


JASPER COUNTY, MISSOURI SUPERFUND SITE

Childhood Follow-Up Lead Exposure Study:
Report to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry

January 23, 2002

Oranogo Dueweg
MAD 980165128
7.0
LDF 0736
01/23/02

Address comments to:
Gary W. McNutt
Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services
Section for Environmental Public Health
P. O. Box 570
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0570



All comments are due to the above named person and address by
5 p.m. CST on Monday, March 11, 2002

RECEIVED

FEB 05 2002

SUPERFUND DIVISION

This report was supported by funds provided to the Missouri Department of Health under Grant No. H75-ATH787866 from the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Public Health Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.



Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services

P.O. Box 570, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0570 Phone: 573-751-6400 FAX: 573-751-6010

Richard C. Dunn
Director



Bob Holden
Governor

RECEIVED

APR 28 2003

SUPERFUND DIVISION

April 21, 2003

Mr. Mark Doolan
SUPRFFSE
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7
901 North Fifth Street
Kansas City, KS 66101

Dear Mark:

The correction sheet for the Jasper Study Report has been completed. We are enclosing 10 copies of the Erratum sheet for the *Final Report Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Childhood 2000 Lead Exposure Study*.

If you need additional copies, please contact Lori Harris-Franklin of my staff.

Sincerely,

For Scott A. Clardy, Administrator
Section for Environmental Public Health

SAC:GMC:LJH:amh

www.dhss.state.mo.us

The Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services protects and promotes quality of life and health for all Missourians by developing and implementing programs and systems that provide: information and education, effective regulation and oversight, quality services, and surveillance of diseases and conditions.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY / AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER Services provided on a nondiscriminatory basis

Erratum

Page 11: Third paragraph under *Standard Reference Material*, the word medium should be median.

Page 13: The next to last paragraph, in the fourth line from the bottom the word medium should be median.

Page 15: Top line (n=44) should be (n=4)

Page 16: First line of the second paragraph, the word average should be deleted.

Page 38, Table 10: Seventh line under Response (2.6 ± 9.7) should be (0.87 ± 1.5)

Page 44, Table 10: Amount out-of-pocket money spent each week on meat, vegetables and milk products in this household: \$51-\$75 (70.9) should be (25.6)

Page 58, Table 13: Window stool should be windowsill

Page 65, Table 16: Window stool should be windowsill

Page 78, Figure 13: The word leading in the legend should be loading.

DISCLAIMER

Mention of the name of any company or product does not constitute endorsement by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, the Public Health Service, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, or the Missouri Department of Health.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Disclaimer	ii
List of Tables	v
List of Figures	vi
List of Appendices	vii
Abstract	1
Introduction	2
Rationale for Study.....	2
Study Hypotheses.....	3
Study Objectives.....	3
Background	4
Problem Statement.....	4
Relationship Between Lead Exposure, Risk Factors, Blood Lead Levels, and Health Problems.....	5
Vulnerability of Children to Lead Exposure.....	5
Adverse Health Effects in Children.....	5
Methods	6
Study Design.....	6
Study Census.....	6
Sample Size.....	6
Participant Selection and Recruitment.....	7
Data Collection.....	8
Informed Consent, IRB Approval and Safeguards for Protecting Confidentiality of Participants.....	8
Questionnaire.....	8
Blood Lead Analysis.....	8
Environmental Sampling and Analysis.....	9
Sampling Protocols.....	9
Sampling Locations.....	10
Sample Analysis Methods.....	10
Quality Control Measures.....	11
Standard Reference Material.....	11
Field Blanks.....	12
Data Entry.....	12
Data Analysis.....	12

	<u>Page</u>
Results.....	13
Census Information.....	13
Recruitment Information.....	13
Descriptive Statistics.....	13
Comparison Between Initial and Follow-up Study.....	15
Discussion.....	16
Study Strengths.....	17
Study Limitations.....	18
Conclusions.....	18
Recommendations.....	18
Authors and Acknowledgments.....	19
References.....	22
Tables.....	25
Figures.....	65
Appendices.....	79

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. – Laboratory Methods, Detection and Quantification Limits for Environmental Samples.....	25
Table 2. – Laboratory Quality Control Procedures.....	25
Table 3. – Quality Control Summary Results for Standard Reference Material and Duplicate Soil Samples.....	26
Table 4. – Quality Control Summary Results for Field Blanks.....	26
Table 5. – Number of residences determined from the census visits by student workers and the percent of each response.....	27
Table 6. – Results of multiple attempts to contact potential participants for the data collection.....	27
Table 7. – Results of contacts of potential study participants in the two study areas during the data collection	28
Table 8. – Reasons documented from potential participants that did not wish to participate.....	28
Table 9. – Mean and Standard Deviation Environmental and Blood Lead Results.....	29
Table 10. – Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study.....	30
Table 11. – Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response.....	44
Table 12. – Correlation Coefficients for Blood Lead Levels with Questionnaire Responses.....	56
Table 13. – Correlation Coefficients for Blood Lead Levels with Environmental Data.....	57
Table 14. – Questionnaire Responses by Factors and Group.....	58
Table 15. – Blood Lead and Environmental Data for Initial 1991 Study.....	63
Table 16. – Mean Blood Lead Levels and Environmental Measurements for Soil-Remediated Homes.....	64

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 1. – Cumulative frequency graph of blood lead levels.....	65
Figure 2. – Boxplots of dust lead levels.....	66
Figure 3. – Boxplots of soil lead levels.....	67
Figure 4. – Boxplots of lead paint levels.....	68
Figure 5. – Mean and 95% confidence interval for blood lead levels of children in the original and follow-up study.....	69
Figure 6. – Boxplots of soil lead levels for soil-remediated homes.....	70
Figure 7. – Average blood lead levels and 95% confidence intervals for children living in homes with or without interior lead based paint and dripline soil lead levels less than or greater than 800 ppm.....	71
Figure 8. – Average blood lead levels and 95% confidence intervals for children living in homes with or without interior lead based paint and dripline soil lead levels less than or greater than 400 ppm.....	72
Figure 9. – Average blood lead levels and 95% confidence intervals for children living in homes with or without interior lead based paint and yard soil lead levels less than or greater than 400 ppm.....	73
Figure 10. – Average blood lead levels and 95% confidence intervals for children living in homes with or without interior lead based paint and overall average soil lead levels less than or greater than 400 ppm.....	74
Figure 11. – Average blood lead levels and 95% confidence intervals for children living in homes with or without interior lead based paint and play area soil lead levels less than or greater than 250 ppm.....	75
Figure 12. – Scatterplot of blood lead levels and log of window sill composite dust wipe samples.....	76
Figure 13. – Scatterplot of blood lead levels and the log of dripline soil lead levels.....	77
Figure 14. – Scatterplot of blood lead levels and log of floor composite leading dust lead levels.....	78

LIST OF APPENDICES

	<u>Page</u>
Appendix 1 – Map of Study Area.....	1-1
Appendix 2 – Household Census Form.....	2-1
Appendix 3 – Power Calculation.....	3-1
Appendix 4 – Sampling Teams.....	4-1
Appendix 5 – Consent Forms.....	5-1
Appendix 6 – Questionnaire.....	6-1
Appendix 7 – Blood Sampling Protocol.....	7-1
Appendix 8 – Sample Blood Lead Result Letters.....	8-1
Appendix 9 – Sample Environmental Results Letters.....	9-1
Appendix 10 – Chain of Custody Form.....	10-1
Appendix 11 – Environmental Sampling Protocols.....	11-1
Appendix 12 – Environmental Sampling Forms.....	12-1

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine whether intervention efforts initiated in Jasper County, Missouri since the 1991 Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Lead and Cadmium Exposure Study have been effective in reducing the mean blood lead levels of children residing in the area. The mean blood lead level for the Original Study was 6.24 µg/dl (geometric mean and standard deviation 4.97 ± 1.96 µg/dl) and for this study was 3.81 µg/dl (3.28 ± 1.73 µg/dl). Blood lead levels declined by approximately 40% between 1991 and 2000 ($p < 0.001$). This is an average decline of 4% per year. The proportion of blood lead levels greater than or equal to 10 µg/dl in the initial study was 14% (32/243), and 2% (4/213) in the follow-up study ($p < .000$).

The results of this study indicated that educational and environmental interventions initiated since 1991 to reduce blood lead levels of children living in the mining waste and smelter areas of Jasper County, Missouri have been effective. Only two percent of the children tested had blood lead levels greater than ten µg/dl.

INTRODUCTION

RATIONALE FOR STUDY

This study was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of environmental and health educational interventions to reduce childhood lead poisoning in the Jasper County Superfund site. The study compares blood lead and environmental data collected in the 1991 Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Lead and Cadmium Exposure Study to data collected in a new cohort of children who should have benefited from these interventions.

The 1991 exposure study was funded by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) through an interagency agreement with the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR).¹ This study examined blood lead levels and urine cadmium levels in people living in areas affected by the past mining activities at the Jasper County Superfund Site compared to a control group of people living in an area where no lead mining related activities occurred. Children between the ages of 6 and 72 months, youth, and adults were evaluated.

Urine cadmium levels were not significantly different between the control and study populations and only children were found to have blood lead levels higher than control children. Mean blood lead levels were almost twice as high in children living in the study area as compared to those in the control area [$6.25 \pm 4.86(\text{SD})$ and 3.59 ± 1.88 $\mu\text{g/dl}$]. As a result, 14% of the study children had blood lead levels ≥ 10 $\mu\text{g/dl}$, the level set by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) at which intervention was required. None of the children in the control area had elevated levels.

The mean blood lead levels in the study group remained significantly higher than those in the control area after adjustment for behavioral, demographic, and socio-economic variables. After dust, soil, water and indoor paint lead levels were controlled, the differences disappeared, suggesting that environmental factors accounted for the differences in blood lead levels.

Since the results of that study were released, major intervention efforts at the Jasper County Superfund site have been initiated with the goal of reducing the mean blood lead levels of all children and thereby reducing the proportion of children with elevated blood lead levels. The major interventions were replacement of lead contaminated soil in residential and day care yards and an aggressive community education campaign. As of June 2000, EPA had remediated 2,288 residential yards. An additional 51 homes were remediated as of October 18, 2000. The health education campaign incorporated lead poisoning awareness into local school curricula, published site-specific coloring/story books, and developed a lead poisoning prevention merit badge for a local Girl Scouts' chapter. In addition, educators made presentations at grand rounds in area hospitals, and distributed flyers, magnets, and other materials to raise awareness about childhood lead poisoning and its prevention.

In addition to the soil removal, the EPA currently provides funding for lead education, outreach and expanded blood-lead screening activities among children in the area around the Jasper County site. In addition, funds from a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant were used to increase the number of lead screenings and to address lead hazards in homes of children with elevated blood-lead levels. Prior to the study reported here, there has been no systematic attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of these lead intervention programs. While both programs have funded lead screening, screening cannot answer the question of whether the interventions have been effective in reducing lead poisoning of children living in this community. Screenings are not random but are skewed to high-risk children. The original exposure study was conducted on a random sampling of the population prior to the interventions. The current study replicated the original study by examining a random sampling of eligible children from the same area as the original study nine years after the original study.

The original study evaluated children, youth, and adults. Children were found to be at highest risk for lead exposure, therefore, only children six to 72 months of age were selected for the current study. This age period is when children exhibit considerable hand-to-mouth behavior.

Study Hypotheses

1. The prevalence of elevated blood lead levels of children living in the Jasper County lead mining area will be lower than prevalence levels determined during the 1991 exposure study.
2. The mean blood lead levels of children living in the Jasper County lead mining area will be lower than mean levels determined during a 1991 exposure study.
3. Average environmental lead levels will be lower than those reported in 1991.

Study Objectives

The objective of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the soil remediation activities of EPA and the public health remedial actions of local public health officials by:

1. Measuring exposure to lead by analyzing blood from Jasper County children.
2. Comparing blood lead levels between 1991 and the present study.
3. Measuring environmental sources of lead.
4. Comparing average environmental lead levels between 1991 and the present study.
5. Evaluating whether recontamination of the remediated yards occurred.

6. Evaluating the relation between blood lead levels and environmental sources of lead.
7. Determining the relation between blood lead levels and behavioral risk factors.

BACKGROUND

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The Jasper County Superfund Site, listed as the Oronogo-Duenweg Mining Belt Site, Jasper County, was added to the National Priorities List in 1990. Jasper County is located in extreme southwest Missouri (See Appendix 1 for area map). The site is part of the Tri-State Mining District, which covers approximately a 2,500-square mile area in southwestern Missouri, southeastern Kansas, and northeastern Oklahoma. Mining, milling, and smelting of Tri-State District lead and zinc ore dates back to 1850 and continued in the district until the 1970's. Mining operations in this region generated several types of waste materials associated with the physical removal and refining of ore from both surface mines and underground mines including mine wastes (non-ore waste rock and overburden), mill wastes (crushed ore wastes and fine tailings), and smelter-related materials (slag, fugitive dust, and air emissions fallout).

Processing of the ore in Jasper County resulted in approximately 150 million tons of wastes. Of these, approximately nine million tons remain interspersed unevenly throughout an area of approximately 250 square miles. These wastes have been distributed over time by both human and natural activities. The wastes contain heavy metals such as lead, cadmium, and zinc. Smelting was conducted at various locations throughout Jasper County during the 1800's. At least 17 major smelters were operating at the site in the late 1800's, mostly in the Joplin, MO area. After the turn of the century, all smelting in Jasper County was conducted at the Eagle-Picher smelter in northwest Joplin. Residential areas of approximately 5,000 homes within the identified zone of contamination surround this smelter, however, EPA has determined that most of the soil contamination is related to mill waste except for contamination related to the Eagle-Picher smelter.

The wastes from the mining, milling, and smelting of the ore have significantly contaminated surface soil, surface water, and groundwater. Approximately 470 homes on the eastern side of the site rely on private groundwater wells. The EPA has determined that at least 100 of these wells exceeded health-based action levels for heavy metals such as lead and cadmium. At least 2,300 residential yards in northwest Joplin, around the Eagle-Picher smelter, were contaminated with lead above acceptable levels. Additionally, EPA determined that yard soil in approximately 200 homes built on or near milling waste piles exceeded acceptable levels of lead.

Exposures in the study area are due to contact with ambient air dust, indoor house dust, soil, and water. For this study, ingestion of soil, dust, and particulate matter was considered the most relevant exposure pathway.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEAD EXPOSURE, RISK FACTORS, BLOOD LEAD LEVELS AND HEALTH PROBLEMS

Vulnerability of Children to Lead Exposure

Lead exposure can affect the health of people regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, or socio-economic status. However, lead exposure can be most harmful to infants and children. Young children are at the highest risk because of their hand-to-mouth behavior, which increases the likelihood of exposure to lead in paint, dust, and soil. In addition, once lead has entered the intestinal tract, young children tend to absorb it more readily than adults. Lead exposure even at levels as low as 10 µg/dl in children has been shown to affect the brain and nervous system resulting in reduced intelligence and attention span and in learning and behavioral problems.² The neurotoxic and other adverse health effects of lead exposure are described below.

Adverse Health Effects In Children

The CDC considers lead poisoning the number one preventable pediatric health problem facing children today.³ At low levels of exposure, several signs of lead toxicity have been described. Since lead is ubiquitous in the environment, all individuals, particularly children, are exposed.⁴ Currently 890,000 children nation wide have blood lead levels greater than 10 µg/dl.⁵ Lead has been shown to cause adverse affects between 10-25 µg/dl, with a critical blood level of around 10 µg/dl.⁶⁻¹¹ According to McMichael,¹² a 2-3 point IQ deficit occurs with each 10 µg/dl increment. A recent study by Lanphear et al. suggests deficits in cognitive and academic skills associated with lead exposure occur at blood lead concentrations lower than 5 µg/dL.¹³

The primary pathways of exposure include inhalation of dust particles and ingestion of leaded paint chips. Lead exposure is greatest in indoor dust, where the contaminants are dispersed, trapped, and settled over a confined area.^{14,15} In areas with high soil and water lead, these environmental sources also play a significant role in blood lead levels.¹

Studies have shown that exposure to lead particles is associated with adverse health affects, particularly among individuals exposed to persistent, low-level doses. Possible adverse affects include: delayed reaction time, distractibility, disorganization, impulsivity, restlessness, hypertension, mental and behavioral perturbations such as hyperactivity, violence, learning disabilities, reduced IQ, and diminished attention span.¹⁶⁻¹⁹ Several studies provide evidence that blood lead levels between 10-25 µg/dl adversely affect children's cognition.²⁰⁻³⁰

METHODS

STUDY DESIGN

Children between 6 and 72 months of age living in the study area for at least 60 days prior to the beginning of the study were qualified to participate. In order to recruit children who had the greatest likelihood of lead exposure from contaminated soil, the study was carried out during summer when children were most likely to have spent time outside. The 1991 study was conducted during this same period. Data from 1991 was compared to data collected during the present study.

STUDY CENSUS

In order to locate children currently living in the study area, a census of all households was conducted. Student workers from Missouri Southern State College (MSSC) were trained on February 9, 2000. Missouri Department of Health (MDOH), MSSC, and Jasper County Health Department (JCHD) representatives participated in the training session. Background information on the site as a former mining area was presented and students were taught how to complete the census form. In addition, the students were taught interview techniques. The training also provided an opportunity for local media to ask questions and report on the study. Local media outlets were helpful in informing the public that students would be working in the area. Police departments from Carterville, Duenweg, Joplin, Oronogo, Webb City, and the Jasper County Sheriff's Department were notified by phone, mail, and fax of the study activities. All students were issued photo identification cards. Each city mayor was also informed of the activities.

A census interview team visited each house and if a respondent was present standard census information was recorded on forms that were entered into a computer base from which a random sample of homes with children would be drawn (see Appendix 2). If there was no response, a minimum of four additional visits were made on different days of the week and at different times of the day.

Census forms were completed on ten percent of the homes a second time with different census takers for quality assurance. All forms were reviewed for accuracy and, if necessary, were followed up with another contact for completion and/or correctness.

SAMPLE SIZE

Data from the 1990 U. S. census was updated to 1996 values using birth and death records to estimate the number of children between the ages of 6 and 72 months in the study area. Using this data, it was estimated that 797 children resided in the study area in 1996. This number was used to approximate the number of children potentially available for this study.

We planned to enroll 350 children into two groups. The first group was a random sample of 250 children from the original study area, (a similar number as in the first exposure study). An additional 100 children from homes in areas affected by smelter activities but outside the original study area was added to gather more information about children living in neighborhoods that may have received soil remediation (the oversample group). The 250 children in the main study group would allow us to detect a decline of 7% in elevated blood lead levels of 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ from the 1991 study with a power of .85 and an alpha of .05. Although the homes included in the oversample area were not part of the original study, blood lead levels can still be compared to the original control group because it is considered representative of children living in a non-mining area of the State. A decline of 15% for the 100 children in the oversample could be detected. We assumed that the standard deviation for this study, both original area and oversample, was similar to that of the 1991 study, therefore, a sample size of 250 will allow us to detect a 2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ decline in mean blood lead levels at a power of .99 and an alpha of .05. For a sample size of 100, a 2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ change in blood lead levels results in a power of .78 with an alpha of .05. (See Appendix 3).

Sample sizes are calculated to assure that adequate numbers of children are sampled so that the investigators can be reasonably certain that any differences between the initial and follow-up study are not the result of chance.

PARTICIPANT SELECTION AND RECRUITMENT

Using the census data, all households with children age 6-72 months were identified. A list of randomly selected individuals was generated from the computerized census database. Individuals on this list were contacted in an attempt to recruit them into the study.

Recruitment training began on June 12, 2000. Actual recruitment for participants began on June 15, 2000. The first environmental assessment/blood drawing appointments occurred on June 19, 2000. Recruitment contacts were conducted by phone or by door-to-door visits until contact was made resulting in agreement to participate or refusal. A minimum of eight attempts were made at varying times of day and days of the week. Homes that had new occupants or were found to be vacant were removed from the recruiting list. If no one was home during a door-to-door visit, a note was left explaining the study and requesting that the resident contact the JCHD with a response. Recruitment of the oversample began on August 11, 2000, and the last environmental assessment and blood drawing was completed on October 2, 2000. Recruiting attempts continued into November, however, no home visits occurred because eligible participants did not consent to participate.

Several problems hindered the participant recruitment. There were a large number of families that had already had their children tested for lead, received a negative result, and felt it unnecessary to retest them. There were also several residences that had new occupants or had become vacant after the census data was obtained. Some eligible

participants' phone numbers were disconnected or incorrect. Attempts were followed by several visits to the home by the team. During the course of the study, some people who were successfully contacted made an appointment, and then cancelled or withdrew from the study.

DATA COLLECTION

A team consisting of a pediatric phlebotomist or registered nurse and an environmental specialist went to each home where parents/guardians gave consent to have their child participate in the study. (See Appendix 4). After receiving informed consent, the phlebotomist or registered nurse administered a questionnaire that included information on the child and on the household and then obtained a venous blood sample. Concurrently, the environmental specialist collected environmental samples from the home and yard. Training of these professionals conducting home visits took place between June 12, 2000 and June 15, 2000. Study investigators observed the activities for two weeks following training and intermittently throughout the study for QA purposes.

INFORMED CONSENT, IRB APPROVAL AND SAFEGUARDS FOR PROTECTING CONFIDENTIALITY OF PARTICIPANTS

This project was reviewed and approved by the MDOH Institutional Review Board (IRB). Identifiers such as child's name were replaced with a unique identification number. This number was used on all forms and data associated with the participant. All data collected from the study and the list of participant identification numbers remain in a locked file cabinet to protect participants' confidentiality. All participants' parents/guardians signed a consent form prior to initiation of the study. Samples of all consent forms are in Appendix 5.

QUESTIONNAIRE

All participants were administered a survey questionnaire. Parents/guardians were asked to provide questionnaire information for their child. The primary purpose of the questionnaire was to document demographic, behavioral, occupational, and educational information. Behavior that increases risk of exposure to contaminated environmental media and other possible factors related to lead exposure was also documented. The questionnaire included all of the questions from the 1991 Jasper County Exposure Study and several additional assessment questions. The questionnaire contained 116 questions and was completed in approximately 45 minutes. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix 6.

BLOOD LEAD ANALYSIS

Venous blood samples were obtained and analyzed for blood lead levels in accordance with CDC protocols.³¹ Blood lead levels were analyzed by the CDC Division of Environmental Health Laboratory Sciences (DEHLS), which is the same lab used in the 1991 study. Each sample received a laboratory identification number and was sent to

the laboratory in a blind fashion. The minimum detection limit for the MDOH laboratory was <5 , however, all values were quantified for the CDC laboratory results. The CDC results were used for all analyses. Duplicate blood samples were taken on 10% of the samples and submitted to the MDOH State Public Health Laboratory for analysis. For control of quality in laboratories, duplicate inter-laboratory samples must be within 20% of each other. All duplicate inter-laboratory samples were within this range. All blood lead values reported by the CDC laboratory that were less than $5 \mu\text{g/dl}$ were also identified by the MDOH Laboratory as less than five. For the 11 values that could be quantified, those greater than $5 \mu\text{g/dl}$, the reliability of the blood lead analysis was .99 (Cronbach Alpha). The protocol for blood sampling is Appendix 7.

Attempts to notify participants of elevated blood lead results began as soon as blood lead results were received. Participants were called or visits were made to their homes within three days after the JCHD received results for elevated blood levels of lead. In addition, written results were sent to participants within four weeks after they were received from the laboratory. Sample letters for disclosure of blood lead results to study participants are Appendix 8.

ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS

Outdoor soil, drinking water from private wells, and household dust samples were collected for total lead analyses at the residence of each study participant. Selected interior and exterior painted surfaces of each residence that might potentially have been a source of lead exposure to the study population were evaluated for lead content using a portable X-ray fluorescence (XRF) monitor. Quality control (QC) measures were practiced during all procedures.

Written notifications of environmental sampling results were sent to participants within four weeks of the time they were received from the laboratory. Sample letters for disclosure of environmental results to study participants are in Appendix 9.

Sampling protocols for this study differed from those used in the initial 1991 study. In the initial study, soil lead levels were collected as a composite of the whole yard excluding the drip line. Because we wanted to better characterize the soil lead levels during the follow-up study, composite samples were taken from several locations. Dust samples in the initial study were collected using a vacuuming system. Since the initial study was completed, this system has been found to be less reliable than dust wipes, therefore, dust wipes in place of vacuuming was used in the follow-up study. In the initial study, only indoor paint levels were measured while in the follow-up study both indoor and outdoor paint levels were measured.

SAMPLING PROTOCOLS

All personnel wore disposable gloves when collecting samples, and changed gloves between collections of different sample types. Outdoor soil and indoor dust wipe samples were collected and stored in 50 ml centrifuge tubes with screw tops (or

equivalent). Samples were numbered in consecutive order on pre-printed labels. Sample identification number, descriptions, and source of all samples were recorded in project log sheets at the time of sampling. Only the sample numbers were coded on the sample chain-of-custody form (Appendix 10). These were the only identifier available for the laboratory. Environmental sampling protocols are in Appendix 11.

Sampling Locations

Three composite outdoor soil sample types were collected. These represented the general yard non-play area, dripline area within three feet of structure walls, and yard primary play area of the child. General yard area (non-play area) soil samples assessed environmental sources other than exterior paint that may have contained lead. Samples from the dripline determine the contribution of exterior lead paint and other sources, such as ambient airborne particulate sources, which may have impacted the house structure and washed off with precipitation. Samples from the child's primary play area assessed site-specific exposure potential.

The interior of the home was evaluated for lead paint and lead dust levels. Indoor testing locations were the child's bedroom, child's main play area and kitchen. The child's bedroom and main play area have been evaluated in past investigations and results suggest these rooms may be high-risk areas for exposure to lead if it is present.³² The main play area has been found to consist of three possible areas that differ from house to house: a separate play room, living room or family room. The kitchen was added as a third location based on previous investigations that suggested this room is a location where young children spend significant time and because they engage in hand to mouth exposure through food items. Individual dust wipe samples were obtained in each room from one windowsill, one vinyl miniblind (if present), and the floor. Lead-based paint determination was performed using an XRF on windows, doors, walls, ceilings and other locations as indicated on Form 110 (See Appendix 12). Lead content of miniblinds was determined using an XRF (See Appendix 12). Outdoor paint from walls, windows, doors and porches as shown in Form 120 (See Appendix 12) was evaluated for each residence. The physical condition of each painted surface tested was noted.

Drinking water was tested from the kitchen faucet for lead in those homes supplied from private wells (See Appendix 11). The previous study did not indicate exposure to lead through public water sources.

SAMPLE ANALYSIS METHODS

All soil and dust wipe samples were analyzed for total lead content with inductively coupled plasma (ICP) or atomic absorption (AA) spectrophotometry by TC Analytics and Metropolitan Laboratories of Norfolk, VA (Table 1). The MDOH Laboratory tested water samples.

QUALITY CONTROL MEASURES

The laboratories performing environmental soil and dust wipe analysis and/or preparing quality assurance samples were members of the Environmental Lead Lab Accreditation Program (ELLAP) and were successful participants in the Environmental Lead Proficiency and Analytical Testing (ELPAT) program. Primary quality control (QC) was handled through the use of laboratories with good laboratory practice (Table 2), as evidenced by their accreditation through the AIHA Laboratory Accreditation Program for the ELLAP, and the laboratories satisfactory participated in the ELPAT program with satisfactory proficiency. For laboratory instrument calibration results outside of the criteria listed in table 2, all samples within the specific sample batch were re-analyzed. The Quality Assurance protocols are included within each sampling method and are attached in Appendix 11.

Standard Reference Material

Standard reference material samples (SRM's) were inserted into the sampling chain-of-custody protocol in the same manner as field samples to monitor the laboratory's analytical performance (Table 3). These samples also provided laboratory analysis analytic recovery information for assessing the accuracy and precision of field sample data through sample preparation and analysis activities. It should be noted, however, that the accuracy and precision achieved for field samples is partially dependent on the matrix matching between the QC sample and field sample since analytical results are generally matrix sensitive. It is not possible to completely match the matrix of the field sample. Dust wipe SRM's were prepared using National Institute of Standard Testing (NIST) Lead Paint Dust Standard Powdered Lead Based Paint SRM 2582. Soil SRM's were prepared using NIST Standard Montana Soil SRM 2710 and 2711.

A summary of the SRM (Blind Reference) sample results is shown in Table 3. Actual concentration values obtained are not shown. Instead, the relative percent difference (RPD) between the reported lab results to the expected SRM concentrations is reported. The analysis of blind reference materials showed good recovery and accuracy by the laboratories. An accepted RPD for SRM samples of this type is from 25% to 30% of the expected value. The mean RPD and confidence limits for the SRM's dust wipe samples falls within this range. Although the mean soil SRM results are less than 30%, the 95% upper confidence limit slightly exceeds this (31.8%). Values above an RPD of 30% were not consistently reported, and the differences in real values were low. Overall SRM RPD's are acceptable. The overall intended frequency of SRM submittals of soil was achieved, and was exceeded for dust wipes.

An additional laboratory check was performed on a subset of soil samples. Both laboratories analyzed a second aliquot of 20 randomly selected soil samples. The results are shown in Table 3. These are real world samples with varying substrate consistency within a sample, and not a uniform substrate such as the SRM's, and a greater variation between laboratory results may be acceptable. Although the variation is somewhat higher than expected (mean - 37.3%), the median was only 16.3%. This overall mean is driven by two outlier values, that when removed result in a mean RPD of 20%.

Field Blanks

Field blanks are identical to regular field samples, except that no sample is actually collected. Field blanks provide information on the extent of contamination resulting from a combination of laboratory processing and field handling. The field blank samples were analyzed for lead. A summary of the field blank results is presented in Table 4. Analysis of field blanks indicated no contamination or interference from the field sampling collection media during field use, shipment, and handling. Only two out of 13 glove wipe samples were reported to be above the laboratory reported level of quantification, and except for glove wipe samples, over 90% of all values are below laboratory reported levels of detection. The submission frequency of all field blanks except glove wipes exceeded the intended rate.

DATA ENTRY

A contractor trained in data entry entered all responses to the questionnaire and the environmental sample results into a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) database. A 100% recheck of all variables was performed before data analysis was initiated.

DATA ANALYSIS

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for analysis. Specifically, the statistical analysis was comprised of:

- Descriptive statistics of frequencies, proportions, means, and standard deviations on blood lead, environmental dust, soil and paint, and questionnaire data;
- Calculation of mean blood lead levels between various risk factor groups;
- Correlations between blood lead levels with scaled questionnaire responses and environmental sample results;
- Comparison of mean blood lead between the 1991 and 2000 samples by student t-test and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) adjusting for potential confounding variables;
- Comparison of questionnaire responses between the 1991 and 2000 studies by chi square and Fisher's exact test for categorical data and t-test for scaled data;
- Comparison of proportion of children with blood lead levels above 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ between the two periods using Fisher's exact test;
- Boxplots and error bar graphs of blood lead and environmental data.

All variables were evaluated for normality and log transformation of data was performed as needed.

The national trend of declining blood lead levels reported by NHANES was reviewed to assist with interpretation of the decline in blood lead levels found in the follow-up study.³³

RESULTS

Census Information

All census data was collected and the quality assurance completed by June 2, 2000. Through a total of 17,288 attempted home contacts, the census identified a total of 957 households that reported a child between 6-72 months of age in residence. The response rate for the census data collection was 89.1%, compared to 82% in 1991 (Table 5).

Recruitment Information

Table 6 reports the number of attempts made to contact guardians of eligible children. The percentage of eligible participants who agreed to participate in the follow-up study (34%, Table 7) was similar to the percentage in the original study (36%). Documentation of the reasons eligible participants chose not to participate is given in Table 8.

Descriptive Statistics

Data was collected from a random sample of 215 homes in the same geographical area as the original 1991 sample and from a random sample of 72 homes in the oversample area, however, only 213 and 71 blood lead levels were obtained from the participants, respectively. This oversample area was included to increase the number of homes that received soil remediation from EPA. All tables include data from homes in both the original study area and the oversample area unless otherwise indicated.

Mean blood lead levels of children recruited into the 2000 follow-up sample and mean dust, soil, and paint lead levels of the homes and yards of those children are presented in Table 9. The table shows both homes in the study area and homes from the study area combined with the 72 homes in the adjacent area. Both the arithmetic and geometric blood lead levels are indicated because the blood lead levels were skewed toward lower blood lead levels. The values for the study area and oversample area combined were similar to the study area alone.

The cumulative frequency distribution of blood lead levels is presented in Figure 1. Seventy six percent of the blood lead values were below 5 $\mu\text{g/dl}$ and 97% were below 10 $\mu\text{g/dl}$. In the 1991 study only 85% of the blood lead levels were below 10 $\mu\text{g/dl}$.

Figures 2, 3, and 4 show boxplots of the medians, quartiles, outliers, and extreme cases of indoor dust, soil, and indoor and outdoor paint lead levels, respectively. The box length is the interquartile range, outliers are cases that fall 1.5 to 3 box lengths from the

top and bottom of the box while extreme cases are greater than 3 box lengths from either end of the box. These plots are a graphical means of indicating the variability in the environmental data. A considerable number of dust, paint, and soil measures were more than three quartiles from the medium value, which indicates substantial variation in these measurements. Because of this variation and the skewness of the data, environmental data was log transformed before the data was correlated with other data and before it was used in analysis of covariance.

Table 10 lists the proportional responses to categorical items, means and standard deviations for scaled data that were collected via interview. The mother of the child completed more than 84% of the questionnaires. Slightly more of the children tested were male and most of them were Caucasian. Only 22% of the children came from households with a family income greater than \$40,000. Most of the heads of household had a high school or higher education and 60% owned their homes. The mother was the head of the household in 30% of the homes. Less than 2% of the homes had lead water pipes with most having plastic and were on public water. Almost 40% of the homes had wood exterior. Within the last year prior to the study, 39% of the homes had some type of home repair. Most of the homes were air-conditioned. Only a few individuals had hobbies that would expose them or their household to lead. The most frequent lead related job was auto body repair and maintenance followed by wire or cable cutting and splicing. Only 3 individuals worked in mining or a mining related job. Approximately half the homes had a cigarette smoker in the household. Less than 3% of the children breastfeed while 25% take a bottle. Fourteen percent of the children play on lead mine waste at least some of the time. A quarter of the children suck their thumb or finders and 25% chew their fingernails. Sixty percent of the children put things other than food in their mouths at least some of the time but few children put paint chips in their mouths.

Table 11 presents the mean blood lead levels for the questionnaire categories. There were few substantial differences in mean blood lead levels between categories. On average children living in air conditioned homes had blood lead levels 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ lower than children living in non-air conditioned homes. The 19 children who living in homes where a family member welded had higher blood lead levels than other children. Children in homes with cigarette smokers also had higher blood lead levels than homes without cigarette smokers.

The univariate relationship between children's blood lead levels and scaled demographic, economic, social, and behavioral factors are indicated by correlation coefficients in Table 12. Younger children have higher blood lead levels than older children. Older homes had children with higher blood lead levels. The more often that a child's bedroom is cleaned the higher the blood lead level. This might be related to rooms with more dust requiring more frequent cleaning. The more often a child plays in dirt compared to grass, the higher their blood lead levels.

Table 13 shows blood lead levels correlated with log transformed environmental data. These correlations were recalculated using log transformed blood lead levels but this did not appreciably change the correlation coefficients and, therefore, they are not

reported. Most of the environmental measures were positively associated with blood lead levels. The higher the reported dust, soil, and paint lead levels, the higher the blood lead levels.

Comparison Between Initial and Follow-up Study

Figure 5 presents a comparison of mean blood lead levels between the initial study and the follow-up study. The mean blood lead level for the Original Study was 6.24 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ (geometric mean and standard deviation $4.97 \pm 1.96 \mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$) and for the Follow-Up Study was 3.81 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ ($3.28 \pm 1.73 \mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$). Blood lead levels declined by approximately 40% between 1991 and 2000 ($p < 0.001$). Mean blood lead levels adjusted (analysis of covariance) for several factors that were significantly different between study periods (family income, education of head of household, if child played in grassy area, and if child took snacks outside) were 6.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ for the original study and 3.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ for the follow-up study ($p < .000$). The proportion of blood lead levels greater than or equal to 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ in the initial study was 14% (32), and 2% (4) in the follow-up study ($p < .000$).

Table 14 compares proportional answers to selected questionnaire data between study periods. Children spent significantly more time at a babysitter in the initial study than during the follow-up study but less time in a day care center. Children were more likely to spend time playing in grassy areas in the follow-up study compared to the initial study.

Environmental data is not directly comparable between the two study periods because the techniques used were different. In the 1991 study, dust lead was reported as an average for the whole house and dust was collected using a vacuum system. In addition, paint lead levels were reported as the average of indoor samples; outdoor samples were not taken. Finally, soil samples were composited from the entire yard excluding the dripline. Table 15 shows the average environmental findings of the original study.

Table 16 shows the mean blood lead levels of children and environmental measures in homes where the EPA replaced the soil and homes where soil was not replaced. Although the mean blood lead levels were significantly higher in the children living in homes that received soil remediation ($p < .001$), the indoor and outdoor paint levels were also higher in those homes. In addition, the income level and educational level of the parents living in homes that received soil remediation were lower. Analysis of covariance adjusting for paint lead levels, income, and education levels indicated that there was no significant difference ($p < .59$) between blood lead levels in soil-remediated homes compared to non-remediated homes after adjustment. Figure 6 shows boxplots of the soil lead levels in the soil-remediated homes.

Figures 7 through 11 are error bar graphs of blood lead levels for children living in homes that were grouped according to the presence or absence of lead paint inside the home and according to different soil lead levels. Figure 7 shows blood lead levels in homes that either had or did not have lead paint present, and where the dripline soil lead

levels were greater than or less than 800 ppm. Figure 8 is similar to Figure 7, but the dripline soil lead levels were greater than or less than 400 ppm. Figure 9 is for yard soil greater than or less than 400 ppm. Figure 10 is for overall soil levels, and Figure 11 is for play-area soil lead levels.

Figures 12 through 14 show scatterplots of soil and dust lead levels with blood lead levels. The environmental data are presented in log form so that the distribution can be better visualized.

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this study was to evaluate the change in children's blood lead levels between 1991 and 2000 in the Jasper County Superfund Site in Jasper County, Missouri to determine the effectiveness of environmental and educational interventions. A secondary objective was to evaluate blood lead levels of children living in homes that had undergone subsequent soil remediation. There was a 40% decline in average blood lead levels between the initial study and the follow-up study. These differences remained after adjusting for differences in demographic and behavioral factors between the two studies. In the initial study, 14% of the children tested had blood lead levels greater than or equal to 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$. Nine years later the proportion of children with elevated blood lead levels declined to only 2%.

The average geometric mean blood lead level for children 1–5 years of age in phase 2 (1991–1994) of NHANES III was 2.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$. Blood lead levels declined to 2.0 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ in the NHANES 1999 survey. This was a 7.5% decline over five to eight years. Although the data on blood lead levels of children in NHANES is not comparable to that on children living in a lead mining area, the NHANES data does estimate the national decline in blood lead levels. The percent decline in blood lead levels for Jasper County is substantially greater than the national decline indicating that soil remediation and community education measures taken during this period were responsible for the decline in blood lead levels.

Reasons for this dramatic decline in blood lead levels are multifaceted. The EPA has replaced soil in approximately 2,288 homes during the period from 1991 to the initiation of the follow-up study. The Jasper County Health Department has been active in community education. It has worked with local radio, television, and print media to increase awareness in the community of the hazards of lead exposure in children, and have provided information on how to reduce exposure through improved home cleaning, personal hygiene, and nutrition. The Citizens Task Force developed a site-specific coloring and story book, a Girl Scout merit badge, and public school health education curriculum. In addition, five homes have been paint abated or stabilized using HUD funds, and 95 homes have been refurbished using community development block grant money.

Although the environmental measures of dust, paint, and soil are not directly comparable between the initial and follow-up study for reasons discussed above, it is interesting to note that the average indoor lead paint levels are similar for the two time periods (Table 9 and Table 15). The soil sampling during the initial study was a composite of yard areas other than the dripline, which was not sampled. The soil lead levels from non-dripline samples in the follow-up study were less than half those found during the initial study. This was the result of the extensive soil remediation by EPA. Blood lead levels were correlated with a number of variables (Table 12). As expected, older children had lower blood lead levels than younger children. The older the home the higher the blood lead levels, probably because the age of the home is related to the presence of lead paint. In homes where the response indicated a more frequent cleaning of the bedroom, the blood lead levels were higher. Since pets might carry lead dust on their fur, the positive correlation with playing with a pet and higher blood lead levels is reasonable. It is also to be expected that the more time that a child plays outside and the more they play in dirt the higher their blood lead levels will be. Contrary to reported literature, mothers with more schooling have children with higher blood lead levels. Most of the environmental measures are positively associated with higher blood lead levels. More lead dust in the home, higher soil lead levels, and higher concentrations of lead based paint are all associated with increased blood lead levels.

Figures 7 through 11 indicate that children who live in homes that do not have interior lead based paint and have low levels of lead in the soil have substantially lower blood lead levels than children living in homes with either lead based paint or elevated soil lead levels. In general, blood lead levels are the highest for children living in homes with both lead based paint and elevated soil lead levels. Figure 11 shows a stepwise decline in average blood lead levels. The highest is for homes with lead paint and play area soil greater than 250 ppm, followed by lead paint but soil lead levels less than 250 ppm, followed by homes with no lead paint but soil lead levels greater than 250 ppm. The lowest average blood lead levels are for children living in homes with no lead paint and play area soil levels less than 250 ppm. These differences, however, were not statistically significant.

STUDY STRENGTHS

This study provided an opportunity to evaluate a soil remediation and health education effort to reduce childhood lead poisoning at the Jasper County Superfund Site nine years after the initial study. The census completion and percentage of those agreeing to participate was similar for both studies. An extensive environmental assessment of every home in the study provided data on paint and dust lead concentrations. These data were used to control for the effects of paint on blood lead levels. One of the indirect benefits of this study was that it expanded the resources available to continue health education efforts to reduce exposure to lead.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

Direct comparisons of the environmental data between the initial and follow-up study cannot be made because these data were collected by different methods. Because both health education, lead paint stabilizations, and soil remediation occurred over the same time period, it is not possible to determine the proportional reduction in childhood blood lead levels contributed by each of the intervention programs.

CONCLUSIONS

Environmental and educational interventions initiated since 1991 to reduce blood lead levels of children living in a mining waste area of Jasper County, Missouri have been effective. Only two percent of the children tested had blood lead levels greater than or equal to 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$. This is an 86% reduction in children suffering from lead poisoning. Although it is not possible to determine the individual contribution of the soil remediation compared to the health education and paint stabilization, it is reasonable to conclude that the substantial soil remediation actions contributed substantially to the reduction in children with elevated blood lead levels. Since those children with the higher mean lead levels were those with multi-media exposure, it is important to combine lead paint remedial actions with soil remediation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to reduce blood lead levels of children living in communities with both lead contaminated soil and homes with lead based paint, a multimedia approach that addresses both lead contaminated soil and outdoor and indoor lead paint is needed. If no remedial actions are taken on exterior lead paint, contamination of dripline soil is likely. Future exterior paint remediation actions should reduce recontamination of dripline soil.

AUTHORS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**Authors:**

R. Gregory Evans, PhD, MPH^{1,2}
Brooke N. Shadel, PhD, MPH^{1,2}
Lori Harris-Franklin, BES¹
Anthony D. Moehr, MPH³
David A. Sterling, PhD, CIH^{1,2}
Brandon Rekus, BS³
Laurie Fasken, MSN, RN³
Scott A. Clardy, BS¹

Affiliations

1. Missouri Department of Health, Jefferson City, Missouri
2. St. Louis University School of Public Health, St. Louis, Missouri
3. Jasper County, Missouri Health Department, Carthage, Missouri

Acknowledgments

Jasper County Health Department, Carthage, Missouri

Kendra Williams, MS

Marcie Goede, RN

Roger Newell

Sue Puckett

Bill Gory

Contract Employees:

Cindy Wagner

Robin Kueghn

Joplin City Health Department, Joplin, Missouri

Missouri Department of Health, Section for Environmental Public Health

Daryl Roberts, MEd

Gary McNutt

Karen Yates, MS

Gale Carlson, MPA

Pam Morgan

Missouri Department of Health, Southwest District Office

Ray Van Ostran, MPHA

Missouri Southern State College, Joplin, Missouri

Wayne Adams, PhD

Census Workers

Andrew Stull

Jeremy Ulman

Tamara Hart

Andrea Hermann

Leanna Struzziery

Tyler Sheilds

Jayme Shanks

Shanna Holman

Bruce Hays

David McNeil

Ben Smith

Tyler Wooldridge

John Greenwood

Debbie Fedie

Wade Raper

Jason French

Ron Hensley

Kelsey Harris

Kristen Bridges

Edith Todd

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VII Office

Mark Doolan

Missouri Department of Natural Resources

David Mosby

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,

National Center for Environmental Health,

Atlanta, Georgia

Charles Dodson

Daniel Pascal

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry,

Region VII, Kansas City, KS

Denise Jordan-Izaguirre, Senior Regional Representative

Ben Puesta

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry,
Atlanta, Georgia

Lakeisha Sykes, MPH
Dave Campagna, PhD
Roberta Erlwein, MPH
Jeffrey Lybarger, MD, MPH

Missouri State Public Health Laboratory
Eric Blank, Dr.PH

The investigators would especially like to acknowledge and thank the citizens of Jasper County for their participation and assistance as the study was implemented.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). Jasper County, Missouri superfund site lead and cadmium exposure study (final report). Missouri Department of Health, Division of Environmental Health and Epidemiology, Bureau of Environmental Epidemiology, 1995.
- ² National Research Council. Measuring Lead Exposure in Infants, Children, and Other Sensitive Populations. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- ³ CDC, Preventing lead poisoning in young children. A statement by the Centers for Disease Control, October, 1991.
- ⁴ Preuss, HG. A review of persistent, low-grade lead challenge: neurological and cardiovascular consequences. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition*, 12(3):246-54, 1993.
- ⁵ CDC, Preventing lead poisoning in young children. A statement by the Centers for Disease Control, October, 1991.
- ⁶ Bellinger, D, Leviton, A., Waternaux, C, Needleman, H, Robinowitz, M. Longitudinal analyses of prenatal and postnatal lead exposure and early cognitive development. *N. England J. Med*, 316: 1037-43, 1987.
- ⁷ Bellinger, D, Sloman, J, Leviton, A, Rabinowitz, M, Needleman, H, Waternaux, C. Low-level exposure and children's cognitive function in the preschool years. *Pediatrics*, 87:219-27, 1991.
- ⁸ Dietrich, K, Kraft, K, Bornsheim, R, Hammond, P, Berger, O, Succop, P, Bier M. Low-level fetal lead exposure effect on neurobehavioral development in early infancy. *Pediatrics*, 80:721-30, 1987.
- ⁹ Needleman, H, Schell, A, Bellinger, D, Leviton, A, Allred, E. The long-term effects of exposure to low doses of lead in childhood: and 11-year follow-up report. *N. Engl J. Med*, 322: 83-8, 1990.
- ¹⁰ Ernhardt, C, Wolf, A, Kennard, M, Ekhard, P, Filipovich, H, Sokol, R. Intrauterine exposure to low levels of lead: the status of the neonate. *Arch Env Health*, 41: 287-91, 1986.
- ¹¹ Lyngbye, T, Hansen, O, Trillingsgaard, A, Beese, I, Grandjean, P. Learning disabilities in children: significance of low-level lead exposure and confounding effects. *Acta Pediatr Scand*, 79: 352-60, 1990.
- ¹² McMichael, A. Lead exposure and child intelligence: interpreting or misinterpreting, the direction of causality. *Journal of Pediatrics & Child Health*, 33(1):7-8, 1997.

- ¹³ Lanphear, B, Dietrick, K, Auinger, P, Cox, C. Cognitive deficits associated with blood lead concentrations <10 µg/dL in US children and adolescents. *Public Health Reports*, 115(6):521-9, 2000.
- ¹⁴ Lepow, M, Bruckman, L, Rubino, R, Markowitz, S, Gillette, M, Kapish, J. Role of airborne lead in increased body burden of lead in Hartford children. *Env Health Perspec*, (99-102), 1974.
- ¹⁵ Vostal, I, Traves, E, Sayre, J, and Charney, E. Lead analysis of house dust: a method for the detection of another source of lead exposure in inner city children. *Env Health Perspec*, 7:91-97, 1974.
- ¹⁶ McMichael, AJ. Lead exposure and child intelligence: interpreting or misinterpreting, the direction of causality. *Journal of Pediatrics & Child Health*, 33(1):7-8, 1997.
- ¹⁷ Needleman, HL, Riess, JA, Tobin, MJ, Biesecker, GE, Greenhouse JB. Bone lead levels and delinquent behavior. *JAMA*, 275(5) 1996.
- ¹⁸ Needleman, H, Gatsonis, C. Low-level lead exposure and the IQ of children. *JAMA*, 263: 673-8, 1990.
- ¹⁹ Preuß, HG. A review of persistent, low-grade lead challenge: neurological and cardiovascular consequences. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition*, 12(3):246-54, 1993.
- ²⁰ Bergomi, M, Borella, P, Fantuzzi, G, Vivola, G, Sturloni, N, Cavazzuti, G, Tampieri, A, Tartoni, P. Relationship between lead exposure indicators and neuropsychological performances in children. *Dev Med Child Neurol*, 31: 181-90, 1989.
- ²¹ Ferguson, D, Fergusson, J, Horwood, L, Kinzett, N. A longitudinal study of dentine lead levels, intelligence, school performance, and behavior part II: dentine lead on cognitive ability. *J. Child Psych Pyschiat*, 29: 793-809, 1988.
- ²² Fulton, M, Raab, G, Thompson, G, Laxen, D, Hunter, R, Hepburn, W. Influence of blood lead on the ability and the attainment of children in Edinburgh. *Lancet*, 1221-6, 1987.
- ²³ Hansen, O, Trillingsgaard, A, Beese, I, Lyngbye, T, Grandjean, P. A neuropsychological study of children with elevated dentine lead level: assessment of the effect of lead in different socio-economic groups. *Neurotoxicology and Teratology*, 11: 205-13, 1989.
- ²⁴ Hawk, B, Schroeder, S, Robinson, G, Otto, D, Mushak, P, Kleinbaum, D, Dwanson, G. Relation of lead and social factors to IQ of low-SES children: a partial replication. *Am J Ment Def*, 91: 178-83, 1986.

²⁵ Hatzakis, A, Kokkevi, A, Maravelias, C, Katsouyanni, K, Salaminios, F, Kalandidi, A, Koutselinis, A, Stefanis, C, Trichopoulos, D. Psychometric intelligence deficits in lead-exposed children. Academic Publishers, 211-23, 1989.

²⁶ Lansdown, R, Yule, W, Urbanowicz, M, Hunter, J. The relationship between blood-level concentrations, intelligence, attainment and behaviour in a school population: the second study. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*, 57: 225-35, 1986.

²⁷ Schroeder, S, Hawk, B, Otto, D, Mushak, P, Hicks, R. Separating the effects of lead and social factors on IQ. *Environ Res*, 38: 144-54, 1985.

²⁸ Silva, P, Hugher, P, Williams, S, Faed, J. Blood lead, intelligence, reading attainment, and behaviour in eleven year old children in Dunedin, New Zealand. *J Child Psych Psychiat*, 29:43-52, 1988.

²⁹ Winneke, G, Brockhaus, A, Ewers, U, Kramer, U, Neuf, M. Results from the European multicenter study on lead neurotoxicity in children: implications for risk assessment. *Neurotoxicity and Teratology*, 12: 553-9, 1990.

³⁰ Yule, W, Lansdown, R, Miller, I, Urbanowicz, M. The relationship between blood lead concentrations, intelligence, and attainment in a school population: a pilot study. *Dev Med Child Neurol*, 23:567-76, 1981.

³¹ Miller, D, Paschal, D, Gunter, E, Stroud, P, D'Angelo, J. Determination of lead in blood using electrothermal atomization atomic absorption spectrometry with a L'vov platform and matrix modifier. *Analyst*, 112:1701-04, 1987.

³² Sterling, D, Roegner, K, Lewis, R, Luke, D, Wilder, L, Burchette, S. Evaluation of four sampling methods for determining exposure of children to lead contaminated household dust. *Environmental Research*, 80(2):130-41, 1999.

³³ Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, Blood lead levels in young children-United States and selected states, 1996-1999. 22;49(50):1133-7, 2000.

Table 1 – Laboratory Methods, Detection and Quantification Limits For Environmental Samples, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

Media and Analyte	Practical Quantification Limit ^{1,2}	Method Detection Limit ^{1,2}	Analysis Method
Dust Wipes	12.0 µg	3.8 µg	Digestion based on EPA SW-846 Method 3050 for acid digestion of sediments, sludge's and soils. Lead analysis based on SW-846 Method 7420 for flame atomic absorption spectrophotometry.
Soil	12.0 mg/kg	3.8 mg/kg	

¹ Dust wipe based on a nominal surface wipe area of 1 ft².

² Soil based on a nominal sample weight of 2.0 grams.

Table 2 – Laboratory Quality Control Procedures, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

QC Procedure	Frequency	Criteria
Initial Calibration	Once per analysis run	None
High Standard Verification	Immediately after initial calibration	95 to 105% of actual concentration
Initial Calibration Verification	Immediately after high standard verification	90 to 110% of actual concentration
Continuing Calibration Verification	Every 10 samples and at the end of the run	90 to 110% of actual concentration
Continuing Blank Verification	Every 10 samples and at the end of the run	Less than detection limit
Interference Check Standard	Beginning and end run plus every 8 hours	80 to 120% of actual concentration
High Sample Results	For every analyte over high standard response	Dilute the sample within the calibration range

Table 3 - Quality Control Summary Results For Standard Reference Material and Duplicate Soil Samples, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

Media	Units ¹	Number of Samples	Frequency ² Achieved (%)	RPD ^{3,4}				95% Confidence ⁷	
				Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD ⁶	LCL	UCL
Soil SRM	mg/kg	15	1.8	3.0	54.0	21.5	18.6	11.1	31.8
Dust Wipe SRM	µg	48	5.4	0	77.0	13.6	14.7	9.4	17.9
Soil Duplicates	mg/kg	20	2.5	41.0	148.5	37.3 ⁵	45.6	15.9	58.7

¹ µg = micrograms, mg = milligram, kg = kilograms.

² Intended frequency for soil and dust wipe SRM's 2%.

³ Relative Percent Difference for SRM's $[(|SRM \text{ value} - Lab \text{ value}|)/SRM \text{ value}] * 100$.

⁴ Relative Percent Difference for Duplicate Soils $[|Samp1 - Samp2|/(Samp1 + Samp2) * 100]$.

⁵ Soil duplicate RPD medium value 16.3.

⁶ SD = standard deviation.

⁷ LCL = Lower Confidence Limit, UCL = Upper Confidence Limit.

Table 4 - Quality Control Summary Results For Field Blanks, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

Field blank Type	Number of Samples	Frequency Achieved (%) ¹	Greater Than PQL ²	Between PQL ² - MDL ³	Below MDL
Dust wipes	63	7.1	0	0	63 (100%)
Glove Wipes	15	1.7	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	10 (67%)
Total Field Blanks	78	8.8	2 (2.6)	3 (3.8%)	73 (93.6%)

¹ Intended frequency was 5%.

² PQL = Practical Quantification Limit

³ MDL = Method Detection Limit

Table 5: Number of residences determined from the census visits by student workers and the percent of each response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

Category	Number of Responses	Percent of Total
Business	896	9.9%
Refused to Participate	55	.6%
No Eligible Children	5078	55.9%
Vacant Home	750	8.3%
Unable to Contact	745	8.2%
Eligible Participant	957	10.5%
No Structure at Listed Address	604	6.6%
Total	9085	
Total Number of Homes in Area ¹		6835
Percent Response ²		89.1%

1. Total Number of Homes = Eligible participants + No eligible children + Unable to contact + Refused to participate
2. Percent Response = (Eligible participants + No eligible children + Refused to participate) / (Total number of homes)

Table 6: Results of multiple attempts to contact potential participants* for the data collection, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

Contact	Participant	Moved	Refused
1	63	53	78
2	67	38	59
3	48	32	43
4	33	13	34
5	11	8	29
6	17	10	17
7	10	5	20
8	5	6	13
9 or more	4	16	58
Unknown ¹	29	1	0
Total	287	182	351

1. Unknown represents those that had information on the potential participant but no recruiting sheet recording the number of attempts made to contact the individual.*46 eligible participants were excluded from the study due to inability to contact them.

Table 7: Results of contacts of potential study participants in the two study areas during the data collection, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

Result	Original Study Area	Oversample Area	Total for Study
Participated	215	72	287
Moved	75	107	182
Refused	247	123	370
No Contact Made	38	8	46
Excluded ¹	50	21	71
Duplicate	1	0	1
Total	626	331	957

1. Excluded were those potential participants not drawn for the random sample.

Table 8: Reasons documented from potential participants that did not wish to participate, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

Reason Refused	Number of Responses	Percent Response
Refused to respond	104	29.6
Didn't want blood tested	84	23.9
Child's blood already tested ¹	69	19.7
No time to take part	35	10.0
Moving from home soon	23	6.6
Lack of concern	16	4.6
Medical reasons	6	1.7
Didn't want samples taken	4	1.1
Dissatisfied with EPA work	2	.6
Other response	8	2.3
Total	351	

1. Forty-four of the 69 potential participants that responded with this reason did have a blood test on record in the state system. Three of those 44 had an elevated child in the residence.

Table 9: Mean and Standard Deviation Environmental and Blood Lead Results, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

Factor	Study Area		Study Area & Oversample Area	
	N	Mean \pm SD	N	Mean \pm SD
Arithmetic Blood Lead Level $\mu\text{g/dl}$	213	3.8 ± 2.3	284	4.1 ± 2.6
Geometric Blood Lead Level $\mu\text{g/dl}$	213	3.3 ± 1.73	284	3.5 ± 1.8
Window sill composite loading $\mu\text{g/ft}^2$	188	403.0 ± 2459	260	371 ± 2121.1
Miniblind composite loading $\mu\text{g/ft}^2$	170	1534.6 ± 3696	229	1305.4 ± 3275.2
Floor composite loading $\mu\text{g/ft}^2$	214	3.8 ± 8.2	286	4.0 ± 10.1
Mean lead dust loading $\mu\text{g/ft}^2$	214	361.8 ± 998	286	343.8 ± 896.7
Dripline soil mg/kg	215	841.9 ± 2652	287	1169 ± 3289.1
Play area soil mg/kg	154	233.8 ± 269	202	260.9 ± 299.1
Yard soil mg/kg	215	292.3 ± 514	287	293.8 ± 459
Overall soil mg/kg	215	518.8 ± 1382	287	629.6 ± 1452
Outdoor wall total XRF mg/cm ²	186	1.6 ± 3.2	252	2.1 ± 3.7
Porch total XRF mg/cm ²	144	3.0 ± 5.9	205	3.6 ± 6.4
Outside structure total XRF mg/cm ²	194	1.8 ± 3.4	262	2.4 ± 3.8
Mean window stool XRF mg/cm ²	161	0.8 ± 2.2	226	0.79 ± 2.1
Mean miniblind XRF mg/cm ²	162	3.9 ± 3.5	220	3.5 ± 3.5
Mean indoor total XRF mg/cm ²	211	1.1 ± 1.6	281	1.1 ± 1.6

Table 10: Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
Person answering question	
Mother	243 (84.7)
Father	31 (10.8)
Grandparent	7 (2.4)
Other person	6 (2.1)
Gender	
Male	149 (52.1)
Female	137 (47.9)
Race	
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	13 (4.6)
Asian/ Pacific Islander	1 (0.4)
Black	4 (1.4)
White	257 (90.2)
Other	9 (3.2)
Don't know	1 (0.4)
Is child Hispanic or of Spanish Descent	
Yes	29 (10.1)
No	255 (89.2)
Don't Know	2 (0.7)
Total gross household income before taxes:	
≤ \$4,999	16 (5.6)
\$5,000-\$9,999	20 (7.0)
\$10,000-\$14,999	30 (10.5)
\$15,000-\$19,999	31 (10.9)
\$20,000-\$24,999	30 (10.5)
\$25,000-\$29,999	26 (9.1)
\$30,000-\$34,999	31 (10.9)
\$35,000-\$39,999	25 (8.8)
≥ \$40,000	65 (22.8)
Refused	1 (0.4)
Don't Know	10 (3.5)
Highest year of education completed by the head of the household:	
No schooling	2 (0.7)
Elementary School	19 (6.6)
High School	142 (49.7)
Technical or Trade School	29 (10.1)
Junior/Community College	38 (13.3)
Four year College/University	45 (15.7)
Attended Graduate school	10 (3.5)
Refused	1 (0.3)
Is the mother the head of the household?	
Yes	84 (29.5)
No	201 (70.5)

**Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study,
Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure
Study, 2001**

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
Highest year of education completed by the mother of the child:	
No schooling	2 (0.9)
Elementary School	20 (9.3)
High School	102 (47.7)
Technical or Trade School	16 (7.5)
Junior/Community College	26 (12.1)
Four year College/University	39 (18.2)
Attended Graduate school	4 (1.9)
Don't know	4 (1.9)
Year house was built	
<1900-1909	24 (8.4)
1910-1919	6 (2.1)
1920-1929	12 (4.2)
1930-1939	14 (4.9)
1940-1949	20 (7.0)
1950-1959	20 (7.0)
1960-1969	14 (4.9)
1970-1979	25 (8.7)
1980-1989	24 (8.4)
1990-present	61 (21.3)
Refused	1 (0.3)
Don't know	66 (23.0)
House rented or owned?	
Rented	107 (37.3)
Owned	172 (59.9)
Other	8 (2.8)
How many people in the home are less than 7 years of age?	
1	161 (56.1)
2	88 (30.7)
3	36 (12.5)
How many people in the home are 7 to 12 years of age?	
0	173 (60.5)
1	82 (28.7)
2	25 (8.7)
3	5 (1.7)
4	1 (0.3)
How many people in the home are 13 to 18 years of age?	
0	242 (84.3)
1	32 (11.1)
2	12 (4.2)
3	1 (0.3)

Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
How long has the child been living in this home? (months)	25.5 ± 19.4 (287)
Type of water pipes	
Lead	4 (1.4)
Plastic	139 (48.8)
Galvanized Steel	26 (9.1)
Copper	10 (3.5)
Iron	1 (0.3)
Mixed	29 (10.2)
Other	4 (1.4)
Don't Know	72 (25.3)
Source of house water for drinking	
Public water	244 (85.0)
Well	5 (1.7)
Bottled	28 (9.8)
Cistern	
Local Spring or Brook	
Mixed	10 (3.5)
Other	
Source of house water for cooking	
Public water	271 (94.4)
Well	5 (1.7)
Bottled	6 (2.1)
Cistern	
Local Spring or Brook	1 (0.3)
Mixed	
Other	4 (1.4)
What type of exterior does your home have?	
Wood	112 (39.0)
Brick	19 (6.6)
Block	3 (1.0)
Mobile home	29 (10.1)
Vinyl/Metal siding	94 (32.8)
Other	26 (9.1)
Refused	
Don't know	4 (1.4)
Any part of house repainted, sanded, or stripped chemically or by heat within last year?	
Yes	113 (39.5)
No	170 (59.4)
Don't know	3 (1.0)

Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
Is home air conditioned	
Yes	260 (90.9)
No	26 (9.1)
Does home have central air or window unit	
Central air	140 (51.7)
Window Unit	125 (46.1)
Both	5 (1.8)
Mine, smelter, or lead industry materials used in or around house or yard	
Yes	42 (14.7)
No	229 (80.4)
Don't know	14 (4.9)
Pets go in and out of house	
Yes	107 (37.9)
No	175 (62.1)
How often does your child play with your pet?	
Never	3 (2.7)
Less than once per week	6 (5.4)
Once per week	6 (5.4)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	10 (8.9)
Once per day	20 (17.9)
More than once per day	67 (59.8)
How often are the child's hands washed after playing with the pet?	
Never	18 (17.0)
Less than once per week	3 (2.8)
Once per week	2 (1.9)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	9 (8.5)
Once per day	18 (17.0)
More than once per day	56 (52.8)
In the last 90 days, any member of household:	
Painted pictures with artists' paints?	
Yes	20 (7.0)
No	264 (93.0)
Painted, stained, or refinished furniture?	
Yes	28 (9.8)
No	257 (90.2)
Painted the inside or outside of a home or building?	
Home	40 (87.0)
Work	5 (10.9)
Both	1 (2.2)
Worked with stained glass?	
Yes	
No	284 (100.0)
Cast lead into fishing sinkers, bullets or anything else?	
Yes	8 (2.8)
No	277 (97.2)
Refused	1 (0.4)

Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
In the last 90 days, any member of household:	
Worked with soldering in electronics?	
Yes	24 (8.4)
No	261 (91.6)
Worked with soldering pipes or sheets of metal?	
Yes	8 (2.8)
No	277 (97.2)
Repaired auto radiators?	
Yes	6 (2.1)
No	279 (97.9)
Worked on auto bodies or auto maintenance? (includes mechanics)	
Yes	63 (22.0)
No	224 (78.0)
Worked at a sewage treatment plant?	
Yes	2 (0.7)
No	282 (99.3)
Made pottery?	
Yes	3 (1.1)
No	280 (98.9)
Ridden a dirt bike, mountain bike, or ATV in the local area?	
Yes	30 (10.5)
No	256 (89.5)
Welded?	
Yes	20 (7.0)
No	265 (93.0)
Cleaned or repaired firearms?	
Yes	20 (7.0)
No	265 (93.0)
Visited indoor firearm target ranges?	
Yes	2 (0.7)
No	282 (98.9)
Don't know	1 (0.4)
Done wire/cable cutting or splicing?	
Yes	53 (18.5)
No	234 (81.5)
Casted or smelted lead?	
Yes	3 (1.0)
No	283 (99.0)
Worked in plastics manufacture?	
Yes	3 (1.1)
No	282 (98.9)
Worked in battery manufacture?	
Yes	5 (1.8)
No	280 (98.2)
Worked in pipe machining?	
Yes	4 (1.4)
No	282 (98.6)
Done electroplating with lead solutions?	
Yes	
No	285 (100.0)
Worked in refining gasoline?	
Yes	
No	285 (100.0)

**Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study,
Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure
Study, 2001**

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
In the last 90 days, any member of household: Worked in paint, glaze, and ink manufacture?	
Yes	
No	285 (100.0)
Worked in rubber manufacture?	
Yes	2 (0.7)
No	283 (99.3)
Worked in scrap metal recovery?	
Yes	12 (4.2)
No	274 (95.8)
Had any other lead-related job of activity?	
Yes	3 (1.1)
No	282 (98.9)
People living in house worked in mining or a mining- related job in last 90 days?	
Yes	3 (1.0)
No	282 (98.6)
Refused	1 (0.3)
When food or drinks are prepared, served or stored, are they often placed in clay pottery or ceramic dishes which were homemade or made in another country?	
Yes	13 (4.6)
No	271 (95.1)
Don't know	1 (0.4)
When food or drinks are prepared, served, or stored are they often placed in copper or pewter dishes or containers?	
Yes	1 (0.3)
No	285 (99.7)
When food or drinks are stored or put away, are they sometimes stored in the original container after being opened?	
Yes	37 (13.1)
No	246 (86.9)
How often do you vacuum?	
Never	12 (4.2)
Rarely	
Sometimes	26 (9.1)
Frequently	151 (52.6)
Always	98 (34.1)
How often do you dry sweep?	
Never	21 (7.3)
Rarely	16 (5.6)
Sometimes	32 (11.1)
Frequently	121 (42.2)
Always	97 (33.8)

Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
How often do you mop?	
Never	20 (7.0)
Rarely	19 (6.6)
Sometimes	105 (36.6)
Frequently	120 (41.8)
Always	23 (8.0)
How often do you wet wipe?	
Never	8 (2.8)
Rarely	22 (7.7)
Sometimes	63 (22.0)
Frequently	116 (40.4)
Always	78 (27.2)
How often do you dry dust?	
Never	64 (22.3)
Rarely	62 (21.6)
Sometimes	102 (35.5)
Frequently	39 (13.6)
Always	20 (7.0)
How often do you use other house cleaning methods?	
Never	73 (25.4)
Rarely	101 (35.2)
Sometimes	77 (26.8)
Frequently	29 (10.1)
Always	7 (2.4)
How long do you spend cleaning the following rooms each time you clean them? (minutes)	
Kitchen	31.1 ± 32.4 (287)
Child's bedroom	30.6 ± 37.8 (287)
Living/family room	25.6 ± 32.4 (286)
Do you have a vacuum cleaner?	
Yes	272 (94.8)
No	15 (5.2)
How many total hours does your child spend at home Monday through Friday?	105.4 ± 20.4 (287)
How many total hours does your child spend at home Saturday and Sunday?	45.7 ± 6.8 (287)
How many total hours does your child spend at the babysitter (outside of home) Monday through Friday?	4.0 ± 11.8 (287)

Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
How many total hours does your child spend at the babysitter (outside of home) Saturday and Sunday?	0.1 ± 1.3 (287)
How many total hours does your child spend at the daycare (commercial facility) Monday through Friday?	5.0 ± 12.7 (287)
How many total hours does your child spend at the daycare (commercial facility) Saturday and Sunday?	0.3 ± 2.1 (287)
How many total hours does your child spend at the other locations Monday through Friday?	5.3 ± 13.3 (287)
How many total hours does your child spend at the other locations Saturday and Sunday?	1.6 ± 5.6 (287)
On the average, how many hours per day does the child Play outside during the spring and fall?	3.4 ± 6.1 (286)
On the average, how many hours per day does the child Play outside during the winter?	2.6 ± 9.7 (286)
On the average, how many hours per day does the child Play outside during the summer?	3.3 ± 2.7 (286)
Does anyone smoke cigarettes in the child's house?	
Yes	136 (47.6)
No	150 (52.4)
If yes, how many cigarettes per day in the child's house?	23.8 ± 16.5 (133)
Does anyone smoke cigars in the child's house?	
Yes	7 (2.5)
No	270 (97.5)
Does anyone smoke pipes in the child's house?	
Yes	6 (2.2)
No	271 (97.8)
How long has the child lived in this home? (months)	25.5 ± 19.4 (287)
Have you ever used smokeless tobacco products?	
Yes	41 (14.3)
No	245 (85.7)
How many people smoke in this house?	1.6 ± 2.9 (283)
Does child breast feed? (Only for participants ≤3yrs old)	
Yes	4 (2.9)
No	132 (97.1)
Does child currently take a bottle?	
Yes	34 (24.6)
No	104 (75.4)

Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
Hours per day the child usually spends playing on the floor in this house:	5.9 ± 3.8 (286)
Does the child play outdoors, around the house, or in the neighborhood?	
Yes	250 (87.7)
No	35 (12.3)
If the child plays outdoors then how many hours a day on the average does the child play outdoors?	3.0 ± 2.2 (257)
Where does child usually play outdoors around the house?	
Back yard	120 (46.5)
Front yard	96 (37.2)
Side yard	31 (12.0)
Other	11 (4.3)
Where does the child usually play (in last 90 days) when not at home?	
Neighbor's yard	48 (18.6)
Playground	11 (4.3)
Near or around creek or ditch	2 (0.8)
On or near sidewalks or streets	9 (3.5)
Park	22 (8.5)
Only plays around the home	92 (35.7)
Other	73 (28.3)
Don't know	1 (0.4)
Is the ground where the child usually plays mainly:	
Grassy	186 (72.4)
Concrete/asphalt	16 (6.2)
Dirt/Soil	39 (15.2)
Sandbox	2 (0.8)
Other	14 (5.4)
How often does the child play in grassy area?	
None of the time	8 (3.1)
Less than half the time	31 (12.1)
Half the time	85 (33.1)
More than half the time	94 (36.6)
All the time	39 (15.2)
How often does the child play on concrete/asphalt?	
None of the time	49 (18.9)
Less than half the time	128 (49.4)
Half the time	55 (21.2)
More than half the time	19 (7.3)
All the time	8 (3.1)

**Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study,
Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure
Study, 2001**

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
How often does the child play in dirt?	
None of the time	50 (19.3)
Less than half the time	115 (44.4)
Half the time	46 (17.8)
More than half the time	26 (10.0)
All the time	22 (8.5)
How often does the child play on mine waste materials?	
None of the time	222 (86.4)
Less than half the time	23 (8.9)
Half the time	4 (1.6)
More than half the time	6 (2.3)
All the time	2 (0.8)
Does child :	
Crawl	4 (2.9)
Walk	98 (71.0)
Both	31 (22.5)
Neither	5 (3.6)
How often does child eat food that has fallen on floor?	
Never	129 (45.4)
Less than once per week	57 (20.1)
Once per week	23 (8.1)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	30 (10.6)
Once per day	17 (6.0)
More than once per day	28 (9.9)
Where does your child usually eat?	
Sitting at the table	171 (59.8)
Sitting on the floor	27 (9.4)
Sitting in a high chair	62 (21.7)
Other	26 (9.1)
Does the child often take food, snacks, candy, bottle, or pacifier with him or her outside to play?	
Yes	145 (51.4)
No	137 (48.6)
How often does child eat food, snacks, or candy outside during the spring, summer and fall?	
Never	11 (7.0)
Less than once per month	38 (24.1)
Once per month	30 (19.0)
Less than once per week, but more than once per month	36 (22.8)
Once per week	30 (19.0)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	13 (8.2)
How often does child take bottle/pacifier out with them?	
Never	18 (46.2)
Rarely	11 (28.2)
Sometimes	2 (5.1)
Frequently	3 (7.7)
Always	5 (12.8)

Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
How often is the child's pacifier washed?	
Never	
Less than once per month	3 (7.7)
Once per month	1 (2.6)
Less than once a week, but more than once a month	2 (5.1)
Once per week	1 (2.6)
Less than once a day, but more than once a week	6 (15.4)
Everyday	25 (64.1)
Child does not have a pacifier	1 (2.6)
How often does the child use a cup with lid (sipee cup), bottle or pacifier outside during the spring, summer, and fall?	
Never	108 (37.9)
Less than once per week	37 (13.0)
Once per week	19 (6.7)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	38 (13.3)
Once per day	40 (14.0)
More than once per day	43 (15.1)
Are the child's hands or face usually washed before eating?	
Yes	266 (93.3)
No	19 (6.7)
How often does the child wash hands or face before eating?	
Never	3 (1.1)
Less than once per week	3 (1.1)
Once per week	2 (0.7)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	7 (2.6)
Once per day	27 (9.9)
More than once per day	230 (84.6)
Are the child's hands or face usually washed before going to sleep?	
Yes	270 (94.7)
No	15 (5.3)
How often does the child wash hands or face before going to sleep?	
Never	
Less than once per week	11 (4.0)
Once per week	
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	13 (4.7)
Once per day	106 (38.7)
More than once per day	144 (52.6)
Are the child's hands or face usually washed after playing with dirt or sand?	
Yes	260 (92.9)
No	20 (7.1)

Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
How often does the child wash hands or face after playing with dirt or sand?	
Never	4 (1.5)
Less than once per week	12 (4.5)
Once per week	4 (1.5)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	4 (1.5)
Once per day	31 (11.7)
More than once per day	209 (78.9)
Don't know	1 (0.4)
Number of times the child is bathed or given a shower per week:	6.7 ± 6.1 (286)
Has the child used a pacifier in the last 6 months?	
Yes	36 (13.3)
No	234 (86.7)
Does the child suck his/her thumb or fingers	
Yes	70 (24.5)
No	216 (75.5)
Does the child chew on their fingernails?	
Yes	73 (25.7)
No	210 (73.9)
Don't know	1 (0.4)
Does the child have a favorite blanket or toy?	
Yes	150 (52.6)
No	135 (47.4)
For those answering yes, does the child carry this around during the day?	
Yes	83 (51.6)
No	78 (48.4)
For those answering yes, does the child put this blanket or toy in their mouth?	
Yes	62 (38.5)
No	99 (61.5)
How often are toys and stuffed animals washed?	
Never	57 (20.1)
Less than once per month	92 (32.5)
Once per month	67 (23.7)
Less than once a week, but more than once a month	29 (10.2)
Once per week	25 (8.8)
Less than once a day, but more than once a week	8 (2.8)
Everyday	5 (1.8)

**Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study,
Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure
Study, 2001**

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
How often does the child put things other than food into their mouth?	
Does this a lot	53 (18.5)
Just once in a while	113 (39.4)
Almost never	50 (17.4)
Never	68 (23.7)
Does the child put their mouth on furniture or on the window sill?	
Does this a lot	20 (7.0)
Just once in a while	67 (23.5)
Almost never	48 (16.8)
Never	150 (52.6)
Does the child swallow things other than food?	
Does this alot	2 (0.7)
Just once in a while	17 (6.0)
Almost never	47 (16.5)
Never	219 (76.8)
Does the child put paint chips in their mouth?	
Does this alot	
Just once in a while	1 (0.4)
Almost never	7 (2.5)
Never	275 (96.5)
Don't know	2 (0.7)
Does your household have a vegetable garden?	
Yes	37 (13.1)
No	245 (86.9)
For those answering yes, how often does the child eat vegetables grown in your garden?	
Once per week or more	13 (33.3)
Less than once per week	7 (17.9)
Never	18 (46.2)
Refused	1 (2.6)
How often does your child eat root vegetables (such as beets or turnips) grown in your garden?	
Once per week or more	3 (12.0)
Less than once per week	1 (4.0)
Never	21 (84.0)
How often does your child eat leafy green vegetables (such as lettuce or spinach) grown in your garden?	
Once per week or more	2 (8.3)
Less than once per week	4 (16.7)
Never	18 (75.0)
Has soil been hauled in and placed on your garden?	
Yes	11 (42.3)
No	12 (46.2)
Don't know	1 (3.8)

Table 10: (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors for the Follow-up Study, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	RESPONSE N (%)
How often does the child eat vegetables grown elsewhere in the local area?	
Once per week or more	34 (12.1)
Less than once per week	65 (23.2)
Never	181 (64.6)
How often does your child eat root vegetables (such as beets or turnips) grown elsewhere in the area?	
Once per week or more	14 (11.5)
Less than once per week	24 (19.7)
Never	84 (68.9)
How often does your child eat leafy green vegetables (such as lettuce or spinach) grown elsewhere in the area?	
Once per week or more	18 (14.9)
Less than once per week	27 (22.3)
Never	76 (62.8)
Has the child ever been treated with traditional, folk, or herbal medications?	
Yes	21 (7.4)
No	264 (92.6)
Number of people living in house:	4.3 ± 1.4 (287)
Amount of out-of-pocket money spent each week on meat, vegetables and milk products in this household:	
≤ \$25	34 (11.9)
\$26-\$50	95 (33.3)
\$51-\$75	73 (70.9)
\$76-\$100	44 (15.4)
> \$100	38 (13.3)
Refused	1 (0.4)
Amount of out-of-pocket money spent each week on items other than meat, vegetables and milk products in this household:	
≤ \$25	69 (24.1)
\$26-\$50	114 (39.9)
\$51-\$75	59 (20.6)
\$76-\$100	25 (8.7)
> \$100	17 (5.9)
Refused	1 (0.3)
Don't know	1 (0.3)
Do you receive food stamps, WIC vouchers, food from pantries, or any other programs?	
Yes	115 (40.2)
No	171 (59.8)

Table 11: Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
Person answering question	
Mother	4.0 \pm 2.3 (241)
Father	4.7 \pm 3.3 (30)
Grandparent	6.9 \pm 4.3 (7)
Other person	2.8 \pm 1.1 (6)
Gender	
Male	4.2 \pm 2.5 (147)
Female	4.0 \pm 2.6 (136)
Race	
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	4.6 \pm 2.1 (12)
Asian/ Pacific Islander	4.8 \pm - (1)
Black	3.0 \pm 3.3 (4)
White	4.1 \pm 2.6 (255)
Other	4.4 \pm 2.8 (9)
Don't know	3.2 \pm - (1)
Is child Hispanic or of Spanish Descent	
Yes	4.0 \pm 2.8 (29)
No	4.1 \pm 2.5 (252)
Don't Know	3.9 \pm 0.7 (2)
Total gross household income before taxes:	
\leq \$4,999	6.3 \pm 3.5 (15)
\$5,000-\$9,999	4.4 \pm 3.0 (20)
\$10,000-\$14,999	4.3 \pm 1.8 (30)
\$15,000-\$19,999	5.4 \pm 4.0 (31)
\$20,000-\$24,999	4.2 \pm 2.1 (30)
\$25,000-\$29,999	4.5 \pm 2.4 (25)
\$30,000-\$34,999	3.1 \pm 1.0 (31)
\$35,000-\$39,999	3.3 \pm 1.7 (25)
\geq \$40,000	3.5 \pm 2.2 (64)
Refused	3.3 \pm - (1)
Don't Know	2.7 \pm 0.8 (10)
Highest year of education completed by the head of the household:	
No schooling	4.2 \pm 0.9 (2)
Elementary School	5.4 \pm 2.3 (18)
High School	4.3 \pm 2.7 (141)
Technical or Trade School	4.3 \pm 2.4 (29)
Junior/Community College	3.2 \pm 1.9 (37)
Four year College/University	3.7 \pm 2.4 (45)
Attended Graduate school	4.0 \pm 3.9 (10)
Refused	3.5 \pm - (1)
Is the mother the head of the household?	
Yes	4.2 \pm 2.5 (84)
No	4.0 \pm 2.6 (198)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
Highest year of education completed by the mother of the child:	
No schooling	6.0 \pm 2.0 (2)
Elementary School	4.6 \pm 2.1 (20)
High School	4.1 \pm 2.6 (101)
Technical or Trade School	3.9 \pm 1.7 (16)
Junior/Community College	4.2 \pm 2.8 (24)
Four year College/University	3.0 \pm 1.9 (39)
Attended Graduate school	3.4 \pm 0.9 (4)
Don't know	6.7 \pm 5.7 (4)
Year house was built ⁵	
<1900-1909	4.5 \pm 2.0 (23)
1910-1919	3.6 \pm 2.6 (6)
1920-1929	4.5 \pm 3.6 (12)
1930-1939	3.4 \pm 1.4 (14)
1940-1949	5.1 \pm 2.5 (20)
1950-1959	4.6 \pm 3.0 (20)
1960-1969	5.0 \pm 3.1 (14)
1970-1979	4.3 \pm 2.6 (25)
1980-1989	2.9 \pm 1.8 (24)
1990-present	3.1 \pm 1.5 (61)
Refused	3.3 \pm - (1)
Don't know	4.7 \pm 3.1 (64)
House rented or owned?	
Rented	4.8 \pm 2.9 (106)
Owned	3.6 \pm 2.2 (170)
Other	5.5 \pm 2.8 (8)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
Type of water pipes	
Lead	7.1 \pm 5.8 (4)
Plastic	3.8 \pm 2.3 (138)
Galvanized Steel	4.5 \pm 2.9 (26)
Copper	3.5 \pm 1.3 (10)
Iron	1.0 \pm - (1)
Mixed	4.6 \pm 2.2 (28)
Other	3.9 \pm 2.1 (4)
Don't Know	4.3 \pm 2.9 (71)
Source of house water for drinking	
Public water	4.2 \pm 2.6 (241)
Well	4.1 \pm 3.1 (5)
Bottled	3.3 \pm 1.5 (28)
Cistern	
Local Spring or Brook	
Mixed	3.3 \pm 1.8 (10)
Other	
Source of house water for cooking	
Public water	4.1 \pm 2.5 (268)
Well	4.3 \pm 3.1 (5)
Bottled	3.6 \pm 1.2 (6)
Cistern	
Local Spring or Brook	15.8 \pm - (1)
Mixed	
Other	3.0 \pm 1.2 (4)
What type of exterior does your home have?	
Wood	4.5 \pm 3.0 (111)
Brick	3.9 \pm 2.3 (19)
Block	2.9 \pm 1.0 (3)
Mobile home	3.7 \pm 1.7 (29)
Vinyl/Metal siding	3.8 \pm 2.1 (93)
Other	4.4 \pm 2.8 (25)
Refused	
Don't know	5.1 \pm 2.3 (4)
Any part of house repainted, sanded, or stripped chemically or by heat within last year?	
Yes	4.3 \pm 2.9 (113)
No	4.0 \pm 2.3 (167)
Don't know	4.8 \pm 3.9 (3)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
Is home air conditioned	
Yes	4.0 \pm 2.5 (257)
No	5.0 \pm 3.2 (26)
Does home have central air or window unit	
Central air	3.5 \pm 2.2 (138)
Window Unit	4.5 \pm 2.6 (124)
Both	5.2 \pm 1.9 (5)
Refused	3.5 \pm - (1)
Mine, smelter, or lead industry materials used in or around house or yard	
Yes	4.4 \pm 3.5 (41)
No	4.0 \pm 2.3 (227)
Don't know	4.7 \pm 2.5 (14)
Pets go in and out of house	
Yes	4.3 \pm 2.6 (107)
No	3.9 \pm 2.5 (172)
How often does your child play with your pet?	
Never	2.5 \pm 1.4 (3)
Less than once per week	2.9 \pm 0.7 (6)
Once per week	4.4 \pm 2.3 (6)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	4.1 \pm 2.4 (9)
Once per day	3.6 \pm 1.5 (20)
More than once per day	4.7 \pm 2.9 (67)
How often are child's hands washed after playing with pet?	
Never	3.4 \pm 1.9 (18)
Less than once per week	3.7 \pm 0.2 (3)
Once per week	6.8 \pm 2.0 (2)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	3.6 \pm 1.7 (9)
Once per day	4.5 \pm 4.1 (18)
More than once per day	4.6 \pm 2.3 (56)
In the last 90 days, any member of household:	
Painted pictures with artists' paints?	
Yes	4.5 \pm 2.9 (20)
No	4.1 \pm 2.5 (261)
Painted, stained, or refinished furniture?	
Yes	3.6 \pm 2.1 (24)
No	3.2 \pm 0.44 (3)
Worked with soldering in electronics?	
Yes	5.2 \pm 4.1 (24)
No	4.0 \pm 2.3 (258)
Worked on auto bodies or auto maintenance? (includes mechanics)	
Yes	4.6 \pm 3.2 (62)
No	3.9 \pm 2.3 (222)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
Ridden a dirt bike, mountain bike, or ATV in the local area?	
Yes	4.2 \pm 2.1 (30)
No	4.1 \pm 2.6 (253)
Welded?	
Yes	5.2 \pm 4.7 (19)
No	4.0 \pm 2.3 (263)
Cleaned or repaired firearms?	
Yes	4.2 \pm 3.2 (19)
No	4.1 \pm 2.5 (263)
Done wire/cable cutting or splicing?	
Yes	4.3 \pm 3.0 (52)
No	4.0 \pm 2.5 (232)
Worked in scrap metal recovery?	
Yes	5.0 \pm 3.1 (12)
No	4.0 \pm 2.5 (271)
People living in house worked in mining or a mining-related job in last 90 days?	
Yes	2.7 \pm 0.7 (3)
No	4.1 \pm 2.6 (280)
Refused	3.0 \pm - (1)
When food or drinks are prepared, served or stored, are they often placed in clay pottery or ceramic dishes which were homemade or made in another country?	
Yes	5.6 \pm 3.3 (12)
No	4.0 \pm 2.5 (269)
Don't know	2.4 \pm - (1)
When food or drinks are prepared, served, or stored are they often placed in copper or pewter dishes or containers?	
Yes	3.0 \pm - (1)
No	4.1 \pm 2.6 (282)
When food or drinks are stored or put away, are they sometimes stored in the original container after being opened?	
Yes	4.0 \pm 2.3 (36)
No	4.1 \pm 2.6 (244)
How often do you vacuum?	
Never	3.8 \pm 1.0 (12)
Rarely	
Sometimes	3.9 \pm 2.6 (25)
Frequently	3.9 \pm 2.3 (151)
Always	4.5 \pm 3.0 (96)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
How often do you dry sweep?	
Never	4.2 \pm 3.1 (21)
Rarely	4.8 \pm 3.8 (19)
Sometimes	4.2 \pm 2.9 (105)
Frequently	3.9 \pm 2.0 (119)
Always	3.9 \pm 2.4 (21)
How often do you wet wipe?	
Never	5.6 \pm 5.3 (8)
Rarely	3.6 \pm 1.9 (22)
Sometimes	4.3 \pm 2.9 (62)
Frequently	4.3 \pm 2.5 (114)
Always	3.5 \pm 1.9 (78)
How often do you dry dust?	
Never	3.5 \pm 1.8 (63)
Rarely	3.9 \pm 2.0 (62)
Sometimes	4.8 \pm 3.1 (100)
Frequently	3.8 \pm 2.5 (39)
Always	3.8 \pm 2.5 (20)
How often do you use other house cleaning methods?	
Never	4.0 \pm 1.9 (71)
Rarely	4.1 \pm 3.1 (101)
Sometimes	4.3 \pm 2.4 (77)
Frequently	3.8 \pm 2.4 (28)
Always	3.8 \pm 1.6 (7)
Do you have a vacuum cleaner?	
Yes	4.1 \pm 2.6 (269)
No	4.2 \pm 1.8 (15)
Does anyone smoke cigarettes in the child's house?	
Yes	4.5 \pm 2.7 (136)
No	3.7 \pm 2.4 (147)
Does anyone smoke cigars in the child's house?	
Yes	7.4 \pm 5.1 (7)
No	4.0 \pm 2.4 (267)
Does anyone smoke pipes in the child's house?	
Yes	3.7 \pm 1.5 (6)
No	4.1 \pm 2.6 (268)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
Have you ever used smokeless tobacco products?	
Yes	4.6 \pm 3.1 (39)
No	4.0 \pm 2.5 (244)
Does child breast feed? (Only for participants ≤ 3 yrs old)	
Yes	5.4 \pm 2.5 (4)
No	4.5 \pm 2.9 (130)
Does child currently take a bottle?	
Yes	4.3 \pm 2.6 (34)
No	4.6 \pm 2.9 (102)
Does the child play outdoors, around the house, or in the neighborhood?	
Yes	4.1 \pm 2.6 (247)
No	4.0 \pm 2.4 (35)
Where does child usually play outdoors around the house?	
Back yard	3.9 \pm 2.4 (119)
Front yard	4.5 \pm 2.9 (95)
Side yard	3.7 \pm 1.8 (30)
Other	3.9 \pm 2.9 (11)
Where does the child usually play (in last 90 days) when not at home?	
Neighbor's yard	3.7 \pm 2.0 (48)
Playground	3.1 \pm 1.8 (11)
Near or around creek or ditch	5.6 \pm 0.21 (2)
On or near sidewalks or streets	3.0 \pm 1.5 (9)
Park	4.8 \pm 2.6 (21)
Only plays around the home	4.5 \pm 3.1 (91)
Other	3.9 \pm 2.3 (72)
Don't know	NA
Is the ground where the child usually plays mainly:	
Grassy	4.0 \pm 2.5 (184)
Concrete/asphalt	4.3 \pm 2.5 (16)
Dirt/Soil	4.8 \pm 2.8 (39)
Sandbox	5.5 \pm 4.7 (2)
Other	3.1 \pm 1.8 (13)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
How often does the child play in grassy area?	
None of the time	4.0 \pm 3.9 (7)
Less than half the time	4.0 \pm 2.2 (113)
Half the time	4.7 \pm 2.4 (46)
More than half the time	4.4 \pm 3.3 (25)
All the time	5.2 \pm 3.8 (22)
How often does the child play on mine waste materials?	
None of the time	4.0 \pm 2.3 (219)
Less than half the time	5.1 \pm 4.4 (23)
Half the time	3.7 \pm 2.4 (4)
More than half the time	4.3 \pm 1.4 (6)
All the time	4.8 \pm 0.99 (2)
Does child :	
Crawl	3.6 \pm 2.7 (4)
Walk	4.6 \pm 2.9 (96)
Both	4.7 \pm 2.8 (31)
Neither	2.8 \pm 2.7 (5)
How often does child eat food that has fallen on floor?	
Never	4.1 \pm 2.6 (128)
Less than once per week	3.8 \pm 2.2 (56)
Once per week	4.0 \pm 2.0 (23)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	4.7 \pm 2.5 (29)
Once per day	4.6 \pm 4.1 (17)
More than once per day	4.2 \pm 2.3 (28)
Where does your child usually eat?	
Sitting at the table	3.8 \pm 2.3 (169)
Sitting on the floor	5.2 \pm 3.6 (27)
Sitting in a high chair	4.4 \pm 2.7 (61)
Other	4.5 \pm 2.4 (26)
Does the child often take food, snacks, candy, bottle, or pacifier with him or her outside to play?	
Yes	4.2 \pm 2.5 (143)
No	4.0 \pm 2.7 (136)
How often does child eat food, snacks, or candy outside during the spring, summer and fall?	
Never	4.1 \pm 2.5 (10)
Less than once per month	3.8 \pm 1.8 (38)
Once per month	4.5 \pm 2.9 (30)
Less than once per week, but more than once per month	4.2 \pm 2.8 (36)
Once per week	4.4 \pm 2.9 (29)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	4.4 \pm 2.1 (13)
How often does child take bottle/pacifier out with them?	
Never	4.5 \pm 2.9 (17)
Rarely	3.5 \pm 2.7 (11)
Sometimes	5.9 \pm 2.0 (2)
Frequently	3.9 \pm 2.4 (3)
Always	2.1 \pm 1.2 (5)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
How often is the child's pacifier washed?	
Never	
Less than once per month	5.9 \pm 5.9 (3)
Once per month	1.2 \pm - (1)
Less than once a week, but more than once a month	5.1 \pm 3.4 (2)
Once per week	3.3 \pm - (1)
Less than once a day, but more than once a week	3.8 \pm 2.9 (6)
Everyday	4.0 \pm 2.3 (24)
Child does not have a pacifier	1.5 \pm - (1)
How often does the child use a cup with lid (sipee cup), bottle or pacifier outside during the spring, summer, and fall?	
Never	3.8 \pm 2.2 (108)
Less than once per week	4.1 \pm 2.8 (36)
Once per week	4.2 \pm 2.2 (19)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	4.6 \pm 3.5 (38)
Once per day	4.3 \pm 2.2 (39)
More than once per day	4.2 \pm 2.7 (42)
Are the child's hands or face usually washed before eating?	
Yes	4.1 \pm 2.5 (263)
No	3.6 \pm 3.0 (19)
How often does the child wash hands or face before eating?	
Never	3.5 \pm 0.4 (3)
Less than once per week	2.8 \pm 0.6 (3)
Once per week	1.7 \pm 1.1 (2)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	4.8 \pm 4.1 (7)
Once per day	4.2 \pm 2.0 (27)
More than once per day	4.1 \pm 2.5 (227)
Are the child's hands or face usually washed before going to sleep?	
Yes	4.2 \pm 2.6 (267)
No	3.5 \pm 2.0 (15)
How often does the child wash hands or face before going to sleep?	
Never	
Less than once per week	3.0 \pm 1.5 (11)
Once per week	
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	4.9 \pm 2.9 (13)
Once per day	4.1 \pm 2.6 (104)
More than once per day	4.2 \pm 2.6 (143)
Are the child's hands or face usually washed after playing with dirt or sand?	
Yes	4.2 \pm 2.6 (257)
No	3.1 \pm 1.7 (20)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
How often does the child wash hands or face after playing with dirt or sand?	
Never	3.5 \pm 1.5 (4)
Less than once per week	2.6 \pm 1.2 (12)
Once per week	2.9 \pm 1.3 (4)
Less than once per day, but more than once per week	4.8 \pm 3.8 (4)
Once per day	4.8 \pm 3.4 (31)
More than once per day	4.2 \pm 2.5 (206)
Has the child used a pacifier in the last 6 months?	
Yes	3.7 \pm 2.3 (35)
No	4.2 \pm 2.6 (232)
Does the child suck his/her thumb or fingers	
Yes	4.4 \pm 2.2 (68)
No	4.0 \pm 2.7 (215)
Does the child chew on their fingernails?	
Yes	4.3 \pm 2.5 (73)
No	4.0 \pm 2.6 (207)
Don't know	4.4 \pm - (1)
Does the child have a favorite blanket or toy?	
Yes	3.9 \pm 2.2 (148)
No	4.4 \pm 2.9 (134)
For those answering yes, does the child carry this around during the day?	
Yes	3.8 \pm 2.5 (82)
No	3.9 \pm 2.1 (77)
For those answering yes, does the child put this blanket or toy in their mouth?	
Yes	3.7 \pm 2.2 (62)
No	3.8 \pm 2.2 (97)
How often are toys and stuffed animals washed?	
Never	3.9 \pm 2.9 (57)
Less than once per month	3.8 \pm 2.3 (90)
Once per month	4.2 \pm 2.2 (67)
Less than once a week, but more than once a month	4.4 \pm 2.2 (28)
Once per week	4.8 \pm 3.4 (25)
Less than once a day, but more than once a week	4.2 \pm 2.2 (8)
Everyday	6.3 \pm 4.7 (5)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
How often does the child put things other than food into their mouth?	
Does this a lot	4.3 \pm 2.3 (53)
Just once in a while	4.7 \pm 3.1 (112)
Almost never	3.4 \pm 2.0 (48)
Never	3.5 \pm 1.7 (68)
Does the child put their mouth on furniture or on the window sill?	
Does this a lot	4.8 \pm 2.8 (19)
Just once in a while	4.7 \pm 3.0 (67)
Almost never	3.8 \pm 2.1 (47)
Never	3.8 \pm 2.4 (149)
Does the child swallow things other than food?	
Does this alot	5.6 \pm 3.7 (2)
Just once in a while	5.4 \pm 2.6 (17)
Almost never	4.7 \pm 2.9 (47)
Never	3.9 \pm 2.4 (216)
Does the child put paint chips in their mouth?	
Does this alot	
Just once in a while	6.1 \pm - (1)
Almost never	3.5 \pm 1.8 (7)
Never	4.1 \pm 2.6 (272)
Don't know	3.7 \pm 1.0 (2)
Does your household have a vegetable garden?	
Yes	3.4 \pm 1.6 (36)
No	4.2 \pm 2.7 (243)
For those answering yes, how often does the child eat vegetables grown in your garden?	
Once per week or more	3.4 \pm 1.9 (13)
Less than once per week	4.0 \pm 1.4 (7)
Never	2.9 \pm 1.1 (17)
Refused	3.5 \pm - (1)
Never	
Has soil been hauled in and placed on your garden?	
Yes	3.9 \pm 1.0 (11)
No	4.1 \pm 2.2 (12)
How often does the child eat vegetables grown elsewhere in the local area?	
Once per week or more	4.0 \pm 2.5 (33)
Less than once per week	4.5 \pm 2.9 (64)
Never	4.0 \pm 2.5 (180)

Table 11: (cont.) Average Blood Lead Levels by Questionnaire Response, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	MEAN ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) \pm S.D. (N)
Has the child ever been treated with traditional, folk, or herbal medications?	
Yes	3.7 \pm 3.4 (21)
No	4.1 \pm 2.5 (261)
Amount of out-of-pocket money spent each week on meat, vegetables and milk products in this household:	
\leq \$25	4.4 \pm 3.5 (33)
\$26-\$50	4.1 \pm 2.5 (93)
\$51-\$75	3.9 \pm 1.9 (73)
\$76-\$100	4.6 \pm 3.1 (44)
$>$ \$100	3.7 \pm 1.8 (38)
Refused	7.9 \pm - (1)
Amount of out-of-pocket money spent each week on items other than meat, vegetables and milk products in this household:	
\leq \$25	4.4 \pm 2.7 (69)
\$26-\$50	4.0 \pm 2.7 (112)
\$51-\$75	4.4 \pm 2.6 (58)
\$76-\$100	3.4 \pm 1.7 (25)
$>$ \$100	3.3 \pm 1.9 (17)
Refused	7.9 \pm - (1)
Don't know	1.9 \pm - (1)
Do you receive food stamps, WIC vouchers, food from pantries, or any other programs?	
Yes	4.6 \pm 2.8 (114)
No	3.7 \pm 2.3 (169)

Table 12: Correlation Coefficients for Blood Lead Levels with Questionnaire Responses, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

Variable	Correlation Coefficient	p-value ^{1,2}	Number of Children
Questionnaire			
Age	-.189	.001	282
Year home built	.118	.047	284
How often clean kitchen	.029	.624	284
How often clean child's bedroom	.135	.023	284
How often dry sweep	-.045	.449	284
How often vacuum	.087	.143	284
How often mop	-.065	.273	284
How often wet wipe	-.103	.084	284
How often dry dust	.083	.164	284
How often use other cleaning methods	.004	.945	284
How often child play with pet	.204	.032	111
How often are child's hands washed after playing with pet	.168	.086	106
How many hours a day child plays outside (spring and fall)	.004	.952	283
How many hours a day child plays outside (winter)	.054	.369	283
How many hours a day child plays outside (summer)	.124	.037	283
How many hours a day child spends playing on the floor	.100	.094	283
How many hours a day child plays outside	.009	.881	254
How often child plays in dirt	.229	.000	256
How often child plays on concrete/asphalt	-.027	.668	256
How often child plays on grassy area	-.164	.009	254
How many times weekly is the child bathed or showered	.030	.619	283
How often child's hands or face washed after playing with dirt	-.039	.527	262
How often child's hands or face washed before going to sleep	.063	.302	271
How often child's hands or face washed before eating	.051	.407	269
How often child eats food that has fallen on the floor	.056	.347	281
How often child eats vegetables from own garden	.016	.924	38
How often child eats root vegetables from own garden	.222	.285	25
How often child eats leafy green vegetables from own garden	.161	.453	24
How often child eats vegetables from elsewhere	-.027	.659	277
How often child eats root vegetables grown elsewhere	.011	.906	119
How often child eats leafy green vegetables from elsewhere	.007	.944	118
How often child takes bottle/pacifier outside	-.244	.140	38
How often child's pacifier washed	-.148	.376	38
How often toys/stuffed animals washed	.135	.024	280
Highest level of education completed by head of household	-.053	.377	283
Highest level of education completed by child's mother	.130	.059	211
Amount of out-of-pocket money spent each week on meat, vegetables and milk	.080	.182	282
Amount of out-of-pocket money spent each week on other food items	.005	.927	283
Number of people smoking in house	.200	.001	280

1. Bolded significance indicates correlation at the 0.10 or less level.

2. Two-tailed significance level.

Table 13: Correlation Coefficients for Blood Lead Levels with Environmental Data, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

Variable	Correlation Coefficient	p-value ^{1,2}	Number of Children
Environmental Samples			
Total number of rooms in residence $\mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$	-.150	.013	275
Window stool composite loading ³ $\mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$.295	.000	257
Miniblint composite loading ³ $\mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$.154	.020	226
Floor composite loading ³ $\mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$.155	.009	283
Mean lead dust loading ³ $\mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$.156	.008	283
Drip line soil ³ mg/kg	.218	.000	284
Play area soil ³ mg/kg	.080	.257	200
Yard soil ³ mg/kg	.094	.114	284
Mean soil ³ mg/kg	.094	.114	284
Outdoor wall total XRF ³ mg/cm ²	.352	.000	248
Porch total XRF ³ mg/cm ²	.241	.001	202
Outdoor structure total XRF ³ mg/cm ²	.322	.000	258
Mean window stool XRF ³ mg/cm ²	.240	.000	223
Mean miniblint XRF ³ mg/cm ²	.037	.592	208
Mean indoor total XRF ³ mg/cm ²	.157	.009	272

1. Bolded significance indicates correlation at the 0.10 or less level.

2. Two-tailed significance level.

3. Log transformed, mean soil levels is the average of yard, dripline, and play areas

Table 14 - Questionnaire Responses by Factors and Group, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	INITIAL N (%)	FOLLOW-UP N (%)	p-VALUE ¹
Age (years)	3.38±1.58	3.29±1.57	.824
Gender			
Male	122 (50.2)	112 (52.3)	
Female	121 (49.8)	102 (47.7)	.649
Race			
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	7 (2.9)	10 (4.7)	
Asian/ Pacific Islander	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Black	2 (0.8)	1 (0.5)	
White	233 (96.3)	194 (91.5)	
Other	0 (0.0)	7 (3.3)	
Don't know			.024
Is child Hispanic or of Spanish Descent			
Yes	12 (5.0)	22 (10.3)	
No	230 (95.0)	191 (89.3)	
Don't Know		1 (0.5)	.030
Total gross household income before taxes:			
≤ \$4,999	20 (8.2)	7 (3.3)	
\$5,000-\$9,999	19 (7.8)	15 (7.0)	
\$10,000-\$14,999	21 (8.6)	20 (9.4)	
\$15,000-\$19,999	36 (14.8)	21 (9.9)	
\$20,000-\$24,999	38 (15.6)	22 (10.3)	
\$25,000-\$29,999	34 (14.0)	18 (8.5)	
\$30,000-\$34,999	23 (9.5)	24 (11.3)	
\$35,000-\$39,999	15 (6.2)	19 (8.9)	
≥ \$40,000	30 (12.3)	56 (26.3)	
Refused	1 (4)	1 (0.5)	
Don't Know	6 (2.5)	10 (4.7)	.002
Highest year of education completed by the mother of the child:			
No schooling	0 (0.0)	1 (0.6)	
Elementary School	3 (1.3)	17 (10.3)	
High School	124 (51.9)	76 (46.9)	
Four year College/Technical School	99 (41.4)	66 (40.7)	
Attended Graduate school	13 (5.4)	2 (1.2)	
Don't know			.000
Year house was built			
<1900-1909	25 (13.4)	14 (8.3)	
1910-1919	10 (5.4)	5 (3.0)	
1920-1929	17 (9.1)	9 (5.4)	
1930-1939	14 (7.5)	8 (4.8)	
1940-1949	19 (10.2)	11 (6.5)	
1950-1959	9 (4.8)	11 (6.5)	
1960-1969	19 (10.2)	9 (5.4)	
1970-1979	21 (11.3)	22 (13.1)	
1980-1989	50 (26.9)	23 (13.7)	
1990-present	2 (1.1)	56 (33.3)	
Refused		1 (0.5)	
Don't know		46 (21.4)	.000

¹ Chi square or Fisher's Exact test used for categorical data, t-test for scaled data. Two tailed test of significance.

Table 14 – (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors and Group, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	INITIAL N (%)	FOLLOW-UP N (%)	p-VALUE ¹
House rented or owned?			
Rented	72 (29.6)	73 (34.8)	
Owned	171 (70.4)	137 (65.2)	
Other			.243
Type of water pipes			
Lead	22 (9.11)	4 (1.9)	
Plastic		110 (51.4)	
Galvanized Steel		16 (7.5)	
Copper		6 (2.8)	
Iron		1 (0.5)	
Mixed		24 (11.2)	
Other	221 (90.9)	4 (1.9)	
Don't Know		49 (22.9)	.001
What type of exterior does your home have?			
Wood	146 (60.1)	78 (36.3)	
Brick			
Block			
Mobile home			
Vinyl/Metal siding			
Other	97 (39.9)	137 (63.7)	
Refused			
Don't know			.000
Any part of house repainted, sanded, or stripped chemically or by heat within last year?			
Yes	107 (44)	82 (38.7)	
No	136 (56.0)	130 (61.3)	.248
How many total hours does your child spend at home Monday through Friday?	106.9 ± 17.4 (243)	105.8 ± 20.2 (215)	.002
How many total hours does your child spend at home Saturday and Sunday?	42.8 ± 9.2 (243)	45.7 ± 7.0 (215)	.001
How many total hours does your child spend at the babysitter (outside of home) Monday through Friday?	6.1 ± 14.2 (243)	3.4 ± 11.0 (215)	.000
How many total hours does your child spend at the babysitter (outside of home) Saturday and Sunday?	0.1 ± 0.8 (243)	0.1 ± 1.2 (215)	.402
How many total hours does your child spend at the daycare (commercial facility) Monday through Friday?	3.6 ± 11.1 (243)	5.2 ± 13.3 (215)	.006
How many total hours does your child spend at the daycare (commercial facility) Saturday and Sunday?	0.3 ± 2.0 (243)	0.1 ± 1.4 (215)	.025
How many total hours does your child spend at the other locations Monday through Friday?	3.3 ± 7.1 (243)	5.0 ± 13.0 (215)	.000
How many total hours does your child spend at the other locations Saturday and Sunday?	4.8 ± 9.2 (243)	1.8 ± 6.1 (215)	.000

¹ Chi square or Fisher's Exact test used for categorical data, t-test for scaled data. Two tailed test of significance.

Table 14 – (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors and Group, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	INITIAL N (%)	FOLLOW-UP N (%)	p-VALUE ¹
Does child breast feed? (Only for participants ≤ 3 yrs old)			
Yes	5 (3.6)	3 (3.0)	.800
No	134 (96.4)	97 (97.0)	
Does the child play outdoors, around the house, or in the neighborhood?			
Yes	224 (92.2%)	186 (87.3)	
No	19 (7.8)	27 (12.7)	.086
Where does child usually play outdoors around the house?			
Back yard	80 (35.7)	92 (47.7)	
Front yard	56 (25.0)	64 (33.2)	
Side yard	80 (35.7)	26 (13.5)	
Other	8 (3.6)	11 (5.7)	.000
Where does the child usually play (in last 90 days) when not at home?			
Neighbor's yard	57 (25.4)	37 (19.3)	
Playground	7 (3.1)	7 (3.6)	
Near or around creek or ditch	2 (.9)	2 (1.0)	
On or near sidewalks or streets	11 (4.9)	8 (4.2)	
Park	27 (12.1)	19 (9.9)	
Only plays around the home	50 (22.3)	60 (31.3)	
Other	68 (30.4)	59 (30.7)	
Don't know			.403
Is the ground where the child usually plays mainly:			
Grassy	134 (59.8)	146 (76.0)	
Concrete/asphalt	14 (6.3)	10 (5.2)	
Dirt/Soil	33 (14.7)	21 (10.9)	
Sandbox	21 (9.4)	2 (1.0)	
Other	22 (9.8)	13 (6.8)	.001
Does the child often take food, snacks, candy, bottle, or pacifier with him or her outside to play?			
Yes	90 (37.0)	108 (51.2)	
No	153 (63.0)	103 (48.8)	.002
Are the child's hands or face usually washed before eating?			
Yes	211 (87.6)	200 (93.9)	
No	30 (12.4)	13 (6.1)	.021
Are the child's hands or face usually washed before going to sleep?			
Yes	221 (91.3)	203 (95.3)	
No	21 (8.7)	10 (4.7)	.092
Are the child's hands or face usually washed after playing with dirt or sand?			
Yes	231 (96.3)	193 (91.9)	
No	9 (3.8)	17 (8.1)	.049

¹ Chi square or Fisher's Exact test used for categorical data, t-test for scaled data. Two tailed test of significance.

Table 14 – (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors and Group, Jasper County, Missouri
Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	INITIAL N (%)	FOLLOW-UP N (%)	p-VALUE ¹
Has the child used a pacifier in the last 6 months?			
Yes	25 (10.3)	24 (11.9)	
No	218 (89.7)	177 (88.1)	.580
Does the child suck his/her thumb or fingers			
Yes	50 (20.6)	47 (22.0)	
No	193 (79.4)	167 (78.0)	.718
Does the child chew on their fingernails?			
Yes	65 (26.7)	54 (25.6)	
No	178 (73.3)	157 (74.4)	
Don't know			.780
Does the child have a favorite blanket or toy?			
Yes	112 (46.1)	111 (52.1)	
No	131 (53.9)	102 (47.9)	.199
For those answering yes, does the child carry this around during the day?			
Yes	47 (42.3)	67 (55.8)	
No	64 (57.7)	53 (44.2)	.040
For those answering yes, does the child put this blanket or toy in their mouth?			
Yes	31 (27.9)	44 (39.3)	
No	80 (72.1)	68 (60.7)	.073
How often does the child put things other than food into their mouth?			
Does this alot	52 (21.4)	37 (17.5)	
Just once in a while	83 (34.2)	83 (39.2)	
Almost never	72 (29.6)	41 (19.3)	
Never	36 (14.8)	51 (24.1)	.009
Does the child put their mouth on furniture or on the window sill?			
Does this alot	22 (9.1)	13 (6.1)	
Just once in a while	56 (23.0)	47 (22.1)	
Almost never	47 (19.3)	35 (16.4)	
Never	118 (48.6)	118 (55.4)	.408
Does the child swallow things other than food?			
Does this alot	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)	
Just once in a while	19 (7.8)	11 (5.2)	
Almost never	63 (25.9)	40 (18.8)	
Never	161 (66.3)	161 (75.6)	.097
Does the child put paint chips in their mouth?			
Does this alot	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Just once in a while	4 (1.7)	1 (0.5)	
Almost never	4 (1.7)	3 (1.4)	
Never	234 (96.7)	207 (98.1)	
Don't know			.477

¹ Chi square or Fisher's Exact test used for categorical data, t-test for scaled data. Two tailed test of significance.

Table 14 – (cont.) Questionnaire Responses by Factors and Group, Jasper County, Missouri
Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

FACTOR	INITIAL N (%)	FOLLOW-UP N (%)	p-VALUE ¹
Does your household have a vegetable garden?			
Yes	51 (21.0)	33 (15.6)	.143
No	192 (79.0)	178 (84.4)	
For those answering yes, how often does the child eat vegetables grown in your garden?			
Once per week or more	20 (39.2)	12 (35.3)	.009
Less than once per week	0 (0.0)	6 (17.6)	
Never	31 (60.8)	15 (44.1)	
Refused	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)	
How often does your child eat root vegetables (such as beets or turnips) grown in your garden?			
Once per week or more	6 (11.8)	3 (12.5)	.952
Less than once per week	3 (5.9)	1 (4.2)	
Never	42 (82.4)	20 (83.3)	
How often does your child eat leafy green vegetables (such as lettuce or spinach) grown in your garden?			
Once per week or more	4 (7.8)	2 (8.7)	.139
Less than once per week	2 (3.9)	4 (17.4)	
Never	45 (88.2)	17 (73.9)	
Has soil been hauled in and placed on your garden?			
Yes	25 (49.0)	11 (50.0)	.939
No	26 (51.0)	11 (50.0)	
Don't know			
How often does the child eat vegetables grown elsewhere in the local area?			
Once per week or more	88 (36.2)	28 (13.5)	.000
Less than once per week	74 (30.5)	55 (26.4)	
Never	81 (33.3)	125 (60.1)	
How often does your child eat root vegetables (such as beets or turnips) grown elsewhere in the area?			
Once per week or more	33 (20.6)	13 (12.3)	.211
Less than once per week	26 (16.3)	19 (17.9)	
Never	101 (63.1)	74 (69.3)	
How often does your child eat leafy green vegetables (such as lettuce or spinach) grown elsewhere in the area?			
Once per week or more	52 (32.1)	17 (16.2)	.015
Less than once per week	31 (19.1)	24 (22.9)	
Never	79 (48.8)	64 (61.0)	
Has the child ever been treated with traditional, folk, or herbal medications?			
Yes	7 (2.9)	17 (8.0)	.015
No	235 (97.1)	196 (92.0)	

¹ Chi square or Fisher's Exact test used for categorical data, t-test for scaled data. Two tailed test of significance.

Table 15- Blood Lead and Environmental Data for Initial 1991 Study

Variable	Study Group
	Mean \pm SD (n)
Blood Lead, $\mu\text{g/dl}$	6.25 \pm 4.86 (225)
Lead Dust, mg/kg	608 \pm 1551 (125)
Lead Paint, mg/cm ²	1.38 \pm 1.65 (121)
Lead Soil, mg/kg	599 \pm 735 (125)

Table 16: Mean Blood Lead Levels and Environmental Measurements for Soil-Remediated Homes and Not Soil Remediated Homes, Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2001

	Soil Remediated Homes			Not Soil Remediated Homes			p value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
Mean Blood Lead Levels $\mu\text{g/dl}$	68	5.14	3.10	216	3.76	2.26	.001
Window Sill Composite Loading $\mu\text{g/ft}^2$	67	850	3952	193	205	770	.189
Miniblind Composite Loading $\mu\text{g/ft}^2$	49	1682	3453	180	1203	3227	.365
Floor Composite Loading $\mu\text{g/ft}^2$	68	5.1	9.7	218	3.7	10.2	.310
Mean Lead Dust Loading $\mu\text{g/ft}^2$	68	480	1008	218	301	857	.152
Drip Line Soil Result mg/kg	68	1617	4800	219	1030	2651	.338
Play Area Soil Result mg/kg	43	200	298	159	277	298	.135
Yard Soil Result mg/kg	68	227	295	219	315	498	.170
Overall Soil mg/kg	68	803	2027	219	576	1221	.384
Outdoor Wall Total XRF mg/cm ²	65	3.7	4.2	187	1.5	3.3	.000
Porch Total XRF mg/cm ²	56	6.6	8.5	149	2.5	5.0	.000
Outside Structure Total XRF mg/cm ²	66	4.6	4.8	196	1.7	3.1	.000
Mean Window Stool XRF Result mg/cm ²	65	1.5	3.0	161	0.5	1.5	.000
Mean Miniblind XRF Result mg/cm ²	50	3.9	3.6	170	3.4	3.4	.367
Mean Indoor Total XRF Result mg/cm ²	68	1.5	1.7	213	1.0	1.5	.022




Figure 1: Cumulative frequency graph of blood lead levels. The perpendicular line indicates the CDC level of concern for elevated blood lead levels.





Figure 2: Boxplots of dust lead levels. Medians are indicated by solid line in box, interquartile ranges indicated by whiskers, outliers indicated by circles, and extreme cases indicated by asterisks. Note that the dust levels on floors was low and did not show details on this scale.



*Figure 3: Boxplots of soil lead levels. Medians are indicated by solid line in box, interquartile ranges indicated by whiskers, outliers indicated by circles, and extreme cases indicated by asterisks.




Figure 4: Boxplots of lead paint levels. Medians are indicated by solid line in box, interquartile ranges indicated by whiskers, outliers indicated by circles, and extreme cases indicated by asterisks.




Figure 5: Mean and 95% confidence intervals for blood lead levels of children in the original and follow-up study.




Figure 6: Boxplots of soil lead levels for soil-remediated homes. Medians are indicated by solid line in box, interquartile ranges indicated by whiskers, outliers indicated by circles, and extreme cases indicated by asterisks.




Figure 7: Average blood lead levels and 95% confidence intervals for children living in homes with or without interior lead based paint and dripline soil lead levels less than or greater than 800 ppm.




Figure 8: Average blood lead levels and 95% confidence intervals for children living in homes with or without interior lead based paint and dripline soil lead levels less than or greater than 400 ppm.




Figure 9: Average blood lead levels and 95% confidence intervals for children living in homes with or without interior lead based paint and yard soil lead levels less than or greater than 400 ppm.




Figure 10: Average blood lead levels and 95% confidence intervals for children living in homes with or without interior lead based paint and overall average soil lead levels less than or greater than 400 ppm.




Figure 12: Scatterplot of blood lead levels and log of window sill composite dust wipe samples.




Figure 13: Scatterplot of blood lead levels and the log of drip line soil lead levels.





Figure 14: Scatterplot of blood lead levels and log of floor composite leading dust lead levels.


APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Study Area


Jasper County Lead Exposure Study Area 2000



-  Roads
-  Original Study Area
-  Oversample



Jasper County Lead Exposure Study Follow-up Participants 2000



Appendix 2: Census Form

Household Census Form

Jasper County, Missouri, Superfund Site

Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2000

Visit Number (at least 3 visits at differing times) Record interviewer number after Date/Time

Date/Time 1 _____ Date/Time 2 _____ Date/Time 3 _____

Date/Time 4 _____ Date/Time 5 _____ Date/Time 6 _____

Date/Time Information obtained from a neighbor _____

Name of Responder _____

1. How many members in this household?

(Circle number)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 >10

2. What is your relationship in this household? (Circle answer)

1- Parent; 2- Child; 3- Other family member; 4- Neighbor; 5- Other

3. What are the names, dates of birth, ages, sexes, ethnicity, and length of residence of persons in the household between ages 0 and 72 months of age? (List below) Ethnicity (W- white; B- black; H- Hispanic; O- other)

First and Last Name (0-72 Months)	Date of Birth	Age	Sex	Ethnicity	Years/Months		
	MM/DD/YY	(opt)*	M/F		at Residence	Y	M

* If no date of birth is available

PRINT

Parent/Guardian Name _____

Residential Address _____ City _____
(Street, RR, Box #)Telephone (Home) _____ (Work) _____ ZIP code _____
(Responder)

Name & Telephone of someone who will know how to contact you _____

Mailing Address (If different) _____
(Street, RR, Box #)

City _____ ZIP code _____

Appendix 3: Power Calculation

Program PASS 6.0 Two-Sample T-Tests Power Analysis

Numeric Results for Two-Sample T-Test

Null Hypothesis: Mean 1=Mean 2 Alternative Hypothesis: Mean 1 \diamond Mean 2

The sigmas were assumed to be known and equal. The N's were forced to be equal.

Power	N1	N2	Alpha	Beta	Mean1	Mean2	Sigma1	Sigma2
0.97857	250	250	0.01000	0.02143	6.25	4.25	4.86	4.86
0.99587	250	250	0.05000	0.00413	6.25	4.25	4.86	4.86
0.99844	250	250	0.10000	0.00156	6.25	4.25	4.86	4.86

Numeric Results for Two-Sample T-Test

Null Hypothesis: Mean1=Mean2 Alternative Hypothesis: Mean1 \diamond Mean 2

The sigmas were assumed to be known and equal. The N's were forced to be equal.

Power	N1	N2	Alpha	Beta	Mean1	Mean2	Sigma1	Sigma2
0.63084	100	100	0.01000	0.36916	6.25	4.25	4.86	4.86
0.82893	100	100	0.05000	0.17107	6.25	4.25	4.86	4.86
0.89708	100	100	0.10000	0.10292	6.25	4.25	4.86	4.86

Reference: Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions, Second Edition; Joseph L. Fleiss

Appendix 4: Sampling Teams

Sampling Teams

Team #	Member	Title	Responsibility
1	Kendra Williams	Environmental Specialist	Environmental Samples, XRF
	Marcie Goade	R.N.	Blood Test, Interview
2	Roger Newell	Environmental Specialist	Environmental Samples, XRF
	Lauri Fasken	R.N., M.S.N	Blood Test, Interview
3	Brandon Rekus	Environmental Specialist	Environmental Samples, XRF
	Cindy Wagner	Phlebotomist	Blood Test, Interview
4	Tony Moehr	Environmental Specialist	Environmental Samples, XRF
	Robin Kueghn	Phlebotomist	Blood Test, Interview

Appendix 5: Consent Forms

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

**Consent to Participate in a Research Study:
Jasper County, Missouri, Superfund Site
Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2000**

A study is being done to see if children living near the Jasper County Superfund Site have lower blood lead levels than in 1991. The study is run by the Missouri Department of Health, along with the Jasper County Health Department, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, St. Louis University School of Public Health, and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.

The project wants you and your child to join in this research study. We are asking you to be in this study because you have lived in Jasper County for 60 days or more and have a child between the ages of 6 to 72 months. Through this study, we hope to learn if the amount of lead in children's blood has improved after the Superfund clean-up efforts. We will also look at factors related to blood lead levels in these children.

You are free to join in the study or not and you may stop being in the study at any time. If you do not join or stop, you will not be punished in any way. If you choose to be in this study, you will be asked to answer questions such as: the occupation, education, income and tobacco use of persons living in your home, cleaning habits, and your children's play. We will also draw about 1 to 2 teaspoons of blood from a vein in your child's arm. People trained to do this safely will take blood. People will take samples of the soil, dust and water in your home for testing as well as samples of soil from the yard around your home. All of this should take about two hours of your time.

Your child will feel a slight sting when we take blood from a vein. The hurt will be over quickly. The stick we use is sterile, so it will not harm your child. Also, the amount of blood we take will not harm your child at all. Your child may have a bruise from where the needle went in.

The possible benefits of being in the study include knowing your child's blood lead level. You will get test results within 90 days. If your child has high blood lead levels, we will refer you to your private doctor or health department for follow-up at your own cost and there may be more samples taken from in and around your home. Helping to carry out this research may help us learn how to protect children from lead in the future.

What we talk about and your and your child's test results will be kept private to the extent allowed by law. We will keep all records in a locked file cabinet and only study staff will be allowed to look at them. Your name, your child's name or other facts that may point to you will not appear when we present this study or publish its results.

The only cost to you for being in the study is the time you must spend. The tests that we do for this study will be done at no cost to you. We will give you \$15 to repay you for the time you take for being in our study, even if you are not able to finish.

As we said before, you are free to join in the study or not and you may stop being in the study at any time. If you do not join or stop, you will not be punished in anyway. You may pull your child from the study at any time without giving a reason. Also, it is important that you know that you do not have to answer any questions asked by the study staff if you do not wish to. In any of these cases, you will not lose any services that you may expect apart from this study. If you choose to not be in this study, you

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

may still have your child tested for lead by going to the Jasper County Health Department or to your doctor.

If you have any questions about how the study works, feel free to contact study investigators, Mr. Daryl Roberts or Mr. Tony Moehr (see phone numbers listed below). If you have any questions about your or your child's rights in the study, or if you believe your child has suffered harm as a result of being in this study, contact Ms. Mahree Skala, Chairperson of the Missouri Department of Health Institutional Review Board, at 573-751-6079.

Investigators on this study and their phone numbers are:

Daryl W. Roberts,	573-751-6102 or 800-392-7245
Tony Moehr	417-358-0480

I have read, or have been read, this consent form. I have had my questions and concerns answered so that all parts of the study are clear to me now. I believe that I see the purpose of the study as well as the potential risks and benefits that are involved. I have received a copy of this consent form. I agree to my and my child being a part of this study.

Date: _____
Month/Day/Year

Parent/Guardian Signature _____

Parent/Guardian Name (Printed) _____

Witness Signature _____

Witness Name (Printed) _____

I certify that I have explained to the above individual(s) the nature and purpose of this research study, the potential benefits and possible risks associated with participation, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

These elements of informed consent conform to the assurance given by the Missouri Department of Health to the Department of Health and Human Services to protect the rights of persons who are in research studies. I have given the participant a copy of this signed consent document.

Date _____
Month/Day/Year

Investigator Signature _____



P.O. Box 570, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0570 • 573/751-6400 • FAX 573/751-6010

Participant Consent to Environmental Sampling In and Around Home

Jasper County, Missouri, Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2000

I understand that the Missouri Department of Health's follow-up lead exposure study will include some environmental sampling in and around the homes of the participants. The sampling may include drinking water, household dust, interior and exterior paint and yard soil. The samples will be taken by the Jasper County Health Department and they will carry and show identification.

I will allow reasonable access to properly identified representatives/contractors. I understand there will be no cost to me for this sampling and that I will be notified of the results. Prior to any sampling, I will be contacted for the arrangement of a convenient date and time.

Printed Name

Signature

Today's Date

Address

Daytime Phone

Nighttime Phone

Directions to home

MO 580-9012 (01-00)

Appendix 6: Questionnaire

Missouri Department of Health

Jasper County, Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study Questionnaire

I would like to ask you a series of questions that will help us determine how we can best help you reduce your child's exposure to lead. All of your answers are confidential and no one other than the research team will see your name or address.

1. Interviewer number:

- 1 Lauri Fasken
- 2 Marcie Goade
- 3 Cindy Wagner
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

2. The child's I.D. Number: _____

3. Today's date: _____

4. The child's first name: _____

5. The child's last name: _____

6. The respondent's first name: _____

7. The respondent's last name: _____
8. The primary care giver's first name: _____
9. The primary care giver's last name: _____
10. The street address of this home: _____
11. The city of this home: _____
12. The state of this home: _____
13. The zip code of this home: _____
14. The phone number of this home: _____
15. Who is answering these questions? (Circle one.)
- 1 = Child's mother
 - 2 = Child's father
 - 3 = Child's grandparents
 - 4 = Other relative
 - 5 = Other (specify) _____
16. How many people live in this home, including (CHILD'S NAME)?
- The number: _____
- 88 = Refused
- 99 = Don't know

17. How many are less than 7 years of age?

The number: _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

18. How many are 7 to 12 years old?

The number: _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

19. How many are 13 to 18 years old?

The number: _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

20. How long has (CHILD'S NAME) been living in this home?

Years _____ Months _____

If less than 90 days, obtain previous address.

Address: _____

Now, I would like to ask you some questions about this home.

21. What year was this home built? (Oldest part)

(Show Card A. Circle one.)

0=1909 or earlier

1= 1910 to 1919

2= 1920 to 1929

3= 1930 to 1939

4= 1940 to 1949

5= 1950 to 1959

6= 1960 to 1969

7= 1970 to 1979

8= 1980 to 1989

9= 1990 to present

88= Refused

99= Don't know

22. Is the home (CHILD'S NAME) lives in rented or owned? (Show Card B.)

1= rent

2= own

3= other (specify) _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

23. What type of water does (CHILD'S NAME) household normally use most for:

	a. Drinking?	b. Cooking?
Private well water	1	1
Public water (city or districts)	2	2
Bottled	3	3
Local spring or brook	4	4
Cistern	5	5
Other (specify) _____	6	6
	88= Refused	88= Refused
	99=Don't know	99=Don't know

24. What type of water pipes does the home contain?

1= lead

2= plastic

3= galvanized steel

4= copper

5= iron

6= mixed (specify) _____

7= other (specify) _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

25. What type of exterior does (CHILD'S NAME) home have?

1= wood

2= brick

3= block

4= mobile home

5= vinyl/metal siding

6= other (specify) _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

26. Has any parts of your house been repainted, sanded, or chemically or heat stripped, or otherwise refinished within the last year?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

IF YES, Approximately when was this more recently done?

_____ (Enter 99 if don't know month)

(Month)/ (year)

27. Do you use air conditioning in (CHILD'S NAME) home?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 29)

88= Refused

99= Don't know

28. Does this home have central air or a window unit?

1= Central air

2= Window unit

3= Both

88= Refused

99= Don't know

29. Has anyone ever used any material from mines or smelters, such as chat or slag, or lead industry in or around your house or yard?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

This is a list of activities you or other household members may do or may have done in the last 90 days. These include activities related to work, hobbies or chores done at home or at other places. (Ref-Refused; DK-Don't know)

30. In the last 90 days, have any members of this household participated in any of these activities or manufactured processes? (Show Card E.)

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
1. Painted pictures with artists paints (not children's paints)	1	2	88	99
2. Painted, stained or refinished furniture	1	2	88	99
3. Painted the inside or outside of a home or building	1	2	88	99
4. Worked with stained glass	1	2	88	99
5. Cast lead into fishing sinkers, bullets, toys or anything else	1	2	88	99
6. Welded	1	2	88	99
7. Worked with soldering in electronics	1	2	88	99

31. IF YES: Was this done at home, work, or elsewhere? (Show Card F.)

	<u>Home</u>	<u>Work</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
1	1	2	3	88	99
2	1	2	3	88	99
3	1	2	3	88	99
4	1	2	3	88	99
5	1	2	3	88	99
6	1	2	3	88	99
7	1	2	3	88	99

32. IF WORK/OTHER: Were those clothes worn home?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
1	1	2	88	99
2	1	2	88	99
3	1	2	88	99
4	1	2	88	99
5	1	2	88	99
6	1	2	88	99
7	1	2	88	99

33. IF WORK/OTHER: Did he/she shower before coming home?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
1	1	2	88	99
2	1	2	88	99
3	1	2	88	99
4	1	2	88	99
5	1	2	88	99
6	1	2	88	99
7	1	2	88	99

30 (cont.). In the last 90 days, have any members of this household participated in any of these activities or manufactured processes?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
8. Soldered pipes or sheets of metal	1	2	88	99
9. Repaired auto radiators	1	2	88	99
10. Worked on auto bodies or auto maintenance (includes mechanics)	1	2	88	99
11. Worked at a sewage treatment plant	1	2	88	99
12. Made pottery	1	2	88	99
13. Ridden a dirt bike, mountain bike or ATV in the local area	1	2	88	99
14. Cleaned or repaired firearms	1	2	88	99
15. Visited indoor firearm target ranges	1	2	88	99

31 (cont.). IF YES: Was this done at home, work, or elsewhere? (Show Card F)

<u>Home</u>	<u>Work</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
1	2	3	88	99
1	2	3	88	99
1	2	3	88	99
1	2	3	88	99
1	2	3	88	99
1	2	3	88	99
1	2	3	88	99
1	2	3	88	99

32 (cont.). IF WORK/OTHER: Were those clothes worn home?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99

33 (cont.). IF WORK/OTHER: Did he/she shower before coming home?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99
1	2	88	99

30 (cont.). In the last 90 days, have any members of this household participated in any of these activities or manufactured processes?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
16. Cut or spliced wire or cable	1	2	88	99
17. Smelted lead	1	2	88	99
18. Manufactured plastics	1	2	88	99
19. Manufactured batteries	1	2	88	99
20. Manufactured paint, glaze, or ink	1	2	88	99
21. Machined pipes	1	2	88	99
22. Electroplated with lead solutions	1	2	88	99
23. Refined gasoline	1	2	88	99
24. Manufactured rubber	1	2	88	99
25. Recovered scrap metal	1	2	88	99
26. Participated in other lead related jobs or activities: Specify: _____	1	2	88	99

31 (cont.). IF YES: Was this done at home, work, or elsewhere? (Show Card F)

	<u>Home</u>	<u>Work</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
	1	2	3	88	99
1	1	2	3	88	99
2	1	2	3	88	99
3	1	2	3	88	99
4	1	2	3	88	99
5	1	2	3	88	99
6	1	2	3	88	99
7	1	2	3	88	99
8	1	2	3	88	99
9	1	2	3	88	99
10	1	2	3	88	99
11	1	2	3	88	99
12	1	2	3	88	99
13	1	2	3	88	99
14	1	2	3	88	99
15	1	2	3	88	99
16	1	2	3	88	99
17	1	2	3	88	99
18	1	2	3	88	99
19	1	2	3	88	99
20	1	2	3	88	99
21	1	2	3	88	99
22	1	2	3	88	99
23	1	2	3	88	99
24	1	2	3	88	99
25	1	2	3	88	99
26	1	2	3	88	99

32 (cont.) IF WORK/ OTHER: Were those clothes worn home?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
	1	2	88	99
1	1	2	88	99
2	1	2	88	99
3	1	2	88	99
4	1	2	88	99
5	1	2	88	99
6	1	2	88	99
7	1	2	88	99
8	1	2	88	99
9	1	2	88	99
10	1	2	88	99
11	1	2	88	99
12	1	2	88	99
13	1	2	88	99
14	1	2	88	99
15	1	2	88	99
16	1	2	88	99
17	1	2	88	99
18	1	2	88	99
19	1	2	88	99
20	1	2	88	99
21	1	2	88	99
22	1	2	88	99
23	1	2	88	99
24	1	2	88	99
25	1	2	88	99
26	1	2	88	99

33 (cont.). IF WORK/ OTHER: Did he/she shower before coming home?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ref</u>	<u>DK</u>
	1	2	88	99
1	1	2	88	99
2	1	2	88	99
3	1	2	88	99
4	1	2	88	99
5	1	2	88	99
6	1	2	88	99
7	1	2	88	99
8	1	2	88	99
9	1	2	88	99
10	1	2	88	99
11	1	2	88	99
12	1	2	88	99
13	1	2	88	99
14	1	2	88	99
15	1	2	88	99
16	1	2	88	99
17	1	2	88	99
18	1	2	88	99
19	1	2	88	99
20	1	2	88	99
21	1	2	88	99
22	1	2	88	99
23	1	2	88	99
24	1	2	88	99
25	1	2	88	99
26	1	2	88	99

34. Have any members of the household worked in mining or a mining related job such as material handling or transportation in the last 90 days?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 39)

88= Refused (Go to Question 39)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 39)

35. What type of mining or mine related work have household members done in the last 90 days? (Show Card G. Circle all that apply.)

		Yes	No	Refused	Don't know
a.	Underground	1	2	88	99
b.	Surface	1	2	88	99
c.	Milling	1	2	88	99
d.	Transportation/ Handling	1	2	88	99
e.	Clerical/Admin.	1	2	88	99
f.	Smelter	1	2	88	99
g.	Other	1	2	88	99

If other, specify: _____

36. What type of mine or mine material have household members worked with in the last 90 days? (Show Card H. Circle all that apply.)

		Yes	No	Don't know	Refused
h.	Lead	1	2	99	88
i.	Zinc	1	2	99	88
j.	Silver	1	2	99	88
k.	Molybdenum	1	2	99	88
l.	Coal	1	2	99	88
m.	Limestone	1	2	99	88
n.	Clay	1	2	99	88
o.	Other	1	2	99	88

If other, specify: _____

37. Does any household member(s) that works in a mine or mining related job wear his/her work clothes home after working? (Show Card I.)

1= Always

2= Sometimes

3= Never

88= Refused

99= Don't know

38. Does any household member(s) that works in a mine or mining related job come home from work without showering? (Show Card I.)

1= Always

2= Sometimes

3= Never

88= Refused

99= Don't know

Now, I have some questions about how you clean your home.

39. How often do you clean the following rooms?

	times per month	how long each time (in minutes)
Kitchen	_____	_____
Child's bedroom	_____	_____
Living/family room	_____	_____

40. How often do you dry sweep? (Show Card J.)

1= Never

2= Rarely

3= Sometimes

4= Frequently

5= Always

88= Refused

99= Don't know

41. How often do you vacuum? (Show Card J.)

1= Never

2= Rarely

3= Sometimes

4= Frequently

5= Always

88= Refused

99= Don't know

42. How often do you mop? (Show Card J.)

1= Never

2= Rarely

3= Sometimes

4= Frequently

5= Always

88= Refused

99= Don't know

43. How often do you wet wipe? (Show Card J.)

1= Never

2= Rarely

3= Sometimes

4= Frequently

5= Always

88= Refused

99= Don't know

44. How often do you dry dust? (Show Card J.)

1= Never

2= Rarely

3= Sometimes

4= Frequently

5= Always

88= Refused

99= Don't know

45. How often do you use other house cleaning methods? (Show Card J.)

Prompt 1: How often do you use other house cleaning methods other than dry sweeping, vacuuming, mopping, wet wiping and dry dusting?

Prompt 2: Example carpet shampoo

Specify: _____

1= Never

2= Rarely

3= Sometimes

4= Frequently

5= Always

88= Refused

99= Don't know

46. Do you have a vacuum cleaner?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

47. Do you have any dogs or cats that go in and out of the house?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 50)

88= Refused (Go to Question 50)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 50)

If yes, specify number _____

48. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) play with your pet? (Show Card M)

0= Never

1= Less than once per week

2= Once per week

3= Less than once per day, but more than once per week

4= Once per day

5= More than once per day

88= Refused

99= Don't know

49. How often are (CHILD'S NAME) hands washed after playing with a pet?

(Show Card M.)

0= Never

1= Less than once per week

2= Once per week

3= Less than once per day, but more than once per week

4= Once per day

5= More than once per day

88= Refused

99= Don't know

Now, I have some questions about your child's activities.

50. In the last 90 days, where does (CHILD'S NAME) usually spend his/her time each 24 hour period? (approximate number of hours) 99= Don't know

	Babysitter (outside of home)	Day Care (commercial facility)	Other Locations	Home	Total (24 hrs.)
Monday	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tuesday	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Wednesday	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Thursday	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Friday	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Saturday	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sunday	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Specify any other: _____

51. On the average, how many hours a day does (CHILD'S NAME) play outside during the spring and fall?

The numbers of HOURS AND MINUTES: _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

EXAMPLE: .45= Forty five minutes

1.30= One hour and thirty minutes

2.15= Two hours and fifteen minutes

52. On the average, how many hours a day does (CHILD'S NAME) play outside during the winter?

The number of HOURS AND MINUTES: _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

EXAMPLE: .45= Forty five minutes

1.30= One hour and thirty minutes

2.15= Two hours and fifteen minutes

53. On the average, how many hours a day does (CHILD'S NAME) play outside during the summer?

The number of HOURS AND MINUTES: _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

EXAMPLE: .45= forty five minutes

1.30= One hour and thirty minutes

2.15= Two hours and fifteen minutes

54. How many hours a day does (CHILD'S NAME) usually spend playing on the floor when he or she is in this home?

The number of HOURS AND MINUTES: _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

EXAMPLE: .45= Forty five minutes

1.30= One hour and thirty minutes

2.15= two hours and fifteen minutes

55. Does (CHILD'S NAME) play outdoors around the house or in the neighborhood?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 63)

88= Refused (Go to Question 63)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 63)

55a. If yes, then how many hours a day on the average does (CHILD'S NAME) play outdoors?

_____ Hours

99= Don't know

56. Where does (CHILD'S NAME) usually play outdoors (in the last 90 days) when he/she is not playing in your home or yard? (Circle one.)

1= Neighbor's yard

2= Playground

3= Near or around creek or ditch

4= On or near tailings or slag piles

5= On sidewalks or streets

6= Park

7= Only plays at home

8= Other (Specify) _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

57. Where does (CHILD'S NAME) usually play when outdoors around the house?

(Circle one.)

1= Back yard

2= Front yard

3= Side yard

7= Other (specify) _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

58. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) play on mine waste (tailings/chat) material?

(Show Card O.)

0= None of the time

1= Less than half of the time

2= Half of the time

3= More than half of the time

4= All of the time

88= Refused

99= Don't know

59. Is the ground where (CHILD'S NAME) usually plays mainly grassy, concrete/asphalt, plain dirt or soil, just a sandbox, or some other stuff?

1= Grassy

2= Concrete/asphalt

3= Dirt/soil

4= Sandbox

7= Other (specify) _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

60. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) play in dirt? (Show Card O.)

0= None of the time

1= Less than half of the time

2= Half of the time

3= More than half of the time

4= All of the time

88= Refused

99= Don't know

61. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) play on concrete/asphalt? (Show Card O.)

0= None of the time

1= Less than half of the time

2= Half of the time

3= More than half of the time

4= All of the time

88= Refused

99= Don't know

62. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) play on a grassy area? (Show Card O.)

0= None of the time

1= Less than half of the time

2= Half of the time

3= More than half of the time

4= All of the time

88= Refused

99= Don't know

IF CHILD LESS THAN 3 YEARS OLD ASK 63-65, OTHERWISE, GO TO 66:

63. Does the (CHILD'S NAME) crawl or walk?

1= Crawl

2= Walk

3= Both

4= Not crawling or walking- specify reason _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

IF CHILD LESS THAN 3 YEARS OLD:

64. Does this child breast-feed?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

IF CHILD LESS THAN 3 YEARS OLD:

65. Does the CHILD'S NAME currently take a bottle?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

66. Has (CHILD'S NAME) ever been treated with traditional, folk, or herbal medications?

1= Yes- what was the medicine called? _____

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

67. Does (CHILD'S NAME) suck his/her thumb or fingers?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

68. How many times is (CHILD'S NAME) bathed or given a shower per week?

Times per week: _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

69. Are (CHILD'S NAME) hands or face usually washed after playing with dirt or sand?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 71)

88= Refused (Go to Question 71)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 71)

70. How often are (CHILD'S NAME) hands or face washed after playing with dirt or sand? (Show Card M.)

0= Never

1= Less than once per week

2= Once per week

3= Less than once per day, but more than once per week

4= Once per day

5= More than once per day

88= Refused

99= Don't know

71. Are (CHILD'S NAME) hands or face usually washed before going to sleep?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 73)

88= Refused (Go to Question 73)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 73)

72. How often are (CHILD'S NAME) hands or face washed before going to sleep?
(Show Card M.)

0= Never

1= Less than once per week

2= Once per week

3= Less than once per day, but more than once per week

4= Once per day

5= More than once per day

88= Refused

99= Don't know

73. Are (CHILD'S NAME) hands or face usually washed before eating?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 75)

88= Refused (Go to Question 75)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 75)

74. How often are (CHILD'S NAME) hands or face washed before eating?

(Show Card M.)

0= Never

1= Less than once per week

2= Once per week

3= Less than once per day, but more than once per week

4= Once per day

5= More than once per day

88= Refused

99= Don't know

75. How often does your child eat food that has fallen on the floor? (Show Card M.)

0= Never

1= Less than once per week

2= Once per week

3= Less than once per day, but more than once per week

4= Once per day

5= More than once per day

88= Refused

99= Don't know

76. Where does your child usually eat?

1= Sitting at the table

2= Sitting on the floor

3= Sitting in a highchair

4= Other (specify) _____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

77. Does this household have a vegetable garden?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 82)

88= Refused (Go to Question 82)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 82)

78. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) eat vegetables grown in your garden? (Show Card D.)

1= Once a week or more

2= Less than once per week

3= Never (Go to Question 82)

88= Refused (Go to Question 82)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 82)

79. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) eat root vegetables, (such as beets or turnips) grown in your garden?

1= Once as week or more

2= Less than once per week

3= Never

88= Refused

99= Don't know

80. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) eat leafy green vegetables, (such as lettuce or spinach) grown in your garden?

1= Once a week

2= Less than once per week

3= Never

88= Refused

99= Don't know

81. Has soil been hauled in and placed on your garden?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

IF YES, SPECIFY FROM WHERE? _____

82. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) eat vegetables grown elsewhere in the local area?
(e.g. Neighbor's garden or local farmers market) (Show Card D.)

1= Once a week or more

2= Less than once per week

3= Never (Go to Question 85)

88= Refused (Go to Question 85)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 85)

83. How often does he/she eat root vegetables, (such as beets or turnips) grown elsewhere in the area? (Show Card D.)

1= Once a week or more

2= Less than once per week

3= Never

88=Refused

99= Don't know

84. How often does he/she eat leafy green vegetables, (such as lettuce or spinach) grown elsewhere in the area? (Show Card D.)

1= Once a week or more

2= Less than once per week

3= Never

88= Refused

99= Don't know

85. When food or drinks are stored or put away, are they sometimes stored in the original can after being opened?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

86. When food or drinks are prepared, served, or stored, are they often placed in copper or pewter dishes or containers?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

87. When food or drinks are prepared, served, or stored, are they often placed in clay pottery or ceramic dishes, which were homemade or made in another country?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

88. Does (CHILD'S NAME) have a favorite blanket or toy?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 91)

88= Refused (Go to Question 91)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 91)

89. Does (CHILD'S NAME) carry this around during the day?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

90. Does (CHILD'S NAME) often put this in his/her mouth?

1= Yes

2 No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

91. Has (CHILD'S NAME) used a pacifier in the last 6 months?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 94)

88= Refused (Go to Question 94)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 94)

92. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) take a bottle or pacifier outside with him/her?

(Show Card J.)

1= Never

2= Rarely

3= Sometimes

4= Frequently

5= Always

88= Refused

99= Don't know

93. How often in the child's pacifier washed? (Show Card K.)

0= Never

1= Less than once per month

2= Once per month

3= Less than once per week, but more than once per month

4= Once per week

5= Less than once per day, but more than once per week

6= Everyday

7= Child does not have a pacifier

88= Refused

99= Don't know

94. How often are toys and stuffed animals washed? (Show Card L.)

0= Never

1= Less than once per month

2= Once per month

3= Less than once per week, but more than once per month

4= Once per week

5= Less than once per day, but more than once per week

6= Everyday

88= Refused

99= Don't know

95. Does (CHILD'S NAME) often take food, snacks, candy, bottle or pacifier with him/her outside to play?

1= Yes

2= No (Go to Question 97)

88= Refused (Go to Question 97)

99= Don't know (Go to Question 97)

96. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) eat food, snacks, or candy outside during the spring, summer and fall? (Show Card M.)

0= Never

1= Less than once per week

2= Once per week

3= Less than once per day, but more than once per week

4= Once per day

5= More than once per day

88= Refused

99= Don't know

97. Many children put some things other than food into their mouths. Would you say that (CHILD'S NAME): (Show Card N.)

1= Does this a lot

2= Just once in a while

3= Almost never

4= Never

88= Refused

99= Don't know

98. How often does (CHILD'S NAME) use a cup with lid (sipee cup), bottle or pacifier outside during the spring, summer and fall? (Show Card M.)

0= Never

1= Less than once per week

2= Once per week

3= Less than once per day, but more than once per week

4= Once per day

5= More than once per day

88= Refused

99= Don't know

99. Does (CHILD'S NAME) chew on his/her fingernails?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

100. Does (CHILD'S NAME) put his/her mouth on furniture or on the windowsill?

(Show Card N.)

1= Does this a lot

2= Just once in a while

3= Almost never

4= Never

88= Refused

99= Don't know

101. Sometimes children swallow things other than food. Would you say that (CHILD'S NAME) swallow things other than food? (Show Card N.)

1= Does this a lot

2= Just once in a while

3= Almost never

4= Never

88= Refused

99= Don't know

102. Does (CHILD'S NAME) ever put paint chips in his/her mouth? (Show Card N.)

1= Does this a lot

2= Just once in a while

3= Almost never

4= Never

88= Refused

99= Don't know

103. What is (CHILD'S NAME) date of birth?

(MO/DA/YR) ____/____/____

88= Refused

99= Don't know

104. Which of the following best describes his/her racial background? (Show Card S.)

1= White

2= Black

3= Asian or Pacific Islander

4= American Indian/ Alaska native

88= Refused

99= Don't know

105. Is this child Hispanic or of Spanish origin or descent?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

106. Is (CHILD'S NAME) a boy or girl?

1= Male

2= Female

107. What is the highest level of education that was completed by the head of this household? (Respondent must decide who is the head of the household.) (Show Card P.)

- 1= No schooling
- 2= Elementary school (Grades 1-8)
- 3= High school GED (Grades 9-12)
- 4= Technical or trade school
- 5= Junior/Community college
- 6= Four year college/university
- 7= Attended graduate school (higher)
- 88= Refused
- 99= Don't know

108. Is the mother the head of the household?

- 1= Yes (Go to Question 110)
- 2= No

109. What is the highest level of education that was completed by the mother of this child? (Show Card P.)

- 1= No schooling
- 2= Elementary school (Grades 1-8)
- 3= High school GED (Grades 9-12)
- 4= Technical or trade school
- 5= Junior/Community college
- 6= Four year college/university
- 7= Attended graduate school (higher)
- 88= Refused
- 99= Don't know

110. What is your total, gross household income before taxes? (Show Card Q.)

1= \$4,999 or less

2= \$5,000 to 9,999

3= \$10,000 to 14,999

4= \$15,000 to 19,999

5= \$20,000 to 24,999

6= \$25,000 to 29,999

7= \$30,000 to 34,999

8= \$35,000 to 39,999

9= \$40,000 or more

88= Refused

99= Don't know

111. Do you receive any of these services - Food stamps, WIC vouchers, food from pantries or any other programs ?

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

112. What is the number that corresponds to the amount of out-of-pocket money spend each week on meat, vegetables, and milk products in this household? (Show Card R.)

1= \$25 or less

2= \$26 to \$50

3= \$51 to \$75

4= \$76 to \$100

5= More than \$100

88= Refused

99= Don't know

113. What is the number that corresponds to the amount of out-of-pocket money spent on other food items? Do NOT INCLUDE MEAT, VEGETABLES, OR MILK PRODUCTS.

(Show Card R.)

1= \$25 or less

2= \$26 to \$50

3= \$51 to \$75

4= \$76 to \$100

5= More than \$100

88= Refused

99= Don't know

114. Does anyone smoke TOBACCO PRODUCTS in (CHILD'S NAME) home?

(Circle response.)

	Yes	No	Refused	Don't know
a. Cigarettes	1	2	88	99
b. Cigars	1	2	88	99
c. Pipes	1	2	88	99

If Yes, How Many:

Cigarettes per day in the house? _____

Cigars per day in the house? _____

Pipe bowls per day in the house? _____

115. Have you ever used smokeless tobacco products?

(e.g. spit tobacco, chewing tobacco, Skoal, Copenhagen, etc.)

1= Yes

2= No

88= Refused

99= Don't know

116. How many people smoke in this house? (including regular visitors/babysitters)

_____ (Number of people)

This completes the questionnaire. Do you have any questions or comments about it?

Thank you for your time.

CARD A

0 = 1909 or earlier

1 = 1910 to 1919

2 = 1920 to 1929

3 = 1930 to 1939

4 = 1940 to 1949

5 = 1950 to 1959

6 = 1960 to 1969

7 = 1970 to 1979

8 = 1980 to 1989

9 = 1990 to present

CARD B

1 = Rent

2 = Own

3 = Other - Specify

CARD D

1 = Once a week or more

2 = Less than once per week

3 = Never

CARD E

- 1= Painted pictures with artists paints (not children's paints)
 - 2= Painted, stained or refinished furniture
 - 3= Painted the inside of a home or building
 - 4= Worked with stained glass
 - 5= Cast lead into fishing sinkers, bullets, toys or anything else
 - 6= Welded
 - 7= Worked with soldering in electronics
 - 8= Soldered pipes or sheets of metal
 - 9= Repaired auto radiators
 - 10= Worked on auto bodies or auto maintenance (inc. mechanics)
 - 11= Worked at a sewage treatment plant
 - 12= Made pottery
 - 13= Ridden a dirt bike, mountain bike or ATV in the local area
 - 14= Cleaned or repaired firearms
 - 15= Visited indoor firearm target ranges
 - 16= Cut or spliced wire or cable
 - 17= Smelted lead
 - 18= Manufactured plastics
 - 19= Manufactured batteries
 - 20= Manufactured paint, glaze, or ink
 - 21= Machined pipes
 - 22= Electroplated with lead solutions
 - 23= Refined gasoline
 - 24= Manufactured rubber
 - 25= Recovered scrap metal
 - 26= Participated in other lead related jobs or activities
- Specify

CARD F

1 = Home

2 = Work/other

3 = Both

CARD G

1 = Underground

2 = Surface

3 = Milling

4 = Transportation/Handling

5 = Clerical/Admin.

6 = Smelter

7 = Other - Specify

CARD H

- 1 = Lead
- 2 = Zinc
- 3 = Silver
- 4 = Molybdenum
- 5 = Coal
- 6 = Limestone
- 7 = Clay
- 8 = Other - Specify

CARD I

1 = Always

2 = Sometimes

3 = Never

CARD J

1 = Never

2 = Rarely

3 = Sometimes

4 = Frequently

5 = Always

CARD K

0 = Never

1 = Less than once per month

2 = Once per month

3 = Less than once per week, but more than once per month

4 = Once per week

5 = Less than once per day, but more than once per week

6 = Everyday

7 = Child does not have a pacifier

CARD L

0 = Never

1 = Less than once per month

2 = Once per month

3 = Less than once per week, but more than once per month

4 = Once per week

5 = Less than once per day, but more than once per week

6 = Everyday

CARD M

0 = Never

1 = Less than once per week

2 = Once per week

3 = Less than once per day, but more than once per week

4 = Once per day

5 = More than once per day

CARD N

1 = Does this a lot

2 = Just once in a while

3 = Almost never

4 = Never

CARD 0

0 = None of the time

1 = Less than half of the time

2 = Half of the time

3 = More than half of the time

4 = All of the time

CARD P

- 1 = No schooling
- 2 = Elementary school (Grades 1-8)
- 3 = High school GED (Grades 9-12)
- 4 = Technical or trade school
- 5 = Junior/Community college
- 6 = Four year college/university
- 7 = Attended graduate school (higher)

CARD Q

- 1 = \$4,999 or less
- 2 = \$5,000 to 9,999
- 3 = \$10,000 to 14,999
- 4 = 15,000 to 19,999
- 5 = \$20,000 to 24,999
- 6 = \$25,000 to 29,999
- 7 = \$30,000 to 34,999
- 8 = \$35,000 to 39,999
- 9 = \$40,000 or more

CARD R

1 = \$25 or less

2 = \$26 to \$50

3 = \$51 to \$75

4 = \$76 to \$100

5 = More than \$100

CARD S

1 = White

2 = Black

3 = Asian or Pacific Islander

4 = American Indian/Alaska native

Appendix 7: Blood Sampling Protocol

Blood Collection Procedure for Jasper County, Missouri, Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study, 2000

1. Have the following items on hand and available for use:
 - Tourniquet
 - Alcohol disinfectant swabs (individually wrapped)
 - Gauze bandages (sterile, individually wrapped)
 - 21g or 22g vacutainer needle or 23g butterfly
 - Vacutainer needle holder
 - 2 ml draw purple top tube with Hemagard cap
 - Bandaid
 - Sharps disposal container for used needles
 - Ice or Refrigerator for storage
 - Gloves
2. Use universal blood-borne pathogen precautions during all procedures. Select the appropriate size needle and attach to the Vacutainer needle holder.
3. Tie the tourniquet onto the upper arm so that it can be quickly released with one hand.
4. Swab the venipuncture area with an alcohol pad.
5. Wipe off excess alcohol with the gauze bandages. Allow to air dry for 5 - 10 seconds.
6. Puncture the vein with the needle.
7. Insert a purple top tube into the barrel of the vacutainer needle holder and push until blood enters the tube. The tube will draw only 2 mls of blood (gray fill line on the paper label).
8. Remove the tourniquet; withdraw the needle and dispose of in the sharps container.
9. Place pressure on the venipuncture site for a few minutes with a gauze pad. Cover the venipuncture site with a bandaid.
10. If mixing by hand rotate the tube at least 5-10 times to insure good distribution of anticoagulant throughout the blood.
11. Place an ID label on the vacutainer tube.
12. Record the sample number by placing a label on the collection log.
13. Place samples in cardboard boxes that are provided. Refrigerate until shipment to CDC can be made.
14. When specimens are ready to be shipped, place each box inside a zip bag along with some absorbent material. Seal the bags and place inside the Styrofoam shipping container. Include a copy of the two specimen collection log forms with the specimens. Keep a copy of the forms for the health departments files. Add several ice packs that have been previously frozen.
15. Ship samples by overnight carrier in insulated containers along with ice packs so that the temperature can be maintained during the shipping process. Samples should be shipped to the following address so that they will arrive on a normal working day (Monday - Friday, non-Federal Holidays). Labels with the address below have been provided for mailing.

Charles Dodson
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Bldg 17 Loading Dock
4770 Buford Highway, NE
Atlanta, GA 30341-3724

16. Please call (770) 488-4305 on the day the shipment is made. Also, if any questions arise, please call the above number.

PAGE ____ OF ____

**JASPER COUNTY EXPOSURE STUDY, 2000
SPECIMEN COLLECTION AND SHIPPING LOG
CDC STUDY NO: _____**

DATE SHIPPED: _____

SHIPPED BY: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

DATE RECEIVED: _____

RECEIVED BY: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

TOTAL NO. SPECIMENS SHIPPED:

B1=BLOOD METALS

COMMENTS: _____

SHIPPING ADDRESS:

**CHARLES DODSON
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL
BUILDING 17 LOADING DOCK
4770 BUFORD HIGHWAY NE
ATLANTA, GA 30341
TEL: 770.488.4305/FAX: 770.488.4541**

**JASPER COUNTY EXPOSURE STUDY, 2000
SPECIMEN COLLECTION AND SHIPPING LOG
CDC STUDY NO:**

B1=BLOOD METALS

[illegible]

Appendix 8: Sample Blood Lead Result Letters

JASPER COUNTY LEAD POISONING PREVENTION PROGRAM

IN COOPERATION WITH
THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
AND THE JASPER COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

105 Lincoln
Carthage, MO 64836

Telephone (417) 358-0480
Fax (417) 358-0494

Street
Joplin, MO 64801

Dear _____:

Your child, _____, was randomly selected to participate in the Jasper County, Missouri, Superfund Site Follow-Up Childhood Lead Exposure Study and was tested for lead by the Jasper County Health Department on 9/26/00. The results of that test showed a lead level of 12.5 micrograms per deciliter (mcg/dl).

State Law in Missouri considers a blood lead level of 10 mcg/dl or greater in a child, to be elevated. Enclosed is some literature about sources of lead exposure. This information should help you to understand more about lead and the possible health effects associated with it. Marcie Goade, RN, will be contacting you, if she hasn't already, and scheduling an appointment at your home to discuss lead poisoning, and to help identify possible lead exposure sources within your home.

Thank you for your participation in this study. If you have any questions or concerns about the testing, or about lead poisoning, please do not hesitate to contact Marcie Goade, RN at the Jasper Co. Health Dept. at (417) 358-0480.

Sincerely,

Tony Moehr
Jasper County Health Department

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER
Services provided on a nondiscriminatory basis.

JASPER COUNTY LEAD POISONING PREVENTION PROGRAM

IN COOPERATION WITH
THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
AND THE JASPER COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

105 Lincoln
Carthage, MO 64836

Telephone (417) 358-0480
Fax (417) 358-0494

Street
Joplin, MO 64801

Dear _____:-

Your child, _____, was randomly selected to participate in the Jasper County, Missouri, Superfund Site Follow-Up Childhood Lead Exposure Study and was tested for lead by the Jasper County Health Department on 9/20/00. The results of that test showed a lead level of **1.6 micrograms per deciliter (mcg/dl)**. State Law in Missouri considers a blood lead level of 10 mcg/dl or greater in a child to be elevated, therefore **your child's blood lead level is considered to be non-elevated**. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention recommends that you have your child tested for lead annually up to the age of seven years.

The environmental sample results will be sent as soon as they are received.

Thank you for your participation in this study. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the test, or regarding lead poisoning, please do not hesitate to contact Marcie Goade, RN or Lauri Fasken, RN, at the Jasper County Health Department at 358-0480.

Sincerely,

Tony Moehr
Jasper County Health Department

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER
Services provided on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Appendix 9: Sample Environmental Results Letters

**Jasper County, Missouri, Superfund Site Follow-Up
Childhood Lead Exposure Study**

IN COOPERATION WITH
THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
AND THE JASPER COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

105 Lincoln
Carthage, MO 64836
Telephone (417) 358-0480
Fax (417) 358-0494

Street
Joplin, MO 64801

Dear _____:

When the Lead Study Team met with you during their visit on June 30, 2000, you provided information about your home and family. In addition, environmental samples were taken at your home to test for the presence of lead in the dust, paint and soil. This letter provides the opportunity to share the results of their visit with you. You are encouraged to discuss this information with a nurse or environmental specialist to learn how you and your family can reduce _____ exposure to lead. Please contact Brandon Rekus, Environmental Specialist, or Lauri Fasken, Community Health Nurse, if you have and questions regarding these environmental test results.

Dust Wipes

Several dust wipes were taken from your home. The dust wipes were taken and combined from the child's bedroom, the kitchen and possibly, from another room where your child spends time.

Dust wipes were taken from various window stools. The average concentration of lead dust was $14.61 \mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$. Those results exceeding $250 \mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$ are considered to be elevated.

The average concentration of lead dust detected on the floor surfaces (hard and carpeted) was $3.74 \mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$. Those results exceeding $40 \mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$ are considered to be elevated.

Mini Blinds

Mini blinds may contain lead. XRF testing was used to determine the amount of lead in the blinds. Dust wipes were used to show if there is dust from deterioration of the blind.

The average concentration of lead dust detected on the mini-blinds was $77.50 \mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$. There currently are no set standards for mini-blinds. In evaluating the results from the mini-blinds, please note whether or not there were positive results. The standard for window sill dust is $250 \mu\text{g}/\text{ft}^2$ and the potential exposure is similar for mini-blinds and window sills. Therefore, replacement of mini-blinds is an effective way to reduce the risk of exposure.

The XRF results taken from the mini-blinds are listed on Table 1 (attached). There currently are no set standards for mini-blinds. The standard for paint is $1 \text{ mg}/\text{cm}^2$. Therefore, for levels above $1 \text{ mg}/\text{cm}^2$, we recommend replacement of mini-blinds.

If the dust wipe exceeded the standard associated with it but the XRF did not exceed the standard, then wet cleaning of those surfaces should be considered.

Painted Surfaces

During the visit, an environmental specialist measured lead in the paint of your home and determined the condition of the painted surface. The areas in which lead-based paint was detected are included in Table 1 (interior paint – child's bedroom, kitchen, and possibly from another room where your child spends time) and Table 2 (exterior paint). HUD and Environmental Protection Agency define lead-based paint as having a lead concentration equal to or greater than 1 milligram per centimeter squared (mg/cm²). Please discuss the areas in your home where lead-based paint has been found with the environmental specialist. (*Attach Tables*).

Soil Samples

Samples were taken in your yard from several areas. These areas included the general yard, the drip line around your home and any play areas. Samples are measured in parts per million (ppm).

The average concentration of lead detected in the general yard area was 91.20 ppm.
Bare areas shouldn't exceed 1200 ppm.

The average concentration of lead detected in the drip line was 92.00 ppm.
Bare areas shouldn't exceed 1200 ppm.

The average concentration of lead detected in the high-contact play area was 112.10 ppm.
Bare areas shouldn't exceed 400 ppm.

If your yard exceeded the standards mentioned, efforts should be made to restrict the child's access to the soil.

Please discuss the specific areas in your yard where lead contaminated soil has been found with the environmental specialist. This person can indicate where each sample was taken in your yard.

If you have further questions regarding these results, please feel free to contact the Jasper County Health Department at (417) 358-0480.

Sincerely,

Tony Moehr
Administrator
Jasper County Health Department

TM/smp

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER
Services provided on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Appendix 10: Chain of Custody Form

FORM 910
CHAIN OF CUSTODY RECORD
 (One Sheet for Each Residence)

Put ID Sticker Here	Jasper Exposure Study 2000 Jasper County Health Department 105 Lincoln Street Carthage, MO 64836	Tony Moehr Environmental Specialist (417) 358-0480 moehrt@hotmail.com
----------------------------	--	--

	Study Sample ID Number	Sample Date	Dimensions (Inches)	Comments
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

	Signature	Company	Date/Time	Comments
Relinquished By:				
Received By:				
Relinquished By:				
Received By:				
Relinquished By:				
Received By:				

Appendix 11: Environmental Sampling Protocols

SOP 100

Environmental Assessment and XRF Sampling

1. **Purpose:** The purpose of this SOP is to establish uniform procedures for the collection of information for the completion of the environmental Assessment Forms and XRF sampling for determination of presence of lead-based paint.
2. **Application:** The procedures outlined in this SOP are applicable to all personnel collecting environmental samples for the Jasper Exposure Study 2000.
3. **General Guidelines:** Direct reading XRF measurements will be made on selected interior and exterior surfaces that are painted or varnished. The condition of the painted surfaces will be recorded.
4. **Selection of Sample Locations:** The "Home Schematic Form (FRM 100)" will be completed.
 - 4.1. XRF sampling will be performed in the child's bedroom, kitchen, child's main play area, and exterior walls and porches.
 - 4.2. Components to be sampled include walls, window components, door components, ceilings, floors that are painted or coated, baseboards, and mini blinds.
 - 4.4. Closets will not be included unless it is an integral part of the room.
5. **Sampling Equipment:** Sampling equipment will consist of a minimum of:
 - 5.1. Portable XRF unit
 - 5.2. Small stepladder
 - 5.3. Flashlight
 - 5.4. Tape measure
6. **Method of Sampling:**
 - 6.1. Complete the "Home Schematic Form (FORM 100)".
 - 6.1.1. Place pre-prepared ID sticker on top left corner and add date.
 - 6.1.2. Include a room plan sketch on the back of FORM 110 used for each room.
 - 6.1.2.1. All schematic diagrams will be labeled using the convention of: Main address exterior wall labeled 'A' with sequential lettering (B, C, and D) in a clockwise direction. The room numbering will be '1' for the child's bedroom, '2' for the kitchen, and '3' for the child's main play area. On the sketch clearly indicate the direction for North.
 - 6.1.3. Complete the general information questions for the home.
 - 6.1.3.1. Inspector and location type information.
 - 6.1.3.2. Exterior covering type, source and type of water pipes (See key at bottom of form 100).
 - 6.1.4. Complete information for each room to be sampled.
 - 6.1.4.1. Floor is the floor of the house. The front entry floor area is floor '1'. If there is a basement or lower floor than it is indicated as '0'.
 - 6.1.4.2. Indicate floor type from the key at the bottom of the data collection form 100.
 - 6.1.4.3. If not wall-to-wall carpet, indicate if piece carpet is present. A 'N' circled indicates no piece carpet present.
 - 6.1.4.3. If the child's bedroom or kitchen is also the child's main play area than indicate here as a 'Y'. If not indicate 'N'.

- 6.1.4.4. Indicate the general condition of neatness of the room on a lickert. See key at bottom of data collection form 100.
- 6.2. XRF measurements are obtained in the interior on a room-by-room, two exterior walls, and one exterior porch. One sample is taken from each unique test combination. A test combination is determined by component type and substrate material. (Form 110).
- 6.2.1. Interior sampling within each of the child's bedroom, kitchen and child's main play area.
- 6.2.1.1. One sample representative of the most accessible interior window area. Take the sample from the sash.
- 6.2.1.2. One sample representative of the most accessible outer window area (casing, stool, trough, apron, stop). Take the sample from the stool.
- 6.2.1.3. One sample representative of the most accessible interior door area. Take the sample from the door. **Note:** If no door is present, this sample is not taken.
- 6.2.1.4. One sample representative of the most accessible outer door area. Take the sample from the jam. **Note:** If no door is present, this sample is not taken.
- 6.2.1.5. One representative floor sample from wood stained or clear coated floors.
- 6.2.1.6. One representative ceiling sample.
- 6.2.1.7. One sample of the most accessible wall.
- 6.2.1.8. One sample of the most accessible baseboard if present.
- 6.2.1.9. One sample of the most accessible radiator if present.
- 6.2.1.10. One representative sample of cabinets and/or shelves.
- 6.2.1.11. One representative miniblind. Miniblind samples are obtained by pulling the drawstring to collect approximately one-inch of thick collection of blinds. Sample is taken from top blind of stack.
- 6.2.2. Exterior sampling. (Form 120).
- 6.2.2.1. Samples are taken from only two wall sides. The first wall will be the side with the MAIN PORCH, or if no porch than WALL A. The second wall is at the discretion of the environmental specialist. If there is an obvious difference among the walls, the second wall should be selected to represent this.
- 6.2.2.1.1. From each of the two walls take one sample representative of each test combination of: wall, window well, window sash, door and door jam.
- 6.2.2.2. Main Porch. Only one exterior porch is sampled. If more than one porch is present the environmental specialist must decide which porch is most representative in usage.
- 6.2.2.2.1. One sample representative of each porch component: ceiling, floor, bannister, column). If doors and windows are present they should be included as part of 'wall' form.
- 6.3. Obtaining XRF Measurements.
- 6.3.1. Perform XRF calibration check prior to use, at the end of each sampling day or every four hours, and if the instrument is knocked, dropped or other impact, turned off for more than two hours, or been exposed to extreme temperature changes for more than one hour. Using the 1.02 mg/cm² source (or other as recommended by the PCS). Take three consecutive measurements. Record calibration information and results on Form 920. If any single measurement is off by more than 0.4 mg/cm², or the average of each of the three measurements is off by more than 0.2 mg/cm², then turn the instrument off, then on again, and repeat. If this occurs again contact the manufacturer concerning how to correct this.
- 6.3.2. If surface is visibly soiled or dusty, wipe surface with a non-alcohol wipe as necessary and/or place a piece of plastic or paper (such as tissue) between the instrument and surface. Use a clean piece of paper or plastic that has previously been checked for

- possible interference. This is to ensure that the XRF window is not contaminated and sample results are from the paint and not surface deposited material. If this surface will be used for a wipe sample, perform the wipe sample first (See SOP 250).
- 6.3.3. On FORM 110 for each area tested enter all the following information on a new form:
 - 6.3.4.1 Place pre-prepared ID sticker and add date.
 - 6.3.4.2 Indicate inspector and xrf instrument.
 - 6.3.4.3 For indoor samples indicate room number (1 – child’s bedroom, 2 – kitchen, 3 – child’s main play area).
 - 6.3.4.4 Indicate number of doors and windows in sample area for rooms and walls.
 - 6.3.4.5 For each XRF sample taken for the specific components indicated on the form:
 - 6.3.3.5.1. If condition intact, fair or pair:
 - 6.3.3.5.1.1. For all surfaces intact indicates no obvious visible deterioration.
 - 6.3.3.5.1.2. Indoor large surface: less than 2 ft² deterioration then fair, if greater than 2 ft² deterioration then poor.
 - 6.3.3.5.1.3. Indoor and outdoor small surface: less than 10% deterioration then fair, if greater than 10% deterioration then poor.
 - 6.3.3.5.1.4. Outdoor large surfaces: less than 10 ft² deterioration than fair, if greater than 10 ft² deterioration than poor.
 - 6.3.3.5.2. Estimated percent of total damage area represented by this sample.
 - 6.3.3.5.3. XRF result (mg/cm²) reported by instrument.
 - 6.3.4. On FORM 120 for the two exterior/outdoor walls tested enter all the following information.
 - 6.3.4.1 Place pre-prepared ID sticker and add date.
 - 6.3.4.2 Indicate inspector and xrf instrument.
 - 6.3.4.3 Indicate location letters for Wall 1 and Wall 2. Wall 1 should either contain the MAIN PORCH an/or be WALL A.
 - 6.3.4.4 Indicate number of doors and windows. This is the combined number for the two walls selected and includes those within a porch area.
 - 6.3.4.5 For each XRF sample taken for the specific components indicated on the form:
 - 6.3.3.5.1. If condition intact, fair or pair:
 - 6.3.4.5.1.1. For all surfaces intact indicates no obvious visible deterioration.
 - 6.3.4.5.1.2. Indoor and outdoor small surface: less than 10% deterioration then fair, if greater than 10% deterioration then poor.
 - 6.3.4.5.1.3. Outdoor large surfaces: less than 10 ft² deterioration than fair, if greater than 10 ft² deterioration than poor.
 - 6.3.3.5.2. Estimated percent of total damage area represented by this sample.
 - 6.3.3.5.3. XRF result (mg/cm²) reported by instrument.
 - 6.3.5. On FORM 120 for the MAIN PORCH enter all the following information.
 - 6.3.4.1 Place pre-prepared ID sticker and add date.
 - 6.3.4.2 Indicate inspector and xrf instrument.
 - 6.3.4.3 Indicate wall letter the MAIN PORCH is located.
 - 6.3.4.4 For each XRF sample taken for the specific components indicated on the form:
 - 6.3.3.5.1. If condition intact, fair or pair:
 - 6.3.5.4.1.1. For all surfaces intact indicates no obvious visible deterioration.
 - 6.3.5.4.1.2. Indoor and outdoor small surface: less than 10% deterioration then fair, if greater than 10% deterioration then poor.
 - 6.3.5.4.1.3. Outdoor large surfaces: less than 10 ft² deterioration than fair, if greater than 10 ft² deterioration than poor.
 - 6.3.3.5.2. Estimated percent of total damage area represented by this sample.

6.3.4.5 XRF result (mg/cm²) reported by instrument.

SOP 1100


Soil Sampling

1. **Purpose:** The purpose of this SOP is to establish uniform procedures for the collection of soil samples.
2. **Application:** The procedure outlined in this SOP are applicable to all personnel collecting environmental samples for Jasper County for the Jasper Exposure Study 2000
3. **General Guidelines:** A rough sketch of the aerial view of the yard will be made which includes the division and indication of the yard areas into sample site categories of: drip line, yard non-play areas, and high contact/play areas. A composite soil sample will be collected from each category. Disposable gloves will be worn for the collection of all samples.
4. **Selection of Sample Locations:**
 - 4.1. Soil sampling will include a composite collected from the general yard non-play area, dripline area within three feet of structure walls, and yard primary play areas of the child.
 - 4.2. An aerial view diagram of the residence and property will be sketched on the reverse side of the Soil Collection Form (Form 1100). The drip line will include the areas contiguous with and extending three feet from the house walls. The yard non-play area will extend from the drip line to the yard outer boundaries. Play areas will be extend three-feet around any playground type equipment or other indication of play area.
 - 4.3. Drip Line
 - 4.3.1. The drip-line soil composite sampling sites (8) will be located and taken from non-vegetated areas as close as possible to 1/3 and 2/3 the distance along each wall and 1-1/2 feet away from the wall and any water discharge locations (i.e. two sample along each of four walls).
 - 4.4. Yard Non-Play Area
 - 4.4.1. Sampling sites for the general yard will be determined by superimposing on "X" using the property corners for each endpoint. Sample sites (8) that do not contain vegetation will make up a composite sample and will be located as close as possible to 1/3 and 2/3 the distance along each leg of the "X" between a point starting three feet away from the residence and extending to the property line (i.e. two samples along each of the four segments of the "X").
 - 4.5. High Contact/Play Area

- 4.5.1. Play area samples (8 or 16) will be taken in a similar manner as the yard non-play area. Up to two primary play areas will have an "X" superimposed over the designated area. Samples are collected from non-vegetated areas as close as possible to 1/3 and 2/3 the distance along each leg of the "X" (total of 8 samples). If two primary areas are indicated, the two areas will be composited together (total of 16 samples).

5. Method of Sampling:

- 5.1. Label sample storage container with residence ID sticker, sample number and date. Sample numbers will be: for yard non-play area (Y-1), high contact/play area (P-1), and drip line (D-1).
- 5.2. Complete Soil Collection form (Form 1100) for composite sample to be obtained. This will entail:
 - 5.2.1. Place sticker on form and indicate date.
 - 5.2.2. Determining the percent of bare ground (exposed soil) to covered ground in the region sampled. Covered ground is considered vegetation and hard surfaces (concrete, asphalt, etc.).
 - 5.2.3. Following sample collection indicate total number of samples used for composite.
 - 5.2.4. If no non-vegetated areas were available for a sample, select a vegetated area within the sample area and collect a sample, removing as much of the vegetation from the sample as possible. Record the total number of samples taken from vegetated areas.
- 5.3. Place on new pair of disposable gloves for each composite type.
- 5.4. Insert collection instrument ½ to 1 inch into soil and remove soil.
- 5.5. Remove any vegetation from top of soil sample and add to collection container.
- 5.6. Dispose of any remaining soil and wipe residual soil from sample probe.
- 5.7. Continue the process at each sample site placing each new composite into sample container until at all samples have been collected for a specific composite type. Repeat for all composite types.
- 5.8. De-contaminate sample probe by wiping off all visible soil with gloved hand and paper towels and baby wipes.
- 5.9. Dispose of all waste at health department.
- 5.10. Soil Standard Reference Material
 - 5.10.1. For every 20th composite soil sample (approximately 17 residences) insert a SRM with the laboratory sample submittals (see SOP 900 Field and Laboratory QA/QC).



- - Play area sample sites
- ⊗ - Yard non-play area sample sites
- ⊗ - Dripline

SOP 250

Dust Wipe Sampling

1. **Purpose:** The purpose of this SOP is to establish uniform procedures for the collection of interior dust wipe samples.
2. **Application:** The procedures outlined in this SOP are applicable to all personnel collecting environmental samples for the Jasper exposure study 2000.
3. **General Guidelines:** Samples will consist of composite wipes from each location type. Wipe sample site selection and collection will be performed after the "Home Schematic (FRM 100)" form has been completed. All floor areas sampled will use a template. Disposable gloves will be worn for the collection of each sample.
4. **Selection of Sample Locations:** Wipe samples for composite will be obtained from a window stool, floor and miniblind of the study child's bedroom, kitchen and child's main play area
 - 4.1. **Window Stool:** In each room a window indicated or considered to be most frequently used and/or of greatest access to the child will be sampled. A window stool will always be sampled unless no windows are available.
 - 4.2. **Surface Floor Wipes:** Floor composite wipe samples will be taken from the closest accessible location to the window sampled or other window. If no window areas are available, then the closest accessible location to the inside hinge of the room entry door will be sampled.
 - 4.3. **Miniblinds:** Miniblind composite wipe samples will be taken from a miniblind indicated or considered to be present at the most frequently used window and/or of greatest access to the child will be sampled.
5. **Sampling Equipment:** Sampling equipment will consist of a minimum of:
 - 5.1 Disposable gloves
 - 5.2 Individually wrapped sampling wipes
 - 5.3 Wash'n Dry Baby Wipes or similar product for cleaning of tools/templates
 - 5.4 Measuring tape
 - 5.5 50 ml centrifuge tubes with screw top caps.
 - 5.6 Sampling area template for floor
 - 5.7 Sealable container to be used for waste materials. No waste materials will be disposed of on-site.
6. **Method of Sampling:**
 - 6.1. Place sticker in top left corner of form and add date.
 - 6.2. Prepare sample collection tube with complete sample number and date. The sample number consists of case ID# and assigned sample number (e.g. 131-F-1 for a floor sample). Sample numbers for each type are indicated on Form 250.
 - 6.3. Record all information on Dust Wipe Collection Form (FORM 250).

- 6.3.1. Dimensions of the area wiped to the closest quarter inch. For a window stool this should be a rectangular area adjacent to the window sash, and not to include edges along the side of the vertical window casing. For a floor use supplied template (dimensions are already recorded on form 17 by 17 inches). For miniblind pull draw string to obtain a collection of miniblind slats approximately one-inch thick. Wipe between the drawstrings for the first wipe, pull the drawer string for another inch and wipe top slat for second wipe, and repeat for third wipe. The dimensions (area wiped) will be the width of the combined three slats (i.e. width of slat one times 3) by the length of the slat.
- 6.3.2. If surface being wiped is deteriorated, such as chipping and flaking paint, delaminating, and so on, indicate yes, otherwise no.
- 6.3.3. If see visible loose soil/dust in the sample area then yes, otherwise no.
- 6.3.4. If see visible paint chips in the sample areas then yes, otherwise no.
- 6.3.5. Only comments concerning conditions or sampling procedure that would affect interpretation of results should be recorded.
- 6.4. Place on new pair of disposable gloves for each composite sample type. If gloves become soiled between samples within the composite, change gloves prior to taking additional samples.
- 6.5. When template for floor is being used, first wipe clean with a baby wipe for decontamination.
- 6.6. Remove a sampling towelette from package and carefully unwrap.
 - 6.6.1. For window stools and floors, place flat at one end of the sample wipe area and wipe in an 'S' pattern over the entire surface making sure that each stroke only slightly overlaps the previous stroke. Fold the wipe in half with the dirt side inside, and then re-wipe the stool at 90° from the first wipe. Fold the wipe a second time in the same manner and re-wipe similar to the first wipe. Fold the wipe three additional times with the dirt side inside, and place into the pre-labeled sample container.
 - 6.6.2. For miniblinds use long 'S' type strokes going along the length of the slat back and forth until complete slat covered. Fold wipe as described above and repeat on next slat, and again fold wipe third time and repeat on last slat.
- 6.7. Place wipe into pre-labeled sample container.
- 6.8. Continue until all wipes of each type have been composited into their respective sample containers. No more than three wipes should be composited together.
- 6.9. If a sampling area template was used, decontaminate with a Wash'n Dri wipe prior to each use.
- 6.10. All waste such as gloves and cleaning towelets shall be placed in a sealable garbage container disposed of at the health department site.
- 6.11. Insert quality assurance samples into prepared tubes and record on data form as appropriate. (See SOP 900 Field and Laboratory QA/QC).
 - 6.11.1. Wipe Field Sample Blanks
 - 6.11.1.1. At the last sample site of the day, each day, prepare a field wipe sample labeled as sample number Q-1 and indicate on Form 250 for that sample site.
 - 6.11.1.2. Place on a new pair of gloves. Removing a wipe, unfold it, and then fold three times as would be performed during a typical wipe sample.

- 6.11.1.3. Place sample into sample container.
- 6.11.2. Glove Field Sample Blanks
 - 6.11.2.1. At every 20th residence environmental samples are collected a field glove blank will be submitted for sample analysis.
 - 6.11.2.2. Place on a new pair of gloves. Removing a wipe, unfold it, and then wipe each hand thoroughly three times, folding following each wipe. Place into pre-labeled container as sample number G-1 and date, and indicate on Form 250 for that sample site.
- 6.11.3. Wipe Standard Reference Material (SRM).
 - 6.11.3.1. For every 50th wipe sample (approximately every 6th residence) a SRM will be inserted with the laboratory sample submittals.
 - 6.11.3.2. Randomly select a prepared wipe SRM sample. Record the SRM Code Number from the plastic bag containing the tube onto Form 250 for the last residence of that day. Place on the sample tube the residence sticker and record sample number WS-1 and date, and indicate on Form 250 for that sample site.

SOP 350

Water Sampling

1. **Purpose:** The purpose of this SOP is to establish uniform procedures for the collection of private well drinking water samples.
2. **Application:** The procedure outlined in this SOP is applicable to all personnel collecting environmental samples for the Jasper County, Missouri Superfund Site Follow-up Childhood Lead Exposure Study.
3. **General Guidelines:** Water samples are to be collected at homes on a private water supply (i.e. private well) from kitchen faucet. Submit at least 500 milliliters of water in a one-quart cubitainer. Fill out Private Water Supply request form Lab 65 (R4-92) for each sample. Be sure identification on the request form and on the label of the sample cubitainer match. Ship samples as soon as possible after collection to the Missouri Department of Health State Public Health Laboratory (MDHSPHL). Samples must arrive within two weeks of collection. Water samples for lead analysis are acidified upon receipt in the laboratory.
4. **Sampling Equipment:** Sampling equipment will consist of a minimum of:
 - 4.1. Disposable gloves
 - 4.2. One-quart cubitainers or other MDOH State Public Laboratory supplied sampling containers
 - 4.3. Masking tape
 - 4.4. Large sealable plastic bag
5. **Method of Sampling:**
 - 5.1. Complete Private Water Supply Collection form.
 - 5.1.1. Place ID sticker in upper left hand corner and add date.
 - 5.2. Label sample containers with residence ID sticker and sample number W-1.
 - 5.3. Flush water line by letting the water run for at least 5 minutes before collecting sample.
 - 5.4. Place on disposable gloves
 - 5.5. Expand container if needed (hold neck and pull outward). Do not blow into container. Rinse three times with water to be collected.
 - 5.6. Fill cubitainer with at least 500 ml of water from tap (50% of container).
 - 5.7. Screw on cubitainer cap securely.
 - 5.8. Tape cap securely with masking tape and place into plastic bag.
 - 5.9. Complete MDHSPHL Private Water Supply submittal form.
 - 5.10. Ship samples through first class mail so that it arrives at the Department of Health State Public Health Laboratory within three (3) days of the collection date. Blue mailing labels should be available from the lab. If no labels available use address: Missouri Department of Health, State Public Health Laboratory, 307 West McCarty, Jefferson City, MO 65101.
 - 5.11. Place used gloves in a garbage bag for dispose at the health department site.

SOP 900

Field And Laboratory QA/QC

Purpose: The purpose of this SOP is to establish uniform procedures for the collection and submittal of laboratory quality control samples and field XRF measurements.

Application: The procedure outlined in this SOP are applicable to all environmental sampling for the Jasper 2000 Exposure Study.

General Guidelines: Laboratory samples submitted for analysis will include, as described below, field wipe and protective glove blanks, and dust and soil standard reference material spikes. Field use XRF's will have their calibrations checked each day of use.

QA/QC Types:

- **Standard Reference Material**
 - As one of the components to assess laboratory analysis quality control the following will be performed:
 - Spiked wipe (2%) and soil (2%) samples prepared by an AIHA accredited laboratory using NIST standard reference materials (SRM) will be submitted with normal field samples.
- **Field Blanks**
 - To assess possible contamination from field practice and/or sample media substrate interference the following will be performed:
 - One dust wipe field blank per sampling day per sampling team will be submitted for laboratory analysis.
 - One field blank per every 20th residence per sampling team will be submitted for laboratory analysis of protective gloves.
- **XRF Calibration Check**
 - To ensure proper operation and sample results with the field use XRF's, calibrations will be checked each day of use. The minimum calibration checks will be performed:
 - Prior to use.
 - Every four hours.
 - If the instrument has been turned off for more than two hours.
 - If the instrument is dropped or other impact, or been exposed to extreme temperature changes for more than one hour.

- At the end of each day of use.

Standard Reference Material: SRM samples shall be submitted as part of the regular sample submittal process in a manner so that the laboratory cannot distinguish the spiked samples from the field samples. Spiked wipe samples will be submitted for every 50 field wipe samples (2%). Spiked soil samples will be submitted for every 50 field soil samples (2%).

- The spiked samples will be given the ID of the location of the last home performed on the sample day each SRM is submitted. Sample numbers for wipe SRM's will be WS - 1, and for soil YS - 1.
- The sample ID and number used for the SRM submitted to the laboratory will be recorded on form 900, the Standard Reference Material Tracking form. The SRM Code number will also be recorded on Form 250 for wipes and Form 1100 for soils of the respective sample site.

Field Blanks: Field sampling media blanks for wipes will be submitted to the laboratory at a rate of one per sampling day per sampling team. Field blanks for gloves will be submitted at a rate of 1 per 20 sampling sites per sampling team. Field sample blanks will be prepared during the sampling at the final sample site of the day.

Wipe field blanks will be obtained by removing a wipe from the sealed container, and while wearing new protective gloves unfold, then refold the wipe as if wipe samples were being taken.

Glove field blanks will be obtained by removing two new gloves as would normally be performed and placing on the hands. Three swipes over both gloved hands will be made, folded between each wipe, and the wipes submitted as field blanks for the gloves in a sample container.

These wipes are then place into a labeled sample container in the same fashion as the field samples. On the sample collection form (Form 250) for the respective site the field blanks are recorded. Wipe field blanks are given the designation Q - 1 and glove field blanks the designation G - 1.

XRF Calibration: Perform XRF calibration check prior to use, at the end of each sampling day or every four hours, and if the instrument is knocked,

dropped or other impact, turned off for more than two hours, or been exposed to extreme temperature changes for more than one hour.

Using the 1.02 mg/cm² source supplied by the manufacturer (or other as recommended by the Performance Characteristic Sheet specific to this unit). Take three consecutive measurements. Record calibration information and results on Form 920. If any single measurement is off by more than 0.4 mg/cm², or the average of the three measurements is off by more than 0.2 mg/cm², then turn the instrument off, then on again, and repeat. If this occurs again contact the manufacturer immediately concerning how to correct this.

SOP 910

Sample Chain of Custody, Storage and Transport

Purpose: The purpose of this SOP is to establish uniform procedures for completion and compliance with the chain of custody requirements, storage requirements and transport of samples to the laboratory or secondary storage location.

Application: The procedures outlined in this SOP are applicable to all environmental sampling for the Jasper Exposure 2000 Study.

General Guidelines: At the end of each sample day "Chain of Custody Record" (Form 910) forms will be completed for each residence sampled that day.

Equipment:

- Storage containers (rigid cardboard boxes, large freezer style storage baggies or similar container) for soils, water and dust wipes.

Methodology:

1. At the end of each sampling day all collected environmental samples from each residence will be entered onto a "Chain of Custody Record" form (Form 910).
2. Add appropriate quality assurance samples as needed.
3. At the end of each sampling day all samples will be stored in secured location with their respective chain of custody forms.
4. Whenever the samples change hands, such as from environmental technicians to individual transporting samples to the laboratory accepting the samples, the chain of custody record will remain with the samples and be completed (signed and dated) by all associated individuals.
5. Samples are to remain in control of the individual who last signed for the samples, such as within eyesight or stored in an appropriate secured location.

Appendix 12: Environmental Sampling Forms

Put ID Sticker Here

FORM 100
Home Schematic

Inspector _____

Is this location a (Check One)

☐ Single family ☐ Mobile Home ☐ Multi family ≤ 4 units ☐ Multi family > 4 units

If multi family, what floor is the main occupant entry on (basement - 0, ground floor - 1, and so on): _____

Location has (Check One) ☐ Basement ☐ Slab ☐ Crawl space

Total number of floors above ground for this residence/building _____.

Total number of rooms in residence _____.

Are there any detached painted structures/objects (Circle) Y N

Primary exterior covering _____ Is the primary covering painted (Circle) Y N

What type of water pipes are present _____ Is drinking or cooking water supplied from a well (Circle) Y N

1 - Child's Bedroom

Floor number _____

Primary Floor Type _____

- Piece carpets present Y N

General condition _____

Is this room also the child's
main play area Y N

Comments:

2 - Kitchen

Floor number _____

Primary Floor Type _____

- Piece carpets present Y N

General condition _____

Is this room also the child's
main play area Y N

Comments:

3 - Child's Main Play Area

Floor number _____

Room type: _____

Primary Floor Type _____

- Piece carpets present Y N

General condition _____

Comments:

- Exterior covering: 1-Wood, 2-Brick, 3-Cement block, 4-Vinyl/Metal siding, 5-Other (specify).
- Water pipes: 1-Lead, 2-Plastic, 3-Galvanized steel, 4-Copper, 5-Iron, 6-Mixed (specify), 7-Other (specify).
- Floor type: 1-wood, 2-linoleum, 3-ceramic tile, 4-wall-to-wall carpet, 5-concrete, 6-other.
- General condition: 1= very neat, uncluttered, no dust or soiling; to 5=very messy, cluttered and obvious accumulation of dust/soiling

Form 110
INDOOR ENVIRONMENTAL PAINT ASSESSMENT

New Form For Each Room
 Draw Diagram On Reverse Side Of Sheet (Indicate North)

Put ID Sticker Here					Inspector _____
Instrument XRF No. _____					
Room No. _____ Within Room - Total No. Doors _____ Total No. Windows _____					
Test Component	Condition (I, F, P)	Damaged (Percent)	XRF Result (mg/cm ²)	Comments	
Wall					
Door					
Door Jam					
Window Sash					
Window Stool					
Miniblind – Vinyl					
Baseboard					
Ceiling					
Floor					
Radiator					
Cabinet – built in					
Shelf – built in					

Condition:

- Intact (I) – no obvious visible deterioration.
- Fair (F) and Poor (P):
 - Small surfaces (window, door, molding, etc.) - less than 10% deterioration then **fair**, if greater then **poor**.
 - Large surfaces (ceiling, floor, wall) - less than 2 ft² then **fair**, if greater then **poor**.

Form 120
OUTDOOR WALL AND PORCH ENVIRONMENTAL PAINT ASSESSMENT
General Information

Put ID Sticker Here	Inspector _____
Instrument XRF No. _____	

Outdoor Wall Information

Wall 1 Letter _____ Wall 2 Letter _____ Total no. doors _____ Total no. windows _____				
Test Component	Condition (I, F, P)	Damaged (Percent)	XRF Result (mg/cm ²)	Comments
Wall 1				
Wall 2				
Window Sash 1				
Window Sash 2				
Window Well 1				
Window Well 2				
Door 1				
Door 2				
Door Jam 1				
Door Jam 2				

Porch Information

Main Porch Wall Side Letter (Usually A) _____				
Test Component	Condition (I, F, P)	Damaged (Percent)	XRF Result (mg/cm ²)	Comments
Floor				
Ceiling				
Handrail				
Column/Post				

Condition:

- Intact (I) – no obvious visible deterioration.
- Fair (F) and Poor (P):
 - Small surfaces (window, door, etc.) - less than 10% deterioration then fair, if greater then poor.
 - Large surfaces (ceiling, floor, wall) - less than 10 ft² then fair, if greater then poor.

Form 1100
Soil Composite Sample Collection

Inspector _____

Yard Area – Non PlaySample No. Y - 1 Comments: _____

Bare % Area _____

Number of samples in Composite (Typical 8) _____

If limited bare areas, number of samples taken from vegetated areas _____

High Contact/Play AreaSample No. P - 1 Comments: _____

Bare % Area _____

Number of samples in Composite (Typical 8 or 16) _____

If limited bare areas, number of samples taken from vegetated areas _____

Drip LineSample No. D - 1 Comments: _____

Bare % Area _____

Number of samples in Composite (Typical 8) _____

If limited bare areas, number of samples taken from vegetated areas _____

Soil SRMIs this the 50th soil composite sample since the last soil SRM (~ 17 residences) - Y NIf yes, insert soil SRM - Sample Number - YS - 1

SRM Code No. _____

Dust Wipe Collection

FORM 250

Sample Type	Window Sill Sample No. <u>S - 1</u>	Floor Sample No. <u>F - 1</u>	Miniblind Sample No. <u>M - 1</u>
Room 1 Child's Bedroom	Dim. (inches) ____ <u>X</u> ____ Deterioration <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. soil/dust <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. paint chips <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Comments:	Carpet ____ or Hard surface ____ Dim. (inches) <u>17</u> <u>X</u> <u>17</u> Deterioration <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. soil/dust <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. paint chips <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Comments:	Dim. (inches) ____ <u>X</u> ____ Deterioration <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. soil/dust <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. paint chips <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Comments:
Room 2 Kitchen	Dim. (inches) ____ <u>X</u> ____ Deterioration <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. soil/dust <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. paint chips <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Comments:	Carpet ____ or Hard surface ____ Dim. (inches) <u>17</u> <u>X</u> <u>17</u> Deterioration <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. soil/dust <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. paint chips <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Comments:	Dim. (inches) ____ <u>X</u> ____ Deterioration <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. soil/dust <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. paint chips <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Comments:
Room 3 Child's Main Play Area Room type:	Dim. (inches) ____ <u>X</u> ____ Deterioration <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. soil/dust <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. paint chips <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Comments:	Carpet ____ or Hard surface ____ Dim. (inches) <u>17</u> <u>X</u> <u>17</u> Deterioration <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. soil/dust <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. paint chips <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Comments:	Dim. (inches) ____ <u>X</u> ____ Deterioration <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. soil/dust <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Vis. paint chips <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> Comments:
QA/QC or SRM	Is this the last sample site of day- <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> • If Yes, then prepare Wipe Field Blank - Sample Number <u>Q - 1</u>	Is this the 20 th residence since last glove field blank - <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> • If yes, Glove Field Blank - Sample Number <u>G - 1</u>	Is this the 50 th wipe sample since the last SRM (~ 5 residences) - <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> • If yes, insert Wipe SRM - Sample Number <u>WS - 1</u> • SRM Code No: _____

Form 350
Drinking Water Collection

**Put ID Sticker
Here**

Sample Number W - 1

Inspector _____

General Comments:



SAMPLES SUBMITTED WITHOUT COLLECTION DATE WILL NOT BE TESTED				
SAMPLE SUBMITTED BY			TELEPHONE NUMBER	
MAILING ADDRESS				
COUNTY	CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
SAMPLE COLLECTED BY			DATE COLLECTED	
LOCATION OF SAMPLE COLLECTION		POINT OF SAMPLE COLLECTION		
TOWNSHIP:	RANGE:	SECTION:		
NAME/LOCATION				
ADDRESS				

SUPPLY TYPE	
<input type="checkbox"/> PRIVATE	<input type="checkbox"/> NON COMM. PUBLIC
<input type="checkbox"/> PUBLIC SUPPLY	<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER _____
BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROBLEM/REASON TESTING BEING REQUESTED	
TESTS REQUESTED	
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	

[illegible]

REC	BY	REPT	BY	LOG NO.
-----	----	------	----	---------

FORM 900

Standard Reference Material Tracking

	SRM Type (Wipe or Soil)	SRM Code Number	Sample Number Assigned	Date Submitted	Comments
1	e.g. Wipe	1			
2	Wipe	2			
3	Wipe	3			
4	Wipe	4			
5	Wipe	5			
6	Wipe	6			
7	Wipe	7			
8	Wipe	8			
9	Wipe	9			
10	Wipe	10			
11	Soil	1			
12	Soil	2			
13	Soil	3			
14	Soil	4			
15	Soil	5			
16	Soil	6			
17	Soil	7			
18	Soil	8			
19	Soil	9			
20	Soil	10			
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

Suffix before sample number indicates matrix type: YS - Soil sample, WS- Wipe sample.