

**Responses to Major Comments on
Technical Support Document**

**Public Health Goal
For
Methoxychlor
In Drinking Water**

Prepared by

**Pesticide and Environmental Toxicology Section
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
California Environmental Protection Agency**

February 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | II |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| RESPONSES TO MAJOR COMMENTS RECEIVED..... | 2 |
| U.S. EPA Office of Water | 2 |

INTRODUCTION

The following are responses to major comments received by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) on the proposed public health goal (PHG) technical support document for methoxychlor as discussed at the PHG workshop held on October 6, 1998, or as revised following the workshop in response to other comments. Some commenters may have provided comments on both the first and second drafts. For the sake of brevity, we have selected the more important or representative comments for responses. Comments appear in quotation marks where they are directly quoted from the submission; paraphrased comments are in italics.

These comments and responses are provided in the spirit of the open dialogue among scientists that is part of the process under Health and Safety Code Section 57003. For further information about the PHG process or to obtain copies of PHG documents, visit the OEHHA web site at www.oehha.org. OEHHA may also be contacted at:

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
301 Capitol Mall, Room 205
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 324-7572

RESPONSES TO MAJOR COMMENTS RECEIVED

U.S. EPA Office of Water

Comment: “The California draft PHG document is adequate and contain more up-to-date information that were not available to OW at the time the MCLG/MCL was developed. The new 1997 rat developmental/reproductive studies are considered as the basis for the PHG of 0.03 mg/L. It is noted that the MCLG/MCL of 0.04 mg/L is almost in the same range of the PHG. The EPA value was based on a rabbit developmental study. It is also noted that this rabbit study was not discussed in the California draft document.”

Response: No changes are needed in response to the above comment. The rabbit study on which the U.S. EPA value was based is in fact discussed in the PHG document.

No other comments have been received on this document.