

From: <Alerts@FreeEats.com>  
To: <coshita@oehha.ca.gov>  
Date: 5/10/2010 7:03 PM  
Subject: Comments Regarding The Proposal Spend Additional Tax Dollars  
on BPA

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

(submitted electronically)

Dear Ms. Oshita:

I am a resident of California, and was recently contacted by the Institute for Liberty, a national advocacy organization focused on limiting the expansion of government power. IFL informed me about an attempt by the State of California to limit my choices as a consumer, through your agency's efforts to halt the use of a particular plastic resin, Bisphenol A (BPA). I am submitting these comments in response to this proposal.

Last July, the California Development and Reproductive Toxicant Identification Committee (DART-IC) investigated the safety of the plastic resin Bisphenol A (BPA) and determined that it was safe and should not be classified it as a toxicant under our strict safe drinking laws. The determination was made based on research provided by the National Toxicology Program, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Centers for Disease Control, and investigative scientific bodies in Canada, Australia, Japan and the EU, all of which found BPA to be safe. Immediately after the DART-IC determination and in an effort to promote its own political agenda, a radical environmental group (the Natural Resources Defense Council) requested that another arm of the California government hold yet another hearing on BPA.

Our state is suffering serious financial woes. Tax dollars are spread thin already, and we have little money to spend on redundant public hearings or unreasonable requests from special interests groups trying to further their own agendas but leave us paying the price. The original DART-IC process was necessary to investigate the safety of BPA, but was very expensive for Californian taxpayers. The NRDC's use of the California government as a private army for its own special interests will cost us even more. BPA has been proven safe by multiple private and governmental agencies both in the U.S. and abroad for use in products that use plastics. It poses no harm to our drinking water. But BPA manufacturing and its associated industries does generate \$6.B in wages and 100,000 jobs in the U.S. They also produce tax revenue from sales, property and income taxes.

The science is clear on BPA - it is safe. In our present economic circumstances, California cannot allow special interests to dictate high cost administrative procedures as we have no financial resources left to deal with imaginary threats to health and safety. Banning BPA will limit consumer choices, hurt the state's small businesses, and ultimately cost the state's residents sorely needed jobs.

I urge you to immediately halt any more costly, redundant and completely unnecessary state action on BPA.

Sincerely,

S E GERRARD

REDLANDS, CA 92373

Comment collected by the Institute for Liberty on May 10 2010 9:03PM