



Proposition 65 Staff Updates to the CIC

New Developments Since the Feb. 2024 CIC Meeting

1. Chemicals and endpoints to be listed
2. Chemicals and endpoints under consideration for listing
3. Proposed safe harbor levels
4. Other regulatory actions



Chemicals and Endpoints to be Listed

Chemical	Mechanism	Endpoint	Date of DARTIC Vote
Bisphenol S (BPS)	State's Qualified Experts	Male Reproductive	December 12, 2024



Chemicals and Endpoints Under Consideration for Listing: Public Request for Information

Chemical	Mechanism	Endpoint	Date Data Call-in Closed/Closes
Bisphenol S (BPS)	State's Qualified Experts	Developmental	April 18, 2022
N-Methyl-N-Formylhydrazine	State's Qualified Experts	Cancer	January 10, 2025



Proposed Safe Harbor Levels

Chemical	Safe Harbor	Proposed Level	Date Proposed
Titanium Dioxide	No Significant Risk Level	Both levels apply to any given exposure: 440 µg/day ¹ 44 µg/day ²	June 24, 2024

¹Unbound, airborne particles with diameters of 10 micrometers or less.

²Unbound, airborne particles with diameters of 0.8 micrometers or less.



Other Proposition 65 Regulatory Actions

Regulatory Actions	Current Status
Safe Harbor Warnings for Acrylamide Exposure in Food (Cal. Code of Regs., title 27, section 25607.2(b))	Approved by the Office of Administrative Law - October 4, 2024 Effective date - January 1, 2025
Amendments to Clear and Reasonable Warnings, Safe Harbor Methods and Content (Cal. Code of Regs., title 27, sections 25601, 25602, 25603, 25607.2 and new sections 25607.50, 25607.51, 25607.52, and 25607.53)	Approved by the Office of Administrative Law - November 26, 2024 Effective date - January 1, 2025 Three-year implementation period of revised short-form warnings through January 1, 2028



Significant Proposition 65 Litigation

ACTIVE:

- *California Chamber of Commerce v. Bonta* (Acrylamide warnings for food)
- *The Personal Care Products Council v. Bonta* (Titanium dioxide (airborne, unbound particles of respirable size) warnings for cosmetic and personal care products)
- *Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine v. Newsom* (Processed meat)