



I refer to the recent regulation impact statement decision on Prohibition on the use of engineered stone.

As a COH regularly interacting with industry by assessing crystalline silica exposure, I have witnessed how hard it is for some of these businesses to adequately control exposures. Behaviour changes and education is one of the biggest challenges in this area.

Based on my experience, I would support any of Options 4 through 6, as I believe we need to ensure only operators that have the greatest motivation to achieve compliance are operating in the industry. I would suggest that restricting materials to less than 40% crystalline silica would have one of the greatest impacts in reducing exposure moving forward, thus I would support this option, if not for a complete ban. A complete ban would likely have too great a negative impact on the broader building and construction industry, thus a 40% cap on content would likely have balanced outcome, at least in the interim until a number of years of data can be accrued to determine the health impacts.

Yours Sincerely

