

Biomonitoring California: The Task Ahead

Thomas F. Webster
Professor of Environmental Health
BUSPH

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF
PUBLIC HEALTH

Biomonitoring California Scientific
Guidance Panel Meeting
8 March 2017
Sacramento

Fundamental task: exposure surveillance

- trends
- emerging compounds
- evaluate interventions
- geographical differences
- vulnerable groups
- ...

There are many reasons to use biomonitoring for this purpose.

Other potential uses:

- e.g., support epidemiology & exposure studies

A number of issues, e.g.:


- Who to sample?
- which compounds to target?


Which compounds to target?

A daunting task:

- $\sim 10^5$ chemicals in commerce (+ by-products, metabolites...)
- relatively poor information about production volume, uses, toxicity, sometimes even identity, etc.
- moving target (& cycle appears to be accelerating)

In a rational world, I think we should have this information, alternatives assessment (and analytical standards) prior to mass production






Flame retardants

PBDEs


foam,
electronics

other
BFRs

PFRs




& photolytic
breakdown products
(Su et al. ES&T 2016)



PFAS “A Never-Ending Story?”

water soluble
bind protein
precursors



Wang et al. ES&T 2017.

Which compounds to target?

Perspectives | Brief Communication

Identifying Chemical Groups for Biomonitoring

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/EHP537>

Krowech et al. *EHP* 2016

SUMMARY: Regulatory agencies face daunting challenges identifying emerging chemical hazards because of the large number of chemicals in commerce and limited data on exposure and toxicology. Evaluating one chemical at a time is inefficient and can lead to replacement with uncharacterized chemicals or chemicals with structural features already linked to toxicity. The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) has developed a process for constructing and assessing chemical groups for potential biomonitoring in California. We screen for chemicals with significant exposure potential and propose possible chemical groups, based on structure and function.

Reasonable approach

A suggestion: SVOCs used in consumer products



- Wambaugh et al. ES&T 2012—expocast
- Weschler & Nazaroff. Atmosph Environ 2008

Exposome approaches (with scientific community)

- Non-targeted analysis
- Dust (SWB, products): exposure potential, higher concentrations than serum/urine

e.g., identification of TBPH/TBB (FM550), “U-OPFR”

Stapleton et al.
ES&T 2009,2011



Mutagenic Azo Dyes, Rather Than Flame Retardants, Are the Predominant Brominated Compounds in House Dust



Peng et al. *ES&T* 2016

- Total organic fluorine, bromine

Are humans exposed to increasing amounts of unidentified organofluorine?

Yeung & Mabury.
Environ Chem 2016


- bioassays—measure total biological activity in serum etc.



**PPAR γ reporter assay
as exposure biomarker
(Edwards et al 2017)**

CALUX

- effect directed analysis: bioassay/fractionation-cycles + analysis




e.g., Fang et al. *ES&T* 2015

PPAR γ agonists in dust

Mixtures

- potential health impact of dose addition



Something from "Nothing" — Eight Weak Estrogenic Chemicals Combined at Concentrations below NOECs Produce Significant Mixture Effects




Silva et al. *ES&T* 2002

Howard & Webster 2009

This may be particularly important for endocrine disruptors involving homodimer receptors (e.g., ER, AR), "similar" mechanisms

Mixtures: Patterns of co-exposure

Important for exposure assessment, epidemiology, toxicology



Keep up the great work!