



United States
Consumer Product Safety Commission

Organohalogen Flame Retardant Scope Document: Polyhalogenated Carbocycle Subclass

February 2024

*This report was prepared by the CPSC staff.
It has not been reviewed or approved by,
and may not represent the views of, the
Commission.*




Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	4
2. Introduction	4
3. Background	5
4. Approach	6
4.1. Criteria for Scoping Determination	6
4.1.1. Hazard.....	6
4.1.2. Exposure	7
4.2. Inventory.....	8
4.3. Market and Use Research	9
4.3.1. Targeted Literature Search	9
4.3.2. Other Data Sources	10
4.4. Literature Survey	11
5. Scoping for PHCs	12
5.1. PHC Subclass Chemistry.....	12
5.1.1. Physicochemical Property Summaries.....	14
5.2. Market and Use Summary for PHCs	14
5.2.1. PHCs Used in Commerce.....	15
5.2.2. PHCs Used in Consumer Products.....	17
5.2.3. Regulatory History and Trends for PHCs	20
5.3. Literature Survey Results: Evidence Maps of Toxicity Data	22
5.3.1. Summary of Level 2.....	22
5.3.2. Summary of Levels 3 and 3B	23
5.4. Literature Survey Results: Evidence Maps of Exposure Data	26
5.4.1. Summary of Level 2.....	27
5.4.2. Summary of Levels 3 and 3B	27
5.5. Literature Survey Results: Summary of Existing Human Health Risk Assessments	30
5.5.1. Summary of Level 2.....	30
5.5.2. Summary of Levels 3 and 3B	30
5.6. Literature Survey Results: Key References.....	31
6. Scoping Determination and Next Steps	32
6.1. Scoping Determination.....	32
6.2. Next Steps for Class-Based Hazard Assessment	32

6.2.1.	Analysis Plan	32
6.2.2.	Initial Human Health Hazard Observations for Class-Based Assessment of PHCs.....	34
6.3.	Next Steps for Class-Based Exposure Assessment	36
6.3.1.	Analysis Plan	36
6.3.2.	Conceptual Exposure Model	37
7.	References	38
8.	Appendix: Supporting Files	40

1. Executive Summary

This scope document addresses the polyhalogenated carbocycle (PHC) subclass, one of 14 subclasses of organohalogen flame retardants (OFR). OFRs contain a carbon-halogen bond and are one of the main categories of flame retardants (FRs). FRs are substances that alter the normal degradation or combustion processes of materials. They are incorporated into materials or used on surfaces to reduce or eliminate the tendency to ignite when exposed to heat or flame for a short period of time.

Informed by initial review of the market and use research, evidence maps, and availability of physicochemical data for the PHC subclass and its analogs, as well as the Criteria for Scoping Determination described in this document, Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC or Commission) staff concludes, at the time of writing, that the PHC subclass has sufficient data to proceed with risk assessment. Next steps, as resources are available, involve completing the hazard, dose-response, and exposure assessments before drafting the class-based risk assessment.

2. Introduction

This document contains the results of scoping efforts by CPSC staff to characterize readily available information on the chemistry, uses, human toxicity, exposure, and human health risk of members of the PHC subclass of OFRs. This document is one of the scope documents that CPSC staff is producing to address each of 14 OFR chemical subclasses.

The primary question answered by the scope documents is:

Can a risk assessment for this subclass be completed based on a combination of existing data and estimation (modeling) approaches?

To answer this question, the scope document developed for each subclass outlines the criteria for determining sufficiency for hazard assessments and exposure assessments, describes the data available, and provides the scoping determination. If the answer to the question above is yes for that subclass, the scope document describes (i) CPSC staff's interpretation of available data through evidence maps and estimation approaches and (ii) the analysis plan and conceptual model that CPSC staff plans to follow to complete this assessment. These subclasses will then be prioritized for risk assessments.

If the answer is no, then the scope document for that particular subclass describes (i) CPSC staff's interpretation of available data through evidence maps and estimation approaches and (ii) key data gaps. These subclasses will be temporarily deprioritized for risk assessments.

For additional details on how the information contained in all scope documents was compiled, refer to the following CPSC companion documents:¹

- Development of a Flame Retardant and an Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemical Inventory
- Market and Use Report: Characterizing OFR Chemistries, Sources, and Uses in the U.S. and International Markets, Volumes 1 and 2 (Appendices)
- Literature Survey Guide: Approaches Taken to Develop Evidence Maps from Readily Available Databases, Completed Assessments, and Literature Reviews

3. Background

In 2015, several organizations and individuals petitioned CPSC (Petition HP 15-1) to ban the use of additive OFRs, as a class, in durable infant or toddler products, children’s toys, childcare articles, or other children’s products (other than car seats), residential upholstered furniture, mattresses and mattress pads, and the plastic casings of electronic devices. In 2017, the Commission voted to grant the petition to direct staff to convene a Chronic Hazard Advisory Panel,² and to complete a scoping and feasibility study in cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM).

NASEM established a committee of experts to address the charge and published the Committee’s report, “A Class Approach to Hazard Assessment of Organohalogen Flame Retardants,” in May 2019 (NASEM, 2019). The Committee first decided to determine whether the chemicals of interest can be defined as a single class or as subclasses, based on structure, physicochemical properties, biology, or a combination of characteristics. The Committee stated that if a class approach is viable, then the hazard assessment approach would be to survey the literature to determine availability of all types of toxicity data (human, animal, in vitro, other relevant studies) for all relevant toxicity end points. Then, if relevant data are available on any chemical of interest for a given end point, the plan would be to extract, evaluate, and integrate the data to reach a decision about potential hazards that can be applied to the entire class or subclass. A key conclusion of the Committee is that OFRs cannot be treated as a single class. Rather, the Committee identified 14 subclasses of OFRs, based on chemical structure, physicochemical properties of the chemicals, and predicted biological activity.

In fiscal year 2020 (FY 2020), CPSC staff developed a process for assessing the risks of OFRs in consumer products. A staff report to the Commission (Staff Plan) (CPSC, 2020) builds on the recommendations from the NASEM committee and outlines options and recommendations for proceeding with the project in FY 2021 and beyond (subject to availability of resources). In brief,

¹ Project documents, including CPSC staff reports, contractor reports, and key references may be found on the CPSC Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment website (<https://www.cpsc.gov/Business--Manufacturing/Organohalogen-Flame-Retardant-Chemicals-Assessment>) or Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022 (<https://www.regulations.gov/docket/CPSC-2015-0022>).

² CHAP review would occur prior to finalizing any subclass risk assessment if carcinogenicity, mutagenicity, or reproductive/developmental toxicity were chosen as relevant endpoints.

the Staff Plan outlined work that initially would establish procedures for class-based risk assessment of each OFR subclass, refine the chemicals and analogs for multiple OFR subclasses, identify data sources, and determine available toxicity, chemical use, and exposure information. Staff subsequently initiated several activities, largely through contractors and interagency collaborations, to begin work on the project.

4. Approach

4.1. Criteria for Scoping Determination

CPSC staff will determine whether a subclass has sufficient data to proceed, at this time, with risk assessment based on data availability. In this context, data availability among subclass members and among identified analog chemicals is characterized as “no data,” “some data,” or “data rich” for both hazard information and exposure information, with definitions of each category provided below.

4.1.1. Hazard

The criteria for sufficiency for hazard assessment for the subclass are:

- At least one data-rich chemical among the subclass chemicals or analog chemicals, and
- Multiple chemicals with some data among subclass chemicals or analog chemicals with empirical short-term toxicity and other data (availability of modeled physicochemical and toxicity data can contribute to the determination).
- Only a minority of the substances in the subclass are “no data” substances.

The data availability categories are defined using the literature survey results as follows:

- Chemicals with no data:
 - No empirical data for physicochemical characteristics, and
 - No empirical data for toxicity, and
 - No or limited predicted/modeled physicochemical or toxicity data.
- Chemicals with some data (i.e., chemicals that are neither data rich nor have no data):
 - Some physicochemical data (may include empirical or modeled), and
 - No to limited traditional chronic/subchronic animal toxicity studies, and
 - Some short-term toxicity, in vitro, high-throughput, or other nonanimal data.

- Chemicals that are data rich:
 - Near complete empirical physicochemical data, and
 - Multiple traditional animal toxicity studies (i.e., acute, systemic repeated dose toxicity, or reproductive/developmental), and
 - Multiple short-term in vivo toxicity studies, and in vitro, high-throughput, or other nonanimal data, and
 - Available empirical data likely support derivation of a quantitative toxicity reference value(s).
 - Modeled toxicity data, if such data demonstrate close agreement with available empirical data, are acceptable to support this category, but such data are not required.
 - Availability of human data supports this category but is not required.

In addition to evaluating the amount and breadth of available data for each chemical in a subclass, CPSC staff plans to consider the availability of similar types of data for multiple subclass members (e.g., similar subchronic/chronic studies, similar endpoints evaluated, and similar short-term toxicity studies, in vitro assays, or mechanistic data). That is, CPSC staff plans to consider consistency in data availability across members of a subclass.

4.1.2. Exposure

The criteria for sufficiency for exposure assessment for the subclass are:

- At least one data-rich chemical among the subclass chemicals for which average daily doses for human populations have been reported or can be estimated, and
- Multiple subclass chemicals with some data from environmental monitoring, biomonitoring, product-testing, or any toxicokinetic studies (availability of modeled physicochemical, emissions, migration, occurrence, or disposition data can contribute to the determination).
- Note that subclass members classified as “no data” chemicals do not have sufficient information for exposure assessment.

The data availability categories are defined using the literature survey and market and use research results as follows:

- Chemicals with no data:
 - No market and use information indicating use as a flame retardant.

- Chemicals with some data (i.e., chemicals that are neither data rich nor have no data):
 - Some evidence (per market and use information) that it has been, currently is, or could be used as a flame retardant, and
 - Some physicochemical data (may include empirical or modeled), or
 - At least one experimental environmental monitoring, biomonitoring, product-testing, or toxicokinetic study, or comparable modeling studies that provide information on estimated occurrence, emissions, or disposition, or
 - Existing or de novo modeled estimates of physicochemical properties, emissions, migration, occurrence, or disposition.
- Chemicals that are data rich:
 - Evidence (per market and use information) that it has been, currently is, or could be used as a flame retardant, and
 - Near complete empirical physicochemical data, and
 - Multiple environmental monitoring, biomonitoring, product-testing, or toxicokinetic studies, and
 - Available empirical data supports estimates of quantitative average daily dose(s) for human exposure, and
 - Modeled exposure data (emissions, occurrence, disposition), if such data demonstrate close agreement with empirical data, are acceptable to support this category, but such data are not required.

4.2. Inventory

The NASEM committee, as part of its consideration of class approaches to hazard assessment, created an inventory of 161 OFRs and identified more than 1,000 analog chemicals (i.e., chemicals with similar functional, structural, and predicted biological activity) across 14 chemical subclasses. Subsequently, CPSC staff, in collaboration with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), refined a Quantitative-Structure-Use-Relationship (QSUR) model to predict the probability of whether a chemical is a flame retardant or an OFR. These efforts, in combination with market and use research, led to a manuscript, “Development of a Flame Retardant and an Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemical Inventory,” published in *Nature Scientific Data* (Bevington et al., 2022). This work identified additional OFR chemicals, resulting in an expanded inventory of 488 OFRs in 14 subclasses.

The OFR inventory completed by CPSC staff should not be considered a fixed and final list of all possible OFR chemicals. This project, including the market and use research and literature survey work, has used established identifiers for each chemical, such as CAS RN[®],³ DTXSID,⁴

³ CAS RN[®], or CAS Registry Number[®], is a unique identification number for individual chemical substances assigned by CAS, a division of the American Chemical Society.

⁴ DTXSID, or DSSTox substance identifier, is an alphanumeric identifier for individual chemical substances used in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s CompTox Chemicals Dashboard.

INCHIKEY,⁵ PUBCHEM ID,⁶ and SMILES,⁷ as well as chemical names and common synonyms. However, even with identifiers that should uniquely describe chemicals, there are a few cases in the inventory of the same chemical identified in different ways. CPSC staff also acknowledges that some identifiers correspond to mixtures.⁸ To the extent that information on chemicals would be located using different identifiers, CPSC staff will maintain separate listings; however, once staff confirms that multiple records apply to a single chemical (or mixture), analyses of the chemical will consider the combined data for that chemical regardless of the identifiers.

CPSC staff also notes that the inventory may be modified through the course of the project as staff continues analyses of chemicals in each subclass and considers additional information. The result of additional analyses could be the removal or addition of chemicals to the inventory.

4.3. Market and Use Research

The OFR market and use research was intended to collect relevant information and data to (1) characterize each OFR subclass, (2) identify uses of chemicals in each OFR subclass, and (3) identify trends associated with each OFR subclass. CPSC staff sought information about production or consumption of OFR chemicals and identified uses in consumer products and other market information. CPSC staff also sought information on regulatory actions, including current and proposed laws, policies, and regulations related to OFR chemicals at international, federal, state, and local levels of government. Detailed descriptions of the approach and process are found in Volume 1 of the Market and Use Profile (see Appendix: Supporting Files) completed under a CPSC-sponsored contract. Briefly, the market and use research captured information from targeted scientific literature and gray literature, and from readily available data sources in other formats. Data sources included national chemical inventories, other government data, such as from required reporting of production and waste information for specified chemicals or other types of curated databases, and certain commercial sources.

4.3.1. Targeted Literature Search

Section 3.2.6 of the Market and Use Report explains the methodology used for the targeted literature search completed for the OFR market and use research. The targeted searches for literature related to the flame-retardant market identified sources of relevant material from databases, websites, or other online information repositories, and broader searches of internet-based sources using standard search tools such as Google Scholar and selected searches of

⁵ INCHIKEY, stands for International Chemical Identifier and is a unique 27-character identifier.

⁶ PUBCHEM ID is a unique identifier specific to the National Library of Medicine's PUBCHEM database.

⁷ Simplified molecular-input line-entry system (SMILES) describes the structure of a chemical in a way that can be used by a computer.

⁸ See, for example, CAS RN 85535-84-8, which refers to a group of halogenated aliphatic chain chemicals with chain length from 10 to 13 carbons. Chemical names associated with this CAS RN include short chain chlorinated paraffins; alkanes, C10-13, chloro; and chlorinated paraffins, C10-13.

commercial online literature databases (e.g., Dialog/ProQuest). Specifically, the contractor executed searches of 140 literature databases using the Dialog/ProQuest platform.⁹

Following a review of the source title and abstract, the contractor rated each identified source for relevance on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being the most relevant, and obtained PDF copies of as many of the sources identified as possible, with priority given to those sources rated higher for relevance. Among all 255 sources obtained, the contractor prioritized the review of 187 complete sources.

For each PDF reviewed, the contractor highlighted information on topics of interest for the study, such as manufacturing or import activity, use of chemicals in products, lifecycle considerations, and regulatory or other trends. The report further identified all OFR chemicals discussed in the source, and where available, captured the CAS RN for each chemical and any synonyms, abbreviations, and trade names. From the 187 sources extracted and reviewed, the contractor made over 2,200 OFR identifications (for 488 unique OFRs). The summary of sources reviewed is provided in the Data Source Synthesis Excel workbook of the supplemental Market and Use Profile Supporting Files, referenced by OFR subclass.

4.3.2. Other Data Sources

The OFR Market and Use Report contains information collected from inventories and registries from the United States, Canada, Mexico, the EU, Japan, and China. In the United States, the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) inventory was used to identify if an OFR substance was designated as active or inactive.¹⁰ In addition to determining whether OFR substances appear as active substances on the TSCA chemical inventory, the contractor conducted a detailed analysis of U.S. production and import activity using data available from the EPA Chemical Data Reporting (CDR) program, and the manufacturing, processing, and waste management trends of OFR substances from the Toxic Release Inventory (TRI), as reported by industrial and federal facilities.

To determine whether individual OFR chemicals are used in consumer and/or children's products the contractor reviewed information available from the EPA's CDR and the Interstate Chemicals Clearinghouse High Priority Chemicals Data System (HPCDS). European data on OFR substances in products could not be reviewed in their entirety in time for the publication of the report.

In addition, the contractor made efforts to identify OFR chemicals on several chemical business to business (B2B) or e-Commerce sites, using automated techniques to "scrape" data on OFRs from these sites. From Buyersguide.com and Chemnet.com, the contractor obtained the identity, country, and website of OFR suppliers. From Alibaba.com, they obtained the name and website of the OFR suppliers, as well as some data on quantities available and pricing.

⁹ For a list of data sources searched using Dialog/ProQuest, see Exhibit 3-32 of the Market and Use Report Volume 1.

¹⁰ Active chemicals are those that have been reported to EPA for manufacture or processing in the U.S., including those reported within a 10-year time period ending on June 21, 2016. Inactive chemicals are those that have not been reported and are, therefore, not considered to be in commercial use.

4.4. Literature Survey

The OFR literature survey was intended to gather readily available toxicity, exposure, and risk information to characterize the types and amounts of data available for chemicals (and analogs) within a class. CPSC staff defined data sources for the literature survey effort as toxicity, exposure, and chemistry databases; completed toxicity, exposure, or risk assessments; and completed literature reviews. Sources identified in the literature survey were screened to confirm utility and identify the type of data, but the actual data were not evaluated or extracted.


Detailed descriptions of the literature survey approach and process are found in the Literature Survey Guide and accompanying documentation. These documents were developed by University of Cincinnati (UC) Risk Science Center staff as part of work performed under a CPSC-sponsored contract (UC, 2022a; UC, 2022b). Development of the evidence maps followed a multilevel process to screen data sources initially identified in a defined search.

Briefly, for peer-reviewed and gray literature, **Level 1** screening was used to confirm that the reference might contain information about at least one OFR chemical and that the reference was relevant to the PECO statement.¹¹ **Level 2** screening identified the OFR subclasses included in each reference and tagged the references for the types of data (hazard, exposure, risk). **Level 3** identified the specific OFR or analog chemicals in each reference and extracted more specific information about the types of hazard data, exposure data, or risk assessment information presented for each chemical. Finally, **Level 3B** tagging was performed on a subset of toxicity assessments, toxicity literature reviews, risk assessments, and exposure literature reviews selected from Level 3 to identify even more specific information for the chemicals in these references.

Similarly, data from databases were tagged for type of data using a database logic developed to provide consistency across different data sources. Finally, the tagged information was organized into evidence maps by OFR subclass and specific chemicals. Figure 4-1 shows the numbers of records initially identified and the number of records screened or extracted at each level.

¹¹ PECO refers to population (P), exposure (E), comparator (C), and outcomes (O) of interest, and generally describes the scope of a literature search and subsequent analyses.

Figure 4-1. Literature Flow Diagram



Notes:

[^]Removal of duplicates within the subclass, and between this subclass and previous subclasses.

^{*}PHC evidence maps contain additional references uploaded with other subclasses. Number in parentheses is the number of references identified by searching for the PHC subclass only, excluding the references identified by searching for other subclasses.

5. Scoping for PHCs

5.1. PHC Subclass Chemistry

The PHC subclass generally consists of chemicals containing one or more carbon rings containing halogen substituents. The presence of aromatic and non-aromatic rings as well as additional functional groups on the various chemicals may lead to chemistry-based differences throughout this subclass despite structural similarities amongst the members.

Table 5-1 lists 21 individual chemicals in the PHC subclass.

Table 5-1. List of Chemicals in PHC Subclass

	CAS RN	Chemical Name	Abbreviation/ Synonyms	SMILES
1	115-27-5	Chlorendic anhydride	HCBCH-DCA ^{anh}	<chem>C12C(C(=O)OC1=O)C3(C(=C(C2(C3(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
2	115-28-6	Chlorendic acid	HCBCH-DCA	<chem>C1(C(C2(C(=C(C1(C2(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C(=O)O)C(=O)O</chem>

CAS RN	Chemical Name	Abbreviation/ Synonyms	SMILES
3 13560-89-9	Dechlorane Plus	DDC-CO; DP	<chem>C1CC2C(CCC3C1C4(C(=C(C3(C4(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C5(C(=C(C2(C5(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
4 13560-90-2	4,5,6,7,13,14,15,16,19,19,20,20-Dodecachloroheptacyclo[9.6.1.1~4,7~.1~13,16~.0~2,10~.0~3,8~.0~12,17~]icosa-5,14-diene (nonpreferred name)	NA	<chem>C1C2C3CC4C(C3C1C5C2C6(C(=C(C5(C6(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C7(C(=C(C4(C7(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
5 13560-91-3	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,10,11,11-Dodecachloro-4,4a,4b,5,8,8a,9,9a-octahydro-1H-1,4:5,8-dimethanofluorene	NA	<chem>C1C2C(C3C1C4(C(=C(C3(C4(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C5(C(=C(C2(C5(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
6 13560-92-4	1,4:5,8:9,10-Trimethanoanthracene, 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,12,12,13,13-dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5,8,8a,9,9a,10,10a-decahydro-	DDC-Ant	<chem>C1C2C3C(C1C4C2C5(C(=C(C4(C5(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C6(C(=C(C3(C6(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
7 135821-03-3	DeChlordane Plus (syn isomer)	NA	<chem>C1CC2C(CCC3C1C4(C(=C(C3(C4(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C5(C(=C(C2(C5(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
8 135821-74-8	anti-Dechlorane Plus	NA	<chem>C1CC2C(CCC3C1C4(C(=C(C3(C4(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C5(C(=C(C2(C5(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
9 1770-80-5	Dibutyl chlorendate	NA	<chem>CCCCOC(=O)C1C(C2(C(=C(C1(C2(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C(=O)OCCCC</chem>
10 1773-89-3	Chlorendate dimethyl	NA	<chem>COC(=O)C1C(C2(C(=C(C1(C2(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C(=O)OC</chem>
11 18300-04-4	1,2-Dibromo-4,5,6,7,8,8-hexachloro-2,3,3a,4,7,7a-hexahydro-4,7-methano-1H-indene	NA	<chem>C1C2C(C(C1Br)Br)C3(C(=C(C2(C3(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
12 2234-13-1	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8-Octachloronaphthalene	NA	<chem>C12=C(C(=C(C(=C1Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C(=C(C(=C2Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
13 2385-85-5	Mirex	NA	<chem>C12(C3(C4(C5(C3(C1(C5(C2(C4(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
14 31107-44-5	1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,10,11,11-Dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5a,6,9,9a,9b-octahydro-1,4:6,9-dimethanodibenzofuran	DDC-DBF	<chem>C12C3C(C4(C(=C(C3(C4(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)OC1C5(C(=C(C2(C5(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl</chem>
15 34571-16-9*	1,2,3,4,7,7-Hexachloro-5-(pentabromophenyl)bicyclo[2.2.1]hept-2-ene	HCTBPH	<chem>C1C(C2(C(=C(C1(C2(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C3=CC(=C(C(=C3Br)Br)Br)Br</chem>

CAS RN	Chemical Name	Abbreviation/ Synonyms	SMILES
16 40703-79-5	4,7-Methano-1H-isoindole-1,3(2H)-dione, 5,6-dibromohexahydro-2-phenyl-	NA	<chem>C1C2C3C(C1C(C2Br)Br)C(=O)N(C3=O)C4=CC=CC=C4</chem>
17 51936-55-1	7,8-Dibromo-1,2,3,4,11,11-hexachloro-1,4,4a,5,6,7,8,9,10,10a-decahydro-1,4-methanobenzocyclooctene	DBHCTD	<chem>C1CC(C(CCC2C1C3(C(=C(C2(C3(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Br)Br</chem>
18 52907-07-0	N,N'-(Ethylene)bis[4,5-dibromohexahydro-3,6-methanophthalimide]	NA	<chem>C1C2C3C(C1C(C2Br)Br)C(=O)N(C3=O)CCN4C(=O)C5C6CC(C5C4=O)C(C6Br)Br</chem>
19 71245-27-7	Dechloran 604	NA	<chem>C1C(C2(C(=C(C1(C2(Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)Cl)C3=CC(=C(C(=C3Br)Br)Br)Br</chem>
20 855992-98-2*	(rel)-(1R,2R,3S,4S)-1,2,3,9-Tetrabromo-1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-1,4-methanonaphthalene	NA	<chem>C1=CC=C2C(=C1)C3C(C(C2(C3Br)Br)Br)Br</chem>
21 855993-01-0**	(rel)-(1R,2S,3S,4S)-1,2,3,9-Tetrabromo-1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-1,4-methanonaphthalene	NA	<chem>[H]C1(Br)[C@]2([H])[C@H](Br)[C@H](Br)[C@@]1(Br)C1=CC=CC=C21</chem>

SMILES = simplified molecular-input line-entry system. NA = not available or not found.

There is a difference between the number of chemicals identified in the inventory and evidence maps versus the market-use report.

* These two chemicals were originally included in both the Polyhalogenated Bisphenol Aliphatics and Functionalized Class and the Polyhalogenated Carbocycle class. As part of finalizing the scope document, staff decided to assign these chemicals to the PHC subclass.

** This chemical was not originally identified in the PHC subclass inventory. Like the above two chemicals, it was initially categorized in the PHBzAF subclass. As part of finalizing the scope document, staff decided to assign this chemical to the PHC subclass. Based on this and the above changes, the final count of chemicals in this subclass is 21.

5.1.1. Physicochemical Property Summaries

The information collected to date led CPSC staff to find that experimental physicochemical data on PHC chemicals are limited. Four PHC subclass members have experimental data and twenty PHC members have predicted data. Well-studied chemicals in this subclass include Mirex (CAS RN 2385-85-5) and 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8-Octachloronaphthalene (CAS RN 2234-13-1). From this data set, studied PHCs have predicted boiling points ranging from 166°C to 648 °C, and predicted vapor pressures from 9.77×10^{-11} to 6.27×10^{-6} mm Hg. Data show water solubility values ranging from 6.73×10^{-14} to 8.96×10^{-3} mol/L. The predicted octanol/water partition coefficient (K_{ow}) values, which are commonly expressed as log K_{ow} , range from 2.44 to 9.13.

5.2. Market and Use Summary for PHCs

The OFR Market and Use Report, completed in March 2022, includes 19 PHC chemicals.

- Eighteen PHC chemicals had market and use information and one chemical had no market and use information.
- According to EPA data, seven PHC chemicals were identified to be on the EPA's TSCA chemical substance (active) inventory, five PHC chemicals were identified on the TSCA (inactive) inventory, two were on the CDR, and one was on the TRI program list.
- No PHC chemicals were identified in the Interstate Chemicals Clearinghouse (IC2) HPCDS.
- Eight PHC chemicals were identified in the targeted literature search.
- Sixteen PHC chemicals had patent data.

5.2.1. PHCs Used in Commerce

The Market and Use Report summarizes data from a variety of sources, including U.S. and international chemical registries, scientific literature, patents, and chemical databases. To determine whether individual OFRs are currently in commerce, have been used in the past, or may be used in the future, these registries, patent data, and literature were reviewed in detail under a CPSC-sponsored contract and data were compiled from four main types of sources. Chemicals that have been in commerce appear on the (1) TSCA inventory, (2) international inventories, (3) in literature, or (4) in patent data. Table 5-2 lists the 18 PHCs that are known to be or have been used in commerce, according to data available from these sources.

The one PHC chemical that is not known to be used in commerce is:

- Dechloran 604 (CAS RN 71245-27-7)

Among the 18 PHC chemicals used in commerce, 12 can be found in the TSCA inventory. Seven chemicals are in the TSCA active inventory and five PHCs are in the TSCA inactive inventory. In Table 5-2, PHC chemicals found in the TSCA inventory are identified as "Active" or "Inactive," accordingly.

Five other international registries were reviewed: EU REACH (2021), CANADA DSL (2021), MEXICO INSQ (2009), JAPAN CSCL (2021), AND CHINA IECSC (2013).¹² Ten PHC chemicals appear in one or more of these international inventories. In Table 5-2, the number of international registries for the identified PHC chemical was identified is listed in the "International Inventories" column.

Eight PHC chemicals were identified in the literature through a targeted literature search.¹³ In Table 5-2, the numeric value listed in the Literature Cites column is the number of sources from the targeted literature search that referenced the chemical.

Sixteen PHC chemicals were mentioned in patents. The total count of patents is provided for each chemical in Table 5-2, returned from a search of the associated Compound Identifier (CID) in PubChem.

¹² EU REACH = European Union Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation, and Restriction of Chemicals; INSQ = Inventario Nacional de Sustancias Químicas; CSCL = Chemical Substances Control Law; IECSC = Inventory of Existing Chemical Substances Produced or Imported in China.

¹³ For additional detail on the methodology used for the targeted literature search, see Section 4.3.1, Targeted Literature Search, in this scope document.

Table 5-2. PHC Chemicals Used in Commerce

CAS RN	Chemical Name	TSCA	International Inventories	Literature Cites	Patents
115-27-5	Chlorendic anhydride	Active	4	0	4,973
115-28-6	Chlorendic acid	Active	3	1	4,973
13560-89-9	Dechlorane Plus	Active	4	7	2,077
13560-90-2	4,5,6,7,13,14,15,16,19,19,20,20-Dodecachloroheptacyclo[9.6.1.1~4,7~.1~13,16~.0~2,10~.0~3,8~.0~12,17~]jicosa-5,14-diene (non-preferred name)	Not found	Not found	0	2,077
13560-91-3	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,10,11,11-Dodecachloro-4,4a,4b,5,8,8a,9,9a-octahydro-1H-1,4:5,8-dimethanofluorene	Not found	Not found	0	1
13560-92-4	1,4:5,8:9,10-Trimethanoanthracene, 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,12,12,13,13-dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5,8,8a,9,9a,10,10a-decahydro-	Not found	1	0	0
135821-03-3	DeChlordane Plus (syn isomer)	Not found	Not found	2	0
135821-74-8	anti-Dechlorane Plus	Not found	Not found	2	3
1770-80-5	Dibutyl chlorendate	Active	3	0	110
1773-89-3	Chlorendate dimethyl	Inactive	Not found	0	110
18300-04-4	1,2-Dibromo-4,5,6,7,8,8-hexachloro-2,3,3a,4,7,7a-hexahydro-4,7-methano-1H-indene	Inactive	Not found	0	4
2234-13-1	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8-Octachloronaphthalene	Active	2	0	556
2385-85-5	Mirex	Not found	2	3	11,381
31107-44-5	1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,10,11,11-Dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5a,6,9,9a,9b-octahydro-1,4:6,9-dimethanodibenzofuran	Inactive	1	0	2
34571-16-9	1,2,3,4,7,7-Hexachloro-5-(pentabromophenyl)bicyclo[2.2.1]hept-2-ene	Active	1	2	3
40703-79-5	4,7-Methano-1H-isoindole-1,3(2H)-dione, 5,6-dibromohexahydro-2-phenyl-	Inactive	Not found	0	2

CAS RN	Chemical Name	TSCA	International Inventories	Literature Cites	Patents
51936-55-1	7,8-Dibromo-1,2,3,4,11,11-hexachloro-1,4,4a,5,6,7,8,9,10,10a-decahydro-1,4-methanobenzocyclooctene	Inactive	Not found	5	5
52907-07-0	N,N'-(Ethylene)bis[4,5-dibromohexahydro-3,6-methanophthalimide]	Active	1	1	127

Table 5-2 shows that information on commercially used PHC chemicals is available from thousands of patents, numerous literature sources, and multiple chemical inventories.

5.2.2. PHCs Used in Consumer Products

The Market and Use Report identified the use of PHCs in consumer products, including children's products. To determine whether individual OFR chemicals are used in consumer and/or children's products, a CPSC-sponsored contractor reviewed the information available from the EPA's CDR,¹⁴ the European Chemicals Agency's (ECHA) Substances of Concern in articles as such or in complex objects (Products) (SCIP) database, and the IC2's HPCDS. Data on the uses and applications of PHC chemicals were also found in the literature.

Targeted Literature Search. In the literature, among the eight PHCs cited, chemicals appearing in the greatest number of these sources include: CAS No. 13560-89-9 (13 sources), CAS No. 51936-55-1 (7 sources) and CAS No. 2385-85-5 (4 sources). The following PHC chemicals were identified from the targeted literature search to have been used in consumer and/or children's products, and example uses are provided below:

CAS RN 13560-89-9: pipes, water barriers, kitchen hoods, electronics, automotive plastics and electronic and electrical equipment; cable coatings, computer monitors, furniture, plastic roofing materials, chlorinated polyethylene, elastomers, engineering thermoplastic, high impact polystyrene (HIPS), polyethylene (PE), polypropylene (PP), thermosets in wires/cables, and construction materials.

CAS RN 34571-16-9: plastics, rubber, paint, and electrical equipment.

CAS RN 51936-55-1: styrenic polymers, such as polystyrene butadiene rubber.

HPCDS. Using the HPCDS reporting tool, private industry reports the use of chemicals of concern in products intended for use by children that are sold in select states.¹⁵ From 2012 to

¹⁴ Data from the review of EPA's CDR for consumer products was generally incomplete, especially for children's products, and therefore are not summarized below however they are available in Section 3.2.5.1 in Volume I of the Market and Use Report.

¹⁵ At this time, CPSC staff is unable to determine if information reported to the HPCDS for Washington and Oregon is representative. Presumably, the number of reports would go up if information for all 50 states were available; however, it is not known whether the chemicals identified and types of children's products would also change.

2020, 1,093 reports were submitted to HPCDS identifying the use of OFR chemicals from seven subclasses in children’s products sold in two U.S. states, Washington and Oregon. No HPCDS reports documented the use of PHC chemicals in children’s products.

SCIP. ECHA maintains a database of information through the REACH regulation, which was enacted in 2007 to improve the protection of human health from risks posed by chemicals. REACH applies to consumer products as well as to the chemicals industry. The REACH regulation requires suppliers of articles (products) containing potentially hazardous chemicals, including OFRs, to communicate down the supply chain and to consumers sufficient information to allow for the safe use of those products that contain them. Any supplier of an article containing a substance of very high concern (SVHC) in a concentration above 0.1% weight by weight (w/w) on the EU market is required to submit information on that article to ECHA. This information is commonly referred to as a “SCIP notification.” From data available from the European Union, SCIP notifications have supported the development of the SCIP database.

The SCIP database is an important tool of the REACH framework and helps ensure that information regarding the use of hazardous substances in products is more readily and efficiently shared within the supply chain, and that certain information regarding the use of hazardous substances in products is also available to the public.

Table 5-3 shows that at least three PHC chemicals are included in the SCIP database. (See Exhibit 3-30 in the Market and Use Report, Volume 1.)

Table 5-3. PHC Chemicals Included in SCIP Database

CAS RN	Substance Name	EC No.	Number of Search Results Returned
13560-89-9	Dechlorane Plus	236-948-9	596,291
135821-03-3	DeChlordane Plus (syn isomer)	NA	129
135821-74-8	anti-Dechlorane Plus	NA	1

As of May 2022, there were over 590 thousand search results for PHC chemicals in the SCIP database. Articles that contain these candidate list substances can be found in over 80 article categories that can be used to help identify articles based on function and use. According to SCIP data, PHC chemicals can be found in polyethylene and polymers of ethylene, laminated glass, engines (including marine propulsion engines, diesel or semi-diesel engines, and hydraulic power engines and motors), compressors,¹⁶ static converters, starter motors and dual-purpose starter generators, and exposure meters. However, because SCIP data were first released in September 2021, they could not be reviewed in time for publication of the Market and Use Report.

CDR. According to data available from the EPA’s CDR, PHC chemicals have been used in a variety of product use categories for many years (see Table 5-4). This table presents both

¹⁶ Compressors of a kind used in refrigerating equipment.

commercial and consumer product uses of PHC chemicals because CPSC needs to know the range of product uses for these chemicals during the scoping phase.¹⁷

EPA changed the names of some product use categories between 2006 and 2012, and again in 2016, and so Table 5-4 presents the names of product use categories of PHC chemicals in the three reporting periods.¹⁸ To handle small changes in product use category names over these periods, staff used a more generic or general name to be inclusive. The designated general product use category names help maintain consistency over the period displayed in the table below without distorting product use.

According to the CDR, the most common uses of PHC chemicals are in rubber and plastic products and paints and coatings, although PHCs are reported to be used in a variety of other products as well.

Table 5-4. Report Counts of Commercial and Consumer Product Uses of PHC Chemicals

Product Use Category	2006	2012	2016	Total
Building/construction materials not covered elsewhere	NR	1	1	2
Product description, not identified	NR	1	NR	1
Rubber and plastic products	1	2	2	5
Electrical and electronic products	1	1	1	3
Paints and coatings	1	2	1	4
Grand Total	3	7	5	15

Notes: Data listed as “Product description not identified” may be interpreted as one of any of the other product categories reported for PHCs, generally. NR = not reported or not available.

In addition, the CDR provides an opportunity for firms that report the use of a chemical substance to identify if the substance could be used in children’s products. However, the CDR should not be considered a complete source for identifying the use of OFR chemical substances in children’s products.¹⁹ In 2006, the use of PHC chemicals in children’s products was not readily obtainable. In 2012, the use of PHC chemicals in children’s products was not reported. In 2016, the use of PHC chemicals in children’s products was considered not knowable or

¹⁷ In the global economy, supply chains are complex, and reporters to the CDR do not know (and cannot reasonably ascertain) the end use of a product. Therefore, CPSC is reviewing all product use categories of OFR chemicals reported to the CDR, but may exclude certain categories later, if there is sufficient evidence showing that these chemical substances can be found exclusively in commercial products.

¹⁸ For the 2006, 2012, and 2016 reporting periods, chemical-specific product use reporting was only required for the principal reporting year (PRY), the latest completed calendar year preceding the submission period. Therefore, 2006 data are from PRY 2005, 2012 data are from PRY 2011, and 2016 data from PRY 2015.

¹⁹ The CDR rule provides reporting exemptions for chemical substances in articles, byproducts, impurities, non-isolated intermediates, certain polymers, research and development, and those produced by small manufacturers and small importers. 40 C.F.R. §§ 704.5 and 711.6. The CDR rule also exempts chemical substances manufactured in quantities of less than 2,500 pounds. *Id.* at § 711.15.

reasonably ascertainable (NKRA) for use in paints and coatings and plastic and rubber products.

5.2.3. Regulatory History and Trends for PHCs


OFRs have received considerable regulatory attention from governmental jurisdictions in the United States and around the world; however, the scope and applicability of these regulatory actions varies significantly. This section describes legislative actions taken in the United States at the state level.

The Market and Use Report provides greater detail of legislative action taken in the United States, as well as by other nations. Volume 2, Appendix R of the Market and Use Report provides detailed fact sheets describing specific pieces of legislation enacted or under consideration since 1986 in 22 U.S. states and the District of Columbia, at the U.S. federal level, and by Canada, the EU, and Japan.²⁰

According to the Market and Use Report, 22 states and the District of Columbia have current or pending OFR chemicals regulations. State regulation of OFRs has tended to focus primarily on the use of these chemicals in children's products, upholstered furniture, and mattresses. (See Market and Use Report Volume 1, section 4.1.2.4 Summary of U.S. Regulatory Trends.) Among areas that have regulated the use of OFRs, two states have proposed or enacted regulation of PHCs specifically. In the map below (Figure 5-1), states that regulate OFRs are shown with circle borders, and states that regulate PHCs specifically are shown with a square within the circle. For more information on the state regulation of OFRs and PHCs, see Volume 2 of the Market and Use Report, Appendix R.

²⁰ As part of work performed under the CPSC-sponsored contract, CPSC staff also sought to identify legislation developed in China related to OFRs. The literature review suggests China imposes some restrictions on OFRs, which is discussed more generally in Section 4.1.3 of Volume 1 of the Market and Use Report.

Figure 5-1. U.S. States That Regulate the Use of OFR and PHC Chemical Flame Retardants



The sharing of data reported to states helps to improve the effectiveness of enacted legislation on potentially hazardous OFR chemicals and to address information asymmetries in the market. Increasingly, state legislation compels reporting and allows for reciprocal data-sharing agreements with trade associations, the IC2, or other independent third parties. Reported data are also shared with the public. According to data compiled in the Market and Use Report (see Appendix R of Volume 2), eight states and the District of Columbia have reporting or data-sharing requirements for OFR chemicals.

5.3. Literature Survey Results: Evidence Maps of Toxicity Data

The toxicity evidence map descriptions below are high-level observations of the Level 2, 3, and 3B literature surveys in the designated spreadsheet files.²¹ The database counts indicate either the number of sources within the database (if available) or the number of entries in the database (if no information on source is available) after attempts were made to remove duplicates. The unit for PDF counts is the individual PDF file. Level 3B tagging was performed on a subset of toxicity assessments, toxicity literature reviews, and risk assessments selected from Level 3 to identify even more specific information for the chemicals in these references. Note that most of the Level 3B data are from database data, and only a subset of the PDF data sources is tagged at Level 3B.

The general observations from the Level 2, 3, and 3B reviews are:

- PHC members Mirex; Chlorendic acid; and Dechlorane Plus had the highest number of toxicity data sources in each category.
- PHC members Mirex; Chlorendic anhydride; and Dechlorane Plus had the most representation across toxicity categories for database and PDF reviews.
- The *QSAR*, *Read-across*, *Analog* category (QSAR = quantitative structure activity relationships) had broad representation with 100% of PHC members and 87% of analogs having at least one data source at Level 3 review and similar representation at Level 3B.

5.3.1. Summary of Level 2

The “Integrated” tab contains summed Level 2 toxicity data counts across PDF and database data.²²

The literature survey identified integrated data sources (sum of databases and PDFs) for all 21 PHC members and for 27 of 31 analogs. The PHC members with the most data sources were Mirex and Dechlorane plus. Table 5-5 summarizes how many PHC members and analogs had different degrees of data source abundance.

Table 5-5. Distribution of Toxicity Data Source Abundance Levels at Level 2

Distribution of Number of Data Sources Available for Each Chemical	Number of Chemicals with Level 2 Toxicity Data Sources	
	PHC Chemicals (n = 21)	Analog Chemicals (n = 31)
21+	2	5
6–20	10	4
1–5	9	18
0	0	4

²¹ See evidence map files on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website or [Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022](#).

²² See evidence map file “PHC Level 2 Evidence Maps 12.2.22, Tab: Integrated” on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website or [Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022](#).

5.3.2. Summary of Levels 3 and 3B

The “TOX_Integrated” tabs from each file contain Level 3 and Level 3B toxicity data counts across all toxicity databases and PDFs.²³ The Level 3B tabs were divided into A, B, and C to keep the spreadsheets manageable. Integrated Level 3B counts report the sum of data sources from databases and a sample of 25 selected PDFs (i.e., not all PDFs identified at Level 3 were reviewed at Level 3B). The integrated counts indicate the number of data sources per chemical from databases and PDFs identified and classified into seven toxicity data type categories. At Level 3B, reviewers tagged the data sources from each category with subcategories to provide additional details of specific data types. Table 5-6 and Table 5-7 summarize how many PHC members and analogs had different degrees of Level 3 toxicity data source abundance.

Table 5-6. Distribution of Toxicity Data Source Abundance Levels at Level 3 – Chemicals

Distribution of Number of Data Sources Available for Each Chemical	Number of Chemicals with Level 3 Toxicity Data Sources						
	PHC Chemicals (n = 21)						
	Animal Toxicity or Accepted Alternative	Human Toxicity	Human, Animal, or Modeled Toxicokinetics (ADME)	Experimental Mechanistic	QSAR, Read-Across, Analog	Qualitative Hazard Characterization	Quantitative Hazard Characterization
21+	4	0	2	4	19	4	4
6–20	2	1	8	2	2	1	1
1–5	6	4	8	3	0	5	5
0	9	16	3	12	0	11	11

Animal Toxicity or Accepted Alternative data sources were available for 12 PHC members and 14 analogs at Level 3 review. Eight PHC members and 14 analogs had data in the databases and PDFs at Level 3B review. Level 3B reviews provided additional detail for nine subcategories: Acute Toxicity, Systemic or Repeated Dose Toxicity, Neurotoxicity, Carcinogenicity, Mutagenicity/Genotoxicity, Reproductive Toxicity/Developmental Toxicity, Irritation, Sensitization, and Endocrine Disruption. CPSC staff observed the following:

²³ See evidence map file “PHC Level 3 Evidence Maps 12.2.22, Tab: TOX Integrated” and “PHC Level 3B Evidence Maps 12.2.22, Tab: TOX Integrated” on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website or [Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022](#).

- PHC member Chlorendic acid had data sources in all subcategories except Reproductive Toxicity/Developmental Toxicity and Endocrine Disruption.
 - PHC member Mirex had data sources in all subcategories except Sensitization.
 - PHC members Chlorendic anhydride and Dechlorane plus had data sources for all subcategories except Neurotoxicity and Endocrine Disruption.
 - Acute Toxicity and Mutagenicity/Genotoxicity are the subcategories with data sources for the most PHC members.
- Acute Toxicity is the subcategory with data sources for the highest number (14) of analogs.

Table 5-7. Distribution of Toxicity Data Source Abundance Levels at Level 3 – Analogs

Distribution of Number of Data Sources Available for Each Chemical	Number of Chemicals with Level 3 Toxicity Data Sources						
	PHC Analogs (n = 31)						
	Animal Toxicity or Accepted Alternative	Human Toxicity	Human, Animal, or Modeled Toxicokinetics (ADME)	Experimental Mechanistic	QSAR, Read-Across, Analog	Qualitative Hazard Characterization	Quantitative Hazard Characterization
21+	4	1	3	9	22	2	3
6–20	3	3	4	3	0	2	3
1–5	7	5	13	3	5	10	8
0	17	22	11	16	4	17	17

Human Toxicity data sources were available for five PHC members and nine analogs at Level 3 review. Five PHC members and seven analogs had data in the databases and PDFs at Level 3B review. Level 3B reviews provided additional detail for the same nine subcategories used for *Animal Toxicity or Accepted Alternative* above. CPSC staff observed the following:

- PHC member Mirex had the highest number of hits (13) with data sources in all subcategories except Acute Toxicity, Mutagenicity/Genotoxicity, Irritation, and Sensitization.
- Systemic or Repeated Dose Toxicity and Endocrine Disruption are the subcategories containing the highest number of data sources.
- PHC members Dechlorane plus; DeChlordane plus (syn isomer); and anti-Dechlorane plus had data sources in Endocrine Disruption.

Human, Animal, or Modeled Toxicokinetics (ADME [absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion]) data sources were available for 18 PHC members and 20 analogs at Level 3 review and in the databases and PDFs at Level 3B review. Level 3B reviews provided additional detail on seven subcategories: Human Absorption, Distribution, Excretion; Animal Absorption,

Distribution, Excretion; Human Metabolism; Animal Metabolism; In Vitro; Chemical- or Class-Specific physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) Model; and Chemical- or Class-Specific QSAR for an ADME Parameter. CPSC staff observed the following:

- No data sources were reported for any PHC members or analogs under the subcategory Chemical- or Class-Specific PBPK Model.
- PHC member Mirex had data sources in all subcategories except Chemical- or Class-Specific PBPK Model.
- PHC member Dechlorane Plus had data sources in all subcategories except Human Metabolism, In Vitro, and Chemical- or Class-Specific PBPK Model.
- The subcategory with the most data sources and for the most chemicals was Chemical- or Class-Specific QSAR for an ADME Parameter, with data sources identified for 16 PHC members and 20 analogs.

Experimental Mechanistic data sources were available for nine PHC members and 15 analogs at Level 3 review. Five PHC members and eight analogs had data in the databases and PDFs at Level 3B review.²⁴ This category has two subcategories at Level 3B review separating those data sources that make a connection to a mode of action (MOA) and a potential health effect from those that do not.²⁵ CPSC staff observed the following for Level 3B review:

- Four PHC members, Chlorendic acid; Dechlorane Plus; Mirex; and 7,8-Dibromo-1,2,3,4,11,11-hexachloro-1,4,4a,5,6,7,8,9,10,10a-decahydro-1,4-methanobenzocyclooctene, had data sources in both subcategories. Some of these hit counts are large, with hundreds or thousands of data sources per chemical per subcategory.
- The remaining one PHC member, Chlorendic anhydride, with data sources in this category had hits only in the subcategory Study Makes Connection to MOA and Potential Health Effect.

QSAR, Read-Across, Analog data sources were available for all PHC members and 27 of 31 analogs at Level 3 review and in the databases and PDFs at Level 3B review. Level 3B reviews provided additional detail across the same nine subcategories used for *Animal Toxicity or Accepted Alternative* above. CPSC staff observed the following:

²⁴ See “TOX_DB” and “TOX_PDF” tabs of evidence map file on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website. The 3B data counts for Experimental Mechanistic data are presented only in the “TOX_DB” and “TOX_PDF” tabs and not in the “TOX_Integrated” tab, because PubChem Bioassay data did not contain enough information to distinguish between the Level 3B tags for mechanistic data.

²⁵ Many database sources could not be tagged for Level 3B because it was not clear whether a connection was made to MOA.

- No data sources for PHC members or analogs were identified for Neurotoxicity. The vast majority of data with the *QSAR*, *Read-across*, *Analog* tag are from the Danish QSAR Database, which does not include any data that are taggable as Neurotoxicity.
- Of the remaining subcategories, at least one data source is available for the majority of PHC members per subcategory.
- All but four of the analogs had at least one data source for the Acute Toxicity, Systemic or Repeated Dose Toxicity, Carcinogenicity, Mutagenicity/Genotoxicity, Reproductive Toxicity/Developmental Toxicity, Irritation, and Endocrine Disruption subcategories.

Qualitative Hazard Characterization data sources were available for 10 PHC members and 14 analogs at Level 3 review. Eight PHC members and 14 analogs had data in the databases and PDFs at Level 3B review. In contrast with all other data types, a tag for Qualitative Hazard Characterization indicates that a review/assessment was attempted, not necessarily that data were found (e.g., if a review/assessment clearly stated that authors looked for data for endpoint X for chemical Y but found none, chemical Y was tagged for Qualitative Hazard Characterization for endpoint X, but not as any other data type.) This category was separated into the same nine subcategories used for *Animal Toxicity or Accepted Alternative* above for Level 3B review. CPSC staff observed the following:

- PHC members 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8-Octachloronaphthalene and Mirex had data sources for each of the nine subcategories.
- PHC member Chlorendic acid had data sources in all subcategories except Endocrine Disruption.
- Including those mentioned above, eight PHC members and 14 analogs had data sources for Acute Toxicity which is the subcategory containing most data sources.

Quantitative Hazard Characterization data sources were available for 10 PHC members and 14 analogs at Level 3 review. Eight PHC members and 14 analogs had data in the databases and PDFs at Level 3B review. At Level 3B review, this category was further divided into seven subcategories: Acute Toxicity, Systemic or Repeated Dose Toxicity, Neurotoxicity, Carcinogenicity, Reproductive Toxicity/Developmental Toxicity, Sensitization, and Endocrine Disruption. CPSC staff observed the following:

- Among PHC members and analogs at Level 3B review, Acute Toxicity and Systemic or Repeated Dose Toxicity are the subcategories containing the most abundant data resources. PHC members Chlorendic anhydride and Mirex had the highest counts within these subcategories.
- PHC member Mirex had data sources available in all subcategories except Sensitization.

5.4. Literature Survey Results: Evidence Maps of Exposure Data

The exposure evidence maps below describe high-level observations of the Level 2, 3, and 3B literature surveys in the indicated spreadsheet files.²⁶ Level 3B tagging was performed on a

²⁶ Exposure evidence map files are available on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website or [Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022](#).

subset of 25 toxicity exposure literature reviews selected from Level 3 to identify even more specific information for the chemicals in these references. The database counts indicate the number of entries in the Multimedia Monitoring Database (MMDB). The unit for PDF counts is the individual PDF file. PHC analogs were not included in the exposure evidence map analyses because exposure to the analogs is outside the scope of the current project.

The general observations from the Level 2, 3, and 3B reviews are:

- PHC members Mirex and Dechlorane Plus had the highest number of data sources in each category.
- PHC members Mirex; Dechlorane Plus; DeChlordane Plus (syn isomer); and anti-Dechlorane Plus had the most representation across exposure categories for database and PDF reviews.

5.4.1. Summary of Level 2

The MMDB database and PDF searches identified exposure data sources for 17 of 21 PHC members.²⁷ The PHC members with the most data sources were Mirex; Dechlorane Plus; anti-Dechlorane Plus; and DeChlordane Plus (syn isomer). Table 5-8 summarizes how many PHC members have different degrees of data source abundance. The PDFs provided more total data sources and covered more PHC members than the database.

Table 5-8. Distribution of Exposure Data Source Abundance Levels at Level 2

Distribution of Number of Data Sources Available for Each Chemical	Number of Chemicals with Level 2 Exposure Data Sources	
	PHC Chemicals (n = 21)	
21+	8	
6–20	2	
1–5	7	
0	4	

5.4.2. Summary of Levels 3 and 3B

The “EXP_Integrated” tabs from each file contain Level 3 and 3B exposure data counts.²⁸ The Level 3 integrated counts indicate the number of data sources per chemical from the MMDB database and identified PDFs. Level 3 counts are classified into six exposure data type categories. Integrated Level 3B counts report the sum of data sources from MMDB and selected PDFs. At Level 3B, reviewers tagged the data sources to subcategories to provide additional details of specific data types. Table 5-9 summarizes how many PHC members have different degrees of Level 3 exposure data source abundance.

²⁷ Exposure evidence map files are available on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website or [Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022](#).

²⁸ Exposure evidence map files are available on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website or [Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022](#).

Table 5-9. Distribution of Exposure Data Source Abundance Levels at Level 3

Distribution of Number of Data Sources Available for Each Chemical	Number of Chemicals with Level 3 Exposure Data Sources					
	PHC Chemicals (n = 21)					
	Environmental Monitoring	Biomonitoring/ Personal Monitoring	Source Characterization	Epidemiology – Population Group	Modeled Concentrations	Modeled Human Dose
21+	4	2	4	0	0	1
6–20	4	4	6	0	1	3
1–5	3	3	7	6	7	4
0	10	12	4	15	13	13

Environmental Monitoring data sources were available for 11 PHC members at Level 3 review. Nine PHC members had data in the database and PDFs at Level 3B review. This category is separated into six subcategories for Level 3B review: Indoor/Personal Air, Indoor Dust, Outdoor Air, Food/Dietary, Soil, and Drinking Water.

- PHC member Dechlorane Plus had data sources in all subcategories and high numbers of hits for Indoor/Personal Air, Indoor Dust, Outdoor Air, and Soil subcategories.
- PHC members DeChlordane Plus (syn isomer) and anti-Dechlorane Plus had data sources in all subcategories except Drinking Water.
- PHC member Mirex had hundreds of data sources for Food/Dietary and Drinking Water subcategories, respectively.
- PHC member 7,8-Dibromo-1,2,3,4,11,11-hexachloro-1,4,4a,5,6,7,8,9,10,10a-decahydro-1,4-methanobenzocyclooctene had data sources for Indoor Dust subcategory.

Biomonitoring/Personal Monitoring data sources were available for nine PHC members at Level 3 review. Six PHC members had data in the database and PDFs at Level 3B review. This category was separated into five subcategories for Level 3B review: Blood/Serum, Urine, Breast Milk/Lipids, Skin/Dermal, and Human (Other).

- PHC members Dechlorane Plus; DeChlordane Plus (syn isomer); and anti-Dechlorane Plus had data sources in all of the subcategories except Urine.
- PHC member Mirex had data sources in Blood/Serum, Breast Milk/Lipids and Human (Other) subcategories.
- PHC members 1,4:5,8:9,10-Trimethanoanthracene; 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,12,12,13,13-dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5,8,8a,9,9a,10,10a-decahydro-; and 1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,10,11,11-dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5a,6,9,9a,9b-octahydro-1,4:6,9-dimethanodibenzofuran had data sources in Blood/Serum subcategory.
- PHC member Mirex had 99 data sources for Blood/Serum.

Source Characterization data sources were available for 17 PHC members at Level 3 review. Sixteen PHC members had data in the database and PDFs at Level 3B review. This category is separated into four subcategories for Level 3B review: Product Testing: Content Only, Product Testing: Emission/Migration Data, Nonexperimental Product- or Chemical-Specific Modeling Inputs, and Other Qualitative or Quantitative Description of Product Use or Class/Chemical.

- PHC member Dechlorane Plus had data sources for all four subcategories except Product Testing: Emission/Migration Data.
- PHC members Chlorendic anhydride; Chlorendic acid; DeChlordane Plus (syn isomer); anti-Dechlorane Plus; Mirex; 1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,10,11,11-dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5a,6,9,9a,9b-octahydro-1,4:6,9-dimethanodibenzofuran; and 7,8-Dibromo-1,2,3,4,11,11-hexachloro-1,4,4a,5,6,7,8,9,10,10a-decahydro-1,4-methanobenzocyclooctene had data sources for Nonexperimental Product- or Chemical-Specific Modeling Inputs and Other Qualitative or Quantitative Description of Product Use or Class/Chemical subcategories.
- Other Qualitative or Quantitative Description of Product Use or Class/Chemical is the subcategory that contains the most abundant data sources.

*Environmental Epidemiology*²⁹ data sources were available for six PHC members at Level 3 review. Five PHC members had data in the database and PDFs at Level 3B review. The subcategories were Children; Adult, Non-Occupational; and Other, Specify (with Suggestions).

- PHC members Dechlorane Plus; DeChlordane Plus (syn isomer); anti-Dechlorane Plus; and 1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,10,11,11-dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5a,6,9,9a,9b-octahydro-1,4:6,9-dimethanodibenzofuran had data sources for Children and Adult, Non-Occupational subcategories.
- PHC member Mirex had data sources for Adult, Non-Occupational subcategory.

Modeled Concentrations data sources were available for eight PHC members at Level 3 review. Level 3B reviews of the database and PDFs found no data sources in three subcategories (Indoor Concentration, Outdoor Concentration, and Dietary/Food).

Modeled Human Dose data sources were available for eight PHC members at Level 3 review and in the database and PDFs at Level 3B review. The subcategories were Children; Adult, Non-occupational; and Other, Specify (with Suggestions).

²⁹ The category *Environmental Epidemiology* here was identified as “*Epidemiology – POP Group*” in the “EXP_Integrated_C” tab of the Excel file, which can be found on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website). The change was made in this document for clarity.

- PHC members Dechlorane Plus; DeChlordane Plus (syn isomer); and anti-Dechlorane Plus had data sources for the subcategories Children and Adult, Non-occupational.
- PHC members 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,10,11,11-Dodecachloro-4,4a,4b,5,8,8a,9,9a-octahydro-1H-1,4:5,8-dimethanofluorene; 1,4:5,8:9,10-Trimethanoanthracene; 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,12,12,13,13-dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5,8,8a,9,9a,10,10a-decahydro-; Mirex; 1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,10,11,11-dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5a,6,9,9a,9b-octahydro-1,4:6,9-dimethanodibenzofuran; and Dechloran 604 had data sources for Adult, Non-occupational only.
- The subcategory Other, Specify (with Suggestions) had no hits for any PHC members.

5.5. Literature Survey Results: Summary of Existing Human Health Risk Assessments

None of the “Database” (DB) tabs at Levels 2, 3, or 3B reported risk assessment data sources. Therefore, the Integrated and PDF data counts for Human Health Risk Assessments are identical at all levels. In the files that reported PDF data sources, human health risk assessments are included in the tabs for spreadsheets displaying toxicity data sources.

5.5.1. Summary of Level 2

The “Integrated” tab contains summed Level 2 risk data counts from PDF sources.³⁰ No risk data were found in the databases. Six PHC members and six analogs have PDF data sources for risk at Level 2 review. Table 5-10 summarizes how many PHC members had different degrees of data source abundance. PHC members Mirex and Dechlorane Plus had the highest numbers of human health risk assessments available.

Table 5-10. Distribution of Human Health Risk Data Sources Abundance Levels at Level 2

Distribution of Number of Data Sources Available for Each Chemical	Number of Chemicals with Level 2 Risk Data Sources	
	PHC Chemicals (n = 21)	
21+	0	
6–20	2	
1–5	4	
0	15	

5.5.2. Summary of Levels 3 and 3B

The “Integrated” tab for the Level 3 file contains the *Human Health Risk Assessment* counts from PDF data sources.³¹ The “TOX_PDF” tab for Level 3B contains the *Human Health Risk Assessment* counts from 25 PDFs that were selected for 3B extraction. The counts indicate the

³⁰ Risk evidence map files are available on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website or [Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022](#).

³¹ Risk evidence map files are available on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website or [Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022](#).

number of PDFs identified per chemical for each Noncancer and Cancer risk assessment. Table 5-11 summarizes how many PHC members and analogs had different degrees of Level 3 human health risk data source abundance.

Human Health Risk Assessment data were available for six PHC members and six analogs at Level 3 review. One PHC member and five analogs had data in the selected PDFs at Level 3B review. The subcategories used are Noncancer Risk and Cancer Risk, with one Noncancer Risk and no Cancer Risk assessment identified. Staff noted the following observations:

- PHC member Dechlorane Plus had one Noncancer Risk data source.
- PHC analogs trans-Nonachlor; cis-Chlordane; cis-Nonachlor; trans-Chlordane; and Chlordane had data sources for Noncancer Risk.

Table 5-11. Distribution of Human Health Risk Data Sources Abundance Levels at Level 3

Distribution of Number of Data Sources Available for Each Chemical	Number of Chemicals with Level 3 Risk Data Sources	
	PHC Chemicals (n = 21)	
21+	0	
6–20	2	
1–5	4	
0	15	

5.6. Literature Survey Results: Key References

Among the literature survey results are several references from authoritative sources. These references include a toxicological profile by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ASTDR), European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) reports, International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) evaluation, National Toxicology Program (NTP) technical reports, International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS) documentation, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) reviews and assessments. Each of these references addressed one or more PHCs.³² These reports included four PHCs and five PHC analogs. These four (non-analog) chemicals are among the PHCs most frequently noted in the market use report as found in consumer products, as well as in the literature survey results generally. These reports demonstrate the existence of data about these chemicals, including hazard and potential exposures, that are sufficient to support hazard, exposure, and risk assessment, and are likely to be useful references for CPSC staff evaluations of these and other PHCs.

³² The four PCHs included in one or more key references are (by CAS RN): 2385-85-5; 115-27-5; 13560-89-9; 115-28-6. The five analog PCHs included in one or more key references are (by CAS RN): 12789-03-6; 57-74-9; 5103-71-9; 5103-74-2; 1024-57-3.

6. Scoping Determination and Next Steps

6.1. Scoping Determination

Informed by initial review of the market and use research, evidence maps, and availability of physicochemical data for the PHC subclass and its analogs, and the criteria described in Section 3.1, Criteria for Scoping Determination, CPSC staff concludes, at the time of writing, that the PHC subclass has sufficient data to proceed with risk assessment.

The criteria for sufficiency for hazard assessment for the subclass require that the subclass and analogs must have at least one data-rich chemical, multiple chemicals with some data, and a minority of chemicals that are “no data” substances.

CPSC staff concludes that the PHC subclass includes 11 data-rich PHC chemicals and six data-rich analog chemicals. A majority of PHC chemicals and some analogs have some data. The evidence maps show that many PHC chemicals have data in the Animal Toxicity or Accepted Alternative category, including among acute, systemic or repeated dose toxicity, or reproductive/developmental studies. In addition, a majority of PHC chemicals and some analogs have data in the experimental, mechanistic, and QSAR categories, all of which may be used to support further analyses, including performing read-across analyses for predictions among class members with less available data.

The criteria for sufficiency for exposure assessment for the subclass require that the subclass must have at least one data-rich chemical and multiple chemicals with some data.

CPSC staff concludes that the subclass includes up to 10 data-rich chemicals and that a majority of chemicals have some data. In addition, according to available data sources, 18 of the 19 chemicals have market information for use in commerce.

Following the determination that the PHC subclass has sufficient data to proceed with risk assessment, the sections below outline the next steps that CPSC staff plans to take, resources permitting. Below, CPSC staff provides plans for analysis to complete a class-based risk assessment. The first analysis plan describes how CPSC staff will consider data in the development of a class-based hazard identification and dose response assessment for select endpoints. The second analysis plan describes how CPSC staff will consider data in a class-based human exposure assessment. The last step of both analysis plans is identical in that CPSC staff will consider how to combine class-based human exposure estimates with class-based toxicity reference values in a class-based risk assessment.

6.2. Next Steps for Class-Based Hazard Assessment

6.2.1. Analysis Plan

CPSC staff plans to actively work on the remaining list of activities outlined below. Many of these activities can be undertaken concurrently, as resources are available. Before completing a hazard analysis, CPSC staff expects to consider and analyze data that could inform hazard identification and dose response as follows, if resources are available:

1. CPSC staff, in coordination with the Division of Translational Toxicology (DTT) at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, is working on a comprehensive literature search. Available toxicity information from PHC class members and analogs will be further summarized and integrated after this search is complete. After the search, staff will refine the list of data-rich PHCs, data-rich PHC analogs, PHCs with some toxicity information, and PHCs with no toxicity information.
2. CPSC staff plans to complete a systematic evidence map that will be based on a scoping review in coordination with DTT. This evidence map will include a wide range of toxicity data (e.g., animal, human, mechanistic, QSAR, read-across, new approach methodologies [NAMs]³³) from the comprehensive literature search.
3. CPSC staff will refine the NAS analog list and characterize analog substances for the PHC class that are both chemically and toxicologically similar and have any amount of empirical toxicity information. Analog substances that are data poor, and not sufficiently similar to PHC class members to be associated with them, will be deprioritized. CPSC staff's initial survey shows that empirical toxicity data are available for 14 analogs and empirical toxicokinetic data are available for 20 analogs.
4. CPSC staff will estimate major metabolites of PHC class members by interpreting results from the major metabolite prediction tools, such as GLORYx and the OECD QSAR toolbox, and comparing these results with data presented in the literature. CPSC staff will consider predicted and measured metabolites to inform class-based approaches for hazard identification.
5. CPSC staff plans to use a read-across approach that incorporates multiple types of data (i.e., animal, human, mechanistic, QSAR, read-across). Data-rich PHC class members and analogs with available toxicity data can be used to read-across to PHC class members with insufficient data to estimate toxicity reference values for one or more endpoints of concern. The initial CPSC literature survey suggests that toxicity endpoints that are likely higher priority for the PHC class are acute toxicity, systemic repeat dose toxicity, carcinogenicity, and reproductive toxicity/developmental toxicity.
6. CPSC staff will identify a smaller number of endpoint(s) and studies that are candidates for identifying points of departure (POD) and generating toxicity reference values for multiple PHC class members. PODs may be developed using a wide range of toxicity studies (e.g., animal, human, NAM, QSAR, read-across). CPSC staff will identify studies with a range of reported doses and associated contextual information when developing dose-response information. Benchmark dose modeling will be used as appropriate.
7. CPSC staff will compare these values with toxicity reference values developed by other organizations for PHC class members.

³³ NAMs include any technology, methodology, approach, or combination thereof that can be used to provide information on chemical hazard and risk assessment that avoids the use of intact animals. NAM studies may include studies using human or animal cells and tissues (i.e., in vitro assays, ex vivo studies), toxicity testing using alternative animal species, such as zebrafish and nematodes, and a variety of computational modeling approaches.

8. CPSC staff will explore the variability and uncertainty associated with dose response values for PHC chemicals within the class.
9. CPSC staff will use information developed in a class-based hazard assessment and dose-response assessment to support a class-based risk assessment for PHCs.

6.2.2. Initial Human Health Hazard Observations for Class-Based Assessment of PHCs

The primary objective of completing a literature survey for a subclass of OFRs is to array available information and determine whether a class-based assessment is possible. CPSC staff considers class-based exposure assessment possible for any class if data on consumer uses and physicochemical properties are available. However, CPSC staff considers class-based hazard assessment as highly data dependent. Thus, whether a class-based risk assessment is possible depends on the availability of different types of human hazard data. When sufficient human health hazard data were identified from the literature survey, this section of the scope document includes initial observations informed by review of select data sources.

Of the PHC subclass members that have data, acute toxicity by any route appears to be lowest for DP, which is listed as being of “low concern for acute toxicity via the oral, inhalation or dermal routes” (ECCC and HC, 2019; POPRC, 2020), although specific LD50 or LC50 values were not reported. Acute oral toxicity of Mirex appears to be higher than that of chlorendic acid, with reported LD50s of 365 mg/kg (Mirex; ATSDR, 2020) and 1770 mg/kg (chlorendic acid; EHC, 1996). Acute dermal toxicity appears low across all subclass members with data, with reported dermal LD50s >2000 mg/kg (Mirex; ATSDR 2020) and >3000 mg/kg (chlorendic anhydride; EHC, 1996). Inhalation toxicity for chlorendic acid and chlorendic anhydride appears to be higher than for other subclass members. For chlorendic acid, the approximate lethal concentration of inhaled chlorendic acid was 0.066 mg/L (66 mg/m³) under nitrogen and 0.095 mg/L (95 mg/m³) under air, though no deaths were observed after chlorendic acid dust was administered to rats for 4 hours at 0.79 mg/L (790 mg/m³; EHC, 1996). For chlorendic anhydride, 4-hour LC50s were >5.27 mg/L (5270 mg/m³; as vapor) and >203 mg/L (2030 mg/m³; as dust) (EHC, 1996). ATSDR (2020) identified no inhalation toxicity studies for Mirex but noted that Mirex is essentially nonvolatile.

Repeated dose studies are available for Mirex, DP, chlorendic acid, and chlorendic anhydride. All show some effects on the liver. ATSDR (2020) and U.S. EPA (1992) considered the liver or liver and thyroid to be the key targets for chronic exposure to Mirex. Repeated dose oral and dermal toxicity studies in rats found no adverse effects of DP up to 5000 mg/kg-day for up to 90 days or 2000 mg/kg-day for up to 28 days, respectively (ECCC and HC, 2012; ECHA, 2017), though at least one oral study of DP in mice found oxidative damage to the liver (Ghelli et al., 2021; POPRC, 2020). A repeated dose inhalation toxicity study of DP (as dust) found hepatocytomegaly, as well as increased lung weights (ECCC and HC, 2012). A 13-week NTP oral study of chlorendic acid including both mice and rats found hyperplasia in both the liver and bile duct, hepatocytomegaly, and liver necrosis (EHC, 1996). Studies exposing rats orally or by inhalation to chlorendic anhydride found decreased relative liver weight and increased serum enzymes indicative of liver damage but no gross or histopathological lesions (EHC, 1996). For

PCN-75, the ACGIH TLV and OSHA PEL (8-hour TWA) values are 0.1 mg/m³ (Charles et al., 2005), based on protection from liver damage (ACGIH, 2001).

Reproductive and developmental outcomes may be targets of both Mirex and chlorendic anhydride. Studies exposing rats and mice orally to Mirex have found effects on both male and female fertility and reproductive organs, as well as reduced fetal and postnatal survival and increased fetal cardiac arrhythmias (ATSDR, 2020; Health Canada, 2020). A study exposing pregnant rats to chlorendic anhydride on gestational days 6-15 found decreased maternal body weight, altered fetal sex ratio, and increased post-implantation losses (EHC, 1996). A combined repeated-dose/reproductive/developmental toxicity study of DP found no reproductive or developmental toxicity (ECCC and HC, 2012; POPRC, 2020), although DP has affected neurobehavior in zebrafish embryos (Ghelli et al., 2021; POPRC, 2020).

Both Mirex and DP may disrupt thyroid function, although the mechanism of this disruption is not known. Studies in rats have found the thyroid to be a target of Mirex (including effects on follicles but not on levels of thyroxine (T3) or triiodothyronine (T4)). Epidemiological studies have found no association between Mirex and the risk of thyroid disease (ATSDR, 2020). DP (including both syn-DP and anti-DP) may be associated with disruptions in thyroid hormones in humans (POPRC, 2020; Singh et al., 2021) and zebrafish (POPRC, 2020; Ghelli et al., 2021).

PHC subclass members were generally negative for gene mutation, though results were mixed for chlorendic acid. ATSDR concluded that Mirex is not genotoxic (ATSDR, 2020), based on negative results in the Ames assay and in the mouse dominant lethal assay. DP is not mutagenic, based on negative results in bacterial and mammalian (mouse lymphoma) cells, and an in vivo mouse Comet assay showed no DNA damage (ECHA, 2017; POPRC, 2020; ECCC and HC, 2019). Chlorendic anhydride was not mutagenic in the Ames assay, mouse lymphoma assay, or in vitro malignant transformation assay (EHC, 1996). Chlorendic acid was not mutagenic in the Ames assay or sex-linked recessive lethal assay but was mutagenic in a mouse lymphoma assay and “a standard transformation assay using BALB/c-3T3 cells” (EHC, 1996).

Mirex and chlorendic acid are both carcinogenic in rodents. Mirex is classified as IARC Group 2B (possible human carcinogen) (IARC, 1979). Mice and rats exposed orally to Mirex for up to 2 years had increased levels of hepatomas, neoplastic nodules in the liver, hepatocellular carcinoma, and mononuclear cell leukemia (ATSDR, 2020). Mice exposed to chlorendic acid had hepatocellular adenomas and carcinomas, leading to a conclusion of *clear evidence of carcinogenic potential* (EHC, 1996). In rats, chlorendic acid increased tumors in a variety of organs (EHC, 1996). No carcinogenicity study on chlorendic anhydride has been conducted, but EHC has stated it is not necessary because of rapid metabolism into chlorendic acid (EHC, 1996).

In summary, the liver appears to be a shared target among Mirex, DP, chlorendic acid, chlorendic anhydride, and PCN-75. Mirex may share reproductive and developmental endpoints and carcinogenicity with chlorendic acid and thyroid endpoints with DP. One challenge for this class may be the solubility of various subclass members in different vehicles leading to uncertainties regarding dosing schemes: DP may not be fully soluble in corn oil (ECHA, 2017;

POPRC, 2020), and a single study has reported order of magnitude differences in oral LD50s for Mirex in corn oil versus in peanut oil (ATSDR, 2020).

6.3. Next Steps for Class-Based Exposure Assessment

6.3.1. Analysis Plan

CPSC staff plans to actively work on the remaining list of activities outlined below. Many of these activities can be undertaken concurrently, as resources are available. Before completing a hazard analysis, CPSC staff expects to consider and analyze data that could inform hazard identification and dose-response as follows, as resources permit:

1. CPSC staff, in coordination with DTT staff, is working on a comprehensive literature search. Available exposure information from PHC class members will be further summarized and integrated after this search is complete. After the search, staff will refine the list of data-rich PHCs, PHCs with some exposure and use information, and PHCs with no exposure and use information.
2. Using the market and use research, CPSC staff expects to compile a list of PHC chemicals that have been or could be used in consumer products. While 18 of the 19 chemicals had some market-use information, 10 PHC chemicals had more market and use information that could be used to inform analyses for PHC chemicals with less information. CPSC staff will characterize uses for PHCs according to available information and consider temporal trends when developing exposure scenarios.
3. CPSC staff will characterize the uses identified in the market and use research and combine this information with likely exposure pathways and populations exposed to define unique combinations of exposure scenarios for chemical substances within the class. Depending on available information, CPSC may be able to quantify exposure scenarios for between 10 and 18 PHC subclass members.
4. Exposure pathways with likely higher potential for PHC class members include dietary ingestion, drinking water ingestion, contact exposures with consumer products and articles, indoor dust ingestion, and inhalation of indoor air. Exposure pathways with likely lower potential for PHC class members include ambient air and soil ingestion. CPSC staff will review available environmental monitoring data to determine a range of potential concentrations to which people could be exposed. There are 17 chemicals in the class with source characterization data, 11 chemicals in the class with environmental monitoring data, and 11 chemicals in the class with both types of data.
5. CPSC staff plans to review measurement techniques and analytical methods and assess how they have changed over time with regard to identification and quantification of PHC chemicals. Lack of detection in older studies may be due to older analytical methods with higher detection limits, whereas presence in newer studies may be due to newer analytical methods with lower detection limits. CPSC staff plans to evaluate reported methods and how they influence likely distributions of OFRs in different environmental media or biological matrices.
6. CPSC staff will explore the connection between consumer product sources and reported levels in environmental media by estimating environmental concentrations for a range of


uses and determining whether these estimates fall within the range of reported environmental monitoring data. CPSC staff plans to consider indoor exposure modeling, modeling approaches specific to semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), and product-testing measurement techniques that characterize emissions or migration of OFRs from products into the indoor environment. When environmental monitoring is not available for comparison, CPSC staff will estimate environmental concentrations for the range of reported uses. There are six chemicals in the class with source characterization data and no corresponding environmental monitoring data.

7. CPSC staff will explore the connection between reported or estimated environmental concentrations and reported exposures from human biomonitoring data. First, doses will be estimated using reported or estimated environmental concentrations and population specific exposure factors and activity patterns. Second, doses will be estimated using reported human biomonitoring data and reported or estimated toxicokinetic data. There are nine PHC class members with both environmental monitoring data and human biomonitoring data.
8. CPSC staff plans to use multiple approaches to estimate exposures and doses for multiple age groups and populations. CPSC staff plans to develop both deterministic and probabilistic estimates of dose, as data allow. CPSC staff will explore the variability and uncertainty associated with exposure and dose estimates for the population groups included in the human exposure assessment.
9. CPSC staff will use information developed in a class-based exposure assessment to support a class-based risk assessment for PHCs.

6.3.2. Conceptual Exposure Model

A conceptual exposure model visually represents connections between sources, pathways, receptors, and health effects. Figure 6-1 shows the conceptual exposure model for the PHC subclass. Sources are grouped into (i) those that can be related back to consumer products and (ii) all other sources that can inform background exposures. These sources will be part of a generic background exposure scenario. Each product/source will be part of an exposure scenario and quantified. Exposure pathways similarly are grouped into pathways related to emission or migration from consumer products and pathways related to occurrence in nonconsumer product-related media. Receptors include human populations of all age groups for which human biomonitoring data will be used to inform ranges of aggregate exposures from all sources. Finally, human health effects most likely to be considered for PHCs are listed.

Figure 6-1. PHC Conceptual Exposure Model



7. References

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). (2020). *Toxicological profile for mirex and chlordecone*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service. <https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxprofiles/tp66.pdf>

American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH). (2001). Octachloronaphthalene. In *Documentation of the threshold limit values and biological exposure indices* (7th ed.).

Bevington, C., Williams, A.J., Guider, C., Baker, N.C., Meyer, B., Babich, M.A., Robinson, S., Jones, A., & Phillips, K.A. (2022). Development of a flame retardant and an organohalogen

flame retardant chemical inventory. *Scientific Data*, 9, Article 295.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01351-0>

Charles, K.E., Magee, R.J., Won, D.Y., & Luszyk, E. (2005). *Indoor air quality guidelines and standards: Final report 5.1*. National Research Council of Canada.
<https://doi.org/10.4224/20377459>

Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2020). *Staff briefing package: Project plan: Organohalogen flame retardant chemicals assessment: July 1, 2020*.
<https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/OFR-plan-report-package-final.pdf>

Environment and Climate Change Canada & Health Canada (ECCC & HC). (2019). *Screening assessment: Certain organic flame retardants substance grouping: 1,4:7,10-Dimethanodibenzo[a,e]cyclooctene, 1,2,3,4,7,8,9,10,13,13,14,14-dodecachloro-1,4,4a,5,6,6a,7,10,10a,11,12,12a-dodecahydro-: Dechlorane Plus (DP)*. Government of Canada. <https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/evaluating-existing-substances/screening-assessment-certain-organic-flame-retardants-substance-grouping-dimethanodibenzo-cyclooctene-dodecachloro-dodecahydro-dechlorane-plus-dp.html>

European Chemicals Agency (ECHA). (2017). *Member state committee support document for identification of 1,6,7,8,9,14,15,16,17,17,18,18-dodecachloropentacyclo[12.2.1.1^{6,9}.0^{2,13}.0^{5,10}]octadeca-7,15-diene (“Dechlorane Plus”™) [covering any of its individual anti- and syn-isomers or any combination thereof] as a substance of very high concern because of its vPvB¹ properties (Article 57(E))*.
<https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/edc6fe0d-7df5-137a-9b49-641fc2d25818>

Ghelli, E., Cariou, R., Dervilly, G., Pagliuca, G., & Gazzotti, T. (2021). Dechlorane Plus and related compounds in food—A review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(2), Article 690. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18020690>

Health Canada. (2020). *Report on human biomonitoring of environmental chemicals in pooled samples: Results of the Canadian Health Measures Survey cycles 1 (2007–2009), 3 (2012–2013), 4 (2014–2015) and 5 (2016–2017)*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/environmental-workplace-health/environmental-contaminants/human-biomonitoring-environmental-chemicals/report-pooled-samples.html>

International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). (1979). Mirex: 5. Summary of data reported and evaluation. In *Summaries & evaluations* (Vol. 20, p. 283). International Programme on Chemical Safety. <https://incem.org/documents/iarc/vol20/mirex.html>

International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS). (1996). *Environmental health criteria 185: Chlorendic acid and anhydride*. <https://www.inchem.org/documents/ehc/ehc/ehc185.htm>

Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee (POPRC). (2020). *Dechlorane Plus and its syn- and anti-isomers: Draft risk profile*. European Chemicals Agency.
<https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/df683e4a-06d5-676f-8180-106bac9bbdf4>

Singh, N., Ogunseitán, O.A., & Tang, Y. (2021). Systematic review of pregnancy and neonatal health outcomes associated with exposure to e-waste disposal. *Critical Reviews in*

Environmental Science and Technology, 51(20), 2424-2448.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10643389.2020.1788913>

United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA). (1992). *Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) summary: Mirex; CASRN 2385-85-5 | DTXSID7020895*.
https://iris.epa.gov/ChemicalLanding/&substance_nmbr=251

8. Appendix: Supporting Files

The following supporting files are available on the CPSC [Organohalogen Flame Retardant Chemicals Assessment](#) website. They can also be found on [Docket No. CPSC-2015-0022](#).

Literature Survey Guide: Approaches Taken to Develop Evidence Maps from Readily Available Databases, Completed Assessments, and Literature Reviews

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *Literature survey guide: Draft 6* [Literature Survey Guide Draft 6_10.17.22_final.docx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Market and Use Report: Characterizing OFR Chemistries, Sources, and Uses in the U.S. and International Markets, Volumes 1 and 2 (Appendices)

Industrial Economics Incorporated (IEc). (2022). *Characterizing organohalogen flame retardant (OFR) chemistries, sources, and uses in United States and international markets: Vol. 1 – Main report* [Vol 1 Main Report 03.24.2022_Final.pdf]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Industrial Economics Incorporated (IEc). (2022). *Characterizing organohalogen flame retardant (OFR) chemistries, sources, and uses in United States and international markets: Vol. 2 – Appendices* [Vol 2 Appendices 03.09.2022_Final.pdf]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Literature Survey Results

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *PHC subclass level 2 literature survey evidence map* [PHC Level 2 Evidence Maps 12.7.22.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *PHC subclass level 3 literature survey evidence map* [PHC Level 3 Evidence Maps 12.7.22.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *PHC subclass level 3B literature survey evidence map* [PHC Level 3B Evidence Maps 12.7.22.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *PHC subclass information downloaded from databases* [PHC Tox Individual Database Evidence Maps - Levels 2, 3, 3B - 12.7.22.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Literature Survey Results Supporting Files

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *PHC subclass detailed 3B extraction counts* [PHCs PDF 3B Extraction Final 11.08.22.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *PHC subclass selected studies for 3B extraction* [PHCs 3B Selection Sheets 9.21.22.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *PHC subclass information and heatmaps for level 3B study selection* [PHCs 3B Selection Heatmaps 9.21.22.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *PHC subclass power-query cleaning and visualizing of PDF data sources* [PHCs PQ clean and viz.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *PHC subclass data from Multimedia Monitoring Database* [PHCs MMDB Working.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

University of Cincinnati (UC). (2022). *PHC subclass aggregated toxicity database counts* [PHCs DB Tox Totals Working.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Market and Use Profile Supporting Files

Industrial Economics Incorporated (IEc). (2022). *Characterizing organohalogen flame retardant (OFR) chemistries, sources, and uses in United States and international markets: Attachment A: Standard operating procedure for producing data source outputs* [Attachment A_Data SOP.pdf]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research CompTox chemical information* [OFR_universe_wCompTox_batch_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research CompTox chemical synonyms* [OFR_universe_wCompTox_syms_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research CompTox experimental data* [OFR_universe_wCompTox_exp_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research CompTox predicted data* [OFR_universe_wCompTox_pred_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research CompTox product use* [OFR_universe_wCompTox_prod_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research data synthesis* [Data Source Synthesis_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research database readme* [00_ReadMe_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research ECHA plastics* [OFR_universe_wECHA_add_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research ECHA sources* [OFR_universe_wECHA_links_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research EPA TRI* [OFR_universe_wTRI_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research field counts* [04_FieldCounts_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research fields list* [03_FieldsList_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research NORMAN database* [OFR_universe_wNorman_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research OFR chemical list* [01_Attachment 1_OFR_universe_cid_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research PubChem chemical data* [OFR_universe_wPCPy_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research PubChem chemical identification* [OFR_universe_wPCBrowser_ID_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research PubChem mass spec* [OFR_universe_wPCBrowser_MS_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research PubChem MassBank spectra* [OFR_universe_wPCBrowser_MoNA_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research PubChem NORMAN* [OFR_universe_wPCBrowser_Norman_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research QSUR* [OFR_universe_wQSUR_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research source list* [02_SourcesList_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Market research TSCA inventory* [OFR_universe_wTSCA_03042022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Organohalogen flame retardant (OFR) market data workbook* [_OFR Market Data Workbook_mod1_01.25.2022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Eastern Research Group Incorporated (ERG). (2022). *Organohalogen flame retardant (OFR) source extraction workbook* [OFR Source Review Workbook_mod1_02.28.2022.xlsx]. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.