Supporting Information for

After the PBDE phase-out: A broad suite of flame retardants in repeat house dust samples from California

Robin E. Dodson,1 Laura J. Perovich,1 Adrian Covaci,2 Nele Van den Eede,* 2^2 *Alin C. Ionas,* 2^2 *Alin C. Dirtu,* 2^2 *Julia Green Brody*, 1^2 *Ruthann A. Rudel*^{1}

¹Silent Spring Institute, 29 Crafts Street, Newton, MA USA ²Toxicological Centre, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk-Antwerp, Belgium *dodson@silentspring.org; Tel: 617-332-4288

Contents:

Analytical Methods Quality Control Correlation and Cluster Analysis Daily Intake Rate Calculation Table SI1 – Nomenclature and analytical information Table SI2 – Summary of procedural blanks Table SI3 – Residential soil screening levels Table SI4 – FR sources and health effects with references Figure SI1 – Summary of NIST dust analysis Figure SI2 – Inter-laboratory comparison Figure SI3 – Home-specific concentrations Figure SI4 – Correlation matrix Figure SI5 – Cluster analysis dendrograms References

Analytical Methods

Materials and reagents

Solvents used during analysis were all of pesticide grade. *n*-hexane (Hex) was purchased from Acros Organics (Geel, Belgium). Acetone (Ac), dichloromethane (DCM), ethyl acetate (EA), *iso*-octane and methanol (MeOH) were purchased from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany). Standards of BDE 28, 47, 66, 85, 99, 100, 153, 154, 183, 196, 197, 203 and 209, α-

HBCYD, β-HBCYD, γ-HBCYD, BTBPE, DBDPE, HCDBCO, EH-TBB (or TBB), BEH-TEBP (or TBPH), HBB, TBBPA-BDBPE, TBBPA, DBE-DBCH (or TBECH) isomers, TBP-AE (or ATE), TBP-BAE (or BATE), TBP-DBPE (or DPTE), TBCO isomers, OBTMPI (or OBIND), dechlorane plus (DP) isomers, and labeled internal standards (IS) ¹³C-BDE 209, ¹³C- α -HBCD, ¹³C-β-HBCD, ¹³C-γ-HBCD, and ¹³C-TBBPA were purchased from Wellington Laboratories (Guelph, ON, Canada). Standards of PCBs, PBBs and OCPs were purchased from Dr. Ehrenstorfer (Augsburg, Germany). BDE 77 and 128 (IS) were obtained from AccuStandard Inc. (New Haven, CT, USA). See Table 1 (main manuscript) for abbreviations and acronyms.

Standards of TEP, tri-*n*-propyl phosphate (T*n*PP), tri-*iso*butyl phosphate (TIBP), tri-*n*butyl phosphate (TNBP), triphenyl phosphate (TPHP), tris(2-chloroethyl) phosphate (TCEP), tri-2-ethyl-hexyl phosphate (TEHP), ethyl-hexyl-diphenyl phosphate (EHDPP), tricresyl phosphate (TMPP or TCP, mixture of 4 isomers), tris(1,3-dibromopropyl) phosphate (TDBPP) and tris(1,3 dichloro-isopropyl) phosphate (TDCIPP, mixture of 2 isomers) were purchased from Chiron AS (Trondheim, Norway). Triamyl phosphate (TAP; IS) was purchased from TCI Europe (Zwijndrecht, Belgium). Labeled TPHP-d15 (IS) and tris(2-butoxyethyl) phosphate (TBOEP) were purchased from Sigma Aldrich. Tris(1-chloro-2-propyl) phosphate (TCIPP, mixture of 3 isomers) was purchased from Pfaltz & Bauer (Waterbury, CT, USA). Purity of analytical standards was >98%, except for TBOEP (>94%). Standard stock solutions were prepared in *iso*octane, except for NBFRs which were prepared in a mixture of *iso*-octane:toluene (8:2, *v/v*).

Indoor dust SRM 2585 was purchased from the US National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST, Gaithersburg, MD, USA). Silica SPE cartridges (500 mg/3 mL, Bond Elut) were purchased from Agilent, while empty polypropylene filtration tubes (3 mL) SPE cartridges and 500 mg/3 mL Supelclean ENVI- Florisil cartridges were purchased from Supelco (Bellefonte, PA, USA). Silica gel, anhydrous sodium sulfate (Na_2SO_4), and concentrated sulfuric acid $(H₂SO₄, 98%)$ were purchased from Merck. The preparation of acid impregnated silica $(44\%, w/w)$ was carried out as described elsewhere[.](#page-22-0)¹ Glass test tubes were cleaned by soaking for at least 12 h in an alkali solution (diluted RBS 35, pH 11–12). After washing, the tubes were rinsed with water and dried at 100 °C for at least 12 h. The tubes were rinsed with Hex before use.

Sample Preparation

Due to the very comprehensive list of targeted flame retardants and the large differences in their physico-chemical properties, we have decided to use two separate sample preparation methods which have led to four extracts per sample (two fractions obtained per analytical method). These extracts were injected in various instruments, according to the expected presence of the FR groups.

Method I (Florisil fractionation)

The fractionation on Florisil was employed to measure the bulk of BFRs and OCs which elute in the first fraction (Fraction $1 - F1$) and OPFRs which elute in the 2nd fraction (Fraction 2 $-$ F2). The method is largely based on the recent method described by Van den Eede et al.² In detail, a sample aliquot (around 50 mg) was accurately weighed and spiked with IS $(^{13}C-BDE$ 209, BDE 77, BDE 128, CB 143, TCEP-d12, TBOEP-d6, TDCIPP-d15, TAP, and TPHP-d15). Samples were extracted using 2 mL Hex-Ac $(3:1 \text{ v/v})$ by a combination of vortexing and ultrasonic extraction $(2 \times 1$ min vortex and 5 min ultrasonic extraction) which was repeated three times. After each extraction cycle, dust extracts were centrifuged at 3500 rpm for 2 min and supernatants were collected and transferred into clean glass tubes. The pooled supernatants were evaporated until dryness under a gentle nitrogen flow and redissolved in 1 mL Hex.

Prior to fractionation, Florisil® cartridges were prewashed with 6 mL of Hex. The extracts were quantitatively transferred and fractionation was achieved by eluting with 8 mL of Hex (F1) and 10 mL of EA (F2). The 1st fraction (F1) was evaporated until 1 mL and quantitatively transferred onto acidified silica 44% cartridges (prewashed with 6 mL Hex) for a second clean-up. The target analytes were eluted with 10 mL of Hex/DCM (1:1 v/v), and afterwards evaporated until dryness under gentle nitrogen flow and reconstituted in 100 µL of iso-octane.

In the $2nd$ fraction (F2), IS BDE 128 was added for the quantification of TBPH, followed by evaporation until dryness and resolubilized in 100 µL of iso-octane.

Fraction F1, contained PBDEs, most NBFRs, OCs and PBBs, was subjected to analysis by GC-ECNI/MS (different acquisition methods) and GC-EI/MS (confirmation of OCs and PBBs). The 2nd fraction (F2), containing OPFRs and BEH-TBEP was subjected to analysis by GC-EI/MS (for OPFRs) and GC-ECNI/MS (for BEH-TBEP and TDBPP).

Method II (Silica fractionation)

The fractionation on Silica was in first instance employed to measure HBCYDs and TBBPA which eluted in the 2nd fraction $(Fraction B - FB)$ and confirmation of PBDEs which eluted in the first fraction (Fraction A – FA). The extraction was similar to that described above² while the fractionation on silica was similar to the procedure described by Roosens et al.^{[3](#page-22-2)}

In detail, a sample aliquot (typically 50 mg) was accurately weighed and spiked with a mixture containing IS $(^{13}C-a-$, β -, γ -HBCYD, ¹³C-TBBPA, ¹³C-BDE 209, BDE 77, and BDE 128). Samples were extracted using 2 mL Hex-Ac (3:1 v/v) by a combination of vortexing and ultrasonic extraction $(2 \times 1$ min vortex and 5 min ultrasonic extraction) which was repeated three times. After each extraction cycle, dust extracts were centrifuged at 3500 rpm for 2 min and supernatants were collected and transferred into clean glass tubes. The pooled supernatants were evaporated until dryness under a gentle nitrogen flow and redissolved in 1 mL Hex.

Prior to fractionation, silica cartridges were topped with 100 mg acid silica (44%) and prewashed with 6 mL of Hex. The extracts were quantitatively transferred and fractionation was achieved by eluting with 8 mL of Hex (Fraction $A - FA$) and 10 mL of DCM (Fraction $B - FB$).

Both fractions were afterwards evaporated until dryness under gentle nitrogen flow. Fraction FA, containing PBDEs, was reconstituted in 100 μ L of iso-octane and was subjected to $GC-ECNI/MS$. The 2nd fraction (FB), containing HBCYDs, was resolubilized in 100 μ L of methanol and further subjected to LC-MS/MS analysis.

Chemical Analysis

GC/ECNI-MS Analysis

The analysis of F1, containing PBDEs, most NBFRs, and OCs, and the analysis of F2, containing BEH-TBEP, was performed with an Agilent 6890 GC coupled to an Agilent 5973 MS operated in electrochemical negative ionization (ECNI) mode. The GC system was equipped

with electronic pressure control and a programmable-temperature vaporizer (PTV). A volume of 2 μL of cleaned extract was injected on a DB-5 column (15 m \times 0.25 mm \times 0.10 μm) using solvent vent injection. The injection temperature was set at 90 °C, hold 0.04 min, ramp 700 °C/min to 295 °C. Vent time was 0.02 min and vent flow 75 mL/min. Injection was performed under a pressure of 10 psi until 1.25 min and purge flow to split vent of 50 mL/min after 1.25 min. The GC temperature program was 90 °C, hold 1.50 min, ramp 10 °C/min to 300 °C, hold 3 min, ramp 40 °C/min to 310 °C, hold 5 min. Helium was used as a carrier gas with a ramped flow rate of 1.0 mL/min until 20 min and then raised to 2.0 mL/min. The mass spectrometer was employed in selected ion monitoring (SIM) mode, with ions 79 and 81 monitored the whole run time. For BDE 209, ions 487 and 485 were used, while 13 C-BDE 209 was monitored using ions 495 and 497. Dwell times were set on 35 ms. The ion source, quadrupole and interface temperatures were set at 250, 150 and 300 °C, respectively and the electron multiplier voltage was at 2200 V. Methane was used as moderating gas. An overview of analytes containing detailed nomenclature and applied abbreviation, together with ions acquired for identification and quantification purposes on the GC-EI-MS and GC-ECNI-MS are presented in Table SI1.

GC/EI-MS Analysis

Analysis of OPFRs in F2 was performed with an Agilent 6890 GC coupled to an Agilent 5973 MS operated in electron impact ionization (EI) mode. The GC system was equipped with electronic pressure control and a programmable-temperature vaporizer (PTV). One μL of purified extract was injected on a HT-8 column (25 m \times 0.22 mm \times 0.25 µm) using cold splitless injection. The injection temperature was set at 90 °C, hold 0.03 min, ramp 700 °C/min to 290 °C. Injection was performed using a pressure of1 bar until 1.25 min and purge flow to split vent of 50 mL/min after 1.25 min. The GC temperature program was 90 °C, hold 1.25 min, ramp 10 °C/min to 240 °C, ramp 20 °C/min to 310 °C, hold 16 min. Helium was used as a carrier gas with a flow rate of 1.0 mL/min. The mass spectrometer was run in selected ion monitoring (SIM) mode. Dwell times ranged between 20 and 30 ms in different acquisition windows. The ion source, quadrupole and interface temperatures were set at 230, 150 and 300 °C, respectively, and the electron multiplier voltage was at 2200 V.

LC-MS/MS

The determination of individual HBCYD isomers and TBBPA in the Fraction B (silica fractionation) was achieved using a dual pump Agilent 1100 Series liquid chromatograph equipped with autosampler and vacuum degasser. A Luna C18(2) reversed phase (RP) analytical column (150 mm \times 2 mm i.d., 3 µm particle size, Phenomenex) was used for the separation of α -, β-, and γ-HBCYD. A mobile phase of (A) ammonium acetate 2mM in water/methanol (1:1 v/v) and (B) methanol at a flow rate of 0.250 mL/min was applied for elution of HBCYD isomers; starting at 75% (B) held for 2 min, then increased linearly to 100% (b) until 9 min; held until 12 min followed by a linear decrease to 70% (B) over 0.5 min and held for 7.5 min.

The target analytes were baseline separated on the RP column with retention times of 4.0, 6.0, 6.8 and 7.4 min for TBBPA, α-, β- and γ-HBCYD, respectively. MS analysis was performed using an Agilent 6410 triple quadrupole MS system operated in the electrospray negative ionization mode. N2 was used as drying gas at a flow of 10 L/min and heated to 300 °C. Nebulizer pressure was 35 psi and capillary voltage 4000 V. HBCYD isomers were quantified by isotope dilution. MS/MS detection operated in the MRM mode was used for quantitative determination of the HBCYD isomers based on m/z 640.6 to 81 and m/z 652.6 to 81 for the native and ¹³C-labeled diastereomers, respectively. Fragmentor voltage and collision energy were set as 80 and 15 V, respectively. For quantitative determination of TBBPA, the following MRMs were used: m/z 5 to 81 and m/z 652.6 to 81 for the native and 13C-labeled diastereomers, respectively.

Quality Control

Six procedural blanks were analyzed in the same batches as the samples and results are blank corrected. This implies subtraction of mean blank values (in pg) from the raw FR values (in pg) in the samples. Blank values, when detected, were $\langle 0.5\%$ of sample values. Compounds consistently detected (found in all blanks) in the procedural blanks at levels >1 ng (organophosphates) or >10 pg (all others) were: TIBP (mean=3.4ng), TNBP (13.1ng), TEHP (3.8ng), β-HBCYD (40pg), BDE 47 (19pg), BDE 85 (14pg), BDE 154 (40pg), BDE 196 (11pg), BTBPE (18pg), and BDE 209 (1330pg). See Table SI2 for summary of mass values in procedural blanks.

Method limits of quantification (LOQ) were calculated as three times the standard deviation of blank values and divided by the amount of dust used for analysis (typically 50 mg). For compounds not detected in the blanks, the LOQ was calculated based on the signal to noise ratio 10/1, taking into account also the chromatogram's characteristics for the respective retention time (co-elution, noisy baseline, etc). LOQs are compound-specific variables and therefore spanned a large range of concentrations (see Table 1 in manuscript).

The method has been recently validated as described by Van den Eede et al.² A series of optimization and spiking experiments were performed for BFRs and OPFRs at two concentration levels, Q_{low} and Q_{high} , and three replicates for each level. Precision between different days were assessed using the same concentration levels spiked on a low contaminated dust sample, using three replicates per level and executed on three different days. Precision was within 12% for each set of triplicates and all analytes. The recovery was calculated by subtracting the blank concentrations and divided by the calculated concentration of a mixed solution of standards (having the same concentrations)[.](#page-22-1) Further details can be found in Van den Eede et al. $²$ </sup>

SRM 2585 (Organic Contaminants in House Dust), which has certified values for PBDEs and indicative values for EH-TBB, BEH-TBEP, HBCYDs, chlorinated OPFRs and TBOEP, was used to test the accuracy (Figure SI1). Concentrations of PBDEs range between 2 and 30% relative difference from the certified values. EH-TBB, BEH-TBEP and chlorinated OPFRs were within 0 and 56% relative difference; while analytes with lower concentration ranges (e.g. HBCYD) fared worse. Despite a few discrepancies, there does not appear to be a systematic bias to the samples and values were not adjusted.

Inter-laboratory comparisons were conducted using samples collected in 2006 and analyzed at two different time periods. In 2006, as part of the Northern California Household Exposure Study, Southwest Research Institute (SWRI) analyzed 50 dust for approximately 100 semivolatile organic compounds, including PBDEs and legacy compounds. The 16 homes in this study are a subset of the 50 homes studied in 2006. In 2011, for this study, University of Antwerp analyzed stored dust samples (splits of the original samples collected in 2006) for FRs and legacy compounds. Results from the 2006 and 2011 analysis are compared for the 9 overlapping analytes (Figure SI2). Results for all 9 are significantly correlated (Spearman $\rho =$ 0.76-1, $p<0.05$). PBDE concentrations were similar, except for the one or two homes with the highest concentrations where SWRI reports higher concentrations (up to 2-fold) than University of Antwerp. However, University of Antwerp appears to report higher concentrations (up to 2 fold) for legacy analytes at the upper end of the concentration range.

Correlation and Cluster Analysis

Kendall's tau rank correlation estimates, adjusted for censored data, were calculated to investigate relationships between analytes within each sampling round and for each analyte across rounds, with p-values obtained from 1,000 bootstrap replications (Figure SI4). Kendall's tau correlation estimates, with adjustments for ties, are more accurate for censored data than Pearson or Spearman estimates with arbitrary substitutions (e.g. LOQ/2); although, in general, they tend to be lower than corresponding Pearson or Spearman estimates.⁴

Cluster analysis was performed to elucidate common mixtures and potential sources (Figure SI5). Distance matrices were constructed using Kendall's tau correlation estimates for all analytes with sufficient number of simultaneous detects (>3 pairs) within each sampling round. A simple approach of using one minus correlation to represent the dissimilarity matrix was used for ease of interpretability. Chemicals close together on the same long stem on the dendrogram have higher correlations. Sensitivity of clusters to bootstrapping for correlation estimates was evaluated by comparing results from multiple iterations. Hierarchical cluster analysis, using the complete agglomeration method, and subsequent graphing were performed using the 'hclust' package in R.

Daily Intake Calculation

Daily intake (DI) rate (μ g/day) for FRs in house dust was calculated using the following equation:

$$
C \times IR \times CF = DI
$$

where, C is the concentration (ng/g), IR is the ingestion rate (mg_{dust}/day), and CF is the conversion factor (0.001 g/mg \times 0.001 ug/ng) The cumulative FR concentration is 290,000 ng/g. We assume a dust ingestion rate of 100 mg/day.^{[5](#page-22-4)}

Table SI1. Full and abbreviated nomenclature, identification and quantification ions (bold values), their respective internal standards (IS) used for quantification of targeted analytes, together with instrumental technique employed for their analysis.

n.a. – not applicable

Table SI2. Summary of procedural blanks.

Compound	Units	BI-01	BI-02	BI-03	BI-04	BI-05	BI-06	Mean	SD	RSD (%)
TBBPA	pg	$\pmb{0}$	$\pmb{0}$	0	0	$\pmb{0}$	$\pmb{0}$	0	0.0	NA
α-HBCYD	pg	0	0	0	0	$\pmb{0}$	0	0	0.0	NA
β-HBCYD	pg	32	40	19	48	42	37	40	5.9	15
y-HBCYD	pg	$\pmb{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	$\pmb{0}$	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0.0	NA
pp-DDE	pg	0	$\pmb{0}$	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
pp-DDD	pg	0	$\pmb{0}$	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
pp-DDT	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
BB 80	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
BB 103	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
BB 153	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
BB 180	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
CB 153	pg	4	0	8	6	6	5	4	2.5	61
CB 180	pg	5	5	11	9	9	11	8	2.4	31
trans-chlordane (TC)	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
cis-chlordane (CC)	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
trans-Nonachlor (TN)	pg	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
BDE 28	pg	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	7	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
BDE 47	pg	12	17		21	23	23	19	4.8	25
BDE 66	pg	$\pmb{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$		0	$\pmb{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0.0	NA
BDE 100	pg	0	0		0	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0.0	NA
BDE 99	pg	6	9		6	6	10	7	1.9	25
BDE 85	pg	9	9		18	17	19	14	4.9	35
BDE 154	pg	25	23	33	52	51	49	40	14.8	37
BDE 153	pg	5	8		13	12	11	10	3.4	36
HBB-ion79	pg	2	5	7	8	8	3	5	2.6	50
BDHCTD (HCDBCO)	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
EH-TBB (TBB)	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
BDE 183	pg	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	NA
BDE 197	pg	5	$\overline{7}$	13	11	8	11	8	2.4	29
BDE 203	pg	5	6	11	13	10	10	9	3.1	35
BDE 196	pg	6	5	15	11	13	19	11	5.5	51
BTBPE	pg	18	20	29	19	14	17	18	\overline{c}	12
BDE 209	pg	1540	920	2030	1490	1330	1370	1330	245	18
DBDPE	pg	$\mathbf 0$	0	0	$\pmb{0}$	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf 0$	0	NA
alpha-TBECH	pg		$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	$\pmb{0}$	$\pmb{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	NA
beta-TBECH	pg	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	$\pmb{0}$	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	NA
gamma-TBECH	pg	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0	NA
delta-TBECH	pg	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0	NA
TBP-AE (ATE)	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
TBP-BAE (BATE)	pg	0	0	0	0	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0	NA
TBP-DBPE (DPTE)	pg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
alpha-TBCO	pg	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
beta-TBCO	pg	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0	$\mathbf 0$	0	0	0	NA
OBTMPI (OBIND)	pg	0	0	0	0	0	$\boldsymbol{0}$	0	0	NA
syn-DP	pg	5	7	0	0	8	$\boldsymbol{0}$	3	4	112
anti-DP		3	4	3	0	3	0	\overline{c}	$\overline{2}$	79
	pg									

NA – not applicable

Table SI3. Residential soil screening levels.^{[6](#page-22-5)}

pp-DDD 2.0
^a Screening levels include ingestion, inhalation and dermal pathways and are risk-based concentrations derived from standard exposure information and EPA toxicity values.

^b Derived using standard assumptions and cancer slope factor published under California's Proposition 65 (0.13 mg/kg -day⁻⁻¹)

Dodson et al., FRs in California house dust

Table SI4. Summary of flame retardant uses and health effects $\overline{}$

Flame Retardant Class Uses Health Concerns^a

^a From laboratory or animal studies unless otherwise indicated *Lack of health studies*

Figure SI1. Distributions of the absolute relative difference (%) among the 5 NIST samples (10 possible comparisons), dashed line represents 20% absolute difference (top); distributions of absolute relative differences (%) between 5 NIST samples and available Certified or Indicative values (middle); and measured concentrations (ng/g) of the 3 blinded and 2 unblinded NIST samples with available Certified or Indicative values (bottom).

Figure SI2. Comparing analytical results for samples collected in 16 California homes in 2006. Southwest Research Institute (SWRI) analyzed samples in 2006 and University of Antwerp analyzed samples in 2011. Spearman correlation coefficients and associated p-values presented for each analyte.

Figure SI3. Concentrations (ng/g) measured in individual samples collected in 2006 and 2011. Each home represented across the top margin with 2006 results in left column and 2011 results in right column.

Figure SI4. Kendall's tau correlation estimates for analytes within each sampling round (2006 samples in top left corner and 2011 samples in bottom right corner) as well as correlations for each analyte across sampling rounds (diagonal). Significant (p<0.05) positive correlation estimates shaded blue; significant negative correlations estimates shaded orange. '⋅' indicates insufficient number (< 3) of simultaneous detects to estimate correlation. Correlated analytes suggest they are used in combination; correlation across sampling rounds indicates temporal stability.

Figure SI5. Dendrograms from cluster analysis for each sampling round: 2006 samples (top) and 2011 samples (bottom). Dendrogram heights are 1 minus Kendall's tau correlation estimates. Chemicals never detected are removed. If insufficient number of simultaneous detects $(n \le 3)$ and correlation estimate could not be calculated, estimate replaced with 1.

References

1. Covaci, A.; Schepens, P., Simplified method for determination of organochlorine pollutants in human serum by solid-phase disk extraction and gas chromatography. *Chemosphere* **2001,** *43*, (4-7), 439-47.

2. Van den Eede, N.; Dirtu, A. C.; Ali, N.; Neels, H.; Covaci, A., Multi-residue method for the determination of brominated and organophosphate flame retardants in indoor dust. *Talanta* **2012,** *89*, 292-300.

3. Roosens, L.; Geeraerts, C.; Belpaire, C.; Van Pelt, I.; Neels, H.; Covaci, A., Spatial variations in the levels and isomeric patterns of PBDEs and HBCDs in the European eel in Flanders. *Environ. Int.* **2010,** *36*, (5), 415-23.

4. Newton, E.; Rudel, R., Estimating correlation with multiply censored data arising from the adjustment of singly censored data. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2007,** *41*, (1), 221-8.

5. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency *Exposure Factors Handbook: 2011 Edition*; National Center for Environmental Assessment, Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Washington, DC, 2011.

6. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regional Screening Levels (Formerly PRGs): Screening Levels for Chemical Contaminants.<http://www.epa.gov/region9/superfund/prg/> (October 23, 2012),

7. Birnbaum, L. S.; Staskal, D. F., Brominated flame retardants: cause for concern? *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2004,** *112*, (1), 9-17.

8. Zhou, T., Ross, D.G., DeVito, M.J., Crofton, K.M. , Effects of Short-Term in Vivo Exposure to Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers on Thyroid Hormones and Hepatic Enzyme Activities in Weanling Rats. *Toxicol. Sci.* **2001,** *61*, (1), 76–82.

9. Stoker, T. E., Assessment of DE-71, a Commercial Polybrominated Diphenyl Ether (PBDE) Mixture, in the EDSP Male and Female Pubertal Protocols. *Toxicol. Sci.* **2004,** *78*, (1), 144-155.

10. Kuriyama, S. N.; Talsness, C. E.; Grote, K.; Chahoud, I., Developmental Exposure to Low-Dose PBDE-99: Effects on Male Fertility and Neurobehavior in Rat Offspring. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2005,** *113*, (2), 149-154.

11. Chao, H.-R.; Wang, S.-L.; Lee, W.-J.; Wang, Y.-F.; Päpke, O., Levels of polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) in breast milk from central Taiwan and their relation to infant birth outcome and maternal menstruation effects. *Environ. Int.* **2007,** *33*, (2), 239-245.

12. Herbstman, J. B.; Sjödin, A.; Kurzon, M.; Lederman, S. A.; Jones, R. S.; Rauh, V.; Needham, L. L.; Tang, D.; Niedzwiecki, M.; Wang, R. Y.; Perera, F., Prenatal Exposure to PBDEs and Neurodevelopment. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2010,** *118*, (5), 712-719.

13. Turyk, M. E.; Persky, V. W.; Imm, P.; Knobeloch, L.; Chatterton, R.; Anderson, H. A., Hormone Disruption by PBDEs in Adult Male Sport Fish Consumers. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2008,** *116*, (12), 1635-1641.

14. Chevrier, J.; Harley, K. G.; Bradman, A.; Gharbi, M.; Sjodin, A.; Eskenazi, B., Polybrominated diphenyl ether (PBDE) flame retardants and thyroid hormone during pregnancy. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2010,** *118*, (10), 1444-9.

15. Stapleton, H. M.; Eagle, S.; Anthopolos, R.; Wolkin, A.; Miranda, M. L., Associations between Polybrominated Diphenyl Ether (PBDE) Flame Retardants, Phenolic Metabolites, and Thyroid Hormones during Pregnancy. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2011,** *119*, (10), 1454-1459.

16. Hamers, T., In Vitro Profiling of the Endocrine-Disrupting Potency of Brominated Flame Retardants. *Toxicol. Sci.* **2006,** *92*, (1), 157-173.

17. Eskenazi, B.; Chevrier, J.; Rauch, S. A.; Kogut, K.; Harley, K. G.; Johnson, C.; Trujillo, C.; Sjodin, A.; Bradman, A., In Utero and Childhood Polybrominated Diphenyl Ether (PBDE) Exposures and Neurodevelopment in the CHAMACOS Study. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2012**.

18. Viberg, H., Exposure to Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers 203 and 206 during the Neonatal Brain Growth Spurt Affects Proteins Important for Normal Neurodevelopment in Mice. *Toxicol. Sci.* **2009,** *109*, (2), 306-311.

19. Tseng, L.-H.; Hsu, P.-C.; Lee, C.-W.; Tsai, S.-S.; Pan, M.-H.; Li, M.-H., Developmental exposure to decabrominated diphenyl ether (BDE-209): Effects on sperm oxidative stress and chromatin dna damage in mouse offspring. *Environ. Toxicol.* **2011**, n/a-n/a.

20. Viberg, H., Neurobehavioral Derangements in Adult Mice Receiving Decabrominated Diphenyl Ether (PBDE 209) during a Defined Period of Neonatal Brain Development. *Toxicol. Sci.* **2003,** *76*, (1), 112-120.

21. Rice, D. C.; Reeve, E. A.; Herlihy, A.; Thomas Zoeller, R.; Douglas Thompson, W.; Markowski, V. P., Developmental delays and locomotor activity in the C57BL6/J mouse following neonatal exposure to the fully-brominated PBDE, decabromodiphenyl ether. *Neurotoxicol. Teratol.* **2007,** *29*, (4), 511-520.

22. National Toxicology Program *Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies of Decabromodiphenyl Oxide in F344/N Rats and B6C3F1 Mice*; 1986.

23. Bearr, J. S.; Stapleton, H. M.; Mitchelmore, C. L., Accumulation and DNA damage in fathead minnows (Pimephales promelas) exposed to 2 brominated flame-retardant mixtures, Firemaster® 550 and Firemaster® BZ-54. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **2010,** *29*, (3), 722-729.

24. Patisaul, H. B.; Mabrey, N.; McCaffrey, K. A.; Roberts, S. C.; Stapleton, H. M.; Gear, R. B.; Belcher, S. M.; Braun, J., Accumulation and Endocrine Disrupting Effects of the Flame Retardant Mixture Firemaster 550 in Rats: An Exploratory Assessment. *J. Biochem. Mol. Toxicol.* **2012**.

25. California Environmental Contaminant Biomonitoring Program *Brominated and Chlorinated Organic Chemical Compounds Used as Flame Retardants - Additional Information on Four Flame Retardants*; 2009.

26. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency *Environmental Profiles of Chemical Flame-Retardant Alternatives for Low-Density Polyurethane Foam*; United State Environmental Protection Agency, Design for the Environment: 2005.

27. Springer, C.; Dere, E.; Hall, S. J.; McDonnell, E. V.; Roberts, S. C.; Butt, C. M.; Stapleton, H. M.; Watkins, D. J.; McClean, M. D.; Webster, T. F.; Schlezinger, J. J.; Boekelheide, K., Rodent Thyroid, Liver, and Fetal Testis Toxicity of the Monoester Metabolite of Bis-(2-ethylhexyl) Tetrabromophthalate (TBPH), a Novel Brominated Flame Retardant Present in Indoor Dust. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2012**.

28. Meeker, J. D.; Stapleton, H. M., House Dust Concentrations of Organophosphate Flame Retardants in Relation to Hormone Levels and Semen Quality Parameters. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2010,** *118*, (3), 318-323.

29. Illinois Environmental Protection Agency *Report on Alternatives to the Flame Retardant DecaBDE: Evaluation of Toxicity, Availability, Affordability, and Fire Safety Issues*; 2007.

30. Covaci, A.; Gerecke, A. C.; Law, R. J.; Voorspoels, S.; Kohler, M.; Heeb, N. V.; Leslie, H.; Allchin, C. R.; De Boer, J., Hexabromocyclododecanes (HBCDs) in the environment and humans: a review. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2006,** *40*, (12), 3679-88.

31. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency *Hexabromocyclododecane (HBCD) Action Plan*; 2010.

32. Eriksson, P.; Fischer, C.; Wallin, M.; Jakobsson, E.; Fredriksson, A., Impaired behaviour, learning and memory, in adult mice neonatally exposed to hexabromocyclododecane (HBCDD). *Environ. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* **2006,** *21*, (3), 317-322.

33. Ema, M.; Fujii, S.; Hiratakoizumi, M.; Matsumoto, M., Two-generation reproductive toxicity study of the flame retardant hexabromocyclododecane in rats. *Reprod. Toxicol.* **2008,** *25*, (3), 335-351.

34. Marvin, C. H.; Tomy, G. T.; Armitage, J. M.; Arnot, J. A.; McCarty, L.; Covaci, A.; Palace, V., Hexabromocyclododecane: Current Understanding of Chemistry, Environmental Fate and Toxicology and Implications for Global Management. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2011,** *45*, (20), 8613-8623.

35. Mariussen, E.; Fonnum, F., The effect of brominated flame retardants on neurotransmitter uptake into rat brain synaptosomes and vesicles. *Neurochem. Int.* **2003,** *43*, (4-5), 533-542.

36. Meerts, I. A.; Letcher, R. J.; Hoving, S.; Marsh, G.; Bergman, A.; Lemmen, J. G.; van der Burg, B.; Brouwer, A., In vitro estrogenicity of polybrominated diphenyl ethers, hydroxylated PDBEs, and polybrominated bisphenol A compounds. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2001,** *109*, (4), 399-407.

37. Pullen, S., Boecker, R., Tiegs, G., The flame retardants tetrabromobisphenol A and tetrabromobisphenol $A\Box/b$ isallylether suppress the induction of interleukin-2 receptor a chain (CD25) in murine splenocytes. *Toxicology* **2003,** *184*, (1), 11-22.

38. Van der Ven, L. T. M.; Van de Kuil, T.; Verhoef, A.; Verwer, C. M.; Lilienthal, H.; Leonards, P. E. G.; Schauer, U. M. D.; Cantón, R. F.; Litens, S.; De Jong, F. H.; Visser, T. J.; Dekant, W.; Stern, N.; Håkansson, H.; Slob, W.; Van den Berg, M.; Vos, J. G.; Piersma, A. H., Endocrine effects of tetrabromobisphenol-A (TBBPA) in Wistar rats as tested in a onegeneration reproduction study and a subacute toxicity study. *Toxicology* **2008,** *245*, (1-2), 76-89. 39. Covaci, A.; Harrad, S.; Abdallah, M. A.; Ali, N.; Law, R. J.; Herzke, D.; de Wit, C. A.,

Novel brominated flame retardants: a review of their analysis, environmental fate and behaviour. *Environ. Int.* **2011,** *37*, (2), 532-56.

40. National Toxicology Program *Tetrabromobisphenol A [79-94-7]: Review of Toxicological Literature*; 2002.

41. Szymanska, J. A., Piotrowski, J.K., Hepatotoxicity of monobromobenzene and hexabromobenzene: e **Cheets of repeated doses of repeated doses** ℓ *chets of repeated doses* ℓ **in**); at ℓ s ℓ **in**).

42. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Hexabromobenzene Integrated Risk Information System Summary.<http://www.epa.gov/iris/subst/0161.htm>

43. Norwegian Pollution Control Authority *Current state of knowledge and monitoring requirements - Emerging "New" Brominated Flame Retardants in Flame Retarded Products and the Environment*; 2009.

44. Nakari, T.; Huhtala, S., In vivo and in vitro toxicity of decabromodiphenyl ethane, a flame retardant. *Environ. Toxicol.* **2009,** *25*, (4), 333-338.

45. Van den Eede, N.; Dirtu, A. C.; Neels, H.; Covaci, A., Analytical developments and preliminary assessment of human exposure to organophosphate flame retardants from indoor dust. *Environ. Int.* **2011,** *37*, (2), 454-61.

46. van der Veen, I.; de Boer, J., Phosphorus flame retardants: Properties, production, environmental occurrence, toxicity and analysis. *Chemosphere* **2012,** *88*, 1119-1153.

47. New York Senate Chapter Amendments to S. 4085-A and A. 6195-A. <http://open.nysenate.gov/legislation/bill/S5774-2011>

48. ECHA *Support Document for Identification of tris(2-chloroethyl)phosphate as a Substance of Very High Concern Beacuse of its CMR Properties*; European Chemicals Agency: 2009.

49. World Health Organization *Flame Retardants: tris(chloropropyl)phosphate and tris(2 chloroethyl)phosphate*; Word Health Organization: Geneva, 1998.

50. Dishaw, L. V.; Powers, C. M.; Ryde, I. T.; Roberts, S. C.; Seidler, F. J.; Slotkin, T. A.; Stapleton, H. M., Is the PentaBDE replacement, tris (1,3-dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate (TDCPP), a developmental neurotoxicant? Studies in PC12 cells. *Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol.* **2011,** *256*, (3), 281-9.

51. European Commission Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks *Opinion on tris(2-chloroethyl)phosphate (TCEP) in Toys*; 2012.

52. California Environmental Protection Agency *Evidence on the Carcinogenicity of tris(1,3 dichloro-2-propyl)phosphate*; Reproductive and Cancer Hazard Assessment Branch, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, California Environmental Protection Agency: 2011.

53. Kanazawa, A.; Saito, I.; Araki, A.; Takeda, M.; Ma, M.; Saijo, Y.; Kishi, R., Association between indoor exposure to semi-volatile organic compounds and building-related symptoms among the occupants of residential dwellings. *Indoor Air* **2010,** *20*, (1), 72-84.

54. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC Bans TRIS-Treated Children's Garments. In Commission, U. S. C. P. S., Ed. 1977.

55. Brown, D. a. M., S., Factors Influencing Dimethoate and Triethyl Phosphate-Induced Narcosis in Rats and Mice192. *Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol.* **1971,** *18*, 895-206.

56. Auletta, C.; Weiner, M. L.; Richter, W. R., A dietary toxicity:oncogenicity study of tributyl phosphate in the rat. *Toxicology* **1998,** *128*, 125-134.

57. World Health Organization *Flame retardants: tris(2-butoxyethyl) phosphate, tris(2 ethylhexyl) phosphate, and tetrakis(hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salts*; 2000.

58. Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment *Chemical for CIC Consultation: Tris (2-Ethylhexyl) Phosphate*; 2011.

59. National Toxicology Program *Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies of tris(2 ethylhexyl)phosphate in F344/N rats and B6C3F1 mice (gavage studies)*; 1984.

60. Carlton, B. D., Basaran, A.H., Mezza, L.E. and Smith, M.K. , Examination of the reproductive effects of tricresyl phosphate administered to Long-Evans rats. *Toxicology* **1987,** *46*, (3), 321-328.

61. Sverko, E.; Tomy, G. T.; Reiner, E. J.; Li, Y. F.; McCarry, B. E.; Arnot, J. A.; Law, R. J.; Hites, R. A., Dechlorane plus and related compounds in the environment: a review. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2011,** *45*, (12), 5088-98.

62. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency *Dechlorane Plus: Screening Level Hazard Characterization*; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: 2011.

63. DiGangi, J.; Blum, A.; Bergman, A.; de Wit, C. A.; Lucas, D.; Mortimer, D.; Schecter, A.; Scheringer, M.; Shaw, S. D.; Webster, T. F., San Antonio Statement on brominated and chlorinated flame retardants. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2010,** *118*, (12), A516-8.