

## **7 Home Produced Food Exposure Assessment**

### **7.1 Introduction**

Semivolatile organic toxicants and toxic heavy metals emitted into the air by California facilities (e.g., dioxin and lead) are subject to deposition onto vegetation, soil, and surface water bodies. Homegrown produce can become contaminated through the deposition of the toxicant onto the surface of edible leaves, exposed edible portions of vegetables, and fruit, or, in the case of metals, may be taken up from the soil into the roots of the plant. Food animals may become contaminated from consuming contaminated vegetation (e.g., pasture, grains), water, or soil, or from inhaling the airborne toxicants. Humans may then be exposed by consuming the contaminated produce (leafy greens, fruits, vegetables), or animal products (meat, milk, and eggs).

Commercially grown produce or commercially raised beef, chicken, pork, cow's milk, and eggs come from diverse sources, so that the potential public health impacts from a single Hot Spots facility impacting a commercial operation are minimal. Therefore, only the risks from Hot Spots facility contamination of homegrown produce and home-raised beef, chicken, pork, eggs, and milk are assessed.

In order to quantify risks (cancer and chronic noncancer) from homegrown, or home raised food exposures, the dose from these sources must be determined. Dose is proportional to the consumption rate of the homegrown food items and the concentration of the toxicant in the homegrown products (i.e., produce, meat, eggs, and milk). In this chapter, we discuss and present consumption rates (both probability distributions and point estimate values) and methods to determine toxicant concentration levels for homegrown foods. The equation for determining the dose from home grown foods is shown in Equation 7.1.

### **7.2 Home Produced Food Exposure Recommendations**

OEHHA has used the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 1999-2004 survey data to generate per capita consumption distributions for produce (exposed, leafy, protected, and root categories), meat (beef, chicken, and pork), dairy products, and eggs. The NHANES data are the most recent data available with which to estimate consumption rates for the food categories discussed and that are relatively representative of the California population. The variability in food consumption that may be associated with interindividual variability in body weight was accounted for by presenting the rates on a body weight basis.

There is uncertainty in the estimations of produce, meat, dairy products, and eggs. The consumption rates are based on a single day of surveyed food intake. One day of survey data per individual is not adequate for capturing typical intake, which means that the lower percentile is likely to be underestimated and upper percentile is overestimated. Unfortunately these data are the best representative data for the United States population.

### **7.2.1 Point Estimates**

OEHHA is recommending that the default values presented in Table 7.1 be used, as needed, for the point estimate approach (Tier 1). These default values represent the mean and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the empirical distributions presented in Tables 7.8 through 7.13. When the food pathway is a dominant pathway, and multiple homegrown produce, home raised meat, milk, and eggs categories all are assessed, the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile default consumption rate for the highest risk category (e.g. leafy produce) should be used. OEHHA recommends using the mean consumption values for the remaining categories. This procedure will help avoid overly conservative estimation of risk that would arise from assuming that a single receptor would be a high consumer of all homegrown categories.

**Table 7.1 Recommended Average and High End Point Estimate Values for Home Produced Food Consumption (g/kg-day)**

Food Category	Third Trimester		Ages 0<2		Ages 2<9	
	Avg.	High End	Avg.	High End	Avg.	High End
Produce	1.9	5.9	11.7	30.2	7.4	21.7
Exposed	1.9	5.9	11.7	30.2	7.4	21.7
Leafy	0.9	3.2	3.8	10.8	2.5	7.9
Protected	1.7	5.8	5.9	17.5	4.7	13.3
Root	1.7	4.6	5.7	15.3	3.9	10.8
Meat						
Beef	2.0	4.8	3.9	11.3	3.5	8.6
Poultry	0.9	2.9	2.9	10.5	2.2	7.8
Pork	1.8	4.7	4.5	11.4	3.7	9.0
Milk	5.4	15.9	50.9	116	23.3	61.4
Eggs	1.6	4.2	6.1	15.0	3.9	9.4
	Ages 2>16		Ages 16<30		Ages 16-70	
	Avg.	High End	Avg.	High End	Avg.	High End
Produce	1.9	5.9	1.9	5.9	1.8	5.6
Exposed	1.9	5.9	1.9	5.9	1.8	5.6
Leafy	0.9	3.2	0.9	3.2	1.1	3.4
Protected	1.7	5.8	1.7	5.8	1.6	5.2
Root	1.7	4.6	1.7	4.6	1.5	4.2
Meat						
Beef	2.0	4.8	2.0	4.8	1.7	4.4
Poultry	0.9	2.9	0.9	2.9	0.9	2.8
Pork	1.8	4.7	1.8	4.7	1.5	3.8
Milk	5.4	15.9	5.4	15.9	4.3	13.2
Eggs	1.6	4.2	1.6	4.2	1.3	3.4

<sup>a</sup> Food consumption values for 3<sup>rd</sup> trimester calculated by assuming that the fetus receives the same amount of contaminated food on a per kg BW basis as the mother (adult age 16 to less than 30).

### 7.2.2 Stochastic Approach

OEHHA is recommending that the parametric models for food consumption distributions presented in Tables 7.2 through 7.7 be used as needed in Tier III stochastic risk assessments. The methods leading to these distributions are described in Section 7.4.1.

**Table 7.2 Parametric Models of Food Consumption (g/kg-day)**

Food Category	Distribution Type	Anderson-Darling Statistic	Mean	Std. Dev	Location	Scale	Shape
Produce							
Exposed	LogN	62	11.8	11.9			
Leafy	Gamma	88			0.0	1.26	0.9664
Protected	Gamma	95			0.0	2.49	0.8076
Root	Gamma	70			0.0	1.77	1.0592
Meat							
Beef	LogN	16	1.97	1.73			
Poultry	LogN	19	1.84	1.64			
Pork	LogN	144	1.08	1.76			
Dairy							
Dairy	LogN	358	8.74	21			
Eggs	LogN	114	1.62	1.55			

**Table 7.3 Parametric Models of Food Consumption (g/kg-day)**

Food Category	Distrib. Type	Anderson-Darling Statistic	Mean	Std. Dev	Location	Scale	Shape	Like-liest
Produce								
Exposed	Gamma	60			0.01	6.56	0.830	
Leafy	Gamma	167			0.01	3.30	1.161	
Protected	LogN	67	6.03	7.31				
Root	Gamma	83			0.06	4.44	1.28	
Meat								
Beef	LogN	16	1.97	1.73				
Poultry	LogN	58	4.5	4.08				
Pork	LogN	230	3.00	4.46				
Dairy								
Dairy	Max Ext.	169				27.82		33.79
Eggs	LogN	172	6.11	4.21				

**Table 7.4 Parametric Models of Food Consumption (g/kg-day) for Ages 2<9**

Food Category	Distribution Type	Anderson-Darling Statistic	Mean	Std. Dev	Location	Scale	Shape	Rate
Produce								
Exposed	Exponential	206						0.14
Leafy	LogN	127	2.64	3.89				
Protected	Weibull	68			0.02	4.76	1.063	
Root	LogN	60	3.95	3.85				
Meat								
Beef	LogN	35	3.55	2.79				
Poultry	LogN	17	3.71	2.67				
Pork	LogN	66	2.25	2.84				
Milk	LogN	12	23.4	20.78				
Eggs	LogN	38	3.93	3.00				

**Table 7.5 Parametric Models of Food Consumption (g/kg-day) for Ages 2<16**

Food Category	Distribution Type	Anderson-Darling Statistic	Mean	Std. Dev	Location	Scale	Shape
Produce							
Exposed	Gamma	60			0.01	6.54	0.8325
Leafy	LogN	68	1.83	2.91			
Protected	Gamma	47			0.00	3.69	0.9729
Root	LogN	51	3.10	3.44			
Meat							
Beef	LogN	10	2.96	2.49			
Poultry	LogN	27	2.98	2.52			
Pork	LogN	48	1.84	2.79			
Milk	LogN	35	16.8	19.2			
Eggs	LogN	71	3.16	2.95			

**Table 7.6 Parametric Models of Food Consumption (g/kg-day) for Ages 16-30<sup>a</sup>**

Food Category	Distribution Type	Anderson-Darling Statistic	Mean	Std. Dev	Location	Scale	Shape
Produce							
Exposed	Gamma	70			0.01	2.05	0.9220
Leafy	Weibull	191			0.00	0.88	0.8732
Protected	LogN	93	1.81	3.31			
Root	LogN	43	1.69	1.69			
Meat							
Beef	LogN	26	1.98	1.54			
Poultry	LogN	26	1.80	1.42			
Pork	LogN	242	1.01	1.74			
Milk	Gamma	22			0.02	5.66	0.9421
Eggs	LogN	29	1.55	1.36			

<sup>a</sup> These distributions are also recommended for the third trimester.

**Table 7.7 Parametric Models of Food Consumption (g/kg-day) for Ages 16-70**

Food Category	Distribution Type	Anderson-Darling Statistic	Mean	Std. Dev	Location	Scale	Shape
Produce							
Exposed	Gamma	148			0.01	2.07	0.8628
Leafy	Gamma	83			0.00	1.15	0.9713
Protected	Gamma	78			0.01	1.90	0.8325
Root	Gamma	14			0.00	1.28	1.166
Meat							
Beef	LogN	20	1.75	1.40			
Poultry	LogN	18	1.53	1.18			
Pork	LogN	190	0.97	1.59			
Milk	Gamma	20			0.00	4.50	0.9627
Eggs	LogN	30	1.3	1.01			

### 7.3 Home Grown Food Intake Dose

#### 7.3.1 Point Estimate (Deterministic) Algorithm

The general algorithm for estimating dose via the food pathway is as follows:

$$\text{DOSE}_{\text{food}} = (\text{Cf} * \text{IF} * \text{GRAF} * \text{L}) * \text{EF} * (1 \times 10^{-6}) \quad (\text{Eq. 7-1})$$

Where:  $\text{DOSE}_{\text{food}}$  = (mg/kg-day)

Cf	= concentration of toxicant in food type F ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )
IF	= consumption for food type F (g/kg body weight per day)
GRAF	= gastrointestinal relative absorption factor (unitless)
L	= fraction of food type consumed from contaminated source (unitless)
$1 \times 10^{-6}$	= conversion factor ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ to mg/g) for Cf term
EF	= exposure frequency (days/365 days)

The gastrointestinal relative absorption factor (GRAF) is currently only available for dioxins and furans. In most cases, a GRAF factor of one is used because it assumed that absorption would be similar in the animal oral studies as it would for humans consuming the contaminated food. In addition, data for estimating a GRAF are almost never available. The exposure frequency (EF) is set at 350 days per year (i.e., per 365 days) (US EPA, 1991).

For cancer risk, the risk is calculated for each age group using the appropriate age sensitivity factors (ASFs) and the chemical-specific cancer potency factor (CPF), expressed in units of (mg/kg-day)<sup>-1</sup>:

$$\text{RISK}_{\text{food}} = \text{DOSE}_{\text{food}} * (\text{CPF}) * \text{ASF} * \text{ED} / \text{AT} \quad (\text{Eq. 7-2})$$

Exposure duration (ED) is the number of years within the age groupings. In order to accommodate the use of the ASFs (see OEHHA, 2009), the exposure for each age grouping must be separately calculated. Thus, the  $\text{DOSE}_{\text{food}}$  and ED are different for each age grouping. The ASF, as shown below, is 10 for the third trimester and infants 0<2 years of age, is 3 for children age 2<16 years of age, and is 1 for adults 16 to 70 years of age.

ED = exposure duration (yrs):	
0.25 yrs for third trimester	(ASF = 10)
2 yrs for 0<2 age group	(ASF = 10)
7 yrs for 2<9 age group	(ASF = 3)
14 yrs for 2<16 age group	(ASF = 3)
14 yrs for 16<30 age group	(ASF = 1)
54 yrs for 16-70 age group	(ASF = 1)

AT, the averaging time for lifetime cancer risks, is 70 years in all cases. To determine lifetime cancer risks, the risks are then summed across the age groups:

$$\text{RISKfood}_{(\text{lifetime})} = \text{RISKfood}_{(3\text{rdtri})} + \text{RISKfood}_{(0<2 \text{ yr})} + \text{RISKfood}_{(2<16 \text{ yr})} + \text{RISKfood}_{(16-70\text{yr})} \quad (\text{Eq. 7-3})$$

As explained in Chapter 1, we also need to accommodate cancer risk estimates for the average (9 years) and high-end (30 years) length of time at a single residence, as well as the traditional 70 year lifetime cancer risk estimate. For example, assessing risk in a 9 year residential exposure scenario assumes exposure during the most sensitive period, from the third trimester to 9 years of age and would be presented as such:

$$\text{RISKfood}_{(9\text{-yr residency})} = \text{RISKfood}_{(3\text{rdtri})} + \text{RISKfood}_{(0<2 \text{ yr})} + \text{RISKfood}_{(2<9 \text{ yr})} \quad (\text{Eq. 7-4})$$

For the 30-year residential exposure scenario, the risk for the 2<16 and 16<30 age group would be added in to the risk from exposures in the third trimester and from age 0<2 yr. For 70 year residency risk, Eq 7-3 would apply.

### **7.3.2 Stochastic Algorithm**

The algorithm for the stochastic method is the same as the point estimate algorithm. Recommended distributions, as parametric model of empirical data on variability, are available to substitute for single values, where data permit.

## **7.4 Food Consumption Variates for the Hot Spots Exposure Model**

The homegrown produce and home-raised meat, eggs, and milk pathways in the Hot Spots program are used to assess chronic noncancer risks and cancer risks. Separate consumption estimates are needed for the third trimester, 0 to <2 years, 2<16 years, 16<30 years and 30 to 70 years in g/kg body weight per day, in order to account for the greater exposure of children and the differential impact of early in life exposure.

The ideal data for such long-term exposure determinations would be recent, representative of the California population, and have repeated measures on the same individuals to characterize typical intake over time. The amount of homegrown produce, and home-raised meat, eggs and milk would be addressed. Such data are not available. The available data, while not perfect, are nonetheless useful for the purposes of chronic exposure assessment. In the next Section, we review the currently available data and discuss the reasons for our recommendations.

### **7.4.1 Derivation of Consumption Rates**

#### **7.4.1.1 Data**

Several survey methods have been used to estimate consumption of various foods or food items by a population. These include market basket, food frequency, diary, and consumption recall methods. The USDA has conducted market basket surveys in which the amount of food that enters into the wholesale and retail markets was measured (Putnam and Allshouse, 1992). These amounts are then divided by the U.S.

population to give per capita consumption. This methodology does not allow determination of food consumption rates for individuals in the age ranges that are needed. It provides data on the amount bought at the market, not the amount consumed, which differ due to trimming, water and fat loss during processing and cooking (Putnam and Allshouse, 1992). The USDA market basket studies are thus not useful for assessing chronic exposure in our model because of these limitations.

The food frequency method asks subjects to recall the frequency with which they consumed certain food items over a previous period of time. Typically, information is collected on specific food items (e.g., green tea) or food groups (e.g., grilled red meat) that are being evaluated for their relationship to a certain disease (e.g., cancer). These surveys are conducted on relatively small groups of individuals or on large groups of a certain subpopulation (e.g., nurses in the Nurses Health Study). The food frequency method could provide very helpful information for estimating 'usual' consumption of foods that are typically consumed on a less than daily basis (e.g., berries), and for assessing intraindividual variability (Block, 1992). However, food frequency data from current studies are not representative of the general population and thus not ideal for assessing chronic exposure in the Hot Spots model.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) conducted seven Nationwide Food Consumption Surveys (NFCS) beginning in 1935 and ending in 1987-88 that collected data on household food consumption (<http://www.ars.usda.gov/Services/docs.htm>). The two most recent NFCS studies (1977-78 and 1987-88) included data on individuals. Because one of our objectives for food consumption rates was that the rates reflect current dietary patterns, the NFCS were considered too old to meet our needs. The USDA also conducted a series of food consumption surveys called the Continuing Survey of Food Intake of Individuals (CSFII) (1985, 1986, 1987, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1994-96, and 1998). OEHHA used the 1989-91 CSFII data to determine distributions of food consumption rates for the previous version of the Hot Spots Exposure Assessment and Stochastic Analysis Guidelines (OEHHA, 2000).

The three days of consumption data per individual in the CSFII 1989-1991 capture typical intake better than the fewer days in more recent surveys but are still not considered a sufficient number of repeated measures for a good determination of intraindividual variability (Andersen, 2006). The CSFII 1994-96, 1998 and the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 1999-2004, with more recent data, have become available. We therefore chose to consider the more recent datasets because the advantages of the more recent data outweighed the greater number of individual measures on the same individual in the older surveys.

The CSFII 1994-1996, 1998 survey (hereafter referred to as CSFII) collected data on two non-consecutive days of consumption, 3-10 days apart, by over 20,000 individuals, while the NHANES 1999-2004 (hereafter referred to as NHANES) dataset provided only one day of consumption (with the exception of the 2004 year) on over 30,000 individuals. OEHHA considered that the two days of intake of the CSFII did not provide sufficient additional information on typical intake to outweigh the advantage of the more recent NHANES data.

Further, the number of days between data collection for each individual in the CSFII was not available in the dataset and CSFII reported that there was no standard procedure used to determine the second day of food consumption. This likely resulted in the interval between the first and second days of data collection to be widely variable

California specific food consumption data are not available. The CSFII data are available for the Pacific region, but not for California alone. Neither California-specific nor Pacific region-specific data are available for NHANES. Therefore, OEHHA chose to use the NHANES dataset since the need for the most recent data was considered more important than having data specific to California.

#### 7.4.1.2 The NHANES Data

The NHANES uses a multistage sampling design to select individuals for the survey. Some of these stages do not use simple random sampling to select units to be surveyed (i.e., “sampled”) resulting in uneven probability and non-independent selection. Therefore, statisticians also created weights to account for these issues. These weights allow for proper estimation of variance, the standard error of the mean (SEM), and confidence intervals (CIs). These parameters (variance, SEM, CIs) estimate confidence that the value of a statistic (e.g., the mean) is the true population value. Therefore, accounting for a multistage survey design is important for estimating confidence in the numerical value of the results. This differs from the sampling weights that provided results that best represent the targeted population.

It is common that some individuals selected to participate in a survey end up either voluntarily or for other reasons, such as incomplete responses, not participating or contributing to the survey. This may result in a surveyed sample of individuals that do not reflect the targeted demographics of the survey. In NHANES, the statisticians created “sample weights” that account for non-participation. Using these weights in statistical analyses provides results that are more representative of the population.

NHANES is designed to collect the most accurate information possible. Participants are interviewed in a private setting, the mobile examination center (MEC), which consists of several mobile units specially designed and equipped for the survey. The MEC is used by NHANES to collect dietary information as well as body measurements (e.g., height, X-rays) and body specimens (e.g., urine) that are also part of the total survey for some participants. The privacy and professional setting of the MEC is thought to encourage greater accuracy in food consumption reporting. The dietary interview room of the MEC contains measuring devices (e.g., cups, spoons, photos) to help participants better estimate the amounts of various foods consumed. In 2002, NHANES implemented the automated multiple pass method, a method intended to solicit greater and more accurate recall of food consumption.

The NHANES survey is quite comprehensive in the range of prepared and non-prepared foods for which data are collected. These foods include beverages, sweets, and condiments, as well as items more commonly considered foods. Further, some

food entries contain very detailed information about the food (e.g., peaches, sliced, canned, in light syrup).

We chose to use NHANES data for the derivation of consumption rates because the data are the most recent available, have a larger sample size than CSFII, use detailed procedures to best estimate consumption (e.g., automated pass), and provide weights (sampling and multistage) with which to generate results that are the most representative of the population. Further, because NHANES is now considered a continuous survey (a complete nationwide survey is completed every two years), past results can be compared with future ones due to consistent operating procedures and study design, and future data can be added to past data to provide a more statistically sound sample size.

The disadvantage of the NHANES data is that the single day of data will tend to exaggerate the higher percentiles of the distribution. For example, if chicken consumption were investigated for 2 separate days, and the individual indicates consumption on one day but not on the second survey day, then chicken consumption would be the average of the two survey days. The average of the two days is probably closer to typical intake for the individual than the one day of chicken consumption that is captured by the NHANES survey.

#### 7.4.1.3 Methodology for the Derivation of Food Consumption Rates

Since 1999, NHANES has been conducted in two-year increments on a continuous basis. The two-year increment is needed to collect data on the full national sample of selected participants. Thus, the NHANES data are composed of datasets from the 1999-2000, 2001-2002, and 2003-2004 periods and the survey is sometimes called the "Continuous NHANES."

The NHANES collected two days of intake for some individuals in the 1999-2004 period. In 2002, a pilot test of collecting two days of intake was conducted on 10 percent of the participants. The pilot study results were not publicly released because of confidentiality issues. In 2003-2004, two days of intake were collected. However, the 2003-2004 dataset has a much smaller sample size relative to the 1999-2004 dataset. We decided that the increased interindividual information available from the larger sample size of one-day intake from the 1999-2000 dataset was advantageous to the two-day intake from a smaller sample size of the 2003-2004 dataset.

#### 7.4.1.4 Categorization of Produce

For the risk assessment of home produced foods, food items can be grouped into food categories to simplify calculations. For produce (i.e., fruits and vegetables), we reviewed the study of Baes et al. (1984) who considered exposure to radionuclides from produce consumption. The physical processes by which plants can be contaminated by airborne radionuclides are analogous to the processes by which airborne low volatility chemical contamination may occur. In the Baes et al. study, produce is divided into

three categories based on the manner in which contamination from air deposition could occur.

The first category, leafy produce, consists of broad-leafed vegetables in which the leaf is the edible part with a large surface area and can be contaminated by deposition of the toxicant onto its surface (e.g., spinach). The next category, exposed produce, includes produce with a small surface area subject to air deposition (e.g., strawberries, green peppers). The third category, protected produce, includes produce in which the edible part is not exposed to air deposition (e.g., oranges, peas).

OEHHA has chosen to use an additional category, root produce, which includes produce for which root translocation could be a source of contamination (e.g., potatoes). In Baes et al., root produce had been placed into one of the other three categories. For the semi-volatile organic and heavy metal toxicants addressed in the AB-2588 program, the produce items from NHANES are classified into the four categories of leafy, exposed, protected, and root produce.

#### 7.4.1.5 Categorization of Meat, Eggs, and Dairy

In addition to homegrown produce, animals are sometimes raised at home, depending on space and zoning regulations, for meat, egg, and milk consumption. Animal derived food items such as lamb, goat meat, or goat milk where consumption rates are small are not included in our risk assessment model.

Cattle, pigs, and poultry differ in the types (e.g., pasture vs. grain) and quantities (g/kg-body weight) of feed consumed and thus food products from these animals are likely to differ in contaminant concentrations. The transfer of contaminant into meat differs from that into eggs and milk. Therefore, we categorized animal derived foods into beef, pork, poultry, eggs, and milk product groups. These groups include the main food item (e.g., milk) as well as products from that item (e.g., cheese).

#### 7.4.1.6 Estimating and Analyzing Consumption Rate Distributions

We used the NHANES 1999-2004 data to estimate consumption rates for the third trimester, 0 to <2 years, 2 <9 years, 9 <16 years, 16 <30 years, 30 to 70 years, and 0-70 years age groups. The NHANES dataset contained data on food items as eaten (e.g., grams of raw apple or grams of cheeseburger), which resulted in two issues for data analysis. In order to estimate the dose of toxicant from the beef component of the hamburger, we need to estimate the grams of beef in hamburger. Toxicant concentration is calculated based on grams of raw or harvested food. Therefore, for foods composed of multiple food items (e.g., ground beef, cheese, tomato, lettuce), the weight of each food item in the food was estimated based on the food item's typical proportion in that type of food. For example, ground beef is considered to be 50 percent of the weight of the cheeseburger while tomatoes in a lettuce and tomato salad are estimated at 50 percent of the reported weight of salad.

The second issue was that ideally we would use the weight of the raw food (rather than the food as eaten) because the concentration of toxicant in a food group (e.g., exposed

produce) is based on the raw food at the time of produce harvesting, meat butchering, milking, or egg laying. In particular, the gram weight of food consumed was adjusted for food items such as jams, jellies, juices, and cheese (a complete list of adjustments, including adjustments to the grams consumed for other reasons, is presented in Appendix D). This is because it takes one part fruit to make 2/3 part juice while one needs 1.5 parts milk to make 1 part cheese. OEHHA did not adjust meats for the amount of moisture lost during cooking. This is because the percent moisture can be highly variable but the majority of the time it is less than 10 percent of initial raw weight, and a default adjustment would have introduced significant uncertainty due to highly variable methods of cooking.

For each participant in the survey, the grams of each food item eaten at each eating occasion was divided by that participant's body weight in kg to give g/kg for each food item-occasion. For food items (e.g., cheeseburger) with multiple components (e.g., ground beef, cheese, lettuce, tomato) the proportional g/kg of each food component was determined (e.g., g/kg ground beef, g/kg cheese). For some food item components the consumption amounts were adjusted, as described above, to account for differences in "as eaten" weights and raw/harvested weights.

We then summed the g/kg of the food item components across eating occasions during the day (e.g., ground beef in cheeseburger at lunch and in meatballs at dinner) to give g/kg-day for each food item component. The sum of the g/kg-day of each food item component was then assigned to its appropriate food group category (an example of this is described in the paragraph following this one). The g/kg-day of all food item components in a food group category were summed to give g/kg-day of the food group category for that participant (e.g., g/kg-day exposed produce).

As an example of assigning food item components to food group categories, we can use a study participant who consumed the following foods: strawberries on cereal at breakfast; a tomato, lettuce and cheese salad and strawberry shake for lunch; chicken, a baked potato, and broccoli, and a slice of apple pie for dinner.

In this example, the g/kg of strawberries at breakfast and at lunch would be added together and then added to the g/kg of the summed g/kg tomatoes, and apples to give the g/kg daily intake for the exposed produce group. Likewise, the g/kg of lettuce at lunch, and broccoli at dinner would be added together for the leafy produce group, the g/kg of onion (in the salad) and potato would be added together for the root produce group. For the poultry food group, the g/kg of chicken at lunch would have been the daily intake for the poultry food group. Beverages were also included as food items so that the g/kg of milk on cereal and in the shake would be added together. These intake rates of milk would then be added to the g/kg of cheese on the salad for the milk products food group for that survey participant. In this manner we obtain the g/kg-day values for each participant for each food group.

Foods that could not be grown in California (e.g., bananas, pineapple) or are only available commercially (e.g., canned milk) were excluded from our analyses. Some food items were not easily identified as to whether they were commercial or home

produced (e.g., frozen berries). In these cases, the assumption was made that they were home produced. Canned produce was also included because the product of home canning is sometimes referred to as canned (e.g., “canned peaches”). The list of foods eligible to be used in deriving the food consumption rates for these guidelines is in Appendix D.

Resultant g/kg-day values for each food group category were analyzed across all ages and the third trimester to <2 years, 2<9 years, 9<16 years, 16<30 years, 16<70 years age groups. It was assumed that during the third trimester that food consumption (and exposure to food borne contaminants) was the same as during ages 16<30 years. This is clearly a simplification but the third trimester is a short time period and the error introduced by this assumption is likely to be small. The “Proc Surveymeans” procedure in SAS 9.1 (SAS Institute, 2007) was used to derive mean, SEM, and 50<sup>th</sup>-, 90<sup>th</sup>-, 95<sup>th</sup>-, and 99<sup>th</sup>-percentile values. The “Proc Surveymeans” procedure incorporates information from each stage of the sampling, which is needed to provide non-biased variance estimates (e.g., the SEM), as well as incorporating information from the sampling weights to provide results that are the most representative of the population.

#### 7.4.1.7 Produce, Meat, Dairy and Egg Consumption Distributions

Produce, meat, dairy and egg consumption empirical distributions are presented for 0-70, 0<2 years, 2<9 years, 2<16 years, 16<30 years, and 16-70 years (Tables 7.8, 7.9, 7.10, 7.11, 7.12, and 7.13 respectively). The empirical distribution for 16<30 is also recommended for the third trimester because the fetus is assumed to receive the same dose (mg/kg BW) as the mother, and this age category is most representative of the child-bearing years. Consumption is expressed in terms of grams of food per kilogram body weight per day in these tables. The average and high end point estimate recommendations are presented above in Table 7.4.1. These point estimates are the mean and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles from the distributions.

The parametric model that best fit each distribution was estimated using the fitting function in Crystal Ball® version 7.2.1 (Oracle, 2007) and presented in Tables 7.2, through 7.7. Of the three goodness-of-fit tests available in Crystal Ball, the Anderson-Darling test was chosen to identify the best-fit distribution since this test is more sensitive to the tails of the distributions than the other two goodness-of-fit tests (the Chi-Square and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov). For an individual dataset and distribution, the better the distribution fits the data set, the smaller the Anderson-Darling statistic will be.

There are 20 distributions that Crystal Ball can test for distributional fit to the dataset of interest, including the Lognormal, Beta, Gamma, Logistic, Beta, and Pareto. For a few consumption rate stratifications (i.e., for a specific age group and food category), the best fit was determined to be Pareto. However, the mean and percentiles estimated for the Pareto distribution were significantly different from the empirically derived mean and percentiles. For these consumption rate strata, we chose to use the second best fit rather than the Pareto, which more clearly fit the empirically derived mean. Tables 7.2 – 7.7 present the best fit distribution for the consumption rates (noted in the column labeled “distribution type”).

**Table 7.8 Empirical Distributions of Food Consumption (g/kg-day) for All Ages 0-70 years**

Food Category	N	Mean	SEM	Min	Max	50 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	75 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	80 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	90 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	95 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	99 <sup>th</sup> - %ile
Produce											
Exposed	9683	3.1	0.05	0.0	84.3	1.7	3.5	4.3	7.2	10.8	23.5
Leafy	7049	1.2	0.03	0.0	19.9	0.8	1.6	1.8	2.7	3.8	7.0
Protected	7033	2.0	0.04	0.0	49.8	1.2	2.5	3.0	4.8	6.8	13.3
Root	11,467	1.9	0.01	0.0	39.5	1.3	2.4	2.8	4.0	5.6	10.8
Meat											
Beef	9043	2.0	0.03	0.0	26.8	1.5	2.5	2.9	4.0	5.2	8.5
Pork	3585	1.1	0.03	0.0	21.4	0.6	1.4	1.6	2.4	3.5	6.8
Poultry	8813	1.9	0.02	0.0	22.5	1.4	2.3	2.6	3.8	5.1	8.7
Milk	17,635	8.4	0.14	0.0	285.3	4.2	9.1	11.3	19.5	31.3	70.6
Eggs	5056	1.7	0.03	0.0	27.1	1.2	2.0	2.3	3.6	5.1	9.3

**Table 7.9 Empirical Distributions of Food Consumption (g/kg-day) for Ages 0<2 Yrs**

Food Category	N	Mean	SEM	Min	Max	50 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	75 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	80 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	90 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	95 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	99 <sup>th</sup> - %ile
Produce											
Exposed	941	11.7	0.05	0.1	84.3	8.9	15.4	17.6	23.9	30.2	55.3
Leafy	169	3.8	0.04	0.0	19.9	2.8	5.3	6.6	9.2	10.8	14.5
Protected	464	5.9	0.04	0.1	49.8	3.9	7.5	9.1	12.8	17.5	28.8
Root	783	5.7	0.02	0.1	51.4	4.2	8.2	9.2	12.3	15.3	24.0
Meat											
Beef	301	3.9	0.03	0.1	17.7	3.1	5.6	6.4	8.4	11.3	15.6
Pork	91	2.9	0.37	0.0	14.0	1.7	3.8	4.9	6.8	10.5	14.0
Poultry	472	4.5	0.02	0.0	21.8	3.5	5.9	6.7	9.3	11.4	19.6
Milk	924	50.9	1.9	0.0	285.3	44.1	72.3	80.4	100.1	116.1	167.6
Eggs	330	6.1	0.03	0.1	27.1	4.9	7.7	8.5	13.4	15.0	18.8

**Table 7.10 Empirical Distributions of Food Consumption (g/kg-day) for Ages 2<9 Years**

Food Category	N	Mean	SEM	Min	Max	50 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	75 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	80 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	90 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	95 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	99 <sup>th</sup> - %ile
<b>Produce</b>											
Exposed	1944	7.4	0.26	0.0	74.2	5.6	9.9	11.0	15.6	21.7	35.2
Leafy	689	2.5	0.15	0.0	14.0	1.6	3.3	3.9	6.0	7.9	12.3
Protected	970	4.7	0.17	0.0	33.9	3.5	6.3	7.3	10.2	13.3	19.3
Root	643	3.9	0.12	0.0	34.9	3.1	5.0	5.7	8.0	10.8	17.7
<b>Meat</b>											
Beef	1288	3.5	0.10	0.0	26.8	2.9	4.6	5.0	6.8	8.6	13.6
Pork	434	2.2	0.17	0.0	21.4	1.4	2.7	3.4	4.6	7.8	10.6
Poultry	1430	3.7	0.10	0.0	22.5	3.1	4.7	5.2	7.0	9.0	14.1
<b>Milk</b>											
Milk	3294	23.3	0.59	0.0	181.8	18.0	30.6	35.2	47.4	61.4	91.2
<b>Eggs</b>											
Eggs	782	3.9	0.15	0.1	19.7	3.4	5.0	5.7	7.4	9.4	15.2

**Table 7.11 Empirical Distributions of Food Consumption (g/kg-day) for Ages 2<16 Years**

Food Category	N	Mean	SEM	Min	Max	50 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	75 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	80 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	90 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	95 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	99 <sup>th</sup> - %ile
<b>Produce</b>											
Exposed	3764	5.5	0.15	0.0	74.2	3.5	7.3	8.4	12.4	16.6	32.1
Leafy	1833	1.7	0.09	0.0	14.5	1.0	2.3	2.6	4.0	5.8	11.3
Protected	2128	3.6	0.11	0.0	34.7	2.5	4.9	5.6	8.5	10.6	17.5
Root	3599	3.0	0.06	0.0	34.9	2.2	3.9	4.5	6.4	8.7	15.5
<b>Meat</b>											
Beef	3119	3.0	0.07	0.0	26.8	2.3	3.9	4.3	5.7	7.6	11.8
Pork	1018	1.8	0.10	0.0	21.4	1.1	2.2	2.7	4.0	5.7	10.4
Poultry	3093	3.0	0.06	0.0	22.5	2.4	3.9	4.4	5.9	7.5	11.4
<b>Milk</b>											
Milk	7082	16.5	0.34	0.0	181.8	11.6	21.8	25.2	36.7	48.4	78.6
<b>Eggs</b>											
Eggs	1500	3.1	0.09	0.0	19.7	2.4	4.2	4.6	6.4	8.1	13.5

**Table 7.12 Empirical Distributions of Food Consumption (g/kg-day) for  
Ages 16<30 Years**

Food Category	N	Mean	SEM	Min	Max	50 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	75 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	80 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	90 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	95 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	99 <sup>th</sup> - %ile
Produce											
Exposed	1757	1.9	0.06	0.0	20.6	1.4	2.6	3.2	4.3	5.9	9.1
Leafy	1774	0.9	0.04	0.0	11.4	0.6	1.3	1.6	2.2	3.2	5.2
Protected	1523	1.7	0.09	0.0	22.7	1.0	2.1	2.5	3.9	5.8	10.7
Root	2703	1.7	0.05	0.0	13.0	1.2	2.2	2.5	3.6	4.6	7.5
Meat											
Beef	2462	2.0	0.05	0.0	19.4	1.6	2.6	2.9	3.9	4.8	7.4
Pork	843	0.9	0.04	0.0	9.0	0.5	1.4	1.6	2.3	2.9	4.9
Poultry	2208	1.8	0.04	0.0	12.1	1.4	2.3	2.5	3.5	4.7	7.5
Milk	3806	5.4	0.16	0.0	116.3	3.6	7.1	8.4	12.4	15.9	27.6
Eggs	1053	1.6	0.06	0.0	11.6	1.2	1.9	2.3	3.2	4.2	5.8

**Table 7.13 Empirical Distributions of Food Consumption (g/kg-day) for  
Ages 16-70 Years**

Food Category	N	Mean	SEM	Min	Max	50 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	75 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	80 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	90 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	95 <sup>th</sup> - %ile	99 <sup>th</sup> - %ile
Produce											
Exposed	4978	1.8	0.06	0.0	23.2	1.3	2.4	2.8	4.1	5.6	8.8
Leafy	5047	1.1	0.03	0.0	15.6	0.8	1.5	1.7	2.5	3.4	5.8
Protected	4441	1.6	0.05	0.0	30.6	1.0	2.1	2.4	3.7	5.2	9.7
Root	6852	1.5	0.02	0.0	13.0	1.1	2.1	2.3	3.2	4.2	6.6
Meat											
Beef	5623	1.7	0.03	0.0	19.4	1.4	2.3	2.5	3.4	4.4	6.8
Pork	2476	0.9	0.03	0.0	14.6	0.5	1.3	1.5	2.2	2.8	4.8
Poultry	5248	1.5	0.02	0.0	12.1	1.3	2.0	2.2	2.9	3.8	6.1
Milk	9629	4.3	0.08	0.0	116.3	3.0	5.8	6.6	9.9	13.2	22.6
Eggs	3226	1.3	0.03	0.0	11.6	1.0	1.6	1.8	2.5	3.4	5.4

\*Min = 0 (zero) is due to amounts consumed <0.05 that were rounded to 0.0 (zero)

## 7.5 Calculating Contaminant Concentrations in Food

The previous sections focused on consumption rates for a variety of foods, and included development of means and distributions for those consumption rates. Consumption rates represent one exposure variate in the algorithm for calculating human exposure to contaminants through the food chain. As in Eq. 7-1, concentrations of contaminants in food products,  $C_f$ , must also be estimated. The following sections describe the algorithms and default values for exposure variates used in estimating concentrations in foods.

### 7.5.1 Algorithms used to Estimate Concentration in Vegetation (Food and Feed)

Vegetation that is consumed directly by humans will be referred to as 'food', while that consumed by animals is termed 'feed'. Humans can be exposed to contaminants from vegetation either directly through food consumption or indirectly through the consumption of animal products derived from animals that have consumed contaminated feed.

The concentration of contaminants in plants is a function of both direct deposition and root uptake. These two processes are estimated through the following equations:

$$C_f = (C_{dep}) * (GRAF) + C_{trans} \quad (\text{Eq. 7-5})$$

where:  $C_f$  = concentration in the food ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )  
 $C_{dep}$  = concentration due to direct deposition ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )  
GRAF = gastrointestinal relative absorption fraction  
 $C_{trans}$  = concentration due to translocation from the roots ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )

#### 7.5.1.1 GRAF

A gastrointestinal relative absorption fraction (GRAF) is included in the calculation of concentration via deposition to account for decreased absorption in the GI tract of materials bound to fly ash or fly ash-like particulate matter relative to absorption of a contaminant added to the diet in animal feeding studies (i.e., laboratory animal studies used to determine oral chronic Reference Exposure Levels). At the present time, GRAF data are only available for polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans (PCDD/F), based on the 2,3,7,8-TCDD congener. The GRAF for those compounds is 0.43. All other compounds have a GRAF of 1.0. There are no data available to describe differential absorption onto feed from fly ash particles as compared to other compounds. Consequently, the factor comes into play only in calculating dose of PCDD/F through this pathway. Note that the factor is not applied to the material translocated through the roots, as toxicants taken up by the roots are assumed to be absorbed to the same extent as that in the feed of the experimental animals in the study, which is the basis for both the cancer potency factor and reference exposure level.

### 7.5.1.2 Deposition onto Crops

The factor Cdep is calculated by the following equation:

$$C_{dep} = [(Dep) (IF)/(k) (Y)] \times (1 - e^{-kT}) \quad \text{(Eq. 7-6)}$$

where: Cdep = amount of toxicant depositing on the vegetation per kg crop ( $\mu\text{g}$ -toxicant / kg-crop)  
Dep = deposition rate on impacted vegetation ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^2\text{day}$ )  
IF = interception fraction  
k = weathering constant ( $\text{d}^{-1}$ )  
Y = crop yield ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ )  
e = base of natural logarithm ( $\sim 2.718$ )  
T = growth period (days)

The variate, Dep, is a function of the modeled (or measured) ground level concentration, and the vertical rate of deposition of emitted materials, and is calculated as follows:

$$Dep = \text{GLC} \times \text{Dep-rate} \times 86,400 \quad \text{(Eq. 7-7)}$$

where: GLC = ground level concentration of contaminant in air ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )  
Dep-rate = vertical deposition rate (m/sec)  
86,400 = seconds per day (sec/day)

The ground level concentration is calculated in the air dispersion modeling (see Chapter 2). The deposition rate is assumed to be 0.02 meters per second for a controlled source and 0.05 meters/second for an uncontrolled source (see Chapter 2).

The interception fraction in Eq. 7-6 above is crop specific. The work of Baes et al. (1984), examining the transport of radionuclides through agriculture, describes interception fraction as a factor which accounts for the fact that not all airborne material depositing in a given area initially deposits on edible vegetation surfaces. That fraction will be somewhere between zero and one.

There are no data on interception fraction for leafy and exposed produce but interception fractions for these produce categories were modeled by Baes et al. (1984). Baes et al. used assumptions based on typical methods of cultivating leafy and exposed produce in the U.S., and on the following equations:

$$\text{If } e = 1 - e^{(-0.0324Ye)} \\ \text{If } l = 1 - e^{(-0.0846Yl)}$$

where: If e = interception fraction for exposed produce  
If l = interception fraction for leafy produce  
Y = yield of exposed produce ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ , dry)  
Y = yield of leafy produce ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ , dry).

Baes et al. calculated an average interception fraction of 0.15 for leafy produce and 0.052 for exposed produce. For these guidelines, the interception fractions were rounded off to 0.2 and 0.1 for leafy and exposed produce, respectively.

Some information is available from studies of radioactive isotopes for pasture grasses. The empirical relationship for grasses is given by:

$$\text{IFpg} = 1 - e^{-2.88 Y} \quad \text{(Eq. 7-8)}$$

where: IFpg = interception fraction for pasture grasses  
Y = yield in kg/m<sup>2</sup> (dry)

Assuming that the wet yield is 2 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, and 80 percent of the wet weight is water, then the IFpg is approximately 0.7 (Baes et al., 1984). This value compares well with the Baes modeled interception fractions for leafy and exposed produce since grasses are more densely packed into a given area relative to home grown leafy and exposed produce.

For protected and root produce, there are no known interception fractions (modeled or empirical) and it is difficult to arrive at a wet yield value. OEHHA recommends that the 2 kg/m<sup>2</sup> wet yield value be used for the protected and root categories of produce.

Additional default values for variates in Eq. 7-6 are obtained from *Multi-pathway Health Risk Assessment Parameters Guidance Document* prepared for South Coast Air Quality Management District (Clement Associates, 1988). The weathering constant, k, is based on experimental observations from studies of particulate radionuclides on plant surfaces. This weathering constant does not include volatilization from the leaf surface since the radionuclides used were not volatile, nor does it include biotransformation or chemical transformation on the leaf surface. Baes et al. (1984) describe particulate half-lives ranging from 2.8 to 34 days with a geometric mean of 10 days for radionuclides depositing on plants. OEHHA proposes using a weathering constant of 10 days based on Baes et al. (1984).

The growth period, T, in Equation 7-6 above is based on the time from planting to harvest. OEHHA recommends a value of 45 days for leafy and root crops and 90 days for exposed and protected produce (time from fruit set to harvest). The assumptions in the interception fraction include the issue of increasing surface area with growth. Therefore, no additional adjustment is necessary.

#### 7.5.1.3 Translocation from the Roots

The variate, C<sub>trans</sub>, in Equation 7-9, represents the amount of contaminant that is translocated, or absorbed, from the soil into the roots of homegrown crops that are food sources for humans. Once absorbed, the contaminant may accumulate in edible roots (e.g., carrots) and be translocated to other parts of the plant that are consumed including the leaves and fruit. The equation for calculating concentration in the plant from root uptake is as follows:

$$C_{\text{trans}} = C_s \times \text{UF} \quad \text{(Eq. 7-9)}$$

Where:  $C_s$  = concentration in the soil (see Chapter 6)  
 UF = soil-to-plant uptake factor

The soil-to-plant uptake factor (UF) is the ratio of the fresh weight contaminant concentration in the edible plant or plant part over the total concentration of the contaminant in soil wet weight. The UFs (Eq. 7-9) recommended by OEHHA are from the scientific literature. Due to the large volume of studies investigating metal concentrations in edible plants grown in contaminated soils, OEHHA created a database to assemble the data and calculate UFs. The database and methods used to estimate the UFs are described in Appendix H.

The concentration in the soil ( $C_s$ ) is calculated as described in Chapter 6 using air dispersion and deposition modeling. The UF for specified metals can then be applied in Eq. 7-9 in order to estimate  $C_{\text{trans}}$ .

Due to lack of root absorption and translocation, the soil-to-plant uptake from the roots of organic compounds under the “Hot Spots” program (e.g., dioxins and PCBs) is not included. Therefore, the soil-to-plant UFs are currently limited to the inorganic metals and chemicals.

The soil-to-plant UFs of edible plants, shown in Table 7.14, are divided into four types: leafy, root, protected, and exposed. The foods in each of these produce categories are presented in Appendix D. The classification of edible plants into these four groups reflects the potential differences in contaminant concentrations that may occur in the plant parts resulting not only from soil-to-plant uptake, but also from airborne deposition.

**Table 7.14 Soil-to-plant uptake factors for inorganic metals and chemicals in edible crops<sup>a</sup>**

Element	Leafy	Exposed	Protected	Root
Arsenic	$1 \times 10^{-2}$	$2 \times 10^{-2}$	$7 \times 10^{-2}$	$8 \times 10^{-3}$
Beryllium	$2 \times 10^{-4}$	$8 \times 10^{-3}$	$3 \times 10^{-4}$	$5 \times 10^{-3}$
Cadmium	$1 \times 10^{-1}$	$2 \times 10^{-2}$	$1 \times 10^{-2}$	$8 \times 10^{-2}$
Chromium (VI)	$3 \times 10^{-1}$	$2 \times 10^{-2}$	$7 \times 10^{-2}$	$3 \times 10^0$
Fluoride	$4 \times 10^{-2}$	$4 \times 10^{-3}$	$4 \times 10^{-3}$	$9 \times 10^{-3}$
Lead	$8 \times 10^{-3}$	$7 \times 10^{-3}$	$3 \times 10^{-3}$	$4 \times 10^{-3}$
Mercury	$2 \times 10^{-2}$	$9 \times 10^{-3}$	$1 \times 10^{-2}$	$2 \times 10^{-2}$
Nickel	$1 \times 10^{-2}$	$3 \times 10^{-3}$	$3 \times 10^{-2}$	$6 \times 10^{-3}$
Selenium	$6 \times 10^{-2}$	$4 \times 10^{-2}$	$3 \times 10^{-1}$	$7 \times 10^{-2}$

<sup>a</sup> Soil-to-plant UFs represent the fresh weight concentration of a contaminant in the plant part over the wet weight concentration of contaminant in the soil.

### 7.5.2 Algorithms used to Estimate Dose to the Food Animal

The general formula for estimating concentrations of contaminants in animal products is as follows:

$$C_{fa} = [D_{inh} + D_{wi} + D_{feed} + D_{past} + D_{si}] \times T_{co} \quad (\text{Eq. 7-10})$$

where:  $D_{inh}$  = dose through inhalation ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$ )  
 $D_{wi}$  = dose through water intake ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$ )  
 $D_{feed}$  = dose through feed consumption ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$ )  
 $D_{past}$  = dose through pasturing/grazing ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$ )  
 $D_{si}$  = dose through soil ingestion ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$ )  
 $T_{co}$  = transfer coefficient from consumed media to meat/milk products

Ideally, the  $T_{co}$  values would be evaluated separately for the inhalation and oral routes but the data do not exist to separately evaluate the inhalation route. The  $T_{co}$  values are based on oral studies, and are presented in Appendix K, and summarized in Table 7.16 and 7.17.

#### 7.5.2.1 Dose via Inhalation

The dose via inhalation is proportional to the concentration of the contaminant in the air and the amount of air breathed by the animal in a single day. It is assumed that 100 percent of the chemical is absorbed. The dose via inhalation is calculated as follows:

$$D_{inh} = BR \times GLC \quad (\text{Eq.7-11})$$

where:  $D_{inh}$  = dose to the animal via inhalation ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$ )  
 $BR$  = daily breathing rate of the animal ( $\text{m}^3/\text{day}$ )  
 $GLC$  = ground level concentration ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )

#### 7.5.2.2 Dose via Water Consumption

Airborne contaminants depositing in surface water sources of drinking water for food animals can end up in the human food chain. The dose to the food animal from water consumption is proportional to the concentration of the contaminant in the drinking water and the amount of water consumed by the animal daily. In addition, the fraction of the water consumed daily that comes from a contaminated body of water is used to adjust the dose to the food animal. That fraction is a site-specific value that must be estimated for the site. The dose via water consumption can be calculated as follows:

$$D_{wi} = WI \times C_w \times Fr \quad (\text{Eq. 7-12})$$

where:  $D_{wi}$  = dose to the food animal through water intake ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$ )  
 $WI$  = water intake rate (L/day)  
 $C_w$  = concentration of contaminant in water ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ )  
 $Fr$  = fraction of animal's water intake from the impacted source

C<sub>w</sub> is calculated as in Chapter 8. Water consumption rates for food animals are shown in Table 7.15. The fraction of the animals' water intake that comes from the source impacted by emissions is a site-specific variable.

### 7.5.2.3 Dose from Feed Consumption, Pasturing and Grazing

Airborne contaminants may deposit on pastureland and on fields growing feed for animals. The default assumption is that the feed is not contaminated because most feed would be purchased from offsite sources. However, if feed is produced onsite, the dose from contaminated feed should be determined. Deposited contaminant contributes to the total burden of contaminants in the meat and milk. The dose to the animal from feed and pasture/grazing can be calculated as follows:

$$D_{\text{feed}} = (1 - G) \times FI \times L \times C_f \quad \text{(Eq. 7-13)}$$

where: D<sub>feed</sub> = dose through feed intake (μg/day)  
G = fraction of diet provided by grazing  
FI = feed consumption rate (kg/d)  
L = fraction of feed that is locally grown and impacted by facility emissions  
C<sub>f</sub> = concentration of contaminant in feed (μg/kg)  
(calculated in Eq. 7-2)

$$D_{\text{past}} = G \times C_f \times FI \quad \text{(Eq. 7-14)}$$

where: D<sub>past</sub> = dose from pasture grazing (μg/day)  
G = fraction of diet provided by grazing  
FI = pasture consumption rate (kg/day)  
C<sub>f</sub> = concentration of contaminant in pasture (μg/kg)

DMI, kg dry matter intake (feed), is given for food animals in Table 7.15. The percent of the diet that comes from pasture and feed, and the fraction of feed that is locally grown and impacted by emissions are site-specific variables and values for these variables need to be assessed by surveying farmers in the impacted area. Concentration in the feed and pasture are calculated as in Equations 7-10 and 7-11 above. It is considered likely that feed will come from sources not subject to contamination from the stationary source under evaluation.

**Table 7.15 Point Estimates for Animal Pathway**

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Beef Cattle</b>	<b>Lactating Dairy Cattle</b>	<b>Pigs</b>	<b>Meat Poultry</b>	<b>Egg-laying Poultry</b>
BW (body weight in kg)	533	575	55	1.7	1.6
BR (inhalation rate in m <sup>3</sup> /d)	107	115	7	0.4	0.4
WI (water consumption in kg/d)	45	110	6.6	0.16	0.23
DMI ( kg/d) <sup>1</sup>	9	22			
Feed Intake			2.4	0.13	0.12
%Sf (soil fraction of feed)	0.01	0.01	NA	NA	NA
%Sp (soil fraction of pasture)	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.02

<sup>1</sup> Dry matter intake

7.5.2.4 Transfer Coefficients from Feed to Animal Products

The derivation and use of transfer coefficients for specific chemicals is explained in Appendix K. Tables 7.16 and 7.17 contain the recommended values for multipathway organic and inorganic chemicals, respectively.

**Table 7.16 Food Animal Transfer Coefficients for Organic Chemicals**

Organic Chemical	Tcos (d/kg) <sup>a</sup>				
	Cow's Milk	Chicken Egg	Chicken Meat	Cattle Meat	Pig Meat
Diethylhexylphthalate	9 x 10 <sup>-5</sup>	0.04	0.002	6 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	5 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>
Hexachlorobenzene	0.02	20	10	0.2	0.08
Hexachlorocyclohexanes	0.01	7	5	0.2	0.09
PAHs	0.01	0.003	0.003	0.07	0.06
Polychlorinated biphenyls					
Congener 77	0.001	6	4	0.07	0.4
81	0.004	10	7	0.2	0.4
105	0.01	10	7	0.6	0.7
114	0.02	10	7	0.9	0.7
118	0.03	10	7	1	0.7
123	0.004	10	7	0.2	0.7
126	0.04	10	7	2.	0.7
156	0.02	10	8	0.9	2
157	0.01	10	8	0.5	2
167	0.02	10	8	1	2
169	0.04	10	8	2	2
189	0.005	10	8	0.2	1
Unspeciated	0.01	10	7	0.2	0.5
PCDD/Fs					
Congener 2378-TCDD	0.02	10	9	0.7	0.1
12378-PeCDD	0.01	10	9	0.3	0.09
123478-HxCDD	0.009	10	6	0.3	0.2
123678-HxCDD	0.01	10	6	0.4	0.1
123789-HxCDD	0.007	7	3	0.06	0.02
1234678-HpCDD	0.001	5	2	0.05	0.2
OCDD	0.0006	3	1	0.02	0.1
2378-TCDF	0.004	10	6	0.1	0.02
12378-PeCDF	0.004	30	10	0.1	0.01
23478-PeCDF	0.02	10	8	0.7	0.09
123478-HxCDF	0.009	10	5	0.3	0.1
123678-HxCDF	0.009	10	6	0.3	0.09
234678-HxCDF	0.008	5	3	0.3	0.06
123789-HxCDF	0.009	3	3	0.3	0.03
1234678-HpCDF	0.002	3	1	0.07	0.06
1234789-HpCDF	0.003	3	1	0.1	0.02
OCDF	0.002	1	0.6	0.02	0.03
Unspeciated	0.001	6	5	0.03	0.09

<sup>a</sup> All Tco values were rounded to the nearest whole number.

<sup>b</sup> NA – no data available or not applicable

**Table 7.17 Food Animal Transfer Coefficients for Inorganic Chemicals**

Inorganic Metals and Chemicals	Tcos (d/kg) <sup>a</sup>				
	Cow's Milk	Chicken Egg	Chicken Meat	Cattle Meat	Pig Meat
Arsenic	5 x 10 <sup>-5</sup>	0.07	0.03	2 x 10 <sup>-3</sup>	0.01 <sup>b</sup>
Beryllium	9 x 10 <sup>-7</sup>	0.09	0.2	3 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0.001
Cadmium	5 x 10 <sup>-6</sup>	0.01	0.5	2 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0.005
Chromium (VI)	9 x 10 <sup>-6</sup>	NA <sup>c</sup>	NA	NA	NA
Fluoride	3 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0.008	0.03	8 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0.004 <sup>b</sup>
Lead	6 x 10 <sup>-5</sup>	0.04	0.4	3 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0.001 <sup>b</sup>
Mercury	7 x 10 <sup>-5</sup>	0.8	0.1	4 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0.002 <sup>b</sup>
Nickel	3 x 10 <sup>-5</sup>	0.02	0.02	3 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0.001
Selenium	0.009	3	0.9	0.04	0.5

<sup>a</sup> All Tco values were rounded to the nearest whole number.

<sup>b</sup> The meat Tco was estimated using the metabolic weight adjustment ratio of 4.8 from cattle to pig

<sup>c</sup> NA – no data available or was not applicable

## 7.6 Default Values for Calculation of Contaminant Concentration in Animal Products

### 7.6.1 Body Weight Defaults

Cows used for milk production will be adults (i.e., full body weight) and females, so only adult female weights should be used for the home produced milk pathway. OEHHA recommends the central tendency weight of 575 kg for the home raised milk cow (midpoint of the adult cow range). A cow or bull raised for home produced beef may be of any age, gender or strain. We recommend 533 kg (midpoint of the beef cattle range) for the home produced beef pathways (National Research Council, 2000). Beef cattle are growing while being raised and thus transitioning through lower body weights to reach the mature body weight. We therefore propose a default central tendency value.

Mean pig body weights of 30.9-80 kg at age 13-23 weeks have been reported (Agricultural Research Council, London, 1967). The 4H club, which encourages children to participate in the home raising of pigs, recommends that the pigs weigh between 200 and 240 pounds (90.9 and 109 kg) at the end of the project (<http://www.goats4h.com/Pigs.html#weight>). OEHHA recommends half of 240 pounds, 120 pounds or 55 kg, as the average weight of the pig while being raised.

The National Research Council (1994) in Table 2.5 lists the weight of broiler chickens by week up to 9 weeks. The weight for the males is 3.5 kg after 9 weeks. The average weight over the 9-week period is 1.7 kg, which is the OEHHA's recommendation for a default body weight for chickens raised for meat. The OEHHA recommends the average weight of white and brown egg laying chickens at 18 weeks to first egg laying (1.5 kg) in Table 2-1 National Research Council (1994).

### **7.6.2 Breathing Rate Defaults**

Animal breathing rate defaults were calculated based upon a relationship of tidal volume to body weight. Each pound of body weight has been reported to correspond to approximately 2.76 ml of tidal volume ( $2.76 \text{ ml/lb} \cong 6.07 \text{ ml/kg}$  body weight) (Breazile, 1971). Using this relationship, the default animal body weight, and breathing cycle frequencies provided in Breazile (1971), we generated breathing rates. Reported breathing frequencies for cattle, pigs, and poultry were 18-28, 8-18, and 15-30 respirations per minute, respectively. The body weight defaults described above were used in the calculations. Use of these values generated a range of breathing rates and the default value was derived as the average of the range limits. Default breathing rates for dairy cattle, beef cattle, pigs, and poultry are 116, 107, 6.2, and  $0.33 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$ , respectively. The default value for cattle falls within the range of that reported by Altman et al. (1958).

### **7.6.3 Feed Consumption Defaults**

Backyard farmers could raise cattle, swine, and chickens from birth to early adulthood for meat. There is a large change in body weight that correlates with feed-consumption rates during that period of the animal's life. For meat animals, the OEHHA attempted to identify the consumption rate at the mid-point of the meat animals' pre-slaughter life span. In contrast, the adult cows and chicken that produce milk and eggs have relatively constant feed-consumption rates and body weights. For these cows and chickens, OEHHA attempted to identify the consumption rate of the fully-grown adult.

OEHHA's risk assessment model assumes that the source contaminates the pasture or hay from that pasture. A regulated source could contaminate a pasture that provides a cow with 100 percent of its nutrition. In contrast, homeowners usually procure feed for backyard swine and chicken that is produced off-site. Therefore, the default assumptions are that the regulated source contaminates 0 percent of the swine or chicken feed, and 100 percent of cows' feed. Site-specific conditions may require that different percent contamination be used.

#### **7.6.3.1 Bovine Feed Ingestion**

Most published literature on bovine feed ingestion is on commercial production. While the backyard and commercial animals are the same breeds, the feeding patterns can be different. It is likely that home raised cattle will be fed a higher percentage of forage, for example. DMI is the feed consumption rate with the units of kilograms feed per day (kg/d). Feed is dried before it is weighed to obtain a DMI because water content varies. The NRC identifies several factors that affect DMI (NRC, 2001). These include fiber content of the forage, initial size of the animal, and time preceding parturition. Two types of feed are reported in the literature: forage (grass, hay, alfalfa, etc.) and concentrate (high-energy feeds like corn, soybean or oats). As concentrate increases, consumption of forage decreases.

As the animal gets larger, it eats more food; therefore, DMI is correlated with body weight. Body weight does not change greatly during the majority of the milk producing years of dairy cows. Therefore, we assume the backyard dairy cow consumes the same amount as those in the studies described below. In contrast, the body weight of beef cattle varies greatly as they grow from calves to adults. Papers often report the starting body weight for beef cattle. OEHHA selected peer-reviewed papers in which DMI was reported with adequate description of the methods. DMI was measured in these studies but was not necessarily the objective of the study.

Cows eat about as much pasture as they do hay or silage. Holden et al. (1994) compared DMIs of pasture, hay, and silage in three non-lactating, non-pregnant dairy cows. The pasture was identical to that used for the hay and silage. The cows ate pasture, hay, and silage in sequential 19-day exposures. Chromium oxide, an indigestible component of vegetation, was used to estimate consumption. This study showed that fecal chromium oxide accurately predicts DMI of hay and silage. More importantly, intake rates (kg/d) showed no difference among pasture, silage or hay using fecal chromium oxide estimates. Therefore, OEHHA selected studies that measured silage or hay consumptions assuming they are the same as pasture consumption.

Britt et al. (2003) measured DMI in 13 herds of lactating Holstein dairy cows in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mexico at different times throughout the year. The mean  $\pm$  standard deviation of 34 measurements is  $21.8 \pm 1.6$  kg/day with a range of 16.8 to 24.5. Holcomb et al. (2001) reported an average DMI for 40 Holsteins of 21.6 kg/day. Rastani et al. (2005) measured DMI for 20 weeks around birth. Ten weeks prior to birth, the DMI was 20 kg/day and gradually decreased to 10 kg/day at birth, and then it gradually increased to 23 kg/day ten weeks post-partum. The OEHHA recommendation for DMI for dairy cows is 22 kg/day, the mean of these three reports.

As described in the Bovine section above, a number of factors influence the uncertainty and variability of pasture DMI of backyard dairy cows. As Rastani et al. (2005) show, lactating cows consume about twice as much as cows not lactating. We did not consider non-lactating cows since milk is the vehicle of human exposure. Cows fed supplements such as corn, soybean, or oats would eat less pasture.

The NRC (2000) has developed an equation predicting DMI based on the energy content in mega-calories per kg of dry matter of the forage (Mcal/kg). A graph of DMI vs. energy content using this equation peaks at about 9 kg/d with cows fed medium energy content forage. The DMI gradually decreases to about 7.6 kg/day with both high and low energy content forages. A second graph in the NRC report shows DMI plotted against initial body weight. The smallest steers (200 kg) ate the least (4 kg/d) and larger animals ate the most (12 kg/d for 350 kg steers). Burns et al. (2000) reported DMI in six Angus steers (initial mean BW = 334 kg) fed with an average DMI of 9.7 kg/d. Stanley et al. (1993) measured DMI in four Hereford x Angus cows at seven time points. The total duration was 83 days during which there was a linear increase in DMI from 8.8 to 14.9 kg/day. Unfortunately, the authors did not report body weights at the seven time

points. OEHHA recommends a default DMI of 9 kg/day for cattle home raised for beef to estimate average food consumption during the home raising period.

The uncertainties described for dairy cows apply to beef cattle. In addition, DMI correlates with body weight and the body weight varies greatly in beef cattle grown from calves to young adults for slaughter. The OEHHA value is an average over this period. It could over-estimate intake if calves are slaughtered for veal or under-estimate intake of cattle slaughtered long after reaching maturity.

#### 7.6.3.2 Swine Feed Ingestion

Since it is likely that most backyard swine would eat feed produced off-site, this exposure pathway to the swine should be included only when feed is grown on-site. OEHHA assumes people obtain backyard swine as weanlings and slaughter them at early adulthood when they weigh about 110 kg. The food consumption varies with body weight and calorie density of the feed. The NRC has developed a mathematical model from simultaneous observations of body weight and feed intake of a nutritionally adequate corn/soybean mix to over 8,000 swine. The model (NRC, 1998) predicts the digestible energy requirement (in kcal/day) as a function of body weight (from 10 to 120 kg). The equation predicts that swine at the average body weight of 55 kg would require about 8000 kcal/d. Corn has a digestible energy content of about 3,300 kcal/kg (Feoli et al.(2007). Thus, a 55 kg swine would consume about 2.4 kg/d.

Generally, backyard swine consume restaurant waste or other feed not produced on-site. Therefore, risk assessors should assume the amount of contaminated feed consumed by backyard swine is zero, as the default. If the dry weight digestible energy content of this feed is known, it can be used to convert 8,000 kcal into kg of feed consumed per day. When swine eat supplements not raised on-site, the risk assessor will need to determine the fraction of feed raised on-site.

#### 7.6.3.3 Chicken Feed Ingestion

Since most backyard chickens would eat feed produced off-site, this exposure pathway for chickens should be included only when chickens' feed is known to be grown on-site. Chicken feed consumption from onsite could contaminate the meat and/or eggs.

#### 7.6.3.4 Feed Ingestion by Chickens Raised for Meat

Ingestion of homegrown feed by chickens, which are home-raised for meat, is only an exposure pathway if the feed is also grown on site, which is unlikely. If the feed is grown on site then the following feed consumption value is provided. The National Research Council (1994) report in Table 2.5 of their document shows data on chicken food consumption for broilers from one to nine weeks of age. Males, the most likely to be eaten by homeowners, weigh 3.5 kg at 9 weeks and consume 0.23 kg/d of feed. Males at the midpoint, 4 weeks, weigh 1 kg and consume 0.132 kg/d. If only a fraction of the feed at a particular site is grown on site, this fraction should be used to reduce the consumption rate.

#### 7.6.3.5 Laying Hen Feed Ingestion

Ingestion of homegrown feed by chickens home-raised for eggs, is only an exposure pathway if the feed is grown on site, which is unlikely. If the feed is grown on site, then the following feed consumption value is provided. Table 2.2 of the NRC report (1994) shows consumption rates for laying hens from 2 to 20 weeks of age. At 20 weeks, the average weight of strains laying brown eggs and strains laying white eggs is 1.6 kg and the average food consumption at 20 weeks is 0.12 kg/d, which is recommended as the default for egg laying chickens. If only a fraction of the feed which chickens at a particular site ingest is grown on site, this fraction should be used to reduce the consumption rate.

#### **7.6.4 Water Consumption Defaults**

Water consumption for home raised beef cattle, dairy cattle, pigs, and chickens would be an exposure pathway for these animals only if surface waters are used as a water source (e.g., a farm pond). If municipal or well water were used, the water supply would not be contaminated by the facility under evaluation under the assumptions of the Hot Spots risk assessment model.

##### 7.6.4.1 Bovine Water Consumption

Literature reported bovine water intake rates are generally expressed in relation to dry matter consumption on a weight basis. Water intake also generally increases with increasing temperature. Water intakes for cattle of 3.1-5.9 kg/kg dry matter at temperatures ranging from 12°C to 29.4°C have been reported (Winchester and Morris, 1956, as summarized by the Agricultural Research Council, London, 1965).

Water intakes of 6.6-10.2 kg/kg dry matter consumed for shorthorn cows at 27°C and 3.2-3.8 kg/kg dry matter consumed at 10°C have been reported (Johnson et al., 1958). Water intake for shorthorn cows at 18-21°C of 4.2-5.0 kg/kg dry matter consumed have also been reported (Balch et al., 1953). Water intake at lower temperatures (-18 to 4°C) of 3.5 kg/kg dry matter consumed has also been reported (MacDonald and Bell, 1958). Friesian cattle water intake was estimated at 3.3-4.3 kg/kg dry matter consumed (Atkeson et al., 1934).

The National Research Council (2001) has several equations for calculating water intake of dairy cows that take into account ambient temperature, sodium intake, DMI, and milk production to produce a refined estimate of water intake. Given the feed intake for both non-lactating and lactating cattle as described above, a reasonable default estimate of water consumption is approximately 5-fold the dry matter consumption. If this exposure pathway to beef cattle or dairy cows is applicable, the resulting default water consumption rates for beef cattle and lactating dairy cattle are 45 and 110 kg/day, respectively.

#### 7.6.4.2 Swine Water Consumption Rates

Water consumption has been estimated for pigs at 1 kg/day for 15 kg pigs, increasing to 5 kg/day at 90 kg body weight (Agricultural Research Council, London, 1967). Non-pregnant sow water consumption was estimated at 5 kg/day, pregnant sows at 5-8 kg/day, and lactating sows at 15-20 kg/day. The National Research Council (1998) estimates 120 mL water/kg BW day for growing (30 to 40 kg) nonlactating pigs and 80 mL water/kg BW-day for nonlactating adult pigs (157 kg). A default value of 6.6 L/day is recommended based on the 120 mL/kg BW day figure in the National Research Council (1998).

#### 7.6.4.3 Water Consumption Rates by Chickens

The water consumption exposure pathway would only be applicable as an exposure pathway for chickens if surface water were used as a drinking water source (e.g., a farm pond). If municipal water or well water is used as the water supply for home raised chicken, the water is assumed uncontaminated from airborne emissions of a facility. Water consumption by chickens has been reported to fall in the range of 1-3 times the food consumption on a weight basis (Agricultural Research Council, London, 1975). They established a 2:1 ratio of water to feed consumption as the default value. Given a daily feed consumption rate of 0.1 kg/day, the resulting daily water consumption rate for chickens is 0.2 kg/day.

The National Research Council (1994) estimated water consumption over an eight-week period for broilers and brown egg layers. The average water consumption rate is 0.16 L/day for broilers. The daily water consumption rate is 0.23 L/day for brown egg layers at 20 weeks (National Research Council, 1994). A default water consumption rate of 0.16 L/day is recommended for broilers and 0.23 L/day is recommended for egg laying chickens, if the water exposure pathway is applicable to chickens.

#### **7.6.5 Soil Ingestion Defaults**

Soil ingestion was estimated for dairy cattle based upon fecal titanium content (Fries et al., 1982). Among yearling heifers and non-lactating cattle receiving feed (vs. pasture), soil ranged from 0.25 to 3.77 percent of dry matter ingested, depending on the management system used, with those cattle with access to pasture having the greatest soil ingestion. For cattle on feed, a reasonable estimate of 1 percent soil ingestion was made. For cattle grazing pasture, soil intake estimates of 4-8 percent dry matter ingestion have been made for cattle receiving no supplemental feed (Healy, 1968).

Soil ingestion varies seasonally, with the greatest soil ingestion during times of poor plant growth (14 percent) and the least soil ingestion during lush growth (2 percent). In a study of several farms in England, beef and dairy cattle were found to have soil ingestion rates ranging from 0.2 to 17.9 percent of dry matter consumed, depending both on the location and the time of year (Thornton and Abrahams, 1983). The two largest sets of data evaluated showed a range of soil ingestion of 1.1-4.4 percent dry

matter consumed. Thus, a reasonable estimate of soil ingestion by beef and dairy cattle as percent of pasture consumed is 5 percent.

Soil ingestion estimates have been made for pigs (Healy and Drew, 1970). A mean weekly soil ingestion estimate of 1 kg soil/week was made for pigs grazing swedes (rutabaga), corresponding to 0.014 kg soil/day. Other estimates for animals grazing swedes, swedes with hay, and pasture only were 0.084, 0.048, and 0.030 kg soil/day, respectively. Assuming total feed ingestion of 2 kg/day, the soil ingestion as percent of grazed feed (pasture) ranged from 1.5 to 7 percent, with a best estimate of 4 percent. In the absence of information concerning soil content of feed for pigs, no estimate has been made for soil ingestion from feed. For risk assessment purposes, pigs are assumed to consume 4 percent soil from pasture ingestion.

As a digestive aid, chickens normally consume approximately 2 percent grit in their diet (McKone, 1993). This value was used as an estimate of the fraction of soil ingestion for chickens with access to pasture. Chickens were assumed to have access to pasture/soil and therefore, no estimate was made for soil ingestion strictly from feed.

### 7.7 Fraction of Food Intake that is Home-Produced

The Child-Specific Exposure Factors Handbook (USEPA, 2008) has information on the fraction of food intake that is home produced (Table 13.6). This information is from a U.S. EPA analysis of the 1987-1988 National Food Consumption Survey. The Table contains information on a number of specific home produced items as well as broad categories such as total vegetables and fruits.

**Table 7.18 Fraction of Food Intake that is Home-Produced**

	<b>All Households</b>	<b>Households that Garden</b>	<b>Households that Farm</b>
Total Fruits	0.04	0.101	0.161
Total Vegetables	0.068	0.173	0.308
Avg. Total Veg & Fruits	0.054	0.137	0.235
	<b>All Households</b>	<b>Households that Raise Animals/Hunt</b>	<b>Households that Farm</b>
Beef	0.038	0.485	0.478
Pork	0.013	0.242	0.239
Poultry	0.011	0.156	0.151
Eggs	0.014	0.146	0.214
Total Dairy	0.012	0.207	0.254

The data on the fraction of food intake that is home produced are older than would be considered optimal and there is no data on variability in percent consumption in the populations of concern. There are many factors that could affect the percent of home-

produced fruits and vegetables. These may include lot size, employment status, avidity and income. As a default for home-produced leafy, exposed, protected and root produce, OEHHA recommends 0.137 as the fraction of produce that is home raised (Table 7.18). The households that grow their own vegetables and fruits are the population of concern. In rural situations where the receptor is engaged in farming, OEHHA recommends 0.235 as the default value for fraction of leafy, exposed, protected and root produce that is home produced.

OEHHA recommends the fraction home-raised under “Households that raise animals/hunt” (Table 7.18) for beef, pork, poultry (chicken), eggs and dairy (milk), with the exception of rural household receptors engaged in farming. OEHHA recommends that the fractions listed under “Households that farm” be used for the rural household receptors.

## 7.8 References

Agricultural Research Council, London (1975). The Nutrient Requirements of Farm Livestock, No. 1, Poultry.

Agricultural Research Council, London (1965). The Nutrient Requirements of Farm Livestock, No. 2, Ruminants.

Agricultural Research Council, London (1967). The Nutrient Requirements of Farm Livestock, No. 3, Pigs.

Altman, PI, Gibson, JF, and Wang, CC. (1958). Handbook of Respiration. Dittmer, D.S. and Grebe, R.M. (eds.). W.B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia.

Atkeson, FW, Warren, TR, and Anderson, GC. (1934). Water requirements of dairy calves. J Dairy Sci, 17:249.

Baes, C, Sharp, R, Sjoreen, A, and Shor, R. (1984). A Review and Analysis of Parameters for Assessing Transport of Environmentally Released Radionuclides Through Agriculture. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and The Office of Radiation Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Interagency Agreement AD-89-F-2-A106, September.

Block, G. (1992). A review of validations of dietary assessment methods. Am J Epidemiol 115: 492-505.

Breazile, JE (ed.) (1971). Textbook of Veterinary Physiology. Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia.

Britt, JS, Thomas RC, et al. (2003). "Efficiency of converting nutrient dry matter to milk in Holstein herds." J Dairy Sci 86(11): 3796-3801.

Clement (1988). Multi-pathway Health Risk Assessment Input Parameters Guidance Document. Prepared for the South Coast Air Quality Management District by Clement Associates, Inc., Fairfax, Virginia, June 1988.

Feoli, C, Hancock JD, Monge C, Gugle TL, Carter SD, and Cole NA (2007) Digestible Energy Content Of Corn- Vs Sorghum-Based Dried Distillers Grains With Solubles And Their Effects On Growth Performance And Carcass Characteristics. In Finishing Pigs. American Society of Animal Science

Fries, GF, Marrow, GS, and Snow, PA (1982). Soil ingestion by dairy cattle. J Dairy Sci, 65:611-8.

Healy, W.B. (1968). Ingestion of soil by dairy cows. New Zealand J Agricul Res, 11:487-99.

Technical Support Document for Exposure Assessment and Stochastic Analysis,  
FINAL, August, 2012

Healy, WB and Drew, KR (1970). Ingestion of soil by hoggets grazing swedes. *New Zealand J Agricult Res*, 13:940-4.

Holcomb, CS, Van Horn, HH, et al. (2001). Effects of prepartum dry matter intake and forage percentage on postpartum performance of lactating dairy cows. *J Dairy Sci* **84**(9): 2051-2058.

Holden, LA, LD Muller, GA Varga and Hillard PJ (1994) Ruminant Digestion and Duodenal Nutrient Flows in Dairy Cows Consuming Grass as Pasture, Hay or Silage. *J Dairy Sci* 77(10):3034-42.

MacDonald, MA and Bell, JM (1958). Effects of low fluctuating temperatures on farm animals. II Influence of ambient air temperatures on water intake of lactating Holstein-Fresian cows. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*, 38: 23-32.

McKone, TE (1993). CalTOX, A Multimedia Total-Exposure Model for Hazardous-Wastes Sites, Parts I-III. Prepared for the State of California, Department of Toxic Substances Control, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, UCRL-111456.

NRC (1994). Nutrient Requirements of Poultry. National Research Council, Washington, D.C., National Academy Press.

NRC (1998). Nutrient Requirements of Swine. National Research Council, Washington, D.C., National Academy Press.

NRC (2000). Nutrient Requirements of Beef Cattle. National Research Council, Washington, D.C., National Academy Press.

NRC (2001). Nutrient requirements of Dairy Cattle. National Research Council, Washington, D.C., National Academy Press

NHANES II (1976-80). The National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys. Total Nutrient Intakes, Food Frequency and Other Related Dietary Data Tape. National Center for Health Statistics, 1983. Public use data tape documentation (Tape No. 5701).

Oracle (2007) Crystal Ball® version 7.2.1

Putnam, J and Allshouse, J (1992). Food Consumption, Prices, and Expenditures 1970-92. United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Statistical Bulletin Number 867.

Rastani, RR, Grummer RR, et al. (2005). Reducing dry period length to simplify feeding transition cows: Milk production, energy balance, and metabolic profiles. Journal of Dairy Science **88**(3): 1004-1014.

Technical Support Document for Exposure Assessment and Stochastic Analysis,  
FINAL, August, 2012

Stanley, TA, Cochran RC, et al. (1993). "Periparturient Changes in Intake, Ruminal Capacity, and Digestive Characteristics in Beef-Cows Consuming Alfalfa Hay." *Journal of Animal Science* 71(3): 788-795.

Thornton, I and Abrahams, P. (1983). Soil ingestion - A major pathway of heavy metals into livestock grazing contaminated land. *Sci Total Environ*, 28:287-94.

USDA (1983) United States Department of Agriculture. Nationwide Food Consumption Survey Food Intakes: Individuals in 48 States, Year 1977-78, Report No 1-1. Hyattsville, Md: Consumer Nutrition Division, Human Nutrition Information Service.

USDA (1985) United States Department of Agriculture. Nationwide Food Consumption Survey. Continuing Survey of Food Intakes of Individuals, Women 19-50 Years and Their Children 1-5 Years, 1 Day, 1985. Report No 85-1, Hyattsville, Md: Nutrition Monitoring Division, Human Nutrition Information Service.

USDA (1986a) United States Department of Agriculture. Nationwide Food Consumption Survey. Continuing Survey of Food Intakes of Individuals, Women 19-50 Years and Their Children 1-5 Years, 1 Day, 1985. Report No 85-2, Hyattsville, Md: Nutrition Monitoring Division, Human Nutrition Information Service.

USDA (1986b) United States Department of Agriculture. Nationwide Food Consumption Survey. Continuing Survey of Food Intakes of Individuals, Men 19-50 Years, 1 day, 1985 Report No 85-3, Hyattsville, Md: Nutrition Monitoring Division, Human Nutrition Information Service.

USDA (1987a) United States Department of Agriculture. Nationwide Food Consumption Survey. Continuing Survey of Food Intakes of Individuals, Low-Income Women 19-50 Years and Their Children 1-5 Years, 1 Day, 1985. Report No 86-2, Hyattsville, Md: Nutrition Monitoring Division, Human Nutrition Information Service.

USDA (1987b) United States Department of Agriculture. Nationwide Food Consumption Survey. Continuing Survey of Food Intakes of Individuals, Women 19-50 Years and Their Children 1-5 Years, 1 Day, 1985. Report No 86-1, Hyattsville, Md: Nutrition Monitoring Division, Human Nutrition Information Service.

USDA (1987c) United States Department of Agriculture. Nationwide Food Consumption Survey. Continuing Survey of Food Intakes of Individuals, Women 19-50 Years and Their Children 1-5 Years, 4 Days, 1985. Report No 85-4, Hyattsville, Md: Nutrition Monitoring Division, Human Nutrition Information Service.

USDA (1988) United States Department of Agriculture Nationwide Food Consumption Survey. Continuing Survey of Food Intakes of Individuals, Low-Income Women 19-50 Years and Their Children 1-5 Years, 4 Days, 1985. Report No 85-5, Hyattsville, Md: Nutrition Monitoring Division, Human Nutrition Information Service.

Technical Support Document for Exposure Assessment and Stochastic Analysis,  
FINAL, August, 2012

USDA (1989-91) United States Department of Agriculture. Nationwide Food  
Consumption Survey. Continuing Survey of Food Intakes of Individuals (Data Tapes)  
Hyattsville, Md: Nutrition Monitoring Division, Human Nutrition Information Service.

USEPA, 2008 Child-Specific Exposure Factors Handbook (Final Report) 2008. U.S.  
Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, EPA/600/R-06/096F