Date of Hearing: March 25, 2025

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY AND TOXIC MATERIALS
Damon Connolly, Chair
AB 60 (Papan) – As Amended March 3, 2025

SUBJECT: Cosmetic safety

SUMMARY: Prohibits, commencing January 1, 2027, a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any of the specified ingredients. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Prohibits, beginning January 1, 2027 a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale, in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any of the following intentionally added ingredients:

   a) Musk ambrette (CAS no. 83-66-9).

   b) Musk tibetene (CAS no. 145-39-1).

   c) Musk moskene (CAS no. 116-66-5).

   d) Musk xylene (CAS no. 81-15-2).

2) Prohibits, beginning January 1, 2027, a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce a cosmetic product that contains more than 1.4 % in fine fragrance products, 0.56 % in eau de toilette, and 0.042 % in all other products of musk ketone (CAS no. 81-14-1).

3) Define "oral products" as a cosmetic product that is intended to be applied on teeth or the mucous membranes of the oral cavity.

4) Provides that the restriction on musk ketone does not apply to oral products.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Requires, pursuant to the federal Food, Drug & Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act), cosmetics produced or distributed for retail sale to consumers for their personal care to bear an ingredient declaration. (21 Code of Federal Regulations § 701.3)

2) Defines, pursuant to the Sherman Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law (Sherman Act), "cosmetic" as any article, or its components, intended to be rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, introduced into, or otherwise applied to, the human body, or any part of the human body, for cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance. Provides that the term "cosmetic" does not include soap. Makes it unlawful for any person to manufacture, sell, deliver, hold, or offer for sale any cosmetic that is adulterated. Makes it unlawful for any person to adulterate any cosmetic. Makes it unlawful for any person to receive in commerce any cosmetic that is adulterated or to deliver or proffer for delivery any such cosmetic. (Health & Safety Code (HSC) § 109900)

3) Requires, pursuant to the Safe Consumer Cosmetic Act (Cosmetics Act), a manufacturer of a cosmetic that is subject to regulation by the federal Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to submit to the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) a list of its cosmetic products sold in California that contain any ingredient that is a chemical identified as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. (HSC § 111792)

4) Prohibits, commencing January 1, 2025, a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any of the following intentionally added ingredients.

   (1) Dibutyl phthalate (CAS no. 84-74-2);

   (2) Diethylhexyl phthalate (CAS no. 117-81-7);

   (3) Formaldehyde (CAS no. 50-00-0);

   (4) Paraformaldehyde (CAS no. 30525-89-4);

   (5) Methylene glycol (CAS no. 463-57-0);

   (6) Quaternium-15 (CAS no. 51229-78-8);

   (7) Mercury (CAS no. 7439-97-6);

   (8) Isobutylparaben (CAS no. 4247-02-3);

   (9) Isopropylparaben (CAS no. 4191-73-5);

   (10) m-Phenylenediamine and its salts (CAS no. 108-45-2);

   (11) o-Phenylenediamine and its salts (CAS no. 95-54-5); and,

   (12) The following per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and their salts:

      (A) Perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS); heptadecafluorooctane-1-sulfonic acid (CAS no. 1763-23-1);

      (B) Potassium perfluorooctanesulfonate; potassium heptadecafluorooctane-1-sulfonate (CAS no. 2795-39-3);

      (C) Diethanolamine perfluorooctane sulfonate (CAS 70225-14-8);

      (D) Ammonium perfluorooctane sulfonate; ammonium heptadecafluorooctanesulfonate (CAS 29081-56-9);

      (E) Lithium perfluorooctane sulfonate; lithium heptadecafluorooctanesulfonate (CAS 29457-72-5);

      (F) Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)(CAS no. 335-67-1);

      (G) Ammonium pentadecafluorooctanoate (CAS no. 3825-26-1);

(H) Nonadecafluorodecanoic acid (CAS no. 355-76-2);

(I) Ammonium nonadecafluorodecanoate (CAS no. 3108-42-7);

(J) Sodium nonadecafluorodecanoate (CAS no. 3830-45-3);

(K) Perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA) (CAS no. 375-95-1);

(L) Sodium heptadecafluorononanoate (CAS no. 21049-39-8); and,

(M) Ammonium perfluorononanoate (CAS no. 4149-60-4). (HSC § 108980 (a))

5) Prohibits, beginning January 1, 2027, a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any of the following intentionally added ingredients:

a) Lily aldehyde (CAS no. 80-54-6);

b) Acetaldehyde (CAS no. 75-07-0);

c) Cyclohexylamine (CAS no. 108-91-8);

d) Cyclotetrasiloxane (CAS no. 556-67-2);

e) Phytonadione (CAS no. 84-80-0);

f) Sodium perborate (CAS no. 15120-21-5);

g) Styrene (CAS no. 100-42-5);

h) Trichloroacetic acid (CAS no. 76-03-9);

i) Tricresyl phosphate (CAS no. 1330-78-5);

j) Vinyl acetate (CAS no. 108-05-4);

k) 2-Chloracetamide (CAS no. 79-07-2);

l) Allyl isothiocyanate (CAS no. 57-06-7);

m) Anthraquinone (CAS no. 84-65-1);

n) Malachite green (CAS no. 569-64-2);

o) Oil from the seeds of Laurus nobilis L. (CAS no. 84603-73-6);

p) Pyrogallol (CAS no. 87-66-1);

q) C.I. disperse blue 1 (CAS no. 2475-45-8);

r) Trisodium nitrilotriacetate (CAS no. 5064-31-3);

s) The following boron substances:

i) Perboric acids:

A) Sodium salt (CAS no. 11138-47-9);

B) Sodium salt, monohydrate (CAS no. 12040-72-1); and,

C) Sodium perborate monohydrate (CAS no. 10332-33-9).

ii) Boric acid (CAS nos. 10043-35-3 and 11113-50-1).

iii) Borates, tetraborates, octaborates, and boric acid salts and esters, including all of the following:

A) Disodium octaborate anhydrous (CAS no. 12008-41-2);

B) Disodium octaborate tetrahydrate (CAS no. 12280-03-4);

C) 2-Aminoethanol, monoester with boric acid (CAS no. 10377-81-8);

D) 2-Hydroxypropyl ammonium dihydrogen orthoborate (CAS no. 68003-13-4);

E) Potassium borate, boric acid potassium salt (CAS no. 12712-38-8);

F) Trioctyldodecyl borate;

G) Zinc borate (CAS no. 1332-07-6);

H) Sodium borate, disodium tetraborate anhydrous; boric acid, sodium salt (CAS no. 1330-43-4);

I) Tetraboron disodium heptaoxide, hydrate (CAS no. 12267-73-1);

J) Orthoboric acid, sodium salt (CAS no. 13840-56-7);

K) Disodium tetraborate decahydrate; borax decahydrate (CAS no. 1303-96-4); and,

L) Disodium tetraborate pentahydrate; borax pentahydrate (CAS no. 12179-04-3).

t) C.I. disperse blue 3 (CAS no. 2475-46-9);

u) Basic green 1 (CAS no. 633-03-4);

v) Basic blue 7 (CAS no. 2390-60-5);

w) 3(or5)-((4-(benzylmethylamino)phenyl)azo)-1,2-(or1,4)-dimethyl-1H-1,2,4-triazolium and its salts (CAS nos. 89959-98-8 and 12221-69-1);

x) Basic violet 4 (CAS no. 2390-59-2);

y) Basic blue 3 (CAS no. 33203-82-6); and,

z) Basic blue 9 (CAS no. 61-73-4). (HSC § 108980 (b))

6) Provides that a cosmetic product shall not be in violation of the law, if the cosmetic product made through manufacturing processes intended to comply with the law contains a technically unavoidable trace quantity of an ingredient listed in HSC 108980 § (a) and that trace quantity stems from impurities of natural or synthetic ingredients, the manufacturing process, storage, or migration from packaging. (HSC § 108980(b))

UNCODIFIED INTENT LANGUAGE:

1) Provides that it is the intent of the Legislature to enact a prohibition on the presence of intentionally added ingredients in cosmetics that is consistent with the prohibition on the presence of intentionally added ingredients in cosmetics that was enacted by the European Union (EU). (Added by AB 2762, Muratsuchi, Chapter 314, Statutes of 2020).

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill: According to the author,

> "AB 60 will eliminate and restrict the use of nitro musk in everyday products like perfumes, body washes, and personal care items, thereby reducing Californians' exposure to toxic chemicals.
>
> Nitro musks have been known to disrupt the endocrine system. The endocrine system, which governs the body's communication network, is critical to the development and regulation of the reproductive system. Endocrine-disrupting chemicals, such as nitro musks, contribute to an alarming rise in reproductive health issues, including early puberty, endometriosis, and infertility. While the EU and Canada have already banned or heavily regulated these harmful compounds, the U.S. has failed to take similar action, leaving Californians vulnerable to their effects.
>
> By aligning California's regulations with stricter European Union safety standards, AB 60 will eliminate these unsafe ingredients from personal care products, minimizing Californians' contact with unhealthy substances. California has a responsibility to lead on environmental justice and addressing the toxins in consumer products is a vital first step. AB 60 is essential for a healthier, safer future."

Public health concerns with cosmetics: Cosmetic products are sold to consumers across California, including to children who are still in the formative years of development. These products are used as part of daily beauty and cleansing routines, often times on the skin's most sensitive areas, like the face, eyelids, and lips. Cosmetic products are most heavily used by women, including those of childbearing age, increasing the likelihood of exposing mothers, fetuses, and nursing children to substances that can cause cancer and reproductive toxicity. That is why it is so important that cosmetic products are safe, properly labeled, and free of contamination.

State cosmetic regulatory requirements: California has two laws governing the safety of cosmetics. The first is the Sherman Act, which is administered by CDPH to regulate cosmetics. It broadly defines a cosmetic as any article, or its components, intended to be rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, introduced into, or otherwise applied to, the human body, or any part of the human body, for cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance.

Pursuant to the Sherman Act, any cosmetic is considered to be adulterated "if it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance that may render it injurious to users." However, adulteration, in many instances, refers to tampering with a product after the manufacturer has completed its manufacturing. Selling adulterated cosmetics can lead to civil and administrative penalties, embargoes, and even bans on products.

The other law is the California's Cosmetics Act, established by SB 484 (Migden, Chapter 729, Statutes of 2005). It requires, for all cosmetic products sold in California, the manufacturer, packer, and/or distributor named on the product label to provide CDPH a list of all cosmetic products that contain any ingredients known or suspected to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm. CDPH maintains an active, searchable database with all of the data collected from manufacturers under the Cosmetics Act. CDPH is required to make that data user-friendly and available to the public. To date**,** 1,145 companies have reported 145,638 products and 345 ingredients to CDPH. CDPH does not have any enforcement authority or penalty authority over the manufacturers that are covered, so not all manufacturers are currently complying and submitting their products' information. State law does not currently contain a mechanism that would allow the state to compel these manufacturers to comply.

Federal cosmetics regulatory requirements: Neither the FDA nor CDPH require premarket safety testing, review, or approval of cosmetic products.

Under the FD&C Act, cosmetics and their ingredients are not required to be approved before they are sold to the public, and the FDA does not have the authority to require manufacturers to file health and safety data on cosmetic ingredients or to order a recall of a dangerous cosmetic product.

What we know about the chemicals listed in the bill vis-à-vis the EU: The EU, which includes 27 member countries mostly across Europe, develops policies to ensure the free movement of people, goods, services, and capital within the internal market, and enacts legislation to maintain common policies to have cohesion amongst the 27 members on things from trade to agriculture.

The EU Cosmetics Directive (Directive) was adopted in 1976 and formed on the basis of commonly accepted safety standards relative to cosmetics. On September 15, 2022, the European Commission published Regulation (EU) 2022/1531 to amend Cosmetics Regulation No. 1223/2009 for the use of certain ingredients classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic, or toxic for reproduction in cosmetic products.

The EU Directive requires member states to take all necessary measures to ensure that only cosmetic products which conform to the provisions of the Directive and its Annexes can be put on the market. Additionally, the Directive requires member states to prohibit the marketing of cosmetic products containing ingredients listed in the Directive and its Annexes. The regulation defines "cosmetic product" as "any substance or mixture intended to be placed in contact with the external parts of the human body (epidermis, hair system, nails, lips and external genital

organs) or with the teeth and the mucous membranes of the oral cavity with a view exclusively or mainly to cleaning them, perfuming them, changing their appearance, protecting them, keeping them in good condition or correcting body odors." The scope of products covered under the EU's definition of cosmetics is broader than the scope of products covered under California's definition of cosmetics.

The Directive and its Annexes cover the following cosmetic products:

- Creams, emulsions, lotions, gels and oils for the skin (hands, face, feet, etc.);
- Face masks (with the exception of peeling products);
- Tinted bases (liquids, pastes, powders);
- Make-up powders, after-bath powders, hygienic powders, etc.;
- Toilet soaps, deodorant soaps, etc.;
- Perfumes, toilet waters and eau de Cologne;
- Bath and shower preparations (salts, foams, oils, gels, etc.);
- Depilatories;
- Deodorants and anti-perspirants;
- Hair care products: hair tints and bleaches, products for waving, straightening and fixing, setting products, cleansing products (lotions, powders, shampoos), conditioning products (lotions, creams, oils), and hairdressing products (lotions, lacquers, brilliantines);
- Shaving products (creams, foams, lotions, etc.);
- Products for make-up and removing make-up from the face and the eyes;
- Products intended for application to the lips;
- Products for care of the teeth and the mouth;
- Products for nail care and make-up;
- Products for external intimate hygiene;
- Sunbathing products;
- Products for tanning without sun;
- Skin-whitening products; and,
- Anti-wrinkle products.

The intent of this bill is to be consistent with the approach of the EU's cosmetic regulation. All of the chemicals listed in AB 60 have been fully banned or otherwise restricted in the EU Directive and its Annexes and consequently the chemicals have already been removed or reduced in cosmetic products sold in the EU.

Health studies on Nitro Musks: According to the article, "Human exposure to nitro musks and the evaluation of their potential toxicity: an overview", published in *Environmental Health* (Taylor et al, 2014):

> "Synthetic nitro musks are fragrant chemicals found in household and personal care products. The use of these products leads to direct exposures via dermal absorption, as well as inhalation of contaminated dust and volatilized fragrances. Evidence also suggests that humans are exposed to low doses of these chemicals through oral absorption of contaminated

liquids and foods. As these compounds are lipophilic, they and their metabolites, have been found not only in blood, but also breast milk and adipose tissue. After personal use, these environmentally persistent pollutants then pass through sewage treatment plants through their effluent into the environment.

Little is known about the biological effects in humans after such a prolonged low dose exposure to these chemicals. While epidemiologic studies evaluating the effects of nitro musk exposures are lacking, there is limited evidence that suggest blood levels of nitro musks are inversely related to luteal hormone levels. This is supported by animal models and laboratory studies that have shown that nitro musks are weakly estrogenic. Nitro musks exposure has been associated with an increased risk of tumor formation in mice. The evidence suggests that while nitro musks by themselves are not genotoxic, they may increase the genotoxicity of other chemicals. However, animal models for nitro musk exposure have proven to be problematic since certain outcomes are species specific. This may explain why evidence for developmental effects in animals is conflicting and inconclusive. Given that animal models and cell-line experiments are suggestive of adverse outcomes, further epidemiologic studies are warranted.

In 2008, under the authority of the Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemicals regulation, musk xylene was classified as a substance of high concern with a very persistent, very bioaccumulative designation. A restricted use warning was placed on musk ketone. They found that nitro musk compounds do not degrade easily, causing them to be highly stable and ubiquitous in the environment.

Nitro musks have been largely replaced by polycyclic musks due to banning of these compounds in several countries. However, nitro musks are still being produced in China and India and used in non-cosmetic compounds in the United States that have not been reformulated. Given the environmental persistence and the continued use of nitro musks even at a decreased level, there are concerns for the effects of long-term exposure.

The body of literature supports the conclusion that not only are we being exposed to nitro musks, we are also bioaccumulating them and passing them on to our offspring through breast milk and perinatal exposures. While the animal studies do not address long-term low dose effects, they do indicate that a particular area of focus for health outcomes from nitro musk exposure should be tumor genesis and cancer. While animal studies were conflicting for potential developmental effects, this lack of agreement indicates that more research needs to be done in this field. Human endocrine effects have been seen for nitro musk exposures; this indicates that more studies need to be done in animals and humans at environmentally relevant exposure levels. In light of the evidence, the precautionary principle should be taken into account. This can be done through a reduction in the use and production of products containing nitro musks."

Risk Assessment of Nitro Musks: In Australia, the National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS), regulates chemicals that are manufactured or imported into Australia for an industrial use such as in inks, paints, adhesives, solvents, cosmetics and personal care products (On July 1, 2020, NICNAS was replaced by the Australian Industrial Chemicals Introduction Scheme). On March 8, 2019, NICNAS released a risk assessment of nitromusks, *Nitromusks: Human Health Tier III Assessment*. Exerpts from the assessment include:

"The nitromusks musk xylene, musk ketone, musk tibetene and musk moskene are synthetic fragrances used in domestic and personal care products. Concerns that repeated exposure to these chemicals could adversely affect human health were raised in the e Inventory Multi-tiered Assessment and Prioritisation Tier II assessment. Therefore more detailed quantitative risk assessments were undertaken at the Tier III level.

The use of nitromusks is declining and the chemicals are gradually getting replaced by other synthetic musks, including polycyclic and macrocyclic musks. Despite this decline in use, the public may still be exposed to the chemicals through use as fragrances in cosmetics and domestic products including detergents, fabric softeners, household cleaning products and other fragranced products.

Musk ketone (CAS No. 81-14-1) and musk xylene (CAS No. 81-15-2) are suspected carcinogens. The main organ affected by repeated exposures to nitromusks is the liver. The reported adverse effects include changes in liver weight (musk xylene, musk ketone and musk moskene), liver histology (musk xylene and musk ketone) and liver cancer (musk xylene) (ECB, 2005a-b). Due to a potential public exposure and the hazard profile of the chemicals, a detailed quantitative risk assessment was recommended in the Human Health Hazard Inventory Multi-tiered Assessment and Prioritisation framework.

Conclusions of the Tier III Assessment: The margin of exposures (MOE) for musk xylene and musk ketone are well above 100 and, therefore, considered acceptable for a risk assessment based on a no-observed-adverse-effect-level. Together with the conservative approaches taken in both the risk and the hazard assessments, musk xylene and musk ketone are not considered to pose an unreasonable risk to public health. No national or international uses were identified for musk moskene and musk tibetene.

This assessment has also demonstrated that the current levels of musk xylene and musk ketone reported in the scientific literature are substantially lower than the reported and the restricted concentrations used in the MOE calculations. Finally, the uses of nitromusks have declined in the last decade and several companies have declared that they have stopped using the chemicals (Johnson and Johnson; Unilever; and Procter & Gamble). Environmental assessments of chemicals in this group have determined that musk xylene is persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic to the environment and musk ketone is persistent and toxic. Therefore, environmental regulations are also expected to limit the use of the chemicals, further supporting the conservatism of the exposure assessment. Considering the low risk of toxicity from use of the chemicals in cosmetic, personal care or domestic products and the expected decline in use, no further risk management is required."

Prior legislation: AB 2762 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 314, Statutes of 2020) bans a list of specified ingredients from cosmetics products consistent with the EU's Annex II of regulation No. 1223/2009, which lists the substances prohibited in cosmetic products sold in the EU. All of the ingredients listed in this bill have been fully banned in the EU under Annex II.

While AB 2762 was moving through the legislative process, industry stakeholders weighed in and formally opposed the bill while it was being heard in the Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee. Specifically in opposition to AB 2762, the Personal Care Products Council, Fragrance Creators Association, California Chamber of Commerce, and other industry groups opposeed unless the bill was further amended. They collectively stated:

"The undersigned organizations support better alignment with the health and safety standards set forth by the European Union that prohibit the intentional use of specified ingredients which are listed in the EU Cosmetics Regulation 1223/2009, ANNEX II, List of Substances Prohibited in Cosmetic Products. In order to achieve this goal, AB 2762 needs further amendments. The authors have already publicly committed to aligning California law with the EU regulation – not anything more or less. We remain committed to achieving this goal. As such, we have submitted draft language that we believe would fully align AB 2762 with the EU regulations."

In 2023, AB 496 (Friedman, Chapter 441, Statutes of 2023) amended AB 2762 by adding chemicals that would be prohibited in cosmetics beginning January 1, 2027.

AB 60 is consistent with both AB 496 and AB 2762 and aligns with the EU regulations along the same lines as requested during the debate of AB 2762 and AB 496.

This bill: AB 60 adds several musks to the list of chemicals prohibited to be used, in cosmetics. These musks have been banned in cosmetics in the EU, with the exception of musk ketone which has been restricted (the restrictions in AB 60 mirror the restrictions in the EU). This bill is consistent with previous legislation that banned chemicals in cosmetics that had been banned by the EU.

Further discussion: There is one organization that has submitted an oppose unless amended position seeking to change the implementation date and to remove one of the musks (musk ketone) from the bill. As the bill moves through the process, there are likely to be further discussions on these topics.

Arguments in Support: According to the Environmental Working Group,

> "On behalf of the Environmental Working Group (EWG), I write in support of Assembly Bill (AB) 60 (Papan), which will prohibit the use of nitro musk chemicals in cosmetics and personal care products. By eliminating these hazardous substances, California can reduce exposure to chemicals linked to environmental contamination and serious health risks, particularly for women and girls.
>
> Nitro musks are synthetic fragrance compounds widely used in personal care products, including soaps, perfumes, shampoos, and deodorants. Research has shown that these chemicals persist in the environment, contaminating water systems, accumulating in marine life, and even making their way into the food chain. Studies have detected musks in wastewater treatment plants, air, soil, and human tissue—underscoring their widespread and persistent nature.
>
> Of even greater concern, nitro musks are known endocrine disruptors. The endocrine system plays a critical role in regulating hormones, including those essential for reproductive health. Exposure to endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs) has been linked to alarming trends in early puberty, endometriosis, uterine fibroids, polycystic ovary syndrome, menstrual irregularities, and infertility. Given these risks, it is unacceptable that these chemicals remain in everyday products used by millions of Californians.

The European Union has long recognized the dangers of nitro musks, implementing bans and strict regulations decades ago. California, a leader in environmental and public health protections, must follow suit. AB 60 will align California with the best available science and international health standards by ensuring these harmful chemicals are removed from personal care products."

Arguments in Opposition: According to the Fragrance Creators Association,

"Fragrance Creators Association ("FCA") is writing to express our opposed unless amended position on AB 60. We appreciate your goal of limiting the use of ingredients in cosmetics that pose a risk to California consumers, and we have no reservations regarding the musk-related chemicals that AB 60 seeks to prohibit. We write to raise a concern regarding the proposal of adding concentration limits for musk ketone.

We must respectfully request that this ingredient be removed from the legislation, as the body of regulatory science does not show there is a risk to consumers as used today as established by international agencies and real-world evidence.

It must be emphasized that the limits of musk ketone in Annex III are not reflective of current uses in personal care products. Canada, Japan, and Australia have subsequently conducted their own assessment and concluded that a ban or regulatory restriction was not needed to protect consumer and environmental safety. Accordingly, current – and sound – science does *not* support a restriction of musk ketone in California.

On a practical level, we must advise you that the current timeline – which imposes restrictions on the use of musk ketone as of January 1, 2027 – will be difficult for many companies to meet. Because it may take significant time for companies to reformulate their products, retest their reformulations, and revise labels and packaging, we ask that any restriction on musk ketone be delayed until January 1, 2029.

For these reasons, Fragrance Creators is opposed unless amended to AB 60."

Related legislation:

1) AB 496 (Friedman, Chapter 441, Statutes of 2023). Prohibits, commencing January 1, 2027, a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any of the ingredients specified in the bill.

2) AB 2771 (Friedman, Chapter 804, Statutes of 2022). Prohibits any person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any per- or polyfluoroalkyl substance (PFAS).

3) AB 2762 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 314, Statutes of 2020). Prohibits, beginning January 1, 2025, the manufacture, sale, delivery, holding, or offering for sale in commerce of any cosmetic product containing specified intentionally added ingredients.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

A Voice for Choice Advocacy
California Environmental Voters (formerly CLCV)
California Health Coalition Advocacy
California Public Policy Group
California Women's Law Center
Center for Environmental Health
Cleanearth4kids.org
Environmental Working Group
Women's Voices for The Earth

Opposition

Fragrance Creators Association

Analysis Prepared by: Josh Tooker / E.S. & T.M. / (916) 319-3965