

APPROVED MINUTES
INDOOR AIR QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 8, 1994

1

DOSH means DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH
Board MEANS OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD
IAQ means INDOOR AIR QUALITY
ETS means ENVIRONMENTAL TOBACCO SMOKE
CFM means CUBIC FEET PER MINUTE
SBS means SICK BUILDING SYNDROME
BRI means BUILDING RELATED ILLNESS
ASHRAE means AMERICAN SOCIETY OF HEATING, REFRIGERATION AND AIR-CONDITIONING ENGINEERS

Title 24 refers to Title 24 of the California Building Code of the California Code of Regulations.
Title 8 refers to Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, DOSH REGULATIONS

The following individuals attended the meeting. Comments may be inappropriately attributed to them by the author.

John Howard
Len Welsh
Ana Maria Osorio
Les Michael
Peggy Jenkins
John Kaschak
Bill Borwegan
Steve Crouch
Maggie Robbins
Barbara Plog
Robert Reeves
W. Dart Rinefort
Jeff Jones
Barbara Spark
Anne Bell
Albert Benson
Steve Smith
Michael Crandall

Katlyn Diaz
James Cone
Esther Schiller
Ellen Brotsky
Scott Robinson
Dave Gidley
Phil Verniulin
Herman Woessner
Sharen Muraoka
Rod Repke
Bruce Wallace
Rick Axe

Michael called the meeting to order and self introductions were made.
Attention was called to the Agenda and new material, namely, AMA press release and AB 13.

Howard then spoke about the impact of AB 13 on IAQ. It would require multiple local jurisdiction actions (3) prior to a referral for enforcement activity by the Division. Action on the bill requires return to the Assembly because of Senate amendments. The Division has a neutral position regarding this bill.

2041201557

Spark inquired about the Philip Morris initiative at the state level. There was no response relative to this voter petition initiative.

Len Welsh responded to comments concerning ACR 90 that this action by the legislature was advisory and did not impose a mandatory requirement for action on the Division or the Board.

Jenkins responded to the discussion and recommended that regulatory action be delayed to determine federal action.

Barbara Spark indicated she thought IAQ was on a fast track at OSHA and that OMB would be favorably inclined as the regulatory promulgation process appears to have been more rapid recently.

Osorio concurred with Jenkins.

Borwegan commented that OSHA rulemaking was different. States such as New Hampshire had shown leadership by promulgating smoking regulation in the absence of OSHA regulation. ETS and IAQ were a major health and safety concern of his union's membership. He suggested that OSHA wanted the comments by June 22, 1994 in response to comments about a potential delay in the June 29, 1994 OSHA deadline for comments.

Cone inquired about the status of the revision of the ASHRAE standard.

Offerman responded that he did not "represent" ASHRAE but that as a member of the ASHRAE 62 committee he would share the draft changes with the committee.

Vermeulen questioned
Where is the Building Commission?
Who selected the committee?
What about all the building studies?

Michael responded that the Building Commission was incorporated in any rulemaking the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board undertakes. The committee was selected by the Division. Steve Hayward, a committee member, was identified as the individual with knowledge of the named studies and he is not present.

Woessner asked about the availability of written material.

Michael indicated that the materials had been sent to committee members and that it was available to all.

Howard then directed the discussion to subsection (e)(1) of the OSHA proposal. He sought response from the petitioners, only one of whom were present.

Benson responded that as a petitioner and as member of SAFE he favored the OSHA proposal regarding smoking. He further stated that there is a need for ventilation requirements. Individuals such as he are adversely effected by "any" smoke. Filtering is ineffective as it does not remove gases. Individuals who are sensitized to ETS, are effected by very low levels. They are frequently sensitized to other materials because of the large number of substances that comprise ETS.

Offerman cited three venues

- 1. Ventilate
- 1. Negative pressure
- 3. Exhaust the ETS

ASHRAE is extending beyond comfort recommendations and is using risk assessment in some aspects of the revised ASHRAE 62.

2041201558

Schiller inquired about other spaces such as hotel rooms. She indicated that some bartenders are suing due to exposures.

Welsh commented that a federal regulation would provide a level economic playing field as opposed to the concerns about the shift of business to regulatory free environments.

Spark commented about hotels with no fresh air supply in Virginia. She suggested this was common in new construction. She indicated that there was a piece of literature which was widely distributed raising concern about infiltration of contaminants into workplaces that could be harmful to employees.

Vermeulen commented that some successful controls had been installed. He indicated a Bingo Parlor had installed a plastic barrier between smoking and non smoking areas and this was successfully done for \$4500.

Borwegan commented that ETS is controlled in submarines therefore it should be controllable elsewhere. A comprehensive rule should be undertaken and not be limited to ETS. There is currently momentum for a regulation and the opportunity should be seized.

Shiller indicated that effected persons are severely impaired. ETS sensitive people may be more sensitive to other substances because of the sensitization from ETS.

Muraoka indicated that the American Cancer Society supports the OSHA regulation and that the Division should support the proposed regulation.

Welsh inquired if there was consensus on supporting subsection (e)(1) of the proposed OSHA regulation?

Jenkins requested stronger language. Employers should prohibit smoking in all workplaces. Building studies suggest that prohibiting smoking does not resolve the problem of ETS in a building that had previously permitted smoking. Enclosed smoking rooms need a supply of air. It should be a separate supply.

Kaschak inquired how negative should the pressure be in a negative pressure ETS enclosure be?

Spark indicated a concern about reentrained ETS.

Offerman indicated this was addressed in the proposed regulation.

Welsh commented that there appeared to be general consensus supportive of the proposed federal regulation subsection (e)(1) for the control of ETS.

Robbins indicated that an option for allowing smoking is a requisite for her membership. There are insufficient break opportunities for smokers to leave work places to be able to use this as an option for smokers. Some latitude should be permitted to allow employers and employees to reach an accommodation on smoking policy within facilities.

Benson supported Robbins's comment and indicated that the new facility being constructed by his place of employment will have an isolated smoking area.

Schiller inquired about how this would be controlled in shopping malls?
Will shopping malls have designated areas?

Welsh responded, this is a scope question.

Offerman emphasized that there are major economic questions which will arise from control strategies. He also inquired about the fate of regulation for those employees within smoking areas.

2041201559

Offerman corrected the comment as follows: I do not believe the installation of control strategies is a major economic question. The only control strategies are either a designated smoking area or banning smoking. In most non-industrial spaces which fall under this regulation, such as office buildings, hospitals, schools, shopping malls the installation of a designated smoking area (e.g. a negative pressure area with exhaust) is not a big task. For those non-industrial spaces where employees must mix with customers (i.e. servers at bussers at bars, restaurants, casinos) it is not possible to protect the worker and thus there can be no smoking in these places except in separate designated smoking areas (lounges) where workers for cleaning or whatever, would only enter the space following a three air change purge (with no smoking) or with proper respiratory protection.

Welsh indicated that a federal standard might not provide an exemption from compliance for these workers.

Robbins indicated this might not be acceptable to the total working population. As examples she cited race track workers exposed by non employees in line.

Offerman indicated this would be controllable by isolating the worker by a barrier. This is not a control applicable to bars.

Welsh commented that this was the thrust of AB 13, a state initiative. Federal OSHA would establish a level economic basis by its universal applicability.

Schiller indicated she had data available from economic studies showing that there was no adverse economic impact as a result of local ordinances prohibiting smoking. There are now smoke free bars in the Los Angeles, CA. area. The musician's union is concerned about ETS in bars.

Borwegan inquired if the Division was going to submit something to OSHA.

Welsh indicated he thought that the consensus was to attempt to prepare a response on behalf of the committee.

Jones concurred.

Rinefort commented, that from a design engineering perspective, specifications are a problem. More specificity in regulation may restrict the ability to implement new or improved design or technology. Another consideration is the flexibility required in order to be able to design for the handicapped. How to design a workable system is the question.

Welsh responded that federal regulation tend to be specification standards and inquired if more specifications were required in addition to those proposed by OSHA. Performance places the requirement upon the employer to assure protection from the hazard' whereas, a prescriptive regulation only places a requirement to conform to the standard. The TB proposal is an example of giving the employer the flexibility of a performance regulation.

Wallace indicated that a regulatory prescriptive alternative provides an alternative, a safe harbor, for those seeking to comply with the regulation.

Vermuelen inquired what is the Energy Commission's posture on this regulation.

Welsh concurred that a "doable" appendix might provide criteria for the safe harbor.

2041201560

Offerman outlined some requirements for the regulation:

5

Pressure could be specified.

A 10% criteria for pressure requirements is not workable. Measurements are insufficiently precise.

Recordkeeping should be a key element.

He cited hospitals as a workplace with minimal impact because of the resources available are a small increment of the total. This is contrasted with the problems in schools, where any cost impact is a problem.

Offerman corrected the comment as follows: I said that negative pressure should not only be specified but that there should be surveillance in the form of an inexpensive pressure sensor.

Benson inquired why cannot negative air be prescribed in CFM?

Borwegan inquired wouldn't an anteroom be required for a negative pressure enclosure?

Offerman responded to Borwegan that an anteroom would not be required for a negative pressure enclosure.

Borwegan San Francisco Airport has a smoking area without an anteroom, and it does not work.

Offerman responded to Borwegan that an appropriately designed negative pressure area does not require an anteroom.

Schiller commented that the asthma population was greater than cited in the federal preamble. She cited that 10% of the U. S. population have respiratory problems. ETS aggravates individuals with respiratory problems which are not resolved by medication.

Welsh suggested that Schiller should provide the data in a personal response to the docket.

Jenkins commented that ARB would respond directly to the docket only with regard to the ARB data. DOSH is the lead agency in this regulatory action. She would support additional guidance in a California regulation.

Benson inquired about a resolution to employees in smoking environments such as in bars and restaurants. He indicated that a bartender at the San Francisco Airport required a heart transplant as a result of exposure to ETS.

Spark indicated she had observed a "fake" bar as a means of making a restaurant smoking accessible when smoking is permitted in bars but prohibited in restaurants. She inquired, what is a bar?

The committee agreed to adjourn early for a one hour lunch break.
There was consensus for support of subsection (e)(1).

Afternoon Session.

The following discussion is focused on subsection (d)(1). Much of the discussion concerned operating a mechanical air delivery system following a shut down, such as overnight.

Spark suggested including a fresh air requirement.

Woessner indicated that some buildings do not have a fresh air mechanical system.

Borwegan stated the government should not put a seal of approval upon inadequate systems.

2041201561

John Howard indicated that there was problems with tying regulations of one aspect to control hazards in other venues. Thus the Building Code, Energy Code and occupational safety and health regulation must not conflict. However, the design nature of the former do not resolve conditions identified by problems in existing structures.

Cone ETS is essentially a point source problem. Regulation should seek to provide optimal requirements for health with a minimum of regulation. Essentially, what is required?

Woessner inquired what is meant by "operating" in the regulation?

Welsh responded that operating should be clarified to mean "on."

Offerman indicated that some of this concern was addressed in the revision to ASHRAE 62. The term "purge" is used to address sweeping the environment prior to occupancy by operating the HVAC System prior to "normal" building occupancy.

Crandall indicated that such a concept was not in the proposed regulation.

Offerman indicated that such a purge could be accomplished by 3 air changes to accomplish a 95% purge. Normally 3 air changes is accomplished in one hour. There is some indication that there is a range of purges and that the range is 1 to 3 air changes to perform a purge.

Offerman corrected the comment as follows: I said that three air changes of outside air (at a rate equal to or greater than the minimum outside air exchange rate) is required to reduce the concentrations of indoor air contaminants that have built up during the night to within 5% of their daytime concentrations. Two air changes will result in concentrations 14% higher than the daytime concentrations and one air change will result in concentrations 37% higher. Of course the amount of purge required to produce air that is acceptable depends upon the sources in the building. Buildings with stronger sources will require longer purge periods. I think we should recommend a minimum of one air change conducted at an airflow rate equal to or greater than the minimum rate with the caveat that longer purge rates may be required for buildings with strong indoor sources (e.g. new or newly renovated, or with pesticide applications etc.) In these buildings purge rates of up to three air changes conducted at rates equal to or greater than the minimum rate may be required. Purges longer than three air changes do not provide any significant reduction of the contaminant concentrations (concentrations are already within 5% of their daytime concentrations) and thus set a maximum amount. Of course in buildings with strong indoor contaminant sources such as new or newly renovated buildings, the minimum outside air ventilation rates may not be sufficient to maintain the indoor concentrations at acceptable levels. We recommend to our clients that subjective measurements be used as a guide.

For systems designed for a minimum of 15 cfm/occupant the minimum outside air exchange rate is approximately one air change per hour. Thus a one air change purge conducted at the minimum air exchange rate will take only one hour. Systems with the capability of running with 100% outside air would do one air change in 15 minutes. Building designed for only 5 cfm/occupant would have to ventilate for three to four hours prior to occupancy. However, the longer purge periods required by these type buildings, would be a moot point if we require a minimum outside air ventilation rate of 15 cfm/occupant. I should add here that the idea of allowing an exemption for buildings which have been designed for only 5 cfm/occupant and which cannot be easily upgraded to 15 cfm/occupant (fortunately there are not very many of these, in over 500 sick building investigations I have never see one, although I know of one or two in the Bay Area.) is unappealing to me. First of all which the 15 cfm/occupant ventilation rate is based on comfort (odor) it does establish a health baseline for concentrations of human bioeffluents such as bacteria and virus which cause disease. At 5 cfm/occupant the concentrations of airborne disease causing biological contaminants will be up to three times higher than if there is 15 cfm/occupant. Because of the health implications of minimum outside air ventilation rates I believe we should insist that all buildings comply without exception. This will not be an insurmountable problem for 99% of the buildings in California.

2041201562

Osorio commented that this may be insufficient for some odors.

Offerman indicated that existing and historical ASHRAE standards were comfort based and not health based except as health is impacted by comfort.

Jenkins proposed leaving the system on all night

Weish responded that this is a problem. There are economic, energy and other factors which impact imposing a constant operating system.

Cone proposed that the energy transfer portion of the system be shut down and just run the fans.

Rinefort continual operation is not a good regulatory criteria and may conflict with existing Title 24.

Offerman cited 15 CFM / person as proposal for fresh air requirement. 7 CFM per person would control body odors but would not alleviate odors of other origins such as pesticides and cleaning products.

Offerman corrected the comment as follows: An outside air ventilation rate of 15 cfm/occupant and not 7 cfm/occupant is required to control body odors. The 15 cfm rate is for 80% acceptability as determined by first impressions (i.e. as you enter the space). Since the olfactory sense acclimates within a few minutes, a rate of 7 cfm/occupant will be sufficient to maintain air acceptable to 80% for acclimated occupants. However, since not everyone enters occupied spaces at the same time, we design buildings for first impressions using minimum ventilation rates of 15 cfm/occupant.

Rinefort commented that operating in the air-movement not in warm up might be an energy conservation mechanism. Again, it is not reasonable to require systems to be operated overnight.

Weish proposed that different types of systems need to be identified.

Schiller. There are operations that occur only at night.

Benson cited floor cleaning as such a night time operation.

Borwegan cited a methylene chloride fatality as a result of maintenance use of this chemical.

Weish stated types of air conditioning systems should be delineated. Require fresh air on new mechanical ventilation systems as an installation requirement.

Kaschak commented this will not rectify the problems present in existing systems. Many of the problems cited are a result of regulation.

Michael the regulation should clarify that any renovation should include an modification of the air handling system to meet the design criteria of the regulation, if such a requirement is developed in Title 8 and Title 24.

Robbins many systems need to be upgraded.

Rinefort prescriptive regulation may require the modification to be a drastic so as to require building demolition.

Osorio is there a PEL for ETS?

2041201563

Welsh responded that none are proposed at this time. Only the carbon dioxide trigger is mentioned and that is a trigger for action not a proposed regulatory requirement

Offerman added that ASHRAE also consider building materials as a source of problems. They are a particular source of odors in renovation.

He cited Title 24 requirements.

15 CFM/person or

1 air change per hour which is equivalent to 0.2 CFM /person

Rinefort commented that buildings designed in the 1978-1986 period conformed to the 5 CFM per person requirement in existence at that time.

Kaschak confirmed Rinefort's statement.

Crouch commented that permits have been executed based on current requirements.

Osorio Windows should be required to be functional.

Regulation should seek the high ground rather than minimal requirements.

Rinefort commented that windows may compromise building design, ability to control environment not adjacent to the window and fire regulations with regard to air movement or control.

Osorio commented that many of the complaints that DHS receives, and they receive a large number, are from high rise structures with sophisticated HVAC systems.

Welsh commented that the regulation must provide a venue that can be met with existing technology. Does the literature reflect that a low flow rate is unacceptable.

Cone inquired are the buildings being used as designed? Witness the energy, space allocation and security factors which have been imposed on existing structures. Occupancy with the decreased codified space requirements may impose personnel loads which exceed the design occupancy loads of the building.

Borwegan suggested that the regulation should impose a posting requirement; for example, this building has a carbon dioxide concentration of less than 800 ppm

Reeves inquired where would such a sign be posted among the plethora of currently required signage?

There appeared to be no consensus for additional signage.

Jenkins proposed that some consideration should be given to air filtration.

Rinefort responded that filters are doable.

Woessner commented that if the regulation does not stipulate a PEL, why is this not acceptable?

Welsh responded that perhaps a series of requirements could be established for air flow rates based on the activities.

Smith commented that it would appear that this may impose a list of activities within a building, which may be beyond the scope of this regulation or outside of the jurisdiction of the Board.

Jones stated that he has a concern about the dichotomy of language wherein the preamble speaks to SBS but the standard speaks to BRI. Further, there are no performance criteria. There is no definition of SBS.

2041201564

Kaschak noted that the 5 CFM problem is the result of regulation. Caution should be exercised before we make more regulation which may be shown, subsequently, to introduce new problems.

There was general consensus that relying on previously existing codes is unacceptable in an enforcement regulation. The problem remains as to how to resolve the issues that arise from regulations relied upon in the design of existing structures but which now are deemed inadequate.

Welsh the addressed the Scope and Application, subsection (a)(1). Should types of worksites be excluded; namely, industrial vs. non industrial?

Plog inquired what is meant by "material impairment"? Is this a new paradigm as opposed to the concept of protection afforded by a PEL?

Jones also inquired what is meant by "hazardous chemical and particulate as used in subsection (d)(4)?"

Kaschak what is acceptable indoor air? The PEL question articulated by Woessner, Rinefort, Offerman, Jenkins and the Energy Commission (which specifies air flow rates)

Welsh and Osorio had a discussion about the difference between the "charters" of OSHA vs. the California Labor Code. The latter stipulates that there must be a hazard to an employee of an employer. Enforcement action can only arise when the Division can demonstrate such a hazard. OSHA has viewed that enforcement action may be taken against and party that has the authority and ability to abate the hazard. Welsh indicated that legislation may be required to bridge this gap in existing California Code.

Borwegan, Smith, Robbins, Woessner discussed the problem of integrating the IAQ solution among all tenants and the building owner.

Welsh commented that an approach to resolving the multiple parties would be to utilize the IIPP, 8 CCR 3203, as a vehicle to require each employer to address IAQ.

Robbins the problem of tenant turn over needs to be addressed. How can tenants determine if the HVAC is operating properly.

Crandall stated that OSHA requests additional input concerning the "designated person". There are also interested in:
who it should be, and
what qualifications should be imposed?

Woessner proposed adding authority and responsibility to the definition of "designated person".

Jenkins proposed that a pesticide management program be instituted as a requirement. Such a program would integrate pest management with source substitution or source reduction.

Spark stated that pesticide regulations do not stipulate what pesticide to use but rather how to use a pesticide once selected.

Osorio suggested that perhaps guidelines could be developed.

Spark proposed an integrated pest management plan be instituted as a requirement.

204120156E

Offerman suggested that a dust reduction program should be instituted. This would include the housekeeping aspects of dust. With increasing monetary considerations, maintenance bearing on cleaning has been reduced. The result is that the residual or accumulated dust is entrained repeatedly.

Offerman corrected the comment as follows: I said (or might have said) that a dust reduction program is not a bad idea, but I did not say the reason for this is that "residual or accumulated dust is entrained repeatedly." This hypothesis has been put forth by some, but there is no hard evidence that good housekeeping significantly effects indoor air quality, although intuitively it seems like a good idea. Thus, I think we should limit ourselves simply to recommendations in the area.

Jones concurred and stressed that reduced maintenance is essential element in IAQ. Lack of maintenance has been a solution in a major portion of his IAQ experience.

Osorio commented that this should be an addition as subsection (c)(3)(vii).

Robbins commented that should Source Control should also be considered in subsection (e)(4).

Jenkins remarked that some of these communication problems should be addressed by adhering to the Prop. 65 requirements.

Robbins concurred that "Toxic Use Reduction" should be addressed as part of integrate pest management and Source Control.

Borwegan added that federal GSA is working on a "safe list."

Plog commented that Rafael Moure of Lowell University may be working on that with OSHA.

Osorio indicated that Lynn Goldman, now at EPA, may be of assistance in identifying such a list.

BREAK

Woessner indicated that a appropriate venue would be to address a "management of change of plans" as addressed by subsections (c)(4) or (c)(5).

Kaschak indicate owners and tenants should be addressed in (c)(3)(iv) and (c)(5).

Jones reiterated his concern with subsection (d)(5) which addresses BRI and ignores SBS. The regulation should also address SBS.

Crandall stated that the standard requires that there be a material impairment of health.

Osorio proposed that there is a need to introduce a clinical definition for SBS which would include material impairment of health. A medical subcommittee could address that.

Diaz commented that the BRI should be tied to addressing the problem with a building.

Robbins stated that the OSHA 200 could be utilized as a tool to indicate SBS.

Welsh noted that we again have the problem with the different enforcement recourse OSHA has as opposed to the Division.

Osorio suggested look at rate phenomenon as was done with the proposed TB regulation.

Welsh inquired are we speaking of a cluster as a manifestation of a SBS?

2041201566

Oserio perhaps this could be added to the medical subcommittee for which Dr. Cone and I have volunteered. The committee could develop an appendix for the proposed regulation.

Robbins commented on subsection (c)(6) as a venue for tenant responsible for sub items of the HVAC system.

Kaschak suggested that tenants be required to provide information about their individual contribution to HVAC system to the "designated person"

Offerman stated that the real employer, that is the individual with monetary interests in the building's HVAC system, will be driven by market considerations.

Robbins a system to sort the lease sublet contractual relationship should be codified.

Michael again, the specter of the employer employee relationship vs. the federal ability to abate requirement is present.

Kaschak stated that if the tenant is irresponsible, what leverage does the building owner/operator have/

Robbins commented that in subsection (d)(3) a requirement for addressing minimal ventilation requirements for off shift/night work should be added.

She also stated that there are frequently problems with differential controls, inside outside monitors, when frequently the inside outside differential is small. Under these circumstances the control does not actuate the HVAC system, and no outside air is provided. This is frequently the type of unit in low rise offices such as physician's offices.

Jenkins is 15 CFM per person a constant air flow requirement, an average level requirement or what precisely is the recommendation?

Subsection (d)(4) should be modified.

"chemical or particulate exposures to employees working in other areas of the building or facility."

should be changed to:

"chemical or particulate exposures to employees doing work or working in other areas of the building or facility."

Borwegan proposed ending the phrase after "employees".

Kaschak proposed a change to:

"chemical or particulate exposures to any employee working in any area of the building."

Offerman again raised the question of the scope wherein a distinction is made between the industrial and non-industrial workplace.

Jenkins noted that subsection (d)(4) needs further work for non-maintenance operations. Why run the system if safety cannot be assured.

How are "periodic" presence of "harsh" conditions to be managed?

Would this be the place to invoke the toxic use reduction program in the management system/

The use of methylene chloride as a "stripper" was raised again.

Rinefort inquired is it a fair assumption to run the HVAC system continuously? BOMA will oppose a regulation which imposes an unreasonable economic burden which may arise from running the HVAC continuously.

Jones raised the question about the meaning of "hazardous chemical and particulate" definition.

204120156

Rinefort stated that the imposition of the less than 60% relative humidity requirement is unacceptable and contrary to Title 24.

Kaschak proposed deleting the 60% requirement.

Osorio suggested that some averaging might be utilized to achieve the 60% value.

Rinefort inquired is the 60% value a criteria for biological control, that is to suppress mold production?

Jenkins noted that perhaps a climate zone approach could be proposed to meet the 60% criteria.

Repke a climatologist could be utilized to address the problem.

Crandall stated that OSHA intends to impose the 60% relative humidity requirement.

Kaschak the 60% requirement would impose major capitol cost requirements to implement because of the long standing requirement of Title 24.

There was general consensus that a 60% relative humidity was an unnecessary requirement in "most" of California.

Two committees were established.

Medical: Drs. Osorio and Cone

Engineering: Rinefort, chair; Offerman and Jones.

The next meeting was set at 9:30 am, June 20, 1994 in Emeryville, courtesy of Dr. Osorio.

NO! Note change.

The meeting will be in Emeryville at 9:30 am in Suite E at 5900 Hollis Street, Suite P Conference Room.

The June 14, 1994 Federal Register will state that:

Notice to appear for comment on 29 CFR 1910.1033 must be received by August 5, 1994.

Written comments must be postmarked by August 13, 1994.

The hearing will be held in D.C. during the period September 20 to October 14.

2041201568