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## Introduction

-Concerns of health risks from fish consumption are a priority of tribes
-There are risks as well as benefits for fish consumption

- Important to assess fish intake and exposure of PCBs and MeHg
- Meta-analyses helps to integrate various studies for tribal fish consumption


## Daily fish intake for NHANES and Tribal populations

|  | g/kg bw/day |  |  | g/day |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Group | Mean | 90th | 95th | Mean | 95th | 99th |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mexican American (0-19) | 0.18 | 0.00 | 1.05 | 6.0 | 36.7 | 146.5 |
| Mexican American (20+) | 0.24 | 0.73 | 1.74 | 17.9 | 128.0 | 297.8 |
| Non-Hispanic White (0-19) | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.86 | 5.1 | 31.8 | 127.6 |
| Non-Hispanic White (20+) | 0.21 | 0.73 | 1.45 | 16.7 | 113.4 | 260.5 |
| Non-Hispnaic Black (0-19) | 0.22 | 0.41 | 1.55 | 8.3 | 55.8 | 168.7 |
| Non-Hispnaic Black (20+) | 0.26 | 0.91 | 1.59 | 21.7 | 133.0 | 291.6 |
| Other Hispanic (0-19) | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 5.8 | 40.0 | 150.7 |
| Other Hispanic (20+) | 0.24 | 0.81 | 1.56 | 16.9 | 110.6 | 262.8 |
| APNM (0-19) | 0.33 | 0.96 | 2.20 | 10.3 | 62.8 | 184.1 |
| APNM (20+) | 0.46 | 1.69 | 2.53 | 30.7 | 167.8 | 327.9 |
| Toy, K.A 1996 | 0.89 | 2.31 | 2.94 |  |  |  |
| Suquamish 2000 | 2.71 | 6.19 | 10.09 |  |  |  |
| Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission. (1994) |  |  | 58.7 | 170.0 | 389.0 |  |

## Table 2

Meta analysis for fish consumption of different age groups (g/day)

| Age group | Population | Sample Size Lower Limit Upper Limit |  |  | Mean | Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adult | U.S. General population | 70310 | 14.4 | 18.2 | 16.3 |  |
|  | Tribal population | 1972 | 50.9 | 62.4 | 56.6 | 3.47 |
| Children | U.S. General population | 33315 | 2.9 | 4.3 | 3.6 |  |
|  | Tribal population | 211 | 7.0 | 31.9 | 19.5 | 5.42 |
| 0 to 10 | U.S. General population | 43029 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 4.2 |  |
|  | Tribal population | 211 | 6.9 | 31.9 | 19.5 | 4.64 |
| 0 to 20 | U.S. General population | 66337 | 3.8 | 6.2 | 5.0 |  |
|  | Tribal population | 228 | 17.9 | 46.2 | 32.1 | 6.42 |
| 20 to 30 | U.S. General population | 11109 | 9.9 | 16.7 | 13.3 |  |
|  | Tribal population | 310 | 43.9 | 69.2 | 56.6 | 4.26 |
| 30 to 40 | U.S. General population | 11552 | 15.2 | 19.1 | 17.2 |  |
|  | Tribal population | 23 | 43.9 | 69.2 | 56.6 | 3.29 |
| 40 to 50 | U.S. General population | 11238 | 12.2 | 22.8 | 17.5 |  |
|  | Tribal population | 495 | 46.6 | 63.5 | 55.0 | 3.14 |
| 50 plus | U.S. General population | 31007 | 16.1 | 19.0 | 17.5 |  |
|  | Tribal population | 264 | 47.5 | 70.7 | 59.1 | 3.38 |

## Daily fish consumption rate of U.S. general and tribal adult (18+ years old) populations

| Study | Mean |
| :--- | ---: |
| US gen. pop. |  |
| nhanes_adult | 17.2 |
| csfii_adult | 15.3 |
| Overall | $\mathbf{1 6 . 3}$ |
|  |  |
| Tirbal pop. |  |
| umatilla_adults | 58.7 |
| umatilla_18_34 | 57.6 |
| umatilla_40_59 | 55.8 |
| umatilla_60plus | 74.4 |
| Dellinger_LH_adults | 62.1 |
| Dellinger_LS_adults | 60.1 |
| Dellinger_IN_adults | 46.2 |
| Dellinger_MN_adults | 38.9 |
| Dellinger_OR_adults | 87.1 |
| Inlet_st_adults | 53.3 |
| Inlet_st_40_59 | 43.8 |
| Inlet_st_60plus | 64.3 |
| Inlet_pg_adults | 116.4 |
| inlet_pg_18_39 | 70.5 |
| Inlet_pg_40_59 | 281.1 |
| Inlet_pg_60plus | 50.4 |
| Inlet_nt_adults | 136.1 |
| inlet_nt_18_39 | 164.7 |
| Inlet_nt_40_59 | 101.8 |
| Inlet_nt_60plus | 113.4 |
| Inlet_tt_adults | 62.9 |
| inlet_tt_18_39 | 47.6 |
| Inlet_tt_40_59 | 77.1 |
| Overall | 56.6 |



# Daily fish consumption rate of U.S. general and American Indian children (0-6 years old) populations 

| Study | Mean |
| :--- | ---: |
| US gen. pop. |  |
| nhanes_child | 3.3 |
| csfii_child | 3.9 |
| Overall | 3.6 |
|  |  |
| Tirbal pop. |  |
| Inlet_pg_0_5 | 49.4 |
| Inlet_nt_0_5 | 43.9 |
| Inlet_tt_0_5 | 7.1 |
| Colimbia_river_0-5 | 19.6 |
| Overall | $\mathbf{1 9 . 5}$ |



## Blood MeHg level of U.S. general and tribal populations



## Hair MeHg level of U.S. general and tribal populations

| Study | Mean |
| :--- | ---: |
| US gen. pop. |  |
| Schaefer_18_40 | 1.2 |
| Schaefer_41_60 | 1.9 |
| Schaefer_60plus | 1.7 |
| Knobeloch_18_39 | 0.5 |
| Knobeloch_40_54 | 0.8 |
| Knobeloch_55plus | 0.9 |
| Knobeloch_asian | 0.3 |
| Knobeloch_white | 1 |
| Knobeloch_hispanic | 0.6 |
| Egeland_sample6 | 3.7 |
| Egeland_sample20 | 0.2 |
| Egeland_sample18 | 0.4 |
| Overall | 0.9 |
|  |  |
| Tirbal pop. | 3 |
| Edward | 0.7 |
| Hightower | 5 |
| Egeland_PI1 | 6 |
| Egeland_PI2 | 1.6 |
| Egeland_juneau | 1.3 |
| Egeland_ykriver | 4.6 |
| Egeland_ykcostal | 3.7 |
| Egeland_ykinterior | 4.3 |
| Egeland_urban | 1.5 |
| Egeland_napakiak | 1.1 |
| Egeland_ancho | 13.5 |
| Dellinger_2003 | 2.7 |
| Overall |  |



Total PCBs exposures by percentiles for U.S. (NHANES) and Tribal populations


Dietary exposure and Blood level of total MeHg in various groups


Biomarker: total blood hg (ug/l)
Exposure: MeHg exposure from fishes 10 x ug/kg bw/day

Dietary exposure and Blood level of total PCBs in various groups
 <br> \title{
Correlations between dietary intakes and blood biomarkers
} <br> \title{
Correlations between dietary intakes and blood biomarkers
}


Averaged Total PCBs exposure from fishes X100 uglkg|day


Total PCBs absorption estimated by SHEDS from 5 schools in NYC


Figure 4

*High-concentrated MeHg fishes such as bowfin and walleye are removed

Averaged exposure of PCBs by fish (ug/kg bw/day) for Tribal population


Simulation with averaged fish intake and distribution of various fish PCB concentration

## Conclusions

- Fish consumption rate of tribal populations about 3-5 times of US general population
- Exposure of PCBs and MeHg of tribal populations is 3 times of US general population
- Biomarkers of MeHgs in tribal pop'n is about 3 times of US general pop'n
- Fish intake could be main pathway of MeHg exposure
- Avoiding eating carp and cat fish could reduce PCBs dietary exposure, shark and sword fish and other fishes can reduce the exposure of MeHg


## Future analyses

-Detailed fish consumption data focus on fish species

- Cost-benefit analyses on fish consumption
- Holistic assessment of cumulative risks for tribal population

