



March 19, 2013

Cynthia Oshita
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
P.O. Box 4010, MS-19B
Sacramento, California 95812-4010

Subject: NOIL-Bisphenol A

Dear Ms. Oshita,

On behalf of the Breast Cancer Fund, I am writing to submit our comments in response to the recent notice of the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's (OEHHA) intent to list bisphenol A (BPA) on the Proposition 65 list as a reproductive toxicant using the authoritative bodies listing mechanism outlined in Section 25306(c) of the California Health and Safety Code.

Over the last decade, research has demonstrated that BPA can have devastating effects on the developing fetus. In 2008, the National Toxicology Program (NTP) formally acknowledged that BPA can cause decreased birth weight and can interfere with the timing of puberty in its final report to its Center for the Evaluation of Risks to Human Reproduction.

We agree with OEHHA's assessment that the scientific evidence has clearly shown that BPA impacts human reproduction. We also concur that the requirements outlined in Section 25249.8 of the California Health and Safety Code have been met. Therefore, we strongly support the office's decision to list BPA as a reproductive toxicant.

We must also state our concern with length of time it has taken for OEHHA to meet its statutory obligation to list BPA as a reproductive toxicant based on the authoritative bodies mechanism. Section 25306 (c) requires the state to list a chemical on the Proposition 65 list if an authoritative body has found that the chemical is either a carcinogen or reproductive toxicant. The NTP report cited in this particular listing was published in 2008. The fact that it has taken OEHHA five years to list this chemical is highly concerning. We urge OEHHA to do everything in its power to expedite the rest of the BPA listing process and to move at a more deliberate pace when listing future chemicals

In addition, we urge OEHHA to continue its examination of BPA's toxicity at low doses. Hundreds of animal studies have demonstrated BPA's toxic effects on both reproductive and developmental outcomes at doses far below those that are cited in the NTP report on BPA. NTP itself has cited "some concern" for the effects of BPA at low doses. In fact, several dozen studies have since been released since the NTP report's publication.

Finally, we are dismayed that the public comment period was extended by OEHHA in response to a request from special interest chemical manufacturers and their trade associations. This industry has repeatedly asked for extra time to provide public comment, even when ample time and ample notice has been given. OEHHA has been working on listing BPA for over two years and the NTP CERHR report that is the basis for this listing was released four years ago. We fail to see how an industry with such a wealth of resources is unable to meet the very same timeframe that severely underresourced non-profit public and environmental health organizations and academicians have been able to meet. We

The Breast Cancer Fund works to identify and eliminate the environmental causes of the disease.

415 346.8223 www.breastcancerfund.org info@breastcancerfund.org

urge OEHHA to deny any future extensions on this and on other listings that have undergone similar lengthy scrutiny.

We urge OEHHA to move quickly to list BPA on the Proposition 65 list and look forward to our continued work together to ensure that the impacts of low-dose exposure to BPA are fully examined and incorporated into OEHHA's efforts to protect the public from exposure to harmful chemicals.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jeanne Rizzo".

Jeanne Rizzo, RN
President and CEO