Evaluation of Chloropicrin as a Toxic Air Contaminant

Part B. Human Health Assessment

Carolyn M. Lewis, MS, DABT Medical Toxicology Branch Depart. of Pesticide Regulation, Cal/EPA

December 10, 2009

Historical Background

- Chloropicrin was used as a warfare agent in WWI
- First used as a fumigant in flour mills in 1926
- NIOSH IDLH 2 ppm
- ACGIH TWA-TLV 0.1 ppm

DPR placed chloropicrin into reevaluation based on air monitoring data with levels greater than TLV



Figure 1 (p. 9). Proposed pathways for reaction of chloropicrin with glutathione and hemoglobin

Acute Toxicity – 1 Hour Exposure

Human sensory irritation study (Cain, 2004)
Three phases

- Phase 1 Brief inhalation exposures (seconds)
- Phase 2 20 minute exposure
- Phase 3 1 hour exposure on 4 consecutive days

DPR found this study acceptable

- Conducted in accordance with GLP regulations and protocol approved by the IRB at U.C. San Diego
- Protocol was reviewed by biostatistician to ensure there was sufficient statistical power
- Approved by U.S. EPA's HSRB

Acute Toxicity – 1 Hour Exposure (cont.)

- Human Sensory Irritation Study, Phase 3
- 32 Young adult subjects 15 males and 17 females
- Subjects exposed to 0, 100 or 150 ppb for 1 hour on 4 consecutive days

Rated eye, nose and throat irritation on scale of 0 to 3 every minute during their 1-hour exposures
 No nasal or throat irritation reported
 Eye irritation at 100 and 150 ppb



Figure 4 (p. 20). Average rated severity of ocular irritation by day of exposure of the human sensory irritation study for chloropicrin*

*(n = 32, males and females combined; blank = open circles, 100 ppb = solid circles; 150 = open squares) $_{6}$



Figure 5 (abridged p. 21). Average rated severity of ocular irritation during 1- hour exposures during phase 3 of the human sensory irritation study for chloropicrin*

* (n = 32, males and females combined).

Acute Toxicity - Human Sensory Irritation Study (cont.)

- Other respiratory variables evaluated in Phase 3
 - Lower respiratory variables unaffected
 Nitric oxide (NO) concentration in expired pulmonary air
 - Pulmonary function (FVC and FEV₁)
 - Upper respiratory variables affected
 - Nasal air flow reduced at 150 ppb
 - Elevated NO concentration in expired nasal air at 100 and 150 ppb

Table 2 (p. 20). Ocular and Nasal Irritation in HumanSubjects after 1-Hour Exposures for 4 ConsecutiveDays to Chloropicrin a

	Dose Level (ppb)				
	0	100	150		
Ocular irritation					
Average score, overall ^b	0.10±0.19 ^c	0.39±0.39	0.76±0.71		
Average score, plateau ^d	0.12±0.22	0.54±0.51	0.90±0.86		
Nasal Irritation					
Average increase in NO ^e	1.6±15.6	12.0±11.9	12.7±16.6		
in expired nasal air					

a Cain, 2004.

- b Average severity score reported for every minute of 1 hour exposure for all four days of exposure. Severity score ranged from 0 (no irritation) to 3 (severe hard to tolerate and can interfere with activities of daily living)
- c mean ± standard deviation n = 32, males and females combined since no significant gender differences
- d Plateau period was defined as minutes 30 to 55 when the maximum scores were observed.
- e The average difference in nitric oxide (NO) concentration (ppb) in expired nasal air before and after exposure for each individual for all four days of exposure.

Benchmark Dose Analysis for Human Study

Threshold for identifying responders was estimated using the standard deviation in the control group

 Benchmark concentration at the 10% response level (BMCL₁₀) was used for eye irritation rather than the default of 5% because this effect was mild and reversible

BMCL₁₀ for eye irritation was 26 ppb

BMCL₀₅ for increased NO in nasal air was 44 ppb

Acute Toxicity – 8 and 24 Hour Exposures Rabbit Developmental Toxicity Study

Pregnant rabbits exposed to vapors 6 hrs/day from GDs 7-21

- Maternal effects observed in first few days of exposure were considered acute
 - Deaths
 - Red discolored lungs and pulmonary edema
 - Clinical signs of sensory and respiratory irritation
 - Reduced body weights and food consumption

Acute NOEL = 0.4 ppm
 (8 hr HEC – 270 ppb; 24 hr HEC – 92 ppb)

Table 12 (abridged, p. 43). Acute Effects in Pregnant Rabbits Exposed to Chloropicrin Vapors During Gestation Days 7-20^a

	Dose Level (ppm)					
Endpoint	0	0.4	1.2	2.0		
Death	0 (0) ^b	0 (0)	1 (1)	8 (2)		
Labored breathing	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (2)		
Excessive lacrimation	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (2)		
Nasal Discharge	0 (1)	0 (3)	7 (10)	1 (10)		
Red discolored lungs	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	8 (2)		
Edema in lungs	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	5 (2)		
Body weight gain (g)	-20	15	-243	-407		
GDs 7-13	±89	±65	±165**	±194**		
Food consumption (g)	145	145	74	32		
GDs 7-13	±24	±25	±29**	±28**		
a York, 1993.						

b Incidence outside and inside parentheses for GDs 7-11 and GDs 12-20, respectively.12

Acute Toxicity – 8 and 24 Hour Exposures Rabbit Developmental Toxicity Study (cont.)

I-hr RfC for ↑ NO in nasal air = 1.5 ppb for children, if additional uncertainty factor of 3 applied for children

8-hr RfC from rabbit study = 0.9 ppb for children applying an additional uncertainty factor of 3 for children

Subchronic Toxicity

90-Day Inhalation Toxicity Studies with Rats and Mice

Exposure for 6 hrs/day, 5 days/wk for 13 weeks

Effects at 1.03 ppm and higher

- Mortalities and clinical signs
- Reduced body weights and food consumption
- Increased lung weights and pathological lesions in nasal cavity and lungs

Benchmark dose analysis performed to determine most sensitive endpoint

Default 5% response level used since frank effects

Tables 3 and 4 (abridged, p. 24-25).Respiratory Lesionsin Mice Exposed to Chloropicrin Vapors for 90 Days^a

		Dose Level (ppm)			
Effect	Sex	0	0.3	1.03	2.89
Nasal Cavity		Z SZ			2. 2
Epithelial Hyalin	М	0/10	0/10	3/9	10/10**
Inclusions	F	0/9	2/10	6/10*	8/10**
Rhinitis	M	0/10	1/10	1/9	10/10**
	F	1/9	0/10	4/10	9/10**
Lungs				9	
Alveolar	M	2/10	1/10	5/9	9/10**
Histiocytosis	F	1/9	2/10	8/10**	10/10**

a Chun and Kintigh, 1993

** Significantly different from controls at p < 0.05 and 0.01, respectively by Fisher's exact test</p>

Tables 5 and 6 (abridged, p. 27-28). Respiratory Lesions in Rats Exposed to Chloropicrin Vapors for 90 Days^a

		Dose Level (ppm)				
Effect	Sex	0	0.3	1.03	2.89	
Nasal Cavity				2.		
Rhinitis	M	2/10	2/10	4/10	10/10**	
	F	1/10	1/10	7/10*	8/10**	
Goblet Cell	М	7/10	7/10	8/10	9/10	
Hyperplasia	F	0/10	6/10*	7/10**	5/10*	
Lungs				, p	P	
Peribronchial	M	0/10	0/10	3/10	8/10**	
Muscle Hyperplasia	F	0/10	0/10	6/10*	7/10**	
Bronchial	M	0/10	0/10	4/10	9/10**	
Epithelial Hyperplasia	F	0/10	0/10	5/10*	7/10**	

Chun and Kintigh, 1993 a

Significantly different from controls at p < 0.05 and 0.01, respectively by Fisher's exact test **

Table 15 (abridged, p. 51). Benchmark Dose Analysis of the MostSensitive Endpoints in Mouse and Rat Subchronic Inhalation Studies

Species	Endpoint	Sex	BMCL ₀₅	HEC (ppb)
			(ppb)	Child/Adult
Mouse	Epithelial Hyalin Inclusions	М	- 360 -	200/413
		F	84	45/96
	Rhinitis	M	650	350/746
		F	210	110/241
	Alveolar Histiocytosis		140	76/161
		F	81 🗩	44/93
Rat	Rhinitis	M	320	93/196
		F	120	34/73
	Peribronchial	M	220	64/135
Muscle Hyperplasia		F	160	46/98
	Bronchial	М	200	58/122
	Epithelial Hyperplasia	F	180	52/110

Chronic Toxicity

Chronic Inhalation Studies with Rats and Mice

- Exposed for 6 hrs/day, 5 days/wk for 78 weeks (mice) or 107 weeks (rats)
 - Effects in mice at 0.5 ppm and higher
 - Reduced body weights and food consumption
 - Pathological lesions in nasal cavity and lungs
 - Effects in rats at 0.5 ppm or higher
 - Clinical signs and reduced survival
 - Reduced body weights and increased lung weights
 - Rhinitis

BMD analysis performed to determine the most sensitive endpoint

Tables 7 and 8 (abridged, p. 30-31). Respiratory Lesionsin Mice Exposed to Chloropicrin Vapors for 78 Weeks^a

		Dose Level (ppm)				
Effect	Sex	0	0.1	0.5	1.0	
Nasal Cavity						
Epithelial Hyalin	M	3/50	6/50	7/50	16/50**	
Inclusions	F	10/50	11/50	24/50**	37/50**	
Rhinitis	M	6/50	7/50	17/50**	35/50**	
	F	3/50	6/50	18/50**	32/50**	
Lungs						
Alveolar	M	8/50	17/50	22/50	29/50*	
Histiocytosis	F	14/50	14/40	19/50	35/50**	
Bronchiectasis	M	0/50	3/50	28/50**	41/50**	
	F	0/50	5/50	28/50**	44/50**	

a Burleigh-Flyer *et* al., 1995

*,** Significantly different from controls at p < 0.05 and 0.01, respectively by Fisher's exact test.

Table 9 (abridged, p. 33). Respiratory Lesions in RatsExposed to Chloropicrin Vapors for 107 Weeks^a

		Dose Level (ppm)			
Effect	Sex	0	0.1	0.5	1.0
Nasal Cavity					
Rhinitis	M	20/50	24/50	21/50	35/50**
	F <	18/50	17/50	26/50	23/50
a Burleigh Elver and Ber	$\frac{100}{100}$	15		9	\sim

a Burleigh-Flyer and Benson, 1995

** Significantly different from controls at p < 0.05 and 0.01, respectively by Fisher's exact test

Table 17 (abridged, p. 54). Benchmark Dose Analysis of the Most Sensitive Endpoints in Mouse and Rat Chronic Inhalation Studies

Species	Endpoint	Sex	BMCL ₀₅	HEC (ppb)			
			(ppb)	Child/Adult			
Mouse	Rhinitis	М	130	70/149			
		F	120	65/138			
	Epithelial Hyalin Inclusions	M	290	160/333			
		F	100	54/115			
	Alveolar Histiocytosis	M	190	100/218			
		F	150 🥏	82/172			
	Bronchiectasis	M	50	27/57			
			(68)	(37/78)			
		F	43*	23/49			
			(59)	(32/68)			
Rat	Rhinitis	М	230	67/141			
* A BMR o BMCL ₀₅ s	 * A BMR of 2.5% used for bronchiec tasis instead of 5% due to adversity of endpoint. BMCL₀₅ shown in parentheses. 						

Weight of Evidence - Carcinogenicity

Genotoxicity Studies

Numerous positive assays

- 8 Reverse mutation assays with Salmonella, usually with TA100 + S-9
- In vitro Comet assay with TK6 cells
- In vitro chromosomal aberrations assay with CHO cells
- Sister chromatid exchange assay in human lymphocytes

Significant negative assays

- Forward mutation assay with mouse lymphoma cells
- In vitro and in vivo micronucleus assays
- In vitro chromosomal aberrations assay with human lymphocytes

 Based on these data, DPR concluded that a genotoxic mode of action for tumor formation may be possible Weight of Evidence – Carcinogenicity (cont.) Carcinogenicity Studies in Animals

 Inhalation Studies
 Increase in the combined incidence of adenomas and carcinomas in the lungs of female mice

> Significant trend (p < 0.01) and pairwise comparison (p < 0.05), when adjusted for survival
> Dose-related increase in the multiplicity of the tumors

Slight shortening of time-to-tumor at high dose

Table 8 (abridged, p. 31).Possible Treatment-Related Neoplastic
Lesions in the Lungs of Female Mice Exposed to Chloropicrin
for 78 Weeks^a

	Dose Level (ppm)				
Lesion	0	0.1	0.5	1.0	
Lung	13/48 ^{+b}	9/48	17/47	19/49	
Adenoma	(27%)	(19%)	(36%)	(39%)	
Carcinoma	0/48	4/48	3/47	4/49	
	(0%)	(8%)	(6%)	(8%)	
Combined Adenoma and	13/48++	12/48	20/47	22/49	
Carcinoma	(27%)	(25%)	(43%)	(45%)	
Combined Adenoma and	13/42 ^{++c}	12/41	20/43	22/41*	
Carcinoma – Adjusted	(31%)	(29%)	(46%)	(54%)	

a Burleigh-Flyer et al., 1995.

b Denominator is the number of animals that survived up to the day of the first tumor, 253 days.

c Animals at risk (denominator) determined by the Poly-3 trend test.

- +,++ Significant trend based on the Armitage-Cochran trend test at p < 0.05 and 0.01, respectively, except for the adjusted incidence which was based on Poly-3 trend test.
- * Significant at p < 0.05 using the pairwise comparison from the Poly-3 trend test.

Weight of Evidence – Carcinogenicity (cont.)

Carcinogenicity Studies in Animals (cont.)

Oral Studies

Increase in mammary fibroadenomas of female rats

 Significant by trend analysis (p < 0.05) and pairwise comparison (p < 0.05)

DPR concluded that the evidence was sufficient to warrant a quantitative assessment of carcinogenicity

Cancer potency estimated to be 2.3 (mg/kg/day)⁻¹ based on lung tumors in female mice

Table 19 (abridged, p. 59).DPR Critical Endpoints and
Human Equivalent Concentrations for Chloropicrin

HEC (ppb) Child/Adult	Effects at LOEL
26/26	Ocular irritation in humans
	Mortalities, nasal discharge, \downarrow body wts. &
270/580	food consumption, red discoloration of lungs of
92/190	pregnant rabbits
35/73	Rhinitis in female rats
23/49	Bronchiectasis in female mice
Potency = 2.3 (mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	Lung tumors in female mice
	Child/Adult 26/26 270/580 92/190 35/73 23/49

TAC Listing Criteria

HEC (ppb) Aargino Exposure Concentration (ppb) Air

Generally, a MOE > 100 is considered protective of human health based on the following assumptions:

Humans are 10 times more sensitive than animals

10-fold variation in sensitivity in the human population

To not list as TAC, MOE > 1,000

- For sensory irritation MOE > 30
 - No interspecies UF needed
 - Intraspecies UF = 3 since toxicokinetic differences not expected with direct-acting mechanism of toxicity

TAC Listing Criteria



Carcinogenicity

Risk < 10⁻⁶ is generally considered negligible

To not list a TAC: Risk < 10⁻⁷

Table 24 (abridged, p. 67). Worse Case Margins of Exposurefor Bystanders Following Soil Fumigation withChloropicrin

Exposure Duration	Margin of I	Target MOE	
Exposure Duration	Children	Adult	for TAC Listing
Acute – 1 hour Eye Irritation/human	0.0016	0.0016	30
Acute – 8 hour Deaths, lung path/rabbit	0.042	0.088	1,000
Acute – 24 hour Deaths, lung path/rabbit	0.084	0.18	1,000
Seasonal Rhinitis/rat	0.48	1.0	1,000
Annual Bronchiectasis/mice	0.76	1.6	1,000

a Margin of Exposure (MOE) = HEC / Air Concentration. HEC = Human Equivalent Concentration. Only MOEs for the application method with the highest worse case estimate is shown for each exposure duration. Table 30 (abridged, p. 75). Margins of Exposure for BystandersFollowing Soil Fumigation with Chloropicrin Using 50thPercentile

	Margin of I	Exposure ^b	Target MOE
Exposure Duration	Children	Adults	for TAC Listing
Acute – 1 hour			
Eye irritation/human	0.0060	0.0060	30
Acute – 8 hour			
Deaths, lung path./rabbits	0.15	0.32	1,000
Acute – 24 hour			
Deaths, lung path./rabbits	0.25	0.52	1,000

a Margin of Exposure (MOE) = HEC / Air Concentration. HEC = Human Equivalent Concentration. Only MOEs for the application method with the highest exposure estimate for each exposure duration is shown using the 50th percentile for application rate and field size. Table 31 (abridged, p. 76). Margins of Exposure for BystandersFollowing Soil Fumigation with Chloropicrin Using 50thPercentile and Half Mile from Field Edgea

	Margin of Exposure ^b		Target MOE
Exposure Duration	Children	Adults	for TAC Listing
Acute – 1 hour			
Eye irritation/human	0.024	0.024	30
Acute – 8 hour			2
Deaths, lung path./rabbits	0.62	1.3	1,000
Acute – 24 hour			
Deaths, lung path./rabbits	2.5	5.2	1,000

a Margin of Exposure (MOE) = HEC / Air Concentration. HEC = Human Equivalent Concentration. Only MOEs for the application method with the highest exposure estimate for each exposure duration is shown using the 50th percentile for application rate and field size and assuming the bystander is standing ½ mile from the field edge. Table 25 (abridged, p.68). Estimated Cancer Risks forBystanders Exposed to Chloropicrin Following
Soil Fumigation^a

Application	Residential		Occupational	
Method	MLE	95% UB	MLE	95% UB
Bedded, tarped	3.4x10 ⁻²	5.6x10 ⁻²	2.0x10 ⁻²	3.2x10 ⁻²
a Target risk level for listing purposes is less than 1 x 10 ⁻⁷ .				

Table 26 (abridged, p. 69). Margins of Exposure for BystandersFollowing Structural Fumigation with Chloropicrin

	Margin of Exposure ^b		Target MOE
Exposure Duration	Children	Adults	for TAC Listing
Acute – 1 hour			2 2 g
Eye irritation/human	0.72	0.72	30
Acute – 8 hour			
Deaths, lung path./rabbits	27	57	1,000
Acute – 24 hour			
Deaths, lung path./rabbits	12	26	1,000
a Margin of Exposure (MOE) = HEC / Air Concentration. HEC = Human Equivalent Concentration.			

Table 27 (abridged, p. 69). Margins of Exposure for Indoor AirFollowing Structural Fumigation with Chloropicrin

	Margin of Exposure ^b		Target MOE
Exposure Duration	Children	Adults	for TAC Listing
Acute – 1 hour			2° 2° 4
Eye irritation/human	0.057	0.057	30
Acute – 8 hour		1	2
Deaths, lung path./rabbits	1.5	3.2	1,000
Acute – 24 hour			
Deaths, lung path./rabbits	0.54	1.1	1,000
a Margin of Exposure (MOE) = HEC / Air Concentration. HEC = Human Equivalent Concentration.			

Table 28 (abridged, p. 70). Margins of Exposure for BystandersFollowing Enclosed Space Fumigation with Chloropicrin

	Margin of Exposure ^b		Target MOE
Exposure Duration	Children	Adults	for TAC Listing
Acute – 1 hour	L. L.	Z Z	2 6
Eye irritation/human	0.0011	0.0011	-30
Acute – 8 hour			
Deaths, lung path./rabbits	0.040	0.085	1,000
Acute – 24 hour			
Deaths, lung path./rabbits	0.018	0.039	1,000
Annual			
Bronchiectasis/mice	1.1	2.4	1,000
a Margin of Exposure (MOE) = HEC / Air Concentration. HEC = Human Equivalent Concentration.			

Estimated Cancer Risk for Bystanders Exposed to Chloropicrin Following Enclosed Space Fumigation

Exposure Scenario	MLE	95% UB
Enclosed Space Fumigation	7.4 x 10 ⁻²	1.2 x 10 ⁻¹

Table 32 (abridged, p. 81).Comparison of DPR's and
USEPA's Reference Concentrations

Exposure	DPR RfC (ppb)		USEPA RfC (ppb)	
Duration	Child	Adult	Residential	Occupational
Acute	8.7	8.7	73	73
	UF=3 ^a	UF=3	UF=1 ^b	UF=1
Seasonal	0.35	0.73	0.27	1.2
	UF=100 ^c	UF=100	UF=30 ^d	UF=30
Chronic	0.23	0.49	0.13 🧹	0.50
	UF=100	UF=100	UF=30	UF=30

- a UF = Uncertainty factor used to derive RfC. For eye i rritation in humans, DPR assumed toxicokinetic variation = 1 and toxicodynamic variation = 3 for intraspecies variation.
- b USEPA assumed both toxicokinetic and toxicodynamic variation for eye irritation in humans are 1.
- c DPR did not use RGDR adjustment factor in calculating HEC from animal studies and instead used a default uncertainty factor of 10 for interspecies variation
- d USEPA reduced the interspecies uncertainty factor to 3 since they used an RGDR adjustment in their HEC calculation.

Other Toxicity Issues Evaluated

Prenatal and Postnatal Sensitivity

- Fetal NOELs > maternal NOELs in developmental toxicity studies in rats and rabbits
 - Fetal effects were nonspecific signs, possibly secondary to maternal toxicity

Pup NOEL > parental NOEL in rat reproductive toxicity study

 Neonates were not exposed directly from birth to PD28 and could be more sensitive due to the immaturity of their respiratory system, immune system and metabolic enzymes.

An additional uncertainty for children may be appropriate

Endocrine effects

- Some reproductive effects, but unclear if endocrine-related
 - Reduced number of implantation sites
 - Increased pre- and post-implantation losses
 - Late-term abortions

Conclusions

Soil fumigation

- All of the bystander MOEs are significantly less than the target MOEs
- The cancer risk estimates are significantly greater than the target risk level of 10⁻⁷
- Clearly meets criteria for listing as a TAC

Structural fumigation

- All of the bystander MOEs are significantly less than their target MOEs
- MOEs for indoor air are also significantly less than their target MOEs
- Clearly meets criteria for listing as a TAC

Enclosed space fumigation

- Bystander MOEs are significantly less than target MOEs
- The cancer risk estimates are significantly greater than the target risk level of 10⁻⁷
- Clearly meets the criteria for listing as a TAC