

The Effects of JP8 Jet Fuel on Immune Cell Counts of Tank Entry Workers

By

A. Gayle Rhodes, M.D., M.S.
Occupational Medicine Resident
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH

Grace Kawas LeMasters, Ph.D.
Professor and Director
Division of Biostatistics and Epidemiology
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH

James E. Lockey, M.D., M.S.
Professor and Director
Division of Occupational and Environmental Medicine
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH

James W. Smith, Ph.D.
Clinical Researcher
Clinical Investigation Laboratory
Travis AFB, CA

James H. Yiin, M.P.H.
Doctoral Candidate
Division of Biostatistics and Epidemiology
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH

Roger Gibson, DVM, Ph.D., MPH
Chief Epidemiology Consultant
AFIERA/RSRH
Brooks AFB, TX.

Stephen Rappaport, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina

Acknowledgements:

This study was funded in part from a grant (T42/CC51042-07) sponsored by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Education and Research Center, Pilot Research Program, at the University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, and NIEHS grant (5P30ES06096-10).

Abstract

Jet fuel is a common occupational exposure among commercial and military maintenance workers. JP8 jet fuel, a military formulation, has been found to have immunotoxic effects in mice but little data exists for humans. The aim of this cross-sectional study was to determine if immune cell counts in the peripheral blood were altered among tank entry workers at three Air Force bases. After adjusting for covariates, tank entry workers (n=45) were found to have higher numbers of white blood cells ($p=0.01$), neutrophils ($p=0.05$), and monocytes ($p=0.02$) when compared to a low exposure group (n=78) and no differences were noted in the numbers of total lymphocytes, T-cells, T-helper cells, T-suppressor cells, Natural Killer cells, and B-cells. Further investigations are under way to evaluate the functional ability of these cells to produce lymphokines and cytokines and modulate the immune system.

Introduction

The worldwide consumption of jet fuel approaches 60 billion gallons annually.¹ According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1.3 million workers were exposed to jet fuels in 1992.² The U.S. Department of Defense uses Jet Propellant fuel type eight (JP8), one formulation of jet fuel, at a rate of 3.5 billion gallons yearly, of which the Air Force is the largest consumer. JP8 is the battlefield fuel for all U.S. military operations and is expected to be in use well beyond the year 2025.³

JP8 is a kerosene-based fuel similar to commercial aviation fuel Jet A and Jet A-1, but has military additives which include antioxidants, static inhibitors, corrosion inhibitors, fuel system icing inhibitors, and thermal stability improvers.⁴ In 1996, JP8 replaced JP-4, which was a more volatile and explosive, gasoline based fuel. JP8 contains benzene, a proven carcinogen, but contains less per volume than JP-4 (0.01% versus 0.5%).^{5,6}

In the Air Force, persons having the highest exposure to JP8 are tank entry personnel.⁵ These persons enter aircraft on-board fuel tanks to perform inspections and maintenance activities. They are exposed to residual fuel in the tanks and to fuel released from reticulated polyurethane foam. The foam is fitted in fuel tanks of various aircraft and serves to reduce the risk of explosion from electrical arcing, lightening strikes, and static electricity. Fuel tanks with foam are less likely to explode if struck by ballistics or involved in a crash as the foam prevents fuel sloshing and spraying in the event of tank rupture. Tank entry personnel work in groups of three. The entrant works within the confined space of the tank and wears a respirator. Two attendants work near the tank entry port fetching tools and handling the fuel impregnated foam, which is usually stacked on the aircraft wing while maintenance is occurring within the tank. The two exterior attendants do not wear respirators and therefore may have inhalation exposure to jet fuel while working near the tank opening or handling foam. All three wear cotton clothing rather than impermeable garments, which may generate static electricity. Fuel left within tanks or released from foam during handling, may be readily absorbed and deposited onto the skin creating a dermal exposure.

While the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has not developed a permissible exposure limit (PEL) for jet fuel, the Air Force has occupational exposure limits of 350 mg/m³, Time Weighted Average (TWA) over 8 hours and 1,800 mg/m³ for short term exposures over 15 minutes. Tank entry personnel handling foam have been found to have exposures as high as 1,304 mg/m³ for an 8-hour TWA and 10,295 mg/m³ for a 15 min short-term exposure.⁵

After the introduction of JP8, fuel handlers complained of objectionable odors, skin irritation, dizziness and the persistent taste of jet fuel long after exposure.⁷ Health outcome studies in humans of the effect of JP8 are limited, but some effects have been reported. Genotoxic changes as evidenced by sister chromatid exchanges were noted in aircraft maintenance workers. However, no male reproductive effects have been noted on male semen parameters.⁸ Neurological disorders and hearing loss were also noted in aircraft maintenance workers occupationally exposed to jet fuel.⁹ Other reports on Swedish workers exposed to jet fuel cite differences in psychiatric symptoms, attention, and sensorimotor effects when compared

to nonexposed workers.^{10,11,12} Postural balance deficiencies were noted in workers exposed to chronic low-levels of jet fuel over an average of 4.6 years.¹³

A reference report, published in 1998, by the Center for Disease Control's Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, indicated the toxicities of jet fuel are not well defined.¹⁴ The immune system was identified as one area where human health effects needed further study and was the purpose of this research project.

Background

The immune system is responsible for regulatory responses to infection, cancer, autoimmune disease, and allergens. The spleen, thymus, lymph nodes, bone marrow, blood and other organs have cells involved in the immune response. In the peripheral blood, immune cells are represented by white blood cells that consist of lymphocytes, neutrophils, basophils, eosinophils, and monocytes.

Lymphocytes have several subpopulations that can be delineated by cluster designation (CD). T-cells (CD3) and B-cells (CD19) orchestrate the entire immune response.¹⁵ T-cells consist of T-helper cells (CD4) and T-suppressor cells (CD8) that modulate cell-mediated immunity both directly and by the secretion of lymphokines and cytokines. Natural Killer (NK) cells (CD56) target cancer cells.

Most immune system toxicology studies concerning the health effects of jet fuel have been undertaken in mice. Exposure to inhaled benzene (a component of jet fuel) at levels of 50 ppm to 200 ppm over 7 days and 14 days produced a decreased ratio and absolute number of T-cells and B-cells in the blood and spleen.¹⁶ The effect was dose dependent and resulted in a suppressed ability to form antibodies. Subpopulations of T-cells were not addressed in the above benzene study and jet fuel as a complex mixture was not evaluated. However, the level of benzene exposure in the above study would be comparable to the levels (104 ppm to 142 ppm) found in Air Force workers exposed to JP8.⁶

Short-term exposure of mice to JP8, by inhalation one hour daily for seven days at levels comparable to tank entry worker exposure, produced a dose response decrease in weights of the spleen and thymus, and a reduction in T-cell subpopulations in the lymph nodes.² A decrease in circulating immune cells at low (100-250 mg/m³) concentrations was noted whereas at medium (500-1,000 mg/m³) concentrations the number of cells increased. High (2,500 mg/m³) concentrations appeared to be toxic to peripheral blood immune cells. Total T-cells were noted to decrease significantly at doses as low as 250 mg/m³ in the peripheral blood but absolute number and ratio of T-helper and T-suppressor cells were not evaluated. Macrophage percentages were also noted to decrease by two-thirds at low and high concentrations compared to unexposed mice. The long-term effects of the same short-term exposure noted above were studied in mice until 28 days post-exposure.¹⁷ The weights of the spleen and thymus initially decreased, returned to normal, and finally increased. At the high exposure of 2,500 mg/m³, immune cell numbers in the peripheral blood were substantially decreased at 1, 7 and 21 days, but were not noted to be statistically different from unexposed controls at 14 and 28 days. Again the subpopulations of immune cells were not delineated.

In experiments with mice exposed to JP8 by dermal absorption, impairment in the induction of contact sensitivity and the generation of delayed-type hypersensitivity were found when the mice were challenged several days later by antigens.¹⁸ Splenic T-cells were noted to have significantly decreased proliferation rates compared to positive controls when stimulated, indicating a reduction in the functional capacity of the immune system. The number of circulating immune cells in the peripheral blood was not determined.

In humans, few immunotoxicity studies have been reported on exposure to jet fuel. One of note was a pilot study of exposed and unexposed workers, during the conversion of JP-4 to JP8.⁶ In this study by Olsen, et al, differences in the hematopoietic system were noted but no significant findings were found in the immune system. Mean corpuscular hemoglobin and mean corpuscular volume were significantly lower in the exposed group while immune cells (total white blood cell counts and differential counts) were not significantly different. The sample size was small however, (18 exposed and 18 unexposed) and the lymphocyte subpopulations were not studied.

Methods

This investigation was a cross-sectional study designed to evaluate the effects of military jet fuel on the human immune system. The aim of this study was to determine if changes in the number of white blood cells or constituent components could be detected in the peripheral blood that may indicate abnormalities within the immune system. Particular attention was devoted to lymphocyte subpopulations (T-cells, T-helper cells, T-suppressor cells, NK cells, B-cells), as these were the focus of several animal studies. This study was part of a larger U.S. Air Force research project (The Acute Effects of JP8 Jet Fuel).⁷

Population

Three Air Force bases in the Southeastern United States with significant numbers of personnel performing tank entry work were identified. Volunteers were solicited among tank entry personnel and other low and unexposed base personnel. A recruitment briefing was conducted at each aircraft fuel-systems-repair shop and a letter was sent to all potentially

exposed workers describing the study and asking for participation. Volunteers were also solicited at Commanders Calls, informational press releases and advertisements at local base newspapers. Each participant was provided an incentive of fifty dollars. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained from the Air Force and University of Cincinnati and informed consents were signed.

To be included in the study, subjects had to be active duty military personnel with a minimum of nine months on their current base. Tank entry personnel had to have one or more hours of tank entry twice a week for at least nine months (validated against shop records). Personnel in the low exposure group had to have minimal exposure to fuel or solvents in the course of their routine work.

Excluded were those using alcohol within 12 hours prior to entering the study, suffering an injury requiring medical attention within the last six months, having a history of cancer, cerebral vascular accident, diabetes, or seizures on medical profile, pregnant, or using hypertension medication, steroids, antacids or other heartburn medication, diet pills or other stimulants, tranquilizers or muscle relaxants, antidepressants, psychotherapeutic medication or large doses of megavitamins containing antioxidants.

Of the 189 volunteers, 4 did not meet inclusion criteria and 24 were no-shows on the day of sample collection and testing leaving 161 to participate. Sixty of the volunteers were tank entry workers and 50 participated (4 noneligible and 6 no-shows). After venipuncture consents were obtained, blood samples were collected on 151 personnel for Complete Blood Count (CBC) and included in these were 141 who also had blood samples drawn for flow cytometry testing (10 were excluded due to shipping constraints).

Questionnaire

Each participant completed a questionnaire to determine current and past medical history, age, race, gender, months in present job title, body mass index (BMI), tobacco use, alcohol use, and mental exertion. BMI (weight divided by height²) was calculated from responses to height and weight inquiries. Tobacco use during the preceding six months was dichotomized into smokers and nonsmokers. Alcohol use was determined by multiplying the average number of reported drinks per day times the average number of days per week alcohol was reportedly consumed. Alcohol use was then categorized as none, light (<10 drinks/week), moderate (10-30 drinks/week) and heavy (>30 drinks/week). Respondents were asked to rate the level of mental exertion on the job on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 9 (highest). Responses were grouped into thirds to facilitate analysis and categorized as mild, moderate, and heavy mental exertion.

Exposure Groups

One of the primary investigators for the larger Air Force study, an epidemiologist, convened a group of co-investigators, which by consensus categorized exposure levels by job title. Tank entry personnel were categorized as the high exposure group. Personnel in non-fuels related job titles (e.g. mechanics and information managers) were categorized as the low exposure group. A moderate exposure group was also identified which consisted primarily of fuel distribution workers. This group could not be statistically separated from the high or low exposure groups so individual investigators were given the option of including this group in a

three way analysis or excluding it altogether. This study on immune system effects does not include the moderate exposure group (n=28).

Another investigator for the larger Air Force study collected passive and breath levels of naphthalene, a surrogate for JP8, on all participants. Passive levels were obtained by a breathing zone air-sampling device using an aluminum cartridge containing Tenax to capture volatile organic compounds on participants performing four hours of job-specific tasks. A sampling kit containing a 75 milliliter glass bulb with caps attached to each end was used to collect pre-task and post-task breath samples. Approximately 30 minutes preceding and 30 minutes following a four-hour task, workers removed the caps and forcibly exhaled into the bulb and replaced the caps. Assays on the collected samples were performed by gas chromatography. The purpose was to determine an internal dose that would account for inhalation, dermal absorption and ingestion. The results of these assays were used to validate the categorization of exposure groups by job title.

Lymphocyte Analysis

To control for diurnal variation, blood samples were collected in ten milliliter heparinized tubes during the post exposure phase of data collection, all within a two-hour window in the early afternoon. T-helper cells have been known to vary by 50% or more depending on the time of day of collection.¹⁹ The specimens were packaged and sent overnight express under room temperature to the Travis Air Force Base Clinical Investigation Laboratory in California. Specimens were analyzed on arrival with the length of time from collection to analysis averaging 24 hours (range 22 – 26).

Specimens were analyzed by flow cytometry. Becton Dickinson Immunocytometry Systems TRUCOUNT™ tubes containing a known quantity of beads were used to determine absolute counts of leukocytes. Fifty microliters of heparinized whole blood were added to two tubes, one containing 20 microliters of antibodies to CD3/CD8/CD45/CD4 and the other 20 microliters of CD3/CD16+CD56/CD45/CD19 antibodies. The tubes were capped, gently vortexed for 5 seconds and incubated for 15 minutes in the dark at room temperature. The tubes were uncapped and 450 microliters of FACS Lysing Solution was added to lyse red blood cells. The tubes were recapped, vortexed for 5 seconds and incubated for 15 minutes in the dark. Samples were then run on a Becton Dickinson Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorter (FACSCalibur™ flow cytometer) using the MultiSET system and the Lyse/No-Wash technique. The flow cytometer was equipped to detect three-color fluorescence, forward scatter, and side scatter to determine the absolute count of lymphocytes and subpopulations (T-cells, T-helper cells, T-suppressor cells, Natural Killer cells, and B cells). The percent of these cells to total lymphocytes was calculated and the absolute number and percent of T-helper cells and T-suppressor cells comprising the T-cells population was also determined.

White Blood Cell Count and Differential Analysis

Three milliliters of blood was collected in a separate tube for a CBC. The CBC was processed by Coulter counter at each base's local clinical laboratory on the day of collection. The white blood cell count and machine generated differential were determined.

Statistical Analysis

The Fisher's Exact test was used to test statistical associations between exposure groups and categorical covariates. The mean, standard deviation, and range were determined for all outcome variables and continuous covariates. To determine significant differences in the means of the high and low exposure groups a normality test was performed on all outcome variables and those with a normal distribution were evaluated with a student t test and those that were non-normal or represented as percentages by a Wilcoxon rank sum test. Pearson Correlation analyses and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were applied to identify confounders that were significantly associated with both outcome variables and exposure levels. An Analysis of Covariance (ANOCOVA) using a general linear model procedure with backward elimination was employed to test the differences in outcome variables between exposure levels, while adjusting for other significant covariates. The SAS system was used for all analyses.

Results

Demographics and Life Style Characteristics

Table 1 lists the demographic characteristics by exposure group. There were 1.7 low exposure subjects for each high exposure enrollee. Differences between exposure groups were noted for tobacco use, race, age, gender and BMI. A disproportionate number of smokers were noted in the high exposure group. African Americans and Hispanics were more common in the low exposure group. Only two females were represented in the high exposure group compared to 13 in the low exposure group, a function of few females being employed as tank entry workers. The high exposure group was significantly younger than the low exposure group, although everyone in the study was less than 45 years old. BMI was higher in the low exposure group probably reflecting the older age of the participants. Alcohol consumption, mental exertion and months performing within the current job title did not differ among exposure groups. Therefore, on the variables that the two groups differ, an adjustment was performed in analysis.

Exposure Levels

Both passive Industrial Hygiene (IH) measures and post-task breath analysis of naphthalene differed significantly between exposure groups, which validated the characterization of exposure levels by job title (Table 2). The high exposure group was exposed to mean levels of 583.23 micrograms/m³ and the low exposure group to 2.47 micrograms/m³. The post breath levels of 3.80 micrograms/m³ in the high exposure group were considerably less than the environmental level. The pre-task baseline breath analysis shows no significant difference between exposure groups indicating that high and low exposure personnel had a similar baseline exposure prior to performing their job on the day of testing. Each exposure group had mean levels around 0.75 micrograms/m³.

Lymphocytes and Subpopulations

Flow cytometry results from 22 blood samples had to be discarded due to quality control issues (Lyse Wash protocol was used instead of Lyse No-Wash) leaving a total of 93 samples for statistical analysis. Table 3 lists results for the lymphocyte analysis. No significant differences were noted between high and low exposure groups.

White Blood Cells and Differential Counts

All 123 samples were adequate for evaluation. White blood cells and differential results are noted in Table 4. Significant elevations of white blood cell counts ($p=0.004$), neutrophil counts ($p=0.003$), and monocyte counts ($p=0.02$) were noted in the high exposure group versus the low exposure group. After controlling for confounders (smoking and race) and other significant covariates (age, gender, and BMI), significant levels for these same outcome variables persisted; white blood cells ($p=0.01$), neutrophils ($p=0.05$) and monocytes ($p=0.02$).

Discussion

Though the primary Air Force study was related to the acute effects of jet fuel, this study was aimed at the potential health effects of chronic exposure. Tank entry workers in the study were exposed to jet fuel twice a week for at least nine months prior to being studied.

Unlike previous animal studies, no effect on the peripheral blood T-cells was seen on flow cytometry analysis. It is difficult to compare jet fuel levels with naphthalene levels and correlate the inhalation exposures in this study but tank entry personnel and the experimental mice may have had comparable inhalation exposures to JP8. It took inhalation exposures of $250\text{mg}/\text{m}^3$ (one hour for seven days) to decrease T-cell percentages in the animal's peripheral blood.² Attendant workers in other studies have been reported to have 15 min STELs of $250\text{mg}/\text{m}^3$ and 8 hour TWAs of $200\text{mg}/\text{m}^3$.⁵ The entrant worker wearing a respirator would not be expected to have significant inhalation exposure.²⁰

Dermal exposure however, appeared by observation to be substantial as the cotton clothes worn by tank entry workers and attendants were commonly drenched with JP8. Elevated post breath levels in this study suggest dermal absorption. It has been estimated that 100 milliliters absorbed and deposited on the skin of a 200 pound person is equivalent to the exposure level that produced immunotoxic effects in mice.¹⁸ Tank entry workers almost certainly experienced this level of exposure but no change in lymphocyte numbers were noted.

The complete blood count analysis done by Coulter counter showed increased white blood cell numbers, neutrophil counts and monocyte counts. The increase in white blood cells is a function of the increased neutrophils and monocytes. Neutrophils and monocytes are "professional" phagocytic cells.²¹ Neutrophils have a half life of about 6-20 hours in the peripheral blood and have the main task of ingesting bacteria although they are capable of binding and ingesting any appropriately opsonized material.²² The neutrophil is a critical effector cell in humoral and innate immunity and plays vital roles in phagocytosis and bacterial killing.²³ Monocytes in the circulating blood are transformed into macrophages in tissues, such as lung, liver, spleen, lymph nodes and skin. In the lung they are known as alveolar macrophages and in the skin as histiocytes and Langerhans cells. Macrophages can ingest solutes by pinocytosis and larger particles or microbes by phagocytosis.²¹ Macrophages and lymphocytes are the most significant cells of the immune system because of their release of lymphokines and cytokines that have wide ranging effects on host defense.

The reason for the elevations of neutrophils and monocytes is not clear. Smoking has been known to be associated with increased white blood cell counts.²⁴ In this study, elevated WBC counts persisted after adjusting for smoking. It cannot be explained by illness as exclusion

criteria eliminated anyone with a significant medical condition or anyone ill on the day of testing. There have been reports of microbial (bacterial and fungal) colonization of jet fuel.²⁵ An inhalation exposure to bacteria, endotoxin, fungus or mycotoxin could possibly elevate the neutrophil and monocyte counts. The jet fuel would have to be aerosolized in order for that to happen, however. Exposure to vapors would not be sufficient. In observing tank entry workers involved in job specific tasks, there were no grinding or blowing operations that would produce an aerosol. With intact skin, microbes should not enter the body to produce a systemic reaction that would elevate the white cell count.

It may be that jet fuel vapors create a systemic immune response unrelated to biological agents. An elevated white blood cell count has been observed in inhalation fever, a condition that can occur as the result of inhaling microorganisms but also by inhaling metal fumes, organic grain dust or pyrolysis products of fluoropolymers. The mechanism seems to be related to biochemical messengers mediating a systemic reaction.²⁶ In dermal exposure, fuel that is absorbed through the skin would almost certainly be ingested by Langerhans cells. These cells would proliferate and other macrophages would be recruited, and if the fuel load were great, the overall response would be increased numbers of monocytes entering the blood from the bone marrow. It is uncertain what the role of the neutrophil would be in a non-microbial foreign substance exposure.

It must be made clear that the increase in white blood cells, neutrophils and monocytes in the high exposure group was only in comparison to the low exposure group. The levels noted were almost always within the normal limits noted in Table 5. In reality, only four of the 123 enrolled subjects had elevated counts of one or more of these three lab tests. All four were in the high exposure group and were scattered among all three bases visited. These abnormalities were noted in individuals who, on the day of the study, denied present illness, significant medical history or medication use. One person had elevations of all three parameters that were also the highest levels seen in each category (WBC 10,200, neutrophils 7,800, and monocytes 1,100). These were not thought to be extreme enough to eliminate the subject from the study.

Limitations

Subjects were not randomly selected. Selection bias could have occurred with the use of volunteers. However it must be noted that almost all tank entry workers available for testing, volunteered, and were accepted into the study.

In cross-sectional studies, such as this one, associations can be drawn but causation cannot be determined. There was, however, significant control of covariates in the attempt to neutralize confounders.

Some of the subjects had to be eliminated from the lymphocyte analysis due to laboratory errors. This should have made little difference, as the percentage decrease in subjects was proportional among high and low exposure groups.

Immune cell counts can give an indication of the intactness of the immune system but does not measure the ability of these cells to function. Future studies should be directed at

mitogen stimulation and proliferation assays that measure function and the ability to produce cytokines that regulate the immune system.

Table 1. Demographic and Life Style Characteristics by Exposure Group

| n=123 | High Exposure | Low Exposure | p value |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| | n (%) | n (%) | |
| Subjects | 45 (36) | 78 (64) | |
| Tobacco | | | 0.02 |
| Smoker | 21 (50) | 21 (27) | |
| Nonsmoker | 21 (50) | 57 (73) | |
| Alcohol | | | 0.41 |
| None | 18 (43) | 23 (29) | |
| Light | 5 (12) | 13 (17) | |
| Moderate | 18 (43) | 41 (53) | |
| Heavy | 1 (2) | 1 (1) | |
| Race (includes Hispanic) | | | 0.02 |
| Caucasian | 39 (87) | 51 (65) | |
| African American | 2 (4) | 17 (22) | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 1 (2) | 1 (1) | |
| Other | 3 (7) | 9 (12) | |
| Hispanic* | | | 1.0 |
| Hispanic | 4 (33) | 8 (67) | |
| Gender | | | 0.05 |
| Male | 43 (96) | 65 (83) | |
| Female | 2 (4) | 13 (17) | |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Mental Exertion | | | 0.61 |
| Mild | 16 (37) | 34 (44) | |
| Moderate | 21 (49) | 36 (47) | |
| Heavy | 6 (14) | 7 (9) | |
| Age | Years | Years | |
| Mean | 23.87 | 27.14 | 0.002 |
| Std dev | 4.30 | 6.17 | |
| Range | 18-37 | 19-44 | |
| Months on job | Months | Months | |
| Mean | 47.20 | 50.04 | 0.75 |
| Std dev | 44.11 | 49.20 | |
| Range | 7-172 | 1-223 | |
| Body Mass Index (BMI) | BMI | BMI | |
| Mean | 24.61 | 25.79 | 0.04 |
| Std dev | 3.24 | 2.87 | |
| Range | 18-31 | 19-33 | |

*Hispanic represents responses to 'also Hispanic' among respondents to questions regarding race.

P values for tobacco, alcohol, race, gender, Hispanic, and mental exertion calculated using Fisher's Exact test. P values for age, month on job, and BMI calculated with student t test.

Significant ($p \leq 0.05$) levels are highlighted in bold.

Table 2. Breathing Zone and Breath Test Naphthalene Levels by Exposure Group

| n=123 | High Exposure | Low Exposure | p value |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Subjects | (n=45) | (n=78) | |
| Industrial Hygiene | | | |
| Mean | 583.23 | 2.47 | <0.0001 |
| Std dev | 268.89 | 1.73 | |
| Range | 123-1000 | 0.67-8.8 | |
| Pre-Breath | | | |
| Mean | 0.75 | 0.71 | 0.76 |
| Std dev | 0.91 | 0.49 | |
| Range | 0.33-6.1 | 0.33-2.8 | |
| Post-Breath | | | |
| Mean | 3.80 | 0.80 | <0.0001 |
| Std dev | 2.17 | 0.80 | |
| Range | 0.9-11 | 0.33-6.9 | |

Units – micrograms/cubic meter

Industrial Hygiene - breathing zone passive measures of naphthalene.

Pre-Breath – breath test measures of naphthalene pre-job exposure.

Post -Breath – breath test measures of naphthalene post-job exposure.

P values calculated using student t test.

Significant (p<0.05) levels are highlighted in bold.

Table 3. Lymphocyte Subpopulation Counts and Percentages by Exposure Group

| n=93 | High Exposure | | Low Exposure | | p value | |
|--------------------------|---------------|----------|--------------|----------|---------|----------|
| | n=36 | | n=57 | | | |
| | Counts | Percents | Counts | Percents | Counts | Percents |
| Total lymphocytes | | | | | | |
| Mean | 2,041 | | 2,065 | | 0.85 | |
| Std dev | 524 | | 624 | | | |
| Range | 1,019-3,245 | | 962-3,658 | | | |
| T-cells | | | | | | |
| Mean | 1,520 | 74.19 | 1,509 | 72.88 | 0.91 | 0.28 |
| Std dev | 423 | 5.75 | 490 | 5.89 | | |
| Range | 632-2,574 | 61-84 | 655-2,866 | 50-84 | | |
| T-sup cells | | | | | | |
| Mean | 550 | 27.22 | 545 | 26.09 | 0.92 | 0.19 |
| Std dev | 178 | 5.95 | 260 | 6.69 | | |
| Range | 179-1,050 | 15-39 | 196-1,633 | 15-46 | | |
| T-help cells | | | | | | |
| Mean | 924 | 45.30 | 914 | 44.72 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Std dev | 283 | 6.58 | 284 | 5.65 | | |
| Range | 409-1,439 | 31-60 | 443-1,556 | 28-54 | | |
| NK cells | | | | | | |
| Mean | 182 | 9.08 | 191 | 9.33 | 0.68 | 0.44 |
| Std dev | 96 | 4.43 | 95 | 3.67 | | |
| Range | 38-480 | 4-19 | 32-585 | 3-22 | | |

| B-cells | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------|------|----------|-------|------|------|
| Mean | 316 | 15.4 | 344 | 16.63 | 0.39 | 0.29 |
| Std dev | 119 | 4.2 | 166 | 5.45 | | |
| Range | 122-663 | 6-28 | 88-1,105 | 5-36 | | |

T-sup – T-suppressor cells, T-help – T-helper cells, NK – Natural Killer Cells

T-sup cells and T-help cells are percentages of T-cells. T-cells, NK cells, and B-cells are percentages of Total Lymphocytes.

P values calculated with student t test or Wilcoxon rank sum test.

Counts are cells/mm³.

Table 4. White Blood Cell Differential Counts and Percentages by Exposure Group

| n=123 | High Exposure | | Low Exposure | | p value | |
|--------------------------|---------------|----------|--------------|----------|---------|----------|
| | n=45 | | N=78 | | | |
| | Counts | Percents | Counts | Percents | Counts | Percents |
| White blood cells | | | | | | |
| Mean | 6,515 | | 5,755 | | 0.004 | |
| Std dev | 1,402 | | 1,309 | | | |
| Range | 3,100-10,100 | | 3,100-9,000 | | | |
| Neutrophils | | | | | | |
| Mean | 3,960 | 59.65 | 3,328 | 57.16 | 0.003 | 0.33 |
| Std dev | 1,267 | 9.17 | 1,030 | 8.90 | | |
| Range | 1,500-7,800 | 39-82 | 1,400-6,400 | 33-79 | | |
| Lymphocytes | | | | | | |
| Mean | 1,827 | 28.74 | 1,799 | 31.67 | 0.75 | 0.11 |
| Std dev | 482 | 7.06 | 587 | 8.13 | | |
| Range | 1,000-3,200 | 11-41 | 100-3,700 | 13-56 | | |
| Monocytes | | | | | | |
| Mean | 518 | 8.06 | 440 | 7.76 | 0.02 | 0.29 |
| Std dev | 193 | 2.55 | 155 | 2.28 | | |
| Range | 200-1,100 | 2-14 | 100-900 | 2-13 | | |
| Eosinophils | | | | | | |
| Mean | 196 | 3.06 | 113 | 2.93 | 0.18 | 0.58 |
| Std dev | 165 | 2.07 | 125 | 2.15 | | |
| Range | 0-500 | 0.5-11 | 0-600 | 0.5-11 | | |

| Basophils | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|
| Mean | 16 | 0.49 | 12 | 0.48 | 0.53 | 0.84 |
| Std dev | 37 | 0.39 | 32 | 0.41 | | |
| Range | 0-100 | 0-1.7 | 0-100 | 0-1.9 | | |

P values calculated with student t test or Wilcoxon rank sum test.

Significant ($p \leq 0.05$) levels are highlighted in bold and represent levels of significance before adjusting for covariates.

Counts are cells/mm³.

Table 5. Normal Values for White Blood Cell Indices*

| | Number of cells/mm³ | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| White Blood Cells | 3,000-9,400 | Percent of WBC |
| Neutrophils | 1,000-6,400 | 40.2-75.4 |
| Monocytes | 200-800 | 4.2-12.6 |
| Eosinophils | 0-400 | 0-6.1 |
| Basophils | 0-100 | 0-1.3 |
| Lymphocytes | 800-2,800 | 14.9-45.8 |
| | | Percent of Lymphocytes |
| Natural Killer cells | 90-590 | 5-27 |
| B-cells | 90-660 | 6-25 |
| T-cells | 690-2540 | 55-84 |
| | | Percent of T-cells |
| T-suppressor | 190-1140 | 13-41 |
| T-helper | 410-1590 | 31-60 |

*Normal values are those cited by clinical laboratories performing analyses for this study.

Bibliography

1. Defense Fuels Supply Center. 1997 Fact Book. DFSC, Ft Belvoir, VA. 1997.
2. Harris DT, Sakiestewa D, Robledo RF, Witten M. Immunotoxicological effects of JP8 jet fuel exposure. *Toxicology and Industrial Health*. 13(1):43-55, 1997.
3. Defense Energy Support Center. Survey of jet fuels procured by defense energy support center, 1990-1996, DESC, Ft Belvoir, VA. 1998.
4. PRO-ACT Fact Sheet. Petroleum fuels: basic composition and properties. TI#19206. Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence. Feb, 1999.
5. Carlton GN, Smith LB. Exposures to jet fuel and benzene during aircraft fuel tank repair in the U.S. Air Force. *Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene Journal*. 15(6):455-91, 2000.
6. Olsen DM, Mattie DR, Gould WD, Witzmann F, Ledbetter M, Lemasters GK, Yiin J. A pilot study of occupational assessment of air force personnel exposure to jet fuel before and after conversion to JP8. United States Air Force Research Laboratory, AFRL-HE-WP-TR-1998-0107. Sep, 1998.
7. Smith LB. Risk assessment of acute exposure to jet fuel. Proposal # F-BR-200-0016-H, IERA/RSHI, Brooks AFB, TX. 3 Jan 2000.
8. Lemasters GK, Livingston GK, Lockey JE et al. Genotoxic changes after low-level solvent and fuel exposure on aircraft maintenance personnel. *Mutagenesis*. 12(4): 237-243, 1997.
9. Kaufman L. A study of occupational neurological disorders and hearing loss in aircraft maintenance workers exposed to fuels and solvents. Dissertation in the Department of Environmental Health, College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati, 1998.
10. Knave B, Mindus P, Struwe G. Neurasthenic symptoms in workers occupationally exposed to jet fuel. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 60(1):39-49, 1979.
11. Knave B, Olson BA, Elofsson S, et al. Long-term exposure to jet fuel. II. A cross-sectional epidemiologic investigation on occupationally exposed industrial workers with special reference to the nervous system. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 4(1):19-45, 1978.
12. Knave B, Persson HE, Goldberg JM, Westerholm P. Long-term exposure to jet fuel: an investigation on occupationally exposed workers with special reference to the nervous system. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2(3):152-164, 1976.
13. Smith LB, Bhattacharya A, Lemasters GK, et al. Effect of chronic low-level exposure to jet fuel on postural balance of US Air Force personnel. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Health*. 39(7):623-632, 1997.
14. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. Toxicological profile for jet fuels JP-5 and JP8. ATSDR, CDC, Atlanta GA, 1998.
15. Salvaggio JE, Sullivan KA. The immune system and the environment. In: Rom WN, ed. Environmental and Occupational Medicine. Philadelphia: Lippincott-Raven. 87-111, 1998.
16. Aoyama K. Effects of benzene inhalation on lymphocyte subpopulations and immune response in mice. *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology*. 85:92-101, 1996.
17. Harris DT, Sakiestewa D, Robledo RF, Witten M. Short-term exposure to JP8 Jet fuel results in long-term immunotoxicity. *Toxicology and Industrial Health*. 13(5):559-570, 1997.

18. Ullrich SE. Dermal application of JP8 jet fuel induces immune suppression. *Toxicological Sciences*. 52:61-67, 1999.
19. Giorgi JV. Lymphocytes subset measurements: significance in clinical medicine. In: Rose N, Friedman H, Fahey J, eds. *Manual of Clinical Laboratory Immunology*, 3rd ed. Washington DC: American Society of Microbiology. 236-246, 1986.
20. Pleil JD, Smith LB, Zelnick SD. Personal exposure to JP8 jet fuel vapors and exhaust at air force bases. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 108(3):183-192, 2000.
21. Werb Z. Phagocytic cells: chemotaxis and effector functions of macrophages and granulocytes. In: Stites DP, Stobo JD, Fudenberg HH, Wells JV, eds. *Basic and Clinical Immunology*, 4th ed. Los Altos: Lange Medical Publications. 109-123, 1982.
22. Douglas SD. Development and structure of cells in the immune system. In: Stites DP, Stobo JD, Fudenberg HH, Wells JV, eds. *Basic and Clinical Immunology*, 4th ed. Los Altos: Lange Medical Publications. 87-108, 1982.
23. Burg ND, Pillinger MH. The neutrophil: function and regulation in innate and humoral immunity. *Clinical Immunology*. 99(1):7-17, 2001.
24. Collins JJ, Conner P, Friedlander BR, Easterday PA, Nair RS, Braun J. A study of the hematologic effects of chronic low-level exposure to benzene. *Journal of Occupational Medicine*. 33(5):619-626, 1991.
25. Ferrari MD, Neirotti E, Albornoz C. Occurrence of heterotrophic bacteria and fungi in an aviation fuel handling system and its relationship with fuel fouling. *Rev Argent Microbiol*. 30(3):105-114, 1998.
26. Rose CS, Blanc PD. Inhalation fever. In: Rom WN ed. *Environmental and Occupational Medicine*, 3rd ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott-Raven. :87-111, 1998.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
AFIOH

JP-8 Final Risk Assessment



Ronald K. Kendall
Ernest Smith

Texas Tech University
The Institute of Environmental and Human Health
1207 Gilbert Drive
Lubbock, TX 79416

Leslie B. Smith, Major, USAF, BSC
Roger L. Gibson, Lieutenant Colonel, USAF

20060221 082

August 2001

Approved for public release;
distribution is unlimited.

Air Force Institute for Operational Health
Risk Analysis Directorate
Environmental Analysis Division
2513 Kennedy Circle
Brooks City-Base TX 78235-5116

NOTICES

This report is published as received and has not been edited by the staff of the Air Force Institute for Operational Health (AFIOH).

Publication of this report does not constitute approval or disapproval of the ideas or findings. It is published in the interest of scientific and technical information (STINFO) exchange.

When Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely Government-related procurement, the United States Government incurs no responsibility or any obligation whatsoever. The fact that the Government may have formulated or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data, is not to be regarded by implication, or otherwise in any manner construed, as licensing the holder or any other person or corporation; or as conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

The mention of trade names or commercial products in this publication is for illustration purposes and does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use by the United States Air Force.

The Office of Public Affairs has reviewed this report, and it is releasable to the National Technical Information Service, where it will be available to the general public, including foreign nationals.

This report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

Government agencies and their contractors registered with Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) should direct requests for copies to: Defense Technical Information Center, 8725 John J. Kingman Rd., STE 0944, Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218.

Non-Government agencies may purchase copies of this report from: National Technical Information Services (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161-2103.

//signed//

//signed//

GROVER K. YAMANE, Col, USAF, MC, SFS
Preventive Medicine Consultant

CANDACE L. MCCALL, Lt Col, USAF, BSC
Chief, Risk Assessment Division

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| | | | |
| 1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank) | 2. REPORT DATE | 3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED | |
| | | Final | |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE | | 5. FUNDING NUMBERS | |
| JP-8 Final Risk Assessment | | F41624-99-2-0002 | |
| 6. AUTHOR(S) | | | |
| *Kendall, Ronald K.; *Smith, Ernest Smith, Leslie B.; Gibson, Roger L. | | | |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) | | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER | |
| * Texas Tech University The Institute of Environmental and Human Health 1207 Gilbert Drive Lubbock , TX 79416 | | | |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) | | 10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER | |
| Air Force Institute for Operational Health Risk Analysis Directorate Risk Assessment Division 2513 Kennedy Circle Brooks City-Base, TX 78235-5116 | | IOH-RS-BR-SR-2005-0003 | |
| 11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | | |
| Prepared in cooperation with The Institute of Environmental and Human Health (TIEHH) for the Air Force Institute for Operational Health (AFIOH). | | | |
| 12a. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT | | 12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE | |
| Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. | | | |
| 13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) | | | |
| The JP-8 Final Risk Assessment is a collection of several studies assessing the health and performance effects from acute exposure to Jet Propellant type 8 (JP-8) jet fuel. Exposed subjects were active duty Air Force personnel who worked with or were routinely exposed to JP-8 in the performance of their duties. Non-exposed subjects were active duty Air Force personnel who did not have routine contact with JP-8 during the performance of their duties. Assessments included JP-8 exposure in the immediate personal environment, JP-8 body burden, neurologic effects, hormonal effects, immunological effects, liver/renal function, cytotoxic/genotoxic effects, glutathione-S-transferase activity, and self-reported health status. | | | |
| 14. SUBJECT TERMS | | 15. NUMBER OF PAGES | |
| JP-8, Jet Fuel, Human Risks, Occupational Health | | 186 | |
| | | 16. PRICE CODE | |
| 17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT | 18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE | 19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT | 20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT |
| Unclassified | Unclassified | Unclassified | UL |