user groups. It is a broad swath. And the way this works is 2475 2476 people get the draft, the canvasees comment, and submit their 2477 comments back in. The comments are shared with everyone on 2478 the canvas, then ROHVA responds to those comments. Each one has to say, your suggestion for this area, say seat belts, 2479

```
2480
     here is our response.
2481
           Then the canvas gets all of those comments from ROHVA
2482
     back to the canvasee, so everyone gets to see this full
2483
      exchange of information, and then a consensus is built around
2484
      the voluntary standard. It is then sent to ANSI, here is how
2485
     we did it, and ANSI checks that process and verifies that you
2486
      followed the ANSI procedure. When ANSI approves it, then it
2487
     becomes official, and ultimately a book, for lack of a better
2488
     word, is published, and that becomes the standard by which
2489
     all of the vehicles subject to that voluntary standard must
2490
     conform.
          Mr. {Guthrie.} So then it becomes mandatory?
2491
          Mr. {Pritchard.} It is voluntary--
2492
2493
           Mr. {Guthrie.} So what is the difference between
2494
     mandatory and voluntary, then?
           Mr. {Pritchard.} Sure. It is voluntary in the sense
2495
      of--it is developed by stakeholders, but it is enforceable.
2496
2497
     Mandatory means the CPSC imposes what it thinks is the best
2498
     approach. And where we are now is at an impasse between a
2499
     voluntary standard that is brand new, that just came out in
      September 2014, and a mandatory standard, or at least a
2500
```

2501 proposal for a mandatory standard, based on the old standard, 2502 but a mandatory standard proposed by the CPSC. And the 2503 engineers and industry just think CPSC has got this wrong. 2504 Mr. {Guthrie.} Well, was the voluntary standard better? What--was it more likely to protect life than the mandatory 2505 2506 standard? Mr. {Pritchard.} So--2507 2508 Mr. {Guthrie.} What are the critical differences, and 2509 why is yours more--better? 2510 Mr. {Pritchard.} So there are three--what I call three 2511 fundamental differences between the two. One is on vehicle 2512 handling. The CPSC wants to impose something called an 2513 understeer mandate. Every vehicle must understeer, and I can 2514 tell you about that. The next is testing lateral stability. The CPSC's test for lateral stability, frankly, suffers from 2515 2516 problems with repeatability and reproducibility, which the CPSC is conducting testing to address right now. The final 2517 2518 piece is seat belts. CPSC has proposed a seat belt interlock 2519 which would essentially prevent the vehicle from moving above 2520 15 miles an hour if the seat belts aren't moved in both the 2521 driver and the passenger seat.

2522 Now, in the driver seat, there is actually a lot of 2523 agreement, and the voluntary standard includes that as an approach. The dispute really is over the passenger seat. 2524 2525 CPSC commissioned a study of the passenger seat interlock. 2526 They just got the results I think in February. They 2527 published them in March. So they got these after the 2528 voluntary standard was voted out. And the study confirmed 2529 what industry had been telling--that we have heard from our 2530 own consumers, which is no one wants this passenger side seat 2531 belt interlock because drivers don't want to lose control of their vehicle. You add on top of that the technical 2532 challenges, which would be if you put your dog in the seat, 2533 2534 your toolbox in the seat--this is an area for which there is 2535 no answer. 2536 And the final wrinkle on this is that even on the driver's side seat belt interlock, you--it doesn't work with 2537 a diesel or carbureted engine, because it has to be talking 2538 with a computer. Computer has to talk from the seat belt 2539 2540 through the speed limited to tell it that we have a 2541 connection here. So that is one small example of what is a, frankly, complex area. And the CPSC's engineers, while I 2542

2543 believe well intentioned, don't have this right. 2544 And I want to add, we didn't get -- we went through this voluntary standard process last year, which I didn't think 2545 2546 the CPSC was very engaged in. A better way to put that, 2547 though, is that they seem to be much more engaged with 2548 industry now. And there is a meeting taking place right now 2549 between industry and CPSC staff to discuss the voluntary 2550 standards. That is the path forward. 2551 Mr. {Guthrie.} Thank you. And, before I yield back, if 2552 I could ask--I want to say, Ms. Crow-Michael, thank you for 2553 coming. Your advocacy is very important, and thoughts and 2554 prayers are with you. But thank you for taking this cause, 2555 and hopefully we can come to the right standard and do the right -- and have the right thing as a result. Thank you. 2556 2557 Mr. {Burgess.} Gentleman yields back. The Chair thanks 2558 the gentleman. Chair recognizes Ms. Schakowsky for the 2559 purpose of a unanimous consent request. 2560 Ms. {Schakowsky.} I would like to put on the record 2561 statement of G.K. Butterfield, opening statement of--the 2562 statement of John Sand, father of an ROV victim, letters from the American Academy of Pediatrics, letter from various 2563

```
consumer groups, testimony of Rachel Weintraub of the

Consumer Federation of America before the CPSC, Citizens'

Report that Ms. Crow-Michael referred to in her testimony.

We will add that to the permanent record.

Mr. {Burgess.} Without objection, so ordered.

The information follows:]
```

```
2571
           Mr. {Burgess.} Chair would just note I offered Ms.
2572
      Schakowsky a follow-up question. She declined. I did have
2573
      one follow up question that I wanted to ask.
2574
           Ms. Crow-Michael, your son was injured on the Yamaha
2575
     Rhino 450. Just ask the question of anyone on the panel, is
2576
      that particular model still available? Is that something
2577
      that is still sold on the market?
2578
           Mr. {Pritchard.} I can address it.
2579
          Mr. {Burgess.} Please.
2580
           Mr. {Pritchard.} That vehicle is not sold. In fact, it
      is--you are talking about a vehicle from 2007, if I recall
2581
      your testimony correctly. We are now three voluntary
2582
2583
      standards past that, so the technology has evolved beyond
2584
      that. I can add, there are tens of thousands of those Rhinos
2585
      still in use that people enjoy, at this point have probably
2586
     put on hundreds of thousands, if not more, hours of use.
2587
     But, no, we are--the technology for these vehicles has
2588
      evolved, and we are now in a new standard.
2589
           Mr. {Burgess.} But you could still buy one on
      Craigslist?
2590
```

2591 Mr. {Pritchard.} Yeah, I would guess. 2592 Mr. {Burgess.} Yeah. So it is going to be an informational challenge to get information to people who may 2593 be new purchasers of old machines. 2594 2595 Mr. {Pritchard.} But those vehicles--and--respectfully, 2596 are not defective, period. I think that this--that this--I 2597 think these incidents are more complicated than what we have 2598 heard today. I don't think that is the focus of today. I 2599 think the focus of today is, can we get this right between 2600 industry and the CPSC, and if the CPSC just won't listen to 2601 industry, they won't listen to the folks who make these 2602 vehicles, maybe they will listen to the National Academy of 2603 Sciences. 2604 Mr. {Burgess.} Very well. Chair wishes to thank all 2605 members of the panel. Ms. Crow-Michael, I just echo what Mr. Guthrie said. I am sure every member of the Subcommittee 2606 2607 extends to you our condolences for your loss. 2608 Seeing that there are no further members wishing to ask 2609 questions, before we conclude, I would like to submit the 2610 following documents for inclusion in the record by unanimous 2611 consent. Statement for the record from Commissioner Marietta

2612	Robinson from the Consumer Product Safety Commission, a
2613	letterwe already did Mr. Olson's letter. A response letter
2614	from Chairman Elliot Kaye to Chairman Olson.
2615	[The information follows:]
2616	*********

```
2617
          Mr. {Burgess.} Pursuant to Committee rules, I remind
2618
     members they have 10 business days to submit additional
2619
     questions for the record. I ask the witnesses to submit
     their response within 10 business days upon receipt of the
2620
2621
      questions. Without objection, again, my thanks to the panel,
     and thank you for staying with us through a long morning.
2622
2623
     Without objection, the Subcommittee is adjourned.
2624
           [Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the Subcommittee was
2625
     adjourned.]
```