I. CONVENE MEETING
   a. The meeting was convened at 2:08 PM.

II. REMARKS BY THE CHAIRS
   a. Rep. Baram laid the background and parameters of the meeting, the resources available to the task force members and inviting other individuals as guest speakers.

III. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION
   a. Rep. Baram provided remarks on the key issues he felt the group should have on their minds for the remainder of the year. Rep. Baram noted the following areas: The difference of the 75 parts-per-million (PPM) versus 300 PPM, the difference in jewelry that does or does not have specific protective coating, soluble vs. non-soluble regulations, discussion of a notice requirement or available educational materials, and finding common ground despite the best and worst case scenarios of accidental ingestion.

   b. Rep. Urban said her concerns include the period testing timelines for exposure to stomach acid, wear and tear exposure testing, paying for migration tests, and a parts-per-million (PPM) standard before it fails. Dr. Gary Ginsberg indicated that funding would be a primary concern for wet chemists to assist in DPH testing of these products. Rep. Urban noted the necessity to get this policy right rather than fast.

   c. Rep. Baram asked Rep. Urban a question regarding migration tests. Rep. Urban deferred to Dr. Ginsberg. Dr. Ginsberg responded to Rep. Baram’s inquiry with details regarding the ASTM standards for initial testing based on content, then migration to understand what may be bioavailable. Rep. Baram asked what would occur if a product failed the first test. Dr. Ginsberg responded that current law which is not in effect yet would follow ASTM standards indicate and require the additional tests.

   d. Sen. Kevin Witkos stated the task force should explore the interaction the product would have with food items in the digestive system, what occurs as the product moves from the stomach through the intestines, and the 24-hour acidic testing. Sen. Witkos then asked Dr. Ginsberg a question regarding the time it takes to run a test on a jewelry piece made with cadmium. Dr. Ginsberg responded to that tests run three tests from $50-$200 per sample to make a decision regarding product safety. Sen. Witkos indicated the task force should also explore is why the toy and jewelry industries are not testing jewelry that's been distressed.

   e. Rep. Dan Carter discussed whether there are other studies regarding distressed jewelry, noting Dr. Weidenhamer’s report being the only one he has seen, but the importance of the point Dr. Weidenhamer provides. Rep. Urban provided a brief response to Rep. Carter regarding TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act) and it’s relation to government verifications of industry testing for certain products. Rep. Urban indicated that it has not been updated for some time due to the debate surrounding verification of the testing.

   f. Tim Phalen requested a manufacturer be brought in to discuss their process, standards, and testing jewelry. His top concern is the potential impact on retailers and manufacturers if the standards change. Rep. Baram noted the necessity of such a guest to present and ask questions of at a future meeting. Tim Phalen stated he would take responsibility for recommending speakers that cover his topics for discussion.

   g. Rep. Baram asked for clarification of component testing. Anthony DèGeorge clarified by providing an example of a product that would be broken down by specific parts and different paint coatings. Rep. Baram followed up with questions regarding the sample size for testing a mass produced product. Mr. DèGeorge responded that not every product can be tested by wet chemistry, but that XRF testing can be done on a wider scale for each raw product prior to assembly. Anthony DèGeorge added that after a mass produced item is finalized, roughly 24 pieces are taken and sent to labs for testing multiple times. Rep. Baram asked if any of those sample pieces failed at the lab, what happens to the remaining bulk of produced items. Anthony DèGeorge responded a hold is put on the delivery of those goods depending on what component failed. The specific component would be removed from all of the mass produced items, re-produced by the manufacturer, reassemble to the remaining body of the product, and then resent out to labs for resting.

   h. Rep. Urban asked Anthony DèGeorge regarding the use of cadmium versus zinc and whether zinc has not been more widely used because of cost. Mr. DèGeorge responded that the industry did not switch to cadmium. Rep. Urban asked for clarification if cadmium has always been a part of the process and did not increase after standards were placed on lead. Anthony DèGeorge responded that he did not believe the industry increased the use of cadmium after lead regulations were put in place. Anthony DèGeorge indicated that there were high levels of cadmium observed in the market alongside lead because there were no
IV. ADJOURNMENT

a. The meeting was adjourned at 3:51 P.M.