

Benzo[k]fluoranthene Environmental estimates (circa 2011): Supplemental data



Table of Contents

Dat	ta for lifetime excess cancer risk estimates	
i.		
ii.		
iii.	•	
iv.	•	
Suppo	· · · · ·	
i.		
ii.	Indoor air	3
iii.	Dust	5
iv.	Drinking water	6
٧.		
Dat	ta quality for lifetime excess cancer risk estimates	q
Estima	ates by health region	10
Estima	ates by census block	10
	Overv i. ii. iv. Suppo i. iii. iv. v. Data	ii. Calculated Lifetime Daily Intake iii. Cancer Potency Factors iv. Lifetime Excess Cancer Risk (per million people) Supporting data by exposure pathway i. Outdoor air ii. Indoor air iii. Dust iv. Drinking water v. Food and Beverages



1. Data for lifetime excess cancer risk estimates

Overview

The summary data used to calculate lifetime excess cancer risk and the results for benzo[k]fluoranthene are provided in the tables below. For more detailed information on supporting data and sources, see below for each exposure pathway.

i. Environmental Concentrations

Exposure pathway	Units	Average	Maximum	Notes	
Outdoor air	μg/m³	0.00011	0.00042		
Indoor air	μg/m³	0.000085	0.0012		
Dust	μg/g	1.6	19		
Drinking water	μg/L	Insuffic	ient data		
Foods and beverages		See deta	iled data		

ii. Calculated Lifetime Daily Intake

Exposure pathway	Average intake (mg/kg bodyweight per day)	Maximum intake (mg/kg bodyweight per day)
Outdoor air	0.00000003	0.0000001
Indoor air	0.00000028	0.00000039
Dust	0.000011	0.000012
Drinking water	Insu	ifficient data
Foods and beverages	0.000000056	Not estimated

iii. Cancer Potency Factors

Exposure route	Health Canada	US EPA	CA OEHHA
Inhalation			0.39
Ingestion			1.2

Sources for Cancer Potency Factors:

- Health Canada, 2010. Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada, Part I:
 Guidance on Human Health Preliminary Quantitative Risk Assessment. Version 2.0.
- Health Canada, 2010. Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada, Part II: Health Canada Toxicological Reference Values (TRVs) and Chemical-Specific Factors. Version 2.0.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency Integrated Risk Information System.
- California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, 2009. Air Toxics Hot Spots Risk Assessment Guidelines Part II: Technical Support Document for Cancer Potency Factors, Appendix A. (Updated 2011)



iv. Lifetime Excess Cancer Risk (per million people)

		Average ¹		Maximum ²
Exposure pathway	Health Canada	US EPA	CA OEHHA³	
Outdoor air			0.001	0.0038
Indoor air			0.011	0.15
Dust			1.26	14.97
Drinking water		Insufficient data		
Foods and beverages			0.0067	Not estimated

¹Lifetime excess cancer risk based on average intake x cancer potency factor from each agency

Supporting data by exposure pathway

i. Outdoor air

Outdoor air concentrations are from the National Air Pollution Surveillance monitoring network operated by Environment Canada, for the year 2010.

Source	Stations (n)	Min	Max	Mean	DF
NAPS 2010 (μg/m ³)	17	0.000013	0.00042	0.00011	1.0

DF = Detection frequency

We assume benzo(k)fluoranthene is present at these levels in all outdoor air, although concentrations may vary from one location to another.

ii. Indoor air

Indoor air concentrations are based on data published in peer-reviewed literature since 2000. A ranking system was used to select data most representative of Canadian conditions circa 2011:

- 1. Canadian data collected in 2000 or more recently, sample duration of 24 hours or longer;
- 2. US studies of similar currency and sample duration;
- 3. Studies from northern European countries of similar currency and sample duration;
- Canadian, US or European studies with data collected prior to 2000 and similar sample duration;
 and
- Studies with sample duration of less than 24 hours regardless of country or collection date, or studies from countries not comparable to Canada.

 $^{^2}$ Lifetime excess cancer risk based on maximum intake x highest cancer potency factor

³California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment



	Author:	Jung (2010)				Location:	New York 0	City		
Samples (n)	DF*	DL**	Sample Date	Units	Sample Duration	Min	Max	Mean (AM)	Med	Geomean (GM)	Percentile
203			2005 -	μg/m³	14 days	0.00002	0.0014	0.00011	0.00008		
98			2010				0.00074	0.00006	0.00004		

Notes: Values listed in the following order: heating season (Oct-Apr), non-heating season (May-Sept)

^{**}DL = Detection limit

Rank: 2	Author:	Li (200	5)				Location:	Chicago			
Samples (n)	DF*	DL**	Sample Date	Units	Sample Duration	Min	Max	Mean (AM)	Med	Geomean (GM)	Percentile
10	~0.95		2000 - 2001	μg/m³	48h x 14 months	0.000001	0.0013		0.00085	2	0th 0.000001 25th 0.00002 75th 0.0002 90th 0.0003

Notes: non-smoking homes, (sampled once a month for 14 months) total n = 115

^{**}DL = Detection limit

Rank: 3	Author	Gustaf	son (2008)				Location:	Hagfors, Sv	weden		
Samples (n)	DF*	DL**	Sample Date	Units	Sample Duration	Min	Max	Mean (AM)	Med	Geomean (GM)	Percentile
13	1.0	0.00005	Feb-	μg/m³	24hr	0.00006	0.00077	0.00023	0.00018		
10	0.9		March			<dl< td=""><td>0.00034</td><td>0.00011</td><td>0.00008</td><td></td><td></td></dl<>	0.00034	0.00011	0.00008		
			2003								

 $Notes: Values\ listed\ in\ the\ following\ order:\ wood\ burning,\ non-wood\ burning\ homes.$

^{**}DL = Detection limit

Rank: 3	Author	r: Halsall	(2008)				Location:	Lancaster UK			
Samples (n)	DF*	DL**	Sample Date	Units	Sample Duration	Min	Max	Mean (AM)	Med	Geomean (GM)	Percentile
7	0.43	0.00001 to 0.00015	Summer 2003	μg/m³	6 to 24 hours	<dl< th=""><th>0.00015</th><th>0.00007</th><th>0.00003</th><th></th><th></th></dl<>	0.00015	0.00007	0.00003		

Notes: 3 locations

^{**}DL = Detection limit

Rank: 4	Author	Sande	rson (2004)				Location:	Beauharnois	, PQ		
Samples (n)	DF*	DL**	Sample Date	Units	Sample Duration	Min	Max	Mean (AM)	Med	Geomean (GM)	Percentile
3	0.84	0.00001		μg/m³	24h			0.00004		0.000033	
12								0.000082			

Notes: near aluminum smelter, Values listed in the following order: homes with oil heating, with no oil heating

^{*}DF = Detection frequency

^{**}DL = Detection limit



Sources for indoor air data:

- Gustafson P, Östman C, Sällsten G. 2008. Indoor levels of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in homes with or without wood burning for heating. Environ Sci Technol 42: 5074-5080.
- Halsall CJ, Maher BA, Karloukovski VV, Shah P, Watkins SJ. 2008. A novel approach to investigating indoor/outdoor pollution links: Combined magnetic and PAH measurements. Atmospheric Environment 42: 8902-8909.
- Jung K, Patel MM, Kinney PL, Chillrud SN, Whyatt R, Hoepner L, et al. 2010. 1. Effects of Season and Indoor Heating on Indoor and Outdoor Residential Levels of Airborne Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons, Absorbance and Particulate Matter 2.5 in an Inner City Cohort of Young Children. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology 125: AB81.
- Li A, Schoonover TM, Zou QM, Norlock F, Conroy LM, Scheff PA, et al. 2005. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in residential air of ten Chicago area homes: Concentrations and influencing factors. Atmospheric Environment 39: 3491-3501.
- Sanderson EG, Farant JP. 2004. Indoor and outdoor polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in residences surrounding a Soderberg aluminum smelter in Canada. Environ Sci Technol 38: 5350-5356.

iii. Dust

Indoor dust concentrations are based on data published in peer-reviewed literature since 2000. A ranking system was used to select data most representative of Canadian conditions circa 2011:

- 1. Canadian data collected in 2000 or more recently, sample duration of 24 hours or longer;
- 2. US studies of similar currency and sample duration;
- 3. Studies from northern European countries of similar currency and sample duration;
- Canadian, US or European studies with data collected prior to 2000 and similar sample duration;
 and
- Studies with sample duration of less than 24 hours regardless of country or collection date, or studies from countries not comparable to Canada.

Rank: 1	Author:	Maerte	ens (2008)				Location:	Ottawa, Car	nada		
Samples (n)	DF*	DL**	Sample Date	Units	Sample Duration	Min	Max	Mean (AM)	Med	Geomean (GM)	Percentile
51	1.0	0.034	2002 - 2003	μg/g		0.05	19.0	1.6	0.5	0.7	

Notes: Analyzed using GC/MS

^{**}DL = Detection limit

Rank: 2	Author:	Whitel	head (2011)				Location:	California, U	ISA		
Samples (n)	DF*	DL**	Sample Date	Units	Sample Duration	Min	Max	Mean (AM)	Med	Geomean (GM)	Percentile
583	1.0	0.002	2001- 2007	μg/g		0.003	0.814		0.040		

Notes: Analyzed using GC/MS

^{*}DF = Detection frequency

^{*}DF = Detection frequency

^{**}DL = Detection limit



Sources for dust data:

- Maertens RM, Yang XF, Zhu JP, Gagne RW, Douglas GR, White PA. 2008. Mutagenic and carcinogenic hazards of settled house dust I: Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon content and excess lifetime cancer risk from preschool exposure. Environmental Science & Technology 42: 1747-1753.
- Whitehead T, Metayer C, Gunier RB, Ward MH, Nishioka MG, Buffler P, Rappaport SM. 2011.
 Determinants of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon levels in house dust. J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol 21(2): 123-132.

iv. Drinking water

No recent data or studies were identified.

v. Food and Beverages

Food consumption data are from the Statistics Canada Food Survey (2006) - Food available, adjusted for losses tables, and from the Nutrition Canada Survey (1970-1972).

Food concentration data are primarily from the US-FDA Total Diet Study (2003-2004), with additional data on metals and several PAHs from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) - National Chemical Residue Monitoring Program: 2009-2010 Annual Report and the US-FDA (TDS Statistics on Element Results - 2008).

In order to better represent actual intake, we incorporated data for cooked and/or processed foods, as in some cases, this can either add to or diminish the amount measured in raw food.

Concentration data were obtained for 7% of total meat consumed.



Food or Beverage	Concentration (µg/g)	DF	Food or Beverage	Concentration (µg/g)	DF
Beef			Peaches fresh		
Chicken	0.00040	0.07700	Pears canned		
Mutton and lamb	0.00036	0.14300	Pears fresh		
Offal			Pineapples canned		
Oils and fats			Pineapples fresh		
Pork			Plums total fresh		
Salad oils			Quinces fresh		
Shortening and shortening o	oils		Raspberries frozen		
Stewing hen			Strawberries canned		
Turkey			Strawberries fresh		
Veal			Strawberries frozen		
Fish fresh and frozen seafish			Sugar maple		
Fish freshwater			Sugar refined		
Fish processed seafish			Honey		
Apple pie filling			Artichokes fresh		
Apple sauce			Asparagus canned		
Apples canned			Asparagus fresh		
Apples dried			Avocados fresh		
Apples fresh			Beans baked and canned		
Apples frozen			Beans dry		
Apricots canned			Beans green and wax cann	ed	
Apricots fresh			Beans green and wax fresh		
Bananas fresh			Beans green and wax froze		
Berries other fresh			Beets canned		
Blueberries canned			Beets fresh		
Blueberries fresh			Broccoli fresh		
Blueberries frozen			Broccoli frozen		
Cherries fresh			Brussels sprouts fresh		
Cherries frozen			Brussels sprouts frozen		
Citrus other fresh			Cabbage Chinese fresh		
Coconut fresh			Cabbage fresh		
Cranberries fresh			Carrots canned		
Dates fresh			Carrots fresh		
Figs fresh			Carrots frozen		
Fruit dried			Cauliflower fresh		
Grapefruit fresh			Cauliflower frozen		
Grapes fresh			Celery fresh		
Guava and mangoes fresh			Corn canned		
Kiwi fresh			Corn flour and meal		
Lemons fresh			Corn fresh		
Limes fresh			Corn frozen		
Mandarins fresh			Cucumbers fresh		
Melons musk, cantaloupe fre	esh		Eggplant fresh		
Melons other fresh			Garlic fresh		
Melons watermelons fresh			Kohlrabi fresh		
Melons, winter melons fresh	1		Leeks fresh		
Nectarines fresh			Lettuce fresh		
Oranges fresh			Lima beans frozen		
Papayas fresh			Manioc fresh		
Peaches canned			Mushrooms canned		



Food or Beverage Concentration DF Food or Beverage Concentration (μg/g) $(\mu g/g)$ Mushrooms fresh Milk buttermilk Okra fresh Milk chocolate drink Olives fresh Milk concentrated skim Onions and shallots fresh Milk concentrated whole Parsley fresh Milk other whole milk products Parsnips fresh Milk partly skimmed 2% Peas canned Milk skim Peas dry Milk standard Milk sweetened concentrated skim Peas fresh Milkshake Peas frozen Peppers fresh Powder buttermilk Powder skim milk Potatoes chips Potatoes frozen Powder whev Potatoes other processed Sherbet Potatoes sweet fresh Yogurt Potatoes white fresh Cereal products Potatoes white fresh and processed Oatmeal and rolled oats Pumpkins and squash fresh Peanuts Radishes fresh Pot and pearl barley Rappini fresh Pulses and nuts Rutabagas and turnip fresh Rice Spinach fresh Rye flour Spinach frozen Tree nuts Tomatoes canned Wheat flour Tomatoes fresh Ale, beer, stout and porter Tomatoes pulp, paste and puree Beverages alcoholic Coffee Vegetables other edible root fresh Vegetables other leguminous fresh Distilled spirits Vegetables unspecified canned Juice apple Vegetables unspecified fresh Juice grape Vegetables unspecified frozen Juice tomato Juice fruit Butter Cheese cheddar Juice grapefruit Cheese cottage Juice lemon Cheese processed Juice orange Cheese variety Juice pineapple Cream cereal 10% Juice vegetable Cream sour Soft drinks Cream table 18% Tea Cream whipping 32% or 35% Water bottled Eggs Wines Ice cream Cocoa Ice milk

Margarine



2. Data quality for lifetime excess cancer risk estimates

Only publicly available data were used to calculate these indicators. Data that are not publicly available may produce different results.

No systematic method for measuring data quality was possible, so we provide the following assessments of how well the data used may represent the actual Canadian average levels. Quality is rated higher when there are data from a number of Canadian monitors, or from Canadian studies that show results similar to other comparable studies. Quality is rated lower when data from few monitors or studies were available, and lowest when estimates are based on non-Canadian data. Others may rate data quality differently.

Exposure Pathway	Data Quality	Notes
Outdoor air	Low	Benzo[k]fluoranthene is regularly measured in outdoor air at 17 monitoring stations across Canada using accepted protocols.
Indoor air	Very Low	 One recent US study identified (New York City). Agrees reasonably well with a smaller US study in Chicago. A small Canadian study near an aluminum smelter reported a similar mean for 10 homes without oil heating, but a lower mean for 3 homes with oil heating.
Indoor dust	Low	 Measured levels from one recent Canadian study (Ottawa, ON) are considerably higher than 1 recent study conducted in California, USA using the same analytical method.
Drinking water	Gap	 Only 1 distribution sample was analyzed for benzo[k]fluoranthene in Ontario in 2009. No recent data or studies identified.
Foods and beverages	Very Low	 Very limited data from CFIA (National Chemical Residue Monitoring Program: 2009-2010 Annual Report) for benzo[k]fluoranthene in foods and beverages were identified.

3. Data for mapping concentrations

The maps use geographic coordinates at the census block level to represent residential locations. Concentration estimates are mapped at the health region level, which are created with aggregated census block data.

We used a model to predict annual average concentrations of benzo[k]fluoranthene in outdoor air at residential locations for 2011. These are predicted using levels measured from the National Air Pollution Surveillance (NAPS) monitors and estimated concentrations from known emitters. For more information on how these estimates were created, please see the Mapping Methods document on the Environmental Approach section of our website.



Estimates by health region

The table below shows predicted benzo[k]fluoranthene concentrations by province based on data at the health region level. The median concentration of benzo[k]fluoranthene measured in outdoor air in 2011 at the health region level was $0.00015~\mu g/m^3$, while the mean concentration was $0.00017~\mu g/m^3$. Concentrations of benzo[k]fluoranthene can be higher or lower than average in many locations.

i. Provincial averages of predicted benzo[k]fluoranthene concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$) in outdoor air in 2011 based on health regions

Province	Median	Mean		
ВС	0.00019	0.00019		
AB	0.00009	0.00010		
SK	0.00009	0.00010		
МВ	0.00009	0.00009		
ON	0.00016	0.00021		
QC	0.00017	0.00022		
NB	0.00015	0.00015		
PE	0.00014	0.00014		
NS	0.00018	0.00018		
NL	0.00008	0.00010		
YK	0.00014	0.00014		
NT	0.00009	0.00009		
NU	0.00015	0.00015		
Canada	0.00015	0.00017		

Estimates by census block

The table below shows provincial populations by concentration levels (either annual average or number of times above/below the national average) based on the census block data and the associated potential lifetime excess risk given different cancer potency factors.



i. Provincial population distribution by estimated average concentration ($\mu g/m^3$) of benzo[k]fluoranthene in outdoor air in 2011 based on NAPS data at the census block

Estimated annual average concentration (μg/m³)	Less than 0.000037	0.000037 to 0.000044	0.000044 to 0.000055	0.000055 to 0.000073	0.000073 to 0.00011	0.00011 to 0.00017	0.00017 to 0.00022	0.00022 to 0.00028	0.00028 to 0.00033	More than 0.00033
Compared to national average	>3x lower	2.5 to 3x lower	2 to 2.5x lower	1.5 to 2x lower	1 to 1.5x lower	1 to 1.5x higher	1.5 to 2x higher	2 to 2.5x higher	2.5 to 3x higher	>3.0x higher
(0.00011µg/m³)*	←			Below A	verage	Above A	verage			\longrightarrow
ВС				462,267 (10.5%)	25,607 (0.6%)	2,449,332 (55.7%)	383,138 (8.7%)	390,447 (8.9%)	400,234 (9.1%)	289,032 (6.6%)
AB		1,131,247 (31.0%)	570,266 (15.6%)	781,713 (21.4%)	385,117 (10.6%)	622,320 (17.1%)	62,792 (1.7%)	33,838 (0.9%)	25,186 (0.7%)	32,778 (0.9%)
SK				345,294 (33.4%)	14,699 (1.4%)	450,671 (43.6%)	64,870 (6.2%)	52,498 (5.1%)	54,091 (5.2%)	51,258 (5.0%)
МВ			509,087 (42.1%)	369,289 (30.6%)	113,053 (9.4%)	168,098 (13.9%)	25,996 (2.2%)	6,697 (0.6%)	6,782 (0.6%)	9,266 (0.8%)
ON	897,026 7.0%)	38,433 (0.3%)	27,119 (0.2%)	2,141,559 (16.7%)	2,515,860 (19.6%)	3,771,040 (29.3%)	841,465 (6.5%)	685,455 (5.3%)	375,311 (2.9%)	1,558,553 (12.1%)
QC				1,059,630 (13.4%)	65,631 (0.8%)	3,020,071 (38.2%)	1,342,812 (17.0%)	525,190 (6.6%)	485,544 (6.1%)	1,404,123 (17.8%)
NB	97,219 (12.9%)	10,768 (14.3%)	15,263 (2.0%)	251,019 (33.4%)	15,791 (21.0%)	265,443 (35.3%)	26,085 (3.5%)	15,560 (2.1%)	15,507 (2.1%)	38,516 (5.1%)
NS				276,543 (30.0%)	14,018 (1.5%)	454,883 (49.4%)	44,506 (48.3%)	32,747 (35.5%)	37,808 (4.1%)	61,222 (6.6%)
PE				50,210 (3.6%)	2,533 (1.8%)	66,134 (47.2%)	5,378 (3.8%)	3,316 (2.4%)	3,158 (2.3%)	9,475 (6.8%)
NL				204,295 (39.7%)	40,472 (7.9%)	178,649 (34.7%)	37,224 (7.2%)	22,647 (4.4%)	17,173 (3.3%)	14,076 (2.7%)
NU				31,906 (100.0%)						
NT				20,350 (49.1%)	623 (1.5%)	16,780 (40.5%)	1,727 (4.2%)	670 (1.6%)	1,312 (3.2%)	0 (<0.1%)
YT				7,021 (20.7%)	276 (0.8%)	18,165 (53.6%)	1,966 (5.8%)	1,898 (5.6%)	2,906 (8.6%)	1,665 (4.9%)
CANADA	994,245	1,180,448	1,121,735	6,001,096	3,193,680	11,481,586	2,837,959	1,770,963	1,425,012	3,469,964
% of pop.	(3.0%)	(3.5%)	(3.4%)	(17.9%)	(9.5%)	(34.3%)	(8.5%)	(5.3%)	4.3%)	(10.4%)

ASSOCIATED LIFETIME EXCESS CANCER RISK (per million people):

RED = POTENTIAL LIFETIME EXCESS RISK IS GREATER THAN 1 PER MILLION PEOPLE

Health Canada CPF: No CPF										
California OEHHA CPF: 0.39	< 0.0003	0.0003 to < 0.0004	0.0004 to < 0.0005	0.0004 to < 0.0007	0.0007 to < 0.001	0.001 to < 0.0015	0.0015 to < 0.002	0.002to < 0.0025	0.0025 to < 0.003	> 0.003
US EPA CPF: No CPF										

^{*} measured at National Air Pollution Surveillance (NAPS) monitors in 2011 CPF: Cancer Potency Factor