

## Anonymous Anonymous

The section on Personal care products is badly flawed. First, though DEP, diethyl phthalate, has a similar name to other phthalates, it HAS NOT BEEN SHOWN TO BE HARMFUL TO HUMANS.

Second, it's a mistake to take advice from the Environmental Working Group as they use bad science or no science, are largely funded by companies who stand to profit by selling alternatives to the items they raise fear of, and tailor their ratings to promote products sold by their members, and get a cut of the sales of those products. That's not science, that's corruption.

EWG are thus not trustworthy nor unbiased and a poor choice to make legislation upon.

And third, the supposed alternative you list, DPG, is incompatible with wide swaths of personal care products.

It is unusable in soap for example, wrecking batches it's used in. Any fragrance oil would become unusable if it were used instead of DEP. You should have involved stakeholders who actually utilize DEP before deciding to dictate what to use as alternatives. ANNE MARIE FAIOLA of Brambleberry, a Washington State soapmakers' supplier, could explain seizing to you and the harmless products she'd have to discontinue as none of her customers will be able to use them if she has to switch to DPG.

So by following insincere, faulty advice from millionaire advocacy groups with zero science background, this law would severely damage the artisan soapmakers and their suppliers of Washington state without protecting consumers' health, for no reason, as DEP is not shown to be harmful.

You really should have had people advise you who understand the science and aren't giving misleading, incorrect information. Perry Romanofsky would be a great source for scientific accuracy. He's not going to make money either way so he's neutral.

This is a case of those seeking financial gain leading the unknowing, and bad rulemaking.