

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  
26  
27  
28

***Human health effects of drinking water exposures to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) at Pease International Tradeport, Portsmouth, NH***

**(Pease Study - Proof of Concept)**

**Protocol**  
July 29, 2020

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry  
National Center for Environmental Health

This protocol has been updated to reflect changes necessary to restart the Pease Study during the COVID-19 pandemic. Appropriate safety precautions, including the use of all appropriate additional personal protective equipment (PPE), will be implemented to keep the Pease Study team and participants safe during the study data and sample collection. The Pease Study Restart Plan (Appendix G in the Manual of Procedures - Attachment 14) has been developed and outlines the additional procedures that will be implemented during recruitment, field work and community meetings to ensure that the Pease Study continues in compliance with CDC, state, and local requirements. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/non-covid-19-client-interaction.html> for non-COVID-19

The activities that will be modified include:

- Holding virtual Community Assistance Panel (CAP) meetings. Small group sessions (less than 10 participants) may be held as needed following applicable local, state and CDC guidelines in place at the time of the meeting.
- Ensuring that social distancing and the use of PPE are employed to comply with CDC and state guidelines during door-to-door recruitment.
- Adding information to the recruitment letter and consent documents to reassure potential Pease Study participants that all state and CDC guidelines will be followed.

1

2 **Table of Contents**

3

4 1. PROJECT OVERVIEW..... 5

5 1.1 Summary..... 5

6 1.1.1 Literature Review..... 5

7 1.1.2 Pease Site History..... 6

8 1.1.3 Health Study Feasibility Assessment..... 6

9 1.1.4 Summary of Pease Study Goals..... 7

10 1.2 Study Investigators and Roles..... 9

11 2. INTRODUCTION..... 10

12 2.1 Authority..... 10

13 2.2 Background..... 10

14 2.2.1 Characterization of Pease Drinking Water PFAS Contamination..... 10

15 2.2.2 2015 Pease Biomonitoring Program..... 12

16 2.3 General Approach for Pease Study Recruitment..... 13

17 2.4 Study Objectives..... 14

18 2.5 Study Questions..... 14

19 2.5.1 Literature Review..... 14

20 2.5.1.1 Health Effects in Children..... 15

21 2.5.1.2 Health Effects in Adults..... 16

22 2.5.2 Hypotheses..... 18

23 2.6 Intended Use of Study Findings..... 20

24 3.1 Study Design..... 20

25 3.2 Study Populations and Eligibility..... 21

26 3.2.1 Children..... 22

27 3.2.2 Adults..... 23

28 3.3 Sample Size Considerations..... 24

29 3.3.1 Children..... 25

30 3.3.2 Adults..... 28

1	3.4 Study Roll Out and Communication Plan.....	31
2	3.5 Recruitment.....	32
3	3.5.1 Wave One Recruitment from Biomonitoring Recruitment Frame.....	32
4	3.5.2 Wave Two Recruitment of Additional Exposed Children and Adults.....	32
5	3.5.3 Wave Three Recruitment of Referent Children and Adults.....	32
6	3.5.3 Enrollment Procedures.....	33
7	3.6 Data Collection Procedures.....	34
8	3.6.1 Check-in Procedures.....	34
9	3.6.2 Informed Consent Process.....	35
10	3.6.2.1 Consent for Specimens and Data.....	35
11	3.6.2.2 Child Consent.....	35
12	3.6.2.3 Adult Consent.....	36
13	3.6.2.4 Risks and Benefits.....	36
14	3.6.3 Update Contact Information and Medication List.....	37
15	3.6.4 Body and Clinical Measurements.....	37
16	3.6.5 Questionnaire.....	39
17	3.6.4.1 Children and Parents.....	39
18	3.6.5.1.1 Child/Parent Neurobehavioral Assessments.....	40
19	3.6.5.2 Adults.....	42
20	3.6.6 Exit Procedures.....	42
21	3.6.6.1 Gift Cards as a Token of Appreciation for Participation.....	42
22	3.7 Biochemical Analyses.....	43
23	3.7.1 Children.....	44
24	3.7.2 Adults.....	45
25	3.7.3 Quality Control/Quality Assurance.....	45
26	3.7.4 Reference Values.....	46
27	3.8 Data Handling.....	46
28	3.8.1 Certificate of Confidentiality.....	46
29	3.8.3 Impact on Privacy.....	48
30	3.8.3.1 Access Controls and Security.....	49
31	3.8.4 Data Delivery.....	51

1	3.8.6 Storing Residual Blood for Future Use.....	52
2	3.9 Exposure Estimation.....	53
3	3.10 Statistical Analyses.....	55
4	4. RESULTS REPORTING.....	56
5	4.1 Notification of Individual Results.....	56
6	4.2 Disseminating Results to the Public.....	57
7	5. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS.....	57
8	6. REFERENCES.....	59
9	7. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS.....	69
10		

# 1 1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

## 2 1.1 Summary

### 3 1.1.1 Literature Review

4 Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are a family of chemicals used in industrial applications and  
5 consumer products. A number of PFAS chemicals including perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS),  
6 perfluorooctanoate (PFOA), and perfluorohexane sulfonate (PFHxS) persist in the environment and have  
7 long serum half-lives in humans (Wang 2017).

8 A detailed review of epidemiological studies published to date was included in the ATSDR feasibility  
9 study (ATSDR 2017a; released Nov 2017). Health effects of PFAS exposure in children were also recently  
10 reviewed by Rappazzo (2017). Most studies of the health effects from PFAS exposures have focused on  
11 PFOA and PFOS, but have only evaluated PFHxS and perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA) and other PFAS  
12 chemicals sparingly (ATSDR 2017a). These include studies that evaluated data from the National Health  
13 and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), occupational studies, studies of West Virginia and Ohio  
14 residents and workers exposed to PFOA from a chemical plant (the “C8” studies), and national surveys  
15 conducted in other countries where exposures to PFAS were found mostly from consumption of food  
16 and beverages in PFAS-contaminated packaging.

17 The scientific evidence linking PFAS exposures with adverse health effects is rapidly growing but is  
18 inconsistent for a variety of reasons, including differences concerning exposure levels, methods of  
19 ascertaining diseases and the exposure and effect biomarkers measured. For some health endpoints,  
20 only one or a few studies currently exist. Nevertheless, studies have found associations with changes in  
21 lipids (Steenland 2009; Zeng 2015, Mora 2018), levels of uric acid (Steenland 2010), thyroid and sex  
22 hormones (Wen 2013; Lopez-Espinosa 2016, Preston 2018), liver (Darrow 2016, Mora 2018), and  
23 immune function (Grandjean 2012, 2017), as well as reduced birth weight (Bach 2015, Verner 2015),  
24 reproductive effects and some cancers (Lopez-Espinosa 2011; Barry 2013). While C8 studies provided  
25 extensive and high quality information on PFOA studying a large cohort of highly exposed residents  
26 (60,000+) and workers living in the vicinity of the production facility; it didn’t address the number of  
27 other PFAS compounds and exposures routes. Because of this research gap, there is a need for more  
28 epidemiological research on the health effects of PFAS exposures. Except for the C8 studies, there is  
29 scant information on the health effects of exposures to PFAS-contaminated drinking water.

1 **1.1.2 Pease Site History**

2 PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS and other PFAS are constituents in aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF), used to  
3 extinguish flammable liquid fires. Since the 1970s, military bases in the U.S. have used AFFF with PFAS  
4 constituents for firefighting training as well as to extinguish fires. At some military bases, such as the  
5 Pease Air Force Base in Portsmouth, NH, AFFF use has resulted in the migration of PFAS chemicals  
6 through soils to ground water and/or surface water sources of drinking water for the base and/or  
7 surrounding communities (ATSDR 2017a). After the base closed in 1991, the three on-base supply wells  
8 served the Pease International Tradeport (“Pease”), a business and aviation industrial park, with water  
9 in one supply well contaminated with PFAS at concentrations measured in 2014 as high as 2.4 µg/L for  
10 PFOS and 0.35 µg/L for PFOA, which were above the EPA advisory levels (NH DHHS 2016). In 2009, the  
11 US EPA established provisional drinking water health advisory levels for PFOS and PFOA of 0.2 µg/L and  
12 0.4 µg/L, respectively, and in 2016, EPA established a new lifetime health advisory for the total PFOA  
13 and PFOS combined of 0.07 µg/L (US EPA 2009, 2016).

14 In 2015, the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services (NH DHHS) initiated the Pease  
15 biomonitoring program in response to the affected community members’ request for clinical testing  
16 following their consumption of PFAS-contaminated water. This program established a design framework  
17 which was adopted by ATSDR for this current study (NH DHHS 2016).

18 **1.1.3 Health Study Feasibility Assessment**

19 In 2017, ATSDR published a feasibility assessment of possible future drinking water epidemiological  
20 studies at Pease (ATSDR 2017a). As part of this feasibility assessment, ATSDR reviewed the published  
21 epidemiological studies that evaluated the health effects of PFAS exposures and the available  
22 information. Most of the epidemiological studies were cross-sectional in design because cross-sectional  
23 studies are especially suitable for evaluating effect biomarker tests such as liver, kidney, immune and  
24 thyroid function (Checkoway 2004). ATSDR concluded that cross-sectional epidemiological studies of  
25 children and adults at one site (e.g. at Pease) were feasible for some health endpoints (e.g., lipids,  
26 kidney function), but the size of populations would be insufficient for other important health endpoints  
27 (e.g., thyroid, liver and immune function, autoimmune diseases). Therefore, the feasibility assessment  
28 concluded that a multi-site PFAS study was necessary.

29 For the multi-site study, the studies at different sites will be cross-sectional and involve separate  
30 evaluations of children (ages 4-17) and adults (ages ≥18). The children and adult studies will evaluate

1 multiple communities impacted by PFAS-contaminated public drinking water supply wells and/or private  
2 wells. The criteria for selecting study sites include:

- 3 1. Documented past or present PFAS drinking water concentrations at the tap above the current  
4 EPA Lifetime Health Advisory for PFOS + PFOA (i.e., 70 µg/L or 70 parts per trillion [ppt]), or PFAS  
5 serum biomonitoring results indicating levels above NHANES serum levels for PFOA, PFOS  
6 and/or PFHxS,
- 7 2. Size of the population exposed,
- 8 3. Amount of information available on the contaminated drinking water system or private wells,  
9 and
- 10 4. If biomonitoring for PFAS has previously occurred at the site.

11 The overall goal will be to recruit at least 2,000 children and 6,000 adults for the multi-site study from  
12 the sites exposed to PFAS-contaminated drinking water. The participants will be categorized based on  
13 the measured serum concentration of PFAS compounds or on modeled estimated historical serum levels  
14 (e.g., referent or low, medium, high). At sites with preceding biomonitoring such as at Pease (NH DHHS  
15 2016), the child and adult studies will evaluate changes in PFAS concentration over time. The studies will  
16 reconstruct historic serum PFAS concentrations by estimating half-lives and elimination rates as well as  
17 water contamination modeling to inform the pharmacokinetic (PK) or physiologically based  
18 pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling. Historical serum PFAS reconstruction will enable the evaluation of  
19 exposure lags and vulnerable periods as well as statistical analyses that can control for reverse  
20 causations (Dhingra 2017).

#### 21 **1.1.4 Summary of Pease Study Goals**

22 The research study, titled the “Human health effects of drinking water exposures to per- and  
23 polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) at Pease International Tradeport, Portsmouth, NH” (hereafter, the  
24 “Pease Study”), will be a proof of concept study for the multi-site health study. It will be a cross-  
25 sectional study and will recruit from the convenience sample of children and adults who participated in  
26 the 2015-7 Pease biomonitoring program (NH DHHS, 2016; Daly 2018). The goal is to enroll at least 350  
27 children (ages 4-17) and 1,000 adults aged ≥18 years. To meet sample size requirements, those that met  
28 biomonitoring eligibility criteria but were not enrolled in the 2015-7 Pease biomonitoring program may  
29 be recruited. Eligible exposed participants had to work at, live on, or attend childcare at the Pease



1 Tradeport or Pease Air Force Base, or live in a home near the Pease facilities that were served by a PFAS-  
2 contaminated private well between 2004 and May 2014. In order to restrict this study to drinking water  
3 exposures, adults occupationally exposed to PFAS will not be eligible for the study (e.g., ever  
4 firefighters). Likewise, children whose birth mothers were occupationally exposed will not be eligible.  
5 Eligible females who are pregnant may enroll. The federal regulations do not allow people who are  
6 prisoners or under house arrest to take part in this type of study.

7 The main goals of the study are to 1) evaluate the procedures and test the study protocols in order to  
8 identify any issues that need to be addressed before embarking on a multi-site study; and 2) examine  
9 associations between measured and historically reconstructed serum levels of PFAS including PFOA,  
10 PFOS, and PFHxS (see **Section 3.10**), and selected health outcomes as described below and detailed in  
11 study hypotheses (see **Section 2.5.2**).

12 The adult and children studies will also include smaller referent groups of children (n=175) and adults  
13 (n=100) from other areas of Portsmouth, NH, who were never exposed to PFAS-contaminated drinking  
14 water. Birth mothers of referent children likewise must never have had exposure to contaminated  
15 drinking water from Pease. Referent results will be used to compare serum concentration in exposed  
16 versus 'unexposed' and evaluate the need for the referent groups in the multi-site study. Categorization  
17 based on measured serum PFAS concentrations in communities with exposure may provide enough  
18 participants at background levels without a need to sample external comparisons. As most Americans  
19 have measurable concentrations of at least some PFAS (Calafat 2007, Ye 2017), participants will be  
20 categorized based on the measured concentration of PFAS compounds or on modeled estimated  
21 historical levels (e.g., referent or low, medium, high).

22 Based on our literature review of epidemiological studies of PFAS, we propose to examine association  
23 between PFAS compounds and lipids, renal function and kidney disease, thyroid hormones and disease,  
24 liver function and disease, glycemic parameters and diabetes, as well as immune response and function  
25 in both children and adults. In addition, we plan to investigate PFAS differences in sex hormones and  
26 sexual maturation, vaccine response, and neurobehavioral outcomes in children. In adults, additional  
27 outcomes of interest include cardiovascular disease, osteoarthritis and osteoporosis, endometriosis, and  
28 autoimmune disease.

29 The underlying justifications for the selected research hypotheses and health outcomes were: (1) to  
30 follow-up a suggestive positive result (e.g., OR or RR >1.2) for a disease or effect biomarker in one or  
31 more PFAS epidemiological studies of children aged 4 or older and/or adults; or (2) to follow-up a finding

1 for a disease or biomarker in the C8 studies and/or PFAS studies utilizing NHANES data; and/or 3) to  
2 study a biomarker or disease for which a multi-site study of individuals aged 4 years or older would have  
3 sufficient statistical power but for which there is a lack of data on the effect of PFHxS exposure on the  
4 disease or biomarker. With the proposed sample sizes for the overall multi-site study (n=6,000 for  
5 adults and n=2,000 for children) we should have sufficient power to detect mean differences and odds  
6 ratios in the ranges of those observed in other well designed epidemiologic studies.

7 The adult and children studies will obtain blood specimens from participants to measure PFAS serum  
8 levels and several effect biomarkers in addition to completing a questionnaire. The child and adult  
9 studies will evaluate changes in serum PFAS concentration over time using the existing biomonitoring  
10 and new PFAS results, and will contribute to half-lives and elimination rate estimations for PBPK  
11 modeling. Urine specimens will be collected and stored until such time that analytical methods are  
12 developed and scientific evidence shows which PFAS tests will yield useful measurable results.

13 The results from the Pease Study will contribute to the body of scientific research examining health  
14 outcomes related to community PFAS exposures from contaminated drinking water. They will inform  
15 the direction and design of the multi-site and other future PFAS studies.

## 16 **1.2 Study Investigators and Roles**

17 The health study team at ATSDR is responsible for the development of protocols for the Pease Study and  
18 the future PFAS multi-site study. A table describing the roles of investigators, oversight steering  
19 committee, external experts, as well as other collaborators and consultants is found in **Attachment 1**.  
20 The study investigators declare no conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, that may prevent them  
21 from exercising objectivity in carrying out the study.

22 Serum specimens for PFAS analyses will be submitted to the CDC NCEH DLS, Atlanta, GA. Core clinical  
23 and research effect biomarkers will be analyzed by commercial laboratories as specified in the protocol.  
24 Urine specimens will be collected and stored for future analysis and study.

25 The NH DHHS will provide a recruitment frame and provide support for ATSDR to recruit from its existing  
26 list of participants in its Pease biomonitoring program. ATSDR will work with local officials to recruit  
27 additional exposed and referent participants to meet sample size goals. ATSDR will work with local  
28 officials and school districts to abstract pertinent information from children's school records. Similarly,  
29 ATSDR will also reach out to local medical societies to facilitate medical records verification among local  
30 practitioners.

1 The protocol has undergone external peer review. In addition, the Pease Community Assistance Panel  
2 (CAP) will have an opportunity to provide input on the protocol, and will assist in recruitment outreach.  
3 The study protocol has been reviewed and approved by the CDC Institutional Review Board (IRB, CDC  
4 protocol number 7061) under CDC's Federal wide Assurance (FWA) No. 00001413 and by the Office of  
5 Management and Budget (OMB; OMB control number 0923-0061).

## 6 **2. INTRODUCTION**

### 7 **2.1 Authority**

8 ATSDR is authorized to conduct the Pease Study under Section 8006 of the Consolidated Appropriations  
9 Act, 2018, and research in general, under the 1980 Comprehensive Environmental Response,  
10 Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended by the 1986 Superfund Amendments and  
11 Reauthorization Act (SARA) (42 U.S.C. 9601, 9604).

### 12 **2.2 Background**

#### 13 ***2.2.1 Characterization of Pease Drinking Water PFAS Contamination***

14 From approximately the early 1970s, aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF) for firefighting training and  
15 extinguishing flammable liquid fires was used in a number of military and non-military sites around the  
16 country. Several PFAS are components of AFFF, including perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA),  
17 perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS), and perfluorohexane sulfonate (PFHxS). PFAS chemicals in the AFFF  
18 likely leached into the soil and groundwater at and around the installation using AFFF.

19 The requirements for the site characterization and documentation of drinking water system(s)  
20 contamination by PFAS from AFFF include information on the following parameters:

- 21 1. Enumeration of supply wells that provided drinking water to the site. Range of years in which  
22 the site received water from each of those wells.
- 23 2. By year (or month if available), the proportion of the total water supply provided by each supply  
24 well. How did water supply change after the contamination was detected?
- 25 3. Characteristics of the drinking water distribution system including Information on whether  
26 mixing from the supply well(s) occurred at the treatment plant before entering distribution  
27 system or if each supply well served a specific area in the system. Also information on water  
28 purchased from other systems and areas of the distribution system served by purchased water.

- 1 4. If the water system is supplied by surface water, characteristics of this supply.
- 2 5. Description of when and how samples from monitoring or supply wells (or surface water) were
- 3 obtained when the contamination was detected. Maximum and average sample concentrations
- 4 for each of supply wells.
- 5 6. Which PFAS were detected, when, and at what levels of concentration; how they relate to EPA's
- 6 lifetime advisory limits.
- 7 7. Any historical samples or measurements available?
- 8 8. Any information on the historical use of AFFF (training exercises, fire incidents, spills, etc.) at the
- 9 site (e.g., military base airstrip) which was the source of the drinking water contamination.
- 10 9. Any previous human biomonitoring program conducted? If yes, what were the results in regard
- 11 to concentration and descriptive/predictive factors of those concentrations (i.e. volume of water
- 12 consumed, length of residence at site, differences in age, race, or other population
- 13 characteristics)?

14 Much of the above information is already available in considerable detail for the Pease site as described  
15 below. The Pease Tradeport, Portsmouth, NH, opened in 1993 on land formerly occupied by the Pease  
16 Air Force Base, which closed in 1991. From approximately 1970 until 1991, the base used aqueous film-  
17 forming foam (AFFF) for firefighting training and extinguishing flammable liquid fires. PFAS chemicals in  
18 the AFFF likely leached into the soil and groundwater at the base sometime during the 1970s.

19 Three major supply wells provided drinking water to the base: the Haven, Smith, and Harrison wells.  
20 Before 1981, the wells fed directly into the distribution system so that a particular area of base would  
21 primarily receive water from the nearest well. After 1981, the water from the three supply wells mixed  
22 at the treatment plant before entering the distribution system. These same three supply wells provided  
23 drinking water to the Pease Tradeport after it opened.

24 In 2013, sampling of monitoring wells near the former fire training areas at the base detected PFOS and  
25 PFOA as high as 95 µg/L and 56 µg/L. Sampling of the three supply wells serving the Pease Tradeport for  
26 PFAS contamination occurred in April and May 2014. In the April sampling, the Haven well had PFOS,  
27 PFOA, and PFHxS levels of 2.5 µg/L, 0.35 µg/L, and 0.83 µg/L, respectively. In the May sampling, the  
28 Haven well had PFOS, PFOA, and PFHxS levels of 2.4 µg/L, 0.32 µg/L, and 0.96 µg/L. Other PFAS were  
29 also detected in the Haven well. The Harrison well had much lower levels of these contaminants with  
30 maximum PFOS, PFOA, and PFHxS levels of 0.048 µg/L, 0.009 µg/L, and 0.036 µg/L, respectively. The

1 Smith well had maximum levels of PFOS and PFHxS of 0.018 µg/L and 0.013 µg/L, respectively, with an  
2 estimated level of PFOA of about 0.004 µg/L.

3 From the opening of the Pease Tradeport through 1999, the Haven well on average provided about 56%  
4 of the total water supply at Pease, with the Smith well providing 44% and the Harrison well out of  
5 service. In 2000-2001, the Haven well supplied 88% of the supply and the Smith well supplied 12%. From  
6 2003 until removal from service in May 2014, the Haven well on average supplied about half the water  
7 supply. By 2006, the Harrison well was back in service and the Smith and Harrison wells together  
8 supplied on average about half of the water supply at the Pease Tradeport. After May 2014, the Smith  
9 and Harrison wells supplied 56% of the Pease Tradeport water supply and the City of Portsmouth  
10 provided the other 44%.

11 No water samples of the Pease Tradeport distribution system for PFAS are available from the period  
12 when the Haven well was in operation. However, it is possible to estimate the concentrations of PFOS,  
13 PFOA and PFHxS in the distribution system, by using a simple mixing model and assuming that  
14 contamination concentrations are approximately uniform throughout the system. The model takes into  
15 account the pumping rates for each of the three wells, the total water demand, and the concentrations  
16 of PFAS in the wells during the April and May 2014 sampling. Using this simple approach, the estimated  
17 levels of PFOS, PFOA, and PFHxS in the Pease Tradeport distribution system in April 2014 would be  
18 approximately 1.4 µg/L, 0.2 µg/L, and 0.5 µg/L, respectively. For comparison, the EPA's lifetime health  
19 advisory level for the combined concentrations of PFOA and PFOS is 0.07 µg/L. No drinking water health  
20 advisory level currently exists for PFHxS or other PFAS chemicals.

### 21 **2.2.2 2015 Pease Biomonitoring Program**

22 In 2015, NH DHHS established the Pease biomonitoring program for PFAS. Those participants had to  
23 work at, live on, or attend childcare at the Pease Tradeport or Pease Air Force Base (AFB), or live in a  
24 home in or before 2014 that was served by a private well with Pease-related PFAS contamination (for  
25 any period of time). Ever firefighters (persons who were ever employed as firefighters) were included in  
26 the biomonitoring program.

27 This was an exposure-based convenience (or volunteer) sample, not a statistically based sample.  
28 Nevertheless, the testing program provided important information on the extent and magnitude of  
29 exposures to the PFAS-contaminated drinking water at the Pease Tradeport. The Pease biomonitoring  
30 program obtained blood specimens for PFAS analyses from 1,578 persons (NH DHHS 2016; the report

1 was published in 2016 but some biomonitoring activities were ongoing throughout 2017 and we refer to  
2 those efforts as occurring in 2015-17 with n=1,836).

3 The results from the blood-testing program indicated that the exposed population had serum levels of  
4 PFOS and PFHxS that were about two to three times higher than the U.S. population based on data from  
5 NHANES 2013-4 and from other epidemiological studies in the U.S. (**Attachment 2**). In analyses  
6 conducted by NH DHHS (2016), geometric mean PFHxS serum levels were higher for persons who drank  
7  $\geq 4$  cups of water per day compared to those who drank  $< 4$  cups per day (4.76  $\mu\text{g/L}$  versus 3.77  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ). NH  
8 DHHS measured 8 to 14 PFAS congeners at 3 analytical laboratories. Among PFOA, PFOS, PFHxS and  
9 PFNA concentrations, water consumption had the strongest effect on PFHxS serum levels. In particular,  
10 water consumption had the highest effect on PFHxS serum levels among persons aged  $\leq 19$  years ( $\beta =$   
11 0.31, SE = 0.15, marginal effect = 36.4%). Geometric mean PFOS and PFOA serum levels were also higher  
12 among persons who drank  $\geq 4$  cups of water per day compared with those who drank  $< 4$  cups per day  
13 (NH DHHS 2016). Linear trends were observed for geometric mean serum levels of PFOS, PFOA, and  
14 PFHxS and increasing time spent at the Pease Tradeport. The trend was strongest for PFOS and PFHxS  
15 (NH DHHS 2016). Findings from the report have been recently published (Daly 2018).

### 16 **2.3 General Approach for Pease Study Recruitment**

17 In considering possible study designs, ATSDR focused on the methods used in previous epidemiological  
18 research of PFAS exposures (ATSDR 2017a). Adopting study design methods consistent with previous  
19 research facilitates the interpretation and synthesis of findings across studies. Most of the  
20 epidemiological studies of PFAS exposures were cross-sectional and evaluated serum PFAS  
21 measurements. Some studies also evaluated cumulative PFAS serum levels estimated from historical  
22 reconstruction models. ATSDR concluded that epidemiological studies of populations at Pease should be  
23 cross-sectional and evaluate measured serum PFAS measurements as well as historically reconstructed  
24 estimates of cumulative PFAS serum levels. ATSDR also concluded that methods used to evaluate health-  
25 related endpoints in the studies should be consistent with methods used in previous epidemiological  
26 research of PFAS exposures, given adequate sample size and power.

27 NH DHHS and the Pease CAP will assist ATSDR to conduct outreach to encourage participation. At Pease,  
28 ATSDR will recruit from the existing convenience sample of children (aged 4-17), their parents, and other  
29 adults (aged  $\geq 18$ ) who previously participated in the Pease biomonitoring program. If sample size goals  
30 are not met, those that met biomonitoring eligibility criteria but were not enrolled in 2015-7 will be  
31 recruited. ATSDR will also recruit a small referent group of children unexposed to PFAS-contaminated

1 drinking water through outreach to Portsmouth schools and day care centers (for those 4-5 year old).  
2 Recruitment of a small group of adult referents will include outreach to current adult education students  
3 among the five colleges at Pease (i.e., students who first attended these schools after closure of the  
4 Haven Well), Portsmouth government employees (AFSCME Local #1386), Portsmouth community  
5 organizations, and/or specific Portsmouth neighborhoods.

## 6 **2.4 Study Objectives**

7 The main goals of the studies of children and adults at Pease are to (1) evaluate the methods and  
8 procedures in the study protocols to identify any issues that need to be addressed before embarking on  
9 a national multi-site study; and (2) evaluate the associations between specific health effects and serum  
10 PFAS concentrations among those exposed to PFAS-contaminated drinking water at Pease.

## 11 **2.5 Study Questions**

### 12 **2.5.1 Literature Review**

13 A literature review was conducted for the Pease feasibility assessment and can be accessed in the final  
14 feasibility report (ATSDR 2017a). The literature review from the Pease feasibility assessment concluded  
15 that most information on potential health effects concerned exposures to PFOA. In particular,  
16 numerous studies have been conducted of West Virginia and Ohio residents and workers exposed to  
17 PFOA from a chemical plant (the "C8" studies) (Frisbee 2009). Studies of other workforces also focused  
18 primarily on PFOA exposures. The literature review found that less information was available about the  
19 potential health effects of PFOS exposures, and little information was available on the potential health  
20 effects of exposures to PFHxS. Because the primary contaminants in the drinking water at the Pease  
21 Tradeport were PFOS and PFHxS, epidemiological studies of the Pease populations have the potential to  
22 fill key knowledge gaps and address the community's concerns.

23 The literature review identified many health-related endpoints evaluated in previous epidemiological  
24 studies of PFAS exposures. These included cancers, changes in lipids, effects on thyroid and immune  
25 function, and developmental delays. They also included effects on kidney and liver function and sex  
26 hormones, and diseases such as endometriosis, ulcerative colitis and osteoporosis (ATSDR 2017a).

27 The literature review found that most of the epidemiological studies of PFAS exposures were cross-  
28 sectional and evaluated serum PFAS measurements. Some studies also evaluated cumulative PFAS  
29 serum levels estimated from modeling methods. ATSDR concluded that any study of populations

1 exposed to the PFAS-contaminated drinking water at the Pease Tradeport should be cross-sectional and  
2 should evaluate measured serum PFAS measurements as well as estimated cumulative PFAS serum  
3 levels. ATSDR also concluded that methods used to evaluate health-related endpoints in the Pease  
4 Tradeport populations should be consistent with methods used in previous epidemiological research of  
5 PFAS exposures.

#### 6 2.5.1.1 Health Effects in Children

7 There is some evidence that PFAS exposures are associated with decreased birth weight, small fetus size  
8 for gestational age, measures of intrauterine growth retardation, and preterm birth. In particular, two  
9 meta-analyses have found an overall decrease in birthweight associated with PFOA and PFOS (Johnson  
10 2014, Negri 2017, Verner 2015; Bach 2015). However, the findings across studies are inconsistent for  
11 adverse birth outcomes, and few studies have evaluated PFHxS. Several studies of infants have found  
12 that prenatal PFAS exposures affect thyroid function, but only two studies have evaluated thyroid  
13 function in older children (Lopez-Espinosa 2012; Lin 2013, Preston 2018).

14 A few studies of children have found elevated uric acid with PFAS exposures, but the possibility of  
15 reverse causation exists (Geigere 2013; Kataria 2015; Qin 2016). Positive findings occurred in some of  
16 the four studies of PFAS exposures and testosterone and other sex hormones, but the findings were not  
17 consistent across studies and further research is necessary (Maisonet 2015; Lopez Espinosa 2016, Zhou  
18 2016). Growing evidence suggests that exposure to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFASs) may  
19 disrupt lipid homeostasis and liver function, but data in children are limited. Indicators of adiposity and  
20 glucose metabolism were also linked with PFAS in a large follow up study of children and adolescents  
21 (Domazet 2016). Recent study (Mora, 2018) suggests that prenatal and mid-childhood PFAS exposure  
22 may be associated with modest, but somewhat conflicting changes in the lipid profile and ALT levels in  
23 children.

24 There is some evidence from four studies that PFAS exposures might be associated with attention deficit  
25 hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), but findings have not been consistent across studies (Stein 2011; Liew  
26 2015; Ode 2014; Hoffman 2010). In the Stein (2011) study, the ORs for ADHD and PFOS and PFHxS were  
27 1.27 (95% CI 0.99-1.64) and 1.6 (95% CI 1.21-2.08), so there was some evidence of an increased risk,  
28 although not strong. A study using NHANES data obtained an OR of 1.5 (95% CI 1.02-1.08) for 1µg/L  
29 increase in serum PFOS and ADHD (Hoffman 2010). Other studies have found conduct and coordination  
30 problems associated with PFOS (Fei 2011) and executive function deficits with PFOS and PFHxS (Vuong  
31 2016). Evaluating the evidence for PFAS exposures and neurobehavioral outcomes is difficult for several



1 reasons: 1) the studies used different methods to measure the outcomes, 2) studies are inconsistent in  
2 the outcomes evaluated, and 3) too few studies exist. For example, there is little evidence that PFAS  
3 affects IQ, primarily because only two studies evaluated it; one in Taiwan, which observed deficits (Lien  
4 2016), and one at C8 which did not (Stein 2011). We believe it is worth evaluating whether the PFAS  
5 mixture at Pease (and other sites with contamination due to AFFF use) is associated with IQ deficits or  
6 other neurobehavioral outcomes.

7 A few studies have found associations between PFAS exposures and a decline in antibody response to  
8 specific vaccines (Grandjean 2012, 2017), but only two studies evaluated the same vaccine (i.e., rubella;  
9 Granum 2013, Stein 2016).

10 In summary, there are considerable data gaps concerning the health effects in children of PFAS  
11 exposures. This is because of the small number of studies conducted, inconsistencies in methods and  
12 findings across studies, and limited sample sizes in some studies. As for other adverse outcomes, few  
13 studies have evaluated the effects on children of PFHxS exposures.

14 A systematic review of PFAS studies of children concluded that there was “...generally consistent  
15 evidence for PFAS’ association with dyslipidemia, immunity including vaccine response and asthma,  
16 renal function, and age at menarche” (Rappazzo 2017). The review noted the limited number of studies  
17 for any one particular health outcome, the variability in outcome measurement, and the need for  
18 longitudinal studies.

#### 19 2.5.1.2 Health Effects in Adults

20 Based on its detailed assessment of the epidemiological literature, ATSDR concluded that there was  
21 limited information concerning associations with PFAS exposures and most cancers and other adult  
22 diseases (ATSDR 2017a). In particular, few studies have evaluated PFHxS exposures and the risk of  
23 cancers and other adult diseases.

24 Epidemiologic studies of subjects exposed to PFOA and PFOS at background levels and at occupational  
25 settings have reported positive associations with number of health outcomes and conditions. Lipid and  
26 cholesterol concentrations were associated with increased PFOA or PFOS (Frisbee et al., 2010; Nelson et  
27 al., 2010; Winquist 2014b; Steenland et al., 2015), as were increased uric acid levels (Costa et al., 2009;  
28 Steenland et al., 2010; Shankar et al., 2011; Geiger et al., 2013; Gleason et al., 2015), concentrations of  
29 thyroid and sex hormones (Olsen and Zobel, 2007; Knox et al., 2011; Jain, 2013; Wen et al., 2013;

1 Winquist 2014b), immune parameters (Dalsager et al., 2016), and reproductive effects (Joensen et al.,  
2 2013; Kristensen et al., 2013; Crawford et al., 2017).

3 Associations with elevated liver enzymes were found with PFAS in most cross-sectional studies (Olsen et  
4 al., 2000; Sakr et al., 2007a; Lin et al., 2010; Gallo et al., 2012; Gleason et al., 2015) but were weaker or  
5 found no association in the cohort studies of liver function (Sakr 2007b, Darrow 2016). Structural  
6 protein cytokeratin 18 (CK-18) and its components have been used as a new non-invasive serum  
7 biomarker for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and suspected steatohepatitis for adults and children  
8 (Fieldstein 2013, Shen 2012, Vos 2008). Prevalent coronary heart disease was positively associated with  
9 PFAS exposure in a cross sectional examination of NHANES (Shankar 2012) but not in cohort designs  
10 (Winquist 2014b; Mattsson 2015).

11 Two studies of osteoarthritis show association with PFOA in cross sectional analyses (Innes 2011, Uhl  
12 2013) but no association in longitudinal analyses (Innes 2011). Another cross-sectional NHANES study  
13 (Khalil 2016) found an association with osteoporosis among women for PFHxS. Two NHANES studies (Lin  
14 2014, Khalil 2016) also found associations with bone mineral density. Although, these studies are cross-  
15 sectional, they provide important evidence for a link between PFAS exposures and osteoarthritis and  
16 osteoporosis.

17 In evaluation of kidney function, data from Watkins et al. (2013) and Dhingra et al. (2017) showed that  
18 while measured PFOA showed positive association, modeled PFOA concentrations had no relation to  
19 eGFR illustrating example of potential reverse causality.

20 There is increasing evidence showing associations between PFAS and markers of glucose homeostasis  
21 and insulin resistance, and associations with adult type 2 diabetes risk in men and women (Cardenas  
22 2017; He 2018; Sun 2018).

23 Roles of inflammatory cytokines and adipokines have been explored in several studies of liver disease  
24 such as non-alcoholic fatty liver disease/steatohepatitis and in atherosclerosis (Hennig 2007, Wahlang  
25 2016, and Clair 2018). Proinflammatory responses, alterations in leptin signaling, and increases in TNF-  
26 alpha and IL-2 were reported in mechanistic studies with various persistent organohalogen pollutants in  
27 relation to diabetes and metabolic syndrome (Ferrante 2014; Wieser 2013). These associations have not  
28 yet been explored specifically with PFAS compounds.

1 Some positive associations have also been found for cancer outcomes; with C8 studies finding  
2 associations between PFOA and kidney and testicular cancer (Alexander and Olsen, 2007; Barry et al.,  
3 2013; Bonefeld-Jorgensen et al., 2014; Hardell et al., 2014; Steenland et al., 2015).

4 Some studies have observed no association between PFAS exposure and health effects such as specific  
5 cancers (Alexander and Olsen, 2007; Lundin 2009), lipids or metabolic function (Fisher, 2013). Effects of  
6 confounding, bias, and chance on observed associations with PFAS compounds were explored in  
7 several reviews of immune and cancer outcomes (Chang 2014, Chang 2015) and in studies of PFAS and  
8 menopause and endometriosis (Ruark 2017, Ngueta 2017).

9 In summary, most epidemiological studies of PFAS have evaluated PFOA and PFOS, but the  
10 epidemiological evidence is still limited for these two chemicals. The epidemiological evidence for other  
11 PFAS, e.g., PFHxS and PFNA, is considerably more limited. Therefore, additional research on the effects  
12 of PFAS, including PFHxS, PFNA, PFOS, and PFOA, is necessary to determine whether exposures increase  
13 the risk of adult diseases.

14 The proposed scope of the funding and sample size estimated for this health study would be too small  
15 and insufficient to evaluate cancer health outcomes.

### 16 **2.5.2 Hypotheses**

17 For children (aged 4-17 years), the Pease Study will evaluate the following main hypotheses, following  
18 the outline of the biochemical analytical plan (**Attachment 3**):

19 Higher serum levels of PFOA, PFOS, PFHxS, or other PFAS are associated with:

- 20 1. Lipids (higher total cholesterol, low-density lipoprotein, and triglycerides, and higher prevalence  
21 of hypercholesterolemia; obesity).
- 22 2. Impaired renal function (a higher level of uric acid, a higher prevalence of hyperuricemia, and a  
23 lower estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR)).
- 24 3. Liver function/damage biomarkers (alanine transaminase (ALT),  $\gamma$ -glutamyltransferase (GGT),  
25 direct bilirubin, cytokeratin-18 (CK-18)), and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease/steatohepatitis  
26 (determined by CK-18 levels).
- 27 4. Glycemic parameters (glucose, insulin, glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c), auto-antibodies (GAD-  
28 65 and IA-2), C-peptide, pro-insulin) and diabetes (type 1 and 2).

- 1       5. Measures of thyroid function (differences in thyroid stimulating hormone - TSH, total thyroxin -  
2       TT4, and TT3; higher prevalence of hypothyroidism).
- 3       6. Differences in sex hormones, growth and sexual maturation (testosterone, estradiol, and sex  
4       hormone-binding globulin (SHBG); insulin-like growth factor - 1 (IGF-1), age at menarche,  
5       delayed puberty).
- 6       7. Immune response including prevalence of hypersensitivity-related outcomes (e.g., asthma,  
7       atopic dermatitis; higher levels of immunoglobulins (IgG, IgA and IgM) and lower antibody  
8       responses to rubella, mumps, and diphtheria vaccines).
- 9       8. Neurodevelopmental outcomes (lower intelligence quotient (full scale IQ), attention-deficit and  
10      hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)).

11

12 For adults (aged  $\geq 18$  years), the Pease Study will evaluate the following main hypotheses.

13 Higher serum levels of PFOA, PFOS, PFHxS, or other PFAS are associated with:

- 14      1. Lipids (higher total cholesterol, low-density lipoprotein and triglycerides) and a higher  
15      prevalence of hypercholesterolemia).
- 16      2. Higher prevalence of coronary artery disease and hypertension (including pregnancy induced  
17      hypertension).
- 18      3. Renal function (higher level of uric acid and a higher prevalence of hyperuricemia, lower  
19      estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR)) and higher prevalence of kidney disease.
- 20      4. Glycemic parameters (glucose, insulin, glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c), auto-antibodies (GAD-  
21      65 and IA-2), C-peptide, pro-insulin) and diabetes (type 1 and 2).
- 22      5. Differences in thyroid hormones (thyroid stimulating hormone (TSH), TT4, and TT3), and higher  
23      prevalence of hypothyroidism.
- 24      6. Liver function/damage biomarkers (alanine transaminase (ALT),  $\gamma$ -glutamyltransferase (GGT),  
25      direct bilirubin, cytokeratin-18 (CK-18)) and liver disease.
- 26      7. Higher prevalence of osteoarthritis
- 27      8. Higher prevalence of osteoporosis.
- 28      9. Higher prevalence of endometriosis.

1 10. Measures of immune response and inflammation (serum levels of IgA, IgE, IgG, IgM, C - reactive  
2 protein (CRP), antinuclear antibodies (ANA), inflammatory cytokines and adipokines (interleukin  
3 1- $\beta$  (IL-1 $\beta$ ), interleukin 6 (IL-6), interleukin 8 (IL-8), monocyte chemotactic protein-1 (MCP-1),  
4 tumor necrosis factor  $\alpha$  (TNF $\alpha$ ), leptin, adiponectin, resistin, plasminogen activator inhibitor-1  
5 (PAI-1).

6 11. Higher prevalence of autoimmune diseases such as ulcerative colitis, rheumatoid arthritis, lupus,  
7 and multiple sclerosis.

## 8 **2.6 Intended Use of Study Findings**

9 Given that epidemiological research on the health effects of PFAS is at a relatively early stage, these  
10 health studies should make an important contribution to the scientific literature as the first  
11 epidemiological child and adult studies in the U.S. to evaluate potential health effects occurring in  
12 populations exposed to PFAS-contaminated drinking water caused by the use of AFFF.

13 The studies will provide the PFAS serum level and the results of the effect biomarker tests to each study  
14 participant. The participant can use this information for medical decision-making.

15 The health study will provide summaries of the findings to the participating affected communities.

16 Finally, any issues identified with the procedures, methods and approaches will be addressed in the  
17 protocol for the multi-site study.

18

## 19 **3. METHODS**

### 20 **3.1 Study Design**

21 The child and adult studies will be cross-sectional with separate evaluation of children (ages 4 - 17  
22 years) and adults (aged  $\geq 18$  years). The participants will be recruited from existing convenience samples  
23 from the Pease biomonitoring program, additional exposure groups, and from the referent groups.

24 The general components of the data collection are as follows:

- 25 • ATSDR will obtain adult consent, and parental permission and child assent (ages 7 years and  
26 older), to participate in this research study.

- 1 • ATSDR will administer adult and child questionnaires, and seek medical records verification of  
2 self-reported diseases and medical histories.
- 3 • ATSDR will administer neurobehavioral test batteries to the children and their parents and seek  
4 to abstract children's school records, in particular, special education records.
- 5 • ATSDR will obtain blood samples from each participant for analyses of PFAS and a number of  
6 effect biomarkers.
- 7 • As part of the current protocol, both children and adults will be asked to provide a urine sample  
8 for analyses for PFAS and/or relevant effect biomarkers. ATSDR will wait to analyze urines until  
9 more knowledge is gained about urinary PFAS and effect biomarkers and until the laboratory  
10 methods are developed.
- 11 • ATSDR will seek consent to store residual blood and urine samples for future analyses of other  
12 PFAS and/or relevant effect biomarkers yet to be identified.

### 13 **3.2 Study Populations and Eligibility**

14 The target area for the adult and child studies is the Pease Tradeport in Portsmouth, NH, served by  
15 PFAS-contaminated drinking water caused by the use of AFFF at the former Pease Air Force Base (ATSDR  
16 2017a, NH DHHS 2016). The target population consists of those exposed to PFAS contaminated drinking  
17 water at Pease. Those eligible include those who worked, resided, or attended childcare at the Pease  
18 Tradeport or Pease Air Force Base prior to the closing of the Haven supply well in May 2014, were  
19 exposed in utero or during breastfeeding, or lived in a home near Pease that was served by a PFAS-  
20 contaminated private well. Therefore, ATSDR is recruiting adults and children who had PFAS-  
21 contaminated drinking water exposure from 2004 to May 2014.

22 Persons eligible to take part in this research study will focus on the 2015-2017 Pease biomonitoring  
23 program participants (NH DHHS, 2016). Ever firefighters (a person who was ever employed as firefighter)  
24 were included in the Pease biomonitoring program, but firefighters and others with occupational PFAS  
25 exposure from sources other than the drinking water will not be included in the Pease Study. In  
26 addition, children whose birth mothers had occupational exposures to PFAS from sources other than  
27 drinking water will be excluded. The goal is to enroll at least 350 children (ages 4-17) and 1,000 adults  
28 aged  $\geq 18$  years with community exposure to PFAS. In the event that recruitment does not reach the  
29 desired sample sizes, ATSDR will recruit additional persons who were eligible for but did not participate  
30 in the Pease biomonitoring program. Again, the exclusion for non-drinking water occupational exposures  
31 will apply. Pregnant females will not be excluded. In addition, Section 46.306(b) of the regulations, 45

1 CFR 46, does not allow prisoners, including persons on house arrest, to take part in this type of  
2 research.

3 ATSDR will recruit approximately 175 referent children (ages 4 – 17 years) and 100 adults (aged ≥18  
4 years) from the Portsmouth area who were not exposed to PFAS contaminated drinking water at Pease,  
5 and do not have a history of occupational exposure to PFAS. For referent children, their birth mothers  
6 also must not have exposure to drinking water at Pease. From an exposure point of view, a smaller  
7 number of referents need to be enrolled because a sizeable proportion (e.g. lower tertile) of ‘exposed’  
8 Pease participants are expected to be in range of the general population concentrations for a number of  
9 PFAS compounds (**Attachment 2**) (NH DHHS 2016).

### 10 **3.2.1 Children**

11 The eligibility criteria for children is as follows:

- 12 1. Aged 4 – 17 years at the start of the study,
- 13 2. Resided or attended day care in areas served by PFAS-contaminated drinking water (i.e. during  
14 the period when the combined concentrations of PFOS and PFOA in the drinking water serving  
15 the area exceeded 70 parts per trillion) caused by AFFF use, or were exposed in utero or during  
16 breastfeeding when the mother consumed the contaminated drinking water,
- 17 3. Drinking water exposure from Pease occurred between 2004 and May 2014.
- 18 4. ATSDR will exclude children whose birth mothers were ever employed as a firefighter, ever  
19 participated in fire training exercises using AFFF foam, or were ever employed at industrial  
20 facilities that used PFAS chemicals in the manufacturing process.
- 21 5. Females who are pregnant may enroll.
- 22 6. Youth in prison, including those under house arrest, are not eligible.

23 The requirement that the child’s last exposure to PFAS from drinking water at Pease be from 2004 to  
24 May 2014 takes into account the half-lives of about 3 years for PFOA and PFOS, and about 5 years for  
25 PFHxS, observed in a recent study of drinking water exposures caused by AFFF use at a military facility in  
26 Sweden (Li 2017). Based on these half-lives, those last exposed more than 15 years ago will have greatly  
27 diminished current serum levels of these PFAS chemicals, making the use of these serum measurements  
28 to predict past exposures more problematic.

1 At Pease, about 370 children who participated in the 2015 biomonitoring program at Pease and who  
2 were aged 1–13 years at the time of blood draw would be aged 4–17 years in 2018 and would be eligible  
3 for the child study. Most of these children attended daycare at Pease. We do not know exactly how  
4 many children attended daycare at the Pease Tradeport before June 2014 but the records search of two  
5 daycare centers was undertaken (see below). In addition, those children who attended daycare but  
6 didn't participate in the 2015 biomonitoring would also be eligible in order to reach sample size goals.

7 The Discovery Child Enrichment Center began operation in 1994. Its yearly enrollment was  
8 approximately 149 children ages 6 weeks to 5 years. A records search by the director of the Center  
9 identified 695 children who attended the daycare during 1996–2015 and who would be aged of 6–17  
10 years in 2018. The number of children who attended this day care prior to June 2014 and would be  
11 between the ages of 4 and 17 years in 2018 could be within the range of 250 – 450 individuals. The  
12 Great Bay Kids' Company is also located at the Pease Tradeport and began operation in 2010. Its annual  
13 enrollment is approximately 270 children aged  $\leq 12$  years. Assuming that most of the children enrolled  
14 would be  $\leq 5$  years of age, and that most of the children attend daycare for 4 years, about 300 children  
15 might have attended this daycare during the period of interest and would be aged 4–17 years in 2018.

16 Assuming that a minimum of about 500 children attended the two day-care centers at Pease before  
17 June 2014 and would be aged 4–17 years in 2018, we would require a participation rate of about 70% to  
18 recruit 350 Pease children into the study. Such a participation rate is possible given the high visibility of  
19 the study, strong interest in the community, and the commitment of the Pease CAP and associated  
20 organizations to conduct outreach for the study. It would also be feasible to recruit at least 175 children  
21 in the same age range from the schools in Portsmouth, NH, who were unexposed to the PFAS-  
22 contaminated drinking water at the Pease Tradeport and whose parents did not work at the Pease  
23 Tradeport or have occupational exposures to PFAS.

24 The age range for the child study (4-17 years) was determined by taking into account the age ranges in  
25 previous PFAS studies and the age range appropriate for the candidate endpoints. The study will limit  
26 inclusion to those  $\geq 4$  years of age because those children exposed in utero on or before the closing of  
27 the Haven Well (May 2014) would be at least 4 years of age at the start of the study. In addition, most  
28 of the neurobehavioral tests that will be used in the study are appropriate for children aged  $\geq 4$  years of  
29 age.

30 The study will recruit a comparison population consisting of children aged 4 – 17 years from those  
31 attending school in Portsmouth, NH, who were never exposed to PFAS-contaminated drinking water



1 during their lifetime, including in utero and during breastfeeding. Therefore, the children's birth  
2 mothers also must never had exposure to drinking water from the former Pease Air Force Base or the  
3 Pease International Tradeport. Recruitment of the comparison population will match the age  
4 distribution of children who participated in the Pease biomonitoring program.

### 5 **3.2.2 Adults**

6 The population of interest at Pease is adults aged  $\geq 18$  years who worked at the Pease Tradeport prior to  
7 the closing of the Haven supply well in May 2014, resided or worked at Pease Air Force Base, or lived in  
8 a home near Pease that was served by a PFAS-contaminated private well; and who consumed PFAS-  
9 contaminated drinking water at Pease any time during their lifetime. The eligibility criteria for adults is  
10 as follows:

- 11 1. Aged  $\geq 18$  years at the start of the study.
- 12 2. Resided or worked in areas served by PFAS-contaminated drinking water (i.e. during the  
13 period when the combined concentrations of PFOS and PFOA in the drinking water serving  
14 the area exceeded 70 parts per trillion) caused by AFFF use.
- 15 3. Drinking water exposure from Pease occurred between 2004 and May 2014.
- 16 4. ATSDR will exclude persons ever employed as a firefighter, ever participated in fire training  
17 exercises using AFFF foam, or ever employed at industrial facilities that used PFAS chemicals  
18 in the manufacturing process.
- 19 5. Females who are pregnant may enroll.
- 20 6. Adults in prison, including those under house arrest, are not eligible.

21 Apart from the occupational exposure exclusion, the study will recruit adults who participated in the  
22 Pease biomonitoring program. Adults who did not participate in biomonitoring program but meet  
23 eligibility criteria could also enroll in the current study in order to meet sample size requirements.  
24 About 1,430 adults have participated in this program. A participation rate of 70% would result in a  
25 sample size of about 1,000. In addition, for some of the outcomes of interest, e.g., serum level of total  
26 cholesterol, hyperuricemia, and cardiovascular disease, a sample size of 1,000 would be sufficient for  
27 PFAS serum levels categorized into quartiles.

1 The study will recruit a comparison population of 100 adults, unexposed to the contaminated drinking  
2 water at Pease, consisting of adults aged  $\geq 18$  years, taking into account the age distribution of the  
3 adults who participated in the Pease biomonitoring program.

### 4 **3.3 Sample Size Considerations**

5 The Pease feasibility assessment included sample size calculations for a wide range of health related  
6 outcomes (ATSDR 2017a). Sample size calculations selected a type 1 (“ $\alpha$  error”) of .05 and type 2 error  
7 (“ $\beta$  error”) of .20. The tables present sample sizes per stratum for specific outcomes for children (Table  
8 1) and for adults (Table 2). To determine effect sizes that are reasonable to detect, we selected  
9 epidemiological studies considered most representative of the U.S. population exposed to PFAS-  
10 contaminated drinking water caused by AFFF use at military facilities. Studies conducted using NHANES  
11 data had PFOA and PFHxS serum levels similar to or lower than those observed at number of potential  
12 study sites. In some of the more recent NHANES studies, the PFOS serum levels were only moderately  
13 higher than at Pease or other sites. Therefore, the PFOS, PFOA and PFHxS results in the NHANES studies  
14 were used in many of the sample size calculations. For those outcomes not included in NHANES studies,  
15 the C8 studies were used. The C8 results were considered more representative of U.S. populations (e.g.,  
16 in background disease rates and prevalence of non-PFAS risk factors) than studies conducted in other  
17 countries, although the PFOS, and especially the PFOA, serum levels in the C8 studies were higher than  
18 at Pease. The total sample sizes for children and adults should allow for the categorization of PFAS  
19 serum levels (or cumulative PFAS serum levels) into e.g. quartiles of exposure: reference level, low,  
20 medium and high.

21 **Attachment 4** includes additional information and assumptions pertinent to selected health outcomes  
22 to be studied.

#### 23 **3.3.1 Children**

24 For children, **Table 1** (and **Attachment 4a**) provide the sample size calculations for several health  
25 outcomes of interest assuming a type 1 (“ $\alpha$  error”) of .05 and type 2 error (“ $\beta$  error”) of .20. It was  
26 considered important that a study have a total sample size so that exposures could be categorized into  
27 tertiles (i.e., reference, medium, and high) or preferably into quartiles (i.e., reference, low, medium and  
28 high). Per stratum estimates of needed sample size have been calculated based on different prevalence  
29 of outcomes and detected odds ratios or mean difference.

1 The proposed sample size (350 exposed and 175 referents) is large enough to effectively evaluate some  
2 of the health outcomes identified in the literature review and the recent systematic review (Rappazzo  
3 2017) as potentially associated with PFAS in children (i.e. difference in lipids or renal function). A larger  
4 multi-site study ( $\geq 2,000$  children) is needed to effectively evaluate other health outcomes of interest  
5 (ATSDR 2017a).

6 The health outcomes and biomarkers studied would include mean difference in total cholesterol  
7 (ranging from 156 to 637 per stratum), uric acid levels (556 per stratum), estimated glomerular filtration  
8 rate (eGFR; 275 per stratum), testosterone (about 400 per stratum) and insulin growth factor-1 (IGF-1;  
9 146 per stratum). Based on our estimations, we would also be able to detect mean differences for TT4  
10 (1,080 per stratum), obesity, atopic dermatitis, and in full scale IQ that are similar to or smaller than  
11 those reported in some studies of children exposed to PFAS compounds (Wang 2011, Karlsen 2017, Lin  
12 2013; Stein 2014).

13 An NHANES study of estimated glomerular filtration rate observed statistically significant findings with a  
14 total sample size of just under 2,000 children (Kataria 2015). For thyroid function, estradiol, delayed  
15 puberty, and asthma, a total sample sizes of 2,000 children may be sufficient, although larger sample  
16 sizes would be optimal (Lopez-Espinosa 2011, 2012; Stein 2016).

17 We should note that several well designed epidemiological studies of children exposed to PFAS that  
18 reported robust associations with these health outcomes had similar or smaller sample sizes than the  
19 one proposed for Pease Study, e.g., studies conducted in Taiwan (Zeng 2015, Lin 2013), Avon, UK  
20 (Maisonet 2015a, b), and C8 studies of IQ (Stein 2013) and ADHD behaviors (Stein 2014). Valuable  
21 findings on immune function including vaccine response that we would also like to study were also  
22 reported from studies of similar sample sizes (Grandjean 2012, 2017; Granum 2013, Stein 2016).

23 In summary, a total sample size of  $\geq 2,000$  would be sufficient to evaluate a wide range of biomarkers  
24 and outcomes including lipids (and hypercholesterolemia), uric acid (and hyperuricemia), estimated  
25 glomerular filtration rate, testosterone, IGF-1, neurobehavioral measures (executive function, attention,  
26 IQ) and ADHD, rhinitis, and obesity. The child study at Pease would provide an important contribution  
27 towards that goal and would be able to address at least some of the more prevalent outcomes as a  
28 stand-alone or “pilot” study.

29 **Table 1.** Child Study (ages 4-17 years)

Health-related	Relevant Study	Observed Effect Size	Assumptions	Sample
----------------	----------------	----------------------	-------------	--------

Endpoint				Size/Stratum $\alpha$ error = .05 $\beta$ error = .20
Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)  High cholesterol	Frisbee 2010, C8 Study 1,971 boys <12 yrs 2,773 boys 12-18 yrs 1,886 girls <12 yrs 2,520 girls 12-18 yrs	PFOS: 5 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quintile Age: <12 yrs 12-18 Boys: +6.2 +9.3 Girls: +4.6 +9.4  OR = 1.6	Mean PFOS serum levels were about 20 µg/L. SD for total cholesterol=29.3 mg/dL  Prevalence=34.2%	+4.6: 637/stratum +9.3: 156/stratum  300/stratum
Thyroid function TT <sub>4</sub>  Thyroid disease	Lopez-Espinosa 2012, C8 1,078 1-5 yrs 3,132 6-10 yrs 6,447 >10 - 17 yrs	PFOS, 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 quartile: 2.3% change (mean difference = 0.17 µg/dL)  PFOA: OR=1.44 (PFOS: OR < 1.0)	Mean PFOS serum levels were about 20 µg/L. SD for TT <sub>4</sub> as estimated at 1.4. Percent change in TT <sub>4</sub> was converted to mean difference assuming the median TT <sub>4</sub> was ref. level. Prevalence=0.6% (used PFOA results)	1,080/stratum          16,000/stratum
Uric Acid	Kataria 2015, NHANES 1,960; 12-18 yrs	PFOS: 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile = +0.19 mg/dL	Mean PFOS serum level = 12.8 µg/L. SD = 1.19.	556/stratum
Hyperuricemia	Geiger 2013, NHANES 1,772; 12-18 years	PFOS: 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile, OR=1.65	Mean PFOS serum level =16.6. Prevalence=16%	400/stratum
eGFR	Kataria 2015 1,960; 12-18 yrs	PFOA mean serum level =3.5 µg/L. mean difference= -6.6	Standard deviation=27.6	275/stratum
Testosterone	Lopez-Espinosa 2016, C8 1,169 boys; 6-9 yrs 1,123 girl; 6-9 yrs	PFOS (IQR): -5.8% boys (diff=1.9) -6.6% girls (diff=2.45)	Percent change was converted to mean difference assuming median testosterone level was ref. level. SD estimated at 11.85 for girls and 9.63 for boys.	Boys: 404/stratum Girls: 368/stratum
IGF-1 (Insulin-like growth factor - 1)	Lopez-Espinosa 2016, C8	PFHxS (IQR): Boys: -2.5% (diff=17.3) Girls: -2.1%	Percent change was converted to mean difference assuming median IGF-1 in boys as ref. level. SD estimated as 52.6	146/stratum
Delayed Puberty	Lopez-Espinosa 2011. C8 3,072 boys, 8-18 yrs 2,903 girls, 8-18 yrs	PFOS: mean serum level was about 19 µg/L.	OR for delayed puberty and the number of days delayed puberty had narrow CIs	Insufficient information to calculate sample size, but sample sizes in this study were enough for sufficient precision.
ADHD	Stein 2011, C8 10,546; aged 5-18	PFHxS mean serum level was 5.2 µg/L. 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup>		

	yrs.	quartile, OR=1.5	Prevalence: ADHD Dx: 12.4%	764/stratum
Asthma	Stein 2016, NHANES 640; 12-19 yrs	PFOA mean serum level = 3.6 µg/L. OR=1.2	Prevalence = 11%	2,400/stratum
Atopic dermatitis	Wang 2011 (Taiwan) 244; infants, 2 yrs	PFOS mean serum level=5.5 µg/L., 4 <sup>th</sup> quartile OR=2.19	Prevalence=10.7%	220/stratum
Obesity	Karlsen 2017 (Faroes)	PFOA mean serum level=2.22 µg/L. OR=1.88	Prevalence=17%	250/stratum

1 Note: Observed effect sizes focused on the results for serum levels of PFOS and/or PFHxS.

2 <sup>†</sup> eGFR –estimated glomerular filtration rate, TT4 – total thyroxine; IGF-1 – insulin-like growth factor 1; ADHD – attention-deficit  
3 and hyperactivity disorder.

4

### 5 **3.3.2 Adults**

6 For adults, **Table 2** (and **Attachment 4b**) provide the sample size calculations for several health  
7 outcomes of interest assuming a type 1 (“α error”) of .05 and type 2 error (“β error”) of .20. In this  
8 exposure based study we assume an appropriate coverage of range of exposures that will enable  
9 stratification/categorization to tertiles or quartiles of exposure. Per stratum estimates of needed sample  
10 size (e.g. first vs. fourth quartile) have been calculated based on different measures of association such  
11 as odds ratios or detected mean difference.

12 We propose to enroll at least 1,000 in the Pease adult study which would have enough power to  
13 effectively evaluate some health outcomes of interest described below. To effectively evaluate broader  
14 spectrum of PFAS exposure related health outcomes of interest, a sample size of ≥6,000 participants  
15 would be needed for a multi-site study.

16 For more prevalent outcomes like elevated lipids levels (cholesterol) or uric acid, the range of 229 to 660  
17 participants per stratum (i.e. quartile) or 200 to 550 per stratum, respectively, given observed  
18 differences would be needed. That would translate to overall sample size of about 800 to 2,600  
19 participants being sufficient to detect differences at the specified level of precision and power  
20 (Steenland, 2009, 2010; Fisher 2013; Shankar 2011). Similar sample sizes would also be required to  
21 compare other common health outcomes such as cardiovascular disease (Shankar 2012). Larger samples  
22 sizes would be needed for liver function or osteoarthritis, with a total sample in the range of 3,000 to  
23 4,000 subjects (Uhl 2013; Gallo 2012; Steenland 2010).

24 For thyroid disease and thyroid function, a total sample size of 6,000 may be sufficient although  
25 probably not optimal. However, NHANES studies of thyroid function and thyroid disease obtained

1 statistically significant findings with total sample sizes considerably less than 6,000 (Melzer 2010; Wen  
 2 2013). NHANES studies of liver function also obtained statistically significant findings with total sample  
 3 sizes considerably less than 6,000 (Gleason 2015; n=4333). For biomarkers of immune function (e.g.,  
 4 immunoglobulins, C-reactive protein and cytokines) and fatty liver disease, there was insufficient  
 5 information to calculate sample sizes. However, a total sample size of 6,000 should be sufficient to  
 6 evaluate these biomarkers as we assumed similar endpoint differences of those outcomes.

7 For ulcerative colitis, a sample size of 6,000 might be sufficient if the effect size in the C8 study (i.e.,  
 8 OR=3.05) was consistent for PFOA serum levels considerably lower than those in the C8 study. For more  
 9 modest effect sizes (e.g., ORs < 2.75), a total sample size of 6,000 would not be adequate to evaluate  
 10 associations with ulcerative colitis.

11 In addition, several epidemiological studies of adults exposed to PFAS that reported robust statistical  
 12 associations with these health outcomes had similar or smaller sample sizes than the one proposed for  
 13 Pease Study, e.g., NHANES studies (Nelson 2010, Wen 2013), a C8 longitudinal study (Fitz-Simon 2013), a  
 14 C8 immune study (Looker 2014), and studies in China (Fu 2014) and Korea (Ji 2012).

15 In summary, a total sample size of  $\geq 6,000$  in multi-site study should be sufficient to evaluate a broad  
 16 range of biomarkers and outcomes such as lipids (and hypercholesterolemia), uric acid (and  
 17 hyperuricemia), cardiovascular disease, osteoarthritis, immune biomarkers and biomarkers for fatty liver  
 18 disease. It also may be sufficient to evaluate thyroid disease, thyroid function and liver function. The  
 19 adult study at Pease would provide an important contribution towards that goal and would be able to  
 20 address at least some of the more prevalent outcomes as a stand-alone or “pilot” study.

21 **Table 2.** Adult Study.

Health-related Endpoint	Relevant Study	Observed Effect Size	Assumptions	Sample Size/Stratum $\alpha$ error = .05 $\beta$ error = .20
Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)	Steenland 2009, C8 46,294 aged $\geq 18$ yrs	PFOS, mean serum level = 19.6 $\mu\text{g/L}$ , 10 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> decile: +11 mg/dL	SD=41.9	228/stratum
High cholesterol		4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile, OR=1.51	Prevalence=15%	660/stratum
High Cholesterol	Fisher 2013, Canada	PFHxS, mean serum level = 2.2 $\mu\text{g/L}$ , 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile, OR=1.57	Prevalence=44%	290/stratum
Cardiovascular	Shankar 2012,	PFOA mean serum level = 4.2	Prevalence =	250/stratum

disease	NHANES 1,216 aged ≥40 years	µg/L, 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile: OR=2.01	13%	
Uric Acid	Steenland 2010, C8 53,458 aged ≥20 yrs	PFOS mean serum level = 20.2 µg/L, 10 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> decile: +0.22 mg/dL Hyperuricemia, 5 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quintile: OR=1.26	SD=1.55  Prevalence:24%	780/stratum  1,525/stratum
Uric Acid	Shankar 2011, NHANES 3,883 aged ≥20 yrs	PFOA mean serum level = 3.5 µg/L, 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile: +0.44 mg/dL  Hyperuricemia, 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile: OR=1.97  PFOS mean serum level = 17.9 µg/L Hyperuricemia, 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile: OR=1.5	SD = 2.5  Prevalence: 19.2%	507/stratum  200/stratum  550/stratum
Liver function Elevated ALT	Gallo 2012, C8 46,452 aged ≥18 yrs	PFOA and PFOS mean serum levels were 28 µg/L and 20.3 µg/L, respectively. PFOA: OR=1.54 PFOS: OR=1.25	Prevalence = 11.2%	725/stratum 2,917/stratum
Liver function ALT (µIU/mL)	Gallo 2012, C8 46,452 aged ≥18 yrs	The top quintile of serum PFOS in the Pease population was 15 µg/L. This would approximately correspond to a mean difference in ALT of +1.8 µIU/mL	SD=1.47	1,958/stratum
Liver function Elevated ALT	Gleason 2015, NHANES 4,333 aged ≥12 yrs	PFHxS mean serum level = 1.8 µg/L. 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile: OR=1.37	Assumed similar prevalence as in the C8 study	1,570/stratum
Thyroid disease	Melzer 2010, NHANES 1,900 men, aged ≥20 yrs 2,066 women, aged ≥20 yrs	PFOA, mean serum level=3.5 µg/L, 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile: Thyroid disease ever: Women, OR=1.64 Men, OR=1.58 Thyroid disease with current meds Women, OR=1.86 Men, OR=1.89	Prevalences: 16.18% 3.06%  9.89% 1.88%	410/stratum 2,035/stratum  365/stratum 1,575/stratum
Subclinical hypothyroidism	Wen 2013, NHANES 672 males aged ≥20 yrs 509 females aged ≥20 yrs	PFHxS mean serum level averaged about 2 µg/L. Unit increase in Ln(PFHxS): Women, OR=3.10 Men, OR=1.57	Prevalences: 1.6% 2.2%	475/stratum 2,918/stratum
Osteoarthritis	Innes 2011, C8 49,432 aged >20 yrs	OR=1.42	Prevalence=7.6%	1,580/stratum
Osteoarthritis	Uhl 2013, NHANES	PFOA mean serum level = 5.4	Assumed similar	978/stratum

	4,102 aged 20-84	$\mu\text{g/L}$ , 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile: OR=1.55 PFOS mean serum level = 24.6 $\mu\text{g/L}$ , 4 <sup>th</sup> vs 1 <sup>st</sup> quartile: OR=1.77	prevalence as in the C8 study	550/stratum
Ulcerative colitis	Steenland 2013, C8 28,541 community and 3,713 worker cohorts	OR=3.05	Prevalence=0.5%	1,480/stratum

1 For rare health outcomes such ulcerative colitis, other autoimmune diseases, or cancer the sample size  
2 is too small to detect reasonably expected increases in ORs and those outcomes cannot be effectively  
3 studied at one site or even at multiple sites combined (i.e. about 6,000). We should note that we don't  
4 know actual differences in clinical or research parameters at Pease or any other sites and there is  
5 considerable variability between studies and populations; sample size estimates provide guidance but  
6 should be interpreted with caution and in the context of scientific literature.

7 **Attachment 4** provides further information and details on the derivation of the sample size calculations  
8 for Table 2 and also estimates of detectable mean difference and odds ratios for selected clinical tests  
9 and health outcomes.

### 10 3.4 Study Roll Out and Communication Plan

11 ATSDR will work with NH DHHS and the Pease CAP to conduct outreach to encourage participation. The  
12 Pease CAP has offered to assist in recruitment of Pease and referent children and adults, and CAP  
13 involvement will be crucial in conducting outreach for the study. To increase community awareness of  
14 the study and to encourage participation, study investigators will work with NH DHHS and the Pease CAP  
15 to ensure that outreach about the study is effective. In advance of the start of the study, outreach will  
16 involve announcements to local elected officials, local media, community organizations, and the  
17 Portsmouth schools (**Attachment 5**). Outreach may also involve meetings with community  
18 representatives, medical societies, school officials, and/or public meetings. Although active in outreach,  
19 both NH DHHS and the Pease CAP will not directly obtain consent, intervene, or interact with research  
20 participants.

21 As part of the outreach, ATSDR will provide a factsheet to the Pease Development Authority (PDA) and  
22 Tenants Association of Pease Tradeport (TAP) so that it is included in newsletters and email notices to  
23 subscribing firms at the Pease Tradeport (**Attachment 5, Attachment 7a&b, Attachment 9c**). ATSDR and  
24 study investigators may request employers at Pease, PDA and TAP for rosters of current and former



1 employees at the Pease Tradeport to assist with recruitment efforts. The study will also provide the  
2 factsheet to the Portsmouth schools, local media outlets, and to community organizations in  
3 Portsmouth (**Attachment 5, Attachment 7d&e, Attachment 9c**).

#### 4 **3.5 Recruitment**

##### 5 ***3.5.1 Wave One Recruitment from Biomonitoring Recruitment Frame***

6 ATSDR will first recruit from those who participated in the NH DHHS Pease biomonitoring program in  
7 2015-7. The NH DHHS biomonitoring program consent form did not obtain permission to recontact the  
8 participant for future studies. Therefore, ATSDR will not directly contact the biomonitoring program  
9 participants for Pease Study recruitment. Instead, NH DHHS, which manages the Pease biomonitoring  
10 records and possesses the recruitment frame for the Pease Study, will send out an introductory letter  
11 indicating its support for, and encouraging its former participants to contact ATSDR to take part in the  
12 ATSDR Pease Study (**Attachments 6a&6b**). The letter will provide a toll-free line that the interested  
13 person can call ATSDR to request participation in the study and/or ask any questions about the study.  
14 ATSDR will screen each interested caller using a Wave One eligibility screening script (**Attachment 6c**).

##### 15 ***3.5.2 Wave Two Recruitment of Additional Exposed Children and Adults***

16 Given that the Pease biomonitoring program recruited a convenience sample, no statistical sampling will  
17 be required. All biomonitoring participants in the recruitment frame will be recruited until the list is  
18 exhausted or until the required sample size is reached. If sample size requirements are not met in Wave  
19 One, ATSDR will further recruit individuals who were eligible but did not participate in the biomonitoring  
20 program. ATSDR will launch a media campaign to announce Wave Two (**Attachment 5**). A recruitment  
21 flyer will be sent to parents of other children identified as attending daycare centers at Pease before  
22 2014 who didn't participate in biomonitoring in 2015-7 (**Attachment 7a**). Advertisement in local public  
23 media and through PDA and TAP would encourage other eligible adults to participate in the study  
24 (**Attachment 5**). The flyers will provide a toll-free number that interested recruits can call ATSDR to  
25 request participation in the study and ask any questions about the study (**Attachment 7b**). ATSDR will  
26 screen each interested caller using an eligibility screening script (**Attachment 7c**).

1 **3.5.3 Wave Three Recruitment of Referent Children and Adults**

2 For efficiency, Wave Three may occur concurrently with Waves One and Two. ATSDR will recruit a small  
3 referent group of 175 children and 100 adults not exposed to PFAS-contaminated drinking water.

4 ATSDR will work with school officials to approve this school-based recruitment. ATSDR will also request  
5 that the schools distribute a flyer describing the study to students and instruct the students to give the  
6 flyer to their parents. Children will be recruited through outreach to Portsmouth schools and day care  
7 centers (for those 4-5 year old) (**Attachment 7d**). Recruitment of adult referents will include outreach to  
8 current adult education students among the five colleges at Pease (i.e., students who first attended  
9 these schools after closure of the Haven Well), Portsmouth government employees (AFSCME Local  
10 #1386), Portsmouth community organizations, and/or specific Portsmouth neighborhoods (**Attachment**  
11 **7e**). ATSDR will screen each interested caller using an eligibility screening script (**Attachment 7c**).

12 Both exposure and referent households may have more than one eligible adult and/or child, and some  
13 parents may want to enroll in both of the adult and child studies. Trained study staff will use the  
14 recruitment tracking form (**Attachment 8**) to track recruitment success and to calculate non-response  
15 bias.

16 **3.5.3 Enrollment Procedures**

17 Once potential recruits express interest and are screened for eligibility, study staff will schedule  
18 appointments for them at the central study office, or alternatively for a home visit for some who are  
19 unable or unwilling to attend an office visit and who live a reasonable distance to the office. The study  
20 staff will establish a toll-free telephone line for interested recruits to schedule appointments at their  
21 convenience. Once the appointment is scheduled, study staff will mail an Appointment Packet  
22 (containing an Appointment Reminder Card (**Attachment 9a**), the Informed Consent materials  
23 (**Attachment 9b**), a Study Fact Sheet (**Attachment 9c**) with a description to arrive fasting, and to bring  
24 medications and a urine sample to the appointment. Interested recruits will be mailed urine collection  
25 supplies. They will be instructed to collect a first-morning voided urine sample on the day of their  
26 appointment. An advance copy of the Informed Consent Form will provide an extra opportunity for the  
27 interested recruit to read and more fully understand his or her rights in the study and to ask any  
28 questions before the scheduled appointment.

1 Study staff will give the interested recruit a reminder telephone call and send a text one to two days  
2 before the scheduled appointment (**Attachment 10**). The study protocol will provide the flexibility to  
3 schedule or re-schedule office or home visits within the study period. Interested recruits who are unable  
4 or unwilling to come to the study office, and live within a one-hour drive of the study office, will be  
5 offered an in-home appointment by trained study staff to complete the study. Interested recruits who  
6 request or require a home interview, blood draw, and urine collection, must reside within a one-hour  
7 drive from the study office. The study staff will make up to five contact attempts to an interested recruit  
8 who misses an appointment in order to reschedule the appointment and maximize the number of  
9 completed appointments (**Attachment 11**).

### 10 **3.6 Data Collection Procedures**

11 The study will establish a central office in Portsmouth to obtain informed consent, blood and urine  
12 specimens, administering the neurobehavioral batteries to parents and children, and providing a space  
13 for completion of the questionnaire. Study staff will be available to answer any questions concerning the  
14 study. All study staff will receive training on the goals and purposes of informed consent, administration  
15 of the questionnaire, administration of the neurobehavioral test batteries, collection methods for the  
16 blood specimens, and on proper documentation of data collection procedures. Study staff will receive  
17 certified training on Human Subjects Protection (e.g., Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative [CITI]  
18 Program) and sign a confidentiality agreement prior to contact with potential recruits and enrolled  
19 participants.

20 Trained study staff will attend dedicated telephone lines to respond to questions and to address  
21 concerns from potential recruits, enrolled participants, and the public. Study staff will ask participants to  
22 attend their appointment in at least an eight-hour fasting state; therefore, most recruits will likely  
23 schedule appointments in the early morning. The steps of the data collection will include:

- 24 1. Check-in procedures;
- 25 2. Informed consent;
- 26 3. Data collection procedures;
- 27 4. Exit procedures; including provision of a gift card as a token of appreciation for participation.

1 **3.6.1 Check-in Procedures**

2 Trained study staff will document the completion of each step from check-in to the provision of gift  
3 cards on a hard copy form (**Attachment 11**). This hardcopy form will be stored with the participant's  
4 signed Informed Consent Form (**Attachment 9b**) in locked files and in secure rooms. Staff will securely  
5 ship all files to ATSDR at the end of data collection. All files and biological samples will be securely stored  
6 at the study office prior to shipment.

7 **3.6.2 Informed Consent Process**

8 The informed consent includes a description of study procedures and risks and benefits of participation  
9 (**Attachment 9b**), including a Privacy Act Statement (**Attachment 9b1**). A study factsheet will inform the  
10 adult participant and the child participant and parent of the chemical tests and clinical outcomes to be  
11 measured (**Attachment 9c**). Study staff will emphasize the voluntary nature of participation and will  
12 answer any questions the participant, or parent of the child participant, has prior to obtaining  
13 signatures.

14 **3.6.2.1 Consent for Specimens and Data**

15 ATSDR will obtain fasting blood specimens from each participant for analyses of PFAS and several effect  
16 biomarkers. In addition, all participants will be asked to provide a morning void urine sample on the  
17 same day as their blood draw. After all the current laboratory analyses on blood are completed, ATSDR  
18 will ask for permission to archive any residual blood specimens and the urines for future analyses of  
19 PFAS and/or effect biomarkers.

20 ATSDR will also enter into an agreement with NH DHHS for conditional access to the Pease  
21 biomonitoring program data and residual specimens. The access is conditional because health study  
22 participants must consent to allow ATSDR to obtain their existing residual biomonitoring specimens for  
23 current or future research purposes. ATSDR will re-consent participants to allow further PFAS and effect  
24 biomarker analyses using any remaining residual specimens for research. ATSDR will also seek consent  
25 from participants to link their existing laboratory results from the NH biomonitoring program for this  
26 new research purpose.

### 1 3.6.2.2 Child Consent

2 Before any data collection can begin in the child study, trained study staff will review the hardcopy  
3 Parental Permission and Assent Form (**Attachment 9b2**) with the parent who is interested in having the  
4 child participate. The study staff will explain to the parent and child the purpose of the study and  
5 request that the parent sign the permission forms. If the child is seven years of age or older, the study  
6 staff will request that the child give an assent to participate in the study.

7 ATSDR will request that the parent complete a questionnaire about the child and complete a parental  
8 neurobehavioral test battery on behalf of the child. The permission form will request that the parent  
9 allow the child to donate a fasting blood specimen and store any residual specimens for future analyses.  
10 The parental permission form will allow the investigators to administer a neurobehavioral test battery to  
11 the child, access the child's medical and school records (including special education records)  
12 (**Attachments 9b2, 9b3 & 9b5**), and to contact the child and parent for possible future studies. Once the  
13 parent signs the consent and permission forms (and the child aged  $\geq 7$  years gives assent to participate),  
14 the parent and/or the child become study participants.

15 For those children who participated in the Pease biomonitoring program, the consent form will request  
16 permission from the parent to access the child's residual biomonitoring blood specimen for the analysis  
17 of additional PFAS chemicals and immune biomarkers. The consent form will also permit NH DHHS to  
18 provide the child's PFAS serum results from the biomonitoring program for use in this research study.

### 19 3.6.2.3 Adult Consent

20 Before any data collection can begin in the adult study, trained study staff will review the hardcopy  
21 Adult Consent Form with the interested recruit (**Attachment 9b4**). The study staff will explain the  
22 purpose of the study and obtain written informed consent for the completion of a questionnaire, the  
23 collection of a new fasting blood specimen, the storage of this blood specimen for future analyses,  
24 access to medical records (**Attachment 9b5**), and permission to contact the participant in the future for  
25 a possible study . After signing the consent form, the adult will become a study participant.

26 For those adults who participated in the Pease biomonitoring program, the consent form will request  
27 permission to access the individual's residual blood specimen for the analysis of additional PFAS  
28 chemicals. The consent form will also permit NH DHHS to provide his/her PFAS serum results from the  
29 biomonitoring program for use in this research study.

1 3.6.2.4 Risks and Benefits

2 The main risk in this study is the potential for inadvertent disclosure of participants' personally  
3 identifiable information (PII). ATSDR has taken steps to minimize this risk. Study staff and contractors  
4 will be trained on the requirements to protect identifiable and sensitive data, and will be required to  
5 sign a Rules of Behavior Agreement (**Attachment 14**). As further described in **Section 3.8.1**, ATSDR will  
6 inform the participant that his or her participation is protected by a Certificate of Confidentiality under  
7 Section 301(d) of the Public Health Service Act (PHSA) as amended by Section 2012 of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century  
8 Cures Act. ATSDR will further inform the participant that identifiable occupational history, private  
9 medical records, and to school records are protected from certain disclosures under Section 301(d) of  
10 the PHSA.

11 The risks of participation in this study are minimal (defined in 45 CFR 46.110). In-home urine collections  
12 are minimal risk. This study plans for a one-time 23-ml (5 teaspoons) volume of fasting blood collected  
13 from the child and a one-time 33-ml volume of fasting blood collected from the adult. These amounts of  
14 blood are the minimum necessary to conduct analyses for PFAS and the effect biomarkers (**Attachment**  
15 **3**). After the blood draw, the participant will be offered a small snack, thereby allowing monitoring of  
16 adverse events due to phlebotomy.

17 Participants in this study will not receive any direct benefit from taking part in this research. Their taking  
18 part in this research will provide the scientific community and the public a better understanding of how  
19 exposures to PFAS-contaminated drinking water may affect human health. Each adult participant and  
20 the parent of the child participant will receive the results of the analyses of serum PFAS levels and effect  
21 biomarkers. They will receive the results of their urine PFAS and effect biomarker levels, if ATSDR  
22 identifies meaningful urinary analyses to perform.

23 **3.6.3 Update Contact Information and Medication List**

24 The adult participant and the parent of the child participant will be asked to verify and update his or her  
25 current contact information for results reporting and potential future contact (**Attachment 12**).

26 The study staff will request that the adult participant and the parent of the child participant bring all  
27 current prescription and over the counter medications prior to the study office. This will help the study  
28 staff to complete the medications list (**Attachment 13**).

### 1 **3.6.4 Body and Clinical Measurements**

2 Trained study staff will perform the body and clinical measurements and specimen collections as  
3 described in the Manual of Procedures (**Attachment 14**).

4 *Body Measurements:* Trained study staff will perform body measurements, blood pressure  
5 measurements, and blood draws. Three blood pressure (BP) measurements will be taken and averaged.  
6 The measured BP level is subject to biological and observer variability; therefore, the study will use  
7 three different sizes of the manual cuffs in the measurements; the appropriate cuff size will be selected  
8 for each participant and administered 3 times. The purpose of a specific measurement protocol, or  
9 training and certifications of technicians and of ongoing quality control is to minimize variability due to  
10 known exogenous factors and to reduce imprecision and biases in measurement. Measurement of  
11 resting blood pressure, height, weight, and waist and hip circumference can occur in any order, but the  
12 BP measurement should occur after the subject has been in the seated position for at least five minutes.  
13 BP measurement will occur before venipuncture if the activities are scheduled consecutively. Trained  
14 study staff will record the measurements in the Body and Blood Pressure Measures Form (**Attachment**  
15 **15**).

16 *Fasting Blood Specimen and First Morning Urine Void Collection:* Participants will transport their urine  
17 sample to study office for collection. Trained staff will collect and record the urine specimen intake  
18 (**Attachment 16**). The blood collection procedure consists of administering and recording responses to a  
19 blood draw screening questionnaire for conditions that exclude the participant from the blood draw  
20 (hemophilia, skin condition, or chemotherapy in the past four weeks, and pregnancy), ask about having  
21 diabetes, taking blood thinning medications, participant's weight, and fasting status (**Attachment 16**).  
22 Next, phlebotomists will draw 23-ml (0.8 ounces or about 5 teaspoons) of blood from the child  
23 participant and 33-ml (1.1 ounces or about 7 teaspoons) of blood from the adult participant using  
24 standard venipuncture techniques (**Attachment 14**) and record the outcome (**Attachment 16**). If a  
25 person is unable to provide the desired volume of blood, a smaller amount can be drawn and  
26 documented. Trained study staff will record the phlebotomy and urine collection result on the Blood  
27 Draw and Urine Collection Form (**Attachment 16**).

28 Common adverse events from blood draws include bruising, bleeding, and fainting. No serious adverse  
29 events are anticipated in drawing these volumes of blood. Fasting diabetic participants who use insulin  
30 will receive priority appointments for their blood draw. Light snacks will be provided following blood

1 collection. While we ask participants to provide fasting sample, we realize that some may not be able to  
2 fast. As PFAS are bound to proteins that will affect measured levels less than measurements affected by  
3 lipid levels. In the C8 Science Panel studies, about 25% of participants fasted – but they were not asked  
4 to do so (Frisbee 2009).

5 Phlebotomists will extract serum, and label and prepare the serum and urine specimens for secure  
6 storage and transport from the study office to the CDC NCEH laboratory in Atlanta, GA (**Attachment 14**).

7 The NCEH laboratory will perform the analyses of serum PFAS according to the biochemical analytical  
8 plan (**Attachment 3**) and approved laboratory methods (Kuklennyik 2015). The NCEH laboratory staff will  
9 also aliquot and ship blood and serum specimens to participating laboratories for the analyses of the  
10 effect biomarkers according to the plan. ATSDR will wait to analyze urines until more knowledge is  
11 gained about urinary PFAS and effect biomarkers and until the laboratory methods are developed.  
12 Residual blood and urines will be archived at NCEH so that additional PFAS or effect biomarkers can be  
13 analyzed as new knowledge and analytical methods become available.

#### 14 **3.6.5 Questionnaire**

15 Each adult participant, and a parent of the child participant, will complete a questionnaire during the  
16 appointment for the blood draw.

##### 17 **3.6.4.1 Children and Parents**

18 Study staff will request that the parents of the child participant complete the questionnaire. The  
19 questionnaire will obtain demographic information (e.g., education, primary occupation), medical  
20 history of the mother and child, the child's medications, the mother's reproductive history (including  
21 maternal age at birth of the participating child) and any occupational exposures the mother may have  
22 had to PFAS. The questionnaire will be administered in two formats: a form for the child whose parent is  
23 not also a participant (**Attachment 17**), and an abbreviated form for the child whose parent is also an  
24 adult participant (**Attachment 17a**).

25 The questionnaire will ask about the dates the child's mother worked at the Pease Tradeport, her water  
26 consumption (including bottled water) while at Pease, and the dates the child attended daycare at Pease  
27 and the child's water consumption (including use of water for formula, juices, etc., bottled water use)



1 while attending a daycare center at Pease. The questionnaire will also ask the dates and length of time  
2 of the pregnancy and breastfeeding of the child.

3 The questionnaire will request information on the child's height and weight, vaccination history, and  
4 whether the child regularly exercises, currently smokes (and the number of cigarettes/day), or consumes  
5 alcohol (and the number of drinks/week). The questionnaire will ask when the female child first began  
6 to menstruate. The questionnaire will include specific questions addressing health outcomes of interest.  
7 For example, for ADHD, the questionnaire will ask, "Has a doctor or health professional ever told your  
8 child that your child has/had ADD or ADHD?" If the answer is "yes," a second question will ask for a list  
9 of medications the child took for the condition. The questionnaire will ask if the child had learning or  
10 behavioral problems, and if so, the type of problem and the treatment used. Questions would be  
11 included for the hypersensitivity-related outcomes, asthma, atopic dermatitis (or atopic eczema), and  
12 allergies. The study will attempt to confirm diseases and conditions reported in the questionnaire by  
13 accessing medical records (**Attachments 19,19a&19b**).

#### 14 3.6.5.1.1 Child/Parent Neurobehavioral Assessments

15 **Table 3** provides the neurobehavioral test battery for children enrolled in the Pease Study.

16 Trained professionals will administer the following tests to children:

- 17 • The Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence – 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition (WASI – II) test will be administered  
18 to measure Full Scale IQ (FSIQ) among children 6-17 years (15 minutes). Intelligence testing of  
19 children aged 4 – 5 years will not be conducted.
- 20 • Each child 4-16 years will complete the NEPSY-II selected tests. Except for Theory of Mind, these  
21 additional tests are short and useful to assess memory and inhibition. For all the NEPSY – II  
22 tests, children 4 years would take about 52 minutes, and children ≥5 years, about 70 minutes.
- 23 • Children aged 4 – 7 years will complete the Connors Kiddie Continuous Performance Test (K-CPT  
24 – 2) (8 minutes), and children aged >7 years will complete the Connors CPT – 3 (14 minutes).

25 Trained professionals will administer the following tests to parents about their children:

- 26 • Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) (5 minutes).

- 1 • Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function® (BRIEF®) to assess the child's emotional,  
 2 conduct, and peer relationship problems as well as problems with hyperactivity, inattention and  
 3 executive function.
- 4 o Parents of children aged 4 – 5 years will complete the preschool version (BRIEF® -P) (10  
 5 minutes).
- 6 o Parents of children aged >5 years will complete the BRIEF® (10 minutes).
- 7 A summary of the neurobehavioral test battery is found in **Attachment 20**. Each child will spend an  
 8 average of 90 minutes to complete the child battery of tests. Each parent will spend an average of 15  
 9 minutes to complete the parent battery of tests. Overall, each parent/child pair will take 105 minutes to  
 10 complete the neurobehavioral test battery (**Attachment 20a**).

11 **Table 3. Neurobehavioral Test Battery for Children**

Neurobehavioral Test	Domain	Age	Administration	Time to Administer	
Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence – 2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition (WASI - II)	Two Subtest Form (FSIQ)	6 – 17 <sup>*</sup>	Child	15 minutes	
A Developmental Neuropsychological Assessment – 2 <sup>nd</sup> edition (NEPSY - II) subtests  * from Core Assessment	Comprehension of Instructions* (receptive language, trouble following multi-step commands)	4 – 16	Child	6 – 8 minutes	
	Speeded Naming* (expressive language, processing speed)	4 – 16	Child	2 – 7 minutes	
	Narrative Memory* (comprehension, verbal memory)	4 – 16	Child	6 – 11 minutes	
	Design Copying* (visuospatial processing)	4 – 16	Child	7 – 10 minutes	
	Affect Recognition (social perception)	4 – 16	Child	5 – 7 minutes	
	Statue (inhibitory control)	4 – 6	Child	3 minutes	
	Word Generation (expressive language, executive control)	4 - 16	Child	4 – 6 minutes	
	Conners Kiddie Continuous Performance Test, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition (Conners K-CPT 2)	Inattentiveness, Impulsivity, Sustained Attention, Vigilance	4-7	Child	8 minutes
	Conners Continuous Performance Test 3 <sup>rd</sup> edition (CPT 3)	Inattentiveness, Impulsivity, Sustained Attention, Vigilance	8-17	Child	14 minutes
Strengths and Difficulties	Double-sided form with impact supplement (behavioral problems)	4 – 17	Parent about Child	5 minutes	

Questionnaire <sup>®</sup> (SDQ <sup>®</sup> )				
Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function <sup>®</sup> (BRIEF <sup>®</sup> )	Executive Function	6-17	Parent about Child	10 minutes
Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function <sup>®</sup> - Preschool Version (BRIEF <sup>®</sup> -P)	Executive Function - Preschool	4-5	Parent about Child	10 minutes

1

2 For each child, ATSDR will also review school records, including special education records, to identify  
3 learning problems and behavioral problems as requested by ATSDR (**Attachment 20b**) and as abstracted  
4 by the schools (**Attachment 20c**). If the parent reports that the child has a developmental disability (e.g.,  
5 ADHD, autism, or a learning disability), then the contractor shall obtain and abstract the special  
6 education records for the child including the individualized education program (IEP), the IEP evaluation  
7 report (“Full Individual Evaluation” or “FIE”), and if available, the Independent Educational Evaluation.

#### 8 3.6.5.2 Adults

9 Each adult participant will complete a questionnaire requesting demographic information, occupational  
10 history, medical history and reproductive history (**Attachment 18**). In particular, the questionnaire will  
11 ask if the participant ever had kidney disease, liver disease, cardiovascular disease, hypertension,  
12 thyroid disease, diabetes, autoimmune diseases, osteoporosis, osteoarthritis, pregnancy-induced  
13 hypertension, and endometriosis. For each reported disease or condition, the questionnaire will ask  
14 about the date of diagnosis, the medical provider who made the diagnosis, and the medications used for  
15 treatment. The study will attempt to confirm each disease or condition by accessing medical records.  
16 The questionnaire will ask for the dates the participant worked at Pease and water consumption habits  
17 (including bottled water use) while working at Pease. The questionnaire will ask the participant about  
18 conditions that might affect PFAS serum levels such as date of menopause, menstrual cycle information,  
19 blood transfusions, and blood donations. The study will attempt to confirm diseases and conditions  
20 reported in the questionnaire by medical records review (**Attachments 19,19a&19b**).

#### 21 **3.6.6 Exit Procedures**

22 At the end of the data collection, study coordinators or staff will review recorded items in the  
23 participant’s Appointment Tracking Form for completeness (**Attachment 11**).

1 The adult participant or the parent of the child participant will receive a copy of the participant's Body  
2 and Blood Pressure Measures Report (**Attachment 21**). These results will be immediately available and  
3 will require no further evaluation or interpretation with two exceptions. The adult participant or the  
4 parent of the child participant will receive a supplemental notice if the participant has a critical blood  
5 pressure measure (diastolic blood pressure > 120 mm Hg, or systolic blood pressure >180 mm Hg). In  
6 this case, a Critical Hypertension Notice will be appended to the Body and Blood Pressure  
7 Measurements Report along with written and verbal recommendations to obtain immediate medical  
8 attention. If the participant does not have a personal physician, the study coordinator will provide a  
9 referral. If the participant has an elevated but non-critical blood pressure measure (resting blood  
10 pressure > 140/90), an Elevated Hypertension Notice will be appended to the Body and Blood Pressure  
11 Measures Report with written and verbal recommendations to obtain clinical follow-up.

#### 12 3.6.6.1 Gift Cards as a Token of Appreciation for Participation

13 As a token of thanks for participation, ATSDR will offer gift cards according to the following schedule:

- 14 • \$25 for body and blood pressure measures, and for blood and urine collection;
- 15 • \$25 for completed questionnaire; and
- 16 • \$25 for child/parent completion of the neurobehavioral test battery

17 Trained study staff will document provision of gift cards on the hard copy form (**Attachment 11**). As part  
18 of the exit procedures, the participant will sign this form to document receiving the gift card.

#### 19 **3.6.7 Adverse Events**

20 The risks associated with this study are minimal. There is a small chance of unexpected or adverse  
21 events occurring during the course of this project. Unanticipated problems involving risk to the subjects  
22 or others will be reported to the CDC Human Institutional Review Board (IRB) in accordance with  
23 institutional policies and procedures.

24 The most likely adverse event is a participant feeling lightheaded or fainting during blood collection. The  
25 phlebotomist will receive training to respond to such situations. The tests and procedures conducted by  
26 trained study staff are for research purposes only and are not diagnostic exams. They are not a  
27 substitute for an evaluation by a medical professional. The study will not perform any clinical treatments  
28 or health interventions as part of the study.

1 If a participant loses consciousness, falls, is unable to stand, or experiences chest pain the study staff will  
2 decide whether to advise the adult participant or the parent of the child participant to seek immediate  
3 medical treatment or to contact emergency medical services. Study staff have identified appropriate  
4 local medical care providers that participants may be referred to if clinical results suggest medical  
5 attention is needed (**Attachment 14**).

### 6 **3.7 Biochemical Analyses**

7 *Serum PFAS*: The ATSDR biochemical analytical plan is found in **Attachment 3**. The study will analyze 12  
8 PFAS in fasting serum including PFOA (linear and the sum of branched isomers of PFOA), PFOS (linear  
9 and the sum of perfluoromethylheptane sulfonate isomers, and PFHxS (Kuklenyik 2015). Other PFAS  
10 analyzed will include: perfluorooctane sulfonamide (PFOSA), 2-(N-methyl-perfluorooctane sulfonamido)  
11 acetic acid (Me-PFOSA-AcOH), 2-(N-ethyl-perfluorooctane sulfonamido) acetic acid (Et-PFOSA-AcOH),  
12 perfluorobutane sulfonic acid (PFBS), perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA), perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA),  
13 perfluorodecanoic acid (PFDeA), perfluoroundecanoic acid (PFUA), and perfluorododecanoic acid  
14 (PFDoA).

15 {Note: the study may include measurement of additional PFAS if methods become available by the start  
16 of the study. Addition of new analytes will be submitted to the CDC IRB for approval of amendments}

17 *Urinary PFAS*: The study will also analyze PFAS compounds in first morning void urines at later time on  
18 stored urine samples. Urine is an important excretion pathway for human metabolism and PFAS urine  
19 elimination may be important influencing serum concentrations (Harada 2005, Zhang 2015). The PFAS  
20 compounds to be measured in the future are listed in **Attachment 3**.

#### 21 **3.7.1 Children**

22 The study will analyze fasting serum for the following biomarkers of lipids, thyroid, glycemic, liver, and  
23 kidney function, sex hormones, and immune function (**Attachment 3**):

- 24 • Total cholesterol, low density lipoprotein, high density lipoprotein, total triglycerides,
- 25 • Uric acid, creatinine,
- 26 • Thyroxine (T4), T3, thyroid stimulating hormone (TSH),
- 27 • Glucose, insulin, glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c), auto-antibodies (GAD-65 and IA-2), C-  
28 peptide, pro-insulin,

- 1 • Alanine transaminase (ALT),  $\gamma$ -glutamyltransferase (GGT), direct bilirubin, and cytokeratin-18
- 2 (CK-18),
- 3 • Testosterone, estradiol, sex hormone-binding globulin (SHBG), follicle stimulating hormone,
- 4 insulin-like growth factor,
- 5 • Immunoglobulin G (IgG), IgA, and IgM; antibodies to measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, and
- 6 diphtheria.

7 The child study will use the cut points of 50 ng/dL of total testosterone and 20 pg/mL of estradiol to  
8 identify sexual maturation in boys and girls, respectively (Lopez-Espinosa 2011). The child study will  
9 measure IgG antibodies for measles, rubella, and diphtheria to determine vaccine responses. It will  
10 analyze allergen-specific IgE (mold, dust mites, dog, cat, cow's milk, peanut, hen's egg, and birch). The  
11 study will analyze serum levels of thyroid stimulating hormone (TSH) and total T4 separately and use  
12 these measurements to determine clinical and subclinical hypothyroidism and hyperthyroidism. The  
13 study will measure uric acid, total cholesterol, low-density and high-density lipoprotein, and  
14 triglycerides. We also propose to measure liver enzymes and CK-18 (Feldstein 2013, Mora 2018,  
15 Santoro 2013).

### 16 **3.7.2 Adults**

17 The study will analyze the following biomarkers in the adult fasting serum (**Attachment 3**):

- 18 • Total cholesterol, low density lipoprotein, high density lipoprotein, total triglycerides,
- 19 • Uric acid, creatinine,
- 20 • Thyroxine (T4), T3, thyroid stimulating hormone (TSH),
- 21 • Glucose, insulin, glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c), auto-antibodies (GAD-65 and IA-2), C-
- 22 peptide, pro-insulin,
- 23 • Alanine transaminase (ALT),  $\gamma$ -glutamyltransferase (GGT), direct bilirubin, and cytokeratin-18
- 24 (CK-18),
- 25 • Immunoglobulin G (IgG), IgA, IgE and IgM; C reactive protein, and antinuclear antibodies (ANA),
- 26 • Cytokines and adipokines (e.g. IL-1 $\beta$ , IL-6, IL-8, MCP-1, TNF $\alpha$ , leptin, adiponectin, resistin, PAI-1).

1 **3.7.3 Quality Control/Quality Assurance**

2 To maintain the integrity of the lab results, a backup generator will be available for the refrigerator and  
3 freezer at the study office. All blood specimens will be securely stored at the study office until shipped to  
4 the NCEH laboratory.

5 The NCEH and other participating laboratories will fulfill quality assurance/quality control criteria  
6 (QA/QC) including a documented quality assurance plan and adherence to required quality control  
7 procedures specified in an approved method. The laboratories will ensure that the analytical data are  
8 scientifically valid, defensible, and of known and acceptable precision and accuracy. QA/QC procedures,  
9 including appropriate calibration of instruments, running standards and blanks, reporting limits of  
10 detection, and other parameters will be in place before specimens are tested. Specimen collection,  
11 storage, and transportation techniques are specified in the Manual of Procedures to ensure the integrity  
12 of the specimens (**Attachment 14**). Specimens will be stored at the proper temperature and isolated  
13 from potential sources of contamination.

14 The Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for each analytical method is kept on file by the PI, and is  
15 available for review upon request.

16 **3.7.4 Reference Values**

17 The participating laboratories will provide reference values and action levels for the effect biomarkers  
18 which will be reported in **Attachments 22&23**. ATSDR will report the participant's PFAS results using  
19 reference values from the most recent NHANES report (**Attachment 24**). Currently, the 2013-14 report is  
20 available and provides reference values for children. **Section 4** provides additional descriptions of the  
21 procedures for advance and final results reporting.

22 **3.8 Data Handling**

23 **3.8.1 Certificate of Confidentiality**

24 Section 301(d) of the Public Health Service (PHS) Act, as amended by Section 2012 of the 21st Century  
25 Cures Act, P.L. 114-255 (42 U.S.C. 241(d)), states that the Secretary shall issue CoCs to persons engaged  
26 in biomedical, behavioral, clinical, or other research activities in which identifiable, sensitive information  
27 is collected. In furtherance of this provision, CDC research commenced or ongoing after December 13,  
28 2016 and in which identifiable, sensitive information is collected, as defined by Section 301(d), is

1 deemed issued a CoC and therefore researchers are required to protect the privacy of individuals who  
2 are subjects of such research in accordance with Section 301(d) of the PHSA.

3 Consistent with Section 301(d), ATSDR determined that a CoC applies to this research by answering the  
4 following questions:

- 5 1. Is the activity biomedical, behavioral, clinical, or other research? YES
- 6 2. Does the research involve Human Subjects as defined by 45 CFR Part 46? YES
- 7 3. Is ATSDR collecting or using biospecimens that are identifiable to an individual as part of the  
8 research? YES
- 9 4. If collecting or using biospecimens as part of the research, is there a small risk that some  
10 combination of the biospecimen, a request for the biospecimen, and other available data  
11 sources could be used to deduce the identity of an individual? YES
- 12 5. Does the research involve the generation of individual level, human genomic data? NO

13 Therefore, in accordance with subsection 301(d) of the Public Health Service Act, ATSDR and any of its  
14 contractors shall not:

- 15 • Disclose or provide, in any Federal, State, or local civil, criminal, administrative, legislative, or  
16 other proceeding, the name of such individual or any such information, document, or  
17 biospecimen that contains identifiable, sensitive information about the individual and that was  
18 created or compiled for purposes of the research, unless such disclosure or use is made with the  
19 consent of the individual to whom the information, document, or biospecimen pertains; or
- 20 • Disclose or provide to any other person not connected with the research the name of such an  
21 individual or any information, document, or biospecimen that contains identifiable, sensitive  
22 information about such an individual and that was created or compiled for purposes of the  
23 research.

24 Disclosure is permitted only when:

- 25 • Required by Federal, State, or local laws (e.g., as required by the Federal Food, Drug, and  
26 Cosmetic Act, or state laws requiring the reporting of communicable diseases to State and local  
27 health departments), excluding instances of disclosure in any Federal, State, or local civil,  
28 criminal, administrative, legislative, or other proceeding;
- 29 • Necessary for the medical treatment of the individual to whom the information, document, or  
30 biospecimen pertains and made with the consent of such individual;



- 1 • Made with the consent of the individual to whom the information, document, or biospecimen  
2 pertains; or
- 3 • Made for the purposes of other scientific research that is in compliance with applicable Federal  
4 regulations governing the protection of human subjects in research.

5 ATSDR and its contractors conducting this research are required to establish and maintain effective  
6 internal controls (e.g., policies and procedures) that provide reasonable assurance that the research  
7 contract is managed in compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of  
8 the award (**Attachment 14**). Contractors are also required to ensure: 1) that any investigator or  
9 institution not funded by CDC/ATSDR who receives a copy of identifiable, sensitive information  
10 protected by this CoC, understands that it is also subject to the requirements of subsection 301(d) of  
11 the PHS Act; and 2) that any subrecipient that receives funds to carry out part of this CDC award  
12 involving a copy of identifiable, sensitive information protected by a Certificate understands that it  
13 is subject to subsection 301(d) of the PHS Act.

14 For studies in which informed consent is sought, ATSDR and its contractors shall inform research  
15 participants of the protections and the limits to protections provided by this CoC (**Attachment 4b**).  
16 Therefore, all study staff will receive training on the importance of protecting the confidentiality of  
17 human research subjects and of personal information acquired, including the collection of biological  
18 specimens. The study will minimize the risk of loss of confidentiality and privacy through careful  
19 attention to procedures for such protections in the collection, handling, and reporting of individually  
20 identifiable and sensitive data (**Attachment 14**).

### 21 **3.8.2 Data Management and Security**

22 Data management for this study described below includes guidance on:

- 23 1. Use and protection of information in identifiable form (IIF);
- 24 2. Security access (physical, technical, and administrative) controls for ATSDR and its contractor;
- 25 3. Appropriate data delivery; and
- 26 4. Data ownership and data sharing.

27 *Collection of IIF.* The study staff will collect, manage and store IIF in an already established record system  
28 (System of Records Notice [SORN] No. 09-19-0001 titled "Records of Persons Exposed to Toxic or  
29 Hazardous Substances"). ATSDR will use IIF to report results to each parent of a child participant or adult

1 participant. ATSDR will be the final recipient of the IIF (to keep for potential re-contacting of  
2 participants).

3 The study staff will deliver all field-collected records to ATSDR headquarters at the end of the study.  
4 ATSDR will retain IIF such as name, Social Security Number (SSN), current address, phone number, email  
5 address, date of birth, and the date of the participant's blood draw and questionnaire completion.  
6 ATSDR will store the IIF in a separate master key dataset along with a study-generated ID. This dataset  
7 will be separate from the dataset containing the questionnaire data and other data used in the statistical  
8 analyses. The study-generated ID will be the variable that can link the two datasets if necessary. IIF will  
9 not be linked with files used for statistical analysis and will not appear in any reports generated from this  
10 data set.

### 11 **3.8.3 Impact on Privacy**

12 Because the study staff will collect, store, manage, and maintain IIF on an already established record  
13 system, there would be a likely effect on the participant's privacy if a breach of data security occurred.  
14 Therefore, its established record system has stringent safeguards in place as described in the following  
15 section.

16 Research datasets will include only coded information that might be sensitive, such as questions on  
17 reproductive outcomes, fertility, or fecundability. These files will not have associated information that  
18 might directly identify these participants. IIF will be stored in a separate master key dataset, which will  
19 enable ATSDR investigators to link the participant's research data with his or her IIF via a study-  
20 generated ID. Maintaining this contact information is necessary to provide results of the tests or re-  
21 contact them in the future if a longitudinal study becomes feasible. Therefore, stringent data security  
22 measures will be in place, including administrative, physical, and technical controls as described below.

23 All laboratories involved in biochemical analyses will receive biological specimens with participants'  
24 study-generated ID only. Nondisclosure agreements will be executed between ATSDR and laboratories  
25 that will not be engaged in research.

#### 26 **3.8.3.1 Access Controls and Security**

27 The ATSDR PI and Project Manager will be responsible for all required staff training and certification,  
28 periodic checks of procedures and data collection methods, privacy, and security of data, as well as

1 access of assigned personnel to different types of data. For this information collection, all study staff  
2 will be under the direct supervision of the ATSDR on-site supervisor. The study staff will obtain  
3 appropriate office space for the blood draws, clinical assessments, questionnaire, neurobehavioral  
4 batteries administration, secure storage of questionnaires, medical and school records, and storage of  
5 blood specimens (including refrigeration) prior to shipment to the NCEH laboratory. All data and  
6 biological specimens collected in the study are the property of ATSDR. Methods to ensure least privilege  
7 access to the study information will be in place; therefore, access to identifiable information will be role-  
8 based on a need-to-know basis for ATSDR investigators.

9 The study staff will provide details on its data security technology and methods including password  
10 protection, desktop firewalls, daily backups and server based storage, intrusion detection, vulnerability  
11 scans of personal computers and server, laptop security, and computer encryption procedures.

12 Once collected from the participant, all hardcopy informed consents and data collection forms will be  
13 stored in locked files in locked rooms in the study office and at ATSDR.

14 Upon completion of the project and once the ATSDR has received all approved study related paper  
15 documents, ATSDR will destroy those hardcopy documents not necessary to complete the study  
16 analyses or to contact study participants.

17 Data security measures at ATSDR will comply with the *CDC/ATSDR Protection of Information Resources*  
18 *Policy* and the *CDC/ATSDR IT Security Program Implementation Standards*. These policies apply to all  
19 authorized ATSDR employees. All incidents involving a suspected or confirmed breach of IIF must be  
20 reported to OCISO according to the policy titled *OCISO/CDC Standard for Responding to Breaches of*  
21 *Personally Identifiable Information (PII)*.

22 *Physical controls* - The CDC/ATSDR issues identity credentials based on the Federal Information  
23 Processing Standards (FIPS) Publication 201 for Personal Identity Verification (PIV) authentication of  
24 government employees' identities. Security measures for physical access to secured facilities include the  
25 use of PIV Cards, security guards, and closed circuit TV monitoring.

26 *Technical Controls* - CDC/ATSDR policy requires employees to gain authorized logical access to its  
27 information systems through a unique electronic identity (User ID). The computer-controlled limits on  
28 what can be done by the user are assigned based on program roles and privilege requirements.

1 *Administrative Controls* –Authorized CDC/ATSDR employees are required to:

- 2 • Complete required privacy and information security refresher training.
- 3 • Read, acknowledge, sign (if online completion is not available), and comply with the HHS Rules
- 4 of Behavior, as well as other applicable CDC/ATSDR- and system-specific rules of behavior
- 5 before gaining access to the CDC/ATSDR's systems and networks.
- 6 • Adhere to the requirements set forth in the *CDC/ATSDR IT Security Program Implementation*
- 7 *Standards*, and other security policies and procedures that minimize the risk to CDC systems,
- 8 networks, and data from malicious software and intrusions.
- 9 • Abide by all applicable acceptable use policies and procedures regarding use or abuse of
- 10 CDC/ATSDR IT resources.

11 All study records are subject to the ATSDR Comprehensive Record Control Schedule (CRCS), B-371,  
12 which contains authorized disposition instructions for ATSDR's administrative and program records.  
13 ATSDR is legally required to maintain its program-related records in accordance with disposition  
14 instructions contained in this comprehensive records control schedule. These retention periods have a  
15 direct impact on completing Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests and in applying the  
16 requirements of the Privacy Act. The current schedule requires ATSDR to retain and archive program  
17 records for a period of 75 years after the end of the study activities.

#### 18 **3.8.4 Data Delivery**

19 Study staff will follow checks and quality control procedures for data entry. Only authorized study staff  
20 will receive permission to enter or manipulate the study data. Data entry from hardcopy documents will  
21 involve double entry with discrepancies compared and corrected.

22 Study staff will prepare draft datasets to record questionnaire responses and medical record/school  
23 record data to send to ATSDR for review and approval. ATSDR will work with the study staff to resolve  
24 missing values and other data issues. The study staff will also keep and deliver a shipping log of blood  
25 specimens sent to the NCEH laboratory in Microsoft Excel format (**Attachment 14**). The log will include  
26 the include vial type, volume, ID code, date, and carrier details. ATSDR will receive lab results from the  
27 participating laboratories. The lab dataset will be merged by study ID with the questionnaire data to  
28 create a combined questionnaire and lab dataset.

1 All dataset formats will be transformed to SAS datasets (SAS 9.3, Cary NC). All final data management  
2 will be performed on this platform. Final datasets will be sent to ATSDR using encrypted, password  
3 coded spreadsheets through a password protected data sharing facility. The contractor will deliver to  
4 ATSDR the code and the master key dataset by which the response data are potentially relinkable to PII.

5 Consent forms that collect the signatures of participants will be paper instruments and the adult  
6 participant or parent of the child participant will receive a copy of the consent form. Height, weight, and  
7 other applicable body measures and blood pressure will be recorded on a paper form and transferred to  
8 an electronic form.

### 9 **3.8.5 Data Ownership and Data Sharing**

10 Coded research datasets will be available to all ATSDR study investigators listed in **Attachment 1**. We will  
11 produce coded datasets by removing the following: name, SSN, date of birth, address, former address  
12 (es), phone number, and date of completion of the blood draw and questionnaire. SSN will be collected  
13 at enrollment for linkage to medical records and school records. Once the linkage has occurred, the SSN  
14 will be kept with other PII in a separate access restricted secure database. Age will replace date of birth  
15 in the data analysis file because it is the necessary variable in exposure and health outcome analyses.

16 Release of de-identified data to outside investigators must be approved by ATSDR. A data use  
17 agreement (DUA) will be prepared, detailing the condition of use of the data and proposed analyses for  
18 each outside project. The DUA condition of use will specify that ATSDR will not release the link between  
19 the study IDs and the participants' PII to the outside researchers. The DUA will also specify that:

- 20 1. Our data cannot be merged with public data in such a way that individuals may be identified;
- 21 2. Our data cannot be enhanced with public data sets with identifiable, or potentially identifiable,  
22 data;
- 23 3. One of the study investigators listed **in Attachment 1** must be a co-investigator on any outside  
24 research project to guarantee adherence to the agreed conditions of use; and
- 25 4. Each data release will be cleared by a specific IRB request to the investigator's home institution  
26 prior to data release.

27 After the approved project with the outside researchers is completed, further or secondary analyses of  
28 electronic datasets can only be undertaken with additional approval(s) from ATSDR. Written  
29 confirmation of understanding the conditions of use will be required from the lead scientist and

1 institution. Copies of statistical code and datasets used in statistical analyses by the outside investigators  
2 will be kept by ATSDR.

### 3 **3.8.6 Storing Residual Blood for Future Use**

4 After performing the chemical and clinical tests, there may be some residual blood. In the consent form,  
5 we will ask participant's permission to save this residual blood for additional future analyses of PFAS and  
6 possibly additional effect biomarkers. We will only store blood of those participants who will consent to  
7 have their blood archived for additional PFAS and effect biomarker analyses. Some enrolled participants  
8 would have also participated in the 2015-17 Pease PFC Blood Testing Program and have leftover blood  
9 stored at NH DHHS (NH DHHS 2016). We will ask those Pease study participants if they consent to have  
10 those samples stored by ATSDR to be used in future analyses related to PFAS research. If they do not  
11 consent or if they decided not to participate in the Pease study, those samples will be discarded at the  
12 end of the enrollment by NH DHHS.

13 All residual blood specimens will be stored with the study-generated ID only. ATSDR will keep a separate  
14 dataset that can link the study ID with the participant's name. If participants change their minds later  
15 about letting their blood used for additional analyses, they can contact ATSDR and we will remove their  
16 specimens. We do not plan to provide participants the results of these future tests, but we may contact  
17 them if we learn something that is important.

18 We will consent participants at enrollment and will not recontact them for the additional analyses of  
19 stored biospecimens related to this PFAS research: Because new scientific knowledge, tests, or methods  
20 may arise, we would like to save this leftover biospecimens for additional analyses on exposures or  
21 health conditions related to PFAS. In addition, ATSDR or recipients may release de-identified research  
22 datasets or de-identified biospecimens for future studies related to PFAS to outside investigators under  
23 a data use agreement that will prohibit any attempt to identify you or your child as a research subject. In  
24 this case, your individual test results will not be reported to you.

25 After we complete this study ATSDR may conduct new research studies. At that time, we may ask for  
26 additional consent to include participants' data or leftover biospecimens from this current study.

27 For all future use, the stored biospecimens will not be used for any commercial activities for profit. In  
28 addition, we do not anticipate the collected biospecimens to be used for whole genome sequencing  
29 (you would need to be recontacted to consent for such tests). All future analyses and studies must  
30 adhere to IRB review requirements.

### 1 **3.8.7 Future Exploratory Analyses**

2 CDC IRB approval will be sought for this additional research either as a protocol amendment or under a  
3 new research protocol prior to undertaking this plan.

### 4 **3.9 Exposure Estimation**

5 The study will use the fasting serum PFAS measurements obtained from study participants to estimate  
6 exposures. In addition, the study will estimate each participant's cumulative PFAS serum level, using:

- 7 • PFAS serum measurements obtained in the study,
- 8 • PFAS serum measurements from the Pease biomonitoring program,
- 9 • Historical reconstruction of PFAS concentrations in the drinking water consumed by the  
10 participant,
- 11 • Questionnaire data on the participant's consumption of PFAS-contaminated drinking water and  
12 factors that might affect PFAS serum levels,
- 13 • Age-, sex-, and calendar year-specific "background" PFAS serum levels from NHANES, and  
14 • Physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) models.

15 The C8 studies used PBPK modeling to estimate cumulative serum levels of PFOA and PFOS (Shin 2011).  
16 The model incorporated information from the historical reconstruction of PFAS concentrations in the  
17 drinking water serving the C8 areas, questionnaire data on each participant's water consumption, and  
18 the serum levels of PFOA and PFOS obtained from study participants. A recent effort to reconstruct  
19 historical exposures worked well for PFOA and PFOS; the model for PFHxS serum levels using  
20 biomonitoring data in the US and Australia was not successful (Gomis 2017). However, recently a study  
21 was published that successfully developed a PBPK model for PFHxS (Kim et al 2018). Low environmental  
22 concentrations, lack of decline in older population, possible ongoing exposure in children/younger  
23 adults, and scarcity of time-trend data in consumer products were cited as reason for poor prediction  
24 characteristics of PFHxS models (Gomis 2017). However, if there are high correlations in serum levels  
25 between PFHxS and PFOS and/or PFOA, then it may be possible to estimate cumulative PFHxS serum  
26 levels based on the historical estimates for serum PFOS and/or PFOA.

27 Recently, an online serum PFOA calculator for adults became available using a modified one-  
28 compartment exponential decay model to estimate PFOA serum levels from PFOA concentrations in  
29 drinking water (Bartell 2017). Developing a similar calculation for serum PFOS is possible. The studies of

1 children and adults will explore this approach to estimate serum PFOA, PFOS, PFHxS and PFNA levels  
2 and make comparisons with serum levels from the blood specimens as well as the results of the Pease  
3 biomonitoring program. We propose to use a one-compartment PBPK model similar to one used by Shin  
4 (2011) and Avanası (2016), and also used as the basis for a recent PFOA serum calculator (Bartell SM  
5 2017).

6 A number of improvements in PBPK modeling approaches, especially as related to multi-compartment  
7 models, have been developed recently and we will take those into consideration (Loccisano 2013,  
8 Fabrega 2014, 2016; Verner 2015, 2016).

9 In our efforts, we will attempt to integrate broad range of information on individuals'  
10 sociodemographics (birth year, age, sex, ethnicity), PFAS pharmacokinetics (e.g. tissue partitioning and  
11 distribution volumes, elimination rates), as well as exposure sources as pertain for the general  
12 population (e.g. breastfeeding, water consumption, blood transfusion) and secretion routes (e.g. parity,  
13 breastfeeding history, and menstruation in women; donating blood) which will be collecting in the adult  
14 and child questionnaire. Questionnaires also includes detailed information on menstruation cycles for  
15 women (regular/irregular, length, heavy/light flow, last menstruation before blood draw; Wong 2015,  
16 Verner and Longnecker 2015). We assume the contributions from dietary intake, cookware, cleaning  
17 supplies, etc. to be similar to the background US population (Domingo 2012, Christensen 2017). We will  
18 also assume that NHANES calendar year-, age- and sex-specific PFAS serum concentrations reflect these  
19 background exposures (Calafat 2007, Ye 2017).

20 In order to model the migration of PFAS chemicals contained in the AFFF from the source of  
21 contamination (e.g., fire training areas) on base through the soil and groundwater to the drinking water  
22 supply wells, the sub-studies will need the following information:

- 23 • The annual amount of AFFF used at Pease Air Force Base prior to its closing,
- 24 • Information on any accidental releases at the base,
- 25 • Location of fire training areas at the base,
- 26 • Soil and groundwater characteristics in the vicinity of AFFF use and accidental spills on base, and
- 27 • Production logs and other information on the drinking water supply wells on base.

28 ATSDR will request this information from the U.S. Air Force (USAF) and the NH Department of  
29 Environmental Services.



1 The studies of children and adults will recruit from those who participated in this biomonitoring program  
2 and will use the serum results from the program in the estimation of cumulative PFAS serum levels. In  
3 addition, the studies will ask study participants to consent to the analyses of their stored blood  
4 specimens for additional PFAS chemicals not measured in the biomonitoring program.

### 5 **3.10 Statistical Analyses**

6 ATSDR staff will perform statistical analyses using SAS, R and STATA. ATSDR staff may also use SPSS for  
7 data management. ATSDR staff will calculate descriptive statistics (including means, geometric means,  
8 medians, standard deviations, and percentiles) to identify the presence and distribution of PFAS and  
9 effect biomarker analytes in the Pease participants and their referent groups. Statistical methods will  
10 include multiple linear regression of continuous (untransformed and natural log transformed) effect  
11 biomarkers on continuous (untransformed and natural log transformed) PFAS serum levels and  
12 categorized PFAS serum levels, and logistic regression of categorized effect biomarkers (e.g.,  
13 hypercholesterolemia) or disease prevalence on continuous (untransformed and natural log  
14 transformed) and categorical PFAS serum levels. ATSDR staff will use restricted cubic spline methods (or  
15 generalized additive models using cubic regression splines) for linear and logistic regression to obtain  
16 flexible, smoothed exposure-response curves. To identify risk factors that may act as confounders for a  
17 particular health outcome, the analysis will implement a “10% change in the estimate” rule (Maldonado  
18 1993).

19 Primary analyses will focus on estimated cumulative PFAS serum levels. Supplemental analyses will  
20 evaluate PFAS serum levels in the new blood specimens obtained in the study as well as estimated  
21 maximum and average PFAS serum levels. The primary analyses will evaluate each PFAS chemical  
22 separately. However, ATSDR will explore the use of methods for evaluating multi-pollutant mixtures,  
23 such as the hierarchical Bayesian model, to analyze the effects of exposures to the PFAS mixtures.  
24 ATSDR will use quantitative methods to assess the impact of possible selection bias and possible  
25 confounding due to unmeasured risk factors (Lash 2009). There are several caveats and  
26 recommendations in conducting analyses of mixtures to determine the optimal method that avoids  
27 amplifying bias due to confounding (Weisskopf et al 2018). For the bias analyses, ATSDR will identify  
28 “negative control” diseases with no known association with PFAS exposures (Lipsitch 2010). ATSDR will  
29 conduct a literature search to identify these negative control diseases and include them in the  
30 questionnaire. To gauge the potential and magnitude of possible selection bias and information biases,  
31 two approaches will be taken. First, quantitative methods described in Lash et al (2009) will be used to

1 estimate the possible magnitude of selection and informational biases. Second, “negative control”  
2 diseases will be used to also estimate the potential and magnitude of these biases (Lipsitch et al 2010).  
3 Negative control diseases are those diseases not known to be associated with the exposures of interest.  
4 In the Pease study, the exposures of interest are PFAS serum levels. The negative control diseases for  
5 children included in the questionnaire are celiac disease, scleroderma, lupus, and Crohn’s disease. In  
6 addition to these diseases, negative control diseases for adults include Parkinson disease, emphysema,  
7 chronic bronchitis, multiple sclerosis, and fibromyalgia.

8 ATSDR will interpret the findings from this study based on the magnitude of the effect estimates (e.g.,  
9 the linear regression coefficient for continuous outcomes or the odds ratio for categorical outcomes) of  
10 the exposure-response relationship, consistency with findings from other studies, and the possible  
11 sources of bias (Rothman 2014). The analyses will construct confidence intervals to indicate the level of  
12 precision (or uncertainty) in the effect estimates.

13 The studies will use statistical significance testing to interpret findings but will not use it as a sole factor  
14 in determining scientific and public health significance (Rothman et al. 2008, 2010; Stang et al. 2010). A  
15 finding that fails to achieve statistical significance can still provide evidence for a causal association, and  
16 a finding that achieves statistical significance can lack any such significance (Porta 2014).

## 17 **4. RESULTS REPORTING**

### 18 **4.1 Notification of Individual Results**

19 Some of the clinical tests may include results that indicate disease or serious medical condition. Due to  
20 the scheduled timespan between blood specimen collection and the actual laboratory analyses, we are  
21 unable to report study results in a short period. Study staff will report to the participant the result of a  
22 clinical test that clearly indicates the potential for a serious health consequence immediately after  
23 receiving the result from the laboratory. An advance notification phone call from the study investigators  
24 (**Attachment 22**) with a subsequent letter of clinical tests results will be sent to the participant when the  
25 abnormal result are identified, processed, and checked for accuracy (**Attachment 22a**). Study staff will  
26 advise the participants to consult his/her physician, or to contact the physician associated with the study  
27 for explanation of clinical findings.

28 Participants will also receive results of their effect biomarker tests after the study is completed. Contract  
29 labs will provide their clinical reference abnormal or ‘high’ levels, if available, for interpretation of

1 clinical test results (**Attachment 23**). Participants will receive their PFAS test results. ATSDR will provide  
2 to the 50<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles from NHANES for comparison to the U.S. population (CDC, 2018;  
3 **Attachment 24**). Study staff will advise participants to consult ATSDR with questions about their results  
4 if they wish to do so.

#### 5 **4.2 Disseminating Results to the Public**

6 The Pease CAP has a permanent and active presence in the Portsmouth community. Therefore, ATSDR  
7 will consult with the Pease CAP to determine the most effective method of disseminating the results to  
8 the participants and the public. ATSDR will also consult with the local health department and the NH  
9 DHHS on methods for results dissemination. ATSDR may consider using a user-centered digital interface  
10 developed by the Silent Spring Institute for reporting results to each participant. ATSDR will present  
11 study results to the community in public meetings, printed community handout materials, participating  
12 in local radio programs and in informal activities. ATSDR also will provide a study website for the Pease  
13 community with information about the study findings and general information about any future follow  
14 up studies.

15 Generally, ATSDR will publish study results only as group data analyses in peer-reviewed scientific  
16 journals or government reports. If individual data are presented, those will not be linked to participants'  
17 identities. In the event that some other exceptional characteristics would enable personal identification,  
18 those would be masked or modified as needed to protect individual privacy. ATSDR will use manuscripts  
19 published in peer-reviewed scientific journals and presentations at major scientific meetings to inform  
20 the scientific community about the results of the Pease studies.

#### 21 **5. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS**

22 Cross-sectional studies are especially suitable for assessing effect biomarkers and the prevalences of  
23 nonfatal diseases, in particular, diseases with no clear point of onset (Checkoway 2004). However, if the  
24 cross-sectional study concurrently measures the exposure and the outcome (i.e., the disease or effect  
25 biomarker), it might be difficult to determine whether the exposure caused the outcome or whether the  
26 outcome influenced the measured exposure level (Flanders 1992, 2016). For example, as discussed  
27 above, the concurrent measurement of serum PFAS levels and kidney function biomarkers might raise  
28 the question of “reverse causation” because kidney function can affect the levels of PFAS in serum. One  
29 approach to minimize the problem of reverse causation or possible confounding due to health outcomes  
30 that affect PFAS serum levels is by estimating exposures based on the historical reconstruction modeling

1 of serum PFAS levels. In addition, it might be possible to estimate exposures during critical vulnerable  
2 periods (e.g., in utero exposure) through the modeling of historical serum PFAS levels. However, the  
3 modeling of historical PFAS serum levels is subject to uncertainties and data limitations, and published  
4 methods currently are available only to model serum levels of PFOA and PFOS.

5 Other issues concerning cross-sectional study designs are similar to those that confront other  
6 observational study designs, such as cohort studies. These issues include: 1) the ability to clearly define,  
7 enumerate and recruit (without introducing selection bias) the exposed and comparison populations, 2)  
8 the comparability of the exposed and comparison populations on risk factors other than the PFAS  
9 exposures, 3) accurate exposure assessment, and 4) accurate measurement of effect biomarkers and  
10 ascertainment of diseases. In addition, a bias similar to the “healthy worker survival effect” bias could  
11 occur in a cross-sectional study because the study population consists of those who remained in the  
12 study area (and, for example, did not leave the study area due to health problems caused by exposure  
13 to the PFAS contaminated drinking water).

14 Based on its review of the literature, ATSDR concludes that several health-related endpoints are feasible  
15 for studies of the Pease population. It is also clear that exposures to the PFAS-contaminated drinking  
16 water have occurred in the Pease population, as documented by the observed serum PFAS levels in the  
17 NH DHHS PEASE PFAS blood-testing program. Therefore, it is reasonable to conduct epidemiological  
18 studies of the Pease population. However, whether it is feasible to study a specific health-related  
19 endpoint depends on the size of the exposed population that may be recruited into a study.

20 All epidemiological studies of environmental exposures and health outcomes have limitations and  
21 uncertainties. Whether a study will find an association between an environmental exposure and health  
22 effects is unknown prior to conducting the study. No single study of the Pease population will provide  
23 definitive answers to the community about whether their exposures to the PFAS-contaminated drinking  
24 water caused their health problems. The ability of a study of the Pease population to provide useful  
25 information will depend largely on the success of recruiting a sufficient number of study participants.

## 1 6. REFERENCES

- 2 Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). Feasibility Assessment for Epidemiological  
3 Studies at Pease International Tradeport. Portsmouth, New Hampshire. November 2017a. Available at:  
4 [https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/sites/pease/documents/Pease\\_Feasibility\\_Assessment\\_November-](https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/sites/pease/documents/Pease_Feasibility_Assessment_November-)  
5 [2017\\_508.pdf](https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/sites/pease/documents/Pease_Feasibility_Assessment_November-2017_508.pdf)
- 6 Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). ATSDR's PFAS Exposure Assessment  
7 Technical Tools (PEATT). Atlanta, Georgia. November 2017b. Available at: on request ATSDR/DCAI
- 8 Alexander BH, Olsen GW. Bladder cancer in perfluorooctanesulfonyl fluoride manufacturing workers.  
9 *Ann Epidemiol.* 2007;17(6):471-8.
- 10 Avanasì R, Shin HM, Vieira VM, Savitz DA, Bartell SM. Impact of Exposure Uncertainty on the Association  
11 between Perfluorooctanoate and Preeclampsia in the C8 Health Project Population. *Environ Health*  
12 *Perspect* 2016;124(1):126-32
- 13 Bach CC, Bech BH, Brix N, Nohr EA, Bonde JP, Henriksen TB. Perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl  
14 substances and human fetal growth: a systematic review. *Crit Rev Toxicol* 2015;45(1):53-67.
- 15 Barry V, Winquist A, Steenland K. Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) Exposures and Incident Cancers among  
16 Adults Living Near a Chemical Plant. *Environ Health Perspect* 2013;121:1313-1318.
- 17 Bartell SM. Online serum PFOA calculator for adults. *Environ Health Perspect* 2017; 125:104502.
- 18 Bonfeld-Jørgensen EC, Long M, Fredslund SO, Bossi R, Olsen J. Breast cancer risk after exposure to  
19 perfluorinated compounds in Danish women: a case-control study nested in the Danish National Birth  
20 Cohort. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2014;25(11):1439-48.
- 21 Cardenas et al. Plasma concentrations of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances at baseline and  
22 associations with glycemic indicators and diabetes incidence among high-risk adults in the diabetes  
23 prevention program trial. *Environ Health Perspect* 2017;125(10):107001.
- 24 Calafat AM, Wong LY, Kuklennyik Z, Reidy JA, Needham LL. Polyfluoroalkyl chemicals in the U.S.  
25 population: data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 2003-2004 and  
26 comparisons with NHANES 1999-2000. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2007;115(11):1596-602.
- 27 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Fourth Report on Human Exposure to Environmental  
28 Chemicals, Updated Tables, (January 2017). Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services,  
29 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/exposurereport/>
- 30 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Fourth Report on Human Exposure to Environmental  
31 Chemicals, Updated Tables, (March 2018). Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services,  
32 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/exposurereport/>.
- 33 Chang ET, Adami HO, Boffetta P, Wedner HJ, Mandel JS. A critical review of perfluorooctanoate and  
34 perfluorooctanesulfonate exposure and immunological health conditions in humans. *Crit Rev Toxicol.*  
35 2016;46(4):279-331.
- 36 Chang ET, Adami HO, Boffetta P, Cole P, Starr TB, Mandel JS. A critical review of perfluorooctanoate and  
37 perfluorooctanesulfonate exposure and cancer risk in humans. *Crit Rev Toxicol.* 2014;44 Suppl 1:1-81.

- 1 Checkoway H, Pearce N, Kriebel D. Research Methods in Occupational Epidemiology, Second Edition.  
2 Oxford U. Press 2004.
- 3 Christensen et al. Perfluoroalkyl substances and fish consumption. *Environ Res* 2017; 154:145-151.
- 4 Clair HB, Pinkston C, Pavuk M, Dutton ND, Brock G, Prough RA, Falkner CK, Wahlang B, McClaine CJ, and  
5 Cave MC. High Prevalence of Environmental Liver Disease and Suspected Toxicant Associated  
6 Steatohepatitis in a Large United States Residential Cohort With High Polychlorinated Biphenyl  
7 Exposures. *Toxicol Sci.* 2018; 164(1):39-49.
- 8 Crawford NM, Fenton SE, Strynar M, Hines EP, Pritchard DA, Steiner AZ. Effects of perfluorinated  
9 chemicals on thyroid function, markers of ovarian reserve, and natural fertility. *Reprod Toxicol.*  
10 2017;69:53-59.
- 11 Dalsager L, Christensen N, Husby S, Kyhl H, Nielsen F, Høst A, Grandjean P, Jensen TK. Association  
12 between prenatal exposure to perfluorinated compounds and symptoms of infections at age 1-4years  
13 among 359 children in the Odense Child Cohort. *Environ Int.* 2016 Nov;96:58-64.
- 14 Daly ER, Chan BP, Talbot EA et al. Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substance (PFAS) exposure assessment in a  
15 community exposed to contaminated drinking water, New Hampshire, 2015. *Int J Hyg Environ Health*  
16 2018;221:569-577.
- 17 Darrow LA, Groth AC, Winquist A, Shin HM, Bartell SM, Steenland K. Modeled perfluorooctanoic acid  
18 (PFOA) exposure and liver function in a Mid-Ohio Valley Community. *Environ Health Perspect*  
19 2016;124:1227-1233.
- 20 Dhingra R, Winquist A, Darrow LA, Klein M, Steenland K. A Study of Reverse Causation: Examining the  
21 Associations of Perfluorooctanoic Acid Serum Levels with Two Outcomes. *Environ Health Perspect.*  
22 2017;125(3):416-421.
- 23 Domazet SL, Grøntved A, Timmermann AG, Nielsen F, Jensen TK. Longitudinal associations of exposure  
24 to perfluoroalkylated substances in childhood and adolescence and indicators of adiposity and glycose  
25 metabolism 6 and 12 years later: The European Youth Heart Study. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39(10):1745-51.
- 26 Domingo et al. Human dietary exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances in Catalonia, Spain. *Food Chemistry*  
27 2012;135:1575-1582.
- 28 Emmett, EA, Shofer FS, Zhang H, Freeman D, Desai C, Shaw LM. Community Exposure to  
29 Perfluorooctanoate: Relationships Between Serum Concentrations and Exposure Sources. *J Occ Environ*  
30 *Med* 2006; 48(8):759-770.
- 31 Emmett, EA, Shofer FS, Freeman D, Desai C, Shaw LM. Community Exposure to Perfluorooctanoate:  
32 Relationships Between Serum Levels and Certain Health Parameters. *J Occ Environ Med* 2006;48(8):771-  
33 779.
- 34 Fàbrega F, Kumar V, Schuhmacher M, Domingo JL, Nadal M. PBPK modeling for PFOS and PFOA:  
35 validation with human experimental data. *Toxicol Lett.* 2014 ;230(2):244-51.
- 36 Fàbrega F, Nadal M, Schuhmacher M, Domingo JL, Kumar V. Influence of the uncertainty in the  
37 validation of PBPK models: A case-study for PFOS and PFOA. *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol.* 2016;77:230-9.

- 1 Fei C, Olsen J. Prenatal exposure to perfluorinated chemicals and behavioral or coordination problems at  
2 age 7 years. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2011;119:573-578.
- 3 Feldstein AE, Alkhoury N, De Vito R, Alisi A, Lopez R, Nobili V. Serum cytokeratin-18 fragment levels are  
4 useful biomarkers for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis in children. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2013;108(9):1526-31.
- 5 Ferrante MC, Amero P, Santoro A, Monnolo A, Simeoli R, Di Guida F, Mattace Raso G, Meli R.  
6 Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB 101, PCB 153 and PCB 180) alter leptin signaling and lipid metabolism in  
7 differentiated 3T3-L1 adipocytes. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol.* 2014; 279(3):401-8.
- 8 Fisher M, Arbuckle TE, Wade M, Haines DA. Do perfluoroalkyl substances affect metabolic function and  
9 plasma lipids?—Analysis of the 2007–2009, Canadian Health Measures Survey (CHMS) Cycle1. *Environ*  
10 *Res* 2013;121:95-103.
- 11 Fitz-Simon N, Fletcher T, Luster MI, Steenland K, Calafat AM, Kato K, Armstrong B. Reductions in serum  
12 lipids with a 4-year decline in serum perfluorooctanoic acid and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid.  
13 *Epidemiology* 2013;24:569-76.
- 14 Flanders WD, Lin L, Pirkle JL, Caudill SP. Assessing the direction of causality in cross-sectional studies. *Am*  
15 *J Epidemiol* 1992;135:926-935.
- 16 Flanders WD, Klein M, Mirabelli MC. Conditions for valid estimation of causal effects on prevalence in  
17 cross-sectional and other studies. *Ann Epidemiol* 2016;26:389-394.
- 18 Fleisch AF, Rifas-Shiman SL, Mora AM, Calafat AM, Ye X, Luttmann-Gibson H, Gillman MW, Oken E, Sagiv  
19 SK. Early-Life Exposure to Perfluoroalkyl Substances and Childhood Metabolic Function. *Environ Health*  
20 *Perspect.* 2017;125(3):481-487.
- 21 Frisbee SJ, Brooks Jr AP, Maher A, et al. The C8 health project: design, methods, and participants.  
22 *Environ Health Perspect* 2009;117:1873-1882.
- 23 Frisbee SJ, Shankar A, Knox SS, Steenland K, Savitz DA, Fletcher T, Ducatman AM. Perfluorooctanoic acid,  
24 perfluorooctanesulfonate, and serum lipids in children and adolescents: Results from the C8 Health  
25 Project. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2010;164:860-869.
- 26 Fu Y, Wang T, Fu Q, Wang P, Lu Y. Associations between serum concentrations of perfluoroalkyl acids  
27 and serum lipid levels in a Chinese population. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* 2014;106:246-52.
- 28 Gallo V, Leonardi G, Genser B, Lopez-Espinosa MJ, Frisbee SJ, Karlsson L, Ducatman AM, Fletcher T.  
29 Serum perfluorooctanoate (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) concentrations and liver  
30 function biomarkers in a population with elevated PFOA exposure. *Environ Health Perspect*  
31 2012;120:655–660.
- 32 Geiger SD, Xiao J, Shankar A. Positive association between perfluoroalkyl chemicals and hyperuricemia in  
33 children. *Am J Epidemiol* 2013;177:1255-1262.
- 34 Gleason JA, Post GB, Fagliano JA. Associations of perfluorinated chemical serum concentrations and  
35 biomarkers of liver function and uric acid in the US population (NHANES), 2007-2010. *Environ Res.*  
36 2015;136:8-14.

- 1 Gomis MI, Vestergren R, MacLeod M, Mueller JF, Cousins IT. Historical human exposure to perfluoroalkyl  
2 acids in the United States and Australia reconstructed from biomonitoring data using population-based  
3 pharmacokinetic modelling. *Environ Int* 2017;108:92-102.
- 4 Grandjean P, Andersen EW, Budtz-Jørgensen E, Nielsen F, Mølbak K, Weihe P, Heilmann C. Serum  
5 Vaccine Antibody Concentrations in Children Exposed to Perfluorinated Compounds. *JAMA* 2012;307:  
6 391-397.
- 7 Grandjean P, Heilmann C, Weihe P, Nielsen F, Mogensen UB, Budtz-Jørgensen E. Serum vaccine antibody  
8 concentrations in adolescents exposed to perfluorinated compounds. *Environ Health Perspect*  
9 2017;125(7):077018.
- 10 Granum, Haug LS, Namork E, Stølevik SB, Thomsen C, Aaberge IS, van Loveren H, Løvik M, Nygaard UC.  
11 Pre-natal exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances may be associated with altered vaccine antibody levels  
12 and immune-related health outcomes in early childhood. *J Immunotoxicol* 2013; 10:4, 373-379.
- 13 Harada K, Inoue K, Morikawa A, Yoshinaga T, Saito N, Koizumi A. Renal clearance of perfluorooctane  
14 sulfonate and perfluorooctanoate in humans and their species-specific excretion. *Environ Res* 2005;  
15 99:253-261
- 16 He X, Liu Y, Xu B, Gu L, Tang W. PFOA is associated with diabetes and metabolic alteration in US men:  
17 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2003-2012. *Sci Total Environ* 2018;625:566-74.
- 18 Hennig, B., Oesterling, E., & Toborek, M. Environmental toxicity, nutrition, and gene interactions in the  
19 development of atherosclerosis. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis.* 2007; 17(2):162-169.
- 20 Hoffman K, Webster TF, Weisskopf MG, Weinberg J, Vieira VM. Exposure to polyfluoroalkyl chemicals  
21 and attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder in U.S. children 12-15 years of age. *Environ Health Perspect*  
22 2010;118(12):1762-7.
- 23 Innes KE, Ducatman AM, Luster MI, Shankar A. Association of osteoarthritis with serum levels of the  
24 environmental contaminants perfluorooctanoate and perfluorooctane sulfonate in a large Appalachian  
25 population. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2011;174(4):440-50.
- 26 Jain RB. Association between thyroid profile and perfluoroalkyl acids: data from NHANES 2007-2008.  
27 *Environ Res.* 2013 Oct;126:51-9.
- 28 Ji K, Kim S, Kho Y, Paek D, Sakong J, Ha J, Kim S, Choi K. Serum concentrations of major perfluorinated  
29 compounds among the general population in Korea: Dietary sources and potential impact on thyroid  
30 hormones. *Environ Int* 2012;45:78-85.
- 31 Joensen UN, Veyrand B, Antignac JP, Blomberg Jensen M, Petersen JH, Marchand P, Skakkebaek NE,  
32 Andersson AM, Le Bizec B, Jørgensen N. PFOS (perfluorooctanesulfonate) in serum is negatively  
33 associated with testosterone levels, but not with semen quality, in healthy men. *Hum Reprod.*  
34 2013;28(3):599-608.
- 35 Karlsen M, Grandjean P, Weihe P, Steuerwald U, Oulhote Y, Valvi D. Early-life exposures to persistent  
36 organic pollutants in relation to overweight in preschool children. *Reprod Toxicol* 2017;68:145-153.
- 37 Kataria A, Trachtman H, Malaga-Dieguez L, Trasande L. Association between perfluoroalkyl acids and  
38 kidney function in a cross-sectional study of adolescents. *Environ Health* 2015;14:89.



- 1 Khalil N, Chen A, Lee M, Czerwinski SA, Ebert JR, DeWitt JC, Kannan K. Association of Perfluoroalkyl  
2 Substances, Bone Mineral Density, and Osteoporosis in the U.S. Population in NHANES 2009-2010.  
3 *Environ Health Perspect.* 2016;124(1):81-7.
- 4 [Kim SJ, Shin H, Lee YB, Cho HY. Sex-specific risk assessment of PFHxS using a physiologically based  
5 pharmacokinetic model. \*Arch Toxicol\* 2018;92:1113-1131](#)
- 6 Knox SS, Jackson T, Frisbee SJ, Javins B, Ducatman AM. Perfluorocarbon exposure, gender and thyroid  
7 function in the C8 Health Project. *J Toxicol Sci.* 2011;36(4):403-10.
- 8 Kristensen SL, Ramlau-Hansen CH, Ernst E, Olsen SF, Bonde JP, Vested A, Halldorsson TI, Becher G, Haug  
9 LS, Toft G. Long-term effects of prenatal exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances on female reproduction.  
10 *Hum Reprod.* 2013;28(12):3337-48.
- 11 Kuklennyik Z, Needham LL, Calafat AM. Measurement of 18 perfluorinated organic acids and amides in  
12 human serum using on-line solid-phase extraction. *Anal Chem.* 2005;77(18):6085-91.
- 13 Lash TL, Fox MP, Fink AK. *Applying Quantitative Bias Analysis to Epidemiologic Data.* Springer (NY, 2009).
- 14 Lavrakas PJ ed. *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods.* Sage Publication, 2008.
- 15 Lien GW, Huang CC, Shiu JS, Chen MH, Hsieh WS, Guo YL, Chen PC. Perfluoroalkyl substances in cord  
16 blood and attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder symptoms in seven-year-old children. *Chemosphere.*  
17 2016;156:118-27.
- 18 Liew Z, Ritz B, von Ehrenstein OS, Bech BH, Nohr EA, Fei C, Bossi R, Henriksen TB, Bonfeld-Jørgensen EC,  
19 Olsen J. Attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder and childhood autism in association with prenatal  
20 exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances: a nested case-control study in the Danish National Birth Cohort.  
21 *Environ Health Perspect* 2015;123(4):367-73.
- 22 Lin CY, Wen LL, Lin LY, Wen TW, Lien GW, Hsu SH, Chien KL, Liao CC, Sung FC, Chen PC, Su TC. The  
23 associations between serum perfluorinated chemicals and thyroid function in adolescents and young  
24 adults. *J Hazard Mater* 2013;244-245:637-644.
- 25 Lipsitch M, Tchetgen Tchetgen E, Cohen T. Negative controls: A tool for detecting confounding and bias  
26 in observational studies. *Epidemiol* 2010;21:383-388.
- 27 Loccisano AE, Longnecker MP, Campbell JL Jr, Andersen ME, Clewell HJ 3rd. Development of PBPK  
28 models for PFOA and PFOS for human pregnancy and lactation life stages. *J Toxicol Environ Health A.*  
29 2013;76(1):25-57
- 30 Looker C, Luster MI, Calafat AM, Johnson VJ, Burleson GR, Burleson FG, Fletcher T. Influenza Vaccine  
31 Response in Adults Exposed to Perfluorooctanoate and Perfluorooctanesulfonate. *Toxicol Sci* 2014;  
32 138(1): 76-88.
- 33 Lopez-Espinosa MJ, Fletcher T, Armstrong B, Genser B, Dhatariya K, Mondal D, Ducatman A, Leonardi G.  
34 Association of Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) and Perfluorooctane Sulfonate (PFOS) with age of puberty  
35 among children living near a chemical plant. *Environ Sci Technol* 2011;45:8160-8166.
- 36 Lopez-Espinosa MJ, Mondal D, Armstrong B, Bloom MS, Fletcher T. Thyroid function and perfluoroalkyl  
37 acids in children living near a chemical plant. *Environ Health Perspect* 2012;120:1036-1041.

- 1 Lopez-Espinosa MJ, Mondal D, Armstrong BG, Eskenazi B, Fletcher T. Perfluoroalkyl substances, sex  
2 hormones, and insulin-like growth factor-1 at 6–9 years of age: a cross-sectional analysis within the C8  
3 Health Project. *Environ Health Perspect* 2016;124:1269-1275.
- 4 Maisonet M, Näyhä S, Lawlor DA, Marcus M. Prenatal exposures to perfluoroalkyl acids and serum lipids  
5 at ages 7 and 15 in females. *Environ Int* 2015a;82:49-60.
- 6 Maisonet M, Calafat AM, Marcus M, Jaakkola JJ, Lashen H. Prenatal exposure to perfluoroalkyl acids and  
7 serum testosterone concentrations at 15 years of age in female ALSPAC study participants. *Environ*  
8 *Health Perspect* 2015b;123:1325-1330.
- 9 Maldonado G, Greenland S. Simulation Study of Confounder-Selection Strategies. *Am J Epidemiol*  
10 1993;138: 923–36.
- 11 Mattsson K, Rignell-Hydbom A, Holmberg S, Thelin A, Jönsson BA, Lindh CH1, Sehlstedt A, Rylander L.  
12 Levels of perfluoroalkyl substances and risk of coronary heart disease: Findings from a population-based  
13 longitudinal study. *Environ Res* 2015;142:148-54.
- 14 Melzer D, Rice N, Depledge MH, Henley WE, Galloway TS. Association between serum perfluorooctanoic  
15 acid (PFOA) and thyroid disease in the U.S. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Environ*  
16 *Health Perspect* 2010;118:686–692.
- 17 Mora AM, Fleisch AF, Rifas-Shiman SL, Woo Baidal JA, Pardo L, Webster TF, Calafat AM, Ye X, Oken E,  
18 Sagiv SK. Early life exposure to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances and mid-childhood lipid and alanine  
19 aminotransferase levels. *Environ Int.* 2018;111:1-13.
- 20 Nelson JW, Hatch EE, Webster TF. Exposure to polyfluoroalkyl chemicals and cholesterol, body weight,  
21 and insulin resistance in the general U.S. population. *Environ Health Perspect* 2010;118:197-202.
- 22 New Hampshire Division of Public Health Services, Department of Health and Human Services (NH  
23 DHHS). Pease PFC Blood-testing Program: April 2015 – October 2015. Pease Tradeport, Portsmouth, NH,  
24 June 2016. <http://www.dhhs.nh.gov/dphs/documents/pease-pfc-blood-testing.pdf>
- 25 Ngueta G, Longnecker MP, Yoon M, Ruark CD, Clewell HJ Rd, Andersen ME, Verner MA. Quantitative bias  
26 analysis of a reported association between perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and endometriosis: The  
27 influence of oral contraceptive use. *Environ Int.* 2017;104:118-121.
- 28 Ode A, Kallen K, Gustafsson P, Rylander L, Jonsson BA, Olofsson P, Ivarsson SA, Lindh CH, Rignell-  
29 Hydbom A. Fetal Exposure to Perfluorinated Compounds and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder in  
30 Childhood. *PLoS ONE* 2014; 9(4): e95891.
- 31 Olsen GW, Zobel LR. Assessment of lipid, hepatic, and thyroid parameters with serum  
32 perfluorooctanoate (PFOA) concentrations in fluorochemical production workers. *Int Arch Occup*  
33 *Environ Health.* 2007;81(2):231-46. Epub 2007 Jun 29.
- 34 Oulhote Y, Steuerwald U, Debes F, et al. Behavioral difficulties in 7-year old children in relation to  
35 developmental exposure to perfluorinated alkyl substances. *Environ Int* 2016;97:237-245.
- 36 Porta M. ed. *A Dictionary of Epidemiology*, Sixth Edition, Edited for the International Epidemiological  
37 Association. Oxford University Press (2014, NY) pp. 200, 246.

- 1 Qin XD, Qian Z, Vaughn MG, Huang J, Ward P, Zeng XW, Zhou Y, Zhu Y, Yuan P, Li M, Bai Z, Paul G, Hao  
2 YT, Chen W, Chen PC, Dong GH, Lee YL. Positive associations of serum perfluoroalkyl substances with  
3 uric acid and hyperuricemia in children from Taiwan. *Environ Pollution* 2016;212:519-524.
- 4 Rappazzo KM, Coffman E, Hines EP. Exposure to Perfluorinated Alkyl Substances and Health Outcomes in  
5 Children: A Systematic Review of the Epidemiologic Literature. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2017,  
6 14, 691
- 7 Rothman KJ, Greenland S, Lash TL. *Modern Epidemiology*, 3rd Edition. Walters Kluwer/ Lippincott  
8 Williams & Wilkins, Philadelphia, PA. 2008.
- 9 Rothman KJ. Curbing type I and type II errors. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2010;25:223-224.
- 10 Rothman KJ. Six persistent research misconceptions. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2014;29:1060-4.
- 11 Ruark CD, Song G, Yoon M, Verner MA, Andersen ME, Clewell HJ 3rd, Longnecker MP. Quantitative bias  
12 analysis for epidemiological associations of perfluoroalkyl substance serum concentrations and early  
13 onset of menopause. *Environ Int.* 2017;99:245-254.
- 14 Sakr CJ, Kreckmann KH, Green JW, Gillies PJ, Reynolds JL, Leonard RC. Cross-sectional study of lipids and  
15 liver enzymes related to a serum biomarker of exposure (ammonium perfluorooctanoate or APFO) as  
16 part of a general health survey in a cohort of occupationally exposed workers. *J Occup Environ Med.*  
17 2007a;49(10):1086-96.
- 18 Sakr CJ, Leonard RC, Kreckmann KH, Slade MD, Cullen MR. Longitudinal study of serum lipids and liver  
19 enzymes in workers with occupational exposure to ammonium perfluorooctanoate. *J Occup Environ*  
20 *Med.* 2007b;49(8):872-9
- 21 Santoro N, Feldstein AE, Enoksson E, Pierpont B, Kursawe R, Kim G, Caprio S. The association between  
22 hepatic fat content and liver injury in obese children and adolescents: effects of ethnicity, insulin  
23 resistance, and common gene variants. *Diabetes Care.* 2013;36(5):1353-60.
- 24 Shankar A, Xiao J, Ducatman A. Perfluoroalkyl chemicals and elevated serum uric acid in US adults. *Clin*  
25 *Epidemiol* 2011;3:251-258.
- 26 Shankar A, Xiao J, Ducatman A. Perfluorooctanoic acid and cardiovascular disease in US adults. *Arch*  
27 *Intern Med* 2012;172:1397-403.
- 28 Shen J, Chan HL, Wong GL, Choi PC, Chan AW, Chan HY, Chim AM, Yeung DK, Chan FK, Woo J, Yu J, Chu  
29 WC, Wong VW. Non-invasive diagnosis of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis by combined serum biomarkers.  
30 *J Hepatol.* 2012;56(6):1363-70.
- 31 Shin HM, Vieira VM, Ryan PB et al. Retrospective exposure estimation and predicted versus observed  
32 serum perfluorooctanoic acid concentrations for participants in the C8 Health Project. *Environ Health*  
33 *Perspect* 2011;119:1760-1765.
- 34 Stang A, Poole C, Kuss O: The ongoing tyranny of statistical significance testing in biomedical research.  
35 *Eur J Epidemiol* 2010, 25:225-30.

- 1 Steenland K, Tinker S, Frisbee S, Ducatman A, Vaccarino V. Association of perfluorooctanoic acid and  
2 perfluorooctane sulfonate with serum lipids among adults living near a chemical plant. *Am J Epidemiol*  
3 2009;170:1268-1278.
- 4 Steenland K Association of perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) with uric  
5 acid among adults with elevated community exposure to PFOA. *Environ Health Perspect* 2010;118:229-  
6 233.
- 7 Steenland K, Zhao L, Winqvist A, Parks C. Ulcerative colitis and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) in a highly  
8 exposed population of community residents and workers in the mid-Ohio valley. *Environ Health*  
9 *Perspect.* 2013;121(8):900-5.
- 10 Steenland K, Zhao L, Winqvist A. A cohort incidence study of workers exposed to perfluorooctanoic acid  
11 (PFOA). *Occup Environ Med.* 2015;72(5):373-80.
- 12 Stein CR, Savitz DA. Serum perfluorinated compound concentration and attention deficit/hyperactivity  
13 disorder in children 5-18 years of age. *Environ Health Perspect* 2011;119:1466-1471.
- 14 Stein CR, Savitz DA, Bellinger DC. Perfluorooctanoate and neuropsychological outcomes in children.  
15 *Epidemiology* 2013;24:590-599.
- 16 Stein CR, Savitz DA, Elston B, Thorpe PG, Gilboa SM. Perfluorooctanoate exposure and major birth  
17 defects. *Reprod Toxicol.* 2014a;47:15-20.
- 18 Stein CR, Savitz DA, Bellinger DC. Perfluorooctanoate exposure in a highly exposed community and  
19 parent and teacher reports of behavior in 6-12-year-old children. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*  
20 2014b;28:146-156. Stein CR, McGovern KJ, Pajak AM, Maglione PJ, Wolff MS. Perfluoroalkyl and  
21 Polyfluoroalkyl Substances and Indicators of Immune function in children aged 12-19 y: National Health  
22 and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Pediatr Res.* 2016a; 79(2):348-57.
- 23 Stein CR, Ge Y, Wolff MS et al. Perfluoroalkyl substance serum concentrations and immune response to  
24 FluMist vaccination among healthy adults. *Environ Res* 2016b;149:171-178.
- 25 Sun Q, Zong G, Valvi D, Nielsen F, Coull B, Grandjean P. Plasma concentrations of perfluoroalkyl  
26 substances and risk of type 2 diabetes: A prospective investigation among US Women. *Environ Health*  
27 *Perspect* 2018;126(3):037001.
- 28 Trochim WMK. *Research Methods Knowledge Base.* 2006.  
29 <https://socialresearchmethods.net/kb/sampron.php>.
- 30 Tyrer S, Heyman B. Sampling in epidemiological research: issues, hazards and pitfalls. *BJPsych Bull.*  
31 2016;40(2):57-60.
- 32 Uhl SA, James-Todd J, Bell ML. Association of Osteoarthritis with Perfluorooctanoate and  
33 Perfluorooctane Sulfonate in NHANES 2003-2008. *Environ Health Perspect* 2013;121:447-452.
- 34 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Provisional Health Advisories for Perfluorooctanoic Acid  
35 (PFOA) and Perfluorooctyl Sulfonate (PFOS); 2009. Available from  
36 [http://water.epa.gov/action/advisories/drinking/upload/2009\\_01\\_15\\_criteria\\_drinking\\_pha-](http://water.epa.gov/action/advisories/drinking/upload/2009_01_15_criteria_drinking_pha-PFOA_PFOS.pdf)  
37 [PFOA\\_PFOS.pdf](http://water.epa.gov/action/advisories/drinking/upload/2009_01_15_criteria_drinking_pha-PFOA_PFOS.pdf)

- 1 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Fact Sheet – PFOS & PFOA Drinking Water Health  
2 Advisories. Ground Water and Drinking Water; 2016a. Available from:  
3 [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-06/documents/drinkingwaterhealthadvisories\\_pfoa\\_](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-06/documents/drinkingwaterhealthadvisories_pfoa_)  
4 [pfos\\_updated\\_5.31.16.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-06/documents/drinkingwaterhealthadvisories_pfoa_pfos_updated_5.31.16.pdf)
- 5 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Third Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule, July  
6 2016b. Available from: <https://www.epa.gov/dwucmr/occurrence-data-unregulated-contaminant>  
7 [monitoring-rule#3](https://www.epa.gov/dwucmr/occurrence-data-unregulated-contaminant)
- 8 Verner MA, Longnecker MP. Comment on "enhanced elimination of perfluorooctanesulfonic Acid by  
9 menstruating women: evidence from population-based pharmacokinetic modeling". *Environ Sci Technol.*  
10 2015;49(9):5836-7.
- 11 Verner MA, Loccisano AE, Morken NH, Yoon M, Wu H, McDougall R, Maisonet M, Marcus M, Kishi R,  
12 Miyashita C, Chen MH, Hsieh WS, Andersen ME, Clewell HJ 3rd, Longnecker MP. Associations of  
13 perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) with lower birth weight: an evaluation of potential confounding by  
14 glomerular filtration rate using a physiologically based pharmacokinetic model (PBPK). *Environ Health*  
15 *Perspect* 2015;123(12):1317-24.
- 16 Verner MA, Ngueta G, Jensen ET, Fromme H, Völkel W, Nygaard UC, Granum B, Longnecker MP. A  
17 Simple Pharmacokinetic Model of Prenatal and Postnatal Exposure to Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs).  
18 *Environ Sci Technol.* 2016; 19;50(2):978-86
- 19 Vos MB, Barve S, Joshi-Barve S, Carew JD, Whittington PF, McClain CJ. Cytokeratin 18, a marker of cell  
20 death, is increased in children with suspected nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol*  
21 *Nutr.* 2008 Oct;47(4):481-5.
- 22 Vuong AM, Yolton K, Webster GM, Sjödin A, Calafat AM, Braun JM, Dietrich KN, Lanphear BP, Chen A.  
23 Prenatal polybrominated diphenyl ether and perfluoroalkyl substance exposures and executive function  
24 in school-age children. *Environ Res.* 2016;147:556-64
- 25 Wahlang B, Prough RA, Falkner KC, Hardesty JE, Song M, Clair HB, Clark BJ, States JC, Arteel GE, Cave  
26 MC. Polychlorinated Biphenyl-Xenobiotic Nuclear Receptor Interactions Regulate Energy Metabolism,  
27 Behavior, and Inflammation in Non-alcoholic-Steatohepatitis. *Toxicol Sci.* 2016;149(2):396-410.
- 28 Wang JJ, Hsieh WS, Chen CY, Fletcher T, Lien GW, Chiang HL, Chiang CF, Wu TN, Chen PC. The effect of  
29 prenatal perfluorinated chemicals exposures on pediatric atopy. *Environ Res* 2011; 111:785–791.
- 30 Wang Z, DeWitt JC, Higgins CP, Cousins IT. A never-ending story of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances  
31 (PFASs)? *Environ Sci Technol* 2017;51:2508-2518.
- 32 Weisskopf MG, Seals RM, Webster TF. Bias Amplification in Epidemiologic Analysis of Exposure to  
33 Mixtures. *Environ Health Perspect* 2018;126:047003.
- 34 Wen LL, Lin LY, Su TC, Chen PC, Lin CY. Association between serum perfluorinated chemicals and thyroid  
35 function in U.S. adults: The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2007–2010. *J Clin*  
36 *Endocrinol Metab* 2013;98:E1456-E1464.
- 37 Wieser V, Moschen AR, Tilg H. Inflammation, cytokines and insulin resistance: a clinical perspective. *Arch*  
38 *Immunol Ther Exp (Warsz)*. 2013; 61(2):119-25.

- 1 Winquist A, Steenland K. Perfluorooctanoic acid exposure and thyroid disease in community and worker  
2 cohorts. *Epidemiology* 2014a;25:255-264.
- 3 Winquist A, Steenland K. Modeled PFOA exposure and coronary artery disease, hypertension, and high  
4 cholesterol in community and worker cohorts. *Environ Health Perspect* 2014b; 122:1299-1305.
- 5 Wong F, MacLeod M, Mueller JF, Cousins IT. Enhanced elimination of perfluorooctane sulfonic acid by  
6 menstruating women: evidence from population-based pharmacokinetic modeling. *Environ Sci Technol*.  
7 2014;48(15):8807-14.
- 8 Worley RR, Yang X, Fisher J. Physiologically based pharmacokinetic modeling of human exposure to  
9 perfluorooctanoic acid suggests historical non drinking-water exposures are important for predicting  
10 current serum concentrations. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol*. 2017a;330:9-21.
- 11 Worley RR, Moore, SM, Tierney BC, Ye X, Calafat AM, Campbell S, Woudneh MB, Fisher J. Per- and  
12 polyfluoroalkyl substances in human serum and urine samples from a residentially exposed community.  
13 *Environ Int*. 2017b;106:135-143.
- 14 Ye X, Kato K, Wong LY, Jia T, Kalathil A, Latremouille J, Calafat AM. Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances in  
15 Sera from Children 3 to 11 Years of Age Participating in the National Health and Nutrition Examination  
16 Survey 2013–2014. *Int J Hyg Environ Health* 2017;Sep29: S1438-4639(17)30588-6 [Epub ahead of print]
- 17 Zeng XW, Qian Z, Emo B, Vaughn M, Bao J, Qin XD, Zhu Y, Li J, Lee YL, Dong GH. Association of  
18 polyfluoroalkyl chemical exposure with serum lipids in children. *Sc Total Environ* 2015;512-513;364-370.
- 19 Zhang T, Sun H, Qin X, Gan Z, Kannan K. PFOS and PFOA in paired urine and blood from general adults  
20 and pregnant women: assessment of urinary elimination. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int*. 2015;22(7):5572-9.
- 21 Zhou Y, Hu LW, Qian ZM, Chang JJ, King C, Paul G, Lin S, Chen PC, Lee YL, Dong GH. Association of  
22 perfluoroalkyl substances exposure with reproductive hormone levels in adolescents: By sex status.  
23 *Environ International* 2016;94:189-195.

1	<b>7. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS</b>
2	
3	Attachment 1. Investigators and Key Study Personnel
4	Attachment 2. PFAS Serum Levels, Pease vs. External Populations
5	Attachment 2a. Pease serum PFAS levels in µg/L, by age groups, 2018
6	Attachment 2b. Serum PFAS levels in µg/L, children aged <12 years, Pease vs. comparisons
7	Attachment 2c. Serum PFAS levels in µg/L, aged ≥12 years, Pease vs. NHANES
8	Attachment 3. Biochemical Analytical Plan in Children and Adults
9	Attachment 4. Justification for Sample Size Calculations
10	Attachment 4a. Sample Size for Child Study
11	Attachment 4b. Sample Size for Adult Study
12	Attachment 5 – Pease Study Communication Plan
13	Attachment 5a. Pease Study Communication Plan Objectives
14	Attachment 5b. Pease Study Overarching Communication Messages
15	Attachment 5c. Pease Study Press Release – Launch
16	Attachment 5d. Pease Study Website Flyer
17	Attachment 5e. Pease Study Public Service Announcement
18	Attachment 6 – Wave One - NH DHHS Invitation Letters for Study Roll Out
19	Attachment 6a – NH DHHS Child Invitation Letter
20	Attachment 6b – NH DHHS Adult Invitation Letter
21	Attachment 6c – Wave One Eligibility Screening Script
22	Attachment 7 – Waves 2 and 3 Recruitment Materials
23	Attachment 7a – Wave Two Flyer to Recruit Additional Exposed Children
24	Attachment 7b – Wave Two Flyer to Recruit Additional Exposed Adults
25	Attachment 7c – Wave Two or Wave Three Eligibility Screening Script
26	Attachment 7d – Wave Three Child Flyer for Referent Recruitment
27	Attachment 7e – Wave Three Adult Flyer for Referent Recruitment
28	Attachment 8 – Recruitment Tracking Form
29	Attachment 9 – Appointment Packet
30	Attachment 9a – Appointment Reminder Card
31	Attachment 9b – Informed Consent Packet
32	Attachment 9b1 – Privacy Act Statement
33	Attachment 9b2 – Parental Permission and Child Assent Forms
34	Attachment 9b3 – Parental Consent to Release Student Information
35	Attachment 9b4 – Adult Consent Form
36	Attachment 9b5 – Parent/Child/Adult Permission for Medical Record Abstraction
37	Attachment 9c – Study Fact Sheet
38	Attachment 10 – Appointment Reminder Telephone Script
39	Attachment 11 – Appointment Tracking Form
40	Attachment 12 – Update Contact Information Hardcopy Form
41	Attachment 13 – Medication List
42	Attachment 14 – Manual of Procedures
43	Attachment 15 – Body and Blood Pressure Measures Form
44	Attachment 16 – Blood Draw and Urine Collection Form
45	Attachment 17 – Child Questionnaire – Long Form
46	Attachment 17a – Child Questionnaire – Short Form
47	Attachment 18 – Adult Questionnaire
48	Attachment 19 – Request for Medical Record Abstraction
49	Attachment 19a – Medical Record Abstraction Form

- 1 Attachment 19b – Medical Record Abstraction Form
- 2 Attachment 20 – Child/Parent Neurobehavioral Test Battery
- 3 Attachment 20a – NBT Time Estimation Table, by Age in Years
- 4 Attachment 20b – Request for Child School Record Abstraction
- 5 Attachment 20c – Child School Record Abstraction Form
- 6 Attachment 21 – Body and Blood Pressure Measurements Report
- 7 Attachment 22 – Advance Reporting Script for Clinical Tests
- 8 Attachment 22a – Advance Clinical Test Report Tracking Form
- 9 Attachment 22b – Letter Report of Critical Values
- 10 Attachment 23 – Clinical Test Results Report
- 11 Attachment 24 – PFAS Results Report
- 12 Attachment 24a – ATSDR PFAS Factsheet