


# Atmospheric Effects in the Entertainment Industry

---

## Constituents, Exposures & Health Effects



# Atmospheric Effects in the Entertainment Industry

---

## Constituents, Exposures & Health Effects

Report to SHAPE  
the Workers' Compensation Board of BC  
and the BC Lung Association

March 27, 2003

Kay Teschke<sup>1,2</sup>, Yat Chow<sup>2</sup>  
Michael Brauer<sup>2</sup>, Chris van Netten<sup>1,2</sup>  
Sunil Varughese<sup>2</sup>, Susan Kennedy<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Health Care and Epidemiology  
Mather Building, 5804 Fairview Avenue  
University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z3

<sup>2</sup> School of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Library Processing Centre  
2206 East Mall  
University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z3

# Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our appreciation to the special effects technicians and the many other employees of television, movie, theatre, music and other productions, for their kind participation in lung function testing, allergy testing, questionnaire interviews and exposure monitoring for this study. We are also grateful to the many production managers and technical directors who welcomed us onto their production sites and encouraged their colleagues to participate in the study.

We are grateful to Rob Jackes, Linda Kinney, Beth Hanham, Marty Clausen, Ian Pratt, and Mark Thompson for their invaluable support – introducing us to key personnel, making logistical arrangements on our behalf, and identifying productions for the study. Thomas Special Effects demonstrated special effects and fog generating equipment at the outset of the study. Hollynorth supplied some of the bulk fluid samples. Victor Leung of the School of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene provided analytical chemistry laboratory support. Barbara Karlen, also of the School, provided training and support for the lung function testing.

The Board of SHAPE, IATSE Local 891, the Canadian Film and Television Production Association, the Directors Guild of Canada, the Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers, and the Vancouver Musicians' Association provided letters of support for the original study proposals to granting agencies. Members of these organizations and of the Workers' Compensation Board of BC provided helpful guidance at meetings in the planning and operational stages of the study.

This study was funded in part by the Workers' Compensation Board of BC, SHAPE, and the BC Lung Association.

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	History of the Project	1
1.2	The Issue	1
1.3	Literature	2
1.3.1	Previous research about theatrical fogs	2
1.3.2	Glycols	3
1.3.3	Glycol thermal degradation products	4
1.3.4	Mineral oils	5
1.4	Rationale for the Study	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Research Objectives</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Survey of Special Effects Technicians</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Methods	9
3.2	Results	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Constituents and Thermal Products of Glycol Fluids</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1	Introduction	12
4.2	Methods	12
4.2.1	Sample acquisition	12
4.2.2	Constituents of the fluids	13
4.2.3	Thermal products of the glycol fluids	13
4.3	Results	14
4.3.1	Constituents of the glycol fluids	14
4.3.2	Thermal products of the glycol fluids	16
4.4	Conclusions	19
<b>5</b>	<b>Evaluation of Direct-reading Aerosol Monitors</b>	<b>21</b>
5.1	Methods	21
5.2	Results	22
5.2.1	Comparisons of area measurements using direct-reading monitors to area measurements using standard methods	22
5.2.2	Comparisons of area measurements using direct-reading monitors to personal measurements using standard methods	30
5.2.3	Cost and ease of use of the direct-reading monitors	33
<b>6</b>	<b>Observed vs. Self-reported Time Spent in Visible Fog</b>	<b>35</b>
6.1	Methods	35
6.2	Results	35

<b>7</b>	<b>Levels of Exposure</b>	<b>39</b>
7.1	Methods	39
	7.1.1 Site identification	39
	7.1.2 Area air concentration measurements	39
	7.1.3 Personal exposure measurements	41
	7.1.4 Determinants of exposure to fog aerosols	42
	7.1.5 Data analysis	43
7.2	Results	44
	7.2.1 Sites and participation	44
	7.2.2 Area air concentrations	45
	7.2.3 Personal Exposure Levels	51
	7.2.4 Characteristics of sites, days, and subjects	53
	7.2.5 Determinants of personal aerosol exposure levels	56
7.3	Summary and Conclusions	57
<b>8</b>	<b>Health Effects</b>	<b>60</b>
8.1	Methods	60
	8.1.1 Participation, study design	60
	8.1.2 Ethics, informed consent	60
	8.1.3 Questionnaires	61
	8.1.4 Physiologic testing	61
	8.1.5 Comparison data	62
	8.1.6 Data management and analysis, definitions	62
8.2	Results	67
	8.2.1 Participation	67
	8.2.2 Characteristics of participants - demographics and baseline health	67
	8.2.3 Characteristics of participants: job and exposure features	68
	8.2.4 Respiratory health outcomes: compared to the external control group	73
	8.2.5 Ongoing symptoms and lung function: relationship to work factors	75
	8.2.6 Acute symptoms and lung function changes: relationship to fog exposures on the day of testing	79
8.3	Summary and Conclusions	82
<b>9</b>	<b>Summary and Recommendations</b>	<b>85</b>
9.1	Summary of Results	85
	9.1.1 Survey of special effects technicians	85
	9.1.2 Constituents and thermal products of glycol fluids	85
	9.1.3 Simple monitoring methods for use in the industry	86
	9.1.4 Levels of exposure	86
	9.1.5 Health effects	87
9.2	Strengths and Limitations of the Study	88
9.3	Recommendations	89

**Appendices** (available on request to authors)

A	Special Effects Technicians Survey Form	
B	Exposure Monitoring Data Form	
C	Acute Symptoms and Respiratory Questionnaires	