

# NuMex Plastics, Inc.

I am confused by this rule for 2 reasons.

Reason #1. This proposed rule to require employers to monitor their employees' health when the heat index reaches 80F has me scratching my head with confusion. For example, if the outside ambient temperature is 73F and you add in the required +7F for partial sun exposure, the heat index is then at 80F and an employer would be required to log this situation. My goodness! Working at 73F is the perfect temperature! Why in the world would it harm anyone to be working at 73F ? And partly sunny . It is the perfect working environment to be in the sunshine at 73F. Another example is a 67F day working in full sunlight adds a require +13F and the heat index reaches 80F and again, employers are required to keep records on this day for this heat index. But the part that has me in a confused state is that the flip side of this requirement is where EnergyStar.gov recommends that we set our thermostats in our houses at 85-88F when not home (which means that for the first couple of hours when we get home, the temperature will definitely be above the 80F "dangerous" temperature) and EnergyStar.gov also recommends we sleep with our thermostats set at 82F! This other government agency obviously feels there are no long term health affects at these high temperatures. So, EnergyStar.gov says it is perfectly fine to live at these temperatures in our homes. So can we live at home in an environment that is presumably unsafe to work in? Who will monitor us in our homes?

Reason #2. Another major flaw of this rule is hydration as it pertains to people with diabetes. If you Google, "how much water does a diabetic need to drink each day" you come up with a number of medical sites that say 2 Liters of water per day are suitable for a diabetic. If you search "Can diabetics drink too much water?" the result yields "YES. Too much drinking water causes dangerously low sodium levels in diabetics." Yet the proposed rule encourages employers to push up to 8 Liters of water (4X the recommended levels) on diabetic employees with no regard for their medical condition. So, inadvertently, the employer could be pushing a profound medical emergency on a diabetic employee by following this EPA water ruling. Statistically, there are 217,400 people in New Mexico (or 13.1% of the population) that have diabetes and another 587,000 people have pre-diabetes. The fact that 1 in 8 New Mexicans having diabetes indicates that almost EVERY employer in the state will be unwittingly endangering their workforce by implementing a rule that is medically flawed.

Please VOTE NO on the proposed rule for heat illness. 80F is not a dangerous temperature. My Mom might still be wearing a sweater at 80F.