

MINERAL OILS

**High Viscosity, Class I Medium and Low Viscosity, Class II Medium and Low Viscosity, and Class III Medium and Low Viscosity
(per the World Health Organization classification)**

ORAL RISK ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT



**NSF International
Ann Arbor, MI
September, 2004**

Copyright 2004 NSF International

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	NSF Risk Assessment Procedures	1
1.2	Evaluation of USP and Food Grade Mineral Oils by the World Health Organization	3
2.0	PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES	4
2.1	Organoleptic Properties	5
3.0	PRODUCTION AND USE	5
3.1	Production	5
3.2	Use	5
4.0	ANALYTICAL METHODS	6
4.1	Analysis in Water	6
4.2	Analysis in Biological Matrices	6
5.0	SOURCES OF HUMAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL EXPOSURE	6
5.1	Sources of Human Exposure	6
5.2	Sources of Environmental Exposure	7
6.0	COMPARATIVE KINETICS AND METABOLISM IN HUMANS AND LABORATORY ANIMALS	7
6.1	Absorption	7
6.2	Distribution	7
6.3	Metabolism	8
6.4	Elimination/Excretion	8
7.0	EFFECTS ON HUMANS	8
7.1	Irritation and Sensitization	8
7.2	Eye Irritation	8
7.3	Single-Exposure Studies	9
7.4	Repeated Dose Exposure	9
8.0	EFFECTS ON LABORATORY ANIMALS AND <i>IN VITRO</i> TEST SYSTEMS	9
8.1	Limited-Exposure Effects	10
8.1.1	<i>Irritation and Sensitization Studies</i>	10
8.1.2	<i>Ocular Exposure Studies</i>	10
8.2	Single-Exposure Studies	10
8.3	Short-Term Exposure Studies	10
8.4	Long-Term and Chronic Exposure Studies	10

8.4.1	<i>Subchronic Studies by BIBRA in F344 Rats</i>	11
8.4.2	<i>Subchronic Feeding Studies in F-344 and Sprague-Dawley CRL:CD Rats</i>	20
8.4.3	<i>Subchronic Feeding Studies in Long-Evans Rats and Beagle Dogs</i>	22
8.4.4	<i>Chronic Studies</i>	23
8.5	Studies of Genotoxicity and Related End-Points	23
8.6	Reproduction and Developmental Toxicity Studies	24
8.7	Studies of Immunological and Neurological Effects	24
9.0	RISK CHARACTERIZATION	24
9.1	Hazard Assessment	24
9.1.1	<i>Evaluation of Major Non-Cancer Effects and Mode of Action</i>	24
9.1.2	<i>Weight-of-Evidence Evaluation and Cancer Characterization</i>	26
9.1.3	<i>Selection of Key Study and Critical Effect</i>	27
9.1.4	<i>Identification of Susceptible Populations</i>	28
9.2	Dose-Response Assessment	28
9.2.1	<i>Uncertainty Factor Selection</i>	28
9.2.2	<i>Oral RfD Calculations</i>	30
9.3	Exposure Assessment	31
9.4	TAC Derivation	32
9.4.1	<i>TAC Derivation for High Viscosity Mineral Oils Based on P100 (H)</i>	32
9.4.2	<i>TAC Derivation for Class I Medium and Low Viscosity Mineral Oils</i>	32
9.4.3	<i>TAC Derivation for Class II Medium and Low Viscosity Mineral Oils</i>	33
9.4.4	<i>TAC Derivation for Class III Medium and Low Viscosity Mineral Oils</i>	33
9.5	STEL Derivation	33
9.5.1	<i>STEL Derivation for High Viscosity Mineral Oils Based on P100 (H)</i>	34
9.5.2	<i>STEL Derivation for Class I Medium and Low Viscosity Mineral Oils</i>	34
9.5.3	<i>STEL Derivation for Class II Medium and Low Viscosity Mineral Oils</i>	34
9.5.4	<i>STEL Derivation for Class III Medium and Low Viscosity Mineral Oils</i>	34
10.0	RISK MANAGEMENT	35
10.1	SPAC Derivation	35
10.1.1	<i>SPAC Derivation for High Viscosity Mineral Oils Based on P100 (H)</i>	35
10.1.2	<i>SPAC Derivation for Class I Medium and Low Viscosity Mineral Oils</i>	35
10.1.3	<i>SPAC Derivation for Class II Medium and Low Viscosity Mineral Oils</i>	35
10.1.4	<i>SPAC Derivation for Class III Medium and Low Viscosity Mineral Oils</i>	35
11.0	RISK COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS	35
12.0	REFERENCES	38
13.0	APPENDICES	44

13.1	Other CAS Registry Numbers for USP Mineral oil (ChemIDplus, 2003)	44
13.2	Other CAS Registry Numbers for Mineral oil (ChemIDplus, 2003).....	44
14.0	PEER REVIEW HISTORY	44

AUTHORS, PEER REVIEWERS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Author:

NSF Toxicology Services
1.800.NSF.MARK
NSF International
789 Dixboro Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

Disclaimer:

The responsibility for the content of this document remains solely with NSF International, and the author noted above should be contacted with comments or for clarification. Mention of trade names, proprietary products, or specific equipment does not constitute an endorsement by NSF International, nor does it imply that other products may not be equally suitable.

Internal NSF Peer Reviewers:

Clif McLellan, M.S.

External Peer Reviewers:

NSF gratefully acknowledges the efforts of the following experts on the NSF Health Advisory Board in providing peer review. These peer reviewers serve on a voluntary basis, and their opinions do not necessarily represent the opinions of the organizations with which they are affiliated.

Edward Ohanian, Ph.D. (Chair, NSF Health Advisory Board)
Director, Health and Ecological Criteria Division
Office of Science and Technology/Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Michael Dourson, Ph.D., DABT (Vice Chair, NSF Health Advisory Board)
Director
TERA (Toxicology Excellence for Risk Assessment)

David Blakey, D.Phil.
Director, Environmental Health Science
Safe Environments Programme
Health Canada

Steven Bursian, Ph.D.
Professor of Animal Science
Michigan State University

Randy Deskin, Ph.D., DABT
Director, Toxicology and Product Regulatory Compliance
Cytex Industries Inc.

Robert Hinderer, Ph.D.
Director of Health, Toxicology, and Product Safety
Noveon, Inc.

Jennifer Orme-Zavaleta, Ph.D.
Associate Director for Science
USEPA/NHEERL/WED

Calvin Willhite, Ph.D.
Department of Toxic Substances Control
State of California

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mineral Oil, USP or Food Grade – Oral Risk Assessment (oil classification per the World Health Organization)						
Mineral Oil Class	NOAEL mg/kg-day	Uncertainty Factor	Oral RfD, mg/kg-day	TAC^{1,4} mg/L	SPAC^{2,4} mg/L	STEL^{3,4} mg/L
High viscosity, ≥ 11 centistokes	2,000	100	20	700	70	700
Medium and low viscosity, Class I 8.5-11 centistokes	2,000	100	20	700	70	700
Medium and low viscosity, Class II 7.0-8.5 centistokes	200	100	2	40	4	40
Medium and low viscosity, Class III 3.0-7.0 centistokes	20 20 20	100	0.2	1	0.1	2
¹ Group TAC ² Group SPAC ³ Group STEL ⁴ The solubility of a mineral oil in actual use as a direct or indirect drinking water additive should not be exceeded.						
KEY STUDY and KEY REVIEWS	<p>BIBRA Toxicology International. 1992a. A 90-day feeding study in the rat with six different white mineral oils [N15(H), N70(H), N70(A), P15(H), N10(A), and P100(H)], three different mineral waxes (a low melting point wax, a high melting point wax and a high sulphur wax) and coconut oil. Sponsored by CONCAWE, Brussels, Belgium. Project no. 3.1010. Report no. 1010/3/92.</p> <p>BIBRA Toxicology International. 1992b. Ninety-day feeding study in Fischer 344 rats of highly refined petroleum-derived food-grade white oils and waxes. Presented in part at The Toxicology Forum Special Meeting on Mineral Hydrocarbons, Green College, Oxford, United Kingdom, Sept. 21-23, 1992 and The Toxicology Forum 1993 Annual Winter Meeting, The Capital Hilton, Washington, D.C., February 15-17, 1993.</p> <p>WHO (World Health Organization). 1995a. Evaluation of certain food additives and contaminants. Technical Report Series No. 859. Forty-fourth report of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives. Geneva.</p> <p>WHO (World Health Organization). 2002. Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives. Fifty-ninth meeting. Geneva 4-13 June 2002. Summary and Conclusions (full report in preparation).</p>					
CRITICAL EFFECTS	<p>The critical effects depended to some extent on the physical properties of the mineral oils tested. The two highest viscosity oils did not show any effects considered adverse at the highest dose tested. Other oils produced liver and/or spleen weight effects with liver granulomas or other liver pathology.</p>					
TOXICITY SUMMARY	<p>The available toxicology information on USP and food grade mineral oils has been summarized by the World Health Organization at a number of meetings of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives, and was not re-summarized in this document. The World Health Organization has taken the lead in the risk assessment of mineral oils, requesting or requiring additional studies as needed for clarification.</p> <p>It is clear from both human data and animal studies that mineral oil can accumulate to a small extent in organs and tissues. The liver is a target organ for the lower viscosity oils, based on liver weight effects, granulomas or micro-granulomas in the liver, and biochemical changes indicative of mild liver damage. Immune system effects of pigmented macrophages and lymph node histiocytosis have so far been observed in F-344 rats, but not in other rat strains or in Beagle dogs.</p> <p>Most genetic toxicity studies have shown that test results on mineral oils correlate directly with their polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon content, suggesting the oil itself is not genotoxic. Oral exposure of humans to USP or food grade mineral oil in food and pharmaceuticals over many decades has not produced any evidence of carcinogenicity. Several older long-term oral studies in laboratory animals have shown no evidence of carcinogenicity, although these studies were not conducted according to current regulatory guidelines. Since there are no human epidemiological studies and no adequate animal studies on mineral oil by the oral route, the <i>“data are inadequate for an assessment of human carcinogenic potential”</i>.</p>					
CONCLUSIONS	<p>The drinking water action levels derived in this document are based on NOAEL values from well conducted subchronic studies of well characterized mineral oils. Based on these NOAEL values and appropriate uncertainty factors, the action levels are considered protective of the public health.</p>					

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document has been prepared to allow toxicological evaluation of the unregulated contaminant **mineral oil** in drinking water, as an extractant from one or more drinking water system components evaluated under NSF/ANSI 61 (2003e), or as a drinking water treatment chemical evaluated under NSF/ANSI 60 (2003e). Both non-cancer and cancer endpoints have been considered, and risk assessment methodology developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) has been used. USP grade, white, and commercial mineral oils will be evaluated using criteria developed in this document, with potential impurities in the lower grades evaluated separately under the requirements of NSF/ANSI 60 (2003e) or 61 (2003e).

1.1 NSF Risk Assessment Procedures

Non-cancer endpoints are evaluated using the reference dose (RfD) approach (Barnes and Dourson, 1988; Dourson, 1994; U.S. EPA, 1993; U.S. EPA, 2002a), which assumes that there is a threshold for these endpoints that will not be exceeded if appropriate uncertainty factors (Dourson et al., 1996; U.S. EPA, 2002a) are applied to the highest dose showing no significant effects. This highest dose is derived from human exposure data when available, but more often is derived from studies in laboratory animals. Either the no-observed-adverse-effect level (NOAEL) taken directly from the dose-response data, or the calculated lower 95% confidence limit on the dose resulting in an estimated 10% increase in response (the LED₁₀ or BMDL₁₀ from benchmark dose programs) can be used (U.S. EPA, 2003a). The lowest-observed-adverse-effect level (LOAEL) can also be used, with an additional uncertainty factor, although the benchmark dose approach is preferred in this case. The RfD is expressed in mg/kg-day. It is defined by the U.S. EPA as “an estimate (with uncertainty spanning perhaps an order of magnitude) of a daily exposure to the human population (including sensitive subgroups) that is likely to be without an appreciable risk of deleterious effects during a lifetime” (Barnes and Dourson, 1988; U.S. EPA, 1993; U.S. EPA, 2003b).

NSF uses the RfD to derive three product evaluation criteria for non-cancer endpoints. The total allowable concentration (TAC), generally used to evaluate the results of extraction testing normalized to static at-the-tap conditions, is defined as the RfD multiplied by the 70 kg weight of an average adult assumed to drink two liters of water per day. A relative source contribution (RSC), to ensure that the RfD is not exceeded when food and other non-water sources of exposure to the chemical are considered, is also applied in calculating the TAC. The relative source contribution should be data derived, if possible. Alternately, a 20% default contribution for water can be used (U.S. EPA, 1991a). The TAC calculation is then as follows:

$$\text{TAC (mg/L)} = \frac{[\text{RfD (mg/kg-day)} \times 70 \text{ kg}] - [\text{total contribution of other sources (mg/day)}]}{2 \text{ L/day}}$$

or

$$\text{TAC (mg/L)} = \frac{\text{RfD (mg/kg-day)} \times 70 \text{ kg}}{2 \text{ L/day}} \times 0.2 \text{ (RSC)}$$