

## Recent Soil Intake Studies

- 1) Garlock, TJ; Shirai, JH; Kissel, JC. (1999) Adult responses to a survey of soil contact-related behaviors. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 1(2):134-142.
- 2) Wong, EY; Shirai, JH; Garlock, TJ; et al. (2000) Survey of selected activities relevant to exposures to soils. *Bull Environ Contam Toxicol* 65(4):443-50.  
**Permission for reproduction granted by Springer-Verlag**
- 3) Wong, EY; Shirai, JH; Garlock, TJ; et al. (2000) Adult proxy responses to a survey of children's dermal soil contact activities. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 10 (6 Pt 1):509-517.  
**Permission for reproduction granted by Nature Publishing Group**

Garlock, TJ; Shirai, JH; Kissel, JC. (1999) Adult responses to a survey of soil contact-related behaviors. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 1(2):134-142.

**Permission for reproduction granted by Nature Publishing Group**

In order to better assess dermal exposures, a telephone survey instrument was developed to collect information from 901 private residences on certain behaviors relevant to dermal contact with soil and dust. The survey was called the Soil Contact Survey (SCS). Using random digit dialing, the Gilmore Research Group interviewed two separate populations during the summer of 1996. One sample consisted of residents within a 50 mile radius of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington and Oregon. The second sample was designed to be a national population sample. Each of these samples consisted of approximately 450 respondents, who identified themselves as being 18 years of age or older. The survey response rate was 61% of the households in the national sample and 70% of the households in the Hanford Nuclear Reservation sample (Table 1). These response rates were significantly different. Each interview lasted approximately 11 minutes. SPSS statistical software was used to conduct the statistical analyses.

The survey contained five major sections. The first section solicited information from adults on the incidence and frequency of participation for the last year (warm and cold weather months) in gardening, other yard work, outdoor team sports, and home projects involving digging. The respondents were also asked to recall the clothing usually worn while they participated in these activities and when they bathed or washed their hands following the activities. Percentages for the amount of total skin area potentially exposed to soil during the above activities were assigned using the clothing choices reported. The assumed percentages for exposed body surface areas assigned to each clothing choice are reported in Table 2.

In the second section of the survey, adults in households containing children less than 18 years of age provided information on the behavior of children, ages 5 to 17, in warm weather months. The researchers asked for information on the participation of children in outdoor play on bare soil, gardening or yard work, and organized outdoor team sports. The respondents were asked to describe the clothing worn by the children while they participated in these activities.

The third section of the survey solicited information on dermal exposure to soil resulting from employment. Researchers asked respondents if any adult household member worked in 1) farming or truck gardening, 2) professional gardening, landscaping or nursery work, or 3) outdoor construction involving digging or trenching. Researchers also asked respondents to provide information on the duration of the involvement on any of the above activities, the type of clothing worn, and post-activity hand washing and bathing.

The fourth section solicited information on the type of floor coverings in the residence, the presence of pets, and whether or not shoes were worn in the house. In the fifth section, respondents provided demographic data regarding their age, race, gender, socioeconomic status, level of education, type of dwelling, and proximity to the center of the city (Table 3). The largest percentage of respondents in both the Hanford and national samples identified themselves as white; however, statistically significant differences were observed between the two sample populations within four of the survey categories:

- the Hanford sample contained significantly more white respondents than the national sample;
- the national sample contained significantly more black respondents than the Hanford sample;
  
- the Hanford sample contained significantly more occupants of single-family residences than the national sample;
  
- and the Hanford sample contained significantly more respondents residing in small towns or rural areas than the national sample.

Table 4 summarizes participation rates for several selected activities for both the Hanford sample and the national sample. For both samples, the activity “yard work other than gardening” was the most common (77% for the Hanford sample, and 57% for the national sample). Statistically significant differences were found between the two sample populations for participation rates in all of the activities except team sports. In addition, significantly more respondents in the national sample reported participating in only one activity than respondents in the Hanford sample (Table 5).

Table 6 presents the 5th, 50th, and 95th percentiles of estimates of the percent of skin area exposed for each of the activities in both warm and cold weather months. It can be seen that the amounts of skin area exposed during each of the activities was much higher in the warm months than in the cold months for both sample populations. The only significant difference between the Hanford and national samples was the estimated percent of skin area unclothed in “other yard work” in cold-weather months. The duration of three of these activities (gardening, other yard work, and team sports) in both cold and warm months are presented in Table 7; for the remaining activity (home repair/digging), respondents were only asked to report the activity frequency in days/season (Table 8).

Table 9 presents bathing and hand washing patterns for the respondents participating in these activities. The table presents comparisons between both of the samples in the interval from the end of each activity until both hand washing and bathing. For hand washing, the only significant difference between the Hanford and national samples was for home repair/digging (12% more in the national sample reported washing their hands right away). For bathing, the national sample reported significantly more within an hour of yard work and home repair/digging than the Hanford sample.

Table 10 compares selected demographic data obtained by this survey to 1990 U.S. census data for the Hanford and national survey populations.

In dermal pathway exposure assessment a default estimate of 25% skin exposed is often used by risk assessors. However, median warm weather estimates of skin exposure during each of the activities presented in Table 6 exceed 25% in each case. In addition, exposure assessors often must decide whether to use exposure values specific to the population being studied or other data drawn from a separate population. In this study, the Hanford and national samples differed in reported participation in yard work other than gardening, gardening, and home construction or repair with digging.

A limitation of this study is that it is based on recall data. However, the data are captured over the period of one year. In addition, data are provided for national estimates. Since dermal exposure to soil is assumed to continue until the soil is removed from the skin, data provided in Table 9 on bathing and hand washing patterns are very useful.

Table 1. Survey Response Rates

Interview Result	Hanford (%)	National (%)	Difference (%)	<i>p</i> -Value <sup>a</sup>
Completed	70.5	61.4	9.1	<0.001
Refused	19.2	28.9	-9.7	
Unavailable	6.8	7.9	-1.1	
Terminated	3.5	1.8	1.7	

a Comparison of Hanford and National responses by chi-square test of 2x4 contingency table.

Source: Garlock, et al., 1999.

Table 2. Assumed Body Surface Area Percentages

Clothing Response	Area Assumed Exposed	Percent <sup>a</sup> of Total Adult Body	
		M	F
Long pants		0	0
Short pants	lower ½ of thigh + upper ½ of lower leg	16	16
Long sleeves		0	0
Short sleeves	forearms	6	6
No shirt (males)	¾ trunk + arms	41	–
Halter (females)	½ trunk + arms	–	31
High socks		0	0
Low socks	¼ lower leg	3	3
No socks	bottom half of lower leg	6	6
Shoes		0	0
No shoes or sandals	feet	7	7
Gloves		0	0
No gloves	hands	5	5
Hat or no hat	1/3 head for face	3	3
Maximum exposure		78	68
Unexposed		22	22

a After Anderson et al. (1985).

Source: Garlock, et al., 1999.

Table 3. Demographic Comparison of Sample Populations

Category	Hanford	National	Difference	p-Value <sup>a</sup>
<b><i>Gender</i></b>				
Male	45	50	-5	0.19
Female	55	50	5	
<b><i>Age</i></b>				
18 to 24	7	13	-6	0.08
25 to 34	20	19	1	
35 to 44	26	23	3	
45 to 54	17	16	1	
55 to 64	14	14	0	
≥65	16	14	2	
<b><i>Percent who report their ethnicity as...</i></b>				
White	89	81	8	<0.001
Black	<1	10	-10	
Asian	<1	2	-2	
Native American	3	1	2	
Other	6	5	0	
<b><i>Percent who also describe themselves as Hispanic:</i></b>				
	8	8	0	>0.20
<b><i>Percent who report their residential area as...</i></b>				
Urban	13	22	-9	<0.001
Suburban	10	29	-19	
Small town	45	30	15	
Rural	31	17	14	
<b><i>Percent who report their type of residence as...</i></b>				
SFD <sup>b</sup>	82	76	6	0.002
Duplex/triplex	3	5	-2	
Apt/condo	8	14	-6	
Other	7	5	2	
<b><i>Percent who report their level of education as...</i></b>				
High school	39	41	-2	0.005
Trade school	3	5	-2	
Some college	35	25	10	
4-Year degree	13	18	-5	
Some graduate	1	2	-1	
Graduate degree	8	8	0	

a Comparison of Hanford and National responses by chi-square tests of contingency tables.

b Single-family dwelling.

Source: Garlock, et al., 1999.

Table 4. Reported Adult Participation Rates

Activity	Hanford Doers (%)	National Doers (%)	Difference (%)	<i>p</i> -Value <sup>a</sup>
Gardening	65	52	13	<0.001
Other yard work	77	57	20	<0.001
Repair/digging	30	18	12	<0.001
Team sports	18	19	-1	>0.20
Any activity	89	79	10	<0.01

a Comparison of Hanford and National responses by chi-square tests of contingency tables.

Source: Garlock, et al., 1999.

Table 5. Number of Selected Activities Reported

Number of Activities	Hanford Doers (%)	National Doers (%)	Difference (%)	<i>p</i> -Value <sup>a</sup>
1	26	42	-16	<0.001
2	41	37	4	
3	26	18	8	
4	7	4	3	

a Comparison of Hanford and National responses by chi-square test of 2x4 contingency tables.

Source: Garlock, et al., 1999.

Table 6. Estimated Skin Exposure Among Doers

Activity/Season	Skin Area Exposed (%)								<i>p</i> -Value <sup>a</sup>
	Hanford				National				
	<i>n</i>	5th Percentile	Median	95th Percentile	<i>n</i>	5th Percentile	Median	95th Percentile	
<b><i>Gardening</i></b>									
Cold months	36	3	3	14	31	3	8	33	>0.2
Warm months	273	9	33	68	211	3	33	69	>0.2
<b><i>Other yard work</i></b>									
Cold months	112	3	3	12	73	3	3	31	0.02
Warm months	329	8	31	68	245	8	33	68	>0.2
<b><i>Team sports</i></b>									
Cold months	20	3	8	30	26	3	8	33	>0.2
Warm months	77	14	33	68	71	14	33	43	>0.2
<b><i>Repair/Digging</i></b>									
Cold months	33	3	3	14	15	3	3	14	>0.2
Warm months	112	6	28	67	65	9	28	67	>0.2

a Comparison of Hanford and National sample responses by Wilcoxon rank sum test.

Source: Garlock, et al., 1999.



Table 7. Reported Activity Duration Among Doers of Three Activities

Activity/Season	Activity Duration (hrs/month)								p-Value <sup>a</sup>
	Hanford				National				
	<i>n</i>	5th Percentile	Median	95th Percentile	<i>n</i>	5th Percentile	Median	95th Percentile	
<b><i>Gardening</i></b>									
Cold months	33	1	4	17	33	1	9	74	0.009
Warm months	274	2	17	87	207	2	13	65	>0.2
<b><i>Other yard work</i></b>									
Cold months	108	1	4	22	76	2	9	65	0.0001
Warm months	333	3	13	65	246	3	13	65	>0.2
<b><i>Team sports</i></b>									
Cold months	19	4	17	45	28	1	13	78	0.17
Warm months	79	4	17	89	73	3	17	79	>0.2
<b><i>Totals<sup>b</sup></i></b>									
Cold months	129	1	6	31	106	2	9	130	0.001
Warm months	378	4	27	126	337	4	22	108	0.013

a Comparison of Hanford and National sample responses by Wilcoxon rank sum test.

b Totals for doers of any of gardening, other yard work, and outdoor team sports only (does not include home repair with digging).

Source: Garlock, et al., 1999.

Table 8. Reported Activity Frequency Among Home Repair/Digging Doers

Season	Activity Frequency (event days/season)								<i>p</i> -Value <sup>a</sup>
	Hanford				National				
	<i>n</i>	5th Percentile	Median	95th Percentile	<i>n</i>	5th Percentile	Median	95th Percentile	
Cold months	33	1	4	24	14	1	3	35	>0.2
Warm months	109	1	6	31	60	1	4	28	>0.2

a Comparison of Hanford and National sample responses by Wilcoxon rank sum test.

Source: Garlock, et al., 1999.

Table 9. Reported Bathing and Hand Washing Patterns

	Hanford	National	Difference	p-Value <sup>a</sup>
<b><i>All Activities - Percent Who Report Washing Hands Right Away</i></b>				
Gardening	95	99	-4	0.11
Yard work	94	97	-3	0.18
Team sports	72	79	-7	>0.20
Repair/digging	85	97	-12	0.01
<b><i>After Gardening - Percent Who Report Bathing...</i></b>				
Within 1 hour	34	41	-7	0.13
Later same day	56	53	3	
Next day	8	5	3	
<b><i>After Yard Work - Percent Who Report Bathing...</i></b>				
Within 1 hour	39	55	-16	<0.001
Later same day	53	42	11	
Next day	8	3	5	
<b><i>After Sports - Percent Who Report Bathing...</i></b>				
Within 1 hour	41	49	-8	>0.20
Later same day	54	43	11	
Next day	2	3	-1	
<b><i>After Home Repair/Digging - Percent Who Report Bathing...</i></b>				
Within 1 hour	35	53	-18	0.03
Later same day	54	46	012	
Next day	2	1	4	

a Comparison of Hanford and National responses by chi-square tests of contingency tables.

Source: Garlock, et al., 1999.







Table 1. Consumption of Homegrown Fruits and Vegetables

Response	n	% <sup>a</sup>	% National <sup>b</sup>
Tree fruit only	7	3.2	1.6
Root vegetables only	2	0.9	0.4
Other vegetables only	64	29.2	14.2
Tree fruit & root vegetables	1	0.5	0.2
Tree fruit & other vegetables	13	5.9	2.9
Root & other vegetables	41	18.7	9.1
Tree fruit, root & other vegetables	36	16.4	8.0
None of the above	55	25.1	12.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>48.7</b>

<sup>a</sup> Percent of gardeners (n = 219).

<sup>b</sup> Percent of total sample (n = 450).

Source: Wong et al., 2000.

Table 2. Home and Family Characteristics

Response	N	%
<b>Shoe Removal</b>		
Regular removal of shoes at entry	175	38.9
Street shoes regularly worn indoors	209	46.4
Both/varies	65	14.4
Don't know/refused	1	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Primary Floor Covering</b>		
Area rugs	26	5.8
Wall-to-wall carpeting	273	60.7
Bare wood	57	12.7
Equal rugs/carpet and bare wood	82	18.2
Other	8	1.8
Don't know/refused	4	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Wong et al., 2000.

Table 3. Children's Potential Access to Soil<sup>a</sup>

Response	n	%	% National <sup>b</sup>
<b>Bare Soil in Yard</b>			
Yes	80	44.7	17.8
No	97	54.2	21.6
Don't know/refused	2	1.1	0.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>39.8</b>
<b>Vacant Lots or Fields Within Walking Distance</b>			
Yes	114	63.7	25.3
No	63	35.2	14.0
Don't know/refused	2	1.1	0.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>39.8</b>

<sup>a</sup> Asked only of households with children under 18 (n = 179).

<sup>b</sup> Percent of all households (n = 450).

Source: Wong et al., 2000.



Table 4. Pets Which Spend Time Both Inside and Outside the Home

Response	n	% of Category	% National <sup>a</sup>
<b>Presence of Indoor/Outdoor Pets</b>			
At least one I/O dog	111	54.7	24.7
At least one I/O cat	35	17.2	7.8
I/O cat(s) and dog(s)	17	8.4	3.8
Pets, but always indoors	22	10.8	4.9
Pets, but always outdoors	18	8.9	4.0
No pets	246	–	54.7
Don't know/refused	1	–	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>100.0<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Number of Indoor/Outdoor Dogs</b>			
One	86	67.2	19.1
Two	29	22.7	6.4
Three	8	6.3	1.8
Four	2	1.6	0.4
Five	2	1.6	0.4
More than five	1	0.8	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>100.0<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>28.4</b>
<b>Number of Indoor/Outdoor Cats</b>			
One	36	69.2	8.0
Two	7	13.5	1.6
Three	5	9.6	1.1
Four	3	5.8	0.7
Five	1	1.9	0.2
More than five	0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>100.0<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>11.6</b>

<sup>a</sup> Percent of national sample (n = 450).

<sup>b</sup> Percent of households with pets (n = 203).

<sup>c</sup> Percent of households with indoor/outdoor dogs (n = 128).

<sup>d</sup> Percent of households with indoor/outdoor cats (n = 52).

Source: Wong et al., 2000.

















