

1 **Exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances in a cohort of women firefighters and office**
2 **workers in San Francisco.**

3

4 Jessica Trowbridge^{1,2}, Roy Gerona³, Thomas Lin³, Ruthann A. Rudel⁴, Vincent
5 Bessonneau⁴, Heather Buren⁵, Rachel Morello-Frosch^{1,2*}

6

7 ¹Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, University of California,
8 Berkeley, Berkeley, CA

9 ²School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA

10 ³Clinical Toxicology and Environmental Biomonitoring Lab, Department of Obstetrics,
11 Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences, University of California, San Francisco, San
12 Francisco, CA

13 ⁴Silent Spring Institute, Newton, MA

14 ⁵United Fire Service Women, San Francisco, CA

15 Acknowledgements: The authors thank all of the WFBC study participants for their
16 contribution to the study. This work is supported by the California Breast Cancer
17 Research Program #19BB-2900 (JT, RG, TL, RAR, HB, VB, RMF), the National Institute
18 of Environmental Health Sciences R01ES027051 (RMF) and the San Francisco
19 Firefighter Cancer Prevention Foundation (HB). We thank Anthony Stefani, Cassidy
20 Clarity, Emily O'Rourke, Nancy Carmona, Karen Kerr, Julie Mau, Natasha Parks, Lisa
21 Holdcroft, San Francisco Fire Chief Jeanine Nicholson, former San Francisco Fire Chief
22 Joanne Hayes-White, Sharyle Patton, Connie Engel and Nancy Buermeyer for their
23 contributions to the study.
24 RAR and VB, are employed at the Silent Spring Institute, a scientific research
25 organization dedicated to studying environmental factors in women's health. The
26 Institute is a 501(c)3 public charity funded by federal grants and contracts, foundation
27 grants, and private donations, including from breast cancer organizations. HB is former
28 president and member of United Fire Service Women, a 501(c)3 public charity
29 dedicated to supporting the welfare of women in the San Francisco Fire Department.
30 The authors declare they have no actual or potential competing financial interests.

31 *Corresponding author:

32 Rachel Morello-Frosch

33 rmf@berkeley.edu

34 510-643-6358

35 Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management

36 130 Mulford, Hall #3144, University of California, Berkeley

37 Berkeley CA, 94720

38 **Abstract:**

39 Background: Studies in male firefighters have demonstrated increased exposures to
40 carcinogenic compounds and increased rates of certain cancers compared to the general
41 population. Many chemicals related to these occupational exposures have been
42 associated with breast tumor development in animal and human studies, yet, there have
43 been no studies on women firefighters due to their low numbers in most fire departments.
44 To address this data gap, the Women Firefighters Biomonitoring Collaborative (WFBC)
45 created a biological sample archive and analyzed levels of perfluoroalkyl substances
46 (PFAS) among women firefighters and office workers in San Francisco.

47 Methods: Active duty women firefighters (n=86) and office workers (n=84) were recruited
48 from the San Francisco Fire Department and the City and County of San Francisco,
49 respectively. Serum samples were collected and analyzed using liquid chromatography
50 tandem mass spectrometry (LC MS/MS) to measure and compare PFAS levels between
51 firefighters and office workers. For PFAS congeners detected in at least 70% of our study
52 population, we examined differences in serum PFAS levels controlling for dietary,
53 demographic and other confounders. Among firefighters, we assessed associations
54 between occupational activities and PFAS levels.

55 Results: Eight of 12 PFAS congeners were detected at levels above the limit of detection
56 and seven were detected in at least 70% of the study population. Four PFAS were
57 detected in all study participants (PFNA, PFOA, PFOS, PFHxS). In regression models
58 comparing PFAS levels by occupation and adjusting for potential confounders, firefighters
59 had higher geometric mean (GM) concentrations of PFAS compared to office workers:
60 2.39 (95%CI = 1.64,3.48), 2.32 (95% CI = 1.17,4.62) and 1.26 (95% CI = 0.99, 1.59) times

61 higher for PFHxS, PFUnDA and PFNA, respectively. In analyses limited to firefighters,
62 PFAS levels varied by assigned position in the fire department—firefighters and officers
63 had higher PFNA, PFOA, PFDA, and PFUnDA compared to drivers. Additionally,
64 firefighters who reported having used firefighting foam had higher concentrations of PFOA
65 compared firefighters who reported never having used foam.

66 Conclusion: Our study found ubiquitous exposures to PFAS among WFBC participants,
67 with women firefighters exposed to higher levels of some PFAS compared to office
68 workers, suggesting that some of these exposures may be occupationally related.

69 **Introduction:**

70 Firefighters have higher rates of some cancers compared to the general population. A
71 meta-analysis of 32 studies found elevated rates of lymphoma, testicular, and prostate
72 cancer among male firefighters.¹ Additionally, a review by the International Agency for
73 Research on Cancer (IARC) found increased cancer rates among firefighters, and
74 designated the occupation of firefighting as “possibly carcinogenic” or “class 2b”.² More
75 recently, a study of over 19,000 United States firefighters conducted by the National
76 Institute for Occupational Health and Safety (NIOSH) found that total time spent at fires
77 was associated with increased lung cancer incidence and mortality, and total number of
78 fire responses was associated with leukemia mortality.³ Furthermore, studies in other
79 countries have found increased rates of several cancers among male firefighters and
80 other first responders including brain, thyroid, bladder, kidney, prostate, testicular,
81 breast, digestive cancers, multiple myeloma, and non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma.^{4–10} Despite
82 mounting concern about cancer among male firefighters, few studies have assessed
83 chemical exposures or cancer risk among women firefighters, many of whom are
84 concerned about the potential increased risk of breast cancer and other reproductive
85 cancers. Only two studies have examined the incidence of cancer among women
86 firefighters. Daniels et al. found that women firefighters had higher incidence and
87 mortality rates of breast cancer compared to the general US population, though neither
88 effect estimate was statistically significant.³ A study of Florida firefighters found that
89 women firefighters had an increase in overall cancer risk and, in particular, an increased
90 incidence of Hodgkin’s disease and cervical and thyroid cancers compared to the
91 general Florida population.⁹

92

93 Occupational exposures may be an important contributor to the increased risk of cancer
94 among firefighters. Firefighters' exposure to environmental chemicals may arise from
95 fire suppression activities and during the salvage and overhaul phase of a fire event.^{11–}

96 ¹⁵ Additionally, hazardous chemicals have been identified in fire station dust, firefighting
97 foams, diesel emissions, contaminated fire equipment and firefighter protective gear.^{16–}

98 ²⁰ Previous studies have shown that firefighters are occupationally exposed to polycyclic
99 aromatic hydrocarbons,^{13,21–24} formaldehyde, dioxins, polybrominated diphenyl ethers
100 (PBDEs), organophosphate flame retardants,^{25,26} and perfluoroalkyl substances
101 (PFAS),^{19,25,27,28} among others.^{25,29,30} Many of these chemicals have been associated
102 with adverse health outcomes including breast cancer and breast tumor development in
103 both animal and human studies.^{31,32}

104

105 PFAS may be of particular relevance to firefighting because these compounds are used
106 in turnout gear and are a major ingredient of some firefighting foams, such as aqueous
107 film-forming foams (AFFF).^{19,28,33} More generally, PFAS chemicals are frequently
108 applied to food contact paper, fabrics and furniture to make them stain, water and
109 grease resistant.³⁴ PFAS have long half-lives and bioaccumulate in the environment and
110 human body.³⁵ Because of their widespread use and persistence, they have been
111 detected in nearly everyone tested in large biomonitoring studies.^{36,37} Biomonitoring
112 studies within the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), a
113 nationally representative sample of the U.S. population, have found that more than 98%
114 of people tested had multiple congeners of PFAS detected in their bodies.³⁶

115

116 PFAS exposure has been linked to multiple adverse health outcomes including cancer,
117 immune suppression, thyroid and sex hormone disruption, and decreased semen
118 quality.³⁸⁻⁴¹ Studies also indicate that exposure is associated with metabolic effects,
119 ulcerative colitis and adverse effects on liver and kidney function.⁴²⁻⁴⁵

120

121 Several firefighter biomonitoring studies measured PFAS levels and found higher levels
122 among firefighters compared to the general population.^{25,27,28} These studies, however,
123 included few or no women. Overall, women remain underrepresented in studies of
124 firefighters, and very little is known about the extent of their chemical exposures or
125 occupational health risks for diseases such breast cancer.

126

127 Although women make up 5.1% of firefighters across the United States,⁴⁶ their numbers
128 can be higher in urban jurisdictions, including in San Francisco, which has one of the
129 highest proportions of women firefighters (15%) in any large urban fire department in
130 the U.S.⁴⁷ As fire departments and other first responder professions diversify and recruit
131 more women to their ranks, it is important to characterize chemical exposures and
132 implications for health outcomes of particular relevance to women, such as breast
133 cancer. To address this data gap, a partnership of firefighters, environmental health
134 scientists, and environmental health advocates created the Women Firefighters
135 Biomonitoring Collaborative (WFBC). The WFBC is a community-based, participatory
136 biomonitoring project that aims to better understand how women firefighters are
137 exposed to potential breast carcinogens, while also developing a biospecimen archive

138 of women firefighters and office workers in San Francisco. As part of the WFBC, we
139 conducted a cross-sectional chemical biomonitoring study to compare levels of PFAS in
140 human serum collected from women firefighters from the San Francisco Fire
141 Department (SFFD) and non-firefighter women who are office workers for the City and
142 County of San Francisco. To our knowledge, this is the first biomonitoring study to
143 measure environmental chemical exposures in an exclusively female cohort of
144 firefighters and office workers.

145

146 **Methods:**

147 ***Recruitment:***

148 Participant recruitment and sample collection took place between June 2014 and March
149 2015. Firefighter participants were recruited from the SFFD, via word-of-mouth, emails
150 through the Department listserv and an article about the study in the “The Mainline,” a
151 Department newsletter written and edited by both active and retired firefighters.
152 Similarly, office workers, who were non-first responder employees of the City and
153 County of San Francisco, were recruited via word-of-mouth, public meetings, health
154 fairs, and listserv emails targeting employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

155

156 Study inclusion criteria for both firefighters and office workers included being female,
157 over 18 years old, a full-time employee, and a non-smoker. In addition, firefighters
158 needed to have at least five years of service with the SFFD and currently be on “active
159 duty” (i.e. assigned to a fire station) at the time of recruitment. All participants were

160 consented into the study following protocols approved by the Institutional Review Board
161 of the University of California, Berkeley (# 2013-07-5512).

162

163 ***Exposure assessment interview:***

164 After consent and enrollment into the WFBC study, we conducted an hour-long in-
165 person exposure assessment interview with each participant. The interview captured
166 demographic information, basic health information, and possible sources of PFAS
167 exposure from occupational activities, consumer product use, and dietary factors that
168 prior literature indicates are potential sources of PFAS exposure.^{27,48,49} Food frequency
169 responses were converted to times per week and categorized into quartiles, tertiles, or
170 ever/never.

171

172 ***Sample collection and processing***

173 Blood samples were collected by a certified phlebotomist in 40 mL additive-free glass
174 tubes and transported in a cooler with ice for processing within 3 hours of collection.
175 Serum was separated by allowing clotting at room temperature, then centrifuging at
176 3000 rpm for 10 minutes. Serum was aliquoted into 1.2 mL cryo-vial tubes and stored at
177 -80 °C until analysis per standard protocols.⁵⁰ All samples were processed and
178 analyzed at the University of California, San Francisco.

179

180 ***Laboratory analysis:***

181 Twelve PFAS (perfluorobutanoic acid, PFBA; perfluorobutane sulfonic acid, PFBS;
182 perfluorohexanoic acid, PFHxA; perfluorohexane sulfonic acid, PFHxS;

183 perfluoroheptanoic acid, PFHpA; perfluorooctanoic acid, PFOA; perfluorooctane
184 sulfonic acid, PFOS; perfluorooctane sulfonamide, PFOSA; perfluorononanoic acid,
185 PFNA; perfluorodecanoic acid, PFDA; perfluoroundecanoic acid, PFUnDA;
186 perfluorododecanoic acid, PFDoA) were analyzed in each serum sample (0.5 mL) using
187 liquid chromatography- tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS). An Agilent LC1260
188 (Sta. Clara, CA)- AB Sciex API 5500 (Foster City, CA) platform was used in the
189 analysis. Prior to injection into the LC-MS/MS, each sample was prepared for analysis
190 by solid phase extraction using a Waters Oasis HLB cartridge (10 mg, 1cc). Extracted
191 aliquots of each sample (25uL) were run in duplicates. The twelve analytes were
192 separated by elution gradient chromatography using Phenomenex Kinetex C18 column
193 (100 x 4.6 mm, 2.6 μ) at 40°C. An electrospray ionization source operated in the
194 negative mode was used to ionize each analyte in the mass spectrometer.

195
196 Analytes were detected in each sample by multiple reaction monitoring using two
197 transitions per analyte. To determine the presence of each analyte retention matching
198 (within 0.15 min) along with the peak area ratio between its qualifier and quantifier ions
199 (within 20%) were used. Quantification of each detected analyte was done by isotope
200 dilution method using a 10-point calibration curve (0.02-50 ng/mL) and employing two
201 C13-labelled PFAS isotopologues. The limits of quantification for the twelve analytes
202 range from 0.05 to 0.1 ng/mL. Analyte identification from total ion chromatograms was
203 evaluated using AB Sciex Analyst v2.1 software while quantification of each analyte was
204 processed using AB Sciex MultiQuant v2.02 software. Analysts were blinded to

205 firefighter and office worker status of the serum samples during the analysis. Results
206 were reported in ng/mL for all 170 study participants.

207

208 ***Statistical analysis:***

209 We examined the distribution of each PFAS congener across the study population and
210 then separately for firefighters and office workers and calculated summary statistics
211 including geometric mean (GM), 95% confidence intervals (CI), and percentiles. As is
212 common with environmental data, PFAS concentrations were non-normally distributed,
213 thus we used non-parametric methods (Wilcoxon rank-sum test) to test unadjusted
214 differences in PFAS concentrations between firefighters and office workers. We used
215 lognormal regression analyses to assess differences in PFAS concentrations between
216 firefighters and office workers, controlling for potential confounders. We then limited the
217 analysis to firefighters and used lognormal regression analyses to explore the
218 association between firefighter occupational activities and PFAS concentrations
219 controlling for potential confounders. Congeners with at least a 70% detection frequency
220 were included in the data analysis and we used maximum likelihood estimation (MLE)
221 with the NADA R package to account for left censored data (data below the limit of
222 detection (LOD)) for all regression models.⁵¹

223

224 Potential confounders were identified *a priori* based on previous literature suggesting an
225 independent relationship with PFAS levels. We assessed the relationship between each
226 identified variable and PFAS levels in our data and tested differences between
227 firefighters and office workers for each potential confounder associated. Variables were

228 included in final regression models if there was a statistically significant association with
229 PFAS levels in our data and if the variable demonstrated a statistically significant
230 difference between firefighters and office workers ($p\text{-value} \leq 0.05$) for at least one PFAS
231 congener.

232

233 We ran linear regression models to test the association between occupation and log-
234 transformed PFAS concentrations controlling for age, race and ethnicity, and education
235 (Model 1). A second model controlled for variables in Model 1 as well as consumption
236 frequency of fish and shellfish, red meat, poultry, fast-food or take-out food, and frozen
237 food heated in paper or cardboard packaging (Model 2). Exponentiated beta coefficients
238 estimate the proportional change in the PFAS geometric means associated with being a
239 firefighter compared to being an office worker and controlling for potential confounders.

240

241 We then limited our analysis to firefighters to evaluate the association between
242 firefighter practices in the workplace with PFAS levels adjusting for age, race and
243 ethnicity, and number of years of service with SFFD. Firefighter practices assessed
244 included use of self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) during salvage and
245 overhaul, use of firefighting foam, and the participants' assigned position (firefighter,
246 officer, driver). Likewise, because airport fire stations are required to stock, test and use
247 PFAS-containing firefighting foam due to federal regulations, we included an indicator
248 variable for those firefighters assigned to San Francisco Airport fire stations.⁵² We also
249 examined the relationship between PFAS concentrations and the frequency of
250 handwashing during a work shift and showering after a fire event, as well as the

251 relationship with responding to a fire within 24 hours and one year prior to providing a
252 biospecimen sample. Again, we exponentiated the beta coefficient to obtain the
253 proportional change in the PFAS geometric means associated with a unit change of
254 each dependent variable controlling for potential confounders.

255

256 Lastly, we evaluated how PFAS levels in our study population compared with those
257 measured in the general U.S. population and in firefighters in Southern California.
258 Specifically, we plotted the geometric mean (GM) and 95% confidence interval from the
259 WFBC firefighter and office worker groups and compared them to adult women from the
260 2013-2014 cycle of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)
261 and the Firefighter Occupational Exposure (FOX) study, in which samples were
262 collected from a cohort of mostly male firefighters in Southern California between 2010
263 and 2011.^{27,53,54} WFBC firefighter and office worker levels below the LOD were replaced
264 by the LOD reported for each congener divided by $\sqrt{2}$ to facilitate comparison of our
265 results to the FOX and NHANES cohorts, which also used this approach (LOD/ $\sqrt{2}$).

266

267 All analyses were performed in R version 3.5.2 and R Studio 1.2.1335.^{55,56}

268

269 **Results:**

270 176 participants were recruited into the study. Six individuals, (three firefighters and
271 three office workers) met the study inclusion criteria and were interviewed but did not
272 provide a blood sample and therefore were excluded from the analysis. Our final study
273 sample consisted of 86 firefighters and 84 office workers (N=170) (**Table 1**).

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of firefighters and office workers in the Women Firefighters Biomonitoring Collaborative (2014-2015)

Variables: mean ± SD or N(%)	Firefighters N=86	Office workers N=84	P-value^a
Age (years)	47.5 (±4.6)	48.3 (±10.5)	0.38
Years working for SFFD or SF City & County	17.4 (±4.2)	14.2 (±10.1)	0.0005
U.S. Born	77 (89.5%)	62 (73.8%)	0.01
Race/ethnicity			
NH White	40 (46.5%)	37 (44.0%)	0.29
Latina/Hispanic	19 (22.1%)	13 (15.5%)	
NH Asian	11 (12.8%)	19 (22.6%)	
NH Black	9 (10.5%)	5 (6.0%)	
NH Other	7 (8.1%)	10 (11.9%)	
Last grade completed			
High school or equivalent	6 (7.0%)	4 (4.8%)	< 0.0001
Some college	42 (48.8%)	11 (13.1%)	
Bachelors	32 (37.2%)	26 (31.0%)	
Post Graduate	6 (7.0%)	43 (51.2%)	
Marital status			
Married	37 (43.0%)	47 (56.0%)	0.039
Widowed	1 (1.2%)	2 (2.4%)	
Separated/Divorced	26 (30.2%)	11 (13.1%)	
Never married	22 (25.6%)	24 (28.6%)	
Reported yes, ever been pregnant	60 (70.6%)	52 (61.9%)	0.26
Body mass index^b			
Healthy weight	33 (40.7%)	43 (52.4%)	0.13
Overweight	35 (43.2%)	23 (28.0%)	
Obese	13 (16.0%)	16 (19.5%)	

NH = Non-Hispanic

^aTo account for non-normally distributed variables we used Wilcoxon Rank Sum test to compare continuous variables by firefighter status and the Fisher Test for categorical variables.

^b CDC guidelines for BMI classification (lb/in²): Healthy weight 18.5-24.9; Overweight 25.0-29.9, Obese >30

274
 275 Firefighters and office workers had similar demographic characteristics in terms of age,
 276 and racial/ethnic make-up, while a significantly higher proportion of office workers were
 277 foreign born, married, and had higher levels of educational attainment. Firefighters had
 278 an average of seven years of service with the SFFD while office workers had an
 279 average of fourteen years of service with the City and County of San Francisco.

280

Table 2. Occupational characteristics for WFBC firefighters 2014-15 (N = 86)

Variables	Mean(\pmSD) or N(%)
Frequency of handwashing while at work (times/shift)	18.8 (\pm 12.5)
Frequency of handwashing while not at work (times/day)	10.3 (\pm 5.3)
Reported ever using firefighting foam	77 (89.5%)
Assigned to airport fire station	14 (16.3%)
Response to fire in last 24 hours ^a	15 (17.4%)
Number of fires responded to in year prior to sample collection (N = 66)^b	
\leq 9	17 (25.8%)
10-15	17 (25.8%)
16-19	15 (22.7%)
\geq 20	17 (25.8%)
Assignment in the SFFD	
Driver	21 (24.4%)
Firefighter	25 (29.1%)
Officer	40 (46.5%)
Use self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) during salvage/overhaul^c	
Always/often	12 (15.0%)
Sometimes	14 (17.5%)
Rarely/never	54 (67.5%)

^aIncludes fire response and training involving live fires; ^bIncludes firefighters who consented to give access to SFFD fire history records (n = 66); ^cSix firefighters reported 'do not participate' in salvage/overhaul.

281
282 Occupational activities and characteristics of the firefighter group are shown in **Table 2**.
283 The majority of participants were assigned to the position of firefighter compared to
284 officer or driver positions, and thirteen firefighters were assigned to one of the San
285 Francisco airport fire stations. Most firefighters reported using firefighting foam during
286 their career as a firefighter and over half of participants reported rarely using their SCBA
287 during salvage and overhaul activities after a fire. When asked about recent fires, most
288 firefighters had not responded to a fire or participated in live-fire training in the 24 hours
289 prior to their biospecimen sample collection, while the SFFD fire history data indicated
290 that most firefighters had ten or more fires in the year prior to biospecimen collection.

291

292 **Perfluoroalkyl substance exposures**

293 **Table 3** shows the LOD, detection frequency, GM (95%CI), and percentiles of each
294 PFAS compound analyzed. Of the twelve PFAS we measured in participants' serum,
295 four congeners were not detected in any of the study participants (PFBA, PFHxA,
296 PFHpA, PFOSA). Eight PFAS had measurable levels, seven of which were detected in
297 at least 70% of study participants and four were detected in 100% of study participants
298 (PFHxS, PFNA, PFOA, and PFOS). We excluded PFDoA from further analyses since it
299 was detected in fewer than 25% of study participants. Distributional comparisons of
300 PFAS levels between WFBC firefighters and office workers for those compounds with
301 detection frequencies of at least 70% are shown in **Figure S1**. Levels of PFNA, PFHxS
302 and PFUnDA were statistically significantly higher among the firefighter group compared
303 to office workers.

304

Table 3. Geometric mean (GM) and 95% confidence interval (CI), detection frequency (DF), level of detection (LOD) (ng/mL) and percentiles^a for each PFAS analyzed in the WFBC cohort.

Compound Name	abbr.	DF %	LOD	GM (95% CI)	Min	Max	Percentiles			
							25th	50th	75th	95th
perfluorohexane sulfonic acid	PFHxS	100	0.02	3.79 (3.24, 4.43)	0.22	90.57	1.87	3.04	6.79	22.28
perfluorooctanoic acid	PFOA	100	0.02	1.15 (1.05, 1.25)	0.29	5.18	0.83	1.11	1.56	3.22
perfluorooctane sulfonic acid	PFOS	100	0.02	4.11 (3.68, 4.59)	0.54	81.02	2.56	4.14	6.53	12.61
perfluorononanoic acid	PFNA	100	0.05	0.67 (0.61, 0.74)	0.15	4.49	0.42	0.64	1.03	2.2
perfluorodecanoic acid	PFDA	98	0.02	0.25 (0.23, 0.28)	<LOD	3.69	0.17	0.24	0.36	0.83
perfluoroundecanoic acid	PFUnDA	80	0.02	0.18 (0.14, 0.22)	<LOD	10.85	0.11	0.26	0.48	1.11
perfluorobutane sulfonic acid	PFBuS	73	0.02	0.13 (0.10, 0.16)	<LOD	1.45	<LOD	0.23	0.34	0.84
perfluorododecanoic acid	PBDoA	24	0.02	*	<LOD	1.73	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	0.3
perfluorobutanoic acid	PFBA	0	0.05	*	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD
perfluorhexanoic acid	PFHxA	0	0.02	*	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD
perfluorheptanoic acid	PFHpA	0	0.02	*	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD
perfluorooctane sulfonamide	PFOSA	0	0.02	*	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD	<LOD

^aPercentiles and summary statistics calculated using LOD/sqrt2 for those with less than 100% detection frequency.

*GM and 95%CI not calculated for PFAS with less than 70% DF

305 **Table 4** shows the results from multiple linear regression models assessing the
306 relationship between log-transformed PFAS concentrations and occupation, comparing
307 firefighters to office workers (referent) controlling for potential confounders (**Tables S1**
308 **and S2**). Multiple regression models found higher serum levels of PFHxS, PFUnDA and
309 PFNA among firefighters compared to office workers in both unadjusted in adjusted
310 models. PFHxS levels were 2.39 (95%CI = 1.64,3.48) times higher, PFUnDA levels
311 were 2.32 (95%CI = 1.17, 4.62) times higher and PFNA levels were 1.26 (95% CI =
312 0.99, 1.59) times higher in firefighters compared to office workers after adjusting for
313 age, race and ethnicity, educational attainment, as well as the frequency of
314 consumption of fish/shellfish, red meat, poultry, fast-food, food heated in packaging.

Table 4. Unadjusted and adjusted^{a,b} proportional change in geometric mean (95% confidence interval) of PFAS concentrations by firefighter status

model	β Coef	exp β (95% CI)	p-value
Perfluorononanoic Acid PFNA			
unadjusted	0.23	1.25 (1.03, 1.53)[†]	0.0245
model 1 ^a	0.20	1.23 (0.98, 1.54)*	0.0794
model 2 ^b	0.23	1.26 (0.99, 1.59)*	0.0575
Perfluorooctanoic Acid PFOA			
unadjusted	-0.04	0.96 (0.81, 1.13)	0.6070
model 1 ^a	0.03	1.03 (0.85, 1.25)	0.7364
model 2 ^b	0.11	1.12 (0.91, 1.37)	0.2837
Perfluorooctanoic Sulfonate PFOS			
unadjusted	0.09	1.10 (0.88, 1.36)	0.4097
model 1 ^a	0.18	1.19 (0.93, 1.53)	0.1621
model 2 ^b	0.12	1.13 (0.87, 1.47)	0.3623
Perfluorohexane Sulfonate PFHxS			
unadjusted	0.43	1.54 (1.14, 2.07)[†]	0.0051
model 1 ^a	0.67	1.96 (1.38, 2.78)[†]	0.0002
model 2 ^b	0.87	2.39 (1.64, 3.48)[‡]	0.0000
Perfluorodecanoic Acid PFDA			
unadjusted	0.13	1.14 (0.92, 1.43)	0.2324
model 1 ^a	0.13	1.14 (0.88, 1.49)	0.3183
model 2 ^b	0.16	1.18 (0.89, 1.55)	0.2427
Perfluorbutane Sulfonate PFBuS			
unadjusted	0.17	1.19 (0.65, 2.18)	0.5731
model 1 ^a	0.59	1.80 (0.87, 3.70)	0.1129
model 2 ^b	0.55	1.74 (0.81, 3.75)	0.1580
Perfluoroundecanoic Acid PFUnDA			
unadjusted	0.55	1.74 (1.00, 3.02)[†]	0.0496
model 1 ^a	0.77	2.17 (1.10, 4.25)[†]	0.0245
model 2 ^b	0.84	2.32 (1.17, 4.62)[†]	0.0162

^a model 1 adjusted for: age, race/ethnicity, and education.

^b model 2 adjusted for covariates in model 1 and consumption of: fish/shellfish, red meat, poultry, fast-food or take-out food, frozen food heated in paper or cardboard package. Office worker is referent group. *pvalue \leq 0.1; [†]pvalue \leq 0.05; [‡]pvalue \leq 0.001

315

316 When limiting our analysis to firefighters, we found that assigned firefighter position was

317 associated with higher levels of six of the seven PFAS (Table 5). Having the

318 occupational position of firefighter or officer (versus driver) was associated with higher

319 average serum levels of PFNA, PFOA, PFOS, PFDA and PFUnDA, while drivers had
320 higher average levels of PFBuS compared to those in officer and firefighter positions.
321 Firefighters assigned to the airport had higher levels of PFNA than those assigned to
322 other stations in the fire department. Likewise, firefighters who reported using
323 firefighting foam had elevated PFOA levels compared to those who reported never
324 using foams.

325
326 Surprisingly, using SCBA, washing hands during a work shift and showering after a fire
327 incident were associated with increased levels of some PFAS. Average PFNA and
328 PFUnDA concentrations were higher among participants who said they sometimes used
329 their SCBA during salvage/overhaul versus rarely or never. Similarly, average PFHxS
330 levels were higher among participants who said they washed their hands more
331 frequently or who responded that they always showered after a fire event compared to
332 those who washed hands or showered after a fire event the least often. Those who
333 washed their hands 16-20 times during a work shift had 2.81 (95%CI = 1.56, 5.07) times
334 higher concentration of PFHxS compared to those who reported washing their hands 10
335 times or less per shift. Those who reported always showering after a fire event had 2.01
336 (95% CI = 1.0, 4.03) times higher PFHxS levels compared to those who reported that
337 they sometimes showered.

Table 5. Adjusted proportional change in geometric mean (GM) and 95% confidence interval (CI) of covariates and serum PFAS concentration among firefighters (N=86) from Maximum Likelihood Regression (MLE) models^a


Variable	n	PFNA	PFOA	PFOS	PFHxS	PFDA	PFBuS	PFUnDA
Frequency of SCBA use during salvage/overhaul								
Rarely/never	54	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
Sometimes	14	1.92 (1.28,2.89)[‡]	1.15 (0.84,1.58)	1.25 (0.86,1.83)	0.78 (0.40,1.52)	1.47 (1.04,2.07)[†]	0.81 (0.24, 2.67)	3.65 (1.44,9.26)[†]
Always/Often	12	1.35 (0.91,1.98)	0.98 (0.72,1.32)	0.86 (0.60,1.24)	0.61 (0.33,1.15)	1.13 (0.81,1.56)	0.51 (0.16, 1.61)	0.94 (0.39,2.30)
Ever used firefighting foam								
No	9	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
Yes	77	0.86 (0.53,1.38)	1.56 (1.09,2.24)[†]	1.19 (0.79,1.81)	0.84 (0.39,1.79)	1.18 (0.78,1.80)	0.66 (0.17, 2.52)	0.53 (0.18,1.57)
Position in the fire department								
Driver	21	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
Firefighter	40	2.10 (1.53,2.88)[‡]	1.45 (1.11,1.89)[†]	1.29 (0.95,1.74)*	0.91 (0.52,1.60)	1.48 (1.10,2.00)[†]	0.63 (0.24, 1.63)	1.93 (0.89,4.20)*
Officer	25	1.61 (1.13,2.30)[†]	1.37 (1.02,1.84)[†]	1.25 (0.89,1.75)	0.99 (0.53,1.84)	1.48 (1.06,2.05)[†]	0.28(0.10, 0.81)[†]	3.35 (1.42,7.90)[†]
Frequency of hand washing during a 24hr work shift (times/shift)								
≤10	21	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
11-15	24	0.98 (0.66,1.44)	0.91 (0.67,1.23)	0.90 (0.65,1.26)	1.67 (0.93,3.00)*	1.14 (0.81,1.60)	0.71 (0.24, 2.10)	0.54 (0.22,1.33)
16-20	20	1.09 (0.74,1.61)	0.99 (0.72,1.35)	1.22 (0.87,1.70)	2.81 (1.56,5.07)[‡]	0.94 (0.67,1.33)	0.67 (0.22, 2.04)	0.72 (0.29,1.76)
>20	21	0.77 (0.52,1.15)	0.98 (0.71,1.34)	0.78 (0.55,1.09)*	1.34 (0.74,2.45)	0.81 (0.58,1.15)	1.93 (0.64, 5.84)	0.70 (0.28,1.75)
Frequency of washing and/or showering after an incident								
Sometimes	11	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
Always	75	0.78 (0.50,1.22)	0.93 (0.66,1.32)	0.89 (0.60,1.31)	2.01 (1.00,4.03)[†]	1.00 (0.68,1.49)	0.44 (0.13, 1.50)	0.85 (0.31,2.34)

Table 5. Adjusted proportional change in geometric mean (GM) and 95% confidence interval (CI) of covariates and serum PFAS concentration among firefighters (N=86) from Maximum Likelihood Regression (MLE) models^a

Variable	n	PFNA	PFOA	PFOS	PFHxS	PFDA	PFBuS	PFUnDA
Assigned to the airport fire station								
No	72	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
Yes	14	2.12 (1.50,2.99)[‡]	0.98 (0.73,1.32)	0.99 (0.71,1.38)	0.65 (0.36,1.17)	0.99 (0.71,1.38)	0.99 (0.71, 1.38)	1.75 (0.75,4.06)
Any fire in 24 hours prior to sample collection								
No	71	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
Yes	15	1.00 (0.69,1.46)	0.91 (0.68,1.22)	1.14 (0.82,1.57)	1.41 (0.78,2.55)	0.85 (0.61,1.18)	1.31 (0.46, 3.72)	1.06 (0.45,2.50)
Number of fires in the year prior to the sample collection^b								
≤9	17	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
10-15	17	0.85 (0.58,1.24)	0.86 (0.62,1.18)	1.01 (0.69,1.47)	1.05 (0.53,2.09)	1.09 (0.74,1.60)	1.09 (0.74, 1.60)	0.53 (0.20,1.44)
16-19	15	1.03 (0.67,1.57)	1.13 (0.79,1.62)	1.19 (0.79,1.80)	1.39 (0.65,2.98)	1.12 (0.73,1.72)	1.12 (0.73, 1.72)	0.85 (0.29,2.54)
≥20	17	0.75 (0.50,1.12)	0.79 (0.56,1.10)	0.79 (0.53,1.17)	0.91 (0.44,1.89)	0.89 (0.59,1.33)	0.89 (0.59, 1.33)	0.90 (0.32,2.55)

^aModels adjusted for race/ethnicity, age and years of service with SFFD. ^bData from participants who consented to grant access to their fire history from SFFD; *pvalue≤ 0.1; †pvalue≤ 0.05; ‡pvalue≤ 0.001

339 Figure 1. Comparison of geometric mean (GM) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of
 340 PFAS levels measured in WFBC firefighters and office workers (2014-15) with adult
 341 women in NHANES (2013-14) and the FOX study (2010-11).



342 Figure footnote: Figure shows GM and 95% CI for those PFAS with detection
 343 frequencies of at least 70% among WFBC participants. PFBuS had low DF for FOX
 344 (6.9%) and NHANES (0.7%); therefore, we plotted the LOD, represented by horizontal
 345 green lines, in lieu of GM and 95% CI. We replaced levels below the LOD with LOD/ $\sqrt{2}$
 346 and applied the LOD respective to each study population. Tests of statistical
 347 significance for differences between WFBC groups is shown in Table 4.
 348
 349

350 **Figure 1** compares PFAS levels measured in our WFBC participants with other cohorts,
351 including adult women from the 2013-2014 NHANES⁵⁴ and the predominantly male
352 2010-2011 FOX study.⁵³ WFBC firefighters and office workers had higher serum levels
353 of PFHxS and a higher detection frequency for PFBuS than both NHANES and FOX;
354 while PFBuS had low detection frequencies in both the FOX and NHANES studies (DF:
355 6.9% and 0.7%, respectively) the WFBC had a PFBuS detection frequency of 74% for
356 firefighters and 70% for office workers. WFBC firefighters also had higher levels of
357 PFNA, PFDA and PFUnDA levels compared to NHANES, whereas office workers had
358 similar levels to NHANES for PFOS, PFOA and PFNA. Both WFBC firefighter and office
359 worker groups had lower levels of PFOS, PFOA, PFNA, PFDA, and PFUnDA than
360 those measured in the FOX study.

361

362 **Discussion:**

363 This biomonitoring study is the first to assess levels of PFAS compounds in an all-
364 female cohort of firefighters and office workers. Of the twelve PFAS we measured,
365 detection frequencies ranged from 0 to 100% and all participants had at least four PFAS
366 congeners (PFHxS, PFOA, PFOS and PFNA) detected in their serum samples.
367 Widespread use of PFAS in consumer products, contamination of food and water
368 sources, and their environmental persistence may contribute to the high background
369 levels of these compounds in both firefighters and office workers. Indeed PFAS are
370 ubiquitous in the environment and have been found in dust, food and humans
371 worldwide.^{34,57} In addition, the widespread use of PFAS containing products on clothing,
372 furniture fabrics, carpets and paper food packaging also contributes to levels found in

373 people.^{48,58} Drinking water contamination is considered an important source of PFAS
374 exposure in many communities,^{48,59,60} and people with contaminated drinking water
375 have elevated PFAS in their blood.⁶¹ However, local San Francisco Bay Area water
376 systems are not likely to be a significant source of PFAS exposure for WFBC study
377 participants. Municipal water systems in the locations where most study participants live
378 were tested for PFAS under the Environmental Protection Agency's Unregulated
379 Contaminant Monitoring Rule in 2016 and tests did not detect measurable PFAS
380 contamination in San Francisco or surrounding communities' municipal water systems.⁶²
381
382 Multivariate models showed that PFHxS, PFUnDA, and PFNA exposure was higher in
383 firefighters compared to office workers after controlling for age, race and ethnicity.
384 When we additionally controlled for the frequency of eating certain foods the association
385 remained significantly higher in firefighters compared to office workers and the strength
386 of association became stronger after adjustment for potential confounders. When we
387 limited the analysis to firefighters, we found that several occupational activities were
388 associated with higher PFAS levels. Firefighters' assigned position was the most
389 strongly associated with higher PFAS levels, with those assigned as firefighters or
390 officers having higher levels of PFNA, PFOA, PFDA and PFUnDA compared to drivers.
391 Compared to drivers, PFOS was higher among those assigned to the firefighter position
392 however, PFBuS was higher among drivers compared to officers. Differential PFAS
393 exposures by position may be explained by different roles at fire events. Engine drivers
394 typically remain with the apparatus because they supply water for initial interior fire
395 suppression work, as well as set the ladders for ventilation procedures. In addition,

396 drivers in SFFD do not typically perform overhaul procedures after a fire is extinguished,
397 and thus may avoid a critical source of exposure.⁶³

398

399 Firefighting foams may be another important source of PFAS exposure. Aqueous Film
400 Forming Foams (AFFF) are known to contain PFAS surfactants, including PFOS, PFOA
401 and PFHxS.^{19,64} Our data suggest that firefighters who reported using firefighting foam
402 had higher levels of PFOA than those who reported never using firefighting foams.

403 Among airport firefighters, we found that PFNA levels were two times higher compared
404 to firefighters assigned to other stations in San Francisco. Although PFNA is not
405 considered a main ingredient in AFFF, a study in Finland found that firefighters using
406 AFFF in training activities had increased levels of PFNA after the training activities.¹⁹

407

408 Unexpectedly, procedures that generally are intended to reduce contaminant exposures
409 were associated with increased exposures for some PFAS. Washing hands more
410 frequently during the work shift and always showering after a fire event were associated
411 with increased PFHxS levels while sometimes using SCBA during salvage overhaul was
412 associated with increased PFNA, PFDA and PFUnDA. One possible explanation is that
413 firefighters may be over-reporting their hand washing, showering frequency, and SCBA
414 use because they know that these activities are expected occupational hygiene
415 practices. Duration of SCBA use during fire events may also be an important factor to
416 examine in future studies, as it is possible that although firefighters may wear SCBA
417 frequently, they may remove it after extinguishing a fire and during salvage and
418 overhaul operations because gear is heavy, conditions are hot, and the location

419 appears to be free of smoke.^{14,63} Self-reporting bias in terms of occupational safety and
420 health procedures, which has been shown in other studies settings,^{65,66} may have also
421 affected our results. In addition, there may be unknown and unmeasured occupational
422 sources of PFAS exposure in firefighting that could help explain observed associations.

423

424 We compared the levels of PFAS congeners in WFBC participants with levels from two
425 other exposure studies: A cohort of mostly male firefighters in Southern California (FOX)
426 and a nationally representative sample of adult women (NHANES). In general, WFBC
427 firefighters and office workers had lower PFAS levels than those measured in the FOX
428 study, except for PFHxS which was significantly higher in both WFBC firefighters and
429 office workers. In particular, the lower levels of PFOA and PFOS in the WFBC
430 participants may reflect the temporal trends associated with the phase-out of these
431 compounds in consumer products and firefighting equipment. The FOX study samples
432 were collected between 2010 and 2011, three years before the start of the WFBC study
433 and during the phase out period of PFOA and PFOS.⁶⁷ Studies have shown that PFAS
434 levels have changed over time with many PFAS that have been phased out decreasing
435 and their replacements increasing.^{36,37,68,69} Interestingly, we did see overall higher levels
436 of PFHxS in both groups of WFBC participants collected in 2013-2014 relative to the
437 2010-2011 FOX cohort. The increased levels in WFBC participants may be due to
438 PFHxS' long half-life or other continued sources of PFHxS exposures in California
439 residents.⁶⁸ The elevated levels among WFBC firefighters in relation to FOX participants
440 may be due, in part, to its use as a replacement for PFOA and PFOS in firefighting
441 foams.⁶⁴ Additionally, the lower levels of most PFAS among WFBC participants

442 compared to the mostly male cohort of FOX participants may be further explained by
443 excretion pathway differences between men and women, where women may have
444 lower PFAS levels due to excretion during menstruation.⁷⁰

445

446 WFBC and NHANES data were collected at around the same time (2013-14 for
447 NHANES and 2014-15 for the WFBC) and levels between WFBC and NHANES were
448 more similar to each other than with the FOX study. However, PFHxS, PFDA, and
449 PFBuS levels were higher in WFBC firefighters and office workers compared to
450 NHANES adult women. While we limited the NHANES cohort to adult women, we did
451 not consider occupation or other factors, including location or other potential exposure
452 sources.

453

454 Health effects observed in people exposed to PFOA include high cholesterol, ulcerative
455 colitis, thyroid disease, testicular and kidney cancers, and pregnancy-induced
456 hypertension.⁷¹ PFOS exposure has also been associated with immunotoxicity, as
457 indicated by a decreased response to vaccine in children;⁷² and other studies of people
458 exposed to PFAS show effects on liver and decreased birth weight.⁷³ In animal studies,
459 PFAS have been shown to have a variety of similar toxicological effects including liver
460 toxicity, suppressed immune function, altered mammary gland development, obesity,
461 and cancer.^{74,75} The concordance between endpoints identified in animal studies and
462 human studies, most notably effects on liver, kidney, fetal growth and development, and
463 suppression of the immune system, add confidence to the findings.^{76,77} Based on these
464 studies in humans and animals, some government agencies have established allowable

465 levels of PFOA and PFOS in drinking water.^{76,78} For PFOA, these benchmarks are
466 designed to prevent people from having blood serum levels above 14 ng/ml.⁷⁹ The
467 maximum value in this study was 5 ng/mL. However, PFOA has been shown to alter
468 mammary gland development in mice following in utero exposure at even lower levels,
469 and estimates of target serum levels to protect against those effects are less than 1
470 ng/ml⁷⁹. The health effects of the other PFAS found in elevated levels in firefighters
471 have not been well studied and target serum concentrations that are expected to protect
472 against adverse effects are not available for PFNA, PFBuS, PFHxS, PFUnDA, so it is
473 difficult to compare measured levels in firefighters with benchmarks intended to protect
474 against health effects. Allowable daily intake amounts intended to protect against
475 adverse health effects are in the same range as PFOA for PFNA, while for PFHxS they
476 are about 10 times higher and for PFBuS they are 100 times higher.⁸⁰ However the
477 higher allowable daily intakes for PFBuS and PFHxS do not necessarily correspond to
478 higher allowable serum levels for these chemicals. Instead they reflect differences in the
479 relationship between intake and serum concentration for each of the chemicals.

480

481 We used a community-based participatory research design that entailed the active
482 involvement of firefighters to recruit participants (both firefighters and office workers)
483 into the study. By including office workers from the City and County of San Francisco
484 we were able to compare firefighter exposures to a working population of women who
485 were not involved in firefighting activities, but who live and work in the same
486 geographical region allowing us to examine which PFAS chemicals are most strongly
487 associated with firefighting. Understanding the extent to which PFAS exposures differ

488 between firefighters and office workers can elucidate which compounds are likely to
489 have occupational sources, highlight opportunities for prevention strategies, and assess
490 the effectiveness of workplace exposure reduction efforts.

491

492 **Conclusion:**

493 Our study found ubiquitous exposures to multiple PFAS compounds among all
494 participants of the Women Firefighter Biomonitoring Collaborative. Firefighters were
495 exposed to higher levels of PFNA, PFHxS and PFUnDA than office workers indicating
496 potential occupational sources for firefighters. While industrial hygiene practices, use
497 and access to personal protective equipment, use of AFFF foam, and other
498 occupational conditions may vary across fire departments and fire events, our results
499 have relevance for understanding potential sources and pathways of chemical
500 exposures for other fire departments and regions. Further study is warranted to better
501 understand exposure patterns and health risks for firefighters associated with these
502 compounds.

503

504 **References:**

- 505 (1) LeMasters, G. K.; Genaidy, A. M.; Succop, P.; Deddens, J.; Sobeih, T.; Barriera-Viruet, H.;
506 Dunning, K.; Lockey, J. Cancer Risk among Firefighters: A Review and Meta-Analysis of 32
507 Studies. *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* **2006**, *48* (11), 1189–1202.
508 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.jom.0000246229.68697.90>.
- 509 (2) IARC. *IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans Volume 98*
510 *Painting, Firefighting, and Shiftwork.*; WHO: Lyon, France, 2010.

- 511 (3) Daniels, R. D.; Kubale, T. L.; Yiin, J. H.; Dahm, M. M.; Hales, T. R.; Baris, D.; Zahm, S. H.;
512 Beaumont, J. J.; Waters, K. M.; Pinkerton, L. E. Mortality and Cancer Incidence in a Pooled
513 Cohort of US Firefighters from San Francisco, Chicago and Philadelphia (1950-2009).
514 *Occup. Environ. Med.* **2014**, *71* (6), 388–397. [https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2013-](https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2013-101662)
515 [101662](https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2013-101662).
- 516 (4) Ahn, Y.-S.; Jeong, K.-S.; Kim, K.-S. Cancer Morbidity of Professional Emergency
517 Responders in Korea. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* **2012**, *55* (9), 768–778.
518 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.22068>.
- 519 (5) Bates, M. N. Registry-Based Case-Control Study of Cancer in California Firefighters. *Am. J.*
520 *Ind. Med.* **2007**, *50* (5), 339–344. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.20446>.
- 521 (6) Delahunt, B.; Bethwaite, P. B.; Nacey, J. N. Occupational Risk for Renal Cell Carcinoma. A
522 Case-Control Study Based on the New Zealand Cancer Registry. *Br. J. Urol.* **1995**, *75* (5),
523 578–582. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-410X.1995.tb07410.x>.
- 524 (7) Kang, D.; Davis, L. K.; Hunt, P.; Kriebel, D. Cancer Incidence among Male Massachusetts
525 Firefighters, 1987-2003. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* **2008**, *51* (5), 329–335.
526 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.20549>.
- 527 (8) Ma, F.; Fleming, L. E.; Lee, D. J.; Trapido, E.; Gerace, T. A.; Lai, H.; Lai, S. Mortality in
528 Florida Professional Firefighters, 1972 to 1999. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* **2005**, *47* (6), 509–517.
529 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.20160>.
- 530 (9) Ma, F.; Fleming, L. E.; Lee, D. J.; Trapido, E.; Gerace, T. A. Cancer Incidence in Florida
531 Professional Firefighters, 1981 to 1999. *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* **2006**, *48* (9), 883–888.
532 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.jom.0000235862.12518.04>.

- 533 (10) Tsai, R. J.; Luckhaupt, S. E.; Schumacher, P.; Cress, R. D.; Deapen, D. M.; Calvert, G. M.
534 Risk of Cancer among Firefighters in California, 1988-2007. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* **2015**, *58* (7),
535 715–729. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.22466>.
- 536 (11) Adetona, O.; Zhang, J. J.; Hall, D. B.; Wang, J.-S.; Vena, J. E.; Naeher, L. P. Occupational
537 Exposure to Woodsmoke and Oxidative Stress in Wildland Firefighters. *Sci. Total Environ.*
538 **2013**, *449*, 269–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.01.075>.
- 539 (12) Bolstad-Johnson, D. M.; Burgess, J. L.; Crutchfield, C. D.; Storment, S.; Gerkin, R.; Wilson,
540 J. R. Characterization of Firefighter Exposures during Fire Overhaul. *AIHAJ J. Sci. Occup.*
541 *Environ. Health Saf.* **2000**, *61* (5), 636–641.
- 542 (13) Fent, K. W.; Eisenberg, J.; Snawder, J.; Sammons, D.; Pleil, J. D.; Stiegel, M. A.; Mueller, C.;
543 Horn, G. P.; Dalton, J. Systemic Exposure to PAHs and Benzene in Firefighters Suppressing
544 Controlled Structure Fires. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **2014**, *58* (7), 830–845.
545 <https://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/meu036>.
- 546 (14) Gainey, S. J.; Horn, G. P.; Towers, A. E.; Oelschlager, M. L.; Tir, V. L.; Drnevich, J.; Fent, K.
547 W.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D. L.; Freund, G. G. Exposure to a Firefighting Overhaul
548 Environment without Respiratory Protection Increases Immune Dysregulation and Lung
549 Disease Risk. *PloS One* **2018**, *13* (8), e0201830.
550 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201830>.
- 551 (15) Navarro, K. M.; Cisneros, R.; Noth, E. M.; Balmes, J. R.; Hammond, S. K. Occupational
552 Exposure to Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon of Wildland Firefighters at Prescribed and
553 Wildland Fires. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2017**, *51* (11), 6461–6469.
554 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b00950>.

- 555 (16) Alexander, B. M.; Baxter, C. S. Flame-Retardant Contamination of Firefighter Personal
556 Protective Clothing - A Potential Health Risk for Firefighters. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2016**,
557 *13* (9), D148-155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2016.1183016>.
- 558 (17) Brown, F. R.; Whitehead, T. P.; Park, J.-S.; Metayer, C.; Petreas, M. X. Levels of Non-
559 Polybrominated Diphenyl Ether Brominated Flame Retardants in Residential House Dust
560 Samples and Fire Station Dust Samples in California. *Environ. Res.* **2014**, *135*, 9–14.
561 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2014.08.022>.
- 562 (18) Fent, K. W.; Evans, D. E.; Booher, D.; Pleil, J. D.; Stiegel, M. A.; Horn, G. P.; Dalton, J.
563 Volatile Organic Compounds Off-Gassing from Firefighters' Personal Protective
564 Equipment Ensembles after Use. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2015**, *12* (6), 404–414.
565 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2015.1025135>.
- 566 (19) Laitinen, J. A.; Koponen, J.; Koikkalainen, J.; Kiviranta, H. Firefighters' Exposure to
567 Perfluoroalkyl Acids and 2-Butoxyethanol Present in Firefighting Foams. *Toxicol. Lett.*
568 **2014**, *231* (2), 227–232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2014.09.007>.
- 569 (20) Shen, B.; Whitehead, T. P.; McNeel, S.; Brown, F. R.; Dhaliwal, J.; Das, R.; Israel, L.; Park,
570 J.-S.; Petreas, M. High Levels of Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers in Vacuum Cleaner Dust
571 from California Fire Stations. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2015**, *49* (8), 4988–4994.
572 <https://doi.org/10.1021/es505463g>.
- 573 (21) Robinson, M. S.; Anthony, T. R.; Littau, S. R.; Herckes, P.; Nelson, X.; Poplin, G. S.; Burgess,
574 J. L. Occupational PAH Exposures during Prescribed Pile Burns. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **2008**, *52*
575 (6), 497–508. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/men027>.

- 576 (22) Caux, C.; O'Brien, C.; Viau, C. Determination of Firefighter Exposure to Polycyclic
577 Aromatic Hydrocarbons and Benzene during Fire Fighting Using Measurement of
578 Biological Indicators. *Appl. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2002**, *17* (5), 379–386.
579 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10473220252864987>.
- 580 (23) Austin, C. C.; Wang, D.; Ecobichon, D. J.; Dussault, G. Characterization of Volatile Organic
581 Compounds in Smoke at Experimental Fires. *J. Toxicol. Environ. Health A* **2001**, *63* (3),
582 191–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15287390151101547>.
- 583 (24) Feunekes, F. D.; Jongeneelen, F. J.; vd Laan, H.; Schoonhof, F. H. Uptake of Polycyclic
584 Aromatic Hydrocarbons among Trainers in a Fire-Fighting Training Facility. *Am. Ind. Hyg.*
585 *Assoc. J.* **1997**, *58* (1), 23–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15428119791013035>.
- 586 (25) Shaw, S. D.; Berger, M. L.; Harris, J. H.; Yun, S. H.; Wu, Q.; Liao, C.; Blum, A.; Stefani, A.;
587 Kannan, K. Persistent Organic Pollutants Including Polychlorinated and Polybrominated
588 Dibenzo-p-Dioxins and Dibenzofurans in Firefighters from Northern California.
589 *Chemosphere* **2013**, *91* (10), 1386–1394.
590 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2012.12.070>.
- 591 (26) Park, J.-S.; Voss, R. W.; McNeel, S.; Wu, N.; Guo, T.; Wang, Y.; Israel, L.; Das, R.; Petreas,
592 M. High Exposure of California Firefighters to Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers. *Environ.*
593 *Sci. Technol.* **2015**, *49* (5), 2948–2958. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es5055918>.
- 594 (27) Dobraca, D.; Israel, L.; McNeel, S.; Voss, R.; Wang, M.; Gajek, R.; Park, J.-S.; Harwani, S.;
595 Barley, F.; She, J.; et al. Biomonitoring in California Firefighters: Metals and
596 Perfluorinated Chemicals. *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* **2015**, *57* (1), 88–97.
597 <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000307>.

- 598 (28) Jin, C.; Sun, Y.; Islam, A.; Qian, Y.; Ducatman, A. Perfluoroalkyl Acids Including
599 Perfluorooctane Sulfonate and Perfluorohexane Sulfonate in Firefighters. *J. Occup.*
600 *Environ. Med.* **2011**, *53* (3), 324–328. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e31820d1314>.
- 601 (29) Brandt-Rauf, P. W.; Fallon, L. F.; Tarantini, T.; Idema, C.; Andrews, L. Health Hazards of
602 Fire Fighters: Exposure Assessment. *Br. J. Ind. Med.* **1988**, *45* (9), 606–612.
603 <https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.45.9.606>.
- 604 (30) Edelman, P.; Osterloh, J.; Pirkle, J.; Caudill, S. P.; Grainger, J.; Jones, R.; Blount, B.; Calafat,
605 A.; Turner, W.; Feldman, D.; et al. Biomonitoring of Chemical Exposure among New York
606 City Firefighters Responding to the World Trade Center Fire and Collapse. *Environ. Health*
607 *Perspect.* **2003**, *111* (16), 1906–1911.
- 608 (31) Rudel, R. A.; Fenton, S. E.; Ackerman, J. M.; Euling, S. Y.; Makris, S. L. Environmental
609 Exposures and Mammary Gland Development: State of the Science, Public Health
610 Implications, and Research Recommendations. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2011**, *119* (8),
611 1053–1061. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1002864>.
- 612 (32) Rudel, R. A.; Ackerman, J. M.; Attfield, K. R.; Brody, J. G. New Exposure Biomarkers as
613 Tools for Breast Cancer Epidemiology, Biomonitoring, and Prevention: A Systematic
614 Approach Based on Animal Evidence. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2014**, *122* (9), 881–895.
615 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1307455>.
- 616 (33) Moody, C. A.; Field, J. A. Perfluorinated Surfactants and the Environmental Implications
617 of Their Use in Fire-Fighting Foams. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2000**, *34* (18), 3864–3870.
618 <https://doi.org/10.1021/es991359u>.

- 619 (34) Björklund, J. A.; Thuresson, K.; de Wit, C. A. Perfluoroalkyl Compounds (PFCs) in Indoor
620 Dust: Concentrations, Human Exposure Estimates, and Sources. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*
621 **2009**, *43* (7), 2276–2281. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es803201a>.
- 622 (35) Olsen, G. W.; Mair, D. C.; Reagen, W. K.; Ellefson, M. E.; Ehresman, D. J.; Butenhoff, J. L.;
623 Zobel, L. R. Preliminary Evidence of a Decline in Perfluorooctanesulfonate (PFOS) and
624 Perfluorooctanoate (PFOA) Concentrations in American Red Cross Blood Donors.
625 *Chemosphere* **2007**, *68* (1), 105–111.
626 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2006.12.031>.
- 627 (36) Calafat, A. M.; Wong, L.-Y.; Kuklennyik, Z.; Reidy, J. A.; Needham, L. L. Polyfluoroalkyl
628 Chemicals in the U.S. Population: Data from the National Health and Nutrition
629 Examination Survey (NHANES) 2003-2004 and Comparisons with NHANES 1999-2000.
630 *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2007**, *115* (11), 1596–1602.
631 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.10598>.
- 632 (37) Olsen, G. W.; Mair, D. C.; Lange, C. C.; Harrington, L. M.; Church, T. R.; Goldberg, C. L.;
633 Herron, R. M.; Hanna, H.; Nobiletti, J. B.; Rios, J. A.; et al. Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl
634 Substances (PFAS) in American Red Cross Adult Blood Donors, 2000-2015. *Environ. Res.*
635 **2017**, *157*, 87–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.05.013>.
- 636 (38) Barry, V.; Winqvist, A.; Steenland, K. Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) Exposures and
637 Incident Cancers among Adults Living near a Chemical Plant. *Environ. Health Perspect.*
638 **2013**, *121* (11–12), 1313–1318. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1306615>.

- 639 (39) Joensen, U. N.; Bossi, R.; Leffers, H.; Jensen, A. A.; Skakkebaek, N. E.; Jørgensen, N. Do
640 Perfluoroalkyl Compounds Impair Human Semen Quality? *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2009**,
641 *117* (6), 923–927. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.0800517>.
- 642 (40) Lopez-Espinosa, M.-J.; Mondal, D.; Armstrong, B.; Bloom, M. S.; Fletcher, T. Thyroid
643 Function and Perfluoroalkyl Acids in Children Living Near a Chemical Plant. *Environ.*
644 *Health Perspect.* **2012**, *120* (7), 1036–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1104370>.
- 645 (41) Lopez-Espinosa, M.-J.; Mondal, D.; Armstrong, B. G.; Eskenazi, B.; Fletcher, T.
646 Perfluoroalkyl Substances, Sex Hormones, and Insulin-like Growth Factor-1 at 6-9 Years
647 of Age: A Cross-Sectional Analysis within the C8 Health Project. *Environ. Health Perspect.*
648 **2016**, *124* (8), 1269–1275. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1509869>.
- 649 (42) Bassler, J.; Ducatman, A.; Elliott, M.; Wen, S.; Wahlang, B.; Barnett, J.; Cave, M. C.
650 Environmental Perfluoroalkyl Acid Exposures Are Associated with Liver Disease
651 Characterized by Apoptosis and Altered Serum Adipocytokines. *Environ. Pollut. Barking*
652 *Essex 1987* **2019**, *247*, 1055–1063. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.01.064>.
- 653 (43) Blake, B. E.; Pinney, S. M.; Hines, E. P.; Fenton, S. E.; Ferguson, K. K. Associations between
654 Longitudinal Serum Perfluoroalkyl Substance (PFAS) Levels and Measures of Thyroid
655 Hormone, Kidney Function, and Body Mass Index in the Fernald Community Cohort.
656 *Environ. Pollut. Barking Essex 1987* **2018**, *242* (Pt A), 894–904.
657 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.07.042>.
- 658 (44) Liu, G.; Dhana, K.; Furtado, J. D.; Rood, J.; Zong, G.; Liang, L.; Qi, L.; Bray, G. A.; DeJonge,
659 L.; Coull, B.; et al. Perfluoroalkyl Substances and Changes in Body Weight and Resting

- 660 Metabolic Rate in Response to Weight-Loss Diets: A Prospective Study. *PLoS Med.* **2018**,
661 15 (2), e1002502. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002502>.
- 662 (45) Steenland, K.; Zhao, L.; Winqvist, A.; Parks, C. Ulcerative Colitis and Perfluorooctanoic
663 Acid (PFOA) in a Highly Exposed Population of Community Residents and Workers in the
664 Mid-Ohio Valley. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2013**, 121 (8), 900–905.
665 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1206449>.
- 666 (46) US Department of Labor, B. of L. S. Employed persons by detailed occupation, sex, race,
667 and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity <https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.htm> (accessed Mar
668 19, 2019).
- 669 (47) Hulett, D. M.; Bendick Jr, M.; Thomas, S. Y.; Moccio, F. Enhancing Women’s Inclusion in
670 Firefighting in the USA. *Int. J. Divers. Organ. Communities Nations* **2008**, 8 (2).
- 671 (48) Boronow, K. E.; Brody, J. G.; Schaider, L. A.; Peaslee, G. F.; Havas, L.; Cohn, B. A. Serum
672 Concentrations of PFASs and Exposure-Related Behaviors in African American and Non-
673 Hispanic White Women. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* **2019**, 29 (2), 206–217.
674 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-018-0109-y>.
- 675 (49) Ji, K.; Kim, S.; Kho, Y.; Paek, D.; Sakong, J.; Ha, J.; Kim, S.; Choi, K. Serum Concentrations of
676 Major Perfluorinated Compounds among the General Population in Korea: Dietary
677 Sources and Potential Impact on Thyroid Hormones. *Environ. Int.* **2012**, 45, 78–85.
678 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2012.03.007>.
- 679 (50) Tuck, M. K.; Chan, D. W.; Chia, D.; Godwin, A. K.; Grizzle, W. E.; Krueger, K. E.; Rom, W.;
680 Sanda, M.; Sorbara, L.; Stass, S.; et al. Standard Operating Procedures for Serum and
681 Plasma Collection: Early Detection Research Network Consensus Statement Standard

- 682 Operating Procedure Integration Working Group. *J. Proteome Res.* **2009**, *8* (1), 113–117.
- 683 <https://doi.org/10.1021/pr800545q>.
- 684 (51) Helsel, D. R. More than Obvious: Better Methods for Interpreting Nondetect Data.
- 685 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2005**, *39* (20), 419A-423A.
- 686 (52) Federal Aviation Administration. CertAlerts for Part 139 Airport Certification – Airports
- 687 https://www.faa.gov/airports/airport_safety/certalerts/ (accessed Jun 5, 2019).
- 688 (53) Biomonitoring California. Project Results for Firefighter Occupational Exposures (FOX)
- 689 Project | Measuring Chemicals in Californians
- 690 <https://biomonitoring.ca.gov/results/projects/410> (accessed Jul 17, 2018).
- 691 (54) Center for Disease Control. NHANES 2013-2014 Laboratory Data
- 692 <https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/search/datapage.aspx?Component=Laboratory&CycleBeginYear=2013> (accessed Aug 2, 2018).
- 693
- 694 (55) RStudio Team. *RStudio: Integrated Development for R*; RStudio Inc.: Boston, MA, 2016.
- 695 (56) R Development Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.*; R
- 696 Foundation for Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria, 2008.
- 697 (57) Petersen, M. S.; Halling, J.; Jørgensen, N.; Nielsen, F.; Grandjean, P.; Jensen, T. K.; Weihe,
- 698 P. Reproductive Function in a Population of Young Faroese Men with Elevated Exposure
- 699 to Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) and Perfluorinated Alkylate Substances (PFAS). *Int. J.*
- 700 *Environ. Res. Public. Health* **2018**, *15* (9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15091880>.
- 701 (58) Domingo, J. L.; Nadal, M. Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs) in Food and Human
- 702 Dietary Intake: A Review of the Recent Scientific Literature. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **2017**, *65*
- 703 (3), 533–543. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.6b04683>.

- 704 (59) Hu, X. C.; Andrews, D. Q.; Lindstrom, A. B.; Bruton, T. A.; Schaider, L. A.; Grandjean, P.;
705 Lohmann, R.; Carignan, C. C.; Blum, A.; Balan, S. A.; et al. Detection of Poly- and
706 Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs) in U.S. Drinking Water Linked to Industrial Sites,
707 Military Fire Training Areas, and Wastewater Treatment Plants. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2016**, *3* (10), 344–350. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.6b00260>.
- 708
- 709 (60) Hurley, S.; Houtz, E.; Goldberg, D.; Wang, M.; Park, J.-S.; Nelson, D. O.; Reynolds, P.;
710 Bernstein, L.; Anton-Culver, H.; Horn-Ross, P.; et al. Preliminary Associations between the
711 Detection of Perfluoroalkyl Acids (PFAAs) in Drinking Water and Serum Concentrations in
712 a Sample of California Women. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2016**, *3* (7), 264–269.
713 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.6b00154>.
- 714 (61) New Jersey Drinking Water Quality Institute. *Maximum Contaminant Level*
715 *Recommendation for Perfluorooctanoic Acid in Drinking Water*; 2015.
- 716 (62) US EPA. Occurrence Data for the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule
717 [https://www.epa.gov/dwucmr/occurrence-data-unregulated-contaminant-monitoring-](https://www.epa.gov/dwucmr/occurrence-data-unregulated-contaminant-monitoring-rule)
718 [rule](https://www.epa.gov/dwucmr/occurrence-data-unregulated-contaminant-monitoring-rule) (accessed Aug 20, 2019).
- 719 (63) Fent, K. W.; Evans, D. E.; Babik, K.; Striley, C.; Bertke, S.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.; Horn, G. P.
720 Airborne Contaminants during Controlled Residential Fires. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2018**,
721 *15* (5), 399–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2018.1445260>.
- 722 (64) Rotander, A.; Toms, L.-M. L.; Aylward, L.; Kay, M.; Mueller, J. F. Elevated Levels of PFOS
723 and PFHxS in Firefighters Exposed to Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF). *Environ. Int.*
724 **2015**, *82*, 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.05.005>.

- 725 (65) Griffin, S. C.; Neitzel, R.; Daniell, W. E.; Seixas, N. S. Indicators of Hearing Protection Use:
726 Self-Report and Researcher Observation. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2009**, *6* (10), 639–647.
727 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459620903139060>.
- 728 (66) McCullagh, M. C.; Rosemberg, M.-A. Social Desirability Bias in Self-Reporting of Hearing
729 Protector Use among Farm Operators. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **2015**, *59* (9), 1200–1207.
730 <https://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/mev046>.
- 731 (67) Scheringer, M.; Trier, X.; Cousins, I. T.; de Voogt, P.; Fletcher, T.; Wang, Z.; Webster, T. F.
732 Helsingør Statement on Poly- and Perfluorinated Alkyl Substances (PFASs). *Chemosphere*
733 **2014**, *114*, 337–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.05.044>.
- 734 (68) Hurley, S.; Goldberg, D.; Wang, M.; Park, J.-S.; Petreas, M.; Bernstein, L.; Anton-Culver,
735 H.; Nelson, D. O.; Reynolds, P. Time Trends in Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs)
736 in California Women: Declining Serum Levels, 2011-2015. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2018**, *52*
737 (1), 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b04650>.
- 738 (69) Kato, K.; Calafat, A. M.; Wong, L.-Y.; Wanigatunga, A. A.; Caudill, S. P.; Needham, L. L.
739 Polyfluoroalkyl Compounds in Pooled Sera from Children Participating in the National
740 Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2001- 2002. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2009**, *43* (7),
741 2641–2647.
- 742 (70) Zhang, J.; Huang, Y.; Wang, X.; Lin, K.; Wu, K. Environmental Polychlorinated Biphenyl
743 Exposure and Breast Cancer Risk: A Meta-Analysis of Observational Studies. *PLoS ONE*
744 **2015**, *10* (11). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0142513>.
- 745 (71) C8 Science Panel. C8 Science Panel Website <http://www.c8sciencepanel.org/> (accessed
746 Jul 30, 2019).

- 747 (72) Grandjean, P.; Andersen, E. W.; Budtz-Jørgensen, E.; Nielsen, F.; Mølbak, K.; Weihe, P.;
748 Heilmann, C. Serum Vaccine Antibody Concentrations in Children Exposed to
749 Perfluorinated Compounds. *JAMA* **2012**, *307* (4), 391–397.
750 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2011.2034>.
- 751 (73) Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). *Toxicological Profile for*
752 *Perfluoroalkyls. (Draft for Public Comment)*.; Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and
753 Human Services, Public Health Service., 2018.
- 754 (74) Lau, C. Perfluorinated Compounds: An Overview. In *Toxicological Effects of Perfluoroalkyl*
755 *and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances*; DeWitt, J. C., Ed.; Molecular and Integrative Toxicology;
756 Humana Press, Cham, 2015; pp 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15518-0_1.
- 757 (75) Post, G. B.; Gleason, J. A.; Cooper, K. R. Key Scientific Issues in Developing Drinking Water
758 Guidelines for Perfluoroalkyl Acids: Contaminants of Emerging Concern. *PLoS Biol.* **2017**,
759 *15* (12), e2002855. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2002855>.
- 760 (76) Cordner, A.; De La Rosa, V. Y.; Schaider, L. A.; Rudel, R. A.; Richter, L.; Brown, P. Guideline
761 Levels for PFOA and PFOS in Drinking Water: The Role of Scientific Uncertainty, Risk
762 Assessment Decisions, and Social Factors. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* **2019**, *29* (2),
763 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-018-0099-9>.
- 764 (77) DeWitt, J. C.; Blossom, S. J.; Schaider, L. A. Exposure to Per-Fluoroalkyl and
765 Polyfluoroalkyl Substances Leads to Immunotoxicity: Epidemiological and Toxicological
766 Evidence. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* **2019**, *29* (2), 148–156.
767 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-018-0097-y>.

- 768 (78) Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council. *Interstate Technology and Regularotry*
769 *Council (ITRC) PFAS Regulations, Guidance and Advisories Fact Sheet*; ITRC PFAS
770 Regulations Section 5 Tables, Ed. 2017; Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council,
771 2017.
- 772 (79) New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. *Health-Based Maximum*
773 *Recommendation Level Support Document: Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)*; New Jersey
774 Drinking Water Quality Institute, Heath Effects Sub-committee: Trenton New Jersey,
775 2015; p 475.
- 776 (80) Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Environmental Health.
777 *Public Health Drinking Water Screening Levels for PFAS*; Michigan PFAS Action Response
778 Team Human Health Workgroup: Michigan, 2019.
- 779
- 780