

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Arsenic in urban air: sources, health risk and mitigation

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

**Master of Philosophy
in
Environmental Health**

Massey University, Wellington, New Zealand

Tamsin A. Mitchell

2015

Abstract

Over recent years, several studies have suggested that high concentrations of arsenic may occur in outdoor air in urban areas of New Zealand on some winter nights. These spikes in arsenic concentrations are presumed to be caused by some householders burning copper-chrome-arsenate (CCA)-treated wood as a fuel for domestic home heating, but detailed examination of the issue has been lacking. The aims of this work are to examine the concentrations and source(s) of arsenic in ambient air in a representative New Zealand wood-burning community, identify and quantify potential health risks linked to both arsenic in air and the activity of burning CCA-treated wood, and undertake an initial exploration of social factors that may contribute to the issue. The town of Wainuiomata in the Wellington region was selected as the representative community.

Concentrations of total arsenic in Wainuiomata outdoor air were measured over two years, along with a number of other relevant variables useful for source characterisation, including two size fractions of particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), black carbon and other trace elements. Over both years, concentrations of arsenic in Wainuiomata air were indistinguishable from the national ambient air quality guideline of 5.5 ng/m³ expressed as an annual average. Arsenic levels were strongly seasonal and peaked during the winter months, but with significant variability from night to night. The highest 24-hour concentration recorded during winter was 79 ng/m³. Results of correlation analysis and source attribution provide strong support for the idea that the principal source of elevated arsenic in outdoor air is the domestic burning of wood treated with CCA preservative.

A detailed exposure model was developed and applied to estimate and contextualise potential arsenic exposures that may be experienced by adults and children living in the community, and quantify relative health risks. Potential community health impacts are estimated not to be significant where exposure is limited to outdoor arsenic, including that which infiltrates into the indoor environment, where “not significant” is defined as an additional lifetime cancer risk of less than 1 in 100,000 and a hazard quotient less than 1. Annual average arsenic in outdoor air would need to be around

15 times higher than the guideline value to increase an individual's attributable lifetime cancer risk to 1 in 10,000.

Of more potential concern are health risks arising from indoor exposure for residents who use CCA-treated timber as supplementary firewood where this may lead to fugitive emissions of arsenic from the firebox into indoor air. Not only does the predicted excess lifetime cancer risk approach 7 in 100,000, but there are also non-cancer health risks to children due to short-term exposure to the relatively higher levels of arsenic during the winter months. Hazard quotients above 1 were found to potentially exist for a small number of children (4%) based on the likelihood of living in a home where CCA-treated timber might be burnt combined with the presence of at least one adult smoker. However, overall greatest potential for acute health risk for children was found to be posed by accidental or incidental ingestion of CCA-wood ash, which contains very high concentrations of arsenic.

Results of focus group sessions and community surveying provided useful contextual information about the source activity and identification of some potentially modifiable social factors, along with some understanding about why prohibition of the activity of burning CCA-treated wood may be ineffective. Findings included an upper estimate of the proportion of households that may burn CCA-treated timber (approximately 16%), and identification of the problem that most residents are not able to distinguish treated from untreated wood.

A number of recommendations are made. Despite the preliminary nature of the findings due to uncertainties in the modelling and toxicity reference values, it is recommended that efforts should be made to discourage the practice of CCA-wood burning as a precautionary measure to protect against inhalation exposure to indoor sources of arsenic and ingestion of contaminated ash by children. Community education initiatives would need to be developed from the perspective of local residents, most of whom cannot identify CCA-treated wood. It would be ideal if this were complemented with a high-level review of the policy and regulatory framework which permits the manufacture, use and disposal of CCA-treated wood in New Zealand, to determine where risks might be best managed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Nick Kim (Massey University), for his insightful approach and for sharing his amazing technical knowledge of all things quantitative. I would also like to thank Dr Terry Parminter (Greater Wellington Regional Council) for his sage advice and input into the social science investigation that enabled me to explore the important human dimension of this work. Thank you also to Dr Stuart McLaren (Massey University) for smoothing the way through the administration requirements and for supporting my application for to become a post-graduate student.

This thesis was inspired by Dr Perry Davy (GNS Science) who has been a great mentor throughout, freely sharing data and technical advice. The project could not have been completed without Darren Li (Greater Wellington Regional Council), the air quality instrument guru who was ultimately responsible for ensuring that our monitoring results were accurate and reliable. Thank you also to Chandar Singh (Victoria University of Wellington student) for changing the air filters – your efforts are much appreciated.

I also deeply appreciate the support of Graham Sevicke-Jones (Greater Wellington Regional Council) and his canny ability to keep me on track to finish the project.

Finally I would like to thank to my family, my wonderful husband, James, who encouraged and supported me through this long process, and Luca and Charlotte for being so patient.

Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iv
1 Introduction, aims and structure	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Aims and objectives	3
1.2.1 Overview of approach	3
1.2.2 Aims and objectives	4
1.3 Outline of thesis	6
2 Literature review and context	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Arsenic in the environment.....	8
2.2.1 Physical, chemical and toxicological properties	8
2.2.2 Arsenic sources, environmental fate and partitioning	9
2.2.3 Arsenic in the New Zealand environment.....	11
2.2.3.1 Drinking water	11
2.2.3.2 Food.....	12
2.2.3.3 Soils and indoor dust.....	12
2.3 Arsenic in New Zealand's air.....	13
2.3.1 Outdoor air	13
2.3.2 Air quality guidelines	15
2.3.3 Measurement techniques	16
2.3.4 Source apportionment based on trace elements in air	17
2.4 Arsenic in wood preservatives.....	18
2.4.1 History and background	18
2.4.2 Building industry regulation	19
2.4.3 Identification of CCA-timber	20
2.4.4 Environmental fate of arsenic during CCA-wood combustion	21
2.4.5 Health risks of CCA-wood	23
2.5 Social and regulatory context of domestic wood burning	23
2.5.1 Air quality regulation.....	23
2.5.2 Social understanding of air quality management.....	24
2.6 Synthesis.....	27
3 Ambient air monitoring.....	29
3.1 Introduction	29
3.2 Methodology.....	29
3.2.1 Monitoring site.....	29
3.2.2 Data collection and sampling methods.....	31
3.2.2.1 Overview	31
3.2.2.2 Sampling frequency and rationale.....	31
3.2.2.3 PM ₁₀ gravimetric sampling	32
3.2.2.4 PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} continuous sampling	34
3.2.2.5 Determination of arsenic concentration in PM ₁₀	34
3.2.2.6 Determination of black carbon and multi-element concentrations	35
3.2.3 Data analysis.....	36

3.2.3.1	Handling of measurements below the limit of detection	36
3.2.3.2	Graphical presentation and statistical analyses	36
3.2.3.3	Regulatory guideline comparison	38
3.3	Results and discussion.....	39
3.3.1	Numerical summary of arsenic, PM ₁₀ , PM _{2.5} and black carbon results.....	39
3.3.2	Inter-method agreement for PM ₁₀ and PM ₁₀ :PM _{2.5} ratio	39
3.3.3	Local meteorology at monitoring site.....	42
3.3.4	Comparison with regulatory guidelines and values for health risk assessment	45
3.3.5	Seasonal variation in arsenic, PM ₁₀ , PM _{2.5} and black carbon.....	47
3.3.6	Relationships between arsenic, PM ₁₀ , PM _{2.5} , black carbon and meteorology	52
3.3.7	Relationship between arsenic and other trace elements for source attribution	56
3.3.7.1	Comparison between arsenic concentrations determined by XRF and ICP-MS.....	57
3.3.7.2	Relationships between trace elements based on correlations.....	58
3.3.7.3	Relationship between trace elements based on principal components analysis.....	62
3.3.8	Dependence of arsenic concentration on PM _{2.5} and meteorology.....	64
3.4.	Synthesis of ambient air monitoring	67
4	Health risk assessment	70
4.1	Introduction	70
4.2	Methodology.....	70
4.2.1	Approach.....	70
4.2.2	Assessment scope and conceptual model	71
4.2.3	Exposure assessment method	74
4.2.3.1	Characterisation of exposure setting	74
4.2.3.2	Inhalation pathway assessment	74
4.2.3.3	Inhalation exposure characterisation.....	80
4.2.3.4	Background exposure via inhalation	81
4.2.4	Ingestion pathway assessment method	83
4.2.4.1	Media concentration	83
4.2.4.2	Scenario evaluation.....	84
4.2.4.3	Ingestion exposure characterisation.....	85
4.2.4.4	Background exposure via ingestion	86
4.2.5	Toxicity assessment method	89
4.2.5.1	Toxicity overview	90
4.2.5.2	Carcinogenic effects.....	90
4.2.5.3	Non-cancer effects	93
4.2.5.4	Summary of selected toxicity reference values	96
4.2.6	Risk characterisation method	97
4.2.6.1	Cancer risk estimates.....	97
4.2.6.2	Non-cancer risk estimates.....	98
4.3	Results and discussion.....	99
4.3.1	Inhalation exposure and risk characterisation	99
4.3.1.1	Cancer risk characterisation.....	100
4.3.1.2	Non-cancer risk characterisation	101

4.3.2	Ingestion exposure and risk	104
4.3.3	Background exposure and risk.....	105
4.4	Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.....	106
4.5	Synthesis.....	108
5	Social behavioural context investigation.....	110
5.1	Introduction	110
5.2	Methodology.....	110
5.2.1	Philosophical stance.....	110
5.2.2	Theoretical lens.....	110
5.2.3	Data collection.....	113
5.2.3.1	Focus group participant recruitment.....	113
5.2.4	Ethics and privacy	115
5.2.4.1	Focus group setting and timing	117
5.2.4.2	Focus group facilitation	117
5.2.4.3	Focus group discussion format	118
5.2.5	Data analysis.....	119
5.2.5.1	Transcriptions of audio recordings	119
5.2.5.2	Coding of verbal transcriptions.....	120
5.2.5.3	Thematic analysis.....	120
5.3	Results	120
5.3.1	Focus group demographics.....	120
5.3.2	Themes identified from focus group transcripts.....	121
5.3.2.1	Different practices for warming the home and acquiring fuel.....	121
5.3.2.2	Ash disposal practice	125
5.3.2.3	Ability to discriminate treated from untreated timber	125
5.3.2.4	Awareness of practice of burning treated timber	127
5.3.2.5	Knowledge of emissions, smoke, air pollution and health	129
5.3.2.6	Supporting and discouraging – using treated timber on the fire	133
5.4	Discussion.....	135
5.5	Limitations.....	140
6	Conclusions and recommendations.....	141
6.1	Conclusions.....	141
6.2	Recommendations	143
7	References.....	146
8	Appendices.....	162
8.1	Focus group invitation letter	162
8.2	Focus group information sheet.....	163
8.3	Focus group participant consent form	164
8.4	Focus group questions	165
8.5	Focus group ground rules	166
8.6	Focus group demographic questionnaire	167
8.7	Focus group transcript release form.....	168
8.8	Focus group facilitator and transcriber confidentiality agreement	169

List of Tables

Table 2.1:	Formulation of CCA in New Zealand.....	19
Table 2.2:	Total active element minimum retention as specified in NZS 3640:2003	20
Table 3.1:	Summary statistics for arsenic, PM ₁₀ , PM _{2.5} and black carbon (24-hour averages) ..	40
Table 3.2:	Arsenic weighted annual, winter, non-winter means with 95% confidence intervals ..	45
Table 3.3:	Summary of elemental concentrations (ng/m ³) determined by XRF for variables used in PCA.....	56
Table 4.1:	Indoor air model input parameters	77
Table 4.2:	Estimated proportions of time spent in main 'microenvironments'	81
Table 4.3:	Reported concentration of arsenic (mg/kg) in CCA-wood ash.....	83
Table 4.4:	Default exposure parameters used for standard residential setting	86
Table 4.5:	Default exposure parameters residential soil ingestion	87
Table 4.6:	Estimated daily dietary exposure to inorganic arsenic	88
Table 4.7:	Default childhood exposure parameters CCA-wood surface residues	89
Table 4.8:	Arsenic URFs published by agencies.....	92
Table 4.9:	Toxicity reference values selected for risk characterisation	96
Table 4.10:	Estimated exposure concentration arsenic in air (µg/m ³) by microenvironment	99
Table 4.11:	Estimated 1-year exposure concentration arsenic in air (µg/m ³) weighted by time spent in microenvironment by exposure scenario	100
Table 4.12:	Estimated lifetime (75-year) weighted average exposure concentrations for arsenic in air (µg/m ³) by exposure scenario	100
Table 4.13:	Number of children in Wainuiomata who live in a household with smoker(s) and/or where solid fuels are used for heating.....	102
Table 4.14:	Number of children by age group in each exposure scenario	103
Table 4.15:	Number of children (1-11 years) and HQ by exposure scenario and exposure duration	103
Table 4.16:	Calculated intake dose (mg/kg BW) for one-off exposure to CCA-wood ash for a child at different ingestion rates.....	104
Table 4.17:	Predicted lifetime excess cancer risk from exposure to 'background' sources.....	105
Table 5.1:	Focus group dates and participant numbers	117
Table 5.2:	Coding typology for focus group transcripts	121
Table 5.3:	Focus group participant demographics	122

List of Figures

Figure 3.1:	Monitoring site located at the Wainuiomata Bowling Club.....	30
Figure 3.2:	Laboratory working space and equipment used for filter punching	34
Figure 3.3:	Scatterplot showing linear fit of PM ₁₀ gravimetric regressed against PM ₁₀ BAM measurements	41
Figure 3.4:	Box plot of differences between PM ₁₀ gravimetric and PM ₁₀ BAM (24-hour average) measurements aggregated by month.....	41
Figure 3.5:	Box plot of PM _{2.5} :PM ₁₀ ratios for BAM measurements aggregated by month	42
Figure 3.6:	Wind roses showing frequencies of hours by wind direction for the monitoring period by season.....	43
Figure 3.7:	Box plots of temperature and wind speed variables by month.....	44
Figure 3.8:	Box plots inter-annual variation in arsenic, PM ₁₀ and black carbon.....	46
Figure 3.9:	Time series of arsenic (24-hr average) with measurements below the LOD in black.....	48
Figure 3.10:	Time series of PM ₁₀ by gravimetric method (24-hr average)	48
Figure 3.11:	Time series of PM ₁₀ by BAM (24-hr average)	48
Figure 3.12:	Time series of PM _{2.5} by BAM.....	49
Figure 3.13:	Time series of black carbon (24-hr average).....	49

Figure 3.14: Boxplots of arsenic, PM _{2.5} and black carbon by season	51
Figure 3.15: Histograms of winter measurements of arsenic (left) and PM _{2.5} (right).....	51
Figure 3.16: Density plots of arsenic (left) and PM _{2.5} (right)	51
Figure 3.17: Correlation matrices showing Pearson's correlation coefficients (<i>r</i> -values multiplied by 100) between variables for the non-winter (top) and winter (bottom) periods.....	53
Figure 3.18: Scatterplots of winter arsenic versus PM _{2.5} conditioned by temperature (left) and mean wind speed (right).....	55
Figure 3.19: Scatterplot matrix of key variables (winter only) with fitted LOWESS curve shown in red.....	55
Figure 3.20: Box plot of elemental concentrations (ng/m ³) determined by XRF for variables used in PCA.....	57
Figure 3.21: Scatterplot with linear fit for arsenic determined by XRF vs arsenic determined by ICP-MS (all data) with shaded area denoting 95% confidence interval.....	58
Figure 3.22: Correlation matrix showing relationships between XRF-determined elemental concentrations in PM ₁₀ (all data)	59
Figure 3.23: Seasonality in arsenic, lead and zinc average monthly concentrations determined by XRF with shaded areas showing 95% confidence intervals in the mean calculated through bootstrap simulations	60
Figure 3.24: Scatterplots with linear fit for lead vs arsenic (left) and lead vs black carbon (right) for all data	60
Figure 3.25: Bi-plot of PC1 and PC2 for 14 variables (n=279).....	64
Figure 3.26: Predicted average winter arsenic using all observed PM _{2.5} and meteorological values.....	67
Figure 4.1: Site specific conceptual model for health risk assessment.....	73
Figure 4.2: Individual excess carcinogenic risk for a resident attributable to lifetime arsenic inhalation based on IUR 1.5 x 10 ⁻³ per µg/m ³	101
Figure 4.3: Hazard Quotients for non-cancer effects for lifetime exposure and 24-hour exposure based on 2012 to 2013 concentrations of arsenic in Wainuiomata air and other assumptions.....	102
Figure 4.4: Arsenic dose (mg/kg BW) for a 13 kg child calculated from arsenic concentration in ash (assuming 100% gastrointestinal bioavailability) and ingestion rate required to reach acute toxicity reference values.....	105
Figure 4.5: Estimated excess lifetime cancer risk by source.....	106