Occurrence and Human Health Risk Assessment of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) in New Jersey's Environment



Gloria B. Post, Ph.D., D.A.B.T. Division of Science & Research New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

ATSDR Topics in Environmental Exposure Investigation Series Webinar December 19, 2019

What are Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)?

- 1000s of manufactured compounds.
 - Aliphatic compounds with at least one totally fluorinated carbon atom.
 - Produced for over 70 years.
- Due to structure of molecule:
 - Repel oil & water.
 - Highly water soluble.
- C-F bond is one of strongest known.
 - Chemically & thermally non-reactive.
- Unique properties are the basis for:
 - Commercial & industrial uses.
 - Extreme environmental persistence.
- Most have little or no health effects data.
- Most not detected by routine lab methods.





NJ Focus (so far...) Primarily on Long-Chain Perfluoroalkyl Acids (PFAAs)

- Most well-known PFAS subgroup.
- Charged functional group:
 - Carboxylates (COO⁻)
 Sulfonates (Carboxylates)
- Totally fluorinated carbon chain length varies.
 - Long chain:
 - > 8 carbons carboxylates
 - <u>></u> 6 carbons sulfonates.
 - Generally more bioaccumulative & toxic than short-chain.
- Considerable health effects data.
- Detected by commercial lab methods.
- Although use in U.S. by major manufacturers has ended.....
 - Do not break down.
 - Environmental contamination persists indefinitely.
 - -Some <u>replacements</u> are of concern.





Long-chain PFAAs found in blood serum of almost all U.S. residents:

- **PFOA:** Perfluorooctanoic acid, C8
- **PFNA:** Perfluorononanoic acid; C9
- **PFOS:** Perfluorooctane sulfonate, C8-S
- **PFHxS:** Perfluorohexane sulfonate, C6-S





Commercial & Industrial Uses of PFAS

- Processing aid in production of fluoropolymer plastics used in non-stick cookware & other products.
 - Very low levels in final products.
 - Examples:
 - PFOA; GenX (PFOA replacement)
 - PFNA; PFNA replacements.
- Water/stain resistant coatings for carpets & upholstery.
- Waterproof/breathable clothing
- Grease-proof food packaging.
- Waxes (including ski waxes), polishes, paints, adhesives
- Cosmetics and personal care products
- Aqueous film forming foams (AFFF) for firefightingand many other uses not listed here









PFAS are Found in Environmental Media Worldwide



Including...

- Ground water & surface water
- Drinking water
- Air (indoor & outdoor)
- Biosolids from sewage treatment plants
- Soil
- Sediments
- Dust (outdoor & indoor)
- Plants, including food crops
- Wildlife, including in remote regions (Arctic)
- Polar ice caps









Similarities in Toxicity Among PFAS in Mammalian Studies

	# of Carbons	Liver	Develop- mental	Repro- ductive	Immune	Hema- tologic	Thyroid	Neuro- behavioral	Tumors		
	Perfluoroalkyl Carboxylates										
PFBA	4										
PFPeA	5										
PFHxA	6								🗆 (Negative)		
PFHpA	7										
PFOA	8										
PFNA	9										
PFDA	10										
PFUnA	11										
PFDoA	12										
			Ре	rfluoroc	alkyl Sulfo	nates	-				
PFBS	4										
PFHxS	6										
PFOS	8										
	Per- & Polyfluoroalkyl Ether Replacements										
ADONA	6										
GenX	6										

Effect reported in one or more laboratory animal study

 \square

Effect was evaluated but not found, or effect has not been evaluated

National Toxicology Program 28-Day Rat Studies of 7 PFAAs

E	STIMATE	D HALF-LI	FE	
	# of			Dose versus Plasma Level
	Carbons	Μ	F	
PFHxA	6	2 h	ours	1000 Males 1000 Females
PFOA	8	5 days	3 hours	
PFNA	9	30 days	1-2 days	
PFDA	10	27-50) days	
PFBS	4	3 h	ours	200-200-
PFHxS	6	29 days	2 days	
PFOS	8	50 0	days	Dose (mol/kg/day)



NJ PFAS Evaluation & Regulation Continues NJ Work on Emerging Drinking Water Contaminants since 1980s



- **1980s** Volatile organic chemicals found in NJ waters in NJDEP study.
 - "Emerging contaminants" of the time No federal standards.
- 1984 New Jersey Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments
 - Requires NJ Maximum Contaminant Levels (standards; MCLs) for:
 - 23 listed contaminants.
 - Additional contaminants based on occurrence & health effects.
 - Establishes Drinking Water Quality Institute (DWQI) to recommend MCLs to NJDEP.
 - Appointed members from environmental health community, academia, and water purveyors.
 - Also members from NJDEP and NJ Dept. of Health.
- NJDEP Commissioner decides whether to propose MCLs as regulatory standards.
 - Enforceable (in contrast to guidance).
 - Require testing of all New Jersey public water systems.
- NJ scientists have evaluated many types of drinking water contaminants since 1984.

DWQI & NJDEP Evaluations (1984 – Present)

<u>Earlier Evaluations</u> (1984 - 2009)

- Volatile Organic Contaminants
- Methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE)
- Radium
- Arsenic
- Perchlorate
- Radon

...and many others



<u>Recent Evaluations</u> (2014 - present)

- 1,2,3-Trichloropropane*
- PFNA*
- PFOA & PFOS**
- 1,4-Dioxane currently underway
- * MCLs adopted by NJDEP in September 2018. FIRST MCL IN THE U.S. FOR ANY PFAS
- ** MCLs proposed by NJDEP on April 1, 2019.

Why Are Long-Chain Perfluoroalkyl Acids (PFAAs) of Particular Concern as Drinking Water Contaminants?

- Widespread drinking water occurrence.
- Do not break down in the environment "Forever Chemicals".
- Ubiquitous in human blood serum.
- Long human half-lives (~2-8 years).
 - Bioaccumulate.
 - Remain in the body for many years after exposure ends.
- Multiple types of animal toxicity, some at low doses.
- Evidence for multiple human health effects from low exposures.



- Low drinking water levels can dominate other exposures (e.g. food/food packaging, consumer products).
 - Unlike other persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic (PBT) chemicals (PCBs & dioxins) Drinking water is not an important exposure route.
- Higher drinking water exposures to infants, a sensitive subgroup.
- Overall suggests need for caution about exposure from drinking water. 10

NJDEP & DWQI Focus on PFAS in Drinking Water Since 2006



Initial NJDEP Awareness & Actions on PFOA in NJ Waters in 2004-07

- **2004:** Reported in **groundwater** at large industrial site in Southwest NJ.
- 2006: Nearby public water system.
 - Found in tap water by Delaware Riverkeeper Network.
 - Found in supply wells by potential industrial source.
 - Found later in nearby private wells.
- 2006-2007: NJDEP Actions:
 - Statewide drinking water occurrence study of PFOA and PFOS (2006).
 - Drinking water guidance (NJDEP, 2007;
 Post et al., 2009) 40 ng/L (ppt)
 Requested by affected water system.







Great Increase in PFAS Research in Recent Years: Example-PFOA



DWQI PFOA Literature Review Strategy

More than 2000 citations identified and screened in 2016.



NJ DWQI, 2016

NJDEP Studies of PFAS Occurrence in NJ Public Water Systems

- First state to conduct statewide PFAS occurrence studies.
 - **2006 study:** 23 water systems PFOA and PFOS.
 - 2009-10 study: 31 water systems 10 PFAAs.
 - Reporting Levels 4-5 ng/L (ppt)
- Multiple PFAS (up to 8) found in many water systems.
 - **PFOA** most frequent, ~60% of systems.
 - **PFOS** 30% of systems.
 - PFNA Paulsboro, Gloucester County
 - Highest level reported in drinking water worldwide.
- Current (2019) Data: PFOA, PFOS and/or PFNA detected above NJ MCL (13-14 ng/L) in ~11% of ~1100 water systems tested.
- Many NJ water systems have taken voluntary action.







Post et al., 2009

PFOS

New Jersey vs. National PFAS Drinking Water Occurrence: 2013-15 USEPA Unregulated Contaminated Monitoring Rule 3 (UCMR3) Study

Compound	Reporting	New J Public Wate	ersey er Systems	U.S. Public Water Systems Other than NJ		
•	Level (ng/L)	# Detects*	% Detects	# Detects	% Detects	
PFOA (C8)	20	19/175	10.9%	98/4745	2.1%	
PFNA (C9)	20	4/175	2.3%	10/4745	0.2%	
PFOS (C8-S)	40	6/175	3.4%	89/4745	1.9%	
PFHxS (C6-S)	30	2/175	1.1%	53/4745	1.1%	
PFBS (C4-S)	90	0/175	0%	8/4745	0.2%	
PFHpA (C7)	10	6/175	3.4%	80/4745	1.7%	

- All large (>10,000 users) and a few small public water systems in U.S.
- **PFOA** and **PFNA** much more frequent in NJ than nationally.
 - PFNA Southwestern NJ (Gloucester and Camden Counties).
 - PFOA Various locations statewide.

Sources of PFAS in Drinking Water & Other Environmental Media

- Industrial facilities where PFAS are made or used.
- Wastewater treatment plants.



- Discharge of treated wastewater.
- Application of sludge/biosolids on agricultural land.
- Release of fire fighting foams.



- Military bases.
- Airports.
- Firefighter training sites.



• Leaching from landfills where PFAS-containing products are disposed.







Some Likely Sources of PFAS in NJ Public Water Systems

- PFOA and PFOS in Northeast NJ
 - Sources unknown for most sites.
 - Efforts to identify sources are ongoing.
- **PFOA & PFNA in Southwest NJ.**
 - Two large industrial sites.
 - Current NJDEP multi-media study with USEPA ORD using research analytical methods.
- PFOA in surface water source

 Small industrial facility upstream of river intake (Procopio et al., 2017).
- Multiple PFAAs (carboxylates & sulfonates)
 - Military use of aqueous film forming foam.



(Raw and finished water sampling locations shown; multiple data points shown for some pubic water systems.)

PFNA (C9) in Drinking Water, Surface Water, & Fish in Gloucester County, NJ

- PFNA rarely detected nationally or elsewhere in NJ.
- Wells of 2 Gloucester County public water systems highest drinking water levels reported worldwide.
 - Later found in **10 additional nearby PWS** and in nearby **private wells.**
- Delaware River in this vicinity Highest surface water levels reported worldwide (~ 1 ppb).
- Also, elevated PFNA and PFUnA (C11) in **fish** at same river locations.



Identification of Industrial Source of PFNA (from information in Prevedouros et al., 2006)

- PFNA was primary component of "Surflon[®] S-111" PFAS mixture used in production of fluoropolymer (polyvinylidene fluoride; PVDF) at Thorofare, NJ facility.
- Large amounts (tons/year) released to air & water for > 20 years.
- Use ceased in 2010.
- PFNA in drinking water from industrial source has not been investigated elsewhere.

TABLE S2. Commercial PFCA Products Characterization									
Product Identification	Figure S1 Process	% Branched Isomers	8 PFO	9 PFN	10 PFD	11 PFU	12 PFDD	13 PFTD	
Fluorad [®] FC-143	1	15	99	0.22	<u><</u> LOQ	nm	<loq< td=""><td>nm</td></loq<>	nm	
Surflon [®] S-111*	3	0	0.78	74	0.37	20	0.1	5	
APFO - DuPont	2	0	99	nd	<u><</u> LOQ	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>nm</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>nm</td></loq<>	nm	

Producer	Location	Process	Capacity,
	Calvert City, KY, USA	Emulsion	8.4
,	Thorofare, NJ, USA	Emulsion	7.7
	Decatur, AL, USA	Suspension	2.3
	Pierre Bénite, France	Emulsion	2.2
	Tavaux, France	Suspension	5.0
201	Ube, Japan	Emulsion?	0.3
	Settsu, Japan	Suspension?	0.1
·· ·	Iwaki, Japan	Suspension	1.2
TOTAL			27.2



Source: Prevedouros et al. 2006. Environ. Sci. Technol. 40: 32-44. Supporting Information.

Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-018-0096-z

ARTICLE

Per and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) blood levels after contamination of a community water supply and comparison with 2013-2014 NHANES

Judith M. Graber^{1,2} · Cora Alexander^{1,3} · Robert J. Laumbach^{3,4} · Kathleen Black⁴ · Pamela Ohman Strickland¹ · Panos G. Georgopoulos^{2,3} · Elizabeth G. Marshall¹ · Derek G Shendell³ · Donald Alderson⁵ · Zhongyuan Mi² · Michael Mascari¹ · Clifford P. Weisel^{2,3}

Received: 4 July 2018 / Revised: 6 November 2018 / Accepted: 7 November 2018 © Springer Nature America, Inc. 2018

Abstract

Introduction Per and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), including perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), were detected in the community water supply of Paulsboro New Jersey in 2009.

Methods A cross-sectional study enrolled 192 claimants from a class-action lawsuit, not affiliated with this study, who had been awarded a blood test for 13 PFAS. Study participants provided their blood test results and completed a survey about demographics; 105 participants also completed a health survey. Geometric means, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 95th percentiles of exposure of PFNA blood serum concentrations were compared to that of the 2013-2014 NHANES, adjusted for reporting level. Associations between PFNA, PFOA, PFOS, and PFHxS and self-reported health outcomes were assessed using logistic regression.

Results PFNA serum levels were 285% higher in Paulsboro compared with U.S. residents. PFNA serum levels were higher among older compared with younger, and male compared to female, Paulsboro residents. After adjustment for potential confounding, there was a significant association between increased serum PFNA levels and self-reported high cholesterol (OR: 1.15, 95% CI: 1.02, 1.29).

Discussion/Conclusion Further investigation into possible health effects of PFAS exposure in Paulsboro and other community settings is warranted. Since exposure has ceased, toxicokinetics of PFAS elimination should be explored.

PFAS		n	Geometric Mean (95% CI)	25th (95% CI)	50th (95% CI)	75th (95% CI)	95th (95% CI)
PFHxS	Paulsboro	124	2.03 (1.84, 2.25)	1.33 (1.20, 1.45)	2.02 (1.67, 2.38)	2.77 (2.49, 3.05)	4.70 (3.63, 5.76)
	NHANES	1432	2.18 (2.02, 2.36)	1.31 (1.24, 1.38)	1.93 (1.76, 2.10)	3.10 (2.74, 3.45)	6.46 (4.48, 8.44)
PFOA	Paulsboro	165	3.03 (2.70, 3.40)	1.94 (1.67, 2.22)	2.98 (2.43, 3.53)	4.69 (3.87, 5.51)	8.80 (6.91, 10.70)
	NHANES	2080	2.08 (1.91, 2.26)	1.35 (1.28, 1.43)	2.05 (1.89, 2.21)	3.06 (2.74, 3.37)	5.57 (4.63, 6.51)
PFOS	Paulsboro	164	5.37 (4.75, 6.06)	3.09 (2.57, 3.60)	5.66 (4.73, 6.59)	9.28 (7.93, 10.62)	14.76(11.62, 17.90)
	NHANES	2098	5.39 (4.98, 5.84)	3.20 (2.88, 3.51)	5.34 (4.95, 5.72)	8.76 (8.08, 9.43)	18.48 (15.26, 21.70)
PFNA	Paulsboro	165	3.50 (3.04, 4.04)	2.01 (1.60, 2.42)	3.89 (3.18, 4.60)	5.99 (4.47, 7.51)	12.41 (9.68, 15.13)
	NHANES	1599	0.91 (0.87, 0.96)	0.58 (0.57, 0.59)	0.78 (0.75, 0.81)	1.18 (1.09, 1.28)	2.22 (1.90, 2.54)

CDC and ATSDR Award \$7 Million to Begin Multi-Site PFAS Study

Press Release

For Immediate Release: September 23, 2019 **Contact:** <u>Media Relations</u> (404) 639-3286

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) are announcing the start of a multi-site health study to investigate the relationship between drinking water contaminated with per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and health outcomes. CDC and ATSDR are making awards, in the amount of \$1 million each, to the following institutions to look at exposures in communities listed:

- Colorado School of Public Health, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, to look at exposures in El Paso County, CO
- Michigan State Department of Health and Human Services to look at exposures in Parchment/Cooper Township, MI, and North Kent County, MI
- RTI International and the Pennsylvania Department of Health to look at exposures in Montgomery County, PA
- Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences School of Public Health to look at exposures in Gloucester County, NJ
- Silent Spring Institute to look at exposures in Hyannis, MA, and Ayer, MA
- University at Albany, SUNY and New York State Department of Health to look at exposures in Hoosick Falls, NY, and Newburgh, NY
- University of California Irvine to look at exposures in communities near the UC Irvine Medical Center

DWQI & NJDEP Health Effects Evaluation & Risk Assessment of PFOA, PFOS, & PFNA

DWQI Conclusion: Low Drinking Water Concentrations of Long-Chain PFAAs Can Dominate Other Exposure Sources



- Clearance factor (based on t_{1/2} & V_D) predicts PFOA serum:drinking water ratio:
 - 114:1 average water consumption
 - 200:1 upper % water consumption.
- Supported by empirical data from several locations.
- Higher ratios predicted for other long-chain PFAAs (PFOS, PFNA) with longer half-lives.



enzymes, ψ vaccine response, and ψ birth weight.

Relationship Between Drinking Water and Serum Concentrations for Long-Chain PFAAs

- Clearance factor (CL) relates dose to blood serum level.
 - CL (L/kg/day) = Volume of Distribution (L) x (In 2 ÷ Half-life [days])
- Combine with water ingestion rate (L/kg/day) to relate water & serum levels.

Dose (μg/kg/day) = Serum Conc. (μg/L) x CL (L/kg/day)

Dose (µg/kg/day) = Drinking Water Conc. (µg/L) x Ingestion Rate (L/kg/day)

Serum:Water Ratio = <u>Serum Conc. (μg/L)</u> = <u>Ingestion Rate (L/kg/day)</u> Drinking Water Conc. (μg/L) CL (L/kg/day)



Greater Increases in Blood Serum PFAA Levels in Infants

- Higher exposures from breast milk or formula:
 - PFAAs level in breast milk <u>></u> in maternal drinking water.
 - Infants ingest much more fluid per body wt.
- Sensitive subpopulation for developmental & other short-term effects.





New Jersey Conclusions: Human Epidemiology Data in Risk Assessment of Long-Chain PFAAs

- Human data are preferred as basis for risk assessment if suitable.
 - But some other regulated contaminants have little or no human data.
- Evidence for multiple human health effects at low exposures to long-chain PFAAs:

↑ cholesterol (PFOA, PFOS, PFNA)
↑ uric acid (PFOA)
↓

↑ liver enzymes (PFOA, PFNA)
↓ birth weight (PFOA)

vaccine response (PFOA, PFOS)
 infectious disease (PFOS)
 testicular & kidney cancer (PFOA)

- Some effects are generally consistent & data support criteria for causality.
- Generally concordant with toxicity in animal studies.
- However, limitations preclude human data as primary basis for risk assessment.
 - Exposures to multiple PFAS are correlated, so dose-response for each PFAS cannot be determined.
- Conclusion: Human data provide support for public health protective approach based on animal toxicology data.
 - More human data than for many other drinking water contaminants.
 - Justify concern about additional exposure from drinking water.



DWQI Risk Assessment Approach for PFAS

Based on **Reference Dose** for most sensitive <u>non-cancer</u> endpoint that are wellestablished, adverse, and relevant to humans.



Reference Dose (ng/kg/day) =Point of DepartureUncertainty Factors

Definition: "Daily oral dose to humans (including sensitive subgroups) likely to be **without appreciable risk** of deleterious effects during a lifetime."

Carcinogenicity evaluation:

- **PFOA** & **PFOS**: "Suggestive evidence for carcinogenicity in humans"
 - Cancer risk (at 1-in-1 million risk level) was not driving factor.
- -PFNA: No chronic studies.

```
NOTE: New NTP chronic rat PFOA study (draft - 10/15/19; peer review – 12/12/19) was not considered.
```

- "Clear evidence" in males; "Some evidence" in females.
- Benign & malignant tumors of pancreas, liver, possibly uterus.
- Much higher tumor incidence than in earlier chronic studies.

Animal-to-Human Comparison in DWQI PFAS Risk Assessment



- Based on internal dose (serum level), not administered dose.
- Because half-life much longer in humans than animals -> Same dose results in much higher internal dose (serum level) in humans than animals.
- Reference Doses are based on studies that provide **blood serum PFAS data**.

	# of		R	at		
	Carbons	wouse	M F		Human	
PFOA	8	18 days	5 days	3 hours	~2-3 years	
PFNA	9	50 days	30 days	1-2 days	Estimated as twice PFOA	
PFOS	8	37 days	50	days	~3-5 years	

Development of NJ PFAA Reference Doses

<u>Serum Level Point of Departure (POD) for animal endpoint</u> (ng/ml; BMDL, NOAEL, or LOAEL)

Apply Uncertainty Factors

(Note: Animal-to-Human – 3; Toxicokinetic differences accounted for by use of serum level as dose metric)

Target Human Serum Level (ng/ml; µg/L)

Apply Clearance Factor:

Target Human Serum Level (μg/L) x **Clearance (L/kg/day)** = RfD (μg/kg/day)

Reference Dose (µg/kg/day)

DWQI PFOA Reference Dose: Delayed Mammary Gland Development

- Most sensitive effect with serum PFOA data.
- Well established 9 mouse studies; from gestational and/or lactational exposure.
 - Only 1 negative study with problematic issues.
- Adverse Structural changes persist until adulthood.
- Human relevance:
 - Considered relevant to humans.
 - PFOA associated with \checkmark duration of breastfeeding in several human studies.
- Reference Dose: 0.11 ng/kg/day; below general population exposure.
 - Benchmark Dose modeling (data from Macon et al., 2011).
 - \downarrow mammary gland developmental score
 - \downarrow number of terminal end buds.
 - Health-based MCL would be 0.77 ng/L <u>Not recommended</u>:
 - **No precedent** for this effect as primary basis for risk assessment.
- Uncertainty Factor for more sensitive mammary gland effects.



DWQI PFOA Reference Dose: Increased Liver Weight

- Increased liver weight and hepatocellular hypertrophy well-established effects in monkeys and rodents.
- Most sensitive effect with serum PFOA data, except mammary gland.



- **Co-occur with and/or progress** to more severe hepatic effects (*e.g. necrosis*).
- Reference Dose (2 mg/kg/day)
 - Based on increased liver weight in mice (Loveless et al., 2007).
 - Includes additional uncertainty factor for delayed mammary gland development and other low-dose developmental effects.

DWQI Mode of Action Analysis for PFOA: Human Relevance of Rodent Hepatic Toxicity

- PFOA activates peroxisome proliferator activated receptor (PPAR-α) and other nuclear receptors.
 - Involved with hepatic, developmental, and other effects.
 - PPAR- α is functional in human liver.
 - Rodent liver tumors due to PPAR-α activation may not be relevant to humans.
- Are non-cancer hepatic effects of PFOA relevant to humans?
- Extensive review of data from:
 - Non-human primates
 - Standard rodent strains
 - Humanized PPAR-α mice.
 - Overall DWQI conclusion: Non-cancer liver toxicity of PFOA in rodents is relevant to humans for the purposes of risk assessment.

- PPAR-α null mice
- Human tissues.
- In vitro studies.





DWQI PFOS Reference Dose: Decreased Immune Response (Pachkowski et al. 2019. Env. Research)

- Based on decreased plaque forming cell response in mice (Dong et al., 2009).
 Measures antibody response to foreign antigen.
- Well established 4 positive studies; only 1 negative study.
- No reason to discount human relevance.
- Supported by human data:
 - *ibody response to vaccines.*
 - ↑ incidence of infectious
 disease.
- Reference Dose 1.8 ng/kg/day
- Other federal and state PFOS evaluations:
 - NTP (2016) systematic review: Presumed human immune hazard.
 - ATSDR (2018 draft) and at least 5 other states (CA, MI, MN, NH, NY) assessments based on decreased immune system response.



DWQI PFNA Reference Dose: Increased Liver Weight

• "NJ-specific contaminant" – not evaluated by USEPA.



- Toxicity (hepatic, developmental, immune, male reproductive) generally **similar to PFOA** but:
 - Longer half-life.
 - Effects at lower doses.
 - Some effects are more severe.
- Human half-life estimated as twice PFOA:
 - Comparison of rodent half-lives for PFOA and PFNA.
 - Limited human half-life data urinary excretion.
- RfD based on **↑ liver weight** in pregnant mice (Das et al., 2015)
 - Only study at the time with **serum PFNA data**.
- Liver damage (necrosis) much more sensitive effect, but could not be used:
 - Numerical serum PFNA data not provided by study sponsors.
 - Uncertainty factor of 3 for more sensitive effects.
- Reference Dose 0.74 ng/kg/day (3-fold lower than PFOA)
- DWQI conclusions supported by recent NTP 28-day rat study..

NJ, USEPA, ATSDR & European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) Toxicity Factors (ng/kg/day) for PFOA & PFOS

		<u>PFOA</u>		<u>PFOS</u>	
Agency	Species	Basis	Tox. Factor	Basis	Tox. Factor
USEPA		Development: Delayed bone development & earlier male puberty (mouse)	20	Developmental: ↓ offspring body weight (rat)	20
New Jersey	Animal	 ↑ Liver weight (mouse): • Uncertainty factor for mammary gland delay. 	2	Immune suppression (mouse)	1.8
ATSDR Draft		Developmental: Behavioral & skeletal changes (mouse)	3	 ↓ Offspring body weight (rat); • With uncertainty factor for immune toxicity (mouse) 	2
EFSA	Human	 ↑ cholesterol (also ↑ liver enzyme ALT, ↓ birth weight) 	0.8	 ↑ cholesterol; ↓ vaccine response; ↓ birth weight 	1.8

Dose-Response for Developmental Endpoints Used as Basis for USEPA PFOA Health Advisory



4 BMDLBMD ________ 0 50 100 150 200 250 dose 11:27 03/24 2016

Reference Dose is Combined with Drinking Water Exposure Assumptions to Derive Health-based MCL

Health-based MCL =

<u>Reference Dose (mg/kg/day) x Body Wt. (kg) x Relative Source Contribution (%)</u> Drinking Water Consumption (L/day)

Drinking Water Ingestion Rate (L/kg/day)

- NJ Default adult ingestion rate.
- Other assessments:
 - Ingestion rates for sensitive subgroups.
 - Lactating women (higher)
 - Infants (highest).



- Minnesota Dept. of Health model for prenatal and infant exposure.

Relative Source Contribution factor:

- Accounts for non-drinking water exposure sources (e.g. food, consumer products, air).
 - NJ used default assumption: 20% of Reference Dose from drinking water; 80% from other sources.
 - Higher chemical-specific value can be used if data available.



Increases in Serum PFOA & PFOS Predicted from NJ Health-based MCLs (13-14 ng/L) & USEPA Health Advisories (70 ng/L)

"NJ Drinking Water Quality Institute Health Effects Subcommittee concludes that these [blood serum PFAS] increases [at 70 ng/L] are **not desirable and may not be protective of public health.**"

> SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR

MANAGING PFAS CONTAMINATION IN MICHIGAN



Michigan PFAS Science Advisory Panel Report (Dec. 2018)

"If one accepts the probable links between PFOA exposure and adverse health effects detected in the epidemiological literature as critical effects for health risk assessment, then 70 ppt in drinking water might not be sufficiently protective for PFOA."

Factors Considered in DWQI PFAS MCL Recommendations

- Health-based MCL
- Practical Quantitation Level (PQL)
 - Level reliably measured by drinking water laboratories.
- Availability of treatment removal technology.
- * Health-based MCL is the goal *
 - PFAS MCLs not limited by analytical or treatment factors.
- Therefore, PFAS MCLs are set at Health-based MCLs.

(Units: ng/L)	Health-based MCL	Analytical PQL	Treatment Removal	Recommended MCL
PFOA	14	6	Not limiting	14
PFOS	13	4.2	Not limiting	13
PFNA	13	5	Not limiting	13

Public Participation in NJDEP MCL Development Process



Current Status of NJDEP PFAS Regulations

PFNA:

- MCL & Ground Water Quality Standard 13 ng/L (2018).
- First MCL in the nation for any PFAS.
- Quarterly monitoring by public water systems has begun:
 - 2019: ~ 1100 small groundwater systems; nontransient noncommunity systems (e.g. schools, factories).
 - Most are also voluntarily reporting PFOA & PFOS.
 - Through 3rd quarter of 2019: ~11% of systems detected 1 or more PFAS above MCL.
 - MCL violations issued for 6 systems, based on running annual average > PFNA MCL.
 - 2020: Large groundwater systems; all surface water systems.
- Added to NJ Hazardous Substances List (2018).

PFOA & PFOS:

- Interim Ground Water Quality Standards: PFOA-10 ng/L; PFOS-10 ng/L (March 2019).
- Rule proposal (April 2019):
 - MCLs & Ground Water Quality Standards: PFOA 14 ng/L; PFOS 13 ng/L.
 - Add to NJ Hazardous Substances List.
 - Add to NJ Private Well Testing Act.
- In New Jersey, rule adoptions must occur within one year of rule proposal.

NJDEP Study of PFAS in Fish Tissue, Sediments & Surface Water

- 11 sites statewide selected for:
 - Proximity of potential source.
 - Recreational and/or subsistence fishing.
- ~100 fish collected.
 - 12 species (2-4 species per site)
 - 3 trophic levels
- Shorter-chain PFAAs detected in almost all surface water samples, but not in fish.

Compound	# of Sites (n=11)	# of Species- Sites (n=32)	Maximum conc. (ng/g)
PFOS	11	30	162.5
PFUnA	11	31	27.2
PFDoA	10	28	5.42
PFDA	10	24	3.57
PFOSA	3	5	2.83
PFHxS	3	4	1.66
PFNA	2	4	1.39
PFOA	1	2	0.72

Reporting Levels: 0.5 – 1 ng/g (ppb)



NJ Fish Consumption Advisories for PFAS (2018)



	G	eneral Populati	ion	Hig	h Risk Populat	ion*	
	PFOA	PFNA	PFOS	PFOA	PFNA	PFOS	
	(ng/g; ppb)	(ng/g; ppb)	(ng/g; ppb)	(ng/g; ppb)	(ng/g; ppb)	(ng/g; ppb)	
Unlimited	0.62	0.23	0.56	0.62	0.23	0.56	
Once/Week	4.3	1.6	3.9	4.3	1.6	3.9	
Once/Month	18.6	6.9	17	18.6	6.9	17	
Once/3 months	57	21	51	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Once/Year	226	84	204	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Do Not Eat	>226	>84	>204	>18.6	>6.9	>17	

* High risk – infants, children, pregnant & nursing women, women of childbearing age.

- Consumption Advisory Triggers based on NJ Reference Doses.
 - Assume 227 g (8 oz.) meal size, 70 kg body weight.
- Advisories for <u>PFOS</u> at all study sites.
 - Consumption frequency ranges from once per week to once per year.
 - For 1 3 species at each site.

Additional Current PFAS Issues

Current Issue: USEPA & States' PFAS MCLs & Guidance Levels

- No federal drinking water standards (MCLs) for PFAS.
- 1996 amendments to Federal Safe Drinking Water Act
 - Established lengthy & complex process for new MCLs.
 - No federal MCLs for new contaminants since 1990s...
 - ...Despite unregulated contaminants of more concern than some regulated ones.
- USEPA intends to make draft decision in 2019 on whether to develop PFOA & PFOS MCLs.
 - -If federal MCLs are developed, process would take many years.
- USEPA (2016) Drinking Water Health Advisory (guidance) for PFOA & PFOS of 70 ng/L.
 - Since 2016, ATSDR and at least 8 states have developed PFOA & PFOS drinking water risk assessments more stringent than USEPA's.
- NJ and some other states (e.g. CA, MA) have developed their own MCLs for many years.
- Additional states (e.g. MI, NH, PA) have developed PFAS MCLs or plan to do so.
 - Due to nationwide concerns about PFAS in drinking water.



USEPA & State PFAS Drinking Water Guidelines (ng/L; ppt)

(Includes Standards & Guidance Values – Proposed/Recommended* & Final)

	PFOA	PFOS	PFNA	PFHxS	PFHpA	PFDA	Total?	PFBA	PFHxA	PFBS	GenX
EPA	70	70					Yes (2)				
CA	5.1	6.5					No (2)				
СТ	70	70	70	70	70		Yes (5)				
MA*	20	20	20	20	20	20	Yes (6)			2000	
MI*	8	16	6	51			No		400,000	420	370
MN	35	15		47			No	7000		2000	
NH	12	15	11	18			No				
NJ	14*	13*	13				No				
NY*	10	10					No				
NC											140
VT	20	20	20	20	20		Yes (5)				



Setting Their Own Drinking-Water Standards

SOURCE: Inquirer real



Seven states, including Pennsylvania and New Jersey, are at different stages of a multiyear process for setting their own drinking-water standards for PEDA and PEOS, the two perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) that have been several years to establish PFAS standards. Pennsylvania is working to establish its own standards.

JOHN OUCHNESKE / SWE MIL

CHEMICAL EXPOSURE

States act as water safety at EPA lags

Unhappy with fods, Ph., NJ., and others move toward their own drinking water limits.

> By Justice McDanie and Lasers McCrossal

When Maria Collett began intention on divorts an a Pennsylvania state lien eu candidate in 2018, ohe heard one row and over the sum for driviking water

nard it from mothers who remainds or of hursuiff. From a nast who strug of with what to toll his children also or water they drash. From a water to required life altering nargery to a condition that cruic be indeed to forming that had been widely dis red in the local water supply submits in the Harshain, War

risis that new in Bucks and Mr. ad as we

ing works standards on

State & USEPA PFOA Drinking Water Guidelines: 2002-2019 (Note Logarithmic Scale)



Year

State & USEPA PFOA Drinking Water Guidelines: 2002-2019 (Note Logarithmic Scale)



Year



Current Issue: Replacements for Phased Out Long-Chain PFAAs

- 100s of new PFAS/replacements approved by USEPA.
- Short-chain PFAAs (e.g. PFBS) or PFAS with other structures
- Some have shorter half-lives, but no data for others.
- Most have **no toxicity data and** not detected by commercial labs.



- And some have similar toxicity to long-chain PFAS (e.g. GenX).
- And, like long-chain PFAS, do not break down.
- Recently **detected in environmental media** in NJ and elsewhere.
- Current topic of major scientific, regulatory, and public interest.





Current Issue: Toxicity Evaluations for Large Number of PFAS

- Mammalian toxicology testing of large numbers of PFAS is not feasible.
- Current USEPA/NTP effort to develop predictions based on high throughput data.
 - Read-across for PFAS that have in vivo data.
 - Structural diversity to characterize "PFAS landscape."

BUT...not yet known if predictions will be consistently accurate, and...
 High throughput data cannot be used as primary basis for risk assessment under current risk assessment guidelines.



Cierced Testing: In Vitro Toxicokinetic Assays				
		EPA		
Endpoint of Interest	NTP	NCCT	NERL	
Hepatic Clearance	Human primary hepatocyte clearance			
Plasma Protein Binding			Ultracentrifugation assay	
Renal Transport	Renal proximal tubule permeability assay			
Enterohepatic Recirculation		Piloting hepatic transporter assay		
In Vitro Disposition	Cell vs. nominal concentration (Tox21 joint project)	Cell vs. nominal concentration (Tox21 joint project)		
\$ EPA	EPA Tiered Testing: In Vitro Toxicity Assays			
Endpoint of Interest	NTP	NCCT	NHEERL	
Genome-Wide Screening (Tier 0)		High Throughput Transcriptomics (Httr) in 2 cell types and Phenotyipic Profiling		
Hepatotoxicity	2D HepaRG cytotoxicity; 3D HepaRG (spheroid) transcriptomics	Attagene cis- and trans- Factorial assay (HepG2)		
Developmental Toxicity			Zebrafish embryo assay (ZEA)	
Immunotoxicity	Bioseek Immune panel			
Mitochondrial Toxicity	2D HepaRG mitochondrial dye and Seahorse assay			
Developmental Neurotoxicity			Neurodevelopmental microelectrode assay (MEA)	

Finally, other current PFAS issues (<u>not</u> specific to New Jersey) include...

- Risk assessment and/or regulation of PFAS individually or as a group?
- Pollution prevention source reduction
- Occurrence in multiple environmental media
- Characterization of multiple exposure sources
- Analytical methods for non-target & total PFAS
- Remediation treatment removal technologies & potential approaches for destruction

...and many other challenging questions.

Many current and former colleagues from:

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection



New Jersey Department of Health



and the

New Jersey Drinking Water Quality Institute

contributed to the work presented here.

Thank you!

For questions or additional information:

gloria.post@dep.nj.gov

(609) 292-8497

NJDEP Rules and Regulations Websites

 Adopted rules: <u>https://www.nj.gov/dep/rules/adoptions.html</u>

 Proposed rules: <u>https://www.nj.gov/dep/rules/notices.html</u>

Links to NJDEP & NJ Drinking Water Quality Institute PFAS Reports

NJ Drinking Water Quality Institute Maximum Contaminant Levels Recommendations

• Perfluorooctane Sulfonate (PFOS), June 2018

<u>Appendix A</u> – Health-Based Maximum Contaminant Level Support Document for PFOS

Appendix B – Report on the Development of a Practical Quantitation Level for PFOS in Drinking Water

<u>Appendix C</u> – Second Addendum to Appendix C: Recommendation on Perfluorinated Compound Treatment Options for Drinking Water

<u>Appendix D</u> – Responses to Comments on DWQI Health Effects Subcommittee Report: "Public Review Draft - Health-Based Maximum Contaminant Level Support Document: PFOS"

- <u>Perfluorooctanoic Acid</u> (PFOA), March 2017
 - Appendix A Health-Based Maximum Contaminant Level Support Document" PFOA

<u>Appendix B</u> – Report on the Development of a Practical Quantitation Level for PFOA in Drinking Water

<u>Appendix C</u> – Addendum to Appendix C: Recommendation on Perfluorinated Compound Treatment Options for Drinking Water

<u>Appendix D</u> – Responses to Comments on DWQI Health Effects Subcommittee Report: "Public Review Draft-Health-Based Maximum Contaminant Level Support Document: PFOA"

Perfluorononanoic Acid (PFNA), July 2015

Appendix A – Health-Based Maximum Contaminant Level Support Document: PFNA

Appendix B – Report on the development of a Practical Quantitation Level for PFNA

<u>Appendix C</u> – Recommendation on Perfluorinated Compound Treatment Options for Drinking Water

NJDEP Studies

- <u>Investigation of Levels of Perfluorinated Compounds in New Jersey Fish, Surface Water, and Sediment (2018)</u>
- Identification of Perfluorinated Carboxylic Acids (PFCAs) in the Metedeconk River Watershed (February 2016)
 <u>Research Project Summary</u> <u>Full Report</u>
- Occurrence of Perfluorinated Chemicals in Untreated New Jersey Drinking Water Sources (2009-10 Study)
- Determination of Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) in Aqueous Samples (2006 Study). <u>https://www.nj.gov/dep/dsr/dw/final_pfoa_report.pdf</u>

NJDEP PFAS Publications

- Pachkowski, B., Post, G.B., Stern, A.H. (2019). The derivation of a Reference Dose (RfD) for perfluoroctane sulfonate (PFOS) based on immune suppression. Env. Research 171:452-469
- Post, G.B., Gleason, J.A., Cooper, K.R. (2017). Key scientific issues in developing drinking water guidelines for perfluoroalkyl acids: Contaminants of emerging concern. PLoS Biol. 15(12):e2002855. Open access at https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article/file?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.2002855&type=printable
- Procopio, N.A., Karl, R., Goodrow, S.M., Maggio, J., Louis, J.B., Atherholt, T.B. (2017). Occurrence and source identification of perfluoroalkyl acids (PFAAs) in the Metedeconk River Watershed, New Jersey. Environ Sci Pollut Res Int. 24:27125-27135.
- Gleason, J.A., Post, G.B, and Fagliano, J.A. (2015). Associations of perfluorinated chemicals (PFCs) serum concentrations and select biomarkers of health in the US population (NHANES), 2007-2010 Env. Research 136: 8-14.
- Post, G.B., Louis, J.B., Lippincott, R.L., and Procopio, N.A. (2013). Occurrence of perfluorinated chemicals in raw water from New Jersey public drinking water systems. Env. Sci. Technol. 47 (23):13266-75.
- Post, G.B., Cohn, P.D., and Cooper, K.R. (2012). Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), an emerging drinking water contaminant: a critical review of recent literature. Env. Res. 116: 93-117.
- Post, G.B., Louis, J.B., Cooper, K.R., Boros-Russo, B.J., and Lippincott, R.L. (2009). Occurrence and potential significance of perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) detected in New Jersey public drinking water systems. Environ. Sci, Technol. 43: 4547–4554.