



**HAL**  
open science

## Toward setting public health guidelines for chemicals in indoor settled dust?

Philippe Glorennec, Derek G. Shendell, Pat E. Rasmussen, Roger Waeber, Peter Egeghy, Kenichi Azuma, Aurélie Pelfrêne, Barbara Le Bot, Williams Esteve, Guillaume Perouel, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Philippe Glorennec, Derek G. Shendell, Pat E. Rasmussen, Roger Waeber, Peter Egeghy, et al.. Toward setting public health guidelines for chemicals in indoor settled dust?. *Indoor Air*, 2021, 31 (1), pp.1\_\_.  
10.1111/ina.12722 . hal-02926293

**HAL Id: hal-02926293**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02926293v1>**

Submitted on 9 Sep 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



## Towards setting public health guidelines for chemicals in indoor settled dust?

Journal:	<i>Indoor Air</i>
Manuscript ID	INA-20-05-161
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-May-2020
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Glorennec, Philippe; EHESP-School of Public Health, France; IRSET, Shendell, Derek; Rutgers School of Public Health, Department of Environmental and Occupational Health; Rutgers School of Public Health, NJ Safe Schools Program</p> <p>Rasmussen, Pat; Health Canada, Environmental Health Science Research Bureau; University of Ottawa, Earth and Environmental Sciences</p> <p>Waeber, Roger; Swiss Federal Office of Public Health, Consumer Protection Directorate</p> <p>Egghy, Peter; U.S. EPA, National Exposure Research Laboratory</p> <p>Azuma, Kenichi; Kindai University Faculty of Medicine Hospital, Department of Environmental Medicine and Behavioral Science</p> <p>Pelfrène, Aurélie; Yncrea Hautes-de-France Engineering Universities Group, Laboratoire Génie Civil et géo-Environnement</p> <p>Le Bot, Barbara; EHESP; IRSET,</p> <p>Estève, Williams; Institut National de Recherche et de Sécurité, Métrologie des Polluants</p> <p>Perouel, Guillaume; Anses</p> <p>Pernelet-Joly, Valérie; Anses</p> <p>Noack, yves; Aix-Marseille-University; CEREGE</p> <p>Delannoy, Matthieu; University of Lorraine</p> <p>Keirsbulck, Marion; Anses</p> <p>Mandin, Corinne; CSTB, Health and Comfort</p>
Keywords:	Environmental health, exposure, indoor air quality, indoor environment, chemical safety, environmental policy

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Towards setting public health guidelines for chemicals in indoor settled dust?

### Authors:

Glorennec P., Univ Rennes, EHESP, Inserm, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail) - UMR\_S 1085, Rennes, France

Shendell D.G., Department of Environmental & Occupational Health, Rutgers School of Public Health Piscataway, NJ, U.S.A.; New Jersey Safe Schools Program, Rutgers School of Public Health, Piscataway, NJ, U.S.A.

Rasmussen P.E., Environmental Health Science and Research Bureau, Healthy Environments and Consumer Safety Branch, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada

Waeber R., Consumer Protection Directorate, Federal Office of Public Health, Berne, Switzerland

Egghy P., Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC, USA

Azuma K., Department of Environmental Medicine and Behavioral Science, Kindai University Faculty of Medicine, Osakasayama, Japan

Pelfrène A., Yncréa Hauts-de-France, ULR 4515, Laboratoire Génie Civil et géo-Environnement (LGCgE), F-59000 Lille, France

Le Bot B., Univ Rennes, EHESP, Inserm, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail) - UMR\_S 1085, Rennes, France

Esteve W., Département Métrologie des Polluants, Institut National de Recherche et de Sécurité (INRS), Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy, France

Perouel G., Agency for food, environmental and occupational health safety (Anses), France

Pernelet Joly, V. Agency for food, environmental and occupational health safety (Anses), France

Noack, Y., Aix-Marseille University, CNRS, IRD, INRAe, Collège de France, CEREGE, Aix-en-Provence, France

Delannoy M., URAFFPA, Université de Lorraine, INRAe, USC 340, 54 500 Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy

Keirsbulck, M., Agency for food, environmental and occupational health safety (Anses), France

Mandin C. University of Paris-Est, Scientific and Technical Center for Building (CSTB), Health and Comfort Department, French Indoor Air Quality Observatory (OQAI), France.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Authors express here their personal point of view, without institutional and/or agency endorsement.  
6  
7  
8

## 9 **Abstract**

10  
11 Indoor settled dust may result in substantial human exposure to chemicals, especially by ingestion  
12 following hand-to-mouth or hand-to-object-to-mouth contact. As with other environmental media  
13 related to exposure, dust may thus be subject to regulation. An international scientific workshop was  
14 convened in Paris in September 2019 to assess the relevance for public health of setting guidelines for  
15 indoor settled dust, and secondly to discuss scientific and technical challenges related to such  
16 guidelines. The main discussions and conclusions, with consensus achieved, are reported herein.  
17 Discussions concerned general considerations, objectives and definitions, relevance for a health-based  
18 guideline, units of measure, and finally derivation of the guideline. These points should be addressed  
19 when considering an indoor settled dust guideline as part of a policy to reduce exposure indoors to a  
20 given chemical or group of chemicals.  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 25 **Practical Implications**

26  
27 Indoor settled dust may result in substantial human exposure to chemicals. An international scientific  
28 workshop was convened in Paris in September 2019 to assess the relevance for public health of setting  
29 guidelines for indoor settled dust, and to discuss related scientific and technical challenges. An indoor  
30 settled dust guideline can inform future policy to help reduce indoor exposure to chemicals.  
31  
32

## 33 **Keywords**

34 Environmental health, exposure, indoor air quality, indoor environment, chemical safety,  
35 environmental policy.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

Indoor settled dust may result in direct human exposure to chemicals by ingestion following hand-to-mouth or hand-to-object-to-mouth contact, inhalation of re-suspended particles, or dermal penetration by contact. This exposure can be evidenced by the existence of a correlation between the concentration of a compound in dust and its concentration (or concentration of a metabolite) in relevant human tissues or body fluids. For lead, the contribution of ingested settled dust to total exposure is well documented by numerous studies with consistent results. Lanphear et al. (1998) in the United States, Levallois et al. (2014) in Quebec, Canada, and Etchevers et al. (2015) in France have demonstrated a significant correlation between the lead concentration of sampled floor dust and the blood lead levels of children. A recent review of studies conducted since 2005 on chemicals in dust deposited in indoor environments in Europe, North America, Australia and New Zealand suggested dust by ingestion can be a relevant source of exposure for a variety of chemicals (Larsson and Berglund, 2018). In particular, the authors showed dust ingestion can be a strong contributor to total dust exposure for brominated flame retardants, certain phthalates and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).

Controlling environmental exposure is one of the ways to reduce potential damage to human health. Guidelines exist for outdoor air and indoor air, water, food, consumer products, building materials, and sometimes soils, but not for dust with the exception of lead: in 2019, U.S. EPA lowered the dust-lead hazard standards for floors to  $108 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^2$  ( $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$ ) to protect children from the harmful effects of lead exposure (USEPA 2019).

In France, the agency for food, environmental and occupational health safety (Anses) studies the feasibility and relevance of setting guidelines for chemicals present in indoor settled dust in dwellings and public places as schools, for instance. Anses proposed to discuss and address the associated challenges such as multi-pathway and multi-route exposure within the scientific community. Anses created a dedicated working group in 2018 and, in the absence of literature on indoor settled dust guidelines, a dedicated scientific international workshop was convened in September 2019 in Paris. The objectives were firstly to assess the relevance for public health of setting guidelines for indoor settled dust (Indoor Settled Dust Guideline, or ISDG), and secondly to discuss scientific and technical challenges related to such guidelines. The main discussions and conclusions, with consensus achieved, are reported.

## General considerations

Before setting an ISDG, its public health benefit has to be evaluated. While this benefit may seem obvious for lead, the benefit would need to be assessed separately for other chemicals found in indoor settled dust.

The objective of an ISDG should *not* be to promote measurements of settled dust concentrations by individuals themselves.

Any guideline such as an ISDG should be accompanied by a measurement protocol, including both sampling and analytical aspects.

1  
2  
3 Independently of a possible ISDG, a general public health risk communication message should  
4 be to clean and remove dust on surfaces, especially when accessible to children, as often as  
5 possible.  
6  
7

## 8 **Key points**

### 9 **Objectives and proposal for corresponding definitions**

10 A human health based guideline like an ISDG helps to answer the question “*is there a risk?*” It  
11 could be a “concern” or “alert” value, depending on the level of risk corresponding to the  
12 guideline. A “concern” ISDG may correspond to dose via ingested dust equal to or higher than  
13 a fraction of tolerable daily intake (e.g. 20% for non-carcinogenic endpoints), while an “alert”  
14 ISDG may correspond to an ingested dust equal to or higher than the tolerable daily intake.  
15  
16

17  
18 Another complementary environment-based value may be useful to answer the question: “is  
19 there contamination?” Such a comparison value would be based on typical values of the  
20 environmental distribution, e.g. 95<sup>th</sup> percentile of observed values in national or regional  
21 indoor settled dust surveys. This approach is oriented towards source reduction, different  
22 environments (schools, dwellings, etc.) have to be considered.  
23  
24

### 25 **Relevance criteria for a health based guideline**

26 An ISDG may be relevant for chronic environmental exposures in cases where dust accounts  
27 for a “**certain part**” of **total exposure** for the majority of the target population, *or*, for the most  
28 exposed people. Given the inherent uncertainty, the group thought this “certain part” must be  
29 substantial, perhaps situated around 30-50% of total exposure for the majority or the most  
30 exposed people. The discussion of relevance should therefore also consider the possible  
31 existence of other exposure sources (diet, consumer products...).

32  
33 In addition, the relevance of an ISDG depends also on the availability of a **toxicological**  
34 **reference value** (oral chronic reference dose or tolerable daily intake for instance).  
35  
36

37  
38 A **priority ranking of target compounds** is necessary, without excluding banned compounds  
39 because of their possible long persistence in the environment.  
40  
41

42 **Cumulative risks** need to be considered, e.g., phthalates instead of as diethyl hexyl phthalate,  
43 notably because of continuous substitution of an individual chemical or congener in a category.  
44  
45

### 46 **Measurement Units for ISDG**

47 Two expressions of measurement units, surface area concentration (or loading) and mass  
48 concentration (or concentration), both have their own strengths and limitations, and are thus  
49 complementary.  
50

51 **Loading ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^2$ )** was judged by the group to be a better indicator of exposure because it  
52 combines the dustiness of the indoor environment and the concentration of the compound in  
53 dust (Rasmussen et al., 2017). Studies with lead have suggested dust loading correlates better  
54 with children's blood levels than does the concentration (Davies et al, 1990; Lanphear et al,  
55 1995). Its measurement could be achieved with a wipe or with a specific vacuum cleaner  
56 (Mercier et al., 2011; Kubwabo et al., 2013; Rasmussen et al., 2017), on a measured surface  
57 area. One limitation is the spot measurement of loading is influenced by the delay between  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 last cleaning and sampling. Another limitation is the assessment of calculated dose needs an  
4 empirically derived -transfer coefficient, expressed in  $\text{m}^2/\text{day}$ , to aggregate the mass transfer  
5 associated with a series of contacts. An alternative is to use a default dustiness assumption in  
6  $\text{mg}/\text{m}^2$  and a default dust intake rate in  $\text{mg}/\text{day}$  (or a conservative intake rate for a protective  
7 health-based value). Both transfer coefficient and default dustiness assumptions have large  
8 uncertainties (Cohen Hubal et al., 2006; Wilson et al., 2016).  
9  
10

11 **Concentration ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{g}$ )** more clearly identifies presence of sources, and is less influenced by the  
12 delay since the last cleaning. A strength is this value could be obtained from the analysis of  
13 dust easily collected in the bag of a vacuum cleaner (household or specific) (Kubwabo et al.,  
14 2013; Rasmussen et al., 2017). Estimates of intake and dose, however, still necessitate the use  
15 of a default, age-specific dust intake rate in  $\text{mg}/\text{day}$  (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.  
16 Exposure Factors Handbook).  
17  
18  
19

20 In addition, the selection of a sampling protocol (e.g. surface wipe versus vacuum) may be  
21 driven by the risk assessment approach to be used, but also by the need to collect adequate  
22 dust mass for analysis as well as to avoid inadvertent contamination of the dust sample.  
23  
24

## 25 Deriving an ISDG

26 Because both exposure and susceptibility (and vulnerability to adverse health outcomes) vary  
27 over the course of an individual's lifetime, different **age groups** have to be considered during  
28 the guideline derivation process, even if at the end a unique value, the lowest one, is proposed.  
29  
30

31 In the absence of complete data, use of an arbitrary proportional **contribution of ingested dust**  
32 to total exposure is recommended, because it is easier to calculate (less data needed), easier  
33 to communicate and allows consistency of the approach between media (e.g. drinking water  
34 guidelines). A default contribution of 20% such as is recommended in the WHO drinking water  
35 quality guidelines (World Health Organization 2011) or in the Canadian protocol for setting soil  
36 quality guidelines (Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, 2006) is suggested,  
37 which may be further modified if data make it possible and more useful. An alternative  
38 approach, but not recommended, is to determine contribution of ingested dust by allocating  
39 rates of intake from other pathways and routes of exposures to the toxicological reference  
40 value; however, this approach requires more data, especially recent representative data, and  
41 the confidence that every source of exposure has been identified.  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Concerning the oral **bioaccessibility** of chemicals in dust, a default value of 100% is  
47 recommended, which could be replaced with a defensible lower value if robust data are  
48 available. Indeed, there are no *in vivo* validated tests for organics, and therefore few data,  
49 whereas there is a large variability between chemicals and among places (Raffy et al. 2018).  
50 Considering a pathway specific bioaccessibility adjustment would ideally require, to ensure  
51 consistency, also considering such a correction for other exposure pathways and routes, which  
52 may be difficult in practice due to lack of data.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Conclusion

The workshop participants reached a consensus that an indoor settled dust guideline, or ISDG, may add value to and be an integral component in support of a general policy to reduce exposure to a given chemical or group of chemicals.

## Acknowledgements:

Anses funded and organised this seminar that was prepared by an experts working group. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views or the policies of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, or any other listed agency or institution.

## Conflicts of interest:

The authors declare they do not have any financial conflict of interest associated with the question of setting of public health guidelines for indoor settled dust.

PROOF



## References

Cohen Hubal, E.A., Egeghy, P.P., Leovic, K.W., & Akland, G.G. (2006). Measuring potential dermal transfer of a pesticide to children in a child care center. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 114(2), 264-9.

Davies, D.J.A., Thornton, I., Watt, J.M., Culbard, E.B., Harvey, P.G., Delves, H.T., Sherlock, J.C., Smart, G.A., Thomas, J.F.A., and Quinn, M.J. (1990). Lead intake and blood lead in two-year-old U.K. urban children. *Science of the Total Environment*, 90, 13-29.

Etchevers, A., Le Tertre, A., Lucas, J. P., Bretin, P., Oulhote, Y., Le Bot, B., & Glorennec, P. (2015). Environmental determinants of different blood lead levels in children: A quantile analysis from a nationwide survey. *Environment International*, 74, 152-159.

Kubwabo C, Rasmussen PE, Fan X, Kosarac I, Wu F, Zidek A, Kuchta SK. Analysis of selected phthalates in Canadian indoor dust collected using household vacuum and standardized sampling techniques. *Indoor Air*. 2013;23:506-514.

Lanphear BP, Emond M, Jacobs DE, Weitzman M, Tanner M, Winter NL, Yakir B, Eberly S. (1995). A side-by-side comparison of dust collection methods for sampling lead-contaminated house dust. *Environmental Research*, 68(2), 114-23.

Lanphear, B. P., Matte, T. D., Rogers, J., Clickner, R. P., Dietz, B., Bornschein, R. L., ... & Rabinowitz, M. (1998). The contribution of lead-contaminated house dust and residential soil to children's blood lead levels. A pooled analysis of 12 epidemiologic studies. *Environmental Research*, 79, 51-68.

Larsson, K., & Berglund, M. (2018). Children's exposure to chemicals in indoor environments-a literature survey of chemicals in dust. Karolinska institutet. Report 2018-06-15. 102p. <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1220692/FULLTEXT01.pdf>. Last accessed 2020 may 13.

Levallois, P., St-Laurent, J., Gauvin, D., Courteau, M., Prévost, M., Campagna, C., ... & Rasmussen, P. E. (2014). The impact of drinking water, indoor dust and paint on blood lead levels of children aged 1–5 years in Montréal (Québec, Canada). *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology*, 24(2), 185-191.

Mercier, F., Glorennec, P., Thomas, O., & Bot, B. L. (2011). Organic contamination of settled house dust, a review for exposure assessment purposes. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 45(16), 6716-6727.

Raffy G, Mercier F, Glorennec P, Mandin C, Le Bot B. Oral bioaccessibility of semi-volatile organic compounds (svocs) in settled dust: A review of measurement methods, data and influencing factors. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*. 2018;352:215-227.

Rasmussen PE, Levesque C, Chenier M, Gardner HD. (2017) Rare earth elements and select actinoids in the Canadian House Dust Study. *Indoor Air*. 2017;27:965-976.

1  
2  
3 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Exposure Factors Handbook. Retrieved from:  
4 <https://www.epa.gov/expobox/about-exposure-factors-handbook> (Last accessed May 1, 2020).  
5  
6

7  
8 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2019. Review of the dust-lead hazard standards and  
9 the definition of lead-based paint. Fed Reg 84 FR 32632.  
10 [https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/07/09/2019-14024/review-of-the-dust-lead-](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/07/09/2019-14024/review-of-the-dust-lead-hazard-standards-and-the-definition-of-lead-based-paint)  
11 [hazard-standards-and-the-definition-of-lead-based-paint](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/07/09/2019-14024/review-of-the-dust-lead-hazard-standards-and-the-definition-of-lead-based-paint) (last accessed May 5, 2020)  
12

13 World Health Organization (WHO). 2011. Guidelines for drinking-water quality- recommendations.  
14 Geneva:WHO. [https://www.who.int/water\\_sanitation\\_health/publications/dwq-guidelines-4/en/](https://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/publications/dwq-guidelines-4/en/)  
15 (last accessed May 5, 2020).  
16

17  
18 Wilson, R., Mitchell, I., & Richardson, G. M. (2016). Estimation of dust ingestion rates in units of surface  
19 area per day using a mechanistic hand-to-mouth model. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An*  
20 *International Journal*, 22(4), 874-881.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

PROOF