SNARL for Tetrachloroet ylene
Office of Drinking Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C. 20460

THE OFFICE OF DRINKING WATER "SHARLS" PROGRAM

The Office of Drinking Water provides advice on health effects upon request, concerning unregulated contaminants found in drinking water supplies. This information suggests the level of a contaminant in drinking water at which adverse health effects would not be anticipated with a margin of safety; it is called a SNARL (suggested no adverse response level). Normally values are provided for one-day, 10-day and longer-term exposure periods where available data exists. A SNARL does not condone the presence of a contaminant in drinking water, but rather provides useful information to assist in the setting of control priorities in cases when they have been found.

In the absence of a formal drinking water standard for tetrachloroethylene, the Office of Drinking Water has estimated a suggested no adverse response level (SNARL) following the state-of-the-art concepts in toxicology for non-carcinogenic risk for short and long term exposures. For carcinogenic risk, a range of risk estimates is provided for life-time exposures using a model and computations from the NAS Report (1979) entitled "Toxicity of selected drinking water contaminants." However, SNARLS are given on a case-by-case basis in emergency situations such as spills and accidents. The SNARL calculations for short-term and chronic exposures ignore the possible carcinogenic risk that may result from those exposures. In addition, SNARLS usually do not consider the health risk resulting from possible synergistic effect of other chemicals in drinking water, food and air.

SNARLS are not legally enforceable standards; they are not issued as an official regulation, and they may or may not lead ultimately to the issuance of a national standard or Maximum Contamination Level (MCL). The latter must take into account occurrence, relative source contribution factors, treatment technology, monitoring capability, and costs, in addition to health effects. It is quite conceivable that the concentration set for SNARL purposes might differ from an eventual MCL. The SNARLs may also change as additional information becomes available. In short SNARLs are offered as advice to assist those that are dealing with specific contamination situations to protect public health.

## General Information and Health Effects

Substantial quantities of tetrachloroethylene are being produced (700 million pounds in the U.S. in 1973). Tetrachloroethylene (perchloroethylene) is used as a dry cleaning and degreasing solvent, heat-transfer medium, and in the manufacture of fluorocarbons. This chemical is slightly soluble in water (0.01% by volume).

Little work has been done to delineate the uptake, distribution, metabolish and excretion patterns following oral exposures to tetrachloroethylene. For our purposes, an assumption is being made that 30% is absorbed via respiration and almost 100% via the gastrointestinal tract, as has been shown for trichloroethylene. Only a small fraction of tetrachloroethylene is metabolized to trichloroacetic acid and/or trichloroethanol. The urinary half-life of tetrachloroethylene is markedly longer (144 hours) than that of trichloroethylene indicating some level of bioaccumulation.

Tetrachloroethylene, like other halogenated hydrocarbons at high doses, has been reported to produce liver and kidney damage and central nervous system disturbances in mammals, including humans. In addition, tetrachloroethylene has been demonstrated to lower the DNA and RNA content of several organ systems of rats. High concentrations of this chemical result in growth inhibition and mortality as demonstrated in animal inhalation studies.

Investigations of chronic toxicity of tetrachloroethylene in animals have all involved inhalation exposure, with the exception of an assessment of carcinogenesis which involved oral dosing (NCI, 1977). The National Cancer Institute has reported tetrachloroethylene-induced hepatocellular carcinomas in male and female mice, but not in male or female rats.

Schwetz et al. (1975) reported that tetrachloroethylene was not teratogenic to rats and Swiss Webster mice after in-halation exposures of 300 ppm for seven hours per day on days six-15 of gestation. Careful examination of their data, however, indicate that there were a number of modest but statistically significant deviations of adverse health effect parameters from control animals, including increased body maternal weights, decreased body weight of mouse fetuses, increased fetal resorptions and increased incidence of split

CLW .0000003725 sternebrae, subcutaneous edema and delayed ossification of skull bones in mouse fetuses. Shumacher et al. (1962) exposed three week old mice for eight hours/day, three days each to 200, 400, 800 and 1600 ppm perchloroethylene. The exposures produced significant nortality and growth inhibition in survivors.

## Tetrachloroethylene SNARL

Tetrachloroethylene is a carcinogen in mice, and also causes . non-carcinogenic bioeffects at high doses. One-day, 10-day and chronic SNARL values based on non-carcinogenic bioeffects are computed incorporating appropriate factors of safety. Estimates of concentrations projected to increase the lifetime cancer risk by one in 100,000 and one in a 1,000,000 are also provided using the NAS model. The non-carcinogenic SNARL recommendations are made considering the child and other sensitive members of the population.

A one-day SNARL of 2.3 mg/l can be calculated using a study by Kylin (1963). In this study mice were exposed to 200 ppm tetrachloroethylene in air for a period of four hours. Histological examinations of the liver demonstrated fatty infiltration but not cellular necrosis. Even though the exposure levels ranged from 200 to 1600 ppm tetrachloroethylene, the no-adverse-effect level was not established.

Using the method by Olsen and Gehring (1976) whereby the lung/whole body ratios for humans and animals are assumed to be roughly equivalent, the total exposure of 200 ppm (1358 mg/m) for four hours via inhalation, could be used to determine the one-day SNARL:

$$\frac{(1358 \text{ mg/m}^3)(4 \text{ m}^3/\text{day})(0.30)}{(1 \text{ l/day})(100 \text{ uncertainty factor})(7)} = \frac{2.3 \text{ mg/l}}{}$$

Where:

1/7 = child/adult body weight ratio
0.30 = absorption factor
1 1/day = child's daily water consumption
100 uncertainty factor because of animal experiment
1358 mg/m = (200 ppm)(6.79 conversion factor)
4m = according to Olsen and Gehring whereby the
lung-whole body ratios for humans (adults) and
rats (adults) are assigned to be roughly
equivalent

An uncertainty factor of 100 beau thosen rather than 1,000 even though the SKARD is below upon an animal experiment in which the no-observed-effect level was not identified. It

was felt that the index of toxicity, namely fatty infiltration of the liver, is a delicate disorder in itself which is reversible and not life-threatening after a short exposure, therefore an additional margin of safety was not warranted.

The National Academy of Sciences (NAS, 1979) has computed a one-day SNARL of 172 mg/l and 24.5 mg/l for the seven-day SNARL. Calculations used by the NAS to determine a one-day SNARL were based on hepatotoxicity at a dose level of 490 mg/kg body weight given intraperitoneally to the animals. The calculations were made for a 70 kg man and the drinking water was considered to be the sole source of exposure. The seven-day NAS SNARL was calculated by dividing the one-day SNARL value by the appropriate number of days.

The NAS chose to work with data in animals given intraperitoneal injections. The Office of Drinking Water selected
an inhalation study in animals for extrapolation of its
SNARL and calculated the SNARL for the 10 kg child. Animal
studies and a human case history suggest that, in this case,
children appear to be a sensitive population which needs to
be protected from the adverse health effects.

The Office of Drinking Water 10-day SNARL was calculated using an inhalation study by Savolainen, et al. (1977) in which inhalation exposures of adult male rats to 200 ppm of tetrachloroethylene six hours daily for five days caused diminished brain RNA content. The 10-day SNARL of 175 ug/l was thus determined:

$$\frac{(1358 \text{ mg/m}^3)(6 \text{ m}^3)(0.30)(1)(1)}{(1 \text{ 1/day})(1000)} = \frac{(7)(2)}{(7)(2)}$$

Where:

1358 mg/m<sup>3</sup> = (200 ppm)(6.79 conversion factor)
6 m<sup>3</sup> = according to Olsen and Gehring whereby the
lung-whole body ratio for humans (adults) and
rats

(adults) are assumed to be roughly equivalent 0.30 = absorption factor

1 1/day = Child's daily consumption of drinking water

1000 = uncertainty factor due to animal experinent where the no-observed-effect level was not identi-

1/7 = child/adult body weight ratio

1/2 = factor to provide for equivalent toxicity on day 10 as noted on day five

As a matter of interest "Medical World News" contained a report of a six week old baby with jaundice and an enlarged liver; the baby was breast fed by a mother who was frequently

CLW 00'0 0 0 0 3 7 2 7 exposed to tetrachloroethylene in a dry cleaning establishment (Anonymous, 1978). The mother's milk contained perchloroethyl levels up to one mg %: The child's symptoms vanished when breast feeding was discontinued.

## Longer-Term SNARL:

A longer-term SNARL of 20 ug/l (rounded from the computation) can be estimated from a study by Navrotskii et al. (1971). The authors reported increased urinary urobilinogen and pathological changes in the parenchyma of the liver and kidneys of rabbits after inhalation exposure to 100 mg/m perchloroethylene for three to four hours/day for seven to 11 months. The calculations for a longer-term SNARL are:

$$\frac{(100 \text{ mg/m}^3)(4 \text{ m}^3/\text{day})(0.30)}{(1 \text{ l/day})(1000 \text{ uncertainty factor})(7)} = 0.017 \text{ mg/l}.$$

Where:

100 mg/m<sup>3</sup> = observed effect level.

4m<sup>3</sup> = according to Olsen and Gehring whereby the lung-whole body ratio for humans (adults) and rats (adults) are assumed to be roughly equivaled.

0.30 = absorption factor

1 l/day = child's consumption of drinking water

1/7 = child/adult body weight ratio.

1000 = uncertainty factor due to animal study where health effect was observed

Since tetrachloroethylene is considered a carcinogen, at least for mice, and using the risk etimates generated by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), it is possible to identify that range of tetrachloroethylene concentrations that would increase the risk of one excess cancer per 10° or 10° people exposed over a lifetime. From the NAS model it is estimated that consuming 2 1/day over a lifetime having a tetrachloroet concentration of 3.5 ug/l or 35 ug/l would increase the risk by one excess cancer/million exposed or one excess cancer/100 exposed, respectively. This is the range of risks where many EPA regulatory values for other carcinogens have been.

These risk extrapolations were based on an assumption that there is no threshold effect level for carcinogens. The state-of-the-art at the present time is such that no experime tools can accurately define the absolute numbers of excess tancer deaths attributable to tetrachloroethylene in drinking water. Due to biological variability and the number of accumptions required, each of the risk estimating procedures leads to a different value. There is wide variation between these estimates and also in their interpretation. For this

reason we report the results of the NAS risk computations, which is a conservative approach, as a range of values from one in 100,000 to one in 1,000,000 incremental risk (risk above background) for a carcinogen. The NAS risk estimates are based on the multistage model concept. "At low dose, the multistage model is often mathematically equivalent to the linear or single hit model. Therefore, its use for extrapolation is consistent with the conservative linear risk estimation. If the precise mechanism of carcinogenesis is represented by a threshold or log-normal dose response relationship, the multistage model may considerably over estimate the risk at low dose levels. However, this possibility cannot be reasonably quantified (NAS-1979).

In summary, the one-day, ten-day and longer-term SNARL values for tetrachloroethylene are 2300 ug/l, 175 ug/l and 20 ug/l, respectively, if drinking water is the only source of exposure. The concentrations resulting in a lifetime risk of 10 and 10 are 3.5 ug/l and 35 ug/l, respectively, if the contaminated drinking water was consumed over a lifetime. The longer-term SNARL of 20 ug/l tetrachloroethylene in drinking water may result in excess cancer risk of approximately six in one million, if the exposure was for a lifetime (70 years).

## APR 9 1980

Suggested Action Guidance - Tetrachloroethylene
Criteria and Standards Division
Office of Drinking Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C. 20460

The Office of Drinking Water, Criteria and Standards Division, recommends the following actions related to drinking water contamination from coated A/C pipe based upon its earlier document entitled "SNARL for tetrachloroethylene (February 6, 1980). This suggested action guidance should not imply that EPA condones the presence of any level of this contaminant in drinking water, but rather provides useful information to assist in the setting of control priorities in those cases where tetrachloroethylene has been found so as to minimize possible risks from exposure from drinking water.

Our recommendations for this situation include: (1) immediate remedial action (within 24 hours) if the drinking water concentration of tetrachloroethylene is found to exceed 2.3 mg/l (equivalent to our 1-day SNARL), and (2) remedial action within 10 days if the tetrachloroethylene concentration exceeds 0.13 mg/l (equivalent to our 10-day SNARL). Furthermore, the priority and timeliness of remedial actions should be proportional to the exposure level. For extended exposures, we recommend, in addition, that the drinking water supplies should be maintained at no more than 0.04 mg/l for any extended period. That concentration, if consumed over a lifetime at 2 1/day would, by a conservative estimation process, have an associated excess cancer risk of approximately one per 100,000. Thus, an additional safety margin is included since the source of this present exposure would be transient and variable, not lifetime. In light of the limited precision for estimating concentrations which may result in a particular computed risk and appreciating the variability in water concentrations over time, the 0.04 mg/l concentration is essentially equivalent to our longer-term SNARL of 0.02 mg/l where a margin of safety was incorporated to protect the 10 kg child from non-carcinogenic, adverse health effects from long term exposure.

In the derivation of the tetrachloroethylene SNARL, and of this suggested action guidance, it has been assumed that drinking water is the sole source of the exposure of an individual to this particular contaminant. In actuality, however, any individual is exposed to most substances via a variety of routes including air, food and drinking water. Even though the relative exposure from each source is location—dependent, it was estimated that a 10 kg child would be exposed on the average across the U.S. to 0.04 kg TCE/day with 94 percent, 4 percent, and < 1 percent coming from air, drinking water and food, respectively. We assume that the

The of absorption through the gastrointestinal tract for food and water is nearly 100 percent and that the rate of absorption via inhalation is approximately 30 percent. Further consideration should also be given to the fact that the amount of tetrachloroethylene exposure from air would be much higher for people working in dry-cleaning and metal degreasing industries. With the exception of occupational exposure to tetrachloroethylene, then, the body burden from non-impacted environmental sources and the associated background levels due to normal releases of tetrachloroethylene nationally are roughly equivalent to the longer-term SNARL of 0.02 mg/l or the suggested guidance of 0.04 mg/l (rounded from the 35 ug/l-SNARL). The suggested guidance would then pose, a risk which is essentially equivalent to that experienced from exposure to the national background levels.