

From: <adepeyst@mail.sdsu.edu>
To: <coshita@oehha.ca.gov>
CC: <adepeyst@mail.sdsu.edu>
Date: 7/13/2009 10:57 AM
Subject: RE: ETBE REQUEST FOR COMMENTS (Prop 65)

RE: ETBE: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON CHEMICALS PROPOSED FOR LISTING BY THE LABOR CODE MECHANISM
[06/12/09]

Dear Ms. Oshita,

I must comment on OEHHA's apparent reliance on incomplete and now outdated information in their review of the Prop 65 listing of ETBE by the labor code mechanism.

Medinsky et al (1999) reported seeing testicular effects in Fisher 344 rats, but others have followed up on this claim and have been unable to replicate these findings.

Has OEHHA considered all of the consistently negative testicular effects in male rats in several more recent GLP reproductive toxicology studies, most notably Gaoua 2003 and Gaoua 2004 (two studies)? I am also aware of several GLP studies sponsored by the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry in which male rats were gavaged with MTBE with no effects observed on testicular pathology or male reproductive function.

I have considerable respect for OEHHA scientists, many of whom are close colleagues or former students from our program. Some must already know from a review by Doug McGregor (2007) that Gaoua's studies could not reproduce Medinsky's findings and instead provide consistent support for lack of reproductive effects in rats. The later Japanese studies are harder to obtain. I urge OEHHA to request details of these studies from the study sponsors if they do not already have them.

As a fuel oxygenates researcher at San Diego State University's Graduate School of Public Health for over 15 years now---and also a California resident who supports OEHHA's attempts to protect the public health of California citizens based on the most current sound science---I feel especially compelled to question OEHHA on this particular issue. Designating ETBE a reproductive toxicant at this time on the basis of the Medinsky study alone, and indeed, with any evidence that I could see from this notice that newer studies were even consulted, is not a good decision that I could support.

Again, I must emphasize that judging from everything I have seen so far I find it increasingly hard to believe that Medinsky's description of effects in male rat testes that makes ETBE appear to be more potent than MTBE in this regard is reproducible or significant with respect to making predictions about human health. My judgment is based on several additional studies, most of which are GLP, and some other data in an ETBE manuscript from my lab that was recently accepted for publication in Toxicology Letters.

In summary: I strongly urge OEHHA to consult all of the latest studies before setting any kind of standards based on old findings that could not be replicated. I appreciate this opportunity to voice my concern about this upcoming decision.

Ann de Peyster, Ph.D.
Graduate School of Public Health
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182
o: 619-594-3690
c: 858-699-3599